

San Francisco Bay Area Regional Prosperity Plan
Final Report Outline for Sub-Grantees

Dated: July 7, 2014

All sub-grantees must submit a final report at project close-out; a required deliverable included in all funding agreements. Sub-grantees must use the outline below to complete their reports. Sub-grantees must submit a draft Final Report to MTC for review at least one month before the end of the performance period of the sub-grant. The sub-grantee must submit a final version of the report, incorporating feedback from MTC, no later than one month after the performance period for the sub-grant ends. Please refer to the executed funding agreement for information on the performance period for your sub-grant.

Sub-grantees are also encouraged to share images from the project (in JPEG format) with MTC. These images may be submitted on a flash drive or compact disc.

A. Project Profile (1 page maximum)

Project Name:	Housing Our Workforce: Funding Affordable Housing through State, Regional and Local Sources
Lead and Partner Organizations:	Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California
Primary Contact Person:	Pilar Lorenzana-Campo Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California (NPH) pilar@nonprofithousing.org 369 Pine Street, Suite 350, San Francisco, CA 94104
Sub-Grant Program:	Housing the Workforce
Project Type:	Local Revenue Sources for Affordable Housing
Total Grant Amount:	\$69,000
Total Match (if any):	N/A
Geographic Coverage of Project:	Bay Area-wide, with focus on Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties
Brief Description (150 words maximum):	This project will address the ambitious housing goals in Plan Bay Area through a multi-path strategy to restore affordable housing funding to levels that will ensure the success of the Plan.
Images:	Attach Separately in JPEG Format

B. Project Description (1 page maximum)

1. Goals and Objectives

Describe what the project expected to achieve, why there was a need for this project, who would have benefited, and how they would have benefited.

Through this grant, NPH focused on tasks designed to ensure that adequate affordable housing is built for our region will require a holistic approach that creates policy and funding solutions for our local jurisdictions. NPH's approach focused on: 1.) ***Creative Financing Solutions*** – which will use an “all of the above” approach to generate funds for affordable housing at the state, regional, and local levels – and 2.) ***Equitable Housing Elements*** – which will ensure that Bay Area cities and counties incorporate necessary zoning, policies, and adequate and properly zoned sites in their housing elements to create the affordable homes their communities need.

2. Work Plan

Describe the key tasks and deliverables for the project. Include information on outreach and engagement activities.

Empower more stakeholders across the Bay Area. NPH will support our partners' efforts to empower residents in communities of concern and build their capacity to participate in their respective housing element update processes. To this end, NPH convened new and existing partner advocates, affordable housing developers, and planning staff through the Santa Clara Housing Element Coalition. Additionally, in partnership with Bay Area Legal Aid, NPH will convene a new Bay Area Housing Element Working Group. These working groups served as a clearinghouse for logistical and technical information, as well as advocacy efforts around on-going housing element update processes, housing impact fee and commercial linkage fee campaigns.

Increase the feasibility of affordable housing production. NPH will provide technical assistance, analysis, and advocacy support to ensure that housing elements are well positioned to create the needed affordable homes through identification of adequate and appropriate sites and inclusion of policies (such as housing impact fees) that local jurisdictions will use as tools to create affordable homes. At the regional level, NPH compiled regional housing production data for the RHNA Cycle 4 period between 2007 and 2014. At the sub-regional and local levels, NPH analyzed and provided feedback on proposed affordable housing policies and programs included in housing elements for least ten (10) cities.

Reduce affordable housing gap. Through strategic partnerships and engagement NPH will lead and support efforts to create new sources and increase funding for affordable housing at all levels of government. In addition to pursuing legislation to provide permanent funding for affordable housing at the State level, NPH led and supported boomerang fund, housing impact fee, and commercial linkage fee campaigns in at least nine (9) cities and counties. NPH has also compiled and disseminated regional data on the use of impact fees.

3. Role of Lead and Partners

List the lead and partner organizations and briefly describe the role each organization fulfilled on the project.

