

FINANCING AFFORDABLE HOUSING: LOCAL IN-LIEU FEES AND SET-ASIDE FUNDS

SUMMARY

Surveys in Marin County always indicate that a range of housing options in the county is a top priority. Affordable housing is needed for the wide variety of people who constitute a well-balanced community. It also is clear that a lack of the full range of housing resources severely impacts some of the other important county issues, such as transportation and emergency response.

As mandated by state legislation, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has developed a formula for each municipality and unincorporated area in the nine Bay Area counties that specifies how many units and what types of affordable housing a community must provide for in its general plan, and sets a time table for implementation.

Funding for most affordable housing development is provided by a combination of private sector, nonprofit and government programs. In this report, the Grand Jury limited itself to an investigation of city and county funding that might be available under current conditions and legislation, specifically in-lieu fees and set-aside funds ("set-asides"). In-lieu fees, more fully described in the next section, refer to fees paid to communities by housing developers when affordable housing is not included on site in a particular development. Set-asides, also more fully described in the next section, represent a percentage of increased property tax revenues paid to communities from redeveloped properties. Both sources of revenue must be segregated in special accounts by the communities and used for affordable housing-related purposes.

To make their dollars go further, jurisdictions in the county typically leverage their in-lieu funds and set-asides in a variety of ways. For example, they may use these monies to provide rental subsidies, low-interest loans for downpayments, or moving assistance for affordable housing projects in collaboration with other agencies and nonprofit organizations.

The Grand Jury has concluded that treating the county as a single housing market, rather than dictating quotas to each jurisdiction, would be a more efficient way to approach the affordable housing problem in the county. The Board of Supervisors and the cities and towns should consider establishing an appropriate mechanism for coordinating all of the affordable housing activities in the county. The county should enlist the support of the various non-profit agencies and other housing developers by including them in the implementation of a countywide plan. Finally, the Grand Jury recommends that jurisdictions fully disclose to the public what in-lieu fees and set-aside funds they hold, how they are accounted for, and how they have been spent to date or will be spent in the future.

BACKGROUND

In recent years, communities have become increasingly aware of the need to have housing that lower income persons, who provide essential services in the communities, can afford. Therefore, many communities require that, when a developer seeks to build a number of residential units, that development must include a percentage of so-called affordable units. This requirement is referred to as “inclusionary zoning.” The percentage is set by the community and varies depending upon its needs and options. Both the public and the development community have found that there are circumstances when the provision of those affordable units on site are not feasible or appropriate. Therefore, a program of in-lieu fees has been created that permits a developer, instead of building the units on site, to pay a predetermined amount into an account set up specifically for that purpose. The community then uses those funds for affordable housing-related purposes.

Despite existing federal and state housing legislation, funding for affordable housing programs has been lagging behind the clearly known need. In the 1940’s the State of California acknowledged that redevelopment activities should be connected to the provision of affordable housing and included the 20% set aside provision in the state law on urban redevelopment.

EXPLANATION OF TERMINOLOGY:

IN-LIEU FEES:

Many contemporary zoning ordinances, in order to meet the requirements of their communities’ general plans for the provision of affordable housing units, have instituted a variety of techniques to enable the private market to provide the vast majority of the affordable units needed. By far the preferred method is to require the developer to include a percentage of affordable units integrated into its overall development program. There are times, however, when such integration is not possible or desirable as a result of some local condition. Therefore, many communities have instituted an alternative to the actual physical integration of affordable units into a given development program. This alternative provides that the developer pay to the community a predetermined sum of money **in-lieu** of constructing the physical affordable housing units on site. These monies are put into a segregated account for the community’s future to support development of affordable housing units.

SET-ASIDE FUNDS:

Housing set-aside funds, called “set-asides”, in redevelopment projects are required by California redevelopment law (California Health and Safety Code Sections 33000 et. seq.). It applies only to jurisdictions that have established redevelopment agencies. The principle behind these set-asides is as follows:

A redevelopment project area must meet certain requirements in order to be able to withstand legal challenges to its establishment. These areas are supposed to have met standards of deterioration (physical and/or economic). Therefore, it is assumed that property tax revenue from these areas is relatively low. Once such an area is redeveloped, it is again assumed that the new development will have a significantly higher value and will yield significantly higher property taxes in the future.

