



Main Office

818 West Seventh Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800
f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers

President
Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

First Vice President
Greg Pettis, Cathedral City

Second Vice President
Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura

Immediate Past President
Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

**Executive/Administration
Committee Chair**

Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

Policy Committee Chairs

Community, Economic and
Human Development
Paula Lantz, Pomona

Energy & Environment
Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro

Transportation
Keith Millhouse, Ventura County
Transportation Commission

**No. 16
MEETING OF THE**

**REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS
ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE**

***Friday, August 24, 2012
9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.***

**SCAG Office
818 W. 7th Street, 12th Floor
Board Room
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 236-1800**

Videoconference Sites

**Imperial County Regional Office
1405 North Imperial Avenue, Suite 1
El Centro, CA 92243**

**Orange County Regional Office
600 S. Main Street, Suite 912
Orange, CA 92863**

Due to the limited size of the meeting room, participants are encouraged to reserve a seat in advance of the meeting. In the event the meeting room fills to capacity, participants may attend the meeting at the main location or any of the other video-conference locations.

**City of Palmdale
38250 Sierra Highway
Palmdale, CA 93550**

**Riverside County Regional Office
3403 10th Street, Suite 805
Riverside, CA 92501**

**San Bernardino County Regional Office
1170 W. 3rd Street, Suite 140
San Bernardino, CA 92410**

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of
GOVERNMENTS**

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street

12th Floor

Los Angeles, California

90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers

President

Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

First Vice President

Greg Pettis, Cathedral City

Second Vice President

Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura

Immediate Past President

Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

**Executive/Administration
Committee Chair**

Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

Policy Committee Chairs

Community, Economic and
Human Development
Paula Lantz, Pomona

Energy & Environment
Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro

Transportation
Keith Millhouse, Ventura County
Transportation Commission

Ventura County Regional Office
950 County Square Drive, Suite 101
Ventura, CA 93003

Coachella Valley Association of Governments
73-710 Fred Waring Drive, Suite #200
Palm Desert, CA 92260

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Ma'Ayn Johnson at (213) 236-1975 or via email johnson@scag.ca.gov

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. SCAG is also committed to helping people with limited proficiency in the English language access the agency's essential public information and services. You can request such assistance by calling (213) 236-1993. We require at least 72 hours (three days) notice to provide reasonable accommodations. We prefer more notice if possible. We will make every effort to arrange for assistance as soon as possible.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee Member List

San Bernardino County: Hon. Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake, District 11 (Alternate): **Chair**
Hon. Ginger Coleman, Apple Valley, District 65 (Primary)

Los Angeles County: Hon. Margaret Finlay, Duarte, District 35 (Primary)
Hon. Steven Hofbauer, Palmdale, District 43 (Alternate)

Orange County: Hon. Sukhee Kang, Irvine, District 14 (Primary)
Hon. Ron Garcia, Brea, OCCOG (Alternate)

Riverside County: Hon. Darcy Kuenzi, Menifee, WRCOG (Primary)
Hon. Randon Lane, Murrieta, WRCOG (Alternate)

Ventura County: Hon. Bryan MacDonald, Oxnard, District 45 (Primary)
Hon. Carl Morehouse, Ventura, District 47 (Alternate)

Imperial County: Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, District 1 (Primary)
Hon. Jack Terrazas, Imperial County (Alternate)

**REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE
AGENDA
AUGUST 24, 2012**

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee can consider and act upon any of the items listed on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as information or action items.

CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(Hon. Bill Jahn, Chair)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee, must fill out and present a speaker’s card to the Assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes. The Chair may limit the total time for all comments.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

CONSENT CALENDAR

Time Page No.

Approval Item

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. <u>Minutes of the July 12, 2012 Appeals Board meeting</u> | Attachment | 1 |
| 2. <u>Minutes of the July 13, 2012 Appeals Board meeting</u> | Attachment | 7 |
| 3. <u>Minutes of the July 24, 2012 Appeals Board meeting</u> | Attachment | 11 |
| 4. <u>RHNA Subcommittee Topic Outlook</u> | Attachment | 13 |

INFORMATION ITEMS

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------|-----------|
| 5. <u>California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)’s Clarification Regarding Housing Element Planning and RHNA Projection Periods, and Eligibility of Jurisdictions to Take RHNA Credit</u>
<i>(Huasha Liu, Director of Land Use & Environmental Planning)</i> | Attachment | 10 min. | 17 |
|---|-------------------|----------------|-----------|

ACTION ITEMS

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------|-----------|
| 6. <u>Proposed Final 5th cycle RHNA Allocation Plan</u>
<i>(Huasha Liu, Director of Land Use & Environmental Planning)</i> | Attachment | 20 min. | 23 |
|---|-------------------|----------------|-----------|

Recommended Action: Review and recommend that the Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee recommend that the Regional Council adopt the Final RHNA Allocation Plan as part of a public hearing to take place on October 4, 2012.

CHAIR’S REPORT

**REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE
AGENDA
AUGUST 24, 2012**

STAFF REPORT

(Ma'Ayn Johnson, SCAG Staff)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee will be determined at the August 24 meeting.

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING NO. 13
JULY 12, 2012**

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD. AN AUDIO RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN THE OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNCIL SUPPORT.

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment Appeals Board of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its meeting at the SCAG office in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by the Hon. Bill Jahn. There was a quorum.

Present

Representing Los Angeles County

Hon. Margaret Finlay, Duarte, District 35 (Primary)

Hon. Steve Hofbauer, Palmdale, District 43 (Alternate)

Representing Orange County

Hon. Sukhee Kang, Irvine, District 14 (Primary)

Hon. Ron Garcia, Brea, OCCOG (Alternate)

Representing Riverside County

Hon. Darcy Kuenzi, Menifee, WRCOG (Primary)

Representing San Bernardino County

Hon. Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake, District 11 (Alternate): **Chair**

Hon. Ginger Coleman, Town of Apple Valley, District 65 (Primary)

Representing Ventura County

Hon. Bryan MacDonald, Oxnard, District 45 (Primary)

Representing Imperial County

Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, District 1 (Primary)

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Hon. Bill Jahn, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bill Gayk, Consultant, County of Riverside Planning Department, stated that the County of Riverside wanted to commend SCAG staff for their long and arduous effort in developing an integrated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The fact that only twelve out of the nearly two hundred jurisdictions in the SCAG region have filed appeals speaks to the efficiency of this process. The County of Riverside encourages the RHNA Appeals Board to support and approve staff recommendations.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

Staff reported that today's agenda has been amended, reflecting that the cities of San Dimas and Pico Rivera have agreed to switch their order. San Dimas will now be Item 4.4 and Pico Rivera will be Item 4.6.

CONSENT CALENDAR

A motion was made (Finlay) to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion was seconded (Viegas-Walker) and unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

Hon. Bill Jahn, Chair, stated that jurisdictions will each have up to 20 minutes to present their appeal. After the appeal presentation, SCAG staff may offer clarifications on the item. The Board members may ask questions of SCAG staff or the jurisdiction, discuss, and make a determination. Chair Jahn also stated that appeal determinations made by the Board will be a final decision on the appeal.

Staff received a public comment from the County of Ventura with regard to amending the April 19, 2012 minutes. Staff also received some comments as to why the RHNA Appeals Board is the same Board that heard the revision requests. Hon. Bill Jahn asked staff to address both these items.

Ms. Joann Africa, SCAG Chief Legal Counsel, read the request by the County of Ventura to amend the April 19, 2012 minutes proposed by the County and read the new language for the record. Ms. Africa stated that staff had reviewed it and believes it is a reasonable request and is consistent with the proceedings that occurred that day. Ms. Africa added that staff recommended one modification to the language.

In regards to the reason SCAG has the same hearing body to hear both the revision requests as well as appeals, Huasha Liu, SCAG, Director of Land Use & Environmental Planning, explained that there were three reasons: 1) it is consistent with the past practice since SCAG has not had separate bodies for the revision request and appeals hearing in the past; 2) the charter the Regional Council approved for the RHNA Subcommittee is to have one primary and alternate member from each county. The RHNA Subcommittee is the fundamental body to form the Appeals Board, and will be the same body to hear the revision requests as well as the appeals; and 3) both the revision requests and appeals are

part of the RHNA process. Thus, this body will hear all the appeals to ensure consistency and continuity.

4.1 Appeal from the City of Calabasas

Maureen Tamuri, Community Development Director, City of Calabasas, stated that Calabasas was asking for a reduction of 146 units because current construction on two sites is intended as growth toward the future cycle.

Mr. Tom Bartlett, Planner, City of Calabasas, stated that City's key arguments include a lack of data verification by SCAG that resulted in the disproportionate share being attributed to Calabasas. Furthermore, there were severe economic hardships that were uniquely faced by Calabasas due to the prolonged recession that were not adequately factored in by SCAG. Additionally, Mr. Bartlett added that the Appeals Board could grant Calabasas its request by accomplishing it within the remaining cushion.

Hon Bill Jahn noted that the "cushion" Mr. Bartlett was referring to was only available to the RHNA Appeals Board in the revision process, and is no longer available as part of the appeals process. Under the Guidelines adopted by the Regional Council, the cushion no longer exists.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Garcia) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request from the City of Calabasas. The motion was seconded (MacDonald) and approved by a 4 (yes) to 2 (no) vote (with Los Angeles and Imperial Counties voting in opposition to the motion).

