CREDITS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alameda County Board of Supervisors
Scott Haggerty, District 1
Gail Steele, District 2
Alice Lai-Bitker, District 3
Nate Miley District 4
Keith Carson, District 5

Alameda County Planning Commission
Frank Imhof, District 1
Alane Loisel, District 1
Glenn Kirby, District 2
Kathie Ready, District 3
Ken Carbone, District 4
Richard Rhodes, District 4
Mike Jacob, District 5

Alameda County Community Development Agency
Chris Bazar, Agency Director
Linda Gardner, Director, Housing and Community Development
Albert Lopez, Planning Director
Elizabeth McElligott, Assistant Planning Director
Michelle Starratt, Housing Manager
Angela Robinson Piñon, Planner
Janie Chambers, Administrative Specialist

Alameda County Redevelopment Agency
Eileen Dalton, Redevelopment Director
Marita Hawryluk, Redevelopment Manager

Contributors
Sandi Rivera, Assistant Planning Director
Rodrigo Orduña, Senior Planner
Damien Curry, Planner
Carole Kajita, Planner
Howard Lee, Planner
Richard Tarbell, Planner
Andrew Young, Planner
Pat Anekayuwat, Code Enforcement Officer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION **i**
PURPOSE OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT **i**
HOUSING ELEMENT REQUIREMENTS **i**
Housing Needs Assessment i
Analysis of Constraints on Housing ii
Sites Inventory and Capacity Analysis ii
Housing Plan and Quantified Objectives ii
Other Requirements ii
Review of the Previous Housing Element ii
CHANGES IN HOUSING ELEMENT LAW **iii**
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION **iv**
PREVIOUS PLANNING EFFORTS **iv**

CHAPTER I- HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT **1**
DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION **2**
Population Characteristics 2
Age Composition 3
GENERAL HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS **4**
Households and Household Size 4
Housing Tenure 5
Income Characteristics 6
Self Sufficiency Standard 7
Employment Trends 8
Unemployment Trends 15
HOUSING PROBLEMS **16**
Cost Burden/Overpayment Above 30% of Income 17
Overcrowding 18
SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING **19**
Large Households 19
Female Headed Households 20
Elderly and Frail Elderly 21
Persons with Disabilities 22
Homeless Persons and Families 23
Agricultural Workers 27
HOUSING STOCK **28**
Total Housing Units 28
Multifamily vs. Single Family 29
Condition and Age of Housing Stock 32
Homeownership Housing Costs 32
Rental Housing Costs 35
Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate 36
COST ANALYSIS OF PRESERVING "AT-RISK" PROJECTS **39**
AVAILABLE RESOURCES FOR PRESERVATION **40**
QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES FOR PRESERVATION OF AFFORDABLE "AT-RISK" UNITS **40**

CHAPTER II- HOUSING CONSTRAINTS 41
GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS **41**
Land Use Controls and Mitigations 41

Residential District Zoning 41
Housing for Persons with Disabilities 49
Transitional and Supportive Housing 50
Farmworker Housing 50
Manufactured Housing 50
Emergency Shelters 51
Secondary Units 51
Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Units 51
ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY CONSTRAINTS **51**
Hillsides and Slopes 52
Creeks and Watercourses 52
Fire Hazards 52
Flooding and Mudflows 53
Seismic Hazards 53
Airport Influence Areas 53
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Requirements 54
INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS **54**
Water Supply 54
Sewer/ Wastewater Services 55
Streets 56
Education 56
Parks 56
FEES AND EXACTIONS **57**
Development Impact Fees 57
On-Site and Off-Site Development Fees 59
Planning Fees 61
Processing and Permit Procedures 62
CODES AND STANDARDS **63**
Design Standards 63
Parking and On-Site Open Space Requirements 64
Growth Controls 64
CODES AND ENFORCEMENT **66**
Building Codes 66
Historic Preservation 67
ARTICLE 34 **67**
NONGOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS **66**
Housing Markets 68
Development Costs 73
Total Development Costs 74
ADDITIONAL NONGOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS **75**
Neighborhood Sentiment 75
Housing Discrimination 76

CHAPTER III- SITES INVENTORY AND CAPACITY ANALYSIS **77**
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA) **77**
Progress towards Meeting the RHNA Goals 78
Accommodating the Remaining RHNA Units 80
VACANT AND UNDERUTILIZED SITES ANALYSIS FOR MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL **81**
Redevelopment Areas 82

Methodology 82
Realistic Development Capacity 83
Small Sites 84
Mixed Use (Residential/Commercial) Sites 86
Non-Vacant and Underutilized Sites 87
Development Potential by Unincorporated Community 88
State Route 238 Study Area 88
ZONING APPROPRIATE TO ACCOMMODATE HOUSING FOR LOWER AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS 89
TRANSIT ORIENTED AND MIXED USE DISTRICTS 89
ADEQUACY OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES 89
ADEQUACY OF RESIDENTIAL SITES INVENTORY 90

CHAPTER IV- HOUSING PLAN 92
INTRODUCTION 92
Provide Adequate Sites 92
Assist in the Development of Affordable Housing and Special Needs Housing 94
Address Governmental Constraints 102
Conserve and Improve the Existing Housing Stock 104
Preserve Units at Risk 108
Promote Equal Housing Opportunities 110
Environmental Sustainability 111
SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES 116
RESOURCES 116
Financial Resources 116
Administrative Resources 122

CHAPTER V- OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION 125

CHAPTER VI- OTHER REQUIREMENTS 126
CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS AND OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS 126
NOTIFICATION OF WATER AND SEWER PROVIDERS 128
REVIEW OF CONSERVATION AND SAFETY ELEMENTS PER AB 162 128

APPENDIX A: SITES INVENTORY AND MAP
APPENDIX B: EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS ELEMENT
APPENDIX C: HOUSING PLAN SUMMARY
APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY
APPENDIX E: ACRONYMS
APPENDIX F: SOURCES
APPENDIX G: QUALIFIED ENTITIES
APPENDIX H: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS
APPENDIX I: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PREVIOUS ELEMENT
APPENDIX J: REFERENCE MAPS
APPENDIX K: EVALUATION CHECKLISTS FOR PROJECTS CREDITED UNDER ALTERNATIVE ADEQUATE SITES PROVISIONS

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table i-1: Regional Housing Need Allocation (January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2014)	ii
Table I-1: Population Growth in the Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000-2005	2
Table I-2: Population and Growth in Alameda County, 2000 - 2008	3
Table I-3: Projected Population by Age, Alameda County 2000-2010	3
Table I-4: Household Growth in Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland/Fairview, San Lorenzo, and Remaining Unincorporated Areas, 2000-2005	4
Table I-5: Household Growth in Alameda County by City, 2000-2005	4
Table I-6: Average Household Sizes, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000-2005	5
Table I-7: Tenure by Place, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000	5
Table I-8: Tenure by Jurisdiction, Alameda County, 2000	6
Table I-9: 2000 Alameda County Median Income Compared to Median Income of Unincorporated CDPs	6
Table I-10: 2008 HUD Income Limits for the Oakland PMSA	7
Table I-11: Median Income Increase 1998-2008	7
Table I-12: Self-Sufficiency Wage, Oakland PMSA, 2008	8
Table I-13: Employment Projections	8
Table I-14: Projected Job Growth by Place, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2010-2020	9
Table I-15: Comparison of Job Growth Projections	9
Table I-16: Alameda County Class of Worker, 2000	10
Table I-17: Alameda County Employees by Industry, 2000	11
Table I-18: Alameda County Employees by Occupation, 2000	11
Table I-19: Projected Job Growth by Jurisdiction, Alameda County, 2010-2020	12
Table I-20: Largest-Growing Occupations, Alameda County (Oakland-Fremont-Hayward Metropolitan Division), 2006-2016	13
Table I-21: Major Employers, Occupations, and Wages 2008, Alameda County (Oakland-Fremont-Hayward Metropolitan Division)	14
Table I-22: Unemployment Rates Unincorporated Alameda County, February 2009	15
Table I-23: Unemployment Rates by Jurisdiction, Alameda County, February 2009	15
Table I-24: Percentage of Households with Housing Problems by Place Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000	16
Table I-25: Extremely Low Income Households by CDP	16
Table I-26: Cost Burden for Extremely Low Income Households	17
Table I-27: Housing Costs as a Percentage of Household Income	18
Table I-28: Percentage of Households that are Overcrowded by Tenure, 2000	18
Table I-29: Household Size by Tenure, Unincorporated CDPs	19
Table I-30: Renter Household Size by Income, Unincorporated CDPs	19
Table I-31: Owner Household Size by Income, Unincorporated CDPs	20
Table I-32: Female Headed Households, Total of Unincorporated CDPs	20
Table I-33: Female Headed Households and Poverty, Total of Unincorporated CDPs	20
Table I-34: Elderly Householders by Tenure by Age, Total of Unincorporated CDPs	21
Table I-35: Income of Elderly Householders As a Percentage of Median Income by Census Defined Place	21
Table I-36: Elderly Households Housing Cost As a Percentage of Household Income, Total of Unincorporated CDPs	22
Table I-37: Persons with Disability by Employment Status, Total of Unincorporated CDPs	22
Table I-38: Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type, Total of Unincorporated CDPs	23
Table I-39: Homeless Information	26

Table I-40: Number of Agricultural Operations and Agricultural Workers 2007, Alameda County 27
Table I-41: Change in Number of Agricultural Workers 2002-2007, Alameda County 28
Table I-42: Total Housing Units by Place, Unincorporated Alameda County, 1990-2000 29
Table I-43: Housing Units by Type 29
Table I-44: Housing Type by Unincorporated Area, Alameda County, 2000 30
Table I-45: Percentage Share of Total Housing, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000 30
Table I-46: Housing Type by Alameda County Jurisdiction, 2008 31
Table I-47: Age of Housing Stock by Unit, Unincorporated Alameda County, 1990 32
Table I-48: 1997-2008 Affordability Index, Oakland –Fremont – Hayward Area 33
Table I-49: Median Sales Price by County, Bay Area, February 2001-2009 33
Table I-50: Single-Family Median Home Prices, Selected Alameda County Cities, 2006-2008 34
Table I-51: Condominium Median Home Prices, Selected Alameda County Cities, 2006-2008 34
Table I-52: Comparison of FMRs, Alameda County, 2001 and 2003 35
Table I-53: Reductions in FMR Rates 2003-2008 35
Table I-54: Median Rent of Available Units by Unit Type, 2009, Castro Valley, San Lorenzo, Hayward and San Leandro Market 36
Table I-55: Inventory of Subsidized Rental Housing in Unincorporated Alameda County, April 2009 38
Table II-1: Zoning Districts: Residential Development Requirements, 2009 43
Table II-2: Housing Type Permitted by Zoning District 45
Table II-3: Mixed Use Zoning Guidelines by Specific Plan 47
Table II-4: Land Uses and Zoning 48
Table II-5: Impact Fees for Single Family and Multifamily Housing in the Unincorporated Area as of November 2008 58
Table II-6: Fee Comparison 59
Table II-7: Alameda County Planning Entitlement Application Fees, 2009 61
Table II-8: Impact of Interest Rate on Mortgage Amounts 70
Table II-9: Single Family Development Costs, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2009 71
Table II-10: Single Family Development Costs, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2009 74
Table II-11:Total Multifamily Development Costs, 2009 75
Table III-1: Regional Housing Need Allocation (January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2014) 77
Table III-2: Units Completed or Approved by Affordability Level 81
Table III-3: Sample of Buildout Capacities 84
Table III-4: Summary of Mixed Use Sites in the Sites Inventory 87
Table III-5: Development Potential by Unincorporated Community 88
Table III-6: RHNA Status 91
Table IV-1: Quantified Objectives 2007-2014 116

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT

The Alameda County Housing Element serves as a policy guide to address the comprehensive housing needs of the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. State Housing Element Law requires that local jurisdictions outline the housing needs in the community, the barriers or constraints to providing that housing, and actions proposed to address these concerns over a five-year period. In addition, the State of California allocates, through local Councils of Government, each locality's "fair share housing needs" that the jurisdiction is to consider in the development of the Housing Element.

The provision of decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing for current and future residents of the unincorporated areas of Alameda County is the primary focus of the Housing Element. Additionally, the Housing Element places special emphasis on certain segments of the population, such as the elderly, the disabled, single-parent households, extremely low income and the homeless, as these groups may have more difficulty in finding decent and affordable housing due to their special needs.

The purpose of the Housing Element is to accomplish the following tasks:

- Determine the existing and projected housing needs of residents of the unincorporated areas;
- Identify adequate parcels via the site inventory process to facilitate the development of housing for various income levels;
- Establish goals and policies that guide decision-making to address housing needs, and
- Operate programs to implement the County's housing policies. These programs include activities to be undertaken by the County, as well development activities to be undertaken by the private sector in the development of housing. One of the County's goals is to ensure that government policies do not serve as a constraint to housing production.

HOUSING ELEMENT REQUIREMENTS

The Alameda County Housing Element consists of five key components that fulfill the State's requirements. These sections are briefly described below.

<u>Housing Needs Assessment</u>
Each Housing Element must address the need for housing within their community. A study of the existing housing needs within the community must include population, employment and income statistics; a review of overpayment and overcrowding statistics; information on extremely low income housing needs, and characteristics of the existing housing stock. A section on special needs population, including the elderly, disabled, homeless, large families and female headed households must be provided. The Element must provide policies and programs that address identified housing needs.

Housing element law requires all local governments to plan to meet their existing and projected

housing needs including their share of the regional housing need. In the Bay Area, the regional housing need is determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan (RHNA) process. The RHNA planning period for this Housing Element Update is 2007-2014. The RHNA process specifies the number of housing units that must be accommodated in four income categories: very low, low, moderate, and above moderate.

It should be noted that the units assigned to Alameda County through the RHNA process do not represent a production quota. Instead, the County is required to demonstrate that there is an adequate capacity for new dwelling units on vacant or underutilized sites.

Table i-1 lists the County's RHNA allocation for the 2007-2014 planning period.

Table i-1: Regional Housing Need Allocation (January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2014)

Income Category	***Extremely Low/ Very Low < 50% AMI***	***Low < 80% AMI***	***Moderate <120% AMI***	***Above Moderate >120% AMI***	***Total***
Unit Count	536	340	400	891	2,167
Percentage Distribution	24.7%	15.7%	18.5%	41.1%	100.0%

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) 2007

The County has an RHNA allocation of 536 very low-income units. Pursuant to State law (AB 2634, Lieber), the County must project the housing needs of extremely low-income households based on Census income distribution, or assume 50% of the very low-income units as extremely low-income units. In the absence of income data for the extremely low-income households, 50% of the very low-income units are assumed to be extremely low-income. Therefore, the County's RHNA of 536 very low-income units may be divided into 268 extremely low-income units and 268 very low-income units.

Analysis of Constraints on Housing

The element must address any governmental or non-governmental constraints on housing production, and where legally permissible provide the steps needed to remove governmental constraints to the development of housing.

Sites Inventory and Capacity Analysis

The element must include a detailed land inventory and analysis including a specific list of properties that provides information on zoning and General Plan designation, size of the site, existing uses, general analysis of environmental constraints, the availability of infrastructure, and a realistic assessment of development capacity.

Housing Plan and Quantified Objectives

The County must describe what current or proposed policies and actions will be taken to meet existing and projected housing needs, particularly for low and moderate income households as well as for the population with special needs. The element should address what policies the County has or will adopt to conserve, rehabilitate, and expand the supply of affordable housing. In addition, the County must estimate the maximum number of units, by income level, to be constructed, rehabilitated, and preserved over the planning period of the element.

Other Requirements
The Housing Element must also address the following items: consistency with other General Plan Elements; the notification of water and sewer providers; and the review of Conservation and Safety Elements.

Review of the Previous Housing Element
The County must review the actual results of the goals, objectives, policies, and programs adopted in the previous housing element, and analyze the differences between what was planned and what was achieved.

CHANGES IN HOUSING ELEMENT LAW

The Housing Element must also address compliance with recent changes to Housing Element Law which include the following requirements:

- Provisions for transitional housing, supportive housing, and SRO housing for the Homeless (SB 2) requires local jurisdictions to strengthen provisions for addressing the housing needs of the homeless including the identification of a zone or zones where emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing are allowed as permitted uses without a conditional use permit.

- Anti-NIMBY Regulations (AB 2511) amends several sections of general plan and housing laws. It includes provisions strengthening Anti-NIMBY protections; specifically, requires no-net loss of housing sites. The bill also added potential penalties for non-reporting of the annual General Plan progress report.

- Housing for Extremely Low Income Households (AB 2634) requires quantification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of extremely low income households. Elements must also identify zoning to encourage and facilitate supportive housing and single room occupancy SRO units.

- Water and Sewer Provider Notification (SB 1087) requires local governments to provide a copy of the adopted housing element to water and sewer providers. In addition, water and sewer providers must grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include housing units affordable to lower-income households.

- Timely Implementation of the Housing Element (AB 1233) applies to jurisdictions that failed to adopt an adequate housing element or failed to implement programs in a timely manner during the prior housing element period. If a jurisdiction is subject to this requirement, it must rezone sites within the first year of the new planning period to fulfill its RHNA obligations from the prior planning period. This is in addition to the new projected need or RHNA. Alameda County is in compliance with this statute.

- Adequate Sites Analysis (AB 2348) (Mullin, 2004) requires a more detailed inventory of sites to accommodate projected housing needs and provide greater development certainty.

- Second-Units (AB 1866) amends two sections of Government Code to encourage the creation of second-units. In relation to Housing Element law, the amendments clarify

existing housing element law to allow identification of realistic capacity for second units in addressing a locality's share of the regional housing need.

- Housing for Persons with Disabilities (SB 520) requires the Housing Element to address constraints to housing for persons with disabilities.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The inclusion of community stakeholders in the Housing Element public participation process helps to ensure that appropriate housing strategies are efficiently and effectively evaluated, developed, and implemented. The public outreach process consisted of the following strategies:

- Public Meetings - The Planning Commission established a Housing Element Subcommittee to review draft sections of the document. In total, the Subcommittee hosted five meetings to discuss the Housing Element. In order to provide adequate opportunities for the public to provide input on the Housing Element text, the Subcommittee agreed that staff would bring a working draft of chapter(s) for the public and the Subcommittee to review at each of their meetings. The Housing Element was also discussed at the Transportation and Planning Committee of the Board of Supervisors on February 9, 2009 and by the Unincorporated Services Committee of the Board on June 24, 2009.

- Public Hearings - The Planning Commission held public hearings on January 20, 2009 to initiate the preparation of the Housing Element and on July 6, 2009 to discuss the draft Housing Element in its entirety. In addition, the Board of Supervisors met on ### to discuss the adoption of the Housing Element. Public input was permitted at both of these meetings.

- World Wide Web - Alameda County created a web page to keep the community informed about the preparation of the 2009 Element. This web page provided links to the previous element, as well as documents from each of the meetings held by the Planning Commission Subcommittee.

- Outreach - Alameda County staff contacted over 200 groups and individuals via mail and e-mail to invite them to each of the public meetings/hearings, provide staff contact information, and to direct them to the 2009 Housing Element webpage.

Comments received from the public participation process are summarized in Appendix H.

PREVIOUS PLANNING EFFORTS

This is the seventh Alameda County Housing Element. The previous Alameda County Housing Element was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on October 2, 2003. The 2003 Housing Element was based on the previous Housing Element (adopted in 1990).

CHAPTER I- HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

State Housing Element Law requires that local jurisdictions outline the housing needs in their community at all income levels and for special needs populations. In order to best address a community's needs, an assessment of its existing housing stock, current populations demographics, and the potential future needs of the community must be reviewed.

The Housing Needs Assessment chapter includes:

- An analysis of population and employment trends and existing and projected housing needs for all income levels;
- An analysis of household characteristics, such as level of payment compared to ability to pay, overcrowding, and housing stock condition;
- An analysis of any special housing needs, such as those of the handicapped, elderly, large families, farm workers, families with female heads of households, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter;
- An analysis of opportunities for energy conservation with respect to residential development; and
- An analysis of existing assisted housing developments that are eligible to change from low-income housing uses during the next 10 years due to termination of subsidy contracts, mortgage prepayment, or expiration of restrictions on use.

The following section examines current and projected population figures, income levels, ethnic composition, and age composition to obtain a profile of the residents who make up the County's housing market. It also describes characteristics of the housing stock, including general supply and condition. Countywide statistics are occasionally provided to allow the reader a broader understanding of the conditions facing our communities.

Providing information on the Unincorporated Alameda County is not straight-forward because most data sources do not provide aggregate information covering the entire area. For example, the most recent Census information that is available comes from the 2000 Census. The Census Bureau defines Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol as census designated places (CDP's) and provides information on each place. However, there are additional parts of the Unincorporated County that are located outside of the CDP's. It is not always possible to come up with data covering these other areas.

Secondly, the 2000 Census is almost ten years old. In order to provide information that is as up to date as possible, 2000 Census data are augmented with information from the California Department of Finance. However, the California Department of Finance data does not provide information on the Unincorporated County specifically; rather it provides information on the County and each of the cities. Where possible, information on all the cities in Alameda County is summed up and then subtracted from the County-wide total, leaving a remainder, which represents the entire unincorporated county. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) generates population projections, and provides data on the Unincorporated Areas of the County. For those situations in which data for the unincorporated area is not available, County-wide statistics are used to present an overall understanding of the community.

Information from these sources makes it possible to develop plans and programs to address the needs of our community.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION

Population Characteristics

The population of Unincorporated Alameda County in 2008, according to the California Department of Finance, was 140,825 persons. The Unincorporated County represents approximately nine percent of the County's total population of 1,543,000. The State Department of Finance is not able to disaggregate population data for the unincorporated neighborhoods, but the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2007 data provides this break down. According to ABAG projections made in 2007, the total population of the Unincorporated County in 2005 was 136,800. These data show that the largest numerical increase in population between Census 2000 and 2005 took place in Castro Valley, which grew by 1,808 people, followed by Cherryland/Fairview, Ashland and San Lorenzo, respectively. The remaining Unincorporated Areas showed a gain of about 350 people.

Table I-1: Population Growth in the Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000-2005

Community	2000	2005	Numerical Increase	Percentage Increase
Ashland	20,793	21,200	407	2%
Castro Valley	57,292	59,100	1,808	3%
Cherryland-Fairview	26,567	27,400	833	3%
San Lorenzo	21,898	22,100	202	1%
Remainder	6,642	7,000	358	5%
Unincorporated County	**133,192**	**136,800**	**3,608**	**3%**

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007

The State Department of Finance 2008 County-wide population data indicate a population increase of 99,061 people county-wide, or six percent growth, since the 2000 Census count. The City of Oakland had the largest numerical increase of 20,617 and Dublin had the largest percentage increase of 36 percent. The Unincorporated Areas of the County grew by just over 5,000 people, or four percent of its population.

Table I-2: Population and Growth in Alameda County, 2000 - 2008

Alameda County	4/1/2000	1/1/2008	Numerical Increase	Percentage Increase
Alameda	72,259	75,823	3,564	5%
Albany	16,444	16,877	433	3%
Berkeley	102,743	106,697	3,954	4%
Dublin	30,023	46,934	16,911	36%
Emeryville	6,882	9,727	2,845	29%
Fremont	203,413	213,512	10,099	5%
Hayward	140,030	149,205	9,175	6%
Livermore	73,464	83,604	10,140	12%
Newark	42,471	43,872	1,401	3%
Oakland	399,566	420,183	20,617	5%
Piedmont	10,952	11,100	148	1%
Pleasanton	63,654	69,388	5,734	8%
San Leandro	79,452	81,851	2,399	3%
Union City	66,869	73,402	6,533	9%
Unincorporated	135,717	140,825	5,108	4%
TOTAL	**1,443,939**	**1,543,000**	**99,061**	**6%**

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2008, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2008.

Age Composition

Like much of the Bay Area, Alameda County's population has been aging as "baby boomers" move towards middle age. Census 2000 data are the most recent data on age composition. In the Alameda County 2003 Housing Element, it was reported that the 50-59 age cohort increased 63 percent between 1990 and 2000 County-wide. More recent projections from the State Department of Finance provide information through 2050 on expected Age Compositions. Between 2000 and 2010, all age cohorts below age 39 will decrease in population, while the 50-59 and 60-69 age cohorts will steadily increase across all jurisdictions within the County. This level of data is not available for the Unincorporated County.

Table I-3: Projected Population by Age, Alameda County 2000-2010

Age Cohort	2000	%	2010	%	% Change
0-9	204,056	13.88%	205,333	13.25%	-0.63%
10-19	190,811	12.98%	196,552	12.68%	-0.30%
20-29	216,341	14.72%	198,328	12.79%	-1.92%
30-39	253,593	17.25%	230,918	14.90%	-2.35%
40-49	229,195	15.59%	245,807	15.86%	0.27%
50-59	161,968	11.02%	211,483	13.64%	2.63%
60-69	88,242	6.00%	142,921	9.22%	3.22%
70-79	68,364	4.65%	69,214	4.47%	-0.19%
80+	40,508	2.76%	49,577	3.20%	0.44%
TOTAL	**1,470,155**	**100.00%**	**1,550,133**	**100.00%**	

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, Population Projections for California and Its Counties 2000-2050, by Age, Gender and Race/Ethnicity, Sacramento, California, July 2007.

GENERAL HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Households and Household Size
ABAG's Projections 2007 shows that there were 543,790 households in Alameda County in 2005, an increase of almost four percent since 2000. In the Unincorporated areas, the number of households grew overall by about two percent, with the remainder areas showing the largest increase (5.17%). Castro Valley and Cherryland/Fairview saw small amounts of growth in the number of households (2%), while San Lorenzo's and Ashland's growth in households was less than the unincorporated areas as a whole (.53% and 1.86%, respectively).

Table I-4: Household Growth in Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland/Fairview, San Lorenzo, and Remaining Unincorporated Areas, 2000-2005

Place	2000	2005	Growth	%Change
Alameda County	523,366	543,790	20,424	3.76%
Ashland	7,223	7,360	137	1.86%
Castro Valley	21,606	22,170	564	2.54%
Cherryland-Fairview	9,022	9,230	208	2.25%
San Lorenzo	7,500	7,540	40	0.53%
Remainder	2,276	2,400	124	5.17%
Unincorporated	47,627	48,700	1,073	2.20%

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007

Compared to the rest of the County, the unincorporated neighborhoods grew less than many other jurisdictions. The following table shows the household growth rate in neighboring jurisdictions between 2000 and 2005. The Unincorporated County total is inclusive of all the neighborhoods of the County, and is arrived at by taking the County-wide total and subtracting each of the cities. The largest percentage growth occurred in the City of Dublin, with an increase in households of 30.54 percent. No jurisdiction saw a decrease in the number of households.

Table I-5: Household Growth in Alameda County by City, 2000-2005

Jurisdiction	2000	2005	Growth	%Change
Dublin	9,335	13,440	4,105	30.54%
Hayward	44,979	46,490	1,511	3.25%
Livermore	26,315	28,550	2,235	7.83%
Pleasanton	23,831	25,260	1,429	5.66%
San Leandro	30,642	31,250	608	1.95%
Unincorporated	47,627	48,700	1,073	2.20%

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007

Average household size is an important indicator because it helps identify whether more or fewer people are living together in housing. When the number of persons per household rises, it can be an indicator of increased fertility rates, people "doubling up" in order to cut housing costs, or the influx of immigrant families, many of whom have large or extended families. From 2000 to 2005, the unincorporated neighborhoods had increases of less than 1 percent in household size.

Table I-6: Average Household Sizes, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000-2005

Place	2000	2005	% Change
Ashland	2.83	2.84	1%
Castro Valley	2.58	2.59	1%
Cherryland/Fairview	2.87	2.89	2%
San Lorenzo	2.92	2.93	1%
Remainder	2.87	2.88	1%
Alameda County	**2.71**	**2.72**	

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007

Similarly, average household sizes did not change much in other jurisdictions within the County. Emeryville has the smallest household size, of 1.7 persons per home, and Newark has the largest at 3.2 persons per household and an increase of 2 percent over household size from 2000.

Housing Tenure

The most recent data available regarding housing tenure (ownership rates vs. rental rates) in the Unincorporated County comes from the Census 2000. In 2000, 48 percent of the County's households were renters, while the remaining 51 percent were owners.

In 2000, the Unincorporated neighborhoods saw a higher percentage of owner-occupied housing than the County as a whole (61% vs. 51%), but between Unincorporated County neighborhoods, a great deal of variation existed. For example, Castro Valley and San Lorenzo are predominantly comprised of ownership housing, whereas a majority of housing in Ashland is rental. The following table shows the percentages of renters vs. owners by area of Unincorporated Alameda County from the Census 2000.

Table I-7: Tenure by Place, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000

Place	Renters	Owners
Ashland	67.0%	33.0%
Castro Valley	32.2%	67.8%
Cherryland/Fairview	48.2%	51.8%
San Lorenzo	21.2%	78.8%
Remainder	36.1%	63.9%
TOTAL	**38.6%**	**61.4%**

Source: 2000 Census

Table I-8: Tenure by Jurisdiction, Alameda County, 2000

Jurisdiction	Renters	Owners
Alameda	56.6%	43.4%
Albany	55.3%	44.7%
Berkeley	61.8%	38.2%
Dublin	36.6%	63.4%
Emeryville	89.9%	10.1%
Fremont	37.4%	62.6%
Hayward	51.3%	48.7%
Livermore	29.0%	71.0%
Newark	31.4%	68.6%
Oakland	62.5%	37.5%
Piedmont	9.5%	90.5%
Pleasanton	28.1%	71.9%
San Leandro	42.3%	57.7%
Union City	31.7%	68.3%
Unincorporated	38.6%	61.4%
TOTAL	48.5%	51.5%

Source: 2000 Census

Income Characteristics

The most recent information available on the unincorporated neighborhoods (Place level data) for income comes from Census 2000. The median income for Alameda County in 2000 was $67,600. In 2000, Sunol had the highest median income at $88,353, and Ashland has the lowest at $40,811 of all the unincorporated areas. Table I-9 compares incomes from each of the unincorporated area neighborhoods against the County-wide median income.

Table I-9: 2000 Alameda County Median Income Compared to Median Income of Unincorporated CDPs

Place	Median Income	Median Income as a % of Total County
Alameda County	$ 67,600	100%
Ashland	$ 40,811	60%
Castro Valley	$ 64,874	96%
Cherryland	$ 42,880	63%
Fairview	$ 76,647	113%
San Lorenzo	$ 56,170	83%
Sunol	$ 88,353	131%

Source: Alameda County HCD 2009, from 2000 Census and HUD User Data

For the year 2008, HUD's definition of annual median income was $86,100 for a household of four in the Oakland PMSA.[1] Very low-income (50% of median or below) for a household of four in the Oakland PMSA is $43,050, and low-income (80% of median or below) is $66,250.

1 According to the US Census Bureau, a primary metropolitan statistical area (PMSA) falls within metropolitan areas of more than 1 million people in it. PMSAs consist of a large urbanized county that demonstrate very strong internal economic and social links, in addition to close ties to other portions of the larger area. When PMSAs are established, the larger area of which they are component parts is designated a consolidated metropolitan statistical area (CMSA). Metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) are relatively freestanding MAs and are not closely associated with other MAs. Nonmetropolitan counties typically surround these areas.

Table I-10: 2008 HUD Income Limits for the Oakland PMSA

Persons in Household	Extremely Low (30% AMI)	Very Low (50% AMI)	Low (80% AMI)	Median (100% AMI)	Moderate (120% AMI)
1	$18,100	$30,150	$46,350	$60,300	$72,300
2	$20,700	$34,450	$53,000	$68,900	$82,600
3	$23,250	$38,750	$59,600	$77,500	$93,000
4	$25,850	$43,050	$66,250	$86,100	$103,300
5	$27,900	$46,500	$71,550	$93,000	$111,600
6	$30,000	$49,950	$76,850	$99,900	$119,800
7	$32,050	$53,400	$82,150	$106,800	$128,100
8	$34,100	$56,850	$87,450	$113,700	$136,400

Source: Alameda County HCD, Feb 2008, From HUD User Data

In the ten-year span between1998-2008, HUD's estimates of median income for the County increased from $63,300 to $86,100, an increase of $22,800, or 26.5 percent. Despite these increases, and increases in the amount of general assistance, disability income, and minimum wage; in general, incomes have not kept pace with the cost of living, especially as housing costs rose dramatically during this period.

Table I-11: Median Income Increase 1998-2008

Persons in Household	1998 Median	2008 Median	$ Increase
1	$ 44,300	$60,300	$16,000
2	$ 50,600	$68,900	$18,300
3	$ 57,000	$77,500	$20,500
4	$ 63,300	$86,100	$22,800
5	$ 68,400	$93,000	$24,600
6	$ 73,400	$99,900	$26,500
7	$ 78,500	$106,800	$28,300
8	$ 83,600	$113,700	$30,100

Source: Alameda County HCD 2009, from HUD User Data

Self Sufficiency Standard

The self-sufficiency standard (SSS) is a measure used to estimate the costs of living that families of different sizes must meet to move out of poverty. It is calculated annually by Insight Center for Community Economic Development. It calculates the amount of money working adults need to meet their basic needs without subsides of any kind. Unlike the federal poverty standard, this standard takes into account the costs of living as they vary both by family types and geographic location.

The SSS calculation includes childcare, food, transportation, medical care, clothing and miscellaneous, taxes and tax credits. Calculating the level of wages that will be necessary for families in different locales to survive can assist policymakers and others in designing welfare policies and workforce development programs. This standard can be used to assess whether welfare employment training programs increase recipients' earnings enough to create a path out of poverty. It can also help policy makers understand the impact of eliminating support services such as childcare subsidies, transportation or MediCal.

The SSS for the Oakland PMSA for 2008 shows that a hypothetical single parent household with an infant and a preschool-age child would need to earn more than $27 per hour in order to afford the cost of living in the East Bay without government subsidy. This translates into approximately $58,000 per year, or 76 percent of median income for a family of three. The following table highlights the income needed for various family types for the Oakland PMSA.

Table I-12: Self-Sufficiency Wage, Oakland PMSA, 2008

Self-Sufficiency Wage	Adult	Adult + Infant	Adult + Pre-school	Adult + Teenage	Adult + Infant + Pre-school	Adult + Infant + Pre-school + Teenage	2 Adults + Infant + Pre-school	2 Adults + Pre-school + Teenage
Household Size	1	2	2	2	3	4	4	4
Hourly	$11.66	$20.70	$20.82	$15.14	$27.87	$33.59	$15.36	$12.42
Monthly	$2,052	$3,643	$3,664	$2,665	$4,905	$5,911	$5,406	$4,374
Annually	$24,630	$43,716	$43,974	$31,978	$58,854	$70,934	$64,871	$52,482

Source: Insight Center for Community Economic Development (formerly NEDLC), 2008

Employment Trends

The Association of Bay Area Governments provides the following information in Projections 2007 for employed residents in 2000 and 2010. Table I-13 below shows projected employed residents for 2010 compared to Census Data from 2000. As a whole, the unincorporated area will see an increase of 2% employment growth for its residents between 2000 and 2010.

Table I-13: Employment Projections

Employed Residents	2000	2010	Numerical Increase	Percentage Increase
Ashland	9,421	9,680	259	2.68%
Castro Valley	29,762	30,440	678	2.23%
Cherryland/Fairview	12,459	12,680	221	1.74%
San Lorenzo	10,099	9,940	(159)	-1.60%
Remainder	3,455	3,810	355	9.32%
Total	65,196	66,550	1,354	2.03%

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007

According to Projections 2007, in the Unincorporated neighborhoods of the County the number of jobs was expected to increase by eight percent by 2020, which, on average, is half that of incorporated jurisdictions (16%). This information comes from data created before the current downturn in the economy. Only time will tell if the jobs projected by ABAG will be created.