NPH served as the lead and sole organization affiliated with this grant. However, throughout the course of the grant we partnered with many organizations including: East Bay Housing Organizations, Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo, Bay Area Legal Aid, TransForm, Urban Habitat, Greenbelt Alliance, Housing Trust Silicon Valley, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, the Law Foundation of Silicon Valley, Sacred Heart, and the Affordable Housing Network.

C. Challenges and Outcomes (1 page maximum)

4. Challenges

Describe the main challenges faced of implementing the project. How did your team address them? Describe what worked well and what did not work. What would you have done differently if you could start over?

One of the main challenges encountered during this project was the high need for technical assistance, advocacy support, and coordination in communities across the region. As more jurisdictions move towards adopting affordable housing supportive policies, programs, and tools – the need for the activities and tasks undertaken through this grant continues to build.

5. Outcomes

Describe key outcomes, achievements, successes, deliverables, findings and/or lessons learned for the project. Describe who benefited from this project (may be individuals, groups or organizations) and how.

In addition to the successful affordable housing campaigns identified in the previous section, NPH was also able to organize a regional and sub-regional coalition of affordable housing partners which included cross-sector participation from public agencies, affordable housing advocates, labor, legal non-profits, and non-profit developers and professionals. The two working groups convened as part of this grant show the need and commitment to coordinated action on our regional affordable housing goals.

The key beneficiaries of this grant include the following: public agencies and decision-makers (technical assistance) as well as advocates (capacity building and information dissemination).

D. Replicability and Dissemination (1 page maximum)

6. Replicability

Describe what, how and where (within the region) the above mentioned project outcomes may be applied to address similar issues as your project.

The Santa Clara County working group can and should be replicated, especially for those counties that lack the presence of an affordable housing advocacy organization that is tasked with coordinating and executing an effective policy platform. This was apparent during the RPP Outreach event conducted for Sonoma County on June 2015.

The depth and scope of technical assistance provided can also be replicated to adopt to emerging local and regional planning processes and to ensure that include effective mechanisms for affordable housing. For example, station area planning processes funded through the Regional Planning Grant program could benefit from targeted policy analysis and through sustained engagement with a regional affordable housing advocacy organization such as NPH.

7. Tools and Resources

List the tools and resources developed through this project. These may include policies and strategies, analysis and communication tools, collateral material, key findings, etc. Please attach copies of the materials to this report.

Resources developed through this project include the spreadsheets of boomerang funds, housing impact and commercial linkage fees, and affordable housing policies in the newest iterations of the sixteen cities carrying the bulk of projected housing growth. All of these interim deliverables were included in prior quarterly reports. They are provide again for your convenience.

8. Sharing and Dissemination

Describe how and with whom you will share these tools and resources over the next 12 months. How can other communities access the tools and resources developed through this process?

All of the publications NPH has developed are available on our website and advertised through our bi-monthly bulletin. All materials are also available upon request via email.

E. Recommendations and Next Steps (1 page maximum)

9. Recommendations

List and describe the top four to five recommendations from your project. Recommendations may include but are not limited to (1) policies, projects and/or programs that may be adopted at the local and/or regional level (name agencies and/or organizations where possible); (2) tools, approaches and/or methodologies that may be adopted for analysis, communication and/or decision-making; (3) funding, capacity-building and/or engagement strategies for target communities (specify geographic areas where possible); and/or (4) implementation of specific projects and/or programs to support regional goals.

1. **Aligning transportation and affordable housing goals at the regional and county-level. (MTC and CMAs)**

The two main barriers to affordable housing are the lack of funding sources and the price of land. Given the link between affordable housing, transit use, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions it is critical that we continue to link public transportation and affordable housing through incentives and requirements. The disparity between affordable housing and market rate housing production reflects that inherent additional challenges around building affordable housing, especially around cost and availability of land and the lack of funding for affordable housing. We strongly recommend that transportation funds be conditioned on jurisdictions having housing impact and commercial linkage fees in place as well as a public land ordinance that effectively prioritizes affordable housing and complies with [Section 54220](#) the Government Code.