The pre-redevelopment property value is established as a base and the associated tax revenue will generally continue to flow to the existing taxing agencies. As the new development begins to increase the property values, 80% of the tax revenues above the established base are used to pay for expenditures the municipality made to assure the success of the redevelopment project. Such expenditures include the purchase of the properties needed for redevelopment; public improvements, such as streets, utilities, etc.; and administrative and technical services required to carry the project to fruition.

Twenty percent of the property tax revenues in excess of the base are to be **set aside** for purposes connected with provision of affordable housing in the community.

METHODOLOGY

Last year's Grand Jury circulated a brief questionnaire to the county and its 11 cities to determine what Marin jurisdictions have done to date in the area of affordable housing. The questionnaire had three major sections: zoning, redevelopment issues, and required housing elements of general plans. The responses to the housing element all indicated that the elements are in the process of being updated and are expected to be completed relatively shortly.

Circumstances and time constraints did not permit the 2001-2002 Grand Jury to complete the study. Therefore, the current 2002-2003 Grand Jury decided to continue and complete the work. In order to do that, the grand jury sent an additional and expanded survey to all the jurisdictions in the county, including the county itself. A copy of that survey (Affordable Housing Funding Questionnaire, Grand Jury 2002-2003) and the transmittal letter are attached as Appendix A.

This Grand Jury expresses its appreciation to the county staffs for their generally complete and expeditious replies and their patience in responding to follow-up inquiries.

DISCUSSION

IN-LIEU FEES:

Nine of the 12 jurisdictions in Marin County have provisions in their zoning codes for "inclusionary" zoning (that is, the jurisdictions are required to provide for a full range of housing units that a wide spectrum of economic needs.). Of these, seven of the jurisdictions provide for the alternative of paying in-lieu fees. With regard to the option of paying the fees or constructing the actual units, five of the jurisdictions reserve the

determination to their governing bodies, the county leaves that decision to staff discretion, and the City of Novato currently leaves the decision to the discretion of the developer. (The City of Novato indicated in its response that this issue is currently under discussion and would most likely be changed.)

SET-ASIDE FUNDS:

The County of Marin, Larkspur, Novato, San Rafael, Sausalito, and Tiburon currently have, or have had, redevelopment agencies. At one time, the Larkspur had designated a portion of the community in a designated redevelopment project area, but that area has never been activated. The county has had one active redevelopment area, Novato had three, and San Rafael and Tiburon had one project area each. Sausalito has never established a project area.

In all four jurisdictions that currently have active redevelopment agencies, any funds collected under redevelopment law are kept in r accounts that are segregated and not co-mingled with other accounts. Also, in all the active agencies, the agency boards (either the county Board of Supervisors or local council) must authorize expenditures from those restricted accounts.

SPECIFIC ANALYSIS OF FUNDS RECEIVED AND SPENT FROM FISCAL YEARS 1996-1997 TO 2001-2002:

Results from the current 2002-2003 Grand Jury's survey follow. Included is information on how each of the twelve jurisdictions in the county has handled the issue of in-lieu fees and set-asides over the past six fiscal years. Additional comments provided by Novato, San Rafael, Tiburon and the County of Marin are indented and included in *italics*. They illustrate the creative use and leveraging of available funds.

It should be noted that collections and disbursements are not necessarily equal, as there may have been fund balances prior to the 6 years surveyed which were drawn down, or, conversely, fund balances may have increased over the reporting period.

City of Belvedere: No in-lieu fees have been collected. Since Belvedere does not have a redevelopment agency, no set-aside monies have been generated. Belvedere had no funds on hand.

