

From: [Laura Woodard](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please don't weaken rent control
Date: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 6:34:36 PM

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice-Mayor Vella and Council Members,

Alameda Renters Coalition provides free tenant counseling, and I think any tenant counselor would agree: it's emotionally draining work. A lot of people deal with a lot of stress renting in Alameda, and sometimes it feels like the progress we've made in this city's rent law could slip away in an instant. We do our best to point tenants to resources, and we actually help landlords by reminding tenants to fulfill their contractual obligations whenever possible—even when they're being denied their legal rights—because we don't want them displaced.

When Council passed Alameda's current rent law, many saw it as acknowledgment that housing is not simply a business but a human necessity. That means we accept that shelter, like water, food, and clean air, are necessary for survival and should be guaranteed and regulated in a modern society. The alternative is mass displacement and homelessness.

The proposed pass-throughs for capital improvements go against the spirit of that law. **The proposal sends a message to tenants, landlords, and real estate investors that homes are a business first.**

Tenants should not be forced to pay into improving homes we don't own at the discretion of investors and the Rent Program, and definitely not at the cost of additional 5% increases, year after year in some cases. That's what we pay rent for, roofs over our heads—habitable, functioning homes. And most Alameda renters are paying inflated rents already, in many cases for homes that have never had needed updates and repairs. Let's face it: With the new pass-throughs, property owners would have a new way to raise rents and weed out lower-paying tenants through constructive eviction.

Tenants are so tired of fighting just to afford to live here. These changes are utterly unfair, especially when many tenants are preoccupied with how they're going to pay their back rent when the Covid protections expire. We can't rationalize away that reality. These changes would only worsen the crisis of economic and racial inequality in Alameda. Please reject the CIP proposal.

Thank you,

Laura Woodard

EAST BAY FOR EVERYONE

May 3, 2021

RE: Provisions Concerning Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) for Rental Units in the City of Alameda

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Vella, and Councilmembers Daysog, Herrera Spencer, and Knox White:

East Bay for Everyone writes to join with the Alameda Renters Coalition in asking that you not approve the proposed changes to capital improvement plans for rent controlled units in Alameda.

We believe that the current CIP policy is working as intended as it allows owners to cover only the cost of unexpected major expenses. As the city's rent control ordinance only applies to multifamily residences built before 1995 and went into effect only in 2016, owners and property managers have had decades of market rate rent increases with which to responsibly budget for repairs and renovations that keep their properties safe and livable. And both before and after rent control, rents are generally priced to incorporate upfront the cost of the many smaller repairs and renovations that are part of being in the rental business. As the Alameda Renters Coalition points out, many responsible property owners have recently upgraded their properties without having to rely on CIP pass-throughs, with only a handful of applications in recent years, and serves as empirical evidence that the current policy is working as intended.

We oppose the pass-through requirements as proposed. While the proposed pass-through cap is lower than potential pass-throughs with the current policy, the proposed cost threshold is significantly lower and we believe this would result in higher rents overall due to larger numbers of relatively small capital improvements that qualify under the proposed changes and would lead to more residents being forced out of their homes.

Sincerely,

East Bay for Everyone

From: [Mary Takemoto](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed revisions to Ordinance 3250, agenda item 6-C
Date: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 8:34:22 AM

As a tenant I am concerned about the easing of restrictions in Ordinance 3250 that protect me from arbitrary rent increases. Currently any landlord who is planning on making capital improvements can request a hearing for rental adjustments higher than the allowed rent increases if that landlord feels these adjustments are needed to guarantee a fair rate of return. Since this procedure is in place, I do not understand the need for the proposed revisions especially now when tenants are still reeling from the effects of the pandemic.

I have heard the term “mom and pop” landlords to describe the beneficiaries of these proposed changes. This certainly humanizes this group but unfortunately is not strictly accurate.

Tenants have not been given such a benign term to describe themselves but you should be reminded of who we are. We are the young struggling to make ends meet during an iffy jobs climate, the elderly on fixed income, teachers, service workers – in short, anyone who cannot afford to buy a home, especially not in Alameda where the typical price of a home is over a million dollars.

Incidentally the value of property in Alameda has increased even during the pandemic. So if the proposed changes are allowed, a landlord can raise rents to offset any money spent on capital improvements which in turn increases the value of that landlord’s property. Tenants are being asked to pay for these improvements without the benefit of any oversight. “Fair rate of return” thus becomes an obsolete concept.

The group that is requesting revisions to 3250 is certainly much smaller and richer than the group that will be negatively affected by them should these revisions be put in place. As a tenant I exercised my ballot’s power to elect officials who I thought would protect me from capricious rent increases. Please don’t let me down.

From: WILLIAM NELSEN
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] CIP
Date: Saturday, May 1, 2021 1:57:55 PM

Please do not pass the new CIP Policy,It would mean that I would have to leave Alameda!

From: Araceli Quezada
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Ordinance 6F
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 7:02:30 PM

Dear City Council members,
Please reject Ordinance 6F because it will disproportionately affect people of color and low income residents of Alameda. As an Alameda homeowner, I care very much about our city. I care about the people who live here too.

We have been living in Alameda - first as renters from 2000 to 2012 when we were able to purchase our home.

We know full well how expensive it is to live and rent here.

Ordinance 6F would put unreasonable additional financial burdens on renters. If landlords want to make improvements, they should pay for these and not put the financial burden on renters.

Sincerely,
Araceli Quezada
643 Central Avenue
Alameda, CA 94501

From: Gloria Rios
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Trish Spencer; John Knox White
Cc: City Clerk; Tony Daysog
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reg: Capital improvement plan for rental units in the city of Alameda.
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 6:29:14 PM

April 20,2021

Attention: City Clerk, please read for agenda 6F

To: Honorable Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Malia Vella, Councilmember Tony Daysog, Councilmember Trish Herrera Spencer, and Councilmember John Knox White

Reg: Capital improvement plan for rental units in the city of Alameda.

The additional 5% CIP add on burdens renters much more than it helps the landlord. What is amazing is that you would take this action when the cost of living has not improved due to covid 19. People are dying, businesses are closing, people are still out of work and behind on their rent and utilities. Yet you propose this increase like NOTHING is wrong and is just another day! Wake up folks this is reality! There is an imbalance here!

This is unsettling that you are talking about raising rent by an additional 5% like nothing is going on, are you just callous about what is happening around us and don't see the pain people are going through. You are in the deciding seat because the people of Alameda chose you. Have a heart and help your community. Have a heart and make reasonable changes instead of this.

My name is Gloria Rios and I am a resident of Alameda since 1993. I rented an apartment in a four plex in Alameda for 10 years. My apartment kept going up every year. My salary increases a year is less than the rent percentage increase each year. Due to the yearly rent increases I had to move, and now I rent a room in a house. I plan to retire in three years after working 31 years, in the same job and it seems that the American dream of retiring after working so hard is out of the window, why? Because the cost of rent is higher than your salary. "Where is the fairness".

It seems that the capital improvements will benefit the landlords by increasing their equity, and get a tax break and the tenant gets nothing but the bill. Please vote "NO" to these changes. More study is needed before you make changes.

Sincerely,

A frightened Alameda resident,

Gloria Rios

From: [Diana Cabcabin](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: REPLACE PUBLIC COPY TO THIS [EXTERNAL] Proposed CIP Policy Changes - Item 6F on 4-20-21
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 6:09:36 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcroft, Vice-Mayor Vella and Council Members,

I grew up in Alameda and returned after several years away. My father served in the U.S. Navy we were one of several Filipino immigrant and military families in the former Buena Vista Apartments now owned by the largest corporate landlord in the U.S. This year will be my 18th year living in a once family owned building at 2510 Central Ave. until a few years ago when it was bought by Greentree Veritas after the owner died and the building was neglected. As a result of the Covid19 Pandemic and Shelter-In-Place, my employment with the Alameda Unified School District ended and now I am at the tail end of Unemployment Insurance.

Why has ARC's input to the recent CIP Proposal has been swept under the rug after numerous meetings with city staff, city councilmembers, and even realtor representatives?
A 100% passthrough of the cost of a capital improvement (repair or replacement plus a 5% per year amortization plus a rent increase (AGA) for 2020 of 2.8% would lead to the eviction of all long-term below market renters at 2510 Central Ave. Despite living through 11 mos of gutting, intrusive construction, unneeded improvements and beautification of the property raising rents to 2 and a half times of what we pay. The new owner, Greentree Veritas, is expanding now to Oakland and Los Angeles. You may have heard that when they applied for Covid19 Relief intended for small businesses. They went on the buy more iconic SF buildings with cash.

We respectfully ask you to stop the Passthroughs because they go against the rent control law (Ordinance 3250) that Council just approved in 2019 because they are added on to an annual rent increase. Council his again deciding on a the flat-rate concept and even making rent worst for tenants by adding on 5% to the annual rent increase allowed by any increase in the Consumer Price Index.

Pass-throughs also go against the intent in Ordinance 3250 that landlords have to make a case based on "fair rate of return" before they can get an upward adjustment of rent over the allowed annual increase. There is inequity that exacerbates disparity in the CIP formula: While passthroughs don't require landlords to show any need, there is also no protection for a tenant. The largest corporate landlords will benefit from the CIP as written.

Many Alameda tenants including my neighbors and I were unemployed during Shelter in Place for one year as a result of the economic impacts of Covid19. Pass-throughs made possible by the CIP formula are inherently unfair because you give realtors the power to force renters to pay 100% of the costs but the landlord gets 100% of the tax break. Your change to the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Pass-throughs will force my neighbors and I at 2510 Central Ave. Citywide, it will lead to homelessness when middle and low-income renters are priced out of their homes.

Sincerely,
Diana Cabcabin

From: Neveen Acero
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In support of renters' rights
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 5:23:01 PM

Dear City Council,

As a 10+ year resident of Alameda, I wish to express my opposition to the home improvements ordinance (6F on the 4/21/21 agenda), that reduces the rights and quality of life for renters in Alameda. It is my understanding that this ordinance would require renters to pay for improvements that owners elect to make, taking control out of the hands of renters.

I stand with Alameda Renters' Coalition in strong support of renters' rights in Alameda. I hope you will vote against this ordinance and advocate for the rights of our neighbors who rent.

Sincerely,
Neveen Acero
301 Broadway, Alameda, CA 94501
Alameda Renters' Coalition

From: [Rachel Wilson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment regarding ordinance reducing renters' rights (6F on agenda), in support of ARC
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 5:13:33 PM

Dear Alameda City Council Members,

I would like to express my concern regarding the proposed ordinance that would allow landlords to pass along the cost of home improvements to renters. Rent in Alameda is already very high. The rent control law passed in 2019 was a step in the right direction, though not strong enough. I am concerned that families of color and low income families would be most impacted by this ordinance. I want Alameda to be welcoming and diverse and protecting renters is one step we can take as a community.

Thank you,

Rachel Wilson

Alameda Resident in support of Alameda Renters Coalition
1205 Post St, Alameda, CA 94501

From: [Ruben Aidan Quezada](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] TALKING POINTS AGAINST THE CITY'S CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP)
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 5:03:12 PM

- Why is City Council discussing this plan when we are still in the COVID emergency period? Many renters have lost their jobs and can't pay all of their rent now. Why do you want to increase the rent burden of those who have suffered due to COVID?
- Even if you delay this extra rent burden until 1 year after the local emergency ends, we do not know now what the financial condition of Alameda renters will be then. The Council needs to assess the situation then, not pre-judge now that everything will be OK.
- Pass-throughs go against the rent control law (Ordinance 3250) that Council just approved in 2019 because they are added on to an annual rent increase. Council rejected a flat 5% increase in rent at that time. Why are you going back to that flat-rate concept and even making it worse by adding on 5% to an annual rent increase allowed by any increase in the Consumer Price Index?
- Pass-throughs also go against the intent in Ordinance 3250 that landlords have to make a case based on "fair rate of return" before they can get an upward adjustment of rent over the allowed annual increase. Pass-throughs don't require landlords to show any such need.
- There is no protection for a tenant when a landlord is already making a high rate of return, a large profit, and doesn't financially need the pass-through, but is just using it to maximize profits.
- Council should be concerned by the increasing disparity of income among Alameda residents. Two previous studies commissioned by the city showed that renters' incomes are rising much slower than home-owner's incomes. The pandemic is probably making this situation even worse. Pass-throughs added on to annual rent increases will make this disparity worse, adding to the landlord's income by sucking up more of the renter's income.
- There is no limit on the number of pass-throughs allowed in a one-year period. This uncertainty for the renter will cause housing insecurity and stress.
- ** Pass-throughs added on to rent increases will increase homelessness and gentrification when low-income renters are priced out of their homes.
- Pass-throughs of capital improvement costs are inherently unfair. The renter pays 100% of the costs but the landlord gets 100% of the tax break.
- Since a capital improvement is defined as an "improvement or repair to a rental property that materially adds to the value of the property," it is unfair that the landlord enjoys the increase in his equity while the renter pays 100% of the cost. If the renter has to pay to increase the value of the property, the renter should get part ownership of the property.

