



Housing for All:

Meeting Housing Needs in Alameda County

DRAFT REPORT

Prepared for:

Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department

Prepared by:

The Housing Workshop

December 2023

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose of Report	2
Methodology	2
Data Sources	3
Alameda County Housing Demand.....	4
Population and Households	6
Household Incomes	14
Alameda County Housing Supply & Unmet Need	23
Current Housing Unit Inventory	23
Market Rate Housing Conditions	27
Unhoused Population	38
Production Trends	40
Affordable Housing Supply	44
Existing Rent/Sale Price Restricted Affordable Housing	44
Pipeline of Upcoming Projects	45
Measure A1-Funded Affordable Housing Inventory	46
Affordable Units At-Risk of Conversion.....	48
Estimate of Affordable Housing Supply Shortfalls	49
Affordable Housing Production Challenges	51
Challenge: Development Costs and Need for Funding	51
Challenge: Aligning with State and Regional Housing Location Policies	53
Key Findings and Recommendations	58
Key Findings	58
Recommendations	61
Appendix A: Data Tables	68

Figures

Figure 1: Map of Alameda County with Incorporated and Unincorporated Jurisdictions	5
Figure 2: Alameda County Population by Jurisdiction, 2021	6
Figure 3: Population Growth 2000 – 2021	7
Figure 4: Median Age, 2021	8
Figure 5: Population by Race, 2000 & 2021	9
Figure 6: Household Growth, 2000 - 2021	10
Figure 7: Number of Households, 2000 & 2021	10
Figure 8: Average Household Size, 2000 & 2021	11
Figure 9: Percent of Households with Children under 18. 2000 & 2021	12
Figure 10: Percent of Households with Seniors Age 65+, 2000 & 2021	13
Figure 11: Median Household Income, 2021	14
Figure 12: Change in Real Median Household Income, 2000 - 2021 (inflation-adjusted)	15
Figure 13: Household Income Distribution, 2021	16
Figure 14: Household Income Distribution, Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2021	17
Figure 15: Households by Tenure, Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2021	18
Figure 16: Housing Tenure by Race of Householder, Alameda County, 2019	19
Figure 17: Household Poverty Rate, 2000 & 2021	20
Figure 18: Number & Percent of Households in Poverty, Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2021	20
Figure 20: Tenure by AMI Segment	22
Figure 21: Detail of AMI Segment by Tenure, Alameda County, 2019	22
Figure 22: Housing Units, 2021	23
Figure 23: Housing Units by Type and Tenure, 2021	24
Figure 24: Housing Unit Occupancy and Vacancy Rates, 2021	25
Figure 25: Reasons for Unit Vacancy, Alameda County, 2021	26
Figure 26: Zillow Index Sales Price of Single-Family Homes, 2000-2022	27
Figure 27: Zillow Index Sale Price of Condominiums, 2000-2022 (a)	28
Figure 28: Median Sale Prices by Jurisdiction, 2022	28
Figure 29: Ownership Households Cost Burden, Alameda County 2019	29
Figure 30: Income Needed to Buy Median Single Family Home, Alameda County, 2000 - 2022	30
Figure 31: Average Rent & Vacancy Rate for Market-Rate Units, Alameda County 2000 - 2022	31
Figure 32: Median Gross Rent in 2021 \$'s, Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2000-2021	32
Figure 33: Number of Renter Households with Housing Cost Burden, Alameda County, 2019	33
Figure 34: Income to Afford Average Monthly Market Rate Rent, Alameda County, 2000 - 2022	35
Figure 35: Eviction (Unlawful Detainer) Filings, Alameda County 2013 - 2022	36
Figure 36: Unlawful Detainer Filings per 1,000 Renter Households, Alameda County 2019	37

Figure 37: Point-in-Time (PIT) Count of Unhoused Population, 2007-2022	38
Figure 38: Building Permits, Alameda County, 2000-2021	40
Figure 39: Total New Units Permitted from 2000 – 2021 Per 1,000 Existing Units in 2000	41
Figure 40: RHNA Goals Compared to Housing Production 1999-2022, Alameda County	42
Figure 41: Rent/Price-Restricted Affordable Units, Alameda County, 2023	44
Figure 42: Avg. Unit Cost, Alameda & Contra Costa County Applications to CDLAC, 2021-2023	51
Figure 43: Percent of Affordable Projects in Plan Bay Area 2050 Priority Growth Areas	53
Figure 44: Alameda County Affordable/Measure A1 Units by Equity Priority Communities	54
Figure 45: Alameda County Affordable and Measure A1 Units by Gentrification Risk	55
Figure 46: Alameda County Affordable and Measure A1 Units by HCD Opportunity Zone	56
Figure 47: Unincorporated Alameda County High Resource Areas in Plan Bay Area Growth Areas	57

Introduction

Alameda County is a large, diverse, urbanized county within the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area. Almost 1.7 million people live in Alameda County, making it the 20th most populous county in the United States.

Like most of coastal California's urban centers, Alameda County and the cities within it are facing an unprecedented housing crisis. Whether measured by growing numbers of unhoused persons, or sharply rising rents, or increasingly unaffordable ownership housing, demand for housing throughout Alameda County outstrips available affordable supply, severely impacting residents' lives.

This report is designed to take a long look back to comprehensively document housing trends, forming a picture of these issues' impact on Alameda County residents. This report also provides a snapshot of current unmet housing needs and key efforts to address them, including several recent affordable housing initiatives such as Measure A1. Finally, this report looks forward to identify affordable housing stock at risk of removal from the inventory, along with factors affecting the costs to produce housing in the County. These facets describe the unmet need for "housing for all," which we must join together to collectively solve.

Alameda County, as a governmental entity, impacts housing issues within the County geography in four inter-related ways:

- County government awards local, state, and federal funding to local jurisdictions to subsidize new affordable housing developments and preserve existing affordable housing projects throughout the County, leveraging those funds to maximize production and impact. The recent Measure A1 bond issued by Alameda County exemplifies this role.
- County government manages programs that provide housing stability to residents countywide such as the Alameda County Housing Secure program, which provides eviction defense and other legal services to tenants across all jurisdictions in the County.
- County government coordinates housing services and investments between agencies and jurisdictions across the county including coordinating funding from the federal Community Development Block Grant and allocating rent assistance such as vouchers allocated to new affordable rental projects.
- For unincorporated areas within Alameda County, which currently has a total of approximately 152,000 residents comprising more than 49,000 households, Alameda County's Housing and Community Development Department serves as the direct housing

planning and financing agency of local government. The relatively large population living in unincorporated areas equates to roughly the size of the City of Hayward, the County's third largest city.

Purpose of Report

This report has several goals:

- **Analyze Demographic and Economic Trends.** Identify and understand demographic, economic, and policy trends over the past 20+ years which have affected current housing issues.
- **Assess Changes to Housing Supply.** Document trends in housing supply, including units fostering affordability and the effects of Measure A1 on much-needed production.
- **Summarize Current County Housing Initiatives.** Describe current housing initiatives undertaken by the County, along with key initiatives occurring within Alameda County cities, to track housing outcomes from policy interventions.
- **Document Current and Future Unmet Housing Needs.** Estimate current and future unmet needs, especially within the County's Census Designated Places (CDPs) and other unincorporated areas over which County government had direct jurisdiction, along with County-led funding strategies for its incorporated cities (e.g., new bond measures).

Methodology

This report is based on extensive data collection and analysis across a broad set of topics related to housing issues throughout Alameda County. Every effort was also made to compare current information to a two-decade look back to 2000, especially with respect to publicly available datasets such as demographic and housing data from U.S. Census products, as well as employment data from State of California sources. This long-term trends' analysis was included because several major economic events have affected the County in the past 12 years including the Great Recession, which slowly diminished its impact after 2010, and the 2020 Covid pandemic, which is still causing lingering housing challenges today. These events can distort underlying trends, meaning that looking at the 21-year period from 2000 to 2021 provides the best indicators of underlying changes impacting housing need in Alameda County.

Data Sources

This report relies on an extensive array of published and unpublished data from the U.S. Census Bureau, the State of California, Alameda County Housing & Community Development, published draft local Housing Elements, and private data vendors. To the extent possible, all data is sourced in tables and graphs.


For readability, this report presents primarily graphs of key data in summary form in the body of the text. All data tables, most with extensive detail by jurisdiction within Alameda County, are provided in Appendix A.

Alameda County Housing Demand

Housing demand in Alameda County is affected by both current and new residents. A host of factors underlie demand for housing including population growth, household size and income, life stages, tenure preferences, and economic cycles. This chapter summarizes the demographic and economic factors for Alameda County overall and by jurisdiction that create today's housing challenges.

Much of the following discussion describes Alameda County overall, as well as incorporated cities and unincorporated areas known as Census Data Places (CDPs). The map on the following page indicates the incorporated areas (grey print names and black boundaries) as well as the unincorporated areas of Alameda County (colored areas with CDPs as relevant).

Figure 1: Map of Alameda County with Incorporated and Unincorporated Jurisdictions




Population and Households

Current Population

Alameda County had a total population of 1,673,133 in 2021, representing 21.6% of the nine-county Bay Area total, and 4.2% of California's total population. Alameda County's population is distributed across large, medium, and small cities along with unincorporated Census Data Places (CDPs) of varying sizes. Approximately 90.9% of the County's population lives in incorporated cities, while 9.1% (more than 152,200 residents) lives in unincorporated areas. This unincorporated population is relatively large for an urbanized county; within the nine-county Bay Area region, only Contra Costa County has more residents living in unincorporated communities.

Among Alameda County's incorporated cities in 2021, Oakland was by far the largest, with over 437,500 residents. Fremont, with over 231,500 residents, was the second largest city, followed by Hayward and Berkeley. Among the unincorporated communities, Castro Valley with over 66,000 residents, was just slightly smaller than the City of Dublin.

Figure 2: Alameda County Population by Jurisdiction, 2021



Source: American Community Survey, 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop, 2023.


Population Growth

Alameda County's strong population growth overall is a key driver in housing demand. During the past two decades, Alameda County's population rose substantially, adding more than 229,000 people. The County's growth rate, 15.9%, surpassed the 9-county Bay Area's rate of 14.1%, but slightly lagged California overall, at 16.5%. As shown below, however, the rate of population growth varied among the County's local jurisdictions.

Overall, cities in Alameda County grew more rapidly (16.3%) than the unincorporated areas (12.1%) for the 21-year period. The fastest-growing city, Dublin, more than doubled its population, and the next fastest-growing city, Emeryville, also grew significantly. Both of these cities experienced robust levels of new multifamily housing construction, explaining this phenomenon (see following section). At the other end of the spectrum for incorporated cities, Piedmont grew the most slowly, adding just 416 people in a 21-year period (an increase of 3.8%). Oakland lost population between 2000 and 2010, but then made up for the loss in the next decade, resulting in overall growth of 9.5% for the 21-year period.

Unincorporated Alameda County data overall shows a similar growth pattern. With over 152,000 residents in unincorporated areas in 2021, the Census Data Places (CDPs) mostly experienced growth similar to Bay Area regional rates. The exception was Sunol, a small community located in East County, which lost more than 40% of its population base due to changes in the geographic boundaries between 2000 and 2021.

Figure 3: Population Growth 2000 – 2021




Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SFQ1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Population by Age

The age distribution of a population can affect both housing demand and supply. For example; as residents age and no longer have children living at home, they may be living in units too large for their life stage. Conversely, age can create a mismatch with smaller new unit construction not well suited for young families with children.

The median age in Alameda County overall in 2021, at 38.0 years, was slightly lower than the Bay Area (39.1) and slightly higher than California (37.0). However, the median age for each city and CDP varied significantly within the County. Berkeley, reflecting its large student population, had the lowest median age among the geographies, at 32.1 years. Many communities were notably older, with median ages over 40 years, including Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, Union City, and the unincorporated CDPs of Castro Valley, and Fairview. Sunol and the unincorporated balance of the County had a median age of over 50 years.

Figure 4: Median Age, 2021




Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Population by Race

The Bay Area, including Alameda County, has a diverse racial composition which has also been shifting over time. In 2000, Alameda County had a similar concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents, a higher concentration of Black and Asian residents, and a lower concentration of White residents than the Bay Area overall. By 2021, although racial composition patterns remained similar for Alameda County relative to the Bay Area, the percentage concentrations of the largest groups in both the Bay Area and Alameda County had shifted. Alameda County's share of Hispanic or Latino residents increased from 2000 to 2021 (19.0 to 22.4%), while its share of White residents had dropped from 40.9% to 29.9%. The percentage of Black residents had also dropped from 14.6% to 9.9%, and the percentage of Asian residents had risen from 20.3% to 31.4%. Thus, the percentage of Asian residents in Alameda County exceeded the percentage of White residents by 2021.

Figure 5: Population by Race, 2000 & 2021




Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Household Growth

Household growth patterns mirrored population for the same 21-year period, with Alameda County growing at a similar rate to the Bay Area overall but lagging the state's household growth. For this metric, however, rates of growth were generally lower than for population, indicating increasing household sizes (analyzed in the next section).

Dublin and Emeryville, with the most rapidly growing populations, also grew the most rapidly in number of households, while Berkeley experienced a slight loss of households despite increasing its population in the same period by 16.4%, which likely indicates expanded household sizes for its student population (supported by relatively low median age and increased average household sizes). Other notably sluggish rates of household increases include the City of Alameda, San Leandro, and the unincorporated CDPs of Ashland, Castro Valley, and Cherryland. Both the Sunol CDP and the unincorporated balance of the County experienced dramatic declines in the number of households over the period.


Figure 6: Household Growth, 2000 - 2021



Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SFQ1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Some cities added very few households in the 21-year period. The City of Alameda added just 274 households (or 13 households per year), and Piedmont added just 17 households (less than 1 per year). Notably, for the unincorporated portions of Alameda County, a total of 600 households were added in 21 years (an average of just 28 new households per year).

Figure 7: Number of Households, 2000 & 2021




Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SFQ1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Average Household Size

The slower growth of households than population in many Alameda County jurisdictions can be explained by rising average household sizes during the same period, likely due to both changing demographics and doubling up due to expensive rents.¹ Among incorporated jurisdictions in the County, the cities of San Leandro, Albany, Dublin, and Berkeley experienced the most notable jumps in average household size. Among the unincorporated communities, San Lorenzo and Castro Valley also experienced an increase. The opposite trend was experienced by Union City, which started the period with a relatively high average household size of 3.57, declining to 3.37 by 2021.

Figure 8: Average Household Size, 2000 & 2021



Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SFQ1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Households with Children under Age 18

Understanding households with children is important for housing planning in terms of describing a set of needs related to bedroom counts, location near schools and playgrounds, and for childcare planning.


In 2021, Alameda County's proportion of households with children, at just under 33% of all households, tracks closely with both the region and the state. However, the pattern of households with children varies across the cities and unincorporated areas. The highest

¹ Note that despite increasing household sizes in most locations, Alameda County overall saw a decline in overcrowding from 12% of all County households in 2000 to 8% in 2021.

concentration of households with children occurred in Dublin in 2021 (almost 47%), with Fremont, Piedmont and Albany also all over 40%. The jurisdictions with the lowest concentrations of households with children were in Emeryville (9%), Berkeley (at 19%, reflecting the large university population of young adults without children), and the Sunol and Fairview CDPs.

Overall, Alameda County- along with most jurisdictions- saw a decline in the concentration of households with children since 2000. Exceptions to that pattern, with the concentration of households with children rising since 2000, included Albany and Dublin. Several other jurisdictions, including Alameda (city), Berkeley, Fremont, and Castro Valley CDP were relatively stable, with less than a 1% change during the period.

Figure 9: Percent of Households with Children under 18. 2000 & 2021



Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SFQ1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.


Households with Seniors Age 65+

Another focus of housing planners is on households with seniors, because senior housing has its own set of design and programmatic needs.

The patterns of households with children were reversed for seniors, with higher concentrations of households with seniors evident throughout all geographies (reflecting the general aging of the population in the US due to the large “baby boomer” cohort aging and also living longer).

For the state, region, and County, the proportion of seniors among all households rose sharply between 2000 and 2021, although Alameda County overall had a slightly lower proportion of households with seniors than the region or the state at each point in time.² Similar to other demographic metrics, this varied among jurisdictions. Senior households were relatively high in communities such as Piedmont, Fairview CDP, Castro Valley CDP, Sunol CDP, and the unincorporated balance of the County. The proportion of seniors was much lower in communities with low median ages (e.g., Emeryville) or high proportions of children (e.g., Fremont). Berkeley's combination of a relatively low median age and low concentration of households with children along with a relatively high concentration of seniors is distinct amongst County jurisdictions. This likely reflects a growing student population due to increased enrollment at the university paired with a cohort of longtime residents aging-in-place.

Figure 10: Percent of Households with Seniors Age 65+, 2000 & 2021



Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SFQ1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.


² This trend was also experienced across the US, with a rising share of seniors age 65+ from 12% of population in 2000, increasing to a 17% share in 2021.

Household Incomes

Current Median Household Incomes

Median household income overall in Alameda County, at \$112,000 in 2021, was slightly lower than the region overall, but substantially higher than the state.³ This metric varies widely between jurisdictions in the County, from \$71,000 in the Ashland CDP to over \$250,000 in Piedmont. Of the County's unincorporated areas, both Ashland and Cherryland fell at the lowest end of the range.

Figure 11: Median Household Income, 2021




Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

³ Median household income refers to the mid-point in a series of data. It generally represents a better measure in situations where a few extremely high incomes can skew the average upwards, masking proportions of households at the lower end of the income range.

Median Household Income Trends

A striking feature of household incomes- adjusted for inflation- in Alameda County is their strong increase over time compared to the Bay Area and the state. Alameda County's median household income increased by 12.2% between 2000 and 2021, compared to a less robust increase of 5.0% for the overall Bay Area. The biggest change in median income was experienced by communities with strong population increases (and new housing units as described in the next section), including Emeryville, Dublin, and Oakland, along with communities with rising proportions of older residents building income over time, including Berkeley and the County's unincorporated balance not in a CDP. At the same time, several of the County's unincorporated CDPs experienced a decline in real median household income, most notably Ashland and Cherryland, which also represent the lowest median incomes in the most recent data (see previous section). Alameda County's unincorporated areas combined experienced a small rise in inflation-adjusted household income of 1.3% for the period.

Figure 12: Change in Real Median Household Income, 2000 - 2021 (inflation-adjusted)




Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF3), American Community Survey, 2006-2010, American Community Survey, 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Household Income Distribution

While median household income is a useful metric, it can obscure the distribution of household incomes, masking levels of poverty for households facing housing insecurity. The distribution of household incomes in Alameda County overall tends to mirror the Bay Area in all income segments.


Figure 13: Household Income Distribution, 2021



Source: American Community Survey, 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

In addition, each jurisdiction's income distribution varies widely, as illustrated below. The orange bar segments indicate household incomes of \$0 - \$35,000, the green segments indicate incomes of \$35,000 - \$100,000, and the grey segments indicate incomes of \$100,000 and over.

Figure 14: Household Income Distribution, Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2021




Sources: American Community Survey, 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Household Tenure

Alameda County's household tenure follows similar patterns to its household income distribution. Overall, Alameda County, with a 54% homeownership rate in 2021, echoes but falls slightly below the Bay Area region (56% ownership rate). California overall (55% ownership rate) falls in between Alameda County and the Bay Area. The US ownership rate in 2021 was just over 65%, but the Bay Area and the state have long had lower rates due to higher housing costs. Jurisdictions with the lowest ownership rates included Ashland and Cherryland CDPs, as well as the City of Emeryville. Piedmont, Sunol CDP, and the unincorporated balance of the County all had ownership rates over 80% in 2021.

Figure 15: Households by Tenure, Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2021




Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Household Tenure by Householder Race⁴

Despite the relatively strong overall homeownership rate for Alameda County's households, ownership varies substantially by race. As shown below, the rate for households with a White householder was almost 62% in 2019, while the opposite pattern was true for households with a Black householder, at just 31% ownership. This low ownership rate for Black householders in Alameda County underscores the lagging wealth metrics for Black residents, reflecting centuries of intergenerational barriers to homeownership.

For Asian/Pacific Islander householders, ownership rates were almost the same as for White householders. Hispanic householders also had low ownership rates similar to Black, while those categorized as American Indian or "other race" fell in between White and Black/Hispanic.

Figure 16: Housing Tenure by Race of Householder, Alameda County, 2019




Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop 2023.

⁴ The US Census defines "householder" as "the person, or one of the people, in whose name the home is owned, being bought, or rented."

Households Living in Poverty

To focus on those with the greatest housing needs, a starting point is understanding those households living in the most dire situations, with incomes below the poverty line (a household income dollar threshold defined by the federal government as the cost of meeting bare necessities including rent and food). In 2021, approximately 53,000 households in Alameda County lived below the poverty line (9.1% of all households); these households face the greatest risk of becoming unhoused. Although Alameda's poverty rate has declined since 2000, it still exceeds the poverty rate for the region.


Figure 17: Household Poverty Rate, 2000 & 2021



Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF3), American Community Survey, 2006-2010, American Community Survey, 2017-2021| The Housing Workshop 2023.

Household poverty varies widely by jurisdiction within the County. Berkeley has the highest poverty rate (over 14% of households, partially attributable to students with low incomes), followed by Oakland (over 13%). In unincorporated areas, Ashland and Cherryland have high rates (over 16% and 12% respectively).

Figure 18: Number & Percent of Households in Poverty, Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2021




Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Household Incomes in a Housing Policy Context

To set the stage for analysis of housing costs and affordability, it is also important to understand how household incomes are distributed by Area Median Income (AMI) segment. Area Median Income, a key metric in affordable housing, is defined as the midpoint of a specific area's income distribution and is calculated on an annual basis by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for a household of 4 people. AMI segments in a discussion of affordable housing are described in terms of percent of Area Median Income, so that, for example, a 30% AMI household means a household earning 30% of the Area Median Income. Each segment of AMI (also referred to as "income band") is often used to formulate housing programs, as different segments need different policy approaches to meet their needs. Federal and State sources of funding, and the resultant programs, generally restrict the availability of benefits to households based on their AMI segment.

The graph below illustrates the 2019 distribution of household incomes by AMI segment for Alameda County. Almost 41%, or more than 235,000 of Alameda County's households, fall into AMI cohorts considered eligible for affordable housing by most rental affordable housing programs (e.g., 0 – 80% AMI). Many ownership programs also serve the 80% to 120% AMI moderate income segments (and sometimes up to 140% AMI) to assist households in moving from rental to first-time ownership status, building household and intergenerational wealth. These moderate income ownership programs have not been as frequently targeted by most federal and state subsidy programs, and instead depend more on local policies and funding.

Figure 19: All Households by AMI Cohort, Alameda County, 2019




Source: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Housing Tenure by AMI Segment

Analysis of household income by AMI segment can be conducted across several additional variables using the same CHAS data. As shown below, a striking but expected variation in Alameda County occurs for household tenure. Households with 0 – 80% AMI tend to be renters, reflecting their inability to access Alameda County’s expensive for-sale housing market. Households between 80 and 120% AMI tend to be relatively evenly split between renters and owners, while households above 120% of AMI, and especially above 140% of AMI, tend to be primarily owners.


Figure 19: Tenure by AMI Segment



Source: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023

The figure below shows a breakdown of AMI segment by tenure, underscoring how the distribution of income related to affordable housing is different for renters and owners.

Figure 20: Detail of AMI Segment by Tenure, Alameda County, 2019




Alameda County Housing Supply & Unmet Need

This chapter profiles the housing supply for Alameda County and its local jurisdictions, including the current mix of housing units by occupancy and type, additions to supply, and other factors underscoring housing challenges in the County today.

Current Housing Unit Inventory

In 2021, there were 617,045 housing units in Alameda County, distributed among large, medium, and smaller jurisdictions. Roughly 566,000 units (91.7%) were located in incorporated cities (91.7%), while approximately 51,000 units (8.3%) were located in unincorporated County areas.

Figure 21: Housing Units, 2021




Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Housing Units by Type and Tenure

In Alameda County, 62% of all housing units are single family homes, with most of this stock occupied by owners, although it is notable that almost 14% of all units in the County are single family homes occupied by renters. Alameda County follows regional and statewide patterns for single family homes. Multifamily units comprised almost 37% of housing stock in Alameda County, with most occupied by renters. Again, patterns were similar regionally and statewide. Mobile homes comprise a very small proportion of Alameda County's housing units, with just over 1% of housing stock in this category, mostly occupied by owners. However, mobile home owners face unique challenges due to the fact that they still do not own the lot space on which their home sits, leaving them vulnerable to extreme rent hikes and harassment from mobile home park owners.

Additional detail showing wide variation within each of Alameda County jurisdiction's composition of housing units by type and tenure is found in Appendix A.

Figure 22: Housing Units by Type and Tenure, 2021




Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Housing Occupancy and Vacancy

Housing occupancy and vacancy rates collected most recently from the American Community Survey 2017-2021 encompass the pandemic period when many college students and others temporarily left the Bay Area due to shutdowns. As shown below, this event impacted vacancy rates in communities such as Berkeley, with more than 10% of its housing units registering as vacant in 2021.


Figure 23: Housing Unit Occupancy and Vacancy Rates, 2021



Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Reasons for units held as vacant help to understand housing markets in Alameda County. In the past few years, many residents have come to believe that housing held for short-term lodging (e.g., Airbnb and others) is a primary cause of the Bay Area’s housing crisis. While this may be accurate in certain locations, it is not reflective of the County’s market in general (see yellow bars below for “seasonal use”). Instead, most housing units with vacant status in 2021 were either available for rent or classified as “other vacant” *(e.g., under construction/renovation, or due to the pandemic causing temporary vacancy at that time). It should be noted that for most jurisdictions, the percentage of housing stock available for rent was exceptionally low, well below the 5% level considered a healthy balanced marketplace.

Figure 24: Reasons for Unit Vacancy, Alameda County, 2021




Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Market Rate Housing Conditions

Market Rate Sale Prices

Alameda County has consistently boasted a median sales price for single-family homes higher than California as a whole. While the county averaged approximately \$150,000 above California's median price between 2000 to 2012, in the following decade from 2013 and 2022, Alameda County's median sales price appreciated more rapidly than the state, reaching a median sales price of \$1,251,500 in 2022, compared to just \$792,100 for California overall.

Figure 25: Zillow Index Sales Price of Single-Family Homes, 2000-2022




Note: The Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) measures the typical value for homes sold in the 35th and 65th percentile range. Because the ZHVI publishes data on a monthly basis, this chart shows homes sold in June of each year.

Source: Zillow, 2023.

Condominiums in Alameda County and California are less costly than single-family homes. In 2022, the median sales price for a condominium in Alameda County was \$708,235, just 57% of the median sales price of a single-family home. Since 2000, the median sale price of condominiums in the County has risen 227%, tracking patterns in California overall. In 2022, a four-person household in Alameda County would have to earn about \$178,500 per year, an income falling in line with 125% AMI levels in the same year.


Figure 26: Zillow Index Sale Price of Condominiums, 2000-2022 (a)



Note: The Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) measures the typical value for homes sold in the 35th and 65th percentile range. The data reflects the ZHVI for condominiums sold in June of each year.
Source: Zillow, 2023.

Jurisdictions within Alameda County demonstrate wide variation in current single family and condominium pricing. Piedmont and Pleasanton registered the highest single family home sale prices (over \$1.7M), with Berkeley following closely behind (\$1.65M). For condominiums, Castro Valley (\$1.12M) and Dublin (\$1.1M) topped the range.

Figure 27: Median Sale Prices by Jurisdiction, 2022




Note: Data reflects the Zillow Index for single-family homes and condominiums sold in June of each year. Zillow does not publish data for unincorporated areas in the County.
Source: Zillow, 2023.

Affordability of Ownership Housing

One of the most succinct ways to assess housing affordability is through a metric known as housing cost burden, which describes the percent of total household income spent on housing costs (e.g., mortgage or rent plus utilities).⁵ Most housing policies and programs consider households spending more than 30% of their income on housing as cost-burdened and needing assistance to lower this ratio. This threshold is especially vital for lower income households, who, if cost-burdened, do not have adequate income remaining for other life necessities such as food, clothing, and transportation. If a household is spending 50% or more of its income on housing, it is considered “severely cost-burdened” and faces a high risk of housing insecurity, especially for households at the lower end of the income spectrum.

For Alameda County homeowner households, as in most markets for ownership housing occupancy, the number of households experiencing high cost burdens in excess of 30% of household income was relatively limited in 2019, the last year of available data. This is because most home buyers need a mortgage to own their house, and most mortgage lenders after the 2008 subprime lending crisis, can not lend unless borrowers can afford the mortgage and other costs associated with homeownership. However, it is notable that almost 19,000 extremely low-income County owner households were cost-burdened, paying more than 30% of their income for housing costs. These households, along with those in successively higher income segments with cost burden indicators, are at risk of losing their homes due to unaffordability.

Figure 28: Ownership Households Cost Burden, Alameda County 2019




⁵ Cost burden data is available from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in its Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), which provides tabulations of American Community Survey (ACS) data on an annual basis to assess spending for housing across income categories.

Another way to assess homeownership affordability is to calculate the household income needed to afford the median-priced house in the current marketplace; this approach highlights how unaffordable currently available for-sale units are for many households in Alameda County. Affordability for ownership housing is typically calculated based on the mortgage payment (principal and interest) for a 30-year fixed loan plus property taxes and insurance (known as PITI). The graph below shows the household income needed each year since 2000 to afford that year's median single-family home price in Alameda County, and also shows the gap between the actual median household income for the year and the amount needed to purchase.

The interplay between prices and mortgage interest rates affect affordability; during years of declining prices and low interest rates, the gap between income needed to purchase and actual median household income narrows. For example, during the 2009-2012 Great Recession, when both sale prices dipped and interest rates were at historic lows, Alameda County's median household income met or exceeded the income needed to buy the median-priced single family home. This pattern reversed again in 2013 and has continued to widen (with rapidly rising prices and simultaneously rising interest rates) through 2022. To underscore this further, in 2000, the additional \$13,788 needed to afford the median house price was 23% above median income. By 2022, the additional income needed, \$109,348, was 85% above median income.

Figure 29: Income Needed to Buy Median Single Family Home, Alameda County, 2000 - 2022




Source: *The Housing Workshop*, 2023.

Market Rate Rents

Market rate rents in Alameda County have risen dramatically in the past 10 years, echoing rent increases across California. The figure below shows the average effective rents (i.e., actual rents when taking into account discounts on some new leases) and vacancy rates for market-rate units in Alameda County over time. These average rents are tracked by Costar, a private data vendor. Market rate rents in Alameda County tend to fall when vacancies rise, often due to downturns in the economy. Post the 2020 pandemic, however, rents have risen even in the face of simultaneously rising vacancy rates.

Figure 30: Average Rent & Vacancy Rate for Market-Rate Units, Alameda County 2000 - 2022




Sources: Costar, 2023, The Housing Workshop 2023.

An important way to analyze rents over time is to adjust for inflation, to gauge if housing costs are becoming more significant in a particular market. The chart below compares the median gross rent in 2000 and 2021 on an inflation-adjusted basis. The real median gross rent in Alameda County rose from \$1,530 in 2000 to \$2,043 in 2021, a dramatic increase of 33.5% after inflation. Also, Alameda County's rents rose more than California overall, which saw a 26.6% increase in real median gross rents for the same period.⁶

⁶ Data for this section comes from the American Community Survey (ACS), which relies on self-reported information, and also includes utilities. This data also does not differentiate between market rate and affordable (e.g., rent-restricted) units. Also, ACS did not publish median gross rent for the Sunol CDP in 2021 so it is not shown here.

Figure 31: Median Gross Rent in 2021 \$'s, Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2000-2021




Sources: American Community Survey, 2017-2021, The Housing Workshop 2023.

Affordability of Rental Housing

Since 2000, as rental rates have risen in real dollars more rapidly than incomes, Alameda County overall has experienced rising cost burdens among lower-income households. This trend means that more lower-income households than ever before pay between 30 and 50% of their income in rent, and a large number of lower income households pay more than half of their income for housing costs. In 2019, almost 43,800 Alameda County extremely low-income households (below 30% AMI) paid more than half of their income for housing, leaving inadequate discretionary income for daily living and causing great housing insecurity. For those households with incomes between 30 and 50% AMI, another 13,000 households also paid more

than half of their income for rental housing, along with another 3,700 households with incomes between 50 to 80% AMI. These rental households with lower incomes paying more than half of their income for housing represent the greatest existing unmet housing need and indicate that current affordable housing programs are not meeting the housing needs of existing residents.

Figure 32: Number of Renter Households with Housing Cost Burden, Alameda County, 2019



Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop 2023.

The table on the next page shows how this pattern of housing cost burden has risen since 2000 in Alameda County. Over the 19 years shown, the share of extremely low-income households (earning less than 30% AMI) without a cost burden among all extremely low-income households dropped from 24% of this income segment in 2000 to just 16% by 2019. This pattern repeated for every income segment, with a decline in the share of those without a cost burden, and a rise in the shares of those with cost burdens and severe cost burdens. Given the impact of the pandemic on lower-income households, as well as continued rising market rate rents, it is likely these indicators will worsen further when 2023 data is available.

Appendix A provides more detailed cost burden data for 2000 and 2019 for every Alameda County jurisdiction.

Table 1: Housing Cost Burden Trends, Alameda County, 2000 & 2019

						2000-2019	
		2000		2019		Change in Share	Percent Change
Less than 30% AMI	No Cost Burden	13,575	24%	10,050	16%	-9%	-26%
	Cost Burden (30-50%)	8,130	15%	11,010	17%	2%	35%
	Severe Cost Burden (50%+)	33,905	61%	43,750	68%	7%	29%
	Total (a)	55,610	100%	64,810	100%		17%
30-50% AMI	No Cost Burden	10,895	30%	8,655	22%	-8%	-21%
	Cost Burden (30-50%)	16,525	45%	18,535	46%	1%	12%
	Severe Cost Burden (50%+)	8,964	25%	13,050	32%	8%	46%
	Total (a)	36,384	100%	40,240	100%		11%
50-80% AM	No Cost Burden	24,260	60%	20,175	48%	-12%	-17%
	Cost Burden (30-50%)	14,064	35%	18,085	43%	8%	29%
	Severe Cost Burden (50%+)	1,945	5%	3,690	9%	4%	90%
	Total (a)	40,269	100%	41,950	100%		4%
Above 80% AMI	No Cost Burden	96,610	92%	102,970	88%	-4%	7%
	Cost Burden (30-50%)	7,420	7%	13,095	11%	4%	76%
	Severe Cost Burden (50%+)	629	1%	680	1%	0%	8%
	Total (a)	104,659	100%	116,745	100%		

a) Does not include "not computed" segments.


Sources: *Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop 2023.*

Another way to illustrate the lack of affordable rental housing is to “work backwards” from median rents to calculate the average hourly wage needed to afford that rent. This method is based on the National Low Income Housing Coalition’s annual publication called “Out of Reach: The High Cost of Housing.”⁷ For Alameda County in 2023, the report shows that Alameda County renters earn an average hourly wage of \$34.55, but rents in Alameda County for a 2-bedroom apartment require earning at least \$46.25 an hour, meaning that the average household would need at least 1.3 full time wage earners to afford the average 2-bedroom unit.

⁷ *Out of Reach 2023: The High Cost of Housing* (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2023), Pg. CA-49. See publication at: https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/2023_OOR.pdf

Figure 33: Income to Afford Average Monthly Market Rate Rent, Alameda County, 2000 - 2022

A third way to assess market rate rents compared to household income is to calculate the minimum annual household income needed to afford the average rent for units available in the marketplace at any point in time. In contrast to the math used in homeownership affordability calculations, which is affected directly by rising mortgage interest rates, average rental rates translate to a less dramatic increase each year. In 2000, an additional \$3,850 in annual household income above median income was needed to afford the average rent that year



(106% of median income), just \$840 additional income per ⁸rent.⁹


Source: CoStar, 2023; California HCD, 2023; The Housing Workshop 2023.

⁹ Technically, housing analysts estimate the minimum income needed to afford rent plus utilities, to meet the standard of not more than 30% of income for direct housing costs. However, historic utility rates were not available for this study, so the analysis compares income to just rent.

Rental Evictions

Tenant evictions disproportionately impact lower income households with high rent cost burdens; when tenants lose jobs, or encounter unexpected expenses, or face ever-increasing rents, they are at higher risk of getting evicted. Alameda County Housing & Community Development Department (HCD) was able to obtain data regarding eviction (also called “unlawful detainer”) court filings for all jurisdictions except unincorporated areas other than Sunol. It is important to note, however, that there are typically multiple court filings for the same “incident” during the lengthy process of eviction; thus, the data shown below may overstate the actual number of households facing legal action resulting in eviction. Overall, filings have declined since 2013, with 2020 – 2022 subject to a countywide pandemic eviction moratorium, creating a one-time decline that is expected to rise in 2023 after the moratorium was lifted. It is also important to note that, on a monthly basis, eviction filings are up dramatically since the moratorium was lifted at the end of April, 2023. From May thru October 2023 there were an average of 578 eviction filings per month, compared to a monthly pre-moratorium average of 309 eviction filings per month in 2019. It is likely that eviction filings will remain higher through much of 2024.


Figure 34: Eviction (Unlawful Detainer) Filings, Alameda County 2013 - 2022



Source: Alameda County HCD; *The Housing Workshop*, 2023.

Although Oakland is shown above as having the largest actual number of court filings for each year analyzed, when filings by jurisdiction are equalized by the number of renter households in the jurisdictions, the rate of eviction filings paints a different picture. As shown below, on a per 1,000 renter household basis and measured before the 2020 pandemic moratorium, Hayward had the highest rate of filings, with almost double the rate of the County overall.

Figure 35: Unlawful Detainer Filings per 1,000 Renter Households, Alameda County 2019




Source: Alameda County HCD; *The Housing Workshop*, 2023.

Unhoused Population

The challenges of housing affordability, lack of adequate social services, and lack of emergency support all coalesce into the rising population of unhoused people living on the streets or in shelters/transitional housing throughout Alameda County. The count of those experiencing homelessness is conducted once per year at a particular “point in time.” This point in time (PIT) estimate of homelessness should be considered as undercounting the number of people with unstable housing in any year because an individual could be housed on the night data is collected and living on the streets the following week. For example, “On any given night over 8,000 people experience homelessness in Alameda County, a number that grows to approximately 15,000 people over the course of a year.”¹⁰

As shown below, the PIT County has risen dramatically since 2007, from 4,838 persons to 9,747 in 2022, a 101% increase in 15 years.

Figure 36: Point-in-Time (PIT) Count of Unhoused Population, 2007-2022



Note: The 2021 PIT count was postponed due to Covid.

Source: 2022 Alameda County Homeless Count and Survey, Applied Survey Research, 2022.

For the 2022 PIT Count in Alameda County, a total of 9,747 people in 8,308 households were observed.¹¹ Approximately 27% of this population were counted in organized shelters, while 73% were observed living unsheltered in tents, cars, vans/RVs, on the street, or in abandoned

¹⁰ *Home Together 2026 Community Plan*, adopted by Alameda County Supervisors in August 2020. See: <https://homelessness.acgov.org/home-together.page>

¹¹ 2022 Alameda County Homeless Count and Survey (Applied Survey Research 2022). See: https://homelessness.acgov.org/homelessness-assets/docs/reports/2022-Alameda-County-PIT-Report_9.22.22-FINAL-3.pdf

buildings. The Alameda County PIT process also included follow-up surveys of 1,157 unhoused people in both sheltered and unsheltered situations.

Survey findings include:

- More than 90% of homeless households in Alameda County are adults without minor children.
- 82% had lived in Alameda County prior to experiencing their current homeless period, with most having been long time residents (10 years or more)
- The most frequently mentioned key cause of current homeless period was dispute with family/friends/roommates (27%), followed by eviction/foreclosure (25%), job loss (22%), other financial issues (13%), substance abuse (13%), and family/domestic violence (11%).
- African Americans were disproportionately represented in the unhoused population at 43% of total unhoused people counted in February 2022, compared to just 10% of Alameda County's general population in 2020. Asian Americans were underrepresented, at 5% of the unhoused population compared to 32% of Alameda's general population in 2020.

Alameda County formulated a 5-year plan to address homelessness in 2020, called *Home Together 2026 Community Plan*. This plan calls for a mix of both increased temporary shelter beds, emergency cash grants and vouchers, and permanent supportive housing construction over the next few years. Annual progress reporting since the Plan's publication describes some successful implementation but lagging achievement of numerical goals needed to meet the growing unhoused population counts. Additional funding and intra-agency collaboration are needed to reverse the cycle, along with intensive construction of more permanent supportive housing and other homelessness prevention measures.

Production Trends


Building Permits

Between 2000 and 2021, Alameda County produced a total 97,367 new housing units based on issued permits, for an average of 4,637 units per year during the 21-year study period.

The pattern of housing production as measured by building permits issued each year shows the fluctuations tied primarily to economic cycles. For example, the decline in 2007-2009 reflects the Great Recession, while 2010 and thereafter illustrate the economic recovery. This post-recession expansion peaked in 2017, when more than 9,250 housing units were permitted. More recently, the decline in 2020 marks the pandemic slowdown in new construction, while the rise the following year reflects the recovery from that major economic event.

Over the past 21 years, the type of new housing construction has also shifted dramatically in the County. In 2000, 76% of housing units permitted for construction were single-family units, while in 2021, this relationship reversed so that 73% of units were multifamily.

Figure 37: Building Permits, Alameda County, 2000-2021




Source: US Census, *The Housing Workshop 2023*.

As in almost every indicator reviewed in this report, the pace of new construction has varied substantially among the County's cities and unincorporated communities. Detailed data is provided in Appendix A.

A useful measure of new construction relative to the size of an existing community is the ratio of new units per 1,000 existing units at the start of the period. The graph below shows the results of this metric. During the 21-year study period, California produced 282 new units per every 1,000 existing housing units in 2000. Alameda County and the Bay Area overall had lower rates of new production, at approximately 180 new units for every 1,000 existing units in 2000. Across Alameda County's jurisdictions, this rate varied widely, from a low of 14 new units per 1,000 existing units in Piedmont, to a high of 1,562 new units per every 1,000 existing units in Dublin. The only other jurisdiction which exceeded the statewide rate of new construction was Emeryville, building 818 new units per every 1,000 existing units in 2000. In an era of declining statewide housing production, and an ever-increasing gap between housing needed and construction rates, these metrics for many Alameda County jurisdictions underscore the need to accelerate housing production to meet demand.

Figure 38: Total New Units Permitted from 2000 – 2021 Per 1,000 Existing Units in 2000



Source: *The Housing Workshop* 2023.


Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

A key method to analyze the gaps between housing need and housing production is through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), which is a legally mandated goal for housing production. The California Department of Housing and Community Development produces the goals for each region in the state on an 8-year cycle, taking into account estimated population growth as well as existing unmet housing need. Then, regional agencies in collaboration with advisory groups further break down the allocations by jurisdiction, based on factors reflecting

regional policy goals.¹² The resulting RHNA numbers for each jurisdiction then become a centerpiece of each jurisdiction's Housing Element, with annual tracking of permitted units (a proxy for housing production) and how they are meeting RHNA goals.

The graph below compares RHNA unit goals by affordable income category to actual housing unit production, measuring how well Alameda County's jurisdictions in total achieved their RHNA production goals over time. During each time period including the most recent cycle just completed (2014-2022), Alameda County overall failed to meet its RHNA goals, especially for affordable housing serving very low-, low-, and moderate-income households, repeating the pattern of lack of affordable housing production from each prior period. These failures to meet need as defined by the RHNA process has a cumulative effect; if jurisdictions in Alameda County fail to produce enough new housing affordable to all segments of its population, over time, more and more households either become severely cost-burdened, or risk homelessness, or leave the region for more affordable locations elsewhere.

Figure 39: RHNA Goals Compared to Housing Production 1999-2022, Alameda County



Note: RHNA for the 2007-2014 period ended mid-year 2014, with the next cycle starting 1/1/2104, creating an overlap for that year.
 Sources: HCD Regional Housing Needs Allocation (see <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/regional-housing-needs-allocation>); ABAG; The Housing Workshop 2023.

¹² See: https://abag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2022-12/Final%20RHNA%20Methodology%20Report%202023-2031_update_11-22.pdf

It is notable that for the County overall, in the most recent cycle of 2014-2022, market rate production was more than double the market rate RHNA goal, but fell short significantly for the affordable housing segments. These findings underscore the need to produce housing across all income categories, and also underscore the challenges in providing sufficient affordable housing for the 0-120% AMI income ranges. A host of challenges limit affordable housing production in Alameda County, including insufficient federal and state funding to meet these RHNA goals, along with lack of available sites, and in some cases, the lack of focus by local governments to address these failures.

Current RHNA Cycle 2023-2031

The current RHNA cycle covers the period from 2023-2031, with total units by income segment shown below. Overall, the County and its incorporated jurisdictions are required in their Housing Elements to identify sites with sufficient zoning to provide almost 89,000 new housing units over the next 8 years, including over 4,700 units in unincorporated Alameda County. This overall Alameda County RHNA goal represents a doubling of the last cycle's RHNA goal, and also represents an increase of almost 14% in the housing inventory in the next 8 years. This ambitious level of production across all income segments for the coming 8 years means that all jurisdictions in Alameda County will need to accelerate housing production, particularly for affordable housing serving the 0-120% AMI need segments.

Table 2: Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) for Alameda County Jurisdictions, 2023-2031

	Very Low - Income (I<50% AMI)	Low Income (50-80% AMI)	Moderate Income (80-120% AMI)	Above Moderate (>120% AMI)	RHNA Total	RHNA, as % of 2023 Housing Units
Alameda	1,421	818	868	2,246	5,353	15.8%
Albany	308	178	175	453	1,114	14.0%
Berkeley	2,446	1,408	1,416	3,664	8,934	16.6%
Dublin	1,085	625	560	1,449	3,719	14.7%
Emeryville	451	259	308	797	1,815	23.1%
Fremont	3,640	2,096	1,996	5,165	12,897	15.9%
Hayward	1,075	617	817	2,115	4,624	8.6%
Livermore	1,317	758	696	1,799	4,570	13.8%
Newark	464	268	318	824	1,874	11.6%
Oakland	6,511	3,750	4,457	11,533	26,251	14.0%
Piedmont	163	94	92	238	587	14.8%
Pleasanton	1,750	1,008	894	2,313	5,965	20.0%
San Leandro	862	495	696	1,802	3,855	11.6%
Union City	862	496	382	988	2,728	12.4%
Unincorporated County	1,251	721	763	1,976	4,711	9.0%
Alameda County						
Total	23,606	13,591	14,438	37,362	88,997	13.9%
% of Total	26.5%	15.3%	16.2%	42.0%		

Source: ABAG, 2021; CA Department of Finance, 2023.

Affordable Housing Supply

The substantial need for affordable housing in Alameda County has been a major issue for decades. While great strides have been made in producing affordable units, more needs to be done. This chapter summarizes the inventory of existing rent-restricted affordable housing, the “pipeline” of additional units currently underway, and the potential loss of units as older restrictions expire, meaning units may no longer be affordable.

Existing Rent/Sale Price Restricted Affordable Housing

Alameda County jurisdictions currently contain 30,731 rent/sale price restricted affordable units, representing 4.6% of total housing units in the County. The number and percentage of affordable units varies substantially between jurisdictions, however, from a low of 0 affordable units in Piedmont to a high of almost 12,500 units in Oakland (6.7% of its housing stock). Emeryville has achieved the highest percentage of affordable units, at 10.5% of total housing stock in 2023. In the unincorporated County areas, just 2.3% of the housing stock is restricted affordable housing.

Figure 40: Rent/Price-Restricted Affordable Units, Alameda County, 2023



Sources: CA Department of Housing & Community Development, 2023; CA Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2023; CA Housing Partnership, 2023; Alameda County Housing and Community Development, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Pipeline of Upcoming Projects

In California, each year, every jurisdiction must report its Annual Progress Report (APR) in meeting its RHNA goals per its Housing Element to the California Housing & Community Development Department (HCD). In addition to built units, each jurisdiction must also report its known pipeline of upcoming units either under construction, approved but not yet in construction, or under review for land use approvals. Forecasting the years which the reported future pipeline covers is difficult, however, because many projects that are approved or under entitlement review could not be constructed for several years, and in some cases, even if fully approved, will not be built.

