# REPORT

**DATE:** November 2, 2006

**TO:** Community, Economic, and Human Development (CEHD) Committee

**FROM:** Honorable Jon Edney, Chair CEHD Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Subcommittee

**SUBJECT:** CEHD RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations for Policy Guidance to Prepare the RHNA Methodology for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve the RHNA Subcommittee policy recommendations regarding the RHNA methodology and direct staff to prepare for Regional Council consideration of the methodology and the draft regional housing need allocation plan upon completion of the upcoming regional public hearing and subregional workshops.

**SUMMARY:**

The purpose of determining a regional housing needs methodology is to arrive at a regional construction need determination (the 'assessment' in RHNA) which is then allocated by jurisdiction and by income categories, using a 'fair share' adjustment as part of the Housing Needs Allocation Plan.

With significant comments and inputs from the Programs and Plans Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the CEHD RHNA Subcommittee recommends use of the following methodology to determine the regional housing needs allocation plan:

1. Construction Needs for each Jurisdiction (2005-2014):

[Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005)] +
[Vacancy Rate Adjustment (3.5% = 2.3% for Owner, 5% for Renter)] – adjustments for local jurisdictions where the share of very low and low income household is greater than their county's share of low and very low income household and their vacancy rates are lower than the combined vacancy rate of (3.5%)

2. Allocate Construction Needs by Income Category (fair share adjustment):

Each jurisdiction will move 110% towards the county distribution in each of its four income categories.

For example, based on county median household income in 2000 Census,
A jurisdiction's income distribution is:

Very low (29.5%), Low (16.8%), Moderate (16.6%), Above moderate (37.1%),

The county distribution is:
Very low (24.7%), Low (15.7%), Moderate (17.1%), Above moderate (42.6%),

The final adjusted allocation for the jurisdiction by income category following the fair share adjustment is:

| | |
|---|---|
| Very low: | 24.2% = 29.5% - (29.5% - 24.7%) x 110% |
| Low: | 15.6% = 16.8% - (16.8% - 15.7%) x 110% |
| Moderate: | 17.1% = 16.6% - (16.6% - 17.1%) x 110% |
| Above moderate: | 43.1% = 37.1% - (37.1% - 42.6%) x 110% |

**BACKGROUND:**

The integrated growth forecast and the four main variables: population, household, housing units, and employment are the starting point for developing the regional transportation plan (RTP), environmental impact report (EIR), Compass blueprint plan, and the regional housing needs assessment (RHNA). The integrated growth forecast incorporates most of the AB 2158 housing planning factors.

There are several components to the RHNA methodology. Data sources and application of RHNA methodology are included in the statute and in the RHNA Pilot Program (e.g. 2000 Census, income distribution, county median income). Several of the 2158 housing planning factors require policy guidance before the methodology can be completed.

The role of the RHNA Subcommittee was to provide this policy guidance. The Subcommittee's work and recommendations to the CEHD are with regard to the following planning factors/ policy areas:

- Farmworker housing needs
- Loss of at-risk low-income units
- Housing Cost
- Market Demand
- Fair Share/Over-concentration

Farmworker Housing Needs

The housing needs of farmworkers are not always included in housing allocation methodology. Farmworker housing needs are concentrated geographically and across farm communities in

specific SCAG region counties and sub areas. The issue of how this would factor into RHNA methodology was discussed at the September 28 RHNA Subcommittee meeting.

The RHNA Subcommittee approved a policy that combines an existing housing need statement with the discretion of local jurisdictions. Thus SCAG will provide the farmworker housing need data for local jurisdictions to adequately plan for such need in preparing their housing elements. These data include:

- Farmworkers by Occupation;
- Farmworkers by Industry;
- Place of Work for Agriculture.

Loss of At-risk Low-Income Units

The conversion of low-income units into non-low-income uses is not necessarily reflected in housing allocation methodology. The loss of such units affects the proportion of affordable housing needed within a community and the region as a whole. There is an inherent risk of losing more affordable units in any one year than are allocated to be built, which severely impacts local housing accessibility for low-income households. Hence, the RHNA Subcommittee addressed this issue at their September 28 meeting.

The RHNA Subcommittee approved a policy that combines an existing housing need statement with the discretion of local jurisdictions. Thus SCAG will provide the data for this factor for local jurisdictions to adequately plan for the loss of at risk low income units in preparing their housing elements.

Housing Cost

There are several ways the housing market fluctuates in response to an increase in demand related to population and employment growth. External factors that influence fluctuation include the bidding up in price and cost of homes and apartments, the falling of vacancy rates, the rise of overcrowding in existing units, and the increase in the number of households that pay a disproportionately high level of income on housing, and the diminishing housing and mobility choices. A housing supply response will help correct the market back into equilibrium. Increasing construction activity and vacancy levels can play an important role in relieving the aforementioned demand pressures.

As part of its October 12, 2006 meeting, the RHNA Subcommittee decided to assign more housing to high housing cost jurisdictions relative to lower cost jurisdictions based on vacancy rate differentials as recommended by the TAC. The TAC discussed using the weighted regional vacancy rate of 3.5% (HCD Low scenario) across all jurisdictions to adjust the future vacant unit need, with special adjustments for impacted communities with a high concentration of low income households. For these communities the lower of the Census vacancy rate or the 3.5% vacancy rate will be used. Collectively, this housing stock adjustment will modestly adjust upward housing stock in low vacancy, high housing cost communities versus other jurisdictions based on an ideal healthy market vacancy adjustment consistent with the State HCD low scenario, which assumes an ownership vacancy rate of 2.3% and a renter vacancy rate of 5%.

The consensus of the TAC was that SCAG should use a 3.5% (HCD low scenario) vacancy rate for all jurisdictions broken down by renter and owner-status, rather than the Census 2000 rate of 2.7% for all housing types. For those jurisdictions defined as "impacted" in the categories of low and very-low income groups, the jurisdiction's respective vacancy rate should be used if they are lower than the 3.5% vacancy rate The Subcommittee approved using this vacancy rate on October 19, 2006.

Market Demand

The market demand of housing is identified in state housing law as an AB 2158 factor, which serves as a point of consideration when determining shares of housing need between communities. Although AB 2158 factors may be incorporated into the regional and subregional growth forecast, they cannot be used to lower the regional housing need. The factors must be used to differentiate development suitability between jurisdictions in the 2005 to 2014 housing element planning period.

The Subcommittee concluded that the integrated growth forecast adequate covers this area and decided to consider no further adjustments relating to the market demand for housing and the employment to population relationship.

Fair Share/Over Concentration

California housing law states that the regional housing allocation methodology must avoid or mitigate the over concentration of income groups in a jurisdiction to achieve its objective of increasing the supply and mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in an equitable manner, which would result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low and very low income households [Govt. Code Section 65584(d) (1)].

Local governments are required to consider the diverse housing needs of all income groups in relation to existing conditions when updating their local housing elements. A RHNA fair share adjustment provides a uniform basis for the income category diversity goals that jurisdictions set to collectively address the housing needs of all economic groups in the region, particularly low and very low income households. Without some adjustment, lower income households would become locked into present conditions by the planning process. The chief objective is to bring communities closer to the county average for the percentage of households that are lower income.

As part of its last meeting held on October 19, 2006, the RHNA Subcommittee decided that each community should close the gap between their current income households distribution and the county median distribution, by specifically adjusting their respective levels to 110% of the county average. The adjustment would fully address the statutory planning requirement to achieve equity by moving to the county income distribution over the 2005-2014 planning period and avoid the further concentration of lower income households in "impacted" communities.

The analysis and application of the Subcommittee's recommendations are included in the attachments to this report:

Attachment A is an analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Need at the jurisdictional level based on RHNA Subcommittee recommendations to use the 3.5% vacancy rate (2.3% owner and 5% renter)

Attachment B is a listing by jurisdiction showing which jurisdictions have an over concentration of low and very low income households ("impacted" jurisdictions) and a combined vacancy rate of less than 3.5%. These jurisdictions will have an adjustment made to their housing need.

Attachment C illustrates the policy application of the 110% fair share adjustment to further reduce over concentration of low and very low income households.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

$100,000 from the General Fund has been authorized by the Regional Council to begin the implementation of the RHNA Pilot program. Staff will be reporting in December on additional funding that will be required to complete the RHNA Pilot Program.