Ruben Aidan Quezada

From: Grover Wehman-Brown
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 6-F - Please don't leave tenants holding the bill for capital improvements
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 4:51:45 PM

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft and Councilmembers,

I am writing to ask the city council to not approve the Capital Improvement Plan pass-through to tenants as it is written. Rent caps were passed, by our council and at the state level, because tenants are unable to pay the drastic increase in rents landlords chose to implement over the last decade, often with little increase to their own operating costs. The recently passed COVID19 tenant rent relief bill requires landlord cooperation, potentially leaving tenants with tens of thousands of dollars of rental debt and at risk of eviction; now is not the time to charge tenants any more.

I understand the need for small, landlords who do not have other wealth to maintain their properties; creating a fund for property owners who own few units, have tenants covered under a rent cap, and show a financial need for support is a more viable path to ensure housing quality is maintained. Tax the corporate landlords who raise the rent and charge high fees, perhaps the ones the city sold our public housing to over the last twenty years, and use those funds to create a housing preservation fund.

At a time wealth inequality continues to grow in Alameda, passing the cost on to tenants serves to sidestep hard-won tenant protections and exacerbate this inequity.

Best,

Grover Wehman-Brown
Tenant & Alameda resident

From: [Michelle Macarai](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In opposition of the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 4:43:04 PM

Hello,

I am opposed to the City of Alameda's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) because an ordinance that reduces renters rights in Alameda will impact families of color and low-income residents at a time of great suffering and loss. Please do not approve pass-throughs because we voted on a rent control law in 2019! We should be protecting our residents; renters are vital and important residents of Alameda. Let us please be a community that takes care of each other.

Sincerely,
Michelle Macarai
1300 Hansen Ave.
Alameda, CA 94501
510-205-1243

From: [Kristan LaVietes](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In support of renters' rights
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 4:35:56 PM

As an Alameda resident, I want to voice my opposition to the home improvements ordinance (6F on tonight's agenda) that reduces the rights and quality of life for those in our community who rent.

I stand with Alameda Renters Coalition in strong support of renters' rights in Alameda. I hope you will all vote against this ordinance and advocate for the rights of our many neighbors who are renters.

--

Kristan LaVietes
3273 Adams St, Alameda, CA 94501

From: Denise Wong
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; John Knox White; City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please vote no on proposed amendments to current rent ordinance (Agenda Item 6F, 4/20/2021)
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 4:06:59 PM

To the Mayor, City Council, and City Staff,

Filipino Advocates for Justice is writing to oppose the proposed changes to the city's current rent ordinance, which would allow the transfer of costs from capital improvements onto renters. Our organization firmly believes it is an inappropriate time to even consider amendments that could undermine the city's present renter protections, given the ongoing pandemic and the immediate necessity for Alamedans to stay in their homes.

As you may know, COVID-19 has disproportionately affected certain communities, particularly low-income communities of color. The Filipino community is no exception, with Filipinos representing at least 35% of COVID-related deaths despite only comprising 25% of California's Asian American population. Given the proposed amendment's high cap on capital improvement pass-throughs (up to 5%), unlimited number of pass-throughs on a one-year period, and lack of requirement for landlords to demonstrate need, it is evident that this proposal is easily exploitable and will inevitably result in unsustainable rent increases for vulnerable tenants. This will occur in spite of the fact that renters are struggling to even make rent right now. In our work with the Filipino community here in Alameda, we are seeing that renters who cannot meet their basic expenses develop chronic stress and even end up taking extra jobs that increase their risk of exposure to COVID.

Considering the uncertainty surrounding the B.1.1.7 COVID variant and the projected vaccination rates, the pandemic is still not over. It is unacceptable for Council to adopt this capital improvements plan, which will absolutely exacerbate the impact of the pandemic on our community. Pass-throughs are not just unfair, they are unhealthy. At this time, the integrity of the renter protections Council passed in 2019 is more necessary than ever.

Our organization urges you to vote no on the proposed amendment outlined in agenda item 6-F. Please take our comments into your consideration.

Sincerely,

Filipino Advocates for Justice

Denise Sicat Wong

Tenant Organizer, Filipino Advocates for Justice

Oakland || 310 8th Street #309 || (510) 465-9876

Union City || 3961 Horner Street || (510) 487-8552

www.filipinos4justice.org

From: [Scott McCormick](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed CIP Changes in Tonight's City Council Meeting (4/20/21)
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 3:09:12 PM

Dear Members of the Alameda City Council,

I'm writing in opposition to the proposed reduction of tenant's rights in tonight's discussion of the Ordinance Amending the Alameda Municipal Code by Amending Article XV (Rent Control, Limitations on Evictions and Relocation Payments to Certain Displaced Tenants) to Adopt and Incorporate Provisions Concerning Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) for Rental Units in the City of Alameda, or agenda item 6-F.

These changes will burden the citizens of Alameda, such as myself, with costs that we should not have to bear. The renters of the city of Alameda already face rising costs of living, even with protections from existing rent control. Please reconsider your positions on this ordinance and do not raise the already high cost of being a renter in this city.

Regards,
Scott McCormick

From: [William Smith](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Proposed Changes to City of Alameda's Capital Improvement Program for Rental Property
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 2:42:10 PM

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers:

As an Alameda landlord for almost 30 years, I oppose the proposed changes in Alameda's Capital Improvements Program. During that time rent increases below the consumer price index have been more than sufficient to finance capital improvements to my property such as fences, a new roof, new pavement. Capital expenses for housing are included in calculating the consumer price index.

For my rental properties, capital expenses are planned and budgeted for in advance and do not require sudden increases in the rent charged. A homeowners association that manages one of these properties has formalized the planning and budgeting process for capital improvements, including reroofing and paving. Consequently, I have never had to exceed the consumer price index to cover major capital improvements for this property, or any other.

Perhaps unwittingly, the proposed changes in the Capital Improvements Program for rental property prop up sales prices by covering failures to budget and fund in advance for known expenses including roof replacement, seismic retrofits, plumbing, electrical and heating, installation of water and energy conservation devices and solar roofs, fire sprinklers, stairs or railings and paving. By funding these known expenses in advance, as I have, owners must now discount their sales prices by the cost of the planned capital projects. Discounts are necessary to attract buyers who cannot now plan on recouping these expenses from tenants in a compressed term of 15 years through the Capital Improvement Program. The expected lifetime of furnaces, roofs and internal roads exceeds 20 years.

Many responsible rental property owners who have budgeted for these expenses in advance have upgraded their properties since rent control went into effect in 2016. Thus property owners filing only 8 CIP applications indicates the program is working as it should - helping responsible owners cover unexpected major expenses for which it is impossible to budget for and discouraging irresponsible ones from requiring renters to pay on unfairly compressed timescales for improvements that will force them out of their homes.

Stand in solidarity with the more than half of Alameda residents who are renters. Reject staff's recommendation to revise the CIP program and stick with the current program. The proposed changes would needlessly force many more financially distressed renters to move out of Alameda.

William J. Smith
Alameda, CA 94501
(510)522-0390

From: Ashley Gregory
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Protect Alamedans
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 1:08:38 PM

Dear Councilmembers,

Per agenda item 6F, I urge you to restrict landlords from being able to pass on the costs of home improvements on to renters. If a dwelling is in need of improvement, it is a cost of doing business that should not fall on renters to address. Low income families, particularly people of color, will be drastically negatively impacted if this passes. Furthermore, stable and predictable housing is a cornerstone of mental and physical health. Alameda City Council can play an important role in protecting our community members in maintaining their ability to live with ease in Alameda.

Sincerely,

Ashley

From: Ashley Mullins
To: John Knox White; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 6F
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 11:52:48 AM

Dear City Councilmembers,

I am writing to oppose the *Ordinance Amending the Alameda Municipal Code by Amending Article XV (Rent Control, Limitations on Evictions and Relocation Payments to Certain Displaced Tenants) to Adopt and Incorporate Provisions Concerning Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) for Rental Units in the City of Alameda*. As it is currently written, tenants will shoulder 100% of the burden of capital improvements. While tenants will benefit from capital improvements to the space in which they are living, it is unreasonable to expect them to bear the full cost. Landlords must be willing to absorb some expense as the cost of doing business, particularly when such improvements ultimately serve to protect and increase the value of their investment. Landlords also have the option of claiming rental property improvement expenses, thus reducing their tax liability. We live in a market that continually threatens to unhouse so many of our tenants during a time when renter incomes increase at a dramatically slower rate than property owner incomes and a significant number of renters . There should be some consideration of these facts when calculating who should pay for capital improvements.

While the aim of this ordinance is to incentivize much-needed electrification, seismic retrofitting, and other crucial projects to improve Alameda's rental units, I worry that its unintended consequence will be to push more residents out of Alameda and possibly onto the streets. This is an unacceptable risk. These projects need funding, but this is not the answer. Please send this proposal back in search of a better solution; consider a more reasonable split between landlord and tenant or alternative funding such as state/federal grants or low-interest loans for landlords.

Thank you,
Ashley Mullins
West End Resident

From: [Cheri Johansen](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Toni Grimm](#); alameda-progressives-steering@googlegroups.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 6 F Council Agenda
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 11:47:51 AM

Dear City Clerk.

Please include the following in the record for item 6 F on the April 20 City Council agenda

The Alameda Progressives are opposed to item 6 F in its entirety, but especially financing much needed climate actions by burdening tenants and renters. The Alameda Progressives view the CIP pass thru as a backdoor to egregious rent increases. The proposal if enacted would create the same arbitrary 5 % +++ annual increases. It would evict the families at 470 Central as the unjust eviction did. They would be priced out of Alameda housing. We do not need to return to unstable shelter for Alameda renters. Most corporations which manage/own rental real estate in Alameda expect CIP as a cost of doing business. Surely we can create a case by case adjustment for the few landlords for whom this may be a financial burden.

The Alameda Progressives have approved this statement:

As much as the Alameda Progressives support addressing the Climate crisis by programs which reduce the carbon footprint. We cannot support such a program if it is to be funded on the backs of renters and tenants. We all must be responsible for decreasing the dependence on fossil fuels, but we must do so in a mindful and compassionate way.

The item is part of the proposed CIP pass through to tenants proposed [6F] by staff to the Tuesday, April 20 City Council meeting. Alameda Progressives are opposed to the entire pass-thru proposal but especially by funding the seemingly proactive climate plan by increasing the income inequality between tenants and property owners. And also, increasing the potential homelessness in the Alameda Community.

The city staff is proposing that the cost of energy efficient devices in rental property (that cost at least \$25k) be a *100% pass-through to the tenants*. They try to soften this by putting a cap of 5% annually and amortizing it over 15 years or more, but it is still in *addition* to an annual rent increase. Here's the wording in their new proposed changes to the rent control law, as to what can be included in a CIP:

6. The installation of water conservation devices that are intended to reduce the use of water, or the installation of energy efficient devices, such as a solar roof system, or converting utilities from gas to electric, that are intended to save energy or reduce greenhouse gases.

As an example, using last year's AGI (allowed rent increase) of 2.8%, a CIP-laden renter would have a 7.8% increase in payment to the landlord (they don't technically call the pass-through "rent," which is how they get around the AGA) each year, on top of the increase for the last year. This could go on for 15 years or more, and at an even higher percentage, if the Consumer Price Index goes up

This sets us back to the pre-rent control days. As much as we would like to see the city become more energy-efficient, we would not support it if it's at the expense of

renters being priced out and losing their homes.”
AP Steering Committee.

