Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>1601-1607 Oxford Street, 2200-2210 Cedar Street APN 058-2183-001 and Lot 24 portion of APN 058-2183-002-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Zoning</td>
<td>R3 – Multiple-family residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Multiple-family residential; Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Multiple-family residential (92% affordable); Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>.32 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed Units</td>
<td>37 (115.6 DU/acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td>21 (.57 spaces/unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Owner</td>
<td>All Souls Episcopal Parish (ASEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Owner &amp; Developer Relationship</td>
<td>ASEP &amp; SAHA have entered into a Joint Development Agreement (executed May 2017) pursuant to which SAHA intends to develop the site into affordable rental housing, and ASEP, current site owner, commits to donating the land via a long term lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>HKIT Architects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA) specializes in building and managing affordable rental housing for a diverse group of individuals – families, seniors, and individuals with special needs. Founded in 1966, SAHA currently manages over 2,500 units across 60+ properties located in 19 cities throughout the Bay Area. As a Berkeley-based nonprofit affordable housing developer with decades of local experience, SAHA respects the unique qualities and characteristics of the Berkeley community, and has a proven track record of providing and maintaining high quality affordable housing stock.

1601 Oxford Street presents a unique opportunity to build affordable senior housing in a desirable North Berkeley neighborhood by leveraging a valuable land donation from All Souls Episcopal Parish (ASEP), the adjacent church with whom SAHA is partnering. ASEP recognizes the opportunity to transform underutilized land in a highly desirable location to address the housing affordability crisis they see in their community. This partnership provides opportunities to both expand the supply of affordable housing within the City of Berkeley and serve as an example for other institutional landowners considering the development of affordable housing.

Community Engagement and Design Process

SAHA has worked closely with All Souls Episcopal Parish and a variety of neighborhood stakeholders to create a
site plan and design that meet the needs of the proposed development’s immediate neighbors, future residents and other local stakeholders. SAHA has engaged the community with mailing updates and convening two community-wide meetings jointly hosted with ASEP. In July 2017, SAHA and ASEP held an initial community open house for the project, inviting nearby renters, owners, and other stakeholders to review an early design and site plan. Over the next few months, SAHA and ASEP consulted with interested neighbors to hear more feedback and answer questions about the development while working with HKIT Architects to refine design. Finally, in November 2017, SAHA held a second community open house to present the revised development proposal to the broader community.

Neighbor and local stakeholder feedback garnered through these open houses and small working group meetings has been critical to shaping this project. SAHA and ASEP were excited to hear from many who attended both Community Meetings reported that the revised design, presented in November 2017, was much preferred over the previous version, especially with regard to the Oxford Street elevation. In addition to meeting with local community members, SAHA has shared proposed design and site plan iterations with the City of Berkeley Council and staff on multiple occasions, both meeting in person as well as discussing options electronically.

While this project is not subject to formal design review, SAHA solicited additional feedback from the Design Review planning staff. While their suggestion of increasing setbacks or stepping down larger portions of the upper levels would compromise project feasibility, we have further developed the color and material treatment of the façade in an effort to reduce the scale and mass of the project, as described in more detail below. Color, material, and landscaping treatments are in progress and the design team will continue to refine these in an effort to address the design objective of reducing the building scale and mass.

**Proposed Development Summary**

1601 Oxford Street will provide 37 housing units. Thirty-four (34) of the units will be studios restricted to residents with incomes at or below 60% of area median income, and one (1) unit will be a non-income restricted manager’s unit. Two three-bedroom units will be residential units for ASEP staff. In addition to living space, amenities at the property will include a community room, courtyard, upper floor outdoor terraces, indoor bicycle storage, community vegetable garden, and shared laundry equipment. ASEP will also utilize approximately 1433 square feet on the second story for church administration. The property will be managed by a team of SAHA staff members who will provide management, maintenance and resident service coordination.

**Building & Lot Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area/Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (.32 acres)</td>
<td>14,168 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Area</td>
<td>6,315 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Unit Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Studios</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>353 sq. ft. (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Two Bedroom Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>695 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Three Bedroom Units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1417 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Proposed Development Design Features

- **Single five-story structure**
  - Careful attention was paid to how the height might impact neighbors on all sides of the property
  - Lowest basement story is partially excavated into the slope of the hill to minimize building height
  - Setbacks were maximized along the Oxford Street frontage, where the total building height is the greatest due to the site’s slope, to soften the structure’s interfacing with the Oxford & Cedar intersection and the abutting neighbor property to the south of the development site. The corner terrace sets the upper story back, and four upper floors are setback along the southern edge of the Oxford frontage. There is an additional terrace on the southern edge of the Oxford wing in an attempt to soften the building’s massing from the southern neighbors’ rear yards.
  - The upper story façade treatment uses a lighter color, a corner terrace, and a discontinuation of the bay windows to soften that story.