2. **Create new revenues for affordable housing. (NPH and partners)** Until 2011, many local jurisdictions could rely consistently on a source of funding for affordable housing production through local Redevelopment Agencies. Since the dissolution of RDA's, the 9-county Bay Area has suffered through a loss of funding amounting to \$60 million annually, in addition to the deep and sustained cuts to Federal funding for affordable housing. We cannot rely on the for-profit market sector to provide for our affordable housing needs. At the same time, we cannot rely on a small handful of cities to shoulder the affordable housing obligations of the entire region. Tackling the depth of our affordable housing crisis will require the identification of new revenue mechanisms across the 9-county Bay Area.

3. **Regional planning for jobs and housing fit. (MTC, ABAG, Chris Benner, and others)**

Research from the Regional Prosperity Plan has highlighted the need to incorporate jobs and housing fit data into the regional planning process. The on-going Plan Bay Area planning process provides a unique opportunity to do just this. Additionally, it provides a wonderful opportunity to better understand how patterns of employment and housing growth impact local, county, and regional issues.

4. **Continued conversation. (MTC and ABAG)** The Regional Prosperity Plan was unique in that it provided a permanent space for stakeholders from various sectors and industries to discuss and problem-solve collaboratively. Solving our regional transportation, housing, and equity problems requires sustained discussion, research, policy-making efforts, and engagement. MTC and ABAG should continue to provide a space for the conversation and enable the research and engagement necessary in a sustained, transparent, and inclusive manner.

10. Next Steps

Describe the next steps for your project and how the proposed recommendations will be institutionalized in your community.

NPH continues to advocate for State, County, and local solutions to our housing crisis.

CITIES WITH IMPACT FEES ON NEW, MARKET-RATE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

CITY	PROJECT TYPE	AMOUNT	PAYMENT TERMS	REFERENCE
Fremont	For-Sale and Rental Development	\$19.50 per habitable sq. ft. \$22.50 per habitable sq. ft for single family homes on lots 6,000 sq. ft. or greater.	Prior to issuance of building permit or after permits for affordable units within market-rate development are obtained	Fremont, California Municipal Code Title 18, Chapter 155, Section 30, Article b http://bit.ly/1ot4GHo
Daly City	For-Sale and Rental Development	Single Family: \$14.00 per sq. ft. Townhome: 18 per sq. ft. Condo: \$22.00 per sq. ft. Rental: \$25.00 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of a building permit. For phased developments, payments made prior to issuance of a building permit for that phase.	Ordinance No. 1377 http://bit.ly/1FVyZ4V
San Jose	Residential Rental Development	\$17.00 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of the building permit. An appeal can be made for time of payment to be pushed to the Certificate of Occupancy or to the date of the final inspection.	Resolution No. 77218 http://bit.ly/1FUy11W
Santa Rosa	For-Sale and Rental Development	2.5% of sale price of for-sale units. Based on sq. ft. for rentals	Prior to the final inspection for each unit in the residential development	Santa Rosa, California Municipal Code Ch. 21-02 http://bit.ly/1tXoU2x
Livermore	For-Sale and Rental Development	Based on type of dwelling produced	Prior to final inspection or at the time the certificate of occupancy is issued	Livermore, California Municipal Code Title 3, Chapter 26 http://bit.ly/1nJmqiG

