FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND

2018 MAR -1 PM 4:55

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY

ORSA COUNSEL

OAKLAND REDEVELOPMENT SUCCESSOR AGENCY

RESOLUTION NO. 2018 007

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2016-2021 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE OAK KNOLL REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, Section 33490 of the California Community Redevelopment Law (Health & Safety Code Section 33000, et seq.) requires a redevelopment agency to adopt an implementation plan every five years; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 34173, the Oakland Redevelopment Successor Agency ("ORSA") is the successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Oakland, and is responsible for satisfying the remaining enforceable obligations of the Redevelopment Agency; and

WHEREAS, the ORSA Administrator has prepared and presented to ORSA an Implementation Plan for the Oak Knoll Redevelopment Project for 2016-2021; and

WHEREAS, ORSA has held a public hearing and received comment on the proposed Implementation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Implementation Plan as presented to ORSA sets forth the specific goals and objectives for the Oak Knoll project area, the specific programs, projects and estimated expenditures over the five year period, and an explanation of how the goals, objectives, programs, projects, and expenditures will eliminate blight within the project area and meet low- and moderate-income housing requirements, as required by law, to the extent there are enforceable obligations of the former Redevelopment Agency that have yet to be satisfied; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That ORSA hereby approves and adopts the 2016-2021 Implementation Plan for the Oak Knoll Redevelopment Project attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ORSA Administrator or his or her designee is hereby authorized to take whatever action is appropriate with respect to the Implementation Plan consistent with this Resolution and its basic purposes.

BY SUCCESSOR AGENCY, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APR 17, 2018

PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES- [redacted], CAMPBELL WASHINGTON, GALLO, GIBSON McELHANEY, GUILLEN, KALB, KAPLAN, and CHAIRPERSON [redacted] - 6

NOES- Ø

ABSENT- Ø

ABSTENTION- Ø

excused - Brooks, Reid

ATTEST:
LATONDA SIMMONS
ORSA Secretary

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2016-2021 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE OAK KNOLL REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

EXHIBIT A

This Implementation Plan includes separate Redevelopment and Housing components. The Redevelopment component revisits the goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan, presents the programs, projects, and expenditures (other than those related to low- and moderate-income housing) that have been or will be implemented to achieve ORSA's goals and objectives, to the extent there are remaining enforceable obligations of the Redevelopment Agency that need to be satisfied. It also describes how these programs, projects, and expenditures eliminate blight within the Project Area.

The Housing component describes various CRL requirements regarding low- and moderate-income housing, such as housing preservation and production requirements. Regarding such activities, ORSA can only satisfy existing contractual obligations listed in its Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) that pertain to low-and moderate income housing, but cannot initiate any new housing projects and programs; the City, as housing successor, is now responsible for most affordable housing activities in Oakland.

ORSA is required to prepare a mid-term review of the Implementation Plan and conduct a public hearing between the second and third year after the Implementation Plan has been adopted. New issues and opportunities may be encountered in the course of administering the Implementation Plan during the five-year period. Therefore, this Implementation Plan may be amended, if necessary, to effectuate changes in Agency priorities. Any such amendments will be reflected in the mid-term review of the Implementation Plan.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Project Area Setting

The Oak Knoll Redevelopment Project Area boundaries were selected to include all Federal lands subject to closure as part of the former Naval Medical Center Oakland ("NMCO"). The former NMCO lies in the southeastern portion of Oakland, east of the McArthur Freeway, (U.S. Interstate 580) between the Keller Avenue and Golf Links Road exits, approximately eight miles from downtown Oakland (see Figure 1).

The Project Area consists of approximately 183 acres, of which approximately 135 acres are developed, maintained or landscaped, and includes buildings, roads, parking lots, and recreation facilities. Steep slopes characterize much of the site and many buildings are built in areas where the natural topography ranges from 10 percent to 30 percent slopes. The area surrounding the Project Area contains mostly single-family homes, condominiums and apartments with limited retail services along Mountain Boulevard and in the Ridgemont Plaza strip center.