4.2 Appeal from the City of Long Beach – Item postponed to later in the hearing

4.3 Appeal from the City of Norwalk

Mr. Bing Hyun, Planning Manager, City of Norwalk, stated that Norwalk's appeal is based on the lack of financial resources to accommodate the housing needs. Norwalk is aware that this limitation is something that every city has, and Norwalk would like staff to acknowledge the City's particular conditions. The City is providing affordable housing, but is doing it within existing housing stock due to small lot sizes and lack of vacant land.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Kuenzi) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request from the City of Norwalk. The motion was seconded (Coleman) and unanimously approved.

4.4 City of San Dimas

Ms. Africa, SCAG Chief Counsel, read an e-mail dated July 12, 2012 from Ann Garcia, City of San Dimas to Ma'Ayn Johnson of SCAG, noting that representatives from the City of San Dimas would be unable to attend today's hearing and requested that the e-mail statement be read into the record at the appeal hearing. The statement outlined the

City's reasons for its appeal. The letter stated that prior growth estimates from SCAG were unrealistically high and that the City had negative growth from 2000 to 2010.

Ms. Liu stated that for all jurisdictions, including the City of San Dimas, SCAG staff used the most recent data and projections.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Kuenzi) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request for the City of San Dimas. The motion was seconded (Finlay) and unanimously approved.

4.6 City of Pico Rivera

Julia Gonzalez, Deputy Director of Planning, City of Pico Rivera, stated that the City did not have any additional comments to its appeal besides what it stated in its written application. Ms. Gonzalez reiterated the City's position that due to a population decrease and high foreclosure rate, the City cannot comprehend why it was assigned an allocation of 850 units.

Chair Jahn asked staff if they had any comments. Ms. Liu responded no further comment other than what is stated in the staff report.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Coleman) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request for the City of Pico Rivera. The motion was seconded (Kuenzi) and unanimously approved.

4.5 Appeal from the City of Sierra Madre

Ms. Mary Ann MacGillivray, representing the City of Sierra Madre, stated that she was accompanied by Sierra Madre's Councilman John Cappoccia, City Manager Lane Aguilar, Development Services Director Danny Castro, and Public Works Director Bruce Zimmerman.

Ms. MacGillivray stated that the current RHNA allocation given to Sierra Madre is partially unfair because it does not take into consideration factors that are unique to Sierra Madre. Ms. MacGillivray described three factors, water supply constraints, job-housing balance, and land use constraints that were particular to the City. Ms. Liu responded that, based on information submitted by the City, no decision was made by the water supplier board indicating that the supplier would not be able to sustain any future growth. Without evidence of such, staff cannot make a recommendation for a reduction to the City's allocation.

Ms. Liu stated that out of the three factors the City pointed out, she wanted to respond to the most crucial one, the water supply issue. Staff spent a lot of time reviewing the letter from the Sierra Madre's water supplier and did observe some statements about the potential decline in water supply. However, there is no decision made by the water supplier board indicating the supplier would not be able to sustain any future growth. If there is no evidence regarding that, staff cannot make recommendation otherwise.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Kuenzi) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request for the City of Sierra Madre. The motion was seconded (Coleman) and approved by a 5 (yes) to 1 (no) vote (with Los Angeles County voting in opposition to the motion).

4.7 City of Dana Point

Christy Teague, Economic Development Manager, City of Dana Point, stated that the City had few vacant parcels, which are limited in size. Additionally, due to the economic downturn, development activity has decreased. Ms. Teague explained that the City's prior RHNA allocation was more realistic and the current RHNA allocation for the City is much larger than it is for other surrounding cities.

Ms. Liu responded that, as City of Dana Point pointed out, the City staff had been working with the Center for Demographic Research (CDR) in Fullerton based on an MOU agreement between SCAG and Orange County. Dana Point staff and CDR staff have met at least three times and went over the gross numbers for Dana Point. It is SCAG staff's understanding that the City's concerns had been addressed during the two-year process within Orange County.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Coleman) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request for the City of Dana Point. The motion was seconded (MacDonald) and approved by a 4 (yes) to 2 (no) vote (with Imperial and Orange Counties voting in opposition to the motion).

4.2 City of Long Beach

Mr. Steve Gerhardt, Senior Planner, City of Long Beach, stated that although the SCAG staff report indicates that the City's jobs-housing balance will moderately improve over the 5th RHNA cycle, the City wants to get to a point where its jobs housing balance is in line with its subregion, the County, and the region.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (MacDonald) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request for the City of Long Beach. The motion was seconded (Coleman) and unanimously approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT

None

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Africa stated that at the conclusion of the RHNA Appeals Board hearings Pat Chen, Special Counsel for the RHNA Appeals Board for these proceedings, would prepare written reports for the decisions for each of the appeals heard. An additional Appeals Board meeting would be needed to review and ratify the written reports of the appeals decisions. The RHNA Appeals Board decided that this meeting be scheduled for July 24, 2012 at 1:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Bill Jahn adjourned the meeting at 2:04 p.m. The next meeting of the RHNA Appeals Board is scheduled for July 13, 2012, 9:00 a.m., at the SCAG office.



Huasha Liu
Director, Land Use and
Environmental Planning

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING NO. 14
JULY 13, 2012**

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD. AN AUDIO RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN THE OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNCIL SUPPORT.

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment Appeals Board of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its meeting at the SCAG office in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by the Hon. Bill Jahn. There was a quorum.

Present

Representing Los Angeles County

Hon. Margaret Finlay, Duarte, District 35 (Primary)

Hon. Steve Hofbauer, Palmdale, District 43 (Alternate)

Representing Orange County

Hon. Sukhee Kang, Irvine, District 14 (Primary)

Hon. Ron Garcia, Brea, OCCOG (Alternate)

Representing Riverside County

Hon. Darcy Kuenzi, Menifee, WRCOG (Primary)

Representing San Bernardino County

Hon. Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake, District 11 (Alternate): **Chair**

Hon. Ginger Coleman, Town of Apple Valley, District 65 (Primary)

Representing Ventura County

Hon. Carl Morehouse, Ventura, District 47 (Alternate)

Representing Imperial County

Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, District 1 (Primary)

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Hon. Bill Jahn, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

CONSENT CALENDAR - No action required

ACTION ITEMS

Hon. Bill Jahn, Chair, stated that jurisdictions will each have up to 20 minutes to present their appeal. After the appeal presentation, SCAG staff may offer clarifications on the item. The Board members may ask questions of SCAG staff or the jurisdiction, discuss, and make a determination. Chair Jahn also stated that appeal determinations made by the Board will be a final decision on the appeal.

Hon. Bill Jahn stated that Items 1, 2, and 3 on the agenda were approved at yesterday's hearing and no additional action is needed. Today's hearing will start with Item 4. The Chair opened the floor to staff for comments.

Ms. Joann Africa, Chief Legal Counsel, clarified that the RHNA Appeals Board approved the minutes of April 19, 2012 the previous day with the modification and suggested language requested by the County of Ventura and staff. This information is included as part of today's agenda packet since the County of Ventura's appeal will be heard today.

4.1 Appeal from the County of Ventura

Supervisor Linda Parks, County of Ventura, stated the County had limited land for development, along with a number of land conservation contracts with agricultural land in need of preservation. Mr. Chris Stephens, Director of the Resource Management Agency, County of Ventura, provided information on the County's guidelines to direct development to incorporated cities. Mr. Stephens also added that separate from its appeal testimony, there was an error in the reduction request that the County of Ventura representative provided at the April 19, 2012 meeting to determine revision requests. The original motion reduced the County's allocation to 1,115 units, whereas the intended number was 1,015 units.

Ms. Chen, RHNA Appeals Board Special Counsel Consultant, stated that if the Appeals Board decides to grant the correction based upon the explanation as intended towards the County's revision request on April 19, 2012, the additional 100 units would not be distributed regionally as this is part of the revision process.

A motion was made (Finlay) to correct the error from the revision request proceeding by reducing the draft allocation of the County of Ventura by an additional 100 units. This makes the County's draft allocation 1,015 units. The motion was seconded (Coleman) and unanimously approved.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Finlay) to approve staff

recommendation to deny the appeal request from the County of Ventura. The motion was seconded (Kuenzi) and unanimously approved.

4.2 Appeal from the City of Oxnard

Karen Burnham, Interim City Manager, City of Oxnard, stated that the City's appeal was based on change of circumstances resulting from the Oxnard City Council's adoption of its 2030 General Plan in October 2011, which included a decision to remove a particularly large project from the City's land use plan.

Matt Winegar, Development Services Director, City of Oxnard, stated that the City was governed by urban development limitations from local ordinances. There are greenbelt agreements to preserve agricultural land within the County that lack historical market demand to produce a high number of residential units. For this reason, fairness and equity should be a factor considered in the City's appeal.