The table below summarizes the reported pipeline for Alameda County jurisdictions. While this summary is encouraging compared to RHNA production goals, substantially more affordable units need to enter the pipeline in the next few years to be completed by 2031. An estimate of unmet affordable housing needs for not just RHNA goals but meeting other existing unmet affordable housing needs is provided in the following chapter.

Table 3: Summary of Pipeline Housing Units, Alameda County

	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	Total Affordable	Above Moderate Income	Total Units
Alameda	887	428	202	1,517	2,213	3,730
Albany	53	34	67	154	155	309
Berkeley	437	142	41	620	3,991	4,611
Dublin	266	269	210	745	2,104	2,849
Emeryville	78	49	26	153	470	623
Fremont	163	957	1	1,121	3,967	5,088
Hayward	335	275	82	692	1,382	2,074
Livermore	-	281	84	365	44	409
Newark	301	85	30	416	2,273	2,689
Oakland	1,456	1,514	181	3,151	9,784	12,935
Piedmont	-	-	-	-	1	1
Pleasanton	4	127	-	131	695	826
San Leandro	155	415	30	600	1,935	2,535
Union City	98	104	439	641	850	1,491
Unincorporated County	122	70	-	192	441	633
Total	4,355	4,750	1,393	10,498	30,305	40,803
<i>RHNA Goal - Alameda County</i>	23,606	13,591	14,438	51,635	37,362	88,997
<i>% of RHNA Goal</i>	18.4%	34.9%	9.6%	20.3%	81.1%	45.8%

(a) This table captures housing projects under construction, approved, or under review by each jurisdiction within Alameda County as reported to HCD by each jurisdiction in their 2023-2031 Housing Elements, supplemented by data from Alameda County's affordable housing database.

Sources: CA Department of Housing and Community Development, 2023; Alameda County, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Measure A1-Funded Affordable Housing Inventory

Residents and elected officials in Alameda County have long understood that the County needs more funding to meet affordable housing needs and goals for both lower-income renter and owner households. In November 2016, voters of Alameda County overwhelmingly passed (73% of the vote) a \$580M bond measure known as Measure A1 for this purpose.

Measure A1 made \$425M of funds available for new affordable rental housing development. Each jurisdiction in the County was allocated a base amount adding up to half of the funding, and the other half was subdivided into four regions and made available on a competitive basis. Thus, each jurisdiction was able to subsidize at least one to two affordable rental projects through its base allocation, with many more possible depending in the size of the jurisdiction and the success of competing for the competitive regional allocation portion.

At present, 32 projects with 2,135 units have been completed throughout the County, with another 9 projects (738 units) under construction, and 12 projects with 1,063 units approved for funding and in the pipeline. When all projects are completed, Measure A1 will have provided funding for a total of 53 affordable rental housing projects with 3,936 units. This new affordable rental supply due to Measure A1 funding will have increased the inventory of rent-restricted affordable housing by almost 13% in the County, a substantial jump in much-needed supply. These A1 projects have averaged approximately \$93,600 per unit in bond funding, leveraging other federal, state, and local subsidies and financing with a ratio of 1:7.

Table 4: Summary of Measure A1-Funded Affordable Rental Projects, Alameda County

As of June 2023. Source: Alameda County Housing & Community Development Department.

Status	Projects with A1 Funding	Units with A1 Funding	Total A1 Funds	A1 Funding/Unit	Total Project Cost	Total Project Cost/Unit	Other Funding Sources	A1 Fund Leverage
Completed Projects	32	2,135	\$ 205,564,605	\$ 96,283	\$ 1,554,714,604	\$ 728,204	\$ 1,349,149,999	6.6
Projects Under Construction	9	738	\$ 82,446,027	\$ 111,715	\$ 640,803,828	\$ 868,298	\$ 558,357,801	6.8
Pipeline Projects	12	1,063	\$ 80,572,034	\$ 75,797	\$ 752,829,470	\$ 708,212	\$ 672,257,436	8.3
Total	53	3,936	\$ 368,582,666	\$ 93,644	\$ 2,948,347,902	\$ 749,072	\$ 2,579,765,236	7.0

Source: Alameda County Housing & Community Development Department, 2023. The Housing Workshop, 2023.

A key benefit of Measure A1 was that it provided funding to kickstart projects in every jurisdiction in Alameda County. Just one jurisdiction, Piedmont, did not propose a project to receive A1 funds during the life of the program, forgoing its \$2.2M allocation.

Table 5: Geographic Distribution of Measure A1-Funded Projects, Alameda County, 2023

	Projects with A1 Funding	Units with A1 Funding	A1 Funding	A1 Funding/Unit	Total Affordable Housing Investment (a)	Total Investment/Unit
Alameda	5	342	\$ 30,173,280	\$ 88,226	\$ 260,055,719	\$ 760,397
Albany	1	62	\$ 2,330,206	\$ 37,584	\$ 43,587,941	\$ 703,031
Berkeley	5	244	\$ 26,213,667	\$ 107,433	\$ 158,165,338	\$ 648,219
Dublin	2	249	\$ 7,948,319	\$ 31,921	\$ 195,304,347	\$ 784,355
Emeryville	1	87	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 21,839	\$ 64,532,179	\$ 741,749
Fremont	5	404	\$ 58,430,441	\$ 144,630	\$ 313,350,425	\$ 775,620
Hayward	3	258	\$ 28,213,871	\$ 109,356	\$ 242,171,029	\$ 938,647
Livermore	5	380	\$ 33,629,816	\$ 88,500	\$ 214,793,955	\$ 565,247
Newark	1	79	\$ 5,426,348	\$ 68,688	\$ 49,161,228	\$ 622,294
Oakland	15	1,211	\$ 112,839,121	\$ 93,178	\$ 964,330,132	\$ 796,309
Piedmont	0	0	\$ -		\$ -	
Pleasanton	3	89	\$ 12,348,616	\$ 138,748	\$ 54,730,776	\$ 614,953
San Leandro	4	299	\$ 18,183,257	\$ 60,814	\$ 193,444,152	\$ 646,970
Union City	1	81	\$ 13,241,020	\$ 163,469	\$ 71,600,825	\$ 883,961
Unincorp. Cities	2	151	\$ 17,704,704	\$ 117,250	\$ 123,119,856	\$ 815,363
	53	3,936	\$ 368,582,666	\$ 93,644	\$ 2,948,347,902	\$ 749,072

a) Total investment includes all other forms of affordable housing funding from federal, state, and local government sources. Including Low Income Housing Tax Credits.

Note: The City of Piedmont is working on firming up a project proposal, so this total may increase.

Source: Alameda County Housing & Community Development Department, 2023. *The Housing Workshop*, 2023.

Affordable Units At-Risk of Conversion

In addition to the required new construction of affordable units to meet RHNA goals, older affordable rental and ownership units often face an expiration of their rent or price restrictions. The timing of affordable rent or price restrictions varies depending on the original financing program restrictions, generally, rents or sale prices are restricted for a specific time period and after that, restrictions expire and rents or sale prices can rise to market rates. In practice, this means that although the number of affordable units can decline over time, as restrictions expire, most projects' owners seek to recapitalize using an affordable program again, extending the time period that restrictions apply. Nevertheless, securing extended refinancing to enable continued rent restrictions that preserve affordability is not guaranteed, making these expiring units "at-risk of conversion" to market rate.

The table below summarizes the expiring restrictions by year for projects in Alameda County with known expiration dates (other projects are known to have restrictions that will expire, but dates are unknown).

Table 6: Summary of Units with Expiring Affordability Restrictions by Year, Alameda County

Year	Number of Expiring Affordable Units (a)
2023	25
2024	51
2025	301
2026	204
2027	82
2028	259
2029	123
2030	480
2031	<u>90</u>
Subtotal	1,615
2032-2040	938
2041-2050	1,411
2051-2060	4,622
2061-2070	8,938
After 2070	7,112
No Expiration	<u>1,631</u>
Subtotal	24,652
Total Units	26,267

a) Data for this table was taken from each jurisdiction's 2023-2031 Housing Element supplemented by data from CHPC's Affordable Housing Map, and Alameda County's affordable housing database. Some projects in Alameda County's affordable housing database. Some projects do not have available regulatory period information, so the numbers shown should be considered an undercount.

Sources: CA Department of Housing and Community Development, 2023;
CA Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2023; CA Housing Partnership, 2023; Alameda County, 2023;
The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Estimate of Affordable Housing Supply Shortfalls

The description of population and household demographics, housing supply, affordability issues, market and production trends, RHNA goals, and rent/price restricted units at risk of conversion all point to the extensive need for additional housing assistance to Alameda County residents. While Measure A1, Alameda County's pioneering bond measure for affordable housing production nearing the end of its lifecycle, demonstrated success in producing new affordable housing units, more work is needed to provide housing for all.

The table below summarizes an estimate of unmet housing needs for Alameda County for the current Housing Element cycle to 2031. The estimate is divided into Existing Unmet Need, which includes the current unhoused household population and renters with severe cost-burden (paying more than 50% of their income to rent). The second part of the estimate quantifies RHNA goals plus losses from expiring restricted rents/prices, and subtracts the known pipeline of new units serving lower income households as reported to California HCD. These components are summed to equal total Unmet Housing Need for Alameda County for the 2023-2031 period.

Table 7: Estimate of Affordable Housing Supply Unmet Need, Alameda County, 2023-2031

	Existing Unmet Housing Needs		Future Need			Total Unmet Housing Unit Need 2023-2031
	Unhoused Households (a)	Severely Cost-Burdened Renter HHs (b)	RHNA 2023-2031 (c)	Loss from Expiring Restricted Units (d)	Pipeline (e)	
		+	+	-	=	
Extremely Low Income (< 30% AMI)	8,308	43,750	14,163		1,524	64,697
Very Low Income (30-50% AMI)	0	13,050	9,441		2,831	19,660
Low Income (50-80% AMI)	0	3,690	13,591		4,750	12,531
Moderate Income (80-120% AMI)	0	595	37,362		1,393	36,564
Total	8,308	61,085	74,557	1,615	10,498	133,452
Annual Average	1,039	7,636	9,320	201.875	1,312	19,508

a) Based on 2022 Alameda County Homeless Count and Survey, Comprehensive Report. See pg. 2.

PIT count estimated a total of 8,308 households that were temporarily sheltered or unsheltered during the days/evenings of Feb. 22 and 23, 2022. Even though an unknown number of unhoused households in the PIT count may have incomes greater than 30% AMI and be unboused due to other factors, all households in this population are assumed to have incomes <30% AMI.

b) Based on 2019 CHAS data for Alameda County for renter households only.

c) Based on RHNA for Alameda County. For split between Extremely Low and Low Income (not specified by RHNA), this estimate assumes that Very Low Income RHNA is allocated in proportion to existing split per CHAS data for 2019 for Alameda County.

d) From California Housing Partnership database/Alameda County HCD database for projects with expiring rent restrictions in 2023 - 2031.

e) Based on summation of Housing Elements for each jurisdiction + projects in Alameda County's affordable housing database

Source: *The Housing Workshop 2023*.

The estimate shows that over 133,000 new units are needed in Alameda County for the next 8 years, or just over 19,500 per year, which represents a dramatically accelerated increase over the 9,000 permitted housing units in Alameda County in 2017, the peak year since 2000.

Affordable Housing Production Challenges


This chapter describes several key challenges to producing new affordable housing in Alameda County including rapidly rising development costs per unit, lack of sufficient funding to subsidize projects, and policy regulations affecting development locations.

Challenge: Development Costs and Need for Funding

One of the most challenging aspects of producing new affordable rental units in Alameda County for the past several years has been rapidly rising development costs. A good source to illustrate this concept is the cost data provided in applications to the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC) for 4% Low Income Housing Tax Credits. These applications must show projected site acquisition costs (typically for land), hard construction costs (for actual site and buildings), soft construction costs (e.g., legal, financial, accounting, design), and developer fee (subject to CDLAC regulations).

For this report, applications for all CDLAC rounds of Low Income Housing Tax Credit allocations were analyzed according to these costs. From February 2021 through the most recent round of CDLAC funding in May 2023, the average cost per unit for projects located in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties rose from an average of \$634,000 in early 2021 to over \$984,000 in mid-2023, an increase of 55% in roughly 2.5 years. While there are many reasons for this rapid rise (e.g., pandemic recovery, labor shortages, general inflation), the trend nevertheless makes it very challenging to stretch available funding sources that have not necessarily kept pace.

Figure 41: Avg. Unit Cost, Alameda & Contra Costa County Applications to CDLAC, 2021-2023



Source: California Debt Limit Allocation Committee, 2021-2022; The Housing Workshop 2023.

The table below takes a closer look at the most recent applications to CDLAC for two rounds of LIHTC allocations, both in 2023 (for both Alameda and Contra Costa County projects). Here, due to wide variations in land acquisition costs per unit, the data has been adjusted to eliminate acquisition costs from the analysis. Even when land costs are eliminated, the remaining development costs average over \$916,000 per unit, or \$931 per square foot of residential space.

Table 8: 2023 CDLAC Applications (Adjusted) for 4% Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties

	City	County	Residential		Hard Costs	Soft Costs	Dev Fee	Total Cost	Total Cost/Unit	Total Cost/SF
			Units	Sq. Feet						
Arbor View Apartments	Fremont	Alameda	67	85,057	\$ 42,367,500	\$ 13,679,472	\$ 7,832,642	\$ 63,879,614	\$ 953,427	\$ 751
3050 International	Oakland	Alameda	76	73,145	\$ 59,102,325	\$ 18,301,235	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 80,903,560	\$ 1,064,521	\$ 1,106
North Housing Senior Apartments	Alameda	Alameda	64	47,076	\$ 33,877,821	\$ 12,827,001	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 49,704,822	\$ 776,638	\$ 1,056
Timber Senior Housing	Newark	Alameda	79	91,432	\$ 48,927,739	\$ 15,802,952	\$ 5,500,000	\$ 70,230,691	\$ 888,996	\$ 768
East 12th Street	Oakland	Alameda	91	79,193	\$ 57,249,804	\$ 24,254,693	\$ 2,192,219	\$ 83,696,716	\$ 919,744	\$ 1,057
Legacy Court	Richmond	Contra Costa	43	45,390	\$ 24,191,526	\$ 9,625,272	\$ 4,646,711	\$ 38,463,509	\$ 894,500	\$ 847
Average								\$ 916,304	\$ 931	

Sources: California Debt Limit Allocation Committee, 2023; The Housing Workshop 2023.

Many affordable housing developers are exploring methods to reduce per unit costs moving forward, including using modular housing (constructed off-site and stacked into place on-site) or mass timber (wood material that can support mid-rise buildings). Moreover, many jurisdictions are taking a new look at reusing publicly owned land that can be offered to affordable housing developers at low or no cost. Nevertheless, if these very high construction and development costs continue recent trends, funding such as large-scale local bond measures will need to take this challenge into account when setting production goals moving forward.

Challenge: Aligning with State and Regional Housing Location Policies


This report includes a geospatial analysis of Alameda County's current affordable housing inventory (including built projects with Measure A1 funding) along with the known pipeline of Measure A1-committed projects. The following analyzes the current inventory of affordable projects against four policy frameworks affecting future affordable project location decisions, in order to consider future policymaking in a geospatial context.

Cities maintain a database of built affordable housing projects in their jurisdictions. Data from these projects were assembled from each city's 2023-2031 Housing Elements, along with a list of Measure A1 completed and pipeline projects (with committed Measure A1 funds) and imported into GIS to precisely identify their geospatial coordinates. This undertaking represents the first comprehensive effort to map every built affordable housing project within Alameda County. A total of 570 projects totaling over 30,000 affordable housing units throughout Alameda County were mapped, including Measure A1 projects that were completed or had committed funding up until March 2023. Maps depicting the location of this inventory are included in Appendix A.

Policy Framework Guiding Regional Investments in Growth Areas

The graph below (and map in the Appendix) shows how Alameda County has implemented affordable housing production in areas targeted for regional growth as described in Plan Bay Area 2050, which seeks to limit sprawl and concentrate new development in urbanized areas with sufficient infrastructure and transit services. Over 24,000 built affordable units (81% of the County's inventory), were located within Plan Bay Area 2050 Priority Growth Areas. When considering just those funded by Measure A1, 78% of Measure A1 projects (when all completed) will also align with Plan Bay Area 2050 growth areas..

Figure 42: Percent of Affordable Projects in Plan Bay Area 2050 Priority Growth Areas



Source: See Appendix A23.

Policy Frameworks Addressing Equity, Displacement, and Community Resources

Several other policy frameworks have evolved which intersect with affordable housing development locations. The current affordable housing inventory was analyzed geospatially according to three key policy frameworks to better understand how Alameda County's inventory aligns, informing future potential County-directed affordable housing investments.


Equity Priority Communities

The Equity Priority Communities framework guides Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) decisions about where to target future public investments to reverse historic disparities in transportation, housing, and community services. ABAG/MTC have identified census tracts that have faced underinvestment, including those with significant populations of low-income residents and minority groups. The map below shows the existing affordable housing inventory layered onto tiers of Equity Priority Communities, with the highest areas representing communities with the most significant levels of historic underinvestment.

As the County continues to deploy further initiatives, in addition to supporting new construction affordable rental projects, it can expand programs that not only address historic discrimination but also supports greater housing security and wealth-building in Equity Priority Communities. Using the 3P framework, which will be discussed in a later chapter, these strategies may include the implementation of protection tactics aimed at safeguarding low-income renters (e.g. rental assistance, legal aid), as well as marketing efforts to promote projects and programs that reduce housing cost burden. Equally important is facilitating affordable homeownership opportunities, particularly for younger generations who find the prospect of buying a home financially unattainable.

The data compilation summarized below (and mapped in Appendix A25) indicates that to date, investments in affordable housing, including Measure A1, have not yet directly aligned with the concept of Equity Communities.

Figure 43: Alameda County Affordable/Measure A1 Units by Equity Priority Communities



Source: See Appendix A23.


Urban Displacement Project

The Urban Displacement Project (UDP) is a research initiative sponsored by the University of California Berkeley and the University of Toronto focused on mapping patterns of urban displacement and gentrification. The project collects and analyzes data on housing, income, and other metrics to track displacement risk in urban areas. By mapping and analyzing displacement risk, this enables policymakers to consider tools and resources that can be deployed to mitigate adverse impacts in vulnerable communities.

In the aggregate, the analysis indicates a significant proportion (36%) of Alameda County's affordable housing units are found in census tracts facing a heightened risk of gentrification, exceeding the 17% of county residents who reside in these census tracts. Furthermore, Measure A1 continued to invest affordable units in areas susceptible to displacement, with 29% of A1 units built in census tracts facing some gentrification risk.

Approaches to future County-funded affordable housing programs can be tailored using a number of tools to offset displacement risk. These include use of affirmative marketing strategies so existing residents are able to secure tenancy in new units. Other approaches to promote housing stability include measures to protect low-income renters, including strengthening rent stabilization and just cause protections and offering legal assistance to tenants facing eviction or harassment. Other strategies include preservation programs aimed at maintaining the affordability of the naturally occurring housing stock and offering assistance to facilitate homeownership, particularly for young and low-income families.

Figure 44: Alameda County Affordable and Measure A1 Units by Gentrification Risk



Source: See Appendix A23.


HCD Opportunity Zones to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing

While the Equity Priority Communities and the Urban Displacement Project provide frameworks for investing in historically disadvantaged and rapidly changing communities, it is equally important to affirmatively further fair housing by supporting new affordable developments in high-resource areas (i.e., census tracts with higher average incomes, greater educational attainment levels, access to high-quality schools and job opportunities, access to amenities and open space, and low levels of pollution). This policy approach facilitates pathways for housing and economic mobility, enabling low-income families to integrate into communities with abundant resources and opportunities, particularly important for families with children.

In recent years, California has intensified efforts to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) by refining the scoring criteria for the allocation of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and tax-exempt bond financing to favor projects proposed for high resource areas, thereby encouraging the development of more affordable units in affluent neighborhoods. This is especially significant because LIHTC serves as the key funding source for most affordable housing development in Alameda County. High resource census tracts in Alameda County include portions of Albany, Berkeley, Oakland (above I-580), Fremont, Castro Valley, Dublin, and Pleasanton (see map in Appendix A). It should be noted that for some jurisdictions, this emphasis on higher resource areas per AFFH causes a tension with local policies focusing on displacement in disadvantaged neighborhoods also needing new affordable housing.

Alameda County has historically underproduced affordable units in high and highest resource areas. Although 39% of residents live in high or highest resource areas, only 24% of Alameda County's current inventory of affordable housing units fell within these geographies. Among Measure A1- funded affordable units, only 19% percent will be located in high resource areas, with none in highest resource areas.


Figure 45: Alameda County Affordable and Measure A1 Units by HCD Opportunity Zone



Source: See Appendix A23.

Moving forward, the County may want to consider adjustments to their current policy, including holding affluent communities accountable to building their fair share of affordable housing and ensuring a greater allocation of new production funds go towards high- and highest-resource areas to facilitate affordable projects. The County can also direct additional funding into building new affordable housing on publicly owned land in high-resource opportunity zones near Plan Bay Area 2050 Priority Growth Areas within unincorporated Alameda County, as shown in the map below, which includes portions of Castro Valley and unincorporated areas north of Livermore.

Figure 46: Unincorporated Alameda County High Resource Areas in Plan Bay Area Growth Areas



Source: *The Housing Workshop*, 2023.

Key Findings and Recommendations

Key Findings

This report takes the long view “backwards” to assess demographic, economic, and market trends, with the goal of setting the stage for the next decade’s regional policy and funding strategies, particularly with respect to a planned regional affordable housing funding initiative (through a regional bond issue) currently under discussion with the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA) and its county/local government partners.

As described in this report, Alameda County overall tracks the Bay Area region, with very high housing costs and a wide distribution of household incomes including significant portions of the population living in poverty and/or facing severe housing cost burdens. While Alameda County’s incorporated and unincorporated jurisdictions vary in their particular details, every jurisdiction faces a similar housing crisis and recognizes the need to do more. Although Alameda County and its jurisdictions have produced a substantial amount of new market rate housing units, especially in comparison to RHNA goals, production of affordable housing units compared to unmet need has trailed significantly.

Key summary findings of the report include:

Population, Households, and Income

- Alameda County has grown substantially in both population and households since 2000, tracking the Bay Area region. Overall, the County added 229,000 residents (an almost 16% growth rate) and over 58,000 households (11% growth rate) between 2000 and 2021.
- Household incomes have also grown substantially, on an inflation-adjusted basis, for the same time period. For example, median household income in Alameda County increased by a real 12.2% (after adjusting for inflation) between 2000 and 2021, compared to a less robust increase of 5.0% for the overall Bay Area.
- The greatest increases in real median income in Alameda County since 2000 was experienced by communities with strong new housing unit development, including Emeryville, Dublin, and Oakland, along with communities with rising proportions of older residents building income over time, including Berkeley and the County’s unincorporated balance not in a CDP. At the same time, several of the County’s unincorporated CDPs experienced a decline in real median household income, most notably Ashland and

Cherryland, who also represent the lowest median incomes by jurisdiction in the most recent data.

- Housing ownership has kept pace with the region but lags the state, reflecting the high cost of for-sale housing in Alameda County. In 2021, 54% of Alameda County households owned and 46% rented their homes. These tenure rates vary widely by jurisdiction from a low ownership rate of 28% in Emeryville, to a high of 88% in Piedmont in 2021. Ownership rates in unincorporated Alameda County were lowest in the Cherryland CDP (30%) and highest in Sunol (84%) and the unincorporated balance of Alameda County not in a CDP (87%).
- When analyzed by race of household head, home ownership shows widely varying patterns. Almost 62% of White-headed households owned their homes, while just 31% of African-American households owned their homes. This finding illustrates the need for increased equity policies related to homeownership, particularly for moderate income households.

Housing Market Trends

- Despite real income growth, housing sale prices and rents have escalated more dramatically. In 2022, the median house sale price in Alameda County (single family) required an income 85% higher than the median household income, putting ownership out of reach for most potential buyers.
- Rental rates have also risen substantially, but not as high relative to household income as sale prices. In 2022, the median household income could afford the median market rate 2-bedroom rent (which can house the average 3-person household size). However, for the lower income segments, high rental costs have burdened many households, meaning that in 2019 over 56,800 households with incomes below 50% of AMI paid more than half of their income rent; this is known as having a “severe rent cost burden.” This segment of lower income renter households with severe cost burdens is typically the highest policy priority group for affordable rental housing policies.
- One of the most visible failures of current affordable housing policies and programs for the lower income/severely cost-burdened group is the ever-increasing number of unhoused County residents. At the last point-in-time count in 2022, a total of 9,747 people in 8,308 households were observed, an increase of 101% since 2007. Approximately 27% of this population was counted in organized shelters, while 73% were observed living unsheltered in tents, cars, vans/RVs, on the street, or in abandoned buildings.
- Housing production is a more complicated story than many news reports describe. For

market rate housing, the Alameda County's jurisdictions have mostly met or exceeded their RHNA goals in the past 8 years, and often also in previous cycles. For example, in the most recent completed RHNA cycle (2014-2022), Alameda County overall produced 20,428 more market rate units than the RHNA goal for this segment. However, for the affordable housing RHNA goals, Alameda County overall has failed significantly to meet RHNA goals; in the most recent RHNA cycle (2014-2022), the total shortfall in actual production compared to the total RHNA goal was 18,382 affordable units including a critical shortfall of 7,057 units serving those earning below 50% of AMI.

- To facilitate accelerated affordable housing production, Alameda County voters passed Measure A1 in 2016, creating a \$580M bond-financed fund to produce more affordable units. Measure A1 made \$425M of funds available for new affordable rental housing development. To date, Measure A1 has funded 32 completed affordable rental housing projects with 2,135 units throughout the County; another 9 projects with 738 units are under construction and an additional 12 projects with 1,063 units have been approved for funding and are considered in the pipeline. When all projects are completed, Measure A1 will have provided funding for a total of 53 affordable rental housing projects with 3,936 units. This new affordable rental supply due to Measure A1 funding will have increased the inventory of rent-restricted affordable housing by almost 13% in the County, a substantial jump in much-needed supply. These A1 projects have averaged approximately \$93,600 per unit in bond funding, leveraging other federal, state, and local subsidies and financing with a ratio of 1:7. Measure A1 funding was critical to making these projects feasible, especially with rising construction costs and gaps in funding from under-resourced state and federal sources.

Housing Supply Shortfalls

- For Alameda County during the next 8 years (i.e., 2023-2031, matching the current Housing Element/RHNA cycle), this report estimates an unmet affordable housing need of 133,400 units, or 19,500 units per year to serve households earning less than 120% of AMI.
- While most of the households needing affordable housing will be renters, at least 36,500 of these households (the moderate income segment of RHNA earning 80-120% of AMI) will seek to purchase housing, and will be unable to afford most market rate sale prices.
- Two growing challenges will face housing production and preservation of existing affordable units in the near term: rapidly rising per-unit development costs and the intersection of sometimes conflicting housing policy frameworks administered by key funders at the state and local levels. Alameda County policies which offset high production costs, such as the greater use of publicly-owned land than can be offered at

no cost to non-profit housing developers, will help mitigate that challenge. For housing policy frameworks, Alameda County, particularly in its unincorporated areas for which the County serves as the direct housing agency, may need to take a close look at the intersection of state Low Income Housing Tax Credit location points, as well as evolving regional equity and anti-displacement initiatives, to pro-actively identify sites in locations fitting multi-level policy frameworks.

Recommendations

Context for Recommendations

In 2019, the California Legislature passed AB 1487, which authorized the formation of the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA), a new regional agency tasked with coordinating and funding housing affordability initiatives across the 9 county Bay Area. BAHFA is currently considering placing a General Obligation Bond to produce, preserve, and protect (known as the 3P's) affordable housing in the 9-county Bay Area. This initiative is the first regional housing finance agency in California.

The enabling legislation calls for a 2-part funding approach: use of a portion of the proposed large bond issue to fund regional subsidies and technical assistance, and use of a separate portion of the bond dollars to directly allocate to counties and "large cities" for their administration and expenditure according to some broad requirements. This section of the report summarizes this second portion as it will relate to Alameda County. The requirements for Alameda County will apply to all county-allocated bond proceeds, as detailed below, except for bond proceeds going directly to Oakland (as a "big city").

Alameda County will be required to prepare an Expenditure Plan according to the following regulations in AB 1487:

- **Production:** This will be the primary portion of funding (see estimate below for potential range of dollar amounts). At least 52% of the County's total funding must be used for new affordable rental housing production (subsidies and loans). Production dollars are considered capital dollars and are not available for operating subsidies. This segment can not be used for ownership housing. Units produced must have at least a 55-year deed restriction for affordability and must serve households earning 80% of AMI or below. Production dollars must be used within 5 years of BAHFA provision to the County, aligning well with the Housing Element process and timing to meet affordable housing RHNA goals in this cycle.

- **Preservation:** This component is to acquire, rehab, and preserve existing housing units, many of which are considered “naturally occurring affordable housing” (NOAH). At least 15% of County funds from BAHFA must be allocated to this component. Typically, these kinds of units are located in gentrifying neighborhoods around the Bay Area, with residents being displaced by market forces. This component can be used to create both rental and ownership units, subject to a minimum 55-year deed restriction for affordability and must serve households earning 120% of AMI or below.
- **Protection:** This component targets tenant protection services to mitigate housing issues for renters. At least 5% of BAHFA funds must be spent on this component. Eligible services include pre-eviction and eviction legal services, counseling, training and renter education; emergency rental assistance; relocation assistance; and displacement tracking and data collection.

There County can spend the remaining 28% or less of funds (depending on its plan for the above 3Ps) flexibly, including more of the same sets of activities from above, or on or other housing and housing-related issues. It should be noted that for non-capital expenditures, a review of state legal constraints on bond expenditures (e.g., for operating subsidies or tenant protection programs) may need to be undertaken.

During 2024, Alameda County must prepare an Expenditure Plan for its future bond proceeds, according to the above percentages and categories. The Plan would be adopted by the County Board of Supervisors and reviewed by BAHFA for eligibility. If it meets these requirements, it will trigger funding eligibility.

An estimate of the range of funding that may be generated by BAHFA though a regional bond issuance subject to voter approval, and then allocation to Alameda County for use countywide except in Oakland (which will receive its own allocation from BAHFA) is provided below.

Table 9: Estimated Allocation of BAHFA Potential Bond Proceeds to Alameda County

	If \$10B Bond, then Alameda County receives		If \$20B Bond, then Alameda County receives
Total Potential Bond Proceeds to County	\$ 948,000,000	to	\$ 2,000,000,000
Production (at least 52% of total)	\$ 492,960,000	to	\$ 1,040,000,000
Preservation (at least 15% of total)	\$ 142,200,000	to	\$ 300,000,000
Protection (at least 5% of total)	\$ 47,400,000	to	\$ 100,000,000
Flexible Funding (28% or less of total)	\$ 265,440,000	to	\$ 560,000,000
Total	\$ 948,000,000		\$ 2,000,000,000

Source: *The Housing Workshop, 2023.*

As a comparison, as noted earlier in this report, the County's own Measure A1 will spend \$368.6 M on new affordable rental housing unit production. Since BAHFA funds will be combined with other sources of funding (although the leverage ratios and other aspects of BAHFA funding will differ), it is likely that BAHFA bond proceeds will be able to create at least as many units as Measure A1 has upon its completion of projects (53 projects with almost 4,000 units). This new funding source will have a substantial impact on increasing new production across the County (and Oakland will receive its own allocation in addition, expanding the potential impact).

Recommendations for Production

As described in this report, Alameda County will need to produce an extraordinary amount of affordable units to meet all unmet housing needs in the next 8 years. Since Alameda County will administer the funds from the BAHFA Bond Issue (assuming it passes), as well obtain other potential federal and state funding streams, the following outlines for possible strategies is not tied directly to any particular dollar amount.

Loans and Grants to New Affordable Housing Projects

Much as Measure A1 subsidized new affordable housing construction, the County can plan to expend BAHFA Bond proceeds across all jurisdictions except Oakland by directly loaning or granting funds to eligible new construction projects. Factors such as location relative to equity and fair housing policies (such as in high or moderately-resourced census tracts) will need to be reviewed and refined for maximum implementation impact.

As noted in BAHFA materials and many other publications, the Bay Area housing crisis is perhaps most acute for the unhoused and those at risk of falling into that situation, leading to a potential emphasis on distributing funding to projects that provide permanent supportive housing (PSH), special needs housing and housing that address a range of households in the less than 30% of AMI cohort.

As the County's population continues to age, another focus on senior housing with services for those below 30% AMI will also continue to grow in importance and can be integrated in future County programs.

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Loans and Grants

Another strategy to foster new affordable unit production, particularly effective in neighborhoods with primarily single family homes, is to subsidize ADU construction (now developable by-right in many single family zones in Alameda County), is to provide subsidies in exchange for property owner agreements to place rent-restrictions on the new ADU for a certain period of

time. One model of this type of program is to subsidize half of the construction cost (up to \$150,000), as well as providing technical assistance during the development process to the property owner, in exchange for a 10-year rent restriction agreement or covenant. At the end of the 10-year period, the property owner can elect to charge market rate rents. This can be structured as a low-interest forgivable loan, if the agreement for rent-restriction is fulfilled (so loan payments are deferred until end of year 10, then forgiven if conditions have been met. Some cities have experimented with a phased forgiveness schedule, so that for example, if conditions have been fulfilled for 5 of the 10 years, but then not thereafter, half of the loan would be forgiven and payments would commence.

This type of target subsidy to ADUs, which are surging in popularity for several reasons, enables Alameda County and its incorporated jurisdictions to rapidly facilitate additions to inventory and meet RHNA goals, without land assembly and lengthy approvals processes. The property owner also benefits from the subsidy, and in the longer term, adds value to their property by constructing an income-producing asset (which can go to market rate rents and further enhance asset value after year 10).

“Buy” Additional Affordable Inclusionary Units in Mixed-Income Projects

Another approach which may be cost-effective is to provide partial grant subsidies for capital costs (and/or operating subsidies using the Flexible fund component, if legally approved) to “buy down” the rent charged on some units above the number required to meet local inclusionary ordinances and/or state density bonus programs.¹³ There are various methods to “buy down” the cost to the developer, enabling a lower-than-market rate rent to be charged while maintaining project feasibility. One example is a direct capital grant or deferred low interest loan on that portion of the unit’s development cost. Another method, which has been proposed to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, is to arrange for a welfare exemption from property taxes on the unit, in exchange for a certain number of years of restricted rent; since BAHFA and other funding programs allow units to charge rents at the 80% AMI level, the difference between a unit with and without the property tax exemption for a certain period of years may be sufficient to balance feasibility.

These various approaches to increase the yield of affordable units in a newly construct mixed-income rental project benefit from the economies of scale of developers building larger multifamily projects, as well as limiting the cost per unit of subsidy to the County, expanding the impact of available funding. A “buy down” approach can also be used in acquisition/rehab

¹³ These approaches are not recommended to subsidize required inclusionary units, as most inclusionary programs already factor in the overall feasibility and profitability of mixed income units in the inclusionary context.

projects aimed at preserving existing naturally-occurring affordable housing (“NOAH”).

Focus on New Production in Unincorporated Alameda County

In addition to the above strategies, for which Alameda County would need to coordinate with incorporated jurisdictions’ existing programs, the County should also refocus on increasing production in unincorporated areas. Alameda County has a high number of households living in unincorporated urbanized areas such as Castro Valley, as well as urbanized smaller CDPs such as Ashland and Cherryland, which have some of the lowest incomes and highest cost burdens of unincorporated County locations. The analysis conducted for this report also identified that unincorporated Alameda County overall, has a relatively low percentage of existing affordable housing in its inventory, at just 2.3%, compared with more robust locations such as Emeryville with over 10% of its inventory in affordable housing, and Oakland with 6.7% of its inventory classified as affordable.

The County should consider preparing an in-depth housing production strategy for unincorporated Alameda County, including a detailed needs assessment for lower income households including special needs populations, an inventory of publicly-owned lands (often agencies own parcels not well known to staff), a process to entitle such publicly-owned land as needed, a feasibility and funding analysis for a series of projects, and even release of one or more Requests for Proposals on these sites to accelerate development interest.

Recommendations for Preservation

This set of recommended strategies are intended to focus on unincorporated Alameda County, because Alameda County HCD is the housing agency with direct responsibility for preservation in those areas. Moreover, many incorporated cities in the County have their own preservation programs; to the extent BAHFA proceeds are allocated to those cities, it is likely the County will review and contribute to funding existing initiatives.

Single Family Rental Repair Program

Unincorporated Alameda County has over 8,150 single family homes occupied by renters (see Appendix for data). This large supply of rented single family homes likely contains numerous households earning below 120% AMI (the cap on BAHFA funding for this component). It is also likely, given the age of this housing stock and its rental status, that many homes require moderate to extensive repairs/rehabilitation to bring structures to current code and/or modernize interiors to a sustainable quality. Moreover, it is likely many of these homes also could benefit from upgrades to more energy efficient appliances and systems.

The County could design a repair/rehab program offered to property owners of rented single family homes - in the form of loans, grants, or forgivable loans similar to the ADU program described above - in exchange for maintaining current rents subject to only limited increases for X years after rehab (where the property may otherwise be able to charge a higher rent if not restricted due to improved quality post-rehab).

Acquisition/Rehab of "Small Sites" Multifamily Properties

This program is already established in the City of San Francisco. The program responds directly to the need to preserve small multifamily rental buildings, which are acquired at market rates, rehabilitated as needed (typically moderate rehab level), and re-rented primarily to existing tenants with rent-restricted affordable rents. In some cases, this concept has also been paired around the US with Tenant Opportunities to Purchase Acts (TOPA), a type of local legislation that gives tenants in a building a right of first refusal or similar opportunity to organize and purchase their rental building prior to open market sale. This strategy fosters tenant ownership opportunities, along with enhanced tenant governance. The East Bay Community Law Center has been championing the TOPA concept for several years and may be a partner in this type of program.

Since the BAHFA funding for preservation can be used for rental or ownership housing and can serve up to 120% AMI households, a program designed to preserve existing rentals at affordable rent levels, and/or convert to ownership at affordable purchase prices, can be considered for unincorporated Alameda County areas.

Increased Funding and Technical Assistance Support for Community Land Trusts

This recommendation is related to the types of organization that can effectively implement preservation programs. Although traditional non-profit housing development organizations can be strong implementation partners, another option is to increase support for preservation of existing units at affordable rent or ownership levels is through a Community Land Trust (CLT). These organizations are typically community-based, and serve a specific constituency in a local community. This connection to the local community can be key to building trust, creating specific targeted projects (such as conversion of existing buildings from rental to ownership units), and/or tailoring smaller project governance structures. CLTs in general often start small, with limited staffing and funding. Alameda County has several small CLTs which may benefit from expanded public funding and technical assistance support.

Recommendations for Protection

This set of strategies is also framed to focus primarily on unincorporated Alameda County, again because most incorporated cities already have active protection programs for tenants or are considering them.

Expand Alameda County Housing Secure

As noted previously, Alameda County operates a successful tenant protection suite of services, called Alameda County Housing Secure. Funding from sources such as BAHFA would serve to expand this program to more tenants offering as needed pre-eviction and eviction legal services, mediation between tenants and landlords, and flexible financial assistance such as funding missed rent payments or providing emergency vouchers upon eviction. A steady source of funding would enhance program effectiveness and expand its ability to serve clients.

These services could also be expanded to offer financial assistance to those exiting incarceration, a group that often faces severe housing insecurity until more stabilized situations can be accomplished. It should be noted that although Alameda County does not currently have a “right to counsel,” meaning that applicants for Housing Secure have been turned away, additional funding allocated through BAHFA could move the County closer to meeting a “right to counsel” goal.

Rent Stabilization/Just Cause Eviction Ordinance

This strategy, already implemented in many of Alameda County’s incorporated jurisdictions, would be initiated with a study of rent stabilization and just cause eviction ordinances and programs. Although AB 1482, a statewide tenant rent cap law, has been recently adopted, it has several key weaknesses that could also be refined locally, including a too-high rent increase cap of 10% (whereas most local rent stabilization ordinances cap at CPI or equivalent plus recapture of specific capital improvement costs). Also, AB 1482 does not apply to single family rental homes, which are prevalent in unincorporated Alameda County and could be addressed through local legislation. Finally, the just cause (sometimes called “good cause”) component, usually paired or incorporated into the same type of local legislation, limits legal reasons for eviction to “good” reasons only, such as lack of rent payment, but prevents other currently allowable eviction reasons.

Appendix A: Data Tables

Appendix A1: Current Population and Growth 2000 - 2021

Geography	Population 2000	Population 2010	Population 2021	% Pop Change 2000-2010	% Pop Change 2010-2021	% Pop Change 2000-2021
Alameda County	1,443,741	1,510,271	1,673,133	4.6%	10.8%	15.9%
Bay Area Region	6,783,760	7,150,739	7,740,331	5.4%	8.2%	14.1%
California	33,871,648	37,253,956	39,455,353	10.0%	5.9%	16.5%
Alameda	72,259	73,812	78,320	2.1%	6.1%	8.4%
Albany	16,444	18,539	19,958	12.7%	7.7%	21.4%
Berkeley	102,743	112,580	119,607	9.6%	6.2%	16.4%
Dublin	29,973	46,036	69,818	53.6%	51.7%	132.9%
Emeryville	6,882	10,080	12,747	46.5%	26.5%	85.2%
Fremont	203,413	214,089	231,502	5.2%	8.1%	13.8%
Hayward	140,030	144,186	162,254	3.0%	12.5%	15.9%
Livermore	73,345	80,968	88,403	10.4%	9.2%	20.5%
Newark	42,471	42,573	47,815	0.2%	12.3%	12.6%
Oakland	399,484	390,724	437,548	-2.2%	12.0%	9.5%
Piedmont	10,952	10,667	11,368	-2.6%	6.6%	3.8%
Pleasanton	63,654	70,285	79,558	10.4%	13.2%	25.0%
San Leandro	79,452	84,950	91,176	6.9%	7.3%	14.8%
Union City	66,869	69,516	70,828	4.0%	1.9%	5.9%
Ashland CDP	20,793	21,925	23,640	5.4%	7.8%	13.7%
Castro Valley CDP	57,292	61,388	66,324	7.1%	8.0%	15.8%
Cherryland CDP	13,837	14,728	15,552	6.4%	5.6%	12.4%
Fairview CDP	9,470	10,003	11,050	5.6%	10.5%	16.7%
San Lorenzo CDP	21,898	23,452	30,420	7.1%	29.7%	38.9%
Sunol CDP	1,332	913	799	-31.5%	-12.5%	-40.0%
Uninc. Balance	11,148	8,857	4,446	-20.6%	-49.8%	-60.1%
Total	1,443,741	1,510,271	1,673,133	4.6%	10.8%	15.9%

Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey, 2017-2021

Appendix A2: Current Population by Age

	Median Age
Alameda County	38.0
Bay Area Region	39.1
California	37.0
Alameda	40.6
Albany	36.6
Berkeley	32.1
Dublin	36.5
Emeryville	34.8
Fremont	38.4
Hayward	36.6
Livermore	40.4
Newark	36.5
Oakland	36.9
Piedmont	45.4
Pleasanton	41.1
San Leandro	40.9
Union City	40.8
Ashland CDP	36.1
Castro Valley CDP	42.4
Cherryland CDP	38.7
Fairview CDP	46.6
San Lorenzo CDP	39.0
Sunol CDP	50.9
Unincorporated Balance	51.5

Sources: American Community Survey, 2017-2021
The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Appendix A3: Population by Race, 2000 - 2021

	% Hispanic or Latino		% White alone		% Black alone		% Asian alone		% American Indian and Alaska Native alone		% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone		% Some other race alone		% Two or more races	
	2000	2021	2000	2021	2000	2021	2000	2021	2000	2021	2000	2021	2000	2021	2000	2021
Alameda County	19.0%	22.4%	40.9%	29.9%	14.6%	9.9%	20.3%	31.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%	3.9%	4.9%
Bay Area Region	19.4%	23.7%	50.0%	37.6%	7.3%	5.7%	18.8%	27.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	3.3%	4.7%
California	32.4%	39.5%	46.7%	35.8%	6.4%	5.4%	10.8%	14.7%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	2.7%	3.6%
Alameda	9.3%	12.4%	52.5%	42.1%	6.0%	6.0%	26.0%	31.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	1.1%	4.8%	6.6%
Albany	8.0%	12.9%	57.5%	44.3%	3.9%	4.1%	24.9%	28.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	1.5%	4.7%	8.1%
Berkeley	9.7%	12.0%	55.2%	53.0%	13.3%	7.3%	16.3%	20.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.6%	0.7%	4.5%	6.2%
Dublin	13.5%	9.6%	62.3%	28.8%	10.0%	3.6%	10.2%	52.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	3.0%	4.6%
Emeryville	9.0%	9.5%	41.6%	37.0%	18.9%	17.6%	25.4%	29.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	1.9%	4.1%	4.5%
Fremont	13.5%	12.5%	41.4%	18.6%	3.0%	2.8%	36.8%	61.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	4.5%	3.5%
Hayward	34.2%	38.9%	29.2%	15.9%	10.6%	9.1%	18.7%	28.7%	0.4%	0.3%	1.8%	1.9%	0.5%	0.4%	4.6%	4.8%
Livermore	14.4%	22.8%	74.4%	55.0%	1.5%	1.7%	5.7%	14.7%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	3.1%	5.0%
Newark	28.6%	29.2%	40.3%	22.2%	3.9%	3.4%	21.1%	38.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.9%	1.7%	0.3%	0.4%	4.7%	4.1%
Oakland	21.9%	27.2%	23.5%	28.6%	35.1%	21.6%	15.1%	15.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%	3.2%	5.7%
Piedmont	3.0%	3.2%	76.8%	70.7%	1.2%	1.4%	15.8%	20.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	2.9%	3.9%
Pleasanton	7.9%	10.8%	75.8%	43.5%	1.3%	1.8%	11.6%	38.9%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	2.8%	4.0%
San Leandro	20.1%	27.6%	42.3%	21.5%	9.6%	9.7%	22.7%	34.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.8%	1.6%	0.2%	0.5%	3.8%	4.4%
Union City	24.0%	20.3%	20.4%	14.7%	6.5%	4.7%	43.0%	55.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.3%	0.2%	4.8%	3.8%
Ashland CDP	32.5%	46.1%	26.9%	10.3%	19.6%	14.5%	14.6%	23.0%	0.8%	0.6%	1.1%	1.0%	0.3%	1.4%	4.4%	3.1%
Castro Valley CDP	12.2%	16.9%	64.6%	36.7%	5.0%	9.3%	13.4%	31.2%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	3.8%	4.8%
Cherryland CDP	41.7%	54.1%	35.7%	19.9%	9.5%	10.1%	8.0%	11.0%	0.4%	0.0%	1.2%	2.6%	0.2%	0.7%	3.3%	1.5%
Fairview CDP	15.1%	21.2%	48.8%	33.3%	20.1%	19.5%	10.0%	20.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.4%	0.7%	4.7%	5.2%
San Lorenzo CDP	24.7%	42.0%	52.4%	21.0%	2.7%	3.7%	15.2%	28.2%	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	1.1%	0.2%	0.4%	4.0%	3.3%
Sunol CDP	8.7%	5.3%	80.9%	80.2%	0.0%	0.4%	4.8%	11.3%	1.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	2.6%
Unincorporated Balance	18.2%	15.9%	55.7%	72.3%	6.0%	1.4%	15.3%	7.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	3.7%	3.1%