Cheri Johansen

Healthcare is a Human Right,

Justice Done Right

City of Alameda Democratic Club, 2021 President

Alameda County Central Committee,

Alameda Progressives, Steering Committee

Alameda Justice Alliance Council

Alameda for Bernie Sanders, Volunteer Coordinator

420 Central, Alameda, Ca 94501

4120 Masterson, Oakland 94619

505.930.1946

From: [Brian Lin](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed CIP Changes, Public Comment to 4/20 City Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 11:29:08 AM

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft and members of the Alameda City Council,

I am an Alameda resident writing to oppose the Ordinance Amending the Alameda Municipal Code by Amending Article XV (Rent Control, Limitations on Evictions and Relocation Payments to Certain Displaced Tenants) to Adopt and Incorporate Provisions Concerning Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) for Rental Units in the City of Alameda, or agenda item 6F.

The financial struggle is already burdened by the effects of COVID-19, and many have lost jobs due to structural unemployment. The proposed passage of the Capital Improvement Plan will further endanger the financial struggles of the many renters in Alameda. Why do renters pay 100% of the costs if they don't own the property? If this is the case and the renter adds value to the property, they should at least receive part ownership of the property. Additionally, please consider the long term effects that will further exacerbate the disparity of income between residents and landlords. While renters will carry an additional burden of pass-throughs with competing income, landlords will be maximizing their profits. Please consider my concerns along with the concerns of my fellow neighbors, thank you.

--

Take care,

Brian Lin

brianlin160@gmail.com

From: [C. NT. IA B. NTA](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Capital Improvement Plan
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 : 4:2 AM

As a renter in Alameda, it is disappointing to learn that the cost of any construction to improve the house I am renting will be passed on to me a hundred percent as though I owned the property. Such costs can be shared with me within the 5% over CPI increase to my rent. To be lawful and fair to the renter, any capital improvement costs should be covered within the allowable rent increase. Why change the law that the people have voted on?

Cynthia Bonta

From: jansantos595@gmail.com
To: jansantos595@gmail.com
Cc: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Council meeting 4/20/21 Agenda item 6-F CIP.
Date: Monday, April 19, 2021 3:27:26 PM

RE: Council meeting 4/20/21 Agenda item 6-F CIP.

To Mayor, City Council, and City Staff:

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed revisions to Alameda's Capital Improvement Plan(CIP) policy and to strongly urge you as our Council representatives to take action to see that such a regressive and oppressive policy not be instituted.

Please reject this proposal by City Staff which would pass through 100% of building improvements and renovations onto tenants in addition to the annual rent increase and 5% amortization costs.

Proposed pass-throughs go against the rent control law, (Ordinance 3250) that Council just approved in 2019 whereby landlords have to make a case based on "fair rate of return" before they can get an upward adjustment of rent over the allowed annual increase.

With the proposed CIP policy landlords are not required to show need. **capital improvement costs are inherently unfair. The renter pays 100% of the costs but the landlord gets 100% of the tax break.**

The devastation intensifies when many tenants are vulnerable, unemployed and disadvantaged as a result of the economic impacts of Covid19. These economic hardships will be lasting, with numbers of people having lost worktime and in many cases their jobs. Plus, at the end of the rent moratorium renters will have rent and other debts from the pandemic plus their regular living expenses, stretching their depleted finances even further. .

The 50% of Alamedans who are long time low-income renters currently protected by rent control will be priced out of their homes, leading to increased homelessness of Alamedans.

The current CIP program is working as intended. Please do your public duty to Alamedans and don't allow these drastic changes to the CIP. Such changes would impact not only renters but the entire economy of the City of Alameda for which you Council members are each responsible.

Sincerely,

Jan Santos

From: [Jason Buckley](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment regarding agenda item 6F for 4/20 meeting
Date: Monday, April 19, 2021 11:29:11 AM

Oh my goodness, here we go again, and in the middle of a global pandemic where the financial pain has disproportionately hit the lower rungs of the socioeconomic ladder. The idea of skirting our rent control ordinance by allowing for rents to be increased for improvements is simply deplorable. If landlords want to invest in their properties, by all means they can pay for it and reap the benefits long term. But passing along those costs (which are literally Costs of Doing Business) would hit the most vulnerable renters the hardest and get right back to the displacement that was running rampant and led to a renter uprising that demanded something be done. And luckily we finally had a progressive supermajority on council who finally did something to help Alameda renters. We must not backslide on the rights that renters fought so hard for to the point where a senior citizen was beaten bloody in City Hall! Do we really want to go back to mass displacement like 470 Central again? To an unelected board of realtor-friendly people rubber stamping unreasonable increases? And to the civil unrest of a population desperate to keep the roofs over our heads? I'm counting on our progressive majority to nip this garbage resolution right in the bud. And I'm reminding my fellow Alamedans that this is exactly the kind of garbage that starts creeping in when you put NIMBY pawns of the realtors and landlords on our council.

Jason Buckley
I rent and I organize

From: [Dalia Quezada](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ARC - Low income families of color belong in Alameda
Date: Monday, April 19, 2021 10:55:58 AM

Hello,

My name is Dalia and I have been an Alameda resident since I was two. My family were renters in Alameda up until I was 15.

As a Mexican family growing up in Alameda, we faced constant racism and classism. Alameda's history is full of this, and right now city council has the opportunity to show that they do not want to continue this history.

Ordinance 6F is an attempt to go around Ordinance 3250, which was supposed to protect renters, who are mostly low income people of color. 6F is undeniably a deceitful, racist, and classist attempt to push low income families of color out of Alameda.

The fact that the city council is considering this change when the pandemic has already affected low income people of color the most, is incredibly telling and disgusting. This will increase homelessness in Alameda - is that what you want? What do you truly hope to accomplish by giving landlords tax breaks, while forcing renters to cover their repair costs? It is exploitative, and Alameda residents see right through it.

If you truly want to create a safe and welcoming city for ALL Alamedans, that includes protecting low income people of color. If you want Alameda to be the welcoming place you claim it is, you will not pass Ordinance 6F.

Growing up in Alameda, my family struggled. My parents worked 2-3 jobs each, as teachers at Alameda High and Lum School, as well as the library and any other side jobs they could get. My mom created the bilingual reading program at Alameda library. We are a part of this city and we belong here, but we have never been treated as such. Even with all my parent's hard work, we lived in 1 bedroom apartments, struggled to make rent, and I shared a room with both my brother and sister until I was 15.

I know firsthand that Alameda can and SHOULD do better. Take care of ALL your residents, not just the wealthy white ones. We are informed and we see through Ordinance 6F. Take this opportunity to make things right. Thank you.

Dalia Q

From: [CASANDRA DISON](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 6F
Date: Monday, April 19, 2021 10:21:32 AM

I've received distressing news that additional fees and charges can affect our already enormous rents. We are barely making it day by day, Once the cities are opened up, everyone will be at least trying to rise above to the surface. The last thing we need is a political attack on our rental laws that were assumed to be protected. Help us to help ourselves, not hurt us. Please include in Item 6F of the upcoming City Council Meeting

From: [Erin Snyder](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Ordinance 6F reducing renters rights
Date: Sunday, April 18, 2021 10:41:09 PM

I am asking you to vote against the ordinance (labeled 6F) reducing renter's rights that is on the agenda for Tues April 20, 2021.

There is absolutely no reason for renters to pay for home improvements that landlords choose to make.

The gap between home owners and renters in Alameda is gargantuan. My family is not considered low income by any means. We do not qualify for any assistance programs of any kind. We are not poor. Yet there is no chance that we will ever be able to purchase a home in the city of Alameda (unless property values take a severe nosedive). It's just not in the cards for us, and our situation is not uncommon.

We rent our place near Park Street and we are happy here. We've put down roots. Our daughter has access to good schools. We want to stay.

Please do not make it harder for us and many others to continue living in this city by allowing our landlords to charge us for repairs on homes that we do not own.

Thank you for your time,
Erin Joan Snyder

From: [Aromrak Luangrath](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Renters Ordinance
Date: Sunday, April 18, 2021 10:29:03 PM

Hello,

I've been an Alameda resident for over ten years and am writing to express my concern and disapproval of the ordinance that would require renters to pay maintenance fees (6F on the agenda for the City Council Meeting on Tuesday). Such an ordinance would give landlords the discretion to charge/overcharge rent during a time when living in the Bay Area has become increasingly expensive. This would disproportionately effect people with low income and therefore, people of color and would move Alameda closer to being a more segregated town. There are homeless encampments everywhere now and this has more to do with the rising cost of homes for sale and rent. Shelter is a human right and I don't support displacing more people and leaving them homeless and this is what the ordinance could possibly do. And we are in the middle of the pandemic where job security is at a low.

Thank you,

Aromrak

Sent from my iPhone



April 8, 2021

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Members of the City Council
Via email to: clerk@alamedaca.gov

Re: Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers,

On behalf of the Bay East Association of REALTORS®, we are submitting additional information regarding the costs of various improvements covered under the proposed changes to the Capital Improvement Program. This information augments the comments included in our January 15, 2021 letter.

Pillar To Post Home Inspectors is a nation-wide network of home inspection professionals. They have created a Residential Construction and Remodeling Estimate Cost Guide. The guide is attached to this letter and available on-line at: <https://pillartopost.com/cost-guide/>.

Bay East asks the City Council to include the following observations about the proposed revisions to the Capital Improvement Program, specifically the minimum CIP expenditure amount. These observations are based on the direct experience our members have as housing providers in Alameda and from representing clients who own rental housing units, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Housing Quality Standards (HQS) of work which may be found here https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/hcv/hqs. The Housing Quality Standards checklist is attached to this document.

The \$25,000 total cost, plus the \$2,500 per unit allowance, will complicate the ability of owners and managers of smaller rental properties to continue providing safe and affordable housing in Alameda.

A significant percentage of the current multi-family rental properties in Alameda were previously owner-occupied single-family homes. Once converted to rental properties, they now may have up to eight individual rental units in a single building.

Under the proposed CIP revisions, a major capital improvement project, such as a roof replacement, would not qualify as an eligible expenditure. Furthermore, the \$25,000 requirement would not cover the cost for most of the other eligible major capital improvements listed in the ordinance. These



improvements include basic health and safety maintenance work to comply with the HUD Housing Quality Standards; work such as exterior painting, maintaining or upgrading electrical and plumbing systems, and pest repairs.

The proposed CIP places an unreasonable burden on smaller housing providers given the new regulations regarding accepting all proposed tenants. With the changes to Section 8 laws, all properties may now be subject to the HUD Housing Quality Standards and the required annual HUD inspection.

Property owners must follow the HUD Housing Quality Standards. Bay East proposes using this standard as the basis for Capital Improvement guidelines versus the proposed dollar amount thresholds. This alternative proposal ensures all rental units meet the high HUD standard, and provides equitable treatment for all Alameda tenants.

If the goal of the Capital Improvement Program is to ensure Alameda residents have safe and secure housing, and for housing providers to have the financial resources to maintain and improve their properties, whether they participate in the Section 8 program or not, the City of Alameda CIP program should reflect the economic realities of rental housing ownership stewardship.

Please contact us if you have any questions or need more information about the implications of these policy changes.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Schumacher, Alameda Local Government Relations Chair

Residential Construction and Remodeling Estimates

COST GUIDE

COMPLIMENTS OF



STRUCTURE/EXTERIOR

Structure

> addition (foundation to roof)	\$95 – \$130/sq.ft.
> basement entrance	\$5250 – \$10500
> basement main beam	\$2100
> basement support post / foundation	\$500 – \$1000
> excavation / waterproofing	\$125 – \$175/sq.ft.
> foundation cracks (excavation method)	\$525 – \$1100
> foundation cracks (injection method) (per crack)	\$500
> masonry wall (single story)	\$525 – \$800/lin.ft.
> lower basement	\$200 – \$425
> remove bearing wall	\$2100 – \$3200
> remove partition wall	\$850 – \$1700
> re-support floor joist (sistering)	\$325 – \$525
> roof sheathing (replace)	\$6 – \$8/sq.ft.
> underpinning	\$325 – \$525/lin.ft.
> termite prevention (chemical soil treatment)	\$2100

Wall System

> aluminum siding	\$5 – \$6/sq.ft.
> brick veneer	\$10 – \$25/sq.ft.
> brick cleaning (unpainted)	\$3/sq.ft.
> brick cleaning (painted)	\$6/sq.ft.
> brick repainting	\$6 – \$8/sq.ft.
> cedar siding	\$10 – \$15/sq.ft.
> stucco	\$10 – \$15/sq.ft.
> vinyl siding	\$5 – \$6/sq.ft.