Town of Corte Madera: \$42,000 in in-lieu fees have been collected, but not allocated or expended for any particular projects. Corte Madera does not have a redevelopment agency, and therefore has no set-aside funds. The town made these funds available as a loan to the Ecumenical Association for Housing to expedite a current application for an affordable housing project. Corte Madera had no funds on hand.

Additional comments provided by the Town of Corte Madera. This quote from Corte Madera is included because it raises a relatively recent approach that relates to the need for affordable housing, which is directly created by non-residential developments.

“I thought you might also be interested to know about...Corte Madera’s Nonresidential Development Impact Fee ordinance. This ordinance is not part of the inclusionary housing ordinance and it differs from the inclusionary ordinance in that it applies to nonresidential development projects. The ordinance requires developers of nonresidential projects to pay a fee which is used for the land and/or building costs associated with developing housing affordable to low and very-low income households. The ordinance was adopted last year, and to date has collected approximately \$43,000. An affordable housing fund has been created by the Town Council to receive the fee payments. The Director of Environmental Services administers the fund, and the Town Council must approve all expenditures.”

Town of Fairfax: No in-lieu fees have been collected. Fairfax does not have a redevelopment agency, and therefore has no set-aside funds. Fairfax had no funds on hand.

City of Larkspur: No in-lieu fees have been collected. Larkspur does not have a redevelopment agency, and therefore has no set-aside funds. Larkspur had no funds on hand.

City of Mill Valley: Approximately \$61,000 in in-lieu fees have been collected, but not allocated or disbursed for any particular projects. Mill Valley does not have a redevelopment agency, and therefore has no set-aside funds. Mill Valley had a fund balance of \$73,261 as of June 30, 2002.

City of Novato: Approximately \$315,000 in in-lieu fees and \$1,905,000 in tax increment set-aside funds have been collected in the Grand Jury’s six-year study period. Of the \$2,220,000 total, approximately \$1,720,000 has been disbursed over this period for projects including The Downtown, Hamilton and Vintage Oaks Redevelopment areas, housing services and mobile home rent control.

Novato had a fund balance of \$919,000 at June 30, 2002.

Additional comments provided by the City of Novato: (regarding in-lieu funds)
“As this is a relatively new fee, the City is accumulating the funds for future use. There are no specific projects currently designated for which the funds will be used, however, it is anticipated that funds will be leveraged in participation with public or private developments to provide affordable housing.”

(regarding set-asides) “Major Agency programs include overall Agency management providing oversight compliance with mandated operational and reporting requirements; project area management for the three Redevelopment Project Areas (Vintage Oaks, Hamilton and Downtown); Agency liaison for economic development and downtown revitalization matters; and implementation of the Agency’s housing policies/programs in coordination with the City’s housing programs, homeless matters, and the adopted Housing Element of the General

Plan. All executive staff services are provided by the City Manager. Staff services are charged to Agency program elements on a cost recovery basis.”

Attached as Appendix B is a chart provided by the Novato Redevelopment Agency reporting activities in Fund No. 219, which covers Redevelopment Agency Housing for FY 2000/01

Town of Ross: No in-lieu fees have been collected. Ross does not have a redevelopment agency, and therefore has no set-aside funds. Ross has no funds on hand.

Town of San Anselmo: No in-lieu fees have been collected. San Anselmo does not have a redevelopment agency, and therefore has no set-aside funds. San Anselmo has no funds on hand.

City of San Rafael: Approximately \$610,000 in in-lieu fees and other related revenue (interest, fees for services, and monies from the state and county) have been collected. In addition, approximately \$5,274,000 has been collected in the housing account of the redevelopment agency from set-aside revenues, lease payments and a transfer from the in-lieu account. Approximately \$4,900,000 from these two accounts has been disbursed for a number of uses, including rental assistance, housing support programs, housing rehabilitation, and other specific building renovation and renewal projects. San Rafael had a fund balance of \$292,219 as of June 30, 2002.