Source: American Community Survey, 2017-2021

Appendix A4: Household Growth 2000 – 2021

	Households 2000	Households 2010	Households 2021	% Change in Households, 2000-2010	% Change in Households, 2010-2021	% Change in Households, 2000-2021
Alameda County	523,366	545,138	581,683	4.2%	6.7%	11.1%
Bay Area Region	2,466,019	2,608,023	2,754,719	5.8%	5.6%	11.7%
California	11,502,870	12,577,498	13,217,586	9.3%	5.1%	14.9%
Alameda	30,226	30,123	30,500	-0.3%	1.3%	0.9%
Albany	7,011	7,401	7,586	5.6%	2.5%	8.2%
Berkeley	44,955	46,029	44,195	2.4%	-4.0%	-1.7%
Dublin	9,325	14,913	22,946	59.9%	53.9%	146.1%
Emeryville	3,975	5,694	7,256	43.2%	27.4%	82.5%
Fremont	68,237	71,004	74,629	4.1%	5.1%	9.4%
Hayward	44,804	45,365	49,524	1.3%	9.2%	10.5%
Livermore	26,123	29,134	31,094	11.5%	6.7%	19.0%
Newark	12,992	12,972	14,354	-0.2%	10.7%	10.5%
Oakland	150,790	153,791	167,307	2.0%	8.8%	11.0%
Piedmont	3,804	3,801	3,821	-0.1%	0.5%	0.4%
Pleasanton	23,311	25,245	27,733	8.3%	9.9%	19.0%
San Leandro	30,642	30,717	30,809	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%
Union City	18,642	20,433	20,800	9.6%	1.8%	11.6%
Subtotal	474,837	496,622	532,554	4.6%	7.2%	12.2%
Ashland CDP	7,223	7,270	7,575	0.7%	4.2%	4.9%
Castro Valley CDP	21,606	22,348	22,467	3.4%	0.5%	4.0%
Cherryland CDP	4,658	4,643	4,769	-0.3%	2.7%	2.4%
Fairview CDP	3,281	3,490	3,660	6.4%	4.9%	11.6%
San Lorenzo CDP	7,500	7,425	8,939	-1.0%	20.4%	19.2%
Sunol CDP	483	362	296	-25.1%	-18.2%	-38.7%
Unincorporated Balance	3,778	2,978	1,423	-21.2%	-52.2%	-62.3%
Subtotal	48,529	48,516	49,129	-0.0%	1.3%	1.2%
Total	523,366	545,138	581,683	4.2%	6.7%	11.1%

Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey, 2017-2021

Appendix A5: Average Household Size, 2000 - 2021

	Average Household Size 2000	Average Household Size 2010	Average Household Size 2021	% Change Average Household Size 2000-2010	% Change Average Household Size 2010-2021	% Change Average Household Size 2000-2021
Alameda County	2.71	2.70	2.82	-0.4%	4.4%	4.1%
Bay Area Region	2.69	2.69	2.76	-0.1%	2.6%	2.5%
California	2.87	2.90	2.92	1.0%	0.7%	1.7%
Cities						
Alameda	2.35	2.40	2.53	2.1%	5.4%	7.7%
Albany	2.34	2.49	2.62	6.4%	5.2%	12.0%
Berkeley	2.16	2.17	2.40	0.5%	10.6%	11.1%
Dublin	2.65	2.70	2.98	1.9%	10.4%	12.5%
Emeryville	1.71	1.76	1.76	2.9%	0.0%	2.9%
Fremont	2.96	2.99	3.08	1.0%	3.0%	4.1%
Hayward	3.08	3.12	3.21	1.3%	2.9%	4.2%
Livermore	2.8	2.76	2.83	-1.4%	2.5%	1.1%
Newark	3.26	3.27	3.32	0.3%	1.5%	1.8%
Oakland	2.6	2.49	2.58	-4.2%	3.6%	-0.8%
Piedmont	2.88	2.81	2.97	-2.4%	5.7%	3.1%
Pleasanton	2.72	2.77	2.86	1.8%	3.2%	5.1%
San Leandro	2.57	2.74	2.94	6.6%	7.3%	14.4%
Union City	3.57	3.38	3.37	-5.3%	-0.3%	-5.6%
Subtotal						
Unincorporated Areas						
Ashland CDP	2.83	2.99	3.10	5.7%	3.7%	9.5%
Castro Valley CDP	2.58	2.69	2.9	4.3%	7.8%	12.4%
Cherryland CDP	2.87	3.07	3.15	7.0%	2.6%	9.8%
Fairview CDP	2.84	2.82	2.97	-0.7%	5.3%	4.6%
San Lorenzo CDP	2.92	3.15	3.38	7.9%	7.3%	15.8%
Sunol CDP	2.76	2.52	2.70	-8.7%	7.1%	-2.2%
Balance	2.89	2.87	3.04	-0.7%	5.9%	5.2%
Subtotal						

Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey, 2017-2021

Appendix A6: Households with Children Under 18 and Seniors 65+, 2000 - 2021

	2000	2021	2000	2021
	% HHs w Children Under 18	% HHs w Children Under 18	% of HH with Seniors	% of HH with Seniors
Alameda County	36.5%	32.9%	20.5%	27.9%
Bay Area Region	34.7%	31.4%	22.0%	30.2%
California	39.7%	33.8%	22.3%	30.1%
Cities				
Alameda	30.0%	31.2%	22.7%	30.3%
Albany	34.5%	40.9%	19.9%	25.3%
Berkeley	19.8%	19.3%	17.7%	29.5%
Dublin	37.7%	46.8%	11.2%	19.4%
Emeryville	12.3%	8.8%	14.5%	15.1%
Fremont	43.5%	43.8%	17.5%	26.3%
Hayward	42.5%	37.0%	22.2%	28.7%
Livermore	42.9%	35.4%	15.2%	26.6%
Newark	45.8%	37.9%	19.0%	27.5%
Oakland	33.5%	26.8%	20.9%	25.9%
Piedmont	48.5%	44.2%	27.7%	41.0%
Pleasanton	42.5%	39.4%	14.8%	29.0%
San Leandro	32.4%	30.1%	29.9%	33.5%
Union City	51.7%	35.2%	20.7%	34.9%
Unincorporated CDPs				
Ashland CDP	44.2%	39.1%	18.4%	23.2%
Castro Valley CDP	35.1%	34.5%	26.0%	34.0%
Cherryland CDP	41.7%	33.4%	17.9%	25.3%
Fairview CDP	37.4%	28.3%	23.9%	41.9%
San Lorenzo CDP	39.4%	38.4%	34.2%	35.1%
Sunol CDP	35.8%	27.7%	21.5%	33.4%
Uninc. Balance	42.4%	32.3%	17.2%	55.7%

Sources: American Community Survey, 2000-2021

Appendix A7: Median Household Income Trends, 2000 – 2021 (Adjusted for Inflation)

	Median Household Income 2000 (in 2021\$)	Median Household Income 2010 (in 2021\$)	Median Household Income 2021	% Change in Real Median Income 2000-2010	% Change in Real Median Income 2010-2021	% Change in Real Median Income 2000-2021
Alameda County	\$99,830.	\$94,473.	\$112,017.	-5.4%	18.6%	12.2%
Bay Area Region	\$113,217.	\$104,382.	\$118,931.	-7.8%	13.9%	5.0%
California	\$84,906.	\$82,898.	\$84,097.	-2.4%	1.4%	-1.0%
Alameda	\$100,214.	\$101,059.	\$113,339.	0.8%	12.2%	13.1%
Albany	\$98,510.	\$98,027.	\$113,602.	-0.5%	15.9%	15.3%
Berkeley	\$79,437.	\$79,813.	\$97,834.	0.5%	22.6%	23.2%
Dublin	\$138,864.	\$146,718.	\$171,168.	5.7%	16.7%	23.3%
Emeryville	\$80,049.	\$83,177.	\$109,960.	3.9%	32.2%	37.4%
Fremont	\$136,442.	\$131,104.	\$153,475.	-3.9%	17.1%	12.5%
Hayward	\$91,285.	\$83,423.	\$98,837.	-8.6%	18.5%	8.3%
Livermore	\$133,623.	\$127,974.	\$139,904.	-4.2%	9.3%	4.7%
Newark	\$124,405.	\$110,769.	\$144,011.	-11.0%	30.0%	15.8%
Oakland	\$71,669.	\$67,700.	\$85,628.	-5.5%	26.5%	19.5%
Piedmont	\$235,079.	\$231,028.	\$250,000.	-1.7%	8.2%	6.3%
Pleasanton	\$162,240.	\$156,840.	\$167,932.	-3.3%	7.1%	3.5%
San Leandro	\$91,095.	\$85,248.	\$89,663.	-6.4%	5.2%	-1.6%
Union City	\$128,380.	\$113,869.	\$127,828.	-11.3%	12.3%	-0.4%
Ashland CDP	\$73,370.	\$67,865.	\$71,002.	-7.5%	4.6%	-3.2%
Castro Valley CDP	\$115,688.	\$109,082.	\$124,203.	-5.7%	13.9%	7.4%
Cherryland CDP	\$76,483.	\$68,397.	\$75,470.	-10.6%	10.3%	-1.3%
Fairview CDP	\$136,939.	\$113,183.	\$135,880.	-17.3%	20.1%	-0.8%
San Lorenzo CDP	\$100,868.	\$96,584.	\$95,903.	-4.2%	-0.7%	-4.9%
Sunol CDP	\$151,359.	\$114,602.	\$171,667.	-24.3%	49.8%	13.4%
Unincorporated Balance	\$133,619.	\$92,513.	\$169,907.	-30.8%	83.7%	27.2%

Adjusted for inflation to 2021 \$.s.

Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF3), American Community Survey, 2006-2010, American Community Survey, 2017-2021
The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Appendix A8: Household Income Distribution

	Less than \$15,000	\$15,000- \$24,999	\$25,000- \$34,999	\$35,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$74,999	\$75,000- \$99,999	\$100,000- \$149,999	\$150,000- \$199,999	\$200,000 or more	Total
Alameda County	6.9%	4.7%	4.9%	6.6%	11.4%	10.6%	17.5%	12.7%	24.7%	100.0%
Bay Area Region	6.2%	4.2%	4.5%	6.6%	11.1%	10.3%	17.4%	12.5%	27.1%	100.0%
California	8.2%	6.2%	6.7%	9.4%	14.7%	12.3%	17.5%	9.9%	15.1%	100.0%
Cities										
Alameda	6.5%	4.3%	5.1%	7.3%	11.3%	10.6%	16.4%	12.1%	26.4%	100.0%
Albany	5.4%	4.0%	3.6%	7.0%	12.7%	12.4%	15.6%	10.8%	28.6%	100.0%
Berkeley	10.6%	5.8%	6.7%	7.3%	10.8%	9.4%	14.8%	10.4%	24.1%	100.0%
Dublin	3.7%	1.2%	1.6%	4.0%	6.8%	8.4%	17.5%	14.7%	42.2%	100.0%
Emeryville	8.8%	4.7%	4.2%	8.2%	11.4%	8.4%	19.0%	10.8%	24.4%	100.0%
Fremont	4.0%	3.3%	2.8%	3.8%	7.8%	8.4%	18.6%	16.3%	35.1%	100.0%
Hayward	5.6%	4.5%	5.3%	7.3%	14.7%	13.2%	21.3%	12.0%	16.2%	100.0%
Livermore	3.6%	2.8%	3.2%	4.4%	11.8%	9.1%	18.7%	15.6%	30.8%	100.0%
Newark	3.3%	2.8%	3.0%	5.2%	7.1%	11.9%	20.5%	15.3%	30.9%	100.0%
Oakland	10.3%	6.6%	6.5%	8.3%	13.0%	11.0%	15.7%	10.5%	18.0%	100.0%
Piedmont	1.7%	2.1%	1.6%	2.5%	5.5%	5.3%	8.7%	8.6%	63.9%	100.0%
Pleasanton	3.9%	2.6%	2.6%	4.0%	7.4%	7.7%	16.1%	15.2%	40.4%	100.0%
San Leandro	8.2%	5.7%	6.9%	8.6%	12.7%	13.5%	18.2%	12.1%	14.2%	100.0%
Union City	4.0%	3.3%	2.5%	5.7%	12.0%	11.2%	19.7%	14.4%	27.2%	100.0%
CDPs										
Ashland CDP	8.0%	10.4%	4.6%	12.2%	17.2%	14.2%	19.0%	7.4%	7.0%	100.0%
Castro Valley CDP	5.1%	2.8%	4.6%	5.6%	11.6%	9.9%	19.2%	15.9%	25.2%	100.0%
Cherryland CDP	8.9%	4.2%	7.6%	9.5%	19.3%	18.2%	13.2%	11.6%	7.6%	100.0%
Fairview CDP	1.1%	1.8%	4.2%	6.4%	6.1%	9.8%	31.4%	18.4%	20.7%	100.0%
San Lorenzo CDP	6.1%	4.3%	5.3%	7.5%	15.8%	14.1%	20.2%	12.7%	14.0%	100.0%
Sunol CDP	2.7%	1.0%	0.7%	2.4%	4.7%	10.8%	20.9%	11.1%	45.6%	100.0%
Unicorp. Balance	4.1%	3.4%	3.5%	2.8%	7.4%	6.5%	17.7%	11.4%	43.1%	100.0%

Sources: American Community Survey, 2017-2021. The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Appendix A9: Household Tenure (2021)

	% Renter Households	% Owner Households	Number of Renters	Number of Owners
Alameda County	46%	54%	268,273	313,410
Bay Area Region	44%	56%	1,200,417	1,554,302
California	45%	55%	5,882,339	7,335,247
Cities				
Alameda	53%	47%	16,023	14,477
Albany	51%	49%	3,846	3,740
Berkeley	57%	43%	25,106	19,089
Dublin	36%	64%	8,169	14,777
Emeryville	72%	28%	5,215	2,041
Fremont	38%	62%	28,459	46,170
Hayward	44%	56%	21,909	27,615
Livermore	28%	72%	8,617	22,477
Newark	32%	68%	4,616	9,738
Oakland	59%	41%	98,218	69,089
Piedmont	12%	88%	454	3,367
Pleasanton	32%	68%	9,003	18,730
San Leandro	43%	57%	13,166	17,643
Union City	34%	66%	7,157	13,643
Subtotal	47%	53%	249,958	282,596
CDPs				
Ashland CDP	62%	38%	4,663	2,912
Castro Valley CDP	28%	72%	6,208	16,259
Cherryland CDP	70%	30%	3,321	1,448
Fairview CDP	21%	79%	761	2,899
San Lorenzo CDP	35%	65%	3,126	5,813
Sunol CDP	16%	84%	47	249
Unincorp. Balance	13%	87%	189	1,234
Subtotal	37%	63%	18,315	30,814

Source: American Community Survey 2017-2021.

Appendix A10: Household Tenure by Race

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	California					California					California				
	2000	2019	Change in			2000	2019	Change in			2000	2019	Change in		
Renter Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	362,515	15%	474,800	21%	5%	135,575	29%	189,360	37%	7%	126,910	25%	210,145	28%	3%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	312,665	13%	314,725	14%	0%	75,935	16%	93,995	18%	2%	74,555	15%	102,465	14%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	435,270	19%	418,345	18%	0%	88,585	19%	95,540	18%	-1%	86,725	17%	124,085	17%	-1%
Household Income >80% AMI	1,235,765	53%	1,074,050	47%	-6%	164,105	35%	138,095	27%	-9%	218,735	43%	310,835	42%	-2%
Total	2,346,215	100%	2,281,920	100%		464,200	100%	516,990	100%		506,925	100%	747,530	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		29%		35%			46%		55%			40%		42%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		47%		53%			65%		73%			57%		58%	

	Bay Area					Bay Area					Bay Area				
	2000	2019	Change in			2000	2019	Change in			2000	2019	Change in		
Renter Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	81,630	15%	90,580	18%	3%	35,449	33%	45,195	41%	8%	44,484	26%	69,265	26%	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	65,035	12%	56,500	11%	-1%	18,660	17%	20,105	18%	1%	22,775	13%	29,234	11%	-2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	92,710	17%	74,565	15%	-2%	19,554	18%	16,675	15%	-3%	25,848	15%	35,640	13%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	303,085	56%	273,665	55%	-1%	34,345	32%	29,039	26%	-6%	78,593	46%	131,369	49%	4%
Total	542,460	100%	495,310	100%		108,008	100%	111,014	100%		171,700	100%	265,508	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		27%		30%			50%		59%			39%		37%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		44%		45%			68%		74%			54%		51%	

	Alameda County					Alameda County					Alameda County				
	2000	2019	Change in			2000	2019	Change in			2000	2019	Change in		
Renter Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	15,600	16%	15,670	18%	2%	17,505	34%	20,035	41%	7%	11,645	29%	16,650	27%	-2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	12,290	13%	10,540	12%	-1%	9,110	18%	8,990	19%	1%	5,620	14%	6,655	11%	-3%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	15,235	16%	12,760	15%	-1%	9,145	18%	7,320	15%	-3%	5,745	14%	7,470	12%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	52,535	55%	48,745	56%	1%	15,915	31%	12,195	25%	-6%	16,910	42%	30,805	50%	8%
Total	95,660	100%	87,715	100%		51,675	100%	48,540	100%		39,920	100%	61,580	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		29%		30%			52%		60%			43%		38%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		45%		44%			69%		75%			58%		50%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	American Indian					Hispanic					All Other Races				
	California					California					California				
Renter Households	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
Household Income <=30% AMI	7,975	24%	8,095	34%	9%	330,985	23%	620,925	29%	6%	38,240	23%	44,570	25%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	5,700	17%	4,120	17%	0%	318,950	22%	509,595	24%	2%	25,920	16%	26,085	15%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	6,610	20%	4,535	19%	-1%	353,710	25%	490,350	23%	-2%	31,400	19%	33,400	19%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	12,715	39%	7,335	30%	-8%	439,185	30%	520,475	24%	-6%	67,905	42%	73,765	41%	0%
Total	33,000	100%	24,085	100%		1,442,830	100%	2,141,345	100%		163,465	100%	177,820	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		41%		51%			45%		53%			39%		40%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		61%		70%			70%		76%			58%		59%	
	Bay Area					Bay Area					Bay Area				
Renter Households	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,404	25%	1,390	37%	11%	38,410	22%	76,035	28%	6%	8,957	22%	11,705	24%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	975	18%	363	10%	-8%	36,855	21%	63,555	23%	2%	5,930	15%	6,198	13%	-2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	970	18%	599	16%	-2%	38,495	22%	56,975	21%	-1%	7,423	19%	8,146	17%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	2,174	39%	1,428	38%	-2%	60,625	35%	78,870	29%	-6%	17,601	44%	22,369	46%	2%
Total	5,523	100%	3,780	100%		174,385	100%	275,435	100%		39,911	100%	48,418	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		43%		46%			43%		51%			37%		37%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		61%		62%			65%		71%			56%		54%	
	Alameda County					Alameda County					Alameda County				
Renter Households	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
Household Income <=30% AMI	335	23%	455	37%	14%	7,690	21%	13,865	24%	4%	2,900	26%	2,665	22%	-4%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	320	22%	145	12%	-10%	7,410	20%	12,020	21%	1%	1,680	15%	1,895	16%	1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	175	12%	190	15%	3%	8,065	22%	12,185	21%	0%	1,905	17%	2,025	17%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	610	42%	440	36%	-7%	14,090	38%	19,300	34%	-4%	4,630	42%	5,265	44%	3%
Total	1,440	100%	1,230	100%		37,255	100%	57,370	100%		11,115	100%	11,850	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		45%		49%			41%		45%			41%		38%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		58%		64%			62%		66%			58%		56%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	Alameda City					Alameda City					Alameda City				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,230	14%	1,220	16%	3%	370	27%	730	37%	9%	585	20%	755	23%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,090	12%	825	11%	-1%	195	14%	305	15%	1%	404	14%	385	12%	-2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,535	17%	1,045	14%	-3%	250	19%	230	12%	-7%	570	20%	585	17%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	5,190	57%	4,395	59%	1%	535	40%	730	37%	-3%	1,325	46%	1,620	48%	2%
Total	9,045	100%	7,485	100%		1,350	100%	1,995	100%		2,884	100%	3,345	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		26%		27%			42%		52%			34%		34%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		43%		41%			60%		63%			54%		52%	
	Albany					Albany					Albany				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	250	12%	295	17%	5%	25	16%	25	19%	4%	220	25%	270	21%	-4%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	200	10%	275	16%	6%	25	16%	50	38%	23%	159	18%	320	25%	7%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	365	18%	255	15%	-3%	45	28%	0	0%	-28%	180	20%	155	12%	-8%
Household Income >80% AMI	1,190	59%	875	51%	-8%	65	41%	55	42%	2%	330	37%	535	42%	5%
Total	2,005	100%	1,700	100%		160	100%	130	100%		889	100%	1,280	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		22%		34%			31%		58%			43%		46%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		41%		49%			59%		58%			63%		58%	
	Berkeley					Berkeley					Berkeley				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	3,590	27%	3,360	25%	-2%	1,475	42%	1,320	51%	9%	2,630	52%	2,690	46%	-5%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	2,010	15%	1,850	14%	-1%	645	18%	530	20%	2%	795	16%	765	13%	-2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	2,140	16%	1,910	14%	-2%	450	13%	295	11%	-1%	480	9%	809	14%	4%
Household Income >80% AMI	5,725	43%	6,335	47%	5%	965	27%	460	18%	-10%	1,179	23%	1,540	27%	3%
Total	13,465	100%	13,455	100%		3,535	100%	2,605	100%		5,084	100%	5,804	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		42%		39%			60%		71%			67%		60%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		57%		53%			73%		82%			77%		73%	
	Dublin					Dublin					Dublin				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	100	4%	290	10%	6%	0	0%	75	20%	20%	15	5%	235	10%	5%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	230	10%	310	11%	1%	25	31%	30	8%	-23%	54	17%	84	4%	-14%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	260	11%	350	12%	1%	0	0%	35	9%	9%	45	14%	205	9%	-6%
Household Income >80% AMI	1,735	75%	1,985	68%	-7%	55	69%	240	63%	-6%	200	64%	1,840	78%	14%
Total	2,325	100%	2,935	100%		80	100%	380	100%		314	100%	2,364	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		14%		20%			31%		28%			22%		13%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		25%		32%			31%		37%			36%		22%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	American Indian					Hispanic					All Other Races				
	Alameda City					Alameda City					Alameda City				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	24	18%	15	65%	47%	220	14%	375	17%	3%	210	28%	150	18%	-10%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	25	19%	4	17%	-2%	215	14%	385	18%	4%	85	11%	126	15%	4%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	19	14%	0	0%	-14%	350	23%	385	18%	-5%	115	15%	200	24%	9%
Household Income >80% AMI	64	48%	4	17%	-31%	770	50%	1,015	47%	-3%	333	45%	351	42%	-2%
Total	132	100%	23	100%		1,555	100%	2,160	100%		743	100%	827	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		37%		83%			28%		35%			40%		33%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		52%		83%			50%		53%			55%		58%	
	Albany					Albany					Albany				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	4	50%	4	22%	-28%	55	21%	149	22%	2%	8	9%	47	30%	21%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	34	13%	110	17%	4%	0	0%	5	3%	3%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	4	22%	22%	25	10%	95	14%	5%	14	16%	16	10%	-6%
Household Income >80% AMI	4	50%	10	56%	6%	149	57%	310	47%	-10%	66	75%	90	57%	-18%
Total	8	100%	18	100%		263	100%	664	100%		88	100%	158	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		50%		22%			34%		39%			9%		33%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		50%		44%			43%		53%			25%		43%	
	Berkeley					Berkeley					Berkeley				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	65	69%	95	66%	-3%	655	30%	825	32%	2%	449	33%	380	30%	-3%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	25	27%	0	0%	-27%	350	16%	570	22%	6%	265	19%	120	9%	-10%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	24	17%	17%	470	22%	340	13%	-8%	225	17%	222	17%	1%
Household Income >80% AMI	4	4%	25	17%	13%	700	32%	845	33%	1%	424	31%	565	44%	13%
Total	94	100%	144	100%		2,175	100%	2,580	100%		1,363	100%	1,287	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		96%		66%			46%		54%			52%		39%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		96%		83%			68%		67%			69%		56%	
	Dublin					Dublin					Dublin				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	10	29%	29%	15	4%	45	5%	1%	14	8%	70	16%	8%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	44	13%	70	8%	-5%	20	12%	106	24%	12%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	55	16%	195	23%	7%	64	37%	20	5%	-33%
Household Income >80% AMI	14	100%	25	71%	-29%	224	66%	530	63%	-3%	74	43%	245	56%	13%
Total	14	100%	35	100%		338	100%	840	100%		172	100%	441	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%		29%			17%		14%			20%		40%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		0%		29%			34%		37%			57%		44%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	Emeryville					Emeryville					Emeryville				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	175	17%	210	13%	-4%	120	23%	340	48%	25%	210	30%	140	12%	-18%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	140	13%	140	9%	-5%	180	34%	120	17%	-17%	65	9%	85	7%	-2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	110	11%	220	13%	3%	110	21%	45	6%	-14%	120	17%	90	8%	-9%
Household Income >80% AMI	615	59%	1,075	65%	6%	120	23%	210	29%	7%	310	44%	835	73%	29%
Total	1,040	100%	1,645	100%		530	100%	715	100%		705	100%	1,150	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		30%		21%			57%		64%			39%		20%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		41%		35%			77%		71%			56%		27%	
	Fremont					Fremont					Fremont				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,185	11%	1,170	16%	5%	100	9%	210	15%	7%	885	11%	1,630	10%	-1%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	835	8%	720	10%	2%	120	10%	155	11%	1%	575	7%	1,080	7%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,280	12%	1,140	16%	4%	160	14%	170	13%	-1%	1,030	13%	1,520	9%	-3%
Household Income >80% AMI	7,135	68%	4,200	58%	-10%	780	67%	820	61%	-7%	5,615	69%	11,810	74%	4%
Total	10,435	100%	7,230	100%		1,160	100%	1,355	100%		8,105	100%	16,040	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		19%		26%			19%		27%			18%		17%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		32%		42%			33%		39%			31%		26%	
	Hayward					Hayward					Hayward				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,115	17%	800	19%	2%	610	17%	980	25%	8%	765	23%	920	23%	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	915	14%	490	12%	-2%	630	17%	700	18%	1%	580	17%	560	14%	-3%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,275	19%	725	17%	-2%	735	20%	1,000	26%	5%	580	17%	810	20%	3%
Household Income >80% AMI	3,355	50%	2,180	52%	2%	1,650	46%	1,225	31%	-14%	1,465	43%	1,755	43%	0%
Total	6,660	100%	4,195	100%		3,625	100%	3,905	100%		3,390	100%	4,045	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		30%		31%			34%		43%			40%	40%	37%	37%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		50%		48%			54%		69%			57%	57%	57%	57%
	Livermore					Livermore					Livermore				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	720	14%	985	19%	6%	75	54%	100	45%	-10%	75	19%	205	30%	11%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	745	14%	685	13%	-1%	14	10%	4	2%	-8%	60	16%	85	13%	-3%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	950	18%	695	13%	-4%	19	14%	55	25%	11%	80	21%	135	20%	-1%
Household Income >80% AMI	2,905	55%	2,795	54%	0%	30	22%	65	29%	7%	170	44%	250	37%	-7%
Total	5,320	100%	5,160	100%		138	100%	224	100%		385	100%	675	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		28%		32%			64%		46%			35%		43%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		45%		46%			78%		71%			56%		63%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	American Indian					Hispanic					All Other Races				
	Emeryville					Emeryville					Emeryville				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	20	100%	0	0%	-100%	14	9%	75	16%	7%	20	31%	60	18%	-13%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	55	34%	45	9%	-24%	0	0%	65	19%	19%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	30	18%	20	4%	-14%	4	6%	35	10%	4%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	0%	4	100%	100%	65	40%	340	71%	31%	40	63%	176	52%	-10%
Total	20	100%	4	100%		164	100%	480	100%		64	100%	336	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		100%		0%					42%	25%				37%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		100%		0%					60%	29%				48%	
	Fremont					Fremont					Fremont				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	35	21%	21%	265	9%	355	9%	-1%	435	30%	235	25%	-5%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	60	32%	4	2%	-30%	445	16%	570	14%	-2%	150	10%	81	9%	-2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	15	8%	25	15%	7%	585	20%	1,170	29%	8%	164	11%	200	22%	10%
Household Income >80% AMI	110	59%	105	62%	3%	1,560	55%	1,955	48%	-6%	700	48%	410	44%	-4%
Total	185	100%	169	100%		2,855	100%	4,050	100%		1,449	100%	926	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		32%		23%			25%		23%			40%		34%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		41%		38%			45%		52%			52%		56%	
	Hayward					Hayward					Hayward				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	14	12%	50	43%	31%	1,020	17%	1,820	20%	3%	264	21%	215	21%	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	15	13%	0	0%	-13%	1,205	20%	2,260	25%	4%	210	17%	160	16%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	15	13%	0	0%	-13%	1,335	23%	2,120	23%	0%	285	23%	210	21%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	70	61%	65	57%	-5%	2,350	40%	3,010	33%	-7%	485	39%	435	43%	4%
Total	114	100%	115	100%		5,910	100%	9,210	100%		1,244	100%	1,020	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		25%		43%			38%		44%			38%		37%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		39%		43%			60%		67%			61%		57%	
	Livermore					Livermore					Livermore				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	10	17%	0	0%	-17%	185	17%	470	19%	2%	70	25%	0	0%	-25%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10	17%	4	100%	83%	185	17%	525	21%	4%	10	4%	147	71%	67%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	215	20%	565	23%	3%	35	13%	20	10%	-3%
Household Income >80% AMI	39	66%	0	0%	-66%	490	46%	920	37%	-8%	160	58%	40	19%	-39%
Total	59	100%	4	100%		1,075	100%	2,480	100%		275	100%	207	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		34%		100%			34%		40%			29%		71%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		34%		100%			54%		63%			42%		81%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	Newark					Newark					Newark				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	210	14%	175	18%	4%	14	7%	70	26%	19%	215	26%	240	20%	-6%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	125	8%	50	5%	-3%	20	11%	0	0%	-11%	69	8%	50	4%	-4%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	220	14%	125	13%	-2%	35	19%	4	1%	-17%	125	15%	154	13%	-3%
Household Income >80% AMI	980	64%	634	64%	1%	120	63%	195	72%	9%	409	50%	765	63%	13%
Total	1,535	100%	984	100%		189	100%	269	100%		818	100%	1,209	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		22%		23%			18%		26%			35%		24%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		36%		36%			37%		28%			50%		37%	
	Oakland					Oakland					Oakland				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	4,030	17%	4,165	15%	-2%	13,920	39%	13,820	48%	9%	5,115	44%	7,050	48%	5%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	3,450	15%	2,740	10%	-5%	6,460	18%	5,405	19%	1%	2,209	19%	1,710	12%	-7%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	3,645	16%	4,035	15%	-1%	6,155	17%	3,905	14%	-4%	1,579	13%	1,600	11%	-3%
Household Income >80% AMI	12,290	52%	16,675	60%	8%	8,980	25%	5,750	20%	-5%	2,835	24%	4,280	29%	5%
Total	23,415	100%	27,615	100%		35,515	100%	28,880	100%		11,738	100%	14,640	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		32%		25%			57%		67%			62%		60%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		48%		40%			75%		80%			76%		71%	
	Piedmont					Piedmont					Piedmont				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	30	10%	19	5%	-5%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	30	10%	30	8%	-2%	0	#DIV/0!	15	60%	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	8	3%	4	1%	-2%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	#DIV/0!	10	45%	0	0%	-45%
Household Income >80% AMI	235	78%	334	86%	9%	0	#DIV/0!	10	40%	#DIV/0!	12	55%	35	100%	45%
Total	303	100%	387	100%		0	#DIV/0!	25	100%		22	100%	35	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		20%		13%			#DIV/0!		60%			0%		0%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		22%		14%			#DIV/0!		60%			45%		0%	
	Pleasanton					Pleasanton					Pleasanton				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	395	9%	695	15%	7%	0	0%	50	17%	17%	75	12%	425	17%	5%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	430	9%	510	11%	2%	4	4%	55	19%	15%	44	7%	140	6%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	455	10%	435	10%	0%	20	18%	80	28%	10%	45	7%	180	7%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	3,305	72%	2,860	64%	-9%	90	79%	105	36%	-43%	484	75%	1,785	71%	-4%
Total	4,585	100%	4,500	100%		114	100%	290	100%		648	100%	2,530	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		18%		27%			4%		36%			18%		22%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		28%		36%			21%		64%			25%		29%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	American Indian					Hispanic					All Other Races				
	Newark					Newark					Newark				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	90	9%	225	13%	4%	50	20%	10	6%	-13%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10	100%	0	0%	-100%	185	19%	310	18%	-1%	35	14%	45	28%	15%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	280	28%	450	26%	-3%	53	21%	17	11%	-10%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	0%	20	100%	100%	430	44%	755	43%	0%	118	46%	86	54%	8%
Total	10	100%	20	100%		985	100%	1,740	100%		256	100%	158	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		100%		0%			28%		31%			33%		35%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		100%		0%			56%		57%			54%		46%	
	Oakland					Oakland					Oakland				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	110	27%	170	35%	7%	3,880	28%	7,035	35%	7%	1,010	30%	1,305	29%	-1%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	94	23%	95	19%	-4%	3,400	25%	4,425	22%	-3%	635	19%	625	14%	-5%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	45	11%	89	18%	7%	2,830	20%	3,675	18%	-2%	565	17%	671	15%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	154	38%	135	28%	-11%	3,715	27%	4,990	25%	-2%	1,203	35%	1,890	42%	7%
Total	403	100%	489	100%		13,825	100%	20,125	100%		3,413	100%	4,491	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		51%		54%			53%		57%			48%		43%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		62%		72%			73%		75%			65%		58%	
	Piedmont					Piedmont					Piedmont				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	#DIV/0!		0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	#DIV/0!		0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	#DIV/0!		0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	#DIV/0!		0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	4	100%	10	100%	0%	14	100%	1	100%	0%
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!		4	100%	10	100%		14	100%	1	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!			0%		0%			0%		0%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!			0%		0%			0%		0%	
	Pleasanton					Pleasanton					Pleasanton				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	20	50%	0	0%	-50%	70	11%	175	17%	6%	4	2%	75	22%	20%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	4	20%	20%	75	12%	160	15%	3%	20	12%	56	16%	5%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	4	20%	20%	140	22%	85	8%	-14%	20	12%	1	0%	-11%
Household Income >80% AMI	20	50%	12	60%	10%	350	55%	625	60%	5%	128	74%	208	61%	-13%
Total	40	100%	20	100%		635	100%	1,045	100%		172	100%	340	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		50%		20%			23%		32%			14%		39%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		50%		40%			45%		40%			26%		39%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	San Leandro					San Leandro					San Leandro				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	985	19%	680	21%	2%	265	12%	820	26%	13%	210	13%	920	32%	19%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	930	18%	770	24%	6%	275	13%	635	20%	7%	230	14%	705	24%	10%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,105	21%	525	16%	-5%	535	25%	690	22%	-3%	335	21%	410	14%	-7%
Household Income >80% AMI	2,275	43%	1,300	40%	-3%	1,095	50%	1,060	33%	-17%	835	52%	850	29%	-22%
Total	5,295	100%	3,275	100%		2,170	100%	3,205	100%		1,610	100%	2,885	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		36%		44%			25%		45%			27%		56%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		57%		60%			50%		67%			48%		71%	
	Union City					Union City					Union City				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	170	13%	340	24%	11%	95	17%	155	20%	3%	368	20%	344	10%	-10%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	155	12%	325	23%	11%	74	13%	160	21%	7%	180	10%	405	12%	2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	195	15%	185	13%	-2%	115	20%	169	22%	1%	268	15%	475	14%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	750	59%	560	40%	-19%	280	50%	295	38%	-12%	1,008	55%	2,080	63%	8%
Total	1,270	100%	1,410	100%		564	100%	779	100%		1,824	100%	3,304	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		26%		47%			30%		40%			30%		23%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		41%		60%			50%		62%			45%		37%	
	Ashland CDP					Ashland CDP					Ashland CDP				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	295	21%	135	22%	1%	245	19%	440	29%	10%	84	22%	250	48%	26%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	190	14%	95	15%	2%	275	21%	340	22%	1%	60	15%	115	22%	6%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	260	19%	159	26%	7%	175	14%	360	24%	10%	90	23%	75	14%	-9%
Household Income >80% AMI	635	46%	225	37%	-9%	590	46%	380	25%	-21%	155	40%	85	16%	-24%
Total	1,380	100%	614	100%		1,285	100%	1,520	100%		389	100%	525	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		35%		37%			40%		51%			37%		70%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		54%		63%			54%		75%			60%		84%	
	Castro Valley CDP					Castro Valley CDP					Castro Valley CDP				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	495	11%	680	23%	11%	39	8%	375	38%	31%	79	17%	280	33%	16%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	405	9%	425	14%	5%	60	12%	205	21%	9%	55	12%	40	5%	-7%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	905	21%	570	19%	-2%	150	29%	140	14%	-15%	64	14%	140	17%	3%
Household Income >80% AMI	2,555	59%	1,345	45%	-14%	265	52%	255	26%	-25%	270	58%	385	46%	-12%
Total	4,360	100%	3,020	100%		514	100%	975	100%		468	100%	845	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		21%		37%			19%		59%			29%		38%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		41%		55%			48%		74%			42%		54%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	American Indian					Hispanic					All Other Races				
	San Leandro					San Leandro					San Leandro				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	40	23%	35	51%	29%	270	12%	775	20%	8%	90	16%	40	6%	-10%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	25	14%	4	6%	-8%	335	15%	925	24%	9%	60	11%	246	38%	28%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	25	14%	25	37%	22%	630	28%	835	22%	-6%	130	23%	100	16%	-8%
Household Income >80% AMI	85	49%	4	6%	-43%	1,000	45%	1,260	33%	-12%	280	50%	256	40%	-10%
Total	175	100%	68	100%		2,235	100%	3,795	100%		560	100%	642	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		37%		57%			27%		45%			27%		45%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		51%		94%			55%		67%			50%		60%	
	Union City					Union City					Union City				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	225	17%	160	10%	-7%	90	27%	21	6%	-22%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10	50%	25	86%	36%	200	15%	350	21%	6%	39	12%	50	13%	1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	10	50%	0	0%	-50%	325	24%	385	23%	-1%	39	12%	111	29%	18%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	0%	4	14%	14%	590	44%	775	46%	2%	164	49%	196	52%	2%
Total	20	100%	29	100%		1,340	100%	1,670	100%		332	100%	378	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		50%		86%			32%		31%			39%		19%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		100%		86%			56%		54%			51%		48%	
	Ashland CDP					Ashland CDP					Ashland CDP				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	4	9%	0	0%	-9%	300	25%	500	24%	0%	70	24%	35	18%	-6%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10	23%	0	0%	-23%	240	20%	445	22%	2%	30	10%	40	20%	10%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	25	58%	0	0%	-58%	240	20%	515	25%	5%	50	17%	91	46%	29%
Household Income >80% AMI	4	9%	10	100%	91%	435	36%	585	29%	-7%	144	49%	30	15%	-34%
Total	43	100%	10	100%		1,215	100%	2,045	100%		294	100%	196	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		33%		0%			44%		46%			34%		38%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		91%		0%			64%		71%			51%		85%	
	Castro Valley CDP					Castro Valley CDP					Castro Valley CDP				
Renter Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	4	6%	35	90%	84%	115	13%	210	17%	4%	34	13%	45	14%	1%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	35	52%	0	0%	-52%	135	15%	255	21%	6%	74	28%	15	5%	-24%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	4	6%	0	0%	-6%	220	24%	345	28%	4%	38	15%	50	16%	1%
Household Income >80% AMI	24	36%	4	10%	-26%	440	48%	420	34%	-14%	114	44%	206	65%	21%
Total	67	100%	39	100%		910	100%	1,230	100%		260	100%	316	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		58%		90%			27%		38%			42%		19%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		64%		90%			52%		66%			56%		35%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	White			Black/African American			Asian/Pacific Islander		
	Cherryland CDP			Cherryland CDP			Cherryland CDP		
Renter Households	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	315 23%	110 14%	-9%	50 15%	305 44%	29%	35 13%	140 34%	21%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	190 14%	175 23%	9%	44 13%	105 15%	2%	25 10%	45 11%	1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	310 23%	155 20%	-2%	100 30%	110 16%	-14%	49 19%	50 12%	-7%
Household Income >80% AMI	550 40%	325 42%	2%	144 43%	174 25%	-18%	154 59%	179 43%	-15%
Total	1,365 100%	765 100%		338 100%	694 100%		263 100%	414 100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI	37%	37%		28%	59%		23%	45%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI	60%	58%		57%	75%		41%	57%	
	Fairview CDP			Fairview CDP			Fairview CDP		
Renter Households	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	15 6%	65 29%	23%	15 13%	60 26%	13%	25 64%	0 0%	-64%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	29 11%	19 8%	-3%	30 26%	85 37%	11%	0 0%	0 0%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	20 8%	30 13%	6%	45 38%	10 4%	-34%	10 26%	0 0%	-26%
Household Income >80% AMI	200 76%	110 49%	-27%	27 23%	75 33%	10%	4 10%	10 100%	90%
Total	264 100%	224 100%		117 100%	230 100%		39 100%	10 100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI	17%	38%		38%	63%		64%	0%	0%
% with Incomes <80% AMI	24%	51%		77%	67%		90%	0%	0%
	San Lorenzo CDP			San Lorenzo CDP			San Lorenzo CDP		
Renter Households	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	180 21%	145 23%	1%	30 25%	15 13%	-13%	35 18%	135 30%	12%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	125 15%	50 8%	-7%	20 17%	0 0%	-17%	29 15%	84 19%	3%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	130 15%	119 19%	3%	25 21%	10 8%	-13%	65 34%	80 18%	-16%
Household Income >80% AMI	410 49%	325 51%	2%	45 38%	95 79%	42%	63 33%	155 34%	1%
Total	845 100%	639 100%		120 100%	120 100%		192 100%	454 100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI	36%	31%		42%	13%		33%	48%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI	51%	49%		63%	21%		67%	66%	
	Sunol CDP			Sunol CDP			Sunol CDP		
Renter Households	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total	2000 # %	2019 # %	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	15 14%	4 6%	-8%	0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	4 4%	10 16%	12%	0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0 0%	10 16%	16%	0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Household Income >80% AMI	89 82%	40 63%	-20%	0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	108 100%	64 100%		0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!		0 #DIV/0!	0 #DIV/0!	
% with Incomes <50% AMI	18%	22%		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
% with Incomes <80% AMI	18%	38%		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Renter Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Renter occupied housing units

	American Indian				Hispanic				All Other Races			
	Cherryland CDP				Cherryland CDP				Cherryland CDP			
	2000		2019	Change in % of Total	2000		2019	Change in % of Total	2000		2019	Change in % of Total
Renter Households	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	190	20%	480	27%	8	5%	10	11%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	4	29%	0	0%	235	24%	295	17%	25	17%	15	16%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	10	71%	4	100%	175	18%	500	28%	59	39%	26	28%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	370	38%	480	27%	59	39%	42	45%
Total	14	100%	4	100%	970	100%	1,755	100%	151	100%	93	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		29%		0%		44%		44%		22%		27%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		100%		100%		62%		73%		61%		55%
	Fairview CDP				Fairview CDP				Fairview CDP			
	2000		2019	Change in % of Total	2000		2019	Change in % of Total	2000		2019	Change in % of Total
Renter Households	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	10	100%	0	#DIV/0!	14	20%	10	6%	0	0%	0	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	4	6%	70	44%	0	0%	6	9%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	4	6%	25	16%	4	12%	25	38%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	49	69%	55	34%	30	88%	35	53%
Total	10	100%	0	#DIV/0!	71	100%	160	100%	34	100%	66	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		100%		#DIV/0!		25%		50%		0%		9%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		100%		#DIV/0!		31%		66%		12%		47%
	San Lorenzo CDP				San Lorenzo CDP				San Lorenzo CDP			
	2000		2019	Change in % of Total	2000		2019	Change in % of Total	2000		2019	Change in % of Total
Renter Households	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	69	20%	75	10%	18	35%	0	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	25	7%	115	16%	10	19%	21	75%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	20	83%	75	22%	255	36%	4	8%	1	4%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	4	17%	175	51%	270	38%	20	38%	6	21%
Total	0	#DIV/0!	24	100%	344	100%	715	100%	52	100%	28	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		#DIV/0!		0%		27%		27%		54%		75%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		#DIV/0!		83%		49%		62%		62%		79%
	Sunol CDP				Sunol CDP				Sunol CDP			
	2000		2019	Change in % of Total	2000		2019	Change in % of Total	2000		2019	Change in % of Total
Renter Households	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	4	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	4	50%	0	0%	-4	100%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	15	100%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	15	100%	8	100%	4	100%	-4	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		0%		50%		0%		0%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		0%		100%		0%		100%