Ms. Huasha Liu, SCAG, Director of Land Use & Environmental Planning, stated that the input received from the City has already accounted for less demand for housing construction due to the downturn in the economy. Staff used the data from 2010 Census as well as the projections the City of Oxnard had as of 2011. Staff has already reduced 2,571 households from 2020 for the City of Oxnard to reflect the lower market demand.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Kuenzi) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request from the City of Oxnard. The motion was seconded (Coleman) and unanimously approved

4.3 Appeal from the City of Ojai

Rob Clark, City Manager, City of Ojai, stated that SCAG staff relied on Ojai's General Plan data, which is prohibited by state law. Moreover, the General Plan data SCAG staff relied on was inaccurate. The lack of local input from the City does not justify the use of inaccurate information, and this is something that should be correctible through the appeals process.

Hon. Bill Jahn asked Ms. Liu if the City's claim was true, and whether there was a mistake in the information used. Ms. Liu responded that there was no mistake in this regard, and that SCAG staff used the most recent 2010 Census data regarding the City, which has already resulted in a downward adjustment for the City's draft allocation.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Kuenzi) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request for the City of Ojai. The motion was seconded (Coleman) and unanimously approved.

There was a break at 10:27 a.m. in between the hearings. The hearing reconvened at 12:45 p.m.

4.4 City of Fillmore

Hon. Bill Jahn called the meeting back to order and stated that the last two appeals, City of Fillmore and the City of Norco, have notified SCAG staff that representatives from each of the cities would not be appearing on their appeals this afternoon.

Hon. Bill Jahn opened up the public hearing for the City of Fillmore. No one came forward to comment. The public hearing was then closed. Staff indicated no further comments other than what are stated in the staff report.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Coleman) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request for the City of Fillmore. The motion was seconded (Kang) and unanimously approved.

4.5 City of Norco

Hon. Bill Jahn opened up the public hearing for the City of Norco. No one came forward to comment. The public hearing was then closed. Staff indicated no further comments other than what are stated in the staff report.

Having reviewed the City's appeal and staff's recommendation, the RHNA Appeals Board completed its discussion. A motion was made (Coleman) to approve staff recommendation to deny the appeal request for the City of Norco. The motion was seconded (Morehouse) and unanimously approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT - None

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Liu explained the next steps in the overall RHNA process. On July 24, 2012, 1:30 p.m., there will be a meeting for the RHNA Appeals Board to ratify the written decisions from the appeals hearings of July 12 and 13, 2012. On August 24, 2012, SCAG staff will reconvene the RHNA Subcommittee for review of the proposed Final RHNA Allocation Plan. The Community, Economic & Human Development Committee is expected to review the proposed Final RHNA Allocation Plan at its September 6, 2012 meeting and recommend for Regional Council's adoption at a public hearing on October 4, 2012.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Bill Jahn adjourned the meeting at 1:18 p.m. The next meeting of the RHNA Appeals Board is scheduled for July 24, 2012, 1:30 p.m., at the SCAG office.



Huasha Liu
Director, Land Use and
Environmental Planning

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING NO. 15
July 24, 2012**

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD. AN AUDIO RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN THE OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNCIL SUPPORT.

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment Appeals Board of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its meeting at the SCAG office in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by the Hon. Bill Jahn. There was a quorum.

Present

Representing Los Angeles County

Hon. Margaret Finlay, Duarte, District 35 (Primary) – via teleconference

Representing Orange County

Hon. Sukhee Kang, Irvine, District 14 (Primary) – via videoconference

Representing Riverside County

Hon. Darcy Kuenzi, Menifee, WRCOG (Primary) - via videoconference

Representing San Bernardino County

Hon. Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake, District 11 (Alternate): **Chair** – via teleconference

Hon. Ginger Coleman, Apple Valley, District 65 (Primary) – via videoconference

Representing Ventura County

Hon. Bryan MacDonald, Oxnard, District 45 (Primary) – via videoconference

Representing Imperial County

Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, District 1 (Primary) – via teleconference

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Hon. Bill Jahn, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

INFORMATION ITEM

1. RHNA Subcommittee Topic Outlook

The next and final meeting of the RHNA Appeals Board will be Friday, August 24, 2012.

ACTION ITEMS

2. Staff Report Regarding the Written Determinations of the RHNA Appeals Board on the Appeals Submitted by Jurisdictions Related to the Draft RHNA Allocation Plan and Heard on July 12 and July 13, 2012

Joann Africa, SCAG Chief Counsel, stated that today's staff report had the draft written determinations on the 12 appeals that were reviewed, heard, and decided by the RHNA Appeals Board on July 12 and July 13, 2012. The determinations were prepared by Pat Chen, SCAG special counsel. Staff is asking the Board to review and ratify these written determinations and upon the Board's ratification these determinations will serve as the final decision related to the RHNA appeals submitted by the 12 jurisdictions.

A motion was made (MacDonald) to review and ratify the written determinations, Items 2.1 through 2.12 on the agenda, on the appeals submitted by the 12 jurisdictions related to the draft RHNA Allocation Plan, which were heard and decided by the RHNA Appeals Board on July 12 and July 13, 2012. The motion was seconded (Kang) and unanimously approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT

None

STAFF REPORT

None

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Bill Jahn adjourned the meeting at 1:46 a.m. The next meeting of the RHNA Appeals Board will be on Friday, August 24, 2012.



Huasha Liu
Director, Land Use and
Environmental Planning

RHNA Schedule (February 2011 to September 2012)

RHNA Subcommittee Topic Outlook

Meeting	Proposed Date	Subject	Action
1	February 23, 2011	Overview of RHNA Process; review RHNA Task Force recommendations; RHNA work plan and schedule; subregional delegation guidelines; evaluate issues between the DOF and Census projections; notification to HCD and Caltrans of RTP/SCS adoption date; discussion on Integrated Growth Forecast foundation	Approve charter; approve RHNA work plan and schedule; recommend to CEHD to notify HCD and Caltrans of RTP/SCS adoption date
2	March 22, 2011	Subcommittee Charter; subregional delegation	Approve the RHNA Subcommittee Charter
3	April 19, 2011	Changes to housing element requirements; AB 2158 factor discussion; Draft RHNA Methodology framework, Subregional delegation agreement	
4	May 27, 2011	Regional determination update; Social equity adjustment discussion; Subregional delegation agreement,	Provide direction on subregional delegation
5	June 24, 2011	Update on RHNA consultation with HCD; social equity adjustment; replacement needs survey; AB 2158 factor survey	Recommend a social equity adjustment to CEHD
6	August 12, 2011	Replacement need survey results; AB 2158 factor survey results; continued discussion on Methodology: overcrowding; at-risk affordable units; high housing cost burdens; farmworker housing	
7	August 26, 2011	Continued discussion on proposed RHNA Methodology	Recommend proposed Methodology to CEHD
8	September 16, 2011	RHNA annexation policy	
9	October 11, 2011	Proposed RHNA Methodology excess vacancy credit application	
11	November 4, 2011	RHNA Annexation Policy	Recommend approval of annexation policy
12	December 9, 2011	Discuss Draft RHNA Allocation Plan; RHNA revisions and appeals process guidelines; proposed guidelines on RHNA transfers relating to annexation and incorporation	Recommend Draft RHNA Allocation Plan; recommend RHNA revisions and appeals process guidelines; recommend proposed guidelines on RHNA transfers relating to annexation and incorporation
13	April 19, 2012	Review submitted revision requests	Determine revision requests
14	July 12, 2012	Hearing on appeals	Determine appeals
15	July 13, 2012	Hearing on appeals	Determine appeals
16	July 24, 2012	Review and ratify the decisions on appeals	Issue written decisions regarding appeals
17	August 24, 2012	Final meeting	Recommend to CEHD Final RHNA Allocation Plan

RHNA Schedule (February 2011 to September 2012)

CEHD and Regional Council

Proposed Date	Meeting	Action
March 3, 2011	CEHD	Approve Subcommittee charter; approve RHNA schedule and work plan
April 7, 2011	CEHD	Approve Subcommittee charter
April 7, 2011	Regional Council	Approve RHNA schedule
June 2, 2011	CEHD and Regional Council	Approve subregional delegation agreement
June 2, 2011	Regional Council	Approve Subcommittee charter
September 1, 2011	CEHD	Recommend release of proposed RHNA Methodology
September 1, 2011	Regional Council	Release proposed RHNA Methodology
November 3, 2011	CEHD	Recommend Final RHNA Methodology
November 3, 2011	Regional Council	Approve Final RHNA Methodology
January 5, 2012	CEHD	Recommend Regional Council distribution of Draft RHNA Allocation Plan; recommend approval of revisions and appeals guidelines; recommend proposed guidelines on RHNA transfers relating to annexation and incorporation
February 2, 2012	Regional Council	Approve distribution of Draft RHNA Allocation Plan; approve RHNA revisions and appeals guidelines; approve guidelines on RHNA transfers relating to annexation and incorporation
September 6, 2012	CEHD	Recommend Regional Council adoption of Final RHNA Allocation
October 4, 2012	Regional Council	Public hearing to adopt Final RHNA Allocation

Updated RHNA Timeline (February 2012-October 2013)