Additional comments provided by the City of San Rafael: (regarding in-lieu funds) “Over the past 7 years, the in-lieu funds have been spent to assist in the provision of affordable housing. Two examples include: 1) payment of \$52,354 toward the new homeless shelter at Hamilton, and 2) assistance in the form of a \$200,000 grant to BRIDGE housing, a non-profit housing developer, to purchase and make affordable an apartment building in the Canal Area.”

(regarding set-asides) “The San Rafael Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was established under the provisions of the Community Redevelopment Law (California Health and Safety Code, commencing with Section 33000) primarily to assist in the clearance and rehabilitation of areas determined to be in a declining condition in the City of San Rafael (City). Financial activity of the Agency commenced in July 1973. Under the Agency’s Redevelopment Plan (Plan), approved in November 1972, the Agency proposes to assist in the development of property located in the central San Rafael business core and east San Rafael. The Agency’s Redevelopment Plan has been amended over time and restated in October 1998. The Agency receives incremental tax revenues on the developed property due to increases in assessed value. The Agency functions as an independent entity. The City Council serves as the governing board of the Agency” (from the Auditors’ report for the year ended June 2001).

Attached as Appendix C is a chart provided by the San Rafael Redevelopment Agency specifying the Housing Set-Aside Project and Program Expenditures from 1996 to 2001.

During that reporting period, San Rafael has used the set aside funds for a number of affordable housing-related purposes. Some of the funds have gone into the rehabilitation of units, some into rental assistance funds, some into assistance to homeless support facilities, and some to support needed mediation services. Approximately 20% of the total spent over the five years covered in the chart was used for program administration..

City of Sausalito: No in-lieu funds have been collected. Sausalito has created a redevelopment agency, however, a project area has never been established. Sausalito has no funds on hand.

Town of Tiburon: Approximately \$660,000 in in-lieu fees has been collected and approximately \$600,000 has been disbursed for purchase of “below market rate” housing and rental assistance under the Marin Renters Rebate program. Tiburon’s redevelopment agency has collected approximately \$3,400,000 in set-asides, and approximately \$3,300,000 has been spent for construction of senior housing and rehabilitation of existing housing. Tiburon had a fund balance of \$1,232,129 as of June 30, 2002.

Additional comment provided by the Town of Tiburon: “The funds have been used to purchase affordable units, maintain affordable units owned by the Town, fund payments to the Marin Housing Authority for the construction of additional affordable units in Tiburon. . . .”

County of Marin (for the unincorporated areas of the county): Approximately \$393,000 in in-lieu fees and \$1,090,000 in set-aside funds have been collected, and the Board of Supervisors transferred \$500,000 into the in-lieu fee fund. The county has expended approximately \$2,305,000 for rental assistance, homeless programs and specific housing development/rehabilitation projects. The county had a fund balance of \$2,089,216 as of June 30, 2002.

Additional comments provided by the County: (regarding in-lieu funds) “Over the past eight years since the in-lieu fund was established moneys have been used for new construction of rental and ownership units, preservation and rehabilitation of existing affordable housing, emergency rental assistance, and deposit assistance. The in-lieu housing trust fund has helped to create new housing opportunities for homeless, seniors, families, developmentally disabled, environmentally disabled and very low, low and moderate-income individuals and families. 562 units of housing have been created using funds from the Housing Trust. An additional 174 units have been preserved or rehabilitated using Housing Trust Funds.”

(regarding set-asides) “Since the accrual of tax increments from development in the Marin City Redevelopment Area, the Agency has set aside \$1,142,403, representing 20% of all tax increment revenues, towards low and moderate income housing projects in Marin City and paid it out. A total of \$1,049,403 have been paid to the Gateway Apartment Partners, and \$93,000 have been paid

towards for the Braun Court residential development...” (See Appendix D for a Summary of Disbursements.)

The following table summarizes the combined fund balances of in-lieu fees and set-aside funds as of June 30, 2002.