Exterior Door

> aluminum storm door	\$375
> metal insulated door	\$675 – \$800
> patio door - replace	\$775 – \$1600
> patio door - brick wall (6ft.)	\$2600 – \$3600
> patio door - wood wall (6ft.)	\$2100 – \$3100

ROOF/EAVE/FLASHING/CHIMNEY

Sloped Roofs

> asphalt shingle (over existing)	\$2 – \$3/sq.ft.
> asphalt shingle (strip & re-shingle)	\$3 – \$5/sq.ft.
> asphalt shingle (high quality)	\$5 – \$7/sq.ft.
> cedar shake / shingle	\$7 – \$10/sq.ft.
> clay tile	\$15 – \$20/sq.ft.
> concrete tile	\$9 – \$13/sq.ft.
> wood shake / shingle	\$6 – \$8/sq.ft.
> slate tile	\$30 – \$55/sq.ft.

Flat Roofs

> roll roofing asphalt (90lb.)	\$2 – \$3/sq.ft.
> 4 ply (tar and gravel)	\$6 – \$11/sq.ft.
> single ply membrane	\$6 – \$11/sq.ft.

Gutters

> gutter cleaning	\$175
> gutter / downspout - aluminum	\$7 – \$9/lin.ft.
> gutter / downspout - galvanized	\$6 – \$7/lin.ft.
> downspout extension	\$16
> soffits / fascia (aluminum)	\$16/lin.ft.

Flashing

> chimney flashing (sloped asphalt)	\$250 – \$500
> chimney flashing (flat built-up)	\$350 – \$600
> metal cricket at chimney	\$250 – \$500
> parapet wall flashing	\$32/lin.ft.
> roof vent flashing	\$125
> reflash skylight	\$425 – \$625
> valley flashing	\$21 – \$32/lin.ft.
> wall flashing	\$6 – \$7/lin.ft.

Chimney

> chimney extension	\$150 – \$275/lin.ft.
> chimney repointing	\$8 – \$11/brick
> concrete cap (single flue)	\$100 – \$275
> concrete cap (double flue)	\$200 – \$425
> rain cap	\$125
> reline flue	\$45 – 55/lin.ft.

GARAGE/DRIVEWAY/WALKWAY

Garage

> detached carport	\$5250+
> detached wood frame - single	\$10500+
> detached wood frame - double	\$15750+
> detached block - single	\$21000+
> detached block - double	\$26250+
> removal of existing garage	\$1575+

Overhead Doors

> automatic garage door opener	\$475
> cladboard - single	\$625 - \$850
> cladboard - double	\$1050 - \$1275
> metal - single (one piece)	\$900
> metal - double (one piece)	\$1350
> wood - single (one piece)	\$1050
> wood - double (sectional)	\$1900

Driveway

> asphalt paving (existing base)	\$5 - \$7/sq.ft.
> asphalt paving (new base)	\$5 - \$8/sq.ft.
> asphalt (seal)	\$65 - \$80
> concrete (stamped)	\$7 - \$11/sq.ft.
> interlock brick / stone	\$11 - 13/sq.ft.

LANDSCAPING/DECK/PATIO/FENCE

Landscaping

> lay soil & sod	\$3 - \$6/sq.ft.
> sprinkler system	\$1200
> retaining wall - concrete	\$55/sq.ft.
> retaining wall - wood	\$45/sq.ft.

Deck

> pressure treated / cedar	\$15 - \$30/sq.ft.
> custom designed & built	\$55 - \$80/sq.ft.

Patio

> concrete	\$16 - \$25/sq.ft.
> flagstone / fieldstone	\$21/sq.ft.
> interlock brick / stone	\$11 - \$16/sq.ft.
> patio stone	\$6/sq.ft.

Porch

> flooring	\$8/sq.ft.
> railing	\$225
> skirting	\$21/in.ft.
> steps - concrete	\$525
> steps - wood	\$325

Fence

> chain-link (h 4ft.)	\$10 - \$20/in.ft.
> wood - cedar (h 5ft.)	\$15 - \$30/in.ft.
> wood - pressure treated (h 5ft.)	\$10 - \$20/in.ft.
> reset post in concrete	\$80

INTERIOR

Windows

> awning	\$55/sq.ft.
> awning / casement (replace)	\$50/sq.ft.
> bay / bow	\$50 - \$70/sq.ft.
> casement	\$63/sq.ft.
> double hung	\$53/sq.ft.
> double hung (replace)	\$42/sq.ft.
> skylight	\$800+
> slider - aluminum	\$32/sq.ft.
> slider - aluminum (replace)	\$27/sq.ft.
> storm - aluminum	\$75 - \$200
> thermal glass (existing frame)	\$32/sq.ft.

Kitchen / Bathroom

> kitchen cabinet	\$50 - \$125/in.ft.
> kitchen counter - laminate	\$45/in.ft.
> kitchen counter - marble	\$80/in.ft.
> kitchen renovation	\$7500+
> bathroom renovation	\$5250+

Floor

> carpet - clean	\$125/room
> carpet - outdoor	\$3/sq.ft.
> carpet and underpad	\$6 - \$11/sq.ft.
> ceramic tile	\$6 - \$11/sq.ft.
> hardwood	\$6 - \$11/sq.ft.
> hardwood - prefinished	\$11 - \$16/sq.ft.
> hardwood - refinish	\$3 - \$6/sq.ft.
> vinyl - sheet	\$4 - \$9/sq.ft.
> vinyl - tile	\$4 - \$9/sq.ft.

Doors

> bi-fold louver	\$850
> bi-fold panel	\$625
> custom with casing / hardware	\$525
> exterior - panel	\$1050
> interior - panel	\$525
> french	\$1050
> patio	\$2100
> storm - aluminum	\$200 - \$325

Stairs/Railings

> curved stair - oak (7 risers)	\$7350+
> spiral stair - oak	\$5250+
> standard stair - oak (7 risers)	\$1050+
> stair railing	\$42 - \$63/in.ft.

Insulation

> rigid exterior (prior to finish)	\$1 - \$2/sq.ft.
> r20 - batt	\$1 - \$2/sq.ft.
> r20 - loose	\$1 - \$2/sq.ft.
> r32 - batt	\$2 - \$3/sq.ft.
> r32 - loose	\$2 - \$5/sq.ft.
> wall / roof cavity	\$2 - \$5/sq.ft.

Fireplaces

> damper	\$175
> brick replacement	\$400 - \$1050
> gas insert	\$2600 - \$4200
> glass door	\$525+
> hearth extension	\$420
> flue cleaning	\$200 - \$300
> metal box insert	\$1050 - \$2600
> masonry with flue rough-in	\$5250+
> wood stove	\$1575 - \$3500

Ceiling/Wall

> acoustic ceiling (suspended)	\$6/sq.ft.
> baseboard / door / window casing	\$4/in.ft.
> drywall over plaster	\$3 - \$4/sq.ft.
> plaster (over existing plaster)	\$3 - \$4/sq.ft.
> stucco / stipple	\$3/sq.ft.
> walls (insulations / drywall)	\$4/sq.ft.
> walls painting (3 coats)	\$2/sq.ft.
> wallpaper	\$6 - \$11/sq.ft.

Security System

> alarm monitoring	\$35/month
> alarm system	\$2500
> intercom system (retrofit)	\$1500
> wired system	\$1500
> wireless motion detectors	\$525

Misc

> central vacuum (retrofit)	\$1050 - \$2100
> central vacuum (canister only)	\$1050 - \$1600

Swimming Pool / Hot Tub

> pool - vinyl lined (16ft. x 40ft.)	\$15000 - \$20000
> pool - concrete lined (16ft. x 40ft.)	\$30000+
> pool heater	\$2100
> pump / filter	\$1600
> hot tub fiberglass	\$5250+

ELECTRICAL

Retrofit

> attic ventilator - mechanical	\$325
> baseboard heater (4')	\$180 - \$575
> ceiling fan	\$250
> doorbell system	\$100 - \$130
> dryer duct	\$125 - \$200
> hardwired smoke detector	\$75 - \$150
> exhaust fan - bathroom	\$150 - \$200
> exhaust fan - oven	\$250 - \$325
> exterior light fixture	\$125 - \$275
> fluorescent light fixture	\$175 - \$275
> ground - public system	\$90 - \$125
> ground - private system (with ground rods)	\$250 - \$325
> receptacle - conventional	\$125 - \$175
> receptacle - split	\$175 - \$275
> receptacle - exterior with cover	\$175 - \$275
> receptacle - replace conventional with GFCI	\$100 - \$150
> receptacle - CO/ALR (aluminum)	\$75 - \$125
> receptacle - stove/dryer	\$100 - \$150
> receptacle - rewire reverse polarity	\$50 - \$80
> standard light fixture	\$125 - \$225

Upgrade

> 100 amp (new panel)	\$1200 - \$1600
> 100 amp (existing panel)	\$750 - \$1100
> 200 amp (new panel)	\$2100 - \$2600
> 200 amp (existing panel)	\$1250 - \$1600
> 120 / 240 volt circuit	\$250 - \$525
> breaker panel - main	\$775 - \$950
> breaker panel - auxiliary	\$125 - \$325
> circuit breaker (replace)	\$75 - \$125
> knob and tube wiring (replace)	\$7500 - \$13000

HEATING AND COOLING

Forced-Air System

> air duct (new)	\$4200
> air duct (retrofit)	\$6300
> annual service	\$100 - \$175
> blower motor	\$375 - \$525
> clean duct	\$180 - \$325
> convert oil to gas (1 story)	\$2500 - \$3300
> convert hot water to forced air (1 story)	\$7500 - \$11000
> electronic air filter	\$625 - \$950
> gas - mid efficiency	\$2600 - \$3300
> gas - high efficiency	\$3600 - \$4700
> humidifier - drum type	\$100 - \$175
> humidifier - flow through type	\$400 - \$475
> existing chimney flue - metal	\$600 - \$1100

Hot Water System

> circulating pump	\$600 - \$800
> cast iron radiator	\$600 - \$800
> expansion tank	\$300 - \$450
> gas boiler - standard	\$3000 - \$4800
> gas boiler - high efficiency	\$6500 - \$11000
> removal of oil tank from basement	\$400 - \$650
> radiator / boiler removal	\$1500 - \$2600
> radiator	\$600 - \$950
> radiator valve	\$125 - \$225

Air Conditioner/Heat Pump

> air handler 3-ton (vertical)	\$1400 - \$1900
> air handler 3-ton (horizontal)	\$1800 - \$2100
> central A/C existing duct	\$2500 - \$5000
> central A/C attic mounted; separate duct	\$11000+
> compressor (replace)	\$1500 - \$1800
> condenser (replace)	\$1800 - \$2700
> heat recovery ventilator (HRV)	\$1800 - \$2700
> heat pump	\$5200 - \$6500

PLUMBING

Bathroom

> basin - pedestal type	\$375
> basin - vanity	\$250
> bathtub - replace / retile	\$2500+
> shower connection	\$250
> shower stall - plastic	\$900 - \$2000
> shower stall - ceramic tile	\$2500 - \$3300
> toilet - flush mechanism	\$125 - \$175
> toilet - replace	\$425
> toilet - replace seal	\$125 - \$275
> toilet - unclog	\$125 - \$225
> tub enclosure - ceramic tile	\$2500 - \$3300
> tub enclosure - plastic	\$600 - \$1275
> whirlpool bath	\$4250

Kitchen

> dishwasher	\$675 - \$950
> garbage disposal	\$200 - \$425
> range hood	\$350 - \$525
> sink - porcelain	\$750 - \$900
> sink - stainless steel	\$650 - \$800

Private Plumbing System

> laundry tub and waste pump	\$525 - \$850
> septic tank (1000gal.)	\$2600 - \$6000
> septic tank cleaning	\$175 - \$325
> sewage waste pump	\$1500 - \$1800
> well - shallow	\$32/lin.ft.
> well - deep	\$42/lin.ft.
> well - submersible pump	\$1275
> well - suction / jet pump	\$600 - \$950

Upgrade

> hose bibb	\$125 - \$175
> hot water tank (40 Gal Electric)	\$600 - \$800
> hot water tank (40 Gal Gas)	\$800 - \$1000
> tankless water heater	\$2000 - \$3000
> laundry tub / connection	\$350 - \$550
> main water service	\$175 - \$225/lin.ft.
> main shut-off valve	\$175 - \$325
> sump pump	\$175 - \$275
> supply lines - 1 story; up to 2 baths	\$1850 - \$2600
> temperature & pressure relief valve	\$60 - \$100
> water softener	\$925 - \$1600
> waste drain lines	\$2600 - \$4200

LIFE EXPECTANCY

Component	Average Life (yrs.)
Roof Covering	
> asphalt standard shingle	12-15
> asphalt premium shingle	15-30
> wood shingle	10-20
> concrete / clay tile	20-40
> asbestos cement	40-80
> slate tile	40-80
> roll roofing	5-15
> tar & gravel	15-25
> metal	60
Heating	
> forced air furnace	10-25
> oil tank	40
> water / steam boiler - welded steel	15-30
> water / steam boiler - cast iron	30-50
> water / steam circulating pump	10-25
Cooling	
> central air	10-15
> heat pump	10-15
> window air conditioning	10-20
Plumbing	
> galvanized water pipe	20-25
> hot water heater	5-15
> septic / sewer pump	5-10
> well pump	10
Appliances	
> dishwasher	5-12
> dryer	10-25
> garbage disposal	5-12
> oven / range	15-20
> washing machine	5-15

These estimates reflect the average basic costs for supplies and installation of building materials in Canada and the United States anticipated for 2019-2020. Costs may vary depending on regions, upgrades, complexity and disposal fees.

