

Affordable Housing White Paper

Preventing Displacement and Promoting Affordable
Housing Development in San Mateo County

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
January 22, 2015

Preface

On October 21, 2014, the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors asked staff to research ways the County could address the affordable housing crisis. This White Paper, *Affordable Housing: Preventing Displacement and Promoting Affordable Housing in San Mateo County* has been prepared in response to that request. Because housing policies and land use regulations involve many disciplines, staff from many departments contributed to this report. The authors included:

- Lisa Aozasa, Planning and Building Department
- Will Gibson, Planning and Building Department
- Peggy Jensen, County Manager's Office
- Maeve Johnston, Health System
- William Lowell, Department of Housing
- Shireen Malekafzali, Health System
- Steve Monowitz, Planning and Building Department
- John Nibbelin, County Counsel
- Janet Stone, Department of Housing

Executive Summary

San Mateo County is experiencing an affordable housing crisis. The demand for housing affordable to all but the wealthiest residents far exceeds the available supply.

Over the years, the Board of Supervisors has taken a number of steps to promote the development of affordable housing.

- Since 2003, the county has contributed to the development of 1,554 units of affordable housing located in projects throughout the County. The majority of these projects provide family housing, but five projects are for seniors, two were for special needs populations and two projects serve the homeless. A complete list of the projects is included in Appendix A to this White Paper.
- The Affordable Housing Fund, created by the Board of Supervisors in 2013, has distributed \$13 million. Of those funds, \$8 million was for the construction of 325 affordable units and \$5 million is assisting with the renovation or expansion of 330 emergency shelter and transitional housing beds. An additional \$12 million is being recommended by staff for FY 2015-17 which will help fund an estimated additional 330 housing units.
- In October of 2014, all County owned property was reviewed to identify potential affordable housing development sites. One parcel on the coastside is currently being evaluated and long terms plans are being developed for other parcels.
- To promote the construction of more affordable housing, San Mateo County has second unit and density bonus programs as well as an inclusionary housing ordinance.
- In 2004, a rent control ordinance for mobile homes was approved.

While important steps have been taken, more can be done. This paper identifies measures the Board of Supervisors could take to address the housing crisis. The measures range from funding tenant outreach and education to adopting a rent control ordinance, amending zoning regulations and imposing developer impact fees. Some of the measures could be implemented quite soon while others would require additional research, community input or resolution of a State Supreme Court case.

The measures are summarized below in bold followed by suggested direction to staff if the Board wants to pursue the measure. The measures are presented in two groups. The first group of actions would help current tenants remain in homes they can afford. The second group of actions promotes the development of new affordable housing. Each of these groups of actions – keeping people in homes and building more units that are affordable to all members of our community – are equally important components of a plan to address the housing crisis.

Options to Assist Current Tenants

- 1. Establish a countywide tenant's rights education and assistance program. The program would provide legal advice, help residents resolve their housing issues and prevent and defend evictions.**

Direct staff to assess the current resources devoted to landlord and tenant rights education and assistance in San Mateo County. Working with community partners, develop a work plan, timeline and budget for a Landlord and Tenant Information and Referral Program that includes an estimate of the number of tenants to be assisted and units that would remain affordable.

- 2. Conduct additional research and community outreach on the potential adoption of rent stabilization and just cause eviction ordinances. The rent stabilization ordinance would limit the annual increase in rent for units that can be rent stabilized under state law which includes units in multifamily buildings constructed prior to 1995. The just cause eviction ordinance would define the possible causes for eviction. This would protect tenants in rent controlled units from being evicted just because the landlord wants to raise the rent. Develop options for a rent board or other entity to oversee enforcement of the ordinances, which would apply in the unincorporated areas of the County.**

Direct County Counsel and Housing Department staff to research rent stabilization and just cause eviction ordinances and assess enforcement programs. Request that staff draft a sample ordinance and develop a staffing and budget structure to support and enforce the ordinances. To obtain community input on the proposal, request staff to develop a public comment process and bring all this information back to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

- 3. The 21 Elements program, jointly sponsored by the County Department of Housing and the San Mateo City and County Association of Governments (C/CAG) is a nationally recognized collaboration that has brought the County and all 20 cities in the County together to work on the Housing Elements of their general plans. Through 21 Elements, jurisdictions have shared resources for consultants and jointly researched best practices. Funding for the 21 Elements ends June 30, 2015, when the implementation of the housing elements begins.**

Direct the Department of Housing to work with C/CAG to develop a budget and funding proposal for two more years of the 21 Elements program. The program would continue the countywide collaborative work on affordable housing and the cost sharing. An added potential benefit could be more consistent housing policies countywide.

Options for Creating More Affordable Units

- 4. Second units, also called accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are units located on the same parcel as another dwelling unit and may be detached, separate structures, or attached to the primary residence. But, they are functionally separate and tend to be more affordable than other forms of housing. To promote the development of second units, revise the County Second Unit Ordinance zoning and parking requirements and develop a Second Unit Program that with pre-approved design templates, a second unit guidance manual for builders and a financing program. Publicize these changes via a community outreach campaign.**

Direct Planning and Building staff to develop a work plan and proposed budget for developing a Second Unit Program modeled on the Santa Cruz program, which includes the components listed above. The work plan time line will include a public outreach and comment period.

- 5. To maintain housing while ensuring that it can be occupied safely, take steps to legalize unpermitted second units. Those steps would include facilitating and streamlining the process to legalize second units, amending zoning provisions that may impact legalization, such as set back requirements, reducing permit fees and providing rehabilitation loans.**

Direct Planning and Building to work with the Department of Housing and County Counsel to develop a Second Unit Amnesty program including regulatory relief, permit fee subsidies and a rehabilitation loan program. The program will include a deed restriction requirement to ensure that units remain affordable for a specified number of years after owners benefit from the program.

- 6. Develop a small residence prototype program that offers property owners pre-approved plans for small residences.**

Direct Planning and Building to develop a budget and work plan for a small home prototype project to be considered as part of the Planning and Building Department budget for FY 2015-2017.

- 7. Adopt a “no net loss” policy for affordable units that establishes replacement requirements for affordable units lost to new development**

Direct Planning and Building, County Counsel and the Department of Housing to further research best practices and then develop a “No Net Loss” policy for consideration by the Board.

- 8. Create an affordable housing overlay zone that provides incentives to developers to increase the number of affordable units in projects within the zone.**

Direct Planning and Building and County Counsel to develop an affordable housing overlay zone for the North Fair Oaks community in connection with the zoning changes

needed to implement the North Fair Oaks Community Plan. Further direct staff to report back to the Board of Supervisors on the adoption process and application of the overlay so that the Board of Supervisors can consider expanding the areas covered by the overlay if the pilot in North Fair Oaks is successful. Analysis of the overlay zone, if adopted will include assessment of impacts on public infrastructure and data on the number of affordable units developed.