**Reviewed by:** Lynn Harris
*Division Manager*

**Affirmed by:** for H.I. Richards
*Department Director*

# Attachment A: Analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Needs (2005-2014) Based on RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations: Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005) + Vacancy Needs

Draft

| COUNTY | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imperial | 14,662 | 286 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 58.3% | 522 | 15,470 |
| Los Angeles | 288,755 | 20,476 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.9% | 11,617 | 320,848 |
| Orange | 61,291 | 3,416 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 61.4% | 2,140 | 66,847 |
| Riverside | 173,629 | 1,754 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 68.9% | 5,683 | 181,065 |
| San Bernardino | 113,327 | 3,375 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 64.5% | 3,917 | 120,619 |
| Ventura | 27,209 | 354 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 67.6% | 917 | 28,480 |
| SCAG | 678,873 | 29,661 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 54.8% | 24,795 | 733,329 |

| COUNTY | NEWSR | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imperial | Imperial County | 14,662 | 286 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 58.3% | 522 | 15,470 |
| Los Angeles | North LA | 70,687 | 660 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 68.0% | 2,384 | 73,731 |
| Los Angeles | LA City | 108,680 | 9,230 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 38.9% | 4,872 | 122,781 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | 6,455 | 1,129 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 44.2% | 302 | 7,887 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc. | 52,749 | 3,469 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 58.1% | 1,969 | 58,187 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | 2,737 | 580 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 37.3% | 131 | 3,448 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Assoc. | 13,216 | 3,462 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 53.0% | 626 | 17,304 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | 31,197 | 1,858 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 51.6% | 1,234 | 34,288 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes, Conejo COG | 3,033 | 88 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 77.0% | 100 | 3,221 |
| Orange | Orange | 61,291 | 3,416 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 61.4% | 2,140 | 66,847 |
| Riverside | West Riv. COG | 131,595 | 1,045 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 69.4% | 4,272 | 136,912 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley COG | 42,033 | 709 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 67.1% | 1,411 | 44,153 |
| San Bernardino | SANBAG | 113,327 | 3,375 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 64.5% | 3,917 | 120,619 |
| Ventura | Ventura COG | 27,209 | 354 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 67.6% | 917 | 28,480 |
| | SCAG | 678,873 | 29,661 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 54.8% | 24,795 | 733,329 |





D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment A: Analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Needs (2005-2014) Based on RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations: Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005) + Vacancy Needs

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Association O | Brawley city | 3,245 | 66 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 53.5% | 123 | 3,433 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Association O | Calexico city | 2,609 | 54 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 55.2% | 97 | 2,760 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Association O | Calipatria city | 196 | 2 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.4% | 7 | 205 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Association O | El Centro city | 2,001 | 68 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 50.2% | 79 | 2,148 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Association O | Holtville city | 226 | 9 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 63.7% | 8 | 243 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Association O | Imperial city | 3,641 | 6 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 71.4% | 116 | 3,763 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Association O | Westmorland city | 243 | 4 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 50.7% | 9 | 256 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Association O | Unincorporated | 2,501 | 77 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 70.4% | 83 | 2,661 |
| Los Angeles | North Los Angeles County | Lancaster city | 12,828 | 375 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 61.4% | 459 | 13,663 |
| Los Angeles | North Los Angeles County | Palmdale city | 17,749 | 171 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 71.0% | 573 | 18,493 |
| Los Angeles | North Los Angeles County | Santa Clarita city | 9,267 | 6 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 74.7% | 286 | 9,560 |
| Los Angeles | North Los Angeles County | Unincorporated | 30,842 | 108 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 1065 | 32,015 |
| Los Angeles | City Of Los Angeles | Los Angeles city | 107,079 | 9,165 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 38.6% | 4814 | 121,058 |
| Los Angeles | City Of Los Angeles | San Fernando city | 245 | 27 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 53.9% | 10 | 282 |
| Los Angeles | City Of Los Angeles | Unincorporated | 1,356 | 38 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 48 | 1,441 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | Burbank city | 3,309 | 457 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 43.5% | 151 | 3,916 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | Glendale city | 2,603 | 538 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 38.4% | 130 | 3,271 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | La Canada Flintridge city | 121 | 114 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 90.1% | 6 | 241 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | Unincorporated | 423 | 20 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 15 | 459 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Alhambra city | 2,117 | 110 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 39.2% | 92 | 2,319 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Arcadia city | 1,270 | 853 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.3% | 73 | 2,196 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Azusa city | 1,139 | 11 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 50.5% | 44 | 1,193 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Baldwin Park city | 595 | 143 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 61.0% | 26 | 764 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Bradbury city | 31 | 4 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 91.5% | 1 | 36 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Claremont city | 424 | 38 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 66.7% | 15 | 478 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Covina city | 1,984 | 22 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 58.4% | 71 | 2,077 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Diamond Bar city | 1,317 | 0 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 82.6% | 38 | 1,355 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Duarte city | 365 | 96 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 71.0% | 15 | 476 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | El Monte city | 2,333 | 240 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 41.0% | 105 | 2,678 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Glendora city | 855 | 45 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 73.6% | 28 | 928 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Industry city | 0 | 6 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 39.7% | 0 | 6 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Irwindale city | 68 | 5 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 63.3% | 2 | 75 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | La Puente city | 1,198 | 8 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.9% | 42 | 1,248 |



D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment A: Analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Needs (2005-2014) Based on RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations: Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005) + Vacancy Needs

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | La Verne city | 2,232 | 179 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 77.5% | 73 | 2,484 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Monrovia city | 427 | 130 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.9% | 22 | 578 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Montebello city | 597 | 16 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.5% | 24 | 636 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Monterey Park city | 1,160 | 258 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 54.0% | 52 | 1,470 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Pasadena city | 2,774 | 95 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 45.8% | 113 | 2,982 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Pomona city | 4,304 | 23 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 57.3% | 156 | 4,482 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Rosemead city | 634 | 164 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 48.8% | 31 | 829 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | San Dimas city | 3,575 | 21 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 73.7% | 112 | 3,709 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | San Gabriel city | 1,479 | 127 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.6% | 62 | 1,669 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | San Marino city | 2 | 25 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 91.6% | 1 | 28 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Sierra Madre city | 194 | 23 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 7 | 225 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | South El Monte city | 179 | 19 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 49.0% | 8 | 206 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | South Pasadena city | 144 | 24 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 44.1% | 7 | 175 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Temple City city | 592 | 477 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 63.1% | 37 | 1,106 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Walnut city | 941 | 9 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 88.9% | 25 | 976 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | West Covina city | 3,538 | 25 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 66.5% | 119 | 3,682 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Associatic | Unincorporated | 16,281 | 273 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 570 | 17,124 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | Beverly Hills city | 302 | 125 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 43.4% | 17 | 444 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | Culver City city | 471 | 10 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 54.4% | 18 | 499 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | Santa Monica city | 290 | 351 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 29.8% | 28 | 669 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | West Hollywood city | 524 | 58 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 21.6% | 27 | 609 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | Unincorporated | 1,149 | 36 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 41 | 1,226 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Carson city | 1,745 | 35 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 77.9% | 53 | 1,833 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | El Segundo city | 166 | 44 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 41.6% | 9 | 219 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Gardena city | 2,100 | 48 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.3% | 83 | 2,231 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Hawthorne city | 873 | 29 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 25.9% | 41 | 942 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Hermosa Beach city | 0 | 552 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 42.9% | 22 | 574 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Inglewood city | 2,060 | 430 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 36.3% | 105 | 2,594 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Lawndale city | 407 | 62 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 33.2% | 20 | 489 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Lomita city | 272 | 60 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 46.7% | 13 | 345 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Manhattan Beach city | 45 | 835 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 65.1% | 30 | 909 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Palos Verdes Estates city | 14 | 66 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 90.5% | 2 | 82 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Rancho Palos Verdes city | 307 | 0 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 81.6% | 9 | 315 |



D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

## Attachment A: Analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Needs (2005-2014) Based on RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations: Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005) + Vacancy Needs

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Redondo Beach city | 2,058 | 902 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 49.5% | 113 | 3,073 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Rolling Hills city | 10 | 13 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 95.3% | 1 | 24 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Rolling Hills Estates city | 16 | 10 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 91.1% | 1 | 27 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Torrance city | 1,590 | 286 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 56.0% | 68 | 1,945 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Association | Unincorporated | 1,554 | 90 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 57 | 1,701 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Artesia city | 126 | 38 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 56.4% | 6 | 170 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Avalon city | 220 | 21 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 27.6% | 11 | 251 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Bell city | 44 | 9 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 30.9% | 2 | 55 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Bellflower city | 843 | 185 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 40.3% | 42 | 1,070 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Bell Gardens city | 35 | 84 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 23.8% | 5 | 125 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Cerritos city | 93 | 3 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 83.5% | 3 | 98 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Commerce city | 49 | 13 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.4% | 2 | 65 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Compton city | 12 | 58 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 56.3% | 3 | 72 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Cudahy city | 335 | 50 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 17.4% | 18 | 404 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Downey city | 950 | 115 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 51.8% | 40 | 1,105 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Hawaiian Gardens city | 137 | 11 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 45.1% | 6 | 154 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Huntington Park city | 935 | 50 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 27.4% | 44 | 1,029 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | La Habra Heights city | 370 | 8 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 94.2% | 10 | 387 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Lakewood city | 668 | 17 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 72.0% | 22 | 707 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | La Mirada city | 2,591 | 73 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 82.0% | 77 | 2,741 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Long Beach city | 10,532 | 477 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 41.0% | 448 | 11,457 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Lynwood city | 304 | 155 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.1% | 18 | 477 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Maywood city | 1 | 22 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 29.4% | 1 | 24 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Norwalk city | 284 | 45 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 65.8% | 11 | 340 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Paramount city | 1,189 | 70 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 42.9% | 51 | 1,309 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Pico Rivera city | 988 | 7 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 70.4% | 32 | 1,027 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Santa Fe Springs city | 430 | 11 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.9% | 15 | 456 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Signal Hill city | 225 | 49 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.0% | 11 | 285 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | South Gate city | 1,568 | 32 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 46.9% | 62 | 1,662 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Vernon city | 0 | 0 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 16.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Whittier city | 1,205 | 29 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 57.8% | 44 | 1,279 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Unincorporated | 7,064 | 226 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 251 | 7,541 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Agoura Hills city | 108 | 1 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 83.8% | 3 | 112 |



