OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
2004 FEB 25 PM 7:05

CITY OF OAKLAND and
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF OAKLAND

COUNCIL AND AGENCY AGENDA REPORT

TO:	Office of the City Manager and Agency Administrator
ATTN:	Deborah Edgerly
FROM:	Community and Economic Development Agency
DATE:	March 9, 2004

RE: A REPORT WITH TWO RECOMMENDATIONS: (1) A RECOMMENDATION TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM INCOME LEVELS FOR THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUNDS FOR OWNERSHIP HOUSING PROJECTS TO 120% OF MEDIAN INCOME AS LONG AS THE AVERAGE INCOME IN THE PROJECT DOES NOT EXCEED 100% OF MEDIAN INCOME; AND (2) A RECOMMENDATION TO USE APPROXIMATELY $3.2 MILLION IN UNALLOCATED AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUNDS TO ISSUE A NEW NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY (NOFA) FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP AND REHABILITATION OF EXISTING AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING

SUMMARY

On Tuesday January 27, 2004, staff presented to the Community and Economic Development Committee several recommendations for the use of affordable housing funds. The Committee approved a recommendation to fund specific projects, but directed staff to return to the Committee for future discussions on two policy areas.

(1) Modifying the Redevelopment Agency's current policy regarding income targeting in homeownership developments. Current policy limits the sale of units assisted with Agency funds to households up to 100% of median income. Under the proposed change, to encourage mixed income developments and to provide opportunities for a wider range of incomes, homeownership projects would be allowed to provide ownership opportunities to income ranges that average up to a maximum of 100% of median income. To accomplish this, developers would be allowed to make units available to a range of income levels from very-low income families (up to 50% of median income) to low income families (up to 80% of median income), and to moderate income families (up to 120% of median income).

(2) Designating unallocated funds for ownership and rental activities. Current policy stipulates that funds be split 50/50 between ownership and rental activities. Staff recommends implementing existing policies to promote homeownership and to provide equal funding for ownership and rental activities, using $3,118,850 in unallocated affordable housing funds. A new Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) to be restricted to new ownership housing and to preservation and rehabilitation of existing rental housing would be issued as soon as possible for these funds.

21

ORA/COUNCIL
APR 0 6 2004

FISCAL IMPACTS

Actions taken at the February 17, 2004 joint meeting of the City Council and Redevelopment Agency leave $3,118,850 in Redevelopment Agency affordable housing funds remaining for this fiscal year. The fiscal impacts of these policy recommendations are discussed in the Program Description part of this staff report.

BACKGROUND

Supporting the development of housing in Oakland, including affordable housing, is an objective of City Council Goal #2 for 2003-2005: developing a sustainable city. Affordable housing has been a concern of the City Council for many years. In June 1998, the City Council participated in a work session on affordable housing needs. A report concerning the allocation of Affordable Housing Bond funds and issues surrounding affordable housing development was accepted by the City Council on July 10, 2001. In the past year, two informational reports discussing affordable housing policy – specifically, the allocation of funds to rental and ownership projects and the difficulties of expanding affordable homeownership opportunities – were accepted by the City Council.

The City Council has adopted the policy that affordable housing funds (including those used for development and the First Time Homebuyers Program) be split 50-50 between rental and ownership projects. Allocations have varied somewhat from this goal from year to year, based upon the funding applications submitted to the City year to year. Over the last ten year period, the annual proportion of funding allocations has shifted between ownership to rental. Since FY 1999-2000, the percentage of funds allocated to rental housing has been consistently higher than 50%. Implementation of this policy, and the modifications to it approved by the City Council on December 17, 2002, is discussed in further detail in the "Issues and Impacts" section of this report.

Redevelopment law allows the use of low and moderate income housing funds to benefit households earning up to 120% of median income.[1] (This does not apply to the federal HOME funds that come to the City, which must assist households with incomes at or below 80% of median income). On July 9, 2002, the Agency passed a motion to formally set the maximum income limit for ownership projects at 100% of median income.

KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS

Redevelopment Agency Low and Moderate Income Housing funds may fund activities that serve households up to 120% of median income, but Oakland has chosen to limit assistance for

[1] However, not all housing funds may be used to assist households with moderate incomes. Redevelopment law requires that an agency spend its low and moderate income housing funds over a 10-year period to assist very low and low income households in proportion to the housing needs for these income groups identified in the community's housing element.

ownership projects to households at 100% of median income. Allowing Redevelopment Agency Low and Moderate Income Housing funds to assist households up to 120% of median income enables the Agency to reach a lower income level (as low as 60% of median income) with a lower per project subsidy than the Agency is currently providing. This is illustrated in Table 1 on page 5. This policy modification would also further the goal of assisting the development of mixed income projects. Additionally the Agency is able to assist an income range that cannot afford to buy a home in Oakland, but is not likely to receive any assistance under the current policy.

Affordable Housing Needs
For the past decade, staff has presented the City Council with numerous reports highlighting the severe shortage of decent housing affordable to low and moderate income households. **Attachment A** provides a summary of these needs.

Income Targeting for Homeownership Developments
In December, 2002, the City Council approved staff recommendations to recognize that, when the objective is to increase homeownership opportunities for low and moderate income households, the City's mortgage and downpayment assistance programs for first-time homebuyers are more cost-effective than development of new housing. When the objective is to increase homeownership rates and revitalize neighborhoods in particular areas of the City, however, the development programs are more effective. The City Council directed staff to target homeownership development funding to projects in areas that have low ownership rates or that are part of a broader revitalization program, such as the Oakland Housing Authority's HOPE VI projects. The City Council also approved a policy to limit City assistance to ownership units affordable at or below 100% of median income.

Need to Rehabilitate Older (20-25 years) Affordable Units

There are 3,000 affordable senior and family housing developments in Oakland that are more than 20 years old. These units received federal funds to support development costs and for rental subsidies. While the projects have funds reserved for maintenance and replacement of certain items, the cost of rehabilitation has increased at a rate significantly higher than the maintenance and replacement reserves. Despite sound management and good maintenance practices, the buildings now need a substantial infusion of funds to replace systems and to perform rehabilitation in order to adequately serve families and seniors.

Some of these projects are also at risk of converting to market rate. Small investments of local funds can preserve these units for long-term affordability. Focusing local funds on the rehabilitation of existing affordable units will help maintain these units at a cost far less than new construction.

Distribution of Funds between Rental and Ownership Projects
The City Council has a policy that affordable housing funds should be split 50/50 between ownership and rental housing. The funds concerned include those for housing development and the first-time homebuyer program, exclusive of administration and program delivery costs for staff and overhead. Since the relative strength of rental and ownership projects that apply for

funding in a particular year cannot be controlled, staff has made its best efforts to meet this goal over time, rather than year by year.

Based on the applications received and approved since 1993, only 44% of cumulative funding has been allocated to funding homeownership. The funding history is illustrated in **Attachment B**.

Competing Policy Objectives

The City is faced with competing housing policy goals. On the one hand, resources are generally directed to serve those households with the greatest housing needs – in particular households earning less than 50% of median income ($40,000 or less) who pay more than 30% of income for housing, are overcrowded, or live in substandard housing. On the other hand, the City desires to increase the homeownership rate to promote neighborhood revitalization and stability, and to provide economic opportunities for lower income families.

Because homeownership projects require substantially more subsidy than rental projects (partly due to higher development costs and largely due to the lack of non-City funds that can be leveraged), they serve a different income level than the rental projects.

Ownership projects rarely reach lower than 80% of median income. In the most recent NOFA, the projects hope to provide 50% of the units at 80% of median and 50% at 100% of median income. (East Bay Habitat for Humanity's (Habitat) projects, which include sweat equity, are an exception and the initial buyers of Habitat homes have incomes as low as 60% of median income.).

Rental projects are almost exclusively targeted to households with incomes less than 60% of median income, and include some units at rents affordable to working families with incomes at 30 to 35% of median income (roughly $20,000 to $25,000 per year for a family of four). Projects serving seniors and households with special needs serve even lower income levels because City investments leverage project-based rental subsidies from HUD. The cost of providing homeownership to these households is prohibitive.

As a result, the policy choice between ownership and rental housing is not just a choice about what kind of housing should be provided. It is also a choice about which households should have priority for assistance with scarce City funds.