February 2, 2012	SCAG's Regional Council reviews and considers distribution of SCAG's Draft RHNA Plan.
February 9, 2012	Start of period for local jurisdictions to request revision of its Draft Allocation based upon AB 2158 factors.
March 15, 2012	Last day for local jurisdictions to request revision based upon AB 2158 factors.
April 19, 2012	Deadline to address all revision requests by SCAG staff and RHNA Subcommittee.
April 23, 2012	Start of period for local jurisdiction to file appeal of its Draft Allocation based upon application of SCAG's methodology, AB 2158 factors or changed circumstances.
May 29, 2012	Last day for local jurisdiction to file appeal based upon application of SCAG's Methodology, AB 2158 factors or changed circumstances.
June 8, 2012	Deadline for SCAG to notify jurisdiction of public hearing date before RHNA Subcommittee regarding appeal.
July 12-13, 2012	Public hearings before RHNA Appeals Board held for appealing jurisdictions.
July 24, 2012	RHNA Appeals Board to issue written decisions regarding all appeals.
August 17, 2012	Deadline for jurisdictions who have undertaken the trade & transfer process to submit alternative distribution of draft allocations to SCAG.
August 24, 2012	Final RHNA Subcommittee meeting to recommend the proposed Final RHNA Allocation Plan (Final RHNA Plan), which shall include alternative distribution/transfers and adjustments resulting from post-appeal reallocation process.
September 6, 2012	CEHD Committee to review and recommend approval of the Final RHNA Plan by SCAG's Regional Council. SCAG staff notifies jurisdictions of public hearing date relating to the adoption of the Final RHNA Plan.
October 4, 2012	SCAG's Regional Council holds a public hearing to review and consider adoption of the Final RHNA Plan.
October 5, 2012	SCAG submits its adopted 5 th cycle Final RHNA Plan to HCD.
Dec 3, 2012	Deadline for final approval of SCAG's Final RHNA Plan by HCD.
October 15, 2013	Due date for jurisdictions in the SCAG Region to adopt revised housing elements.

This Page Left Blank Intentionally


REPORT

DATE: August 24, 2012

TO: Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Subcommittee

FROM: Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning, 213-236-1838, liu@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)'s Clarification Regarding Housing Element Planning and RHNA Projection Periods, and Eligibility of Jurisdictions to Take RHNA Credit

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only – No Action Required

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
As SCAG nears conclusion of the 5th cycle RHNA process, staff provides a letter with information from HCD on the eligibility for jurisdictions to receive RHNA credit for recent housing activity. In a letter addressed to SCAG on May 21, 2012 (attached), HCD outlined the 5th cycle housing element “planning” period and RHNA “projection” period and clarified credit eligibility. Due to the statutory definitions of the housing element planning and RHNA projection periods, the adoption date of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, and the overlap of the 4th and 5th RHNA and housing element cycles, the start date of 5th housing element planning period (October 15, 2013) occurs three (3) months before the start of the 5th cycle RHNA projection period (January 1, 2014). Per state law, residential units approved, permitted, or produced during the 4th cycle RHNA cannot be credited towards the 5th cycle RHNA, which starts on January 1, 2014. This information was previously made available to SCAG jurisdictions by posting the HCD letter on the SCAG website and distributed electronically to SCAG-region planning directors, city managers, and county executive officers.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan; Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective a: Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans.

BACKGROUND:
Attached is a letter dated May 21, 2012 from HCD that clarifies housing element planning and RHNA projection periods and the eligibility of jurisdictions to receive RHNA credit.

REPORT

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the current FY 12-13 General Fund Budget (13-800.0160.03: RHNA).

ATTACHMENT:

1. Letter from HCD on Eligibility of Jurisdictions to Take RHNA Credit, May 21, 2012

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

1800 Third Street, Suite 430
P. O. Box 952053
Sacramento, CA 94252-2053
(916) 323-3177 / FAX (916) 327-2643
www.hcd.ca.gov



May 21, 2012

Ms. Huasha Liu
Planning Director, Land Use & Environmental Planning Department
SCAG
818 West 7th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

RE: Clarification of Housing Element (HE) Planning Period and Due Date, Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA) Projection Period, and Eligibility of Jurisdictions to Take RHNA Credit

Dear Ms. Liu:

The Department is responding to your recent request, on behalf of some members of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), for the Department (HCD) to address (a) specific statutory changes regarding the HE "planning" period and due date and the RHNA "projection" period applicable to SCAG jurisdictions for the 5th RHNA and HE update cycle, and (b) jurisdictions' eligibility to take RHNA credit for housing units approved, permitted, or produced.

The brief answers to your questions are that SCAG's RHNA "projection" period is from January 2014 through October 2021, whereas the HE due date is October 15, 2013 for the "planning" period from October 2013 through October 2021. The anomaly of the HE due date for SCAG jurisdictions (October 2013) preceding the RHNA start date (January 2014) by three (3) months is due to (a) legislative changes and statutory definitions described below and (b) the date that SCAG adopted its Regional Transportation Plan. Statutory changes applicable for the 5th and subsequent HE update cycles specify the HE due date to be 18 months from the RTP adoption date. The October 2013 HE due date for SCAG jurisdictions follows 18 months from SCAG's April 5, 2012 RTP adoption date.

Regarding jurisdictions taking RHNA credit, nothing has changed. The jurisdiction authorized to permit a particular housing development can take RHNA credit for "new" units approved, permitted, or produced to accommodate "new" housing need projected since the start date of the "new" RHNA projection period. Units approved, permitted, or produced before the start of the "new" RHNA projection period relate to the previous housing need and can only be credited and reported for the previous RHNA and HE update cycle.

Legislative Changes to RHNA Projection Period and HE Planning Period and Due Date

Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, Chapter 728, 2008 Statutes and Senate Bill 575 (Steinberg, Chapter 354, 2009 Statutes) added Government Code (GC) Sections defining HE planning period and due date and RHNA projection period per below italicized text:

RHNA Projection Period

The new projection period shall begin on the date of December 31 or June 30 that most closely precedes the end of the previous projection period.” [GC 65588(e)(6)]

“Projection Period” shall be the time period for which the regional housing need is calculated. [GC 65588(f)(2)]

Note: HCD uses January 1 or July 1 dates for RHNA determination start date purposes as these are the effective dates used by Department of Finance (DOF) in updating DOF housing estimates and population projections. Also, once HCD has determined the RHNA, there is no statutory authority to make any revision to the RHNA projection period or RHNA determination.

HE Planning Period and Due Date

“Planning Period” shall be the time period between the due date for one housing element and the due date for the next housing element. [GC 65588(f)(1)]

For purposes of determining the existing and projected need for housing within a region pursuant to Sections 65584 to 65584.08, inclusive, the date of the next scheduled revision of the housing element shall be deemed to be the estimated adoption date of the regional transportation plan update described in the notice provided to the Department of Transportation plus 18 months. [GC 65588(e)(5)]

Note: For HE due dates falling before and after the 15th day of a month, HCD rounds “up” the HE due date to fall on either the 15th day or last day of a month. Also, while a change in the “actual” adoption date of the RTP from the “estimated” adoption date of the RTP (after HCD has determined the RHNA and identified the HE due date) can subsequently cause a change to the HE due date and HE “planning” period, it would not change the RHNA determination or “projection” period.

Ms. Huasha Liu
Page 3

Thank you for the opportunity to address questions raised by SCAG's membership. If SCAG or its members have questions, please contact Anda Draghici, Housing Policy Specialist, by email (adraghici@hcd.ca.gov) or telephone (916.327-2640).

Sincerely,



Glen A. Campora
Acting Deputy Director

This Page Left Blank Intentionally

REPORT

DATE: August 24, 2012

TO: Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Subcommittee

FROM: Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning, 213-236-1838, liu@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Proposed Final 5th cycle RHNA Allocation Plan

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Review and recommend that the Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee recommend that the Regional Council adopt the Final RHNA Allocation Plan as part of a public hearing to take place on October 4, 2012.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Staff issues herein for the RHNA Subcommittee's review the Proposed Final Allocation Plan for the 5th cycle RHNA ("Proposed Final RHNA Plan"), which represents the projected housing need for each city and unincorporated county area in the SCAG region for the October 2013-October 2021 housing element planning period. The Proposed Final RHNA Plan was developed from the Draft RHNA Plan, which was approved for distribution by the Regional Council on February 2, 2012, and revised based upon the results of the revision request and appeals process that concluded on July 24, 2012. It is anticipated that the Proposed Final RHNA Plan will be presented to the CEHD Committee on September 6, 2012, and thereafter, to the Regional Council on October 4, 2012 as part of a public hearing. Subsequent to the anticipated adoption of the Final RHNA Plan by the Regional Council, SCAG will submit the Final RHNA Plan to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for approval.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan; Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective a: Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans.

BACKGROUND:

A. Summary of 5th cycle RHNA process

The California Legislature developed the RHNA process [Government Code Section 65580 *et seq.* (the "RHNA statute")] in 1977 to address the serious affordable housing shortage in California. The expressed intent of the Legislature in enacting the RHNA statute was as follows:

- “(a) To assure that counties and cities recognize their responsibilities in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal.
- (b) To assure that counties and cities will prepare and implement housing elements which, along with federal and state programs, will move toward attainment of the state housing goal.
- (c) To recognize that each locality is best capable of determining what efforts are required by it to contribute to the attainment of the state housing goal, provided such a determination is

REPORT

compatible with the state housing goal and regional housing needs.

(d) To ensure that each local government cooperates with other local governments in order to address regional housing needs.” (Govt. Code § 65581).

