



Housing Advisory Commission

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION SOCIAL HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

AGENDA

Friday, November 15, 2019
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Civic Center Cypress Room
2180 Milvia St
Berkeley, CA 94704
Secretary Mike Uberti
HAC@cityofberkeley.info

All agenda items are for discussion and possible action.

Public comment policy: Members of the public may speak on any items on the Agenda and items not on the Agenda during the initial Public Comment period. Members of the public may also comment on any item listed on the agenda as the item is taken up. Members of the public may not speak more than once on any given item. The Chair may limit public comments to 3 minutes or less.

1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Approval
3. Public Comment
4. **Preliminary Discussion of Final Subcommittee Report**– *Commissioner Lord*
5. **Update on “Tenants Opportunity to Purchase Act” (TOPA)** – *all*
6. **Discussion of Social Housing Principles** – *Commissioner Lord*
7. **Future items**
Potential Stakeholder Summit (December)
8. **Adjourn**

Attachments:

Memos for items 4 and 6 are attached - *Commissioner Lord*

This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location. To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services Specialist at 981-6418 (V) or 981-6347 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the Health, Housing & Community Services Department located at 2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor during regular business hours. Agenda packets and minutes are posted online at:

https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Housing_Advisory_Commission/



Housing Advisory Commission

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION SOCIAL HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

AGENDA

Communications to Berkeley boards, commissions or committees are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to a City board, commission or committee, will become part of the public record. If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the Secretary of the commission. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the Secretary for further information.

Housing Advisory Commission

November 15, 2019

To: Housing Advisory Commission
From: Commissioner Thomas Lord
Subject: **Preliminary Discussion of Final Subcommittee Report**

This is a bare outline for a final report from this committee. At our November 15 meeting, we'll discuss the outline to consider changes to it, and how we will flesh it out.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION

In its final meeting, the Social Housing Subcommittee approved this final report.

M/S/C (____ / ____) Adopt the final report. Ayes: ... Noes: Abstain:
.... Absent:

The report records much of what we learned and discussed during the subcommittee process. Additionally, it recommends that the Housing Advisory Committee as a whole make the following recommendation to the City Council:

RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

The Housing Advisory Commissions recommends that City Council take the following action(s):

tbd

SUMMARY

Taking this action will initiate the first steps towards implementing a new affordable housing program for the City of Berkeley.

The program, commonly known as “social housing”, has unique fiscal benefits for the City and social benefits for residents.

In this memo, the section “*A Social Housing Program for Berkeley*” describes the program as envisioned, along with our vision for how the program can be promoted and implemented.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

tbd

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

tbd

This section will enumerate current affordable housing programs in Berkeley, calling out the limiting features of those programs that are overcome by the introduction of social housing.

BACKGROUND

tbd

This section will trace the proposal from its local origins¹ through its commission process to today.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

tbd

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

tbd

¹Commissioner Lord *joined the commission* because he realized that after 20 years of failure, efforts to repeal Costa Hawkins were not likely to ever succeed - yet hoping for such repeal seemed to be the only strategy Berkeley officials ever considered to restore the benefits of strong rent control. He had realized that cross-subsidization within a municipally owned portfolio of housing could create a self-expanding program with extremely deep affordability, and that democratic management of the portfolio would create a path to housing justice and an equitable “right to the city”.

A SOCIAL HOUSING PROGRAM FOR BERKELEY

tbd

The original draft report is our starting point here.

It should be revised to make it clearer that the legal structure proposed is not written in stone and that the HAC recommends further work in that area. Principles that alternative legal structures should honor will be provided.

It should be revised to discuss the nuances and potentials that arise from democratic management which, in the current draft, is not deeply discussed.

Housing Advisory Commission

November 15, 2019

To: Housing Advisory Commission
From: Commissioner Thomas Lord
Subject: **Discussion of Principles - Right to the City Questions**

We will continue our discussion of principles which a social housing program should uphold and how those principles might be translated into practices.

Our focus at this meeting will be on questions of access, availability, and tenure. Some questions to think about in advance:

1. If there is competition for available units, how should it be resolved fairly and in keeping with broader goals? Perhaps we should use lotteries but as a totally random draw? Or should some qualifications count for a higher chance of winning the lottery? What is practical and fair?
2. *Availability* of housing matters. The City's interests include not only housing security for existing residents, but housing available to households new to the City, and housing available for more transient populations, especially students. How do we balance these trade-offs? Should the system contain exceptions to the Just Cause rules, such as strictly term-limited leases?
3. One potential way to raise money for social housing is to pay back small investors "in kind". Should we consider possibilities such as investors who take some or all of their repayment in the form of some time-limited right to unit in the system? (Consider this in relation to question 1.)