As shown in Table I-14 below, during the same period, the jobs-per-capita ratio is expected to decrease slightly from about 0.37 to 0.35 jobs per person. Ashland is expected to increase in jobs per employed person, in contrast to most of the other areas in the Unincorporated County that will experience a declining jobs-to-employed-residents ratio.

Table I-14: Projected Job Growth by Place, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2010-2020

					Jobs per Employed Resident	
Place	**Total Jobs 2010**	**Total Jobs 2020**	**Job Growth 2010-2020**	**Rate**	**2010**	**2020**
Ashland	2,770	5,870	3,100	112%	0.29	0.53
Castro Valley	12,400	13,980	1,580	13%	0.41	0.41
Cherryland/Fairview	2,510	2,710	200	8%	0.20	0.19
San Lorenzo	3,410	3,510	100	3%	0.34	0.32
Remainder	3,580	3,560	-20	-1%	0.94	0.79
TOTAL	**24,520**	**26,430**	**1,910**	**8%**	**0.37**	**0.35**

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007

At public hearings of the Housing Element, Planning Commissioners raised questions about the significantly higher growth rate for jobs in Ashland as compared to other unincorporated neighborhoods. After reviewing the data in detail, 1,770 of the 3,100 new jobs between 2010 and 2020 in Ashland come from the Health Care, Education and Recreation category. It is likely that the projected increase in jobs is due to the presence of the Fairmount Hospital campus in Ashland. However, given the large discrepancy, once Projection 2009 data was available, this same information was reviewed and the following chart added as a comparison.

Table I-15: Comparison of Job Growth Projections

					Jobs per Employed Resident	
Place	**Total Jobs 2010**	**Total Jobs 2020**	**Job Growth 2010-2020**	**Rate**	**2010**	**2020**
Ashland	3,250	4,510	1,260	39%	0.35	0.45
Castro Valley	11,650	13,050	1,400	12%	0.39	0.36
Cherryland/Fairview	2,500	2,900	400	16%	0.20	0.21
San Lorenzo	3,260	3,430	170	5%	0.34	0.35
Remainder	3,420	3,560	140	4%	0.94	0.71
TOTAL - P2009	**24,080**	**27,450**	**3,370**	**14%**	**0.37**	**0.37**
Total - P2007	24,520	29,630	4,960	20%	0.37	0.35
Difference	(440)	(2,180)	(1,740)	-7%	0.00	0.02

Source: ABAG Projections 2007 and Projections 2009

Comparing Projections 2009 data to Projections 2007 data, we see an overall drop of 440 expected jobs in 2010 and 2,180 drop in 2020, which reflects the state of the economy in 2009. In addition, the Job Growth Rate drops from 20% down to 14%. Alternatively, Projections 2009

expects the number of jobs per employed resident to increases slightly by 2%, demonstrating a small expected increase in local jobs for unincorporated community residents.

Finally, the exceptionally high job growth seen in Ashland is tempered, decreasing from 3,100 jobs down to 1,260 jobs or a drop from 112% increase to only a 39% increase.

Within Alameda County, there were approximately 635,840 employed persons over the age of 16 as of 2000. Of those, 75 percent worked in private industry, 16 percent worked in the public sector (including local government, state government and federal government) and 7 percent were self employed.

Table I-16: Alameda County Class of Worker, 2000

CLASS OF WORKER - Employed persons 16 years and over	**Number**	**%**
Total Alameda County	**635,840**	**100.0%**
Private wage and salary workers	479,393	75.4%
Government workers	106,373	16.7%
Local government workers	*47,920*	*45.0%*
State government workers	*29,648*	*27.9%*
Federal government workers	*28,805*	*27.1%*
Self-employed workers	47,726	7.5%
Unpaid family workers	2,348	0.4%

Source: 2000 Census

According to the 2000 Census, the largest employment sectors within Alameda County were from Retail Trade (15.6%) and Manufacturing (15.7% combined of durable non-durable goods). The next largest employment sectors were Professional and Related Services (9.5%) and Educational Services (8.4%). Health Services (7.5%) along with Finance, Insurance and Real Estate (7.4%) are the third largest categories.

Table I-17: Alameda County Employees by Industry, 2000

INDUSTRY - Employed Persons 16 years and over	Number	%
Total Alameda County	**635,840**	**100.0%**
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	6,470	1.0%
Mining	1,122	0.2%
Construction	36,508	5.7%
Manufacturing, nondurable goods	32,533	5.1%
Manufacturing, durable goods	67,647	10.6%
Transportation	37,595	5.9%
Communications and other public utilities	19,031	3.0%
Wholesale trade	31,396	4.9%
Retail trade	99,205	15.6%
Finance, insurance, and real estate	47,121	7.4%
Business and repair services	38,561	6.1%
Personal services	17,730	2.8%
Entertainment and recreation services	9,356	1.5%
Health services	47,760	7.5%
Educational services	53,305	8.4%
the professional and related services	60,183	9.5%
Public administration	30,317	4.8%

Source: Census 2000

The Census Employees by Occupation data shows that Administrative Support (17.9%) and Professional Specialty Occupations (17.1%) represent the largest number of employees. Executive, Administrative and Managerial occupations represent 15.1% of the employed persons.

Table I-18: Alameda County Employees by Occupation, 2000

OCCUPATION - Employed Persons 16 years and over	Number	%
Total Alameda County	**635,840**	**100.0%**
Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations	96,307	15.1%
Professional specialty occupations	108,707	17.1%
Technicians and related support occupations	31,631	5.0%
Sales occupations	72,021	11.3%
Administrative support occupations, including clerical	113,518	17.9%
Private household occupations	2,763	0.4%
Protective service occupations	9,874	1.6%
Service occupations, except protective and household	57,354	9.0%
Farming, forestry, and fishing occupations	6,277	1.0%
Precision production, craft, and repair occupations	63,979	10.1%
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	30,283	4.8%
Transportation and material moving occupations	21,476	3.4%
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	21,650	3.4%

Source: Census 2000

According to the ABAG Projections 2007, a total of 114,530 new jobs are anticipated to be created in Alameda County between 2010 and 2020, as shown in Table I-18 below. The largest job growth is expected in Oakland (24,750 jobs), followed by Fremont (16,650). During this

period, the highest growth rate is projected in the Cities of Union City (45.80%), Dublin (38.76%), Livermore (29.97%), and Alameda (27.99%).

By 2010, 65 percent of all jobs in the County are projected to be located in the Cities of Berkeley, Hayward, Fremont and Oakland. Oakland alone is projected to account for 30% of Alameda County jobs. Readers should note that these projections were made by ABAG before the current economic downturn.

Table I-19: Projected Job Growth by Jurisdiction, Alameda County, 2010-2020

					Jobs per Employed Resident	
Place	**Total Jobs 2010**	**Total Jobs 2020**	**Job Growth 2010-2020**	**Rate**	**2010**	**2020**
Alameda	29,870	38,230	8,360	27.99%	0.74	0.82
Albany	5,430	5,660	230	4.24%	0.59	0.55
Berkeley	78,380	82,150	3,770	4.81%	1.35	1.27
Dublin	22,910	31,790	8,880	38.76%	0.95	0.97
Emeryville	21,140	23,800	2,660	12.58%	3.6	3.06
Fremont	97,530	114,130	16,600	17.02%	0.9	0.9
Hayward	74,530	85,660	11,130	14.93%	1.09	1.09
Livermore	37,600	48,870	11,270	29.97%	0.82	0.85
Newark	21,930	23,720	1,790	8.16%	1.02	0.95
Oakland	218,350	243,100	24,750	11.34%	1.18	1.11
Piedmont	2,100	2,120	20	0.95%	0.4	0.37
Pleasanton	63,330	72,150	8,820	13.93%	1.64	1.55
San Leandro	43,540	49,770	6,230	14.31%	1.1	1.12
Union City	21,880	31,900	10,020	45.80%	0.63	0.76
TOTAL	**738,520**	**853,050**	**114,530**	**15.51%**	**1.08**	**1.05**

Source: ABAG, Projections 2007

Table I-19 shows the occupations that will have the greatest number of new jobs created within the Oakland-Fremont-Hayward Metropolitan Division[2] between 2006 and 2016. Although a significant number of new jobs are expected to be created in the next few years, a large portion of them will be in low-wage service occupations. Six of the ten occupations projected to have the highest number of openings during 2006-2016 have median hourly wages of less than $12. Only registered nurses will earn wages in the moderate income category. This trend indicates that job growth in the County is likely to increase the demand for affordable housing.

2 The term metropolitan division is used to refer to a county or group of closely-tied contiguous counties that serve as a distinct employment region within a metropolitan statistical area that has a population core of at least 2.5 million. While a metropolitan division is a subdivision of a larger metropolitan statistical area, it often functions as a distinct social, economic, and cultural area within the larger region.

Table I-20: Largest-Growing Occupations, Alameda County (Oakland-Fremont-Hayward Metropolitan Division), 2006-2016

Occupation	Openings	Median Hourly Wage	Median Annual Wage	% of Median Income	Income Category
Salespersons, Retail	14,060	$10.76	$23,376	39%	Very Low
Cashiers	12,390	$9.98	$20,756	34%	Very Low
Personal and Home Care Aides	11,340	$11.76	$24,470	41%	Very Low
Waiters and Waitresses	9,250	$8.68	$18,045	30%	Extremely Low
Customer Service Representatives	6,380	$18.05	$37,521	62%	Low
Office Clerks, General	6,320	$15.77	$32,800	54%	Low
Registered Nurses	5,840	$45.03	$93,646	155%	Above Moderate
Combined Food Preparation and Serving Workers, Including Fast Food	5,350	$8.73	$18,168	30%	Extremely Low
Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers, Hand	5,000	$12.27	$25,515	42%	Very Low
Counter Attendant, Cafeteria, Food Concession, and Coffee shop	4,790	$8.79	$18,280	30%	Extremely Low

Source: California Employment Development Department, 2009

Table I-20 below shows the major employers in Alameda County in 2008, along with the typical occupations in these companies and the occupations' mean annual wages for the metropolitan area. The healthcare industry is very strong, and the major employers include Alta Bates Medical Center, Kaiser Permanente, Washington Hospital, and Novartis. The typical occupations and wages of the hospitals include medical secretaries who earn about $36,193, nurses who earn around $93,585 and doctors who earn over $145,600. The government and educational institutions also employ large numbers of people in the County. Alameda County as a whole employs around 9,000 people in a wide range of positions. The law enforcement division of the County is a major employer in and of itself. Dispatchers and police officers are two of the typical jobs at the Sheriff's Department, earning approximately $58,571 and $82,477 respectively. At the University of California Berkeley, the teachers/professors earn between $68,799 to $113,222. Teachers' aides earn about $30,815. Besides the jobs that are specific to each employer, all companies hire administrative and customer service staff. The majority are staff who earn between $35,000 and $50,000.

Table I-21: Major Employers, Occupations, and Wages 2008, Alameda County (Oakland-Fremont-Hayward Metropolitan Division)

Employer and Occupations	Mean Annual Wages
Alameda County Law Enforcement	
Police officers	$82,477
Dispatchers	$58,571
Alta Bates/Kaiser/Washington Hospitals/Medical Clinics	
Medical secretaries	$36,193
Radiology and laboratory technicians	$42,000-$70,829
Registered nurses	$93,585
Physicians	$145,600+
Lawrence Laboratory	
Computer Support	$55,642
Computer scientists, engineers and physicists	$102,824-$129,015
East Bay Water Municipal District	
Biologists	$88,714
Water and waste treatment operators	$68,487
Meter Readers	$56,129
New United Motors	
Welders and machine assemblers	$29,387-$43,443
Industrial Engineers	$91,000
California Department of Transportation	
Civil engineers	$83,832
Planners	$77,792
UC Berkeley	
Teachers	$68,799-$113,222
Teachers Assistants	$30,815
Novartis Vaccine and Diagnostics	
Chemists, scientists, and bioengineers	$70,993-$88,888
Sales representatives	$78,044
Bay Area Rapid Transit	
Mechanics	$56,409
Mechanical, civil, and electrical engineers	$83,832-$92,651

*See Alta Bates Medical Center

Source: Alameda County HCD 2009 from California Department of Labor, www.dot.ca.gov, www.ebmud.com, www.bart.gov, www.llnl.gov

Because the major employers offer a wide range of jobs at a wide range of incomes, various levels of housing affordability are required. There are many employees earning $46,350 or less, which is 80% of the Area Median Income and is considered low-income. The Fair Market Rent (FMR) for a two-bedroom apartment is $1,239 as of 2008. To afford this level of rent and utilities (paying 30% of income on housing), a household must earn $4,130 monthly or $49,560 annually. Therefore, support for the creation of housing that is affordable for low income persons will continue to be needed in the County.

Unemployment Trends

As a result of the downturn in the housing market, the credit crunch, and the overall economic downturn, unemployment rates have increased significantly in the County through the beginning of 2009. The following table shows unemployment for the unincorporated neighborhoods of the County as of February 2009. Within the Unincorporated Areas, the overall unemployment rate of 8% is less than the County-wide (9.7%) and State totals (10.9%). However, unemployment rates vary widely between areas of the Unincorporated County. Cherryland has recently experienced an unemployment rate of 15.5%, the highest rate among all of the jurisdictions in the County. Castro Valley's unemployment rate of 5.8% is one of the lowest in the County.

Table I-22: Unemployment Rates Unincorporated Alameda County, February 2009

Place	Labor Force	Employment	# Unemployed	Rate
Ashland	10,400	9,300	1,100	10.70%
Castro Valley	31,300	29,500	1,800	5.80%
Cherryland	6,900	5,900	1,100	15.50%
Fairview	5,400	5,000	400	6.70%
San Lorenzo	10,800	10,000	700	6.80%
Remainder	7,500	6,900	600	8.00%
TOTAL	72,300	66,600	5,700	8.00%

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information, 2009

Looking at Alameda County as a whole, Oakland has the highest number of unemployed people (30,400), as well as the highest percentage of unemployment (14.7%) of any city in the County. Its unemployment rate is higher than the State-wide average (10.9%). The lowest unemployment rate of all the cities can be found in Albany and Piedmont (3.8% and 4.8%, respectively).

Table I-23: Unemployment Rates by Jurisdiction, Alameda County, February 2009

Jurisdictions	Labor Force	Employment	# Unemployed	Rate
Alameda	40,700	38,000	2,700	6.70%
Albany	9,100	8,800	300	3.80%
Berkeley	60,100	54,500	5,500	9.20%
Dublin	15,700	14,800	900	5.90%
Emeryville	4,600	4,300	300	7.20%
Fremont	111,800	104,000	7,800	7.00%
Hayward	71,900	64,100	7,800	10.80%
Livermore	41,900	39,300	2,700	6.30%
Newark	22,900	20,800	2,100	9.00%
Oakland	207,200	176,800	30,400	14.70%
Piedmont	5,500	5,200	300	4.80%
Pleasanton	36,000	34,300	1,800	4.90%
San Leandro	42,600	38,500	4,100	9.60%
Union City	35,100	31,900	3,200	9.10%
Unincorporated	72,300	66,600	5,700	8.00%
TOTAL	**777,400**	**701,900**	**75,500**	**9.70%**

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information, 2009

HOUSING PROBLEMS

Housing problems are defined as overcrowding, overpayment for housing cost, substandard conditions, or any combination of these three factors.[3] Census data from 2000 show that between 21 percent (Sunol) and 49 percent (Ashland) of households in the unincorporated neighborhoods had housing problems. By contrast, 42 percent of households in the County as a whole had housing problems in 2000.

Table I-24: Percentage of Households with Housing Problems by Place Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000

Place	Total Households	% Households with Housing Problems
Ashland	7,156	49.8%
Castro Valley	21,598	34.0%
Cherryland	4,585	47.5%
Fairview	3,197	34.4%
San Lorenzo	7,444	34.3%
Sunol	425	21.4%

Source: Alameda County HCD April 2009, State of the Cities Data Systems: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) 2000 Data.

Housing problems are more acute for extremely low income households, or those earning less than 30% of Area Median Income. In the 2000 Census, Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol census defined places reported a total of 2,729 extremely low income households and 1,724 very low income households. Table I-24 below details the number of extremely low income households and very low income households in each of the Unincorporated County neighborhoods.

Table I-25: Extremely Low Income Households by CDP

Total Renters							
Household Income	Ashland	Castro Valley	Cherryland	Fairview	San Lorenzo	Sunol	Total
<= 30% MFI*	998	739	583	77	317	15	2,729
>30% to 50% MFI	188	760	530	60	182	4	1,724
>50% to 80% MFI	843	1,363	712	77	299	-	3,294
Total Owners							
<=30% MFI	332	921	152	106	403	20	1,934
>30% to 50% MFI	284	1,121	137	135	695	-	2,372
>50% to 80% MFI	388	1,498	308	272	749	24	3,239

Source: Alameda County HCD April 2009, State of the Cities Data Systems: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) 2000 Data.

*MFI=Median Family Income

3 Overpayment – or cost burden – is the extent to which gross housing costs, including utilities, exceeds 30% of gross household income. Severe overpayment is when these costs exceed 50% of gross household income.

Cost Burden/Overpayment Above 30% of Income

Cost burden – also known as overpayment for housing – is a significant problem for many Alameda County residents, especially as the housing values shot up in the past few years. As housing becomes increasingly scarce, people are required to spend more and more of their income for housing. To generate information on households and how much they spent on their housing costs, we reviewed data from the Census Defined Places (CDP's) of Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol and added the totals of all six of the census defined places. Table I-25 below represents the sum of all CDP's, and is not inclusive of unincorporated areas that do not fall within those Census Defined Places.

In the renter category, almost 80 percent of extremely low income tenants are paying more than 30% of their income in rent in all of the census defined places. Of those same renter households, over 60 percent of them are paying more than half of their income towards their monthly rental payment.

Table I-26: Cost Burden for Extremely Low Income Households

Income Category	Total Renters		Total Owners	
Household Income <=30% MFI	2,729	100%	1,934	100%
% with any housing problems	2,243	82%	1,314	68%
% Cost Burden >30%	2,154	79%	1,294	67%
% Cost Burden >50%	1,763	65%	1,050	54%
Household Income >30% to <=50% MFI	1,724	100%	2,372	100%
% with any housing problems	1,464	85%	1,051	44%
% Cost Burden >30%	1,276	74%	1,029	43%
% Cost Burden >50%	424	25%	682	29%
Household Income >50% to <=80% MFI	3,294	100%	3,239	100%
% with any housing problems	1,818	55%	1,566	48%
% Cost Burden >30%	1,375	42%	1,447	45%
% Cost Burden >50%	136	4%	552	17%

Source: Alameda County HCD April 2009, State of the Cities Data Systems: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) 2000 Data

In the ownership category, the situation is slightly less difficult. Owners tend to spend less of their income on housing payments, although, a large percentage of those at extremely low incomes are still paying more than recommended on housing payments. Sixty-eight percent have a housing problem of some kind, 67% are paying more than 30 percent of their income in mortgage, and 54 percent are paying more than half of their income towards mortgage.

The State Department of Housing and Community Development require that we present this information as a percentage of household income, and also in real dollars. In Table I-26 below, incomes are charted by tens of thousands of dollars per year. The table shows that overpayment in housing costs are most extreme in the households earning below $10,000 per year (for instance Social Security recipients), but that there are a large number of households earning just below $50,000 a year which are also overpaying for their housing.

Table I-27: Housing Costs as a Percentage of Household Income

Income Range	Total Households for CD Places	% of Total Households	# Overpaying for Housing	% by Income category
Owner Occupied Units				
$0-10,000	752	3%	564	75%
$10,000-19,999	1,656	6%	752	45%
$20,000-34,999	2,718	10%	1,112	41%
$35,000-49,999	3,289	13%	1,634	50%
$50,000 +	17,720	68%	3,674	21%
Subtotal	26,135	100%	7,736	30%
Renter-Occupied Units				
$0-10,000	1,397	8%	1,042	75%
$10,000-19,999	1,851	11%	1,614	87%
$20,000-34,999	3,267	20%	2,283	70%
$35,000-49,999	3,572	22%	1,249	35%
$50,000 +	6,414	39%	382	6%
Subtotal	16,501	100%	6,570	40%
TOTAL	**42,636**		**14,306**	**34%**

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009, from Census 2000 Summary Tape File 3A- H73 and H97
Note: A small number of households did not report and therefore are not accounted for. Figures may slightly differ for other U.S. Census estimates for Total Households.

Overcrowding

The definition of overcrowding depends upon the type of housing assistance program and source of funding involved. For the purposes of this discussion, the federal Census definition of more than two persons per room will be used. County-wide, 11 percent of renter households were overcrowded in 2000 as opposed to 3 percent of owner households. In the Unincorporated Areas, differences exist between neighborhoods, with Ashland (13.92%) and Cherryland (13.63%) having larger percentages of overcrowded households than the County-wide percentage in the renter category, and Castro Valley (5.55%) and Fairview (6.07%) with lower percentages than the County-wide number. In the ownership category, the percentages of overcrowded households in Castro Valley (5.85%) and San Lorenzo (4.92%) are larger than the County-wide percentage, while percentages in the remaining unincorporated neighborhoods are lower than County-wide percentages.

Table I-28: Percentage of Households that are Overcrowded by Tenure, 2000

	Over-crowded Renter Households	Total Renter Households	% Over-crowded Renters	Over-crowded Owner Households	Total Owner Households	% Over-crowded Owners
Alameda County	26,970	237,060	11.38%	9,587	286,306	3.35%
Ashland	643	4,619	13.92%	189	2,597	0.07%
Castro Valley	366	6,589	5.55%	152	15,064	5.85%
Cherryland	424	3,110	13.63%	130	1,498	0.86%
Fairview	33	544	6.07%	18	2,681	1.20%
San Lorenzo	168	1,561	10.76%	132	5,971	4.92%
Remainder	192	1,425	13.47%	92	2,862	1.54%

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009 from 2000 Census

SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Special Needs Households are defined as those with disabled members, large households, female-headed households, farm or agricultural workers, the homeless or the elderly.

Large Households

The following table shows the numbers and percentages of large households for the Census Defined Places (CDP's) of Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol combined. The chart shows that of the 39,545 households in these CDP's, the vast majority are small households of four or fewer persons (33,801) as opposed to large households of five or more persons (5,744). In both small and large household categories, the majority are owners. These data represent the overall tenure rates discussed on page 5.

Table I-29: Household Size by Tenure, Unincorporated CDPs

	1-4 persons		5+ Persons		*Total	
	Number	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Owner	22,640	67.0%	3,395	59.1%	26,035	65.8%
Renter	11,161	33.0%	2,349	40.9%	13,510	34.2%
TOTAL	**33,801**	**100%**	**5,744**	**100%**	**39,545**	**100%**

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009, from CHAS Data 2000

Looking at the income level of large and small households shows that 48 percent of large households are low income (80% or below Area Median Income) as compared to 21 percent of ownership households. Similarly, 43 percent of small renter households versus 25 percent of small ownership households are low income. These are shown in the two tables below.

Table I-30: Renter Household Size by Income, Unincorporated CDPs

	1- 4 persons		5+ Persons		** Total	
Income Level	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Very-Low (Below 50% of AMI)	3,052	27.30%	714	30.40%	3,766	27.90%
** Extremely Low (Below 30% of AMI)*	1,648	14.80%	318	13.50%	1,966	14.60%
Low (51% to 80% of AMI)	1,815	16.30%	438	18.60%	2,253	16.70%
Moderate and Above (81% +)	4,646	41.60%	879	37.40%	5,525	40.90%
TOTAL	**11,161**	**100.00%**	**2,349**	**100.00%**	**13,510**	**100.00%**

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009, from CHAS Data 2000

Notes:*subset of 50% or below AMI, ** does not include "all other households" data and therefore may not match census or CHAS data exactly.

Table I-31: Owner Household Size by Income, Unincorporated CDPs

Income Level	1- 4 persons		5+ Persons		** Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very-Low (Below 50% of AMI)	3,535	15.60%	273	8.00%	3,535	15.60%
* *Extremely Low (Below 30% of AMI)*	1,515	6.70%	118	3.50%	1,515	6.70%
Low (51% to 80% of AMI)	2,462	10.90%	454	13.40%	2,462	10.90%
Moderate and Above (81% +)	15,128	66.80%	2,550	75.10%	15,129	66.80%
TOTAL	**22,640**	**100.00%**	**3,395**	**100.00%**	**22,641**	**100.00%**

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009, from CHAS Data 2000

Notes:* subset of 50% or below AMI, ** does not include "all other households" data and therefore may not match census or CHAS data exactly

Female Headed Households

According to the 2000 Census, of the more than 31,557 households with children in the Census Defined Places of Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol, almost 18 percent had a single female at its head.

Table I-32: Female Headed Households, Total of Unincorporated CDPs

Householder Type	Number	Percent of Total HH w/children
Total Households with Children	31,557	100.00%
Total Female Headed Householders	5,675	17.98%
Female Heads with Children under 18	2,992	9.48%
Female Heads w/out Children under 18	2,683	8.50%

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: P10 and P90)

In addition, of the 1,532 households living below the poverty level, slightly more than 50 percent are Female Headed.

Table I-33: Female Headed Households and Poverty, Total of Unincorporated CDPs

Householder Type	Number	Percent of Total HH w/children
Total Families Under the Poverty Level	1,532	100.00%
Female Headed Households Under the Poverty Level	791	51.63%

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: P10 and P90)

Elderly and Frail Elderly

Elderly Households are defined as those with someone aged 62 years or older living in the household. In the Census Defined Places of Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol, there are 5,417 elderly households. Of those, 4,337 are owners and 1,080 are renters.

Table I-34: Elderly Householders by Tenure by Age, Total of Unincorporated CDPs

Householder Age	Owners	Renters	Total
65-74 years	1,685	609	2,294
75 plus years	3,751	754	4,505
TOTAL	**4,337**	**1,080**	**5,417**

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: H14 and P87)

The problem for many elderly lower income people is that they spend a large portion of their fixed income on housing, which leaves little money to pay for other life necessities, such as medical care and prescriptions, food, or transportation. For the disabled elderly population, the challenge of finding permanent housing with supportive services can be even greater. The death of a spouse or partner compounds the problem because the survivor often has reduced income without a reduction in housing cost. Many are faced with the choice of moving with limited housing choices or losing the ability to live independently. Subsidized housing units for low-income elderly people within the County have significant waiting lists, which puts this population at risk of becoming homeless if they are unable to obtain affordable housing.

In all of the Census Defined Places of Unincorporated Alameda County, a significant percentage of elderly households had incomes lower than the county-wide median income. As the elderly age, their fixed incomes decrease in value, and are a smaller percentage of median income.

Table I-35: Income of Elderly Householders As a Percentage of Median Income by Census Defined Place

	Ashland	Castro Valley	Cherryland	Fairview	San Lorenzo	Sunol
Median Income of Householder 65 to 74 years	$26,818	$44,942	$36,250	$63,516	$39,857	$53,750
Percentage of County-wide Median 2000	40%	66%	54%	94%	59%	80%
Median Income of Householder 75 years and over	$21,226	$35,036	$27,500	$43,942	$25,083	$44,318
Percentage of County-wide Median 2000	31%	52%	41%	65%	37%	66%

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009, from Census 2000

As shown in the table below, housing costs for elderly households often represent a significant portion of their incomes. In renter households, the vast majority are paying more than 35% of their incomes for housing. Ownership households tend to have more stability, with the largest portion paying less than 20 percent of their monthly income on housing.

Table I-36: Elderly Households Housing Cost As a Percentage of Household Income, Total of Unincorporated CDPs

Housing Cost as a Percentage of Income	Elderly Owner Households	Elderly Renter Households
Less than 20 percent	4,845	177
20 to 24 percent	575	171
25 to 29 percent	396	251
30 to 34 percent	354	122
35 percent or more	1,283	984
Not computed	78	129

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009, from 2000 Census

Persons with Disabilities

There are a wide variety of disabilities experienced by County residents, including mobility limitations or more acute physical disability, mental disability, substance abuse problems and/or HIV/AIDS. Each of these types of disabilities brings with it a myriad of needs, from specialized services to variations in accessibility needs.

Social Security Income (SSI) is one of the main sources of income for disabled households. Without affordable housing, people with disabilities must often live at home with aging parents, in homeless shelters, in institutions or nursing homes, or be forced into substandard housing.

In the Census Defined Places of Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol, there were a total of 21,698 persons, or 18 percent of the total population, reporting some type of disability to the 2000 Census. Of those, 40 percent had some form of employment, 29 percent were not employed, and 29 percent were elderly.

Table I-37: Persons with Disability by Employment Status, Total of Unincorporated CDPs

	Number	Percent
Total Population (Civilian Non-institutional)	**114,948**	**100.00%**
Total Persons with a Disability	21,698	18.88%
*Age 5-64, Employed Persons with a Disability	8,863	40.85%
*Age 5-64, Not Employed Persons with a Disability	6,351	29.27%
*Persons Age 65 Plus with a Disability	6,484	29.88%

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009 from Census 2000 SF 3: P42

* Percentage of total disabled population

Many people with disabilities have high medical and/or equipment costs, which when combined with high housing costs can take up most of the household's incomes. Persons with mobility disabilities require accessible housing – both to live in and to be able to visit friends and neighbors and participate in the community. Access to transit is also particularly important to many people with disabilities as they may be unable to drive or families may not be able to afford accessible vehicles.

Table I-38: Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type, Total of Unincorporated CDPs

	Number	Percent
Total Disabilities	38,506	100.00%
Total Disabilities for Ages 5-15	1,166	3.03%
Sensory Disability	85	0.22%
Physical disability	182	0.47%
Mental disability	730	1.90%
Self-care disability	169	0.44%
Total Disabilities for Ages 16-64	24,713	64.18%
Sensory Disability	1,569	4.07%
Physical disability	4,073	10.58%
Mental disability	2,511	6.52%
Self-care disability	1,256	3.26%
Go-outside-home disability	5,496	14.27%
Employment disability	9,808	25.47%
Total Disabilities for Ages 65 and Over	12,627	32.79%
Sensory Disability	2,050	5.32%
Physical disability	4,335	11.26%
Mental disability	1,598	4.15%
Self-care disability	1,346	3.50%
Go-outside-home disability	3,298	8.56%

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009, from Census 2000 SF 3: P41

Homeless Persons and Families

Homelessness typically occurs because housing is not affordable or there is insufficient income to weather a personal crisis such as loss of employment or a family illness and continue to pay for housing. Mental disabilities, domestic violence, and alcohol or drug addiction and other problems are contributing factors. Lack of affordable housing, inadequate incomes, and insufficient access to social services are the core causes of homelessness. Homeless people live in cars, parks, abandoned buildings, on the streets, in emergency shelters, doubled up with friends and family members, and in transitional and supportive housing.

County-wide Homeless Count

Beginning in 2003, Alameda County has conducted a point-in-time biennial homeless count as per the HUD directive. The 2003 Count, and subsequent counts, relied on a statistical sampling methodology that has been proven to be the most effective in enumerating homeless populations. One of the drawbacks to this methodology is that it requires a relatively large survey sample to be statistically relevant, and there was not enough data to break down the numbers by jurisdiction boundaries. For instance, in the 2003 Count, the sample sizes were large enough in Berkeley and Oakland to enumerate those cities individually, but for the balance of the County (Albany, Alameda, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Piedmont, Pleasanton, Newark, San Leandro, Union City and the Unincorporated County) the data was not sufficient to provide information specific to each jurisdiction. These other cities were placed into two “sub regions”—“North and other mid-county” (Albany, Alameda, Emeryville, Piedmont, San Leandro, Hayward and Unincorporated Neighborhoods of Castro Valley and San Lorenzo) and

"South and East County" (Union City, Fremont, Newark, Pleasanton, Dublin, Livermore and Unincorporated Neighborhood of Sunol).

The 2003 Count required a vast amount of resource to conduct, but produced a large amount of meaningful data, more than what was required by HUD. Due to a lack of resources, the County has been unable to replicate this depth of data on a biennial basis, and subsequent homeless counts (until 2009) relied on only those HUD mandated elements and definitions. In January 2009, the full count replicating the 2003 Count was conducted. Unfortunately, final data from that count will not be available until late 2009.

HMIS

Since 2003, Alameda County has implemented a County-wide Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) as a requirement for receipt of HUD funding. To date, more than 10,000 unduplicated clients have been entered from 24 services agencies in Alameda County. This database collects a large amount of demographic data on homeless populations, and provides similar levels of information as the 2003 and 2009 Homeless Counts.

While the HMIS data is the most current data available, it has limitations. First, HMIS only contains information from those homeless agencies that enter data into the system. Only those homeless providers which receive funding from HUD are mandated to participate in HMIS, so those that don't receive HUD funding may choose not to participate. Also, for confidentiality reasons, homeless providers which specifically provide services to victims of Domestic Violence are not required to participate in HMIS since the passage of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Finally, children under the age of 18 (who account for a large number of the homeless population county-wide), are not tracked as thoroughly as adults and the information entered into HMIS on them is much less detailed.

Second, HMIS only collects data on those homeless populations that receive services. Homeless populations which do not receive services (and many do not) are not included in HMIS (these populations are included in the Homeless Count each year).
Third, the number of homeless counted in the 2003 census and the number of homeless in the HMIS system to not match, and there is no way to compare the different sets of data.

Housing Element Homeless Information

Given the limitations to both of the data sources, the County used the HMIS data (and all of the unduplicated adult clients who received services during 2008 and not children whose intake does not include information on where they last lived), to come up with a percentage of total homeless population to assign to each City.

The HMIS data was sorted first by the jurisdiction reported as the last jurisdiction in which the homeless individual had permanent housing, and then grouped into the sub-regions used in the 2003 Count. The total for each of the sub regions was then used to establish a pro-rata share or percentage of the total HMIS number. These pro-rata shares or percentages were then applied to the 2003 Count. This process establishes an enumeration by jurisdiction using the 2003 Count data.

For the Unincorporated County, only Castro Valley and San Lorenzo are specifically identified places (with mailing addresses equivalent to cities). Ashland, Cherryland, Fairview, Hillcrest Knowles and Mount Eden neighborhoods of the unincorporated County are not places that are identified as "places of last permanent address". For those homeless individuals and families whose last permanent address was in Ashland or Hillcrest Knolls, they would have listed San

Leandro as their last permanent address. For those living in Cherryland, Fairview or Mt. Eden, they would have listed Hayward as their last permanent address. Due to this, the percentage allocation from HMIS that is ascribed to the Unincorporated Alameda County is lower than expected, while the numbers for Hayward and San Leandro will include those who used to live in the unincorporated areas with mailing address for each of those cities.

Given this caveat, Castro Valley percentage of homeless persons for the Mid-County region is 6.7% and San Lorenzo's is 2.2%. Sunol's percentage of South and East County region is .3%, for a total Unincorporated Alameda County percentage of 9% of the total homeless population. The total number of homeless adults allocated to the Unincorporated County is 90.

Applying those percentages to the actual number count and data provides us with a snap shot of who the homeless are. For instance, of the total adult homeless population, only 7% of the homeless are over the age of 61 years of age, approximately 47% are male and 53% are female, and 21% of the homeless population reported being employed, and 47% reported having a disability of some kind.

Annually, there is a coordinated countywide application submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance funds. In this application, HUD requires a Housing Inventory Chart that specifies the unmet need for homeless shelters in the area seeking funding (countywide in the case of Alameda County). In the most recent application, submitted in 2008, this chart identifies an unmet need for 52 "Total Year-Round Beds" of emergency shelter countywide. Given that only an estimated 9% of the countywide homeless population is attributable to the unincorporated county, the unincorporated county's share on unmet need for emergency shelter would be 5 beds.