9. Revise, as needed, the San Mateo County inclusionary zoning ordinance based on the results of the pending legal cases.

If the California Supreme Court upholds the ability of communities to enforce inclusionary zoning, County Counsel will work with Planning and Building and the Department of Housing to draft any necessary revisions to the current County inclusionary zoning ordinance. All recommended changes will be brought to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. The Board will also be provided with an estimate of the number of affordable units that could be created through this process.

10. Develop legally defensible policies for commercial and residential impact fees for affordable housing.

To be legally defensible, commercial and residential impact fees require a “nexus” study that connects the use of the fee to the proposed development. The 21 Elements Project, sponsored by C/CAG and the County Department of Housing, has commissioned a “Nexus Study and Impact Fee Feasibility Study”. After the results of that study are available in June of 2015, staff will present the results to your Board and outline options for next steps.

11. In collaboration with community partners, expand and promote shared housing programs throughout the County to recruit and retain shared home providers.

HIP Housing operates a Home Sharing program throughout San Mateo County. HIP recently reported that they have 10 individuals interested in shared housing for each homeowner that is interested in sharing their home. A countywide marketing campaign to recruit and retain more home providers would create “affordable units” within the existing housing stock.

Introduction

In San Mateo County rent for a two bedroom apartment has increased 51% over the past four years. The average rent for a two bedroom apartment is now \$2,648 a month or almost \$32,000 a year. According to the United States Department of Housing (HUD) rent is considered affordable when it is no greater than 30% of annual household income. To “afford” an average two bedroom apartment in San Mateo County, a household would have to earn at least \$106,000 annually. In 2013, according to the American Community Survey, over 35,000 renter families, almost 35% of all the renter families in San Mateo County, were paying more than 30% of their income for housing.

Finding and keeping affordable housing in San Mateo County is a challenge, not just for lower income individuals, but also for all but the wealthiest residents. What has San Mateo County done to address this housing affordability crisis? What else can the County do? This white paper addresses those two questions and includes suggested next steps.

What is San Mateo County Doing about the Affordability Crisis?

San Mateo County has contributed funding and provided staff support for the development of affordable housing projects throughout the County. The County has also looked into locating affordable housing on County-owned property and adopted zoning and land use policies that promote the development of affordable units. These existing programs are described below.

Affordable Housing Fund

In FY 2013-14, the Board of Supervisors created the Affordable Housing Fund (AHF) with \$13 million in one-time funds the County received due to the dissolution of the local redevelopment agencies. A total of \$8 million in the first year of the Affordable Housing Fund (AHF 1.0) was awarded to six affordable rental projects with a total of 325 units. AHF 1.0 also included \$2.2 million for the Family Crossroads project which will substantially rehabilitate 15 units of transitional housing in Daly City and \$2.8 million for renovation and expansion projects at the WeHope, Safe Harbor and Maple Street homeless shelters.

In FY 2014/15, year two of the AHF, a total of \$5 million in Housing Authority Moving to Work funds was approved with a set aside of \$500,000 for farm labor housing. Five affordable housing project applications were received in year two totaling \$8 million in requested funds. The Department of Housing will bring recommendations for the allocation of the \$4.5 million available for affordable housing projects to the Board of Supervisors in February of 2015.

Department of Housing staff recommended to the Board on October 21, 2014 that the AHF be funded in FY 2015-2017 with an additional \$9 million in total. The Board requested that this

item be included in the proposed budget presented to the Board in June with the final amount to be determined. The proposal was \$6 million for AHF 3.0 (FY 2015/2016) from \$3 million in Measure A funds and \$3 million in Housing Authority Moving to Work funds. For AHF 4.0 (FY 2016/2017) the proposal was \$3 million in Measure A funds. The Department of Housing is now recommending that AHF 4.0 be increased to \$6 million in Measure A funds. The AHF actual and recommended allocations and results are summarized in the table below.

Affordable Housing Fund: Allocated and Proposed Annual Funding for Development of Affordable Housing Projects

Fiscal Year	Funding Amount	Source	Status	Units to be Constructed (1)
2013-2014	\$8 million	Redevelopment Agencies	Awarded	325
2014-2015	\$4.5 million	Housing Authority & Moving to Work	Five funding requests are under review, to Board in February	90
2015-2016	\$6 million	\$3 m Housing Authority Moving to Work and \$3 m Measure A	<i>Proposed</i>	120
2016-2017	\$6 million	Measure A	<i>Proposed</i>	120
Totals	\$24.5 million			655

(1) The “Units to be constructed” are actuals for FY 2013-14 and estimates for the other three years based on a ballpark figure of a \$50,000 subsidy per unit.

Public Land for Housing

The Board of Supervisors asked Real Property staff to review county land holdings and identify possible affordable housing sites. Staff reported back to the Board on October 21, 2014 that there were a few sites that meet the minimum criteria for constructing affordable housing which include appropriate size and access to transportation. Unfortunately, all the sites that meet the criteria are currently used for other purposes. At the direction of the Board, staff is working on alternative locations for the current uses of those sites and will report back as progress is made.

At the October 21, 2014 meeting, Supervisor Horsley asked staff to investigate the feasibility of building affordable housing on a site in Half Moon Bay. After analyzing the site, staff found that it is appropriately zoned for affordable housing but further environmental and fiscal analysis is required. That work is currently underway and the Board will be updated on progress.

In addition to County owned sites, in the past, land swaps between public agencies and private or public organizations have been used to obtain affordable housing sites. Examples of land

swaps include the Grand Oaks Apartments in South San Francisco and the Half Moon Village senior campus. Staff will keep this option in mind and also review sites described in the County Housing Element for Low Income Housing Tax Credit competitiveness.

Density Bonus Program

State law requires cities and counties to adopt ordinances to facilitate compliance with density bonus laws. San Mateo County has adopted such an ordinance; the "San Mateo County Density Bonus Ordinance" (Chapter 1, Part VI, Division VI of the County Ordinance Code). Pursuant to state density bonus law, the County must grant a developer a density bonus or other specified incentives or concessions when the developer agrees to construct the required percentage of affordable housing units. (Gov. Code §§ 65915-65918.)