D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment A: Analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Needs (2005-2014) Based on RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations: Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005) + Vacancy Needs

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Calabasas city | 844 | 1 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 80.6% | 25 | 870 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Hidden Hills city | 21 | 14 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 96.5% | 1 | 36 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Malibu city | 380 | 51 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 72.8% | 14 | 445 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Westlake Village city | 49 | 1 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 87.8% | 1 | 52 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Unincorporated | 1,630 | 20 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 57 | 1,706 |
| Orange | Orange County | Aliso Viejo city | 1,330 | 0 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 66.4% | 44 | 1,374 |
| Orange | Orange County | Anaheim city | 2,868 | 190 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 50.0% | 116 | 3,174 |
| Orange | Orange County | Brea city | 1,408 | 41 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 64.2% | 49 | 1,498 |
| Orange | Orange County | Buena Park city | 872 | 62 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 57.1% | 34 | 967 |
| Orange | Orange County | Costa Mesa city | 1,462 | 82 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 40.5% | 63 | 1,607 |
| Orange | Orange County | Cypress city | 648 | 40 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 69.4% | 22 | 710 |
| Orange | Orange County | Dana Point city | 481 | 120 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.0% | 21 | 622 |
| Orange | Orange County | Fountain Valley city | 680 | 11 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 74.7% | 21 | 713 |
| Orange | Orange County | Fullerton city | 1,886 | 66 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 53.9% | 72 | 2,024 |
| Orange | Orange County | Garden Grove city | 939 | 49 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 59.6% | 35 | 1,023 |
| Orange | Orange County | Huntington Beach city | 2,199 | 68 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.6% | 79 | 2,347 |
| Orange | Orange County | Irvine city | 5,567 | 0 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.0% | 196 | 5,763 |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Beach city | 497 | 55 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.1% | 19 | 572 |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Hills city | 252 | 3 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 75.2% | 8 | 263 |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Niguel city | 489 | 53 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 75.0% | 17 | 559 |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Woods city | 216 | 0 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 84.9% | 6 | 222 |
| Orange | Orange County | La Habra city | 163 | 6 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 56.6% | 6 | 176 |
| Orange | Orange County | Lake Forest city | 317 | 2 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 72.0% | 10 | 329 |
| Orange | Orange County | La Palma city | 57 | 1 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 74.1% | 2 | 60 |
| Orange | Orange County | Los Alamitos city | 48 | 19 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 45.2% | 3 | 69 |
| Orange | Orange County | Mission Viejo city | 667 | 1 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 81.4% | 19 | 688 |
| Orange | Orange County | Newport Beach city | 3,108 | 831 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 55.7% | 144 | 4,082 |
| Orange | Orange County | Orange city | 1,336 | 62 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.6% | 48 | 1,446 |
| Orange | Orange County | Placentia city | 635 | 17 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 69.0% | 21 | 673 |
| Orange | Orange County | Rancho Santa Margarita city | 335 | 6 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 78.3% | 10 | 352 |
| Orange | Orange County | San Clemente city | 1,924 | 0 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 62.4% | 66 | 1,990 |
| Orange | Orange County | San Juan Capistrano city | 447 | 2 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 78.9% | 13 | 463 |
| Orange | Orange County | Santa Ana city | 1,064 | 177 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 49.3% | 48 | 1,289 |



D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

## Attachment A: Analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Needs (2005-2014) Based on RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations: Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005) + Vacancy Needs

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Orange | Orange County | Seal Beach city | 453 | 64 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 76.4% | 16 | 533 |
| Orange | Orange County | Stanton city | 1,425 | 12 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 48.9% | 55 | 1,492 |
| Orange | Orange County | Tustin city | 1,370 | 1,067 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 49.6% | 93 | 2,530 |
| Orange | Orange County | Villa Park city | 27 | 2 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 97.1% | 1 | 30 |
| Orange | Orange County | Westminster city | 377 | 20 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.2% | 14 | 411 |
| Orange | Orange County | Yorba Linda city | 1,594 | 52 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 84.7% | 46 | 1,692 |
| Orange | Orange County | Unincorporated | 24,148 | 235 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 79.2% | 721 | 25,104 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Banning city | 2,528 | 47 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 72.0% | 82 | 2,657 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Beaumont city | 7,221 | 22 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 54.0% | 267 | 7,511 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Calimesa city | 2,687 | 8 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 83.0% | 77 | 2,772 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Canyon Lake city | 242 | 1 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 88.1% | 7 | 250 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Corona city | 2,867 | 91 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 67.5% | 98 | 3,055 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Hemet city | 17,843 | 31 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 64.6% | 605 | 18,479 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Lake Elsinore city | 4,512 | 78 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 64.6% | 155 | 4,746 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Moreno Valley city | 7,286 | 89 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 71.1% | 236 | 7,611 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Murrieta city | 9,433 | 27 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 79.7% | 279 | 9,739 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Norco city | 953 | 21 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 82.3% | 28 | 1,002 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Perris city | 4,885 | 21 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 68.1% | 161 | 5,067 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Riverside city | 16,248 | 279 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 56.6% | 597 | 17,125 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | San Jacinto city | 2,641 | 24 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 71.0% | 85 | 2,750 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Temecula city | 4,503 | 14 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 73.4% | 141 | 4,659 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Council O | Unincorporated | 47,745 | 292 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 76.8% | 1455 | 49,491 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Blythe city | 1,012 | 150 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 56.9% | 42 | 1,204 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Cathedral City city | 6,489 | 199 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 65.2% | 225 | 6,913 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Coachella city | 1,688 | 16 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.9% | 60 | 1,764 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Desert Hot Springs city | 4,414 | 35 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 47.2% | 173 | 4,622 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Indian Wells city | 552 | 14 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 88.6% | 15 | 582 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Indio city | 4,907 | 3 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 56.2% | 178 | 5,088 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | La Quinta city | 3,175 | 68 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 81.5% | 94 | 3,337 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Palm Desert city | 4,600 | 55 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 66.9% | 154 | 4,809 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Palm Springs city | 2,099 | 26 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.8% | 74 | 2,200 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Rancho Mirage city | 3,197 | 76 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 83.0% | 93 | 3,367 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associaton | Unincorporated | 9,899 | 67 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 76.8% | 302 | 10,268 |



D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

## Attachment A: Analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Needs (2005-2014) Based on RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations: Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005) + Vacancy Needs

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Adelanto city | 3,041 | 54 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 63.8% | 105 | 3,200 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Apple Valley town | 6,598 | 30 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 70.0% | 214 | 6,842 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Barstow city | 2,127 | 39 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 54.1% | 80 | 2,246 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Big Bear Lake city | 428 | 70 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 63.0% | 17 | 515 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Chino city | 3,174 | 100 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 68.7% | 107 | 3,381 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Chino Hills city | 2,194 | 4 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 84.8% | 61 | 2,259 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Colton city | 4,692 | 29 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 52.0% | 177 | 4,898 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Fontana city | 10,498 | 137 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 68.1% | 349 | 10,984 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Grand Terrace city | 493 | 5 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 65.0% | 17 | 515 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Hesperia city | 13,173 | 19 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 72.3% | 417 | 13,608 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Highland city | 3,081 | 110 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 66.6% | 106 | 3,297 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Loma Linda city | 1,815 | 9 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 38.3% | 76 | 1,900 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Montclair city | 398 | 26 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.6% | 15 | 439 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Needles city | 0 | 15 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 56.9% | 1 | 16 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Ontario city | 11,221 | 170 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 57.6% | 409 | 11,800 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Rancho Cucamonga city | 6,492 | 67 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 70.2% | 211 | 6,770 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Redlands city | 2,407 | 59 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 60.4% | 86 | 2,553 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Rialto city | 2,885 | 30 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 68.4% | 95 | 3,010 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | San Bernardino city | 2,574 | 766 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 52.4% | 125 | 3,465 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Twentynine Palms city | 1,710 | 15 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 43.3% | 69 | 1,794 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Upland city | 4,027 | 22 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 58.9% | 144 | 4,193 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Victorville city | 4,340 | 26 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 65.1% | 147 | 4,513 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Yucaipa city | 3,612 | 86 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 74.2% | 115 | 3,813 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Yucca Valley town | 729 | 13 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 68.0% | 24 | 766 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Unincorporated | 21,618 | 1,474 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 69.3% | 750 | 23,841 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Camarillo city | 4,675 | 31 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 73.5% | 147 | 4,853 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Fillmore city | 577 | 11 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 63.2% | 20 | 608 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Moorpark city | 888 | 25 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 82.1% | 26 | 939 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Ojai city | 366 | 4 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 58.4% | 13 | 383 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Oxnard city | 7,045 | 45 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 57.3% | 255 | 7,345 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Port Hueneme city | 492 | 5 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 49.1% | 19 | 516 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governmn | Buenaventura (Ventura) cit | 3,247 | 57 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 58.7% | 118 | 3,422 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Santa Paula city | 1,771 | 21 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 57.7% | 64 | 1,856 |





D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

## Attachment A: Analysis of Preliminary Regional Housing Needs (2005-2014) Based on RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations: Household Growth (2005-2014) + Replacement Needs (1997-2005) + Vacancy Needs

