

SECTION 6 HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

6.0 HOUSING NEED

This section addresses the existing, future and special housing needs of the city. The needs are grouped into three:

- Existing Needs,
- Projected needs over the next five years, or planning period, and
- Special Needs or needs of special groups in the community.

Existing needs (i.e., immediate needs) address lower income households that live in overcrowded conditions and/or overpay for housing. Special needs refer to the several groups of people in the general population who have special housing needs. These needs often make it difficult for these groups to find suitable housing. Thus, the state housing element guidelines direct local governments to address the housing needs of these special groups. Projected or future housing needs address how the city will meet its "fair share" of the region's projected housing needs by household income groups for the five-year planning period.

The city's current five-year planning period is 2002-07. This period began on June 30, 2002 and ends on June 30, 2007. There was an Interim Planning Period, which began on January 1, 2000 and ended on June 30, 2002. The regional housing needs plan period commenced January 1, 2000 and will end on June 30, 2007.

The State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) directs that at the time of preparation of each of their individual housing elements, jurisdictions may reduce their allocations by net units developed during the Interim Planning period. The tables in this section contain data as of February 14, 2000 relative to the city's ability to meet its regional housing allocation. The law requires that the city demonstrate that there is sufficient realistic capacity at appropriate densities and development standards to permit development of a range of housing types and prices to accommodate its fair share of the regional housing need by income level.

The HCD provides each regional council of governments (COGs) its share of the statewide housing need. In turn, all COGs, including the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to which City of Davis belongs, are required by state law to determine the portion allocated to each jurisdiction in their region. The allocation process is made through a plan prepared by the SACOG called Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP). The major goal of the RHNP is to assure a fair distribution of housing among cities and counties within the region, so that each jurisdiction provides an opportunity for a mix of housing affordable to all of its economic segments. The fair share is allocated by SACOG based on the four income categories of very-low, low, moderate and above-moderate incomes.

Income Categories, Overpaying and Overcrowding Defined

The four income category definitions below are derived from Title 25, Sections 6926, 6928, 6930 and 6932 of the California Code of Regulations, the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the State Health and Safety Code Sections 50079.5, 50105, and 50093. The definitions for overpaying and overcrowding below are from the state HCD documents. The following are definitions of some key terms used in this section:

Extremely-Very-Low-Income -- Refers to a household earning 35 percent or less of the area median family income, with adjustments for unusually high or low area income and household size. This category is not included separately by the allocation process. However, it is used in addressing housing needs of some special groups in this document.

Very-Low-Income -- Refers to a household earning up to 50 percent of the area median family income, with adjustments for unusually high or low area income and household size.

Low-Income -- Refers to a household earning between the very-low-income limit (i.e. 50 percent) and 80 percent of the area median family income, with adjustments for unusually high or low area income or housing costs and for household size.

Moderate-Income -- Refers to a household earning between the lower income limit (i.e., 80 percent) and 120 percent of the area median family income, with adjustments for unusually high or low area income or housing costs and for household size.

Above Moderate Income -- Refers to a household earnings that exceed the moderate-income limit (i.e., 120 percent) as adjusted for household size.

Overpaying - Also known as "housing cost burden" is defined in terms of a percentage of the gross household income a household spends for housing including utilities. Thirty percent of the gross household income is the standard affordability level. Severe overpaying occurs when households pay 50 percent or more of their gross income for housing.

Overcrowding -- Refers to a housing unit that is occupied by more than one person per room, excluding kitchens, bathrooms, hallways and porches, as defined by HUD. The Census defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room, excluding bathrooms and kitchens.

The ratio of housing expense-to-income, which establishes overpaying, has been changing in the past years. The current standard affordability level is 30 percent of the gross household income. Fifty percent or more of a household gross income spent for housing is deemed to be "severe overpaying". It is difficult to compute the fifty percent level for lower income households

because the 1990 and 2000 income figure ranges topped off at "35 percent and more." There has been a significant increase in the median income since the 1990 Census.

TABLE 42								
YOLO COUNTY AREA 2002 INCOME LIMITS								
Standard	1-Person	2-Person	3-Person	4-Person	5-Person	6-Person	7-Person	8-Person
Very-low	19950	22800	25650	28500	30800	33050	35350	37600
Lower	31900	36500	41050	45600	49250	52900	56550	60200
Moderate	47900	54700	61550	68400	73850	79350	84800	90300
Median Income	39900	45600	51300	57000	61550	66100	70700	75250
Yolo Area Median			57000					
<p>Source: Department of Housing and Community Development - Division of Housing Policy Development <u>2002 Income Limits</u>, January 2002</p>								

6.1 EXISTING NEEDS

Consistent with the State Housing Element Guidelines and the HCD Housing Element Review Worksheet, this sub-section discusses the existing needs based on available data. The data consists of 2000 and 1990 Census figures.

Commonly known indicators of housing needs include low vacancy rate, overpaying, and overcrowding. These indicators often point to immediate or existing needs of a community. The city's immediate housing needs are discussed below based on these three indicators.

Vacancy Rates

Table 38 below contains Davis apartment vacancy rates for the past twenty years as compiled by the UC Davis Housing Office. The table shows that historically the city has low apartment vacancy rates.

A five-percent vacancy rate is considered the minimum rate necessary to provide rental housing availability without undue upward pressure on rental rates. The UC Davis table shows that the Fall 1983, 1986, 1992 and 1993 apartment vacancy rates of 4.80, 4.70, 8.70 and 5.10 percent respectively, have been the nearest to this standard in the past twenty years. The vacancy rates for the past four years have been less than one percent. The average vacancy rate for the past ten years is 1.32 percent.

<p>TABLE 38 APARTMENT VACANCY RATES IN DAVIS</p>
--

Year	Vacancy Rate in %	Year	Vacancy Rate in %
1981	0.75	1992	8.70
1982	2.80	1993	5.10
1983	4.80	1994	2.90
1984	2.40	1995	1.30
1985	2.50	1996	0.50
1986	4.70	1997	1.40
1987	2.90	1998	0.70
1988	2.20	1999	0.30
1989	0.80	2000	0.50
1990	0.90	2001	0.30
1991	3.80	2002	0.20
Last 10 Years Average			1.32
Source: UC Davis Student Housing Office 2001 & 2002 Davis Apartment Vacancy and Rental Rate Report			

The 2002 and 2001 Davis Apartment Vacancy/Rental Rate Reports contain details about the reports. The vacancy rates in the table are simply used to show the trend over the past 20 years. The UC Davis reports are based on survey of apartment complexes with five or more units that are not subsidized housing. The reports do not include information on those apartments that do not respond to surveys. The UC Davis Housing Office does not survey all students in Davis because smaller apartment complexes, subsidized units, rental homes and duplexes, or purchased homes where students reside are not counted. The UC Davis Housing Office report is only a partial picture of one segment of the Davis rental market. However, it is the only substantive source of data available regarding student housing and vacancy rates.

Year	Vacancy Rate in %	Year	Vacancy Rate in %
1990 Census	1.95	1997 DOF	1.95
1991 DOF	1.51	1998 DOF	1.95
1992 DOF	1.54	1999 DOF	1.95
1993 DOF	2.13	2000 Census	2.8 overall & rental
1994 DOF	1.76	2000 Census	0.8 homeowner
1995 DOF	1.73	2001 DOF	2.83
1996 DOF	1.95	2002 DOF	2.83
1991-99 DOF Ave	1.83	1990 & 2000 Average	2.34
Sources: CA State Department of Finance (DOF) and US Census Bureau			

Table 39 above contains residential vacancy rates from 1990 through 2002. The data was derived from Census Bureau and California State Department of Finance (DOF) annual

estimates. This table shows an historic low vacancy rate trend. There has been a consistently lower residential vacancy rate in the city over the past ten years.

Overpaying

Overpaying refers to the number of very-low-income and low-income households occupying units at a cost greater than 30 percent of gross household income. In 1990, 25 percent was used to compute overpaying. Today, 30 percent is the standard used to compute overpaying. Over the years, the percentage used in computing overpaying has shifted several times.

Census data allow us to compare the percentage of overall households overpaying for housing between 1990 and 2000. Table 40 below indicates that approximately 46 percent of all households were overpaying in 1990. It also shows that in 1990, about 24 percent of owners were overpaying, and approximate 54 percent of renters were overpaying.

Table 41 below shows that in 2000 about 23 percent of owners were overpaying, and approximately 59 percent of renters were overpaying. The overall households overpaying percentage in 2000 was about 44 percent. This table shows that there was a decrease in the percentage of total households overpaying between 1990 and 2000, although there was an increase in the actual number of overpaying households.