It is our strong recommendation that you obtain a minimum of three written quotes from reputable licensed local contractors for validation.



©2019-2020 Pillar To Post Inc.

Each office is independently owned and operated.

Inspection Checklist

Housing Choice Voucher Program

**U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development**
Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB Approval No. 2577-0169
(Exp. 9/30/2012)

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.50 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number. Assurances of confidentiality are not provided under this collection.

This collection of information is authorized under Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f). The information is used to determine if a unit meets the housing quality standards of the section 8 rental assistance program.

Privacy Act Statement. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is authorized to collect the information required on this form by Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f). Collection of the name and address of both family and the owner is mandatory. The information is used to determine if a unit meets the housing quality standards of the Section 8 rental assistance program. HUD may disclose this information to Federal, State and local agencies when relevant to civil, criminal, or regulatory investigations and prosecutions. It will not be otherwise disclosed or released outside of HUD, except as permitted or required by law. Failure to provide any of the information may result in delay or rejection of family participation.

Name of Family		Tenant ID Number	Date of Request (mm/dd/yyyy)
Inspector		Neighborhood/Census Tract	Date of Inspection (mm/dd/yyyy)
Type of Inspection <input type="checkbox"/> Initial <input type="checkbox"/> Special <input type="checkbox"/> Reinspection		Date of Last Inspection (mm/dd/yyyy)	PHA

A. General Information		Housing Type (check as appropriate) <input type="checkbox"/> Single Family Detached <input type="checkbox"/> Duplex or Two Family <input type="checkbox"/> Row House or Town House <input type="checkbox"/> Low Rise: 3, 4 Stories, Including Garden Apartment <input type="checkbox"/> High Rise: 5 or More Stories <input type="checkbox"/> Manufactured Home <input type="checkbox"/> Congregate <input type="checkbox"/> Cooperative <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Group Residence <input type="checkbox"/> Single Room Occupancy <input type="checkbox"/> Shared Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Inspected Unit	Year Constructed (yyyy)	
Full Address (including Street, City, County, State, Zip)		
Number of Children in Family Under 6		
Owner		
Name of Owner or Agent Authorized to Lease Unit Inspected		Phone Number
Address of Owner or Agent		

B. Summary Decision On Unit (To be completed after form has been filled out)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Pass	Number of Bedrooms for Purposes of the FMR or Payment Standard	Number of Sleeping Rooms	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fail			
<input type="checkbox"/> Inconclusive			

Inspection Checklist					Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
Item No.	1. Living Room	Yes Pass	No Fail	In-Conc.	
1.1	Living Room Present				
1.2	Electricity				
1.3	Electrical Hazards				
1.4	Security				
1.5	Window Condition				
1.6	Ceiling Condition				
1.7	Wall Condition				
1.8	Floor Condition				

* Room Codes: 1 = Bedroom or Any Other Room Used for Sleeping (regardless of type of room); 2 = Dining Room or Dining Area;
 3 = Second Living Room, Family Room, Den, Playroom, TV Room; 4 = Entrance Halls, Corridors, Halls, Staircases; 5 = Additional Bathroom; 6 = Other

Item No.	1. Living Room (Continued)	Yes Pass	No Fail	In-Conc.	Comment	Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
1.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Kitchen						
2.1	Kitchen Area Present					
2.2	Electricity					
2.3	Electrical Hazards					
2.4	Security					
2.5	Window Condition					
2.6	Ceiling Condition					
2.7	Wall Condition					
2.8	Floor Condition					
2.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2.10	Stove or Range with Oven					
2.11	Refrigerator					
2.12	Sink					
2.13	Space for Storage, Preparation, and Serving of Food					
3. Bathroom						
3.1	Bathroom Present					
3.2	Electricity					
3.3	Electrical Hazards					
3.4	Security					
3.5	Window Condition					
3.6	Ceiling Condition					
3.7	Wall Condition					
3.8	Floor Condition					
3.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3.10	Flush Toilet in Enclosed Room in Unit					
3.11	Fixed Wash Basin or Lavatory in Unit					
3.12	Tub or Shower in Unit					
3.13	Ventilation					

Item No.	4. Other Rooms Used For Living and Halls	Yes Pass	No Fail	In-Conc.	Comment	Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left	(Circle One) Front/Center/Rear
						____ Floor Level
4.2	Electricity/Illumination					
4.3	Electrical Hazards					
4.4	Security					
4.5	Window Condition					
4.6	Ceiling Condition					
4.7	Wall Condition					
4.8	Floor Condition					
4.9	Lead-Based Paint				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
	Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint?					
	If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?					
4.10	Smoke Detectors					
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left	(Circle One) Front/Center/Rear
						____ Floor Level
4.2	Electricity/Illumination					
4.3	Electrical Hazards					
4.4	Security					
4.5	Window Condition					
4.6	Ceiling Condition					
4.7	Wall Condition					
4.8	Floor Condition					
4.9	Lead-Based Paint				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
	Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint?					
	If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?					
4.10	Smoke Detectors					
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left	(Circle One) Front/Center/Rear
						____ Floor Level
4.2	Electricity/Illumination					
4.3	Electrical Hazards					
4.4	Security					
4.5	Window Condition					
4.6	Ceiling Condition					
4.7	Wall Condition					
4.8	Floor Condition					
4.9	Lead-Based Paint				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
	Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint?					
	If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?					
4.10	Smoke Detectors					

Item No.	4. Other Rooms Used For Living and Halls	Yes Pass	No Fail	In-Conc.	Comment	Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left (Circle One) Front/Center/Rear ____ Floor Level	
4.2	Electricity/Illumination					
4.3	Electrical Hazards					
4.4	Security					
4.5	Window Condition					
4.6	Ceiling Condition					
4.7	Wall Condition					
4.8	Floor Condition					
4.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4.10	Smoke Detectors					
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left (Circle One) Front/Center/Rear ____ Floor Level	
4.2	Electricity/Illumination					
4.3	Electrical Hazards					
4.4	Security					
4.5	Window Condition					
4.6	Ceiling Condition					
4.7	Wall Condition					
4.8	Floor Condition					
4.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4.10	Smoke Detectors					
5. All Secondary Rooms (Rooms not used for living)						
5.1	None Go to Part 6					
5.2	Security					
5.3	Electrical Hazards					
5.4	Other Potentially Hazardous Features in these Rooms					

Item No.	6. Building Exterior	Yes Pass	No Fail	In - Conc.	Comment	Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
6.1	Condition of Foundation					
6.2	Condition of Stairs, Rails, and Porches					
6.3	Condition of Roof/Gutters					
6.4	Condition of Exterior Surfaces					
6.5	Condition of Chimney					
6.6	Lead Paint: Exterior Surfaces Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed 20 square feet of total exterior surface area?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
6.7	Manufactured Home: Tie Downs					
7. Heating and Plumbing						
7.1	Adequacy of Heating Equipment					
7.2	Safety of Heating Equipment					
7.3	Ventilation/Cooling					
7.4	Water Heater					
7.5	Approvable Water Supply					
7.6	Plumbing					
7.7	Sewer Connection					
8. General Health and Safety						
8.1	Access to Unit					
8.2	Fire Exits					
8.3	Evidence of Infestation					
8.4	Garbage and Debris					
8.5	Refuse Disposal					
8.6	Interior Stairs and Common Halls					
8.7	Other Interior Hazards					
8.8	Elevators					
8.9	Interior Air Quality					
8.10	Site and Neighborhood Conditions					
8.11	Lead-Based Paint: Owner's Certification				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

If the owner is required to correct any lead-based paint hazards at the property including deteriorated paint or other hazards identified by a visual assessor, a certified lead-based paint risk assessor, or certified lead-based paint inspector, the PHA must obtain certification that the work has been done in accordance with all applicable requirements of 24 CFR Part 35. The Lead -Based Paint Owner Certification must be received by the PHA before the execution of the HAP contract or within the time period stated by the PHA in the owner HQS violation notice. Receipt of the completed and signed Lead-Based Paint Owner Certification signifies that all HQS lead-based paint requirements have been met and no re-inspection by the HQS inspector is required.

C. Special Amenities (Optional)

This Section is for optional use of the HA. It is designed to collect additional information about other positive features of the unit that may be present. Although the features listed below are not included in the Housing Quality Standards, the tenant and HA may wish to take them into consideration in decisions about renting the unit and the reasonableness of the rent. Check/list any positive features found in relation to the unit.

1. Living Room

- High quality floors or wall coverings
- Working fireplace or stove Balcony, patio, deck, porch Special windows or doors
- Exceptional size relative to needs of family
- Other: (Specify)

2. Kitchen

- Dishwasher
- Separate freezer
- Garbage disposal
- Eating counter/breakfast nook
- Pantry or abundant shelving or cabinets
- Double oven/self cleaning oven, microwave
- Double sink
- High quality cabinets
- Abundant counter-top space
- Modern appliance(s)
- Exceptional size relative to needs of family
- Other: (Specify)

3. Other Rooms Used for Living

- High quality floors or wall coverings
- Working fireplace or stove Balcony, patio, deck, porch Special windows or doors
- Exceptional size relative to needs of family
- Other: (Specify)

4. Bath

- Special feature shower head
- Built-in heat lamp
- Large mirrors
- Glass door on shower/tub
- Separate dressing room
- Double sink or special lavatory
- Exceptional size relative to needs of family
- Other: (Specify)

5. Overall Characteristics

- Storm windows and doors
- Other forms of weatherization (e.g., insulation, weather stripping) Screen doors or windows
- Good upkeep of grounds (i.e., site cleanliness, landscaping, condition of lawn)
- Garage or parking facilities
- Driveway
- Large yard
- Good maintenance of building exterior
- Other: (Specify)

6. Disabled Accessibility

Unit is accessible to a particular disability. Yes No
Disability _____

D. Questions to ask the Tenant (Optional)

1. Does the owner make repairs when asked? Yes No
2. How many people live there? _____
3. How much money do you pay to the owner/agent for rent? \$ _____
4. Do you pay for anything else? (specify) _____
5. Who owns the range and refrigerator? (insert O = Owner or T = Tenant) Range _____ Refrigerator _____ Microwave _____
6. Is there anything else you want to tell us? (specify) Yes No

E. Inspection Summary/Comments (Optional)

Provide a summary description of each item which resulted in a rating of "Fail" or "Pass with Comments."

Tenant ID Number	Inspector	Date of Inspection (mm/dd/yyyy)	Address of Inspected Unit
Type of Inspection	Initial <input type="checkbox"/>	Special <input type="checkbox"/>	Reinspection <input type="checkbox"/>
Item Number	Reason for "Fail" or "Pass with Comments" Rating		

Continued on additional page Yes No

Previous editions are obsolete

From:
To:
Subject:
Date:
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[CIP Ordinance03052021_0001.pdf](#)

From: Catherine Pauling <cjpauling@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 11:38 AM
To: Michael Roush
Cc: Lisa Fitts; Lisa Maxwell; Yibin Shen; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Subject: Re: Fw: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: CIP Ordinance

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Dear Special Counsel Michael Roush,

Thank you for your continued work on improving CIP. Habitability is one of the main complaints tenants express and have done so even before rent regulations were strengthened and in spite of dramatic rent increases over the past seven years.