- **Compatible architectural style**
  - Style incorporates traditional 45-degree bay windows that both reference Bay Area architectural elements and maximize sunlight and Bay views on the Oxford façade
  - While specific colors have not yet been identified, the proposed color treatment aims to create a heavier building base, a medium body, and an even lighter capital to provide a sense of balance, reduce vertical emphasis, and soften the building’s massing
  - Horizontal elements (such as the repetition of the Bay windows on Oxford, repetition of recessed windows on Cedar, and the belt courses that wraps around the corner) further de-emphasize the building height
  - Paneling of the bay windows serves to provide a texture that breaks up and softens the Oxford façade

- **Corner Entrance**
  - The corner entrance activates the intersection with pedestrian activity
  - Oxford façade treatment wraps around the corner structure to reduce emphasis at that location (and contributing to an overall lower building profile) per input from community meetings

- **Visual separation of building to break up building mass**
  - The building is visually separated into two sections:
    - Smaller Cedar Street “wing” contains the building’s community room and ASEP uses, and features recessed windows that reference the concrete blocks of the adjacent church structure to the east
    - Larger affordable housing “wing” along Oxford Street features 45-degree bay windows to emphasize the horizontal nature of the building and maximize Bay views and natural light
for residents; the façade treatment wraps around the corner to reduce the emphasis of the structure at the Oxford and Cedar corner, an element that was important to many neighbors.

- **Driveway and Parking Design**
  - The site is designed with a single garage entrance and exit on Oxford Street
  - Driveway and garage includes two lanes to reduce potential for traffic build-up
  - Excavation of garage into the hill minimizes parking visibility and maximizes ability to create off-street parking, a common neighbor concern

- **Courtyard Design Tailored to Varied Resident Activities**
  - Courtyard includes a variety of features including open space and outdoor seating for both passive and active resident activities where residents may engage and connect with community
  - A paved labyrinth meditation design breaks up the courtyard floor such that it can be passively observed or actively used to foster engagement with and between residents
  - Raised garden beds at the courtyard’s southern edge maximize sun expose and will foster community through gardening and increase resident access to fresh produce
  - Courtyard is tucked inside of the L-shaped building to provide community members protection for the busy intersection at Oxford and Cedar

- **Street trees and Landscaping**
  - Street trees will line the Cedar side of the proposed development to soften the height of the structure, in addition to planters and street trees on the building side of the public right-of-way
  - Landscaping on the upper floor terrace softens the building’s corner elements
  - Streamlined building footprint to maximize openness of interior courtyard, per feedback from neighbors
  - Extensive design development occurred to allow the southern setback to be exclusively a landscaping strip, rather than an exit ramp, per the adjacent neighbor’s request to maximize greenery

**Requested Development Incentives – California Code Chapter 4.3 Density Bonuses and Other Incentives [Section 65915 – 65918]**

- **Open Space**
  - The project proposes 5,293 square feet of open space instead of the required 7,400 square feet, and includes the space on grade, courtyard on podium, and 4th floor terraces
  - Given that 92% of the units are studios for seniors and will be restricted to a maximum of two occupants, we are confident the proposed open space will be sufficient
  - The project includes an additional 1,162 square feet of interior community space, including a first floor community room and the fourth floor lounge

- **Setback**
  - The proposed design includes a setback exception of 6’-12’ along the Cedar side of the property (where 10’ is required) and 10’ along rear yard (where 15’ is required)
o The rear setback exception occurs only underground and is driven by the need to accommodate sufficient underground parking space. At grade (the courtyard level) the rear setback meets the required 15’.

o The proposed Cedar setback is between one and seven feet greater than the setback of existing conditions

• Height

o The average proposed building height of 5 stories (including one basement story partially excavated into Cedar Street’s slope) ranges between 45’4” to 51’2” instead of the required 35’

o Height is comparable to other multi-family buildings on Oxford (including the apartment building directly north, which has a similar elevation)

o Building height is highest along Oxford Street, where the grade elevation is lowest and the height is mitigated by dropping the corner and providing a terrace.