TABLE 40 1990 OVERPAYING		
Renters/Owners	Number in 1990	Percent in 1990
Renters:	10,617	100%
Very-low-income	4,631	43.6%
Low-Income	1,083	10.2%
Total Lower-Income Renters Overpaying	5,714	53.8%
Total Renters Overpaying	6,371	60.0%
Owners:	7,309	100%
Very-Low-Income	311	4.26%
Low-Income	308	4.21%
Total Lower-Income Owners Overpaying	619	8.47%
Total Owners Overpaying	1,573	23.9%
Total Households % Overpaying	46.2%	

In the 1993 Housing Element, it was explicitly pointed out that large proportions of the households overpaying for housing were UC Davis students. It is believed that this fact has not changed.

TABLE 41 2000 OVERPAYING		
Owners	Number in 2000	% in 2000
Total:	9,184	100%
Housing units with a mortgage:	7,637	NA
Housing units without a mortgage:	1,547	NA
Selected Monthly Costs as a Percentage of Household Income in 1999		
Less than 15.0 percent	2,753	30.0%
15 to 19 percent	1,737	18.9%
20 to 24 percent	1,444	15.7%
25 to 29 percent	1,064	11.6%
30 to 34 percent	701	7.6%
35 percent or more	1,417	15.4%
<i>Not computed</i>	68	0.7%
Renters	Number in 2000	% in 2000
Total:	12,717	100.00%
Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income in 1999		
Less than 15 percent	1,187	9.3%
15 to 19 percent	1,267	10.0%
20 to 24 percent	1,086	8.5%
25 to 29 percent	994	7.8%
30 to 34 percent	720	5.7%
35 percent or more	6,751	53.1
<i>Not computed</i>	712	5.6%
Total # of Owners Overpaying	2,118	23.1%
Total # of Renters Overpaying	7,471	58.7%
Total # of Households Overpaying	9,589	43.8%
Source: Census 2000 SF3 compiled by SACOG		

Overcrowding

Overcrowding refers to the number of housing units with 1.01 or more persons per room. Overcrowding occurs when housing costs are so high relative to income that families double up or reside in smaller units to devote income to other basic needs. Overcrowded conditions are assumed to exist when there is more than one person per total rooms in a housing unit.

Census data allow us to compare the percentage of overall households living in overcrowded conditions. Table 43 below contains overcrowding numbers for 1990 and 2000. 5.5 percent (987 households) of households were in overcrowding conditions in 1990. In 2000, 5.5 percent (1,250 households) of households were in overcrowding conditions. There are no statistical differences between the 1990 and 2000 figures to report as shown in the table below. However, overcrowding remains an issue for the city that this Housing Element is addressing. A goal of

the Housing Element is to promote adequate housing supply for people of all ages, incomes, lifestyles and types of households.

1990 Census					2000 Census			
Number of persons per room	Renter	Owner	Total	Percent	Owner	Rental	Total	Percent
1.0 person or less	9,731	7,208	16,939	94.5%	10,022	11,655	21,677	94.5%
1.01 or more persons	886	101	987	5.5%	99	538	637	2.8%
1.51 or more occupants per room	-	-	-	-	78	535	613	2.7%
% Overcrowding	9.1%	1.4%	-	5.5%	1.7%	9.2%	-	5.5%
Total Overcrowding in 2000					177	1,073	1,250	5.5%
Total:	10,617	7,309	17,926	100%	10,199	12,728	22,927	100%
Source: 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census; 2000 Census Data Compiled by SACOG								

Students

As discussed above, students are a major part of overpaying and overcrowding groups relative to existing housing needs in Davis today. The City of Davis' 2001 General Plan Program Environmental Impact Report states that approximately 92 percent of all UC Davis students live within the Davis planning area. Therefore, increases in enrollment at UC Davis will increase the need for student housing in the Davis area.

UC Davis is currently considering how it should plan to accommodate approximately 6,000 new students by school year 2014-15, which the university President has identified as the campus's share of the University of California's projected growth. The projected student enrollment increases will require provision of additional housing on-campus and in the city. UC Davis' 1994 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) has a policy to provide on-campus housing for 25 percent of its students. However, the draft documents for the 2003 LRDP update states that the LRDP will accommodate campus population growth of approximately 5,130 new students and 4,000 new faculty and staff over the 2001-2002 level. It also states that approximately "3,000 upper-division undergraduate and graduate students will be accommodated in apartment-style housing and cottages if financially feasible. Total on-campus Student Housing is planned to accommodate approximately 35 percent of the student population through 2015-16. This would equate to housing 97 percent of the Davis-based student enrollment between 2001-02 and 2015-16." The LRDP is being revised in order to accommodate the anticipated growth.

UC Davis and the city have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which covers, among other issues, student housing. The city and UC Davis representatives are discussing revisions to the current MOU. The most recent draft of the University's Long-Range Development Plan

shows on-campus housing up for nearly all of the net new students through 2015. The current MOU entered by both parties on June 22, 1989, states that:

"UCD agrees to provide on-campus housing for 25% of the 1988-89 base student population of 21,000, and for 35% of the new student population on campus; provided, however that this student housing objective shall be implemented and achieved throughout the implementation period of the LRDP [Long Range Development Plan] and then only to the extent that it is financially feasible based on the principle that residential rental revenues must cover 100% of the capital and operating costs of student housing projects."

The 2000 Census figures show that the age range of 17 to 24 years comprises of 32 percent of the general Davis population. It also shows that the age range from 25 to 29 comprises 8.3 percent of the total population. Considering these facts, students can comprise approximately one-third of Davis' population. In the Fall Quarter of the 1998-99 school year, 21 percent of UC Davis students (undergraduate and graduate) lived in university housing, including the off-campus Cuarto Complex on the north side of Russell Boulevard. In the Fall of the 1999-2000 school year, this percentage decreased to 20 percent due to remodeling of a portion of the Cuarto Complex.

The Housing Element statutes do not mandate a student housing needs assessment. However, the 1996 BAE report commissioned by the city states the following about student housing needs:

- Many students have varied sources of income that are difficult to quantify;
- A reasonable cost burden analysis (i.e., 30% cost burden) may not be appropriate for students because most are single and do not have childcare, medical expenses, and other dependent expenses as do low income families (students are not even making their student loan payments while in school) and in some cases, cost burdens may be overstated due to under-reporting of income, and
- Students often share housing which makes the housing affordable to the students that in turn raises the market-rate that can be charged for larger apartments. Families typically do not have the luxury of sharing housing to make it affordable.

However, the number of students needs to be taken into account to understand the overall number of rental units needed by the city. Increasing the number of rental units in the city will help improve the current low vacancy rates and could in turn assist in making housing more affordable overall.

Consideration of student housing, as a special needs group, was a concern for the Affordable Housing Task Force. Some members of the Task Force believe that due consideration of all special housing needs groups should be taken into account so as to avoid expending limited affordable housing resources, such as monies and dedicated land, to assist in creating off-campus affordable student housing. The belief is that students are in a self-imposed state of temporary poverty based on the hope and realistic expectation that their education will result in

employment in good-paying professions. These groups argue that affordable housing resources should be dedicated to lower-income persons, typically low-wage, families and other special needs individuals that live and/or work in Davis.

Some students are within the special needs category based on their household situations. The students with low incomes also qualify for affordable housing based on this status. For instance, student households where one of the adults is a full-time student and the other is a part-time or a low-income wage earner, sometimes with children, do qualify for low-income housing in Davis.

Affordable housing is often a necessary component in assisting a low-income family to achieve self-sufficiency and to have decent, safe and stable housing. Likewise, affordable housing resources expended on supportive housing for the disabled and/or elderly is often necessary to ensure that these persons have stable housing and, therefore, stable lives. Although students may make up the majority of those searching for rental housing in Davis, the severity of the individual need for affordable housing is far greater for these other low-income groups. Nonetheless, the Affordable Housing Task Force recommends for adoption a Policy HOUSING 1.6, which reads: *Include students from low-income families within the target population for affordable housing opportunities.*

Those in opposition of this viewpoint state that students should be viewed equally as any other resident. This group argues that UC Davis is the primary employer for the city, therefore, should be assisted by the city in addressing its share of student increases allocated by the state. Some believe that the city and UC Davis should work together in addressing the increased enrollment projected. This belief leads to the suggestion that student housing should be provided in the city by the city. In support of this position, it is argued that students who receive PELL Grants are deemed low-income students. Given that the number of UC Davis PELL Grants recipients in 2000-01 was 5,452 (28 percent of the third quarter enrollment of 19,674 undergraduate students for the same year), therefore, the city should consider the provision of student housing that equals this percentage.