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Household Growth (2005-2014) | Total Replacement Needs: 2005-2014 | Owner Vacancy Rate (2.3%) | Renter Vacancy Rate (5%) | Census Ownership Rate (%) | Total Vacancy Needs | Preliminary Total Housing Needs (2005-2014) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Simi Valley city | 4,885 | 52 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 77.6% | 148 | 5,086 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Thousand Oaks city | 1,017 | 23 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 75.3% | 32 | 1,072 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Governm | Unincorporated | 2,247 | 80 | 2.3% | 5.0% | 70.9% | 74 | 2,401 |

**Attachment B: Share of Low and Very Low Income Households at the Jurisdictional Level (Using County MHI) and Analysis of Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions Resulting in an Adjustment to the Total Housing Needs**

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | COUNTY | Share of low and very low income households | if city > county, then 1, else 0 | Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Imperial | 41.2% | | -88 |
| | | Los Angeles | 40.4% | | -2,020 |
| | | Orange | 39.2% | | -294 |
| | | Riverside | 39.7% | | -528 |
| | | San Bernardino | 39.5% | | -5 |
| | | Ventura | 39.0% | | -290 |
| | | SCAG | 40.0% | | -3,224 |

| COUNTY | NEWSR | Share of low and very low income households | if city > county, then 1, else 0 | Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imperial | Imperial County | | | -88 |
| Los Angeles | North LA | | | 0 |
| Los Angeles | LA City | | | -1,396 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | | | -82 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Asoc. | | | -260 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | | | -13 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Assoc. | | | -91 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | | | -177 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes, Conejo COG | | | 0 |
| Orange | Orange | | | -294 |
| Riverside | West Riv. COG | | | -507 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley COG | | | -21 |
| San Bernardino | SANBAG | | | -5 |
| Ventura | Ventura COG | | | -290 |
| | SCAG | | | -3,224 |

**Attachment B: Share of Low and Very Low Income Households at the Jurisdictional Level (Using County MHI) and Analysis of Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions Resulting in an Adjustment to the Total Housing Needs**

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Share of low and very low income households | if city > county, then 1. else 0 | Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Associati | Brawley city | 42.8% | 1 | -17 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Associati | Calexico city | 45.4% | 1 | -70 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Associati | Calipatria city | 43.3% | 1 | -1 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Associati | El Centro city | 39.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Associati | Holtville city | 36.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Associati | Imperial city | 23.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Associati | Westmorland city | 52.0% | 1 | 0 |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley Associati | Unincorporated | 43.2% | 1 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | North Los Angeles Count | Lancaster city | 41.6% | 1 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | North Los Angeles Count | Palmdale city | 34.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | North Los Angeles Count | Santa Clarita city | 20.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | North Los Angeles Count | Unincorporated | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | City Of Los Angeles | Los Angeles city | 46.3% | 1 | -1,390 |
| Los Angeles | City Of Los Angeles | San Fernando city | 42.4% | 1 | -6 |
| Los Angeles | City Of Los Angeles | Unincorporated | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | Burbank city | 34.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | Glendale city | 40.9% | 1 | -82 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | La Canada Flintridge city | 12.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | Unincorporated | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Alhambra city | 42.8% | 1 | -51 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Arcadia city | 29.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Azusa city | 41.8% | 1 | -13 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Baldwin Park city | 39.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Bradbury city | 13.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Claremont city | 25.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Covina city | 33.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Diamond Bar city | 18.2% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Duarte city | 32.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | El Monte city | 51.2% | 1 | -71 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Glendora city | 24.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Industry city | 25.7% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Irwindale city | 38.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | La Puente city | 40.9% | 1 | -27 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | La Verne city | 25.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Monrovia city | 37.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Montebello city | 43.3% | 1 | -12 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Monterey Park city | 41.9% | 1 | -25 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Pasadena city | 37.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Pomona city | 42.4% | 1 | -39 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Rosemead city | 46.3% | 1 | -17 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | San Dimas city | 22.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | San Gabriel city | 40.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | San Marino city | 11.7% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Sierra Madre city | 20.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | South El Monte city | 48.8% | 1 | -6 |

**Attachment B: Share of Low and Very Low Income Households at the Jurisdictional Level (Using County MHI) and Analysis of Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions Resulting in an Adjustment to the Total Housing Needs**

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Share of low and very low income households | if city > county, then 1. else 0 | Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | South Pasadena city | 27.2% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Temple City city | 32.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Walnut city | 16.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | West Covina city | 28.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Assoc | Unincorporated | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | Beverly Hills city | 25.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | Culver City city | 28.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | Santa Monica city | 34.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | West Hollywood city | 43.5% | 1 | -13 |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | Unincorporated | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Carson city | 29.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | El Segundo city | 20.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Gardena city | 43.6% | 1 | -33 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Hawthorne city | 51.8% | 1 | -14 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Hermosa Beach city | 15.7% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Inglewood city | 48.9% | 1 | -33 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Lawndale city | 41.7% | 1 | -10 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Lomita city | 36.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Manhattan Beach city | 11.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Palos Verdes Estates city | 10.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Rancho Palos Verdes city | 12.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Redondo Beach city | 20.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Rolling Hills city | 4.5% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Rolling Hills Estates city | 11.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Torrance city | 27.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Associa | Unincorporated | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Artesia city | 34.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Avalon city | 42.0% | 1 | -8 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Bell city | 56.8% | 1 | -1 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Bellflower city | 41.8% | 1 | -16 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Bell Gardens city | 55.5% | 1 | -3 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Cerritos city | 17.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Commerce city | 49.3% | 1 | -1 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Compton city | 52.7% | 1 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Cudahy city | 58.0% | 1 | -11 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Downey city | 36.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Hawaiian Gardens city | 49.1% | 1 | -2 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Huntington Park city | 57.7% | 1 | -24 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | La Habra Heights city | 9.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Lakewood city | 26.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | La Mirada city | 24.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Long Beach city | 45.5% | 1 | -65 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Lynwood city | 46.7% | 1 | -6 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Maywood city | 56.6% | 1 | -1 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Norwalk city | 34.0% | 0 | 0 |

**Attachment B: Share of Low and Very Low Income Households at the Jurisdictional Level (Using County MHI) and Analysis of Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions Resulting in an Adjustment to the Total Housing Needs**

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Share of low and very low income households | if city > county, then 1. else 0 | Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Paramount city | 45.2% | 1 | -9 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Pico Rivera city | 39.5% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Santa Fe Springs city | 35.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Signal Hill city | 30.7% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | South Gate city | 47.0% | 1 | -32 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Vernon city | 16.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Whittier city | 33.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | Unincorporated | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Agoura Hills city | 12.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Calabasas city | 14.2% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Hidden Hills city | 7.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Malibu city | 16.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Westlake Village city | 14.5% | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes | Unincorporated | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Aliso Viejo city | 21.7% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Anaheim city | 49.7% | 1 | -52 |
| Orange | Orange County | Brea city | 38.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Buena Park city | 46.5% | 1 | -20 |
| Orange | Orange County | Costa Mesa city | 45.8% | 1 | -31 |
| Orange | Orange County | Cypress city | 35.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Dana Point city | 34.2% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Fountain Valley city | 29.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Fullerton city | 46.7% | 1 | -38 |
| Orange | Orange County | Garden Grove city | 49.1% | 1 | -23 |
| Orange | Orange County | Huntington Beach city | 34.1% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Irvine city | 31.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Beach city | 29.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Hills city | 31.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Niguel city | 24.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Woods city | 69.2% | 1 | -1 |
| Orange | Orange County | La Habra city | 49.3% | 1 | -3 |
| Orange | Orange County | Lake Forest city | 31.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | La Palma city | 31.7% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Los Alamitos city | 40.9% | 1 | -2 |
| Orange | Orange County | Mission Viejo city | 24.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Newport Beach city | 27.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Orange city | 39.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Placentia city | 34.3% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Rancho Santa Margarita city | 23.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | San Clemente city | 35.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | San Juan Capistrano city | 35.5% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Santa Ana city | 53.9% | 1 | -31 |
| Orange | Orange County | Seal Beach city | 53.6% | 1 | -1 |
| Orange | Orange County | Stanton city | 59.3% | 1 | -33 |
| Orange | Orange County | Tustin city | 40.4% | 1 | -50 |

**Attachment B: Share of Low and Very Low Income Households at the Jurisdictional Level (Using County MHI) and Analysis of Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions Resulting in an Adjustment to the Total Housing Needs**

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Share of low and very low income households | if city > county, then 1. else 0 | Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Orange | Orange County | Villa Park city | 16.2% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Westminster city | 47.5% | 1 | -9 |
| Orange | Orange County | Yorba Linda city | 19.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Orange | Orange County | Unincorporated | 23.7% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Banning city | 52.7% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Beaumont city | 54.5% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Calimesa city | 46.8% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Canyon Lake city | 20.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Corona city | 24.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Hemet city | 61.5% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Lake Elsinore city | 41.5% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Moreno Valley city | 33.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Murrieta city | 23.0% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Norco city | 21.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Perris city | 48.1% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Riverside city | 40.8% | 1 | -63 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | San Jacinto city | 55.3% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Temecula city | 23.2% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Western Riverside Coun | Unincorporated | 40.9% | 1 | -444 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Blythe city | 48.8% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Cathedral City city | 43.4% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Coachella city | 60.4% | 1 | -20 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Desert Hot Springs city | 65.0% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Indian Wells city | 21.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Indio city | 49.4% | 1 | -1 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | La Quinta city | 27.4% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Palm Desert city | 34.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Palm Springs city | 47.6% | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Rancho Mirage city | 29.5% | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley Associa | Unincorporated | 40.9% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Adelanto city | 51.9% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Apple Valley town | 42.1% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Barstow city | 48.1% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Big Bear Lake city | 48.8% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Chino city | 26.6% | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Chino Hills city | 13.5% | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Colton city | 46.9% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Fontana city | 35.2% | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Grand Terrace city | 25.9% | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Hesperia city | 41.7% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Highland city | 40.4% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Loma Linda city | 44.0% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Montclair city | 41.1% | 1 | -5 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Needles city | 57.6% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Ontario city | 37.1% | 0 | 0 |