B. Base Closure & Reuse Plan

On September 30, 1993, the 183-acre Navel Medical Center Oakland facility was recommended to be closed pursuant to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment ("BRAC") Act of 1990, (Public Law 101-510) Title XXXIX, and confirmed by Congress for closure in October 1993. NMCO had been in military ownership and use since 1942, providing medical services to military and civilian families until its closure on September 30, 1996.

The federal base conversion process requires that the local community prepare a Reuse Plan for the eventual civilian reuse of the military property. Through the Oakland Base Reuse Authority, the recognized local reuse authority, an extensive community outreach and input program was sponsored. The Final Reuse Plan (FRP), a required federal document, was approved by the Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD) and the Department of Defense (DOD) on September 10, 1997. The FRP identified four basic land uses for the NMCO. These include open space at the northeastern and western edges, a nine-hole golf course and single-family residential development (318 units) in the central portion and a driving range and other recreational components in the southern end. A mixed-use area containing multi-family development and several existing structures to be reused by non-profit/public benefit organizations were to be located between the open space at the western edge and the residential/golf course area. This area was also to contain private commercial office and possibly retail uses.

The Oak Knoll Redevelopment Project was adopted by the City Council on July 14, 1998, by Ordinance Number 12065 C.M.S. pursuant to special provisions of the California Community Redevelopment Law for military base closures (see Sections 33492 through 33492.20 of the Health and Safety Code). The site met the Blight requirements of CRL because of the unsafe aged buildings, inadequate or deteriorated infrastructure, incompatible and uneconomic land uses, non compliance of land and buildings that did not meet local building, plumbing, mechanical or electrical code standards. Additionally the land is not subdivided according to local regulations. These conditions were confirmed as a serious physical, social and economic burden on the City. It was determined that private enterprise could not act alone and that governmental action may necessary to correct the blighting conditions.

Also during this time, the City of Oakland adopted its updated General Plan and as a result, the General Plan superseded the Reuse Plan as of 1998.

Due to budget constraints and the potential costs associated with environment clean up and site clearance of the former military base, the former Redevelopment Agency did not accept a transfer of ownership from the Navy to the former Redevelopment Agency through OBRA and no development or redevelopment has occurred on the former Base since Redevelopment Plan adoption in 1998. Instead, the Navy retained ownership of the former Base property and sold 167 acres of land directly to a private developer in a public auction in November 2005. The 167-acres were transferred to a private owner, Lehman Brothers, in March 2006. The owner had selected a developer, SunCal, to develop the property. SunCal had come up with a plan that would lead to the development of over 260 residential units, 40 acres of green space and other amenities within the property. The housing market crash in 2008 led to the owner and developer declaring bankruptcy. The owner went through bankruptcy court to address the issue of the Oak

G. The strengthening of the economic base of the community through the construction and installation of needed site improvements to stimulate new residential, commercial, and recreational uses.

H. The provision of adequate land for parking and open spaces.

I. The establishment and implementation of performance criteria to assure high site design standards, environmental quality, and other design elements which provide unity and integrity between designated land uses within the Project Area.

J. To provide for the expansion, improvement and preservation of the community's supply of housing available to low and moderate income persons and families within or outside the Project Area.

By separate action, the former Redevelopment Agency adopted the following specific amendments to the Oak Knoll Redevelopment Plan:

- Increase in the tax increment limit from $87 million to $1.5 billion;
- Increase in the bonded indebtedness limit from $21.5 million to $400 million;
- Update the Oak Knoll Land Use Map to conform to the General Plan;
- Expand the list of authorized public improvements for Oak Knoll Project Area;
- Change text references in the Oak Knoll Redevelopment Plan from the "Reuse Plan" to the "General Plan," and make other text changes.

This proposed Implementation Plan is consistent with the Redevelopment Plan amendments. The programs and projects proposed in this Implementation Plan are intended to facilitate the achievement of the Goals and Objectives listed above and as revised by the former Redevelopment Agency. ORSA will be winding-down its redevelopment activities over the term of this Implementation Plan. It is ORSA's hope and intent that the Implementation Plan as proposed will encourage further private sector investment in both commercial and residential designated areas.