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	California					California					California				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	232,220	5%	332,260	8%	3%	27,580	9%	33,480	12%	3%	31,750	5%	96,780	9%	4%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	283,885	7%	338,445	9%	2%	23,690	8%	26,885	10%	2%	34,500	6%	93,295	9%	3%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	494,515	11%	527,720	13%	2%	37,715	13%	45,410	16%	4%	68,805	11%	144,695	13%	2%
Household Income >80% AMI	3,327,165	77%	2,751,270	70%	-7%	208,455	70%	171,025	62%	-8%	485,590	78%	744,775	69%	-9%
Total	4,337,785	100%	3,949,695	100%		297,440	100%	276,800	100%		620,645	100%	1,079,545	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		12%		17%			17%		22%			11%		18%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		23%		30%			30%		38%			22%		31%	
	Bay Area					Bay Area					Bay Area				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	54,920	6%	72,990	9%	3%	8,420	12%	7,900	13%	2%	11,983	5%	34,649	9%	3%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	63,240	7%	69,905	8%	2%	6,709	9%	6,450	11%	2%	13,977	6%	33,134	8%	2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	98,970	10%	95,950	11%	1%	9,648	13%	8,950	15%	2%	25,404	11%	47,729	12%	1%
Household Income >80% AMI	730,055	77%	603,025	72%	-5%	47,492	66%	36,189	61%	-5%	178,089	78%	286,549	71%	-6%
Total	947,185	100%	841,870	100%		72,269	100%	59,489	100%		229,453	100%	402,061	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		12%		17%			21%		24%			11%		17%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		23%		28%			34%		39%			22%		29%	
	Alameda County					Alameda County					Alameda County				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	8,910	5%	10,815	8%	2%	4,205	14%	3,515	16%	2%	2,595	5%	7,565	8%	3%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10,915	7%	10,900	8%	1%	3,135	11%	2,490	11%	1%	3,360	6%	6,630	7%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	14,665	9%	13,020	9%	0%	3,990	13%	3,165	14%	1%	4,865	9%	8,915	9%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	130,740	79%	106,350	75%	-4%	18,365	62%	12,875	58%	-3%	41,665	79%	75,685	77%	-3%
Total	165,230	100%	141,085	100%		29,695	100%	22,045	100%		52,485	100%	98,795	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		12%		15%			25%		27%			11%		14%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		21%		25%			38%		42%			21%		23%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	American Indian					Hispanic					All Other Races				
	California					California					California				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	3,585	12%	3,950	15%	3%	78,155	7%	169,390	10%	3%	10,725	8%	12,775	8%	1%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	2,905	10%	3,580	14%	4%	116,690	10%	219,765	13%	3%	10,425	8%	11,775	8%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	4,490	15%	4,060	16%	1%	218,415	19%	354,765	21%	2%	17,515	13%	18,900	12%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	19,455	64%	14,500	56%	-8%	708,675	63%	926,530	55%	-8%	99,325	72%	108,545	71%	-1%
Total	30,435	100%	26,090	100%		1,121,935	100%	1,670,450	100%		137,990	100%	151,995	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		21%		29%			17%		23%			15%		16%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		36%		44%			37%		45%			28%		29%	
	Bay Area					Bay Area					Bay Area				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	396	11%	520	16%	5%	10,670	8%	20,285	11%	3%	2,447	7%	3,161	8%	1%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	324	9%	410	13%	4%	15,130	11%	25,255	14%	3%	2,473	8%	2,856	7%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	353	9%	459	14%	5%	23,535	17%	34,795	19%	2%	3,854	12%	3,942	10%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	2,651	71%	1,855	57%	-14%	89,325	64%	106,190	57%	-7%	23,943	73%	28,802	74%	1%
Total	3,724	100%	3,244	100%		138,660	100%	186,525	100%		32,717	100%	38,761	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		19%		29%			19%		24%			15%		16%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		29%		43%			36%		43%			27%		26%	
	Alameda County					Alameda County					Alameda County				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	55	8%	150	15%	7%	2,180	7%	3,595	10%	2%	580	7%	610	7%	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	65	9%	130	13%	4%	2,995	10%	5,025	13%	4%	574	7%	655	7%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	60	9%	165	17%	8%	4,730	16%	6,200	17%	1%	840	11%	665	8%	-3%
Household Income >80% AMI	520	74%	535	55%	-20%	20,495	67%	22,420	60%	-7%	5,815	74%	6,815	78%	3%
Total	700	100%	980	100%		30,400	100%	37,240	100%		7,809	100%	8,745	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		17%		29%			17%		23%			15%		14%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		26%		45%			33%		40%			26%		22%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	Alameda City					Alameda City					Alameda City				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	505	5%	710	8%	3%	29	11%	35	14%	3%	205	6%	360	8%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	670	7%	695	8%	1%	15	5%	0	0%	-5%	314	9%	395	9%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	875	9%	635	8%	-1%	20	7%	4	2%	-6%	279	8%	400	9%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	7,870	79%	6,425	76%	-3%	210	77%	215	85%	8%	2,514	76%	3,330	74%	-2%
Total	9,920	100%	8,465	100%		274	100%	254	100%		3,312	100%	4,485	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		12%		17%			16%		14%			16%		17%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		21%		24%			23%		15%			24%		26%	
	Albany					Albany					Albany				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	170	7%	65	3%	-4%	4	4%	10	23%	19%	39	6%	125	14%	8%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	175	7%	150	7%	0%	8	8%	15	34%	26%	59	9%	24	3%	-6%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	290	11%	230	10%	-1%	10	10%	15	34%	24%	80	12%	65	7%	-5%
Household Income >80% AMI	1,895	75%	1,755	80%	5%	80	78%	4	9%	-69%	480	73%	710	77%	4%
Total	2,530	100%	2,200	100%		102	100%	44	100%		658	100%	924	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		14%		10%			12%		57%			15%		16%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		25%		20%			22%		91%			27%		23%	
	Berkeley					Berkeley					Berkeley				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	580	4%	820	6%	1%	420	18%	200	18%	0%	155	9%	210	10%	1%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	580	4%	900	6%	2%	410	17%	165	15%	-2%	170	10%	134	6%	-4%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,025	7%	1,125	8%	0%	330	14%	200	18%	4%	235	13%	200	9%	-4%
Household Income >80% AMI	11,525	84%	11,665	80%	-4%	1,240	52%	560	50%	-2%	1,199	68%	1,660	75%	7%
Total	13,710	100%	14,510	100%		2,400	100%	1,125	100%		1,759	100%	2,204	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		8%		12%			35%		32%			18%		16%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		16%		20%			48%		50%			32%		25%	
	Dublin					Dublin					Dublin				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	150	3%	200	4%	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	20	3%	320	5%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	185	4%	385	7%	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	15	2%	85	1%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	340	7%	465	9%	2%	15	13%	10	5%	-9%	20	3%	280	4%	1%
Household Income >80% AMI	4,000	86%	4,090	80%	-6%	99	87%	205	95%	9%	579	91%	6,145	90%	-1%
Total	4,675	100%	5,140	100%		114	100%	215	100%		634	100%	6,830	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		7%		11%			0%		0%			6%		6%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		14%		20%			13%		5%			9%		10%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	American Indian					Hispanic					All Other Races				
	Alameda City					Alameda City					Alameda City				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	45	8%	50	5%	-2%	15	4%	10	3%	-2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10	23%	20	47%	24%	35	6%	45	5%	-1%	55	16%	40	11%	-6%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	4	9%	9%	29	5%	120	12%	7%	30	9%	12	3%	-6%
Household Income >80% AMI	34	77%	19	44%	-33%	485	82%	755	78%	-4%	239	71%	311	83%	13%
Total	44	100%	43	100%		594	100%	970	100%		339	100%	373	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		23%		47%			13%		10%			21%		13%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		23%		56%			18%		22%			29%		17%	
	Albany					Albany					Albany				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	#DIV/0!	20	12%	59	24%	12%	4	5%	1	1%	-4%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	4	33%	#DIV/0!	30	18%	15	6%	-12%	0	0%	12	18%	18%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	4	33%	#DIV/0!	14	9%	4	2%	-7%	4	5%	2	3%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	4	33%	#DIV/0!	100	61%	165	68%	7%	72	90%	52	78%	-12%
Total	0	#DIV/0!	12	100%		164	100%	243	100%		80	100%	67	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		#DIV/0!		33%			30%		30%			5%		19%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		#DIV/0!		67%			39%		32%			10%		22%	
	Berkeley					Berkeley					Berkeley				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	4	33%	0	0%	-33%	100	12%	70	7%	-5%	35	8%	30	5%	-3%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	4	50%	50%	25	3%	40	4%	1%	44	9%	62	10%	1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	115	13%	120	12%	-2%	49	11%	20	3%	-7%
Household Income >80% AMI	8	67%	4	50%	-17%	615	72%	779	77%	5%	338	73%	507	82%	9%
Total	12	100%	8	100%		855	100%	1,009	100%		466	100%	619	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		33%		50%			15%		11%			17%		15%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		33%		50%			28%		23%			27%		18%	
	Dublin					Dublin					Dublin				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	19	66%	66%	4	1%	105	14%	13%	14	11%	11	4%	-7%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	20	5%	45	6%	2%	0	0%	40	14%	14%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	34	8%	40	5%	-2%	0	0%	5	2%	2%
Household Income >80% AMI	60	100%	10	34%	-66%	385	87%	554	74%	-12%	109	89%	226	80%	-8%
Total	60	100%	29	100%		443	100%	744	100%		123	100%	282	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%		66%			5%		20%			11%		18%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		0%		66%			13%		26%			11%		20%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	Emeryville					Emeryville					Emeryville				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	60	7%	110	10%	3%	30	20%	110	41%	21%	20	7%	35	5%	-2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	110	12%	115	10%	-2%	0	0%	20	7%	7%	20	7%	35	5%	-2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	80	9%	90	8%	-1%	45	30%	0	0%	-30%	20	7%	55	8%	1%
Household Income >80% AMI	660	73%	815	72%	0%	75	50%	140	52%	2%	235	80%	554	82%	2%
Total	910	100%	1,130	100%		150	100%	270	100%		295	100%	679	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		19%		20%			20%		48%			14%		10%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		27%		28%			50%		48%			20%		18%	
	Fremont					Fremont					Fremont				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	910	4%	1,260	10%	6%	4	0%	75	8%	8%	480	3%	1,495	5%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,315	6%	1,180	9%	4%	35	4%	35	4%	0%	450	3%	1,385	5%	2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,960	9%	1,425	11%	3%	70	8%	45	5%	-4%	894	6%	1,655	6%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	18,750	82%	8,740	69%	-12%	715	87%	750	83%	-4%	13,055	88%	23,100	84%	-4%
Total	22,935	100%	12,605	100%		824	100%	905	100%		14,879	100%	27,635	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		10%		19%			5%		12%			6%		10%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		18%		31%			13%		17%			12%		16%	
	Hayward					Hayward					Hayward				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,030	9%	1,145	17%	8%	74	4%	145	8%	4%	135	3%	480	5%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,415	12%	775	11%	-1%	120	6%	125	7%	1%	285	7%	614	7%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,630	14%	860	13%	-1%	155	8%	320	18%	10%	479	11%	1,335	15%	4%
Household Income >80% AMI	7,515	65%	3,985	59%	-6%	1,500	81%	1,180	67%	-14%	3,475	79%	6,370	72%	-7%
Total	11,590	100%	6,765	100%		1,849	100%	1,770	100%		4,374	100%	8,799	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		21%		28%			10%		15%			10%		12%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		35%		41%			19%		33%			21%		28%	
	Livermore					Livermore					Livermore				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	540	3%	770	4%	1%	10	4%	25	8%	3%	15	2%	90	3%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	635	4%	1,035	6%	2%	0	0%	15	5%	5%	25	3%	115	4%	1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	980	6%	1,720	10%	4%	15	7%	0	0%	-7%	69	8%	220	8%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	13,730	86%	13,760	80%	-7%	199	89%	275	87%	-2%	755	87%	2,250	84%	-3%
Total	15,885	100%	17,285	100%		224	100%	315	100%		864	100%	2,675	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		7%		10%			4%		13%			5%		8%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		14%		20%			11%		13%			13%		16%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	American Indian			Hispanic			All Other Races		
	Emeryville			Emeryville			Emeryville		
	2000	2019	Change in % of Total	2000	2019	Change in % of Total	2000	2019	Change in % of Total
Owner Households	#	%		#	%		#	%	
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	#DIV/0!		0	0%	8%	0	0%	65%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	#DIV/0!		4	6%	11%	4	7%	-7%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!		14	22%	-22%	20	37%	-4%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!		47	72%	3%	30	56%	-53%
Total	0	#DIV/0!		65	100%		54	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		#DIV/0!		6%	25%		7%	65%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		#DIV/0!		28%	25%		44%	98%	
	Fremont			Fremont			Fremont		
	2000	2019	Change in % of Total	2000	2019	Change in % of Total	2000	2019	Change in % of Total
Owner Households	#	%		#	%		#	%	
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	26%	275	7%	3%	18	1%	13%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10	10%	-3%	220	5%	4%	75	6%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	30	30%	-14%	405	10%	5%	110	9%	-3%
Household Income >80% AMI	60	60%	-9%	3,105	78%	-13%	1,090	84%	-8%
Total	100	100%		4,005	100%		1,293	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		10%	33%	12%	20%		7%	19%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		40%	49%	22%	35%		16%	24%	
	Hayward			Hayward			Hayward		
	2000	2019	Change in % of Total	2000	2019	Change in % of Total	2000	2019	Change in % of Total
Owner Households	#	%		#	%		#	%	
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	9%	305	6%	5%	60	7%	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	21%	685	13%	2%	80	9%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	10	13%	5%	990	19%	0%	178	20%	-8%
Household Income >80% AMI	69	87%	-35%	3,220	62%	-8%	560	64%	8%
Total	79	100%		5,200	100%		878	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%	30%	19%	26%		16%	16%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		13%	48%	38%	46%		36%	28%	
	Livermore			Livermore			Livermore		
	2000	2019	Change in % of Total	2000	2019	Change in % of Total	2000	2019	Change in % of Total
Owner Households	#	%		#	%		#	%	
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	0%	80	6%	-1%	20	5%	-3%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10	29%	-29%	25	2%	9%	30	8%	-2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	33%	185	13%	-1%	34	9%	-1%
Household Income >80% AMI	25	71%	-5%	1,115	79%	-8%	314	79%	7%
Total	35	100%		1,405	100%		398	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		29%	0%	7%	16%		13%	7%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		29%	33%	21%	28%		21%	15%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	Newark					Newark					Newark				
Owner Households	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	320	6%	245	7%	1%	0	0%	10	3%	3%	40	2%	210	6%	4%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	355	7%	235	7%	0%	14	5%	30	10%	5%	60	3%	165	5%	1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	465	9%	540	16%	6%	55	19%	120	39%	19%	179	10%	235	6%	-3%
Household Income >80% AMI	3,810	77%	2,400	70%	-7%	215	76%	150	48%	-27%	1,569	85%	3,010	83%	-2%
Total	4,950	100%	3,420	100%		284	100%	310	100%		1,848	100%	3,620	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		14%		14%			5%		13%			5%		10%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		23%		30%			24%		52%			15%		17%	
	Oakland					Oakland					Oakland				
Owner Households	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,365	5%	1,795	6%	1%	3,445	17%	2,625	19%	2%	884	11%	1,880	17%	6%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,575	6%	1,890	6%	0%	2,430	12%	1,935	14%	2%	1,090	13%	1,395	13%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	2,090	8%	2,095	7%	-1%	3,000	15%	1,930	14%	-1%	1,140	14%	1,309	12%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	20,585	80%	24,255	81%	0%	11,205	56%	7,205	53%	-3%	5,004	62%	6,450	58%	-3%
Total	25,615	100%	30,035	100%		20,080	100%	13,695	100%		8,118	100%	11,034	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		11%		12%			29%		33%			24%		30%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		20%		19%			44%		47%			38%		42%	
	Piedmont					Piedmont					Piedmont				
Owner Households	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	84	3%	110	4%	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	40	8%	40	7%	-1%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	140	5%	60	2%	-3%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	10	2%	2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	125	4%	100	4%	-1%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	14	3%	10	2%	-1%
Household Income >80% AMI	2,470	88%	2,420	90%	2%	10	100%	20	100%	0%	425	89%	485	89%	0%
Total	2,819	100%	2,690	100%		10	100%	20	100%		479	100%	545	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		8%		6%			0%		0%			8%		9%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		12%		10%			0%		0%			11%		11%	
	Pleasanton					Pleasanton					Pleasanton				
Owner Households	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total	2000 #	%	2019 #	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	350	2%	920	8%	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	55	3%	205	3%	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	435	3%	665	5%	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	34	2%	90	1%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	770	5%	820	7%	1%	4	3%	0	0%	-3%	39	2%	420	6%	4%
Household Income >80% AMI	12,585	89%	9,845	80%	-9%	144	97%	110	100%	3%	1,570	92%	5,760	89%	-4%
Total	14,140	100%	12,250	100%		148	100%	110	100%		1,698	100%	6,475	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		6%		13%			0%		0%			5%		5%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		11%		20%			3%		0%			8%		11%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	American Indian					Hispanic					All Other Races				
	Newark					Newark					Newark				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	10	29%	29%	55	3%	115	6%	2%	10	3%	20	9%	7%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	135	8%	320	16%	7%	0	0%	10	5%	5%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	275	17%	425	21%	4%	85	21%	-5	-2%	-24%
Household Income >80% AMI	25	100%	25	71%	-29%	1,200	72%	1,195	58%	-14%	305	76%	195	89%	12%
Total	25	100%	35	100%		1,665	100%	2,055	100%		400	100%	220	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%		29%			11%		21%			3%		14%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		0%		29%			28%		42%			24%		11%	
	Oakland					Oakland					Oakland				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	35	23%	8	5%	-18%	625	9%	995	11%	2%	240	15%	147	6%	-8%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	10	6%	20	11%	5%	950	14%	1,730	19%	6%	120	7%	175	7%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	10	6%	59	33%	27%	1,470	21%	1,710	19%	-2%	150	9%	207	9%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	99	64%	90	51%	-13%	3,855	56%	4,445	50%	-6%	1,119	69%	1,825	78%	9%
Total	154	100%	177	100%		6,900	100%	8,880	100%		1,629	100%	2,354	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		29%		16%			23%		31%			22%		14%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		36%		49%			44%		50%			31%		22%	
	Piedmont					Piedmont					Piedmont				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	10	9%	10	11%	2%	4	18%	10	40%	22%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	-5	-20%	-20%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	100	91%	80	89%	-2%	18	82%	20	80%	-2%
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!		110	100%	90	100%		22	100%	25	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!			9%		11%			18%		40%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!			9%		11%			18%		20%	
	Pleasanton					Pleasanton					Pleasanton				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	30	4%	125	13%	9%	4	1%	15	4%	2%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	20	22%	22%	35	4%	49	5%	1%	4	1%	1	0%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	14	16%	16%	55	7%	75	8%	1%	15	5%	1	0%	-5%
Household Income >80% AMI	4	100%	55	62%	-38%	695	85%	710	74%	-11%	259	92%	385	96%	4%
Total	4	100%	89	100%		815	100%	959	100%		282	100%	402	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%		22%			8%		18%			3%		4%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		0%		38%			15%		26%			8%		4%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	San Leandro					San Leandro					San Leandro				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,145	11%	885	13%	3%	45	5%	140	14%	9%	174	5%	959	15%	10%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,190	11%	795	12%	1%	20	2%	30	3%	1%	334	9%	1,005	15%	7%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,410	13%	730	11%	-2%	90	10%	200	20%	10%	520	14%	985	15%	1%
Household Income >80% AMI	7,140	66%	4,225	64%	-2%	775	83%	644	64%	-20%	2,770	73%	3,615	55%	-18%
Total	10,885	100%	6,635	100%		930	100%	1,014	100%		3,798	100%	6,564	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		21%		25%			7%		17%			13%		30%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		34%		36%			17%		36%			27%		45%	
	Union City					Union City					Union City				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	250	6%	265	9%	3%	39	5%	45	9%	4%	185	3%	555	7%	4%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	295	8%	340	12%	4%	30	4%	40	8%	4%	240	4%	550	7%	2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	350	9%	335	11%	2%	35	4%	125	24%	20%	429	7%	839	10%	3%
Household Income >80% AMI	2,995	77%	2,015	68%	-9%	745	88%	310	60%	-28%	4,920	85%	6,319	76%	-9%
Total	3,890	100%	2,955	100%		849	100%	520	100%		5,774	100%	8,263	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		14%		20%			8%		16%			7%		13%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		23%		32%			12%		40%			15%		24%	
	Ashland CDP					Ashland CDP					Ashland CDP				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	180	15%	170	25%	10%	25	13%	15	15%	3%	44	8%	155	13%	5%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	145	12%	185	27%	15%	10	5%	20	20%	15%	34	6%	100	8%	2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	170	14%	55	8%	-6%	20	10%	0	0%	-10%	120	23%	240	20%	-2%
Household Income >80% AMI	705	59%	265	39%	-19%	145	73%	65	65%	-8%	335	63%	695	58%	-4%
Total	1,200	100%	675	100%		200	100%	100	100%		533	100%	1,190	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		27%		53%			18%		35%			15%		21%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		41%		61%			28%		35%			37%		42%	
	Castro Valley CDP					Castro Valley CDP					Castro Valley CDP				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	740	7%	715	8%	1%	20	4%	40	7%	3%	65	4%	285	7%	3%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	875	8%	1,005	11%	3%	10	2%	40	7%	5%	165	9%	345	8%	-1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,165	10%	920	10%	0%	30	6%	95	16%	10%	145	8%	349	8%	0%
Household Income >80% AMI	8,440	75%	6,490	71%	-4%	425	88%	420	71%	-17%	1,473	80%	3,390	78%	-2%
Total	11,220	100%	9,130	100%		485	100%	595	100%		1,848	100%	4,369	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		14%		19%			6%		13%			12%		14%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		25%		29%			12%		29%			20%		22%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	American Indian				Hispanic				All Other Races			
	San Leandro				San Leandro				San Leandro			
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	24	20%	20%	175	7%	300	11%	3%	60	11%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	20	16%	16%	310	13%	400	14%	1%	50	9%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	10	17%	0	0%	-17%	260	11%	500	18%	7%	60	11%
Household Income >80% AMI	50	83%	79	64%	-19%	1,600	68%	1,595	57%	-11%	379	69%
Total	60	100%	123	100%		2,345	100%	2,795	100%		549	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%		36%			21%		25%			20%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		17%		36%			32%		43%			31%
	Union City				Union City				Union City			
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	15	30%	30%	190	8%	195	9%	1%	34	8%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	225	10%	305	14%	5%	30	7%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	10	20%	20%	320	14%	375	18%	4%	30	7%
Household Income >80% AMI	20	100%	25	50%	-50%	1,570	68%	1,259	59%	-9%	315	77%
Total	20	100%	50	100%		2,305	100%	2,134	100%		409	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%		30%			18%		23%			16%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		0%		50%			32%		41%			23%
	Ashland CDP				Ashland CDP				Ashland CDP			
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	70	13%	105	14%	1%	15	17%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	90	16%	65	9%	-8%	14	16%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	90	16%	80	11%	-6%	4	5%
Household Income >80% AMI	10	100%	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	310	55%	510	67%	12%	54	62%
Total	10	100%	0	#DIV/0!		560	100%	760	100%		87	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%		#DIV/0!			29%		22%			33%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		0%		#DIV/0!			45%		33%			38%
	Castro Valley CDP				Castro Valley CDP				Castro Valley CDP			
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	10	26%	0	0%	-26%	75	7%	90	7%	0%	19	5%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	4	11%	0	0%	-11%	50	5%	125	9%	5%	24	6%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	0%	0%	135	13%	105	8%	-5%	18	4%
Household Income >80% AMI	24	63%	44	100%	37%	810	76%	1,040	76%	1%	344	85%
Total	38	100%	44	100%		1,070	100%	1,360	100%		405	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		37%		0%			12%		16%			11%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		37%		0%			24%		24%			15%

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	White					Black/African American					Asian/Pacific Islander				
	Cherryland CDP					Cherryland CDP					Cherryland CDP				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	80	10%	125	25%	15%	14	14%	0	0%	-14%	4	3%	20	9%	6%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	100	12%	30	6%	-6%	4	4%	0	0%	-4%	0	0%	10	5%	5%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	130	16%	90	18%	2%	10	10%	0	0%	-10%	45	38%	50	23%	-15%
Household Income >80% AMI	520	63%	260	51%	-11%	70	71%	25	100%	29%	70	59%	140	64%	5%
Total	830	100%	505	100%		98	100%	25	100%		119	100%	220	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		22%		31%			18%		0%			3%		14%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		37%		49%			29%		0%			41%		36%	
	Fairview CDP					Fairview CDP					Fairview CDP				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	35	2%	100	7%	5%	35	6%	40	7%	1%	19	7%	0	0%	-7%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	75	5%	115	9%	3%	20	4%	15	3%	-1%	10	4%	30	5%	2%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	135	9%	190	14%	5%	65	12%	40	7%	-5%	24	9%	4	1%	-8%
Household Income >80% AMI	1,180	83%	940	70%	-13%	430	78%	480	83%	5%	224	81%	525	94%	13%
Total	1,425	100%	1,345	100%		550	100%	575	100%		277	100%	559	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		8%		16%			10%		10%			10%		5%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		17%		30%			22%		17%			19%		6%	
	San Lorenzo CDP					San Lorenzo CDP					San Lorenzo CDP				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	310	8%	285	13%	6%	4	6%	0	0%	-6%	15	2%	135	9%	7%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	550	14%	225	11%	-3%	4	6%	0	0%	-6%	35	5%	145	10%	5%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	480	12%	445	21%	9%	4	6%	25	20%	14%	100	13%	215	15%	1%
Household Income >80% AMI	2,655	66%	1,185	55%	-11%	54	82%	100	80%	-2%	608	80%	980	66%	-14%
Total	3,995	100%	2,140	100%		66	100%	125	100%		758	100%	1,475	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		22%		24%			12%		0%			7%		19%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		34%		45%			18%		20%			20%		34%	
	Sunol CDP					Sunol CDP					Sunol CDP				
Owner Households	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total	2000	%	2019	%	Change in % of Total
Household Income <=30% AMI	20	7%	8	4%	-3%	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0%	4	9%	9%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	25	13%	13%	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	30	11%	15	8%	-3%	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0%	4	9%	9%
Household Income >80% AMI	230	82%	149	76%	-7%	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	10	100%	35	81%	-19%
Total	280	100%	197	100%		0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!		10	100%	43	100%	
% with Incomes <50% AMI		7%		17%			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!			0%		9%	
% with Incomes <80% AMI		18%		24%			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!			0%		19%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Owner Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Owner occupied housing units

	American Indian				Hispanic				All Other Races			
	Cherryland CDP				Cherryland CDP				Cherryland CDP			
	2000	2019	Change in		2000	2019	Change in		2000	2019	Change in	
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	45	12%	80	17%	4	11%	0	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	30	8%	35	8%	0	0%	0	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	115	30%	155	34%	10	28%	5	83%
Household Income >80% AMI	8	100%	0	#DIV/0!	195	51%	189	41%	22	61%	1	17%
Total	8	100%	0	#DIV/0!	385	100%	459	100%	36	100%	6	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		0%		#DIV/0!		19%		25%		11%		0%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		0%		#DIV/0!		49%		59%		39%		83%
	Fairview CDP				Fairview CDP				Fairview CDP			
	2000	2019	Change in		2000	2019	Change in		2000	2019	Change in	
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	15	5%	15	3%	0	0%	5	4%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	4	50%	24	7%	50	8%	4	5%	1	1%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	4	50%	55	17%	95	16%	0	0%	52	44%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	230	71%	435	73%	78	95%	60	51%
Total	0	#DIV/0!	8	100%	324	100%	595	100%	82	100%	118	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		#DIV/0!		50%		12%		11%		5%		5%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		#DIV/0!		100%		29%		27%		5%		49%
	San Lorenzo CDP				San Lorenzo CDP				San Lorenzo CDP			
	2000	2019	Change in		2000	2019	Change in		2000	2019	Change in	
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	4	18%	0	0%	70	7%	100	6%	8	5%	0	0%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	4	18%	0	0%	90	9%	135	8%	24	16%	10	7%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	4	18%	4	100%	155	16%	290	17%	20	13%	31	21%
Household Income >80% AMI	10	45%	0	0%	660	68%	1,190	69%	100	66%	105	72%
Total	22	100%	4	100%	975	100%	1,715	100%	152	100%	146	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		36%		0%		16%		14%		21%		7%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		55%		100%		32%		31%		34%		28%
	Sunol CDP				Sunol CDP				Sunol CDP			
	2000	2019	Change in		2000	2019	Change in		2000	2019	Change in	
Owner Households	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	2	-18%
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	0%	4	29%	0	#DIV/0!	-3	27%
Household Income >80% AMI	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	20	100%	10	71%	0	#DIV/0!	-10	91%
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	20	100%	14	100%	0	#DIV/0!	-11	100%
% with Incomes <50% AMI		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		0%		0%		#DIV/0!		-18%
% with Incomes <80% AMI		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		0%		29%		#DIV/0!		9%

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Appendix A11: Households Living in Poverty, 2000 - 2021

	Number of Households Below Poverty Line			% of Households Below Poverty Line	
	2000	2010	2021	2000	2021
Alameda County	51,410	56,989	53,019	9.8%	9.1%
Bay Area Region	185,361	230,475	224,375	7.5%	8.1%
California	1,360,284	1,493,426	1,561,911	11.8%	11.8%
Alameda	2,149	2,665	2,265	7.1%	7.4%
Albany	539	596	592	7.7%	7.8%
Berkeley	8,251	7,115	6,501	18.3%	14.7%
Dublin	216	603	993	2.3%	4.3%
Emeryville	462	733	807	11.6%	11.1%
Fremont	3,049	3,557	3,852	4.5%	5.2%
Hayward	3,820	4,503	3,860	8.5%	7.8%
Livermore	1,146	1,431	1,284	4.4%	4.1%
Newark	686	800	646	5.3%	4.5%
Oakland	24,268	26,078	21,963	16.1%	13.1%
Piedmont	62	104	123	1.6%	3.2%
Pleasanton	557	897	1,311	2.4%	4.7%
San Leandro	1,984	2,402	3,362	6.5%	10.9%
Union City	1,063	1,460	1,109	5.7%	5.3%
Ashland CDP	861	1,058	1,227	11.9%	16.2%
Castro Valley CDP	992	1,428	1,636	4.6%	7.3%
Cherryland CDP	452	565	589	9.7%	12.4%
Fairview CDP	168	194	46	5.2%	1.3%
San Lorenzo CDP	435	548	779	5.7%	8.7%
Sunol CDP	12	15	8	2.5%	2.7%
Uninc. Balance	238	237	66	6.3%	4.6%

Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF3), American Community Survey, 2006-2010, American Community Survey, 2017-2021. The Housing Workshop 2023.

Appendix A12: Household Tenure by AMI

Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

	RENTER HOUSEHOLDS					OWNER HOUSEHOLDS					ALL HOUSEHOLDS				
	California					California					California				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	1,002,200	20%	1,547,895	26%	6%	384,015	6%	648,640	9%	3%	1,386,215	12%	2,196,535	17%	5%
30% to 50% AMI	813,730	16%	1,050,980	18%	1%	472,095	7%	693,745	10%	2%	1,285,825	11%	1,744,725	13%	2%
50% to 80% AMI	1,002,295	20%	1,166,255	20%	0%	841,455	13%	1,095,550	15%	2%	1,843,750	16%	2,261,805	17%	1%
80% to 100% AMI	560,460	11%	575,760	10%	-2%	672,640	10%	738,360	10%	0%	1,233,100	11%	1,314,120	10%	-1%
100% to 120% AMI	405,735	8%	420,695	7%	-1%	622,470	10%	676,995	9%	0%	1,028,205	9%	1,097,690	8%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	308,650	6%	308,115	5%	-1%	584,775	9%	592,195	8%	-1%	893,425	8%	900,310	7%	-1%
> 140% AMI	863,555	17%	819,980	14%	-3%	2,968,785	45%	2,709,095	38%	-7%	3,832,340	33%	3,529,075	27%	-6%
Total	4,956,635	100%	5,889,685	100%		6,546,235	100%	7,154,580	100%		11,502,870	100%	13,044,265	100%	
% <50% AMI		37%		44%			13%		19%			23%		30%	
% <80% AMI		57%		64%			26%		34%			39%		48%	
	Bay Area					Bay Area					Bay Area				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	210,350	20%	294,175	25%	4%	88,845	6%	139,500	9%	3%	299,195	12%	433,675	16%	4%
30% to 50% AMI	150,215	14%	175,960	15%	0%	101,855	7%	138,020	9%	2%	252,070	10%	313,980	11%	1%
50% to 80% AMI	185,025	18%	192,600	16%	-2%	161,775	11%	191,820	13%	1%	346,800	14%	384,420	14%	0%
80% to 100% AMI	152,555	15%	118,575	10%	-5%	189,145	13%	145,315	9%	-4%	341,700	14%	263,890	10%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	90,740	9%	94,100	8%	-1%	147,395	10%	137,990	9%	-1%	238,135	10%	232,090	8%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	67,770	7%	75,765	6%	0%	135,310	10%	124,935	8%	-1%	203,080	8%	200,700	7%	-1%
> 140% AMI	185,345	18%	248,315	21%	3%	599,685	42%	654,375	43%	1%	785,030	32%	902,690	33%	1%
Total	1,042,000	100%	1,199,475	100%		1,424,010	100%	1,531,960	100%		2,466,010	100%	2,731,435	100%	
% <50% AMI		35%		39%			13%		18%			22%		27%	
% <80% AMI		52%		55%			25%		31%			36%		41%	
	Alameda County					Alameda County					Alameda County				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	55,665	23%	69,340	26%	2%	18,525	6%	26,250	8%	2%	74,190	14%	95,590	17%	2%
30% to 50% AMI	36,440	15%	40,245	15%	0%	21,045	7%	25,830	8%	1%	57,485	11%	66,075	11%	0%
50% to 80% AMI	40,270	17%	41,950	16%	-1%	29,145	10%	32,130	10%	0%	69,415	13%	74,080	13%	0%
80% to 100% AMI	38,185	16%	27,605	10%	-6%	40,345	14%	26,695	9%	-5%	78,530	15%	54,300	9%	-6%
100% to 120% AMI	20,205	9%	22,005	8%	0%	30,080	11%	26,535	9%	-2%	50,285	10%	48,540	8%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	14,010	6%	17,835	7%	1%	28,820	10%	25,455	8%	-2%	42,830	8%	43,290	8%	-1%
> 140% AMI	32,280	14%	49,300	18%	5%	118,345	41%	145,985	47%	6%	150,625	29%	195,285	34%	5%
Total	237,060	100%	268,285	100%		286,305	100%	308,890	100%		523,365	100%	577,175	100%	
% <50% AMI		39%		41%			14%		17%			25%		28%	
% <80% AMI		56%		56%			24%		27%			38%		41%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

RENTER HOUSEHOLDS

	Alameda City				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	2,655	17%	3,245	20%	4%
30% to 50% AMI	2,015	13%	2,025	13%	0%
50% to 80% AMI	2,845	18%	2,445	15%	-3%
80% to 100% AMI	2,720	17%	1,775	11%	-6%
100% to 120% AMI	1,505	10%	1,470	9%	0%
120% to 140% AMI	1,015	6%	1,220	8%	1%
> 140% AMI	2,980	19%	3,655	23%	4%
Total	15,735	100%	15,830	100%	
% <50% AMI		30%		33%	
% <80% AMI		48%		49%	

	Albany				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	565	16%	790	20%	4%
30% to 50% AMI	430	12%	760	19%	7%
50% to 80% AMI	634	18%	520	13%	-5%
80% to 100% AMI	590	17%	520	13%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	350	10%	374	9%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	335	10%	160	4%	-6%
> 140% AMI	550	16%	820	21%	5%
Total	3,455	100%	3,950	100%	
% <50% AMI		29%		39%	
% <80% AMI		47%		52%	

	Berkeley				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	8,875	34%	8,670	34%	-1%
30% to 50% AMI	4,090	16%	3,835	15%	-1%
50% to 80% AMI	3,755	15%	3,605	14%	-1%
80% to 100% AMI	3,195	12%	2,125	8%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	1,800	7%	1,560	6%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	1,090	4%	1,435	6%	1%
> 140% AMI	2,940	11%	4,655	18%	7%
Total	25,750	100%	25,875	100%	
% <50% AMI		50%		48%	
% <80% AMI		65%		62%	

OWNER HOUSEHOLDS

	Alameda City				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	800	6%	1,165	8%	2%
30% to 50% AMI	1,100	8%	1,195	8%	1%
50% to 80% AMI	1,240	9%	1,175	8%	-1%
80% to 100% AMI	2,150	15%	1,185	8%	-7%
100% to 120% AMI	1,435	10%	1,175	8%	-2%
120% to 140% AMI	1,455	10%	1,275	9%	-1%
> 140% AMI	6,310	44%	7,410	51%	7%
Total	14,490	100%	14,590	100%	
% <50% AMI		13%		16%	
% <80% AMI		22%		24%	

	Albany				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	239	7%	265	8%	1%
30% to 50% AMI	265	7%	220	6%	-1%
50% to 80% AMI	405	11%	325	9%	-2%
80% to 100% AMI	490	14%	350	10%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	355	10%	169	5%	-5%
120% to 140% AMI	445	13%	255	7%	-5%
> 140% AMI	1,340	38%	1,920	55%	17%
Total	3,560	100%	3,495	100%	
% <50% AMI		14%		14%	
% <80% AMI		26%		23%	

	Berkeley				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	1,285	7%	1,330	7%	0%
30% to 50% AMI	1,230	6%	1,305	7%	0%
50% to 80% AMI	1,760	9%	1,665	9%	-1%
80% to 100% AMI	2,190	11%	1,350	7%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	1,745	9%	1,385	7%	-2%
120% to 140% AMI	1,475	8%	1,400	7%	0%
> 140% AMI	9,520	50%	11,040	57%	7%
Total	19,205	100%	19,480	100%	
% <50% AMI		13%		14%	
% <80% AMI		22%		22%	

ALL HOUSEHOLDS

	Alameda City				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	3,455	11%	4,410	14%	3%
30% to 50% AMI	3,115	10%	3,220	11%	0%
50% to 80% AMI	4,085	14%	3,620	12%	-2%
80% to 100% AMI	4,870	16%	2,960	10%	-6%
100% to 120% AMI	2,940	10%	2,645	9%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	2,470	8%	2,495	8%	0%
> 140% AMI	9,290	31%	11,065	36%	6%
Total	30,225	100%	30,420	100%	
% <50% AMI		22%		25%	
% <80% AMI		35%		37%	

	Albany				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	804	11%	1,055	14%	3%
30% to 50% AMI	695	10%	980	13%	3%
50% to 80% AMI	1,039	15%	845	11%	-3%
80% to 100% AMI	1,080	15%	870	12%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	705	10%	543	7%	-3%
120% to 140% AMI	780	11%	415	6%	-6%
> 140% AMI	1,890	27%	2,740	37%	10%
Total	7,015	100%	7,445	100%	
% <50% AMI		21%		27%	
% <80% AMI		36%		39%	

	Berkeley				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	10,160	23%	10,000	22%	-1%
30% to 50% AMI	5,320	12%	5,140	11%	0%
50% to 80% AMI	5,515	12%	5,270	12%	-1%
80% to 100% AMI	5,385	12%	3,475	8%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	3,545	8%	2,945	6%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	2,565	6%	2,835	6%	1%
> 140% AMI	12,460	28%	15,695	35%	7%
Total	44,955	100%	45,350	100%	
% <50% AMI		34%		33%	
% <80% AMI		47%		45%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

	RENTER HOUSEHOLDS					OWNER HOUSEHOLDS					ALL HOUSEHOLDS				
	Dublin					Dublin					Dublin				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	144	4%	720	10%	6%	190	3%	655	5%	2%	334	4%	1,375	7%	3%
30% to 50% AMI	380	12%	600	9%	-3%	220	4%	555	4%	1%	600	6%	1,155	6%	-1%
50% to 80% AMI	425	13%	805	12%	-1%	405	7%	805	6%	-1%	830	9%	1,610	8%	-1%
80% to 100% AMI	495	15%	720	10%	-5%	775	13%	925	7%	-6%	1,270	14%	1,645	8%	-5%
100% to 120% AMI	370	11%	710	10%	-1%	600	10%	965	7%	-3%	970	10%	1,675	8%	-2%
120% to 140% AMI	370	11%	850	12%	1%	730	12%	1,075	8%	-4%	1,100	12%	1,925	10%	-2%
> 140% AMI	1,090	33%	2,580	37%	4%	3,135	52%	8,255	62%	11%	4,225	45%	10,835	54%	8%
Total	3,275	100%	6,990	100%		6,055	100%	13,245	100%		9,330	100%	20,235	100%	
% <50% AMI		16%		19%			7%		9%			10%		13%	
% <80% AMI		29%		30%			13%		15%			19%		20%	
	Emeryville					Emeryville					Emeryville				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	560	22%	825	19%	-3%	115	8%	295	13%	5%	675	17%	1,120	17%	0%
30% to 50% AMI	435	17%	450	10%	-7%	140	10%	190	8%	-1%	575	14%	640	10%	-5%
50% to 80% AMI	375	15%	410	9%	-5%	185	13%	160	7%	-6%	560	14%	570	9%	-5%
80% to 100% AMI	340	14%	345	8%	-6%	225	15%	235	10%	-5%	565	14%	580	9%	-5%
100% to 120% AMI	190	8%	345	8%	0%	120	8%	165	7%	-1%	310	8%	510	8%	0%
120% to 140% AMI	150	6%	380	9%	3%	130	9%	225	10%	1%	280	7%	605	9%	2%
> 140% AMI	465	19%	1,565	36%	18%	555	38%	980	44%	6%	1,020	26%	2,545	39%	13%
Total	2,510	100%	4,320	100%		1,465	100%	2,245	100%		3,975	100%	6,570	100%	
% <50% AMI		40%		30%			17%		22%			31%		27%	
% <80% AMI		55%		39%			30%		29%			46%		35%	
	Fremont					Fremont					Fremont				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	2,875	12%	3,635	12%	0%	1,695	4%	3,375	7%	4%	4,570	7%	7,010	9%	3%
30% to 50% AMI	2,180	9%	2,610	9%	0%	2,100	5%	3,005	7%	2%	4,280	6%	5,615	7%	1%
50% to 80% AMI	3,230	13%	4,225	14%	1%	3,470	8%	3,755	8%	0%	6,700	10%	7,980	11%	1%
80% to 100% AMI	4,235	18%	3,910	13%	-4%	5,350	12%	3,530	8%	-4%	9,585	14%	7,440	10%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	3,005	12%	3,270	11%	-1%	4,675	11%	3,710	8%	-3%	7,680	11%	6,980	9%	-2%
120% to 140% AMI	2,520	10%	3,080	10%	0%	4,830	11%	3,615	8%	-3%	7,350	11%	6,695	9%	-2%
> 140% AMI	6,140	25%	9,045	30%	5%	21,905	50%	24,930	54%	5%	28,045	41%	33,975	45%	4%
Total	24,190	100%	29,775	100%		44,045	100%	45,910	100%		68,235	100%	75,685	100%	
% <50% AMI		21%		21%			9%		14%			13%		17%	
% <80% AMI		34%		35%			16%		22%			23%		27%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

	RENTER HOUSEHOLDS					OWNER HOUSEHOLDS					ALL HOUSEHOLDS				
	Hayward					Hayward					Hayward				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	3,790	18%	4,780	21%	3%	1,600	7%	2,590	10%	4%	5,390	12%	7,370	15%	3%
30% to 50% AMI	3,555	17%	4,170	19%	2%	2,575	11%	2,665	11%	0%	6,130	14%	6,835	14%	1%
50% to 80% AMI	4,225	20%	4,860	22%	1%	3,435	14%	3,955	16%	1%	7,660	17%	8,815	18%	1%
80% to 100% AMI	4,045	19%	2,725	12%	-7%	4,500	19%	2,785	11%	-8%	8,545	19%	5,510	12%	-7%
100% to 120% AMI	1,895	9%	2,290	10%	1%	2,965	12%	2,910	12%	-1%	4,860	11%	5,200	11%	0%
120% to 140% AMI	1,230	6%	1,460	6%	1%	2,520	11%	2,175	9%	-2%	3,750	8%	3,635	8%	-1%
> 140% AMI	2,200	11%	2,200	10%	-1%	6,350	27%	8,100	32%	6%	8,550	19%	10,300	22%	3%
Total	20,945	100%	22,480	100%		23,955	100%	25,185	100%		44,900	100%	47,665	100%	
% <50% AMI		35%		40%			17%		21%			26%		30%	
% <80% AMI		55%		61%			32%		37%			43%		48%	
	Livermore					Livermore					Livermore				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	1,130	16%	1,760	20%	5%	660	4%	1,010	4%	1%	1,790	7%	2,770	9%	2%
30% to 50% AMI	1,025	14%	1,450	17%	2%	725	4%	1,430	6%	2%	1,750	7%	2,880	9%	2%
50% to 80% AMI	1,300	18%	1,475	17%	-1%	1,285	7%	2,245	10%	3%	2,585	10%	3,720	12%	2%
80% to 100% AMI	1,390	19%	895	10%	-9%	2,455	13%	1,875	8%	-5%	3,845	15%	2,770	9%	-6%
100% to 120% AMI	735	10%	1,004	11%	1%	2,270	12%	2,175	9%	-3%	3,005	12%	3,179	10%	-2%
120% to 140% AMI	500	7%	520	6%	-1%	2,300	12%	1,985	9%	-4%	2,800	11%	2,505	8%	-3%
> 140% AMI	1,185	16%	1,650	19%	3%	9,110	48%	12,280	53%	5%	10,295	39%	13,930	44%	4%
Total	7,260	100%	8,750	100%		18,805	100%	22,995	100%		26,065	100%	31,745	100%	
% <50% AMI		30%		37%			7%		11%			14%		18%	
% <80% AMI		48%		54%			14%		20%			23%		30%	
	Newark					Newark					Newark				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	590	15%	720	16%	1%	425	5%	610	6%	2%	1,015	8%	1,330	9%	2%
30% to 50% AMI	445	12%	455	10%	-1%	565	6%	760	8%	2%	1,010	8%	1,215	9%	1%
50% to 80% AMI	705	19%	750	17%	-1%	1,060	12%	1,315	14%	2%	1,765	14%	2,065	15%	1%
80% to 100% AMI	675	18%	760	17%	0%	1,370	15%	1,035	11%	-4%	2,045	16%	1,795	13%	-3%
100% to 120% AMI	400	10%	440	10%	0%	1,090	12%	830	9%	-3%	1,490	11%	1,270	9%	-2%
120% to 140% AMI	320	8%	420	10%	1%	1,150	13%	1,060	11%	-2%	1,470	11%	1,480	11%	-1%
> 140% AMI	675	18%	845	19%	2%	3,520	38%	4,050	42%	4%	4,195	32%	4,895	35%	3%
Total	3,810	100%	4,380	100%		9,180	100%	9,670	100%		12,990	100%	14,045	100%	
% <50% AMI		27%		27%			11%		14%			16%		18%	
% <80% AMI		46%		44%			22%		28%			29%		33%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

	RENTER HOUSEHOLDS					OWNER HOUSEHOLDS					ALL HOUSEHOLDS				
	Oakland					Oakland					Oakland				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	28,060	32%	33,540	35%	3%	6,590	11%	7,450	11%	1%	34,650	23%	40,990	25%	2%
30% to 50% AMI	16,235	18%	15,000	16%	-3%	6,165	10%	7,145	11%	1%	22,400	15%	22,145	14%	-1%
50% to 80% AMI	14,815	17%	13,980	15%	-2%	7,870	13%	7,310	11%	-2%	22,685	15%	21,290	13%	-2%
80% to 100% AMI	12,375	14%	8,425	9%	-5%	8,695	14%	5,855	9%	-5%	21,070	14%	14,280	9%	-5%
100% to 120% AMI	5,450	6%	5,990	6%	0%	6,020	10%	5,180	8%	-2%	11,470	8%	11,170	7%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	3,655	4%	4,640	5%	1%	5,050	8%	5,075	8%	0%	8,705	6%	9,715	6%	0%
> 140% AMI	7,715	9%	14,670	15%	7%	22,095	35%	28,165	43%	7%	29,810	20%	42,835	26%	7%
Total	88,305	100%	96,240	100%		62,480	100%	66,175	100%		150,785	100%	162,420	100%	
% <50% AMI		50%		50%			20%		22%			38%		39%	
% <80% AMI		67%		65%			33%		33%			53%		52%	

	Piedmont					Piedmont					Piedmont				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	30	8%	20	4%	-4%	139	4%	165	5%	1%	169	4%	185	5%	0%
30% to 50% AMI	30	8%	45	10%	2%	145	4%	70	2%	-2%	175	5%	115	3%	-2%
50% to 80% AMI	19	5%	4	1%	-4%	140	4%	110	3%	-1%	159	4%	114	3%	-1%
80% to 100% AMI	63	18%	40	9%	-9%	135	4%	165	5%	1%	198	5%	205	5%	0%
100% to 120% AMI	49	14%	8	2%	-12%	220	6%	70	2%	-4%	269	7%	78	2%	-5%
120% to 140% AMI	19	5%	40	9%	3%	205	6%	185	5%	0%	224	6%	225	6%	0%
> 140% AMI	135	38%	295	65%	27%	2,470	72%	2,610	77%	6%	2,605	68%	2,905	76%	7%
Total	355	97%	465	100%		3,450	100%	3,375	100%		3,805	100%	3,840	100%	
% <50% AMI		17%		14%			8%		7%			9%		8%	
% <80% AMI		22%		15%			12%		10%			13%		11%	

	Pleasanton					Pleasanton					Pleasanton				
	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total	2000		2019		Change in % of Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
< 30% AMI	565	9%	1,420	16%	7%	445	3%	1,265	6%	4%	1,010	4%	2,685	9%	5%
30% to 50% AMI	580	9%	925	11%	1%	520	3%	825	4%	1%	1,100	5%	1,750	6%	1%
50% to 80% AMI	684	11%	785	9%	-2%	885	5%	1,330	7%	1%	1,569	7%	2,115	7%	1%
80% to 100% AMI	1,035	17%	720	8%	-8%	1,765	10%	1,185	6%	-4%	2,800	12%	1,905	7%	-5%
100% to 120% AMI	815	13%	1,390	16%	3%	1,330	8%	1,185	6%	-2%	2,145	9%	2,575	9%	0%
120% to 140% AMI	545	9%	955	11%	2%	1,585	9%	1,455	7%	-2%	2,130	9%	2,410	8%	-1%
> 140% AMI	1,990	32%	2,525	29%	-3%	10,585	62%	13,045	64%	2%	12,575	54%	15,570	54%	0%
Total	6,210	100%	8,725	100%		17,105	100%	20,285	100%		23,315	100%	29,010	100%	
% <50% AMI		18%		27%			6%		10%			9%		15%	
% <80% AMI		29%		36%			11%		17%			16%		23%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