**Attachment B: Share of Low and Very Low Income Households at the Jurisdictional Level (Using County MHI) and Analysis of Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions Resulting in an Adjustment to the Total Housing Needs**

Draft

| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | Share of low and very low income households | if city > county, then 1. else 0 | Impacts on Housing Needs of Low Income Jurisdictions* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Rancho Cucamonga city | 22.6% | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Redlands city | 33.4% | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Rialto city | 39.5% | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | San Bernardino city | 53.2% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Twentynine Palms city | 54.0% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Upland city | 34.9% | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Victorville city | 46.6% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Yucaipa city | 43.4% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Yucca Valley town | 55.6% | 1 | 0 |
| San Bernardin | SANBAG | Unincorporated | 44.0% | 1 | 0 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Camarillo city | 36.9% | 0 | 0 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Fillmore city | 53.0% | 1 | -16 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Moorpark city | 26.5% | 0 | 0 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Ojai city | 53.3% | 1 | -6 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Oxnard city | 49.1% | 1 | -156 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Port Hueneme city | 56.7% | 1 | -8 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Govean | Buenaventura (Ventura) cit | 44.4% | 1 | -62 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Santa Paula city | 55.4% | 1 | -42 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Simi Valley city | 29.8% | 0 | 0 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Thousand Oaks city | 28.6% | 0 | 0 |
| Ventura | Ventura Council Of Gove | Unincorporated | 36.2% | 0 | 0 |

Note: For the impact analysis, if the share of low and very income households at the jurisdictional level is higher than the county's share, then use 2000 Census vacancy rates for owner and renter hosueholds to produce housing needs. The results are compared with the results of the ideal vacancy rate method (2.3% for owner households and 5% for renter households). The vacancy needs of the low income jurisdictions are generally smaller. If the census rate method still prodcues more vacancy needs than that of the ideal rate method, continue to use the ideal rate method

# Attachment C: RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation: 110% Adjustment to Implement Fair Share Policy

Draft

| | Income Allocation Using 2000 Census County MHI | | | | | 110% Adjustment toward County Distribution | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COUNTY | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
| Imperial | 24.8% | 16.4% | 15.8% | 43.0% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 16.5% | 15.9% | 42.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | 24.7% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.6% | 100.0% | 24.7% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.5% | 100.0% |
| Orange | 21.5% | 17.7% | 19.9% | 40.9% | 100.0% | 21.9% | 18.0% | 20.0% | 40.1% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | 23.4% | 16.3% | 18.5% | 41.8% | 100.0% | 23.2% | 16.3% | 18.5% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| San Bernardino | 23.3% | 16.2% | 18.8% | 41.6% | 100.0% | 23.3% | 16.2% | 18.8% | 41.7% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | 21.4% | 17.6% | 20.5% | 40.5% | 100.0% | 21.3% | 17.5% | 20.5% | 40.8% | 100.0% |
| SCAG | 23.7% | 16.2% | 18.0% | 42.0% | 100.0% | 23.7% | 16.2% | 18.1% | 42.0% | 100.0% |

| COUNTY | NEWSR | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Imperial | Imperial County | 24.8% | 16.4% | 15.8% | 43.0% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 16.5% | 15.9% | 42.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | North LA | 18.9% | 13.4% | 17.1% | 50.6% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.8% | 17.0% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | LA City | 29.4% | 16.8% | 16.6% | 37.2% | 100.0% | 24.2% | 15.6% | 17.1% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | Arroyo Verdugo | 23.0% | 14.1% | 17.0% | 46.0% | 100.0% | 24.9% | 15.8% | 17.0% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | San Gabriel Valley Asoc. | 20.8% | 15.0% | 17.6% | 46.6% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.7% | 17.0% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | Westside Cities | 21.3% | 13.0% | 16.4% | 49.3% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.9% | 17.1% | 42.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | South Bay Cities Assoc. | 18.6% | 13.6% | 16.6% | 51.2% | 100.0% | 25.3% | 15.9% | 17.1% | 41.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | Gateway Cities | 24.3% | 16.7% | 18.3% | 40.7% | 100.0% | 24.8% | 15.6% | 17.0% | 42.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angeles | Las Virgenes, Conejo COG | 10.8% | 8.3% | 11.0% | 69.9% | 100.0% | 25.6% | 16.1% | 17.4% | 40.8% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange | 21.5% | 17.7% | 19.9% | 40.9% | 100.0% | 21.9% | 18.0% | 20.0% | 40.1% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | West Riv. COG | 22.8% | 16.0% | 18.6% | 42.6% | 100.0% | 23.2% | 16.3% | 18.5% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valley COG | 25.3% | 17.4% | 18.2% | 39.2% | 100.0% | 23.1% | 16.2% | 18.5% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| San Bernardino | SANBAG | 23.3% | 16.2% | 18.8% | 41.6% | 100.0% | 23.3% | 16.2% | 18.8% | 41.7% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura COG | 21.4% | 17.6% | 20.5% | 40.5% | 100.0% | 21.3% | 17.5% | 20.5% | 40.8% | 100.0% |
| | SCAG | 23.7% | 16.2% | 18.0% | 42.0% | 100.0% | 23.7% | 16.2% | 18.1% | 42.0% | 100.0% |





D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment C: RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation: 110% Adjustment to Implement Fair Share Policy

Draft

| | | | Income Allocation Using 2000 Census County MHI | | | | | 110% Adjustment toward County Distribution | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley | Brawley city | 27.2% | 15.6% | 14.8% | 42.4% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 16.5% | 15.9% | 43.0% | 100.0% |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley | Calexico city | 26.0% | 19.4% | 18.0% | 36.7% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 16.1% | 15.6% | 43.6% | 100.0% |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley | Calipatria city | 23.3% | 20.0% | 14.9% | 41.8% | 100.0% | 24.9% | 16.1% | 15.9% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley | El Centro city | 24.8% | 15.0% | 14.4% | 45.8% | 100.0% | 24.8% | 16.6% | 16.0% | 42.7% | 100.0% |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley | Holtville city | 20.5% | 15.5% | 16.1% | 47.9% | 100.0% | 25.2% | 16.5% | 15.8% | 42.5% | 100.0% |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley | Imperial city | 12.4% | 10.6% | 12.0% | 64.9% | 100.0% | 26.0% | 17.0% | 16.2% | 40.8% | 100.0% |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley | Westmorland city | 34.8% | 17.2% | 17.4% | 30.6% | 100.0% | 23.8% | 16.4% | 15.7% | 44.2% | 100.0% |
| Imperial | Imperial Valley | Unincorporated | 25.3% | 17.9% | 17.7% | 39.1% | 100.0% | 24.7% | 16.3% | 15.6% | 43.3% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | North Los Ang | Lancaster city | 25.2% | 16.4% | 18.4% | 40.0% | 100.0% | 24.7% | 15.6% | 16.9% | 42.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | North Los Ang | Palmdale city | 20.7% | 14.2% | 18.7% | 46.4% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.8% | 16.9% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | North Los Ang | Santa Clarita city | 11.0% | 9.3% | 14.9% | 64.7% | 100.0% | 26.1% | 16.3% | 17.3% | 40.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | North Los Ang | Unincorporated | 21.8% | 15.1% | 17.1% | 46.1% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | City Of Los An | Los Angeles city | 29.5% | 16.8% | 16.6% | 37.1% | 100.0% | 24.2% | 15.6% | 17.1% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | City Of Los An | San Fernando city | 24.0% | 18.4% | 21.5% | 36.1% | 100.0% | 24.8% | 15.4% | 16.6% | 43.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | City Of Los An | Unincorporated | 21.8% | 15.1% | 17.1% | 46.1% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Arroyo Verdug | Burbank city | 20.6% | 14.0% | 18.2% | 47.3% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.8% | 17.0% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Arroyo Verdug | Glendale city | 25.9% | 15.0% | 17.1% | 42.1% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Arroyo Verdug | Canada Flintridge city | 8.2% | 4.7% | 8.4% | 78.8% | 100.0% | 26.4% | 16.8% | 17.9% | 38.9% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Arroyo Verdug | Unincorporated | 21.8% | 15.1% | 17.1% | 46.1% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Alhambra city | 25.8% | 17.0% | 19.2% | 38.0% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 15.5% | 16.9% | 43.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Arcadia city | 15.6% | 13.7% | 16.2% | 54.5% | 100.0% | 25.6% | 15.9% | 17.2% | 41.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Azusa city | 24.7% | 17.1% | 20.7% | 37.5% | 100.0% | 24.7% | 15.5% | 16.7% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Baldwin Park city | 21.3% | 17.8% | 21.9% | 39.0% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.5% | 16.6% | 42.9% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Bradbury city | 2.4% | 10.6% | 6.2% | 80.8% | 100.0% | 26.9% | 16.2% | 18.2% | 38.7% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Claremont city | 14.9% | 10.5% | 12.8% | 61.8% | 100.0% | 25.7% | 16.2% | 17.5% | 40.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Covina city | 19.6% | 14.2% | 18.3% | 47.9% | 100.0% | 25.2% | 15.8% | 17.0% | 42.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Diamond Bar city | 10.0% | 8.2% | 15.7% | 66.1% | 100.0% | 26.2% | 16.4% | 17.2% | 40.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Duarte city | 19.4% | 12.9% | 17.7% | 50.1% | 100.0% | 25.2% | 15.9% | 17.0% | 41.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | El Monte city | 30.1% | 21.1% | 19.9% | 28.9% | 100.0% | 24.2% | 15.1% | 16.8% | 43.9% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | San Gabriel Va | Glendora city | 13.6% | 11.3% | 16.7% | 58.4% | 100.0% | 25.8% | 16.1% | 17.1% | 41.0% | 100.0% |