The County can only decline to grant the concessions or incentives in certain limited circumstances. (Gov. Code § 65915(d).) State law does not preempt the County from offering developers a density bonus above the maximum amount set in Government Code § 65915 pursuant to a local ordinance and there may be some opportunity to increase the amount of the density bonus, depending on the desires of the Board

Inclusionary Housing Policy

The Board of Supervisors adopted an Inclusionary Housing Policy in 2004 ("Inclusionary Requirement for Affordable Housing," San Mateo County Ordinance Code, Section 7908 to 7918). The policy requires developers of any projects with five or more units to dedicate 20% of the units as affordable housing. Recent court cases have invalidated the use of such inclusionary housing requirements for 100% rental projects, at least until either the California legislature amends current law, or other court cases supersede this outcome. The County's inclusionary ordinance remains applicable and is enforced for multifamily ownership housing projects. However, there is another pending court case that challenges inclusionary housing for ownership projects, which could impact the County's ordinance as a whole.

Second Units

Second units, also called accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are units located on the same parcel as another dwelling unit, typically a single-family home. ADUs may be detached, separate structures, or they may be attached to the primary residence, but they are functionally separate. ADUs are valuable sources of housing, and due to their size and their status as subsidiary to primary units, tend to be more affordable than other forms of housing.

The County has a Second Dwelling Unit ordinance, which is intended to increase the supply of second units and establish standards for their construction and location. Planning and Building will be updating the existing ordinance to comply with new state laws; reflect the growing importance of second units as a source of affordable housing, and streamline and incentivize the production of second units.

Mobile Home Park Rent Control Ordinance

Currently, there are seven mobile home or trailer parks in the unincorporated area that provide approximately 700 units of relatively affordable housing. The County has existing policies and programs to regulate and monitor mobile home park operation, rents, and closures and to provide financial assistance, as appropriate and within available resources, to preserve mobile home parks and stabilize affordability.

Specifically, Housing Element Policy HE 8.2 and the County's Mobile Home Rent Control Ordinance (Ordinance Code Chapter 1.30) regulate any proposed mobile home rent increases. Since sites for the relocation of mobile homes are very limited and moving and installation of mobile homes is expensive, mobile home owners are severely impacted by sudden rent increases. In recognition of this issue, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Mobile Home Rent Control Ordinance in 2004 to limit rent increases to no more than once in a 12-month period and to a percentage of the current Consumer Price Index.

Housing Element Policy HE 8.1 calls for the County to regulate the closure of mobile home parks in accordance with State Government Code Section 65863.7 by mitigating the impacts of park closure on tenants through the provision of relocation assistance and other resources. Although they provide existing affordable housing, in some cases mobile home parks are a relatively low-density affordable housing option in areas that could support redevelopment to higher density development. As such, some mobile home parks are under significant redevelopment pressure, and there is concern about displacement of existing tenants. Under State law and County policy, if a mobile home park is proposed to be closed or converted to another use, the person or entity proposing the change in use must file a report with the County on the impact of the conversion or closure upon the displaced residents of the mobile home park. The report must include measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of the conversion or closure on park residents, such as: (1) provision of replacement space in another mobile home park; (2) provision for payment of costs to physically move the mobile homes; (3) provision of alternative affordable housing within a reasonable distance of the existing mobile home park. The report must be approved by the Board of Supervisors. The Board reviewed and approved such a report for the conversion of the Meadowbrook Mobile Home Park in unincorporated Colma, when the site was redeveloped as high density affordable housing in 2006.

Housing Element Policies HE 8.4 and 8.5 call for the County Housing Department to offer financial assistance to stabilize mobile home affordability and to support new or renewed tenant interest in purchases of mobile home parks should these situations arise, using CDBG and/or HOME funds to assist with stabilization and preservation efforts. In fact, when the tenants of the Pillar Ridge Mobile Home Park in Moss Beach were faced with cost increases imposed by for-profit park owners in 2004, the County assisted the tenants with their efforts to have the park purchased by a non-profit organization to help stabilize costs, an effort that was ultimately successful.

Condominium Conversion Regulation

The Board of Supervisors adopted, as part of the County's subdivision regulations (Subdivision Regulations Chapter 7, Sections 7108 and 7109), a blanket prohibition on conversion of multifamily rental housing to condominiums, except under circumstances where the County's

overall housing vacancy, as determined by the California Department of Finance, exceeds 4.15%. The County has committed, through multiple Housing Element policies in prior and current Housing Elements, to maintaining this prohibition.

Impact Fees

The County has a number of fees that can be classified as impact fees, but not a specific fee related to the need for the development of affordable housing. As background on what the County does require of developers, the existing fees are described below.

- **Subdivision Exactions:** Chapter 4 of the County's Subdivision Regulations describes exactions related to land subdivision. Generally, under certain conditions, the County may require sub-dividers to provide land for public streets, transit facilities, bicycle facilities, storm drainage, sewer, or other facilities. Parcels on shorelines must provide shoreline access, and PAD- and RM-zoned parcels must dedicate conservation easements.
- **Park Fee:** The exaction most directly comparable to a typical impact fee is the park fee, which requires all subdivisions to provide park space, or pay a park in-lieu fee; subdivisions of 50 parcels or less are only required to pay the in-lieu fee. The fee is calculated as follows:
 - (Number of new units in subdivision) X (estimated person per unit) X (park acres needed per person {set at .003}) X (current assessed value per acre of land to be subdivided)
- **Road Mitigation Fee:** All new development in the County must pay a fee to mitigate road impacts.
- **Midcoast Park Mitigation Fee:** The Midcoast area has a specific park impact fee assessed on all new development, residential or non-residential. The fee was established in 2006, and is adjusted annually for inflation, as well as periodically reviewed and adjusted by the Board of Supervisors. The current fee is \$1.55 per square foot of assessable space.
- **School Impact Fee:** Projects in San Mateo County must pay a school impact fee, which is paid directly to the relevant school districts. The fees vary by district.

Section 8 Vouchers

Through the Housing Authority, the Department of Housing commits Project-Based Vouchers for at least 50 percent of units in newly constructed affordable developments. Currently, the Housing Authority has committed to providing 345 vouchers to new affordable housing developments in the County. The vouchers are a no cost subsidy to affordable housing projects because they enhance the competitiveness of the projects for the California Low Income Tax Credit program.

What More Can Be Done to Assist Current Tenants?

Tenant's Rights Education

Between 1999 and 2004, staff from the County, the courts and local non-profits jointly operated the Landlord and Tenant Information and Referral Collaborative of San Mateo County. The collaborative was conceived by Peter Reid, Executive Director of the Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County and Patricia Brown, Executive Director of the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center to address issues such as the following:

- A lack of clear, accessible information about landlord-tenant rights and responsibilities among both the public and service providers
- Lack of information was preventing citizens from taking both self-help pro-active steps to prevent a housing crisis and also from seeking existing resources prior to eviction
- Confusion, miscommunication and rental-related conflicts were contributing to the housing crisis for renters in San Mateo County

With funding from the Peninsula Community Foundation, the collaborative developed and circulated bi-lingual brochures, created a bi-lingual web-site, provided trainings for agencies throughout the County and held workshops targeted to groups at high risk of homelessness. The collaborative also provided resources to local agency staff to assist with complex cases. The outreach work focused on low-income tenants and landlords and immigrant communities.