o The increased height provides additional affordable housing units, allowing the building to be financially feasible (see application Section 4.D, Request for Incentives or Concessions)

General Plan Alignment

The proposed project aligns with the following General Plan policies:

• Policy H-1: Extremely Low, Very Low, Low and Moderate Income Housing

  o Allow increases in density to promote production of below market rate housing in consistency with the State Housing Density Bonus law

  o City seeks to use programs such as the Housing Trust Fund to provide housing to people with low and extremely low incomes

• Policy H-12: Transit Oriented New Construction

  o City seeks to encourage the construction of medium and high-density housing along transit corridors and in proximity to BART stations

• Policy H-17: Housing for Seniors

  o City seeks to support housing programs that increase seniors ability to stay in their neighborhoods and to provide funding for a range of senior housing and service types

• Policy H-26: Affordable Accessible Housing

  o City seeks to expand the supply of accessible, permanently affordable housing units, particularly to those with extremely low-income

• Policy H-28 Regional Housing Needs

  o City seeks to encourage housing production to meet local and regional housing needs

• Policy H-32 Public Participation

  o City seeks to encourage support of affordable housing and attain common goals by increasing awareness of the need of affordable housing

• Policy H-34 Mitigate Governmental Constraints

  o City seeks to regularly evaluate regulations and ordinances to identify and reduce unnecessary impediments to housing development, and particularly affordable housing projects
Housing Element Alignment

- **Increasing Housing Opportunities for Seniors**
  - As seniors age, incomes generally decrease and housing burdens increase, emphasizing the need for affordable housing for this age group.
  - Berkeley’s “Baby boomer” age group increased significantly between 2000-2010, making age-restricted housing stock a key component to housing the city’s growing senior population.
  - 34.6% of all senior-headed households in Berkeley earned less than 50% of area median income in 2012.

- **Energy Efficiency**
  - Berkeley aims to promote energy/water efficient and sustainable building methods and to locate projects near transit hubs and along major transportation corridors.
    - Sustainability features included at this time include a solar-ready roof, passive onsite storm water management, drought tolerant native planting and water-conserving irrigations systems, high efficiency mechanical equipment, low-flow faucets and toilets, and Energy Star appliances in all units and common areas.
    - Location near transit – four Alameda County transit lines with headways of 30 minutes or less during peak travel times are within 1/3 mile of the site. Downtown Berkeley BART is less than 1 mile away.
    - The development will have ample long-term bicycle parking to promote active transport.
    - Building materials will be low VOC and formaldehyde-free where possible, and recycled and locally-sourced materials will be used.
Density Bonus Eligibility Statement
1601 Oxford Street
Berkeley, CA 94709

Requested Development Incentives –
California Code Chapter 4.3: Density Bonuses and Other Incentives [Section 65915]

Eligibility Statement
While the project does not seek to achieve a density higher than allowable per Berkeley code, the project does request three incentives/concessions to be financially viable. 1601 Oxford Street will include 34 affordable units (92% of total units.) The project is thereby eligible for three incentives or concessions according to Section 65915. The schematic plans submitted with this application include a “III.B.2a BASE PROJECT PLAN” that demonstrates only 16 total units could be constructed in the absence of these concessions. 1601 Oxford Street is an affordable housing project that does not produce a rate of return for the applicant as with market rate developments, but the enclosed pro formas demonstrate the financial infeasibility of the scenarios in which these concessions are not possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Affordability Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.75%</td>
<td>Very Low-income (≤50% AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.14%</td>
<td>Low-income (≤60% AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Open Space**
  - The project proposes 5,957 square feet of open space instead of the required 7,400 square feet, and includes the space on grade, courtyard on podium, and 4th floor terraces.
  - Given that 92% of the units are studios for seniors and will be restricted to a maximum of two occupants, we are confident the proposed open space will be sufficient.
  - The project includes an additional 1,162 of interior community space, including a first floor community room and the fourth floor lounge.

- **Setback**
  - The proposed design includes a setback exception of 6’-12’ along the Cedar side of the property (where 10’ is required) and 10’ along rear yard (where 15’ is required).
  - The rear setback exception occurs only underground and is driven by the need to accommodate sufficient underground parking space. At grade (the courtyard level) the rear setback meets the required 15’.
  - The proposed Cedar setback is between one and seven feet greater than the setback of existing conditions.