	RENTER HOUSEHOLDS					OWNER HOUSEHOLDS					ALL HOUSEHOLDS				
	San Leandro					San Leandro					San Leandro				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	1,860	15%	3,270	24%	8%	1,600	9%	2,340	13%	5%	3,460	11%	5,610	18%	7%
30% to 50% AMI	1,855	15%	3,285	24%	8%	1,915	10%	2,310	13%	3%	3,770	12%	5,595	18%	5%
50% to 80% AMI	2,760	23%	2,585	19%	-4%	2,350	13%	2,455	14%	1%	5,110	17%	5,040	16%	-1%
80% to 100% AMI	2,320	19%	1,335	10%	-10%	3,425	18%	1,705	10%	-9%	5,745	19%	3,040	10%	-9%
100% to 120% AMI	1,280	11%	1,150	8%	-2%	2,310	12%	1,680	10%	-3%	3,590	12%	2,830	9%	-3%
120% to 140% AMI	725	6%	910	7%	1%	1,935	10%	1,390	8%	-3%	2,660	9%	2,300	7%	-1%
> 140% AMI	1,245	10%	1,340	10%	-1%	5,050	27%	5,680	32%	5%	6,295	21%	7,020	22%	2%
Total	12,040	100%	13,870	100%		18,575	100%	17,560	100%		30,615	100%	31,435	100%	
% <50% AMI		31%		47%			19%		26%			24%		36%	
% <80% AMI		54%		66%			32%		40%			40%		52%	
	Union City					Union City					Union City				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	950	18%	1,020	13%	-4%	700	5%	1,110	8%	2%	1,650	9%	2,130	10%	1%
30% to 50% AMI	670	12%	1,315	17%	5%	825	6%	1,235	9%	2%	1,495	8%	2,550	12%	4%
50% to 80% AMI	960	18%	1,325	18%	0%	1,175	9%	1,720	12%	3%	2,135	11%	3,045	14%	2%
80% to 100% AMI	900	17%	945	12%	-4%	1,975	15%	1,455	10%	-5%	2,875	15%	2,400	11%	-4%
100% to 120% AMI	670	12%	705	9%	-3%	1,650	12%	1,355	9%	-3%	2,320	12%	2,060	9%	-3%
120% to 140% AMI	390	7%	640	8%	1%	1,660	13%	1,345	9%	-3%	2,050	11%	1,985	9%	-2%
> 140% AMI	835	16%	1,620	21%	6%	5,280	40%	6,060	42%	3%	6,115	33%	7,680	35%	2%
Total	5,375	100%	7,570	100%		13,255	100%	14,280	100%		18,630	100%	21,850	100%	
% <50% AMI		30%		31%			12%		16%			17%		21%	
% <80% AMI		48%		48%			20%		28%			28%		35%	
	Ashland CDP					Ashland CDP					Ashland CDP				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	1,005	22%	1,365	28%	6%	335	13%	450	16%	3%	1,340	19%	1,815	24%	5%
30% to 50% AMI	805	17%	1,035	21%	4%	305	12%	395	14%	2%	1,110	15%	1,430	19%	3%
50% to 80% AMI	840	18%	1,200	24%	6%	405	16%	380	14%	-2%	1,245	17%	1,580	21%	3%
80% to 100% AMI	960	21%	615	13%	-8%	600	23%	365	13%	-10%	1,560	22%	980	13%	-9%
100% to 120% AMI	280	6%	370	8%	1%	299	12%	355	13%	1%	579	8%	725	9%	1%
120% to 140% AMI	215	5%	175	4%	-1%	235	9%	200	7%	-2%	450	6%	375	5%	-1%
> 140% AMI	520	11%	155	3%	-8%	420	16%	635	23%	7%	940	13%	790	10%	-3%
Total	4,620	100%	4,910	100%		2,595	100%	2,785	100%		7,215	100%	7,695	100%	
% <50% AMI		39%		49%			25%		30%			34%		42%	
% <80% AMI		57%		73%			40%		44%			51%		63%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

	RENTER HOUSEHOLDS					OWNER HOUSEHOLDS					ALL HOUSEHOLDS				
	Castro Valley CDP					Castro Valley CDP					Castro Valley CDP				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	775	12%	1,625	25%	14%	925	6%	1,150	7%	1%	1,700	8%	2,775	12%	5%
30% to 50% AMI	770	12%	940	15%	3%	1,125	7%	1,555	10%	2%	1,895	9%	2,495	11%	2%
50% to 80% AMI	1,380	21%	1,250	19%	-2%	1,485	10%	1,490	9%	-1%	2,865	13%	2,740	12%	-1%
80% to 100% AMI	1,405	21%	860	13%	-8%	2,135	14%	1,520	10%	-5%	3,540	16%	2,380	11%	-6%
100% to 120% AMI	790	12%	350	5%	-7%	1,545	10%	1,540	10%	-1%	2,335	11%	1,890	8%	-2%
120% to 140% AMI	455	7%	510	8%	1%	1,620	11%	1,650	10%	0%	2,075	10%	2,160	10%	0%
> 140% AMI	1,020	15%	895	14%	-2%	6,225	41%	7,035	44%	3%	7,245	33%	7,930	35%	2%
Total	6,590	100%	6,430	100%		15,065	100%	15,940	100%		21,655	100%	22,370	100%	
% <50% AMI		23%		40%			14%		17%			17%		24%	
% <80% AMI		44%		59%			23%		26%			30%		36%	
	Cherryland CDP					Cherryland CDP					Cherryland CDP				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	600	19%	1,045	28%	9%	149	10%	220	18%	8%	749	16%	1,265	26%	9%
30% to 50% AMI	525	17%	630	17%	0%	140	9%	75	6%	-3%	665	14%	705	14%	0%
50% to 80% AMI	700	23%	850	23%	0%	315	21%	300	25%	4%	1,015	22%	1,150	23%	1%
80% to 100% AMI	670	22%	390	10%	-11%	325	22%	190	16%	-6%	995	22%	580	12%	-10%
100% to 120% AMI	265	9%	210	6%	-3%	185	12%	179	15%	2%	450	10%	389	8%	-2%
120% to 140% AMI	170	5%	255	7%	1%	170	11%	65	5%	-6%	340	7%	320	6%	-1%
> 140% AMI	170	5%	340	9%	4%	210	14%	185	15%	1%	380	8%	525	11%	2%
Total	3,110	100%	3,720	100%		1,500	100%	1,215	100%		4,610	100%	4,935	100%	
% <50% AMI		36%		45%			19%		24%			31%		40%	
% <80% AMI		59%		68%			40%		49%			53%		63%	
	Fairview CDP					Fairview CDP					Fairview CDP				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	85	16%	135	19%	4%	104	4%	155	5%	1%	189	6%	290	7%	2%
30% to 50% AMI	60	11%	180	26%	15%	140	5%	215	7%	2%	200	6%	395	10%	4%
50% to 80% AMI	85	16%	90	13%	-3%	275	10%	385	12%	2%	360	11%	475	12%	1%
80% to 100% AMI	135	25%	50	7%	-18%	270	10%	360	11%	1%	405	13%	410	11%	-2%
100% to 120% AMI	55	10%	95	14%	3%	235	9%	470	15%	6%	290	9%	565	15%	6%
120% to 140% AMI	29	5%	35	5%	0%	410	15%	275	9%	-7%	439	14%	310	8%	-6%
> 140% AMI	100	18%	115	16%	-2%	1,240	46%	1,330	42%	-5%	1,340	42%	1,445	37%	-4%
Total	545	100%	690	100%		2,680	100%	3,195	100%		3,225	100%	3,885	100%	
% <50% AMI		27%		45%			9%		12%			12%		18%	
% <80% AMI		42%		58%			19%		24%			23%		30%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Households by AMI and Tenure, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

	RENTER HOUSEHOLDS					OWNER HOUSEHOLDS					ALL HOUSEHOLDS				
	San Lorenzo CDP					San Lorenzo CDP					San Lorenzo CDP				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	340	22%	365	19%	-3%	420	7%	520	9%	2%	760	10%	885	12%	2%
30% to 50% AMI	200	13%	265	13%	1%	705	12%	515	9%	-3%	905	12%	780	10%	-2%
50% to 80% AMI	304	19%	480	24%	5%	760	13%	1,010	18%	5%	1,064	14%	1,490	20%	6%
80% to 100% AMI	345	22%	335	17%	-5%	1,225	21%	540	10%	-11%	1,570	21%	875	12%	-9%
100% to 120% AMI	140	9%	215	11%	2%	800	13%	895	16%	3%	940	12%	1,110	15%	2%
120% to 140% AMI	105	7%	110	6%	-1%	630	11%	625	11%	1%	735	10%	735	10%	0%
> 140% AMI	120	8%	195	10%	2%	1,430	24%	1,490	27%	3%	1,550	21%	1,685	22%	2%
Total	1,560	100%	1,970	100%		5,970	100%	5,605	100%		7,530	100%	7,575	100%	
% <50% AMI		35%		32%			19%		18%			22%		22%	
% <80% AMI		54%		56%			32%		36%			36%		42%	
	Sunol CDP					Sunol CDP					Sunol CDP				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	15	12%	10	14%	3%	20	7%	10	4%	-3%	35	8%	20	6%	-2%
30% to 50% AMI	4	3%	10	14%	11%	0	0%	30	12%	12%	4	1%	40	13%	12%
50% to 80% AMI	0	0%	10	14%	14%	30	10%	20	8%	-2%	30	7%	30	9%	2%
80% to 100% AMI	44	34%	20	29%	-6%	20	7%	4	2%	-5%	64	15%	24	8%	-7%
100% to 120% AMI	15	12%	0	0%	-12%	24	8%	24	10%	2%	39	9%	24	8%	-1%
120% to 140% AMI	0	0%	10	14%	14%	45	15%	25	10%	-5%	45	10%	35	11%	1%
> 140% AMI	50	39%	10	14%	-25%	165	54%	135	54%	0%	215	50%	145	46%	-4%
Total	130	100%	70	100%		305	100%	250	100%		435	100%	315	100%	
% <50% AMI		15%		29%			7%		16%			9%		19%	
% <80% AMI		15%		43%			16%		24%			16%		28%	
	Unincorporated Balance					Unincorporated Balance					Unincorporated Balance				
	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in	2000		2019		Change in
	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total	#	%	#	%	% of Total
< 30% AMI	196	15%	380	31%	15%	89	3%	120	8%	5%	285	7%	500	19%	11%
30% to 50% AMI	151	12%	260	21%	9%	140	5%	135	9%	4%	291	8%	395	15%	7%
50% to 80% AMI	229	18%	296	24%	6%	210	8%	220	15%	7%	439	11%	516	19%	8%
80% to 100% AMI	248	19%	95	8%	-11%	270	10%	81	6%	-5%	518	13%	176	7%	-7%
100% to 120% AMI	146	11%	59	5%	-7%	207	8%	118	8%	0%	353	9%	177	7%	-3%
120% to 140% AMI	172	13%	30	2%	-11%	240	9%	100	7%	-2%	412	11%	130	5%	-6%
> 140% AMI	155	12%	125	10%	-2%	1,430	55%	650	46%	-10%	1,585	41%	775	29%	-12%
Total	1,297	100%	1,245	100%		2,565	100%	1,424	100%		3,862	101%	2,669	100%	
% <50% AMI		27%		51%			9%		18%			15%		34%	
% <80% AMI		44%		75%			17%		33%			26%		53%	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Database, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Appendix A13: Housing Units, 2021

	Housing Units 2000	Housing Units 2010	Housing Units 2021	% Change 2000- 2010	% Change 2010- 2021	% Change 2000- 2021
Alameda County	540,183	582,549	617,045	7.8%	5.9%	14.2%
Bay Area Region	2,552,402	2,785,948	2,942,577	9.2%	5.6%	15.3%
California	12,214,549	13,680,081	14,328,539	12.0%	4.7%	17.3%
Cities						
Alameda	31,644	32,351	32,452	2.2%	0.3%	2.6%
Albany	7,248	7,889	7,894	8.8%	0.1%	8.9%
Berkeley	46,875	49,454	49,260	5.5%	-0.4%	5.1%
Dublin	9,872	15,782	23,791	59.9%	50.7%	141.0%
Emeryville	4,274	6,646	7,945	55.5%	19.5%	85.9%
Fremont	69,452	73,989	78,240	6.5%	5.7%	12.7%
Hayward	45,922	48,296	52,193	5.2%	8.1%	13.7%
Livermore	26,610	30,342	32,306	14.0%	6.5%	21.4%
Newark	13,150	13,414	14,989	2.0%	11.7%	14.0%
Oakland	157,508	169,710	180,171	7.7%	6.2%	14.4%
Piedmont	3,859	3,924	4,000	1.7%	1.9%	3.7%
Pleasanton	23,968	26,053	28,960	8.7%	11.2%	20.8%
San Leandro	31,334	32,419	32,109	3.5%	-1.0%	2.5%
Union City	18,877	21,258	21,691	12.6%	2.0%	14.9%
Subtotal	490,593	531,527	566,001	8.3%	6.5%	15.4%
Unincorporated Areas						
Ashland CDP	7,372	7,758	8,018	5.2%	3.4%	8.8%
Castro Valley CDP	22,003	23,392	23,245	6.3%	-0.6%	5.6%
Cherryland CDP	4,823	4,975	4,965	3.2%	-0.2%	2.9%
Fairview CDP	3,351	3,642	3,774	8.7%	3.6%	12.6%
San Lorenzo CDP	7,609	7,674	9,175	0.9%	19.6%	20.6%
Sunol CDP	503	394	356	-21.7%	-9.6%	-29.2%
Unincorporated Balance	3,929	3,187	1,511	-18.9%	-52.6%	-61.5%
Subtotal	49,590	51,022	51,044	2.9%	0.0%	2.9%
Total	540,183	582,549	617,045	7.8%	5.9%	14.2%

Sources: US Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1), US Census 2010 Summary File 1 (SF1), American Community Survey, 2017-2021 The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Appendix A14: Housing Units by Type and Tenure

	Renter Households				Owner Households				Total		Renter Households				Owner Households				Total
	Single-Family	Multifamily 2-4 Units	Multifamily 5+ Units	Mobile Home/Other	Single-Family	Multifamily 2-4 Units	Multifamily 5+ Units	Mobile Home/Other			Single-Family	Multifamily 2-4 Units	Multifamily 5+ Units	Mobile Home/Other	Single-Family	Multifamily 2-4 Units	Multifamily 5+ Units	Mobile Home/Other	
Alameda County	79,360	48,045	139,502	1,366	281,280	9,378	16,737	6,015	581,683		13.6%	8.3%	24.0%	0.2%	48.4%	1.6%	2.9%	1.0%	100.0%
Bay Area Region	368,294	199,557	621,423	11,143	1,372,513	54,185	83,599	44,005	2,754,719		13.4%	7.2%	22.6%	0.4%	49.8%	2.0%	3.0%	1.6%	100.0%
California	2,087,969	881,305	2,786,617	126,448	6,566,089	137,648	294,397	337,113	13,217,586		15.8%	6.7%	21.1%	1.0%	49.7%	1.0%	2.2%	2.6%	100.0%
Cities																			
Alameda	3,859	3,666	8,498	0	12,912	500	1,045	20	30,500		12.7%	12.0%	27.9%	0.0%	42.3%	1.6%	3.4%	0.1%	100.0%
Albany	971	669	2,200	6	3,114	97	529	0	7,586		12.8%	8.8%	29.0%	0.1%	41.0%	1.3%	7.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Berkeley	4,401	6,394	14,230	81	16,045	2,382	606	56	44,195		10.0%	14.5%	32.2%	0.2%	36.3%	5.4%	1.4%	0.1%	100.0%
Dublin	2,399	440	5,330	0	13,737	174	843	23	22,946		10.5%	1.9%	23.2%	0.0%	59.9%	0.8%	3.7%	0.1%	100.0%
Emeryville	469	355	4,391	0	510	169	1,351	11	7,256		6.5%	4.9%	60.5%	0.0%	7.0%	2.3%	18.6%	0.2%	100.0%
Fremont	10,890	1,925	15,446	198	43,149	543	1,816	662	74,629		14.6%	2.6%	20.7%	0.3%	57.8%	0.7%	2.4%	0.9%	100.0%
Hayward	8,067	2,154	11,489	199	24,026	288	1,012	2,289	49,524		16.3%	4.3%	23.2%	0.4%	48.5%	0.6%	2.0%	4.6%	100.0%
Livermore	3,906	1,073	3,598	40	21,609	138	455	275	31,094		12.6%	3.5%	11.6%	0.1%	69.5%	0.4%	1.5%	0.9%	100.0%
Newark	2,435	609	1,541	31	9,021	174	503	40	14,354		17.0%	4.2%	10.7%	0.2%	62.8%	1.2%	3.5%	0.3%	100.0%
Oakland	22,569	24,773	50,630	246	58,366	3,769	6,524	430	167,307		13.5%	14.8%	30.3%	0.1%	34.9%	2.3%	3.9%	0.3%	100.0%
Piedmont	357	53	44	0	3,327	22	0	18	3,821		9.3%	1.4%	1.2%	0.0%	87.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.5%	100.0%
Pleasanton	2,921	1,400	4,682	0	17,900	250	266	314	27,733		10.5%	5.0%	16.9%	0.0%	64.5%	0.9%	1.0%	1.1%	100.0%
San Leandro	4,770	1,342	6,944	110	15,726	268	1,034	615	30,809		15.5%	4.4%	22.5%	0.4%	51.0%	0.9%	3.4%	2.0%	100.0%
Union City	3,188	587	3,160	222	12,287	291	313	752	20,800		15.3%	2.8%	15.2%	1.1%	59.1%	1.4%	1.5%	3.6%	100.0%
Subtotal	71,202	45,440	132,183	1,133	251,729	9,065	16,297	5,505	532,554		13.4%	8.5%	24.8%	0.2%	47.3%	1.7%	3.1%	1.0%	100.0%
CDPs																			
Ashland CDP	1,301	709	2,605	48	2,666	8	91	147	7,575		17.2%	9.4%	34.4%	0.6%	35.2%	0.1%	1.2%	1.9%	100.0%
Castro Valley CDP	2,382	1,093	2,628	105	15,671	239	149	200	22,467		10.6%	4.9%	11.7%	0.5%	69.8%	1.1%	0.7%	0.9%	100.0%
Cherryland CDP	1,886	563	825	47	1,234	20	170	24	4,769		39.5%	11.8%	17.3%	1.0%	25.9%	0.4%	3.6%	0.5%	100.0%
Fairview CDP	508	57	196	0	2,833	28	15	23	3,660		13.9%	1.6%	5.4%	0.0%	77.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.6%	100.0%
San Lorenzo CDP	1,859	183	1,060	24	5,734	1	15	63	8,939		20.8%	2.0%	11.9%	0.3%	64.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.7%	100.0%
Sunol CDP	42	0	0	5	247	0	0	2	296		14.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	83.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	100.0%
Unincorp. Balance	180	0	5	4	1,166	17	0	51	1,423		12.6%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	81.9%	1.2%	0.0%	3.6%	100.0%
Subtotal	8,158	2,605	7,319	233	29,551	313	440	510	49,129		16.6%	5.3%	14.9%	0.5%	60.1%	0.6%	0.9%	1.0%	100.0%

Appendix A15: Housing Units by Occupancy and Vacancy

	Occupied Housing Units	Vacant Housing Units
Alameda County	94.3%	5.7%
Bay Area Region	93.6%	6.4%
California	92.2%	7.8%
Alameda	94.0%	6.0%
Albany	96.1%	3.9%
Berkeley	89.7%	10.3%
Dublin	96.4%	3.6%
Emeryville	91.3%	8.7%
Fremont	95.4%	4.6%
Hayward	94.9%	5.1%
Livermore	96.2%	3.8%
Newark	95.8%	4.2%
Oakland	92.9%	7.1%
Piedmont	95.5%	4.5%
Pleasanton	95.8%	4.2%
Union City	95.9%	4.1%
Ashland CDP	94.5%	5.5%
Castro Valley CDP	96.7%	3.3%
Cherryland CDP	96.1%	3.9%
Fairview CDP	97.0%	3.0%
San Leandro	96.0%	4.0%
San Lorenzo CDP	97.4%	2.6%
Sunol CDP	83.1%	16.9%
Uninc. Balance	94.2%	5.8%

Sources: American Community Survey, 2017-2021
The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Appendix A16: Housing Vacancy by Type of Vacancy, 2021

	For Rent	For Sale Only	Rented or Sold, Not Occupied	For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use	For Migrant Workers	Other Vacant		For Rent	For Sale Only	Rented or Sold, Not Occupied	For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use	For Migrant Workers	Other Vacant
Alameda County	2.0%	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	2.2%	12,440	2,149	3,552	3,926	0	13,295	
Bay Area Region	1.9%	0.4%	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%	2.1%	55,242	10,584	23,363	36,457	203	62,009	
California	1.7%	0.5%	0.8%	2.6%	0.0%	2.2%	240,840	73,319	108,507	370,908	2,992	314,387	
Alameda	2.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	3.0%	775	14	164	17	0	982	
Albany	1.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	1.6%	114	5	0	63	0	126	
Berkeley	4.0%	0.2%	1.5%	0.8%	0.0%	3.8%	1,964	80	732	408	0	1,881	
Dublin	1.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.8%	354	119	67	105	0	200	
Emeryville	3.8%	0.2%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	2.7%	305	19	0	154	0	211	
Fremont	1.5%	0.6%	0.5%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1,187	488	366	782	0	788	
Hayward	2.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.8%	0.0%	1.2%	1,242	122	229	431	0	645	
Livermore	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%	0.7%	0.0%	1.3%	275	83	192	240	0	422	
Newark	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.8%	0.0%	1.0%	124	105	139	116	0	151	
Oakland	2.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	3.3%	4,296	525	1,105	1,027	0	5,911	
Piedmont	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0	0	62	0	0	117	
Pleasanton	1.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.5%	0.0%	1.1%	410	113	243	147	0	314	
San Leandro	1.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	1.4%	453	201	59	138	0	449	
Union City	1.1%	0.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	1.3%	238	149	52	179	0	273	
Ashland CDP	3.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	289	0	65	0	0	89	
Castro Valley CDP	1.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	1.7%	275	68	16	22	0	397	
Cherryland CDP	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	40	0	28	0	0	128	
Fairview CDP	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.4%	0.0%	1.1%	0	0	22	52	0	40	
San Lorenzo CDP	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.4%	53	33	0	20	0	130	
Sunol CDP	3.7%	3.1%	3.1%	2.5%	0.0%	4.5%	13	11	11	9	0	16	
Unincorporated Balance	2.2%	0.9%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.7%	33	14	0	16	0	25	

Sources: American Community Survey, 2017-2021
The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Appendix A17: Market-Rate Single Family Sale Prices, Zillow Index, 2000 - 2022

Zillow Home Value Index, Single Family Homes, 2000-2011

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
California	\$ 199,871	\$ 229,091	\$ 255,074	\$ 298,163	\$ 360,654	\$ 443,486	\$ 495,612	\$ 479,565	\$ 393,489	\$ 311,514	\$ 314,437	\$ 295,180
Alameda County	\$ 311,527	\$ 384,495	\$ 403,059	\$ 441,828	\$ 496,703	\$ 608,463	\$ 653,257	\$ 632,945	\$ 563,534	\$ 463,692	\$ 475,336	\$ 431,386
Alameda	\$ 416,677	\$ 500,966	\$ 522,652	\$ 589,622	\$ 667,372	\$ 794,578	\$ 829,796	\$ 808,084	\$ 754,045	\$ 676,229	\$ 695,154	\$ 616,657
Albany	\$ 390,950	\$ 471,962	\$ 483,158	\$ 564,529	\$ 636,448	\$ 757,348	\$ 790,703	\$ 752,688	\$ 719,123	\$ 658,954	\$ 687,017	\$ 625,098
Berkeley	\$ 437,156	\$ 534,919	\$ 552,860	\$ 611,177	\$ 679,641	\$ 817,161	\$ 843,232	\$ 814,960	\$ 770,148	\$ 710,311	\$ 751,439	\$ 680,299
Dublin	\$ 430,243	\$ 518,236	\$ 539,184	\$ 583,186	\$ 657,341	\$ 811,910	\$ 867,103	\$ 814,552	\$ 742,908	\$ 628,918	\$ 649,656	\$ 602,154
Emeryville	\$ 164,768	\$ 220,175	\$ 232,043	\$ 269,992	\$ 308,861	\$ 375,503	\$ 414,437	\$ 407,708	\$ 360,867	\$ 294,664	\$ 316,668	\$ 274,281
Fremont	\$ 437,202	\$ 544,552	\$ 543,074	\$ 587,091	\$ 647,828	\$ 798,366	\$ 852,368	\$ 829,002	\$ 761,779	\$ 648,511	\$ 672,462	\$ 617,148
Hayward	\$ 277,883	\$ 342,872	\$ 373,054	\$ 409,943	\$ 465,205	\$ 570,905	\$ 628,102	\$ 614,892	\$ 505,458	\$ 347,911	\$ 346,430	\$ 316,801
Livermore	\$ 380,672	\$ 456,307	\$ 475,061	\$ 512,690	\$ 579,943	\$ 712,362	\$ 762,776	\$ 727,871	\$ 645,209	\$ 526,378	\$ 529,715	\$ 482,766
Newark	\$ 361,296	\$ 447,497	\$ 457,010	\$ 496,163	\$ 551,086	\$ 678,324	\$ 738,790	\$ 720,350	\$ 632,254	\$ 494,943	\$ 508,571	\$ 465,316
Oakland	\$ 208,528	\$ 264,979	\$ 294,310	\$ 332,909	\$ 378,352	\$ 458,879	\$ 495,307	\$ 484,287	\$ 427,318	\$ 329,582	\$ 334,803	\$ 295,822
Piedmont	\$ 763,971	\$ 915,313	\$ 960,001	\$ 1,063,038	\$ 1,197,940	\$ 1,446,359	\$ 1,486,768	\$ 1,424,195	\$ 1,360,649	\$ 1,223,790	\$ 1,267,433	\$ 1,213,770
Pleasanton	\$ 524,670	\$ 629,119	\$ 639,195	\$ 690,419	\$ 777,177	\$ 959,010	\$ 1,009,663	\$ 962,733	\$ 895,582	\$ 790,786	\$ 812,264	\$ 766,088
San Leandro	\$ 310,652	\$ 382,101	\$ 417,820	\$ 460,374	\$ 523,665	\$ 635,421	\$ 688,817	\$ 665,724	\$ 557,498	\$ 428,998	\$ 431,505	\$ 381,465
Union City	\$ 384,642	\$ 484,206	\$ 496,015	\$ 533,083	\$ 591,857	\$ 729,165	\$ 788,450	\$ 763,062	\$ 669,385	\$ 528,268	\$ 538,494	\$ 489,263
Castro Valley	\$ 373,933	\$ 453,100	\$ 483,212	\$ 538,247	\$ 605,617	\$ 740,289	\$ 793,314	\$ 758,565	\$ 664,175	\$ 556,178	\$ 570,958	\$ 513,742
San Lorenzo	\$ 300,251	\$ 369,589	\$ 401,613	\$ 448,811	\$ 511,364	\$ 633,267	\$ 688,423	\$ 665,704	\$ 549,267	\$ 410,111	\$ 421,586	\$ 373,549
Sunol	\$ 401,879	\$ 522,340	\$ 524,083	\$ 549,629	\$ 604,015	\$ 705,384	\$ 741,445	\$ 764,390	\$ 762,819	\$ 694,172	\$ 667,430	\$ 590,288

Note: The Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) measures a typical home value for homes in the 35th to 65th percentile range. The table reflects the typical value for single-family homes sold in June of each year. Zillow only publishes data on certain CDPs in Alameda County.
Source: Zillow, 2023.

Zillow Home Value Index, Single Family Homes, 2012-2022

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
California	\$ 285,228	\$ 337,196	\$ 391,844	\$ 422,784	\$ 456,060	\$ 491,154	\$ 535,531	\$ 548,377	\$ 574,375	\$ 679,981	\$ 792,100
Alameda County	\$ 408,254	\$ 502,407	\$ 577,737	\$ 651,313	\$ 730,529	\$ 771,908	\$ 875,428	\$ 858,511	\$ 875,964	\$ 1,066,537	\$ 1,251,500
Alameda	\$ 577,514	\$ 679,786	\$ 760,351	\$ 842,339	\$ 938,435	\$ 982,858	\$ 1,071,793	\$ 1,013,212	\$ 1,054,008	\$ 1,257,283	\$ 1,430,498
Albany	\$ 605,912	\$ 716,798	\$ 798,205	\$ 898,016	\$ 989,106	\$ 1,030,240	\$ 1,131,015	\$ 1,112,157	\$ 1,135,063	\$ 1,301,849	\$ 1,461,651
Berkeley	\$ 654,657	\$ 766,062	\$ 850,649	\$ 969,356	\$ 1,069,792	\$ 1,131,063	\$ 1,247,794	\$ 1,191,932	\$ 1,249,551	\$ 1,492,847	\$ 1,650,772
Dublin	\$ 574,263	\$ 687,230	\$ 808,450	\$ 879,950	\$ 965,527	\$ 998,389	\$ 1,084,188	\$ 1,030,746	\$ 1,022,659	\$ 1,250,787	\$ 1,551,246
Emeryville	\$ 269,172	\$ 354,242	\$ 448,895	\$ 495,979	\$ 570,649	\$ 590,745	\$ 641,497	\$ 620,851	\$ 618,487	\$ 739,620	\$ 808,223
Fremont	\$ 580,070	\$ 696,137	\$ 787,754	\$ 887,873	\$ 982,834	\$ 1,029,478	\$ 1,176,564	\$ 1,118,301	\$ 1,106,416	\$ 1,321,474	\$ 1,594,708
Hayward	\$ 298,891	\$ 378,221	\$ 455,590	\$ 502,975	\$ 572,228	\$ 615,042	\$ 695,089	\$ 690,650	\$ 705,174	\$ 832,779	\$ 941,415
Livermore	\$ 465,331	\$ 569,139	\$ 664,595	\$ 730,271	\$ 783,188	\$ 806,601	\$ 878,130	\$ 851,604	\$ 855,939	\$ 1,035,037	\$ 1,203,618
Newark	\$ 431,758	\$ 532,866	\$ 605,728	\$ 677,416	\$ 761,618	\$ 814,497	\$ 941,603	\$ 907,103	\$ 913,481	\$ 1,087,782	\$ 1,282,048
Oakland	\$ 281,091	\$ 359,761	\$ 431,279	\$ 509,376	\$ 602,196	\$ 650,789	\$ 730,916	\$ 724,320	\$ 763,567	\$ 917,316	\$ 994,332
Piedmont	\$ 1,188,015	\$ 1,395,884	\$ 1,542,165	\$ 1,746,945	\$ 1,878,974	\$ 1,888,836	\$ 2,048,572	\$ 1,989,143	\$ 1,975,194	\$ 2,437,459	\$ 2,817,892
Pleasanton	\$ 737,136	\$ 860,544	\$ 947,688	\$ 1,015,095	\$ 1,099,666	\$ 1,126,444	\$ 1,236,416	\$ 1,191,768	\$ 1,189,262	\$ 1,439,102	\$ 1,767,664
San Leandro	\$ 346,994	\$ 427,860	\$ 486,430	\$ 535,513	\$ 600,764	\$ 644,320	\$ 710,089	\$ 704,726	\$ 731,456	\$ 846,924	\$ 928,693
Union City	\$ 454,172	\$ 562,959	\$ 637,130	\$ 704,109	\$ 774,066	\$ 817,091	\$ 924,665	\$ 896,973	\$ 888,035	\$ 1,070,674	\$ 1,292,299
Castro Valley	\$ 482,994	\$ 587,228	\$ 657,923	\$ 719,196	\$ 797,596	\$ 826,256	\$ 896,010	\$ 874,642	\$ 907,599	\$ 1,082,822	\$ 1,241,459
San Lorenzo	\$ 347,822	\$ 423,184	\$ 476,940	\$ 519,110	\$ 584,559	\$ 626,235	\$ 693,781	\$ 688,562	\$ 720,975	\$ 820,464	\$ 882,340
Sunol	\$ 606,845	\$ 727,070	\$ 763,545	\$ 828,698	\$ 969,546	\$ 996,433	\$ 1,049,239	\$ 950,572	\$ 999,386	\$ 1,302,345	\$ 1,456,452

Note: The Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) measures a typical home value for homes in the 35th to 65th percentile range. The table reflects the typical value for single-family homes sold in June of each year. Zillow only publishes data on certain CDPs in Alameda County.
Source: Zillow, 2023.

Appendix A18: Market-Rate Condo Sale Prices, Zillow Index, 2000 - 2022

Zillow Home Value Index, Condominiums, 2000-2011

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
California	\$ 162,813	\$ 188,908	\$ 210,372	\$ 244,864	\$ 295,380	\$ 356,157	\$ 391,320	\$ 377,527	\$ 319,839	\$ 265,958	\$ 264,061	\$ 240,954
Alameda County	\$ 216,570	\$ 271,302	\$ 284,668	\$ 307,542	\$ 341,555	\$ 416,856	\$ 447,767	\$ 431,164	\$ 387,821	\$ 310,673	\$ 296,517	\$ 258,815
Alameda	\$ 304,888	\$ 367,653	\$ 380,076	\$ 421,084	\$ 470,481	\$ 566,557	\$ 591,965	\$ 568,760	\$ 516,800	\$ 448,113	\$ 454,647	\$ 403,612
Albany												
Berkeley	\$ 215,301	\$ 267,247	\$ 273,835	\$ 305,174	\$ 345,025	\$ 411,614	\$ 429,577	\$ 411,662	\$ 400,017	\$ 380,522	\$ 361,254	\$ 326,827
Dublin	\$ 378,353	\$ 457,778	\$ 485,841	\$ 520,454	\$ 580,558	\$ 716,248	\$ 770,029	\$ 729,216	\$ 644,269	\$ 517,035	\$ 512,823	\$ 453,566
Emeryville	\$ 159,343	\$ 202,069	\$ 215,533	\$ 233,786	\$ 261,302	\$ 313,365	\$ 338,640	\$ 323,264	\$ 326,423	\$ 244,748	\$ 300,512	\$ 241,942
Fremont	\$ 251,705	\$ 318,930	\$ 318,886	\$ 338,561	\$ 372,912	\$ 455,394	\$ 489,862	\$ 472,809	\$ 431,789	\$ 343,226	\$ 324,731	\$ 287,043
Hayward	\$ 230,511	\$ 288,103	\$ 315,195	\$ 343,468	\$ 385,288	\$ 470,935	\$ 510,191	\$ 495,286	\$ 399,235	\$ 261,845	\$ 236,621	\$ 199,959
Livermore	\$ 235,473	\$ 293,694	\$ 318,688	\$ 344,164	\$ 386,377	\$ 475,307	\$ 519,424	\$ 496,803	\$ 425,900	\$ 318,932	\$ 295,114	\$ 264,792
Newark	\$ 320,942	\$ 400,763	\$ 407,871	\$ 436,462	\$ 477,074	\$ 580,455	\$ 640,363	\$ 616,471	\$ 557,786	\$ 437,067	\$ 366,431	\$ 326,428
Oakland	\$ 181,659	\$ 231,941	\$ 255,991	\$ 282,293	\$ 316,919	\$ 384,282	\$ 411,759	\$ 397,432	\$ 368,748	\$ 296,455	\$ 266,023	\$ 227,850
Pleasanton	\$ 288,192	\$ 353,711	\$ 356,694	\$ 384,313	\$ 427,219	\$ 528,419	\$ 559,384	\$ 528,432	\$ 477,056	\$ 404,780	\$ 409,416	\$ 368,587
San Leandro	\$ 158,352	\$ 205,384	\$ 224,547	\$ 243,629	\$ 271,573	\$ 329,154	\$ 354,367	\$ 346,317	\$ 282,448	\$ 202,900	\$ 193,911	\$ 175,771
Union City	\$ 194,637	\$ 248,197	\$ 259,245	\$ 277,804	\$ 306,461	\$ 373,683	\$ 410,020	\$ 399,986	\$ 344,963	\$ 235,304	\$ 219,808	\$ 196,432
Castro Valley	\$ 337,135	\$ 404,233	\$ 422,205	\$ 460,261	\$ 522,065	\$ 631,220	\$ 666,380	\$ 638,900	\$ 578,601	\$ 510,934	\$ 512,204	\$ 463,803
San Lorenzo		\$ 255,371	\$ 277,747	\$ 300,642	\$ 343,178	\$ 411,449	\$ 443,277	\$ 444,475	\$ 360,871	\$ 268,093	\$ 257,252	\$ 225,677

Note: The Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) measures a typical home value for homes in the 35th to 65th percentile range. The table reflects the typical value for condominiums sold in June of each year. Zillow only publishes data on certain CDPs in Alameda County.

Source: Zillow, 2023.

Zillow Home Value Index, Condominiums, 2012-2022

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
California	\$ 226,936	\$ 275,227	\$ 324,495	\$ 349,003	\$ 379,636	\$ 407,822	\$ 449,184	\$ 467,360	\$ 483,148	\$ 529,141	\$ 635,417
Alameda County	\$ 238,498	\$ 304,516	\$ 370,548	\$ 419,943	\$ 489,382	\$ 518,936	\$ 581,897	\$ 633,538	\$ 629,693	\$ 631,556	\$ 708,235
Alameda	\$ 369,797	\$ 441,146	\$ 495,438	\$ 543,701	\$ 617,894	\$ 655,170	\$ 720,645	\$ 748,295	\$ 762,772	\$ 785,860	\$ 869,728
Albany	\$ 269,449	\$ 329,623	\$ 380,026	\$ 421,129	\$ 469,308	\$ 492,057	\$ 546,745	\$ 581,603	\$ 564,565	\$ 578,931	\$ 614,691
Berkeley	\$ 310,595	\$ 375,638	\$ 432,765	\$ 490,076	\$ 563,139	\$ 598,380	\$ 663,411	\$ 766,885	\$ 807,043	\$ 717,420	\$ 818,020
Dublin	\$ 425,994	\$ 560,096	\$ 650,422	\$ 694,247	\$ 768,043	\$ 801,294	\$ 873,351	\$ 898,926	\$ 878,010	\$ 878,364	\$ 1,084,234
Emeryville	\$ 228,591	\$ 277,378	\$ 338,814	\$ 381,023	\$ 447,555	\$ 473,353	\$ 511,751	\$ 537,038	\$ 528,725	\$ 513,003	\$ 547,004
Fremont	\$ 268,650	\$ 347,140	\$ 413,912	\$ 474,087	\$ 551,459	\$ 581,091	\$ 664,919	\$ 738,565	\$ 713,536	\$ 677,507	\$ 774,100
Hayward	\$ 181,343	\$ 237,713	\$ 318,678	\$ 357,847	\$ 417,395	\$ 451,249	\$ 510,581	\$ 541,289	\$ 546,669	\$ 581,364	\$ 652,989
Livermore	\$ 251,380	\$ 341,672	\$ 432,035	\$ 482,416	\$ 531,241	\$ 551,038	\$ 609,627	\$ 630,642	\$ 604,395	\$ 660,577	\$ 803,301
Newark	\$ 291,723	\$ 385,481	\$ 472,610	\$ 524,489	\$ 615,705	\$ 660,707	\$ 768,809	\$ 817,437	\$ 798,516	\$ 838,694	\$ 968,984
Oakland	\$ 204,782	\$ 257,868	\$ 320,376	\$ 377,522	\$ 459,445	\$ 497,282	\$ 546,987	\$ 594,690	\$ 611,311	\$ 589,273	\$ 626,594
Pleasanton	\$ 346,577	\$ 422,206	\$ 477,392	\$ 519,653	\$ 581,174	\$ 606,095	\$ 675,121	\$ 766,957	\$ 756,316	\$ 740,107	\$ 843,125
San Leandro	\$ 156,420	\$ 202,381	\$ 259,825	\$ 289,674	\$ 342,250	\$ 368,199	\$ 408,697	\$ 462,705	\$ 476,478	\$ 483,037	\$ 547,421
Union City	\$ 180,649	\$ 246,281	\$ 307,498	\$ 341,228	\$ 390,934	\$ 417,956	\$ 477,963	\$ 541,106	\$ 519,937	\$ 508,741	\$ 595,513
Castro Valley	\$ 444,642	\$ 519,532	\$ 593,802	\$ 649,618	\$ 716,204	\$ 735,614	\$ 813,092	\$ 844,127	\$ 875,723	\$ 971,598	\$ 1,124,319
San Lorenzo	\$ 201,532	\$ 252,134	\$ 322,724	\$ 360,231	\$ 410,204	\$ 434,399	\$ 470,388	\$ 537,514	\$ 557,711	\$ 541,820	\$ 621,811

Note: The Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) measures a typical home value for homes in the 35th to 65th percentile range. The table reflects the typical value for condominiums sold in June of each year. Zillow only publishes data on certain CDPs in Alameda County.

Source: Zillow, 2023.

Appendix A19: CHAS Cost Burden Data Detail for Owner Households

	California					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	384,014	6%	648,640	9%	264,626	69%
Cost burden <= 30%	110,374	2%	117,890	2%	7,516	7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	51,050	1%	92,940	1%	41,890	82%
Cost burden >50%	222,590	3%	381,175	5%	158,585	71%
Not computed	-	0%	56,635	1%	56,635	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	472,100	7%	693,745	10%	221,645	47%
Cost burden <= 30%	184,510	3%	283,905	4%	99,395	54%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	102,535	2%	168,205	2%	65,670	64%
Cost burden >50%	185,055	3%	241,630	3%	56,575	31%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	841,449	13%	1,095,550	15%	254,101	30%
Cost burden <= 30%	409,005	6%	582,635	8%	173,630	42%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	247,740	4%	332,950	5%	85,210	34%
Cost burden >50%	184,704	3%	179,965	3%	(4,739)	-3%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	4,848,664	74%	4,716,645	66%	(132,019)	-3%
Cost burden <= 30%	3,872,335	59%	4,000,820	56%	128,485	3%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	805,499	12%	613,215	9%	(192,284)	-24%
Cost burden >50%	170,830	3%	102,610	1%	(68,220)	-40%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	6,546,227	100%	7,154,580	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	1,206,824	18%	1,207,310	17%	486	0%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	763,179	12%	905,380	13%	142,201	19%
Households with Cost Burden	1,970,003	30%	2,112,690	30%	142,687	7%

	Bay Area					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	88,845	6%	139,500	9%	50,655	57%
Cost burden <= 30%	26,608	2%	30,010	2%	3,402	13%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	12,866	1%	21,080	1%	8,214	64%
Cost burden >50%	49,360	3%	79,320	5%	29,960	61%
Not computed	11	0%	9,100	1%	9,089	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	101,855	7%	138,020	9%	36,165	36%
Cost burden <= 30%	46,031	3%	62,165	4%	16,134	35%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	20,298	1%	31,405	2%	11,107	55%
Cost burden >50%	35,483	2%	44,455	3%	8,972	25%
Not computed	43	0%	-	0%	(43)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	161,775	11%	191,820	13%	30,045	19%
Cost burden <= 30%	81,581	6%	104,845	7%	23,264	29%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	46,373	3%	55,245	4%	8,872	19%
Cost burden >50%	33,749	2%	31,725	2%	(2,024)	-6%
Not computed	72	0%	-	0%	(72)	
Household Income >80% AMI	1,071,535	75%	1,062,615	69%	(8,920)	-1%
Cost burden <= 30%	853,333	60%	905,125	59%	51,792	6%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	183,113	13%	136,805	9%	(46,308)	-25%
Cost burden >50%	35,085	2%	20,680	1%	(14,405)	-41%
Not computed	4	0%	-	0%	(4)	
Total	1,424,010	100%	1,531,960	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	262,650	18%	244,535	16%	-18,115	-7%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	153,677	11%	176,180	12%	22,503	15%
Households with Cost Burden	416,327	29%	420,715	27%	4,388	1%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Alameda County						
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	18,533	6%	26,250	8%	7,717	42%
Cost burden <= 30%	5,329	2%	5,700	2%	371	7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	2,569	1%	4,190	1%	1,621	63%
Cost burden >50%	10,635	4%	14,670	5%	4,035	38%
Not computed	-	0%	1,690	1%	1,690	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	21,045	7%	25,830	8%	4,785	23%
Cost burden <= 30%	9,570	3%	11,425	4%	1,855	19%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4,170	1%	5,790	2%	1,620	39%
Cost burden >50%	7,291	3%	8,620	3%	1,329	18%
Not computed	14	0%	-	0%	(14)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	29,143	10%	32,130	10%	2,987	10%
Cost burden <= 30%	14,399	5%	17,075	6%	2,676	19%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	8,500	3%	9,705	3%	1,205	14%
Cost burden >50%	6,244	2%	5,350	2%	(894)	-14%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	217,590	76%	224,670	73%	7,080	3%
Cost burden <= 30%	172,482	60%	191,805	62%	19,323	11%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	38,450	13%	29,035	9%	(9,415)	-24%
Cost burden >50%	6,647	2%	3,840	1%	(2,807)	-42%
Not computed	11	0%	-	0%	(11)	
Total	286,311	100%	308,890	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	53,689	19%	48,720	16%	-4,969	-9%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	30,817	11%	32,480	11%	1,663	5%
Households with Cost Burden	84,506	30%	81,200	26%	-3,306	-4%

Alameda City						
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	797	6%	1,165	8%	368	46%
Cost burden <= 30%	234	2%	185	1%	(49)	-21%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	149	1%	250	2%	101	68%
Cost burden >50%	414	3%	640	4%	226	55%
Not computed	-	0%	90	1%	90	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,103	8%	1,195	8%	92	8%
Cost burden <= 30%	459	3%	610	4%	151	33%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	194	1%	200	1%	6	3%
Cost burden >50%	450	3%	385	3%	(65)	-14%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,231	8%	1,175	8%	(56)	-5%
Cost burden <= 30%	638	4%	705	5%	67	11%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	248	2%	230	2%	(18)	-7%
Cost burden >50%	345	2%	240	2%	(105)	-30%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	11,358	78%	11,045	76%	(313)	-3%
Cost burden <= 30%	9,149	63%	9,130	63%	(19)	0%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,864	13%	1,790	12%	(74)	-4%
Cost burden >50%	345	2%	125	1%	(220)	-64%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	14,489	100%	14,590	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	2,455	17%	2,470	17%	15	1%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	1,554	11%	1,390	10%	-164	-11%
Households with Cost Burden	4,009	28%	3,860	26%	-149	-4%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

	Albany					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	239	7%	265	8%	26	11%
Cost burden <= 30%	43	1%	35	1%	(8)	-19%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	35	1%	100	3%	65	186%
Cost burden >50%	149	4%	110	3%	(39)	-26%
Not computed	12	0%	15	0%	3	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	265	7%	220	6%	(45)	-17%
Cost burden <= 30%	119	3%	140	4%	21	18%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	44	1%	50	1%	6	14%
Cost burden >50%	98	3%	25	1%	(73)	-74%
Not computed	4	0%	-	0%	(4)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	412	12%	325	9%	(87)	-21%
Cost burden <= 30%	223	6%	170	5%	(53)	-24%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	90	3%	100	3%	10	11%
Cost burden >50%	99	3%	50	1%	(49)	-49%
Not computed	0	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	2,630	74%	2,694	77%	64	2%
Cost burden <= 30%	2,054	58%	2,320	66%	266	13%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	513	14%	365	10%	(148)	-29%
Cost burden >50%	63	2%	4	0%	(59)	-94%
Not computed	0	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	3,546	100%	3,495	100%		
 <i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	682	19%	615	18%	-67	-10%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	409	12%	189	5%	-220	-54%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	1,091	31%	804	23%	-287	-26%

	Berkeley					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,285	7%	1,330	7%	45	4%
Cost burden <= 30%	269	1%	165	1%	(104)	-39%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	206	1%	135	1%	(71)	-34%
Cost burden >50%	803	4%	920	5%	117	15%
Not computed	7	0%	110	1%	103	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,230	6%	1,305	7%	75	6%
Cost burden <= 30%	464	2%	510	3%	46	10%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	273	1%	230	1%	(43)	-16%
Cost burden >50%	483	3%	570	3%	87	18%
Not computed	10	0%	-	0%	(10)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,760	9%	1,665	9%	(95)	-5%
Cost burden <= 30%	893	5%	820	4%	(73)	-8%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	419	2%	415	2%	(4)	-1%
Cost burden >50%	439	2%	430	2%	(9)	-2%
Not computed	9	0%	-	0%	(9)	
Household Income >80% AMI	14,930	78%	15,175	78%	245	2%
Cost burden <= 30%	11,989	62%	12,885	66%	896	7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	2,404	13%	1,895	10%	(509)	-21%
Cost burden >50%	545	3%	400	2%	(145)	-27%
Not computed	(8)	0%	-	0%	8	
Total	19,205	100%	19,480	100%		
 <i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	3,302	17%	2,675	14%	-627	-19%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	2,270	12%	2,320	12%	50	2%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	5,572	29%	4,995	26%	-577	-10%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

	Dublin					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	190	3%	655	5%	465	245%
Cost burden <= 30%	49	1%	95	1%	46	94%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	12	0%	70	1%	58	483%
Cost burden >50%	123	2%	450	3%	327	266%
Not computed	6	0%	45	0%	39	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	220	4%	555	4%	335	152%
Cost burden <= 30%	42	1%	285	2%	243	579%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	53	1%	55	0%	2	4%
Cost burden >50%	119	2%	215	2%	96	81%
Not computed	6	0%	-	0%	(6)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	405	7%	805	6%	400	99%
Cost burden <= 30%	154	3%	315	2%	161	105%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	118	2%	275	2%	157	133%
Cost burden >50%	123	2%	210	2%	87	71%
Not computed	10	0%	-	0%	(10)	
Household Income >80% AMI	5,240	87%	11,220	85%	5,980	114%
Cost burden <= 30%	3,910	65%	9,430	71%	5,520	141%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,145	19%	1,620	12%	475	41%
Cost burden >50%	179	3%	175	1%	(4)	-2%
Not computed	6	0%	-	0%	(6)	
Total	6,055	100%	13,245	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	1,328	22%	2,020	15%	692	52%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	544	9%	1,050	8%	506	93%
Households with Cost Burden	1,872	31%	3,070	23%	1,198	64%