Recommendation: Direct County staff to assess the resources the County, non-profits and other organizations are currently devoting to preventing housing crises from becoming evictions. Collaborate with community partners to develop a fully funded Landlord and Tenant Information, Referral and Assistance Program.

Rent Stabilization, Rent Board and Just Cause Eviction Ordinance

San Mateo County does not have a rent control/stabilization ordinance, which would limit annual increases in rents for certain types of units. Landlords with property in the unincorporated areas of the County can increase rents at any time and in any amount. If the Board of Supervisors chooses to adopt a rent stabilization ordinance, it must comply with the 1995 Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (Cal. Civ. Co de §§ 1954.50 et. seq.) and also avoid potential constitutional (i.e., 5th Amendment takings) issues. The following limitations would apply to any local rent stabilization ordinance:

- Housing constructed after 1995 is exempt from such ordinances. (Cal. Civ. Code § 1954.52(a) (1).)
- Single-family homes and condominiums units (units where title is held separately) are exempt from local rent stabilization. (Cal. Civil Code § 1954.52(a) (3).)
- Property owners must be allowed to establish market rental rates upon a change in tenancy.

The Costa-Hawkins Act does not limit the authority of local governments to regulate or monitor the basis for evictions. Because the law allows landlords in communities with rent stabilization to set market rents with each new tenant, there is an increased incentive to landlords to evict

tenants in order to raise the rent for a unit. Thus, there may be an increased need to protect tenants from arbitrary eviction if rent stabilization is adopted. Typically, such protection is enacted through a “just cause eviction” ordinance that limits the possible causes for eviction.

In addition, any local rent stabilization ordinance would need to account for constitutional issues related to regulatory takings. Numerous rent stabilization ordinances have passed constitutional muster, but such issues should be considered in the development of any county ordinances.

Jurisdictions that have adopted rent stabilization ordinances typically also establish rent boards. Such boards would typically conduct hearings regarding the adjustment of rents under the jurisdiction’s rent stabilization ordinance. Some jurisdictions also undertake investigations of alleged wrongful evictions, although the power to determine whether an eviction is unlawful remains with the court.

East Palo Alto is the only jurisdiction in San Mateo County that has rent stabilization. The following table lists the median rent in 13 San Mateo County cities in 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 and also indicates the percent increase in the median rent over those four years. In reviewing the data in the table, it’s important to keep in mind that these are median rents, so communities with a high number of subsidized units would have lower rates of increase. The source of the data in this table is the American Community Survey, an annual survey done by the Census Bureau.

Median Rent in San Mateo County Cities from 2010 to 2013

Median Rent	2010	2011	2012	2013	% Increase
Belmont	1,387	1,411	1,423	1,517	9.37
Burlingame	1,281	1,366	1,422	1,443	12.65
Daly City	1,378	1,386	1,403	1,437	4.28
East Palo Alto	1,149	1,159	1,146	1,144	-0.44
Foster City	1,773	1,783	1,886	1,982	11.79
Menlo Park	1,644	1,699	1,672	1,687	2.62
Millbrae	1,485	1,510	1,548	1,634	10.03
Pacifica	1,492	1,589	1,644	1,739	16.55
Redwood City	1,243	1,288	1,388	1,464	17.78
San Bruno	1,362	1,477	1,512	1,612	18.36
San Carlos	1,395	1,423	1,434	1,601	14.77
San Mateo	1,440	1,502	1,554	1,588	10.28
South San Francisco	1,324	1,371	1,412	1,436	8.46

Source: American Community Survey, United States Census

Recommendation: If the Board is interested in pursuing rent stabilization and a just cause eviction ordinance, direct County Counsel and Housing Department

staff to draft both a sample ordinance and also develop a staffing and budget structure to support and enforce the ordinance.

Continuation of the 21 Elements Program

The 21 Elements Program is a nationally recognized collaboration among the County and all 20 cities in San Mateo County. The cities and the County have worked together to update all local Housing Elements. The collaboration has included shared research and joint work on determining best practices. An example of the shared work of 21 Elements is the county-wide nexus study, which is currently under development. The information in that study will be used by any city that wants to establish legally defensible development impact fees. Funding for the 21 Elements project ends in June of 2015.

After the County and all 20 cities complete adoption of their Housing Elements early this year, the next step is implementing the recommendations. Many of the recommendations in this white paper will be included in many of the city and the County housing elements. By continuing the 21 Elements program for another two years, the County and the cities could continue to share costs, share learning and work collaboratively to both maintain and develop affordable housing throughout the County.

Recommendation: Direct the Department of Housing to work with C/CAG to develop a budget and funding proposal for two more years of the 21 Elements program to support the implementation of the city and County Housing Elements.

What More Can Be Done to Promote the Creation of More Affordable Housing?

Build More Second Units

There are a number of ways to incentivize the development of new second units, including the following ideas. .

- **Relaxed development standards for some or all second units.** As second units are built on lots with existing structures, they are often relatively constrained in their possible building footprint, and limited by various zoning and other building standards. Second units could be permitted to encroach into setbacks, or could be exempt from lot coverage or total floor area ratio restrictions, parking requirements, or a variety of other standards that regulate the placement of the structure on a parcel. Alternatively, these exceptions could be available only to second units that meet certain criteria (are below a certain size/bulk threshold, for instance), or only available to second units formally

dedicated as affordable housing. Other types of purely affordable housing projects are often offered similar exceptions, in addition to various kinds of fee waivers. Some jurisdictions (Lexington, Kentucky) have made second units by-right on all single-family properties with homes built within a certain period of time (the past five years, for example), and have allowed multiple second units by right on all lots of sufficient size to accommodate them.

- **Permit streamlining.** The Planning and Building regulations offer certain types of projects fast-track review, as a policy tool to incentivize such projects. Green building projects are one example. A similar process could be applied to second units.
- **Pre-approved second unit design templates.** Some jurisdictions (Portland Oregon; Sacramento California; Santa Cruz, California) offer pre-approved design templates for various types of development projects, including second units. Typically, the templates offer a basic set of project plans, tailored to suit the needs and constraints of different areas, and use of the templates typically guarantees project approval. This approach sharply reduces project design costs for developers, and offers certainty of approval. This program would require the County to work with architects to draft a palette of design templates, tailored to be appropriate for various County areas. An advantage of this strategy is that in addition to promoting second units, it can also promote community-appropriate design standards.
- **Second Unit (Accessory Dwelling Unit) Program.** The City of Santa Cruz has an Accessory Dwelling Unit program that offers a variety of relaxed zoning requirements for developers of second units. The program includes parking exceptions, offers a set of seven possible preapproved design templates, provides a second unit guidance manual and offers financing to assist property owners creating new second units. In addition, to publicize the program, the City held a number of public workshops to educate the community about second units and the tools available to create them. Since adoption of the program, second unit production has increased from roughly 10 units per year to 40 or more per year.