Table I-39: Homeless Information, 2008

Unincorporated Alameda County	Number	Percentage
Age Cohort for Adults		
Adults (18 - 60)	84	93%
Senior (61+)	6	7%
Total Number of Adults	90	
Gender (adults only)		
Male	42	47%
Female	48	53%
Transgender	0	0%
Total	90	100%
Ethnicity (adults only)		
Hispanic/Latino	17	19%
Non Hispanic/Latino	73	81%
Total	90	100%
Race (adults only)		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	3%
Asian	2	2%
Black or African American	20	22%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	3%
White	46	51%
Other (all other combinations)	16	18%
Total	90	100%
Employment Status (adults only)		
Employed	19	21%
Un-employed	66	73%
Unknown	5	6%
Total	90	100%
Do you have a Disability (adults only)		
Yes	42	47%
No	41	46%
Don't Know	0	0%
Refused/Unknown	7	8%
Total	90	100%
Type of Disability * (adults with a disability only)		
Alcohol	30	33%
Developmental	6	7%
Drug Abuse	25	28%
HIV/AIDS	4	4%
Mental Illness	30	33%
Physical/Medical	19	21%
Other	0	0%
Total persons with disability	90	

Source: Alameda County HCD

Agricultural Workers

Determining the exact number of agricultural workers – and their housing needs – is made all the more difficult by the seasonal nature of much of the work. Various studies have shown that agricultural workers in California tend to have lower incomes, poorer health, and experience more substandard housing conditions than other lower-income workers.

Alameda County's agricultural lands include cropland as well as land devoted to the raising of cattle and other livestock. Excluding rangeland (189,000 acres), there were approximately 6,631 harvested acres in Alameda County during 2007. Field crop acreage was the largest portion, at 4,199 acres (approximately 63% of the total) harvest acres. Fruits and nuts were the second at 2,083 acres (32%) of the total. Nursery Products and Vegetables were the smallest at 269 acres (4%) and 80 acres (1%).

Alfalfa and other Hay was the largest single commodity in harvested acres, accounting for 59%; and wine grapes were second at 29% of all harvested acreage. There were approximately 12,792 head of cattle raised in 2007.

Agricultural workers are typically categorized into 3 groups: 1) permanent, 2) seasonal, and 3) migrant. Permanent agricultural workers are typically employed year-round by the same employer. A seasonal agricultural worker works on average less than 150 days per year and earns at least half of his/her income from agricultural work. A migrant agricultural worker is a seasonal agricultural worker who has to travel to his/her permanent residence within the same day.

According to the 2007 Census of Agriculture, there were 1,202 permanent and seasonal agricultural workers working on 147 agricultural operations in Alameda County. As shown in the table below, the vast majority, 118 (80%), of the agricultural operations employ fewer than 10 employees-accounting for 19% of the workers. Larger agricultural operations account for 20% of all agricultural operations in the County, but employ 80% of all agricultural workers.

Table I-40: Number of Agricultural Operations and Agricultural Workers 2007, Alameda County

	Ag. Operations	Workers
Ag. operations with fewer than 10 workers		
Permanent (150 days or more)	52	107
Seasonal (less than 150 days)	66	126
Total with less than 10 workers	118	233
Ag. operations with 10 or more workers		
Permanent (150 days or more)	10	358
Seasonal (less than 150 days)	19	611
Total with 10 or more workers	29	969
Total, all Ag. operations and workers	**147**	**1,202**

Source: Census of Agriculture 2007

According to the 2002 and 2007 Census of Agriculture, the total number of hired agricultural workers increased in the County by 27% between 2002 and 2007. During this same period, the percentage of agricultural workers employed seasonally doubled, while the percentage of agricultural workers employed on a permanent basis decreased by 19%.

Table I-41: Change in Number of Agricultural Workers 2002-2007, Alameda County

	2002	%	2007	%	Change, 2002-2007	% Change
Total Number of Hired Farm Workers	946		1,202		256	27%
Worked More than 150 Days Per Year	577	61%	465	39%	-112	-19%
Worked Less than 150 Days Per Year	369	39%	737	61%	368	100%

Source: Census of Agriculture, 2002 and 2007

According to the California Department of Labor, the mean annual wages in the 2008 1st quarter for farm workers and laborers were between $21,448 and $26,774. To address the likely housing needs of the farm-working poor, the County adopted an ordinance that recognizes temporary agricultural caretaker dwellings as a permitted use rather than requiring a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). In addition, the ordinance requires a Site Development Review process for new and continued occupancy of those dwellings within the "A" (Agriculture) District.

The County determined that the best mechanism to streamline the permit process for all permits requesting new or continued occupancy of an agricultural caretaker unit was to use the existing Site Development Review (SDR) process, combined with submittal of an Agricultural Caretaker Dwelling Report (ACDR). The ACDR is a simple checklist developed with the Alameda County Fire Department and agricultural community representatives that includes the fire requirements and pertinent planning information such as: activity on the property (ranching or dry farming, etc.), intensity (number of animals - horse, cattle, other), and compliance information for fire, health, grading, etc.

Significant advantages of the SDR process are: a) it is equitable; b) costs are minimal over time; c) a public hearing is optional; d) the application can be reviewed every five years; and e) the application would retain the same application number throughout the life of the land use, thus "securing" the existing regulations in place.

Typical SDR conditions of approval for new caretaker dwellings would require the applicant to implement all requirements and obtain permits from the Fire Department, Building Inspection Department and Environmental Health Agency for private sewage disposal system and potable water supply within a specific time frame.

HOUSING STOCK

Total Housing Units

The most recent data on the number of housing units broken down by the unincorporated neighborhoods of the County are from the 2000 Census. According to the Census, Castro Valley saw the greatest numerical increase in housing units between 1990 and 2000 (1,732 units), while Fairview experienced the largest percentage increase, at 31 percent. The Unincorporated remainder areas saw a drop of about 1,200 units, which corresponds with the number of units annexed by incorporated jurisdictions from the unincorporated areas. The following table illustrates these changes to the housing stock in the Unincorporated County.

Table I-42: Total Housing Units by Place, Unincorporated Alameda County, 1990-2000

Place	1990	2000	# Change 1990-2000	% Change 1990-2000
Ashland	7,061	7,295	234	3.3%
Castro Valley	19,682	21,414	1,732	8.8%
Cherryland	4,585	4,810	225	4.9%
Fairview	3,206	4,203	997	31.1%
San Lorenzo	7,471	7,562	91	1.2%
Remainder	4,971	3,778	-1,193	-24.0%
TOTAL	**46,976**	**49,062**	**2,086**	**4.4%**

Source: Census 2000

A more recent picture of activity in the Unincorporated County comes from the State Department of Finance, which tracks the numbers of new housing units built, type of unit, and the number which are occupied versus vacant. Table I-42 below shows that the total number of housing units in the unincorporated county grew from 49,564 to 51,067 from 2000 to 2008. Of those, 97.45% were occupied, and only 2.14% were vacant.

Table I-43: Housing Units by Type

	Unincorporated Alameda County				Alameda County-wide			
	2000		2008		2000		2008	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Units	**49,564**		**51,067**		**540,183**		**569,670**	
Single Family								
Detached	33,721	68.04%	34,526	67.61%	290,896	53.85%	303,112	53.21%
Attached	3,469	7.00%	3,474	6.80%	38,470	7.12%	39,632	6.96%
Multifamily								
2 to 4 units	3,308	6.67%	3,454	6.76%	61,023	11.30%	62,591	10.99%
5 plus units	8,137	16.42%	8,686	17.01%	142,144	26.31%	156,680	27.50%
Mobile Homes	929	1.87%	927	1.82%	7,650	1.42%	7,655	1.34%
Occupied units	48,503	97.86%	49,764	97.45%	523,366	96.89%	552,453	96.98%
Vacancy Rate		2.14%		2.14%		3.11%		3.02%

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates,. Sacramento, California, May 2009

Multifamily vs. Single Family

The types of housing units that have been developed vary between local jurisdictions. The same is true for neighborhoods in the Unincorporated County. The most recent data available for specific neighborhoods in the Unincorporated County come from the 2000 Census. These data show that some areas, such as Fairview, are largely composed of single-family dwellings, while other areas, such as Ashland, have a significant percentage of multi-family units. The following table presents information on housing type by area of the Unincorporated County as of 2000.

Table I-44: Housing Type by Unincorporated Area, Alameda County, 2000

Place	Total Housing Units	Single Family	Multifamily		Mobile Homes
			2-4 Units	5+ Units	
Ashland	7,295	3,421 46.90%	804 11.00%	2,877 39.40%	193 2.60%
Castro Valley	21,414	16,262 75.90%	1,197 5.60%	3,566 16.70%	389 1.80%
Cherryland	4,810	2,863 59.50%	711 14.80%	1,177 24.50%	59 1.20%
Fairview	4,203	3,908 93.00%	163 3.90%	129 3.10%	3 0.10%
San Lorenzo	7,562	6,868 90.80%	131 1.70%	511 6.80%	52 0.70%
Unincorporated	3,778	2,924 77.40%	332 8.80%	329 8.70%	193 5.10%
TOTAL	**49,062**	**36,250 73.90%**	**3,338 6.80%**	**8,590 17.50%**	**889 1.80%**

Source: Census 2000

Data from 2000 for the disaggregated places in the unincorporated areas shows that although Castro Valley contains almost forty percent of the unincorporated area's multifamily units, Ashland also has a significantly high percentage of the units, with nearly thirty-one percent of the total.

Table I-45: Percentage Share of Total Housing, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000

Unincorporated Area	Percentage Share of Multifamily Housing	Percentage Share of Single family Housing
Ashland	30.9%	9.4%
Castro Valley	39.9%	44.9%
Cherryland	15.8%	7.9%
Fairview	2.4%	10.8%
San Lorenzo	5.4%	18.9%
Remainder	5.5%	8.1%

Source: California Department of Finance, 2000

Within the Unincorporated areas, Castro Valley again has the largest percentage share of the single-family units. The following chart shows that San Lorenzo also represents a significant share of the single-family units, with almost nineteen percent of the total number of units in the unincorporated areas.

More recent information from the State Department of Finance on the entire County and all jurisdictions estimates that in 2008, sixty percent of the County's total housing stock consists of single family units, almost eleven percent of the stock is 2-4 unit buildings, and twenty-seven percent of the stock is in multi-family buildings of five or more units. Mobile Homes comprise just over one percent of the County's housing stock. The breakdown between individual jurisdictions is detailed in Table I-45.

Table I-46: Housing Type by Alameda County Jurisdiction, 2008

2008	Total	Single Family	Multifamily 2-4 Units	Multifamily 5+ Units	Mobile Homes
Alameda	32,527	17,390	5,073	9,764	300
		53.46%	15.60%	30.02%	0.92%
Albany	7,351	3,982	828	2,535	6
		54.17%	11.26%	34.49%	0.08%
Berkeley	48,036	21,922	9,337	16,718	59
		45.64%	19.44%	34.80%	0.12%
Dublin	16,029	9,442	462	6,097	28
		58.91%	2.88%	38.04%	0.17%
Emeryville	5,988	667	506	4,778	37
		11.14%	8.45%	79.79%	0.62%
Fremont	72,059	49,687	3,057	18,559	756
		68.95%	4.24%	25.76%	1.05%
Hayward	48,273	27,801	3,462	14,709	2,301
		57.59%	7.17%	30.47%	4.77%
Livermore	29,955	24,245	1,254	4,025	431
		80.94%	4.19%	13.44%	1.44%
Newark	13,423	10,452	766	2,146	59
		77.87%	5.71%	15.99%	0.44%
Oakland	164,053	79,434	29,817	54,346	456
		48.42%	18.18%	33.13%	0.28%
Piedmont	3,864	3,787	35	34	8
		98.01%	0.91%	0.88%	0.21%
Pleasanton	25,822	19,771	1,165	4,430	456
		76.57%	4.51%	17.16%	1.77%
San Leandro	31,904	21,495	2,256	7,249	904
		67.37%	7.07%	22.72%	2.83%
Union City	20,483	15,307	1,133	3,116	927
		74.73%	5.53%	15.21%	4.53%
Unincorporated	50,852	37,973	3,433	8,519	927
		74.67%	6.75%	16.75%	1.82%
TOTAL	570,619	343,355	62,584	157,025	7,655
		60.17%	**10.97%**	**27.52%**	**1.34%**

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2008, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2008.

In 2008, the predominant housing type in the Unincorporated County is the single-family home, representing seventy-four percent of all housing units. Multi-family units in buildings of five or more units represent only sixteen percent of all units in unincorporated neighborhoods, as opposed to twenty-seven percent County-wide. Multi-family units in buildings of two to four units represent six percent of all units in the Unincorporated County, as opposed to ten percent County-wide. Mobile homes represent a slightly larger percentage in Unincorporated County than the rest of the County (1.82% as opposed to 1.34%).

Condition and Age of Housing Stock

The most recent information on the age and condition of the housing stock comes from the 2000 Census. The Census defines unsound buildings as those without plumbing or without kitchens. While those units would certainly be part of the existing housing stock in need of renovation, there are many other deteriorated units which do not fit within that limited definition. An estimate of the maximum number of units needing rehabilitation can also be derived from other Census measures, such as percentage of units built before 1940.

As the stock ages, an increasing percentage of units are in need of rehabilitation. We do not have data on the number of units which have been renovated. In the Unincorporated areas of the County, the vast majority of units were built between 1940 and 1959. Using the number of units built before 1940 as an indicator of the number of units that may be in need of rehabilitation, it is estimated that about 2,139 units (about 5% of the housing stock in the Unincorporated Areas) need some amount of repair and rehabilitation. In the next twenty years, as the housing built between 1940 and 1959 continues to age, these units which represent 65 percent of the Unincorporated County's housing stock will require significant reinvestment to maintain.

Table I-47: Age of Housing Stock by Unit, Unincorporated Alameda County, 1990

Age of Housing Stock	1939 or earlier	1940-59	1960-69	1970-79	1980-89	1990-99
Ashland	452	3,005	1,291	1,043	845	580
Castro Valley	792	8,957	4,202	2,833	2,493	2,376
Cherryland	482	2,002	776	630	485	233
Fairview	142	1,242	475	549	738	197
San Lorenzo	104	6,159	593	302	222	152
Sunol	167	67	93	41	42	25
Total Housing Units	**2,139**	**21,432**	**7,430**	**5,398**	**4,825**	**3,563**
Percent of total	**5%**	**48%**	**17%**	**11%**	**11%**	**8%**

Source: Alameda County HCD, 2000 Census

Homeownership Housing Costs

The cost of housing in Alameda County rose dramatically over the past 15 years, making it difficult for lower income people to find housing that is affordable to them.[4] More recently, home prices have fallen; however, home prices continue to be out of reach for many residents.

The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) reports annually on home affordability for each statistical area in the United States. This "affordability index" is the percentage of households that can afford to purchase a home valued at the median for the area. Since 1997, the County has tracked the affordability index for the Oakland –Fremont-Hayward area.

4 Affordable housing is typically defined as housing for which the occupants spend no more than 30% of their monthly income to rent or own the unit. Although "affordable housing" can theoretically mean housing that is affordable to any income group, including those in the highest income categories, in general it refers to housing that is affordable to lower-income groups.

Table I-48: 1997-2008 Affordability Index, Oakland –Fremont – Hayward Area

Year	Median Home Price	Median Income	Affordability [3]
1997	$199,000	$60,100	49.7%
2001	$330,000	$71,600	26.1%
2003	$402,000	$76,600	22.5%
2006	$555,000	$83,800	9.4%
2008[1]	$400,000	$86,100	32.4%
2008[2]	$281,000	$86,100	60.1%

Source: Alameda County HCD and the NAHB Affordability Index, www.nahb.org/

Notes:
(1) 1st Quarter 2008
(2) 4th Quarter 2008
(3) Percentage of households that can afford to purchase a median priced home.

The previous table shows that in 1997, 49 percent of households in the Oakland-Fremont-Hayward Area could afford to purchase a median priced home. By 2003, as housing prices increased, only 22% could afford to purchase a median priced home. In 2006, at the height of the housing market, only 9% of the households could afford to purchase a median priced home.

With the drop of prices in the housing market, and the subsequent drop of the median price for homes in the area, more households can afford to purchase homes. In the first quarter of 2008, the median price had dropped to $400,000, and 32 percent of households in the area could theoretically afford to purchase. In the last quarter of 2008, the median price had declined still further to $281,000, with 60% of the population being able to afford a median priced home. If prices continue to drop without an equivalent decrease in median income, it will prove beneficial for making homes affordable to a larger portion of the population.

In February 2009, reports from DataQuick (a real estate statistical service) also reflected the downturn in the housing market since 2001. As shown in the chart below, the median sales price in Alameda County was $372,250 in 2001. In following years, the housing prices soared, and as of February 2006, the median sales price in Alameda County was $579,000 (a 56% increase). Due to the impacts of the recession on the real estate market, the median sales price in the County decreased to $290,000 as of February 2009, constituting a 50% decrease from the 2006 prices. Other Bay Area counties also experienced declines in the housing market, although at different rates. Of the nine Bay Area counties, Alameda continues to rank fifth highest in terms of median sales price, following Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The following table highlights the median sales price of all housing sold by counties which are adjacent to Alameda County.

Table I-49: Median Sales Price by County, Bay Area, February 2001-2009

County	Median Sales Price 2001	Median Sales Price 2006	% Change 2001-2006	Median Sales Price 2009	% Change 2006-2009
Alameda	$372,250	$579,000	56%	$290,000	-50%
Contra Costa	$300,750	$569,000	89%	$216,500	-62%
San Francisco	$551,000	$733,000	33%	$640,000	-13%
Santa Clara	$470,000	$663,000	41%	$408,750	-38%

Source: Alameda County HCD from MDA DataQuick Information Systems, www.DQNews.com

The Median Sales price universally increased from 2001 to 2006, with Alameda County seeing a 56 percent increase in the cost of homes. From 2006 to 2009, the Median Sales price universally decreased, with Alameda County seeing a 50% decrease in value.

The following tables illustrate the reduction in median home prices for areas in the Unincorporated County and the cities immediately surrounding the unincorporated area. Data are not tracked separately for the unincorporated neighborhoods of Ashland, Cherryland or Fairview. Ashland numbers are reported in San Leandro data and Fairview and Cherryland are reported in Hayward data.

The first table shows that median prices for single-family homes have decreased by as much as 43% since 2006. The second table shows the decreases in condominium median sales prices for the same jurisdictions.

Table I-50: Single-Family Median Home Prices, Selected Alameda County Cities, 2006-2008

				% Change		
Community	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2006-2007**	**2007-2008**	**2006-2008**
Castro Valley	$675,000	$650,000	$525,000	-4%	-19%	-22%
Hayward	$575,000	$525,000	$325,000	-9%	-38%	-43%
San Leandro	$558,000	$525,000	$380,000	-6%	-28%	-32%
San Lorenzo	$585,000	$550,000	$350,000	-6%	-36%	-40%

Source: Bay East Association of Realtors, January 2009

These are areas that are tracked by Realtors in the Multiple Listing Service. Not all areas of unincorporated Alameda County are tracked separately, and therefore Ashland is represented as if in the City of San Leandro. The same is true for Cherryland and Fairview and the City of Hayward. Of all the areas reported on, Castro Valley saw the lowest decrease in home value at 22 percent, and Hayward saw the highest at 43 percent in Single Family home values.

Table I-51: Condominium Median Home Prices, Selected Alameda County Cities, 2006-2008

				% Change		
Community	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2006-2007**	**2007-2008**	**2006-2008**
Castro Valley	$547,500	$495,000	434,000	-10%	-12%	-21%
Hayward	$425,000	$399,000	227,175	-6%	-43%	-47%
San Leandro	$403,000	$368,000	245,000	-9%	-33%	-39%
San Lorenzo	$410,000	$426,000	249,000	4%	-42%	-39%

Source: Bay East Association of Realtors, January 2009

In the Condominium market, Castro Valley again saw the lowest decrease in value (22%) and Hayward saw the highest (47%).

Rental Housing Costs

The previous ten years of high housing costs placed a particularly heavy burden on renters, whose incomes generally did not keep pace with rising rents in the area (see Table I-16: on change in Median Income between 1998 and 2008 pg 7). The County's 2003 Housing Element documented a fairly dramatic rise in Fair Market Rents (FMRs)[5] in a very short period of time, illustrating the crisis in housing costs experienced by residents of the Bay Area. The following table demonstrates how housing costs increased, and provides back-ground for more recent numbers. For some unit sizes, FMRs increased more than 60% between 2001 and 2003.

Table I-52: Comparison of FMRs, Alameda County, 2001 and 2003

Unit Size	2001 FMR	2003 FMR	Difference	% Difference
Studio	$567	$905	$338	62.7%
1BR	$686	$1,095	$409	62.6%
2BR	$861	$1,374	$513	62.7%
3BR	$1,076	$1,883	$807	57.1%
4BR	$1,181	$2,249	$1,068	52.5%

Source: HUD Information Bulletin, October 2002

Between 2003 and 2008, FMRs dropped by 4.5 percent to 12 percent depending on unit sizes.. While this reduction provides some relief to renter households, rates are still significantly higher than they were in 2001 and are still unaffordable to many households.

Table I-53: Reductions in FMR Rates, 2003 and 2008

Unit Size	2003 FMR	2008 FMR	Difference	% Difference
Studio	$ 905	$866	$ (39)	-4.50%
1BR	$1,095	$1,046	$ (49)	-4.68%
2BR	$1,374	$1,239	$ (135)	-10.90%
3BR	$1,883	$1,680	$ (203)	-12.08%
4BR	$2,249	$2,080	$ (169)	-8.13%

Source: Alameda County HCD 2009, from HUD User Data

Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department conducted a survey of available apartment units in the Castro Valley, San Lorenzo, Hayward and San Leandro rental market in April 2009. Median rents for these jurisdictions, by unit type, are listed below.

5 Fair Market Rents (FMRs) are estimates, prepared by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, of the rent plus utilities that would be required to rent privately owned, decent, safe, and sanitary rental housing of a modest nature with suitable amenities. The calculation of FMRs is based on information from the 1990 Census, housing surveys, and the CPI for housing. The rent figures do not necessarily reflect current asking rents, but rather the upper limits of rents that can be used in the negotiations for Section 8 contracts and other similar rent subsidy programs.

Table I-54: Median Rent of Available Units by Unit Type, 2009, Castro Valley, San Lorenzo, Hayward and San Leandro Market

2009 Median Rents		
Size	**# of Units Surveyed**	**Median Rent**
Studio	7	$ 955
1 Bedroom	26	$ 1,075
2 Bedroom	40	$ 1,350
3 Bedroom	9	$ 1,465

Source: Alameda County HCD Rental Survey, April 2009, from Rent.com data[6]

Median Rents are currently higher than FMR's for Studio, One and Two bedroom units. Renters with Section 8 vouchers will have difficulty finding housing in our communities for these size units. Three bedroom Median Rents are lower than FMR's, but due to the relatively small sample size of these units, it could be that larger households with Section 8 vouchers will also face difficulties in finding an available and suitable rental unit.

According to the Rental Housing Association of Northern Alameda County, the rental market is being affected by the economic recession, an increased number of units entering the market, and tenants doubling up and sharing larger units which decreases the demand for units.

Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate

State Housing Element law requires that all Housing Elements include information about the number of existing subsidized housing units that are "at-risk" of conversion to other, non-low-income housing uses (such as market-rate housing). Units at risk of conversion are those units in which the restrictions, agreements or contracts to maintain the affordability of the units will expire or are otherwise terminated soon. At expiration, units may revert to market rate, rendering them no longer affordable to the people living in them or the general public. Loss of affordability can occur at the termination of bond financing or restrictions, the expiration of density bonuses or contracts for Project –based Section 8 housing assistance, and other similar local programs. The analysis of at-risk units is required to identify and describe the potentially at-risk projects, analyze the cost of preserving them as affordable housing, describe available resources which can be used for preservation, and set quantified objectives for preservation of affordable at-risk units.

In the previous Housing Element, three projects were identified as at-risk: Ashland Village (142 affordable units), Vista Creek Apartments (50 total units, 10 affordable units) and Landmark Villa (97 total units, and 20 affordable units). Ashland Village was preserved by a local non-profit (Eden Housing) and all 142 units remain affordable with restrictions on the units through 2063. Both Vista Creek Apartments and Landmark Villa reached the end of their affordability terms, and all 30 affordable housing units were converted to market rate housing.

Currently, there are a total of 1,112 affordable restricted units in the unincorporated county. This is an increase of 384 additional restricted units from 728 in the previous Housing Element. Of the 1,112, staff determined that there are a total of 44 units in one development that are at risk of conversion in this Housing Element planning period.

6 Due to the relatively small sample size for studio and three bedroom units, these may be less accurate than the one and two bedroom prices listed.

Projects are considered “High Risk” if they are owned by private, for-profit entities and their subsidies/financing restrictions are due to expire or convert during the planning period of this housing element. Projects are considered at “Low Risk” if they are owned by nonprofit housing corporations or if their regulatory restrictions expire after this planning period for the Housing Element.

The following table highlights the current inventory of projects, those that are at high risk and those that are low risk. This table shows the project name, the owner type (nonprofit, private, etc.), the total number of units in the development, the number of those that are income-restricted, the income levels of the restricted units, the potential conversion date, and an analysis of the level of conversion risk for each development.

Table I-55: Inventory of Subsidized Rental Housing in Unincorporated Alameda County, April 2009

Project Name	Owner Type	Program (Subsidy)	Total Units	Restricted Units	Conversion Date	Income Level	Risk Analysis
Sparksway Commons	Cooperative	RHCP	45	44	2013	50%;80% Md	High
Sub-total			*45*	*44*			
Grove Way	Non Profit	Mod Rehab/Sec. 8	8	8	Annual Renewal	50% Md	Low
Acacia Garden/Park Terrace	Public	Bond/221d4/Sec8	43	9	2004	80% Md	Low
Wittenberg Manor I	Non Profit	231/Sec.8	95	92	2033	80% Md	Low
Wittenberg Manor II	Non Profit	Sec.202/CDBG	63	63	2033	50% Md	Low
Pacheco Court	Non Profit	SHP/CDBG	10	10	2052	30%;50% Md	Low
Banyan Street	Non Profit	CDBG/HOME	8	8	2057	50% Md	Low
Bermuda Gardens	Non Profit	CDBG/HOME/Redevelopment	80	80	2057	30%;50%;60%	Low
Concord House	Non Profit	SHP/HOPE/HOPWA	8	8	2057	30%;50% Md	Low
Eden House Apts.	Non Profit	LIHPREA	116	116	2057	80% Md	Low
South County Sober Hsg	Non Profit	CDBG	8	8	2057	SSI/GA	Low
Strobridge Apts.	Non Profit	LIHTC/HOME/Loc.	96	96	2057	50%;60% Md	Low
Hayward Village	Private	LIHTC/4% BOND	151	151	2058	80% Md	Low
Lorenzo Creek Apartments	Non Profit	LIHTC/HOME/CDBG/Loc.	28	28	2059	50% Md	Low
Quail Run Apts.	Private	County Bond/Tax Credits	104	51	2061	80% Md	Low
Kent Gardens	Non Profit	HUD 202/HOME/Trust Fund	84	84	2062	50% Md	Low
Sienna Pointe	Private	HOME/Trust Fund/LIHTF/Bond	109	99	2062	50%,80% Md	Low
Ashland Village Apts.	Non Profit	221d4/Sec.8	142	142	2063	80% Md	Low
Sub-total			*1,158*	*1,068*			
		Total	**1,203**	**1,112**			

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2009

With respect to Acacia Gardens/Park Terrace, these nine units have been preserved directly through the Housing Authority, rather than through a renewal of a contract with a private entity. The Housing Authority owns these units and is maintaining them below market rate indefinitely.

Sparksway Commons is the only development that is at-risk during this planning period. It represents 4.1% of the Unincorporated County's restricted affordable housing supply.

Sparksway Commons is a tenant cooperative, funded by the State of California's Rental Housing Construction Program (RHCP). The program provides an operating subsidy so that residents do not pay more than 25 percent of their incomes in rent. The current subsidy and restrictions are set to expire in 2013. The project has a total of 45 units, 44 of which are restricted to households at 50% and 80% of median income. The project is under cooperative ownership, and nonprofit management. Since it is a cooperative ownership, it is somewhat different from rental housing in terms of conversion. However, without the State subsidy, the affordable monthly payments residents currently pay would not be able to cover the costs of maintaining and managing the development.

COST ANALYSIS OF PRESERVING "AT-RISK" PROJECTS

Given the ownership structure of the project, and the difficulty in finding an additional operating subsidy for the current tenant owners of Sparksway Commons, it is likely that the project will have to raise rents significantly to cover costs when the State subsidy runs out. At that time, low income households may be displaced.

The cost of producing an affordable unit to replace a lost unit is extremely high. For example, recent developments that have been subsidized by the County Housing and Community Development Department and Redevelopment Agency have had local subsidies ranging from $80,000 to $189,000 per unit. The average local subsidy on these projects is $100,000 per unit for the units locally restricted. The total development costs would likely be over $20 million and would require substantial state and federal sources to build. In general, the cost of preserving affordable units is less than the cost of replacement.

Preservation of at risk units can be accomplished in several ways, including acquisition of the property by qualified nonprofit housing corporations, local housing authorities, or other organizations that are committed to long-term affordable housing. As a part of the financing of this type of acquisition, long-term regulatory restrictions are recorded against the property, removing the risk of conversion. In projects where only a portion of the units are restricted, long term project-based subsidies can be put in place to preserve the affordability.

The costs of preservation are significantly lower than the costs of replacement. Based on the current market conditions, rental units in the Unincorporated County can be acquired for between $100,000 and $190,000 per unit depending on location, size, and condition. The cost to acquire the 45 identified high-risk units ranges from $4.5 million to $8.5 million. Additional costs to rehabilitate the units would range from between $50,000 and $110,000 per unit, making the total project costs between $6.75 million and $13.5 million to complete. Since the units are restricted to families with incomes at or below 80% of median income, the project may be able to carry some debt service. Therefore, the actual subsidy required to preserve all 44 units is less than the total project costs (acquisition cost plus rehab cost). Current projects administered by the County have required subsidy levels of approximately $100,000 per unit. Based on this assumption, the subsidy costs of the preservation of the 45 high-risk units is approximately $4.5

million. This cost would be further reduced if the Housing Authority is able to place project based Section 8 vouchers at the sites at the time of purchase.

AVAILABLE RESOURCES FOR PRESERVATION

The County will actively work with the State of California, the owner and the nonprofit property manager to preserve the affordability of Sparksway Commons.

Potential resources include County Redevelopment Agency Housing Set-aside funds, Unincorporated County share of HOME funds, which are awarded through an RFP process within the Urban County, Unincorporated County share of Community Development Block Grant funds, and local Housing Trust Fund monies. It is also possible that funds from other State and Federal programs could be obtained to support preservation efforts. The Alameda County Housing Authority administers the Section 8 existing certificate and voucher program in the Unincorporated County, including project based vouchers.

QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES FOR PRESERVATION OF AFFORDABLE "AT-RISK" UNITS

As part of the objectives for this Housing Element Update, quantified objectives were established for the construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing units. Included in these objectives is the preservation of the development that has been identified as potentially being at High Risk for conversion before 2014. The specific objective is the preservation of all 44 High Risk units of affordable housing.

CHAPTER II- HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

Housing Element law requires that local jurisdictions identify potential constraints to the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including housing for persons with disabilities. This analysis must determine whether or not a jurisdiction's regulations pose an actual constraint and must describe how the jurisdiction will address that constraint over the planning period.

GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Local policies and regulations play an important role in protecting the public's health, safety and welfare. However, governmental policies and regulations can act as constraints that affect both the amount of residential development that occurs and housing affordability. State law requires housing elements to "address and where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing" (Government Code Section 65583[c][3]). Therefore, the County must monitor these regulations to ensure there are no unnecessary restrictions on the operation of the housing market. If the County determines that a policy or regulation results in excessive constraints, the County must attempt to identify what steps can be taken to remove or minimize obstacles to affordable residential development.

Land Use Controls and Mitigations

Land use controls, such as those contained in the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and General Plan are intended to promote the orderly development, and public health, safety and welfare, of the community. The Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 of the Alameda County Code) contains regulations that ensure that land uses in the community are situated properly in relation to each other, such as restrictions on the use, height and bulk of buildings, and requirements for setbacks and parking. The Subdivision Ordinance (Title 16) is concerned with the division of any unit or units of improved or unimproved land for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing. Generally, the Subdivision Ordinance allows the County to address public safety and other concerns by regulating the internal design of streets, lots, public utilities, and other similar infrastructure in each new subdivision.

Residential District Zoning

The County offers a variety of housing opportunities through its land use policies. The five residential districts are the R-1 (Single Family Residence), R-2 (Two Family Residence), R-3 (Four Family Residence), R-4 (Multiple Residence), and R-S (Suburban Residence) Districts. The basic use allowed in each of these districts is residential; however they differ on allowed density. In addition to the residential districts, residential uses are allowed by right in all Agricultural (A) districts and are conditionally permitted in Mixed Use (M-U) districts. The following descriptions summarize the general residential development standards in the unincorporated areas.

- The R-1 District provides for single-family residential neighborhoods. It is a very widely used district and includes much of the suburbanized part of the County. It allows single-family detached homes on separate lots with a minimum 5,000 square feet lot size/building site area (MBSA) requirement. A lot may be larger than this, but only one residence may be constructed on a lot regardless of the size. A property owner having a larger lot may, under the Subdivision

Ordinance, divide the property to create additional lots, each of which must be at least 5,000 square feet in area. Through use of the B Combining District (described below) larger minimum lot sizes may be required such as 10,000 square feet or five acres.

- The R-2 District provides for duplexes. It has limited application; a few neighborhoods are zoned R-2, but it is often used to legalize existing nonconforming duplexes or to address specific circumstances. It also has a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size requirement. Two dwelling units are allowed on each lot; this may be one two-unit or two one-unit structures. On a lot of 7,500 square feet or larger, three dwelling units are allowed as a Conditional Use; these may be a three-unit structure, one two- and one one-unit structure, or three one-unit structures.

- The R-3 District provides for a total of four dwelling units on a lot, but there may be no more than one unit for each 2,000 square feet of lot area with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet; i.e. up to two units are allowed on a 5,000 square foot lot, three on a 6,000 square foot lot, and four on a 8,000 square foot or larger lot. As with the R-2 District these may be in any combination of one-, two-, three- and four-unit structures. This District is seldom used; generally this type of development is done in the R-S District described below.

- The R-4 District provides for larger multiple residential structures. It requires a 6,000 square foot minimum building site area, and allows one unit for each 1,250 square feet. The R-4 District has other requirements and exceptions for lot coverage and density. Like the R-3 District this District is seldom used.

- The R-S District is the most commonly used district for multi-unit development. It has a basic density requirement of one unit for each 5,000 square feet of lot area, and has a minimum lot size requirement of 5,000 square feet. However, unlike the R-1, R-2, and R-3 Districts, each unit (or group of units) does not have to be on a separate lot. Thus, while a 40,000 square foot lot that is zoned R-1 can only have one residence, on it, the same lot zoned R-S may have eight units. (The R-1 zoned lot can, however, be subdivided into 5,000 square foot lots, on each of which one residence can be built.) Through the D Combining District the density may be raised or lowered; the former to a maximum of one unit for each 1,500 square feet of lot area.