ARC also shares the Mayor's concern that additional increases may hit tenants already burdened by back rent and utilities. We believe that the current moratorium on rent increases gives time to explore CIP more broadly and make the needed corrections to Alameda's current fair return system. Furthermore, the relatively new Code Enforcement Unit has not had time to impact Alameda's rental market condition.

Rather than using "legacy" models from cities with 40 years of rent control, please look at (and provide the City Council analysis of) Capital Improvement Plans in cities which have more recently enacted rent control; they should be more in line with Alameda's needs and values. For example, Mountain View implemented a fair return CIP similar to Alameda in 2016.

We hope that staff will look at statistics on what applications were submitted, repairs requested, repairs approved, additional rent increases granted in Mountain View. What other cities have been successful balancing housing preservation with community stabilization? How is their calculation system different? Do they restrict rent increases to habitability and preservation? We would like to see what has worked to encourage the maintenance and habitability of housing.

ARC believes that in a fair system, there are checks and balances. The NOI procedure allows for this; pass-throughs do not. Where is the check on a landlord

who doesn't really need a pass-through in addition to the annual AGA in order to get a fair return? ARC does not think unnecessary asset improvement should become part of tenants' costs when all benefits are only for the investor. ARC believes pass-throughs create a dangerous precedent and will result in greater tenant displacement. Pass-throughs have become a disaster in SF starting about 5 years ago when big actors began entering the housing market. They used pass-throughs to increase asset value and maximize rents without addressing habitability of the individual units. These large investors, such as Veritas and Blackstone. are now buying in Alameda. Please do the additional research on what is the outcome of the different systems explored and proposed. ARC can assist by providing tenant organization perspectives in cities you chose.

ARC met with Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft on March 12th to better understand her concerns and to express ours, so we are copying her on our response to you.

Sincerely,

Catherine Pauling, Toni Grimm, Diana Cacabin,
for Alameda Renters Coalition

On Fri, Mar 5, 2021 at 12:11 PM Michael Roush <mroush@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Catherine, Here is Section 6-58.77. Michael

From: Michael Roush <mhrlegal@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 10:14 AM

To: Michael Roush

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: CIP Ordinance

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

6-58.77 – Capital Improvements.

In addition to the Petition process set forth above, a Landlord may file with the Program Administrator an application for a Capital Improvement Plan, with or without a request for a Pass Through of certain Capital Improvement costs to Tenants of Rental Units not exempt from rent control by State Law, subject to the provisions and limitations set forth in this Article and the Rent Program Regulations

A. The following Capital Improvements may qualify for a Pass Through, provided that the costs for such improvements are no less than \$25,000 for all Capital Improvements referenced in the application and provided further that the direct cost is not less than \$2,500 per Rental Unit affected. These dollar amounts shall be adjusted annually based on the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for the twelve (12) month period ending April of each year.

1. A new roof covering all or substantially all of a building or a structurally independent portion of a building.
2. A significant upgrade of a foundation, including seismic retrofits, of all or substantially all of a building or a structurally independent portion of a building.
3. A new or substantially new plumbing, electrical, or heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system for all or substantially all of a building.
4. Exterior painting or installation/replacement of siding or stucco on all or substantially all of a building.
5. Repairs reasonably related to correcting or preventing the spread of defects that are noted in a findings in a Wood Destroying Pest and Organisms Report issued by a pest control company registered in Branch 3 of the State of California Structural Pest Control Board.
6. The installation of water conservation devices that are intended to reduce the use of water, or the installation of energy efficient devices, such as a solar roof system, or converting utilities from gas to electric, that are intended to save energy or reduce greenhouse gases.
7. Improvements or upgrades to the Rental Unit or the building/complex that meet or exceed disability/accessibility standards as required by law.
8. A fire sprinkler or fire alarm system covering all or substantially all of a building.
- 1-9. Replacement of stairs and/or railings in all or substantially all of a building.

A.B. The Program Administrator shall determine the amount of the Pass Through by amortizing the cost of the authorized Capital Improvement, including an assumed interest rate as provided in Rent Program Regulations, over 15 years (except as otherwise noted below), and dividing that cost by each Rental Unit and any other Dwelling Unit on the property that benefits from the improvement.

In determining such cost that may be included in the calculation of the Pass Through, the Program Administrator shall give no consideration (a) to any additional cost the Landlord incurs for property damage and/or deterioration due to an unreasonable delay in the undertaking or completing of any improvement or repair, or (b) for improvements or repairs for which the Landlord receives insurance proceeds. The Program Administrator shall also give no consideration to any cost the Landlord incurs for any of the items set forth in paragraphs 1 through 9 of subsection A of this Section 6-58.77 if such items have been repaired, replaced or painted within 15 years of an application that seeks a Pass Through for those items except when necessary because a fire, flood, earthquake or other natural disaster requires such repairs, replacement or painting.

C. Except as provided in subsection D of this Section 6-58.77, the Program Administrator shall not approve an application for a Capital Improvement Plan if either of the following apply:

A. The approval of the application results in a cumulative Capital Improvement Pass Through exceeding 5% of a Tenant's Maximum Allowable Rent as such Rent is determined at the time the application is filed.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: A, B, C, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1.25"

B. If, as to the Capital Improvements that are the subject of the application for a Capital Improvement Plan, the Landlord previously received an upward adjustment of Rent through the petition process under Section 6-58.75.

D. If an application for a Capital Improvement Plan, if approved, would result in a cumulative Capital Improvement Pass Through exceeding 5% of a Tenant's Maximum Allowable Rent as such Rent is determined at the time the application is filed, the Program Administrator may approve the application subject to the following:

1. The Capital Improvement Pass Through (for that Tenant) is permanently capped at 5% of the Tenant's Maximum Allowable Rent as such Rent is determined at the time the application is filed.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1.25"

2. The Program Administrator's approval of the application shall provide for the full recovery the cost of the Capital Improvements including extending beyond 15 years the amortization period of the Capital Improvement.

E. The Program Administrator shall determine the amount of the Pass Through based on the cost of the authorized Capital Improvement at the time the Program Administrator approves the application, using the best available information, as provided by the Landlord along with any other relevant information. The Program Administrator's determination of the amount of the Pass Through shall be final

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.38", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: A, B, C, ... + Start at: 3 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1.25"

and not subject to future revision, including revisions based on actual construction costs.

F. Landlords shall provide notice to Tenants of the authorized Pass Through, as determined by the Program Administrator. Upon receiving such notice, any affected Tenant shall have the right to provide a notice to the Landlord that the Landlord must choose between irrevocably forgoing the applicable Pass Through (as to that Tenant) or terminating the Tenancy and making the required permanent Relocation Payment to the Tenant.

G. All Pass Throughs authorized pursuant to a Capital Improvement Plan shall immediately terminate for any Rental Unit that becomes vacant.

C.H. Except as provided in subsection C of this Section 6-58.77, this Section does not preclude a Landlord from filing a petition for an upward adjustment of Rent under subsection G of Section 6-58.75 to the extent full recovery of the cost of Capital Improvements is necessary in order to provide the Landlord with a constitutionally required fair return on property. A Landlord, however, must disclose in such petition any Capital Improvement Pass Through previously awarded under this Section 6-58.77.

I. A Landlord or Tenant may file an appeal with the Program Administrator, with the appeal decided by a Hearing Officer, to any determination of the Program Administrator under this Section 6-58.77 as established in Rent Program Regulations.

From: Karen Miller <karenmillercrs@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2021 9:31 AM
To: Michael Roush
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Comments on the Revised CIP Ordinance

Hi Michael,

The Alameda Realtor Association is working on a letter which should be out the first of next week to Council. I made my comments early on that the threshold is too high to be useful. The 3 Council members who vote as a bloc on these issues only look at the tenants concerns and have no will or understanding of what it costs to maintain a property . The city of Mountain View is currently reviewing their policy that is a Fair Return formula. You can read their staff report on the MountainView website. I'd be happy to send the link. They also allow 100% of the CPI as allowable increases and exempt duplexes. Our Council would not even consider exempting owner occupied duplexes. As I've said before, we have the harshest rent control, possibly in the State. There is no way that landlords are going to be able to maintain their properties in the long run with the current system.

Regards

Karen Miller, Realtor at Windermere DRE 01378335. I have not and will not verify or investigate any information that was supplied by third parties. Sent from my iPhone please forgive the auto corrects

On Mar 30, 2021, at 8:25 AM, Michael Roush <mroush@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Karen, I did not receive any comments from you or any other landlord concerning the most recent revisions that have been made to the CIP Ordinance and that the City Council will likely consider on April 20. If you have any comments, I would appreciate receiving them by Wednesday of this week as the agenda report for this item needs to be completed this week. Any correspondence or comments will be included with the agenda report. Thanks Michael



April 8, 2021

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Members of the City Council
Via email to: clerk@alamedaca.gov

Re: Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers,

On behalf of the Bay East Association of REALTORS®, we are submitting additional information regarding the costs of various improvements covered under the proposed changes to the Capital Improvement Program. This information augments the comments included in our January 15, 2021 letter.

Pillar To Post Home Inspectors is a nation-wide network of home inspection professionals. They have created a Residential Construction and Remodeling Estimate Cost Guide. The guide is attached to this letter and available on-line at: <https://pillartopost.com/cost-guide/>.

Bay East asks the City Council to include the following observations about the proposed revisions to the Capital Improvement Program, specifically the minimum CIP expenditure amount. These observations are based on the direct experience our members have as housing providers in Alameda and from representing clients who own rental housing units, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Housing Quality Standards (HQS) of work which may be found here https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/hcv/hqs. The Housing Quality Standards checklist is attached to this document.

The \$25,000 total cost, plus the \$2,500 per unit allowance, will complicate the ability of owners and managers of smaller rental properties to continue providing safe and affordable housing in Alameda.

A significant percentage of the current multi-family rental properties in Alameda were previously owner-occupied single-family homes. Once converted to rental properties, they now may have up to eight individual rental units in a single building.

Under the proposed CIP revisions, a major capital improvement project, such as a roof replacement, would not qualify as an eligible expenditure. Furthermore, the \$25,000 requirement would not cover the cost for most of the other eligible major capital improvements listed in the ordinance. These



improvements include basic health and safety maintenance work to comply with the HUD Housing Quality Standards; work such as exterior painting, maintaining or upgrading electrical and plumbing systems, and pest repairs.

The proposed CIP places an unreasonable burden on smaller housing providers given the new regulations regarding accepting all proposed tenants. With the changes to Section 8 laws, all properties may now be subject to the HUD Housing Quality Standards and the required annual HUD inspection.

Property owners must follow the HUD Housing Quality Standards. Bay East proposes using this standard as the basis for Capital Improvement guidelines versus the proposed dollar amount thresholds. This alternative proposal ensures all rental units meet the high HUD standard, and provides equitable treatment for all Alameda tenants.

If the goal of the Capital Improvement Program is to ensure Alameda residents have safe and secure housing, and for housing providers to have the financial resources to maintain and improve their properties, whether they participate in the Section 8 program or not, the City of Alameda CIP program should reflect the economic realities of rental housing ownership stewardship.

Please contact us if you have any questions or need more information about the implications of these policy changes.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Schumacher, Alameda Local Government Relations Chair

Residential Construction and Remodeling Estimates

COST GUIDE

COMPLIMENTS OF



STRUCTURE/EXTERIOR

Structure

> addition (foundation to roof)	\$95 – \$130/sq.ft.
> basement entrance	\$5250 – \$10500
> basement main beam	\$2100
> basement support post / foundation	\$500 – \$1000
> excavation / waterproofing	\$125 – \$175/sq.ft.
> foundation cracks (excavation method)	\$525 – \$1100
> foundation cracks (injection method) (per crack)	\$500
> masonry wall (single story)	\$525 – \$800/lin.ft.
> lower basement	\$200 – \$425
> remove bearing wall	\$2100 – \$3200
> remove partition wall	\$850 – \$1700
> re-support floor joist (sistering)	\$325 – \$525
> roof sheathing (replace)	\$6 – \$8/sq.ft.
> underpinning	\$325 – \$525/lin.ft.
> termite prevention (chemical soil treatment)	\$2100

Wall System

> aluminum siding	\$5 – \$6/sq.ft.
> brick veneer	\$10 – \$25/sq.ft.
> brick cleaning (unpainted)	\$3/sq.ft.
> brick cleaning (painted)	\$6/sq.ft.
> brick repainting	\$6 – \$8/sq.ft.
> cedar siding	\$10 – \$15/sq.ft.
> stucco	\$10 – \$15/sq.ft.
> vinyl siding	\$5 – \$6/sq.ft.