These arguments notwithstanding, the city has assisted in providing student cooperative housing in the past and present student households also occupy subsidized apartments. While the debate about how best to provide student housing will go on, it is anticipated that efforts between the city and UC Davis will result in the provision of needed additional student housing in the future.

6.2 FIVE-YEAR PROJECTED HOUSING NEEDS

Under State Law, regional planning organizations determine the regional housing needs among the jurisdictions in the region. SACOG is the regional planning organization for the Sacramento area. The SACOG's final regional housing needs plan (RHNP) allocates the City of Davis a total of 1,962 units for the current planning period of 2002-07. This sub-section addresses the future housing needs of the city, or simply put, how the city will meet its allocated housing needs. Again the Interim Planning period was January 1, 2000 to June 30, 2002.

It should be noted that several factors contribute to existing and future housing needs within the city notwithstanding the SACOG allocation. These factors include:

- UC Davis Tidal Wave II or projected increase in student enrollment that will result in increased faculty and staff employment.
- Scarcity of new residential developable land within the current city's General Plan land use map. This is partially due to some General Plan land-use policies that address the growth of the city relative to additional residential development.
- The recent southward migration of Bay Area residents. The migration into the Sacramento region including the city by Bay Area residents has increased the pressure on housing demands and costs within the region and the city.

Fair Share Allocation

Table 44 below contains a summary of the city's ability to meet its regional housing needs, commonly known as "fair share". The table reveals that the city has the capacity to meet and exceed its total fair share allocation for the 2002-07 planning period. The city has the capacity to provide a minimum of 357 units more than its fair share allocation.

It should be noted that the 2001 General Plan encourages infill development. Recently, there have been a number of infill residential projects proposed, and some have been approved already. Approval of the entitlement applications for most of the infill projects would most likely result in the increased production of housing for various income groups. Infill projects currently under review include

- Kelly Pointe Apartments - proposing 42 market-rate rental units and 15 affordable rental units; and requiring a conditional use permit approval.
- Rosecreek Unit 9 project proposing 15 very-low-income units, 6 low-income units, 9 moderate-income units, and 65 above-moderate income units; and requiring amendments to the General Plan, South Davis Specific Plan and Zoning.
- Glacier Place project proposing seven affordable units, eight senior units, nine single-family units, eleven detached townhouse units, and a medical office building.
- Others - there are a number of other infill project sites, some in preapplication stage, that would require amendments to the General Plan, or Specific Plans, and/or Zoning. (These are not listed herein because the city has capacity to meet its fair share allocation.)

The city has capacity to provide a minimum of 2,325 units. The city's fair share allocation is 1,962 units. The city's capacity can be grouped into a total of 561 units for lower-income

groups, and 1,764 units for moderate-and-above-moderate income groups. The city's RHNP allocation for lower-income groups is 463 units, and 1,499 units for moderate-and-above-moderate income groups. The city has capacity for 274 low-income units and 287 very-low-income units. This is consistent with HCD guidelines.

There is potential for significant infill residential development to occur during this planning period. There is no accurate estimate of the number and location of these potential infill projects due to many variables. The health of the economy, the owners' decision, nature of entitlement approval required, and other factors affect any infill project's development.

Potential infill development sites include vacant sites within the city designated for urban development including commercial, office, and industrial. Examples are Sutter Davis Urban Reserve sub-area, DJUSD Grande school site, Wildhorse school site, and Chiles/Cowell triangle site.

Other potential development sites are adjacent to the city and designated for agricultural use. Examples are Covell Center and Nishi/Gateway. These sites show possibilities for urban development but face significant community debate and need General Plan amendments. There is potential for residential infill projects being approved during the current planning period, but they cannot be accounted for at this time.

TABLE 44				
SUMMARY OF DAVIS FAIR SHARE ANALYSIS FOR 2002-07				
		Summary of City's Ability to Meet Fair Share Based on 1/2000 - 2/14/02 COs & Available Zoned Land		
Income Groups	SACOG Fair Share Allocation	City's Capacity 2002-07	SACOG and City #s Difference	Combined Numbers
Very-Low	79	287	+208	561 <i>463 RHNP</i>
Low	384	274	-110	
Moderate	621	729	+108	1,764 <i>1,499 RHNP</i>
Above-Moderate	878	1,035	+183	
Total Units:	1,962	2,325	+357	
<u>Note:</u> Numbers in <i>italics</i> in the last column are the combined units' number for very-low and low-income groups and moderate and above-moderate-income groups allocated by SACOG.				
<u>Sources:</u> SACOG's RHNP; City of Davis Planning and Building Department				

TABLE 45				
CITY OF DAVIS ABILITY TO MEET ITS RHNP ALLOCATIONS FOR 2002-07				
Built / Issued Certificates of Occupancies	Very-low	Low	Moderate	Above-Mod.
Single-family units Issued Certificates of Occupancy as of 1/1/02 - 2/14/2 , excludes affordable and apartment units	-	-	-	631

1501 & 1515 Shasta Dr - Shasta Point - Evergreen Senior	68	-	-	-
1800 Moore Blvd. - Terracina Apartment in Wildhorse	20	50	-	-
1677 Drew Avenue - Allegre Apartment	30	-	122	-
1500 Shasta Drive - Adobe Apartment - Evergreen	30	-	90	-
1752 Drew Ave. - Pacifico Phase I (84 beds/3 = 28 units)	28	-	-	-
4501 Alhambra - Seville Apartment in Mace Ranch	-	-	83	-
2029-2085 5 th Street Condos - Sequoia Villas	-	-	4	10
Cnr of Redbud & Cottonwood - Willowbank #9 for-sale	-	-	8	-
5512-5537 Marden St - El Macero Estate 2 for-sale units	-	-	8	-
Wildhorse For-sale Single Family units built by Morrison	-	-	52	-
40 Parkside Ave.; 801 Oeste Dr.; 326 I St.; 1307 Union Drive; 1930 Haussler - 2nd Units as of February 28, 2003		5		
5503-5539 Tufts - Simmons Estates SF Affordable units			7	
2120+ Cowell Blvd. - Oakshade Commons Apartment	-	-	42	-
3023 Albany Avenue - Owendale (DMHA) Apartment	36	9	-	-
Covell/Catalina/Phoenix Place - 8 Single-family units	-	-	-	8
312 3rd Str. - 4 MF units & 119 E Street - 7 MF units	-	-	7	4
Sub-total	212	64	423	653

Notes:

1. January 1, 2000 to June 30, 2002 was deemed the Interim Planning Period for which local agencies could use to address their ability to meet their fair share allocation. The city has used data available on the number of certificates of occupancy (CO) issued between January 1, 2000 to February 14, 2002 in reporting its ability to meet its fair share allocation. **COs from January 1, 2000 to February 14, 2002** represent only the market-rate single-family units issued COs between January 1, 2000 and February 14, 2002. Affordable housing single-family units issued COs during this period were excluded for the ease of identifying very-low and low income units.
2. Apartment projects do not require allocations. The COs numbers from 1/1/2000 to 2/14/02 exclude apartment projects.
3. **Built and/or Certificate of Occupancies Issued** - refers to projects that have received COs, or building permits but not necessarily occupied as of 2/14/02.
4. **Timing for Development of Zoned Sites** - The city does not have control over when property owners choose to develop their parcels.
5. **Infill** projects approved and built or under construction since June 30, 2002 are not included in this table. This table highlights conditions as of June 30, 2002.