- The PD (Planned Development) District was originally used for major residential subdivisions, including condominiums. However, the County also uses this District for a variety of other applications where traditional zoning district requirements mat not be appropriate. The PD District has no set standards; it is a free form district in which the ordinance creating the district sets the standards for its use and development. A PD District, together with Site Development Review, can be used to allow a higher density project than might otherwise be allowed under other zoning categories for a property or neighborhood.

Table II-1 summarizes the various zoning classifications in the Unincorporated Areas of the County.

Combining Districts

The Zoning Ordinance also provides for Combining Districts. These districts are mostly used in connection with a residential district. Two of them, the –B District and the –D District, modify the site area and yard requirements of a standard district. For example, the basic R-1 building site area requirement is 5,000 square feet. With a –B District this can be changed to R-1-B-8 to require an 8,000 square foot minimum building site area; R-1-B-10 (10,000 square feet MBSA); R-1-B-20 (20,000 square feet MBSA); R-1-B-40 (40,000 square feet MBSA); or R-1-B-E, in

which case the building site area is as specified in the ordinance, e.g. R-1-B-E (Single Family Residence, 5 acre MBSA).

The –D District is specifically used with the R-S District to set the density at one unit per each 3,500, 2,500, 2,000, or 1,500 square feet of lot area or as specified: R-S-D-35, R-S-D-25, R-S-D-20, R-S-D-15, or R-S-D-E, respectively.

The –DV (Density Variable) District is to be combined with the R-S districts in order to provide for variations in the intensity of development to act as incentive to combine narrow parcels into larger, more regular parcels associated with better site development. DV districts allow one dwelling unit per 2,000 square feet of lot area where average lot width is not less than 100 feet and the lot area is not less than 20,000 square feet; the density for lots not meeting these criteria shall be one dwelling per 3,500 square feet of lot area.

The –SU (Secondary Unit) Districts are combined with the R-1 or the R-S District to allow a secondary residential unit (also known as granny flats, in-law units, etc.) on the same lot as a single-family residence. The units may be attached or detached, and are generally limited to no more than 640 square feet.

Table II-1: Zoning Districts: Residential Development Requirements, 2009

District	Min. Building Site Area (MBSA) (Sq. Ft.)	Front yard setback (feet)	Rear yard setback (feet)	Side yard (feet)	Parking spaces per unit	Max. Height (feet)	Max. lot coverage	Max. unit density
R-1	5,000+	20	20	5	2	25	No limit	8/per acre
R-2	2,500+	20	20	5	2	25	No limit	16/per acre
R-3	2,000+	20	20	5	2	25	No limit	22/per acre
R-4	1,250	20	20	10 - 30	2	45	40 %	34/per acre
R-S	1,500 (through the –D-15 combining district)	20	20	10	2	25	No limit	28/per acre
A	100 Acres	30	10	10	2	30	No limit	2/per 100 acres
A-160	160 Acres	30	10	10	2	30	No limit	2/per 160 acres
A-320	320 Acres	30	10	10	2	30	No limit	2/per 320 acres
M-U	5,000+	20	20	5	2	35	No limit	12/per acre

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Notes:

- Maximum densities do not take into consideration required setbacks, parking, walkways, driveways, and topographic features.
- Alternate provisions for rear yards are permitted in R-1 districts where there is compensating open space.
- Side yards in an R-1,R-2 or R-3 district shall not be less than five feet plus one foot for each full ten feet the median lot width exceeds 50 feet, up to a maximum requirement of ten feet
- Combining units may modify the MBSA for the residential district and thus change the density; secondary units are allowed under an overlay district in some R-1 Districts which would increase potential maximum densities in those areas.
- Under the PD District, the maximum density is determined by site conditions.
- Secondary units for agricultural caretakers are permitted uses in an Agricultural district; however they are subject to Site Development Review.

Parking

Parking is a necessary aspect of any development and can constrain the development of affordable housing. For every parking space that is required, there is less land available for development. Excessive parking requirements can thus drive up the cost of development. Parking requirements in Alameda County, however, are similar to other jurisdictions and are not considered to be so stringent as to be a constraint to affordable development.

Setbacks

Setbacks are necessary to regulate health and safety. However, as setback requirements determine the buildable area on a lot, they may serve to constrain the number of housing units that can be achieved. However, Alameda County's setback requirements are flexible. A developer may choose to rezone the parcel to a Planned Development (PD) district to maximize the lots development potential. As a result, staff does not believe that they pose a major obstacle to development.

Height

The maximum height for all residential development is generally 25 feet, but parcels with R-4 zoning may be as tall as 45 feet, and may be as tall as 75 feet provided that the building does not cover over 30% of the lot.

Housing Type

A housing element must demonstrate the availability of sites, with appropriate zoning, that will encourage and facilitate a variety of housing types, including multifamily rental housing, manufactured housing, mobile homes, housing for agricultural employees, single room occupancy units, emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing. While some of these housing types are not yet permitted by-right, others are. Table II-2 summarizes the various housing types permitted in each zoning district.

Table II-2: Housing Type Permitted by Zoning District

	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-S	CVCBD[1]	CVCBD-S11[5]	A	FA[2]	RC	TA	TC	M-H	M-U
Single-Family	P	P	P	P	P		P	P						
Two-Family		P	P	P	P		P							
Triplex			P	P	P		P							
Fourplex			P	P	P		P							
Multifamily[3]				P	P	P	C		C	P	P	P[4]		
Mobile Home Park													P	
Manufactured Home	P	P	P	P	P		P	P						
Second Unit	P	P	P	P	P			P						
Small Residential Care (six or fewer persons)	P	P	P	P	P			P						
Large Residential Care (seven or more persons)	C	C	C	C			C							
Emergency Shelter				C										
Agricultural Caretaker/Farmworker Housing								P						
Mixed Use						P			P	P	P	P		P

Source: Alameda County Zoning Ordinance, Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan (ACBD), and Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan (CVCBD)

Notes:

(1) High Density Residential (Multifamily) is described as at least 20 du/acre within the CVCBD Subareas 2, 4-10

(2) "FA", Freeway Access; "RC", Residential Commercial, "TA", Transit Access; and "TC", Transit Corridor designations are found in the ACBD. Although they are not part of the County's Zoning Ordinance, they function as zoning districts within their designated portions of the ACBD.

(3) Five or more units

(4) Permitted as a secondary use

(5) "CVCBD-S11" refers to Subarea 11 within the CVCBD. Although the various subareas that comprise the CVCBD are not a part of the Zoning Ordinance, they provide guidelines that impact the development of housing within the specific plan.

Single-Family: Single family residences are permitted in all residential "R" districts, and agricultural "A" districts.

Two-family Dwellings (Duplexes): Two-family dwellings are allowed in all residential districts except R-1.

Triplexes and Fourplexes: Developments with 3 or 4 dwelling units are permitted in R-3, R-4 and R-S districts.

Multifamily Dwellings: The ACBD Specific Plan permits multifamily dwellings in Residential Commercial (RC), Transit Access (TA) and Transit Corridor (TC) districts. They are conditionally permitted within FA (Freeway Access) districts. The CVCBD Specific Plan provides for multiple family dwellings in Subareas 2, 4-10; they are conditionally permitted in Subarea 11.

Mobile Home Parks: The Zoning Ordinance provides for Mobile home parks in areas zoned M-H under Section 17.52.1000-1060.

Manufactured Home: Any manufactured home (which includes mobile homes) that was constructed after June 15, 1976 and certified under the National Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Act and placed on a permanent foundation may be located in any residential area where a single family residence is allowed, and must be subjected to the same development restrictions.

Second Units: A second unit is defined as a unit that is attached or detached to an existing single family dwelling that is no more than 640 square feet. Second units are permitted in R-1 and R-S districts having one but no more than one existing dwelling unit on the parcel subject to the following requirements:

- Property must have at least 3 legal parking spaces independently accessible from the street, not located in front or street side yard, plus 1 parking space anywhere on the lot.
- The attached secondary unit shall have a direct external entry.
- A detached secondary unit shall be limited to one story, fifteen feet in height, a minimum of ten feet from the existing dwelling. The detached secondary unit shall be clearly subordinate to existing principal single-family dwelling by size, appearance and location and shall be located to the rear of the existing dwelling.
- The unit must conform to all other regulations of the zoning district.

Permit approval is subject to a planning staff level review of the site and building plans to ensure compliance with height, setbacks, maximum floor area, and parking requirements. The administrative plan check process can be completed over the counter provided that the proposed project meets the County's development standards for second units.

Residential Care Facilities: Residential Care facilities are nursing and convalescent homes licensed by State Department of Public Health, residential care homes licensed by State Department of Social Welfare and the Alameda County Welfare Department. This term also includes group living quarters housing persons placed by an authorized agency for rehabilitation purposes and is funded by or licensed by or is operated under the auspices of an appropriate federal, state or county governmental agency. Residential care facilities with six or fewer person are allowed by right in all residential districts, while those serving 7 or more residents are

subject to discretionary approval.

Small Group Homes: Small group homes that serve six or fewer persons are permitted in all zones where single-family residences are allowed. Larger facilities serving seven or more persons are conditionally permitted in R-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 districts.

Emergency Shelter: Under the County's Zoning Ordinance homeless shelters are conditionally permitted in R-4 zones.

Agricultural Caretaker/Farmworker Housing: Under the County's Zoning Ordinance agricultural caretaker dwellings are permitted in all A (Agricultural) Districts.

Mixed Use Developments: The mixed use zoning districts referenced in the Housing Element Sites Inventory are the Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan (ACBD), Transit Access (TA); Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan (CVCBDSP), Subarea 10; and the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan (SLVCSP). Staff has compiled a summary of references to these mixed use standards, as well as their guidelines for development.

Table II-3: Mixed Use Zoning Guidelines by Specific Plan

Plan	Density	Development Guidelines
ACBD, Transit Access	50 du/ac (Page 3-29)	A "significant portion" must be for commercial use and no less than 50% of ground floor space (Page 3-28)
CVCBDSP, Subarea 10	Varies; subject to Site Development Review (Page 77-78)	Residential must be to the rear or above commercial (Page 66)
SLVCSP	19.66 (Page 30)	Permitted where part of a project that includes commercial development. (Page 30)

General and Specific Plans
A General Plan is a long range policy document approved by the Board of Supervisors to guide physical, economic, and environmental growth. Moreover, the County utilizes several types of community and area plans, which are components of the General Plan, to allow for context-specific community and neighborhood planning. All goals, policies, standards, and implementing actions in each of these plans must be consistent with the General Plan.

In some cases a jurisdiction may choose to create Area Plans to address the long-term development of large geographic areas within its boundaries. The following is a list of area plans utilized by the County:

- Castro Valley (1985)
- Eden Area (1983)
- East County Area (1994, amended by Measure D in 2000)

A specific plan is a tool for implementing the General Plan. It is the link between the goals and policies of the General Plan and the development of a defined geographical area. A specific plan provides the standards for development within designated parts of the unincorporated county. Currently available specific plans:

- Ashland and Cherryland Business Districts (1993)
- Castro Valley Central Business District (1994)

- Fairview Area (1997)
- Madison Avenue (2006)
- San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan (2004)
- Little Valley (1997)
- South Livermore Valley (1993)

Planning staff believes that the range of density categories, land uses, and zoning provided in these specific plans adequately respond to housing demand. Refinements in zoning have occurred in the County's urbanized Unincorporated Areas with the adoptions of the Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan (1993) and the Ashland and Cherryland Business Districts Specific Plan (1994), both of which provided for mixed uses along transit corridors and/or high density residential adjacent to commercial uses. The San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan, introduced housing into areas that have been previously zoned exclusively for commercial uses. The rezonings that occurred in 2005 and 2006 as the result of the 2003 Housing Element Implementation program provide enough sites to support the current and projected housing needs for the unincorporated areas. Finally, the pending Castro Valley and Eden Area Plans will also address future housing needs. Table II-4 generally describes the land use designations specified in the Alameda County General Plan and their related zoning districts.

Table II-4: Land Uses and Zoning

Land Use Designation	Parcel Size; Maximum Density	Implementing Zoning
Large Parcel Agricultural	100 acre minimum; (1-2 units/per parcel)	Agricultural Districts (A-100, A-160, A-320)
Resource Management	100 acre minimum; (1-2 units/per parcel)	Agricultural Districts (A-100, A-160, A-320)
Water Management Lands	100 acre minimum; (1-2 units/per parcel)	Agricultural Districts (A-100, A-160, A-320)
Rural Density Residential	5 acre minimum parcel; (1 unit/per parcel)	Single Family Residential District (R-1); Limited Agricultural Districts
Low Density	5,000 -40,000 square feet; 1.0-2.0 units/acre	R-1
Low/Medium Density	5,000 -40,000 square feet; 2.0-4.0 units/acre	R-1, R-2 (Duplexes), R-3 (Fourplex), R-4 (Multi-Unit), R-S (Suburban/Multi-Unit)
Medium Density	5,000 -40,000 square feet; 4.1-8.0 units/acre	R-3, R-4 and R-S
Medium/High Density	6,000 -40,000 square feet; 8.1-12.0 units/acre	R-4 and R-S
High Density	6,000 -40,000 square feet; 12.1-25.0 units/acre	R-4 and R-S
Very High Density	6,000 -40,000 square feet; 25.1-75.0 units/acre	R-4 and R-S

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Housing for Persons with Disabilities

The Housing Element must demonstrate efforts to remove constraints or provide reasonable accommodations for housing designed for persons with disabilities. The section describes the County's efforts to remove barriers which prevent the creation of housing for persons with disabilities.

Lanterman Act

At present, there are no zoning, design review, or building code provisions that conflict with the goal of providing a barrier-free environment. Under the State Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Lanterman Act), small licensed residential care facilities for six or fewer persons must be treated as regular residential uses and permitted by right in all residential districts. A State-authorized or certified family care home, adult and senior care facility, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer persons with disabilities or dependent and neglected children on a 24-hours-a-day basis is considered a residential use that is permitted in all residential zones. Facilities for more than six persons are conditionally permitted in most residential zones, as well. Alameda County has no siting or separation requirements for residential care facilities or group homes.

Building Codes

The County's building codes also require that new residential construction comply with Title 24 accessibility standards. These standards include requirements for a minimum percentage of fully accessible units in new multifamily developments, as well as requirements for accessible parking and common spaces. The provision of fully accessible units may also increase the overall project development costs. However, enforcement of accessibility requirements is not at the discretion of the County, but is mandated under State law.

Reasonable Accommodation

Under State and Federal laws, local governments are required to provide "reasonable accommodation" to persons with disabilities when exercising planning and zoning powers. According to the Federal Departments of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Justice (DOJ) a "reasonable accommodation" is a change, exception, or adjustment to a rule, policy, practice, or service that may be necessary for a person with a disability to have an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.[7] In 2006, the County established a Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance. There is currently no established process in place and reasonable accommodations are granted on a case-by-case basis. As part of its Housing Programs, the County will draft reasonable accommodation procedures.

County Assistance

Alameda County also provides assistance via its Accessibility Grants and Rehabilitation Loan programs. Funds provided through these programs may be used to make the dwelling accessible to a person with limited mobility. Both structural and nonstructural modifications for accessibility are permitted. These programs increase the availability of accessible housing stock throughout the unincorporated areas.

Definition of a Family

The Alameda County Zoning Ordinance does not define the term "family", and as such has no occupancy standards for related or unrelated adults.[8]

7 Joint Statement of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Justice: Reasonable Accommodations Under the Fair Housing Act, May 14, 2004

8 California court cases (City of Santa Barbara v. Adamson, 1980 and City of Chula Vista v. Pagard, 1981, etc.) have

Transitional and Supportive Housing
Transitional and supportive housing includes an array of on-site services to help residents gain the independent living skills necessary to transition to permanent housing. Transitional housing provides for stays for up to two years depending upon the individuals' needs.

Under Senate Bill 2 (Cedillo), local jurisdictions must identify sites for supportive transitional and permanent housing and subject them to the same permitting procedures as other housing within the zone without any undue special regulatory requirements. Appropriate sites for supportive and transitional housing should be near existing services and facilities. The County must revise its Zoning Ordinance so that supportive and transitional housing is allowed in specified districts.

For facilities are developed in a manner similar to multifamily housing, it is recommended that the Zoning Ordinance be amended to allow transitional housing as a permitted use in multifamily districts. Where such facilities are operated similar to residential care facilities, it is recommended that the County draft standards regulating their operation.

Farmworker Housing
Housing for farmworkers is a permitted use in all Agricultural (A) Districts. However, creation and occupancy of these dwellings are subject to a site development review. The County is currently updating its Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with State law on agricultural employee housing. This has been included as a part of the County's programs to address constraints on the development of housing.

Manufactured Housing
Manufactured housing is a type of housing that is generally constructed in a factory and is later transported to a site for use. According to HUD, manufactured housing is a dwelling built entirely in a protected environment under as prescribed by Federal law. The term "mobile home" describes factory-built homes produced prior to the revisions to Federal housing law in 1976.

The terms manufactured home and mobile home are defined within the County's Zoning Ordinance; however, there are no standards regarding their use as single-family dwellings outside of mobile home parks. Manufactured homes meeting the State Uniform Housing Code and Installed on a permanent foundation are considered regular single-family homes and are permitted where single-family homes are permitted. With the exception of design requirements, a jurisdiction can only subject the manufactured home and the lot on which it is placed to the same development standards which are required for a conventional single-family residential dwelling. Thus, the County will need to review the Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with State law. This is addressed in the programs section of the Housing Element.

ruled an ordinance as invalid if it defines a "family" as (a) an individual; (b) two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption; or (c) a group of not more than a specific number of unrelated persons as a single housekeeping unit. These cases have explained that defining a family in a manner that distinguishes between blood-related and non-blood related individuals does not serve any legitimate or useful objective or purpose recognized under the zoning and land use planning powers of a municipality, and therefore violates rights of privacy under the California Constitution.

Emergency Shelters
According to Government Code Section 65583(a)(4), every locality must identify a zone or zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without a conditional use or other discretionary permit. The identified zone or zones must include sufficient capacity to accommodate the need for emergency shelter as identified in the housing element, except that all local governments must identify a zone or zones to accommodate at least one year-round shelter. Under Section 50801 (e) of the California Health and Safety Code, emergency shelters are defined as housing with minimal supportive services for residents, where occupancy is limited to six or fewer months. In accordance with these requirements, the County must amend~~ed~~ its Zoning Ordinance to allow emergency shelters to locate by right in one of the residential zoning districts within one year of the adoption of the Housing Element.

Currently the County's Zoning Ordinance conditionally permits emergency shelters in its R-4 zone. Pursuant to State law, the County will amend its Zoning Ordinance within one year of adoption of the Housing Element to permit homeless shelters by right without a discretionary approval process within the R-4 zoning district. The County has already identified several R-4 sites in its Sites Inventory. These sites are appropriate for emergency shelters as they are located urbanized areas where there is convenient access to transportation and services. Also, as a part of the County's ongoing Ordinance review, it will establish performance standards regulating the operation of emergency shelters.

In the Chapter I- Housing Needs Assessment section "Homeless Persons and Families" there is an identified unmet need for 5 emergency shelter beds in the Unincorporated County. This number of shelter beds could easily be accommodated in the current R-4 district zoning. There are twelve parcels within R-4 districts, comprising 6.68 acres, which are listed on the County's Site Inventory that may be used for this purpose.

Secondary Units
Assembly Bill 1866 requires that localities amend their Zoning Ordinance to permit secondary units in all residentially zoned areas. The government may specify minimum requirements for secondary units, but excessively prohibit their development. As a part of the County's Housing Plan, the County will review its Secondary Units policy to ensure consistency with State law.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Units
The County's Zoning Ordinance does not contain specific provisions for SRO units. However, when operated as group quarters, it is permitted or conditionally permitted depending on the number of persons housed in the facility. If the SRO units are operated as apartment dwellings, it is either permitted or conditionally permitted depending upon the zoning of the parcel. The Ordinance Review Committee will draft standards relating to SRO's as a part of the County's programs.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY CONSTRAINTS

In the County's unincorporated urbanized areas (e.g. Castro Valley), most of the remaining undeveloped parcels are infill parcels that have one or more physical constraints, such as slope, drainage, or traffic circulation. Housing projects on these infill parcels must be evaluated under the environmental review process mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which may result in reducing the amount of land available for housing in order to

protect sensitive environmental and visual resources, avoid geologic hazards, and reduce land use incompatibilities with neighboring residents. While at times constraints to more affordable housing, these mitigations are required under State law for the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The following sections describe the environmental and infrastructure constraints to the development of housing.

Hillsides and Slopes

Hillsides exist in both urbanized and rural parts of the County, ranging from slopes of 10-20% to very steep parcels where there are slopes in excess of 30%. Development on such terrain necessitates severe grading and land modifications, which significantly add to the cost of development. A parcel's topography is always a major consideration in the review of development applications. Development restrictions are specifically described in the Madison Avenue and Fairview Specific plans. Within these plans building is restricted to areas where the slope does not exceed 30%. In addition these parcels are generally are larger and are zoned to accommodate single family residences. In addition, the County's Building Code has additional requirements for houses built on steep hillside slopes to mitigate potential earthquake hazards.

Creeks and Watercourses

The presence of rivers, streams, and other water bodies (many of which are subject to regulation by the state and federal governments) may affect the intensity and costs of residential development. Alameda County is pursuing the adoption of a Creeks Ordinance to provide clear standards for the development of parcels that contain or are adjacent to watercourses.

Fire Hazards

Many parts of the County are susceptible to fires because of hilly terrain, dry weather conditions, and the nature of the plant cover. The intensity of development, the size of the potentially affected population, and the difficulties of containment result in high and extreme fire risks in many of the unincorporated areas. To reduce the risk, new developments are required to comply with Fire Department requirements for setbacks, driveways and fire suppression. The fire department charges developers fees to review development plans and to perform inspections of the property prior to the receipt of a Certificate of Occupancy.

In addition to the fire services provided by the Alameda County Fire Department, the Fairview Fire Protection District also serves a portion of the unincorporated area. The Fairview Fire Protection District (the "District") is an independent special fire district in Alameda County; organized under the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code. The District's goal is to provide fire protection service to its residents. Such services include fire prevention through code enforcement and education, as well as fire suppression. The District also provides emergency medical services at the Advanced Life Support (Paramedic) level.

The District has contracted with the City of Hayward since 1993 to provide fire protection and emergency medical services within the boundaries of the District. Under the contract, the City of Hayward also takes care of weed abatement complaints within the District.

Flooding and Mudflows

To determine the risk of flooding, and thereby reduce flood damage, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps flood plains and prepares study to identify areas of likely

flooding based on existing and planned development and existing flood control facilities. Areas with a 1 percent (1 in 100) chance, or more, of flooding in any one year are in a 100-year flood plain. In other words, the area is expected to flood at least once in a 100-year period. These 100-year flood plains are mapped as Special Flood Hazard Areas.

Within the Alameda County Public Works Agency, the Flood Control and Water Conservation District works specifically to protect county citizens from flooding.

The Flood Control District:

- plans, designs and inspects construction of flood control projects,
- maintains flood control infrastructure,
- assists in planning new developments to preserve the integrity of the flood control system, and,
- preserves the natural environment through public outreach and enforcement of pollution control regulations governing our waterways

Seismic Hazards

Within Alameda County, there are many active and potentially active fault segments, and an undetermined number of buried faults, which are potentially capable of producing damaging earthquakes.

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act's main purpose is to limit the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The Act only addresses the hazard of surface fault rupture and is not directed toward other earthquake hazards. The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, (SHMA) passed in 1990, addresses non-surface fault rupture earthquake hazards, including liquefaction and seismically induced landslides.

The SHMA requires the State Division of Mines and Geology (DMG) to prepare new Seismic Hazard Zone Maps showing areas where liquefaction or earthquake-induced landslides have historically occurred or where there is a high potential for such occurrences. The purpose of the maps is to help reduce and, where feasible, mitigate earthquake hazards in new construction. The County is required to use the maps in the regulatory process to mitigate the potential danger and high costs of such events. Larger residential developments within seismic hazard zones require a special geotechnical review before project approval. Construction is not prohibited in these areas, but stricter standards may be requested as part of the geotechnical review and approval process.

Airport Influence Areas

The Airport Land Use Influence areas are established to ensure compatibility between uses surrounding the County's airports. Within these areas, certain land use decisions are subject to review by the Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC). In Airport Influence Areas, all new developments and change of use applications, whether or not they are within cities or in the unincorporated areas, are subject to ALUC review. There are 3 airports that may influence land use decisions in the unincorporated areas. They are the Hayward Executive Airport, Livermore Municipal Airport, and Oakland International Airport. Airport Influence Areas span between 2 to 3 miles from an airport and are defined by flight patterns and type and size of airports.

Requirements for ALUC review may increase case processing time.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Requirements
Urban stormwater runoff has been identified as one of the most serious sources of pollutants reaching the San Francisco Bay. The United States Environmental Protection Agency requires municipalities with storm drainage systems to apply for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to discharge stormwater.

The NPDES permit requires reduction of the discharge of pollutants in stormwater and prohibits the discharge of non-stormwater into storm drains. In particular, the permit requires that stormwater quality control measures be implemented as part of development projects. The requirements of the NPDES stormwater permit are implemented by County Agencies with the coordinating assistance of the unincorporated area Clean Water Program located in the Public Works Agency (PWA).

INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS

Adequate infrastructure and public services are necessary to accommodate future residential development. Existing and projected deficiencies in infrastructure and public services Alameda County are primarily a result of growth and development pressures, although increased consumption by existing customers is also a factor. The following sections discuss the availability of water, sewer, street, education, and park services to accommodate new development in the unincorporated areas.

Water Supply
In Alameda County, the primary sources of potable water are surface water resources. Rural areas where surface water is in short supply or where surface water delivery systems are absent rely on groundwater resources.

There are two primary public water providers in Alameda County they are the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and the Zone 7 Water Agency (Zone 7). Zone 7 supplies treated drinking water to retailers serving nearly 200,000 people in Pleasanton, Livermore, Dublin and, through special agreement with the Dublin San Ramon Services District, to the Dougherty Valley area. They also supply agricultural water to 3,500 acres, primarily South Livermore Valley vineyards, and provide flood protection to all of eastern Alameda County. EBMUD generally supplies water to the western, urban areas of the County. Those areas without water service are generally more rural and agricultural in nature and are served by on-site water resources. In general, the limited availability of public water confines more dense residential development to those areas having potable water service. In addition, the adequacy of the overall water supply is an ongoing concern. Increased demand for water may result in higher impact fees associated with development of vacant land.

The majority of the sites identified in the County's Sites Inventory (Appendix A) are served by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). EBMUD has water rights for up to 325 million gallons per day from the Mokelumne River, which is the source of 90% of EBMUD's water supply. Existing facilities include 21 reservoirs and water tanks that provide water to the areas identified in the Sites Inventory. In normal years, EBMUD reservoirs in the East Bay receive an

additional 30,000 acre feet of water from local watershed runoff.[9] EBMUD summarizes its water services capacity in its Urban Water Management Plan, 2005. According to the plan, EBMUD anticipates higher densities of existing land uses through 2030, consistent with the analyses from the State Department of Finance and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The plan mentions implementation of water conservation and recycled water programs to decrease impacts of development. Although EBMUD may need to replace some facilities during the upcoming years, the District has determined that it can meet customer service demands (based on ABAG population projections) through the year 2030 during normal year conditions. This would include the projected Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2,167 housing units) that the County is required to plan for. EBMUD's Mokelumne River supply is sufficient during normal or wet years to accommodate current demand, but falls short during droughts. The Water Supply Management Program 2040 Plan states that during severe droughts EBMUD may be unable to meet the need for water without imposing extreme rationing measures in excess. At a minimum, the plan requires that EBMUD impose a dry year rationing program of 10%.[10] In the case of multiple dry years, in addition to water consumption reduction programs, the District's water supply would have to be supplemented.

EBMUD has been engaged in several projects to secure the future water supplies and to ensure water availability following a major earthquake. Projects included exploring underground alternatives and desalinization opportunities, and ongoing conservation and recycling efforts. In addition, EBMUD has completed construction of a new 11-mile long emergency transmission pipeline between Castro Valley and San Ramon to provide an alternate water supply route following a major earthquake.

The availability of water to support residential development will depend on the supplies ultimately sought by the water providers in the county and state and federal regulatory constraints on those supplies. The availability of water supply is influenced by the availability of infrastructure to deliver water. Water providers in the county are currently engaged in an infrastructure planning process to ensure that an adequate supply of water is available throughout their service areas. Depending on the timing and funds available for those infrastructure improvements, however, water supply could pose a constraint to the development of housing.

On February 27, 2009, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger declared a state of emergency due to drought conditions. Although no limitation has been imposed upon housing development, the long term impact of the state's water crisis is unknown. Nonetheless the availability of water is an ongoing concern that may impact housing development.

Sewer/ Wastewater Services

There are five providers of waste water treatment services for the unincorporated areas, as well as the cities. For those parcels not linked to public sewers, there are on-site septic systems to treat waste water. The lack of public waste water treatment facilities can be considered an impediment to housing development, but cannot really be addressed in a cost-effective manner.

9 EBMUD, All About EBMUD accessed on October 16, 2009 from http://www.ebmud.com/about_ebmud/publications/all_about_ebmud/current_allaboutebmud.pdf

10 EBMUD, Water Supply Management Program 2040, pages 2-6 to 2-8 accessed on October 16, 2009 from http://ebmud.com/water_&_environment/water_supply/water_supply_management_program/2040%20Plan/WSMP%202040%20Final%20WSMP%202040%20Plan%20-%20Main%20Document.pdf

Public wastewater services are provided to the parcels identified in the Sites Inventory by two Sanitary Districts: Oro Loma (OLSD) and Castro Valley (CVSD). The OLSD treats flows within the boundaries of the Eden Area as well as from the CVSD service area. The service area of the CVSD and OLSD includes all virtually all lands within the voter approved Urban Growth Boundary. The only developed areas that continue to rely upon privately owned septic systems are within Mt. Eden, and off of Crow Canyon Road beyond Coldwater Drive and off of Cull Canyon Road in the Palomares Canyon area.

In general, the capacities of sewer facilities are considered adequate for which the Castro Valley and Eden areas are currently zoned and planned. Mitigation measures, such as replacing under-sized sewer pipes, may be required for individual projects depending on the number of units and square footage.[11]

Streets

In urban residential neighborhoods, new development can overburden aging infrastructure that is not meant to handle the additional demands that higher density developments can generate. In urban expansion areas, developers may need to build new streets to ensure adequate access to the residential developments and/or implement traffic engineering measures to mitigate project impacts to an acceptable level.

Education

Increases in the number of families with school-aged children may create significant overcrowding in public schools. There are several public schools, especially elementary schools that are currently operating in excess of or near their capacity, necessitating the construction of new classroom facilities to mitigate additional school overcrowding. The ongoing budget crisis means that schools have fewer funds available to address the need to either improve or expand school facilities. School fees are established by State legislation and beyond the control of local governments.

Parks

The County has established a developer fee program for park facilities. This program establishes a fee structure to mitigate the impact of residential developments on park facilities in the unincorporated areas served by the Hayward Area Recreational District (HARD) and the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) Developers are required to pay the mitigation fee prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Park Dedication Fees range from $10,200 per unit in multifamily construction to $11,500 for detached single family residences. In 2002, Alameda County established a Park Fee waiver for regulated/restricted affordable housing projects, and senior housing projects (whether market rate or affordable).

11 An analysis of sewer capacity is included on pages 65 and 66 of the 2003 Housing Element Implementation - Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration dated April 29, 2005 and in the Eden Area Redevelopment Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), April 2000 pages 12-16 to 12-17

FEES AND EXACTIONS

Development Impact Fees
Alameda County and other public agencies charge a number of planning, building, and engineering fees to cover the cost of processing development requests, and providing public facilities and services to new development. Payment of these fees can have an impact on the cost of housing, particularly affordable housing. Fees are limited by state law, which requires that "a public agency may not charge applicants a fee that exceeds the amount reasonably necessary" to provide basic permit processing services.[12]

Development impact fees (DIFs) are based upon the impact of new construction on services provided by the jurisdiction. Where development occurs on raw, previously undeveloped land, the cost of providing services is considerably higher than when infrastructure and other services are already in place as is the case where new development occurs as infill. According to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD), fees on new homes can be as high as 15% of the total housing production cost. Many of the development impact fees are attributable to the inability of local jurisdictions to pay for the cost of services as a result of Proposition 13 that places limits on property taxes and thus the ability of the jurisdiction to provide services.[13]

Within urban unincorporated areas of Alameda County, the fee load for a 2,500 square foot single family residence where development is permitted by right ranges from $46,288 - $53,588. This variation is due to differences in development costs within the unincorporated areas. This amount amortized at 5.5%, adds $261- $301 per month to the mortgage payment, or as much as $108,360 over 30 years of loan payments.

As the example above illustrates, fees vary according to location within the unincorporated area. For the purpose of estimating development fees, this study estimated fees for Castro Valley and for the combined areas of San Lorenzo, Ashland and Cherryland. Fees in Castro Valley are higher for both single family and multifamily housing. At present, assuming a 2,500 square foot home with a 400 square foot garage and 200 square foot deck, the Castro Valley fee would be $53,588 per single family unit and in San Lorenzo, Ashland and Cherryland, the fee would be $46,288 per single family unit. For multifamily units, assuming units that are 810 square feet within a 40-unit property, fees would be $31,496 in Castro Valley and $26,381 in the other three areas. The major differences between Castro Valley and the other three areas are higher fees for EBMUD and sewer connections.

Table II-5 describes the range of fees a developer may encounter when constructing new housing within the Unincorporated Alameda County.

12 California Government Code Section 65943 (c)

13 Raising the Roof- California Housing Development Projections and Constraints 1997-2020, Chapter 7, State Department of Housing and Community Development

Table II-5: Impact Fees for Single Family[(1)] and Multifamily[(2)] Housing in the Unincorporated Area as of November 2008

Fee Name	Castro Valley		Ashland, Cherryland, San Lorenzo	
Impact Fees (Per Unit)	Single Family	Multifamily	Single Family	Multifamily
EBMUD Water Service				
Connection, Capacity & Account Fees	$16,473	$6,168	$12,813	$4,708
Sanitary Districts				
Sewer Connection and Inspection Fees	$10,475	$10,217	$6,835	$6,562
County Planning Department				
Park Dedication Fees	$11,500	$10,200	$11,500	$10,200
School Districts				
Residential Impact Fees	$7,425	$2,406	$7,425	$2,406
Public Works				
Building Permit Fee	$3,098	$886	$3,098	$886
Plan Check Fee	$2,258	$423	$2,258	$423
Cumulative Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee	$1,965	$1,175	$1,965	$1,175
Flood Control Review Fee	$69	$13	$69	$13
Stormwater Surcharge [(3)]	NA	NA	NA	NA
Roadway Encroachment Fee [(4)]	$324	$8	$324	$8
Total Fees Per Unit	**$53,558**	**$31,496**	**$46,328**	**$26,381**

Source: Alameda County and Vernazza Wolfe and Associates

Notes:

(1) Based on a prototype of a detached 2,500 SF home with a 400 SF garage and a 200 SF deck.

(2) Based on a prototype of a 40-unit multifamily development consisting of units averaging 810 SF each.

(3) This fee is only assessed on multifamily buildings with more than 10,000 SF of impervious surfaces. In a generic fee Table, it is difficult to derive a base estimate for this charge.

(4) Per-unit fee for multifamily projects varies substantially with the number of units in the development.