The table at the top of page 5 provides a comparison between the costs, subsidy requirements and targeting of rental and ownership projects in New Family Rental and Homeownership Projects from 2001-2004. It should be noted that the analysis does not include the ownership projects that are developed by Habitat. Those projects serve households with incomes at or below 60% of median income by relying on sweat equity to achieve much lower construction costs than is typical. As a result, development costs on Habitat's projects are generally $40,000 per unit less than other homeownership developments, and the subsidy requirements are usually $25,000 - $35,000 per unit below the subsidy requirements of traditional homeownership development projects.

Comparisons New Family Rental and Homeownership 2001-2004

	Ownership Projects	**Rental Projects**
Average development cost per unit	$333,890	$268,389
Average City subsidy per unit	$128,631	$67,284
Targeting by Income Level		
120% of median income	5.1%	0.6%
100% of median	35.4%	0.0%
80% of median (low income)	52.5%	0.0%
60% of median (tax credit limits)	7.1%	32.9%
50% of median income (very low income)	0.0%	56.0%
35% of median income (extremely low income)	0.0%	10.6%
Leveraging of outside funds (per $1.00 of local funds)	$2.59	$4.49

0.6% of the rental units are not subject to restrictions as they are managers units and are therefore put in the category of over 120%.

POLICY DESCRIPTION

Dedicate future funds to homeownership and to rehabilitation of existing rental
In order to implement existing policies to promote homeownership and to provide equal funding for ownership and rental activities, staff proposes to only fund new rental housing when the cumulative funding allocations are back in balance. The proposed NOFA would be restricted to new ownership housing and to preservation and rehabilitation of existing rental housing.

Three proposals that were submitted through the previous NOFA and that staff deemed fundable could reapply. They are rehabilitation at three senior housing developments, St. Andrews Manor, St. Patrick's Terrace and Sojourner Truth. Project Summaries for these three developments are provided in **Attachment D**. A fourth rehabilitation proposal, Eldridge Gonaway, requires modifications prior to any funding recommendation.

Proposed modifications to income targeting for homeownership development
Developing ownership housing is more expensive than developing rental housing, and because there are very few non-local sources of subsidy for homeownership, the City and/or Agency must contribute a higher amount of subsidy. Because the City's policy is to not provide more than 40% of total development costs, this results in homeownership projects serving significantly higher income levels than rental projects.

Allowing assistance to households in the 100% to 120% median income range provides an opportunity for the Agency to also assist homebuyers as low as 60% of median income (outside the Habitat model of sweat equity). This enables the Agency to encourage for mixed-income developments. The analysis in **Attachment C-1** shows that the subsidy required for this type of mixed-income development would be less than the Agency's current average per unit subsidy.

The average development cost for homeownership projects is over $350,000 with some as high as $400,000 (excluding the Habitat model). **Attachment C-2** illustrates the amount of subsidy required to assist households with incomes in four income ranges – 60%, 80%, 100% and 120% of median income. To assist families in the range of 80 to 100% of area median ($68,000 to

$85,000 for a family of four) runs from $96,200 to $170,200 per unit. We calculate that to reach a household at 60% of the median income ($51,000 for a family of four), the subsidy required would approach $225,000. For a household at 120% of median income ($96,000 for a family of four), the subsidy would be approximately $33,500 per household.

DISABILITY AND SENIOR CITIZEN ACCESS

All housing development projects receiving federal funds are required to construct and set aside units to be occupied by persons with disabilities (Federal Section 504 regulation). This means that at least 5% of newly constructed units will be available to persons with disabilities. The State's Title 24 and the Americans with Disabilities Act require consideration of persons with disabilities in design and construction of housing. In all rental units and some ownership housing types, those requirements include accessible units and facilities. Furthermore, developers will be required to devise a strategy to effectively market housing units to the disabled community and present this strategy as part of their Affirmative Fair Marketing Plan.

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

In order to incorporate sustainable development principles pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 74678, C.M.S. adopted on December 1, 1998 developers are required to submit a *Sustainability Statement* outlining the economic, environmental, and social equity benefits of their projects. Staff will continue to encourage developers to follow and, when possible, broaden the sustainability plans outlined in their applications.

Economic: New affordable homeownership projects will expand the affordable housing inventory in Oakland and generate construction and professional services contracts. Homeownership builds wealth for low income people.