Pleasanton	For-Sale and Rental Development	Single Family (over 1,500 sq. ft): \$10,880 per unit Single Family (1,500 sq. ft. or less) and Multi-family (Apt. or Condo): \$2,696 per unit Adjusted annually based on CPI	Upon issuance of the building permit	Pleasanton, California Municipal Code Title 17 Chapter 40 http://bit.ly/1y00TKQ City of Pleasanton Building Permit and Development Fees Effective January 1, 2014 http://bit.ly/1C8goQ6
Napa	For Sale and Rental Development	Single Family: \$ 2.20 per sq. ft. Condo: \$2.20 per sq. ft. Rental: \$3.75 per sq.	Prior to issuance of the building permit or, where a building permit is not required, the use permit	Napa, California Municipal Code Title 15 Chapter 94 http://bit.ly/1x2r6V7 Fees as of May 30, 2014 http://bit.ly/1KLmSuu
Sunnyvale	Rental Development	\$17.00 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of building permit or certificate of occupancy	City of Sunnyvale City Council Meeting March 17, 2015 http://bit.ly/1PFrXUP
Cupertino	For Sale and Rental Development	Detached Single Family: \$15.00 per sq. ft. Small Lot Single Family Res/Townhome: \$16.50 per sq. ft. Owned Multi-Family: \$20.00 per sq. ft. Rental Multi-Family < 35 du/ac: \$20.00 per sq. ft. Rental Multi-Family > 35 du/ac: \$25.00 per sq. ft. Adjusted annually based on CPI	Prior to issuance of construction permits and any work on the site.	City of Cupertino Resolution 15-036

Emeryville	Rental Residential Projects	\$20,000 per dwelling unit	At the time of issuance of the building permit	Emeryville, California Municipal Code Title 9 Chapter 5 Section 407 http://bit.ly/14BPkO9 City of Emeryville Resolution for Affordable Housing Impact Fees on July 15, 2014 http://bit.ly/1FYpcye
Berkeley	Rental Development	\$28,000 per unit <i>*Resolution No. 66, 015 authorizes \$8,000 discount for eligible projects</i>	Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy	City of Berkeley, California Municipal Code Title 22 Chapter 20 Section 65 Article A (5) http://bit.ly/152OHhC Resolution No. 66, 015 http://bit.ly/159pdOZ
San Carlos	Rental Development, Single Family Homes, and Additions	Calculation based on number of units and average sq. ft., and additions 1,000 sq. ft. or more	Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy	City of San Carlos, California Municipal Code Title 18, Chapter 16, Section 30. http://bit.ly/1DNMr8a Resolution No. 2010-030 http://bit.ly/1OK3Lfk
East Palo Alto	For-Sale and Rental Development	Single Family Infill: \$23.95 Owner Townhomes: \$23.00 Rentals: \$22.70 Stacked Flat Condos (Inside RBD): \$22.70 Stacked Flat Condos (Outside of RBD): \$44.72 <i>*RBD = Ravenswood Business District</i>	Prior to issuance of the building permit	City of East Palo Alto Zoning Code Chapter 8.5 http://bit.ly/1GA9400 Ordinance 379 adopted July 15, 2014 http://bit.ly/1GLgUtN
Mountain View	New, Market-Rate Rental Development	\$17.00 per habitable sq. ft.	Prior to issuance to the first final certificate of occupancy	City of Mountain View Resolution 17937, effective February 7, 2015 http://bit.ly/156Wv23

CITIES WITH IMPACT FEES ON NEW COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

CITY	PROJECT TYPE	AMOUNT	PAYMENT TERMS	REFERENCE
Walnut Creek	All development commercially classified i.e. R&D, for-profit medical offices/hospitals, etc.	\$5.00 per sq. ft.	Upon issuance of a building permit and may be delayed until the Certificate of Occupancy issued.	Ordinance No. 2040 http://bit.ly/1rVmnld
Livermore	Commercial: Retail, Discount/Service Retail, Office, Hotels /Motels. Industrial: Manufacturing, Warehouse/Storage, Business/Commercial Industrial, High Intensity Industrial, Low Intensity Industrial	* per unit* Retail: \$1,039 Discount/Service Retail: \$783 Office: \$668 Hotels/Motel Commercial *per room: \$510 Manufacturing: \$320 Warehouse/Storage: \$92 Business/Commercial Industrial: \$663 High Intensity Industrial: \$329 Low Intensity Industrial: \$206	When acquire building permit, certificate of occupancy, or zoning use permit	Livermore, California Municipal Code Title 3, Chapter 26 http://bit.ly/1nJmqjG
Mountain View	Office, High Tech, Industrial, Commercial, Retail, Entertainment, Hotel	Office/High Tech/Industrial: \$25.00 per sq. ft.; new gross floor area 1 -10,000 sq. ft. pays 50% of full fee, more than 10,000 sq. ft pays the full fee); Commercial/Retail/Entertainment/Hotel: \$2.50 per sq. ft. (new gross floor are 1 - 25,000 sq. ft. pay 50% of full fee, more than 25,000 sq. ft. pays the full fee)	Prior to issuance of first grading or building permit	Mountain View, California Municipal Code Part II, Chapter 36, Section 40 Article 30 http://bit.ly/1AYqxiD City of Mountain View Resolution 17938, effective February 7, 2015 http://bit.ly/17RdzKn
Sunnyvale	High-intensity industrial development; Zoning districts M-S and M-3	\$15.00 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of the first grading or building permit for the project.	Sunnyvale, California Municipal Code Title 19, Chapter 22, Section 35, Article (c) http://bit.ly/1221IG6