Source: City of Davis Planning and Building Department

TABLE 45A - CITY OF DAVIS ABILITY TO MEET ITS RHNP ALLOCATIONS FOR 2002-07				
Zoned But Not Built , or Under Construction (uc)	Very-low	Low	Moderate	Above-Mod.
Jan. 1, 2002 Remaining vacant single-family lots	-	-	-	215
726 Drummond - Oasis Place Subdivision	2	3	18	
3101 5 th Street - Walnut Terrace (Mace Sr. Hsg.) - uc	-	30	-	-
2990 5 th St. - Mace SF for-sale & Land Ded.	-	10	1	-
1212 Alvarado - Almondwood Apartment - uc			5	
NE Cnr of Cowell & Drummond - Oakshade Land Ded.	-	15	-	-

Simmons Estates Subdivision - Along Tufts Street - uc	-	-		24
1818 Moore Blvd - Apartment, Wildhorse	-	-	80	-
404 F Street Mixed-Use (8 Lofts - uc)	-	-	-	8
312/316 D Street - 4 market-rate units	-	-	4	-
Callori (Olive Drive)	-	15	34	-
200 G Street - 4 multifamily units - uc			4	
301 7 th Street (2 Single-family units)			2	
306 Dresbach Way - El Macero Estates 2 Land Ded	-	36	-	-
4100 La Paz Drive - Woodbridge Land Dedication	-	16		-
2412 Sloan Street - Wildhorse Land Dedication	-	59	-	-
1617 Valdora St. - Oakshade - Avalon Apartments			8	
2707 5 th St. - O'Boyle Property			2	7
1760 Drew Ave - Pacifico 2 (28 beds/3 = 9 units) - uc	9	-	-	-
Fifth & Second Streets - Cantrill Development - uc			66	66
Fifth & Second Street - Cantrill Drive affordable site	33	14	6	
1056 Olive Drive - Youmans project - uc			61	62
1056 Olive Drive affordable site, Youmans project	31	12		
Zoned & Under Review; Not Approved Projects				
815 & 818 H Street - Boardwalk Apartment			15	
Sub-total	75	210	306	382
Total of Tables 45 & 45A	287	274	729	1,035

Notes:

- Jan. 1, 2002 Remaining vacant single-family lots** - refers to vacant lots in subdivisions in the city that have allocations. Infills do not require allocations, and are not included in the vacant lots' count.
- Zoned But Not Built, or Under Construction** - refers to projects that have been zoned for residential development but may or may not have obtained specific entitlement applications such as design review or final planned development, or may be under construction because it has obtained the necessary entitlement approval for development. The projects are entitled by Zoning Ordinance Land Use Map and the General Plan Land Use Map for residential development.
- Zoned & Under Review; Not Approved Projects** - refers to projects that have appropriate residential zoning but the property owner has chosen to either increase the number of units otherwise permitted or provide a different type of housing units not explicitly allowed in the zoning.
- Tables 45 and 45A do not include pending infill projects that require General Plan and/or Specific Plan amendments. The intent is to identify only sites that are already zoned for residential developments relative to the city's ability to meet its fair share allocation for this planning period.

Source: City of Davis Planning and Building Department

Table 45A contains the zoned but not built or under construction sites information relative to the city's ability to meet its regional fair share. It is a continuation of Table 45 above.

The data in the tables do not include any of the potential infill sites that are not currently zoned for residential development. The projects under review included in the tables are those that have residential zoning but are requesting approval of entitlement for additional units, or final planned development and design review approval. Approval of these additional units would result in an

increase to the total number of residential units the city could provide. Student housing needs are discussed earlier in this chapter.

SECTION 6.3 - SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS GROUPS

The law specifically requires analysis of the special housing needs of the elderly, the disabled, female-headed households, large families, farmworkers and homeless persons and families. The analysis of these identified groups helps a locality to identify groups with the most serious housing needs in order to develop and prioritize responsive programs. The HCD Housing Element Q and A Booklet states that a special assessment starts with the general knowledge of the community's demographics. It also states the housing element should analyze the needs of each group specifically mentioned in the statute and any other group the locality deems appropriate. The analysis should include a discussion of the nature of the special housing need of each group and quantification of the need.

The Davis Household and Population Characteristics are discussed in Section 4 of this document. Each housing need group is further discussed below.

Elderly Households

The 2000 Census shows that there are 1,184 elderly householders (5.2 percent of the total households) in Davis. The 2000 Census shows that 74.5 percent of elderly householders owned and occupied their homes, while 25.5 percent rented. Given the discussions in the overpaying sub-section of this section, the 25.5 percent of elderly households renting are included in the projected overpaying households. So, it is reasonable to conclude that some elderly households renting in Davis may be overpaying.

The 1993 Housing Element identifies seniors or the elderly as having the most urgent need for congregate-care and retirement-home types of housing. Since the 1993 Housing Element adoption, a major congregate-care and retirement facility has been built in the city, University Retirement Community (URC) in Evergreen subdivision. This site contains approximately 200 market-rate and 63 affordable units/beds for seniors. Other elderly housing projects approved since then include Tuscany Villas (6 units), and 30 affordable units in Mace Ranch (Walnut Terrace). The Walnut Terrace project is expected to be completed in 2003.

A need for assisted living sites, especially for low-income seniors, is an emerging need throughout the state. The specific need in Davis is difficult to quantify, but it is expected that 10-20 units of assisted living housing for low-income seniors will be added in this planning period.

It is noteworthy that the trend recently has been the migration of seniors into the Davis area to join loved ones that work or live in Davis. Most of these seniors wish to live near their loved ones but do not wish to live in the same house with them. The URC facilities, for instance, contain some residents in this situation.

Large Households

Given that there is a limited supply of adequately sized house units to accommodate large family households, they are considered a special needs group. Large family households often save for non-housing related expenses, forcing these families to often reside in relatively smaller units, resulting in overcrowded living conditions.

The 2000 Census figures show that there are 1,785 households in Davis with five or more members. This is approximately 7.78 percent of occupied units in Davis (22,948 occupied units). Large households are in need of larger housing units. Large households of low-and very-low- income groups could afford median-rent-priced apartments in Davis, which are generally two-bedroom units. While a two- or three-person household can comfortably fit into a two-bedroom apartment, it is overcrowded for large households of four, five or more persons.

Of the thirty-seven apartment complexes in the city offering subsidized rents, eighteen (about 49 percent) have three- and/or four-bedroom units. This is better than what existed in 1993 when only seven of the twenty-three complexes in the city offering subsidized rents had three- and four-bedroom units. The optimal rental for a large low-income household is a single-family house. Although a single-family rental housing market exists in Davis, it is difficult to analyze. Houses are almost never built as rental units because of the high cost of construction and relatively low rents per square foot. However, it is not possible to design a program to encourage the production of single-family rental housing.

For many students, household size is determined by the size of the unit, and not the other way around. Students renting a large house or apartment, for example, may seek roommates until the unit is full. Families, on the other hand, generally seek units adequate to hold the actual number of members.

The housing being built in Davis is generally large enough to hold all but the largest household. New single-family houses, with few exceptions, have at least three bedrooms and frequently have four or five. Apartments recently built with three-, four- or more bedroom units are tailored to serve student housing needs. Some apartment managers often rent bedrooms rather than the unit. Some students rent larger units because with the help of their roommates they pay reduced rents. These types of arrangements reduce the cost of housing for students. This situation is not typically the case for lower-income non-student large households.

Female-Headed Households with Children

The 2000 Census figures show that there are 1,874 female-headed households and within that, 1,184 female-headed households with children under 18 years. Although not mandated by the law, it should be noted that there are 633 male-headed households in the 2000 Census figures. Single parent households generally have lower incomes and higher living expenses, often making the search for affordable, decent and safe housing more difficult for this group. Single-parent households with children have a greater need for childcare, health care, easy access to transportation and other supportive services. The Census Bureau states that single-parents spend

12 to 25 percent of their income on childcare.

People with Disabilities

The 1990 Census figures show that there were 1,798 households of people with disabilities in Davis. The 1990 Census defined three types of disabilities: work, mobility, and self-care limitations. Disabilities are defined in section 12926 of the Government Code as a mental or physical impairment that limits a major life activity. Physical, mental and/or developmental disabilities may prevent a person from working, restrict one’s mobility, or make it difficult to care for one’s self. People with disabilities often have special housing needs related to potentially limited earning capacity, lack of affordable and accessible housing and higher health costs associated with disability.

Generally, the city is using the estimated census percentage of disabled residents, but adding additional residents known by Citizens Who Care, People's Resources, and SummerHouse, service organizations with significant numbers of disabled clients. However, estimating the number of people with disabilities who need housing is even more difficult.

The 2000 Census data thus released include "Disability Status of the Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population". The 2000 Census revealed that of the 57,215 population for age 5 and over, approximately 5,146 or 9 percent had a disability in 2000. The 2000 Census data below indicates 100 percent for each population age group shown. It contains the 2000 Census disability status.

Davis 2000 Disability Status of the Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population

	Number	Percent
Population 5 years and over	57,215	100%
With a disability	5,146	9.0%
Population 5 to 20 years	16,576	100%
With a disability	960	5.8%
Population 21 to 64 years	36,979	100%
With a disability	3,043	8.2%
Percent employed	-	56.4%
No disability	33,936	91.8
Percent employed	-	75.5%
Population 65 years and over	3,660	100%
With a disability	1,143	31.2%

The percentage of low-income residents with disabilities is proportionately higher than the general population. While not all people with disabilities have low incomes or are unable to work, the sole source of income for many consists of government benefits, including Supplemental Security Income (SSI). As a national average, SSI benefits in 2000 were equal to only 18.5% of the one-person median household income. In 2000, people with disabilities receiving SSI benefits needed to pay, on a national average, 98% of their benefits in order to be

able to rent a modest one-bedroom unit at the HUD fair market rent. In California, the figure is over 101%. In 2000, there was not a single housing market in the country where a person with a disability receiving SSI benefits could afford to rent a modest efficiency or one-bedroom unit. Source: *Priced Out in 2000: The Crisis Continues*, Technical Assistance Collaborative, Inc.