In accordance with the state law, SCAG has been engaged in the development of the 5th cycle RHNA Plan for the past few years. Specifically, the 5th cycle RHNA began in May 2009, when SCAG staff began surveying each of the region’s jurisdictions on its population, household, and employment projections as part of a collaborative process to develop the Integrated Growth Forecast, which would be used for all regional planning efforts including the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). These surveys continued through August 2011. During this time, SCAG staff engaged in extensive communication and data sharing with each jurisdiction in the SCAG region, including in-person meetings, to ensure the highest participation in gathering local input.

Beginning in January 2011, the RHNA Subcommittee held regular monthly meetings to discuss the RHNA process, policies, and methodology, and to provide recommended actions to the CEHD Committee. In August 2011, SCAG received its RHNA determination from HCD. HCD determined a range of housing need of 409,060 – 438,030 units for the SCAG region for the period between January 1, 2014 and October 1, 2021. HCD stated that “[t]his range considered the extraordinary uncertainty regarding national, State, and local economies and housing markets,” and that “[f]or this RHNA cycle only, [HCD] made an adjustment to account for abnormally high vacancies and unique market conditions due to prolonged recessionary conditions, high unemployment, and unprecedented foreclosures.” SCAG is required to maintain the regional total need throughout the RHNA process so that it is within the HCD range and is consistent with SCAG’s Integrated Growth Forecast.

At its August 26, 2011 meeting, the RHNA Subcommittee recommended the release of the proposed RHNA Allocation Methodology to the CEHD Committee. The CEHD Committee reviewed, discussed and further recommended the proposed methodology to the Regional Council, which approved the proposed Methodology for distribution on September 1, 2011. During the 60-day public comment period, SCAG met with interested jurisdictions and stakeholders to present the process, answer questions, and collect input in addition to holding public hearings to receive verbal and written comments on the proposed Methodology. After the close of the public comment period, on November 3, 2011, the Regional Council adopted the RHNA Methodology.

On December 9, 2011, SCAG released the Draft RHNA Plan as part of the agenda for the RHNA Subcommittee meeting. The Draft RHNA Plan was recommended by the RHNA Subcommittee for further approval by the CEHD Committee and the Regional Council. The CEHD Committee reviewed and recommended the Draft RHNA Plan to the Regional Council on January 5, 2012 and the Regional Council reviewed and approved for distribution the Draft RHNA Plan on February 2, 2012. SCAG received various email correspondence from the cities of Calabasas, Ojai, and Oxnard related to revision requests or appeals, which were addressed and responded to as part of the respective revision requests and/or appeals processes. The Draft RHNA Plan acknowledged a total future housing need of 412,721 units for the SCAG region. In addition, on April 4, 2012, the Regional Council unanimously approved SCAG’s 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, including its jurisdictional level Integrated Growth Forecast.

The RHNA revision requests and appeals processes commenced immediately after the Regional Council’s approval for distribution of the Draft RHNA Plan. The Regional Council delegated authority to the RHNA Subcommittee to review and to make final decisions on RHNA revision requests and appeals pursuant to the

REPORT

RHNA Subcommittee Charter, which was approved by the Regional Council on June 2, 2011. In this capacity, the RHNA Subcommittee was designated as the RHNA Appeals Board. On February 2, 2012 (and amended on May 3, 2012), the Regional Council also adopted Procedures Regarding Revision Requests, Appeals and Trade & Transfers (the “Appeals Procedure”) for jurisdictions wishing to request a revision to their allocated housing need, to appeal their allocated housing need, or to trade and transfer their allocated housing need. The existing law and the procedures defined the parameters and basis for a successful revision or appeal. The Appeals Procedure was made available to all SCAG jurisdictions and posted on SCAG’s website.

The RHNA Appeals Board concluded its review and consideration of revisions and appeals. Specifically, the RHNA Appeals Board reviewed, discussed and considered the revision requests of 14 jurisdictions and the appeals of 12 jurisdictions. Revision requests to the Draft RHNA Plan were heard by the RHNA Appeals Board on April 19, 2012 while appeals to the Draft RHNA Plan were heard by the RHNA Appeals Board as part of public hearings held over two days on July 12 and July 13, 2012. The RHNA Appeals Board ratified its written determinations on the appeals on July 24, 2012. The RHNA Appeals Board approved a reduction of 544 units in revision requests. The RHNA Appeals Board approved zero reduction of units in appeals, finding that none of the basis of the appeals could be supported by the RHNA law. As previously indicated, the RHNA Appeals Board was delegated by the Regional Council to review and make the final decisions regarding revision requests and appeals submitted by jurisdictions. These decisions are final, and are not subject to any further review of the CEHD Committee or the Regional Council.

Additionally, the Final RHNA Plan includes a 40-unit correction to the regional total for the City of Glendora. This was due to an error of including already accounted units for Los Angeles County unincorporated land. The result of this correction and the revision requests and appeals processes adjusted the total regional housing need to 412,137 units.

B. Summary of 5th cycle Proposed Final RHNA

Per Government Code Section 65584.05(h), SCAG is required to adopt a final allocation of regional housing need for each local government in the region based on several processes: (1) the Draft RHNA Allocation Plan, which was approved for distribution by the Regional Council on February 2, 2012; (2) the determinations of the revision requests and appeals process, which concluded on July 24, 2012; and (3) trade and transfer agreements between participating jurisdictions, which were due on August 17, 2012.

Staff has developed the Proposed Final RHNA Plan, which represents the proposed regional total housing need and its allocation by income category, for all the cities and unincorporated counties (see attachment). According to the proposed Final RHNA Plan, the regional total housing need for the projection period between January 1, 2014 and October 1, 2021 is 412,137 units.

The Final RHNA Plan was developed from the Draft RHNA Plan, which was adjusted based on the determinations of the revision requests and appeals processes. As of the distribution of this staff report, SCAG staff has not received any trade and transfer agreements. SCAG staff will update the RHNA Subcommittee if necessary with any information regarding received trade and transfer agreements under a separate cover.

Once the Proposed Final RHNA Plan is recommended for approval by the RHNA Subcommittee and the CEHD Committee, a public hearing to adopt the Final RHNA Plan will be held by the Regional Council on

REPORT

October 4, 2012. Following the adoption of the Final RHNA Plan, SCAG will submit the Final RHNA Plan to HCD. HCD will review the Final RHNA Plan and determine within 60 days its consistency with the existing and projected housing need for the region.

Once the Final RHNA Plan is adopted by SCAG, jurisdictions in the SCAG region will have one year to complete and adopt their local housing element update based on respective comments and findings by HCD. The deadline for the jurisdictions to submit their 5th cycle local housing element updates to HCD is October 15, 2013.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the current FY 12-13 General Fund Budget (13-800.0160.03: RHNA).

ATTACHMENT:

1. Proposed 5th Cycle RHNA Final Allocation Plan

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

Income Category Distribution*					Draft RHNA Components**					Final RHNA Allocation				
County	City	% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Imperial	Imperial	25.2%	15.8%	15.5%	43.5%	17,428	479	49	1,404	4,194	2,553	2,546	7,258	16,551
Los Angeles	Los Angeles	25.3%	15.6%	16.8%	42.3%	200,572	6,131	1,268	28,297	45,672	27,469	30,043	76,697	179,881
Orange	Orange	22.9%	16.8%	18.5%	41.8%	41,530	1,143	414	6,150	8,734	6,246	6,971	16,015	37,966
Riverside	Riverside	23.7%	16.5%	18.3%	41.5%	120,308	2,948	175	22,059	24,117	16,319	18,459	42,479	101,374
San Bernardino	San Bernardino	23.3%	16.6%	18.4%	41.7%	70,623	1,890	165	16,833	13,389	9,265	10,490	24,053	57,207
Ventura	Ventura	23.5%	16.5%	18.6%	41.4%	19,628	523	41	647	4,516	3,095	3,544	8,003	19,158
SCAG	SCAG	24.3%	16.2%	17.6%	41.9%	470,089	13,113	2,416	75,390	100,632	64,947	72,053	174,505	412,137
County	City	% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Imperial	Brawley city	24.9%	15.9%	15.4%	43.8%	3,080	90	4	141	760	470	466	1,338	3,034
Imperial	Calexico city	25.3%	15.5%	15.3%	43.9%	3,139	91	8	13	817	489	490	1,428	3,224
Imperial	Calipatria city	25.9%	15.8%	15.5%	42.9%	187	5	0	48	37	22	22	63	144
Imperial	El Centro city	25.2%	15.9%	15.5%	43.3%	2,118	64	8	265	487	300	297	840	1,924
Imperial	Holtville city	25.5%	15.3%	15.4%	43.8%	222	7	1	220	54	31	32	92	209
Imperial	Imperial city	26.5%	16.1%	15.5%	41.9%	1,367	32	1	91	349	205	202	553	1,309
Imperial	Westmorland city	24.2%	15.5%	15.6%	44.6%	230	7	3	8	57	35	36	105	233
Imperial	Unincorporated	25.1%	15.8%	15.5%	43.5%	7,085	182	25	819	1,633	1,001	1,001	2,839	6,474
Los Angeles	Agoura Hills city	27.0%	16.6%	17.1%	39.4%	113	2	0	0	31	19	20	45	115
Los Angeles	Alhambra city	25.4%	15.4%	16.6%	42.6%	1,580	52	0	141	380	224	246	642	1,492
Los Angeles	Arcadia city	26.1%	16.2%	16.9%	40.8%	1,141	30	0	117	276	167	177	434	1,054
Los Angeles	Artesia city	25.5%	15.1%	16.6%	42.8%	112	3	5	0	31	18	20	51	120
Los Angeles	Avalon city	25.5%	15.0%	17.2%	42.3%	149	6	3	79	20	12	14	34	80
Los Angeles	Azusa city	25.4%	15.5%	16.4%	42.7%	868	25	6	120	198	118	127	336	779
Los Angeles	Baldwin Park city	25.3%	15.3%	16.2%	43.1%	528	14	15	0	142	83	90	242	557
Los Angeles	Bell city	24.1%	15.2%	16.7%	44.0%	40	1	6	0	11	7	8	21	47
Los Angeles	Bellflower city	25.3%	15.3%	16.5%	42.9%	91	3	0	115	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Bell Gardens city	24.5%	15.0%	16.4%	44.1%	33	1	12	0	11	7	8	20	46
Los Angeles	Beverly Hills city	26.0%	16.3%	17.1%	40.7%	271	9	34	324	1	1	1	0	3
Los Angeles	Bradbury city	27.5%	17.1%	17.7%	37.7%	7	0	1	7	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Burbank city	25.8%	15.8%	16.6%	41.9%	2,767	88	62	234	694	413	443	1,134	2,684
Los Angeles	Calabasas city	26.7%	16.8%	17.5%	39.0%	325	7	0	3	88	54	57	131	330
Los Angeles	Carson city	26.2%	15.9%	16.6%	41.3%	1,662	36	0	0	447	263	280	708	1,698
Los Angeles	Cerritos city	26.5%	16.2%	17.0%	40.2%	84	2	0	0	23	14	14	35	86
Los Angeles	Claremont city	26.2%	16.1%	17.1%	40.6%	372	9	0	8	98	59	64	152	373
Los Angeles	Commerce city	25.1%	15.5%	15.9%	43.6%	44	1	0	0	12	7	7	20	46
Los Angeles	Compton city	25.0%	15.0%	16.0%	41.7%	11	0	4	302	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Covina city	26.0%	15.6%	16.6%	41.7%	310	9	2	90	60	35	38	97	230
Los Angeles	Cudahy city	25.0%	14.7%	16.1%	44.2%	303	12	3	0	80	46	51	141	318
Los Angeles	Culver City city	26.0%	16.0%	16.9%	41.1%	180	5	0	0	48	29	31	77	185
Los Angeles	Diamond Bar city	26.8%	16.3%	16.7%	40.2%	1,122	23	0	0	308	182	190	466	1,146
Los Angeles	Downey city	25.7%	15.4%	16.6%	42.2%	854	25	19	84	210	123	135	346	814
Los Angeles	Duarte city	25.7%	16.0%	16.3%	42.0%	329	8	0	0	87	53	55	142	337
Los Angeles	El Monte city	24.8%	15.0%	16.5%	43.8%	2,069	67	34	28	529	315	352	946	2,142
Los Angeles	El Segundo city	26.5%	16.0%	17.3%	40.2%	60	2	7	0	18	11	12	28	69
Los Angeles	Gardena city	24.7%	15.4%	16.6%	43.2%	394	12	0	9	98	60	66	173	397
Los Angeles	Glendale city	25.1%	15.7%	16.8%	42.4%	2,291	77	61	411	508	310	337	862	2,017
Los Angeles	Glendora city	26.4%	15.9%	16.8%	40.9%	661	15	9	0	171	100	108	267	646

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County	% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households				Number of moderate income households				Number of above moderate income households																																																																																																																																																														
									32	19	21	57	170	101	112	300	1	0	0	2	5	3	7	18	216	128	149	402	895	250	150	167	446	1,013																																																																																																																																													
Los Angeles	24.9%	15.3%	16.4%	43.4%	100%	124	4	3	2	32	19	21	57	170	101	112	300	1	0	0	2	5	3	7	18	216	128	149	402	895	250	150	167	446	1,013																																																																																																																																												
Hawaiian Gardens city	24.8%	15.2%	16.5%	43.5%	100%	1	0	0	55	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																											
Hawthorne city	26.8%	16.1%	17.4%	39.7%	100%	18	0	3	0	5	3	3	7	18	216	128	149	402	895	250	150	167	446	1,013	250	150	167	446	1,013	250	150	167	446	1,013																																																																																																																																													
Hermosa Beach city	27.6%	17.0%	18.2%	37.2%	100%	845	31	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																											
Hidden Hills city	24.1%	14.7%	16.7%	44.5%	100%	1,159	39	75	261	4	2	2	7	15	11	12	33	81	218	564	1,397	2,208	1,315	1,410	3,389	8,322	53	50	53	139	324	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674																																																																																																																																												
Hidden Hills city	25.0%	15.2%	16.6%	43.7%	100%	15	0	1	1	4	2	2	7	15	11	12	33	81	218	564	1,397	2,208	1,315	1,410	3,389	8,322	53	50	53	139	324	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674																																																																																																																																												
Huntington Park city	24.5%	15.8%	16.4%	41.9%	100%	110	2	0	0	30	18	20	44	112	300	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																										
Industry city	26.8%	16.6%	17.5%	38.1%	100%	117	2	1	1	32	19	21	47	119	300	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																										
Inglewood city	26.5%	16.0%	16.7%	40.8%	100%	425	10	0	32	107	63	67	166	403	62	37	40	96	235	562	1,372	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																												
Inglwood city	25.9%	15.7%	16.5%	42.9%	100%	3,980	107	33	1,610	627	384	413	1,086	2,510	208	121	135	354	818	2,510	208	121	135	354	818	2,510	208	121	135	354	818	2,510	208	121	135	354	818																																																																																																																																										
Inwindaie city	27.0%	16.5%	17.0%	40.7%	100%	942	25	0	0	208	121	135	354	818	250	150	167	446	1,013	2,510	208	121	135	354	818	2,510	208	121	135	354	818	2,510	208	121	135	354	818																																																																																																																																										
La Canada Flintridge city	26.8%	16.6%	17.5%	38.1%	100%	117	2	1	1	32	19	21	47	119	300	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																									
La Habra Heights city	26.5%	16.0%	16.7%	40.8%	100%	425	10	0	32	107	63	67	166	403	62	37	40	96	235	562	1,372	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																												
Lakewood city	26.2%	16.1%	17.0%	40.7%	100%	230	5	0	0	62	37	40	96	235	562	1,372	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																												
Lancaster city	24.9%	15.7%	16.5%	42.9%	100%	3,980	107	33	1,610	627	384	413	1,086	2,510	208	121	135	354	818	2,510	208	121	135	354	818	2,510	208	121	135	354	818	2,510	208	121	135	354	818																																																																																																																																										
La Puente city	26.1%	16.1%	16.8%	41.0%	100%	585	13	3	39	147	88	94	233	562	147	88	94	233	562	1,372	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																													
La Verne city	25.0%	15.4%	16.4%	43.3%	100%	368	13	0	0	96	57	62	166	403	62	37	40	96	235	562	1,372	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																												
Lawndale city	25.8%	15.8%	16.8%	41.6%	100%	36	1	9	0	12	7	8	20	47	119	300	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																										
Lomita city	25.1%	15.5%	16.7%	42.8%	100%	9,487	309	0	2,748	1,773	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																								
Lomita city	24.8%	15.8%	16.8%	42.8%	100%	95,023	3,186	0	16,207	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																								
Long Beach city	24.9%	15.0%	16.5%	43.6%	100%	453	14	27	0	123	72	81	218	564	1,397	2,208	1,315	1,410	3,389	8,322	53	50	53	139	324	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674	1,674																																																																																																																																										
Los Angeles city	26.4%	16.5%	17.4%	39.6%	100%	130	3	3	188	1	1	0	0	2	10	6	7	15	38	94	233	562	1,372	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																										
Lynwood city	26.9%	16.5%	17.5%	39.1%	100%	37	1	0	0	10	6	7	15	38	94	233	562	1,372	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002																																																																																																																																										
Malibu city	24.3%	14.8%	16.7%	44.2%	100%	50	2	1	0	13	8	9	23	53	130	77	85	201	500	1,250	1,572	3,952	9,874	25,180	63,950	162,826	41,206	52,332	131,818	337,180	85,925	108,657	274,642	700,162	1,775,402	4,518,052	11,470,130	29,175,326	73,938,315	187,345,788	471,864,470	1,192,161,162	2,980,403,000	7,451,037,600	18,877,593,600	47,686,490,000	120,716,240,000	306,790,600,000	771,976,600,000	1,954,941,600,000	4,942,364,000,000	12,355,910,000,000	31,139,775,000,000	78,149,437,000,000	197,873,590,000,000	497,183,925,000,000	1,247,964,800,000,000	3,119,912,000,000,000	7,799,780,000,000,000	19,749,450,000,000,000	49,373,625,000,000,000	123,434,062,000,000,000	311,085,155,000,000,000	777,712,887,000,000,000	1,944,282,212,000,000,000	4,860,705,525,000,000,000	12,151,763,812,000,000,000	30,379,414,525,000,000,000	75,948,536,312,000,000,000	192,371,340,775,000,000,000	480,928,351,937,000,000,000	1,202,320,879,842,000,000,000	3,005,772,249,805,000,000,000	7,514,430,624,762,000,000,000	18,786,065,619,155,000,000,000	46,965,164,047,887,000,000,000	117,412,910,119,722,000,000,000	293,532,275,249,805,000,000,000	733,830,688,124,701,000,000,000	1,834,576,720,314,752,000,000,000	4,586,441,550,348,627,000,000,000	11,466,063,751,166,667,000,000,000	28,665,164,429,666,667,000,000,000	71,662,911,069,166,667,000,000,000	179,157,277,666,667,000,000,000	447,893,194,166,667,000,000,000	1,119,732,985,416,667,000,000,000	2,799,332,463,812,500,000,000,000	7,000,824,166,667,000,000,000	17,502,061,666,667,000,000,000	43,755,166,667,000,000,000	109,387,916,667,000,000,000	273,469,791,666,667,000,000,000	683,674,479,166,667,000,000,000	1,714,186,199,166,667,000,000,000	4,285,465,499,166,667,000,000,000	10,714,166,667,000,000,000	26,785,416,667,000,000,000	66,963,583,333,333,000,000,000	167,408,958,333,333,000,000,000	418,522,395,833,333,000,000,000	1,046,306,000,000,000,000	2,615,765,000,000,000,000	6,539,412,500,000,000,000	16,348,500,000,000,000	40,871,250,000,000,000	102,178,125,000,000,000	255,445,312,500,000,000	638,613,250,000,000,000	1,621,533,125,000,000,000	4,053,832,500,000,000,000	10,134,581,250,000,000,000	25,336,453,125,000,000,000	63,341,132,500,000,000,000	158,352,831,250,000,000,000	395,882,078,125,000,000,000	989,705,194,166,667,000,000,000	2,474,262,985,416,667,000,000,000	6,185,657,200,000,000,000	15,464,150,000,000,000,000	38,660,375,000,000,000,000	96,650,937,500,000,000,000	241,647,343,750,000,000,000	604,118,359,375,000,000,000	1,510,272,985,416,667,000,000,000	3,775,697,463,812,500,000,000	9,439,146,581,250,000,000,000	23,597,866,666,667,000,000,000	58,994,666,666,667,000,000,000	147,486,666,666,667,000,000,000	368,716,666,666,667,000,000,000	921,791,666,666,667,000,000,000	2,304,479,166,666,667,000,000,000	5,761,199,166,666,667,000,000,000	14,402,985,416,666,667,000,000,000	35,507,463,812,500,000,000,000	88,768,666,666,667,000,000,000	221,921,666,666,667,000,000,000	554,804,166,666,667,000,000,000	1,387,010,416,666,667,000,000,000	3,467,526,041,666,667,000,000,000	8,668,815,104,166,667,000,000,000	21,672,037,766,667,000,000,000	54,180,094,416,667,000,000,000	135,450,236,041,667,000,000,000	338,625,591,250,000,000,000	846,563,875,000,000,000	2,116,409,687,500,000,000	5,291,024,687,500,000,000	13,227,562,166,667,000,000,000	32,568,905,416,667,000,000,000	81,422,263,666,667,000,000,000	203,555,659,166,667,000,000,000	508,889,147,916,667,000,000,000	1,272,223,869,791,667,000,000,000	3,180,574,674,479,166,667,000,000,000	7,951,416,666,667,000,000,000	19,878,666,666,667,000,000,000	49,696,666,666,667,000,000,000	124,241,666,666,667,000,000,000	310,604,166,666,667,000,000,000	776,510,416,666,667,000,000,000	1,941,275,104,166,667,000,000,000	4,853,188,359,375,000,000,000	12,132,209,375,000,000,000	30,330,619,375,000,000,000	75,826,548,437,500,000,000	189,566,360,625,000,000,000	473,915,912,500,000,000,000	1,184,789,250,000,000,000	2,961,973,125,000,000,000	7,404,932,812,500,000,000	18,512,330,625,000,000,000	46,280,831,250,000,000,000	115,702,078,125,000,00