D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment C: RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation: 110% Adjustment to Implement Fair Share Policy

Draft

| | | Income Allocation Using 2000 Census County MHI | | | | | 110% Adjustment toward County Distribution | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COUNTY NEWSR | CITY | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Industry city | 11.4% | 14.3% | 27.1% | 47.1% | 100.0% | 26.0% | 15.8% | 16.1% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Irwindale city | 29.7% | 8.7% | 23.9% | 37.7% | 100.0% | 24.2% | 16.4% | 16.4% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | La Puente city | 22.5% | 18.4% | 18.7% | 40.4% | 100.0% | 24.9% | 15.4% | 16.9% | 42.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | La Verne city | 13.4% | 12.2% | 15.0% | 59.4% | 100.0% | 25.8% | 16.0% | 17.3% | 40.9% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Monrovia city | 20.7% | 16.3% | 17.9% | 45.1% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.6% | 17.0% | 42.3% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Montebello city | 26.0% | 17.3% | 19.7% | 37.0% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 15.5% | 16.8% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Monterey Park city | 25.2% | 16.7% | 18.2% | 39.9% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 15.6% | 17.0% | 42.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Pasadena city | 23.0% | 14.4% | 16.3% | 46.4% | 100.0% | 24.9% | 15.8% | 17.2% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Pomona city | 25.8% | 16.6% | 19.2% | 38.3% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 15.6% | 16.9% | 43.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Rosemead city | 27.0% | 19.3% | 19.5% | 34.2% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 15.3% | 16.8% | 43.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | San Dimas city | 12.1% | 10.5% | 16.0% | 61.4% | 100.0% | 26.0% | 16.2% | 17.2% | 40.7% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | San Gabriel city | 22.3% | 17.7% | 18.4% | 41.6% | 100.0% | 24.9% | 15.5% | 16.9% | 42.7% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | San Marino city | 6.8% | 4.9% | 5.9% | 82.4% | 100.0% | 26.5% | 16.7% | 18.2% | 38.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Sierra Madre city | 9.5% | 10.8% | 15.3% | 64.4% | 100.0% | 26.2% | 16.2% | 17.3% | 40.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | South El Monte city | 25.1% | 23.7% | 19.3% | 31.9% | 100.0% | 24.7% | 14.9% | 16.9% | 43.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | South Pasadena city | 14.9% | 12.3% | 17.6% | 55.2% | 100.0% | 25.7% | 16.0% | 17.0% | 41.3% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Temple City city | 18.2% | 13.8% | 19.9% | 48.0% | 100.0% | 25.3% | 15.8% | 16.8% | 42.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Walnut city | 9.4% | 6.7% | 9.5% | 74.4% | 100.0% | 26.2% | 16.6% | 17.8% | 39.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | West Covina city | 14.5% | 14.3% | 18.2% | 53.0% | 100.0% | 25.7% | 15.8% | 17.0% | 41.5% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel San Gabriel Va | Unincorporated | 21.8% | 15.1% | 17.1% | 46.1% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Westside Cities | Beverly Hills city | 15.7% | 9.4% | 12.3% | 62.6% | 100.0% | 25.6% | 16.3% | 17.6% | 40.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Westside Cities | Culver City city | 15.4% | 13.2% | 19.5% | 52.0% | 100.0% | 25.6% | 15.9% | 16.8% | 41.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Westside Cities | Santa Monica city | 21.8% | 12.2% | 15.6% | 50.4% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 16.0% | 17.2% | 41.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Westside Cities | West Hollywood city | 27.9% | 15.6% | 17.9% | 38.6% | 100.0% | 24.4% | 15.7% | 17.0% | 43.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Westside Cities | Unincorporated | 21.8% | 15.1% | 17.1% | 46.1% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Carson city | 16.3% | 13.6% | 18.1% | 52.0% | 100.0% | 25.5% | 15.9% | 17.0% | 41.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | El Segundo city | 10.0% | 10.4% | 18.8% | 60.8% | 100.0% | 26.2% | 16.2% | 16.9% | 40.7% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Gardena city | 26.4% | 17.2% | 17.8% | 38.6% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 15.5% | 17.0% | 43.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Hawthorne city | 30.4% | 21.4% | 19.0% | 29.2% | 100.0% | 24.1% | 15.1% | 16.9% | 43.9% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Hermosa Beach city | 8.5% | 7.2% | 13.0% | 71.2% | 100.0% | 26.3% | 16.5% | 17.5% | 39.7% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Inglewood city | 30.7% | 18.2% | 20.0% | 31.1% | 100.0% | 24.1% | 15.4% | 16.8% | 43.7% | 100.0% |



D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment C: RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation: 110% Adjustment to Implement Fair Share Policy

Draft

| | | Income Allocation Using 2000 Census County MHI | | | | | 110% Adjustment toward County Distribution | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COUNTY NEWSR | CITY | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Lawndale city | 23.2% | 18.5% | 22.7% | 35.6% | 100.0% | 24.8% | 15.4% | 16.5% | 43.3% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Lomita city | 20.4% | 16.0% | 19.8% | 43.8% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.6% | 16.8% | 42.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Manhattan Beach city | 6.9% | 4.9% | 9.3% | 78.9% | 100.0% | 26.5% | 16.7% | 17.9% | 38.9% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Cities | Verdes Estates city | 4.7% | 5.6% | 6.1% | 83.6% | 100.0% | 26.7% | 16.7% | 18.2% | 38.5% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | ho Palos Verdes city | 5.9% | 6.4% | 11.1% | 76.6% | 100.0% | 26.6% | 16.6% | 17.7% | 39.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Redondo Beach city | 11.3% | 9.1% | 14.5% | 65.1% | 100.0% | 26.0% | 16.3% | 17.3% | 40.3% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Rolling Hills city | 2.3% | 2.2% | 3.1% | 92.3% | 100.0% | 26.9% | 17.0% | 18.5% | 37.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | ling Hills Estates city | 5.9% | 5.2% | 8.6% | 80.3% | 100.0% | 26.6% | 16.7% | 17.9% | 38.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Torrance city | 15.0% | 12.3% | 16.7% | 56.0% | 100.0% | 25.7% | 16.0% | 17.1% | 41.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel South Bay Citie | Unincorporated | 21.8% | 15.1% | 17.1% | 46.1% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Artesia city | 17.8% | 16.5% | 21.2% | 44.4% | 100.0% | 25.4% | 15.6% | 16.7% | 42.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Avalon city | 20.8% | 21.2% | 19.4% | 38.6% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.1% | 16.8% | 43.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Bell city | 31.4% | 25.4% | 19.1% | 24.0% | 100.0% | 24.0% | 14.7% | 16.9% | 44.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Bellflower city | 24.1% | 17.7% | 21.1% | 37.0% | 100.0% | 24.8% | 15.5% | 16.7% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Bell Gardens city | 31.8% | 23.7% | 21.8% | 22.7% | 100.0% | 24.0% | 14.9% | 16.6% | 44.5% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Cerritos city | 8.5% | 8.9% | 13.4% | 69.3% | 100.0% | 26.3% | 16.3% | 17.4% | 39.9% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Commerce city | 30.3% | 19.0% | 20.6% | 30.0% | 100.0% | 24.1% | 15.3% | 16.7% | 43.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Compton city | 33.5% | 19.2% | 18.7% | 28.7% | 100.0% | 23.8% | 15.3% | 16.9% | 44.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Cudahy city | 35.7% | 22.3% | 20.2% | 21.7% | 100.0% | 23.6% | 15.0% | 16.8% | 44.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Downey city | 20.6% | 15.5% | 19.1% | 44.8% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.7% | 16.9% | 42.3% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | awaiian Gardens city | 29.4% | 19.7% | 20.2% | 30.7% | 100.0% | 24.2% | 15.3% | 16.8% | 43.8% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Huntington Park city | 34.0% | 23.7% | 19.2% | 23.1% | 100.0% | 23.8% | 14.9% | 16.9% | 44.5% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | a Habra Heights city | 5.2% | 4.6% | 8.1% | 82.1% | 100.0% | 26.7% | 16.8% | 18.0% | 38.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Lakewood city | 14.7% | 11.4% | 16.3% | 57.5% | 100.0% | 25.7% | 16.1% | 17.2% | 41.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | La Mirada city | 12.9% | 11.5% | 14.8% | 60.8% | 100.0% | 25.9% | 16.1% | 17.3% | 40.7% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Long Beach city | 28.6% | 16.9% | 17.1% | 37.4% | 100.0% | 24.3% | 15.5% | 17.1% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Lynwood city | 27.1% | 19.6% | 22.5% | 30.8% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 15.3% | 16.5% | 43.7% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Maywood city | 32.9% | 23.7% | 19.0% | 24.5% | 100.0% | 23.9% | 14.9% | 16.9% | 44.4% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Norwalk city | 17.5% | 16.5% | 21.3% | 44.8% | 100.0% | 25.4% | 15.6% | 16.7% | 42.3% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Paramount city | 26.7% | 18.5% | 21.8% | 33.0% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 15.4% | 16.6% | 43.5% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel Gateway Cities | Pico Rivera city | 24.1% | 15.4% | 20.4% | 40.1% | 100.0% | 24.8% | 15.7% | 16.7% | 42.8% | 100.0% |