In addition to general fair housing laws that prohibit discrimination in housing on the basis of disability, in recent years the disability community has advocated for support services and housing allowing institutionalized persons with disabilities to have their needs addressed while living in the community, rather than requiring them to live in structured residential settings, nursing homes, or other institutions. In its 1999 *Olmstead* decision, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed that, under the ADA, unnecessary institutionalization of people with disabilities is a form of disability-based discrimination. These and other circumstances have resulted in an even greater demand for affordable and accessible housing for the disabled persons.

In response to President Bush's *New Freedom Initiative*, in its recent report, *Preliminary Report of Federal Agencies' Actions to Eliminate Barriers and Promote Community Integration*, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services noted the following:

"The lack of accessible, affordable housing continues to present a major barrier to the participation of people with disabilities in their communities and in the economic life of the nation. There exists a full range of housing barriers, manifesting themselves differently depending on geographic location, available services, infrastructure arrangements, and whether the individual is currently living in a community or an institutional setting.

There currently is not enough appropriate or affordable housing for those people with disabilities who already live somewhere in the community. As more people with disabilities leave institutions to enter community life, this housing shortage will become even more acute. There are an insufficient number of accessible privately owned rental units in some housing markets in the nation, often resulting in families with general or targeted vouchers having an extremely difficult time locating an accessible unit that meets their needs."

Federal and state law, including Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504), the federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 (FHAA), the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, contain minimum accessibility requirements for housing. The City enforces these requirements through the building permit plan check process.

Section 504, for example, requires that housing developments that receive federal funds ensure that newly constructed or substantially rehabilitated facilities be made fully accessible (e.g., re-positionable kitchen countertops). Section 504 requires that a minimum of 5% of covered housing units be fully accessible for people with mobility impairments and that a minimum of 2% of the housing units are made accessible to people with hearing or vision impairments. For alterations to existing housing facilities that do not constitute substantial rehabilitation, the alterations must, to the maximum extent feasible, be made readily accessible and usable by people with disabilities.

Section 504 also requires that accessible units first be offered to a qualified individual with disabilities currently residing in a non-accessible unit in the same project or comparable projects under common control. If there are no such persons, then the unit must be offered to the next available qualified individual with disabilities on its waiting list who needs the accessibility features of the unit.

Under the FHAA, all multi-family units constructed for first occupancy after March 1991 must meet minimum accessibility requirements if they are on the ground floor or served by an elevator. This includes condominiums as well as apartments. State law also requires basic accessibility requirements for ground floor or elevator-served units.

Despite laws and regulations governing accessible housing requirements, progress has been slow nationwide. There is still not enough existing accessible housing to meet the demand nationwide. One reason is the difficulty in enforcing fair housing laws. Developers, project managers and landlords are often unaware of, or have been slow to incorporate fair housing and accessible housing requirements into the construction and management of new housing or the rehabilitation of existing housing. As a result, many new housing units are unavailable and inaccessible to people with disabilities.

Unfortunately, when building affordable housing, developers often give primary consideration to neighbor concerns, which are often at the expense of accessibility needs. For example, many communities prefer a townhouse style, which includes both an upstairs and a downstairs in each unit, over stacked units where the bottom and top floors are separate units. For people with mobility impairments, the townhouse model is problematic as there is no access to the upstairs and the apartments are thus unusable to a resident to care for children or to have full access to his or her home. It appears that based on a need for more accessible housing, the City should encourage affordable housing providers to build fewer townhouse style units.

Some individuals with physical disabilities require housing that is both affordable and adapted to their physical impairments. There is often a need for supportive services in addition to housing, such as assistance with daily life activities, in-home assistance, and social services such as employment training, counseling, benefits advocacy, and independent living skills. In recognition of these facts, the disabled housing projects built since the 1993 Housing Element, include Summer House Group Home (counted as 12 units, one per bed) and 21 units for National Handicapped Housing Institute (NHHI).

One often overlooked type of housing for people with disabilities is transitional housing for people with mental disabilities. In Yolo County and Davis, transitional housing for people with mental disabilities is provided by entities like YCCC and Pine Tree Gardens. Given a recent bid to increase its facilities in Davis by Pine Tree Gardens, it is safe to state that there is a housing need for this group of people with disabilities.

Accessibility for people with disabilities in all its forms cannot be over-emphasized. Several federal, state, and local laws require and encourage provision of easy access in its varying forms.

This Housing Element contains policies that encourage construction of accessible and visitability-friendly new units.

Emergency Housing - Homeless Persons and Families

Those in need of emergency housing may be separated into two groups: those who are temporarily displaced and the homeless. Generally, a person is considered homeless when the person or family:

- Lacks a fixed and regular night-time residence, or
- Has a primary night-time residence that is a supervised publicly-operated shelter designated for providing temporary living accommodations, or
- Is residing in a public or private place not designated for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings.

Due to lack of accurate and current data it is very difficult to quantify the homeless population in a given community. There is a need for accommodation for those unwilling or unable to enter an existing shelter program. SACOG's Housing Market Report figures estimate that there are approximately 1,100 homeless persons in Yolo County. There are no estimates provided for city. However, in March and April 2000, the Yolo County Homeless Coordinator, Sergei Shkurkin, conducted a census of all homeless people in the County. The goal of the census was to obtain a head count of all homeless people and to interview as many of them as possible. This effort was part of the overall mission of the Homeless Coordination Project to understand the issue of homelessness in Yolo County, develop programmatic solutions to address those issues, and to maximize internal and external resources to implement appropriate programmatic solutions. The survey findings include the fact that there has been an increase in the number of unsheltered homeless in Davis, and that there have been no new shelter beds added in Davis since 1994. Also the report notes that Davis has secured funding for and is doubling the number of shelter beds in the community in 2001. Regarding the doubling of shelter beds in Davis, the report states, "Our research indicates that this will reverse the trend noted in our study of homelessness increasing in Davis." This funding was secured and the doubling of shelter beds did occur.

Detailing its survey analysis for Davis, the report contains the data below.

Davis		Unsheltered outside or in cars	Self-sheltered	Agency- sheltered
1995	n=10	8	-	Not counted
2000	n=34	16	4	15

-
- "The age of the homeless population is the first of several areas where Davis runs counter to the overall trend. The trend in the entire county is toward an increasingly

older homeless population. In Davis, the median age in 1995 was 38; median age in 2000 was 37.

- Unlike the other locations, there are no dependent children accompanying the homeless adults in Davis.
- Davis has the most highly educated homeless population. While 80 percent of the population of homeless people in the entire county are high school dropouts, in Davis, 79 percent of the homeless have high school diplomas. This figure remains unchanged from 1995. In 2000, 8 of the 34 respondents or 23 percent had a bachelor's degree or higher as compared to none in 1995.
- Davis also runs counter to the general trend of homeless people becoming more accepting of agency rules and regulations. In 1995 two of the 10 or 20 percent of respondents reported having declined services due to rules and regulations. In 2000 16 of the 34 or 47 percent reported having declined services due to rules and regulations.
- The homeless are settling into Davis as at the other locations. In 1995, 5 out of the 10 respondents or 50 percent had been living in Davis for less than a year. In 2000 seven of the 34 respondents or 21 percent had been living in Davis for less than a year.
- Davis is also different from the other locations and the county as a whole in terms of the length of time since the last Doctor visit. While the other locations and the county have dramatically reduced the average length of time since the last doctor visit, it has more than doubled in Davis. The average length of time has increased from 149 days in 1995 to 354 days in 2000.
- The homeless in Davis have significantly increased income by working. In 1995, no respondents reported income from work or odd jobs. In 2000, ten of the 34 respondents or 29 percent reported income from working.
- In 1995, three out of ten respondents (33 percent) were military veterans. In 2000, five out of the 34 respondents (15 percent) were military veterans. This almost perfectly mirrors the county as a whole.
- In 1995, three out of the ten respondents (33 percent) reported active drug habits. In 2000, 19 out of the 34 respondents (56 percent) reported active drug habits. Here again, the data from Davis are countering the trends in the other locations and the county as a whole."