Although development impact and planning fees are a significant portion of the overall housing costs, Alameda County's fees are consistent and in some cases lower than those charged by neighboring jurisdictions, with the possible exception of Site Development Review. The table below lists costs for nearby municipalities

Table II-6: Fee Comparison

Locality	Site Development Review	Variance	Rezone	Park Dedication
Fremont	$1,700	$850	$1,000-4,800	$17,512[(1)]
Hayward	$3,435-5,565	$4,440	$15,000 deposit /At Cost	$9,653-11,953
San Leandro	$1,350 [(2)]	At Cost	At Cost	$12,113-13,858
Dublin	$140 + Time and Materials	$1,939	$10,000 deposit /At Cost	$10,509-16,814
Alameda County	$4,000 deposit/ At Cost	$1,500	$4,000 deposit/ At Cost	$10,200-11,500

Source: City Planning departments, retrieved May 2009

Notes:
(1) Does not include Park Facilities Fee
(2) For major residential projects

Planning staff concludes that while development impact fees certainly constrain the provision of affordable housing, the County's fee structure cannot entirely be considered a constraint to the development of housing. Although the County is required to collect school fees, it does not have the authority to amend them as they are established by the State. Fees related to the installation of water and sewer service are controlled by the applicable water or sewer purveyor.

The County generally does not waive fees for affordable housing as these fees are intended to provide for public facilities necessary to support the new development. However, in order to facilitate the development of new affordable housing, one option is to distinguish fee rates between conventional housing and affordable/senior housing developments, as the park dedication ordinance currently allows. The provision of necessary infrastructure and public facilities is necessary for the development of quality housing in a suitable living environment. In the case of affordable housing developments, the County may use HOME CDBG funds, and Redevelopment Tax-Increment financing to help offset the cost of development within the unincorporated areas. In addition, the County will review its park dedication fee structure so that it is consistent with current land prices, and to ensure that it does not pose an undue constraint to affordable housing development.

On-Site and Off-Site Development Fees
The County may require a project sponsor to incur the expense of either on-site or off-site development fees. On-site improvements pertain to private improvements required within the boundaries of the subject parcel. These include open space, parking, landscaping and lighting requirements. In addition to the fees associated with these improvements, the developer may need to cede some developable area in order to make these improvements. The Subdivision Map Act, and the County's Title 16 (Subdivisions) address these requirements.

The size, location and number of dwelling units proposed all have an impact upon the number of improvements necessary for a subdivision's approval. For example, urban infill parcels may have existing systems and improvements that are deemed adequate to support the additional housing units. In these cases, the costs of on-site and off-site improvements do not serve as a constraint on housing production. However, in less urban/rural areas there may be several improvements required as a condition of approval. The need for infrastructure to support

housing in these areas adds to the overall cost to develop housing. These are typical for such development within the region and are not considered a heavy constraint on development.

Below is a summary of the improvements and their related guidelines that are often associated with large subdivisions (five or more parcels).

Street Right-of-Way Width Requirements: The minimum right-of-way widths of streets which are to be accepted into the County road system is 40 feet. Easements for construction and maintenance of slopes in excavation or embankments outside the limits of street dedication may be required where topographical conditions make easements desirable. Grades of all streets and alleys shall be established so that the subdivision is properly drained and shall conform as nearly as possible to the natural topography of the property. Where a subdivision adjoins acreage, provision may be made for reasonable future access to the acreage. The widths of streets shall be based on the width of streets of which they are a continuation

Curbs and Gutters and Sidewalk: Developers are generally required to construct curbs, gutters and sidewalks as needed to meet the existing street pavement and to support the new subdivision.

Public Safety and Fire Protection: Developers may be asked to construct the following items as they may be necessary for public safety, including but not limited to: local neighborhood drainage, traffic safety signs and devices, and street lighting.

In case of a subdivision included in a fire district the developer shall install water mains, fire hydrants, gated connections and appurtenances to provide water supply for fire protection to the subdivision.

Water and Sewer Connections: For all subdivisions having lots less than forty thousand (40,000) square feet, a sanitary sewer system and sewage disposal works serving each lot administered by a public agency authorized to levy taxes for such purposes, which agency has consented in writing to provide such service. Septic systems may be appropriate where the lot size and intensity of uses are consistent with their use.

Circulation Improvements: A developers may be asked to provide on-site improvements or to dedicate land as needed for access and circulation within the development**.**

Off-site improvements, while directly related to the proposed project's impacts, relate to the County's infrastructure and therefore are for the public's benefit. There are various types of off-site improvements a developer may encounter, Tri-Valley Transportation Development Fee (assessed exclusively in the East County), traffic mitigation fees, school district fees, water and sewer connection fees, and park in-lieu fees. Due to the County's broad geographic scope, these fees may vary depending on the location of the project.

The Planning Department enforces the Park Dedication Ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors in June 1992. A park in-lieu fee is assessed to new construction projects. Under the Park Dedication Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for construction of all new residential units, a dedication of land or payment of fees in lieu of dedication of land. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that new development pays its fair share of provision of park and recreation facilities in the Unincorporated Area. As described herein, the ordinance takes into consideration the jurisdiction's need for affordable and senior housing. As such, in those cases, the requirements are significantly reduced.

Planning Fees

Similar to other jurisdictions, the County has a number of procedures it requires developers to follow for processing entitlements and building permits. Although the permit approval process must conform to the Permit Streamlining Act (*Government Code* Section 65920 et seq.), housing proposed in the county is subject to one or more of the following review processes: environmental review, zoning, subdivision review, use permit control, and building permit approval.

While most planning entitlement fees are one-time fees, some entitlements, such as Plan Amendments, require an initial deposit upon application submittal. Supplemental deposits are required when the actual cost of processing the case exceeds the amount of the initial deposit. As the application fees for certain types of entitlements can vary, applicants may not be able to estimate the actual application cost prior to filing. The Planning Director is authorized to reduce or waive fees for affordable housing projects, and has done so in the past. The following table presents common application fees related to planning entitlements.

Table II-7: Alameda County Planning Entitlement Application Fees, 2009

Application Type		Fees, Deposit
Rezoning	Standard	At-Cost /$4,000 deposit
	Planned Development	At-Cost /$4,000 deposit
Subdivision	Tentative Tract	At-Cost /$4,000 deposit
	Re-file Tentative Tract	At-Cost /$4,000 deposit
	Tentative Parcel Map	At-Cost /$4,000 deposit
	Parcel Map Over 40 acres	At-Cost /$4,000 deposit
Site Development Review	Standard	At-Cost /$4,000 deposit
	Agricultural	At-Cost /$1,000 deposit
	Garage Conversions	$500
California Environmental Quality Act Work (CEQA)	Initial Study	Included in Fee or Cost
	CEQA Exemption	Included in Fee or Cost
	Environmental Impact Report	Included in Fee or Cost
	Other, i.e., Review as Responsible Agency	At-Cost
Conditional Use Permit	All Zoning Districts	$1,500
	Administrative	$500
	Cost Items	At-cost
		Requires a $4,000 deposit
Variance	All Zoning Districts	$1,500

Processing and Permit Procedures

Similar to other jurisdictions, the County has a number of procedures it requires developers to follow for processing entitlements and building permits. Although the permit approval process must conform to the Permit Streamlining Act (*Government Code* Section 65920 et seq.), housing proposed in the county is subject to one or more of the following review processes:

environmental review, zoning, subdivision review, use permit control, design review, and building permit approval.

The time and financial cost of land investments during the development permit process can contribute significantly to housing costs. Generally, the time required for processing a typical development varies depending on the size and complexity, as well as the location of the project. The County has developed forms to help residents and developers navigate through the process. In April 2007, the County completed the construction of its Building Permit Center to streamline the process of obtaining development permits. At the Building Permit Center an applicant can obtain information and feedback on plans from planners, plan checkers, fire department staff and engineers. The center also has several handouts available that describe the requirements for various types of developments and land uses.

Developments that require a discretionary review, such as a subdivision, a plan amendment, or zone change, will normally take a year to process. If an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required, the processing time is increased. In sharp contrast, for cases in which the development is permitted "by-right," such as multi-unit dwellings in R-S, R-3 and R-4 zones, the processing time is markedly less as no discretionary review is required; only site plan approval is required. The processing time for site plan reviews is approximately 2 to 4 months, as measured from the date of a complete application.

The review process for discretionary projects in the unincorporated areas is governed by several advisory and decision-making bodies:

- Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council
- Sunol Citizens Advisory Committee
- Parks Recreation ad Historical Commission
- Airport Land Use Commission
- Agricultural Advisory Committee
- Creeks Task Force
- Boards of Zoning Adjustments
- Planning Commission
- Board of Supervisors

Depending on the project and where it is located, several of these groups may review a project. The general procedures described as follows apply to the following types of applications: General Plan Amendments, Tentative Tract Map, Tentative Parcel Map, Conditional Use Permits (CUP), Rezoning, Site Development Review, and Variances.

1. Applicants generally start the permitting process by obtaining general zoning and application information at the Building Permit Center. At this time the planner will typically identify which ordinances and regulations could potentially affect the proposed project. The planner will also inform the applicant of which development approvals are necessary for the project to proceed. To assist applicants who are interested in filing a subdivision application, the County established an interdepartmental meeting known as the "Fireworks" meeting. Furthermore, applicants are required to contact the Planning Department for this counseling before beginning the subdivision application process may begin. Depending on the nature of the proposed project, additional materials for the application may be required.

2. Applicants make an appointment to submit the completed application and documentation package to the Planning Department. A planner reviews the materials to ensure completeness. All projects subject to a discretionary review require an initial study/environmental assessment in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

3. Within 30 days the applicant will receive notice as to whether or not the project is requires additional information or is complete.

4. Once the application has been deemed complete, it will be referred to various parties for comments. These generally include, Alameda County Public Works, the applicable fire department, and water provider.

5. A planner will complete a staff report outlining the history of the parcel and the proposed project.

6. The Planning Director or appropriate board or commission will conduct a public hearing upon completion of the above requirements. The department sends the applicant and other interested parties (I.e. neighbors and/or persons/groups that request notification) legal notification of the public hearing.

7. A decision is made on the project, and the applicant is notified of the results. There is a ten day window to appeal the decision of the Planning Director or a board. Appeals may be heard by either the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors.

Currently a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Site Development Review (SDR), or Variance would take 1-3 months to complete. Rezonings and General Plan Amendments require the approval from the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission, and may take 4-6 months for a final decision. Tentative Tract Map and Parcel Maps require the approval of the Planning Commission, and may take 3-6 months for approval. Projects that occur in Castro Valley must be heard before the Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council in addition to any other required hearing body. As always projects that meet significant public resistance take longer to finalize than others. Larger subdivisions (20 or more units) may take up to a year to finalize.

The County makes every effort to review applications in an efficient and timely manner. The aforementioned requirements and process meet, but do not exceed, those required under State law and therefore do not impede project approval in comparison to other jurisdictions.

CODES AND STANDARDS

Design Standards

Most of the County's design standards do not significantly constrain the provision of housing. Setback and subdivision requirements are not excessive and would not result in a reduction of units, and there are no lot coverage standards. After careful consideration of the Zoning Ordinance in its entirety, it appears that the height limit of 25 feet (the equivalent of a two-story limit) placed on multifamily housing presents a problem for high density, multifamily residences. To address this constraint, this Housing Element contains a goal to increase the height limit in transit-oriented development districts and higher density residential districts.

Parking and On-Site Open Space Requirements
The parking requirement for housing is the minimum required by some local jurisdictions. Under the County's subdivision ordinance, a single family home must have two onsite, parking places and one on-street-parking place. Because it is assumed that the prime times for commercial use and residential do not typically overlap, higher density housing in mixed-use areas can have a considerably lower parking requirement, which is determined on a case-by-case basis.

The County imposes no on-site open space requirements, except for the R-S District, which usually applies to high-density development. And in the R-S district, the 600 square foot of open space per unit requirement can normally be met within the standard setback requirements.

Growth Controls
In November 2000, the voters of Alameda County approved the Measure D Initiative that amends the Alameda County General Plan. The principle provisions of the Initiative as they pertain to the ability of the County to provide housing include the following:

- The East County Area Plan's (ECAP) Urban Growth Boundary is redrawn to remove North Livermore (and the 12,500 units in the planning stage) from urban development, and the County is directed to withdraw from the joint planning Settlement Agreement with the City of Livermore and North Livermore landowners. North Livermore west of Dagnino Road is redesignated as an Intensive Agriculture area with the potential for 20-acre enhanced agricultural parcels upon demonstration of available water (among other requirements).

- Lands designated for Urban Reserve in East County are redesignated as Large Parcel Agriculture.

- The South Livermore Valley Area Plan is amended to place absolute limits on density and geographical extent.

- Areas identified in the Initiative as Castro Valley and Palomares Canyonlands in the West County have been redesignated as Resource Management (100 acre minimum parcel size).

- General Plan amendments, such as subdivision applications that increase allowed density, will now automatically necessitate a vote of the County electorate.

- Under the Initiative, the Board of Supervisors may modify the East County Urban Growth Boundary in order to meet State-imposed housing obligations, but only if criteria specified by the Initiative can be met.

Under the terms of Measure D, the portions of the County General Plan revised under the Initiative may not be amended except by voter approval, with the exception that the Board of Supervisors can impose more stringent restrictions on development and land use. Furthermore, existing and future County plans, zoning regulations, etc. must be consistent with the provisions of the ordinance. Portions of the ECAP and other planning documents that were not amended or enacted by the Initiative may still be modified without voter approval provided the modifications are consistent with the provisions of the Initiative. For your reference a map

depicting the lands included within the Urban Growth Boundary has been provided as Appendix J.

Measure D has major implications for the development of housing within the County because it explicitly places limitations on the density and intensity of development outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. However there are several programs and policies contained within the ECAP/Measure D that mitigate the impact of the initiative on the provision of affordable housing. Also, the County has initiated several programs to support the development of affordable housing. Under Policy 23 of the plan, the County must provide economic incentives to developers of affordable housing. This policy is implemented through programs 7 through 11 which propose an incentive system that could include density bonuses, low-income housing fees, fee waivers, low income set asides, and joint development projects with non-profit housing developers. In addition, ECAP/Measure D requires each residential and non-residential project to contribute to meeting the housing needs of very low-, low- and moderate-income households. The County already has a density bonus program in place; the park dedication fee ordinance permits waivers of the fee for affordable housing projects; and the County has participated in development project with several local and regional non-profit housing developers.

Despite such restrictions, the proportionate impact of Measure D on the production of market rate housing in the East County area is fairly low because the costs associated with residential development (land acquisition and development) are such that housing produced would generally be affordable only to above moderate income households. What follows is a summary of the constraints on the production of housing within East County.

- Several hundred acres are owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) as they are part of the Alameda watershed that supplies drinking water to the City and County of San Francisco.[14]
- Nearly 1,000 parcels affected by Measure D are currently under Williamson Act contract (California Land Conservation Agreement).[15] Under the provisions of the Williamson Act, residential development is typically limited to one single family residence per parcel; all development occurring on the parcel must be related to or compatible with commercial agriculture.
- Most areas outside of the Urban Growth Boundary are not currently connected to any public wastewater system meaning that developments must provide their own on-site septic systems for waste water treatment. The cost and feasibility of a septic system is greatly affected by the site topography, soil and environmental characteristics, size and type of development, and parcel size. Information obtained from the County Department of Environmental Health, which regulates and monitors septic systems in Alameda County, indicates that the cost to plan, permit and install a septic system within the County generally costs $8,000 or more for so called “standard septic systems” and ranges from $20,000 to $40,000 for an advanced septic system.[16] In addition, the costs

14 Page 11, 2005 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco, SF PUC, December 2005

15 The California Land Conservation Act of 1965--commonly referred to as the Williamson Act—enables Alameda County to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. Local governments receive an annual subvention of forgone property tax revenues from the state via the Open Space Subvention Act of 1971.

16 Telephone conversation with Ron Torres held on July 8, 2010.

associated with providing potable water, either via the Zone 7 Water Agency or by well adds significant costs to the project. Zone 7 updated their fee schedule in 2009 and fees for new water service start at $21,550. The fee is based upon the size and type of meter being installed.[17]

- The majority of the parcels which fall under ECAP as amended by Measure D are zoned "A", Agricultural. Under this zoning designation parcels generally must be 100 acres or larger, and have access on an approved County road in order to have a single family residence. There are exceptions for farmworker housing, and for parcels that are 5 acres or larger that were created prior to May 4, 1972[18]. The 100 acre minimum parcel size, per the County's Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, as well as frontage on a County road limits residential development opportunities.
- In addition to the requirements imposed by Measure D, any development occurring in the East County area is also subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). There are several areas within the ECAP that are biologically sensitive as they contain critical habitats for several protected species such as the Tiger Salamander or the Red Legged Frog and are monitored by the California Department of Fish and Game.[19]

Due to these issues, as well as the requirements of Measure D, the County has not identified any housing opportunity sites within the East County area. Instead it has focused its efforts on providing housing affordable to all Alameda County residents to those areas within the Urban Growth Boundary. In order to accommodate future growth and to mitigate the impact of Measure D on market rate and non-subsidized developments, the County will pursue a housing program that promotes infill, mixed use, and transit oriented development. The following actions described in the County's Housing Plan will be used to accomplish these goals:

- Climate Action Team/Plan
- Infill, Mixed Use and Transit Oriented Developments
- An update of the Ashland/Cherryland Business District Specific Plan
- The pursuit of SB 375 grant funding assistance

CODES AND ENFORCEMENT

Building Codes

Uniform codes regulate new construction and rehabilitation of dwellings. These codes include building, plumbing, electrical, mechanical, and fire codes. The codes establish minimum standards and specifications for structural soundness, safety, and occupancy. Alameda County enforces the 2007 edition of the California Building, Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, and Fire Codes. The County last updated Title 15, the Building Ordinance, effective January 1, 2008, adopting by reference the above codes and defining the County's administrative processes and specific County provisions for construction. The building codes enforced by Alameda County are typical of those enforced throughout the state. The County's Grading Ordinance was last updated in 1992 and may be considered typical of California jurisdictions.

17 Zone 7 Water Agency Water Connection Fee Information Sheet, accessed on July 8, 2010 from http://www.zone7water.com/images/pdf_docs/permits/connex_fee_info_09.pdf

18 Please refer to Alameda County Zoning Ordinance 17.52.120 parts "F" and "G" for more information.

19 State & Federally Listed Endangered & Threatened Animals of California, California Department of Fish and Game, January 2010, accessed on July 8, 2010 from http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEAnimals.pdf

The Alameda County Development Services Department of the Public Works Agency is responsible for enforcement of the codes. Code compliance is conducted through a series of scheduled inspections during the course of construction to ensure compliance with the health and safety standards. Inspections are also conducted in response to public complaints or an inspector's observations that construction is occurring or has occurred without proper permits. Code enforcement is limited to correcting violations that are brought to the County's attention. Proactive code enforcement is limited due to limited resources. Violation correction typically results in code compliance without adverse effects upon the availability or affordability of the housing units involved.

The County's building codes do not place constraints on housing beyond those mandated by state law, and are the minimum necessary to protect public health and safety. Therefore, no changes are necessary.

Historic Preservation

The jurisdictions of the County contain a diverse group of urban and suburban areas, each proud of their unique history and contribution to the economic and social development of the County, region and State. This area was settled by Dutch, Anglo and Portuguese settlers in mid 19th century, and remained largely an agrarian community until the post World War II period. The historical progression from Native American tribal lands to Spanish, then Mexican ranches, thence to farms, ranches, and orchards, suburbs and eventually urban areas has occurred in less than 150 years.

Alameda County recognizes that its architectural and cultural resources provide many historical and aesthetic benefits to the community. In recognition of this, the County initiated a project with the grant support from the State Office of Historic Preservation to develop a Historic Preservation Ordinance, Context Statement, Historic Resources Survey and Register for the unincorporated areas. These documents are under development. The County hopes to adopt a Historic Preservation Ordinance in 2010. The proposed ordinance and revisions to CEQA have provided additional protections to historic resources and may potentially constitute a barrier to the development of affordable housing. Currently development applications involving properties over 50 years of age are reviewed by the Alameda County Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission (PRHC). The PRHC is a 15 member advisory body that is generally for historical preservation activities in the County. The PRHC does not have direct decision making authority; however, their comments are incorporated into the review of the development application.

ARTICLE 34

Article 34 of the California Constitution requires local jurisdictions to obtain voter approval before they develop, construct, or acquire publicly subsidized housing that is affordable to lower-income families. Although not all affordable housing development that is supported by a local jurisdiction falls under the legal definition of "develop, construct, or acquire" subsidized housing, this requirement is a significant constraint to the development and preservation of affordable housing because it requires local jurisdictions to continually return to the voters for permission to develop housing that is critically needed in the jurisdiction or to restrict fewer units to affordable levels than might otherwise be provided. Local jurisdictions typically place a measure or referendum on the local ballot that seeks authority to develop a certain number of units during a given period of time.

Alameda County has not held an Article 34 election, since it does not directly build affordable housing. Although the County provides loans and grants to affordable housing developers, this does not trigger Article 34 unless the County restricts more than 49% of the units within a single project. The County policy is to restrict 49% or less of each project funded. As a result, a lack of Article 34 authorization has not been a barrier in the production of affordable housing.

NONGOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

The production, availability and cost of housing in Unincorporated Alameda County can be negatively impacted by nongovernmental constraints. These constraints can impact the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels. Nongovernmental constraints include state and local housing markets, the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction. Potential additional nongovernmental constraints on the development of new housing could include neighborhood sentiment and housing discrimination. This section of the Housing Element will briefly discuss the current credit markets and the national economic outlook expected impact on overall housing development during this planning period, however most of the issues addressed will focus on nongovernmental constraints that the County may be able to positively impact.

Housing Markets

In the past ten years, banks and lending institutions had significantly changed underwriting criteria, which allowed unprecedented numbers of borrowers to take on debt to purchase housing. Nationwide, the percentage of homeownership increased from 57% to 69% in a ten year period.[20] This was primarily achieved because of extraordinarily low interest rates and availability of capital. This investment into housing had positive impacts on the number of new housing units built. Alameda County has enjoyed ten years of record breaking new home construction starts because of this.

As the market slowed towards the end of 2006, and homes did not sell in record times, prices were reduced to entice buyers. Overall, values began to fall due to the number of homes on the market. Many homeowners were faced with mortgages that were higher than their homes values. If a household had suffered an economic set back (loss of a job), and could no longer afford the mortgage, selling the home was no longer an option, and foreclosure became a reality.

As more homes were foreclosure upon, the values of home prices dropped exponentially, with some areas impacted more severely than others. The foreclosure crisis that began in late 2007 continues to grow.

<u>Availability of Financing</u>

The availability of financing may sometimes constrain the development or conservation of housing. While home mortgage credit has been readily available at attractive rates throughout the U.S. since the early 2000s, due to the current economic downturn, the credit market has tightened significantly. Borrowing costs are still quite low, but the terms and conditions required for financing has restricted the pool of eligible borrowers to those who meet standard underwriting criteria.

20 National Homebuilders Association, Report, 2007

Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data, available for the Oakland MSA, shows that in 2007 fewer lower-income households, especially those earning less than 50% of the median income, obtained mortgages, and those that applied had higher denial rates than households at higher income levels. Although a good portion of these rejections were likely due to an applicant's difficulties in being able to afford the monthly payments, it is likely that some of the rejections were the result of lending discrimination along racial/ethnic lines.

Information from the HMDA report highlights the concern regarding lending discrimination patterns in the area. For example, in the 2001 HMDA report used in the previous Housing Element, Blacks tended to have the highest denial rates across all income categories. The 2007 HMDA data in the following table shows that Hispanics have matched if not surpassed Blacks in percentages of mortgage loan denials. While the denial rates of Native Americans and Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders are less than those of Blacks and Hispanics, their denial rates are often just a few percentage points lower. Although the disparity between Hispanics, Blacks and other racial/ethnic groups is not as pronounced at the lower income levels, as Hispanic households approach median income, this disparity with other groups grows more pronounced. It should be noted that in some categories the low overall number of applications may somewhat skew the denial percentages (or give proportionately heavier weight to the denied applications). However, once income is 120% and above median income, the Hispanic denial rate is lower than the black rate. At the lowest income level, the white denial rate is higher than the black rate and that at all income levels, the Asian rate is the lowest of all groups.

Table II-8: Data on Application Denials by Race and Median Family Income (MFI), Oakland MSA, 2007

Conventional Loans	Applications Received	Loans Originated	Loans Denied	% of Loans Denied
Less than 50% of Median Family Income (MFI)				
Native American/Alaskan	2	1	1	50%
Asian	84	35	25	30%
Black	76	32	25	33%
Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	16	4	7	44%
White	280	109	100	36%
Hispanic	102	30	41	40%
Race Not Available	123	35	52	42%
50-79% of MFI				
Native American/Alaskan	31	18	7	23%
Asian	665	420	115	17%
Black	378	197	112	30%
Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	64	26	17	27%
White	1642	1,000	344	21%
Hispanic	540	251	172	32%
Race Not Available	425	200	119	28%
80-99% of MFI				
Native American/Alaskan	36	24	7	19%
Asian	684	422	110	16%
Black	425	217	119	28%
Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	81	51	15	19%
White	1815	1,114	356	20%
Hispanic	678	329	215	32%
Race Not Available	496	235	138	28%
100-119% of MFI				
Native American/Alaskan	69	35	20	29%
Asian	1002	602	162	16%
Black	465	228	141	30%
Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	132	82	24	18%
White	2637	1,526	555	21%
Hispanic	1070	486	362	34%
Race Not Available	788	360	234	30%
More than 120% of MFI				
Native American/Alaskan	390	151	133	34%
Asian	10493	6,016	1,887	18%
Black	3354	1,130	1,330	40%
Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	912	375	314	34%
White	21,277	11,975	4,381	21%
Hispanic	6474	2,576	2,234	35%
Race Not Available	7498	3,375	1,989	27%

Source: 2007 Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, Aggregate Report for Oakland MSA http://www.ffiec.gov/hmdaadwebreport/AggTableList.aspx

Mortgage Lending to Homebuyers

The cost of borrowing money to buy a home is another factor affecting the cost of housing and overall housing affordability. The higher the interest rate and other financing costs charged for borrowing money to purchase a home, the lower the mortgage amount a household can qualify for. The mortgage amount that a household with income at the 2008 median level for Alameda County ($86,100) can afford declines as the interest rate increases. Higher interest rates in the mortgage market also increase the amount of public subsidy required to provide affordable homeownership opportunities to median- income households.

For example, using a ratio of 28% of a household's monthly gross income as a reasonable amount to qualify for a loan, a principal and interest monthly payment of $2,009 would support a $335,000 mortgage at 6% interest. (Additional costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities will increase the ratio to approximately 38%, a standard commonly used by lenders.) At an interest rate of 10% and the same monthly payment, a household would only be able to afford a mortgage of $228,927. Table II-8 provides an example of the impact of financing costs on housing cost.

Table II-9: Impact of Interest Rate on Mortgage Amounts

Interest Rates	Monthly Payment	Qualifying Mortgage Amount	Down payment of 10%	Total Purchase Price
5%	$2,009	$374,240	$37,424	$411,664
6%	$2009	$335,084	$16,754	$351,839
7%	$2009	$301,968	$15,098	$317,066
8%	$2009	$273,794	$13,690	$287,483
9%	$2009	$249,682	$12,484	$262,166
10%	$2009	$228,927	$11,446	$240,374

Sources: Alameda County HCD, February 2009

Since early 2000, interest rates have been at all time low levels. Nevertheless, purchase prices have been extremely high, and many households have had difficulty purchasing homes. To assist in lowering the cost of homeownership for moderate-income households, Alameda County administers a first-time homebuyer program called the Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) Program. The MCC Program offers first-time homebuyers a credit against their federal income taxes equal to 15% of the mortgage interest paid each year. This credit is available through the life of the loan, and can save borrowers thousands of dollars on their taxes each year, which in effect increases their net income available to purchase a home and pay other necessary expenses.

Affordability

A significant change in nongovernmental constraints in this planning period is housing affordability. The cost of housing in the Bay Area has been exceptionally high over the past eight years. Given the current economic downturn and the high rates of home foreclosures, purchase prices have come down, and the median housing price reduction since July 2006 is significant. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) speculates that while the *median* house price has plunged from a high of $570,000 in the nine county Bay Area in July 2006, the actual value of most homes has not decreased so significantly[21]. In other words, high end homes are not being put on the market at this time, and the number of homes at the bottom end of the market, including foreclosures and bank-owned real estate, are selling in higher numbers than ever before. This is a change from the past when move-up homes constituted a

21 ABAG, 2009 Economic Forecast

larger percentage of the homes sold each month, and the impact is that the median sales price has skewed downward. For the first time in many years, the affordability of homes is back within reach of a median income household.

On a quarterly basis, Wells Fargo Home Mortgage and the National Association of Homebuilders (http://www.nahb.org/) publishes the National Housing Opportunity Index (HOI). The Index for a given area is defined as the share of homes sold in that area that would have been affordable to a family earning the local median income based on standard mortgage underwriting criteria. The HOI comes from public records, and may not represent all transactions in a given metropolitan area. .

Fourth quarter 2008 HOI data of homes that sold and were published in the public records show that the median home price in Oakland/Hayward/ Fremont PSMA was $281,000. This is a point in time number, and previous quarters in 2008 show a higher median. Based on fourth quarter data, the Oakland/Hayward/Fremont area ranks eighth in affordability of the 28 metropolitan statistical areas in the state of California. Sixty percent of the houses sold during this quarter were affordable to households at median income.

Real Estate Financing For New Development

Another nongovernmental constraint to residential development is the difficulty of obtaining the real estate financing necessary to develop housing in older areas of the Unincorporated county that have not experienced significant previous reinvestment. Institutional lenders and outside investors have been cautious in providing financial backing for large scale developments. Developers attracted to projects in these areas are often smaller entities with limited records of achievement or with limited financial resources to invest, compounding the difficulties involved in obtaining development financing. In addition, financing in these areas may be perceived as more risky and therefore only offered at higher interest rates.

While problems still exist, there have been significant improvements in the availability of real estate financing in the past few years. County and Redevelopment Agency support for projects has been an important factor. County funds including loans at below-market interest rates (provided through local, state and federal programs) have provided the basis for partnerships with private lenders, adding both financial support and enhanced credibility to projects. Market factors and conditions, including high demand for Bay Area housing, a lack of alternative development opportunities, and rapidly escalating housing prices and rents in nearby areas have resulted in increased activity in Unincorporated neighborhoods that had previously had little new development in recent years.

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA), passed by Congress in 1977, encourages financial institutions to help meet their communities' needs through sound lending practices and by providing retail banking and community development services in lower income neighborhoods. Thus, commercial banks, in their desire to fulfill CRA requirements, can be a valuable source of capital for affordable housing. The federal government provides additional funds for both interim/transitional and more permanent housing facilities, supportive services, and prevention programs for the homeless. Other program funding sources are highlighted in the chapter entitled *Description of Housing Programs.*

Spurred by CRA requirements, experienced nonprofit developers have been active in the Unincorporated county, bringing credibility and experience in obtaining financing for affordable housing projects. Generally, senior housing projects have been the easiest of the affordable housing projects to find funding according to industry sources. Mixed-use projects also can have

difficulties, often based on uncertainties about the commercial component or the complexities of the project.

Locally Controlled Funding

Although the County seeks all available sources of financing for affordable housing, over the past ten years the amount of available federal funding has either been reduced or remained stagnant, even though the cost of developing housing has increased significantly. Under State Law, Alameda County's Redevelopment Agency is required to set aside at least 20% of its tax increments for the development, maintenance and preservation of housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households. This is an additional source of funding for affordable housing and helps to augment federal subsidies. As a result of the decrease in federal funds, it is not uncommon to find new affordable housing developments with six or more sources of financing in order to make projects financially feasible. This adds to the overall costs of development, since it can take a significant amount of time to receive funding approval from so many sources.

Development Costs

The cost of development includes multiple factors, including the cost of land, construction, permits and fees as well as developer overhead and expected profit.

Land Availability

The cost of land is impacted first by what is available Availability of sites for development can be constrained by the need to assemble smaller parcels into larger development sites and/or by landowners seeking high prices for their properties. The latter is particularly the case for older properties formerly in commercial or industrial uses that are being held as long-term investments by owners hoping to reap the rewards of an improving local market. To facilitate site availability, the Redevelopment Agency is playing a role in purchasing and assembling development sites and then soliciting developers for building new housing and/or mixed use developments. The County also has a program for assisting nonprofit housing developers in acquiring sites for affordable housing. Alameda County's Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) has led efforts to identify larger, underutilized sites for housing development.

Cost of Land

The cost of land varies considerably between and within jurisdictions. Market factors, especially the desirability of the location, play an important role in setting property values. Many infill lots are 7,500 square feet, i.e. larger than the minimum size lot of 5,000 square feet but too small to subdivide. Information from the Multiple Listing Service in February 2009 indicates the cost of a ready-to-build lot for a single-family unit ranged from $140,000 to $275,000. The cost of land suitable for multifamily development or subdivision for multiple single-family homes also varies. Recent affordable developments in the County that are subsidized by the County's Housing and Community Development Department have faced land costs that ranged between $1.4 million to $2 million per acre.

Construction Costs

Escalating land prices and construction costs due to a high demand for housing have been major contributors to the increasing cost of housing in the Bay Area. Another major impediment to the production of more housing is the cost of construction, which covers the cost of materials and the cost of labor. However, the cost of construction varies with the type of new housing and the way it is built. According to the Association of Bay Area Governments, wood frame construction at 20-30 units per acre is generally the most cost efficient method of residential

development. However, local circumstances of land costs and market demand will impact the economic feasibility of construction types.

Total Development Costs
All of these factors – cost of construction, cost of land, cost of labor – jointly contribute to the overall cost of housing in the Bay Area, including the Unincorporated Areas of the County.

Single Family Homes
As shown in the following table, the average estimated cost to develop a standard quality, 1,500 square foot, single family detached house on a lot in the Unincorporated County is $691,000. This includes an average land cost of $150,000 (low compared to past years) the cost of construction at $250 per square foot, fees, permits, financing, and the developer's profit. Under this market rate infill scenario, land is approximately 20% of total cost, construction of the building is around 50%, soft costs are about 20% and permits and fees are 7%. These figures may vary within the County because Castro Valley's fees are about 1% higher than those of San Lorenzo, Ashland, and Cherryland.

Given the downturn in the market, purchase prices of existing homes are currently significantly less than this. According to the Multiple Listing Services, in 2008, the average price of homes in Castro Valley was $585,654, and the average price was $377,681 in the San Lorenzo, Ashland, and Cherryland areas. Until either the sales prices of existing homes goes up, or the total development costs comes down, production of new single family homes will not be feasible.

Table II-10: Single Family Development Costs, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2009

Item	Cost	Percentage
Land Cost	$150,000.00	22%
Permits & Fees	$46,328.00	7%
Soft Costs (Architecture, Legal, Developer Fee)	$120,000.00	17%
Construction Costs @ $250/sq.ft. (1500 sq ft)	$375,000.00	54%
Total Development Costs	$691,328.00	100%

Source: Alameda County HCD, Vernazza Wolfe Inclusionary Housing Report to Alameda County

Multifamily Housing
Multifamily housing costs are shown using a per unit cost scenario. In multi family buildings, units are generally smaller (850 sq feet for a two bedroom unit, 1100 sq feet for a three bedroom unit). In addition, there are economies of scale that do not exist in single family lot development. For instance, the cost of architecture on a per unit basis is significantly less when building 50 units as compared to just one unit. In addition, the cost of the land is spread over many units, and generally comes out much lower. In the chart below, the average cost to develop one unit in a larger building is $393,643 and is well below the average cost to build a single family detached unit.