Environmental: Points are awarded for highly energy efficient projects; as a result, to date, all projects have agreed to exceed the Title 24 energy standards by at least 15%. Also, new construction proposals will provide housing on vacant or underutilized sites and are often near major public transit corridors. By developing in built-up areas, these projects reduce the pressure to build on undeveloped land. Sites near mass transit enable residents to reduce dependency on automobiles and further reduce any adverse environmental impacts of development.

Social Equity: Affordable housing is a means of achieving greater social equity. Oakland's neighborhood-level environment will be improved by replacing underused and sometimes blighted buildings and lots with new homes and residents. Projects that apply for affordable housing funds from Oakland either allow low-income households to purchase homes and/or provide affordable rental housing for low, very low, senior citizens and families. Social services, including technology centers for residents, are a component of each rental development, and further build social equity.

RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE

Recommendation #1: Proposed Modifications to Income Targeting for Homeownership Development

Staff is recommending that that the Redevelopment Agency amend its current policy (which limits Agency assistance on homeownership project to units that are affordable to families at or below 100% of median) to allow the average affordability level to be 100% of area median income. This would provide flexibility for developers to set sales prices to be affordable to a range that includes very-low income, low income and moderate income families. In order to accomplish this, the sales price of some units would be set to be affordable to families at up to 120% of median income, which is still in line with State redevelopment law. Staff is not recommending any specific percentages for any single income level, as long as the average targeting requirement is met.

These higher limits are only possible for Redevelopment Agency funds. Federal regulations limit the use of HOME funds to households with incomes at or less than 80% of median income. HOME funds could be used to assist the lower-priced units in a development, with Agency funds used to assist the units targeted to higher income levels.

Recommendation #2: Proposed Guidelines for Allocation of Funds Not Awarded in FY 2003-04 NOFA

The most recent NOFA awarded $14,974,400 to three ownership projects and three rental projects. There is $3,118,850 remaining. In a separate report staff recommends using $1.1 million of this to complete Palm Villas. The remaining $2 million would be available for homeownership and rehabilitation of existing affordable rental housing in the proposed NOFA.

In order to implement existing policies to promote homeownership and to provide equal funding for ownership and rental activities, staff proposes that the remaining funds be restricted to new ownership housing and to preservation and rehabilitation of existing rental housing. Staff proposes that a new NOFA be issued as soon as possible for these funds.

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Alternative to Recommendation #1: Leave the July 2002 policy intact, limiting funds to ownership projects at or below 100% of median income.

Alternative to Recommendation #2: Currently, as noted in a concurrent report, staff has recommended a grant to the Palm Villas ownership project for $1.1 million. In addition, there are three senior rental developments that were not funded in the current round. They are the rehabilitation of St. Andrews Manor senior housing, St. Patrick's Terrace senior housing and Sojourner Truth senior housing. Council could direct staff to return with resolutions authorizing funding for these projects that total $1,664,000 million. If this alternative was adopted, the ratio of ownership/rental funding would be 50/50 for this year and 44/56 since 1993.

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

It is recommended that the Redevelopment Agency modify its current policy to increase the limits of Agency assistance to ownership projects from the current limit of assistance at or below 100% of median income to households with a range of incomes up to 120% of median income as long as the average affordability level is at 100% of median income.

Staff further recommends that in keeping with existing City policies to promote homeownership and to ensure an equal distribution of housing funds between ownership and rental activities, the Council/Agency endorse staff recommendations that the remaining funds of $3,118,850 be restricted to new ownership housing and to preservation and rehabilitation of existing rental housing, and that a new NOFA be issued as soon as possible for these funds.

Respectfully submitted,

DANIEL VANDERPRIEM
Director of Redevelopment, Economic Development and Housing

Prepared by:
Roy L. Schweyer, Director
Housing & Community Development

Janet M. Howley, Manager
Housing Development

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO
THE COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Office of the City Manager and Agency Administrator

21
ORA/COUNCIL

APR 06 2004

Attachment A: Summary of Housing Needs
Attachment B: Distribution of Funds for Ownership and Rental Housing, 1993-present
Attachment C: Project Description of rehabilitation projects
Attachment D: Subsidy Requirements at different affordability levels

ATTACHMENT A

Summary of Housing Needs

Using special cross-tabulations of the 1990 and 2000 census data provided by the Census Bureau, the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) publishes "CHAS Data Sets" that provide detailed analysis of housing needs for various income groups and households types. These data sets are available on line at http://socds.huduser.org/scripts/odbic.exe/chas/index.htm? Information below is taken from these cross-tabulations.