Recommendation: Direct Planning and Building staff to develop a work plan and proposed budget for a Second Unit (Accessory Dwelling Unit) Program modeled on the Santa Cruz program. The program will include zoning changes, design templates, a guidance manual and a community outreach program. The work plan will include a proposed timeline for community outreach and Planning Commission and Board review of the program.

Legalizing Existing Second Units

While there are no reliable data on unpermitted second dwelling units, anecdotal reports suggest that there are a number of “informal” second units in the County, including fully detached units that have been built without building permits, conversions of rooms or accessory structures that were appropriately permitted for their original use, but have subsequently been transformed into living units, and ad hoc or substandard conversions of garages, sheds, or other

illegal space. While some of these units are probably not legally habitable under any circumstances, many might be improved to legal habitability through some degree of upgrade.

Strategies to legalize second units focus on bringing the units into compliance with zoning and building codes, and retroactively permitting them. The intent is to maintain the housing, while ensuring that it is safely habitable. Strategies to achieve this aim vary, depending on the nature of the unit and degree of improvement required.

- **Legalizing minor non-conformities through zoning changes or exceptions.** Some second units may be legally habitable, but do not comply with zoning because, for example, they encroach into setbacks, have minor height or bulk non-conformities, or other similar issues. In these cases, general changes to zoning regulations could legalize these units en masse, or exceptions to zoning regulations could be offered to second units on a per-project basis.
- **Rehabilitating and upgrading substandard units.** If existing units do not meet building codes or health and safety codes, legalization can be contingent on upgrades to meet code standards. The cost of upgrades can be substantial, however, and some financial assistance might be needed in many cases to make improvements financially feasible for the property owner.

Either of these strategies typically requires some form of amnesty program, which allows property owners to apply to legalize the units without penalty. Typically, an amnesty program is coupled with sharply reduced permitting fees and in some cases with financial assistance, and/or an incremental fee payment plan.

The conundrum of amnesty/legalization. When a property owner applies for a second unit amnesty program and rehabilitation of the unit is required, either the owner must fund the rehabilitation, or other sources must be made available. If funds are unavailable (or if there is inadequate public awareness of funds available) owners may be reluctant to apply for amnesty without reasonable assurances that they can afford to bring the units up to code. If owners do apply for amnesty, but resources are not available to bring the units into compliance, the County must record a violation and may have to force demolition, which in fact results in the loss of a housing unit and displacement of tenants, which is not the intent of the amnesty program.

Thus, to be fully effective, any amnesty program should include a program of exceptions for minor code issues, and some type of grant or forgivable loan program, in addition to a payment program, to fund rehabilitation.

A number of California communities have implemented second unit amnesty programs, including Marin County, Fairfax, and Ventura. In each case, any unpermitted second units, or unpermitted units built within a certain time frame, are eligible for amnesty, and waiver of penalties is coupled with reduction in normal fees, and the possibility of relaxed zoning standards. Some jurisdictions also offer financial assistance, while others only offer fee waivers and exceptions to standards.

Recommendation: Direct Planning and Building to develop a Second Unit Amnesty program that maintains the housing, while ensuring that it is safely habitable. The program will include regulatory relief, permit fee subsidies and a rehabilitation loan program developed in conjunction with the Department of Housing

Small Home Prototypes

As discussed above, second dwelling units provide an important source of affordable housing because they are typically smaller than a primary residence, and often house relatives, students, young adults, and other segments of the population that have trouble affording the rent of a primary residence. To encourage the provision of secondary dwelling units on appropriate sites, some jurisdictions, such as the County of San Luis Obispo, offer property owners free sets of plans that have been drafted in accordance with current building code requirements. By reducing the cost of developing secondary units, this program provides a significant financial incentive for the provision of such units.

In San Mateo County, there is an opportunity to establish a similar program that can also be applied to the construction of primary residences. There are numerous antiquated subdivisions throughout the unincorporated area, where typical lot sizes are below that which is required by zoning, and where the construction of a residence to the maximum size allowed by the zoning can have an adverse impact on community character, visual resources, and infrastructure constraints. Prototype plans for smaller homes on such lots provide an opportunity to address these issues by providing a financial incentive for property owners to construct homes that are proportional to small lot sizes, provide more room for onsite parking and landscaping, and place lower demands on public services. The availability of such plans will also reduce the costs and risks typically associated with the development of vacant properties. For example, the prototype plans could be reviewed and approved by applicable Design Review Committees, thereby minimizing the need for project-by-project reviews and plan revisions.

In addition to providing a less costly and more streamlined process for building affordable units, such a program provides an opportunity to encourage green building and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Prototype plans will employ designs and materials that maximize energy efficiency, environmental sustainability, and public health.

The steps required to implement such a program include: identifying a source of funds to pay for the development of prototype plans; conducting a competitive process to select an architectural, design, and/or engineering firm capable of creating these plans; working with the County's Design Review Committees and other stakeholders to obtain feedback on the designs and the ways in which the program will be carried out; and, establishing the specific procedures regarding the use of the plans and what if any obligations the property owners who desire to use the plans must fulfill.

Recommendation: Direct staff to develop a budget and work plan for a small home prototype project to be considered as part of the Planning and Building Department budget for FY 2015-2017.

No Net Loss Policy

A no net loss policy is a formally adopted policy establishing a jurisdiction's intent, through either preservation or replacement, to maintain at least its current level of affordable housing, either jurisdiction-wide, or with-in specifically defined areas.

Implementation of a no net loss policy can take different forms, including:

- **Funding/Policy-Based strategies**, such as a pool of dedicated funding to create or maintain affordable units. The funding could be used for units at-risk of loss or already lost. It could subsidize maintenance and/or rehabilitation of units that may be at risk of loss due to either expiring affordability restrictions, or from simple degradation and lack of upkeep. This approach imposes a financial and administrative burden on the jurisdiction implementing the no net loss policy.
- **Regulatory strategies**, such as a prohibition on demolitions or conversion of affordable housing, or one-for-one replacement requirements for developers who demolish affordable housing in the course of creating other development. This level of regulation might face legal challenges, although the County currently has a prohibition on conversion of condominiums, which is similar to either a prohibition or replacement requirement for affordable housing in general, and other cities have enacted similar ordinances (see below). This approach puts the primary burden on project sponsors (developers, builders).