D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment C: RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation: 110% Adjustment to Implement Fair Share Policy

Draft

| | | | Income Allocation Using 2000 Census County MHI | | | | | 110% Adjustment toward County Distribution | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
| Los Angel | Gateway Cities | Santa Fe Springs city | 20.6% | 14.7% | 21.7% | 43.0% | 100.0% | 25.1% | 15.8% | 16.6% | 42.5% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Gateway Cities | Signal Hill city | 16.8% | 13.9% | 21.1% | 48.2% | 100.0% | 25.5% | 15.8% | 16.7% | 42.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Gateway Cities | South Gate city | 25.6% | 21.4% | 21.5% | 31.5% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 15.1% | 16.6% | 43.7% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Gateway Cities | Vernon city | 8.3% | 8.3% | 20.8% | 62.5% | 100.0% | 26.3% | 16.4% | 16.7% | 40.6% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Gateway Cities | Whittier city | 18.5% | 14.5% | 18.2% | 48.8% | 100.0% | 25.3% | 15.8% | 17.0% | 41.9% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Gateway Cities | Unincorporated | 21.8% | 15.1% | 17.1% | 46.1% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Las Virgenes | Agoura Hills city | 5.6% | 6.5% | 9.5% | 78.4% | 100.0% | 26.6% | 16.6% | 17.8% | 39.0% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Las Virgenes | Calabasas city | 7.6% | 6.6% | 9.6% | 76.2% | 100.0% | 26.4% | 16.6% | 17.8% | 39.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Las Virgenes | Hidden Hills city | 3.3% | 3.8% | 6.6% | 86.2% | 100.0% | 26.8% | 16.8% | 18.1% | 38.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Las Virgenes | Malibu city | 10.4% | 6.4% | 8.3% | 74.9% | 100.0% | 26.1% | 16.6% | 17.9% | 39.3% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Las Virgenes | Westlake Village city | 8.2% | 6.3% | 9.5% | 76.0% | 100.0% | 26.3% | 16.6% | 17.8% | 39.2% | 100.0% |
| Los Angel | Las Virgenes | Unincorporated | 21.8% | 15.1% | 17.1% | 46.1% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 15.7% | 17.1% | 42.2% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Aliso Viejo city | 9.1% | 12.6% | 23.2% | 55.2% | 100.0% | 22.8% | 18.2% | 19.6% | 39.5% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Anaheim city | 27.5% | 22.2% | 20.5% | 29.8% | 100.0% | 20.9% | 17.2% | 19.8% | 42.0% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Brea city | 19.7% | 18.7% | 21.0% | 40.6% | 100.0% | 21.7% | 17.6% | 19.8% | 40.9% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Buena Park city | 25.2% | 21.3% | 22.5% | 30.9% | 100.0% | 21.2% | 17.3% | 19.6% | 41.9% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Costa Mesa city | 25.0% | 20.8% | 21.9% | 32.3% | 100.0% | 21.2% | 17.4% | 19.7% | 41.7% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Cypress city | 17.5% | 17.5% | 20.6% | 44.5% | 100.0% | 21.9% | 17.7% | 19.8% | 40.5% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Dana Point city | 17.5% | 16.7% | 20.3% | 45.5% | 100.0% | 21.9% | 17.8% | 19.9% | 40.4% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Fountain Valley city | 14.2% | 15.7% | 20.5% | 49.6% | 100.0% | 22.3% | 17.9% | 19.8% | 40.0% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Fullerton city | 26.3% | 20.4% | 20.5% | 32.7% | 100.0% | 21.1% | 17.4% | 19.8% | 41.7% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Garden Grove city | 27.6% | 21.5% | 22.0% | 28.9% | 100.0% | 20.9% | 17.3% | 19.7% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Huntington Beach city | 18.0% | 16.1% | 20.3% | 45.6% | 100.0% | 21.9% | 17.8% | 19.9% | 40.4% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Irvine city | 18.1% | 12.9% | 17.7% | 51.3% | 100.0% | 21.9% | 18.2% | 20.1% | 39.8% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Beach city | 16.9% | 12.7% | 16.8% | 53.7% | 100.0% | 22.0% | 18.2% | 20.2% | 39.6% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Hills city | 15.9% | 15.7% | 19.3% | 49.1% | 100.0% | 22.1% | 17.9% | 19.9% | 40.1% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Niguel city | 11.8% | 13.1% | 17.9% | 57.3% | 100.0% | 22.5% | 18.1% | 20.1% | 39.2% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Laguna Woods city | 48.4% | 20.8% | 14.7% | 16.1% | 100.0% | 18.8% | 17.4% | 20.4% | 43.4% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | La Habra city | 28.9% | 20.4% | 21.3% | 29.3% | 100.0% | 20.8% | 17.4% | 19.8% | 42.0% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Lake Forest city | 15.7% | 16.1% | 19.9% | 48.2% | 100.0% | 22.1% | 17.8% | 19.9% | 40.2% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | La Palma city | 15.2% | 16.5% | 18.8% | 49.5% | 100.0% | 22.2% | 17.8% | 20.0% | 40.0% | 100.0% |





D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment C: RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation: 110% Adjustment to Implement Fair Share Policy

Draft

| | | | Income Allocation Using 2000 Census County MHI | | | | | 110% Adjustment toward County Distribution | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
| Orange | Orange County | Los Alamitos city | 21.8% | 19.1% | 24.8% | 34.3% | 100.0% | 21.5% | 17.5% | 19.4% | 41.5% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Mission Viejo city | 11.9% | 12.9% | 18.9% | 56.3% | 100.0% | 22.5% | 18.2% | 20.0% | 39.3% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Newport Beach city | 15.1% | 12.3% | 15.1% | 57.5% | 100.0% | 22.2% | 18.2% | 20.4% | 39.2% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Orange city | 21.1% | 17.9% | 20.3% | 40.7% | 100.0% | 21.6% | 17.7% | 19.9% | 40.9% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Placentia city | 17.2% | 17.1% | 21.3% | 44.4% | 100.0% | 22.0% | 17.7% | 19.8% | 40.5% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Santa Margarita city | 10.0% | 13.9% | 18.8% | 57.2% | 100.0% | 22.7% | 18.1% | 20.0% | 39.3% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | San Clemente city | 19.2% | 16.4% | 19.1% | 45.3% | 100.0% | 21.8% | 17.8% | 20.0% | 40.4% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Juan Capistrano city | 19.5% | 16.0% | 20.4% | 44.1% | 100.0% | 21.7% | 17.9% | 19.8% | 40.6% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Santa Ana city | 30.5% | 23.4% | 21.9% | 24.2% | 100.0% | 20.6% | 17.1% | 19.7% | 42.6% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Seal Beach city | 36.1% | 17.5% | 15.0% | 31.5% | 100.0% | 20.1% | 17.7% | 20.4% | 41.8% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Stanton city | 37.2% | 22.1% | 20.9% | 19.8% | 100.0% | 20.0% | 17.2% | 19.8% | 43.0% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Tustin city | 19.9% | 20.5% | 21.3% | 38.3% | 100.0% | 21.7% | 17.4% | 19.8% | 41.1% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Villa Park city | 6.8% | 9.4% | 11.5% | 72.3% | 100.0% | 23.0% | 18.5% | 20.7% | 37.7% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Westminster city | 29.4% | 18.1% | 20.3% | 32.2% | 100.0% | 20.7% | 17.6% | 19.9% | 41.8% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Yorba Linda city | 9.5% | 10.4% | 15.8% | 64.3% | 100.0% | 22.7% | 18.4% | 20.3% | 38.5% | 100.0% |
| Orange | Orange County | Unincorporated | 12.2% | 11.5% | 17.8% | 58.5% | 100.0% | 22.5% | 18.3% | 20.1% | 39.1% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Banning city | 33.0% | 19.7% | 19.6% | 27.7% | 100.0% | 22.4% | 16.0% | 18.4% | 43.2% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Beaumont city | 35.8% | 18.7% | 16.5% | 29.0% | 100.0% | 22.1% | 16.1% | 18.7% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Calimesa city | 27.8% | 19.0% | 18.7% | 34.4% | 100.0% | 22.9% | 16.1% | 18.5% | 42.5% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Canyon Lake city | 11.4% | 9.2% | 14.3% | 65.0% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 17.0% | 18.9% | 39.5% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Corona city | 12.6% | 11.4% | 18.3% | 57.8% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 16.8% | 18.5% | 40.2% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Hemet city | 39.2% | 22.3% | 18.1% | 20.3% | 100.0% | 21.8% | 15.7% | 18.5% | 43.9% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Lake Elsinore city | 25.6% | 15.9% | 16.8% | 41.6% | 100.0% | 23.2% | 16.4% | 18.7% | 41.8% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Moreno Valley city | 18.6% | 15.0% | 20.8% | 45.5% | 100.0% | 23.9% | 16.5% | 18.3% | 41.4% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Murrieta city | 11.6% | 11.4% | 17.2% | 59.8% | 100.0% | 24.6% | 16.8% | 18.6% | 40.0% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Norco city | 12.0% | 9.8% | 16.8% | 61.4% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 17.0% | 18.6% | 39.8% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Perris city | 27.9% | 20.2% | 23.3% | 28.7% | 100.0% | 22.9% | 15.9% | 18.0% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Riverside city | 24.1% | 16.7% | 18.7% | 40.5% | 100.0% | 23.3% | 16.3% | 18.5% | 41.9% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | San Jacinto city | 35.1% | 20.2% | 19.7% | 25.0% | 100.0% | 22.2% | 15.9% | 18.4% | 43.5% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Temecula city | 12.1% | 11.1% | 17.9% | 58.8% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 16.9% | 18.5% | 40.1% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Western Rivers | Unincorporated | 24.2% | 16.7% | 18.1% | 41.0% | 100.0% | 23.3% | 16.3% | 18.5% | 41.9% | 100.0% |