Jurisdiction	In-lieu Fees and Set-Aside Funds @ 6/30/2002 (in dollars)
Belvedere	0
Corte Madera	0
Fairfax	0
Larkspur	0
Mill Valley	73,261
Novato	1,100,000
Ross	0
San Anselmo	0
San Rafael	292,219
Sausalito	0
Tiburon	1,232,129
County of Marin (Unincorporated Areas)	2,089,216
Totals	\$4,686,825

The Grand Jury found that limited public financial resources are currently available from in-lieu fees and set-aside funds. Thus there is very little money in the “public bank” for affordable housing. The median single-family home in Marin currently is hovering at about \$700,000. Therefore, \$4.7 million in Marin, without creative financing and/or leveraging, can buy only six to seven single-family homes.

STATE LAW, ABAG AND MARIN COUNTY

California law requires that each jurisdiction be treated as a stand-alone entity. Therefore, ABAG is required to establish housing targets for Marin County and each of its cities and towns. Marin County’s small size and relatively small population often preclude places of work and housing resources to be within the same jurisdiction. If Marin County were treated as a single housing market, a more productive use of the limited available funds might be feasible. The following illustrates the problem:

The amount of money collected from in-lieu fees, particularly in the smaller communities that have relatively little new development, is insignificant relative to the costs of providing affordable housing. Set-asides generated from redevelopment projects are much larger but again, not all jurisdictions have redevelopment projects. Because affordable housing projects generally need a significant amount of “seed money” or other subsidies to get them started, imaginative uses of either in-lieu fees or set-aside

funds can be extremely helpful in facilitating the creation of such badly needed housing resources.

The Grand Jury observed that several of the jurisdictions that generate either type of funds use the funds for projects that are not wholly within their jurisdiction. However, they did not seem to be a well-defined plan for the coordinated and efficient use of these funds on a countywide basis. It would be possible to make more effective use of these funds if countywide coordination was implemented to allocate funds from the various jurisdictions for projects throughout the county.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Just as ABAG is constrained by existing state law in the assignment of housing targets to the separate jurisdictions, THE Board of Supervisors is limited to the areas of the county under its direct jurisdiction. However, Board with its countywide perspective should look at the advisability of establishing some kind of funding pool, which could lead to using some of the limited available funding across municipal boundaries. It should not be an insurmountable challenge to set up an appropriate mechanism for the administration of such a funding pool. It could be either the Board acting in its role as the County Housing Authority, a committee established by the Council of Mayors and Council Members, or some other mechanism acceptable to the community. Such a mechanism could become another significant building block toward to the development of an ever improving Marin County community.

An example of positive cooperation toward to the goal of addressing countywide housing needs is the preparation of the Marin Housing Workbook of February 2002. It was created by countywide representative committee, which included not only public agencies but also the nonprofit agencies active in providing affordable housing throughout the county.

ONE FINAL COMMENT

During its investigation, the Grand Jury found that information about local affordable housing funding is available but not readily accessible. Easy accessibility to information related to affordable housing funding would encourage more public input that may lead to better solutions to solve this chronic problem.

FINDINGS

1. Jurisdictions with little, if any, development generate minimal in-lieu fees.
2. A number of jurisdictions have not established redevelopment agencies and therefore do not collect set-asides.
3. Small amounts of in-lieu fees, held in special accounts in some jurisdictions in the county, are not large enough to be particularly useful in promoting that jurisdiction's affordable housing goals.

4. Redevelopment agencies established by larger jurisdictions may generate substantial set-aside funds. These funds can be used effectively to provide affordable housing in those jurisdictions.
5. The Town of Corte Madera's nonresidential development impact fee is an innovative way to raise funds for affordable housing from commercial developers.
6. Several jurisdictions are finding creative uses for their in-lieu fees and set-asides, thereby maximizing the effectiveness of these funds in creating affordable housing.
7. ABAG treats each jurisdiction as a stand-alone entity as required by state law.
8. There is no formal countywide mechanism for treating the affordable housing problem.
9. The recently developed Marin Housing Workbook can be an important tool in creating affordable housing particularly since it urges the full inclusion of all housing providers: public private and nonprofit.
10. Local affordable housing information is not easily accessible to the general public.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Board of Supervisors should request that ABAG and/or the California Department of Housing and Community Development treat the County of Marin as a single housing market unit for purposes of establishing affordable housing goals.
2. The Board of Supervisors and the cities and towns should establish an appropriate mechanism for the coordination of all affordable housing activities in the County.
3. The intra-county governmental cooperation, which was basic to the development of the Marin Housing Workbook (February 2002), should be used as a foundation for ongoing implementation of the recommendations contained therein.
4. The Board of Supervisors should support and cooperate with the various nonprofit housing agencies and developers within the County by including them in the implementation of the countywide housing programs.
5. All local governmental agencies should assure that their housing programs and funding are fully disclosed to the public.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05, the Grand Jury respectfully requests responses as follows:

- Marin County Board of Supervisors to all Findings and Recommendations
- All Marin city and town Councils to all Findings and Recommendations

APPENDIX A

Housing Funding Questionnaire

Grand Jury 2002-2003

General Issues

1. Has your jurisdiction updated its affordable housing element in your master plan? If yes, has it been approved by the State of California? When was it approved? If no, what is your timeline for completion?
2. How many affordable units are in your inventory currently? How many units are envisioned for the future?
3. What issues or problems do you see in meeting your affordable housing unit mandate?

Zoning Issues

1. Does your jurisdiction have requirements in your zoning for the inclusion of affordable housing? If not, why not?
2. If you have such provisions, do they include the alternative of paying fees “in lieu” of actually building such housing? If not, why not?
3. Does the developer or does the municipality determine whether “in lieu” fees are paid or units are constructed?
4. Regarding question # 3 above, what is the ordinary outcome – units or in “lieu funds”?
5. If you receive “in lieu” fees:
 - a. Over the past 10 years, how much money has been received in such “in lieu” fees?
 - b. How are they accounted for in your financial records? Please reference specific accounts / trust funds in your jurisdiction’s financial records.
 - c. Over the past six years, for what purposes have the “in lieu” funds been spent? Please be specific and put this information in a format similar to the attached spreadsheet.
 - d. Name the person or entities that can access the expenditure of these “in lieu” fees and the procedure for so doing.

Housing Funding Questionnaire (continued)

Grand Jury 2002-2003

Redevelopment Issues

1. Does your jurisdiction have a Redevelopment Agency?
2. If so:
 - a. Do you have or have you had Redevelopment Projects?
 - b. Have you complied with the provisions of State law that require 20% of “set aside” funds be spent on affordable housing?
 - c. Indicate the amount, dates and uses of Redevelopment funds for affordable housing.
 - e. How are these funds accounted for in your jurisdiction’s financial records? Over the past six years, for what purposes have the “in lieu” funds been spent? Please be specific and put this information in a format similar to the attached spreadsheet.
 - f. Name the persons or entities that can access the expenditure of these redevelopment fees and the procedure for so doing.

###

APPENDIX B

NOVATO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY HOUSING PROGRAM FUND NO. 219

This table identifies the funding and expenditures for the housing program of the Redevelopment Agency. Tax increment funds for the housing program are generated from all parcels within the Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 - Hahn (Vintage Oaks), and the new Hamilton and Downtown Project Areas. These reserved funds have been used as a source of funding for the interim housing and homelessness prevention programs addressing Novato's at risk population; update of the Housing Element and Hamilton Reuse planning and implementation effort. These funds will be considered for implementing appropriate programs in the adopted Housing Element.