Table II-11: Total Multifamily Development Costs, 2009

Item	Cost	Percentage
Land Cost/Unit	$36,024.00	9%
Construction Cost/Unit	$237,745.00	60%
Soft Costs/Unit (Permits, Fees, Financing, Legal and Architecture)	$92,970.00	24%
Developer Fee/Unit	$26,956.00	7%
Total Development Costs/Unit	$393,643.00	100%

Source: Alameda County HCD

Costs of greenfield subdivision housing development may be less than infill housing (depending on the cost of the land, which varies considerably depending on the degree to which necessary approvals have been granted). While fees are much higher in greenfield development (15-17%) in order to cover the expense of new infrastructure and services, efficiencies of scale often reduce construction costs. However, future greenfield housing development in Unincorporated Alameda County is unlikely due to the Measure D Initiative, which established an urban limit line contiguous to city boundaries. It is possible that through annexation to a city, previous unincorporated lands could be developed, but in this case, the land would no longer be under Alameda County jurisdiction.

ADDITIONAL NONGOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Neighborhood Sentiment

Neighborhood concerns and opposition to higher-density developments and to affordable housing developments can hamper efforts to construct new housing in the Unincorporated County. As in many other jurisdictions, there can be resistance to change in familiar environments. The “Not In My Backyard” or NIMBY syndrome can be a significant constraint to the development of housing. While there is general agreement that housing should be available to all income levels, there can be resistance to specific affordable housing proposals, particularly rental housing projects, based on a lack of information or misinformation, a poor image of such developments, and/or concerns that an area already has a disproportionately large number of high density housing units.

Many of the higher density housing projects in the Unincorporated County were built during the 1950s, 60s, and 70s. The quality of construction during this era was extremely variable. Some of the projects were constructed with little attention to context and architectural detail, creating a negative image of higher density. The ubiquitous “motel style” buildings, oriented perpendicular to the street on lots formerly occupied by single family homes, are often cited as the reason that more multifamily housing should be discouraged. Maintenance on some of these properties has been inconsistent. Some properties have been the source of neighborhood complaints and code enforcement actions.

The County Community Development Agency is trying to address these concerns in various ways. The Planning Department is developing a set of design guidelines which will help guide larger multifamily developments. The Code Enforcement section of the Planning Department

consistently works to correct violations. The Housing and Community Development Department works with developers to identify and finance appropriately attractive, affordable housing projects and, after construction, monitors the properties to make sure that proper property management is maintained.

The rebuilding and rehabilitation of older housing projects will greatly improved the quality, image, and acceptability of affordable housing. Successful, new low-income housing developments enhance many neighborhoods and blend, unnoticed, into others.

Housing Discrimination

Housing discrimination is prohibited by the federal Fair Housing Act of 1968, as amended in 1988, based on race, religion, color, national origin, gender physical or mental disability (including AIDS/HIV+), and familial status. The State of California also bans housing discrimination under the State Fair Employment and Housing Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act, providing the same broad coverage as the federal law. In addition, State law bans housing discrimination based on marital status and sexual orientation. These laws provide protections against unequal treatment in a person's search for housing to rent or buy, mortgage lending, insurance and appraisal practices, and advertising. It is also illegal to threaten or intimidate a person in a protected class or any person who supports persons in the pursuit of their rights, or to engage in blockbusting and steering. Discriminating practices continue to be a constraint on housing in Alameda County, including the unincorporated county. Because of this Alameda County HCD provides fair housing services through its contract with the Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO). Fair Housing services are provided in English, with translation services available. EHCO investigates housing discrimination complaints, provides public education and outreach, provides training on fair housing laws, recruits and trains testers for investigating complaints. In addition ECHO provides counseling to victims of discrimination.

Administrative remedies for housing discrimination are available through the California State Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD investigates most discrimination complaints on mortgage lending due to the length of time, nature, and cost of such investigations.

CHAPTER III- SITES INVENTORY AND CAPACITY ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the land available for the development of housing in the unincorporated areas of Alameda County and the County's ability to satisfy its share of the region's future housing needs.

REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)

Housing element law requires all local governments to adequately plan to meet their existing and projected housing needs including their share of the regional housing need. In the Bay Area, the regional housing need is determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process. The RHNA planning period for this element is 2007-2014. The RHNA process specifies the number of housing units that must be accommodated in four income categories: very low, low, moderate and above moderate. RHNA is not a production quota; however, demonstration of adequate capacity for new dwelling units on vacant or underutilized sites is the basis for compliance with the RHNA component of housing element law. For the 2007-2014 period, the County's RHNA are listed below.

Table III-1: Regional Housing Need Allocation (January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2014)

Extremely Low/ Very Low <50% AMI[22]	Low <80% AMI	Moderate <120% AMI	Above Moderate >120% AMI	Total
536	340	400	891	2,167

AMI = Area Median Income

To demonstrate adequate capacity, the element must include a detailed inventory and analysis of land suitable for residential development. This inventory has been placed in Appendix A. The determination of suitable sites to include in the inventory was based on what sites could be available for residential use in the planning period. Other characteristics the County must consider when evaluating the appropriateness of sites include physical features (e.g. susceptibility to flooding, slope instability or erosion, or environmental considerations) and location (proximity to transit, job centers, and public or community services).

The State Department of Housing and Community Development permits a jurisdiction to consider all of the following:

- vacant residentially zoned sites;
- vacant non-residentially zoned sites that allow residential development;
- underutilized residentially zoned sites capable of being developed at a higher density or with greater intensity; and

22 The County has an RHNA allocation of 536 very low-income units. Pursuant to State law (AB 2634, Lieber), the County must project the housing needs of extremely low-income households based on Census income distribution, or assume 50% of the very low-income units as extremely low-income units. In the absence of income data for the extremely low-income households, 50% of the very low-income units are assumed to be extremely low-income. Therefore, the County's RHNA of 536 very low-income units may be divided into 268 extremely low-income units and 268 very low-income units. However, for purposes of identifying adequate sites for the RHNA, State law does not mandate the separate accounting for the extremely low income category.

- non-residentially zoned sites that can be redeveloped for, and/or rezoned for, residential use (via program actions)

Progress towards Meeting the RHNA Goals
ABAG uses January 1, 2007 as the baseline for growth projections for the Housing Element planning period of 2007-2014. As a result, jurisdictions may count toward the RHNA goals any new units built, under construction, or approved since January 1, 2007. Table III-1 presents a summary of the County's progress towards achieving its RHNA allocation.

Units Constructed or Permitted
Since January 2007, 499 housing units have been constructed[23] or permitted by the Alameda County Building Inspection Division. These units have the following income distribution: 87 very low income units, 167 low income units, 81 moderate income units, and 164 above moderate income units.

Sales data from the Alameda County Assessor's office for the period of January 1, 2007 through July 1, 2009 indicates that the median price of new residential dwelling in the urban unincorporated areas is $365,000. A home with a $365,000 price may be affordable to moderate income household (up to 120% if the area median income) of four earning $103,300.[24] A housing expense is generally considered affordable when more than 30 percent of a household's gross income is used for housing.[25] The mortgage for a $365,000 home financed over 30 years at 6 percent interest would cost $2,188.36 per month.[26] For a household of four earning $103,300 a year, 30 percent of their gross monthly income would be $2,582.50. While it is highly unlikely in this current economic climate that a person or persons would be permitted to finance a home at 100 percent of its purchase price, it is important to note that under this scenario it would be possible for a moderate income household to afford the housing costs associated with a median priced new home in the urban unincorporated area. The County has chosen to use this analysis as the basis for its estimates of the affordability of dwelling units within the unincorporated area and has attributed a third of market rate units to the moderate income category.

Affordable Housing Developments
The Alameda County Redevelopment Agency and Department of Housing and Community Development provide financial support to several affordable housing developments within the unincorporated areas. In 2007, the County partnered with Mercy Housing for the funding and development of Kent Gardens, an 84 unit apartment complex for very-low income seniors. These affordability covenants limit rentals to low and very low income households for 55 years. In addition, Redevelopment has supported the construction of 30 units of housing during the housing element planning period of which 6 units must be affordable to low or very low income households. The County also helped to finance the development of the Hayward Village Senior Apartments, a 151 unit development that is affordable to seniors who earn up to 80% of the

23 For the purposes of this analysis, units constructed are those that have been granted certificates of occupancy.

24 Income data is from HUD for the Oakland-Fremont Metropolitan Area.

25 This definition of affordable housing was provided in the California Department of Housing and Community Development publication, Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements: Housing Needs-Overpayments and Overcrowding.

26 Staff used the mortgage calculator available at Bankrate.com

area's median income.

Units Approved/Entitled

As of April 2009, there were 35 projects that have received entitlements, representing 140 new housing units which have not yet received building permits. Although staff has no building valuation data on these units, it is not unreasonable to presume that a portion of these units may be affordable to moderate income households. Recent sales of new single family and multifamily housing within the urban unincorporated area suggest that half of the homes sold would be affordable to a moderate income household of four earning $103,300. Staff has estimated that at least 20% of the multifamily dwellings would be affordable to a moderate income household (up to 120% of the area median income) based on the density and size of the proposed units.

Second Unit Construction

Thirteen secondary units have already been permitted or constructed during the current planning period. Based on this data staff, estimates that 42[27] secondary units will be constructed during the current planning period. As provided for in Government Code Section 65583.1, the County is applying second units towards its RHNA requirement (See Table III-2). Although it is not required that these units be rented, these units are similar in size to studio or one bedroom apartments. Current market rent for studio and one bedroom apartments in the area are $1,000 or less.[28] As a result, these units may be considered affordable to low income households.

Substantial Rehabilitation, Conversion, and Preservation of Affordable Housing Stock

The 2003 Housing Element identified the 142-unit, Ashland Village complex as a property that had a "high" risk of conversion to a market rate development. These units were also in need of substantial repair. The property had been restricted under the Below Market Interest Rate Program under Section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act (Title 12 United States Code Section 17151(d)(3) and (5)), with those covenants set to expire in 2004. In 2007, the County partnered with non-profit developer Eden Housing, Inc. for the purchase and substantial rehabilitation of 142 units in the Ashland Village Apartment Complex. In order to prevent the conversion of these subsidized units to market rate, the County's Department of Housing and Community Development and the Redevelopment Agency provided committed assistance in accordance with Government Code 65583.1(c) to the project. The Board of the Redevelopment Agency approved an allocation of $6.5 million dollars towards the project on November 6, 2007. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors approved the release of HOME funds were in a contract for $740,000 on September 8, 2008. The 142 units are restricted at levels affordable to low and very low income households for 59 years. Eden has negotiated a new Section 8, Housing Assistance Program agreement with HUD as part of this process.

The Park Hill Apartments were a 109-unit, privately held development located in Fairview. The complex had experienced years of deferred maintenance that resulted in numerous Building Code violations. In 2001, 124 tenants of the complex filed a class action lawsuit against the previous owner citing racial discrimination, sexual harassment, and unsafe living conditions. A judgment in favor of the plaintiffs was made in 2004. Later, the property was placed on the market. In November 2006, the County was able to secure $11,441,000 in Multi-Family Mortgage Revenue Funds for the project. The County partnered with a private entity, Dawson

27 Based on an average of 6 units per year, over the seven year planning period

28 craigslist.org, March 30, 2009

Holdings, Inc. to acquire and to substantially rehabilitate the 109 unit Sienna Pointe/Park Hill apartment complex. Local HOME and Housing Trust Fund monies were also utilized. The units are restricted to very-low and low income households for a 59 year period. The County has determined these funds are sufficient to maintain the affordability of the identified units as demonstrated by the analysis in Appendix K.

As provided in Government Code Section 65583(c)(1), in addition to identifying vacant or underutilized land resources, local governments can meet up to 25 percent of the site requirement to provide adequate sites by making available affordable units through rehabilitation, conversion, and/or preservation. At 251 housing units, the County's efforts exceed the maximum credit allowed under this statute. In accordance with this provision the County will credit 219 units (25% of its low and very low income RHNA allocation) towards meeting its 2007-2014 RHNA goals. An analysis of both the Ashland Village and Siena Pointe/Park Hill projects has been provided as Appendix K to this element.

On Table I-55, the County identified Sparksway Commons as a project at risk of conversion to market rate in 2013. The County will monitor this project throughout the planning period and will determine what course of action shall be taken to preserve those units. The County will report on its any activities to preserve Sparksway Commons in its Annual Report. The Program "Preservation of at Risk Housing" is included in its Housing Plan (Chapter IV).

Pending Development Activities

As of April 2009, an additional 222 units (180 single family and 42 multifamily) were under consideration by the Planning Department. As these applications have not been approved, staff cannot make an accurate determination of their affordability nor can they be truly considered development "credits"; however, the data provides a forecast of anticipated residential development activity in the unincorporated areas. Once these units are approved permitted or constructed, staff will be able to make a better informed determination of their affordability.

Accommodating the Remaining RHNA Units

With units constructed, under construction, permitted, approved, and pending, the County has already met a portion of its RHNA. For the 2009-2014 Housing Element period, the County has a remaining RHNA of1,087 units, for which it must provide sufficient land to accommodate: 315 very low income units; 88 low income units; 305 moderate income units; and 379 above moderate income units. Table III-2 provides a summary of this data.

Table III-2: Units Completed or Approved by Affordability Level

Project	Total Units	Units by Income Level				Method of Affordability Determination
		VL	L	M	AM	
Units Completed/Permitted						
Single Family Residences[29]	189			63	126	Sales Price
Two – Four Unit Buildings	41			13	28	Sales Price
Affordable Housing	241	87	154[30]			County Subsidy, Section 8
Multifamily (5 or more units)	15			5	10	Sales Price
Second Units	13		13			Rent Price
Substantial Rehabilitation[31]	219	134	85			County Subsidy, Section 8
Units Approved/Entitled						
Single Family Residences	86				86	Not yet determined
Two – Four Unit Buildings						Not yet determined
Multifamily (5 or more units)	54			14	40	
RHNA Credits	858	221	252	95	290	
Pending Development	222				222	Not yet determined
RHNA	2,167	536	340	400	891	
Remaining RHNA	1,087	315	88	305	379	

VACANT AND UNDERUTILIZED SITES ANALYSIS FOR MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

The Sites Inventory identifies vacant and underutilized sites that have the greatest redevelopment potential during the planning period. These parcels were selected based on following criteria: the age of the improvements on the site; the evidence, as supported by building records, of a lack of recent tenant improvements; and a ratio of improvements versus land value less than 1. In general, newer properties are less likely to be redeveloped, as are properties where there have been recent investments. The County also considered development patterns in the area and found that nearly all of the residential development activity, as demonstrated by recent subdivisions (2007 and 2008) and site development review applications, has occurred on parcels where there was an existing use. Based on this data one could conclude that active land uses historically have not been a barrier to new residential development. Finally, the County also reviewed market conditions within the County and

29 Single family residences described as “secondary units” and limited to 640 sq. feet of habitable area were subtracted from this number.

30 This number includes Hayward Village, a 151 unit senior housing development affordable to seniors at approximately 80% of AMI. The project was completed in February, 2007.

31 Although the County supported the substantial rehabilitation of 256 units of housing, the County may credit no more than 25% of its RHNA under this program.

throughout the Bay Area and observed that residential development is generally characterized by high land and construction costs, combined with a limited supply of vacant developable land; thus leading to redevelopment of non-vacant sites.

The unincorporated portion of Alameda County contains many well established communities. The County's goal is to encourage housing development that is consistent with existing patterns of neighborhood development and current zoning. The Alameda County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance have guided staff in evaluating which areas are appropriate for future housing development. As a result the County has chosen to highlight infill sites with the potential for transit oriented and mixed use development. These sites are located in Castro Valley and Eden Area Plans. A detailed sites inventory has been included in Appendix A.

Redevelopment Areas

Current market conditions have severely limited the amount of financing available for residential construction. The recession which began in 2008 has had an immediate impact on residential construction and the rental and sale of homes. According to data obtained from the Public Works Agency - Building Inspection Division database, residential permits in the period beginning January 1 and ending August 31, 2009 are down over 50% compared with the same period last year. Sale prices for new and existing homes have also faced double digit declines. How long these effects will last is unknown at this time, and therefore it is hard to predict development trends over the planning period. Recognizing these constraints, Sites Inventory has been used to identify several parcels located within the County's Redevelopment Areas as projects in these areas may qualify for financial assistance from the Redevelopment Agency or another government entity. The constricting of credit markets may cause housing developers to consider using Redevelopment tax-increment financing, bonds or other publicly administered funds; and therefore, they may become critical in meeting existing and projected housing needs.

The Redevelopment Agency works through the Housing & Community Development Agency to support an active Affordable Housing Program through which financial assistance is made available directly or indirectly to very low, low and moderate-income households / to improve and preserve the community's supply of housing particularly hosing opportunities available to low and moderate income households. Redevelopment activities are focused in two project areas, referred to as the "Joint Project" and "Eden Project" areas. The Joint Project Area & the Eden Project Area are adjacent redevelopment project areas located in the unincorporated area of Alameda County. The project areas are located near the 238, 580 & 880 freeway interchanges and cover 4,000 acres that run through portions of the Castro Valley, Cherryland, Ashland, Foothill, San Lorenzo and Mt Eden communities.

Methodology

The County's evaluation of adequate sites began with a listing of those parcels that were identified in the 2003 Housing Element Inventory and during the 2005/2006 Housing Element Implementation. In total, staff has reviewed the development capacity of almost 1,200 individual parcels throughout the urban unincorporated areas. These sites are available and could be realistically developed by June 30, 2014 as required by State HCD.

To demonstrate the realistic development viability of the sites, the inventory describes: (1) whether appropriate zoning is in place, (2) the applicable development standards and their impact on projected development capacity and affordability, (3) existing constraints including

any known environmental issues, and the (4) availability of existing and planned public service capacity levels.

The County's land inventory was developed with the use of a combination of resources including the County's GIS database, updated Assessor's data, field surveys, and review of the County's various plans and Zoning Ordinance. The inventory includes both small and large residentially and non-residentially zoned parcels and parcels which are substantially vacant or underutilized which could be developed for more intense residential uses. The compilation resulted in not only an identification of sites, but also an estimate of potential development capacity for these sites. The majority of the land available for residential development is located in: (1) areas currently served by public transit, (2) within specific plan areas that are zoned R-S, R-2, R-3, and R-4 that allow duplexes and multifamily residential development, and (3) within planning areas that provide for mixed use development.

The primary development areas are near the main commercial corridors within Eden and Castro Valley Plan areas. These areas contain several parcels that have been designated for higher density development relative to most residential areas in the unincorporated areas. In addition to avoiding the low-density residential areas, these commercial areas are suited for new housing units because they have transit access and existing services. Furthermore, there are currently no known service limits to these sites, although developers would be required to pay fees or construct public improvements prior to or concurrent with development. A map of these areas has been included in Appendix A.

In developing its methodology the County reviewed the characteristics of recent subdivisions that were either constructed or approved in 2007 and 2008. These years were selected as they provide the best data upon which to project development trends over the planning period. This is because 2007-2008 are within the current planning period, they are the last two years for which there is substantial (20 or more subdivisions) residential development for staff to evaluate, and they are the initial years of the national recession which is likely to affect development activity throughout the planning period. Based on a review of these projects, staff observed that they had several of the following traits in common:

- Improvements were at least 30 years old
- Existing number of units is less than 80% of the maximum allowable density for the zoning district and could yield two or more additional units
- Improvement to land value ratio is less than 1; the land is more valuable than the structure

After the initial GIS screening orthophotos were reviewed to confirm the status of the sites, evaluate any possible environmental constraints requiring further study (i.e. slopes, creeks, etc.), and the sites consolidation potential. Field visits were also used for sites with the capacity to develop 10 or more units.

Realistic Development Capacity

The realistic development capacity is an estimate of a parcel's residential development potential. To generate this figure, first, the County considered current zoning standards for residential development within the aforementioned zoning districts to determine an approximate density and unit yield. These standards included parking requirements, building height limitations, setbacks, open space requirements, driveways, and pedestrian access. Second, staff has evaluated recent development in the unincorporated area and has determined that average residential development density is over 80% of maximum permitted density. A

summary of this data is provided below.

Table III-3: Sample of Buildout Capacities

Project	Acreage	Zone	Maximum Units	Actual Units	Resulting du/acre
16100 Maubert	0.70	R-S-D-3/PD	10	10	16
19505 Meekland	0.54	R-S-D-3/PD	8	9	16
1168 Elgin	0.39	R-S-D-20	8	5	13
Liberty Point	0.96	R-S-D-15/PD	29	24	25
20560 Forest	1.61	R-S-D-20/PD	35	28	19
334 Cherry Way	0.50	R-S-SU	4	3	6

Source: Alameda County Planning Department and Dyett and Bhatia and Khan Mortimer and Associates

The County's Site Inventory relies heavily on parcels that are currently zoned for multifamily residential development to accommodate its regional share of housing for lower income households. The corresponding zoning designations are R-S (residential suburban), R-2 (two family dwellings), R-3 (up to four dwelling units) and R-4 (multifamily dwellings). The following analysis describes the County's process in determining the realistic development capacity for parcels included within the Sites Inventory.

Also underway is a County program to develop Illustrated Design Guidelines which may limit the development potential on the identified opportunity sites. In anticipation of these changes, staff has chosen to calculate the realistic development capacity for parcels listed within the Sites Inventory at 75% of their maximum development capacity as permitted by zoning. Although the outcome of the Design Guidelines process is months away, as an added measure to consider their potential impact on the inventory, staff believes the 75% number is adequate to address any reduction in unit yield that may result.

Small Sites

Within the San Francisco Bay Area the availability of public infrastructure, consumer preference for a shortened work commute or to commute less by car, access to cultural and recreational amenities, and a commitment from the populace and facilitated by local, regional and state entities to support the preservation of open space for recreation, conservation or agriculture either through land use controls such as Measure D for unincorporated Alameda County[32] or by the application of state laws such as the California Environmental Quality Act have led to the redevelopment of small (less than a 0.5 acre), infill sites either within the urban core, or within so called "first ring" suburbs. In unincorporated Alameda County, these sites were granted 48% of all planning entitlements for the years 2007 and 2008.[33] Of the 33 parcels for which a subdivision application was approved in 2007, 14 (45%) of these sites had lot areas of 0.5 acres or less. In 2008, of the 23 projects approved by the Planning Department 11 (48%) of the sites had an area of 0.5 acre or less. As a result, the Sites Inventory includes several of these small sites.

Generally smaller sites (parcels less than 0.5 acres) have been included in the County's Site Inventory when appropriate zoning is in place to support multifamily development (i.e. the R-S

32 Other communities in the Bay Area that have adopted similar "urban growth boundaries" or "urban limit lines" include Union City, the Cities of Livermore, Novato, San Jose, Palo Alto, Los Gatos, Pleasanton, and Milpitas; and Napa, Marin, Sonoma and Solano Counties.

33 Information obtained from the Alameda County Planning Department database

(residential suburban), R-2 (two family dwellings), R-3 (up to four dwelling units) and R-4 (multifamily dwellings) zoning districts) or the lot is large enough that it may be subdivided into 2 or more parcels; lot consolidation is feasible and when the current development is less than 70% of the maximum density per zoning. The 70% threshold was chosen because recent development activity (see Table III-3 above) shows that when sites within the area were redeveloped, on average they were developed to at least 80% of their permitted density. This difference between a site's existing level of development and its development potential, coupled with current raw land and infrastructure costs may provide an incentive for more intensive development. Furthermore, 63% (38 out of 56) of subdivisions approved in 2007 and 2008 were for projects that would result in two more units. Thus, it was assumed that sites developed to less than the 80% threshold and could yield two or more units might be suitable candidates for redevelopment. When assessing the feasibility of smaller sites, parcels that are 5,000 square feet or more that are zoned at a density permitting at least 12 units per acre or more are included in the inventory. This lot size is the minimum residential lot size and such densities are ideal for multifamily dwellings. Such housing provides affordable options for moderate-income households.

While generally not considered ideal for the development of housing affordable to low-income households, the small sites included within the inventory are appropriate for the following reasons: availability of public infrastructure (water, sewer, police, fire, schools, etc.); transit accessibility; and proximity to major employment centers. Moreover, the growth limitations imposed by Measure D upon the Eastern Alameda County, as well as the cost and availability of public infrastructure, makes affordable housing infeasible outside of the western and more urbanized portions of the County. Furthermore, environmental standards enacted by the legislature through as AB 32 (2006, Nuñez) and SB 375 (2008, Steinberg) encourage infill and transit oriented development as a means to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to reverse the effects of climate change. The small sites included in the inventory are all infill development; however, many would be described as transit oriented development as well due to their proximity (less than .25 mile) to transit.

Lot Consolidation

The urbanized unincorporated areas are characterized by small parcels that are often developed at densities lower than permitted by zoning. Fragmented ownership makes the assemblage of parcels for large-scale developments such as mixed use and transit oriented development difficult, if not financially infeasible. Lot consolidation is a tool that may be used by housing developers to gain greater area upon which to develop housing, to provide for amenities (such as parking and common areas), and to provide a wider range of options for building siting, traffic flow and circulation. Of the 56 subdivisions approved in 2007 and 2008, 10 (18%) required the merger of 2 or more parcels. Thus, the Planning Department has chosen to highlight those parcels where consolidation might be appropriate. Consolidation potential was determined by analyzing those parcels that are adjacent/contiguous, that have the same or comparable zoning and General Plan designations as these traits typified the parcels that were consolidated and for which entitlements were granted in 2007-2008. When calculating the realistic development capacity of the individual sites, the potential for lot mergers was not considered in the formal analysis. The realistic development capacity figure is conservative estimate of a parcel's unit yield. The figure does not rely upon assumptions about which lots would be consolidated. As the data from 2007 and 2008 shows, there have been residential developments that have required the merger of 2 or more parcels. This is certain to occur in the future; however, predicting which parcels would be consolidated is difficult, particularly where there are many parcels adjacent to one another. Rather than providing an arbitrary listing of consolidated parcels, and risk inflating the County's development capacity estimates, it

was decided to consider the sites in their current configurations. However, the County is aware that a listing of those sites that have the highest potential for consolidation could be a useful development tool. In order to meet this need, the County has provided a separate summary of those lots that may be candidates for merger within the planning period and provides a rough estimate of their realistic development capacity post merger. This information is included in Appendix A. Under its "Residential Sites Inventory" program the County will maintain a listing of sites that have the potential for consolidation.

The County has taken many steps to facilitate the consolidation of small sites. Many of the smaller sites included within the Site Inventory are zoned R-S-DV (Residential Suburban, Density Variable). This zoning designation was created as a result of the 2003 Housing Element update with the intention of facilitating small lot consolidation and promoting better residential development. Under DV zoning property owners are able to increase the allowable density by 75% based on the size of the site, thereby encouraging owners of adjoining properties to collaborate in development or to package parcels for sale. The minimum density under DV zoning is one dwelling unit per 3,500 square feet (12.45 dwelling units per acre). For those sites where average lot width is greater than 100 feet and the lot area is not less than 20,000 square feet; the density shall be one dwelling per 2,000 square feet of lot area (21.78 dwelling units per acre).

Other Incentives for Small Site Development

In addition to DV zoning, the County established its Density Bonus Ordinance to provide incentives for the development of affordable housing. The County may also waive its park dedication fee requirements for affordable housing developments. Finally, parties interested in developing affordable housing may access funding from the Redevelopment Agency or the County's Department of Housing and Community Development to support and encourage low and moderate income housing development. In addition to these programs currently provided by the county to support the use of underutilized, small, infill sites the County will investigate the feasibility of providing additional incentives to encourage their development via its Housing Plan.

Mixed Use (Residential/Commercial) Sites

A significant number of sites identified in the County's inventory are mixed use (commercial/residential sites) as specified in their respective general or specific plan. These sites have been included because of their location along commercial corridors and around transit centers, and their overall redevelopment potential. These sites are also within the County's targeted redevelopment areas thereby making projects potentially eligible for financial assistance from the County's Redevelopment Agency. Access to publicly administered financial assistance is quite important considering substantial reductions in the availability of development financing as described in Chapter II, under the section entitled "Housing Markets". The allowable densities sited within the inventory reflect staff and community input, and are consistent with existing patterns of development. For example sites within the Castro Valley Central Business District Specific plan, have allowable densities ranging from 21.78 to 50 dwelling units per acre. Similar to those parcels outside of commercial areas, the realistic development capacity was calculated assuming the site would be developed at 80% of their maximum capacity. A listing of mixed use parcels has been included in Appendix A. While there has been limited redevelopment of these sites in the past, the County has embraced goals via the recently adopted Eden Area plan and Draft Castro Valley and Climate Action plans to encourage infill, higher density mixed use development that capitalizes on the public transportation, traffic capacity, commercial and public amenities that are available along the major commercial corridors, namely East 14th Street, Castro Valley and Hesperian Boulevards.

The following table summarizes the contribution of mixed use sites to the Sites Inventory.

Table III-4: Summary of Mixed Use Sites in the Sites Inventory

Specific Plan	Number of Parcels	Acres	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity	Net Yield
Ashland Cherryland Business District	33	14.78	739	566	458
Castro Valley Central Business District	9	14.09	308	231	63
San Lorenzo Village	20	25.74	590	461	461

Currently there is no guarantee that parcels zoned as "mixed use" be developed to include housing units. If a proposed project would result in fewer dwelling units than projected in the Sites Inventory, as required in Government Code Section 65863 (b), the County shall make the following findings prior to project approval:

(1) The reduction is consistent with the adopted general plan, including the housing element.
(2) The remaining sites identified in the housing element are adequate to accommodate the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need pursuant to Section 65584.

The County will monitor the residential capacity of these sites during the planning period to see if additional incentives or policies are required to ensure that the County has enough capacity to meet its RHNA allocation.

Non-Vacant and Underutilized Sites

The majority of the parcels identified in the Sites Inventory are non-vacant or underutilized parcels in west County areas. Like many jurisdictions in the Bay Area, the western unincorporated areas of the County are "built out". Consequently, the majority of the County's RHNA is realized through the use of non-vacant and underutilized parcels. The geographic scope of the Sites Inventory is necessarily limited by requirements set forth in the East County Area Plan (ECAP) as amended by voter initiative, Measure D. In 2002, Measure D established an Urban Growth Boundary and amended the General Plan to limit development to the western, more urbanized portions of the County. Moreover, the parcels identified have existing infrastructure (water, sewer, streets, sidewalks and public transit) that can accommodate the anticipated population increase over the planning period and are relatively free of environmental constraints that would prevent their redevelopment. They also have existing zoning in place that would permit the development of additional housing units. Staff considered the year of their construction (at least 30 years ago). Units were also selected when the difference between their zoned density and their realistic development capacity resulted in at least two additional units of housing. In addition, these parcels are all located within established redevelopment areas; therefore housing developers may choose to construct dwellings in these areas due to the availability of Redevelopment funding. Within unincorporated Alameda County nearly all of the development activity occurs on parcels where there is an existing use. Planning Department data from 2007 and 2008 shows that of the 56 subdivisions authorized those years, only one occurred on a parcel that was "vacant" or where there were no existing structures (residential or commercial on the property). Raw land costs, growth policies, consumer preference, and the costs of infrastructure have encouraged the redevelopment of non-vacant and underutilized sites within Alameda County; therefore, similar parcels were selected for inclusion in the Sites Inventory. Planning Department data as well as regional trends indicate that the demand for such sites with remain throughout the planning period.

The Alameda County Redevelopment Agency and Department of Housing and Community Development are currently developing an affordable housing strategy for the unincorporated areas that will address housing needs during the current planning period. This strategy will employ funding from the Community Development Block Grant, Redevelopment Housing Set Aside, and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. The County is working proactively with various community organizations, its Citizen's Advisory committees and others to establish incentives for affordable housing development and to inform the public of the housing opportunity sites specified in the Sites Inventory. This housing strategy will be implemented within the first year of the planning period and is included in the County's Housing Plan.

Development Potential by Unincorporated Community

The urban unincorporated areas consist of the communities of Ashland, Cherryland, Castro Valley, Fairview, Hayward Acres and San Lorenzo. The following table summarizes the development capacity by unincorporated community.

Table III-5: Development Potential by Unincorporated Community

Community	# of Units	# of Parcels	% of Total Units
Ashland	502	29	21%
Cherryland	427	93	18%
Castro Valley	402	63	17%
Fairview	223	52	9%
Hayward Acres	372	60	16%
San Lorenzo	444	22	19%
Total Capacity	**2,370**	**319**	**100%**

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

State Route 238 Study Area

Twenty six parcels identified on the Sites Inventory are currently owned by the State of California, and are under the supervision of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). These parcels were obtained by the State over 40 years ago as a part of a planned expansion and redesign of State Route 238. Through a series of legal actions initiated by local residents, the project was stopped, although the parcels have remained under State ownership. At this time, Caltrans has initiated the process to dispose of the surplus parcels and has begun discussions with Alameda County about how these parcels may be redeveloped for residential uses.

The area surrounding these parcels have been developed primarily with residential subdivisions, multi-family housing, commercial and institutional uses. Of the twenty six parcels listed in the inventory only six are developed with structures. Five of these sites have single family homes and one has two dwelling units present.

When the County updated its Castro Valley and Eden Area Plans in 1985 and 1983 respectively, these parcels were neither identified nor were they provided with corresponding general plan designations. Staff has analyzed the history of these documents and concluded that the omission reflected a reasonable expectation of the County that these sites would be developed by Caltrans as a part of the 238 expansion and thus would not be subject to the County's land use policies or oversight. As the legal dispute over the 238 project had yet to be resolved, the project was abandoned in 2004; the County did not wish to further complicate an already contentious matter. The County plans to formalize the planned use of these parcels into proposed amendments to the Eden and Castro Valley area plans. These documents will

identify these parcels and provide general plan designations for each of the sites. The County intends to finalize and adopt these general plan amendments in 2010. Staff expects that the general plan designation will of these sites will be consistent with their current zoning. In the interim the County has provided the proposed general plan designations for these parcels in the absence of a current description.

Among all of the small parcels included in the Sites Inventory, the parcels within the 238 study area have the greatest potential for lot consolidation as all parcels are owned by the State. Yet, the County has chosen to not assume lot consolidation in its estimates of development capacity as provided in Tables III-5 and III-6. Consistent with the methodology and rationale provided in the section above entitled 'Small Sites", the County has calculated the realistic development capacity based upon the sites' current configuration and zoning. We anticipate that these sites will be available early in the planning period. A summary of all parcels listed on the Sites Inventory (not just those that are within the Route 238 Study area) that may be candidates for mergers has been provided in Appendix A.

ZONING APPROPRIATE TO ACCOMMODATE HOUSING FOR LOWER AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

As per AB 2348 Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)(B), the County has identified sites that may be developed at densities of 30 or more units per acre as feasible for the development of housing affordable to low income households. The purpose of this default density standard is to provide a numerical density standard for local governments, resulting in greater certainty in the housing element review process. No further analysis is required to establish the adequacy of sites density with respect to affordable housing development for low income households. Using the default density as a baseline estimate, the county has determined that sites that can be developed at densities between 13 and 22 units per acre are assumed to be affordable to moderate income households. Parcels zoned at this density are appropriate for the development of medium density housing developments such as duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. None of the parcels identified in the Sites Inventory require rezoning to accommodate the housing needs of lower and moderate income households.

TRANSIT ORIENTED AND MIXED USE DISTRICTS

The County's site inventory includes parcels that are located in close proximity to public transit, and in areas that are currently zoned to accommodate mixed uses. The selection of these sites is consistent with the County's Housing Element goals as described in Goals 2 and 7 of the element. The County will seek opportunities to encourage such developments as part of its Infill, Mixed Use and Transit Oriented Developments program.

ADEQUACY OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

A lack of adequate infrastructure or public services and facilities can be a substantial constraint to residential development if it is to avoid impacting existing residents. As a result, developers cannot receive building permits to initiate construction without demonstrating water availability, and either sewer availability or the ability to accommodate septic systems.