	Emeryville					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	115	8%	295	13%	180	157%
Cost burden <= 30%	45	3%	70	3%	25	56%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	10	1%	45	2%	35	350%
Cost burden >50%	60	4%	125	6%	65	108%
Not computed	-	0%	55	2%	55	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	145	10%	190	8%	45	31%
Cost burden <= 30%	15	1%	95	4%	80	533%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	50	3%	10	0%	(40)	-80%
Cost burden >50%	80	5%	85	4%	5	6%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	184	12%	160	7%	(24)	-13%
Cost burden <= 30%	59	4%	65	3%	6	10%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	65	4%	80	4%	15	23%
Cost burden >50%	60	4%	20	1%	(40)	-67%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	1,039	70%	1,605	71%	566	54%
Cost burden <= 30%	809	55%	1,455	65%	646	80%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	170	11%	145	6%	(25)	-15%
Cost burden >50%	60	4%	0	0%	(60)	-100%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	1,483	100%	2,245	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	295	20%	280	12%	-15	-5%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	260	18%	230	10%	-30	-12%
Households with Cost Burden	555	37%	510	23%	-45	-8%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

	Fremont					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,696	4%	3,375	7%	1,679	99%
Cost burden <= 30%	448	1%	670	1%	222	50%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	174	0%	695	2%	521	299%
Cost burden >50%	1,074	2%	1,805	4%	731	68%
Not computed	-	0%	205	0%	205	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	2,109	5%	3,005	7%	896	42%
Cost burden <= 30%	915	2%	1,335	3%	420	46%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	455	1%	705	2%	250	55%
Cost burden >50%	739	2%	970	2%	231	31%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	3,472	8%	3,755	8%	283	8%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,495	3%	2,265	5%	770	52%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,028	2%	780	2%	(248)	-24%
Cost burden >50%	949	2%	705	2%	(244)	-26%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	36,760	83%	35,785	78%	(975)	-3%
Cost burden <= 30%	28,470	65%	31,295	68%	2,825	10%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	7,173	16%	4,040	9%	(3,133)	-44%
Cost burden >50%	1,105	3%	445	1%	(660)	-60%
Not computed	12	0%	-	0%	(12)	
Total	44,037	100%	45,910	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	8,830	20%	6,220	14%	-2,610	-30%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	3,867	9%	3,925	9%	58	1%
Households with Cost Burden	12,697	29%	10,145	22%	-2,552	-20%

	Hayward					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,600	7%	2,590	10%	990	62%
Cost burden <= 30%	493	2%	765	3%	272	55%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	237	1%	390	2%	153	65%
Cost burden >50%	870	4%	1,335	5%	465	53%
Not computed	-	0%	100	0%	100	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	2,576	11%	2,665	11%	89	3%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,275	5%	1,090	4%	(185)	-15%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	513	2%	670	3%	157	31%
Cost burden >50%	788	3%	900	4%	112	14%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	3,444	14%	3,955	16%	511	15%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,739	7%	2,035	8%	296	17%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,160	5%	1,605	6%	445	38%
Cost burden >50%	545	2%	310	1%	(235)	-43%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	16,335	68%	15,970	63%	(365)	-2%
Cost burden <= 30%	13,140	55%	13,755	55%	615	5%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	2,783	12%	2,065	8%	(718)	-26%
Cost burden >50%	394	2%	160	1%	(234)	-59%
Not computed	18	0%	-	0%	(18)	
Total	23,955	100%	25,185	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	4,693	20%	4,730	19%	37	1%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	2,597	11%	2,705	11%	108	4%
Households with Cost Burden	7,290	30%	7,435	30%	145	2%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.
(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

	Livermore					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	659	4%	1,010	4%	351	53%
Cost burden <= 30%	170	1%	265	1%	95	56%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	50	0%	190	1%	140	280%
Cost burden >50%	439	2%	440	2%	1	0%
Not computed	-	0%	110	0%	110	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	725	4%	1,430	6%	705	97%
Cost burden <= 30%	300	2%	660	3%	360	120%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	115	1%	255	1%	140	122%
Cost burden >50%	310	2%	510	2%	200	65%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,302	7%	2,245	10%	943	72%
Cost burden <= 30%	604	3%	1,130	5%	526	87%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	329	2%	665	3%	336	102%
Cost burden >50%	369	2%	450	2%	81	22%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	16,125	86%	18,315	80%	2,190	14%
Cost burden <= 30%	12,340	66%	15,665	68%	3,325	27%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	3,305	18%	2,320	10%	(985)	-30%
Cost burden >50%	480	3%	330	1%	(150)	-31%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	18,811	100%	22,995	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	3,799	20%	3,430	15%	-369	-10%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	1,598	8%	1,730	8%	132	8%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	5,397	29%	5,160	22%	-237	-4%

	Newark					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	424	5%	610	6%	186	44%
Cost burden <= 30%	123	1%	210	2%	87	71%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	73	1%	70	1%	(3)	-4%
Cost burden >50%	228	2%	255	3%	27	12%
Not computed	-	0%	80	1%	80	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	564	6%	760	8%	196	35%
Cost burden <= 30%	275	3%	355	4%	80	29%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	89	1%	185	2%	96	108%
Cost burden >50%	200	2%	220	2%	20	10%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,074	12%	1,315	14%	241	22%
Cost burden <= 30%	315	3%	690	7%	375	119%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	480	5%	450	5%	(30)	-6%
Cost burden >50%	279	3%	180	2%	(99)	-35%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	7,122	78%	6,975	72%	(147)	-2%
Cost burden <= 30%	5,730	62%	6,135	64%	405	7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,215	13%	790	8%	(425)	-35%
Cost burden >50%	177	2%	50	1%	(127)	-72%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	9,184	100%	9,670	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	1,857	20%	1,495	15%	-362	-19%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	884	10%	705	7%	-179	-20%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	2,741	30%	2,200	23%	-541	-20%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

	Oakland					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	6,588	11%	7,450	11%	862	13%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,799	3%	1,130	2%	(669)	-37%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	930	1%	1,330	2%	400	43%
Cost burden >50%	3,859	6%	4,580	7%	721	19%
Not computed	-	0%	415	1%	415	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	6,181	10%	7,145	11%	964	16%
Cost burden <= 30%	2,580	4%	2,890	4%	310	12%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,455	2%	1,965	3%	510	35%
Cost burden >50%	2,146	3%	2,290	3%	144	7%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	7,862	13%	7,310	11%	(552)	-7%
Cost burden <= 30%	4,225	7%	4,000	6%	(225)	-5%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	2,209	4%	2,205	3%	(4)	0%
Cost burden >50%	1,428	2%	1,110	2%	(318)	-22%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	41,848	67%	44,275	67%	2,427	6%
Cost burden <= 30%	33,978	54%	36,950	56%	2,972	9%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	6,470	10%	6,265	9%	(205)	-3%
Cost burden >50%	1,400	2%	1,055	2%	(345)	-25%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	62,479	100%	66,175	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	11,064	18%	11,765	18%	701	6%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	8,833	14%	9,035	14%	202	2%
Households with Cost Burden	19,897	32%	20,800	31%	903	5%

	Piedmont					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	144	4%	165	5%	21	15%
Cost burden <= 30%	4	0%	10	0%	6	150%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	15	0%	35	1%	20	133%
Cost burden >50%	125	4%	115	3%	(10)	-8%
Not computed	-	0%	10	0%	10	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	131	4%	70	2%	(61)	-47%
Cost burden <= 30%	28	1%	15	0%	(13)	-46%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	29	1%	0	0%	(29)	-100%
Cost burden >50%	74	2%	55	2%	(19)	-26%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	134	4%	110	3%	(24)	-18%
Cost burden <= 30%	72	2%	50	1%	(22)	-31%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	23	1%	45	1%	22	96%
Cost burden >50%	39	1%	10	0%	(29)	-74%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	3,030	88%	3,030	90%	-	0%
Cost burden <= 30%	2,390	69%	2,605	77%	215	9%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	460	13%	335	10%	(125)	-27%
Cost burden >50%	180	5%	85	3%	(95)	-53%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	3,439	100%	3,375	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	527	15%	415	12%	-112	-21%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	418	12%	265	8%	-153	-37%
Households with Cost Burden	945	27%	680	20%	-265	-28%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

	Pleasanton					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	446	3%	1,265	6%	819	184%
Cost burden <= 30%	55	0%	290	1%	235	427%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	44	0%	145	1%	101	230%
Cost burden >50%	347	2%	775	4%	428	123%
Not computed	-	0%	55	0%	55	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	512	3%	825	4%	313	61%
Cost burden <= 30%	209	1%	340	2%	131	63%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	35	0%	180	1%	145	414%
Cost burden >50%	268	2%	300	1%	32	12%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	877	5%	1,330	7%	453	52%
Cost burden <= 30%	393	2%	595	3%	202	51%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	234	1%	265	1%	31	13%
Cost burden >50%	250	1%	470	2%	220	88%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	15,268	89%	16,870	83%	1,602	10%
Cost burden <= 30%	11,750	69%	14,535	72%	2,785	24%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	2,899	17%	1,890	9%	(1,009)	-35%
Cost burden >50%	619	4%	440	2%	(179)	-29%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	17,103	100%	20,285	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	3,212	19%	2,480	12%	-732	-23%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	1,484	9%	1,985	10%	501	34%
Households with Cost Burden	4,696	27%	4,465	22%	-231	-5%

	San Leandro					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,600	9%	2,340	13%	740	46%
Cost burden <= 30%	709	4%	805	5%	96	14%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	289	2%	220	1%	(69)	-24%
Cost burden >50%	593	3%	1,145	7%	552	93%
Not computed	9	0%	170	1%	161	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,915	10%	2,310	13%	395	21%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,139	6%	1,055	6%	(84)	-7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	313	2%	430	2%	117	37%
Cost burden >50%	455	2%	830	5%	375	82%
Not computed	8	0%	-	0%	(8)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	2,357	13%	2,455	14%	98	4%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,309	7%	1,245	7%	(64)	-5%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	710	4%	710	4%	-	0%
Cost burden >50%	338	2%	495	3%	157	46%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	12,692	68%	10,455	60%	(2,237)	-18%
Cost burden <= 30%	10,444	56%	8,985	51%	(1,459)	-14%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,973	11%	1,390	8%	(583)	-30%
Cost burden >50%	275	1%	80	0%	(195)	-71%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	18,564	100%	17,560	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	3,285	18%	2,750	16%	-535	-16%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	1,661	9%	2,550	15%	889	54%
Households with Cost Burden	4,946	27%	5,300	30%	354	7%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

	Union City					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	700	5%	1,110	8%	410	59%
Cost burden <= 30%	180	1%	255	2%	75	42%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	55	0%	155	1%	100	182%
Cost burden >50%	453	3%	600	4%	147	32%
Not computed	12	0%	100	1%	88	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	825	6%	1,235	9%	410	50%
Cost burden <= 30%	319	2%	635	4%	316	99%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	135	1%	235	2%	100	74%
Cost burden >50%	354	3%	370	3%	16	5%
Not computed	17	0%	-	0%	(17)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,175	9%	1,720	12%	545	46%
Cost burden <= 30%	409	3%	850	6%	441	108%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	440	3%	655	5%	215	49%
Cost burden >50%	304	2%	210	1%	(94)	-31%
Not computed	22	0%	-	0%	(22)	
Household Income >80% AMI	10,557	80%	10,215	72%	(342)	-3%
Cost burden <= 30%	8,325	63%	8,805	62%	480	6%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	2,015	15%	1,265	9%	(750)	-37%
Cost burden >50%	217	2%	150	1%	(67)	-31%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	13,257	100%	14,280	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	2,645	20%	2,310	16%	-335	-13%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	1,328	10%	1,330	9%	2	0%
Households with Cost Burden	3,973	30%	3,640	25%	-333	-8%

	Ashland CDP					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	335	13%	450	16%	115	34%
Cost burden <= 30%	110	4%	125	4%	15	14%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	34	1%	30	1%	(4)	-12%
Cost burden >50%	188	7%	275	10%	87	46%
Not computed	3	0%	20	1%	17	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	305	12%	395	14%	90	30%
Cost burden <= 30%	143	6%	170	6%	27	19%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	73	3%	100	4%	27	37%
Cost burden >50%	68	3%	125	4%	57	84%
Not computed	21	1%	-	0%	(21)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	405	16%	380	14%	(25)	-6%
Cost burden <= 30%	221	9%	220	8%	(1)	0%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	113	4%	135	5%	22	19%
Cost burden >50%	54	2%	25	1%	(29)	-54%
Not computed	17	1%	-	0%	(17)	
Household Income >80% AMI	1,554	60%	1,555	56%	1	0%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,238	48%	1,380	50%	142	11%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	280	11%	170	6%	(110)	-39%
Cost burden >50%	29	1%	10	0%	(19)	-66%
Not computed	7	0%	-	0%	(7)	
Total	2,599	100%	2,785	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	500	19%	435	16%	-65	-13%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	339	13%	435	16%	96	28%
Households with Cost Burden	839	32%	870	31%	31	4%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Castro Valley CDP						
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	921	6%	1,150	7%	229	25%
Cost burden <= 30%	324	2%	295	2%	(29)	-9%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	104	1%	210	1%	106	102%
Cost burden >50%	493	3%	545	3%	52	11%
Not computed	-	0%	100	1%	100	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,121	7%	1,555	10%	434	39%
Cost burden <= 30%	618	4%	750	5%	132	21%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	164	1%	300	2%	136	83%
Cost burden >50%	339	2%	510	3%	171	50%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,498	10%	1,490	9%	(8)	-1%
Cost burden <= 30%	793	5%	895	6%	102	13%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	450	3%	385	2%	(65)	-14%
Cost burden >50%	255	2%	210	1%	(45)	-18%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	11,527	77%	11,745	74%	218	2%
Cost burden <= 30%	9,239	61%	9,930	62%	691	7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	2,020	13%	1,585	10%	(435)	-22%
Cost burden >50%	268	2%	220	1%	(48)	-18%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	15,067	100%	15,940	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	2,738	18%	2,480	16%	-258	-9%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	1,355	9%	1,485	9%	130	10%
Households with Cost Burden	4,093	27%	3,965	25%	-128	-3%

Cherryland CDP						
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	152	10%	220	18%	68	45%
Cost burden <= 30%	28	2%	25	2%	(3)	-11%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	34	2%	30	2%	(4)	-12%
Cost burden >50%	90	6%	165	14%	75	83%
Not computed	-	0%	0	0%	-	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	137	9%	75	6%	(62)	-45%
Cost burden <= 30%	69	5%	30	2%	(39)	-57%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	14	1%	45	4%	31	221%
Cost burden >50%	54	4%	0	0%	(54)	-100%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	308	21%	300	25%	(8)	-3%
Cost burden <= 30%	207	14%	195	16%	(12)	-6%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	63	4%	90	7%	27	43%
Cost burden >50%	38	3%	10	1%	(28)	-74%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	890	60%	619	51%	(271)	-30%
Cost burden <= 30%	739	50%	490	40%	(249)	-34%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	127	9%	125	10%	(2)	-2%
Cost burden >50%	24	2%	4	0%	(20)	-83%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	1,487	100%	1,215	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	238	16%	290	24%	52	22%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	206	14%	179	15%	-27	-13%
Households with Cost Burden	444	30%	469	39%	25	6%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Fairview CDP						
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	106	4%	155	5%	49	46%
Cost burden <= 30%	24	1%	30	1%	6	25%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	20	1%	20	1%	-	0%
Cost burden >50%	62	2%	110	3%	48	77%
Not computed	0	0%	0	0%	-	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	140	5%	215	7%	75	54%
Cost burden <= 30%	33	1%	150	5%	117	355%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	19	1%	15	0%	(4)	-21%
Cost burden >50%	83	3%	50	2%	(33)	-40%
Not computed	5	0%	-	0%	(5)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	275	10%	385	12%	110	40%
Cost burden <= 30%	102	4%	125	4%	23	23%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	35	1%	155	5%	120	343%
Cost burden >50%	135	5%	105	3%	(30)	-22%
Not computed	3	0%	-	0%	(3)	
Household Income >80% AMI	2,155	81%	2,435	76%	280	13%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,703	64%	2,045	64%	342	20%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	395	15%	360	11%	(35)	-9%
Cost burden >50%	49	2%	35	1%	(14)	-29%
Not computed	8	0%	-	0%	(8)	
Total	2,676	100%	3,195	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	469	18%	550	17%	81	17%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	329	12%	300	9%	-29	-9%
Households with Cost Burden	798	30%	850	27%	52	7%

San Lorenzo CDP						
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	420	7%	520	9%	100	24%
Cost burden <= 30%	144	2%	245	4%	101	70%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	52	1%	45	1%	(7)	-13%
Cost burden >50%	207	3%	220	4%	13	6%
Not computed	17	0%	10	0%	(7)	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	705	12%	515	9%	(190)	-27%
Cost burden <= 30%	480	8%	245	4%	(235)	-49%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	76	1%	125	2%	49	64%
Cost burden >50%	139	2%	145	3%	6	4%
Not computed	10	0%	-	0%	(10)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	760	13%	1,010	18%	250	33%
Cost burden <= 30%	459	8%	535	10%	76	17%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	229	4%	365	7%	136	59%
Cost burden >50%	61	1%	110	2%	49	80%
Not computed	11	0%	-	0%	(11)	
Household Income >80% AMI	4,085	68%	3,550	63%	(535)	-13%
Cost burden <= 30%	3,314	56%	3,150	56%	(164)	-5%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	675	11%	400	7%	(275)	-41%
Cost burden >50%	98	2%	10	0%	(88)	-90%
Not computed	(2)	0%	-	0%	2	
Total	5,970	100%	5,605	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	1,032	17%	935	17%	-97	-9%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	505	8%	485	9%	-20	-4%
Households with Cost Burden	1,537	26%	1,420	25%	-117	-8%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables
Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

	Sunol CDP					
	2000		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Owner Households						
Household Income <=30% AMI	20	7%	10	4%	(10)	-50%
Cost burden <= 30%	10	3%	10	4%	-	0%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Cost burden >50%	10	3%	4	2%	(6)	-60%
Not computed	-	0%	0	0%	-	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	0	0%	30	12%	30	#DIV/0!
Cost burden <= 30%	0	0%	10	4%	10	#DIV/0!
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	15	6%	15	#DIV/0!
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	24	8%	20	8%	(4)	-17%
Cost burden <= 30%	10	3%	20	8%	10	100%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4	1%	4	2%	-	0%
Cost burden >50%	10	3%	0	0%	(10)	-100%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	253	85%	188	76%	(65)	-26%
Cost burden <= 30%	204	69%	139	56%	(65)	-32%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	45	15%	30	12%	(15)	-33%
Cost burden >50%	4	1%	20	8%	16	400%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	297	100%	250	100%		
 HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	 49	 16%	 34	 14%	 -15	 -31%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	24	8%	39	16%	15	63%
Households with Cost Burden	73	25%	73	29%	0	0%

Notes

Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Appendix A20: Market-Rate Rents by Jurisdiction, 2022

Effective Rent Per Unit for Market-Rate Residential Units, Alameda County, 2000-2011

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Alameda County	\$1,616	\$1,631	\$1,589	\$1,542	\$1,521	\$1,537	\$1,601	\$1,687	\$1,706	\$1,587	\$1,616	\$1,661
Alameda	\$1,584	\$1,677	\$1,647	\$1,568	\$1,542	\$1,558	\$1,624	\$1,702	\$1,739	\$1,637	\$1,657	\$1,709
Albany	\$1,238	\$1,342	\$1,320	\$1,256	\$1,238	\$1,246	\$1,287	\$1,361	\$1,374	\$1,291	\$1,306	\$1,354
Berkeley	\$1,737	\$1,917	\$1,878	\$1,794	\$1,767	\$1,783	\$1,857	\$1,973	\$2,001	\$1,841	\$1,887	\$1,910
Dublin	\$1,849	\$1,763	\$1,671	\$1,633	\$1,620	\$1,655	\$1,738	\$1,831	\$1,869	\$1,781	\$1,830	\$1,965
Emeryville	\$2,270	\$2,412	\$2,385	\$2,388	\$2,325	\$2,330	\$2,378	\$2,515	\$2,546	\$2,389	\$2,336	\$2,409
Fremont	\$1,798	\$1,596	\$1,518	\$1,449	\$1,436	\$1,469	\$1,563	\$1,653	\$1,686	\$1,564	\$1,604	\$1,683
Hayward	\$1,402	\$1,370	\$1,320	\$1,266	\$1,248	\$1,260	\$1,308	\$1,379	\$1,410	\$1,326	\$1,346	\$1,382
Livermore	\$1,337	\$1,271	\$1,246	\$1,188	\$1,213	\$1,210	\$1,269	\$1,332	\$1,366	\$1,296	\$1,380	\$1,437
Newark	\$1,784	\$1,562	\$1,535	\$1,450	\$1,404	\$1,411	\$1,510	\$1,559	\$1,644	\$1,550	\$1,504	\$1,568
Oakland	\$1,644	\$1,780	\$1,763	\$1,746	\$1,713	\$1,723	\$1,777	\$1,863	\$1,855	\$1,712	\$1,732	\$1,751
Piedmont	\$1,861	\$2,037	\$2,001	\$1,920	\$1,895	\$1,912	\$1,990	\$2,114	\$2,143	\$1,965	\$2,012	\$2,032
Pleasanton	\$1,626	\$1,475	\$1,417	\$1,397	\$1,393	\$1,428	\$1,494	\$1,575	\$1,593	\$1,520	\$1,583	\$1,688
San Leandro	\$1,278	\$1,328	\$1,290	\$1,236	\$1,226	\$1,234	\$1,275	\$1,349	\$1,376	\$1,303	\$1,325	\$1,355
Union City	\$1,826	\$1,539	\$1,434	\$1,386	\$1,371	\$1,401	\$1,476	\$1,593	\$1,602	\$1,453	\$1,490	\$1,553
Ashland	\$1,079	\$1,154	\$1,111	\$1,068	\$1,053	\$1,041	\$1,081	\$1,140	\$1,171	\$1,087	\$1,109	\$1,131
Castro Valley	\$1,310	\$1,347	\$1,291	\$1,237	\$1,220	\$1,229	\$1,275	\$1,351	\$1,372	\$1,301	\$1,317	\$1,349
Cherryland	\$1,178	\$1,294	\$1,271	\$1,214	\$1,185	\$1,194	\$1,237	\$1,304	\$1,348	\$1,247	\$1,272	\$1,307
Fairview	\$1,382	\$1,516	\$1,445	\$1,431	\$1,418	\$1,425	\$1,460	\$1,566	\$1,580	\$1,467	\$1,484	\$1,548
San Lorenzo	\$1,405	\$1,455	\$1,525	\$1,480	\$1,507	\$1,500	\$1,543	\$1,719	\$1,772	\$1,658	\$1,642	\$1,688

Note:

Data was not available for all census-designated places (CDPs) in Alameda County.

Source: Costar, 2023.

Effective Rent Per Unit for Market-Rate Residential Units, Alameda County, 2012-2022

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Alameda County	\$1,732	\$1,824	\$1,922	\$2,067	\$2,108	\$2,154	\$2,210	\$2,254	\$2,160	\$2,259	\$2,301
Alameda	\$1,806	\$1,893	\$2,021	\$2,158	\$2,221	\$2,301	\$2,405	\$2,452	\$2,357	\$2,485	\$2,616
Albany	\$1,412	\$1,514	\$1,602	\$1,706	\$1,811	\$1,837	\$1,863	\$1,877	\$1,886	\$1,908	\$1,918
Berkeley	\$1,958	\$2,024	\$2,093	\$2,177	\$2,234	\$2,259	\$2,310	\$2,360	\$2,344	\$2,385	\$2,420
Dublin	\$2,041	\$2,164	\$2,223	\$2,433	\$2,431	\$2,442	\$2,433	\$2,545	\$2,446	\$2,602	\$2,682
Emeryville	\$2,514	\$2,669	\$2,794	\$2,914	\$2,935	\$3,008	\$3,154	\$3,107	\$2,862	\$3,133	\$2,788
Fremont	\$1,781	\$1,909	\$2,056	\$2,233	\$2,233	\$2,284	\$2,339	\$2,416	\$2,264	\$2,429	\$2,571
Hayward	\$1,463	\$1,561	\$1,669	\$1,832	\$1,898	\$1,939	\$1,988	\$2,044	\$2,029	\$2,085	\$2,127
Livermore	\$1,503	\$1,601	\$1,690	\$1,877	\$1,915	\$1,930	\$2,012	\$2,057	\$2,107	\$2,284	\$2,444
Newark	\$1,690	\$1,798	\$1,935	\$2,095	\$2,004	\$2,099	\$2,172	\$2,224	\$2,143	\$2,233	\$2,267
Oakland	\$1,806	\$1,877	\$1,942	\$2,052	\$2,099	\$2,157	\$2,203	\$2,220	\$2,066	\$2,122	\$2,092
Piedmont	\$2,077	\$2,139	\$2,192	\$2,297	\$2,335	\$2,359	\$2,399	\$2,423	\$2,439	\$2,464	\$2,493
Pleasanton	\$1,754	\$1,886	\$2,031	\$2,243	\$2,311	\$2,261	\$2,312	\$2,349	\$2,264	\$2,568	\$2,619
San Leandro	\$1,403	\$1,477	\$1,563	\$1,740	\$1,824	\$1,867	\$1,925	\$1,962	\$1,977	\$2,043	\$2,070
Union City	\$1,663	\$1,786	\$1,952	\$2,144	\$2,092	\$2,132	\$2,200	\$2,272	\$2,135	\$2,333	\$2,371
Ashland	\$1,173	\$1,242	\$1,325	\$1,508	\$1,577	\$1,635	\$1,691	\$1,745	\$1,753	\$1,823	\$1,891
Castro Valley	\$1,401	\$1,475	\$1,598	\$1,764	\$1,843	\$1,892	\$1,945	\$1,980	\$1,994	\$2,048	\$2,140
Cherryland	\$1,345	\$1,414	\$1,531	\$1,653	\$1,727	\$1,773	\$2,017	\$1,978	\$1,988	\$1,996	\$2,057
Fairview	\$1,576	\$1,619	\$1,662	\$1,759	\$1,809	\$1,835	\$1,863	\$1,885	\$1,893	\$1,916	\$1,959
San Lorenzo	\$1,796	\$1,972	\$2,021	\$2,181	\$2,308	\$2,426	\$2,603	\$2,616	\$2,773	\$2,719	\$2,816

Note:

Data was not available for all census-designated places (CDPs) in Alameda County.

Source: Costar, 2023.

Appendix A21: CHAS Cost Burden Data Detail for Renter Households

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	California					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,002,200	20%	1,547,895	26%	545,695	54%
Cost burden <= 30%	233,040	5%	172,130	3%	(60,910)	-26%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	130,065	3%	216,880	4%	86,815	67%
Cost burden >50%	637,145	13%	1,038,395	18%	401,250	63%
Not computed	1,950	0%	120,485	2%	118,535	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	813,730	16%	1,050,980	18%	237,250	29%
Cost burden <= 30%	202,575	4%	211,375	4%	8,800	4%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	366,295	7%	477,225	8%	110,930	30%
Cost burden >50%	243,900	5%	362,380	6%	118,480	49%
Not computed	960	0%	-	0%	(960)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,002,295	20%	1,166,255	20%	163,960	16%
Cost burden <= 30%	573,140	12%	572,165	10%	(975)	0%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	361,205	7%	487,185	8%	125,980	35%
Cost burden >50%	67,050	1%	106,910	2%	39,860	59%
Not computed	900	0%	-	0%	(900)	
Household Income >80% AMI	2,138,400	43%	2,124,550	36%	(13,850)	-1%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,948,835	39%	1,866,375	32%	(82,460)	-4%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	170,435	3%	243,590	4%	73,155	43%
Cost burden >50%	17,839	0%	14,590	0%	(3,249)	-18%
Not computed	1,291	0%	-	0%	(1,291)	
Total	4,956,625	100%	5,889,685	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	1,028,000	21%	1,424,880	24%	396,880	39%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	965,934	19%	1,522,275	26%	556,341	58%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	1,993,934	40%	2,947,155	50%	953,221	48%

Renter Households	Bay Area					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	210,350	20%	294,175	25%	83,825	40%
Cost burden <= 30%	55,190	5%	44,970	4%	(10,220)	-19%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	31,960	3%	50,035	4%	18,075	57%
Cost burden >50%	122,789	12%	180,770	15%	57,981	47%
Not computed	411	0%	18,395	2%	17,984	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	150,215	14%	175,960	15%	25,745	17%
Cost burden <= 30%	44,171	4%	42,950	4%	(1,221)	-3%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	65,068	6%	74,685	6%	9,617	15%
Cost burden >50%	40,802	4%	58,320	5%	17,518	43%
Not computed	174	0%	-	0%	(174)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	185,025	18%	192,600	16%	7,575	4%
Cost burden <= 30%	105,491	10%	94,125	8%	(11,366)	-11%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	67,259	6%	81,075	7%	13,816	21%
Cost burden >50%	12,143	1%	17,400	1%	5,257	43%
Not computed	132	0%	-	0%	(132)	
Household Income >80% AMI	496,410	48%	536,755	45%	40,345	8%
Cost burden <= 30%	451,345	43%	479,675	40%	28,330	6%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	41,443	4%	55,195	5%	13,752	33%
Cost burden >50%	3,339	0%	1,875	0%	(1,464)	-44%
Not computed	283	0%	-	0%	(283)	
Total	1,042,000	100%	1,199,475	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	205,730	20%	260,990	22%	55,260	27%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	179,073	17%	258,365	22%	79,292	44%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	384,803	37%	519,355	43%	134,552	35%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Alameda County					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	55,665	23%	69,340	26%	13,675	25%
Cost burden <= 30%	13,575	6%	10,050	4%	(3,525)	-26%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	8,130	3%	11,010	4%	2,880	35%
Cost burden >50%	33,905	14%	43,750	16%	9,845	29%
Not computed	55	0%	4,535	2%	4,480	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	36,440	15%	40,245	15%	3,805	10%
Cost burden <= 30%	10,895	5%	8,655	3%	(2,240)	-21%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	16,525	7%	18,535	7%	2,010	12%
Cost burden >50%	8,964	4%	13,050	5%	4,086	46%
Not computed	56	0%	-	0%	(56)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	40,270	17%	41,950	16%	1,680	4%
Cost burden <= 30%	24,260	10%	20,175	8%	(4,085)	-17%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	14,064	6%	18,085	7%	4,021	29%
Cost burden >50%	1,945	1%	3,690	1%	1,745	90%
Not computed	1	0%	-	0%	(1)	
Household Income >80% AMI	104,680	44%	116,745	44%	12,065	12%
Cost burden <= 30%	96,610	41%	102,970	38%	6,360	7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	7,420	3%	13,095	5%	5,675	76%
Cost burden >50%	629	0%	680	0%	51	8%
Not computed	21	0%	-	0%	(21)	
Total	237,055	100%	268,285	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	46,139	19%	60,725	23%	14,586	32%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	45,443	19%	61,170	23%	15,727	35%
Households with Cost Burden	91,582	39%	121,895	45%	30,313	33%

Renter Households	Alameda City					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	2,655	17%	3,245	20%	590	22%
Cost burden <= 30%	585	4%	570	4%	(15)	-3%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	319	2%	315	2%	(4)	-1%
Cost burden >50%	1,729	11%	2,075	13%	346	20%
Not computed	22	0%	285	2%	263	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	2,015	13%	2,025	13%	10	0%
Cost burden <= 30%	452	3%	475	3%	23	5%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	942	6%	940	6%	(2)	0%
Cost burden >50%	603	4%	610	4%	7	1%
Not computed	18	0%	-	0%	(18)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	2,845	18%	2,445	15%	(400)	-14%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,558	10%	1,060	7%	(498)	-32%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,158	7%	1,140	7%	(18)	-2%
Cost burden >50%	113	1%	245	2%	132	117%
Not computed	16	0%	-	0%	(16)	
Household Income >80% AMI	8,220	52%	8,120	51%	(100)	-1%
Cost burden <= 30%	7,634	49%	7,285	46%	(349)	-5%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	536	3%	775	5%	239	45%
Cost burden >50%	34	0%	55	0%	21	62%
Not computed	16	0%	-	0%	(16)	
Total	15,735	100%	15,830	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	2,955	19%	3,170	20%	215	7%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	2,479	16%	2,985	19%	506	20%
Households with Cost Burden	5,434	35%	6,155	39%	721	13%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Albany					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	565	16%	790	20%	225	40%
Cost burden <= 30%	112	3%	4	0%	(108)	-96%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	111	3%	30	1%	(81)	-73%
Cost burden >50%	324	9%	645	16%	321	99%
Not computed	18	1%	110	3%	92	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	430	12%	760	19%	330	77%
Cost burden <= 30%	125	4%	90	2%	(35)	-28%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	120	3%	385	10%	265	221%
Cost burden >50%	172	5%	285	7%	113	66%
Not computed	13	0%	-	0%	(13)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	634	18%	520	13%	(114)	-18%
Cost burden <= 30%	272	8%	225	6%	(47)	-17%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	315	9%	275	7%	(40)	-13%
Cost burden >50%	38	1%	25	1%	(13)	-34%
Not computed	9	0%	-	0%	(9)	
Household Income >80% AMI	1,825	53%	1,874	48%	49	-3%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,690	49%	1,650	42%	(40)	-2%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	124	4%	225	6%	101	81%
Cost burden >50%	10	0%	0	0%	(10)	-100%
Not computed	1	0%	-	0%	(1)	
Total	3,454	100%	3,950	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	670	19%	915	23%	245	37%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	544	16%	955	24%	411	76%
Households with Cost Burden	1,214	35%	1,870	47%	656	54%

Renter Households	Berkeley					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	8,875	34%	8,670	33%	(205)	-2%
Cost burden <= 30%	2,129	8%	1,015	4%	(1,114)	-52%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	734	3%	1,045	4%	311	42%
Cost burden >50%	6,012	23%	5,835	23%	(177)	-3%
Not computed	-	0%	770	3%	770	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	4,094	16%	3,835	15%	(259)	-6%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,145	4%	560	2%	(585)	-51%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,925	7%	1,585	6%	(340)	-18%
Cost burden >50%	1,024	4%	1,685	7%	661	65%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	3,767	15%	3,605	14%	(162)	-4%
Cost burden <= 30%	2,395	9%	1,800	7%	(595)	-25%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,099	4%	1,290	5%	191	17%
Cost burden >50%	273	1%	515	2%	242	89%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	9,015	35%	9,775	38%	760	8%
Cost burden <= 30%	8,380	33%	8,475	33%	95	1%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	590	2%	1,280	5%	690	117%
Cost burden >50%	45	0%	15	0%	(30)	-67%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	25,751	100%	25,875	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	4,348	17%	5,200	20%	852	20%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	7,354	29%	8,050	31%	696	9%
Households with Cost Burden	11,702	45%	13,250	51%	1,548	13%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Dublin					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	144	4%	720	10%	576	400%
Cost burden <= 30%	28	1%	55	1%	27	96%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4	0%	100	1%	96	2400%
Cost burden >50%	105	3%	450	6%	345	329%
Not computed	7	0%	115	2%	108	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	380	12%	600	9%	220	58%
Cost burden <= 30%	87	3%	65	1%	(22)	-25%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	95	3%	140	2%	45	47%
Cost burden >50%	192	6%	390	6%	198	103%
Not computed	6	0%	-	0%	(6)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	425	13%	805	12%	380	89%
Cost burden <= 30%	61	2%	165	2%	104	170%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	229	7%	360	5%	131	57%
Cost burden >50%	135	4%	280	4%	145	107%
Not computed	0	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	2,325	71%	4,860	70%	2,535	109%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,945	59%	3,875	55%	1,930	99%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	332	10%	895	13%	563	170%
Cost burden >50%	39	1%	95	1%	56	144%
Not computed	9	0%	-	0%	(9)	
Total	3,274	100%	6,990	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	660	20%	1,495	21%	835	127%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	471	14%	1,215	17%	744	158%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	1,131	35%	2,710	39%	1,579	140%

Renter Households	Emeryville					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	560	22%	825	19%	265	47%
Cost burden <= 30%	195	8%	120	3%	(75)	-38%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	40	2%	95	2%	55	138%
Cost burden >50%	325	13%	485	11%	160	49%
Not computed	-	0%	125	3%	125	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	435	17%	450	10%	15	3%
Cost burden <= 30%	53	2%	60	1%	7	13%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	179	7%	90	2%	(89)	-50%
Cost burden >50%	190	8%	300	7%	110	58%
Not computed	13	1%	-	0%	(13)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	375	15%	410	9%	35	9%
Cost burden <= 30%	159	6%	75	2%	(84)	-53%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	175	7%	165	4%	(10)	-6%
Cost burden >50%	40	2%	170	4%	130	325%
Not computed	1	0%	-	0%	(1)	
Household Income >80% AMI	1,145	46%	2,635	61%	1,490	130%
Cost burden <= 30%	965	38%	2,125	49%	1,160	120%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	169	7%	475	11%	306	181%
Cost burden >50%	10	0%	44	1%	34	340%
Not computed	1	0%	-	0%	(1)	
Total	2,515	100%	4,320	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	563	22%	825	19%	262	47%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	565	22%	999	23%	434	77%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	1,128	45%	1,824	42%	696	62%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Fremont					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	2,880	12%	3,635	12%	755	26%
Cost burden <= 30%	635	3%	395	1%	(240)	-38%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	340	1%	440	1%	100	29%
Cost burden >50%	1,905	8%	2,435	8%	530	28%
Not computed	-	0%	365	1%	365	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	2,180	9%	2,610	9%	430	20%
Cost burden <= 30%	199	1%	255	1%	56	28%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	992	4%	1,165	4%	173	17%
Cost burden >50%	975	4%	1,195	4%	220	23%
Not computed	14	0%	-	0%	(14)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	3,230	13%	4,225	14%	995	31%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,124	5%	985	3%	(139)	-12%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,730	7%	2,600	9%	870	50%
Cost burden >50%	370	2%	640	2%	270	73%
Not computed	6	0%	-	0%	(6)	
Household Income >80% AMI	15,900	66%	19,305	65%	3,405	21%
Cost burden <= 30%	14,110	58%	16,915	57%	2,805	20%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,680	7%	2,310	8%	630	38%
Cost burden >50%	103	0%	80	0%	(23)	-22%
Not computed	7	0%	-	0%	(7)	
Total	24,190	100%	29,775	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	4,742	20%	6,515	22%	1,773	37%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	3,353	14%	4,350	15%	997	30%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	8,095	33%	10,865	36%	2,770	34%

Renter Households	Hayward					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	3,793	18%	4,780	21%	987	26%
Cost burden <= 30%	705	3%	565	3%	(140)	-20%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	364	2%	720	3%	356	98%
Cost burden >50%	2,724	13%	3,295	15%	571	21%
Not computed	-	0%	205	1%	205	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	3,555	17%	4,170	19%	615	17%
Cost burden <= 30%	813	4%	740	3%	(73)	-9%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,738	8%	2,150	10%	412	24%
Cost burden >50%	992	5%	1,275	6%	283	29%
Not computed	12	0%	-	0%	(12)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	4,225	20%	4,860	22%	635	15%
Cost burden <= 30%	2,295	11%	2,165	10%	(130)	-6%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,779	8%	2,240	10%	461	26%
Cost burden >50%	139	1%	455	2%	316	227%
Not computed	12	0%	-	0%	(12)	
Household Income >80% AMI	9,370	45%	8,675	39%	(695)	-7%
Cost burden <= 30%	8,880	42%	7,740	34%	(1,140)	-13%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	488	2%	895	4%	407	83%
Cost burden >50%	4	0%	30	0%	26	650%
Not computed	-2	0%	-	0%	2	
Total	20,943	100%	22,480	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	4,369	21%	6,005	27%	1,636	37%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	3,859	18%	5,055	22%	1,196	31%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	8,228	39%	11,060	49%	2,832	34%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Livermore					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,145	16%	1,760	20%	615	54%
Cost burden <= 30%	215	3%	350	4%	135	63%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	165	2%	275	3%	110	67%
Cost burden >50%	765	10%	1,045	12%	280	37%
Not computed	-	0%	90	1%	90	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,023	14%	1,450	17%	427	42%
Cost burden <= 30%	290	4%	190	2%	(100)	-34%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	388	5%	590	7%	202	52%
Cost burden >50%	345	5%	670	8%	325	94%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,300	18%	1,475	17%	175	13%
Cost burden <= 30%	520	7%	540	6%	20	4%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	705	10%	770	9%	65	9%
Cost burden >50%	75	1%	165	2%	90	120%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	3,820	52%	4,069	46%	249	7%
Cost burden <= 30%	3,510	48%	3,480	40%	(30)	-1%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	280	4%	510	6%	230	82%
Cost burden >50%	30	0%	80	1%	50	167%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	7,288	100%	8,750	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	1,538	21%	2,145	25%	607	39%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	1,215	17%	1,960	22%	745	61%
Households with Cost Burden	2,753	38%	4,105	47%	1,352	49%

Renter Households	Newark					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	595	16%	720	16%	125	21%
Cost burden <= 30%	218	6%	80	2%	(138)	-63%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	65	2%	170	4%	105	162%
Cost burden >50%	312	8%	365	8%	53	17%
Not computed	-	0%	105	2%	105	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	453	12%	455	10%	2	0%
Cost burden <= 30%	104	3%	65	1%	(39)	-38%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	215	6%	150	3%	(65)	-30%
Cost burden >50%	134	4%	235	5%	101	75%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	707	18%	750	17%	43	6%
Cost burden <= 30%	320	8%	315	7%	(5)	-2%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	343	9%	415	9%	72	21%
Cost burden >50%	44	1%	20	0%	(24)	-55%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	2,067	54%	2,465	56%	398	19%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,888	49%	2,040	46%	152	8%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	179	5%	415	9%	236	132%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	3,822	100%	4,390	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	802	21%	1,150	26%	348	43%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	490	13%	620	14%	130	27%
Households with Cost Burden	1,292	34%	1,770	40%	478	37%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Oakland					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	28,065	32%	33,540	35%	5,475	20%
Cost burden <= 30%	7,350	8%	5,565	6%	(1,785)	-24%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	5,100	6%	6,565	7%	1,465	29%
Cost burden >50%	15,615	18%	19,455	20%	3,840	25%
Not computed	-	0%	1,960	2%	1,960	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	16,235	18%	15,000	16%	(1,235)	-8%
Cost burden <= 30%	6,489	7%	4,740	5%	(1,749)	-27%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	7,140	8%	6,830	7%	(310)	-4%
Cost burden >50%	2,584	3%	3,430	4%	846	33%
Not computed	22	0%	-	0%	(22)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	14,815	17%	13,980	15%	(835)	-6%
Cost burden <= 30%	11,205	13%	8,490	9%	(2,715)	-24%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	3,219	4%	4,695	5%	1,476	46%
Cost burden >50%	384	0%	795	1%	411	107%
Not computed	7	0%	-	0%	(7)	
Household Income >80% AMI	29,195	33%	33,725	35%	4,530	16%
Cost burden <= 30%	27,515	31%	30,540	32%	3,025	11%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,434	2%	3,005	3%	1,571	110%
Cost burden >50%	234	0%	175	0%	(59)	-25%
Not computed	12	0%	-	0%	(12)	
Total	88,310	100%	96,240	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	16,893	19%	21,095	22%	4,202	25%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	18,817	21%	23,855	25%	5,038	27%
Households with Cost Burden	35,710	40%	44,950	47%	9,240	26%

Renter Households	Piedmont					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	30	9%	20	4%	(10)	-33%
Cost burden <= 30%	0	0%	4	1%	4	#DIV/0!
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Cost burden >50%	28	8%	15	3%	(13)	-46%
Not computed	2	1%	0	0%	(2)	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	30	9%	45	10%	15	50%
Cost burden <= 30%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4	1%	25	6%	21	525%
Cost burden >50%	16	5%	20	4%	4	25%
Not computed	10	3%	-	0%	(10)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	19	6%	4	1%	(15)	-79%
Cost burden <= 30%	12	3%	4	1%	(8)	-67%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4	1%	0	0%	(4)	-100%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Not computed	3	1%	-	0%	(3)	
Household Income >80% AMI	266	77%	383	85%	117	44%
Cost burden <= 30%	204	59%	355	79%	151	74%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	49	14%	29	6%	(20)	-41%
Cost burden >50%	4	1%	4	1%	-	0%
Not computed	9	3%	-	0%	(9)	
Total	345	100%	465	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	57	17%	54	12%	-3	-5%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	48	14%	39	9%	-9	-19%
Households with Cost Burden	105	30%	93	21%	-12	-11%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Pleasanton					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	565	9%	1,420	16%	855	151%
Cost burden <= 30%	144	2%	145	2%	1	1%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	70	1%	125	1%	55	79%
Cost burden >50%	348	6%	1,110	13%	762	219%
Not computed	3	0%	45	1%	42	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	580	9%	925	11%	345	59%
Cost burden <= 30%	52	1%	125	1%	73	140%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	228	4%	340	4%	112	49%
Cost burden >50%	283	5%	455	5%	172	61%
Not computed	17	0%	-	0%	(17)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	688	11%	785	9%	97	14%
Cost burden <= 30%	200	3%	150	2%	(50)	-25%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	413	7%	505	6%	92	22%
Cost burden >50%	75	1%	130	1%	55	73%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	4,385	71%	5,590	64%	1,205	27%
Cost burden <= 30%	3,800	61%	4,610	53%	810	21%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	546	9%	940	11%	394	72%
Cost burden >50%	29	0%	50	1%	21	72%
Not computed	10	0%	-	0%	(10)	
Total	6,218	100%	8,725	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	1,257	20%	1,910	22%	653	52%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	735	12%	1,745	20%	1,010	137%
Households with Cost Burden	1,992	32%	3,655	42%	1,663	83%

Renter Households	San Leandro					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,860	15%	3,270	24%	1,410	76%
Cost burden <= 30%	407	3%	470	3%	63	15%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	244	2%	510	4%	266	109%
Cost burden >50%	1,189	10%	2,170	16%	981	83%
Not computed	20	0%	120	1%	100	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	1,855	15%	3,285	24%	1,430	77%
Cost burden <= 30%	293	2%	445	3%	152	52%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,044	9%	1,865	13%	821	79%
Cost burden >50%	497	4%	975	7%	478	96%
Not computed	21	0%	-	0%	(21)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	2,760	23%	2,585	19%	(175)	-6%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,680	14%	1,535	11%	(145)	-9%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	1,015	8%	990	7%	(25)	-2%
Cost burden >50%	64	1%	55	0%	(9)	-14%
Not computed	1	0%	-	0%	(1)	
Household Income >80% AMI	5,570	46%	4,735	34%	(835)	-15%
Cost burden <= 30%	5,299	44%	4,480	32%	(819)	-15%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	247	2%	250	2%	3	1%
Cost burden >50%	14	0%	0	0%	(14)	-100%
Not computed	10	0%	-	0%	(10)	
Total	12,045	100%	13,870	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	2,550	21%	3,615	26%	1,065	42%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	1,764	15%	3,200	23%	1,436	81%
Households with Cost Burden	4,314	36%	6,815	49%	2,501	58%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Union City					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	950	18%	1,020	13%	70	7%
Cost burden <= 30%	253	5%	145	2%	(108)	-43%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	122	2%	165	2%	43	35%
Cost burden >50%	555	10%	640	8%	85	15%
Not computed	20	0%	70	1%	50	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	670	12%	1,315	17%	645	96%
Cost burden <= 30%	131	2%	200	3%	69	53%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	272	5%	580	8%	308	113%
Cost burden >50%	248	5%	535	7%	287	116%
Not computed	19	0%	-	0%	(19)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	960	18%	1,325	18%	365	38%
Cost burden <= 30%	381	7%	470	6%	89	23%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	554	10%	815	11%	261	47%
Cost burden >50%	20	0%	45	1%	25	125%
Not computed	5	0%	-	0%	(5)	
Household Income >80% AMI	2,795	52%	3,910	52%	1,115	40%
Cost burden <= 30%	2,669	50%	3,435	45%	766	29%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	122	2%	450	6%	328	269%
Cost burden >50%	4	0%	25	0%	21	525%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	5,375	100%	7,570	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	1,070	20%	2,010	27%	940	88%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	827	15%	1,245	16%	418	51%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	1,897	35%	3,255	43%	1,358	72%