The report summarizes that in Davis, the homeless are slipping backward on several key indicators of drug use, health care, and trust between clients and the agencies. Also the report notes that the homeless of Davis are much better educated than the other locations.

Homeless people often fall through the cracks and are difficult to count. In addition, determining whether a household is homeless can be difficult. This is because of many factors, which include some families that "double-up" thereby having two households share one unit, or some families that stay with friends or relatives in an impermanent arrangement.

While many homeless people are unemployed, very-low and low-income employed persons often are homeless or unable to find permanent housing. A major problem for these working but very-low or low-income people is saving enough money to pay deposits on rental housing. Often working people and families earning low incomes and without the savings to pay deposits on rental housing live in housing rented by the week. This short-term rental situation, such as motels, while affordable in the sense that the units can be rented without a deposit, are generally unsuitable for families, and almost always more expensive on a monthly basis than permanent housing such as apartments and rental houses. Because they must pay an even greater proportion of their income for housing when paying rent by the week, saving up the money for a deposit on an apartment or house is even harder, and often impossible.

Homelessness is not an issue that stops at the city limits. It is a regional problem. Thus, it is being addressed on a countywide basis. Davis, along with the Cities of Winters, Woodland and West Sacramento, contracts with Yolo County for the services of the Yolo County Homeless Coordinator. In addition, the city is contributing to the operation of the county's cold weather shelter, located in Woodland. Homeless persons in Davis are eligible for bus vouchers for transportation to the shelter and motel vouchers provided through STEAC. In Yolo County, the largest number of homeless persons are served in either Woodland, by the Yolo Wayfarer Center, or in West Sacramento, by the West Sacramento Resource Center. The Yolo Wayfarer Center has a scattered Site Shelter program, and Cold Weather Shelter program.

There have also been dynamic changes in the homeless population in 2001 and early 2002, owing most likely to significant policy changes in nearby cities. The City of Sacramento has been significantly increasing enforcement of camping and inebriation ordinances, encouraging homeless people to leave public areas. During the summer of 2001, a significantly larger number of homeless people came to Davis, and then left as the seasons changed. In Woodland, the city has approved a new ordinance prohibiting public camping. While Woodland is significantly expanding its shelter space, homeless individuals not desiring or ineligible for shelters are coming to Davis from Woodland. As a result, the city is considering expansion of services to homeless individuals. Recently, the city cooperated in a grant application to expand services to mentally ill homeless people. The city has recently adopted open container ordinance, a camping ordinance, and strategies to mitigate the inherent problems of increasing numbers of homeless individuals sharing public spaces with local businesses, customers and children participating in programs in local parks.

Existing programs providing services to the homeless include referrals to Salvation Army shelters in West Sacramento and Woodland, and referral to Yolo County Community Partnership programs in Woodland and West Sacramento. The Davis Police Department administers a Salvation Army fund that can pay for meals or sometimes a room for the night for transient homeless. The need for transitional housing for the homeless, in addition to existing and

proposed transitional housing for the homeless is difficult to determine. An emergency shelter could meet the need for transitional housing as well as shorter-term shelter housing until the need can be accurately determined.

Davis Community Meals (DCM) has 16 beds, 14 for transitional housing, and 5 scattered sites including at least 20 beds for families. At these shelters DCM provides counseling, life skills, substance abuse counseling, public benefits advising, referrals to permanent housing, a resource center, laundry facilities, and meals. Homeless individuals and families are eligible. The average occupancy is 86% with four or five people being turned away each year because of lack of space. Most others refused are refused shelter for mental health and substance use issues. It is important to note that there are both homeless families and individuals in need of transitional assistance. The vacancy rate discussed above is for services to homeless individuals. There are rarely any vacancies for transitional housing, which serves homeless families.

The Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Center (SADVC) provides 30 beds in the Davis area, caring for seven or eight families at a time. They also have two or three scattered sites for transitional housing referral with partners in West Sacramento and Woodland, as well as four out of county beds. Their services are equivalent to those of DCM and are available to families who meet criteria related to domestic violence: no other safe housing option, no substance abuse, and no severe mental illness. SADVC reports no waiting list as the organization works closely with other shelters to make sure that all families can be sheltered in nearby communities as needed.

YCCC currently has 6 beds available with a 14-bed expansion under construction. They offer transitional housing, counseling, eligibility assistance, transit to health care, permanent housing placement, and laundry facilities. YCCC is open to homeless, single, mentally ill or disabled adults. Their expansion is greatly needed as 127 people were turned away last year because of lack of space.

Pine Tree Gardens provides housing to mentally ill and disabled single adults. They provide 32 beds, some transitional some not, as residents may stay three months and others several years. Pine Tree Gardens offers counseling, eligibility assistance, transit to health care, permanent housing, job coaching, AA/NA groups, recreation programs, and laundry facilities.

STEAC offers food, clothing, vouchers, and household items. Very-low income Davis residents are eligible--their current client base is 47% children and 59% families.

Other county services are coordinated by the Yolo County Homeless Coalition and include Transitional Housing for Families in Woodland and West Sacramento, Cold Weather Shelter in Woodland, and the Homeless Resource Center in West Sacramento. These organizations offer much the same services as DCM and are open to the homeless in Davis.

Table 46 below is a brief summary of organizations in Davis that provide temporary and other services to homeless persons and families. The table contains the number of units or beds the entity has, and the types of services it provides.

**TABLE 46
ORGANIZATIONS IN DAVIS PROVIDING ASSISTANCE**

Group	No. of Units /Beds	Services provided
STEAC	None	Food; Clothing; Hotel Vouchers; Household Items
DCM	16 Beds, 2 reserved for shelter; 5 scattered sites including at least 20 beds	Counseling; Shelter; Life Skills; Substance Abuse Counseling; Pub. Benefits Advising; Referral to Perm.; Housing; Resource Center; Laundry; Food; Meals
SADVC	30 Beds in Davis shelter; 7-8 families at a time; 2-3 scattered sites for transitional housing referral with partners in West Sac and Woodland; 4 out-of-county beds available in Sacramento, Placer and El Dorado County.	Counseling; Shelter; Life Skills; Substance Abuse counseling; Pub. Benefits Advising; -Referral to Perm. Housing; Resource Center; Laundry; Food; Meals; School Transport; Tutoring
YCCC	6 Beds in current project, 14 bed expansion under construction	Transitional Housing; Counseling; Eligibility Assistance; Transit to Health Care; Laundry; Permanent Housing Placement
Pine Tree Gardens	32 beds of "transitional" housing; it depends on whether the housing is for transitional or permanent -- some residents stay several years and many stay for 3-6 months.	Counseling; Eligibility Assistance; Transit to Health Care; Laundry; Permanent Housing; Job Coaching; AA/NA Groups; Recreation Program

The American Red Cross provides disaster assistance in small and large emergencies. Households displaced as a result of fire, for example, will be placed in local motels. In a large disaster, such as a flood, people would be given emergency shelter in several public buildings in the city and/or on the UC Davis campus.

It is also recognized that there is a portion of the homeless population that is resistant to service. The primary causes of this resistance are reported to be alcohol and drug use, mental illness and homelessness as a lifestyle. Notwithstanding the circumstances that lead people to resist homeless services, there is a need for homeless and transitional housing focusing on the needs of people with substance abuse and mental health issues. There is also a significant need for supportive housing for people leaving homelessness and who are at risk of homelessness because of disabilities. It is recognized that supportive housing is not just for homeless people, but also can serve teens leaving foster care, the elderly, the disabled and people leaving violent homes.

Farmworkers

Davis is situated in an agricultural area. The need for housing for farmworkers in the city cannot be precisely determined. However, seven assisted affordable units are provided for farmworkers in Davis. These are passive solar units previously owned by the city and scattered throughout the city. They are rented to very-low income farmworkers and managed by the Yolo County Housing Authority.

The 1990 and 2000 Census contain no farmworker figures for the city. The 2000 Census indicates that 114 persons identified their occupation as being "Farming, fishing, and forestry". Given the existence of UC Davis College of Agriculture and California State Department of Forest that are in Davis, it is likely that employees of the two agencies are the people identified.