One of the primary functions of this Implementation Plan is to illustrate how ORSA's efforts during the five-year term of this Implementation Plan will continue to eliminate blighting conditions throughout the Project Area, to the extent there are remaining enforceable obligations that would achieve these goals. The next section provides a description of those activities planned for the term of this Plan.

IV. PROJECTS, PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES PROPOSED FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS (2016-2021)

This section of the Implementation Plan provides a summary of ORSA's remaining enforceable obligations for the next five years and how these will serve to eliminate blight in the Project Area. Per the redevelopment dissolution law, and California Health and Safety Code Section 34177(1), ORSA is required to prepare a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule ("ROPS") each year listing the Redevelopment Agency's recognized enforceable obligations, payment sources, and related information. This Implementation Plan focuses on all the items included on the ROPS.

Table 1. Projected Expenditures in the Oak Knoll Project Area, Fiscal Years 2016/17 to 2020/21

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	TOTAL
ORSA Budget						
Administration & Overhead						
Administrative Cost Allowance	$32,013					**$32,013**
City Staff & Overhead	$0					**$0**
PERS Pension obligation	$15,551	$15,551	$15,551	$15,551	$15,551	**$77,755**
OPEB unfunded obligation	$7,854	$7,854	$7,854	$7,854	$7,854	**$39,270**
Unemployment obligation	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Bond Expenditure Agreement (City Projects)	$0					**$0**
Debt Service	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Low-Mod Funds						**$0**
Staffing	$19,671	$19,671	$19,671	$19,671	$19,671	**$98,354**
Debt Service (Staffing proportion)	$143,766	$143,766	$143,766	$143,766	$143,766	**$718,832**
Projects	$225,747					**$225,747**
Property Management, Maintenance & Insurance Costs	$590					**$590**
Property Remediation	$0					**$0**
TI Rebates	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
TOTAL	**$389,775**	**$163,437**	**$163,437**	**$163,437**	**$163,437**	**$1,043,52 4**

the Project Area. The proper management and ultimate development of the former Agency-owned parcel(s) will contribute to the overall development of the Project Area. This would decrease blight, enhance the aesthetic appeal of the area, positively impact any commercial development and alleviate any safety concerns regarding the parcel(s) and surrounding areas. A key parcel is the Barcelona Street Parcel (APN# 048-6870-002), a 5.4-acre site that includes portions of Barcelona Street and St. Andrews Road, that is currently owned by the City.

4. Vegetation Management: This function is currently administered by the Developer. Proper management of the area is required in order to properly address and minimize fire safety concerns.

VI. TIME LIMITS

California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code § 33000 *et seq*. "CRL") requires that this Implementation Plan identify the year in which each of the time limits for the Project Area will expire. Table 2 shows the existing time limits for the Project Area.

Table 2. Project Area Time Limit Expirations

Description of Time Limit Expiration	Expiration
The time limit for the commencement of eminent domain proceedings to acquire property within the Project Area	1/21/2021
The time limit for the establishment of loans, advances, and indebtedness to finance the redevelopment project	1/21/2029
The time limit for the effectiveness of the Redevelopment Plan	1/21/2040
The time limit to repay indebtedness with the proceeds of property taxes	1/21/2055

VII. HOW GOALS, OBJECTIVES, PROJECTS, PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES WILL FULFILL THE LOW/MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING REQUIREMENTS

A. Implementation Plan Requirements

The CRL provides that, in addition to the removal of blight, a fundamental purpose of redevelopment is to expand the supply of low- and moderate-income housing (Section 33071). This section of the Implementation Plan represents the Housing component for the Project Area. (All citations in this portion of the Implementation Plan are to the Health and Safety Code unless otherwise specified.)