Exterior Door

> aluminum storm door	\$375
> metal insulated door	\$675 – \$800
> patio door - replace	\$775 – \$1600
> patio door - brick wall (6ft.)	\$2600 – \$3600
> patio door - wood wall (6ft.)	\$2100 – \$3100

ROOF/EAVE/FLASHING/CHIMNEY

Sloped Roofs

> asphalt shingle (over existing)	\$2 – \$3/sq.ft.
> asphalt shingle (strip & re-shingle)	\$3 – \$5/sq.ft.
> asphalt shingle (high quality)	\$5 – \$7/sq.ft.
> cedar shake / shingle	\$7 – \$10/sq.ft.
> clay tile	\$15 – \$20/sq.ft.
> concrete tile	\$9 – \$13/sq.ft.
> wood shake / shingle	\$6 – \$8/sq.ft.
> slate tile	\$30 – \$55/sq.ft.

Flat Roofs

> roll roofing asphalt (90lb.)	\$2 – \$3/sq.ft.
> 4 ply (tar and gravel)	\$6 – \$11/sq.ft.
> single ply membrane	\$6 – \$11/sq.ft.

Gutters

> gutter cleaning	\$175
> gutter / downspout - aluminum	\$7 – \$9/lin.ft.
> gutter / downspout - galvanized	\$6 – \$7/lin.ft.
> downspout extension	\$16
> soffits / fascia (aluminum)	\$16/lin.ft.

Flashing

> chimney flashing (sloped asphalt)	\$250 – \$500
> chimney flashing (flat built-up)	\$350 – \$600
> metal cricket at chimney	\$250 – \$500
> parapet wall flashing	\$32/lin.ft.
> roof vent flashing	\$125
> reflash skylight	\$425 – \$625
> valley flashing	\$21 – \$32/lin.ft.
> wall flashing	\$6 – \$7/lin.ft.

Chimney

> chimney extension	\$150 – \$275/lin.ft.
> chimney repointing	\$8 – \$11/brick
> concrete cap (single flue)	\$100 – \$275
> concrete cap (double flue)	\$200 – \$425
> rain cap	\$125
> reline flue	\$45 – 55/lin.ft.

GARAGE/DRIVEWAY/WALKWAY

Garage

> detached carport	\$5250+
> detached wood frame - single	\$10500+
> detached wood frame - double	\$15750+
> detached block - single	\$21000+
> detached block - double	\$26250+
> removal of existing garage	\$1575+

Overhead Doors

> automatic garage door opener	\$475
> cladboard - single	\$625 - \$850
> cladboard - double	\$1050 - \$1275
> metal - single (one piece)	\$900
> metal - double (one piece)	\$1350
> wood - single (one piece)	\$1050
> wood - double (sectional)	\$1900

Driveway

> asphalt paving (existing base)	\$5 - \$7/sq.ft.
> asphalt paving (new base)	\$5 - \$8/sq.ft.
> asphalt (seal)	\$65 - \$80
> concrete (stamped)	\$7 - \$11/sq.ft.
> interlock brick / stone	\$11 - 13/sq.ft.

LANDSCAPING/DECK/PATIO/FENCE

Landscaping

> lay soil & sod	\$3 - \$6/sq.ft.
> sprinkler system	\$1200
> retaining wall - concrete	\$55/sq.ft.
> retaining wall - wood	\$45/sq.ft.

Deck

> pressure treated / cedar	\$15 - \$30/sq.ft.
> custom designed & built	\$55 - \$80/sq.ft.

Patio

> concrete	\$16 - \$25/sq.ft.
> flagstone / fieldstone	\$21/sq.ft.
> interlock brick / stone	\$11 - \$16/sq.ft.
> patio stone	\$6/sq.ft.

Porch

> flooring	\$8/sq.ft.
> railing	\$225
> skirting	\$21/in.ft.
> steps - concrete	\$525
> steps - wood	\$325

Fence

> chain-link (h 4ft.)	\$10 - \$20/in.ft.
> wood - cedar (h 5ft.)	\$15 - \$30/in.ft.
> wood - pressure treated (h 5ft.)	\$10 - \$20/in.ft.
> reset post in concrete	\$80

INTERIOR

Windows

> awning	\$55/sq.ft.
> awning / casement (replace)	\$50/sq.ft.
> bay / bow	\$50 - \$70/sq.ft.
> casement	\$63/sq.ft.
> double hung	\$53/sq.ft.
> double hung (replace)	\$42/sq.ft.
> skylight	\$800+
> slider - aluminum	\$32/sq.ft.
> slider - aluminum (replace)	\$27/sq.ft.
> storm - aluminum	\$75 - \$200
> thermal glass (existing frame)	\$32/sq.ft.

Kitchen / Bathroom

> kitchen cabinet	\$50 - \$125/in.ft.
> kitchen counter - laminate	\$45/in.ft.
> kitchen counter - marble	\$80/in.ft.
> kitchen renovation	\$7500+
> bathroom renovation	\$5250+

Floor

> carpet - clean	\$125/room
> carpet - outdoor	\$3/sq.ft.
> carpet and underpad	\$6 - \$11/sq.ft.
> ceramic tile	\$6 - \$11/sq.ft.
> hardwood	\$6 - \$11/sq.ft.
> hardwood - prefinished	\$11 - \$16/sq.ft.
> hardwood - refinish	\$3 - \$6/sq.ft.
> vinyl - sheet	\$4 - \$9/sq.ft.
> vinyl - tile	\$4 - \$9/sq.ft.

Doors

> bi-fold louver	\$850
> bi-fold panel	\$625
> custom with casing / hardware	\$525
> exterior - panel	\$1050
> interior - panel	\$525
> french	\$1050
> patio	\$2100
> storm - aluminum	\$200 - \$325

Stairs/Railings

> curved stair - oak (7 risers)	\$7350+
> spiral stair - oak	\$5250+
> standard stair - oak (7 risers)	\$1050+
> stair railing	\$42 - \$63/in.ft.

Insulation

> rigid exterior (prior to finish)	\$1 - \$2/sq.ft.
> r20 - batt	\$1 - \$2/sq.ft.
> r20 - loose	\$1 - \$2/sq.ft.
> r32 - batt	\$2 - \$3/sq.ft.
> r32 - loose	\$2 - \$5/sq.ft.
> wall / roof cavity	\$2 - \$5/sq.ft.

Fireplaces

> damper	\$175
> brick replacement	\$400 - \$1050
> gas insert	\$2600 - \$4200
> glass door	\$525+
> hearth extension	\$420
> flue cleaning	\$200 - \$300
> metal box insert	\$1050 - \$2600
> masonry with flue rough-in	\$5250+
> wood stove	\$1575 - \$3500

Ceiling/Wall

> acoustic ceiling (suspended)	\$6/sq.ft.
> baseboard / door / window casing	\$4/in.ft.
> drywall over plaster	\$3 - \$4/sq.ft.
> plaster (over existing plaster)	\$3 - \$4/sq.ft.
> stucco / stipple	\$3/sq.ft.
> walls (insulations / drywall)	\$4/sq.ft.
> walls painting (3 coats)	\$2/sq.ft.
> wallpaper	\$6 - \$11/sq.ft.

Security System

> alarm monitoring	\$35/month
> alarm system	\$2500
> intercom system (retrofit)	\$1500
> wired system	\$1500
> wireless motion detectors	\$525

Misc

> central vacuum (retrofit)	\$1050 - \$2100
> central vacuum (canister only)	\$1050 - \$1600

Swimming Pool / Hot Tub

> pool - vinyl lined (16ft. x 40ft.)	\$15000 - \$20000
> pool - concrete lined (16ft. x 40ft.)	\$30000+
> pool heater	\$2100
> pump / filter	\$1600
> hot tub fiberglass	\$5250+

ELECTRICAL

Retrofit

> attic ventilator - mechanical	\$325
> baseboard heater (4')	\$180 - \$575
> ceiling fan	\$250
> doorbell system	\$100 - \$130
> dryer duct	\$125 - \$200
> hardwired smoke detector	\$75 - \$150
> exhaust fan - bathroom	\$150 - \$200
> exhaust fan - oven	\$250 - \$325
> exterior light fixture	\$125 - \$275
> fluorescent light fixture	\$175 - \$275
> ground - public system	\$90 - \$125
> ground - private system (with ground rods)	\$250 - \$325
> receptacle - conventional	\$125 - \$175
> receptacle - split	\$175 - \$275
> receptacle - exterior with cover	\$175 - \$275
> receptacle - replace conventional with GFCI	\$100 - \$150
> receptacle - CO/ALR (aluminum)	\$75 - \$125
> receptacle - stove/dryer	\$100 - \$150
> receptacle - rewire reverse polarity	\$50 - \$80
> standard light fixture	\$125 - \$225

Upgrade

> 100 amp (new panel)	\$1200 - \$1600
> 100 amp (existing panel)	\$750 - \$1100
> 200 amp (new panel)	\$2100 - \$2600
> 200 amp (existing panel)	\$1250 - \$1600
> 120 / 240 volt circuit	\$250 - \$525
> breaker panel - main	\$775 - \$950
> breaker panel - auxiliary	\$125 - \$325
> circuit breaker (replace)	\$75 - \$125
> knob and tube wiring (replace)	\$7500 - \$13000

HEATING AND COOLING

Forced-Air System

> air duct (new)	\$4200
> air duct (retrofit)	\$6300
> annual service	\$100 - \$175
> blower motor	\$375 - \$525
> clean duct	\$180 - \$325
> convert oil to gas (1 story)	\$2500 - \$3300
> convert hot water to forced air (1 story)	\$7500 - \$11000
> electronic air filter	\$625 - \$950
> gas - mid efficiency	\$2600 - \$3300
> gas - high efficiency	\$3600 - \$4700
> humidifier - drum type	\$100 - \$175
> humidifier - flow through type	\$400 - \$475
> existing chimney flue - metal	\$600 - \$1100

Hot Water System

> circulating pump	\$600 - \$800
> cast iron radiator	\$600 - \$800
> expansion tank	\$300 - \$450
> gas boiler - standard	\$3000 - \$4800
> gas boiler - high efficiency	\$6500 - \$11000
> removal of oil tank from basement	\$400 - \$650
> radiator / boiler removal	\$1500 - \$2600
> radiator	\$600 - \$950
> radiator valve	\$125 - \$225

Air Conditioner/Heat Pump

> air handler 3-ton (vertical)	\$1400 - \$1900
> air handler 3-ton (horizontal)	\$1800 - \$2100
> central A/C existing duct	\$2500 - \$5000
> central A/C attic mounted; separate duct	\$11000+
> compressor (replace)	\$1500 - \$1800
> condenser (replace)	\$1800 - \$2700
> heat recovery ventilator (HRV)	\$1800 - \$2700
> heat pump	\$5200 - \$6500

PLUMBING

Bathroom

> basin - pedestal type	\$375
> basin - vanity	\$250
> bathtub - replace / retile	\$2500+
> shower connection	\$250
> shower stall - plastic	\$900 - \$2000
> shower stall - ceramic tile	\$2500 - \$3300
> toilet - flush mechanism	\$125 - \$175
> toilet - replace	\$425
> toilet - replace seal	\$125 - \$275
> toilet - unclog	\$125 - \$225
> tub enclosure - ceramic tile	\$2500 - \$3300
> tub enclosure - plastic	\$600 - \$1275
> whirlpool bath	\$4250

Kitchen

> dishwasher	\$675 - \$950
> garbage disposal	\$200 - \$425
> range hood	\$350 - \$525
> sink - porcelain	\$750 - \$900
> sink - stainless steel	\$650 - \$800

Private Plumbing System

> laundry tub and waste pump	\$525 - \$850
> septic tank (1000gal.)	\$2600 - \$6000
> septic tank cleaning	\$175 - \$325
> sewage waste pump	\$1500 - \$1800
> well - shallow	\$32/lin.ft.
> well - deep	\$42/lin.ft.
> well - submersible pump	\$1275
> well - suction / jet pump	\$600 - \$950

Upgrade

> hose bibb	\$125 - \$175
> hot water tank (40 Gal Electric)	\$600 - \$800
> hot water tank (40 Gal Gas)	\$800 - \$1000
> tankless water heater	\$2000 - \$3000
> laundry tub / connection	\$350 - \$550
> main water service	\$175 - \$225/lin.ft.
> main shut-off valve	\$175 - \$325
> sump pump	\$175 - \$275
> supply lines - 1 story; up to 2 baths	\$1850 - \$2600
> temperature & pressure relief valve	\$60 - \$100
> water softener	\$925 - \$1600
> waste drain lines	\$2600 - \$4200

LIFE EXPECTANCY

Component	Average Life (yrs.)
Roof Covering	
> asphalt standard shingle	12-15
> asphalt premium shingle	15-30
> wood shingle	10-20
> concrete / clay tile	20-40
> asbestos cement	40-80
> slate tile	40-80
> roll roofing	5-15
> tar & gravel	15-25
> metal	60
Heating	
> forced air furnace	10-25
> oil tank	40
> water / steam boiler - welded steel	15-30
> water / steam boiler - cast iron	30-50
> water / steam circulating pump	10-25
Cooling	
> central air	10-15
> heat pump	10-15
> window air conditioning	10-20
Plumbing	
> galvanized water pipe	20-25
> hot water heater	5-15
> septic / sewer pump	5-10
> well pump	10
Appliances	
> dishwasher	5-12
> dryer	10-25
> garbage disposal	5-12
> oven / range	15-20
> washing machine	5-15

These estimates reflect the average basic costs for supplies and installation of building materials in Canada and the United States anticipated for 2019-2020. Costs may vary depending on regions, upgrades, complexity and disposal fees.