More than half of all Oakland households have incomes less than 80% of the metropolitan area median income ($51,000 to $62,000 depending upon family size). Over 30,000 renters with incomes less than 50% of median income pay more than they can afford, are overcrowded or live in substandard housing. The problems faced by renters with incomes less than $35,000 and large households are particularly severe.

During the 1990s, conditions improved for low income renters, but worsened for low income homeowners. For renters with incomes between 50% and 80% of median income ("low income"), the number of households with housing problems (as defined by HUD) decreased from 7,893 to 6,793 (from 59% of 46.6% of low income renters). For renters with incomes between 30% and 50% of median income ("very low income"), the number with housing problems decreased from 12,545 to 12,417 (a reduction from 83% to 78.3% of all very low income renters).

For low income homeowners, however, the number of households with housing problems increased from 3,290 to 4.477 (from 43% to 59.7% of this group).

Thus, while the City's housing development program was successful in reducing cost burdens for many low income renters, the rapid increase in the cost of for-sale housing during the 1990s resulted in a much higher percentage of low income owners paying more than 30% of their incomes for housing, making their ownership particularly vulnerable in the event of job losses, illness or other events that could reduce their incomes.

Oakland also has a much lower homeownership rate (41.4%) than the average for Bay Area cities (57%). Among the 10 largest California cities, Oakland ranks seventh in homeownership, ahead of only Long Beach, Los Angeles and San Francisco, but behind San Jose, Sacramento, San Diego, Anaheim, Fresno and Santa Ana.

Homeownership programs will not improve the situation of existing homeowners, but they will affect the cost burden faced by new homeowners. Because City-assisted housing programs usually require homeowners to pay a smaller share of their income for housing costs than is true for private lenders, an increase in City assistance to homeownership will reduce housing cost burdens for new low income homeowners.

Attachment B

Distribution of Funds for Ownership and Rental Housing, 1993-present

Funding Year	Ownership Allocation	Rental Allocation*	Total Funding Allocated	% Owner	% Rental
FY 1993-94	5,284,315	5,273,057	10,557,372	50%	50%
FY 1994-95	4,173,622	3,409,375	7,582,997	55%	45%
FY 1995-96	4,138,440	5,811,756	9,950,196	42%	58%
FY 1996-97	7,465,000	9,122,965	16,587,965	45%	55%
FY 1997-98	5,255,560	(499,540)	4,756,020	111%	-11%
FY 1998-99	3,272,175	2,542,854	5,815,029	56%	44%
FY 1999-00	3,500,000	9,291,219	12,791,219	27%	73%
FY 2000-01	6,900,000	11,130,000	18,030,000	38%	62%
FY 2001-02	8,648,125	13,256,495	21,904,620	39%	61%
FY 2002-03	8,046,487	9,366,493	17,412,980	46%	54%
Cancellation of Land Trust	(4,950,000)		(4,950,000)		
Subtotal	51,773,724	68,704,674	120,438,398	43%	57%
FY 2003-04 (approved)**	8,928,500	8,396,900	17,324,400	52%	48%
Cumulative Total	**60,662,224**	**77,101,574**	**137,763,798**	**44%**	**56%**

*Negative allocations reflect recapture of funds from canceled projects.

**Ownership number includes $2.5 million already budgeted for the First Time Homebuyer Program

ATTACHMENT C-1

SUBSIDIES REQUIRED FOR DIFFERENT INCOME RANGES

Using a 40-unit homeownership development with a per unit development cost of $350,000, the subsidies required for different income levels are illustrated below in Table 2. In mixed income development, if the same number of units are above 100% and below 100% (for example, 15 units are at 60% and 80% of median income, and 15 units are at 120% of median income), the average income is $80,670 which is 95% of median income and the per unit subsidy is less than is needed at this time.