Renter Households	Ashland CDP					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	1,005	22%	1,365	28%	360	36%
Cost burden <= 30%	239	5%	130	3%	(109)	-46%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	154	3%	150	3%	(4)	-3%
Cost burden >50%	605	13%	1,000	20%	395	65%
Not computed	7	0%	85	2%	78	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	805	17%	1,035	21%	230	29%
Cost burden <= 30%	160	3%	250	5%	90	56%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	473	10%	590	12%	117	25%
Cost burden >50%	157	3%	195	4%	38	24%
Not computed	15	0%	-	0%	(15)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	843	18%	1,200	24%	357	42%
Cost burden <= 30%	608	13%	580	12%	(28)	-5%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	235	5%	575	12%	340	145%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	45	1%	45	#DIV/0!
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	1,975	43%	1,315	27%	(660)	-33%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,879	41%	1,210	25%	(669)	-36%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	95	2%	105	2%	10	11%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Not computed	1	0%	-	0%	(1)	
Total	4,628	100%	4,910	100%		
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%</i>	957	21%	1,420	29%	463	48%
<i>HHs with Cost Burden >50%</i>	762	16%	1,240	25%	478	63%
<i>Households with Cost Burden</i>	1,719	37%	2,660	54%	941	55%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Castro Valley CDP					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	775	12%	1,625	25%	850	110%
Cost burden <= 30%	144	2%	170	3%	26	18%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	77	1%	90	1%	13	17%
Cost burden >50%	518	8%	1,355	21%	837	162%
Not computed	36	1%	10	0%	(26)	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	770	12%	940	15%	170	22%
Cost burden <= 30%	118	2%	125	2%	7	6%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	349	5%	450	7%	101	29%
Cost burden >50%	293	4%	360	6%	67	23%
Not computed	10	0%	-	0%	(10)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	1,380	21%	1,250	19%	(130)	-9%
Cost burden <= 30%	613	9%	535	8%	(78)	-13%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	679	10%	670	10%	(9)	-1%
Cost burden >50%	71	1%	40	1%	(31)	-44%
Not computed	17	0%	-	0%	(17)	
Household Income >80% AMI	3,670	56%	2,615	41%	(1,055)	-29%
Cost burden <= 30%	3,285	50%	2,300	36%	(985)	-30%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	334	5%	315	5%	(19)	-6%
Cost burden >50%	50	1%	0	0%	(50)	-100%
Not computed	1	0%	-	0%	(1)	
Total	6,595	100%	6,430	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	1,439	22%	1,525	24%	86	6%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	932	14%	1,755	27%	823	88%
Households with Cost Burden	2,371	36%	3,280	51%	909	38%

Renter Households	Cherryland CDP					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	600	19%	1,045	28%	445	74%
Cost burden <= 30%	78	3%	105	3%	27	35%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	98	3%	90	2%	(8)	-8%
Cost burden >50%	407	13%	845	23%	438	108%
Not computed	17	1%	10	0%	(7)	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	530	17%	630	17%	100	19%
Cost burden <= 30%	199	6%	105	3%	(94)	-47%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	232	7%	375	10%	143	62%
Cost burden >50%	99	3%	150	4%	51	52%
Not computed	0	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	712	23%	850	23%	138	19%
Cost burden <= 30%	533	17%	450	12%	(83)	-16%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	139	4%	340	9%	201	145%
Cost burden >50%	40	1%	60	2%	20	50%
Not computed	0	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	1,275	41%	1,195	32%	(80)	-6%
Cost burden <= 30%	1,213	39%	1,125	30%	(88)	-7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	60	2%	65	2%	5	8%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	
Not computed	2	0%	-	0%	(2)	-100%
Total	3,117	100%	3,720	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	529	17%	870	23%	341	64%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	546	18%	1,055	28%	509	93%
Households with Cost Burden	1,075	34%	1,925	52%	850	79%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Fairview CDP					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	85	15%	135	19%	50	59%
Cost burden <= 30%	20	4%	0	0%	(20)	-100%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	0	0%	60	9%	60	#DIV/0!
Cost burden >50%	57	10%	75	11%	18	32%
Not computed	8	1%	0	0%	(8)	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	60	11%	180	26%	120	200%
Cost burden <= 30%	10	2%	4	1%	(6)	-60%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	20	4%	100	14%	80	400%
Cost burden >50%	30	5%	70	10%	40	133%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	85	15%	90	13%	5	6%
Cost burden <= 30%	39	7%	55	8%	16	41%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	28	5%	35	5%	7	25%
Cost burden >50%	10	2%	0	0%	(10)	-100%
Not computed	8	1%	-	0%	(8)	
Household Income >80% AMI	323	58%	295	42%	(28)	-9%
Cost burden <= 30%	273	49%	255	36%	(18)	-7%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	50	9%	15	2%	(35)	-70%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	15	2%	15	#DIV/0!
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	553	100%	690	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	98	18%	210	30%	112	114%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	97	18%	160	23%	63	65%
Households with Cost Burden	195	35%	370	53%	175	90%

Renter Households	San Lorenzo CDP					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	340	22%	365	19%	25	7%
Cost burden <= 30%	79	5%	120	6%	41	52%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	62	4%	35	2%	(27)	-44%
Cost burden >50%	176	11%	170	9%	(6)	-3%
Not computed	23	1%	40	2%	17	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	200	13%	265	13%	65	33%
Cost burden <= 30%	83	5%	125	6%	42	51%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	67	4%	65	3%	(2)	-3%
Cost burden >50%	32	2%	75	4%	43	134%
Not computed	18	1%	-	0%	(18)	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	304	20%	480	24%	176	58%
Cost burden <= 30%	126	8%	260	13%	134	106%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	158	10%	200	10%	42	27%
Cost burden >50%	15	1%	25	1%	10	67%
Not computed	5	0%	-	0%	(5)	
Household Income >80% AMI	712	46%	855	44%	143	20%
Cost burden <= 30%	674	43%	715	36%	41	6%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	34	2%	140	7%	106	312%
Cost burden >50%	4	0%	0	0%	(4)	-100%
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	1,556	100%	1,970	100%		
HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	321	21%	440	22%	119	37%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	227	15%	270	14%	43	19%
Households with Cost Burden	548	35%	710	36%	162	30%

Notes: Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Renter Households by AMI and Cost Burden, 2000-2019

Universe: Occupied housing units

Renter Households	Sunol CDP					
	2000 (a)		2019		2000-2019 Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Income <=30% AMI	23	14%	10	14%	(13)	-57%
Cost burden <= 30%	15	9%	4	6%	(11)	-73%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4	2%	0	0%	(4)	-100%
Cost burden >50%	4	2%	4	6%	-	0%
Not computed	-	0%	0	0%	-	
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMI	4	2%	10	14%	6	150%
Cost burden <= 30%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4	2%	10	14%	6	150%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMI	8	5%	10	14%	2	25%
Cost burden <= 30%	4	2%	10	14%	6	150%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4	2%	0	0%	(4)	-100%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Household Income >80% AMI	129	79%	40	57%	(89)	-69%
Cost burden <= 30%	125	76%	30	43%	(95)	-76%
Cost burden >30% and <=50%	4	2%	4	6%	-	0%
Cost burden >50%	0	0%	0	0%	-	#DIV/0!
Not computed	-	0%	-	0%	-	
Total	164	100%	70	100%		
 HHs with Cost Burden >30% and <=50%	 16	 10%	 14	 20%	 -2	 -13%
HHs with Cost Burden >50%	4	2%	4	6%	0	0%
Households with Cost Burden	20	12%	18	26%	-2	-10%

Notes

Totals may not add due to rounding. Totals in this table may not match totals in other tables due to rounding.

(a) The 2000 CHAS data excludes renters living on boats, RVs, or vans, so total renter households do not match other tables

Sources: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2000, 2015-2019; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023

Appendix A22: Building Permit Detail by Jurisdiction

Building Permit Trends, 2000-2021

California

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	105,018	107,361	123,013	139,870	151,568	154,703	107,714	68,266	32,432	25,525	25,693	21,705	27,736	37,034	39,220	45,644	50,311	57,132	58,831	58,575	59,043	65,890	84,880
Multifamily 2-4 Units	4,241	3,928	3,955	5,901	7,228	7,203	6,507	5,002	2,607	1,391	1,717	1,426	2,125	2,441	2,239	2,808	3,189	4,306	4,640	4,170	3,817	4,039	854,057
Multifamily 5+ Units	36,316	35,450	32,605	46,177	48,594	43,114	46,281	36,805	27,642	8,153	16,306	22,340	28,688	41,267	42,186	49,736	48,850	53,342	50,031	47,452	43,215	49,507	2,501,221
Total	145,575	146,739	159,573	191,948	207,390	205,020	160,502	110,073	62,681	35,069	43,716	45,471	58,549	80,742	83,645	98,188	102,350	114,780	113,502	110,197	106,075	119,436	3,440,158
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	72.1%	73.2%	77.1%	72.9%	73.1%	75.5%	67.1%	62.0%	51.7%	72.8%	58.8%	47.7%	47.4%	45.9%	46.9%	46.5%	49.2%	49.8%	51.8%	53.2%	55.7%	55.2%	2.5%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	2.9%	2.7%	2.5%	3.1%	3.5%	3.5%	4.1%	4.5%	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%	3.1%	3.6%	3.0%	2.7%	2.9%	3.1%	3.8%	4.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.4%	24.8%
Multifamily 5+ Units	24.9%	24.2%	20.4%	24.1%	23.4%	21.0%	28.8%	33.4%	44.1%	23.2%	37.3%	49.1%	49.0%	51.1%	50.4%	50.7%	47.7%	46.5%	44.1%	43.1%	40.7%	41.5%	72.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Bay Area Region (b)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	16,356	12,873	14,517	15,272	15,029	14,623	10,647	9,026	4,384	3,955	3,796	3,857	5,450	6,444	6,629	8,126	8,268	8,563	10,188	9,244	7,022	8,745	203,014
Multifamily 2-4 Units	842	752	654	809	919	801	587	523	326	190	200	211	334	359	346	395	408	451	545	351	221	432	10,656
Multifamily 5+ Units	9,834	9,502	7,252	11,254	10,478	10,932	12,993	7,953	7,723	16,18	5,811	5,953	10,080	13,776	14,414	12,662	13,895	18,174	19,417	14,049	12,168	13,673	243,611
Total	27,032	23,127	22,423	27,335	26,426	26,356	24,227	17,502	12,433	5,763	9,807	10,021	15,864	20,579	21,389	21,183	22,571	27,188	30,150	23,644	19,411	22,850	457,281
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	60.5%	55.7%	64.7%	55.9%	56.9%	55.5%	43.9%	51.6%	35.3%	68.6%	38.7%	38.5%	34.4%	31.3%	31.0%	38.4%	36.6%	31.5%	33.8%	39.1%	36.2%	38.3%	44.4%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	3.1%	3.3%	2.9%	3.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.4%	3.0%	2.6%	3.3%	2.0%	2.1%	2.1%	1.7%	1.6%	1.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.9%	2.3%
Multifamily 5+ Units	36.4%	41.1%	32.3%	41.2%	39.7%	41.5%	53.6%	45.4%	62.1%	28.1%	59.3%	59.4%	63.5%	66.9%	67.4%	59.8%	61.6%	66.8%	64.4%	59.4%	62.7%	59.8%	53.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Alameda County

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	3,071	1,764	2,501	2,138	2,309	1,561	1,635	1,315	780	811	879	820	1,373	1,391	1,613	1,905	2,398	2,595	1,965	1,972	1,342	1,368	37,506
Multifamily 2-4 Units	128	83	44	122	162	75	193	93	39	41	73	49	151	98	45	89	107	170	267	157	117	116	2,419
Multifamily 5+ Units	855	1,402	1,010	2,209	2,907	2,740	4,448	1,730	1,114	481	775	1,303	1,221	1,592	1,780	3,107	3,187	6,493	5,824	4,273	2,661	3,541	54,653
Total	4,054	3,249	3,555	4,469	5,378	4,376	6,276	3,138	1,933	1,333	1,727	2,172	2,745	3,081	3,438	5,101	5,692	9,258	8,056	6,402	4,120	5,025	94,578
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	75.8%	54.3%	70.4%	47.8%	42.9%	35.7%	26.1%	41.9%	40.4%	60.8%	50.9%	37.8%	50.0%	45.1%	46.9%	37.3%	42.1%	28.0%	24.4%	30.8%	32.6%	27.2%	39.7%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	3.2%	2.6%	1.2%	2.7%	3.0%	1.7%	3.1%	3.0%	2.0%	3.1%	4.2%	2.3%	5.5%	3.2%	1.3%	1.7%	1.9%	1.8%	3.3%	2.5%	2.8%	2.3%	2.6%
Multifamily 5+ Units	21.1%	43.2%	28.4%	49.4%	54.1%	62.6%	70.9%	55.1%	57.6%	36.1%	44.9%	60.0%	44.5%	51.7%	51.8%	60.9%	56.0%	70.1%	72.3%	66.7%	64.6%	70.5%	57.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

(a) Number of housing units reported.

(b) The Bay Area Region includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma counties.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau Building Permits Survey, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Building Permit Trends, 2000-2021

Alameda (city)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	3	30	79	59	83	149	112	104	2	3	16	24	0	1	5	118	59	46	31	61	81	198	1,264
Multifamily 2-4 Units	2	2	4	8	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	0	36
Multifamily 5+ Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	52	55	31	10	0	622	263	420	1,489
Total	5	32	83	67	83	151	116	106	2	3	16	24	0	37	57	181	90	56	31	683	348	618	2,789
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	60.0%	93.8%	95.2%	88.1%	100.0%	98.7%	96.6%	98.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	2.7%	8.8%	65.2%	65.6%	82.1%	100.0%	8.9%	23.3%	32.0%	45.3%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	40.0%	6.3%	4.8%	11.9%	0.0%	1.3%	3.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.3%
Multifamily 5+ Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	97.3%	91.2%	30.4%	34.4%	17.9%	0.0%	91.1%	75.6%	68.0%	53.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Albany

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	2	21	2	4	6	8	3	4	2	0	1	3	1	2	3	6	3	9	9	12	18	10	129
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	12
Multifamily 5+ Units	0	0	12	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175	0	0	0	0	0	237
Total	2	21	14	4	6	8	53	7	2	0	5	6	1	2	3	6	178	9	9	12	20	10	378
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	100.0%	100.0%	14.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	5.7%	57.1%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	20.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	90.0%	100.0%	34.1%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	80.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	3.2%
Multifamily 5+ Units	0.0%	0.0%	85.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	94.3%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	62.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Berkeley

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	10	19	13	34	20	13	9	14	15	8	2	4	1	17	20	12	16	36	66	80	82	88	579
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	8	3	13	10	12	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	2	6	80
Multifamily 5+ Units	37	79	20	249	299	172	120	51	384	166	16	38	94	45	342	292	341	275	125	186	255	222	3,808
Total	47	98	41	286	332	195	141	74	406	178	18	42	95	62	364	304	357	311	195	266	339	316	4,467
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	21.3%	19.4%	31.7%	11.9%	6.0%	6.7%	6.4%	18.9%	3.7%	4.5%	11.1%	9.5%	1.1%	27.4%	5.5%	3.9%	4.5%	11.6%	33.8%	30.1%	24.2%	27.8%	13.0%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	0.0%	19.5%	1.0%	3.9%	5.1%	8.5%	12.2%	1.7%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.6%	1.9%	1.8%
Multifamily 5+ Units	78.7%	80.6%	48.8%	87.1%	90.1%	88.2%	85.1%	68.9%	94.6%	93.3%	88.9%	90.5%	98.9%	72.6%	94.0%	96.1%	95.5%	88.4%	64.1%	69.9%	75.2%	70.3%	85.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Dublin

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	753	154	376	214	327	171	163	38	139	122	228	276	756	665	816	529	606	966	615	145	146	101	8,306
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	0	8	4	0	41	13	2	8	40	38	24	3	12	0	0	45	66	14	10	28	356
Multifamily 5+ Units	114	515	243	544	841	804	720	67	0	11	76	505	304	13	267	379	5	186	105	82	340	641	6,762
Total	867	669	619	766	1,172	975	924	118	141	141	344	819	1,084	681	1,095	908	611	1,197	786	241	496	770	15,424
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	86.9%	23.0%	60.7%	27.9%	27.9%	17.5%	17.6%	32.2%	98.6%	86.5%	66.3%	33.7%	69.7%	97.7%	74.5%	58.3%	99.2%	80.7%	78.2%	60.2%	29.4%	13.1%	53.9%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%	0.0%	4.4%	11.0%	1.4%	5.7%	11.6%	4.6%	2.2%	0.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	8.4%	5.8%	2.0%	3.6%	2.3%
Multifamily 5+ Units	13.1%	77.0%	39.3%	71.0%	71.8%	82.5%	77.9%	56.8%	0.0%	7.8%	22.1%	61.7%	28.0%	1.9%	24.4%	41.7%	0.8%	15.5%	13.4%	34.0%	68.5%	83.2%	43.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

(a) Number of housing units reported.

(b) The Bay Area Region includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma counties.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau Building Permits Survey, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Building Permit Trends, 2000-2021

Emeryville

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	3	21
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	0	10	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Multifamily 5+ Units	0	0	0	493	401	156	426	131	125	0	0	5	251	190	209	0	0	310	66	0	504	186	3,453
Total	2	2	1	503	401	156	428	139	127	0	0	6	256	191	209	2	1	312	66	1	504	189	3,496
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	1.6%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	16.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.6%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	3.6%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Multifamily 5+ Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.5%	94.2%	98.4%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	83.3%	98.0%	99.5%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	99.4%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	98.4%	98.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Fremont

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	236	85	99	87	142	157	155	192	170	221	100	127	161	176	258	206	414	326	159	169	112	141	3,893
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	4	0	33	9	3	7	0	4	3	0	0	0	16	3	48	63	46	44	8	32	323
Multifamily 5+ Units	253	110	0	0	87	385	94	203	110	76	212	379	64	48	0	249	160	1,557	1,762	935	166	546	7,396
Total	489	195	103	87	262	551	252	402	280	301	315	506	225	224	274	458	622	1,946	1,967	1,148	286	719	11,612
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	48.3%	43.6%	96.1%	100.0%	54.2%	28.5%	61.5%	47.8%	60.7%	73.4%	31.7%	25.1%	71.6%	78.6%	94.2%	45.0%	66.6%	16.8%	8.1%	14.7%	39.2%	19.6%	33.5%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	12.6%	1.6%	1.2%	1.7%	0.0%	1.3%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	0.7%	7.7%	3.2%	2.3%	3.8%	2.8%	4.5%	2.8%
Multifamily 5+ Units	51.7%	56.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.2%	69.9%	37.3%	50.5%	39.3%	25.2%	67.3%	74.9%	28.4%	21.4%	0.0%	54.4%	25.7%	80.0%	89.6%	81.4%	58.0%	75.9%	63.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Hayward

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	294	101	134	496	468	140	253	255	157	204	248	223	183	161	222	301	474	414	284	695	320	209	6,236
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	34	2	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	3	0	14	0	74
Multifamily 5+ Units	0	128	0	0	0	57	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	357	0	0	0	0	653	204	125	1,624
Total	294	263	136	496	474	201	333	255	157	204	248	223	185	183	586	301	474	414	287	1,348	538	334	7,934
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	100.0%	38.4%	98.5%	100.0%	98.7%	69.7%	76.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.9%	88.0%	37.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.0%	51.6%	59.5%	62.6%	78.6%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	12.9%	1.5%	0.0%	1.3%	2.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.9%
Multifamily 5+ Units	0.0%	48.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.4%	23.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%	60.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48.4%	37.9%	37.4%	20.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Livermore

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	456	386	529	324	327	258	163	142	62	93	78	60	102	112	71	334	261	308	124	53	56	36	4,335
Multifamily 2-4 Units	23	17	4	8	35	3	24	8	8	16	8	8	36	11	6	24	15	4	13	0	8	0	279
Multifamily 5+ Units	32	0	255	99	191	179	20	41	0	0	9	30	78	53	9	62	54	78	180	49	35	0	1,454
Total	511	403	788	431	553	440	207	191	70	109	95	98	216	176	86	420	330	390	317	102	99	36	6,068
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	89.2%	95.8%	67.1%	75.2%	59.1%	58.6%	78.7%	74.3%	88.6%	85.3%	82.1%	61.2%	47.2%	63.6%	82.6%	79.5%	79.1%	79.0%	39.1%	52.0%	56.6%	100.0%	71.4%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	4.5%	4.2%	0.5%	1.9%	6.3%	0.7%	11.6%	4.2%	11.4%	14.7%	8.4%	8.2%	16.7%	6.3%	7.0%	5.7%	4.5%	1.0%	4.1%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	4.6%
Multifamily 5+ Units	6.3%	0.0%	32.4%	23.0%	34.5%	40.7%	9.7%	21.5%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	30.6%	36.1%	30.1%	10.5%	14.8%	16.4%	20.0%	56.8%	48.0%	35.4%	0.0%	24.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

(a) Number of housing units reported.

(b) The Bay Area Region includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma counties.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau Building Permits Survey, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Building Permit Trends, 2000-2021

Newark

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	107	61	84	0	3	2	3	6	1	0	0	0	3	0	26	97	273	244	281	266	294	266	2,017
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	9	15	22	26	21	117
Multifamily 5+ Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	236	133	158	155	141	111	1,001
Total	107	61	84	2	3	2	5	6	1	0	0	0	3	0	26	170	523	386	454	443	461	398	3,135
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	57.1%	52.2%	63.2%	61.9%	60.0%	63.8%	66.8%	64.3%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	3.5%	2.7%	2.3%	3.3%	5.0%	5.6%	5.3%	3.7%
Multifamily 5+ Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	39.4%	45.1%	34.5%	34.8%	35.0%	30.6%	27.9%	31.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Oakland

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	148	346	420	304	440	217	213	265	127	105	144	41	54	52	81	109	190	132	230	282	98	114	4,112
Multifamily 2-4 Units	91	16	8	53	53	44	28	25	6	9	18	0	2	2	2	28	18	13	39	61	20	11	547
Multifamily 5+ Units	210	474	461	728	747	964	2,709	691	495	167	362	249	219	455	174	729	1,928	3,750	3,370	1,519	712	1,226	22,339
Total	449	836	889	1,085	1,240	1,225	2,950	981	628	281	524	290	275	509	257	866	2,136	3,895	3,639	1,862	830	1,351	26,998
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	33.0%	41.4%	47.2%	28.0%	35.5%	17.7%	7.2%	27.0%	20.2%	37.4%	27.5%	14.1%	19.6%	10.2%	31.5%	12.6%	8.9%	3.4%	6.3%	15.1%	11.8%	8.4%	15.2%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	20.3%	1.9%	0.9%	4.9%	4.3%	3.6%	0.9%	2.5%	1.0%	3.2%	3.4%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%	0.8%	3.2%	0.8%	0.3%	1.1%	3.3%	2.4%	0.8%	2.0%
Multifamily 5+ Units	46.8%	56.7%	51.9%	67.1%	60.2%	78.7%	91.8%	70.4%	78.8%	59.4%	69.1%	85.9%	79.6%	89.4%	67.7%	84.2%	90.3%	96.3%	92.6%	81.6%	85.8%	90.7%	82.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Piedmont

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	0	1	0	1	3	7	6	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	1	7	2	1	0	1	7	9	53
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multifamily 5+ Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	0	1	3	7	6	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	1	7	2	1	0	1	7	9	53
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	#DIV/0!	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Multifamily 5+ Units	#DIV/0!	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	#DIV/0!	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Pleasanton

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	368	189	259	253	237	210	136	47	32	14	42	41	89	180	78	94	72	48	42	71	72	77	2,651
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	4	0	0	0	0	17	0	3	0	0	0	82	82	0	4	2	24	8	6	6	12	250
Multifamily 5+ Units	0	96	0	0	108	0	24	5	0	0	0	0	211	645	255	954	257	68	46	72	41	64	2,846
Total	368	289	259	253	345	210	177	52	35	14	42	41	382	907	333	1,052	331	140	96	149	119	153	5,747
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	100.0%	65.4%	100.0%	100.0%	68.7%	100.0%	76.8%	90.4%	91.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	23.3%	19.8%	23.4%	8.9%	21.8%	34.3%	43.8%	47.7%	60.5%	50.3%	46.1%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.5%	9.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	17.1%	8.3%	4.0%	5.0%	7.8%	4.4%
Multifamily 5+ Units	0.0%	33.2%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%	0.0%	13.6%	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.2%	71.1%	76.6%	90.7%	77.6%	48.6%	47.9%	48.3%	34.5%	41.8%	49.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

(a) Number of housing units reported.

(b) The Bay Area Region includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma counties.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau Building Permits Survey, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Building Permit Trends, 2000-2021

San Leandro

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	175	114	244	58	38	17	74	19	8	3	7	8	7	2	1	0	4	0	2	34	18	48	881
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	18
Multifamily 5+ Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	51	0	0	0	0	115	0	0	85	0	0	0	0	262
Total	175	114	244	60	38	17	76	32	8	54	7	8	7	2	116	0	4	85	2	38	20	54	1,161
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	96.7%	100.0%	100.0%	97.4%	59.4%	100.0%	5.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.9%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	89.5%	90.0%	88.9%	75.9%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%	10.0%	11.1%	1.6%
Multifamily 5+ Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	0.0%	94.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	99.1%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Union City

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	340	127	88	92	132	111	266	177	21	8	2	2	5	0	1	47	1	30	86	15	3	23	1,577
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0	0	0	2	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Multifamily 5+ Units	157	0	0	40	200	5	0	392	0	0	100	57	0	0	0	243	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,194
Total	497	127	88	134	332	116	288	569	21	8	102	59	5	0	1	290	1	30	86	15	3	23	2,795
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	68.4%	100.0%	100.0%	68.7%	39.8%	95.7%	92.4%	31.1%	100.0%	100.0%	2.0%	3.4%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	16.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	56.4%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
Multifamily 5+ Units	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	29.9%	60.2%	4.3%	0.0%	68.9%	0.0%	0.0%	98.0%	96.6%	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	83.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Unincorporated Alameda County

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Building Type (#) (a)																							
Single-Family Units	177	128	173	212	83	101	79	49	41	26	9	10	11	22	30	43	22	33	36	87	35	45	1,452
Multifamily 2-4 Units	12	10	14	26	18	3	34	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	12	73	6	15	0	281
Multifamily 5+ Units	52	0	19	56	33	18	207	138	0	10	0	40	0	85	0	77	0	41	12	0	0	0	788
Total	241	138	206	294	134	122	320	206	54	36	9	50	11	107	30	136	32	86	121	93	50	45	2,521
Building Type (%)																							
Single-Family Units	73.4%	92.8%	84.0%	72.1%	61.9%	82.8%	24.7%	23.8%	75.9%	72.2%	100.0%	20.0%	100.0%	20.6%	100.0%	31.6%	68.8%	38.4%	29.8%	93.5%	70.0%	100.0%	57.6%
Multifamily 2-4 Units	5.0%	7.2%	6.8%	8.8%	13.4%	2.5%	10.6%	9.2%	24.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	31.3%	14.0%	60.3%	6.5%	30.0%	0.0%	11.1%
Multifamily 5+ Units	21.6%	0.0%	9.2%	19.0%	24.6%	14.8%	64.7%	67.0%	0.0%	27.8%	0.0%	80.0%	0.0%	79.4%	0.0%	56.6%	0.0%	47.7%	9.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

(a) Number of housing units reported.

(b) The Bay Area Region includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma counties.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau Building Permits Survey, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Appendix A23: Summary and Inventory of Rent/Price-Restricted Affordable Housing Units, Alameda County, 2023

Jurisdiction	Rent-Restricted Affordable Housing Units (a)	Total Housing Units (b)	Rent/Price- Restricted Affordable Units as % of Total Units
Alameda	836	33,959	2.5%
Albany	19	7,967	0.2%
Berkeley	2,615	53,734	4.9%
Dublin	2,149	25,304	8.5%
Emeryville	826	7,853	10.5%
Fremont	2,695	81,065	3.3%
Hayward	2,431	53,564	4.5%
Livermore	1,373	33,157	4.1%
Newark	274	16,153	1.7%
Oakland	12,498	187,734	6.7%
Piedmont	0	3,979	0.0%
Pleasanton	1,284	29,776	4.3%
San Leandro	1,717	33,223	5.2%
Union City	791	21,960	3.6%
Unincorporated County	1,223	52,381	2.3%
Total	30,731	641,809	4.8%

Notes:

(a) The number of affordable units in each jurisdiction is based the rent-restricted affordable projects reported in each jurisdiction's 2023-2031 Housing Element, supplemented by data from the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) on multi-family projects, CHPC's Affordable Housing Map, and Alameda County's affordable housing database.

(b) Housing units are based on California DOF E-5 estimates for 2023.

Sources: CA Department of Housing and Community Development, 2023; California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2023; California Housing Partnership, 2023; Alameda County, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023.

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Alameda (City)													
Playa del Alameda Apartments	148 Crolis Garden Ct	Alameda	CA	94501					39	40	2054		12/15/2000
The Breakers at Bayport	459 Neptune Gardens Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	0	33	18	0	51	52	2061		3/29/2006
Shinsei Gardens	401 Stargell Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	12	23	3	0	38	39	2065		9/3/2009
The Alameda Islander	2428 Central Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	13	48	0	0	61	62	2066		12/27/2012
Jack Capon Villa	2216 Lincoln Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	6	12	0	0	18	19	2068		1/9/2014
Stargell Commons	2700 Bette St	Alameda	CA	94501	8	17	6	0	31	32	2069		
Del Monte Senior Housing	1301 Buena Vista Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	9	16	5	0	30	31	2070		
Eagle Family Housing	2437 Eagle Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	4	11	4	0	19	20	2073		12/17/2018
Alameda Point Senior / Corsair Flats	171 W Atlantic Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	16	15	28	0	59	60	2072	Measure A1	
Rosefield Village	727 Buena Vista Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	0	52	39	0	91	92	2074	Measure A1	6/1/2022
The Starling/Alameda Point Family	170 Coronado St	Alameda	CA	94501	34	16	19	0	69	70	2074	Measure A1	3/1/2022
Eagle Village	747 Eagle Ave	Alameda	CA	94501					42	42			
Parrot Village	1800 Wood St	Alameda	CA	94501					50	50			
New Life Gardens	230 Corpus Christi Rd	Alameda	CA	94501	0	30	0	0	30	30	2072		2000
Miramar-Mariposa	451 Corpus Christi Rd	Alameda	CA	94501	8	24	0	0	32	32	2058		2005
Unity Village	200 Corpus Christi Rd	Alameda	CA	94501	0	20	0	0	20	20	2057		
Bessie Coleman Court	2500 Barbers Point Rd	Alameda	CA	94501	0	52	0	0	52	53	2059		
Sherman Street Housing	1416 Sherman Street	Alameda	CA	94501	0	7	2	0	9	9	2067		
Dignity Village	2350 5th St	Alameda	CA	94501	47	0	0	0	47	48			2023
745 Lincoln Ave	745 Lincoln Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	0	4	0	0	4	4	2067		
Spirit of Hope I-II	2751 Orion St	Alameda	CA	94501	0	44	0	0	44	45	2057		
Albany													
Creekside Apartments	1155 San Pablo Ave	Albany	CA	94706	0	4	11	0	15	16	2057		3/7/2001
Villa de Albany	727 San Pablo Ave	Albany	CA	94706					4	25	In perpetuity		
Berkeley													
Bonita House	1910 Hearst Ave	Berkeley	CA	94709	0	12	0	0	12	12	Annual		
Stuart Pratt Manor	2020 Durant Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	43	0	0	43	44	Annual		
Adeline Street Apartments	3224 Adeline St	Berkeley	CA	94703	7	11	0	0	18	19	2055		12/26/2002
Ashby Lofts	2909 and 2919 Ninth St	Berkeley	CA	94710	40	13	0	0	53	54	2060		7/31/2007
Berkeley 75	1107-1123 Francisco St	Berkeley	CA	94701	2	6	1	0	9	9	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	1161-1175 Francisco St	Berkeley	CA	94701	2	3	2	0	7	7	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	1323 Channing Way	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	1	0	0	1	1	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	2374 West St	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	1	0	0	1	1	2055		
Berkeley 75	1360 Dwight Way	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	1	0	0	1	1	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	1370 Dwight Way	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	1	0	0	1	1	2055		
Berkeley 75	1371 Dwight Way	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	1	0	0	1	1	2055		
Berkeley 75	2450 Valley St	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	0	1	0	1	1	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	1402-1408 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	Berkeley	CA	94709	1	2	1	0	4	4	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	1838-1840 Rose St	Berkeley	CA	94709	0	2	0	0	2	2	2055		
Berkeley 75	1500-1504 7th St	Berkeley	CA	94701	1	2	0	0	3	3	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	870-880 Jones St	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	2	0	0	2	2	2055		
Berkeley 75	1903-1917 Ward St	Berkeley	CA	94709	0	6	2	0	8	8	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	1921-1927 Ward St	Berkeley	CA	94709	0	2	2	0	4	4	2055		
Berkeley 75	2024-2036 Virginia St	Berkeley	CA	94709	1	4	2	0	7	7	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	2725-2737 Sojourner Truth Ct	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	6	1	0	7	7	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	2798 A Sacramento St	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	0	1	0	1	1	2055		
Berkeley 75	2799 B Sacramento St	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	0	1	0	1	1	2055		
Berkeley 75	1812 Fairview St #A-C	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	2	1	0	3	3	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	1521 Alcatraz Ave #A-D	Berkeley	CA	94701	1	3	0	0	4	4	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	1605 Stuart St #A-C	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	2	1	0	3	3	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	3016 Harper St #A-B	Berkeley	CA	94701	0	1	1	0	2	2	2055		10/20/2014
Berkeley 75	2231 8th St, #A-B	Berkeley	CA	94705	0	1	0	0	1	2	2055		10/20/2014
Harmon Gardens	3240 Sacramento St	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	15	0	0	15	16	2065		8/19/2011
Harper Crossing	3132 Martin Luther King Jr Way	Berkeley	CA	94703	5	26	10	0	41	42	2071		
Lorin Station	3253 Adeline St	Berkeley	CA	94703	14	0	0	0	14	14	2078		4/28/1993
Oxford Plaza	2175 Kittredge St	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	4	83	9	96	97	2062		2/6/2009
William Byron Rumford Plaza	3012 Sacramento St	Berkeley	CA	94702	12	0	14	0	26	43	2075		
Redwood Gardens	2951 Derby St	Berkeley	CA	94705	0	168	0	0	168	169	2047		
Rosewood Manor	1615 Russell St	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	0	35	0	35	35	2078		

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Berkeley													
1314 Haskell Street	Housing Consortium of the East Bay	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	0	0	3	3	3	2055		
1320 Haskell Street	1320 Haskell St	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	0	0	5	5	5	2055		
Berkeley Way Apartments	2020 Berkeley Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	54	34	0	88	89	2077	Measure A1	
BFHP Hope Center Permanent Supportive	2012 Berkeley Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	53	0	0	0	53	53	2077	Measure A1	
BFHP Hope Center Temporary Supportive	2012 Berkeley Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	44	0	0	0	44		2077	Measure A1	
Addison Court Housing Cooperative	1135 Addison St	Berkeley	CA	94702	10	0	0	0	10	10	2051		
Alcatraz Apartments	1900 Alcatraz Ave	Berkeley	CA	94703	3	4	1	5	8		2052		
Allston Commons	2203-2207 Sixth St	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	3	9	0	12		2049		
Allston House	2121 Seventh St	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	28	0	0	39	47	2064		5/1/2007
Amistad House	2050 Delaware St	Berkeley	CA	94709	12	0	47	0	59	60	2064		7/15/2010
Ashby Apartments	1317 Ashby Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	6	0	0	0	6		2049		
Ashby Court Apartments	1222-1228 Ashby Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	20	0	0	20		2052		
Ashby Studios	1303-1311 Ashby Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	0	6	0	6		2049		
BFHP - Transitional House / North County	2140 Dwight Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	14	0	0	10		2053		
Blake Street 1340	1340-1348 Blake St	Berkeley	CA	94702	1	0	4	0	5		2074		
Bonita House	1410 Bonita Ave	Berkeley	CA	94709	15	0	0	0	15		2055		
Build, Inc	2110 Seventh St	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	0	6	0	6		2057		
California Street 2425	2425 California St	Berkeley	CA	94703	1	1	3	1	6		2055		
Casa Buenos Amigos Housing Cooperative	3011 Shattuck Ave	Berkeley	CA	94705	0	1	3	0	4		2055		
Channing House	1843-1849 Channing Way	Berkeley	CA	94703	4	0	0	0	4		2047		
Crossroads Village Mutual Housing	1966-1970-A San Pablo Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	0	26	0	26		2046		
Dwight Way Apartments	2501 Sacramento St	Berkeley	CA	94702	15	0	0	0	15	15	2055		
Erna P. Harris / Belair Housing Project	1330 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	34	0	0	0	34	35	2065		11/7/2011
Fairview House Cooperative	1801 Fairview St	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	9	0	0	9		2055		
Fred Finch Youth House - Turning Point	3404 King St	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	12	0	0	12		2055		
Grayson Apartments	2748 San Pablo Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	14	4	4	0	22	23	2074		
Harriet Tubman Terrace	2870 Adeline St	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	90	0	0	90	91	2059		12/31/2005
Haste Street 2207	2207 Haste St	Berkeley	CA	94704	7	0	0	0	7		2055		
Hearst Street Apartments	1133-1139 Hearst St	Berkeley	CA	94702	31	0	0	0	31		2055		
Hearst Studios	950 Hearst Ave	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	2	6	0	8		2049		
Helios Corner	1535 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94703	47	32	0	0	79	80	2060		6/29/2007
Hillegass Apartments	2500 Hillegass Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	4	4	4	5	17		2070		
Hope Homes	2418 Eighth St	Berkeley	CA	94710	1	0	2	0	3		2056		
Idaho Street	3227 Idaho St	Berkeley	CA	94702	1	0	0	0	1		2055		
Lawrence Moore Manor	1909 Cedar St	Berkeley	CA	94709	0	45	0	0	45	46	Annual		
MLK House	2942 - 2944 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	0	0	12	12		2055		
Maggie Kuhn Apartments	1499 Alcatraz Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	40	0	0	39	40	2052		
Margaret Breland Senior Homes / Jubilee	2577 San Pablo Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	27	0	0	27	27	2046		
McKinley House	2111 McKinley St	Berkeley	CA	94703	6	0	0	0	6		2069		
Prince Street	1534 Prince St	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	6	0	0	6		2071		
Regent House	2511 Regent St	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	0	0	6	6		2065		
Rosevine	1431-33 Oxford St	Berkeley	CA	94709	0	5	0	0	5		2052		
Sacramento Senior Homes	1501 Blake St	Berkeley	CA	94702	2	17	20	0	39	40	2058		9/29/2006
Sankofa House	711 Harrison St	Berkeley	CA	94607	7	0	0	0	7		2058		
Savo Island	2017 Stuart St	Berkeley	CA	94703	31	4	0	0	35		2067		
Shattuck Senior Homes	2425 Shattuck Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	15	11	0	26	27	2052		9/23/1998
Strawberry Creek Lodge	1320 Addison St	Berkeley	CA	94702	78	13	28	0	119	150	2069		
U A Coop Homes (UACH)	1471 Addison St	Berkeley	CA	94702	6	32	8	0	46	47	2080		3/1/2014
U A Homes/U.C. Hotel	1040 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94710	52	22	0	0	74	74	2069		12/19/2013
University Neighborhood Apartments	1719 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94703	8	13	5	0	26	27	2060		6/1/2005
Oceanview Gardens	1715-35 5th St; 1726-32 6th St;	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	0	61	0	61	62	2059		
Oceanview Garden Apartments (Site A)	1715 5th St	Berkeley	CA	94710							2059		7/31/2004
Oceanview Garden Apartments (Site B)	1726 6th St	Berkeley	CA	94710							2059		7/31/2004
Oceanview Garden Apartments (Site C)	1816 6th St	Berkeley	CA	94710							2059		7/31/2004
Oceanview Garden Apartments (Site D)	813 Hearst St	Berkeley	CA	94710							2059		7/31/2004
2214 Martin Luther King Jr	2214 Martin Luther King Jr Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	2	0	0	2		In Perpetuity		
2319-23 Shattuck	2319 Shattuck Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	2	0	1	3		In Perpetuity		
2801 Cherry	2801 Cherry St	Berkeley	CA	94705	0	0	1	0	1		In Perpetuity		
4th & U Apartments	2020 4th St	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	16	0	15	31		In Perpetuity		
Acton Courtyard	1392 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	15	5	50	70		In Perpetuity		
Allston Place	2161 Allston Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	6	6	0	12		In Perpetuity		
Aquatic III	2000-2010 Fifth St	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	12	0	0	12		In Perpetuity		

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Berkeley													
Aquatic II	814 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	4	0	0	4		In Perpetuity		
Aquatic	2001 5th St	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	4	0	0	4		In Perpetuity		
Avalon Berkeley	651 Addison St	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	8	6	0	14		In Perpetuity		
Aventerra Apartments	2700 San Pablo Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	3	3	0	6		In Perpetuity		
Bachenheimer Apartments	2119 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	4	3	0	7		In Perpetuity		
Berkeley Central	2055 Center St	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	12	0	11	23		In Perpetuity		
Blake Berkeley	2035 Blake St	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	4	0	0	4		In Perpetuity		
Campanile Court (1122U)	1122-1132 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	4	9	0	13		In Perpetuity		
Garden Village	2201 Dwight Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	7	0	0	7		In Perpetuity		
800 Heinz	800 Heinz Ave	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	3	15	0	18		In Perpetuity		
Higby	3015 San Pablo Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	8	7	0	15		In Perpetuity		
Hillside Village LLC	1797-1801 Shattuck Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	10	0	11	21		In Perpetuity		
Jones Berkeley	1500 San Pablo Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	16	0	0	16		In Perpetuity		
K Street Flats	2020 Kittredge St D	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	0	35	0	35		In Perpetuity		
2500 Martin Luther King Way	2500 Martin Luther King Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	0	2	0	2		In Perpetuity		
Modera Berkeley	2133 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	6	0	0	6		In Perpetuity		
New Californian	1950 Martin Luther King Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	11	11	0	22		In Perpetuity		
Parker Place	2037 & 2038 Parker St	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	15	16	0	31		In Perpetuity		
Regent Terrace	2597 Telegraph Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	1	0	0	1		In Perpetuity		
Standard Berkeley	2580 Bancroft Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	11	0	0	11		In Perpetuity		
1385 Shattuck	1385 Shattuck Ave	Berkeley	CA	94709	0	0	0	8	8		In Perpetuity		
Stadium Place	2310 Fulton St	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	7	8	0	15		In Perpetuity		
Sterling Addison (ARTech)	2002 Addison St	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	1	0	4	5		In Perpetuity		
Sterling Allston (Gaia)	2116 Allston Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	9	9	0	18		In Perpetuity		
Sterling Haste (Fine Arts)	2110 Haste St	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	0	10	10	20		In Perpetuity		
Sterling Jefferson (Renaissance Villas)	1627 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	0	0	6	6		In Perpetuity		
Sterling Oxford (Berkeleyan)	1910 Oxford St	Berkeley	CA	94709	0	6	5	0	11		In Perpetuity		
Sterling University Ave (Touriel)	2006 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	4	3	0	7		In Perpetuity		
Stonefire	2010 Milvia St	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	8	0	0	8		In Perpetuity		
Stranda	1901 Dwight Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	0	3	0	3		In Perpetuity		
Telegraph Gardens	3001 Telegraph Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	3	1	2	6		In Perpetuity		
Telegraph Bay Apartments	2616-20 Telegraph Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	2	2	0	4		In Perpetuity		
The Addison	1950 Addison St	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	4	0	0	4		In Perpetuity		
The Den	2510 Channing Way	Berkeley	CA	94720	0	3	0	0	3		In Perpetuity		
The Dwight	2121 Dwight Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	9	0	0	9		In Perpetuity		
The Overture	1812 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94703	0	4	0	0	4		In Perpetuity		
The Panoramic	2539 Telegraph Ave	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	6	0	0	6		In Perpetuity		
The URSA	2124 Bancroft Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	5	0	0	5		In Perpetuity		
Wesley House	2398 Bancroft Way	Berkeley	CA	94704	0	1	0	0	1		In Perpetuity		
2747 San Pablo Avenue	2747 San Pablo Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	0	6	0	6		In Perpetuity		
2001 Fourth Street	2001 Fourth St	Berkeley	CA	94710	0	12	0	0	12		In Perpetuity		
Maudelle Miller Shirek Community	2001 Ashby Ave	Berkeley	CA	94703	5	48	33	0	86	87			9/1/2023
Jordan Court	1601 Oxford St	Berkeley	CA	94709	7	16	11	0	34	35	2076	Measure A1	8/1/2021
1974 University Avenue	1974 University Ave	Berkeley	CA	94702	0	8	0	0	8		In Perpetuity		
Dublin													
Park Sierra at Iron Horse Trail	6450 Dougherty Rd	Dublin	CA	94568					57	283	2029		5/28/1999
Pine Grove 55+ Apartments	3115 Finnian Way	Dublin	CA	94568					292	322	2062		2/21/2007
Wicklow Square Senior Apartments	7606 Amador Valley Blvd	Dublin	CA	94568					53	54	2075		9/15/2005
Fairway Family Community	4161 Keegan St	Dublin	CA	94568					243	304	2062		1/11/2007
Camellia Place	5450 DeMarcus Blvd	Dublin	CA	94568					111	112	2062		1/17/2007
Carlow Court Senior Apartments at Emerald	6880 Mariposa Circle	Dublin	CA	94568					49	50	2067		
Wexford Way at Emerald Vista	6900 Mariposa Cir	Dublin	CA	94568					129	130	2067		12/27/2012
Avalon Dublin Station	5200 Iron Horse Pkwy	Dublin	CA	94568					50	505	2067		2013
Avana (Archstone) Apartments	6233 Dougherty Rd	Dublin	CA	94568					2	177	2033		2001
Dublin Station by Windsor	5300 Iron Horse Pkwy	Dublin	CA	94568					30	305	2063		
Tralee Village Apartments	6599 Dublin Blvd	Dublin	CA	94568					16	130	2069		2011
Tralee Townhomes	Tralee Village Drive	Dublin	CA	94568					3	103	2063		
Valor Crossing	7500 St Patrick Way	Dublin	CA	94568	0	26	39	0	65	66	2072		