These standards ensure that the infrastructure and public services and facilities are in place to

serve that particular development. These standards are implemented through payment of fees and exaction and site improvements discussed within the chapter entitled “Housing Constraints” under the heading “Development Impact Fees”.

Many of the County’s affordable housing developments are located in infill locations currently served by existing infrastructure. While such infill sites are beneficial in that they do not require the extension of services, provide housing near public transit and jobs, encourage economic growth in urban areas, and thus promote “smart growth” development principles, they may face other challenges to development. Infill sites in the older communities in the County may require upgrading of existing infrastructure systems to support more intense development, such as roadway improvements, and replacement of undersized sewer and water lines.

ADEQUACY OF RESIDENTIAL SITES INVENTORY

The County must demonstrate adequate sites to accommodate its RHNA goals of 2,167 units. The County’s residential sites potential is composed of the following:

- vacant residentially zoned sites;
- vacant non-residentially zoned sites that allow residential development;
- underutilized residentially zoned sites capable of being developed at a higher density or with greater intensity; and
- non-residentially zoned sites that can be redeveloped for, and/or rezoned for, residential use (via program actions); and
- Second units

The table below provides a summary of the units constructed, permitted, approved/ entitled, or planned between January 1, 2007, and July, 2009 as well as additional units that can be accommodated on sites identified as having residential development potential. Based on planned development and capacity of vacant and underutilized sites, the County can accommodate an additional 2,398 units of housing which is sufficient to cover the County’s remaining housing need. Pending multifamily residential development projects and subdivision activities provide 222 additional units. The majority of these units will be single-family or lower density units that are generally affordable only to moderate and above moderate-income households. Very Low-, Low- and moderate-income housing will be accommodated within multifamily residential and commercial zones where mixed use developments are permitted, as well as through second units. The table below summarizes the County’s RHNA status.

Table III-6: RHNA Status

		Income Level			
	Total	**Very Low**	**Low**	**Moderate**	**Above Moderate**
RHNA	2,167	536	340	400	891
RHNA Credits	858	221	252	95	290
Pending Development	222				222
Second Units[34]	29		29		
Sites Capacity	2,370	700		1,217	443
RHNA Credits, Pending Development and Site Capacity vs. Remaining RHNA	(1,312)	(326)		(950)	(64)

34 The number of units anticipated from 2009-2014.

CHAPTER IV- HOUSING PLAN

INTRODUCTION

The focus of the Alameda County Housing Element is the provision of safe, decent and affordable housing for all residents of the unincorporated areas. The goals, principles and policies set forth in the following section provide the foundation for Alameda County's housing strategy and guide its housing programs. The goals represent the community's desired outcomes, while the principles describe the underlying beliefs that support the goals, and the policies guide the County's decision making. Finally, housing programs are presented in a subsequent subsection. These programs represent the actions that the County intends to take in order to meet the policy objectives stated in the Housing Element over a five year period (2009-2014). Many of these programs are ongoing programs and are subject to regulatory constraints and funding availability. There are some programs listed in this document that may require further study and public review before they become formalized. Changes to the County Ordinance or amendments to the General Plan require hearings before both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors prior to their adoption.

In accordance with State law, Alameda County has established the following outcomes for its housing plan:

- Provide adequate sites, with appropriate zoning and development standards and services to accommodate the locality's share of the regional housing needs for each income level; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(1))

- Assist in the development of adequate and affordable housing to meet the needs of extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(2))

- Address, and where possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing, including housing for all income levels and housing for persons with disabilities; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(3))

- Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(4))

- Preserve assisted housing developments at-risk of conversion to market-rate; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(6)(d))

- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status or disability; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(5))

- Encourage building development that incorporates sustainable and energy efficient features (Government Code Section 65583(a)(7))

Provide Adequate Sites

In order to facilitate the development of housing affordable to persons at various income levels, the County must first identify land that is suitable for housing development. Specifically, the

County must identify sites that are appropriately zoned that can be developed to accommodate its regional housing share as defined by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The County must also take the steps necessary to keep this information current and to ensure that this information is accessible and usable by the development community. Housing development must be monitored to ensure that the County's efforts are achieving measurable results towards its goals of housing access and affordability.

Goal 1: Provide sites suitable for housing development that can accommodate a range of housing by type, size, location and tenure.

Policy 1.1: Assist housing developers in identifying and consolidating suitable sites for the development of housing affordable to a wide range of households.

Policy 1.2: Consider all County-owned and other public lands for their suitability as housing sites and adopt and support land use plans, disposition agreements and development programs to provide a range of housing on appropriate sites.

Policy 1.3: Complete centralized accessible information service for each parcel in the Unincorporated Area of the County, including planning and zoning information, and physical constraints.

Policy 1.4: Maintain adequate land appropriately zoned for a mix of rental and sale housing which is consistent with demand for these types of units.

Policy 1.5 Provide timely reports on the status of housing development in the Unincorporated County.

Policy 1.6 Review development potential under current zoning, and revise zoning to increase densities, where appropriate, to ensure appropriate use of scarce land resources and compatibility with existing uses.

Programs

Residential Sites Inventory

The County shall maintain an inventory of land with zoning and adequate infrastructure and services to meet the County's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Allocation of 2,167 units.

Objectives:

- Continue to provide adequate sites to accommodate the County's RHNA of 2,167 units.
- Maintain an up-to-date inventory of vacant/underutilized residential sites as funding permits and make the inventory readily available to potential developers
- Highlight small sites that may be consolidated to accommodate additional housing units and maximize their development potential
- Pursue completion and adoption of the Castro Valley and Eden Area Plans
- Monitor the redevelopment of mixed use sites to ensure that the County complies with Government Code Section 65863. Specifically, the County will compare the number of

dwelling units constructed to the realistic development capacity provided in the Sites Inventory (Appendix A). If fewer units were constructed than projected, the County shall determine if the remaining parcels on the County's Sites Inventory are sufficient to meet the County's RHNA, and if not it shall identify additional sites or rezone parcels as need to make up the deficiency.

Web Based Zoning and Planning Information

Information is essential for effective land use planning, and the County will make data available to support residential and commercial development in the unincorporated areas.

Objectives:

- Provide a centralized, accessible, web based information service for each parcel in the Unincorporated Area of the County, including planning and zoning information, and physical constraints.

Timeframe: 2010
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Annual Progress Report

Per Government Code Section 65400, local governments are required to annually report on the progress of implementation of their general plans. With respect to the housing element portion of the annual report, State law requires that, by April 1 of each year, the local planning agency to provide an annual report to the local government's legislative body, to the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD). This report should include the following information:

- The "status of the plan and progress in its implementation;"
- The "progress in meeting its share of regional housing needs determined pursuant to Government Code Section 65584;" and
- Local efforts to "remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(c)(3)."

Objectives:

- Prepare an annual report for submission to State HCD by April 1st of each year during the planning period
- Initiate implementation activities as prescribed in the adopted Housing Element, and ensure an effective program of ongoing monitoring to track housing needs and achievements
- Monitor legislation and issues related to the maintenance and development of housing
- Report on the development of mixed use sites identified in the Sites Inventory to confirm compliance with Government Code Section 65863.

Assist in the Development of Affordable Housing and Special Needs Housing

The County is committed to supporting the development of housing of varying types, sizes and affordability levels for its current and future residents. The State has also identified certain populations that have special housing needs and often face limited housing options. These include, but are not limited to extremely low-income households, seniors, farmworkers, persons requiring emergency or transitional housing, and persons with disabilities. Existing County affordable housing funding programs include rating criteria that target extremely low-income,

homeless and special needs populations. The County also targets funding to developments providing mixed-income housing to avoid over concentration and to support inclusion of all segments of the community. Over 50% of the affordable housing funds administered by the County's Housing and Community Development Department have targeted ELI households. Over the past 15 years, programs administered have produced 702 special needs housing units, 381 of which are for homeless populations county-wide. The County will continue to use affordable housing monies to support the development of housing for extremely low-income households. These targets ensure that the County will support the development of affordable housing for all segments of the population and that existing programs are sufficient to meet the Housing Element requirement regarding programs to assist the development of housing to meet the needs of Extremely Low-Income Households.

Goal 2: To ensure that there is a wide range of housing opportunities for current and future residents of the unincorporated communities.

Principles: Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and improving the supply of housing available to very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over-concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.

The housing supply should include a mix of rental and sale housing units that is consistent with demand for these types of units.

Ensure adequate housing opportunities for population groups or persons with special housing needs. Housing facilities for these groups should, to the extent possible, be integrated into existing residential neighborhoods and housing developments and sited to provide convenient access to public and private services and facilities.

Permit manufactured homes placed on a permanent foundation, subject to applicable building and zoning regulations, on any site that a conventional dwelling is permitted.

Recognize the value of mobile home parks in providing affordable home ownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income households.

Policy 2.1: Coordinate with the private sector in the development of affordable and special needs housing for rental and homeownership. When and where appropriate, promote such development through incentives.

Policy 2.2: Participate in State and federal housing programs.

Policy 2.3: Provide education on the problems and needs in the area of housing as a means of changing ingrained negative attitudes towards the provision of low and moderate-income housing.

Policy 2.4: Encourage participation at the neighborhood level towards a solution of housing problems through seminars, community meetings and dialogue with local officials.

Policy 2.5: Use all present methods and develop new methods of providing economic assistance to provide affordable housing for persons residing in the County.

Policy 2.6: Encourage federal, State and local legislation and programs to provide housing assistance.

Policy 2.7: Encourage and support research to enable more rapid data collection and analysis in the field of housing.

Policy 2.8: Prevent exclusionary housing actions that put undue pressures on surrounding communities.

Policy 2.9: Develop and consider adoption of an Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance to promote inclusion of affordable housing in new residential developments.

Policy 2.10: Develop policies and procedures to give priority expedited processing to residential developments that include a significant portion of units restricted to low- or moderate-income households.

Policy 2.11: Modify appropriate ordinances and policies to reduce and/or waive fees for residential developments that include a significant portion of units restricted to low- or moderate-income households. Allow these developments to pay fees upon issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

Policy 2.12: Sponsor and support legislation to provide and expand federal tax incentives to stimulate investment in low- and moderate-income housing, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Mortgage Credit Certificates, and tax-exempt financing.

Policy 2.13: Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, review County Density Bonus ordinance and consider amendments to offer incentives in exchange for deeper affordability and/or an increase in the number of affordable units.

Policy 2.14: Maintain and update information on area rental housing availability in assessing demand for rentals.

Policy 2.15: Enforce provisions of the County Zoning Ordinance and the County Building Code, which, since 1981, permit the placement of modular homes and mobile homes, built since 1976 and placed on a permanent foundation to be located on any site on which a conventional dwelling unit is permitted.

Policy 2.16: Review existing Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Ordinance and amend to include specific provisions regarding allowable reasons for increasing rents over the allowed maximum, increasing the review fee, and providing for sufficient notice for tenants of all proposed rent increases.

Policy 2.17: Continue to support the Community Reinvestment Act to encourage financial institutions to provide loans in high-risk areas and for affordable housing developments.

Policy 2.18: Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, review and, as appropriate, revise or create zoning districts and regulations, and site development and planned development district standards and guidelines to support appropriate mixed-use residential/commercial development.

Policy 2.19: Coordinate planning efforts with local water and sewer providers.

Programs

Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance

Inclusionary Zoning Ordinances require that housing developers "include" a minimum percentage of lower and moderate income housing within new developments. All jurisdictions within Alameda County, except the City of Oakland and the unincorporated County have adopted an Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance. Inclusionary programs vary widely; however, they generally include mandatory requirements or development incentives, such as density bonuses. Most inclusionary zoning programs contain the following elements:

- Inclusionary housing percentage
- Income-eligibility criteria for defining affordability
- Pricing criteria for affordable units
- Restrictions on resale prices and rents of affordable units
- Provisions for in-lieu fees
- Exemptions for small scale developments
- Other provisions regarding on-site or off-site construction requirements

During the planning period the County will perform a feasibility study to assess economic impacts and make recommendations on the possible structure of an ordinance.

Objectives:

- Investigate the feasibility, legal constraints and economic impacts of an inclusionary zoning ordinance
- Recommend parameters of an inclusionary Zoning Ordinance

Timeframe: 2011
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Density Bonus Program

State law requires cities and counties to approve density bonuses for housing developments that contain specified percentages of units affordable to very low- or low-income households or units restricted to occupancy by seniors. Under state law (California Government Code, Section

65915–65918), housing developers may qualify for several types of density bonuses—up to 35 percent—based on the percentage housing units in a development affordable to very low-income, low-income, moderate-income, or senior households. Density bonus units must be restricted to occupancy by seniors or affordable to the targeted income for at least 30 years. Depending on the percentage of affordable units and the income level(s) to which the units are affordable, jurisdictions must also grant "concessions" (additional incentives) in addition to a density bonus. Under the basic requirements, jurisdictions must provide one concession. If a higher percentage of affordable units is provided (or if deeper affordability is provided), a new development can be provided with two to three concessions.

Currently, a housing development must consist of five or more dwelling units and meet one or more of the following criteria in order to qualify for a density bonus and one or more incentives:

- 10% of the total units are designated as restricted units for very low income households; or
- 20% of the total units are designated as restricted units for lower income households; or
- 50% of the total units are designated as restricted units for senior households.

In addition to an increase in density, the County's Density Bonus Ordinance provides a variety of incentives. An applicant is eligible for one or more incentives, depending upon the amount of affordable units that set aside. An incentive may include any of the following:

1. Approval of a mixed-use development if commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses will help to offset the costs of the housing development.
2. Government-assisted financing, including, but not limited to, mortgage revenue bonds issued by the county;
3. A reduction in site development standards
4. Other incentives proposed by the developer or the County which result in identifiable cost reductions, including but not limited to:
    - Waiver or reduction of certain county fees applicable to restricted units in a housing development,
    - Reduction of interior amenities,
    - Priority processing of a housing development which provides restricted units.

Objectives:

- Revise Chapter 17.56 of the Municipal Code, which contains the County's density bonus requirements, to reflect current density bonus law.
- Create brochures and other materials necessary to promote the County's Density Bonus Program to developers.

Timeframe: 2010
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

<u>Secondary Units</u>
Objectives:

- Promote the Secondary Unit Program to increase public awareness
- Review applications for secondary units
- Periodically review the Zoning Ordinance to maintain consistency with State law.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning, Public Works Administration (PWA)-Building Inspections Division (BID)
Funding Source: General Fund, Permit Fees

Park Fee Waiver

Section 12.20 of the Alameda County Ordinance Code addresses Park Dedication Fees. Under sections 12.20.090 C. and 12.20.110 B. affordable housing developments may be exempted from this fee if they conform to the definition of "affordable housing" provided in 12.20.050:

> "Affordable housing" means a rental housing unit with rent restricted for fifty-five (55) years to be affordable to households with incomes of no more than sixty (60) percent of area median income, adjusted for household size, or an ownership housing unit with price restricted for forty-five (45) years to be affordable to households with incomes of no more than eighty (80) percent of area median income, adjusted for household size, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development or a successor agency designated by the director of community development.

Objectives:

- Promote affordable housing development and ensures financial feasibility

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

EveryOne Home

EveryOne Home is the result of a unique collaboration among community stakeholders, cities and Alameda County government agencies representing three separate care systems — homeless services, HIV/AIDS services and mental health services — that share overlapping client populations. The collaboration arose from their recognition that stable housing is a critical cornerstone to the health and well-being of homeless and at-risk people, and our communities. Rather than continue on their separate paths toward housing solutions, the agencies creating these plans realized that they serve many people with similar needs — and in many cases, the same individuals — and came together in 2004 to develop one plan with mutual goals and joint effort for implementation.

In January 2008 EveryOne Home became a community based organization with the Tides Center serving as its fiscal agent. The original governmental entities that sponsored the Plan fund EveryOne Home's operations and serve on its strategic Leadership Board. The County will continue to participate in Everyone Home to coordinate planning and to leverage financial and administrative resources

Timeframe: Through 2020
Responsible Agency: BHCS; CDA-HCD; PHD-OAA; SSA; and the CoC
Funding Source: General Fund

HIV/AIDS Housing and Services

Alameda County's HIV/AIDS housing and service system is supported primarily by two federal programs: the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program of the U.S.

Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency (CARE) Act, a program of the Health Resources and Services Administration of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Locally, HOPWA funds are administered by the Housing and Community Development Department of the Alameda County Community Development Agency (CDA-HCD), and Ryan White funds are administered by the Office of AIDS Administration in the Alameda County Public Health Department (PHD-OAA).

Objectives:
Address the housing and needs of low income people with HIV/AIDS and their families.

Timeframe:	Ongoing
Responsible Agency:	CDA-HCD and the PHD-OAA
Funding Source:	HOPWA, CARE, and McKinney-Vento Funds

First Time Homebuyer Resources
The Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development maintains a website with information pertinent to first-time homebuyers. The site includes links to both state and federal homeownership resources, as well as information on predatory lending and financial literacy.

Objectives:
- Continue to provide resources for first time homebuyers
- Periodically update the website as new information and programs become available

Timeframe:	Ongoing
Responsible Agency:	CDA-HCD
Funding Source:	Various

Mortgage Credit Certificate
The Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC), authorized by Congress in the Tax Reform Act of 1984, provides assistance to first-time homebuyers for the purchase of owner-occupied single family homes, duplexes, townhomes, and condominiums.

The program provides the income eligible buyer with an opportunity to reduce the amount of federal income tax otherwise due by an amount equal to 15% of the mortgage interest payments at a dollar for dollar credit. The remaining 85% can be taken as the usual allowable deduction of the itemized return. The result increases the household's overall income and ability to qualify for a mortgage loan.

Objective:
- Assist 5-7 low and moderate income first time homebuyers in the unincorporated areas.

Timeframe:	Ongoing
Responsible Agency:	CDA-HCD
Funding Source:	Mortgage Credit Certificate

Section 8 Housing Programs
The Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) operates the programs listed below in Unincorporated Alameda County and several cities within the County. The programs are administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). They provide

rental housing or rental assistance for low-income families, the elderly, people with disabilities, and others.

The Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP): Over 7,000 families and landlords participate in the HCVP. The HCVP is the federal government's major program for assisting very low-income families, the elderly, and the disabled to afford decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the private market. Since housing assistance is provided on behalf of the family or individual, participants are able to find their own housing, including single-family homes, townhouses and apartments. The family's portion of the rent ranges from 30 to 40 percent of the total household income. HACA pays the difference directly to the landlord.

The Section 8 Project-Based Voucher Program (PBV): This program subsidizes the rent and utilities of a unit in a subsidized development. HACA provides 18 units of Section 8 Project-Based assistance in the unincorporated area.

Objectives:

- Provide rental assistance to 600 extremely low and very low income households in the unincorporated areas during the planning period.

Timeframe:	Ongoing
Responsible Agency:	HACA
Funding Source:	HUD - Section 8

Family Self Sufficiency Program (FSS)

The objective of the FSS program is to reduce or eliminate the dependency of low-income families on welfare assistance and on Section 8, public assistance, or any Federal, State, or local rent or homeownership program. HACA measures the success of its FSS program by the number of FSS families, who have become welfare free, obtained their first job or a higher paying job, obtained a diploma or higher education degree, or similar goals that will assist the family in obtaining economic independence.

Affordable decent, safe, and sanitary housing provides a family a measure of stability. FSS builds on that foundation made possible by the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP). FSS participants sign a 5-year Contract of Participation. HACA's FSS Counselors leverage public- and private-sector resources to provide and facilitate the case management, education and job training opportunities that can help families become economically independent. FSS also offers a homebuyers education and financial incentive program to help participants purchase a home of their own upon successful completion of their Contract of Participation or upon achievement of certain interim goals.

HACA's FSS program has successfully graduated over 150 families throughout Alameda County. Over 20 of those families have become homeowners.

Objectives:

- Assist 20 Section 8 recipients in the unincorporated areas to achieve self-sufficiency during the planning period.

Timeframe:	Ongoing
Responsible Agency:	HACA
Funding Source:	HUD - Section 8, additional public and private funds

Affordable Housing Development

The Housing and Community Development Department (CDA-HCD) and the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) will collaborate on various projects that will increase the County's supply of affordable housing. RDA and CDA-HCD will provide both administrative and financial resources to support affordable housing development within the unincorporated areas.

Objectives:

- Develop a housing strategy
- Identify and complete between four to six new affordable housing projects during the planning period

Time Frame:	2009-2014
Responsible Agency:	CDA-HCD and RDA
Funding Sources:	Redevelopment Housing Set Aside, HOME, CDBG (Affordable Housing Pool and Rental Rehabilitation Program), Alameda County Affordable Housing Trust Fund

Address Governmental Constraints

Land use and building policies and regulations can impact the cost to develop housing. Affordable housing is particularly sensitive to price considerations, and so the County will evaluate its existing policies to identify and mitigate those requirements, procedures, fees and exactions that may constrain the development and maintenance of affordable housing within the unincorporated areas.

Goal 3:	Mitigate governmental constraints or mandates to housing development and affordability.
Principles:	Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and expanding the supply of housing available to very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.
Policy 3.1:	Review ordinances and requirements that may unnecessarily increase the cost of housing or be working at cross-purposes in implementing the goals of the Housing Element.
Policy 3.2:	Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, review requirements for on- and off-site improvements for new developments, define what "excessive" requirements are, identify "excessive" potential requirements, and make every effort to reduce these "excessive" requirements, if any.
Policy 3.3:	Increase the height limit to a maximum of 40 feet in transit-oriented mixed-use development districts and high-density residential districts to ensure that multifamily housing can be effectively built. Allow exceptions to this maximum through the use of Conditional Use Permits.

Policy 3.4: Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, analyze the 25-foot height requirement in medium density residential zones and other zones, and consider modifications to these requirements, as appropriate.

Policy 3.5: Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, analyze the impact of the County's parking requirements on the development of housing and modify the requirements if needed, especially as they relate to the provision of affordable and senior housing.

Policy 3.6: Maintain a community-based Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, whose purpose would be to assist the County in developing proposed changes to zoning regulations, site review requirements, and similar requirements as noted in the Housing Element implementing actions listed below.

Programs

Ordinance Review Committee

The County regulates the type, location, density, and scale of residential development in the unincorporated areas primarily through the Zoning Ordinance. Zoning regulations are designed to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of residents as well as implement the policies of the County General Plan. The County is engaged in an ongoing process of reviewing the Zoning Ordinance for consistency with State laws. For this purpose Alameda County has established an Ordinance Review Committee. The goal of this review is to ensure that the County's requirements and standards do not act as a constraint to the development of affordable housing. The County will review the following policies in order to mitigate potential constraints to housing and to ensure consistency with State law:

- Create standards for Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units, supportive housing, emergency shelters and transitional housing per Senate Bill 2 (Cedillo) and Assembly Bill 2634 (Lieber)
- Draft reasonable accommodation procedures compatible with fair housing laws, State Housing Element law, and the Health and Safety Code
- Evaluate the County's Ordinance with respect to Secondary Units and amend it as necessary for consistency with State law
- Review provisions for agricultural caretaker housing to be consistent with the Health and Safety Code, Employee Housing Act, and Housing Element law
- Amend the density bonus ordinance to reflect changes in State law
- Review provisions related to manufactured housing
- Evaluate the Park Dedication fee structure to ensure that it does not pose a constraint to the development of affordable housing.
- Review height and parking requirements and revise as appropriate

Objectives:

- Periodically review proposed changes to the Alameda County Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with the Housing Element law and State and Federal fair housing laws.
- Ensure that County regulations do not unnecessarily constrain housing development
- Coordinate efforts with other County agencies as needed

Timeframe: Ongoing

Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Design Guidelines

The Alameda County CDA has initiated an Illustrated Design Guidelines and Development Standards project to establish design review guidelines for new construction and redevelopment projects in the County. The Design Guidelines will be used by developers to assist in the design of projects and by County staff, County decision-makers and the general public to review applications for proposed projects. The key goal is to provide clarity and certainty about site planning and architectural design expectations.

Objectives:

- Establish design review guidelines for new construction and redevelopment projects in the County.

Timeframe: 2010
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Conserve and Improve the Existing Housing Stock

The County must take action to conserve and improve the existing housing stock to meet its goal of providing safe, decent and affordable housing to its residents. Actions such as these which stimulate community reinvestment are essential in the removal of blight and the revitalization of existing neighborhoods. Conserving and rehabilitating these sites not only helps the County to meet its housing needs, but it also protects the safety and welfare of its residents.

Goal 4: To ensure a supply of sound housing units in safe and attractive residential neighborhoods.

Principles: All housing should be adequately maintained and, where needed, rehabilitated to protect the health and safety of residents while still maintaining affordability.

Maintain and improve the quality of residential neighborhoods. Incompatible residential and non-residential projects should be excluded where they would significantly impair desirable residential qualities. Compatible mixed-use developments should be supported in commercial areas adjacent to and on the edges of residential areas. Public facilities in and services to residential areas should be adequately maintained and, where necessary, improved.

Policy 4.1: Enforce applicable provisions of the housing and building codes.

Policy 4.2: Stimulate neighborhood and community improvement by providing financial and technical assistance in the form of low interest loans, technical assistance and code enforcement.

Policy 4.3: Sponsor and support legislation that would increase funding available to low and moderate income housing rehabilitation programs.

Policy 4.4: Provide adequate funding for maintenance and improvement of public facilities within the unincorporated areas, such as child care, and services provided to residential areas.

Policy 4.5: Enforce the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance. Review and revise, as necessary.

Policy 4.6: Enforce applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

Policy 4.7: Continue providing accessibility improvements under housing rehabilitation programs to increase the ability of physically disabled people to a) obtain and retain appropriate housing, and b) live independently.

Policy 4.8: Prepare a study to determine the cost and feasibility of reinstituting housing code enforcement by the County Building Inspection Department.

Policy 4.9: Require, as a condition of property transfer, building inspection and necessary repairs to meet health and safety standards.

Policy 4.10: Continue providing housing rehabilitation programs.

Policy 4.11: Continue to support the Community Reinvestment Act to encourage financial institutions to provide loans in high-risk areas and for affordable housing developments.

Policy 4.12: Review and, as appropriate, revise or create zoning districts and regulations, and site development and planned development district standards and guidelines to support appropriate mixed-use residential/commercial development.

Policy 4.13: Disseminate foreclosure prevention information.

Programs

Minor Home Repair

Alameda County provides grants for emergency repairs of plumbing, carpentry, electrical, railings, grab bars, toilets, water heaters, furnaces, doors, locks and more. The applicant must be the owner of record and the combined income of the household must meet program requirements.

Objectives:

- Continue to provide rehabilitation grants to qualified lower income homeowners.
- Assist 290 lower income households over the planning period.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Construction, HCD and RDA

Funding Source: CDBG, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside

Accessibility Grants

Alameda County offers Accessibility grants for seniors or persons with special needs to install ramps, railings, doorways, counter height modifications, etc. Tenants and/or property owners may apply for assistance.

Objectives:

- Continue to provide accessibility grants to qualified persons.
- Assist 17 households over the planning period.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Construction, HCD and RDA
Funding Source: CDBG, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside

Curb Appeal/Paint Grants

Alameda County provides Curb Appeal/Paint grants for exterior painting and driveway replacement. All work is inspected and coordinated by qualified, professional Construction Department staff and performed by licensed Contractors. The applicant must be the owner of record and the combined income of the household must meet program requirements.

Objectives:

- Continue to provide rehabilitation grants to qualified lower income homeowners.
- Assist 116 lower income households over the planning period.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Construction, HCD and RDA
Funding Source: CDBG, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside

Rehabilitation Loans

The Alameda County Rehabilitation Loan Program provides eligible lower income homeowners with below market-rate deferred loans to correct major health and safety deficiencies and make needed accessibility modifications. Loans may be secured for up to $60,000. Repayment may be deferred until the property is sold refinanced or title transferred.

Objectives:

- Provide loans to qualified lower income homeowners
- Distribute information on the program
- Assist 56 homeowners during the planning period

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Construction, HCD and RDA
Funding Source: CDBG, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside

Foreclosure Prevention

Unincorporated Alameda County has a high number of foreclosures, and the County is committed to distributing information to help residents avert foreclosure.

Objectives:

- Provide up to date information about avoiding and dealing with foreclosure.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD
Funding Source: Various

Graffiti Abatement

The purpose of this program is to provide a graffiti removal service for private properties in the Alameda County Redevelopment Sub-Areas including Ashland, Cherryland, Foothill, San Lorenzo and Castro Valley and for all public property in the unincorporated area with the intent of preventing and controlling the spread of graffiti.

Objectives:

- Provide removal of graffiti from commercial, residential, and public properties.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Redevelopment Agency (RDA)
Funding Source: Redevelopment Tax-Increment Financing

Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)

In 2008, Alameda County's Housing and Community Development Department (CDA-HCD) received an allocation of $2.1 million in NSP funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to address the problem of abandoned and foreclosed homes. In accordance with the NSP fund guidelines, Alameda County has identified 5 strategies to address the issue of abandoned and foreclosed properties:

1. Revolving fund for property purchase and rehabilitation
2. Down payment assistance/shared appreciation loans
3. Funding for the purchase and rehabilitation of residential properties suitable for long-term rentals
4. Demolition and land banking of blighted properties
5. Homebuyer pre-purchase counseling

Funds must be targeted to the areas with the greatest need as determined by the percentage of sub prime or high cost mortgages, rate of foreclosures, and risk of further decline through foreclosures and abandonment. The County has 18 months to fully obligate these funds, and four years to expend all funds. Any program revenue can be reallocated to NSP eligible uses through 2014.

Objectives:

- Collaborate with nonprofit housing developers to NSP implement the program in 2009
- Purchase and rehabilitate 25 foreclosed properties during the planning period.
- Educate 25 potential homebuyers

Timeframe: 2009-2014
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD
Funding Source: Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)

Lead Based Paint Program

In 1987, the California Department of Health Services conducted a study that found high levels of lead in many Alameda County children. In response to the concerns of People United for a

Better Oakland (PUEBLO) and other community organizations, the County Health Officer formed a task force composed of city, county and state public health professionals, pediatricians, community groups, and housing officials. The task force proposed the development of a unique new entity, the Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (ACLPPP).

The Board of Supervisors passed a resolution officially establishing the Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (ACLPPP) in 1991. The resolution allowed cities in the County to participate in and support the Program by assessing an annual $10 fee on all residential dwellings constructed before 1978, the first year that the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) banned lead in paint for residential use. The cities of Oakland, Berkeley, and Alameda were the first to participate in the program and the city of Emeryville joined in 1992. The program is governed by the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) which is composed of elected officials from each participating city and a community representative.

The ACLPPP's unique multi-disciplinary approach has received federal and state funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Center for Disease Control (CDC), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Health Services (DHS).

Objectives:

- Prevent childhood lead poisoning and other health-related environmental problems

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: ACLPPP
Funding Source: HUD, EPA, CDC and DHS

Code Enforcement

The Code Enforcement Division is headed by the Code Enforcement Manager, an Assistant Deputy Director, and is responsible for enforcement of the Zoning Ordinance, the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance, the Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Ordinance, the Building Code, the Housing code, and sections of the Fire Code, as well as land use regulations. Complaints usually derive from an illegal activity on or use of a property, such as operating a business in a residential district or an illegal dwelling unit. Investigations of violations occur on a complaint basis; as current staffing is not adequate to seek out violations.

Objectives:

- Continue to enforce applicable sections of the Alameda County Ordinance and related land use regulations
- Investigate the cost of housing code enforcement
- Seek additional funding opportunities to increase staffing

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning, Code Enforcement Division
Funding Source: General Fund and Planning Fees

Preserve Units at Risk

There is an ever present need for affordable housing, particularly for seniors and low-income households. In order to keep pace with the current and rising demand for affordable housing, the County must not only support programs that encourage the development of new housing

units, but it must also preserve existing subsidized affordable housing. During the planning period the County will take steps to prevent the conversion of subsidized affordable housing units to market rate housing.

Goal 5: Seek to preserve units at risk of losing their affordability restrictions.

Principle Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and improving the supply of housing available to very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over-concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.

Policy 5.1: Monitor and encourage Federal and State efforts to ensure retention of existing federally subsidized housing stock.

Policy 5.2: Evaluate the feasibility of allocating local resources to preserve existing affordable housing units and prevent the displacement of low- and moderate- income households.

Policy 5.3: Evaluate potential impacts of public and private projects on the existing housing supply. Restrict development or require that adequate replacement housing be provided when projects will result in substantial losses of low and moderate cost housing units.

Policy 5.4: Continue to maintain a system for keeping track of all subsidized low and moderate-income units.

Programs

Preservation of At Risk Housing

44 units of housing are at risk of conversion to market rate units during the planning period. The County will monitor all units considered at risk of conversion, and to the extent feasible, work to preserve the affordability of these units.

Objectives:

- Maintain a database of subsidized housing units in order to monitor the status of units at risk of conversion
- Pursue funding from private, State and Federal programs to assist in preserving at risk housing
- Provide assistance via the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program to households displaced due to the expiration of affordability restrictions
- Discuss preservation options with at-risk project owners
- Contact nonprofit housing developers to collaborate on projects that preserve units at risk
- Provide financial assistance to nonprofit housing developers to either acquire or rehabilitate units at risk of conversion
- Report on its activities to preserve at risk units in its Annual Report

Timeframe: 2009-2014
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD and HACA
Funding Source: Redevelopment Set-Aside, HUD, HOME, and Section 8

Condominium Conversion

The County's apartment housing stock represents an important source of affordable housing to lower and moderate income households. Loss of apartment housing due to conversion to common interest developments (such as condominiums) compromises the County's ability to address rental housing needs. However, condominium may also provide affordable housing opportunities. In response to these concerns, in 1979 the County drafted guidelines to regulate the condominium conversion process. The guidelines list specific performance standards that must be met prior to conversion which include requirements for parking, open space, and energy efficiency. The guidelines also establish provisions for protecting the rights of tenants currently residing in units that are approved for conversion. These provisions include specific purchasing rights for tenants, as well as eviction clauses to which the owners must adhere.

Objectives:

- Continue to enforce the Condominium Conversion Guidelines

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning, PWA-Development Services
Funding Source: Planning and Permit Fees

Promote Equal Housing Opportunities

Access to housing is a matter of great concern to all persons; therefore Alameda County is committed to efforts to identify and prevent housing discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, family or marital status, national origin, color, age, physical or mental disability, or sexual orientation.

Goal 6: To ensure equal housing opportunity for all persons without discrimination in accordance with State and Federal laws.

Principle Everyone who finances, sells, or rents properties should do so without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, sex, family status, sexual orientation or disability in accordance with State and Federal law.

Policy 6.1: Codify the County's practice of offering reasonable accommodations in zoning and other requirements for residential developments serving disabled people or households with a disabled member in accordance with State and federal law, into written policies and procedures. Publicize the availability of these policies and procedures.

Policy 6.2: Complete an analysis of the potential and actual governmental constraints upon the development, maintenance and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities.

Policy 6.3: Develop programs that remove constraints or provide reasonable accommodations for housing designed for persons with disabilities.

Policy 6.4: Continue to support organizations that are active in fair housing education and counseling and housing discrimination investigation.

Programs

Fair Housing Services

Alameda County HCD provides fair housing services through its contract with the Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO). Funding for fair housing is through Federal Community Development Block Grants. Fair Housing services are provided in English with translation services available. Services include:

- Investigation of housing discrimination complaints;
- Administration or judicial enforcement efforts related to individual or systemic forms of discrimination, conciliation by the fair housing agencies themselves, and follow-up;
- Public education and targeted outreach;
- Management training on fair housing laws;
- Tester recruitment and training for investigating complaints;
- Studies or audits to uncover patterns of discrimination;
- Counseling likely and actual victims of discrimination, housing providers, homeowners, insurers, lender and other industry representatives; and
- Landlord/tenant referrals.