- **Height**
The average proposed building height of 5 stories (including one basement story partially excavated into Cedar Street’s slope) ranges between 45’4” to 51’2” instead of the required 35’.

Height is comparable to other multi-family buildings on Oxford (including the apartment building directly north, which has a similar elevation).

Building height is highest along Oxford Street, where the grade elevation is lowest and the height is mitigated by dropping the corner and providing a terrace.

The increased height provides additional affordable housing units, allowing the building to be financially feasible (see application Section 4.D, Request for Incentives or Concessions).
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 19, 2018

To: Ms. Layal Nawfal
   Associate Planner, City of Berkeley Planning & Development
   1947 Center Street, 2nd Floor
   Berkeley, CA 94704
   Tel: 510.981.7424
   Email: Lnawfal@CityofBerkeley.info

Re: Proposed All Souls Church Project

Dear Layal,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with my wife and I to discuss the proposed All Souls Church Project.

Introduction
This project can be characterized by different people in different ways. The obvious is addressing the housing benefit that may accrue to seniors with limited resources in our neighborhood. This is what the church would have people believe is the motive behind the proposal. However, investigation just below the surface of this façade would lead to a different conclusion as described below.

Background
The building that is proposed to be demolished was owned by a group of monks who did not burden the neighborhood in any manner. They were quiet people who went about their business in a non-obvious manner. They did not create traffic, congestion, parking or other problems for the neighborhood. They were, in simple words, good neighbors. It appears that for reasons not completely clear to us they decided to sell the building to the neighboring All Souls Church for a song.

The church, upon its purchase of the monks’ abode, did nothing to improve the condition of the building in any noticeable way. It appears that the church must have embarked on a plan to monetize its purchase with an obvious scheme from the very beginning. The scheme includes the following:
   (1) Doing nothing to improve the structure or appearance of the building
   (2) Provide people with living accommodations in the building on a selected basis
   (3) Collect rent or other in-kind consideration from the individuals who were housed in the building
(4) Continued to enjoy tax-free status
(5) Devise a scheme that would appeal to many—propose apparent senior housing for people who don’t make much money but retain a considerable portion of the proposed building for the church leaders’ own personal use without paying for any significant construction, and continue to enjoy tax beneficial status.

This church has had some experience in this regard. Currently they obtain benefits from a school that is operated on a portion of the church premises. The school generates revenue for the church. The obvious question is whether they paid taxes on any of the proceeds attributable to the school. We understand the school was started with the minimum of traditional requirements or answers to questions such as the following:

1. What environmental impact documentation was generated as part of the approval process if in fact there was one? Can we have that documentation?
2. What traffic considerations were looked into and what were the results? Can we have that documentation?
3. What congestion considerations were looked into? Can we have that documentation?
4. What safety if any considerations were investigated? Can we have that documentation?
5. What parking considerations were looked into? Can we have that documentation?
6. What if any precautions were undertaken to minimize accidents both in picking up and dropping off students and what precautions were planned to protect the children from traffic on both abutting busy streets? Can we have that documentation?
7. What taxes of any have been paid on the property (both income and other)?
8. What if any determination was made as to whether the children reside in this district or would come from other parts of Berkeley and beyond? Can we have that documentation?
9. Was any consideration given to the burden if any imposed on the local nearby residents? Can we have that documentation?

We believe that your investigation will reveal that the answers to these questions are inadequate at best and should allow you to focus on the project at hand.

The Proposed New Project
We are concerned that there are no adequate safeguards or answers to the following questions: Why does the building need to be higher than the existing structure and thereby obstruct the view of the church’s neighbors? Is this yet another burden the church would like to impose on its neighbors? Will the church pay property taxes and other taxes on the portion of the structure that will be provided to the church? What will the tax rate be and what is the proposed valuation of the church portion of the property? What environmental impact studies will be required in furtherance of approval? Who will do it and who will be responsible for their approval or rejection? We would want to know
the names and departments of the individuals involved so we can approach them with our concerns. We realize the ultimate approval may be with the mayor and city council. What traffic studies will be required? What parameters will need to be studied? Who will be responsible for this? Is this an independent study, or part of a broader requirement? Who will determine whether there is adequate parking being set aside for the entirety of the proposed project the church included? What if anything will be done to determine the number of cars that will need parking? Why does the proposed structure not address this issue in any meaningful way? Any arbitrary set aside like one car per X units is not appropriate and we would expect to challenge any such finding.