D:\qm\rtp07\rhna07\pptac_101906.xls

# Attachment C: RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation: 110% Adjustment to Implement Fair Share Policy

Draft

| | | | Income Allocation Using 2000 Census County MHI | | | | | 110% Adjustment toward County Distribution | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Blythe city | 32.9% | 15.9% | 17.3% | 33.9% | 100.0% | 22.4% | 16.4% | 18.6% | 42.6% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Cathedral City city | 25.3% | 18.1% | 20.3% | 36.4% | 100.0% | 23.2% | 16.2% | 18.3% | 42.3% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Coachella city | 35.4% | 25.0% | 18.5% | 21.1% | 100.0% | 22.2% | 15.5% | 18.5% | 43.9% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | esert Hot Springs city | 42.4% | 22.6% | 14.6% | 20.5% | 100.0% | 21.5% | 15.7% | 18.9% | 43.9% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Indian Wells city | 12.1% | 9.3% | 8.6% | 70.0% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 17.0% | 19.5% | 39.0% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Indio city | 29.5% | 19.9% | 21.8% | 28.8% | 100.0% | 22.8% | 16.0% | 18.2% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | La Quinta city | 14.1% | 13.3% | 19.1% | 53.4% | 100.0% | 24.3% | 16.6% | 18.4% | 40.6% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Palm Desert city | 19.4% | 15.4% | 18.3% | 46.9% | 100.0% | 23.8% | 16.4% | 18.5% | 41.3% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Palm Springs city | 29.0% | 18.6% | 17.1% | 35.2% | 100.0% | 22.8% | 16.1% | 18.6% | 42.5% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Rancho Mirage city | 16.7% | 12.8% | 14.9% | 55.5% | 100.0% | 24.0% | 16.7% | 18.8% | 40.4% | 100.0% |
| Riverside | Coachella Valle | Unincorporated | 24.2% | 16.7% | 18.1% | 41.0% | 100.0% | 23.3% | 16.3% | 18.5% | 41.9% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Adelanto city | 32.1% | 19.8% | 23.0% | 25.1% | 100.0% | 22.4% | 15.8% | 18.4% | 43.3% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Apple Valley town | 24.1% | 18.0% | 18.7% | 39.2% | 100.0% | 23.3% | 16.0% | 18.9% | 41.9% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Barstow city | 31.3% | 16.8% | 20.2% | 31.7% | 100.0% | 22.5% | 16.1% | 18.7% | 42.6% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Big Bear Lake city | 30.7% | 18.1% | 14.6% | 36.6% | 100.0% | 22.6% | 16.0% | 19.3% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Chino city | 15.8% | 10.8% | 17.5% | 56.0% | 100.0% | 24.1% | 16.7% | 19.0% | 40.2% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Chino Hills city | 6.8% | 6.7% | 11.3% | 75.2% | 100.0% | 25.0% | 17.1% | 19.6% | 38.3% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Colton city | 28.1% | 18.8% | 21.2% | 32.0% | 100.0% | 22.9% | 15.9% | 18.6% | 42.6% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Fontana city | 19.3% | 15.9% | 19.8% | 45.1% | 100.0% | 23.7% | 16.2% | 18.7% | 41.3% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Grand Terrace city | 14.4% | 11.5% | 19.1% | 55.0% | 100.0% | 24.2% | 16.7% | 18.8% | 40.3% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Hesperia city | 23.9% | 17.8% | 20.6% | 37.7% | 100.0% | 23.3% | 16.0% | 18.7% | 42.0% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Highland city | 25.7% | 14.7% | 18.6% | 41.0% | 100.0% | 23.1% | 16.3% | 18.9% | 41.7% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Loma Linda city | 27.9% | 16.1% | 18.9% | 37.0% | 100.0% | 22.9% | 16.2% | 18.8% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Montclair city | 23.2% | 17.9% | 18.8% | 40.1% | 100.0% | 23.3% | 16.0% | 18.8% | 41.8% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Needles city | 42.5% | 15.1% | 15.4% | 27.0% | 100.0% | 21.4% | 16.3% | 19.2% | 43.1% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Ontario city | 20.0% | 17.1% | 22.2% | 40.6% | 100.0% | 23.7% | 16.1% | 18.5% | 41.7% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | icho Cucamonga city | 11.9% | 10.7% | 16.7% | 60.8% | 100.0% | 24.5% | 16.8% | 19.1% | 39.7% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Redlands city | 18.9% | 14.5% | 18.9% | 47.8% | 100.0% | 23.8% | 16.4% | 18.8% | 41.0% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Rialto city | 22.0% | 17.5% | 20.4% | 40.2% | 100.0% | 23.5% | 16.1% | 18.7% | 41.8% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | San Bernardino city | 34.4% | 18.8% | 18.5% | 28.3% | 100.0% | 22.2% | 15.9% | 18.9% | 43.0% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | wentynine Palms city | 30.6% | 23.4% | 20.5% | 25.4% | 100.0% | 22.6% | 15.5% | 18.7% | 43.3% | 100.0% |

# Attachment C: RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation: 110% Adjustment to Implement Fair Share Policy

Draft

| | | | Income Allocation Using 2000 Census County MHI | | | | | 110% Adjustment toward County Distribution | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COUNTY | NEWSR | CITY | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % | % OF VERY LOW | % OF LOW | % OF MODERATE | % OF ABOVE | Total of all Income Groups % |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Upland city | 19.9% | 15.0% | 16.6% | 48.5% | 100.0% | 23.7% | 16.3% | 19.1% | 41.0% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Victorville city | 29.8% | 16.8% | 19.0% | 34.4% | 100.0% | 22.7% | 16.1% | 18.8% | 42.4% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Yucaipa city | 26.3% | 17.1% | 18.1% | 38.5% | 100.0% | 23.0% | 16.1% | 18.9% | 41.9% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Yucca Valley town | 35.4% | 20.2% | 19.4% | 25.0% | 100.0% | 22.1% | 15.8% | 18.8% | 43.3% | 100.0% |
| San Berna | SANBAG | Unincorporated | 25.8% | 18.2% | 19.2% | 36.9% | 100.0% | 23.1% | 16.0% | 18.8% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Camarillo city | 19.7% | 17.2% | 20.5% | 42.6% | 100.0% | 21.6% | 17.6% | 20.5% | 40.3% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Fillmore city | 31.5% | 21.5% | 21.0% | 26.0% | 100.0% | 20.4% | 17.2% | 20.5% | 42.0% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Moorpark city | 12.9% | 13.6% | 18.9% | 54.6% | 100.0% | 22.3% | 18.0% | 20.7% | 39.1% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Ojai city | 29.5% | 23.8% | 17.8% | 28.9% | 100.0% | 20.6% | 16.9% | 20.8% | 41.7% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Oxnard city | 27.1% | 22.0% | 22.4% | 28.5% | 100.0% | 20.8% | 17.1% | 20.3% | 41.7% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Port Hueneme city | 34.4% | 22.3% | 23.0% | 20.3% | 100.0% | 20.1% | 17.1% | 20.3% | 42.5% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | ventura (Ventura) cit | 25.6% | 18.8% | 22.7% | 32.9% | 100.0% | 21.0% | 17.4% | 20.3% | 41.3% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Santa Paula city | 35.2% | 20.2% | 19.8% | 24.7% | 100.0% | 20.0% | 17.3% | 20.6% | 42.1% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Simi Valley city | 14.5% | 15.3% | 20.8% | 49.4% | 100.0% | 22.1% | 17.8% | 20.5% | 39.6% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Thousand Oaks city | 14.9% | 13.7% | 17.7% | 53.7% | 100.0% | 22.1% | 17.9% | 20.8% | 39.2% | 100.0% |
| Ventura | Ventura Counc | Unincorporated | 20.1% | 16.1% | 19.0% | 44.9% | 100.0% | 21.5% | 17.7% | 20.7% | 40.1% | 100.0% |