TABLE 47					
YOLO COUNTY FARMWORKERS 2001					
Adjusted MSFW* Estimates	Migrant Farmworker	Seasonal Farmworker	Non-Farmworker in Migrant Households	Non-Farmworker in Seasonal Households	MSFW Farmworker and Non Farmworker
14,794	6,850	7,944	2,517	9,015	26,326
<u>Source:</u> Regional Housing Needs Plan for the SACOG Region					

Approximately 6,900 persons were directly employed in agriculture in Yolo County according to the State of California Employment Development Department (EDD) June 2000 report. SACOG estimates that there are 7,944 seasonal farmworkers and 6,850 migrant farmworkers in Yolo County. According to the Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) adopted for the SACOG region, estimating farmworkers and those households associated with farm work within the state is extremely difficult. Traditional sources of population estimates, including the census, have tended to significantly underestimate the farmworker population. The RHNP reports that there are a total of 26,236 farmworker related persons residing in Yolo County. However, no estimates are provided for Davis.

Consultation with state the Employment Development Department (EDD) revealed that the EDD has no specific numbers for farmworkers for the Davis area or any other similar area in California. The EDD indicates that its surveys conducted for the Department of Labor are on housing inspections in various areas, and wage surveys. However, The EDD report on Labor Market Information - Industry Trends and Outlook, 1997-2004 Yolo County contains the following statements:

"... Yolo County is becoming a life sciences research center, largely due to the presence of the University of California Davis and local efforts to preserve Yolo County's agricultural economy and encourage biotechnology research and development. ...

Agricultural and chemical production will also grow, mostly related to agricultural industries. The food-processing sector will decline due to the closure of a tomato processing plant, but some of the loss will be offset due to gains associated with increasing wine production in Yolo County. Other food processing jobs may decline slightly, due to plant automation and productivity improvements."

A closer look at the surrounding farming activities within the Davis sphere of influence show that tomato farming is giving way to other crops, such as grapes, corn and sunflower. It is likely that there are laborers in farming or food processing within the Davis city limits. However, there is no data to support that these groups of farmworkers housing needs cannot be served through existing affordable housing offered to persons of lower-income groups in the city. Farmworkers may be served similar to many other groups of lower-income workers in the Davis area. The existing housing policies support provision of housing for all lower-income groups and discourage discrimination against any group.

The available farmworker data beyond the 1990 Census is a farmworker needs assessment that was conducted in 1995 by the Rural California Housing Corporation. The purpose of the study was to determine the adequacy, supply, and affordability of farmworker housing in Yolo County and to identify grower/contractor concerns regarding housing and their future needs for labor. The study did not isolate the Davis, therefore, no specific data exist for the city. Of the 202 in-field interviews, which took place throughout 1995, 29 percent were found to be permanent employees, working more than 10 months in Yolo County or the vicinity. Thirty-nine percent were classified as local seasonal workers, who are permanent residents of Yolo County and work less than 10 months, and 21 percent were classified as migrants, who travel more than 50 miles to find work in agriculture. Another 11 percent did not fall securely under any of the above categories and were classified as seasonal migrant workers. Seasonal migrants considered Yolo County to be their permanent residence however they owned a home outside the County (usually Mexico) where their family resided permanently.

There are presently two State Migrant Centers in Yolo County, (i.e. housing units that are constructed and managed by the state, through the County Housing Authority, to house migrant farmworker families). The two facilities are located near Davis and Madison. The center located near Davis has 75 units and houses 350 to 380 persons annually. Both these centers are currently running at full capacity and have no further room for migrant families or individuals. The Davis Migrant Center, located outside of the planning area, seven miles south of El Maccro, houses 72 families of seasonal farmworkers each season (from the beginning of May to the end of October). Many of these families would like to remain in Davis permanently, among other reasons, because they have been offered year-round jobs on farms and ranches in the area, and because they would like to keep their children in the same schools all year. This is a challenge because the income of the families is not stable during the year and because work patterns can lead the head of the household out of the area several times per year. In addition, migrant farmworkers who wish to find permanent housing often encounter the same problem discussed above of finding the money for deposits on housing they could otherwise afford.

The Yolo County Housing Authority has reported that farmworker households have gotten smaller and very large families no longer predominate, as they did in the past. As of 2001, the Office of Migrant Education for the Davis Joint Unified School District has records of service to 79 children of farmworker families in the Davis area. This information covers only those households with school-age children who work on farms or in local farm businesses. There are likely to be other farmworker households without children also living in Davis. These farmworker households are not likely to have unique characteristics, which limit the type of housing suitable for the household, other than ability to pay.

The Bay Area Economics company conducted a Housing Needs Assessment for the city in 1996. This report discussed farmworker-housing needs. It concluded by stating that it appears that there is a relatively small farmworker population living in Davis and surrounding areas but that additional farmworkers would live in Davis, given opportunities for affordable housing. It further concluded that due to the long growing season, and the ability of many farmworkers to find consistent employment for most of the year, housing for resident farmworkers appears to be in need, in addition to the ongoing need to accommodate the housing needs of migrant farmworkers. The report added that "the Yolo County Community Development Department has commissioned a study of farmworker housing needs, which is due out soon. This document may provide additional information that would serve to inform the City of Davis about local farmworker housing needs." The document, Farmworker Housing Survey, had been released and it offered no new information regarding whether there are farmworkers in Davis or on their numbers.

The findings contained in the summary section of the Farmworker Housing Survey conducted by Yolo County include the following statement:

"The survey results indicate that basic housing needs of farmworkers in Yolo County are being met by the existing housing stock. None of the farmworkers interviewed during the course of the study indicated they were homeless or living outside of permanent shelters. The 1995 Yolo County Homeless Survey confirms that the homeless population in Yolo County does not include farmworkers or their families..."

The Rural California Housing Corporation conducted this survey for Yolo County. The survey was a farmworker needs assessment for the purpose of determining the adequacy, supply, and affordability of farmworker housing in Yolo County and to identify grower/contractor concerns regarding housing and their future needs for labor.

Given the above discussions, it is useful to differentiate between migrant and permanent farmworkers. Generally, migrant farmworkers move around where job opportunities exist, while permanent farmworkers, which could range from workers on the farm to workers in agriculture related industries, remain in one place permanently. Given the minimal seasonal farming within the Davis sphere of influence and the loss of the Hunt Wesson tomato plant, it could be argued that it is likely that seasonal or migrant farmworkers may not be prominent in the Davis area. However, the contrary may be the case for permanent farmworkers. It should be noted, however,

that any low-income permanent farmworker would have the same opportunity relative to affordable housing opportunities in Davis as any other group of low-income persons.

Low-Income Minority Households

The 2000 Census indicated a small proportion of racial minorities in Davis. In 1990, there was a small proportion of racial minorities also. Table 48 below shows the 2000 racial breakdown for one race. The 2000 Census changed the way the races were enumerated. The change makes it difficult to accurately compare past racial data with the 2000 data. Table 6 of this report contains additional information on racial composition in 2000.

In 1990, the ratio of low-income households was higher for minorities. This ratio ranged from 63.2% for Hispanics to 69.3% for blacks and 70.0% for Asians, while 45.0% of white households are low-income. It does not appear logical to extrapolate the percentage for 2000 given that the 1990 and 2000 data cannot be accurately compared. Given that this group is so small now similar to 1990, no special programs other than a program of investigating and prosecuting cases of housing discrimination are necessary. Low-income minority households would, of course, benefit from all programs for low-income households. The city maintains a Fair Housing and Employment Program that is widely publicized throughout the community. This mediation-based program investigates claims of discrimination and resolves the housing complaints locally, when possible. The Parks and Community Services Department oversees this program.

Low-income minority households would, of course, benefit from all programs for low-income households. In fact, outreach to underrepresented groups in Davis has been successful in affordable housing projects in Davis. The city's *Analysis to Impediments to Fair Housing* notes that federally-funded affordable housing projects in Davis have 37 percent more minority households than the city as a whole.

The released poverty status for the 2000 Census is for families. It does not include a minority breakdown. It states that 609 families were below poverty level in 1999, and that 335 of the families consisted of a female householder with no husband present.

RACE	Number	Percent
Total population	60,308	100.0
One race	57,372	95.1
White	42,256	70.1
Black or African American	1,417	2.3
American Indian and Alaska Native	407	0.7
Asian	10,576	17.5
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	144	0.2

Some other race	2,572	4.3
Two or more races	2,936	4.9
<u>Source:</u> 2000 Census		

6.4 CONVERSION OF ASSISTED HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

In Davis, there are currently 39 housing complexes reserved for very-low, low, or moderate-income households, with a total of 1,372 subsidized units/bedrooms. Table 49 below contains data for subsidized apartment complexes with subsidy end dates. It also contains the types of subsidies that are applicable to the complex. Since the 1993 Housing Element adoption, 39 units have opted out from the Section 8 provision. Approximately 52 units are in the process of opting out. The 52 units are in four complexes. The units at risk of conversion to market-rate housing are in older complexes, which may have an unidentified need for rehabilitation, as well. In 1993, there were 23 housing complexes reserved for very-low, low, or moderate-income households, with a total of 700 subsidized units. Since 1993 approximately 16 new housing complexes have been added, with a total of 711 units/beds. These were financed through a variety of local, state, and federal programs, and are located throughout Davis.