On January 10, 2012, the City of Oakland, pursuant to Resolution No. 83680 C.M.S., elected to retain and assume the housing assets, functions and obligations of the Redevelopment Agency upon Redevelopment Agency dissolution. Since this Implementation Plan does not govern City activities, this Housing component does not cover any of the City's activities or expenditure of funds relating to the production of housing affordable to low-and moderate-income households, least 50 percent must be affordable to very low-income households. This requirement applies only to units developed by a redevelopment agency and does not apply to units developed by housing developers pursuant to agreements with a redevelopment agency.

Neither ORSA nor the former Redevelopment Agency directly developed housing in the past, nor does ORSA have plans to do so in the future. Therefore, ORSA does not have an affordable housing production requirement of 30 percent with respect to agency-developed housing.

When new dwelling units are developed in a project area by public or private entities other than the redevelopment agency or when housing is substantially rehabilitated in a project area by public or private entities with redevelopment agency assistance, at least 15 percent of these units must be affordable to very low, low or moderate income households. Of those units, at least 40 percent must be affordable to very low-income households. This affordable housing production requirement applies to the Project Area.

2. Replacement Housing Obligation

Agencies are required to meet replacement-housing obligations pursuant to CRL Section 33413(a). This Section requires an agency to replace, on a one-for-one basis, all units removed from the low and moderate income housing stock caused by agency activities in the project area. Article 16.5 requires that if an implementation plan contains projects that could result in the removal of low-mod housing units, the plan must identify locations suitable for the replacement of such housing.

ORSA will not undertake or assist any actions in the Project Area that would result in the demolition or removal from the market of low and moderate income housing. Therefore, there is no replacement housing obligation at present and no need to identify potential locations for replacement dwellings.

3. Set-Aside and Expenditure of Tax Increment for Housing Purposes

The redevelopment dissolution law abolished tax increment financing, and there is no longer a requirement to deposit tax increment funds into the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund, thereby eliminating the primary funding mechanism for affordable housing development in the Project Area.

4. Additional Requirements

The CRL provides that the implementation plan must include estimates of the balances and deposits into the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund; a housing program identifying expenditures from the Housing Fund; an indication of housing activity that has occurred in the project area; and estimates of housing units that will be produced in the project area for each of the various income categories.

However, since the redevelopment dissolution law abolished tax increment financing and the requirement to deposit tax increment funds into the Low and Moderate Income Housing were remitted to the County for distribution to the taxing entities per Health and Safety Code Section 34179.6. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 34176(d), the City will deposit any revenue generated from the housing assets of the former Redevelopment Agency, such as loan repayments or sales proceeds, into a Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund.

a. Housing Goals and Objectives of the Implementation Plan

The City elected to become the housing successor to the Redevelopment Agency's housing functions, obligations and assets. ORSA does not have any housing goals or objectives, except for unwinding any enforceable obligations related to housing activities that are included in the ROPS.

b. Estimated Housing Fund Revenues and Expenditures

The dissolution law abolished tax increment financing and there is no longer a requirement to deposit tax increment funds into the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund. The remaining unencumbered balance of the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund were remitted to the County for distribution to the taxing entities per Health and Safety Code Section 34179.6. Therefore, ORSA will not receive any housing fund revenues or make housing fund expenditures in the Project Area. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 34176(d), the City will deposit any revenue generated from the housing assets of the former Redevelopment Agency, such as loan repayments or sales proceeds, into a Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund. State law will govern the use of such funds on expenditures by the City.

c. Anticipated Housing Program Activities

As noted above, since the dissolution law abolished tax increment financing, there is no longer a requirement to deposit funds into the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund. Therefore, ORSA will not undertake any housing program activities in the Project Area. State law will govern the use of funds in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Funds held by the City.

d. Allocation of Housing Funds over Previous Implementation Period

The dissolution law abolished tax increment financing and there is no longer a requirement to deposit funds into the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund. The remaining unencumbered balance of the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund has been distributed to the taxing entities per Health and Safety Code Section 34179.6.