Oakland	Office and Warehouse/Distribution	\$5.24 per sq. ft. used for office of warehouse /distribution needs beyond 25,000 Sq. ft	Three installments: 25% due prior to issuance of building permits, 50% due prior to issuance of Temporary Certificate of Occupancy, and remaining balance due 18 months after	Ordinance No. 12442 http://bit.ly/1nASMfj
San Francisco	Entertainment, Hotel, Office, R&D, Retail, Integrated PDR, Small Enterprise Workspace	Based on type of space and additional gross sq. ft. past 25,000 Entertainment/retail: \$22.42 per sq. ft. Office: \$24.03 per sq. ft. Integrated PDR/small enterprise: \$18.89 per sq. ft. Hotel: \$17.99 per sq. ft. R&D: \$16.01 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of the First Certificate of Occupancy	San Francisco, California Planning Code Article 4 §413 http://bit.ly/1sR1dGk
Palo Alto	Large commercial and industrial projects and any new gross sq. footage	\$19.31 per sq. ft. Adjusted yearly by the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco-Oakland area.	Prior to issuance of the first grading or building permit. For phased developments, payments made prior to issuance of a building permit for that phase.	Palo Alto, California Municipal Code Title 16, Chapter 47 http://bit.ly/1iagNaU
Menlo Park	Office, R&D, other commercial and industrial Projects of 10,000 sq. ft or less are exempt	Office and R&D: \$14.92 per sq. ft All other: \$8.10 per sq. ft Adjusted yearly by the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco-Oakland area.	Prior to issuance of building permits	City of Menlo Park Summary of Commercial Development Requirements http://bit.ly/1yUbTs1 Menlo Park, California Municipal Code Title 16, Chapter 96, Section 30 http://bit.ly/1CNyuf5

Dublin	Industrial, Office, R&D, Retail, Services & Accommodations	Industrial: \$.048 per sq. ft. Office: \$1.24 per sq. ft. R&D: \$0.81 per sq. ft. Retail: \$1.00 per sq. ft. Services & Acc.: \$0.42 per sq. ft. * Buildings less than 20,000 sq. ft. are exempt.	Not stipulated	Dublin, California Municipal Code Title 7 Chapter 86 http://bit.ly/1KRRRqX City of Dublin Impact Fees Effective July 1, 2014 http://bit.ly/1Age1lq
Pleasanton	All commercial office or industrial development projects	\$2.87 per sq. ft. Adjusted annually based on CPI	Upon issuance of the building permit	Pleasanton, California Municipal Code Title 17 Chapter 40 http://bit.ly/1y00TKQ City of Pleasanton Building Permit and Development Fees Effective January 1, 2014 http://bit.ly/1C8goQ6
Alameda	Retail, Office, Warehousing, Manufacturing, Hotel//Motel	Retail: \$2.24 per sq. ft. Office: \$4.42 per sq. ft. Warehouse & Manufacturing: \$0.77 per sq. ft. Hotel/Motel: \$1,108 per room/suite May be adjusted annually based on CPI	Prior to issuance of the building permit or, where a building permit is not required, the use permit	Alameda, California Municipal Code Title 27 Chapter 1 http://bit.ly/1DGMUNC City of Alameda Master Fee Schedule Effective July 2014 http://bit.ly/1y03kwS
Napa	Office, Hotel, Retail, Industrial (Industrial, Warehouse, Wine Production)	Office: \$1.00 per sq. ft. Hotel: \$3.00 per sq. ft. Retail: \$0.80 per sq. ft. Industrial: \$0.50 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of the building permit or, where a building permit is not required, the use permit	Napa, California Municipal Code Title 15 Chapter 94 http://bit.ly/1x2r6V7 Fees as of May 30, 2014 http://bit.ly/1KLmSuu