A no net loss policy could also be implemented through a hybrid of regulatory and funding approaches, or could apply one approach for projects with certain levels of impact (up to a certain number of units lost, for instance), while applying a more stringent approach for projects above a certain threshold of impact. The County already tracks Section 8 units and certain other types of formally dedicated affordable housing units at risk of loss, and provides some types of rehabilitation and other funding to prevent these losses.

Implementation of any strategy typically requires an accurate inventory of affordable units, which could include only dedicated affordable units (those with legal restrictions maintaining their affordability) or dedicated affordable units and units that are considered "naturally" affordable because their rent or price is relatively low (due to unit quality, location, or other market factors). Another key component of implementation is rigorous tracking of units lost or at-risk of loss, and assessment of proposed development projects to determine their potential net impact on housing stock.

To be most effective, a no net loss policy typically establishes a goal of no net loss of affordable units not only in total, but by income level. For example, the policy should maintain at least the

current stock of extremely low-income units, the stock of very-low income units, and the stock of low-income units, with each income grouping maintained at the current level, rather than treating units as fungible across income categories. For purposes of tracking unit affordability, most jurisdictions rely on the affordability calculations established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, or the variations on those calculations established by various state Departments of Housing, which establish the basic income categories that count as each level of affordability, and typically assume 30% of income as an affordable monthly budget for housing expenses.

- **Funding/Policy-based approach:** Portland, Oregon has enacted a no net loss policy for the entire Central City area. Portland tracks the number of affordable units in the Central City area by income level, and attempts through a variety of policy measures to incentivize or create replacement housing. Portland does not prohibit residential conversion or demolition on a per-project basis, but attempts to balance the number of units in the area overall, through policy and funding tools.
- **Regulatory approach:** San Luis Obispo, CA, on the other hand, has a regulation that directly prohibits housing conversion and demolition in the downtown area. The ordinance requires developers of any project that would result in a net loss of affordable housing, as determined by the City's calculations, provide replacement units directly to make up the loss.

From the legal perspective, County Counsel noted that this concept has ordinarily been used by local entities as a policy goal when implementing redevelopment projects undertaken by the entity. There are a couple of specific ways it can be used to require developers to maintain affordable housing when converting or re-building housing that has been vacant, destroyed or demolished.

For example, San Francisco has a condo conversion ordinance which appears to allow some tenants options to purchase units or to keep rent controlled leases after conversion. San Mateo County also has a condominium conversion ordinance as noted above, but the county ordinance does not have any requirements regarding tenant purchases or continued habitation. Options for amending the current ordinance along the lines of the San Francisco ordinance could be researched further if there is interest by the Board of Supervisors.

There is also a state statute (Government Code section 65863, *et seq.*) which requires local jurisdictions, when reducing the residential density for a parcel of land, to consider the impact of such reduced density on regional housing needs and to identify sufficient additional, adequate and available sites with an equal or greater residential density in the jurisdiction so that there is no net loss of residential unit capacity.

Finally, the state law on density bonuses has recently been amended to condition certain density bonuses for redevelopment of housing and condo conversions on replacement of pre-existing affordable units.

Recommendation: Direct Planning and Building, County Counsel and the Department of Housing to further research best practices and develop a “No Net Loss” concept for consideration by the Board.

Affordable Housing Overlay Zoning

An affordable housing overlay zone is an additional zoning layer, applied to a specific geographic area, that offers incentives to developers to provide affordable housing as part of projects built in that area. The zoning overlay is in addition to normal zoning for the area, which remains in force.

While the County has several existing zoning mechanisms that incentivize or require the creation of affordable housing, the County has never used an affordable housing overlay zoning. The County currently relies mainly on project-specific affordable housing regulations: the density bonus ordinance and the inclusionary housing ordinance which include incentives and requirements, respectively, for the creation of affordable units as part of any qualifying project in any County area. In the past, the County has also zoned specific parcels for affordable housing, using Planned Unit Development (PUD) and “A” zoning designations (R-3-A/PUD-124 zoning, for example, applies to several coast-side parcels and designates them for multifamily affordable housing).

An affordable housing overlay zone creates a new set of incentives that developers may receive in exchange for the creation of affordable housing beyond that created pursuant to any other existing requirements or incentive programs. Such overlay zoning incentives may include the following:

- Additional density beyond that allowed under standard zoning and the density bonus program.
- Reduction or waiver of various planning/permit fees
- Exemption from various discretionary approvals
- Fast-tracked permit processing
- Adjustments to development standards, including reduced setbacks and parking requirements, greater height limits, higher floor-area-ratio and/or lot coverage requirements, or other standards

The overlay zoning would typically define the amount of affordable housing to be provided and the affordability levels required, to qualify for the incentives. It would also define either a specific set of incentives, or a range of incentives that might be available, to be further refined based on negotiation between the developer and the County. This negotiated arrangement is also how the inclusionary housing ordinance and density bonus ordinance typically function.

An affordable housing overlay zone has a number of benefits: it does not require amendment of existing zoning regulations or the general plan; offers incentives, rather than requirements, which may be more palatable to developers and residents; it can incentivize affordable rental housing, which is currently not covered by the County’s Inclusionary Housing requirements; it is

limited in geographic scope, and can be carefully crafted to cover only appropriate areas; and it can be crafted with a flexible mix of potential incentives to suit the particular needs of different developers. Local examples of housing overlay zones include:

- Menlo Park recently adopted an affordable housing overlay zone covering the Menlo Park El Camino Real and Downtown Specific Plan areas, as well as some other targeted areas. Menlo Park's ordinance creates one set of incentives for projects between 5 and 100 units, and another set of incentives for projects greater than 100 units; generally, both require developers to provide 21% of housing as affordable to receive a density bonus of 35% or more, but differently sized project may achieve that affordability target through a different mix of affordability levels. The zoning also includes a set of possible reductions or waivers of development standards.
- Alameda also has affordable housing overlay zoning, and provides a range of benefits, with the maximum achievable by projects providing 50% of units as affordable.
- Orange County has an affordable housing overlay zone that covers several traditionally commercial areas, to incentivize the creation of affordable units in residential and mixed-use redevelopment projects.

Recommendation: Direct Planning and Building and County Counsel to develop an affordable housing overlay zoning concept for the North Fair Oaks community for inclusion in the proposed zoning changes that will implement the North Fair Oaks community plan. Also, if the overlay zone is adopted for North Fair Oaks, direct staff to report back to the Board on the adoption process and the application of the overlay so the Board can consider expanding the areas covered by the overlay.