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	% very low income households			% low income households			% moderate income households			% above moderate income households			Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
					%	households	households	%	households	households	%	households	households	%	households	households				
Los Angeles	Temple City city	26.2%	15.8%	16.5%	41.5%	100%	61	14	61	2	159	93	99	252	603					
Los Angeles	Torrance city	26.1%	16.0%	16.8%	41.0%	100%	38	40	38	43	380	227	243	600	1,450					
Los Angeles	Vernon city	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2						
Los Angeles	Walnut city	26.9%	16.3%	17.1%	39.6%	100%	892	17	0	0	246	144	155	363	908					
Los Angeles	West Covina city	26.0%	15.8%	16.7%	41.5%	100%	806	20	5	0	217	129	138	347	831					
Los Angeles	West Hollywood city	24.8%	15.7%	16.9%	42.7%	100%	408	16	0	347	19	12	13	33	77					
Los Angeles	Westlake Village city	27.0%	16.3%	17.5%	38.2%	100%	44	1	0	0	12	7	8	18	45					
Los Angeles	Whittier city	25.9%	15.8%	16.7%	41.6%	100%	911	25	3	60	228	135	146	369	878					
Los Angeles	Unincorporated	25.6%	15.6%	16.8%	42.0%	100%	30,574	804	269	1,503	7,854	4,650	5,060	12,581	30,145					
Orange	Aliso Viejo city	23.9%	17.0%	18.2%	40.9%	100%	38	1	0	9	7	7	16	39						
Orange	Anaheim city	21.9%	16.3%	18.3%	43.5%	100%	6,877	209	0	1,385	1,256	907	1,038	2,501	5,702					
Orange	Brea city	22.9%	16.9%	18.2%	42.0%	100%	1,826	47	4	26	426	305	335	785	1,851					
Orange	Buena Park city	22.4%	16.1%	18.3%	43.2%	100%	349	10	7	27	76	53	62	148	339					
Orange	Costa Mesa city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	174	6	24	312	1	0	0	2						
Orange	Cypress city	23.1%	16.8%	18.2%	42.0%	100%	295	7	6	0	71	50	56	131	308					
Orange	Dana Point city	23.0%	16.6%	18.6%	41.8%	100%	474	13	17	178	76	53	61	137	327					
Orange	Fountain Valley city	23.1%	16.9%	18.2%	41.9%	100%	350	8	0	0	83	59	65	151	358					
Orange	Fullerton city	22.2%	16.6%	18.4%	42.8%	100%	2,163	62	416	411	299	337	794	1,841						
Orange	Garden Grove city	21.9%	16.4%	18.2%	43.5%	100%	715	20	12	328	164	120	135	328	747					
Orange	Huntington Beach city	23.0%	16.7%	18.4%	41.9%	100%	1,478	40	11	175	313	220	248	572	1,353					
Orange	Irvine city	23.1%	17.1%	18.5%	41.3%	100%	12,686	380	0	918	2,817	2,034	2,239	5,069	12,149					
Orange	Laguna Beach city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	32	1	1	172	1	1	0	2						
Orange	Laguna Hills city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	124	3	0	166	1	1	0	2						
Orange	Laguna Niguel city	23.4%	17.1%	18.5%	41.0%	100%	158	4	21	0	43	30	34	75	182					
Orange	Laguna Woods city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	129	3	0	443	1	0	0	2						
Orange	La Habra city	22.4%	16.1%	18.1%	43.3%	100%	135	4	0	135	0	1	1	4						
Orange	Lake Forest city	23.6%	16.9%	18.3%	41.2%	100%	2,663	63	0	647	450	497	1,133	2,727						
Orange	La Palma city	23.2%	16.8%	18.3%	41.7%	100%	9	0	0	2	2	2	3	9						
Orange	Los Alamitos city	22.6%	17.1%	17.7%	42.6%	100%	55	2	4	0	14	10	11	26	61					
Orange	Mission Viejo city	23.4%	16.9%	18.5%	41.2%	100%	173	4	0	0	42	29	33	73	177					
Orange	Newport Beach city	23.3%	17.2%	19.0%	40.6%	100%	533	15	0	608	1	1	2	5						
Orange	Orange city	22.8%	16.6%	18.4%	42.2%	100%	394	11	7	49	83	59	66	155	363					
Orange	Placentia city	22.6%	16.9%	18.3%	42.2%	100%	479	12	1	0	112	81	90	209	492					
Orange	Rancho Santa Margarita city	23.9%	16.9%	18.4%	40.7%	100%	12	0	1	31	1	1	0	2						
Orange	San Clemente city	23.0%	16.8%	18.7%	41.5%	100%	662	17	4	101	134	95	108	244	581					
Orange	San Juan Capistrano city	22.9%	16.7%	18.9%	41.5%	100%	625	14	0	2	147	104	120	267	638					
Orange	Santa Ana city	21.8%	16.1%	18.1%	44.0%	100%	503	15	25	339	45	32	37	90	204					
Orange	Seal Beach city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	19	0	10	186	1	0	0	2						
Orange	Sierraville city	21.8%	16.1%	18.1%	44.0%	100%	329	10	2	28	68	49	56	140	313					
Orange	Tustin city	22.9%	16.3%	18.3%	42.5%	100%	1,219	36	127	155	283	195	224	525	1,227					
Orange	Villa Park city	24.5%	17.3%	19.2%	39.1%	100%	14	0	0	0	3	2	6	14	4					
Orange	Westminster city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	110	3	5	297	1	1	0	2						
Orange	Yorba Linda city	23.8%	17.3%	18.9%	40.1%	100%	633	13	24	0	160	113	126	270	669					
Orange	Unincorporated	23.4%	17.1%	18.7%	40.8%	100%	5,094	111	67	0	1,240	879	979	2,174	5,272					
Riverside	Banning city	23.0%	16.0%	18.2%	42.8%	100%	4,120	101	8	437	585	685	1,642	3,792						
Riverside	Beaumont city	24.2%	16.7%	18.5%	40.6%	100%	5,415	122	2	289	1,267	854	969	2,160	5,250					
Riverside	Blythe city	22.7%	16.4%	18.7%	42.2%	100%	565	17	15	194	91	64	75	172	402					
Riverside	Calimesa city	23.2%	16.8%	18.6%	41.4%	100%	2,439	51	1	150	543	383	433	982	2,341					
Riverside	Canyon Lake city	25.3%	17.0%	18.9%	38.7%	100%	141	3	0	61	21	14	16	32	83					
Riverside	Cathedral City city	23.5%	16.2%	18.4%	41.8%	100%	1,241	32	19	683	141	95	110	254	600					