San Rafael	Office or R&D, Retail, Restaurant, Personal Service, Manufacturing, Light Industrial, Warehouse, Hotel/Motel	5,000 sq. ft. or more to provide affordable housing units or pay a fee * \$254,599 per unit Office & R&D: 0.03 units Retail, Restaurant or Personal Service: 0.0225 units Manufacturing or Light Industrial: 0.01625 units Warehouse: 0.00875 units Hotel/Motel: 0.0075 units	Prior to issuance of the building permit	Municipal Code Title 14 Chapter 16 Section 30 Article 1 http://bit.ly/1CncVgV City of San Rafael Development Impact Fees April 2014 http://bit.ly/1u7JoDf
Cupertino	Office/Industrial/R&D, Hotel, Retail	Office: \$20.00 per sq. ft. Hotel: \$10.00 per sq. ft. Retail: \$10.00 per sq. ft. Adjusted annually to CPI	Upon issuance of construction permit	City of Cupertino Resolution 15-036
Petaluma	Commercial, Retail, Industrial	Commercial: \$2.14 per sq. ft. Retail: \$3.69 per sq. ft. Industrial: \$2.21 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of the building permit, or if no permit is to be issued, at the time a new business license is issued.	Petaluma, California Municipal Code Title 19 Chapter 36 http://bit.ly/1yj0Av5 City of Petaluma Development Impact Fees Effective July 1, 2014 http://bit.ly/1C8PGXw
Emeryville	Any development of non residential uses for which a discretionary permit or building permit is required	\$4.00 per sq. ft.	Upon issuance of the building permit	Emeryville, California Municipal Code Title 9 Chapter 5 Section 409 http://bit.ly/14BPKO9 City of Emeryville Resolution for Affordable Housing Impact Fees on July 15, 2014 http://bit.ly/1FYpcye

Berkeley	Developments in non-residential and R-4 Zones, except in South Berkeley IX Target Area, over 7,500 sq. ft.	Office/Retail/Restaurant/Hotel/Lodging/R&D: \$4.00 per sq. ft. Industrial/Manufacturing/Warehouse/Storage: \$2.00 per sq. ft.	Three equal installments: first prior to building permit receipt, second prior to occupancy permit receipt, third made in an appropriate form of security	Berkeley, California Municipal Code Title 22 Chapter 20 Section 65 http://bit.ly/152OHhC City of Berkeley Resolution 56.912 http://bit.ly/1tPS217



Boomerang Funds in the Bay Area

Jurisdiction	One Time Funding	Potential Funding
Emeryville	20% and all swept funds totaling to \$1,522,267 through June 2013	20% of all current and future Residual Property Tax Revenue
Fremont	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Oakland	N/A	FY 2015-16: \$4,300,000 FY 16-17: \$4,600,000
San Mateo County	\$13,400,000	N/A
San Mateo	\$706,000	\$240,000
Foster City	\$3,000,000	N/A
Redwood City	N/A	\$200,000
San Francisco	N/A	\$15,000,000 the first year, with an additional \$2,800,000 thereafter until reach \$50,800,000
San Jose	N/A	\$30,316,655
Campbell	\$600,000	N/A
Cupertino	N/A	\$120,544
Los Gatos	\$546,000	N/A
Milpitas	\$1,879,615	\$5,501,255
Morgan Hill	N/A	\$2,642,419
Mountain View	\$275,000	\$609,577
Santa Clara	N/A	\$30,316,655
Sunnyvale	N/A	\$1,623,018
Alameda County	\$13,700,000	\$2,000,000 beginning in FY 2016/2017