Inclusionary Housing Ordinances

Many jurisdictions have adopted rules and regulations that mandate inclusion of affordable housing in residential developments or require in lieu payments from residential and commercial developers for an affordable housing fund. However, inclusionary housing ordinances in California are currently under review by the State Supreme Court. Until clear direction is received from the courts, it is recommended that the County Counsel monitor the situation and that once the Supreme Court has issued a decision, bring back options for the Board to consider based on that decision. The County's existing Inclusionary Housing Ordinance may be entirely enforceable, partly unenforceable, or may need some amendments in order to comply with legal outcomes.

San Mateo County enacted an inclusionary zoning ordinance in 2004. However, the law relating to inclusionary housing ordinances is in a state of flux. There is a case pending with the California Supreme Court on review from the Court of Appeal which upheld the San Jose inclusionary housing ordinance (which requires developers to set aside a percentage of the units for affordable housing or pay an in-lieu fee). (*California Building Industry Association v. City of San Jose* (2013) 216 Cal. App. 4th 1373.)

The issues relate to the burden of proof and standard of review when such ordinances are challenged. The Court of Appeal held that the burden lies on the developer to show that the legislation is not reasonably related to the promotion of affordable housing (the standard generally applicable to police power zoning regulations). The Building Industry Association argued that it is the City's burden to show a nexus between the impact of the development and the inclusionary housing requirements of the ordinance (a heightened scrutiny standard).

Depending on the way the Supreme Court rules, the burden may be on the County to show a connection between the development at issue and the need for affordable housing. Many jurisdictions (including San Jose and San Mateo County) are now doing nexus studies, to support their inclusionary ordinances.

With respect to rental housing, local ordinances which attempt to impose affordability requirements on newly constructed rental housing are preempted by the Costa Hawkins Act unless the developer of rental housing has agreed to provide affordable units in exchange for a density bonus or a financial contribution pursuant to Government Code section 65915. (*Palmer/Sixth Street Properties, L.P. v. City of Los Angeles* (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1396.) However, there are efforts at the state level to legislatively amend the Costa Hawkins act to remove this preemption; a bill to do so was vetoed by the Governor in the last legislative session, but similar bills are likely to be proposed this year.

Recommendation: Direct staff to report back to the Board of Supervisors on the results of the legal cases related to inclusionary housing and their impact on the San Mateo County ordinance.

Impact/Mitigation Fees

There have also been legal challenges to impact fees which have resulted in the requirement for “nexus studies” that demonstrate the link between a development project and the fee. The County is part of the 21 Elements “Nexus Study and Impact Fee Feasibility Study” which is currently being prepared by a consultant. The study will help the County and other cities in San Mateo County assess the feasibility of using commercial and/or market rate impact fees to support affordable housing. The study will also provide guidance on developing legally defensible fees. When the 21 Elements countywide nexus study is complete, staff will review the recommendations and bring back suggested next steps for the Board. The final report is expected in June of 2015. General background on impact fees is presented in the following paragraphs.

Impact or mitigation fees can be established to fund any valid public purpose which is legitimately impacted by new development. Any new impact or mitigation fee established by the County must meet the dual “nexus” test of rationality and proportionality: there must be a rational connection between new development and the impact being addressed by the fee, and the size of the fee must be proportional to new development’s share of that impact. The County is currently participating in a multijurisdictional nexus study, which is intended to establish the

legal basis for establishing new affordable housing impact fees, as well as determining the appropriate, legally justifiable size of such fees.

Various local jurisdictions have adopted impact fees. Example fee levels are shown in the table below along with the amount determined to be justifiable by nexus study. The fees vary dramatically by jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction	Impact Fee	Nexus Study Fee Range
Berkeley	\$20,000 per unit	\$19,500 to \$34,000 per unit
Fremont	\$17.55 to \$20.25 per sf	\$17.41 to \$24.97 per sf
San Carlos	\$18,554 per unit	\$5,325 to \$66,538 per unit
Santa Rosa	\$1,137 to \$1,911 per unit	\$7,583 to \$12,741 per unit
Walnut Creek	\$1.60 to \$15 per sf	\$28.930 to \$31,550 per unit
Mountain View	\$10 per sf	\$17.51 to \$23.63 per sf
Marin County	\$0 to \$10 per sf	
Napa County	\$1,738 per unit	

Housing Impact Fee

Section 66000, *et seq.*, of the California Government Code, commonly referred to as the “Mitigation Fee Act,” authorizes cities and counties to impose a “housing impact fee” if the local agency can establish a relationship between market rate residential development and an increased demand for affordable housing. A number of jurisdictions, including for example, the City of San Jose, have prepared nexus studies establishing that new market rate residential rental development leads to increased demand for affordable housing for new residents working in jobs that provide services to the residents of market rate housing. These jurisdictions have adopted housing impact fees to raise revenues used to build such affordable housing.

With a proper nexus study, the County could consider imposing such a housing impact fee on developers of market rate housing in the unincorporated area.

Commercial Linkage Fees

Commercial linkage fees are fees imposed on commercial development to ameliorate housing impacts generated by such projects (which often create the need for affordable housing for their employees). The impact is measured through a Jobs-Housing Nexus Analysis which shows the connection between the construction of new commercial buildings, employment and the need for affordable housing. It appears that several cities have adopted these fees including, for example, Menlo Park, Oakland, Walnut Creek, San Francisco, Berkeley, San Diego and Santa Monica. For the County to adopt a commercial linkage fee, a jobs-housing nexus study would have to be prepared.

Recommendation: Direct staff to report back when the court cases are resolved and the nexus studies are complete on the options for adopting legally defensible policies for commercial and residential impact fees for affordable housing.

Shared Housing

HIP Housing, a San Mateo County nonprofit, operates the only home sharing program in San Mateo County. The program matches people that have space to share with those that need an affordable place to live. The program serves over 700 people a year. Over 90% of the people using the home sharing program qualify as low or extremely low income according to the Department of Housing and Urban Development standards. And, over 60% of the home providers are seniors aging in place. HIP reports that they have 10 individuals interested in shared housing for each person interested in sharing their home. A countywide marketing campaign to recruit and retain more home providers for the shared housing program would create “affordable units” within the existing housing stock.

Recommendation: In collaboration with community partners, expand and promote shared housing program throughout the County to recruit and retain more shared housing providers.