Table 5. Redevelopment Agency Assisted Housing Activities Completed or Underway, 2000-2016

				Number of Units at Each Affordability Level (2)				
Property Name	**Type**	**Status / Date Completed**	**Project Area**	**Very Low Income**	**Low Income**	**Moderate**	**Above Mod**	**Total Low/Mod Funds (1)**
1574-1590 7th Street (Site Acq.)	TBD	Proposed	W. Oakland			2	3	$ 127,327
3701 MLK Jr. Way (Site Acq.)	TBD	Proposed	W. Oakland		4			$ 109,510
3801 MLK Jr. Way (Site Acq.)	TBD	Proposed	B/M/SP					$ 800,000
3829 MLK Jr. Way (Site Acq.)	TBD	Proposed	B/M/SP		4			$ 52,000
7th & Campbell Streets (Site Acq.)	TBD	Proposed	W. Oakland				79	$ 789,598
94th and International	Family	Underway	Coliseum	58			1	$5,597,000
Adeline Lofts	Family	2002	W. Oakland	31	6		1	$ 70,179
Allen Temple Gardens	Senior	2001	Coliseum	49			1	$1,951,000
Altenheim Phase I	Senior	2007	None	39	53		1	$4,084,660
Altenheim Phase II	Senior	2010	None	48	32		1	$1,753,000
Bayporte Village	Ownership	2000	Acorn		71			$2,000,000
Brookfield Court	Ownership	2014	Coliseum	3	9			$1,867,000
Byron Ave Homes (Site Acq.)	Ownership	Proposed	Central City East	4	4	2		$ 386,550
California Hotel	SRO	2013	W. Oakland	135			2	$5,253,000
Casa Velasco	Senior	2003	Central City East	19			1	$1,350,000
Chestnut Court-Ownership	Ownership	2003	Oak Center		15			$1,727,000
Chestnut Court-Rental	Family	2003	Oak Center		26		1	$2,976,000
Clinton Commons	Family	2012	Central City East	37	17		1	$5,827,497
Courtyards at Acorn	Family	2000	Acorn		87			$ 904,500
CURA-North	Disabled or HIV/AIDS	2001	None	17			1	$ 587,876
Drachma, Inc.	Family	2012	W. Oakland	14				$ 840,000
Drachma, L.P.	Family	2003	W. Oakland		19			$1,712,000
Drasnin Manor	Family	2013	Coliseum	25			1	$1,800,000
East Side Arts and Housing	Family	2006	Coliseum	4	12		2	$1,130,000
Eastmont Court	Disabled or HIV/AIDS	2005	Central City East	18			1	$1,427,000
Edes Avenue Homes, Phase A	Ownership	2008	Coliseum		26			$2,517,000
Edes Avenue Homes, Phase B	Ownership	2010	Coliseum		13	15		$3,601,000
Effie's House	Family	2014	None	4	17			$2,517,000
Eldridge Gonaway	Family	2013	Central City East	39			1	$1,690,000
Fairmount Apartments	Family	2011	None	30			1	$3,700,000
Fox Courts	Family	2009	Central District	40	39		1	$4,950,000
Golf Links Road	Ownership	2009	None			3	7	$ 584,000
Habitat Fruitvale Homes	Ownership	2003	None		4			$ 112,000
Habitat Village	Ownership	2001	Coliseum		40			$1,212,740
Harrison Senior	Senior	2012	Central District	29	43		1	$5,133,000
Hugh Taylor	SRO	2011	Central City East	42				$1,220,000