INCOME MIX	SUBSIDY PER UNIT	SUBSIDY PER PROJECT
All units at 60% median	$223,897	$8,955,880
All units at 80% median	$170,182	$6,807,280
All units at 100% median:	$96,181	$3,847,240
All units at 120% median	$33,514	$1,340,560
Mixed income: Alt 1 5 units @ 60%; 10 units @ 80% 10 units @ 100% 15 units @ 120%	$120,575	$4,285,825
Mixed Income Alt 2 15 units @80% 10 units @100% 15 units @120%	$100,431	$4,017,250

***Note that under Redevelopment law the percentage of income used to calculate the affordable housing cost is 35% for households above 80% of median income and 30% for households at 80% of median and below**

ATTACHMENT C-2

Subsidy Requirements for Homeownership Developments Targeted at Different Affordability Levels

Area Median Income (4-person)	$85,000	Estimated limit at time of sale (mid-2005)
Development Cost	$350,000	Average cost/unit from 2003-04 NOFA
Interest Rate	6.50%	
Loan to Value Ratio	95%	
Tax Rate	1.32%	of purchase price
HOA Dues	$50	per month
Hazard Insurance	0.25%	of 1st mortgage
PMI	0.77%	of 1st mortgage
Repairs	$300	per year
Utilities	$148	per month

Subsidy Requirements at Different Income Levels

Income at 60% AMI	$51,000	
Affordable Sales Price	$106,103	
Total Subsidy Needed	$243,897	
less Subsidy from Non-City Funds	($20,000)	Typical per unit subsidy from AHP
City Subsidy Required	**$223,897**	

Income at 80% AMI	$68,000	
Affordable Sales Price	$159,818	
Total Subsidy Needed	$190,182	
less Subsidy from Non-City Funds	($20,000)	Typical per unit subsidy from AHP
City Subsidy Required	**$170,182**	

Income at 100% AMI	$85,000	
Affordable Sales Price	$253,819	
Total Subsidy Needed	$96,181	
less Subsidy from Non-City Funds	$0	not eligible for AHP
City Subsidy Required	**$170,182**	

Income at 120% AMI	$96,120	
Affordable Sales Price	$316,486	
Total Subsidy Needed	$33,514	
less Subsidy from Non-City Funds	$0	not eligible for AHP
City Subsidy Required	**$170,182**	

ATTACHMENT D

PROJECT SUMMARIES FOR SENIOR REHABILITATION PROJECTS - RENTAL

St. Andrews' Manor Senior Housing 3250 San Pablo

St. Patrick's Terrace Senior 1212 Center

Sojourner Truth Senior Housing 5815 MLK Way

St. Andrew's Manor
Project Summary

Address/Location	3250 San Pablo Avenue
Developer	Satellite Housing, Inc.
Type of Construction	Existing 5 story building
Number of Units	60
Resident Type	Seniors
Total Development Cost	$2,343,244
Cost per Unit	$ 39,054
Agency Site Acquisition Loan	$ -
Previous Local Development Funding	$ -
Current Request for Local Funds	***$ 748,288***
Total City/Agency Funds Requested	$ 748,288
Total City/Agency Funds per Unit	$ 12,471
Total City/Agency Funds as Percent of Total Cost	32%

	AFFORDABILITY LEVEL				
	<35% AMI	<50% AMI	<60% AMI	<80% AMI	<100% AMI
0 Bedroom	5	46			
1 Bedroom		7			
2 Bedroom	1				
3 Bedroom					
4 Bedroom					

Description of Project:
Saint Andrew's Manor, built in 1973, provides 59 affordable housing units (and one manager's unit) for very low income senior households. This project will involve substantial rehabilitation, including residential unit renovation, systems upgrades, energy conservation improvements and renovated community spaces. The scope of work was determined with input from their Tenants' Association. The project will also involve refinancing of the building's existing HUD 236 mortgage to improve cash flow. The unit mix is primarily studios, although some one and two bedrooms units are also available. Four units are accessible for persons with disabilities. St. Andrew's is located on a transit-accessible corridor near shopping and services.