**The Zoning Adjustment Board**

When would you expect this project to be before the zoning adjustment board? Will this project be considered along with the permit for the school to operate in the church premises? We understand that there are more children who attend the school then the permit allows. We also understand that the proposed project will impact the basis for obtaining the permit in the first place. How can we best provide the City of Berkeley with necessary information regarding both the school and the proposed project?

**Traffic**

What consideration if any has been given to the increased traffic on already congested Cedar and other streets by the addition of the proposed residence to the new project? What consideration has been given to traffic during the proposed building? How many 18-wheelers per hour and day are going to be permitted to come up and down on these narrow Berkeley streets, and for how long? Will they be allowed on weekends and holidays? Will they start early in the morning and continue through late at night? Are any streets proposed to be blocked during construction?

**Occupancy**

Who will determine whether an individual or individuals will qualify for occupancy? We are aware of the SAHA guidelines, but who will actually make sure that these guidelines will be implemented? What consideration, if any, has been given to a limit of occupancy per unit? How many people and for how long? Have the traffic and parking concerns been considered with respect to the occupants' guests? Where will those cars be parked? On our streets in our neighborhood? How will rent increases for the occupants be determined? How much profit will SAHA be permitted to make?

**Additional Concerns**

What considerations have been given to the dust that will result from the proposed building construction? Will the church be required to be responsible for any cleanup of neighborhood homes? What consideration, if any, has been given to any drug use or sale by either the occupants or the occupants guests? Has any consideration been given to possible crime in the neighborhood committed by guests of the occupants?

**Conclusion**

As you can see, this project for purported low-income housing raises many concerns. The neighbors of this project have enjoyed the peace, serenity, and good property values of
the neighborhood. They wish to preserve the same with as much accommodation as reasonable. Many of us support and continue to support our churches. We are very pleased with the overall activities of our numerous churches and religious institution that are located in our community. However, we must recognize and be prepared to question certain churches and religious institutions that have enjoyed tax-free status for decades and now seek to monetize those properties to the detriment of their neighbors.

Please copy me on any documentation that is generated in connection with this project. I am happy to meet with any of the individuals who will be part of the approval process of this project. Please provide me with access to as much of the project information as permissible by law. I truly hope we can reach an acceptable accommodation. Please forward this letter to all individuals and departments involved in the approval process. Please also provide me with the names and addresses of the decision makers of this project. I look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

K.F.T. Cherian
1601 OXFORD STREET
BERKELEY, CA 94709
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ZONING NOTES

Berkeley Zoning Requirements
Project Address: 1601 Oxford, Berkeley, CA 94709
Project Legal Address: ---
Project Description: 37 units of affordable family housing with associated parking and common spaces
Zoning: R3
Easements: None
Site Area: 14,083 sf

BUILDING DEPARTMENT NOTES

Demolition: Existing three story building to be demolished
Existing trees to be removed

Construction Types: 4 stories Type V-A over one story basement Type IA

Number of Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Allowable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type IA (S-2, R-2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type VA (R-2, B, A-Y)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type IA (S-2, R-2)</td>
<td>26,043 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IA (A-Y)</td>
<td>11,229 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>37,842 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Construction

2 hour rated stair and elevator enclosures

All construction to conform to OSCE table 601, Fire Resistance Rating Requirements

DATA BY FLOOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Gross Area</th>
<th>Unfinished</th>
<th>Occupancy Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>9843 sf</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>84 parking/1800 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor</td>
<td>6315 sf</td>
<td>8 studios</td>
<td>R2A-R2 church offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor</td>
<td>6739 sf</td>
<td>10 studios</td>
<td>R2-BI church offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Floor</td>
<td>6644 sf</td>
<td>10 studios</td>
<td>1-3BR R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Floor</td>
<td>6344 sf</td>
<td>6-8-12 BR-1-3BR</td>
<td>R3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

37,842 sf
37 total units
18 parking
34 studios

VICTINITY MAP

APPLICABLE CODES & STANDARDS

2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
2016 MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING CODES
2016 FAS CODE
2010 AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT ACCESSIBILITY GUIDELINES
TITLE 24 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
TITLE 24 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS 2016 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE
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