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County	% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households % total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of				Total
									low income households	moderate income households	above moderate income households	low income households	
Riverside	23.0%	16.0%	18.0%	43.0%	6,871	181	1	283	1,555	1,059	1,212	2,945	6,771
Riverside	25.0%	17.0%	18.4%	39.5%	1,081	27	5	343	192	128	142	308	770
Riverside	22.6%	16.1%	18.5%	42.8%	4,944	151	3	903	946	661	772	1,817	4,196
Riverside	25.6%	17.1%	18.7%	38.6%	1,578	32	0	147	374	250	274	565	1,463
Riverside	22.2%	16.3%	18.6%	43.0%	2,797	74	0	2,267	134	96	112	262	604
Riverside	17.3%	17.3%	19.2%	38.2%	291	6	1	1,387	40	27	31	62	160
Riverside	23.6%	16.5%	18.4%	41.5%	4,053	103	0	1,131	714	487	563	1,271	3,025
Riverside	23.9%	16.1%	17.9%	42.1%	1,975	49	0	313	409	275	307	721	1,712
Riverside	24.3%	16.7%	18.3%	40.8%	5,211	131	11	424	1,196	801	897	2,035	4,929
Riverside	25.0%	17.1%	18.2%	39.7%	1,336	30	18	1,020	91	61	66	146	364
Riverside	23.9%	16.5%	18.3%	41.3%	6,942	150	0	748	1,488	1,007	1,140	2,610	6,245
Riverside	24.3%	16.5%	18.1%	41.1%	7,114	182	15	1,142	1,500	993	1,112	2,564	6,169
Riverside	25.1%	17.1%	18.5%	39.3%	2,174	52	4	657	395	262	289	627	1,573
Riverside	25.0%	17.0%	18.6%	39.4%	809	17	4	12	205	136	151	326	818
Riverside	23.9%	16.5%	18.6%	41.0%	1,960	50	0	1,596	98	67	76	172	413
Riverside	23.3%	16.3%	18.5%	42.0%	2,010	55	8	1,802	63	43	50	116	272
Riverside	24.0%	16.3%	17.8%	41.9%	4,693	118	4	536	1,026	681	759	1,814	4,280
Riverside	24.3%	17.1%	18.6%	40.0%	594	12	0	511	23	15	18	39	95
Riverside	24.2%	16.5%	18.2%	41.0%	9,534	270	35	1,556	2,002	1,336	1,503	3,442	8,283
Riverside	23.1%	16.6%	18.2%	42.1%	3,000	74	5	646	562	394	441	1,036	2,433
Riverside	25.2%	17.2%	18.2%	39.4%	1,903	46	14	470	375	251	271	596	1,493
Riverside	24.5%	16.8%	18.3%	40.4%	2,620	60	1	146	621	415	461	1,038	2,535
Riverside	23.8%	16.6%	18.4%	41.3%	32,994	752	0	3,443	7,173	4,871	5,534	12,725	30,303
San Bernardino	22.2%	16.5%	18.1%	43.1%	3,276	91	8	534	633	459	513	1,236	2,841
San Bernardino	22.8%	16.6%	18.8%	41.8%	4,055	98	0	819	764	541	622	1,407	3,334
San Bernardino	22.2%	16.8%	18.4%	42.6%	1,456	44	4	662	188	138	154	363	843
San Bernardino	25.0%	25.0%	25.1%	24.8%	188	5	11	776	1	1	0	0	2
San Bernardino	24.3%	16.9%	18.5%	40.2%	3,008	73	0	187	707	478	533	1,176	2,894
San Bernardino	25.0%	17.6%	19.1%	38.3%	844	18	0	0	217	148	164	333	862
San Bernardino	23.0%	16.1%	18.1%	42.8%	2,265	67	17	425	443	302	347	831	1,923
San Bernardino	24.0%	16.7%	18.3%	40.9%	6,385	155	0	564	1,442	974	1,090	2,471	5,977
San Bernardino	23.6%	16.9%	18.4%	41.1%	158	4	0	44	28	19	22	49	118
San Bernardino	23.1%	16.4%	18.4%	42.1%	2,416	60	7	768	398	274	314	729	1,715
San Bernardino	23.2%	16.8%	18.8%	41.2%	1,744	44	3	291	349	246	280	625	1,500
San Bernardino	23.1%	16.6%	18.6%	41.7%	1,354	45	3	308	254	177	202	462	1,095
San Bernardino	23.4%	16.7%	18.0%	41.9%	709	19	3	35	164	114	125	294	697
San Bernardino	21.0%	16.6%	18.9%	43.4%	359	10	3	191	38	29	34	80	181
San Bernardino	23.8%	16.5%	18.3%	41.5%	10,921	310	22	392	2,592	1,745	1,977	4,547	10,861
San Bernardino	24.5%	17.1%	18.7%	39.8%	1,002	26	9	188	209	141	158	340	848
San Bernardino	23.8%	16.7%	18.7%	40.8%	2,765	74	8	418	579	396	463	1,001	2,429
San Bernardino	23.4%	16.3%	18.3%	42.0%	3,304	85	0	674	636	432	496	1,151	2,715
San Bernardino	22.3%	16.3%	18.5%	43.0%	6,116	183	113	2,028	980	696	808	1,900	4,384
San Bernardino	22.5%	16.3%	18.6%	42.6%	807	28	2	412	103	72	84	195	454
San Bernardino	24.0%	16.7%	18.6%	40.7%	1,945	54	3	412	382	260	294	653	1,589
San Bernardino	23.0%	16.8%	18.3%	42.0%	8,679	230	42	1,579	1,698	1,207	1,342	3,124	7,371
San Bernardino	23.4%	16.7%	18.7%	41.2%	1,942	44	13	395	376	261	299	669	1,605
San Bernardino	22.4%	16.4%	18.6%	42.6%	1,262	33	2	366	209	149	172	400	930
San Bernardino	23.0%	16.5%	18.5%	41.9%	3,662	89	197	4,392	9	6	7	17	39
San Bernardino	24.1%	16.9%	18.6%	40.4%	2,229	54	0	59	539	366	411	908	2,224
Ventura	23.0%	16.6%	18.5%	41.9%	714	18	2	40	160	112	128	294	694

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County	% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of			Total
									low income households	moderate income households	above moderate income households	
Ventura	24.7%	17.3%	18.7%	39.3%	1,135	25	4	0	289	197	482	1,164
Ventura	23.3%	16.3%	19.0%	41.4%	382	11	0	22	87	59	155	371
Ventura	23.0%	16.3%	18.6%	42.1%	7,090	200	11	0	1,888	1,160	3,102	7,301
Ventura	23.1%	15.9%	18.2%	42.8%	162	5	0	173	1	1	0	2
Ventura	23.5%	16.6%	18.5%	41.5%	3,706	105	6	163	861	591	1,529	3,654
Ventura	22.3%	16.0%	18.9%	42.8%	1,261	35	2	14	288	201	555	1,285
Ventura	24.6%	17.0%	18.4%	40.1%	1,228	28	0	0	310	208	509	1,256
Ventura	24.6%	17.1%	18.8%	39.5%	188	4	0	0	47	32	77	192
Ventura	24.2%	16.9%	18.7%	40.3%	1,534	37	15	177	246	168	412	1,015

*Final income category distribution is based on 2005-09 ACS data, HCD's regional income category distribution, 110% social equity adjustment, and adjustments resulting from any incorporation agreements. Due to rounding, the Final RHNA Allocation may not follow the exact percentage.

**The Draft RHNA Allocation components do not total the Final RHNA Allocation due to adjustments resulting from the revision request process (La Puente and County of Ventura), and a correction made due to the inclusion of unincorporated county growth (Glendora). In some local jurisdictions, the sum of the components may not equal to the Final RHNA Allocation.