	Actual 1998/99	Actual 1999/00	Projected Actual 2000/01	Adopted Budget 2001/02
Fund Balance – Begin Fiscal Year	403,276	398,076	458,139	648,084
Revenues:				
Investment Earnings	11,286	13,836	20,325	10,450
Tax Increment:				
Vintage Oaks	273,285	324,438	321,709	315,477
Hamilton	0	0	1,757	14,000
Downtown	0	19,160	40,768	40,415
Mobile Home Rent Control	9,240	40,590	23,997	
Other	17,804	41,740	33,147	40,000
Subtotal Revenues	311,615	439,764	441,703	420,342
Transfers In:				
General Fund				310,779
Housing Opportunity Fund	3,000	3,000		
Loan Repayment-Novato Financing Auth	14,200	51,887	14,200	14,200
TOTAL FINANCING AVAILABLE	732,091	892,727	914,042	1,393,405
Expenditures:				
Downtown RDA	0	0	440	77,573
Hamilton RDA	0	0	1,757	38,999
Loan to Hamilton Redevelopment	100,000	100,000	100,000	93,278
Vintage Oaks	117,266	329,690	137,983	42,590
Housing & Services	0	0	3,943	23,666
Mobile Home Rent Control		4,558	21,835	30,120
Other	16,749	340	0	0
Transfer out - Redevelopment Agency	100,000	0	0	0
Total Expenditures & Transfers Out	334,015	434,588	265,958	306,226
Fund Balance - End Fiscal Year	398,076	458,139	648,084	1,087,179

APPENDIX C

SAN RAFAEL REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY					
HOUSING SET ASIDE PROJECT AND PROGRAM EXPENDITURES					
	FY96/97	FY97/98	FY98/99	FY99/00	FY00/01
Marin Housing Renter Rebate	\$ 21,300	\$ 21,800	\$ 21,800	\$ 21,800	\$ 21,800
Marin Mediation Service	\$ -	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000
Ritter House	\$ 28,531	\$ 35,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
MCIL Rehab Grant	\$ -	\$ 12,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
162-172 Belvedere					\$ 750,040
55 Fairfax					\$ 20,000
Lone Palm	\$ -	\$ 168,264	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
190 Mills Street-HB		\$ 28,531			
Carmel Hotel Rehab Grant-HB	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 142,000	\$ 23,600	\$ -
1111 Fourth Street-HB	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 173,571
Gordon's Opera House	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 340,000	\$ -
Christmas in April	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000
Bucklew - 7 Mariposa	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -
161 Novato-CCA	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85,000
165 Novato-CCA	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000
Mediation Rental Complaints	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Downpament Assistance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Program Administration	\$ 114,210	\$ 110,370	\$ 101,392	\$ 139,320	\$ 187,287
PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS TOTAL	\$ 164,041	\$ 499,965	\$ 311,192	\$ 632,720	\$ 1,415,698

APPENDIX D

MARIN COUNTY HOUSING SET-ASIDE FUNDS - PAID

MARIN COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
 SUMMARY OF DISBURSEMENTS
 FROM THE LOW & MODERATE HOUSING FUND
 20% HOUSING SET-ASIDE OF TAX INCREMENT

<u>Date</u>	<u>Uses</u>	<u>Paid</u>
8/17/9	Marin City Affordable Homes, Inc., for Braun	\$38,800.00
8/17/9	Marin City Affordable Homes, Inc., for Braun	31,400.00
9/20/9	Fidelity Nat'l. Title for Marin City Apartments	72,316.69
12/29/	Fidelity Nat'l. Title for Marin City Apartments	14,350.31
2/24/9	Marin City Affordable Homes, Inc., for Braun	22,800.00
12/19/	Fidelity Nat'l. Title for Gateway Apartment	76,689.88
1/13/9	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	69,623.00
7/7/98	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	63,347.00
12/23/	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	108,757.00
7/22/9	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	97,372.00
1/13/0	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	108,358.00
7/10/0	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	92,715.00
1/9/01	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	115,495.00
7/13/0	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	96,934.00
1/11/0	Gateway Apartment Partners for Marin City	133,445.00
	Total Disbursed to Date	\$1,142,402.88

DISBURSEMENT OF 20% HOUSING SET ASIDE:

Low & Moderate Housing Fund, including Interest	
Braun Court, Marin City -1993, 1994, 1997	\$93,000.00
Marin City Apartments -1995, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 to Gateway Apartment Partners	1,049,402.88

Total **\$1,142,402.88**

Source: Marin County Housing Set Aside Ledger