The project has been managed by Satellite Housing, Inc. since it was originally constructed. Services geared towards its residents are provided, including a full-time on-site social service coordinator shared with St. Patrick's Terrace, weekly van service, a meal program and intergenerational programs that foster relationships between residents and area youth. There is also an extensive Senior Supportive Housing Program in collaboration with Lifelong Medical Care, St. Mary's Center and the Samuel Merritt College of Nursing that provides an on-site nurse practitioner, clinic coordinator and social worker, and access to off-site support staff that includes a physician and psychiatrist specializing in geriatric medicine.

St. Patrick's Terrace
Project Summary

Address/Location	1212 Center Street
Developer	Satellite Housing, Inc.
Type of Construction	Existing 5 story building
Number of Units	66
Resident Type	Senior
Total Development Cost	$2,356,565
Cost per Unit	$ 36,255
Agency Site Acquisition Loan	$ -
Previous Local Development Funding	$ -
Current Request for Local Funds	***$ 753,596***
Total City/Agency Funds Requested	$ 753,596
Total City/Agency Funds per Unit	$ 11,418
Total City/Agency Funds as Percent of Total Cost	32%

	AFFORDABILITY LEVEL				
	<35% AMI	<50% AMI	<60% AMI	<80% AMI	<100% AMI
0 Bedroom	6	51			
1 Bedroom		7			
2 Bedroom	1				
3 Bedroom					
4 Bedroom					

Description of Project:
Saint Patrick's Terrace, built in 1973, provides 65 affordable housing units (and one manager's unit) for very low income senior households. This project will involve substantial rehabilitation, including residential unit renovation, systems upgrades, energy conservation improvements and renovated community spaces. The scope of work was determined with input from their Tenants' Association. The project will also involve refinancing of the building's existing HUD 236 mortgage to improve cash flow. The unit mix is primarily studios, although some one and two bedrooms units are also available. Four units are accessible for persons with disabilities. St. Patrick's is located on a transit-accessible corridor near shopping and services.

The project has been managed by Satellite Housing, Inc. since it was originally constructed. Services geared towards its residents are provided, including a full-time on-site social service coordinator shared with St. Andrew's Manor, weekly van service, a meal program and intergenerational programs that foster relationships between residents and area youth. There is also an extensive Senior Supportive Housing Program in collaboration with Lifelong Medical Care, St. Mary's Center and the Samuel Merritt College of Nursing that provides an on-site nurse practitioner, clinic coordinator and social worker, and access to off-site support staff that includes a physician and psychiatrist specializing in geriatric medicine.

Sojourner Truth
Project Summary

Address/Location	5815, 5915 & 6015 MLK, Jr. Way
Developer	Christian Church Homes of Northern California, Inc.
Type of Construction	3 stucco-sided, four story buildings
Number of Units	87
Resident Type	Senior
Total Development Cost	$402,872
Cost per Unit	$ 4,631
Agency Site Acquisition Loan	-
Previous Local Development Funding	-
Current Request for Local Funds	***$162,120***
Total City/Agency Funds Requested	$162,120
Total City/Agency Funds per Unit	$1,863
Total City/Agency Funds as Percent of Total Cost	40%

	AFFORDABILITY LEVEL				
	<35% AMI	<50% AMI	<60% AMI	<80% AMI	<100% AMI
0 Bedroom	7		66		
1 Bedroom	2		12		
2 Bedroom					
3 Bedroom					
4 Bedroom					

Description of Project:
The proposed project entails elevator upgrades, entryway door replacement, and fire safety improvements in the three buildings that comprise Sojourner Truth Manor, an existing senior affordable housing development constructed 28 years ago in North Oakland. Although the development is a valuable source of affordable senior housing, this project is necessary as the elevators are currently prone to frequent breakdowns, and the entryway doors are cumbersome to operate for frail or mobility-impaired residents. The complex has a mix of studios and one bedroom units. Twelve of the units are accessible to those with mobility impairments, and the units are designed to promote residents' ability to age in place. Most of the project costs will be covered by the development's existing reserves.

Managed by Christian Church Homes of Northern California, Inc. since 1995, Sojourner Truth Manor has an array of supportive services, including an on-site social service coordinator, translation services as needed, and an individualized resident needs assessment and care plan and regular social events. The buildings are also located one to three blocks away from the North Oakland Senior Center.

21

ORA/COUNCIL
APR 0 6 2004

7

COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT CMTE
MAR 9 2004