The city has a number of resources for assisting in the creation of affordable housing and the preservation of existing subsidized housing. The most important, land obtained through developer dedications, is discussed in the section on the Affordable Housing Ordinance (Section 4.5 of this Element). The other resources are other city-owned land (not suitable for housing preservation projects), the Community Development Block Grant, the Housing Trust Fund, and the Redevelopment Agency Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund.

Community Development Block Grant

The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. The city receives approximately \$950,000 per year to be used to benefit low-income households and individuals. The city has allocated approximately one-third to one-half its CDBG funds to various housing activities. Assisted housing developments at risk of conversion to market-priced housing can be preserved with CDBG funds.

City of Davis Housing Trust Fund

The Housing Trust Fund was established by the city to receive in-lieu payments for affordable housing. Contributions also come from payment of second mortgages on homes built under the affordable housing program. Because this is not a federal or state program, the city has a great deal of discretion in use of the funds. The Housing Trust Fund has been

used in the development of the following projects: Davis Mutual Housing Association Twin Pines project, Solar Community Housing Association's Homestead Cooperative, CHOC Windmere II, and DCC Pacifico.

Redevelopment Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund

As required by state law, the Redevelopment Agency sets aside 20 percent of the tax increment revenue to increase and improve the supply of housing for low and moderate income households. These funds may be used anywhere within the city limits. Use outside the project area, however, would require a determination by the Redevelopment Agency that the use benefits the project area.

Revenues accruing to the Low and Moderate-Income Housing Fund have amounted to approximately \$900,000 per year. Over \$3 million has been allocated to provide subsidy loans to DMHA Owendale and CHOC Walnut Terrace.

Funds accrue to the Redevelopment Low and Moderate-Income Housing Fund as assessed values increase within the project area. Increased revenues will result from rising property values within the project area, property transfers leading to re-assessment, and new development or redevelopment of under-utilized land. The Redevelopment Agency is working to extend the term of the project area, which will increase the future contributions to this fund by millions of dollars.

HOME

The city is an entitlement jurisdiction for the Federal Home Investment Partnership Program. Funds of \$600,000 to \$700,000 per year must be used for affordable housing to benefit low-income households. Similar to the CDBG program, the Social Services Commission makes the HOME funding recommendations.

Other resources

In addition to city-controlled resources, state and federal funding programs (such as those from the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act) are available to assist preservation efforts. Eligible recipients for these funds include nonprofit agencies and the city itself.

**TABLE 49
SUBSIDIZED HOUSING IN DAVIS WITH SUBSIDY END-DATES**

Complex	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Bedroom Types	Subsidy Program	Subsidy End Date
Adobe	1500 Shasta Dr	120	30	2,3,4		
Alhambra	4500 Alhambra Dr	160	160	1,2,3,4	FHA	
Allegre	1677 Drew Circle	152	17	2,3,4	FHA	
Almondwood	1212 Alvarado Ave.	95	19	1, 2, 3	FHA 221d4	2002
Anderson Place	1850 Hanover Drive	240	240	S, 1, 2	FHA 236	12/1990
Arlington Farms	2900 Portage Bay	138	28	1, 2, 3, 4	CHFA	11/2018
Brush Creek	1333 Arlington Blvd.	80	17	2	FHA 221d4	10/2000
Cambridge Glen	4849 El Cemonte Ave.	125	25	1, 2, 3, 4	CHFA	2015
Chaparral	2689 Sycamore Lane	60	12	1, 2, 3	City MRB	4/2003
Clubside	1050 Lake Boulevard	48	11	2	FHA 221d4	11/2000
Cranbrook South	920 Cranbrook Ct.	40	40	1, 2	FHA 236	12/1992
Davisville (Snrs)	1111 Kennedy Place	70	70	1, 2	FHA 221d4	2/1994
Eastlake	1420 Lake Boulevard	40	8	1	City MRB	4/2003
El Macero Village	4735 Cowell Blvd.	104	21	1, 2	FHA 221d4	12/2001
Farmworker Units	Scattered Site	7	7	3, 4	City FMHA	Permanent
Fox Creek	1515 Valdora St	36	36	1,2,3	RA, HCD	Permanent
Heather Glen	2324 Shasta Dr	62	62	2,3	RA, HCD	Permanent
Homestead Co-op	2610 Gambling Court	15	15	1,2,3	City, HCD	
La Salle	880 Alvarado Ave.	98	20	1, 2, 3, 4	City MRB	4/2003
Le Tournesol	2640 Portage Bay	45	9	2	FHA 221d4	12/2001
Olive Court	1414 Olive Dr.	24	24	2	City, HCD, CHFA	Permanent
Olympic Cottages	1707 Olympic Drive	12	1		City, Other	Permanent
Parque Plaza	690 Alvarado Ave.	53	16	1, 2	FHA 221d4	11/2000
Pepperwood	2222 Sycamore Lane	40	8	2	FHA 221d4	11/2001
Rosa Parks (DCH)	1205 Fifth Street	10	10	1, 2	City, HCD, CHFA	Permanent
Rosewood Park	616 Ohlone	36	36	1,2,3		Permanent
Sequoia	2255 Sycamore Lane	50	10	1, 2	City MRB	4/2003
SADVC	(Confidential)	26 beds	26beds	beds	City, Other	Permanent
Sharps & Flats	1660 Drew Ave	132	34	2,3,4	FHA	Permanent
Sojourner Truth	1220 Fifth Street	14	14	2	City, HCD, CHFA	Permanent
Sorrento	1540 Valdora St	108	22	2,3,4		
Suntree	2033 F Street	95	60	2, 3, 4	CHFA S8	12/1994
Summer House	2525 E. 8 th St	15	12	1/Bedrm	City, HUD	Permanent
Temescal	2477 Sycamore Lane	100	20	1, 2	City MRB	4/2003
Terracina	1800 Moore Blvd	70	70	2,3,4	City, LIHTC	Permanent
Tuscany Villas	2526 E. 8 th St	30	30	2,3		Permanent
Twin Pines	3333 F Street	36	36	1,2,3	City, LIHTC	Permanent

University House	320 K Street	48	11	2	FHA 221d4	3/1990
Villa Calabria	2537 E. 8 th St	6	6	1,2	City, HCD	Permanent
Willow Glen	310 Becerra Way	12	12	1,2	City, HCD	Permanent
Windmere I & II	303-3100 5 th St	106	106	2,3	City, HCD	Permanent

Notes:

- **FHA 221d4** One of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Low Income Housing Tax Credit programs-- 221(d)(4) for new construction/substantial rehabilitation programs
- **FHA 236** Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Section 236 -- Mortgage Insurance for Subsidized Rental Housing Projects
- **CHFA** California Housing Financing Agency (now known as CalHFA)
- **FHA 221d4** One of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Low Income Housing Tax Credit programs-- 221(d)(4) for new construction/substantial rehabilitation programs
- **FHA 236** Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Section 236 -- Mortgage Insurance for Subsidized Rental Housing Projects
- **City FMHA** City of Davis Farmer's Home Administration Loan--Used for Famrworker Housing in late 1980s
- **City, HCD, CHFA** City of Davis, Department of Housing and Community Development, California Housing Financing Agency (now known as CalHFA)
- **FHA 221d4** One of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Low Income Housing Tax Credit programs-- 221(d)(4) for new construction/substantial rehabilitation programs
- **City, HCD, CHFA** City of Davis, Department of Housing and Community Development, California Housing Financing Agency (now known as CalHFA)
- **City MRB** Mortgage Revenue Bond. The city borrows money and lend it to the project.
- **CHFA S8** Check to the context of the use of this phrase, but I think it means the CalHFA Section 202 refinancing program to preserve Section 8 housing. CalHFA calls this the HUD Section 202 Refinancing Program.

Source: City of Davis, Planning and Building Department

Table 49A below contains the subsidized projects that their end dates expired, or opted out, or are in the process of opting out from their affordable program.

TABLE 49A	
SUBSIDIZED PROJECTS OPTED OUT OR IN PROCESS OF OPTING OUT	
Projects	Units
University House	11
Clubside Apartments	11
Brush Creek Apartments	17
Parque Plaza Apartments	16
Pepperwood Apartments	8
Almondwood Apartments	19
Le Tournesol Apartments	9
Total	91