It is our strong recommendation that you obtain a minimum of three written quotes from reputable licensed local contractors for validation.



©2019-2020 Pillar To Post Inc.

Each office is independently owned and operated.

Inspection Checklist

Housing Choice Voucher Program

**U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development**
Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB Approval No. 2577-0169
(Exp. 9/30/2012)

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.50 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number. Assurances of confidentiality are not provided under this collection.

This collection of information is authorized under Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f). The information is used to determine if a unit meets the housing quality standards of the section 8 rental assistance program.

Privacy Act Statement. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is authorized to collect the information required on this form by Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f). Collection of the name and address of both family and the owner is mandatory. The information is used to determine if a unit meets the housing quality standards of the Section 8 rental assistance program. HUD may disclose this information to Federal, State and local agencies when relevant to civil, criminal, or regulatory investigations and prosecutions. It will not be otherwise disclosed or released outside of HUD, except as permitted or required by law. Failure to provide any of the information may result in delay or rejection of family participation.

Name of Family		Tenant ID Number	Date of Request (mm/dd/yyyy)
Inspector		Neighborhood/Census Tract	Date of Inspection (mm/dd/yyyy)
Type of Inspection <input type="checkbox"/> Initial <input type="checkbox"/> Special <input type="checkbox"/> Reinspection		Date of Last Inspection (mm/dd/yyyy)	PHA

A. General Information		Housing Type (check as appropriate) <input type="checkbox"/> Single Family Detached <input type="checkbox"/> Duplex or Two Family <input type="checkbox"/> Row House or Town House <input type="checkbox"/> Low Rise: 3, 4 Stories, Including Garden Apartment <input type="checkbox"/> High Rise: 5 or More Stories <input type="checkbox"/> Manufactured Home <input type="checkbox"/> Congregate <input type="checkbox"/> Cooperative <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Group Residence <input type="checkbox"/> Single Room Occupancy <input type="checkbox"/> Shared Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Inspected Unit	Year Constructed (yyyy)	
Full Address (including Street, City, County, State, Zip)		
Number of Children in Family Under 6		
Owner		
Name of Owner or Agent Authorized to Lease Unit Inspected		Phone Number
Address of Owner or Agent		

B. Summary Decision On Unit (To be completed after form has been filled out)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Pass	Number of Bedrooms for Purposes of the FMR or Payment Standard	Number of Sleeping Rooms	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fail			
<input type="checkbox"/> Inconclusive			

Inspection Checklist					Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
Item No.	1. Living Room	Yes Pass	No Fail	In-Conc.	
1.1	Living Room Present				
1.2	Electricity				
1.3	Electrical Hazards				
1.4	Security				
1.5	Window Condition				
1.6	Ceiling Condition				
1.7	Wall Condition				
1.8	Floor Condition				

* Room Codes: 1 = Bedroom or Any Other Room Used for Sleeping (regardless of type of room); 2 = Dining Room or Dining Area;
 3 = Second Living Room, Family Room, Den, Playroom, TV Room; 4 = Entrance Halls, Corridors, Halls, Staircases; 5 = Additional Bathroom; 6 = Other

Item No.	1. Living Room (Continued)	Yes Pass	No Fail	In-Conc.	Comment	Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
1.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Kitchen						
2.1	Kitchen Area Present					
2.2	Electricity					
2.3	Electrical Hazards					
2.4	Security					
2.5	Window Condition					
2.6	Ceiling Condition					
2.7	Wall Condition					
2.8	Floor Condition					
2.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2.10	Stove or Range with Oven					
2.11	Refrigerator					
2.12	Sink					
2.13	Space for Storage, Preparation, and Serving of Food					
3. Bathroom						
3.1	Bathroom Present					
3.2	Electricity					
3.3	Electrical Hazards					
3.4	Security					
3.5	Window Condition					
3.6	Ceiling Condition					
3.7	Wall Condition					
3.8	Floor Condition					
3.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3.10	Flush Toilet in Enclosed Room in Unit					
3.11	Fixed Wash Basin or Lavatory in Unit					
3.12	Tub or Shower in Unit					
3.13	Ventilation					

Item No.	4. Other Rooms Used For Living and Halls	Yes Pass	No Fail	In-Conc.	Comment	Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left	(Circle One) Front/Center/Rear	____ Floor Level
4.2	Electricity/Illumination						
4.3	Electrical Hazards						
4.4	Security						
4.5	Window Condition						
4.6	Ceiling Condition						
4.7	Wall Condition						
4.8	Floor Condition						
4.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable		
4.10	Smoke Detectors						
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left	(Circle One) Front/Center/Rear	____ Floor Level
4.2	Electricity/Illumination						
4.3	Electrical Hazards						
4.4	Security						
4.5	Window Condition						
4.6	Ceiling Condition						
4.7	Wall Condition						
4.8	Floor Condition						
4.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable		
4.10	Smoke Detectors						
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left	(Circle One) Front/Center/Rear	____ Floor Level
4.2	Electricity/Illumination						
4.3	Electrical Hazards						
4.4	Security						
4.5	Window Condition						
4.6	Ceiling Condition						
4.7	Wall Condition						
4.8	Floor Condition						
4.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable		
4.10	Smoke Detectors						

Item No.	4. Other Rooms Used For Living and Halls	Yes Pass	No Fail	In-Conc.	Comment	Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left (Circle One) Front/Center/Rear ____ Floor Level	
4.2	Electricity/Illumination					
4.3	Electrical Hazards					
4.4	Security					
4.5	Window Condition					
4.6	Ceiling Condition					
4.7	Wall Condition					
4.8	Floor Condition					
4.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4.10	Smoke Detectors					
4.1	Room Code* and Room Location <input type="checkbox"/>				(Circle One) Right/Center/Left (Circle One) Front/Center/Rear ____ Floor Level	
4.2	Electricity/Illumination					
4.3	Electrical Hazards					
4.4	Security					
4.5	Window Condition					
4.6	Ceiling Condition					
4.7	Wall Condition					
4.8	Floor Condition					
4.9	Lead-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed two square feet per room and/or is more than 10% of a component?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4.10	Smoke Detectors					
5. All Secondary Rooms (Rooms not used for living)						
5.1	None Go to Part 6					
5.2	Security					
5.3	Electrical Hazards					
5.4	Other Potentially Hazardous Features in these Rooms					

Item No.	6. Building Exterior	Yes Pass	No Fail	In - Conc.	Comment	Final Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
6.1	Condition of Foundation					
6.2	Condition of Stairs, Rails, and Porches					
6.3	Condition of Roof/Gutters					
6.4	Condition of Exterior Surfaces					
6.5	Condition of Chimney					
6.6	Lead Paint: Exterior Surfaces Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint? If not, do deteriorated surfaces exceed 20 square feet of total exterior surface area?				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
6.7	Manufactured Home: Tie Downs					
7. Heating and Plumbing						
7.1	Adequacy of Heating Equipment					
7.2	Safety of Heating Equipment					
7.3	Ventilation/Cooling					
7.4	Water Heater					
7.5	Approvable Water Supply					
7.6	Plumbing					
7.7	Sewer Connection					
8. General Health and Safety						
8.1	Access to Unit					
8.2	Fire Exits					
8.3	Evidence of Infestation					
8.4	Garbage and Debris					
8.5	Refuse Disposal					
8.6	Interior Stairs and Common Halls					
8.7	Other Interior Hazards					
8.8	Elevators					
8.9	Interior Air Quality					
8.10	Site and Neighborhood Conditions					
8.11	Lead-Based Paint: Owner's Certification				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

If the owner is required to correct any lead-based paint hazards at the property including deteriorated paint or other hazards identified by a visual assessor, a certified lead-based paint risk assessor, or certified lead-based paint inspector, the PHA must obtain certification that the work has been done in accordance with all applicable requirements of 24 CFR Part 35. The Lead -Based Paint Owner Certification must be received by the PHA before the execution of the HAP contract or within the time period stated by the PHA in the owner HQS violation notice. Receipt of the completed and signed Lead-Based Paint Owner Certification signifies that all HQS lead-based paint requirements have been met and no re-inspection by the HQS inspector is required.

C. Special Amenities (Optional)

This Section is for optional use of the HA. It is designed to collect additional information about other positive features of the unit that may be present. Although the features listed below are not included in the Housing Quality Standards, the tenant and HA may wish to take them into consideration in decisions about renting the unit and the reasonableness of the rent. Check/list any positive features found in relation to the unit.

1. Living Room

- High quality floors or wall coverings
- Working fireplace or stove Balcony, patio, deck, porch Special windows or doors
- Exceptional size relative to needs of family
- Other: (Specify)

2. Kitchen

- Dishwasher
- Separate freezer
- Garbage disposal
- Eating counter/breakfast nook
- Pantry or abundant shelving or cabinets
- Double oven/self cleaning oven, microwave
- Double sink
- High quality cabinets
- Abundant counter-top space
- Modern appliance(s)
- Exceptional size relative to needs of family
- Other: (Specify)

3. Other Rooms Used for Living

- High quality floors or wall coverings
- Working fireplace or stove Balcony, patio, deck, porch Special windows or doors
- Exceptional size relative to needs of family
- Other: (Specify)

4. Bath

- Special feature shower head
- Built-in heat lamp
- Large mirrors
- Glass door on shower/tub
- Separate dressing room
- Double sink or special lavatory
- Exceptional size relative to needs of family
- Other: (Specify)

5. Overall Characteristics

- Storm windows and doors
- Other forms of weatherization (e.g., insulation, weather stripping) Screen doors or windows
- Good upkeep of grounds (i.e., site cleanliness, landscaping, condition of lawn)
- Garage or parking facilities
- Driveway
- Large yard
- Good maintenance of building exterior
- Other: (Specify)

6. Disabled Accessibility

Unit is accessible to a particular disability. Yes No
Disability _____

D. Questions to ask the Tenant (Optional)

1. Does the owner make repairs when asked? Yes No
2. How many people live there? _____
3. How much money do you pay to the owner/agent for rent? \$ _____
4. Do you pay for anything else? (specify) _____
5. Who owns the range and refrigerator? (insert O = Owner or T = Tenant) Range _____ Refrigerator _____ Microwave _____
6. Is there anything else you want to tell us? (specify) Yes No

E. Inspection Summary/Comments (Optional)

Provide a summary description of each item which resulted in a rating of "Fail" or "Pass with Comments."

Tenant ID Number	Inspector	Date of Inspection (mm/dd/yyyy)	Address of Inspected Unit
Type of Inspection	Initial <input type="checkbox"/>	Special <input type="checkbox"/>	Reinspection <input type="checkbox"/>
Item Number	Reason for "Fail" or "Pass with Comments" Rating		

Continued on additional page Yes No

Previous editions are obsolete