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Emeryville													
Ocean Avenue Court	1265-69 Ocean Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608					6	6	2026		
Bakery Lofts I & II	4600 Adeline St	Emeryville	CA	94608					8	41	2028		
390 Adeline	3900 Adeline St	Emeryville	CA	94608					12	101	2073		
Ambassador Housing	1168 36th St	Emeryville	CA	94608	8	60			68	69	2068		12/2/2013
Artistry (Archstone) Emeryville	6401 Shellmound St	Emeryville	CA	94608					52	261	2062		
Avalon Senior Apartments	3850 San Pablo Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608					66	67	2055		9/22/2000
Avenue 64	6399 Christie Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608					23	224	2060		
Bay Bridge Apartments	1034 36th St	Emeryville	CA	94608					6	6	2038		
Bay Street Apartments / AVE Emeryville at	5684 Bay St	Emeryville	CA	94607					57	284	2060		10/25/2006
Bridgecourt Apartments	1325 40th St	Emeryville	CA	94608					90	220	2052		12/8/1997
The Courtyards	1465 65th St	Emeryville	CA	94608					61	331	2059		
Emeryville	4320 San Pablo Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608					50	50	2066		
Emme	6350 Christie Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608					29	190	2067		
Estrella Vista	3706 San Pablo Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608	26	44	16		86	87	2095		
Icon at Park	1401 Park Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608					3	54	2062		
Magnolia Terrace	4001 Adeline St	Emeryville	CA	94608	0	5	0	0	5	5	2066		
Ocean Avenue	1265 Ocean Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608	3	3			6	6	2024		
Parc on Powell	1333 Powell St	Emeryville	CA	94608					21	172	2067		
Triangle Court	1063 45th St	Emeryville	CA	94608					20	20	2052		
Marketplace - Parcel D	6301 Shellmound St	Emeryville	CA	94608					25	223	2071		
Marketplace - Parcel C2	63rd Street and Shellmound St	Emeryville	CA	94608					7	66	2073		
The Intersection Mixed Use "Maz"	3800 San Pablo Ave	Emeryville	CA	94608					11	108	2075		
Fremont													
Archstone Fremont	39410 Civic Center Dr	Fremont	CA	94538					65	322	2030		9/15/2004
Baywood Apartments	4275 Bay St	Fremont	CA	94538					80	82	2104		8/1/2006
Bridgeway East	4145 Bay St	Fremont	CA	94538					18	18	2097		6/30/2005
Bridgeway - 4165 Bay St	4165 Bay St	Fremont	CA	94538					8	8	2097		
Canyon Flats	44960 Warm Springs Blvd	Fremont	CA	94539	14	28	28		70	71	2074		
Century Village Apartments	41299 Paseo Padre Pkwy	Fremont	CA	94539	11	65	23		99	99	2094		10/1/2013
City Center Apartments	38631 Fremont Blvd	Fremont	CA	94536	20	31	8		59	60	2073	Measure A1	
Cottonwood Place	3701 Peralta Blvd	Fremont	CA	94536					97	98	2066		3/9/2012
Courtyards at Cottonwood II	41911 Osgood Rd	Fremont	CA	94539	5	15	12		32	32			6/1/2024
Doug Ford Senior	4038 Irvington Ave	Fremont	CA	94538	45	44			89	90	2073	Measure A1	3/1/2023
Fremont Family Apartments	34320 Fremont Blvd	Fremont	CA	94555	13	30	10		53	54	2079	Measure A1	
Fremont Oak Gardens	2681 Driscoll Rd	Fremont	CA	94539					49	51	2055		4/25/2005
Geo Apartments	S. Grimmer Blvd & Old Warm Springs	Fremont	CA	94538		34	67		101	102	2072		
Glen Haven Apartments	4262 Central Ave	Fremont	CA	94536					57	81	2060		11/15/2003
Glenview Apartments	4400 Central Ave	Fremont	CA	94536					70	71	2060		1/1/2005
Good Shepherd Residence	1335 Mowry Ave	Fremont	CA	94538					32	32			
Granite Ridge Apartments	37350 Sequoia Rd	Fremont	CA	94536	15	36	21		72	73	2074	Measure A1	5/2/2022
Innovia	S. Grimmer Blvd & Lopes Ct	Fremont	CA	94538		93	194		287	290	2071		
Irvington Terrace	4109 Broadmoor Cmn	Fremont	CA	94538					99	100	2104		7/16/2007
Laguna Commons	41152 Fremont Blvd	Fremont	CA	94538	19	26	18		63	64	2070		
Lincoln Oaks Apartments	40852 Lincoln St	Fremont	CA	94538					10		2102		
Main Street Apartments	3615 Main St	Fremont	CA	94538					63	64	2066		8/4/2011
Maple Square	4163 Baine Ave	Fremont	CA	94537					130	132	2103		3/9/2007
Oroysom Village	43280 Bryant Terrace	Fremont	CA	94539					59	60	2097		12/27/1999
Oroysom Village Senior	221 Bryant Terrace	Fremont	CA	94539					40		2097		
Osgood Apartments	41829 Osgood Rd	Fremont	CA	94539		24	87		111	112	2077		2/1/2024
Pacific Grove	41247 Roberts Ave	Fremont	CA	94538					20		2094		
Paragon Apartments	3700 Beacon Ave	Fremont	CA	94538					45		2041		
Park Vista Apartments	1301 Stevenson Blvd	Fremont	CA	94538					60	60	2095		2/2/1998
Pasatiempo Apartments	39548 Fremont Blvd	Fremont	CA	94538					59				
Pauline Weaver Senior	47003 Mission Falls Ct	Fremont	CA	94539	14	30			44	44	2072		
Pickering Place	20 West Pickering Ave	Fremont	CA	94536					42	43	2094		5/30/1997
Rancho Sol Y Luna	3939 Monroe Ave	Fremont	CA	94536					38				
Redwood Lodge	40767 Fremont Blvd	Fremont	CA	94538	3	20			23	24	2087		4/9/2013
Reilly Station	44960 Warm Springs Blvd	Fremont	CA	94539	12	24	24		60	61	2074		
Sequoia Manor	40789 Fremont Blvd	Fremont	CA	94538	8	72			80	81	2087		4/27/2014
Stevenson Terrace	39605 Stevenson Place	Fremont	CA	94539	15	44	20		79	80	2072		
Sundale Arms	39150 Sundale Dr	Fremont	CA	94538					130	132	2028		4/22/1998

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Hayward													
Hayward Villa	27424 Tampa Ave	Hayward	CA	94544					78	78	2025		
Josephine Lum Lodge	2747 Oliver Dr	Hayward	CA	94545					148	150	2025		8/1/2006
Sycamore Square	22650 Alice St	Hayward	CA	94541					26	26	2028		
Weinreb Place	22605 Grand St	Hayward	CA	94541					21	22	2070		
EC Magnolia Court	22880 Watkins St	Hayward	CA	94541	2	18			20	21	2033		4/9/2013
S Hayward BART Family & Senior	28901 Mission Blvd	Hayward	CA	94544		114	36		150	151	2072		2017
Depot Community Apartments	2595 Depot Rd	Hayward	CA	94545	45	49	30		124	125	2078	Measure A1	2023
Eden Issei Terrace	200 Fagundes St	Hayward	CA	94544	10	88			98	100	2033		1/21/2014
Maple & Main Apartments	22330 Main St	Hayward	CA	94541			48		48	240			
Montgomery Plaza	21659 Montgomery Ave	Hayward	CA	94541	5	30	14		49	50	2034		9/25/2014
Olive Tree Plaza	671 W. A St	Hayward	CA	94541	3	22			25	26	2033		1/1/2014
Tennyson Gardens Apartments/Faith Manor	983 Forselles Way	Hayward	CA	94544	15	56	84		155	158	2073		
Villa Springs	22328 South Garden Ave	Hayward	CA	94541					65	66	2065		7/1/2008
Hayward Senior Housing	568 C St	Hayward	CA	94541					59	60	2064		5/30/2008
Hayward Senior Housing II	22605 Grand St	Hayward	CA	94145	3	18			21	22	2070		1/28/2015
Downtown Hayward Senior Apartments	808 A St	Hayward	CA	94541		40	19		59	60	2072		
The Majestic Apartments	951 Torrano Ave	Hayward	CA	94542					80	81	2063		12/11/2008
Saklan Family Housing	1401 North Ln	Hayward	CA	94545					77	78	2062		5/1/2008
Hayward Mission Family Apartments	29497 Mission Blvd	Hayward	CA	94544		26	113		139	140			3/1/2022
Leisure Terrace Apartments	1638 E St	Hayward	CA	94541		7	60		67	68			
Lord Tennyson	2191 W. Tennyson Rd	Hayward	CA	94545					249	252	2060		8/1/2006
Sara Connor Court	32520 Pulaski Dr	Hayward	CA	94544					56	57	2059		8/29/2006
Park Manor Apartments	24200 Silva Ave	Hayward	CA	94544		25	55		80	81	2031		
Hayward Four (Site A)	742 Harris Ct	Hayward	CA	94541		1	2		3	4	2054		
Hayward Four (Site B)	735 Harris Ct	Hayward	CA	94541		11	8		19	20	2054		
Hayward Four (Site C)	25100 Cypress Ave	Hayward	CA	94541		18	31		49	54	2054		
Hayward Four (Site D) - Huntwood	27901 Huntwood Ave	Hayward	CA	94541		13	26		39	40	2054		
Glen Berry (Site A)	625 Berry Ave	Hayward	CA	94544					50	50	2048		
Glen Eden (Site B)	561 A St	Hayward	CA	94541					36	36	2047		
Bridgeway-Hayward	22651 3rd St	Hayward	CA	94541	4				4	4	2098		
Alta Mira Senior and Family Apartments	28901 Mission Blvd	Hayward	CA	94544		150			150		2071		
Leidig Court	27751 Leidig Court	Hayward	CA	94544	0	0	8	7	15	16			
Livermore													
Agno Apartments	1055 Westwind Street	Livermore	CA	94550			34		34	171	2070		
The Arbors	3550 Pacific Ave	Livermore	CA	94550			81	81	162	162	2050		
Arbor Vista	1300 S. Livermore Ave	Livermore	CA	94550		39		41	79	80	2039		
Avance	4260 First St	Livermore	CA	94551	32	12			44	45	2074	Measure A1	
Arroyo Del Valle Commons	1140 Mocho St	Livermore	CA	94550	3	8			11	12	2038		
Bluebell Apartments	1023 Bluebell Dr	Livermore	CA	94551		9		6	15	27	2028		
Carmen Avenue	2891 Carmen Ave	Livermore	CA	94550	9	20			29	30	2062		1/23/2008
Chestnut Apartments	2260-2280 Chestnut St	Livermore	CA	94551		2	4		6	6	2061		
Chestnut Square Senior Housing	1625 Chestnut St	Livermore	CA	94551	8	44	19	0	71	72	2071		
Chestnut Square Family Housing	1665 Chestnut St	Livermore	CA	94551	19	14	8		41	42	2072		
Colgate (Lily House)	4355 Colgate Way	Livermore	CA	94550		6			6	6	2057		
Corte Cava	Corte Cava	Livermore	CA	94551		2			2	2	2037		
Dogwood House (Crane Ave)	791 Crane Ave	Livermore	CA	94551		3			3	3	2071		
Vandenburgh Villa (formerly Gardella)	3330 Gardella Plaza	Livermore	CA	94551		39			39	39	2044		
Goodness Village	1660 Freisman Rd	Livermore	CA	94551	28				28	28			
Heritage Estates (Assisted living)	900 East Stanley Blvd	Livermore	CA	94550		100			100	250	2058		5/11/2004
Heritage Estates (Senior Apartments)	800 East Stanley Blvd	Livermore	CA	94550		23	32		55	130	2061		1/15/2007
Heritage Park	1089 Bluebell Dr	Livermore	CA	94551			33		33	167	2085		
Hillcrest Gardens	550 Hillcrest Ave	Livermore	CA	94550		43	11		54	55	N/A		1971
Las Posadas	353 North I St	Livermore	CA	94551		9			9	9	2059		
Leahy Square	3203 Leahy Way	Livermore	CA	94550		125			125	125	N/A		
Marilisa Meadows	6175 Water Lily Commons	Livermore	CA	94551			31		31	50	2027		
McLeod Apartments	389 McLeod St	Livermore	CA	94550		2	3		5	5	2070		
Oak Street Apartments	2160-2174 Oak St	Livermore	CA	94551		2			2	8	2056		
Outrigger Apartments	1020 Dolores Dr	Livermore	CA	94550		18	10		28	42	2034		
Owl's Landing	860 Herman Ave	Livermore	CA	94550		71			71	72	2052		8/10/2000
Railroad Ave	Railroad Avenue	Livermore	CA	94550		6			6	6	2074		
Shepherd's Gate	1660 Portola Ave	Livermore	CA	94551	70				70	70			

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Livermore													
Shiloh House	Safe House	Livermore	CA		30				30	30			
Sojourner House	559 Meadowlark St	Livermore	CA	94551	16				16	16			
Stoney Creek Apartments	5896 East Ave	Livermore	CA	94550		69			69	70	2070		
Vineyard Site	460 N. Livermore Ave	Livermore	CA	94551	23				23	23	2078	Measure A1	
Vineyard Village	3700 Pacific Ave	Livermore	CA	94550		75			75	75	2022		
Newark													
Newark Gardens II	35322 Cedar Blvd	Newark	CA	94560		50			50	50	2055		
Rosemont Aka Newark Garden I	35300 Cedar Blvd	Newark	CA	94560					150	150			1983
Newark Station Seniors	37433 Willow St	Newark	CA	94560		15	59		74	75			
Oakland													
United Together Manor Blvd	9410 MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94602					0	17	2025		
Lottie Johnson Apartments	970 14th St	Oakland	CA	94607					25	27	2023		
Hamilton Hotel	2101 Telegraph Ave	Oakland	CA	94612					0	92	2027		
CURA-North	531 24th St	Oakland	CA	94612					0	17	2031		
Effie's House	829 E. 19th St	Oakland	CA	94606					0	20	2029		
Courtyards at Acorn	923 Adeline St	Oakland	CA	94607					0	87	2031		
Hotel Oakland	270 Thirteenth St	Oakland	CA	94612					315	315	2030		
Alameda County Comfort Inn	8452 Edes Ave	Oakland	CA	94621					0	102	2075		
Days Hotel	8350 Edes Ave	Oakland	CA	94621	138				138	140	2075		
Town Center at Acorn	1143 10th St	Oakland	CA	94607					25	25	2034		
St. Joseph's Family Apartments	1272 26th Ave	Oakland	CA	94601	25	18	18		61	62	2067		11/13/2013
Ironhorse at Central Station	1801 14th St	Oakland	CA	94607					98	99	2065		10/28/2009
St. Joseph's Senior Apartments	2647 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94601					83	84	2064		5/1/2010
MacArthur Transit Village	3838 Turquoise Way	Oakland	CA	94609	29	60			89	90	2067		
460 Grand Avenue Apartments	460 Grand Ave	Oakland	CA	94610	17	31	19		67	68	2067		
Fruitvale Transit Village Phase IIB	3511 E 12th St	Oakland	CA	94601	46	29	94	10	179	181	2074		3/1/2023
Mandela Gateway	1350 7th St	Oakland	CA	94607					166	168	2060		11/29/2004
Percy Abram Jr. Senior Apartments	1094 Alcatraz Ave	Oakland	CA	94608					44	44	2061		
Irene Cooper Manor	1218 2nd Ave	Oakland	CA	94606					40	40	2041		
Southlake Tower	1501 Alice St	Oakland	CA	94612					130	130	2058		
Harrison Street Senior Housing	1633 Harrison St	Oakland	CA	94612					72	73	2066		9/18/2012
J. L. Richard Terrace	250 E. 12th St	Oakland	CA	94606					80	80	2028		
Westlake Christian Terrace East	251 28th St	Oakland	CA	94611		198			198	200	2068		1/1/2014
Westlake Christian Terrace West	275 28th St	Oakland	CA	94611		199			199	200	2072		
Bancroft Senior Homes	5636 Bancroft Ave	Oakland	CA	94605					60	61	2041		
Sojourner Truth Manor	5815 Martin Luther King Jr Way	Oakland	CA	94609					87	88	2044		
Sister Thea Bowman Manor	6400 San Pablo Ave	Oakland	CA	94608					55	55	2037		
St. Mary's Gardens	801 10th St	Oakland	CA	94607					100	101	2030		
Clifton Hall	5276 Broadway	Oakland	CA	94618					0	63	2075		
Cathedral Gardens	618 21st St	Oakland	CA	94612		30	69		99	100	2059		9/26/2014
Madison Park Apartments	100 9th St	Oakland	CA	94607		24	72		96	98	2072		
Prosperity Place	1110 Jackson St	Oakland	CA	94607	8	32	30		70	71	2068		
Oakland Point, L.P.	1448 10th St	Oakland	CA	94607					31	31	2055		3/1/2001
Noble Tower Apartments	1515 Lakeside Dr	Oakland	CA	94612		128	66		194	195	2073		
Marcus Garvey Hismen Hin-Nu (Site A)	1769 Goss St	Oakland	CA	94607		42	69		111	114	2069		
San Pablo Hotel	1955 San Pablo Ave	Oakland	CA	94612		142			142	144	2073		
Drasnin Manor Apartments	2530 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94601		8	17		25	26	2067		5/10/2013
Oak Park Apartments	2618 East 16th St	Oakland	CA	94601					34	35	2059		9/10/2004
Frank G Mar Apartments	283 13th St	Oakland	CA	94612	30	32	35	20	117	119	2074		7/1/2021
Seven Directions	2946 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94601					35	36	2063		8/29/2008
California Hotel	3501 San Pablo Ave	Oakland	CA	94608	55	80			135	137	2067		1/1/2013
Fruitvale Transit Village II-A (aka Casa	3611 East 12th St	Oakland	CA	94601	23	49	20		92	94	2071		
Madrone Hotel	477 8th St	Oakland	CA	94607					0	32	2069		
Slim Jenkins Court	700 Willow St	Oakland	CA	94607					13	32	2021		
Swan's Market Hall Apartments	918 Clay St	Oakland	CA	94607					17	18	2053		12/15/1999
Jack London Gateway Senior Housing	989 Brush St	Oakland	CA	94607					60	61	2064		5/8/2009
The Altenheim Senior Housing, Phase 2	1720 MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94602					80	81	2064		8/30/2010
Altenheim Senior Housing	1720 MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94602					92	93	2062		12/13/2006
Allen Temple Arms III	10121 E. 14th St	Oakland	CA	94603					49	49	2042		
Allen Temple Arms II	1388 81st Ave	Oakland	CA	94621					51	51	2027		

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Oakland													
Allen Temple Manor	7607 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94621					24	24	2040		
Allen Temple	8135 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94621					75	76	2022		
Santana Apartments	2220 10th Ave	Oakland	CA	94606					30	30	N/A		8/3/1992
Hamilton Apartments	510 21st St	Oakland	CA	94612					92	93	2051		7/25/1997
Brooklyn Basin Family Housing Project	101 10th Ave	Oakland	CA	94606	5	31	24		60	60	2072		
Brooklyn Basin Senior Housing Project 2	280 8th Ave	Oakland	CA	94606		76	33		109	110	2072		
Foon Lok West	311 9th Ave	Oakland	CA	94606	52	37	40		129	130	2074	Measure A1	6/1/2022
Tassafaronga Village Phase 2	1001 83rd Ave	Oakland	CA	94621					19	20	2066		5/13/2010
Chestnut Linden Court	1060 West Grand Ave	Oakland	CA	94607					149	151	2057		6/30/2003
Linden Court Rental	1089 26th St	Oakland	CA	94607					0	79	2057		
Keller Plaza Apartments	5321 Telegraph Ave	Oakland	CA	94609		145	22		167	201	2066		8/3/2012
Oak Grove North & South	620 17th St	Oakland	CA	94612	37	52	60		149	152	2072		
Foothill Family Apartments	6946 Foothill Blvd	Oakland	CA	94605					64	65	2057		12/30/2002
Tassafaronga Village Phase 1	930 84th Ave	Oakland	CA	94621					136	137	2066		4/14/2010
Coliseum Gardens Phase II aka Lion Creek	6615 Leona Creek Dr	Oakland	CA	94621					145	146	2062		9/26/2007
Lion Creek Crossings Phase V	6710 Lion Way	Oakland	CA	94621	70	57			127	128	2068		7/21/2014
Lion Creek Crossings fka Coliseum	6818 Lion Way	Oakland	CA	94621					114	115	2064		4/27/2006
Lion Creek Crossings, Phase IV	6888 Lion Way	Oakland	CA	94607					71	72	2067		12/16/2011
Lion Creek Crossings Phase III	928 66th Ave	Oakland	CA	94621					105	106	2064		5/21/2008
Drachma Housing	1029 Campbell St	Oakland	CA	94607					19	19	2057		7/24/2003
1701 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	1701 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	Oakland	CA	94612	14	11			25	26	2067		
Embark Apartments	2126 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	Oakland	CA	94612	26	30			61	62	2071		
Northgate Apartments	2301 Northgate Ave	Oakland	CA	94612					41	42	2058		11/25/2003
Vernon Street Housing, Inc.	269 Vernon St	Oakland	CA	94610					12	13	2036		
Eldridge Gonaway Commons	275 East 12th St	Oakland	CA	94606		39			39	40	2067		10/30/2013
Empyrean Harrison Renovation (Site A)	344 13th St	Oakland	CA	94612	59	22	55		146	147	2072		
Fox Courts	555 19th St	Oakland	CA	94612					79	80	2065		4/1/2009
Stanley Avenue Apartments	6006 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94621					23	24	2057		12/31/2002
International Blvd. Family Housing Initiative	6600 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94621					29	30	2053		12/17/2001
Eastmont Court	6850 Foothill Blvd	Oakland	CA	94605					18	19	2064		
Clinton Commons	720 East 11th St	Oakland	CA	94606					54	55	2066		9/19/2012
Coliseum Place	905 72nd Ave	Oakland	CA	94621		27	31		58	59	2073	Measure A1	
Oak Street Terrace	1109 Oak St	Oakland	CA	94607					38	39	2058		11/30/2004
Adeline Street Lofts	1131 24th St	Oakland	CA	94607					37	38	2056		1/31/2002
Lakeside Senior Apartments	116 E. 15th St	Oakland	CA	94606	22	56	13		91	92	2068		12/16/2014
St. Patrick's Terrace	1212 Center St	Oakland	CA	94607					65	66	2064		
Camino 23	1233 23rd Ave	Oakland	CA	94606	9	27			36	37	2075		
Jefferson Oaks Apartments (Site A)	1424 Jefferson St	Oakland	CA	94612					101	102	2066		12/31/2012
Madison Apartments	160 14th St	Oakland	CA	94612					78	79	2063		4/18/2008
Homes Now in the Community	1800 Linden St	Oakland	CA	94607					10	10	2031		
The Orchards on Foothill	2719 Foothill Blvd	Oakland	CA	94601					64	65	2063		9/30/2008
Valdez Plaza	280 28th St	Oakland	CA	94611					150	150	2026		
Linda Glen	32 Linda Ave	Oakland	CA	94611					40	42	2025		
St. Andrew's Manor	3250 San Pablo Ave	Oakland	CA	94608					59	60	2068		
Monarch Homes	3268 San Pablo Ave	Oakland	CA	94608	13	18	19		50	51	2073	Measure A1	
Beth Asher	3649 Dimond Ave	Oakland	CA	94602	7	41			48	49	2026		11/1/2022
Fairmount Apartments	401 Fairmount Ave	Oakland	CA	94611					30	31	2065		2/10/2011
Redwood Hill Townhomes	4856 Calaveras Ave	Oakland	CA	94619	8		19		27	28	2070		
Otterbein Manor	5375 Manila Ave	Oakland	CA	94618					39	39	2024		
Satellite First Communities	540 21st St	Oakland	CA	94607		40	305		345	346	2066		12/15/2012
Merritt Crossing	609 Oak St	Oakland	CA	94607					69	70	2066		5/31/2012
Kenneth Henry Court	6455 Foothill Blvd	Oakland	CA	94605		33	17		50	51	2066		5/1/2012
Las Bougainvillias	1223 37th Ave	Oakland	CA	94601					67	68	2038		
Posada de Colores Apartments	2221 Fruitvale Ave	Oakland	CA	94601		99			99	100	2071		
Casa Velasco	3430 Foothill Blvd	Oakland	CA	94601					20	20	2058		12/3/2003
Bishop Roy C. Nichols fka Downs Senior	1027 60th St	Oakland	CA	94608					16	17	2057		3/31/2003
Oakland International	10500 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94603		33	288		321	324	2072		
City Towers	1065 8th St	Oakland	CA	94607					229	231	2058		7/31/2004
Oakland 34	10920 MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94605	4	18	10		32	33	2068		5/30/2014
Beth Eden	1100 Market St	Oakland	CA	94607					54	54	2035		
LakeHouse Commons Affordable	121 E. 12th	Oakland	CA	94606	33	10	51		90	91	2071		
Lakemount Apartments	136 E. 12th St	Oakland	CA	94606					66	66	2036		

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Oakland													
Coit Apartments	1445 Harrison St	Oakland	CA	94612					105	106	2050		12/15/1995
Oak Center Towers	1515 Market St	Oakland	CA	94607					195	196	2060		1/1/2006
Rose of Sharon Homes	1600 Lakeshore Ave	Oakland	CA	94606					142	143	2061		8/1/2007
Oak Center I Apartments	1601 Market St	Oakland	CA	94607		65	11		76	77	2069		
Lake Merritt Apartments	1714 1st Ave	Oakland	CA	94606		54			55	55	2071		
Villa Oakland	2116 Brush St	Oakland	CA	94612	12	41	51		104	105	2075		
Piedmont Apartments	215 West MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94611		25	222		247	250	2066		12/28/2012
Baywood Apartments	225 41st St	Oakland	CA	94611					76	77	2058		10/31/2004
East Side Arts and Housing	2285 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94606					0	16	2062		
Lincoln Court Senior Housing	2400 MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94602					81	82	2062		8/14/2007
United Seniors Housing at the Eastmont	2520 Church St	Oakland	CA	94605					68	69	2061		10/3/2007
San Pablo Suites	2551 San Pablo Ave	Oakland	CA	94612					43	43	2047		7/1/1992
E.E. Cleveland Manor	2611 EC Reems Ct	Oakland	CA	94605		22	31		53	54	2071		
Gatewood Commons	2700 Alvingroom Ct	Oakland	CA	94614					118	120	2052		
East Bay Transit Homes	2787 79th Ave	Oakland	CA	94605					12	12	2036		
North Oakland Senior Housing	3255 San Pablo Ave	Oakland	CA	94608					64	65	2058		7/1/2003
Mark Twain Senior Community Center	3525 Lyon Ave	Oakland	CA	94601					105	106	2051		6/21/1996
Rising Oaks (aka Emancipation Village)	3800 Coolidge Ave	Oakland	CA	94602					7	31	2069		
Coolidge Court	3850 Coolidge Ave	Oakland	CA	94602					18	19	2038		
St. Marks Apartments	392 12th St	Oakland	CA	94607		11	89		100	102	2070		
Harp Plaza	430 28th St	Oakland	CA	94612					20	20	2049		7/14/1995
NOVA Apartments	445 30th St	Oakland	CA	94609	28	28			56	57	2073		
Uptown Apartments	500 William St	Oakland	CA	94612					135	665	2063		11/28/2008
Adcock Joyner Apartments	532 16th St	Oakland	CA	94612		18	31		49	50	2074		3/1/2022
Providence House Oakland	540 23rd St	Oakland	CA	94612		4	36		40	41	2070		
Temescal Apartments	5406 Telegraph Ave	Oakland	CA	94609					6	6	2060		
Northgate Terrace Apartments	550 24th St	Oakland	CA	94612		20	179		199	201	2069		
Brookfield Place Apartments	555 98th Ave	Oakland	CA	94603					57	58	2063		4/1/2009
Oaks Hotel	587 15th St	Oakland	CA	94612					0	85	2040		
Aztec Hotel	587 8th St	Oakland	CA	94607					57	57	2042		
Granite Pointe Apartments	6311 Foothill Blvd	Oakland	CA	94605		12	86		98	99	2037		
Civic Center 14 TOD	632 14th St	Oakland	CA	94612	12	14	13		39	40	2074		
The Claridge Hotel Ridge Hotel	634 15th St	Oakland	CA	94612					198	200	2048		1/1/1994
C.L. Dellums Apartments	644 14th St	Oakland	CA	94612	8	64			72	73	2068		12/1/2014
Aurora Apartments	657 W. MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94609		43			43	44	2073		
James Lee Court (Dignity House)	690 Fifteenth St	Oakland	CA	94612					12	25	2090		
MORH I Housing	701 Filbert St	Oakland	CA	94607		125			125	126	2069		9/15/2000
Oak Village Apartments	801 14th St	Oakland	CA	94612					116	117	2058		12/31/2004
Coliseum Connections	801 71st Ave	Oakland	CA	94621		22	33		55	110	2075		
Oak Center Homes	850 18th St	Oakland	CA	94607		9	79		88	89	2066		10/31/2013
94th and International Apartments	9400 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94603	24	34			58	59	2069		
95th & International Apartments	9409 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94603	14	40			54	55	2074		7/1/2022
MacArthur Apartments	9800 MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94605	6	24	1		31	32	2067		9/27/2013
Garden Villas fka Garden Manor	9914 99th Avenue Ct	Oakland	CA	94603					71	72	2063		11/24/2009
MacArthur Studios	4311 & 4317 MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	CA	94619					191	191	2075		
Oakland Homekey 4	3270 Telegraph Ave	Oakland	CA	94602					21	21	2075		
Project Reclamation		Oakland	CA						89	89	2075		
Fruitvale Studios	2600 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94601	11	1	11		23	24	2078	Measure A1	
Options Recovery	396 Fairmount Ave	Oakland	CA	94611		6			6	6	2053		
EOCP Shelter	7515 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94621	25	76			101	102	2065		2006
Walker House	9702 International Blvd	Oakland	CA	94603		10			10	10			
Peter Babcock	2350 Woolsey St	Oakland	CA	94705	5				5	5	2062		
Rosa Parks House	521 W. Grand Ave	Oakland	CA	94612	11				11	11	2064		
FACT Permanent Supportive Housing	814 Mead Ave	Oakland	CA	94607		7			7	7	2071		
Hugh Taylor House	1935 Seminary Ave	Oakland	CA	94621					42	42	2043		
Piedmont													
No projects in Housing Element													

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Pleasanton													
Anton Hacienda	5729 W Las Positas Blvd	Pleasanton	CA	94588	0	35	0	0	35	168	In Perpetuity		10/23/2015
Civic Square	4800 Bernal Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	5	31	36	298	In Perpetuity		2011
Galloway @ Owens	4863 Willow Rd	Pleasanton	CA	94588	0	38	0	0	38	254	In Perpetuity		2016
Galloway @ Hacienda	5789 Gibraltar Dr	Pleasanton	CA	94588	0	38	0	0	38	251	In Perpetuity		2017
Park Hacienda	5700 Owens Dr	Pleasanton	CA	94588	0	0	135	0	135	540	In Perpetuity		2001
Promenade Apartments	5300 Case Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	34	34	0	68	146	2051		1997
The Kensington	1490 East Gate Way	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	11	20	0	31	100	In Perpetuity		11/14/2002
The Mason Flats	1605 Lexington Ln	Pleasanton	CA	94588	0	16	16	0	32	210	In Perpetuity		2016
Division St Senior Apartments	443 Division St	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	3	17	0	20	20	In Perpetuity		1994
Gardens at Ironwood	3431 Cornerstone Ct	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	69	69	0	138	172	In Perpetuity		10/27/2005
Kottinger Gardens Phase 1	240 Kottinger Dr	Pleasanton	CA	94566	13	107	10	0	130	131	2069		2017
Kottinger Gardens Phase 2	243 Kottinger Dr	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	53	0	53	54	2071		1970
Parkview Assisted Living	100 Valley Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	31	0	0	31	105	In Perpetuity		2007
Ridgeview Commons	5200 Case Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	80	120	0	200	200	In Perpetuity		1989
Stanley Junction	4031 Stanley Blvd	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	8	78	0	86	86	In Perpetuity		1996
Sunflower Hill at Irby Ranch	3780 Stanley Blvd	Pleasanton	CA	94566	6	17	7	0	30	31	In Perpetuity		2020
Andares (SummerHill)	5850 W. Las Positas Blvd	Pleasanton	CA	94588	0	0	10	0	10	94	In Perpetuity		
Birch Terrace / Silverstone	3909 Vineyard Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	5	2	7	45	In Perpetuity		
California Reflections	Stanley Blvd & Reflections Dr	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	0	16	16	108	In Perpetuity		
Calif. Somerset I / KB Home	3100-3300 W Las Positas Blvd	Pleasanton	CA	94588	0	0	0	26	26	152	In Perpetuity		
Canyon Oaks / KB Home	Rocky Hill Place & Sterling Greens	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	26	0	26	200	In Perpetuity		
Carlton Oaks / Greenbriar	Royal Creek Ct & Moss Tree Way	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	10	0	10	113	In Perpetuity		
Nolan Farm / SummerHill	Rose Ave & Fair St	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	5	0	0	5	36	In Perpetuity		
Palomino Place / Callahan	Palomino Dr & Bernal Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	0	4	4	24	In Perpetuity		
Rotary Commons	Palomino Dr & Concord Way	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	7	0	7	7	In Perpetuity		
Ryder Homes / The Vines	5835 Vineyard Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	1	0	1	10	In Perpetuity		
Sycamore Place	Rheem Dr & Katie Ln	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	0	6	6	36	In Perpetuity		
Town Square	Ray St & Vineyard Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	0	23	23	30	In Perpetuity		
Walnut Hills / KB Home	Whispering Oaks Way and Cotton Mill	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	0	20	0	20	121	In Perpetuity		
BACS (Bay Area Comm. Svcs.)	4344 Railroad St	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	6	0	0	6	6	In Perpetuity		1992
REACH (HOUSE, Inc.)	4158 Vineyard Ave	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	4	0	0	4	4	In Perpetuity		
REACH (HOUSE, Inc.)	5608 Hansen Dr	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	3	0	0	3	3	In Perpetuity		
REACH (HOUSE, Inc.)	2253 Tanager Sr	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	3	0	0	3	3	In Perpetuity		
REACH (HOUSE, Inc.)	1352 Oak Vista Way	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	3	0	0	3	3	In Perpetuity		
REACH (HOUSE, Inc.)	313 Trenton Cir	Pleasanton	CA	94566	0	3	0	0	3	3	In Perpetuity		
San Leandro													
Casa Verde	2398 East 14th St	San Leandro	CA	94577	67				67	68	2062		5/9/2008
Lakeside Village Apartments	4170 Springlake Dr	San Leandro	CA	94578			830		830	840			10/31/2014
Eden Lodge	400 Springlake Dr	San Leandro	CA	94578					141	143	2065		5/31/2011
Fargo Senior Center	868 Fargo Ave	San Leandro	CA	94579	8	51	14		73	75	2069		12/1/2012
Fuller Lodge	2141 Bancroft Ave	San Leandro	CA	94577	3	22			25	26	2068		3/28/2014
Luella Fuller Group Home	342 West Joaquin Ave	San Leandro	CA	94577			5	1	5	6	2034		
Broadmoor Plaza	232 East 14th St	San Leandro	CA	94577					60	60	2044		
Fuller Gardens	2390 East 14th St	San Leandro	CA	94577	16				16	16	2044		
Estabrook Senior Housing	2103 East 14th St	San Leandro	CA	94577				1	50	51	2064		6/1/2010
The Surf Apartments	15320 Tropic Ct	San Leandro	CA	94579	11		25	10	35	46	2057		10/1/2003
Mission Bell	112 Garcia Ave	San Leandro	CA	94577	23		2		25	25	2061		
Gateway Apartments 1	902 Davis St	San Leandro	CA	94577			35	201	35	236	2025		
Marea Alta	1400 San Leandro Blvd	San Leandro	CA	94577	12	70	31		113	115	2068		
La Palmas Apartments	15370 Tropic Ct	San Leandro	CA	94579		24	53		77	91	2069		
La Vereda	528 West Juana Ave	San Leandro	CA	94577	13	71			84	85	2070	Measure A1	4/25/2019
Loro Landing / Parrott St Apts	1604 San Leandro Blvd	San Leandro	CA	94577	23	20	18		61	62	2075	Measure A1	
Sister Me Home - Safe House	Safe House	San Leandro	CA	94577					20	20			

Project Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120%	Total Affordable	Total Units	Affordability Expiration ¹	Alameda County Measure AI Project	Placed in Service Date
Union City													
Station Center Phase 1	11th Street and Cheeves Way	Union City	CA	94587					99	100	2066		9/29/2011
Station Center Phase 2	34800 11th St	Union City	CA	94587	6	50	0	0	56	57	2067		3/20/2012
Los Robles	32300 Almaden Blvd	Union City	CA	94587	14	84	20	0	140	140	Renewed		12/1/2012
Mission Gateway Apartments	33155 Mission Blvd	Union City	CA	94587					120	121	2059		3/31/2006
Mission Sierra	3464 Mission Blvd	Union City	CA	94587					31	150	2029		1986
Skylark Apartments	34655 Skylark Dr	Union City	CA	94587					35	176	2029		1986
E Street Housing	Railroad Avenue and E Street	Union City	CA	94587					1	1	Renewed		1992-1997
Rosewood Terrace	33935 Alvarado Niles Rd	Union City	CA	94587					44	45	2040		1999
Vintage Court Senior Apartments	2499 Decoto Rd	Union City	CA	94587					124	125	2053		12/30/1998
Wisteria Place	33821 Alvarado-Niles Rd	Union City	CA	94587					39	40	2034		2004
Ryland Glen	Glenwood Terrace	Union City	CA	94587					6	6	In perpetuity		2001
E Street Housing	Railroad Avenue and E Street	Union City	CA	94587					8	8	In perpetuity		1992-1997
Monte Vista	Monterra Cir	Union City	CA	94587					20	20	In perpetuity		2001
Bridgeway - Union City	33914 13th St	Union City	CA	94587									
Avalon Union City	24 Union Square	Union City	CA	94587	0	20	46	0	66	439			2010
Unincorporated Alameda County													
First Presbyterian Tiny Homes	2490 Grove Way	Castro Valley	CA	94546	6				6	6	2024		2/7/2020
Lorenzo Creek Apartments	22198 Center Street	Castro Valley	CA	94546	0	27	0	0	27	28	2065		
Strobridge Apartments	21000 Wilbeam Ave	Castro Valley	CA	94546					96	96	2055		
Shared SPC Housing	759 Linnea Avenue	San Lorenzo	CA	94580		4			4	4	2070		
Ashland Village Apartments	1300 Kentwood Ln	San Lorenzo	CA	94580		130	10		140	142			9/1/2009
Kent Gardens	16438 Kent Ave	San Lorenzo	CA	94580		41	42		83	84			
1456 Plaza Dr - CCT	1456 Plaza Dr	San Leandro	CA	94578		2			2	2	2072		
1480 Plaza Dr - Shared MHSA	1480 Plaza Dr	San Leandro	CA	94578		3			3	3	2069		
1563 Thrush Ave - Shared MHSA	1563 Thrush Ave	San Leandro	CA	94578		4			4	4	2072		
Ashland Family	16385 East 14th St	San Leandro	CA	94578	12	71	1		84	85	2070		
Bermuda Gardens Apartments	1475 167th Ave	San Leandro	CA	94578	20	20	39		79	80	2076	Measure A1	12/7/1998
Eden House Apartments	1601 165th Ave	San Leandro	CA	94578		46	67		113	116			11/1/2014
Quail Run Apartments	1511 163rd Ave	San Leandro	CA	94578					84	104			10/23/2003
205 Smalley Ave	205 Smalley Ave	Hayward	CA	94541			4		4	7	2035		
Banyan Street	21568 Banyan St	Hayward	CA	94541	8				8	8	2057		
Concord House	20373 Concord Ave	Hayward	CA	94541					8	8	2057		
Hayward Village Senior Apartments	22084 Arbor Ave	Hayward	CA	94541					150	151			10/20/2006
Pacheco Court	720-732 Bartlett Ave	Hayward	CA	94541					10	10	2052		
Siena Pointe Apartments	22842 Vermont St	Hayward	CA	94541					99	109	2067		12/31/2007
South County Sober Housing	21757 Meekland Ave	Hayward	CA	94541					7	8	2057		
Sparks Way Commons	2750 Sparks Way	Hayward	CA	94541					45	45	2045		
Wittenberg Manor	657 Bartlett Ave	Hayward	CA	94541					95	95	2040		
Wittenberg Manor II	713 Bartlett Ave	Hayward	CA	94541					64	65	2022		
Grove Way						8			8	8	Annual		

Note:

Data for this table was taken from each jurisdiction's 2023-2031 Housing Element, supplemented by data from CHPC's Affordable Housing Map, and Alameda County's affordable housing database.

Sources: CA Department of Housing and Community Development, 2023; California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2023; California Housing Partnership, 2023; Alameda County, 2023; The Housing Workshop, 2023; Urban Math, 2023.

Appendix A24: Projects Funded by Measure A1

Project	Address	City	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120% AMI	Total Units	New Construction /Rehab	Measure A1	Total Project Cost	A1, as % of TPC
Completed											
Everett Commons	2437 Eagle Ave	Alameda	4	11	4	0	20	NC	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 18,806,380	5%
Estrella Vista	3706 San Pablo Ave	Emeryville	26	44	16	0	87	NC	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 64,532,179	3%
La Vereda	528 West Juana Ave	San Leandro	13	71	0	0	85	NC	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 48,761,196	3%
Coliseum Connections	801 71st Ave	Oakland	0	22	33	0	110	NC	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 58,887,296	4%
Kottinger Gardens Phase 2	243 Kottinger Dr	Pleasanton	0	43	10	0	54	NC	\$ 4,600,000	\$ 30,213,856	15%
Casa Arabella	3611 East 12th St	Oakland	23	49	20	0	94	NC	\$ 6,350,000	\$ 60,527,997	10%
Grayson Street Apartments	2748 San Pablo Ave	Berkeley	14	4	4	0	23	NC	\$ 691,394	\$ 28,662,144	2%
Camino 23	1233 23rd Ave	Oakland	9	27	0	0	37	NC	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 25,992,018	16%
Corsair Flats	171 W Atlantic Ave	Alameda	16	15	28	0	60	NC	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 35,611,782	8%
Coliseum Place	905 72nd Ave	Oakland	0	27	31	0	59	NC	\$ 9,775,050	\$ 55,771,952	18%
Empyrean and Harrison	344 13th St	Oakland	59	22	65	0	147	Rehab	\$ 4,685,000	\$ 118,190,482	4%
Sunflower Hill at Irby Ranch	3780 Stanley Blvd	Pleasanton	6	17	7	0	31	NC	\$ 7,195,844	\$ 23,964,198	30%
Chestnut Square Family Apa	1665 Chestnut St	Livermore	19	14	8	0	42	NC	\$ 4,286,746	\$ 39,315,113	11%
Monarch Homes	3268 San Pablo Ave	Oakland	13	18	19	0	51	NC	\$ 7,180,000	\$ 57,474,309	12%
Embark Apartments	2126 Martin Luther King Jr. \	Oakland	31	30	0	0	62	NC	\$ 5,198,909	\$ 38,698,386	13%
Aurora Apartments	657 W. MacArthur Blvd	Oakland	0	43	0	0	44	NC	\$ 6,447,872	\$ 38,821,669	17%
NOVA Apartments	445 30th St	Oakland	28	28	0	0	57	NC	\$ 13,766,776	\$ 40,083,701	34%
Bermuda Gardens	1475 167th Ave	San Leandro	20	20	39	0	80	Rehab	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 44,471,290	13%
City Center Apartments	38631 Fremont Blvd	Fremont	20	31	8	0	60	NC	\$ 6,757,321	\$ 41,766,598	16%
Loro Landing	1604 San Leandro Blvd	San Leandro	23	20	18	0	62	NC	\$ 5,466,259	\$ 43,392,637	13%
Fruitvale Studios	2600 International Blvd	Oakland	11	1	11	0	24	Rehab	\$ 3,484,309	\$ 9,928,171	35%
BFHP Hope Center PSH	2012 Berkeley Way	Berkeley	53	0	0	0	53	NC	\$ 6,162,839	\$ 39,116,352	16%
BFHP Hope Center Tempora	2012 Berkeley Way	Berkeley	44	0	0	0	44	NC	\$ 1,352,534		
Berkeley Way Apartments	2020 Berkeley Way	Berkeley	0	54	34	0	89	NC	\$ 12,172,804	\$ 66,317,472	18%
The Starling	170 Coronado St	Alameda	34	16	19	0	70	NC	\$ 11,153,038	\$ 55,547,719	20%
Foon Lok West	311 9th Ave	Oakland	52	37	40	0	130	NC	\$ 9,698,000	\$ 110,499,559	9%
Rosefield Village	727 Buena Vista Ave	Alameda	0	52	39	0	92	NC	\$ 8,093,414	\$ 75,973,873	11%
Jordan Court	1601 Oxford St	Berkeley	7	16	11	0	35	NC	\$ 5,834,096	\$ 24,069,370	24%
Avance	4260 First St	Livermore	32	12	0	0	45	NC	\$ 4,743,935	\$ 29,475,310	16%
Doug Ford - Irvington Senior	4038 Irvington Ave	Fremont	45	44	0	0	90	NC	\$ 12,200,000	\$ 69,569,612	18%
Granite Ridge Apartments	37350 Sequoia Rd	Fremont	15	36	21	0	73	NC	\$ 9,700,000	\$ 46,655,607	21%
Depot Community Apartmer	2595 Depot Rd	Hayward	45	49	30	0	125	NC	\$ 18,268,465	\$ 113,616,376	16%
Subtotal			662	873	515	0	2,135		\$ 205,564,605	\$ 1,554,714,604	

Alameda County Measure A1 Projects

Project	Address	City	Extremely Low Income <30% AMI	Very Low Income 31-50% AMI	Low Income 51-80% AMI	Moderate Income 81-120% AMI	Total Units	New Construction /Rehab	Measure A1	Total Project Cost	A1, as % of TPC
In Construction											
Casa Suenos	3511 E 12th St	Oakland	46	29	104	0	181	NC	\$ 16,227,175	\$ 141,202,939	11%
The Vineyard	460 N. Livermore Ave	Livermore	23	0	0	0	23	NC	\$ 6,197,490	\$ 22,197,217	28%
Fremont Family Apartments	34320 Fremont Blvd	Fremont	13	30	10	0	53	NC	\$ 8,452,654	\$ 48,857,623	17%
Ancora Place	2227 International Blvd	Oakland	35	25	16	0	77	NC	\$ 5,370,606	\$ 75,137,351	7%
7th and Campbell	1664 7th St	Oakland	78	0	0	0	79	NC	\$ 12,688,996	\$ 77,942,611	16%
West Grand and Brush	2201 Brush Street	Oakland	30	0	28	0	59	NC	\$ 5,266,428	\$ 55,171,691	10%
Mission Paradise	28000 Mission Blvd	Hayward	36	20	19	0	76	NC	\$ 4,592,006	\$ 70,205,470	7%
Albany Family Housing	755 Cleveland Ave	Albany	19	12	30	0	62	NC	\$ 2,330,206	\$ 43,587,941	5%
Bell Street Gardens	38889 Bell St	Fremont	48	61	17	0	128	Rehab/NC	\$ 21,320,466	\$ 106,500,985	20%
Subtotal			328	177	224	0	738		\$ 82,446,027	\$ 640,803,828	
Predevelopment											
1245 McKay Perm Housing	1245 McKay Ave	Alameda					100	NC	\$ 6,926,828	\$ 74,115,965	9%
15101 Washington Ave	15101 Washington Ave	San Leandro					72	NC	\$ 5,016,998	\$ 56,819,029	9%
Amador Station Phase 1	6501 Golden Gate Dr	Dublin					136	NC	\$ 2,900,000	\$ 109,708,818	3%
Downtown Livermore Apts	Railroad Ave & South L St	Livermore					130	NC	\$ 14,402,382	\$ 59,930,666	24%
Lazuli Landing	Mission Blvd and D St	Union City					81	NC	\$ 13,241,020	\$ 71,600,825	18%
Madrone Terrace	16060 E. 14th St	Unincorporated Alameda County					79	NC	\$ 8,852,352	\$ 65,686,482	13%
Pacific Avenue Senior Home	3701 Pacific Ave	Livermore					140	NC	\$ 3,999,263	\$ 63,875,649	6%
Pimentel Place	22634 Second St	Hayward					57	NC	\$ 5,353,400	\$ 58,349,183	9%
Regional Street	6543 Regional St	Dublin					113	NC	\$ 5,048,319	\$ 85,595,529	6%
Ruby Street	22447 Ruby St	Unincorporated Alameda County					72	NC	\$ 8,852,352	\$ 57,433,374	15%
Timber Senior Housing	37660 Timber St	Newark					79	NC	\$ 5,426,348	\$ 49,161,228	11%
Tri-Valley REACH ADU Project	2253 Tanager Dr, 5608 Hans Pleasanton						4	NC	\$ 552,772	\$ 552,722	100%
Subtotal							1,063		\$ 80,572,034	\$ 752,829,470	


Sources: Alameda County HCD, 2023

This dataset includes all known subsidized built projects including those funded by Measure A1 that are either built or have committed A1 funding


Legend:

- Alameda County
- Alameda County Measure A1 Affordable Projects
- Alameda County Affordable Housing Projects
- Alameda County CDPs (colored areas)


Alameda County - Mid County




Alameda County - East County




Alameda County - South County



Appendix A26: Affordable Projects / Measure A1 Projects & Plan Bay Area 2050 Priority Growth Areas




Appendix 27: ABAG/MTC Equity Priority Communities in Alameda County




Source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2018

Appendix 28: Communities At-Risk of Gentrification



Source: Urban Displacement Project, 2018

Appendix A29: HCD Opportunity Zones, 2023



Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, 2023