				Number of Units at Each Affordability Level (2)				
Property Name	**Type**	**Status / Date Completed**	**Project Area**	**Very Low Income**	**Low Income**	**Moderate**	**Above Mod**	**Total Low/Mod Funds (1)**
Project Pride	Transitional Housing	2012	W. Oakland	20				$1,600,000
Redwood Hill	Ownership	Underway	None			12		$1,310,000
Rising Oaks	Special Use	2013	None	30			1	$1,652,000
Saint Joseph Senior	Senior	2011	Coliseum	35	48		1	$4,639,000
San Pablo Gateway	Ownership	2000	B/M/SP		5	6		$1,475,000
Santana	Family	2003	Central City East	30				$ 670,923
Sausal Creek	Ownership	2008	None			17		$3,980,000
Seven Directions	Family	2009	Coliseum	23	12		1	$3,289,000
Slim Jenkins	Family	2012	W. Oakland	27		3	2	$1,920,000
Swans Market Apartments	Family	2000	Central District		18			$2,500,000
Sylvester Rutledge Manor	Senior	2003	W. Oakland	64			1	$2,551,750
Kinsell Commons	Ownership	2012	Coliseum		17	5		$1,868,000
Tassafaronga Village	Family	2010	Coliseum		50			$3,000,000
Terraza Palmera	Family	2014	Coliseum	25	18	18	1	$6,427,656
The Savoy	SRO and Special Needs	2013	Central District	105			1	$1,100,000
Town Center at Acorn	Family	2000	Acorn	102	104			$ 565,000
Wang Scattered Site	Ownership	2009	None		2		1	$ 148,000
Wood Street Affordable Housing Parcel (Site Acq.)	TBD	Proposed	Oakland Army Base		141		29	$8,000,000

(1) Agency Funding includes all funding provided from Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund over the life of the project. Some funding may have been provided prior to 2000.
(2) TBD = "to be determined" – specific affordability levels have not yet been established.

				Number of Units at Each Affordability Level (2)				
Property Name	**Type**	**Status / Date Completed**	**Project Area**	**Very Low Income**	**Low Income**	**Moderate**	**Above Mod**	**Total Other City Funds (1)**
Mandela Gateway Townhomes	Ownership	2008	W. Oakland		8	6		$ 771,300
Marcus Garvey Commons	Family	2013	W. Oakland	12	9			$ 382,000
Merritt Crossing	Senior	2013	Central District	69			1	$3,850,344
Northgate Apartments	Family	2003	None	32	9		1	$2,200,771
Oakland Community Land Trust	Ownership	2012	Scattered Sites		15			$5,025,000
Oakland Home Renovation	Ownership	Proposed	Scattered Sites			3	2	$ 750,000
Orchards on Foothill Senior	Senior	2008	Central City East	64			1	$3,475,000
Percy Abrams Jr. Senior	Senior	2006	None	44				$1,045,800
Project Pride	Transitional Housing	2012	W. Oakland	20				$ 904,000
Prosperity Place	Family	2016	Central District	40	30		1	$2,750,000
Saint Andrew's Manor	Senior	2013	W. Oakland	59			1	$1,248,300
Saint Joseph Senior	Senior	2011	Coliseum	35	48		1	$3,991,000
Saint Patrick's Terrace	Senior	2009	W. Oakland	65			1	$ 753,600
Seven Directions	Family	2009	Coliseum	23	12		1	$1,216,600
Slim Jenkins	Family	2012	W. Oakland	27		3	2	$ 669,000
Stanley Avenue Apartments	Family	2002	Coliseum	23			1	$2,033,167
Terraza Palmera	Family	2014	Coliseum	25	18	18	1	$3,850,344
The Savoy	SRO and Special Needs	2013	Central District	105			1	$2,500,000
Town Center at Acorn	Family	2000	Acorn	102	104			$ 450,000
Wang Scattered Site (4100 MLK Jr. Way)	Ownership	2002	None		1			$ 65,000
Wang Scattered Site 2002 - Wang (1063 82nd St)	Ownership	2002	Coliseum		2			$ 27,000
Wang Scattered Site 2002 (1226 94th Ave)	Ownership	2002	Coliseum		1			$ 13,000
Wang Scattered Site	Ownership	2007	None		2			$ 60,000
Wang Scattered Site	Ownership	2004	Coliseum		1			$ 60,000
Wang Scattered Site	Ownership	2005	W. Oakland		1			$ 45,000
Wang Scattered Site	Ownership	2009	None		2		1	$ 34,000

(1) City Funding includes all funding provided from Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund over the life of the project. Some funding may have been provided prior to 2000.
(2) TBD = "to be determined" – specific affordability levels have not yet been established.
(1) City Funding includes all funding provided from Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund over the life of the project. Some funding may have been provided prior to 2000.
(2) TBD = "to be determined" – specific affordability levels have not yet been established.