THE NON-PROFIT HOUSING ASSOCIATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Cities with Impact Fees on New, Market-Rate Residential Development

City	Project Type	Amount	Payment Terms	Reference
Fremont	For-Sale and Rental Development	\$19.50 per habitable sq. ft. \$22.50 per habitable sq. ft for single family homes on lots 6,000 sq. ft. or greater.	Prior to issuance of building permit or after permits for affordable units within market-rate development are obtained	Fremont, California Municipal Coed Title 18, Chapter 155, Section 30, Article b http://bit.ly/1ot4GHo
Daly City	For-Sale and Rental Development	Single Family: \$14.00 per sq. ft. Townhome: 18 per sq. ft. Condo: \$22.00 per sq. ft. Rental: \$25.00 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of a building permit. For phased developments, payments made prior to issuance of a building permit for that phase.	Ordinance No. 1377 http://bit.ly/1FVyZ4V
San Jose	Residential Rental Development	\$17.00 per sq. ft.	Prior to issuance of the building permit. An appeal can be made for time of payment to be pushed to the Certificate of Occupancy or to the date of the final inspection.	Resolution No. 77218 http://bit.ly/1FUyI1W
Santa Rosa	For-Sale and Rental Development	2.5% of sale price of for-sale units. Based on sq. ft. for rentals	Prior to the final inspection for each unit in the residential development	Santa Rosa, California Municipal Code Ch. 21-02 http://bit.ly/1tXoU2x
Livermore	For-Sale and Rental Development	Based on type of dwelling produced	Prior to final inspection or at the time the certificate of occupancy is issued	Livermore, California Municipal Code Title 3, Chapter 26 http://bit.ly/1nJmqjG

Pleasanton	For-Sale and Rental Development	Single Family (over 1,500 sq. ft): \$10, 880 per unit Single Family (1,500 sq. ft. or less) and Multi-family (Apt. or Condo): \$2,696 per unit Adjusted annually based on CPI	Upon issuance of the building permit	Pleasanton, California Municipal Code Title 17 Chapter 40 http://bit.ly/1y00TKQ City of Pleasanton Building Permit and Development Fees Effective January 1, 2014 http://bit.ly/1C8goQ6
Napa	For Sale and Rental Development	Single Family: \$ 2.20 per sq. ft. Condo: \$2.20 per sq. ft. Rental: \$3.75 per sq.	Prior to issuance of the building permit or, where a building permit is not required, the use permit	Napa, California Municipal Code Title 15 Chapter 94 http://bit.ly/1x2r6V7 Fees as of May 30, 2014 http://bit.ly/1KLmSuu
Cupertino	New residential units and new single family lots created through a subdivision with one to six units	\$3.00 per sq. ft. Adjusted annually based on CPI	Prior to issuance of construction permits and any work on the site.	City of Cupertino Planning Fee Schedule Effective July 1, 2014 http://bit.ly/1FYgboT City of Cupertino Housing Mitigation Manual http://bit.ly/1FYhx36
Emeryville	Rental Residential Projects	\$20,000 per dwelling unit	At the time of issuance of the building permit	Emeryville, California Municipal Code Title 9 Chapter 5 Section 407 http://bit.ly/14BPkO9 City of Emeryville Resolution for Affordable Housing Impact Fees on July 15, 2014 http://bit.ly/1FYpcye

Berkeley	Rental Development	<p>\$28,000 per unit</p> <p><i>*Resolution No. 66, 015 authorizes \$8,000 discount for eligible projects</i></p>	Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy	<p>Berkeley, California Municipal Code Title 22 Chapter 20 Section 65 Article A (5) http://bit.ly/152OHhC</p> <p>Resolution No. 66, 015 http://bit.ly/159pdOZ</p>
----------	--------------------	--	---	---