Administrative remedies for housing discrimination are available through the California State Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD investigates most discrimination complaints on mortgage lending due to the length of time, nature, and cost of such investigations.

Objectives:

- Reduce housing discrimination through the provision of fair housing and landlord/tenant services
- Pursue and allocate CDBG funds to support fair housing opportunities for all residents

Timeframe:	Ongoing
Responsible Agency:	CDA-HCD
Funding Source:	CDBG

Environmental Sustainability

Land use and development have long lasting impacts upon the environment and individual health and well-being. Alameda County believes that thoughtful consideration must be given to how buildings are sited, designed, constructed and maintained if the County and region are to reverse harmful environmental impacts, particularly in the area of climate change. The County is interested in the identification and promotion of sustainable and healthy development practices that will lead to reductions in green house gas emissions and air pollution, promote greater housing choice and shorter commutes, reduce fossil fuel consumption, and provide for walkable communities and safe bicycle routes.

Goal 7: To minimize the adverse environmental impacts of new residential development

Principles: Encourage new residential development to locate on vacant or underutilized sites within the existing urban area, or on land contiguous to existing urban areas and where development would result in more efficient use of existing public services and facilities and improve housing opportunities close to employment centers, shopping areas, preschools and schools, and major transportation facilities.

In terms of site planning and building design, all new residential projects should prevent underutilization of scarce land resources while also being compatible with adjoining residential uses.

Residential projects should utilize a variety of housing types, unit clustering, and special construction techniques, where these will preserve natural topographic, landscape and scenic qualities.

Encourage the utilization of passive and active solar energy collection systems and other energy saving and water conservation measures in residential developments.

All residential projects should be sited, designed and landscaped to: ensure privacy and adequate light, air and ventilation to units and residential open space areas; provide adequate and usable private indoor and outdoor spaces; and ensure adequate visual and acoustical buffering and/or separation between residential units and adjoining non-residential units and major transportation facilities.

Wherever possible the principles of the Eden Area Livability Initiative shall be used to guide land use policy and decision making.

Policy 7.1: Review and, as appropriate, revise zoning regulations, site development standards, and planned development district standards and guidelines to favor in-fill development.

Policy 7.2: Review and, as appropriate, revise service-related development fees and assessments to encourage development in areas where minimal improvements to infrastructure would be required.

Policy 7.3: Review utilization of Secondary Unit provisions of Zoning Ordinance. Review standards and revise, as needed to promote utilization while minimizing adverse impacts.

Policy 7.4: Develop and consider adoption of revisions to Zoning Ordinance to require minimum densities for new residential developments in all residential zoning categories.

Policy 7.5: Identify areas adjacent to or in close proximity to transit and transportation corridors that are appropriate for high-density residential development. Re-zone as appropriate to increase densities.

Policy 7.6: Continue specific policies and guidelines for development in areas of significant environmental resources and hazards.

Policy 7.7: Enforce requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and "Title 24" of the State Building Code and any other requirements providing for solar access and energy conservation.

Policy 7.8: Promote energy efficiency and solar generation through provision of low-interest loans, grants, and technical assistance.

Policy 7.9: Utilize adopted plans, environmental review, site review and planned development provisions.

Policy 7.10: Enforce applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance; review and revise as necessary.

Policy 7.11: Evaluate current policies to ensure consistency and compliance with statewide efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.

Policy 7.12: Promote land development that is consistent with state efforts to reverse climate change.

Policy 7.13: Adopt and implement a Green Building Ordinance.

Policy 7.14: Participate in county-wide, regional and national efforts that promote sustainable development practices.

Programs

Green Building Ordinance

The building sector accounts for almost half of all greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. annually. The design, construction, and maintenance of buildings and structures within the County can have a significant impact on the County's environmental sustainability, green house gas emissions, resource usage and efficiency, waste management, and the health and productivity of residents, workers, and visitors to the County. Constructing "green" buildings will minimize negative environmental effects cause by the construction, maintenance and operation of buildings. The largest contributor to green house gases in a building is the energy consumption. Construction and demolition waste recycling produces significant CO_2 emissions savings for the building and community. Incorporating green practices into the design and construction of buildings can improve interior air quality, maximize energy efficiency, reduce water consumption, and make the buildings more durable.

Alameda County is currently developing a Green Building Ordinance that would affect new construction (residential structures or additions greater than 1,000 square feet and non-commercial projects that are 10,000 square feet or more). The goal of the ordinance is to help the County to become more energy efficient and to develop more sustainable land use and development practices in response to the landmark global warming bills AB 32 and SB 375.

Objectives:

- Adopt and enact a Green Building Ordinance

Timeframe: 2009
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning, PWA, and StopWaste.org
Funding Source: General Fund

Climate Action Team/Action Plan

The County has established a Climate Action Team consisting of staff from the Community Development, General Services and Public Works Agencies and the Alameda County Waste Management Authority & Recycling Board (StopWaste.Org) to develop a comprehensive, integrated strategy to address climate change and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction. It is anticipated that this team will develop plans that address transportation, land use, energy efficiency, and waste reduction. To date the County Climate Action Team has sponsored a Countywide Climate Action Summit (January 2009). This event attracted participation from all cities within Alameda County and incorporated Alameda County, City and County leaders, representatives from the Regional Transportation and Congestion Management Agency, and leaders in climate change. All cities and incorporated areas in Alameda County have joined Cool Counties program and ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability to reduce green house gases. In April of this year the County began interviewing consultants to assist the County in developing its Climate Action Plan.

Objectives:

- Develop a climate action plan in 2010
- Convene countywide events to discuss and disseminate information about the causes of climate change and strategies to reverse its affects
- Promote sustainable land use and building practices

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: Alameda County CDA, General Services Agency (GSA), Public Works Agency (PWA), and Stopwaste.org
Funding Source: General fund and grant support from the Regional Air Quality Control Board

StopWaste.org

StopWaste.Org is a public agency formed in 1976 by a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement among the County of Alameda, each of the fourteen cities within the county, and two sanitary districts. The agency serves as the Alameda County Waste Management Authority and the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board. In this dual role StopWaste.Org is responsible for the preparation and implementation of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan and Hazardous Waste Management Plan as well as the delivery of voter approved programs in the areas of waste reduction, recycled product procurement, market development and grants to non-profit organizations, to help the County achieve its 75% waste

diversion goal. In support of this goal StopWaste.org operates several programs which emphasize sustainability and waste reduction these include: the Bay Friendly Gardening Program; Green Building; the Environmental Preferable Purchasing Program; and the irecycle@school Program.
Objectives:

- Provide strategic planning, research, education and technical assistance to the public, businesses and local governments.
- Initiate innovative programs and facilities to maximize waste prevention, recycling and economic development opportunities.
- Serve as a pro-active public policy advocate for long term solutions to our challenges.
- Partner with organizations with compatible goals.

Timeframe:	Ongoing
Responsible Agency:	StopWaste.org
Funding Source:	Facilities Fees and fees paid for waste disposal

Infill, Mixed Use and Transit Oriented Developments

Infill projects are generally defined as projects occurring on parcels where existing infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, sewers, water) is present and there is an active or recently expired use. Mixed use developments generally combine residential uses with one or more uses such as commercial, civic, or recreational. Transit oriented development refers to projects that occur in close proximity to a transit access point (typically bus, train, or ferry). Infill, mixed use and transit oriented developments offer effective solutions to problems that many communities face: the scarcity of affordable housing, the need for economic investment, water and air pollution, the preservation of open space, and public health concerns. These strategies can yield many benefits, these include:

- Efficient use of existing infrastructure and facilities;
- Encouraging investment in existing urban centers;
- Reducing urban sprawl by using infill lots and applying compact development patterns;
- Minimizing traffic congestion by providing housing close to employment centers and child care facilities;
- Creating sufficient density to support adjacent businesses;
- Lowering greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging the use of public transportation; and
- Improving public health by offering safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists

Currently the San Lorenzo Village and the Ashland/Cherryland Business District Specific Plans allow for mixed use developments. Alameda County is revising its Castro Valley and Eden Area Plans and is considering including designations that would permit mixed use and transit oriented developments in these plan areas as well.

Objectives:

- Adopt and implement Eden Area and Castro Valley Area Plans as these plans contain policies to promote and support infill, mixed use and transit oriented developments
- Investigate and develop programs to promote the redevelopment of infill sites, mixed use and transit oriented developments; these programs may include: annual outreach and marketing to developers; deferring fees for projects that would require lot consolidation; expedited permit processing; targeting specific financial resources; and modifying development standards.
- Investigate incentives to support infill, mixed use and transit oriented developments

- Work with BART and the City of San Leandro to develop a station area plan that would facilitate transit oriented development adjacent to the Bayfair BART Station.
- Maintain the Density Variable (DV) zoning designation which provides a density bonus of %75 for existing or consolidated sites that have a minimum of 100 foot median lot width and are at least 20,000 square feet in area.
- Publicize parcels with the Density Variable (DV) zoning designation to encourage the redevelopment of small infill sites.
- Continue to provide funding via the Redevelopment Agency Housing Set aside for infill, mixed use and transit oriented developments.
- Update the Ashland/Cherryland Business District Specific Plan
- Pursue SB 375 funding opportunities

SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

The table below illustrates the quantified objectives for the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. These figures are an estimate of the number of units likely to be constructed, rehabilitated or conserved/preserved by income level during the planning period.

Table IV-1: Quantified Objectives 2007-2014

Income Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	Conservation/ Preservation
Extremely Low/ Very-Low Income	536		22
Low	340	56	22
Moderate	400		
Above Moderate	891		
TOTALS	**2,167**	**56**	**44**

The sources of information for Table IV-1 are as follows:

- The “new construction” objectives are specified by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) during their regional housing needs allocation process. ABAG has designated a total of 2,167 units of housing as the unincorporated areas “fair share” of housing within the 9 county Bay Area region.
- The rehabilitation goals were provided by the County’s HCD and Redevelopment Agency.
- The conservation objectives reflect the 44 units of affordable housing at-risk of conversion to market rate in 2013 at the Sparksway Commons development.

RESOURCES

The following section describes both the administrative and financial resources available to Alameda County in order to pursue its housing goals during the planning period.

Financial Resources
This section identifies federal, state, local, and private financial resources which may be used to meet Alameda County’s affordable housing goals. Resources can be sources of funds or technical assistance and can be available to private and non-profit entities as well as to local

government agencies. The County actively participates in as many housing programs as possible and aggressively seeks financing and other resources to expand the affordable housing stock countywide. The County continuously submits and supports applications for funding to develop affordable housing. The list includes resources that Alameda County has on-hand or expects to receive, and programs the County may apply for funding. Alameda County closely monitors legislation and State and Federal budget decisions that could impact its community development objectives.

Federal

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds
The Urban County is one of the eight CDBG entitlement jurisdictions in the Alameda County HOME Consortium, which applies annually to HUD for funding from this program. Funding is awarded annually on a formula basis to entitlement jurisdictions. These funds can be used for a variety of housing and community development activities.

Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)
The Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) is authorized by the recently enacted Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA). Under the NSP Alameda County may acquire and redevelop foreclosed properties that might otherwise be abandoned and eventually become blighted. It is believed that these efforts will stabilize neighborhoods, encourage community investment and stem the decline of house values of neighboring homes.

Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG)
The ESG program provides homeless persons with basic shelter and essential supportive services. The funds are available for the rehabilitation or remodeling of a building used as a new shelter, operations and maintenance of the facility, essential supportive services, homeless prevention, and grant administration.

Home Investment Partnership Act (HOME)
HOME provides flexible funding to states and local governments for affordable housing programs for low income households. HOME funds can be used to acquire, rehabilitate, finance, and construct affordable rental or ownership housing, as well as to provide tenant-based assistance. In the Home Ownership program, the funds may be used for such items as down payment and closing costs, funding construction costs, or funding permanent loans towards the cost of acquisition.

The County serves as lead agency for the Alameda County HOME Consortium. The Consortium is made up of the Unincorporated County and all of the cities in the County except Berkeley and Oakland. Each year, the Consortium receives HOME funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through the entitlement process. These funds are then allocated to the participating cities, and the Urban County (a HUD-designated jurisdiction comprised of the cities of Albany, Dublin, Emeryville, Newark, and Piedmont and the Unincorporated County). As required by HUD, 15% of the total allocation is reserved for use by qualified Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO). The Urban County and CHDO funds, administered by the County, have been used to subsidize the acquisition and rehabilitation, and new construction of a variety of affordable housing projects.

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)
HCD administers the HOPWA program for Alameda County, under contract with the City of Oakland. Oakland receives the HOPWA entitlement as the largest city in the Eligible

Metropolitan Area. HOPWA funds can be used for a variety of housing and service activities for lower income persons living with HIV and AIDS and are intended to serve all of Alameda County. HCD is also being funded directly by HUD for Project Independence, a HOPWA Performance Grant, which provides shallow rental assistance and accessibility modifications to people living with HIV/AIDS throughout Alameda County.

HUD 202/HUD 811 Program Funds
These program funds are awarded on a competitive basis specifically for the development of affordable housing for seniors or for the disabled. Projects may apply at any time during the year.

HUD Section 8 Rental Assistance Program
The Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) will continue to administer Federal Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers including use of a portion of its vouchers for project-based units.

Lead Poisoning Prevention
The Community Development Agency's Lead Poisoning Prevention Program's (LPPP) integrated health, environmental, and housing program is nationally recognized as one of the leaders in the field of lead poisoning prevention. It has successfully completed six Lead Hazard Control grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control. These grants have provided funding to reduce lead hazards in more than 1,300 low income residential units in the County's Lead Abatement Service Area, which includes the cities of Alameda, Berkeley, Emeryville and Oakland. These funds have afforded the LPPP leveraging power to acquire, and renew since 1993, a California Department of Public Health contract, in the amount of $600,000 per year for case management of Alameda County's lead poisoned children. In October 2006, HUD also awarded the LPPP its second Healthy Homes Demonstration grant, totaling $1,000,000. Healthy Homes grant activities, designed to address additional housing hazards such as moisture, pests, and other asthma triggers as well as safety, will be completed in October 2009. In October 2008, the ACLPPP garnered its seventh Lead Hazard Control grant, totaling $3,000,000, bringing to more than $24 million the amount of HUD funding awarded to the Program for Lead Hazard Reduction and Healthy Homes interventions.

Low-income Housing Preservation Program (LIHPP)
LIHPP funds are awarded on a competitive basis to preserve federally subsidized affordable rental housing developments.

McKinney/Vento Homeless Assistance Act Funds

Supportive Housing Program (SHP): This competitive program, authorized under the McKinney/Vento Act, is designed to promote the development of supportive housing and supportive services for homeless persons, including innovative approaches to assist homeless persons in the transition from homelessness. The funding can be used for a variety of purposes, including acquisition and rehabilitation, new construction, leasing, operating expenses, and supportive services. Funding, if received, will be used for operating costs, supportive services and acquisition and/or rehabilitation of permanent and transitional housing for homeless individuals and families.

Shelter Plus Care Program: This program is designed to provide housing and supportive services on a long-term basis for homeless persons with disabilities, those with serious mental

illness, chronic problems with alcohol and/or drugs, and/or acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) or related diseases who are living on the streets or in shelters. Grants for new programs are made on a competitive basis and come in the form of rental assistance payments. Renewal grants are awarded at existing utilization levels on an annual basis. Alameda County HCD is the grantee for competitive and renewal grants under the Shelter Plus Care Program. The County has received a total of five separate grants under the Shelter Plus Care Program. Through these programs, the County provides rental subsidies for over 400 individuals and families each year countywide.

State

CalHOME
Provides grants to local public agencies and nonprofit developers to assist individual households through deferred-payment loans. It also provides direct, forgivable loans to assist development projects involving multiple ownership units, including single-family subdivisions.

California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA)
CalHFA provides a variety of tax-exempt bond financing for the creation and preservation of affordable housing. CalHFA also provides bond financing for qualified first-time homebuyers.

CalHFA administers the Housing Enabled by Local Partnerships (HELP) program which facilitates affordable housing opportunities through their partnerships with local government entities. In prior years, Alameda County has received funding from HELP. These funds have been used to capitalize a revolving loan fund used for acquisition and construction financing for affordable housing projects located throughout the County.

Low Income Housing Tax Credits (Federal and State)
Tax credits are an important financing resource in Alameda County. Developers can apply to the State for an allocation of tax credits to finance low income rental housing developments. The tax credits are syndicated to corporations in exchange for project equity. The County currently supports and provides local review of applications for Low Income Tax Credits for the California State Tax Credit Allocation Committee.

Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)
The Mental Health Services Act expands mental health services to children/youth, adults and older adults who have severe mental illness/severe mental disorders. The State Department of Mental Health administers the funds, and passes funding down to County Mental Health Departments. The Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (BHCS) Department is the recipient of MHSA funds for programs in Alameda County. BHCS set aside $4,000,000 from locally controlled funds, and contracts with HCD to administer the Alameda County MHSA housing development funding program. In addition, the State Department of Mental Health has set aside $115,000,000 a year for a five year period to create new affordable housing state-wide. The California Housing Finance Agency will administer these funds. Alameda County's portion of these funds for the first three years is $14,000,000. These funds will leverage additional HUD funding, to create new housing units restricted to people with severe mental illness for as long a term as is feasible.

Mortgage Revenue Bonds
Local jurisdictions can apply to the State for authority to issue tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds for the purpose of funding affordable housing development and to provide low-interest mortgages to qualified first-time homebuyers. In the past, the County has issued Single-Family

Mortgage Revenue Bonds when there has been market demand for this program. The County currently administers a number of Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bonds for developments within the Unincorporated County and in cities within Alameda County, at the city's request. The County issues Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bonds when there is market demand for this subsidy source and when the developments meet County standards.

Mortgage Credit Certificates
Local jurisdictions can apply to the State for a single family bond allocation to convert to Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCC), which provide a tax credit to subsidize the mortgage interest rate for qualified first-time homebuyers. The County is currently administering a Mortgage Credit Certificate program that supports approximately 60 first-time homebuyers annually countywide. HCD submits a county-wide application every year for its maximum allocation of MCC's.

Multifamily Housing Program
Local jurisdictions and non-profit housing developers can competitively apply to the State for the purpose of funding affordable multifamily housing developments.

Opportunity Zone Inter-Regional Partnership
The County has two inter-regional partnership-designated jobs/housing balance opportunity zones: one is a project involving Dublin BART station and one for a project at San Lorenzo Village. The County will apply for and support applications for any funds that these projects are eligible for that will assist in implementation.

Local

Alameda County General Funds
Funds from the Alameda County General fund may be used for a variety of housing and community development activities.

Alameda County Redevelopment Tax Increment Funds - Housing Set-Aside
Twenty percent of the tax-increment in redevelopment areas must be set-aside for affordable housing, according to State law. Ten of the county's fourteen cities and the County itself have active redevelopment areas. Alameda County recently established the policy that 25% of the tax increment in its redevelopment areas would be contributed to affordable housing, rather than the 20% required by State law.

In the Unincorporated Area, Housing Set-Aside funds from the Redevelopment Project Areas are to be used to increase, improve, and/or preserve the supply of housing for persons and families of low- and moderate-income in the redevelopment areas. The specific goals and objectives for redevelopment activity are as follows:

Goal:
Improve and preserve the community's supply of housing, particularly housing opportunities available to low and moderate-income households.

Objectives:
- Increase the supply of affordable and market rate housing through rehabilitation, mixed-use and infill development projects.
- Assist in the provision of affordable housing.

- Develop incentives through grants and loans for residential property owners and tenants to improve, rehabilitate and maintain their properties

The County's Redevelopment Agency (RDA) is comprised of two Redevelopment Project Areas that include the unincorporated communities commonly known as Ashland, San Lorenzo, Cherryland, Castro Valley, Hillcrest Knolls, and Mount Eden. Over the last several years the Alameda County Redevelopment Agency has been accruing its Housing Set-Aside funds to aggregate to a sufficient level to be able to fund its proposed affordable housing projects. Below is an outline of the Agency's projected projects and allocated monies for affordable housing projects in the urban unincorporated area of Alameda County through 2014. There is a total of $69,200,000 that will come from tax increment monies both accrued to date and anticipated over the next 5 years as well as bond proceeds that the Agency will access as necessary.

Ashland Infill Housing Project: New construction of Infill Housing Projects can be multifamily rental, mixed use, or first time homebuyer for sale products. New construction developments are assisted on a project-by-project basis. Projects that receive assistance are required to provide a portion of the units built to be made available to moderate and low income eligible individuals and families. The unit's affordability can be preserved for the long term through covenants or deed restrictions. The Agency will consider development of an affordable mixed-use infill housing project. The projected five year budget for this development is $8,500,000.

Ashland Youth/Family Focused Housing Project: A site adjacent to the Youth Campus will be considered for development of an affordable transitional youth / family focused housing project. The projected five year budget for this development is $8,500,000.

Castro Valley Infill Housing Project: New construction of Infill Housing Projects can be either multi-family rental, mixed-use, or first time homebuyer for sale products. New construction developments are assisted on a project-by-project basis. Projects that receive assistance are required to provide a portion of the units built to be made available to moderate and low income eligible individuals and families. The unit's affordability can be preserved for the long term through covenants or deed restrictions. The Agency will consider an infill multi-family affordable housing project for the Castro Valley Sub-Area. The projected five year budget for this development is $5,500,000.

Castro Valley Senior Housing Project: An affordable senior housing is also under consideration within the Castro Valley Project Sub-Area. The projected five year budget for this development is $5,500,000.

Cherryland Multi-Family Housing Project: New construction of Affordable Housing Projects can be either multi-family rental, mixed-use for sale products. New construction developments are assisted on a project-by-project basis. In identifying locations for new housing projects, the community would prefer the Agency consider purchasing properties with existing blighted conditions so that the reuse of the property can serve both the housing and blight removal goals of the Project Area. Projects that receive assistance are required to provide a portion of the units built to be made available to moderate and low income eligible individuals and families. The unit's affordability can be preserved for the long term through covenants or deed restrictions. The Agency will consider a multi-family affordable housing project for the Cherryland Sub-Area. The projected five year budget for this development is $11,100,000.

Cherryland Infill Housing Project: In order to address blight elimination, the Agency will pursue an infill project in Cherryland based on the community's high interest in improving its neighborhood. Depending on whether the development is an ownership or rental project the Agency could assist in providing anywhere from 12 to 30 housing units at a variety of affordable income levels. The projected five year budget for this development is $11,100,000.

San Lorenzo Infill Housing Project: New construction of Affordable Housing Projects can be either multi-family rental, mixed-use, or first time homebuyer for sale products. New construction developments are assisted on a project-by-project basis. Projects that receive assistance are required to provide a portion of the units built to be made available to moderate and low income eligible individuals and families. The unit's affordability can be preserved for the long term through covenants or deed restrictions. The Agency will consider a first time homebuyer housing project for the San Lorenzo Sub-Area. The projected five year budget for this development is $9,500,000.

San Lorenzo Senior Housing Project: An affordable senior housing project that could have an additional family focus is also under consideration within the San Lorenzo Sub-Area. The projected five year budget for this development is $9,500,000.

Planning and Development Impact Fees
Alameda County uses both planning and development impact fees to fund activities related to the development of housing and public infrastructure.

Private

Community Reinvestment Act (CRA)
The Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department encourages local lenders to provide favorable lending terms for projects which involve the provision and/or rehabilitation of affordable rental and ownership housing.

Federal Home Loan Bank Board Affordable Housing Program
The Federal Home Loan Bank Board administers the Affordable Housing Program (AHP) in accordance with the Federal Regulations governing the program. The AHP provides gap subsidy to projects that provide affordable housing for a minimum of 15 years. In Alameda County, these funds have been used in conjunction with County-provided funding to close gaps and deepen affordability on projects located throughout the County.

Other
Local foundations, faith communities, service organizations and private individuals contribute their support for a variety of affordable housing, homeless assistance and prevention programs, which serve the unincorporated areas.

Administrative Resources
The following organizations are primarily responsible for the provision of affordable housing within Unincorporated Alameda County. Over the planning period these groups will work on tasks relating to the construction, acquisition, rehabilitation and conservation of affordable housing stock.

Alameda County Community Development Agency

The mission of the Community Development Agency (CDA) is to enhance the quality-of-life of County residents and plan for the future well-being of the County's diverse communities; to balance the physical, economic, and social needs of County residents through land use planning, environmental management, neighborhood improvement, and community development; and to promote and protect agriculture, the environment, economic vitality and human health. The CDA represents the consolidation of the three key functions: land use planning; community and economic development; and the dispensation of County assets. The following paragraphs describe the functions of the three departments that will be tasked with the implementation of much of the goals, policies and programs of the Housing Element.

Planning Department

The Planning Department plans and oversees new development and redevelopment plans; creates policy for land use; and regulates, monitors and enforces County Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision, Surface Mining, Neighborhood Preservation, and other ordinances. The Planning Department performs municipal-type land use regulation functions for unincorporated areas of the county, ensuring compatible land use for the nearly 136,000 citizens within its jurisdiction.

Housing and Community Development

The Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) plays a lead role in the development of housing and programs to serve the county's low and moderate income households, homeless, and disabled populations. HCD maintains and expands housing opportunities for low--and moderate--income persons and families in the county by:

- Preserving the county's housing stock through rehabilitation and repair assistance programs.
- Expanding the supply of affordable housing for lower income renters and owners, including first-time homebuyers.
- Serving the needs of the homeless community as the lead agency in the countywide homeless collaborative and partnering with homeless service providers.
- Revitalizing low-income neighborhoods by installing sidewalks and public accessibility improvements, and by constructing neighborhood-serving facilities.

Redevelopment Agency

The Redevelopment Agency (RDA) works actively to stimulate commercial development and revitalization within the specified redevelopment project areas through business attraction and retention, job growth, and creation of improvements to selected commercial and/or public land parcels and spaces. Redevelopment was created by state law to help cities and counties renew themselves. It infuses needed capital into communities through the use of tax-increment financing, and empowers residents to assume control of distressed through their participation in their local Citizen's Advisory Committees. The Agency focuses on developing partnerships with private developers, businesses, state and federal agencies, non-profit and cultural organizations and neighborhood groups in order to orchestrate the community's re-growth.

In accordance with State law, RDA reserves a minimum of 20 percent of its annual tax increment revenues for the support of affordable housing projects. RDA resources are used to support the maintenance and expansion of affordable homeownership and rental opportunities within designated redevelopment areas.

Lead Poisoning Prevention
Established in 1991, the Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program has become a national leader in childhood lead poisoning programs, combining health, environmental and residential hazard reduction services under one umbrella. The Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program's unique multidisciplinary approach is serving the community to eliminate environmental lead contamination and prevent childhood lead poisoning.

Alameda County Public Works Agency, Development Services Department
The Development Services Department assists in the planning of new subdivisions, commercial developments, and infrastructure by reviewing development plans, issuing permits, and inspecting building construction and infrastructure to support land development. The Department is composed of the Building Inspection Division, Land Development Division, Grading Permits, and Clean Water Program.

Housing Authority of the County of Alameda
The Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) operates a number of programs administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that provide rental housing or rental assistance for low-income families, the elderly, people with disabilities, and others, in much of Alameda County.

Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services
Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (BHCS), Housing Services Office utilizes Mental Health Services Act funding to develop policies and programs that support homeless individuals and households throughout the unincorporated areas. BHCS supports agencies that provide emergency, transitional and supportive housing services to persons who are currently or at risk of becoming homeless. The programs sponsored by BHCS are designed to assist individuals in their transition to a stable living environment and greater economic self-sufficiency. BHCS also collaborates with the County's HCD to plan and implement the EveryOne Home program that seeks to prevent and eliminate homelessness throughout Alameda County.

Non Profit Housing Developers
The County's HCD works with a large number of affordable housing developers and managers. These partnerships allow the County to expand affordable housing opportunities by managing the construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of housing. These developers include, but are not limited to:

- Eden Housing
- Mercy Housing
- BRIDGE Housing
- Allied Housing
- Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS)
- East Bay Asian Development Corporation
- Affordable Housing Associates
- Resources for Community Development

CHAPTER V- OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION

Alameda County has long advocated and implemented policies that support for smart growth. The following is a list of policy related documents either in use or under development within the unincorporated areas which promote sustainability, mixed use and transit-oriented development, pedestrian and bicycle friendly design:

- Alameda County Housing Element, 2003 (Under Revision)
- Eden Area General Plan, 1995 (Under Revision)
- Castro Valley General Plan, 1985 (Under Revision)
- Design Guidelines and Development Standards (In Development)
- Green Building Ordinance (Pending Adoption)
- East County Area Plan/Measure D, 2002
- Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan, 1995
- Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan, 1993
- San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan, 2004

In addition to these land use policies, the County has established a Climate Action Team to develop a comprehensive, integrated strategy to address climate change and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction. It is anticipated that this team will develop plans that address transportation, land use, energy efficiency, and waste reduction. To date the County Climate Action Team has sponsored a Countywide Climate Action Summit (January 2009). This event attracted participation from all cities within Alameda County and incorporated Alameda County, City and County leaders, representatives from the Regional Transportation and Congestion Management Agency, and leaders in climate change. All cities and incorporated areas in Alameda County have joined Cool Counties program and ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability to reduce GHGs. In April of this year the County began interviewing consultants to assist the County in developing its Climate Action Plan.

The County is also compelled to act due to two recent changes in California Law: Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), Steinberg, 2008; and Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), Nunez, 2006. The goal of SB 375 is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by curbing urban sprawl via improved coordination of land use and transportation policy. AB 32 established a statewide goal to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2010. Furthermore, AB 32 requires that GHG emissions are evaluated and analyzed within Environmental Impact Reports and General Plans to determine their impact and if necessary propose mitigation strategies.

As a part of its Housing Plan, Alameda County has included several initiatives that reduce negative impacts often associated with residential development. Please refer to that section for more information.

CHAPTER VI- OTHER REQUIREMENTS

CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS AND OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS

State law requires the elements of the General Plan to be consistent. The Housing Element is consistent with all of the other elements of the General Plan, in that it does not require any significant changes to the other elements of the General Plan, modify or relocate density, and recommend policies or action programs that would create housing at the expense of goals and policies within the General Plan. The Housing Element goals should be interpreted and implemented consistent with those in other portions of the General Plan. As the General Plan may be amended over time, goal, policies, and implementing programs in other General Plan elements will be comprehensively reviewed for internal consistency. The following text provides a brief overview of the General Plan Elements, as well as the County's process for maintaining consistency between each document.

The Alameda County General Plan consists of a number of elements, both geographic and functional. The Housing Element, one of the functional elements, was developed as a separate document containing background and policy information that is useful in guiding public and private decisions affecting housing. In the event that policies conflict with earlier elements, the more recently adopted policies will prevail.

Supplemented by background information, analysis and policy statements, the following Elements and Plans, including the updated Housing Element, comprise the comprehensive General Plan for the County:

- General Plan, County of Alameda (Land Use and Circulation Elements), adopted May 26, 1966. Amended August 27, 1969; June 6, 1974; October 10, 1974; November 3, 1977; August 8, 1978; January 4, 1979; December 16, 1980; November 3, 1984; and April 5, 1984.

- Castro Valley Plan, adopted June 15, 1961. Amended January 29, 1974; August 8, 1978; April 4, 1985; modified by voters through Measure D, November, 2000, codified by Board of Supervisors May, 2002.

- Livermore-Amador Valley Planning Unit General Plan, adopted November 3, 1977. Amended January 4, 1979; December 16, 1980; November 3, 1983; April 5, 1984; December 12, 1989. Superseded by the East County Area Plan, adopted May 5, 1993; modified by voters through Measure D, November, 2000, codified by Board of Supervisors May, 2002.

- General Plan for the Central Metropolitan, Eden and Washington Planning Units, adopted January 13, 1981. Amended November 3, 1983.

- Unincorporated Eden (Portion) Area Plan, adopted November 3, 1983.

- Housing Element, adopted October 2, 2003

- Park and Recreation Element, adopted June 12, 1956. Amended November 21, 1968.

- Scenic Route Element, adopted May 5, 1966.
- Open Space Element, adopted May 31, 1973. Amended December 12, 1989.
- Conservation Element, adopted January 8, 1976. Amended November 23, 1976.
- Seismic Safety Element, adopted January 8, 1976. Amended August 5, 1982.
- Safety Element, adopted January 8, 1976. Amended August 5, 1982.
- Noise Element, adopted January 8, 1976.

In addition, the County is currently revising the Eden Area Plan. The plan update will covers the communities of Ashland, Cherryland, Hillcrest Knolls, Mt. Eden, and San Lorenzo, as well as other small unincorporated pockets in the area. Although Fairview is considered part of the Eden Area, the Fairview Area is not included in the existing Eden Area Plan, the current update to the Eden Plan. The 1997 Fairview Area Specific Plan contains the land use goals, policies and zoning regulations that apply to this area. This revision also includes an evaluation of the Ashland/Cherryland Business Districts Specific Plan. Housing Element policies will be incorporated into this document as appropriate.

The County has also initiated a review of the Castro Valley Plan. This plan covers the unincorporated community of Castro Valley, including the Five Canyons development south of I-580 and east of the Fairview community, as well as the surrounding canyon lands. A review of the Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan will be incorporated into this analysis. Housing Element policies will be incorporated into this document as appropriate.

The East County Area Plan, adopted in 1993, modified by County-wide voters through Measure D, in November, 2000, modifications codified by Board May, 2002. That measure sets an Urban Growth Boundary beyond which no urban development may occur except under very limited specified circumstances. It does provide that "To the maximum extent feasible, the County shall meet State housing obligations for the East County Area within the County Urban Growth Boundary." It further states:

> If State-imposed housing obligations make it necessary to go beyond the Urban Growth Boundary, the voters of the County may approve an extension of the Boundary. The Board of Supervisors may approve housing beyond an Urban Growth Boundary only if:
>
> (1) It is indisputable that there is no land within the Urban Growth Boundary to meet a State housing requirement either through new development, more intensive development, or redevelopment; (2) no more land is used outside the Urban Growth Boundary than is required by the affordable housing necessary to meet a State obligation; (3) the area is adjacent to the Urban Growth Boundary, or to an existing urban or intensive residential area; (4) the percentage goals for low- and very low-income housing in Policy 42 [21% moderate, 15% low, and 21% very low-income housing] will be met in any housing approved; (5) there will be adequate public facilities and services for the housing; and (6) the development shall not be on prime agricultural lands, or lands designated, at

least conditionally, for intensive agriculture, unless no other land is available under this Policy.

Consistent with Measure D, the County has not identified sites outside of the Urban Growth Boundary for development.

While preparing the Housing Element update staff consulted the County's most recent Consolidated Plan and Redevelopment Agency Implementation Plan. The Housing Element is consistent with the policies and goals of each of those documents.

NOTIFICATION OF WATER AND SEWER PROVIDERS

Upon adoption and certification of this Housing Element, the Alameda County will provide a copy of the Housing Element to the East Bay Municipal Water District, Zone 7 Water District and Oro Loma Sanitary District, pursuant to Government Code Section 65589.7. The purpose of this notification is to ensure that these providers of water and sewer services place a priority for proposed housing developments for lower-income households in their current and future resource or service allocations.

REVIEW OF CONSERVATION AND SAFETY ELEMENTS PER AB 162

Assembly Bill 162 requires that Alameda County review, and if necessary, to identify new information for its Conservation and Safety Elements of its General Plan upon next revision of the Housing Element, on or after January 1, 2009. Specifically, these elements must be revised to include analysis and policies regarding flood hazard and management information. The purpose of this review is to identify rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitat, and land that may accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management. In addition, the Safety Element will be reviewed to identify information regarding flood hazards that could affect development on the potential sites listed in the Housing Element. The County has begun to review these elements and plans to adopt amendments in 2010.