Appendix A

Affordable Housing Production Assisted by the
County of San Mateo from 2003 through 2014

Affordable Housing Production Assisted by the County during 2003 - 2014

	AH units	Development	Proj Type	Tenure	Target Pop	Location	Developer		Notes		
COMPLETED											
FY 03-04											
	39	First Step for Families	NC	Transitional	Homeless	San Mateo	Shelter Network		Transitional Hsg		
	64	Lesley Gardens	NC	Rent	Seniors	HMB	Lesley Found				
	1	BMR Hsg Acq. (Univ Sq)	Acq	Own	Families	EPA	City of EPA				
	4	Willow Gardens IV	Acq	Rent	Families	SSF	Mid-Pen Hsg				
	4	Willow Gardens V	Acq	Rent	Families	SSF	Mid-Pen Hsg				
	4	Willow Gardens VI	Acq	Rent	Families	SSF	Mid-Pen Hsg				
	4	Willow Gardens VII	Acq	Rent	Families	SSF	Mid-Pen Hsg				
sub-total	120										
FY 04-05											
	10	Lakeside Apts	NC	Rent	Families	Pacifica	Natl Church Residences				
	32	Nugent Square	NC	Rent	Families	EPA	EPA CAN DO/ Eden				
	227	Pillar Ridge (El Granada MHP)	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Families	Unincorp	COACH of San Diego				
	11	South Delaware Apts	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Families	San Mateo	HIP Hsg Devel				
sub-total	280										
FY 05-06											
	25	Belmont Apts	NC	Rent	Spec Needs	Belmont	Mental Health Assoc				
	77	Courtyard at Bay Road	NC	Rent	Families	EPA	Community Hsg Dev				
Jun-06	4	DeLong St Habitat Homes	NC	Own	Families	Daly City	Pen Habitat				
Aug-05	7	Habitat Way Habitat Homes	NC	Own	Families	Daly City	Pen Habitat				
	50	Rotary Floritas Sr. Hsg	NC	Rent	Seniors	San Mateo	Mid-Pen/Rotary Club				
sub-total	163										
FY 06-07											
May-07	5	Plumas Ave- Habitat Homes	NC	Own	Families	Brisbane	Pen Habitat		Townhomes		
	89	Opp Center of Mid-Peninsula	NC	Rent	Homeless	Palo Alto	Comm. Wkg Group		Serves SMCo and SCCo residents		
Jan-07	15	Vendome Hotel (SRO)	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Homeless	San Mateo	City of San Mateo		Shelter Network will provide services		
sub-total	109										
FY 07-08											
Sep-07	2	San Bruno Ave- Habitat Homes	NC	Own	Families	Brisbane	Pen Habitat				
Feb-08	4	Commercial Av- Habitat Homes	NC	Own	Families	SSF	Pen Habitat				
Mar-07	228	The Village at the Crossing	NC	Rent	Seniors	San Bruno	Citizens Hsg/ KDF				
Aug-07	43	Grand Oak Apts	NC	Rent	Families	SSF	BRIDGE				
May-08	15	Commercial Ave Apts	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Families	SSF	HIP Hsg Devel				
	4	University Av. Apt. A/R	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Families	EPA	EPA CAN DO				
Sep-07	58	Villa Montgomery	NC	Rent	Families	Redwood City	First Community Hsg				
sub-total	354										
FY 08-09											
Nov-08	40	Hillcrest Gardens	NC	Rent	Seniors	Daly City	ABHOW				
	12	Hope House for Men (2 hses)	Acq	Transitional	Spec Needs	RWC/NFO	Service League		12 beds -- Transit Hsg		
sub-total	52										
FY 09-10											

3/2/2015

May-10	119	Trestle Glen at El Camino Vlg	NC	Rent	Families	Unincorp	BRIDGE				
sub-total	119										
FY 10-11											
Sep-10	68	Peninsula Station	NC	Rent	Families	San Mateo	Mid-Pen				
	3	714-718 Linden Ave	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Families	SSF	City of SSF				
	3	Scattered sites	Acq/Rehab	Own	Families	EPA	Habitat for Humanity				
May-11	15	Cedar Street Apts.	NC	Rent	Spec Needs	Redwood City	Mental Health Assn		Supportive Hsg.		
Jun-11	1	2372 University Av. Apt. A/R	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Families	EPA	EPA CAN DO				
sub-total	90										
FY 11-12											
	1	University Av. Housing	Acq	Rent	Families	EPA	EPA CAN DO		part of site assembly		
sub-total	1										
FY 12-13											
Aug-12	109	636 El Camino (formerly El Camino Family Hsg)	NC	Rent	Families	SSF	MidPen Hsg		20 units of Supportive Hsg		
	12	Willow Road Apts.	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Families	Menlo Park	HIP Housing				
sub-total	121										
FY 13-14											
Feb-14	45	Half Moon Village - Phase 1	NC	Rent	Seniors	Half Moon Bay	MidPen Hsg				
Jan-14	40	Coastside Senior Housing	NC	Rent	Seniors	Half Moon Bay	Mercy/Lesley				
Feb-14	60	Delaware Pacific (formerly 2000 S. Delaware)	NC	Rent	Families	San Mateo	MidPen Hsg		Part of a Mixed-Use Devel (120 units total)		
sub-total	145										
TOTAL	1,554										

IN PRE-DEVELOPMENT OR CONSTRUCTION AS OF MARCH 2015									
(Developments with County subsidy commitment and/or seeking County subsidy)									
Construction									
	49	Woodlands Newell	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Families	EPA	Mid-Pen		In construction
	115	Half Moon Village - Phase 2	NC	Rent	Families	Half Moon Bay	Mid-Pen		In construction
	60	Willow Vets Housing	NC	Rent	Homeless (Veterans)	Menlo Park	CORE		Supportive Hsg, with portion of the units targeted to Homeless Vets
	66	Foster Square Senior Hsg	NC	Rent	Seniors	Foster City	MidPen Hsg		
sub-total	290								
Pre-Development									
	23	Main St. Housing	Acq/Rehab	Rent	Homeless (some units)	Redwood City	City of RWC		Pre-dev
	15	Waverly Place	NC	Rent	Special Needs	Unincorp Co	Mental Health Assoc		15 units of Supportive Hsg
	52	6800 Mission St	NC	Rent	Families	Daly City	MidPen Hsg		
	90	Gateway Senior Apts	NC	Rent	Seniors	Menlo Park	MidPen Hsg		
	41	University Ave Senior Apts	NC	Rent	Seniors	EPA	MidPen Hsg		
	50	Colma Veterans Village	NC	Rent	Homeless (Veterans)	Colma	Mercy Housing		Targeted to At-Risk & Homeless Vets & other Vet families
	16	612 Jefferson Ave (condos)	NC	Own	Families	Redwood City	Habitat for Humanity		
sub-total	287								
TOTAL	577								