

**MOORPARK CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA REPORT**

TO: Honorable City Council

FROM: Steven Kueny, City Manager *SK*
Prepared By: David A. Bobardt, Planning Manager *DB*

DATE: January 10, 2007 (CC Meeting of 1/17/2007)

SUBJECT: Consider the Draft 2006-2014 Regional Housing Needs Assessment

BACKGROUND

On December 20, 2006, staff presented a report at a special City Council meeting on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). A copy of the report is attached. The City Council received and filed the report, acknowledging staff's continued work with the other jurisdictions in the Ventura County Council of Governments (VCOG) to seek a distribution of the RHNA for Ventura County among the cities and county in a manner that made more sense than the distribution initially proposed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

DISCUSSION

The City-County Planning Association, comprised of Planning Directors and senior level planning staff from Ventura County jurisdictions, had been working together to create a formula for a more appropriate distribution of the Ventura County RHNA. Preliminary options were presented to the VCOG Board on December 14, 2006. At the direction of the VCOG Board, the City-County Planning Association refined four different formulas for distributing the RHNA a meeting on January 4, 2007. The first three formulas were based on varying the relative weighting of 2006 housing units, 2006 jobs, vacant land, and General Plan capacity within each jurisdiction to distribute the RHNA. The fourth formula was based fifty percent on the relative amount of 2006-2014 housing growth and fifty percent on the relative General Plan capacity, both as estimated by each jurisdiction. As the formulas varied on the weighting of demand factors (housing units, jobs) and supply factors (vacant land, General Plan capacity), the City-County Planning Association could not achieve consensus on a single formula to recommend to the VCOG Board.

The City Manager's Group met on January 8, 2007 to consider this matter and the four options developed by the planners. The group developed a new option which was based on a combination of the first four options with adjustments made in the spirit of compromise. On January 9, 2007, the VCOG Board unanimously endorsed the City Manager's Group option. The options are shown in the following table.

Jurisdiction	Draft 2006-2014 RHNA	Option 1* (30%, 50%, 20%, 0%)	Option 2* (25%, 25%, 10%, 40%)	Option 3* (15%, 15%, 40%, 30%)	Option 4**	City Manager's/ VCOG Option
Camarillo	4853	2951	2598	2977	3019	3664
Fillmore	608	628	1017	1332	1487	1019
Moorpark	939	1044	1314	1359	1847	1650
Ojai	383	728	579	1006	314	450
Oxnard	7345	4919	6343	5935	8495	7564
Port Hueneme	516	621	475	316	208	198
Ventura	3422	4721	5120	4814	5114	4327
Santa Paula	1856	1546	1931	2897	2074	2299
Simi Valley	5086	3619	3388	3208	2921	3735
Thousand Oaks	1072	4583	3341	2709	1559	2100
County	2401	3120	2375	1929	1443	1475
TOTAL	28481	28481	28481	28481	28481	28481

* Percentages refer to (in order) relative weighting of 2006 housing units, 2006 jobs, vacant land, and General Plan housing unit capacity

**Based 50% on City growth forecasts and 50% on General Plan capacity as reported by each jurisdiction

For SCAG to accept the VCOG's endorsed distribution and lock in the maximum RHNA for the Ventura County subregion at 28,481 housing units, VCOG must accept delegation of the SCAG's authority to consider appeals by the member jurisdictions by January 31, 2007. On January 9, 2007, the VCOG Board agreed to accept this delegation; the terms of the delegation agreement are being finalized.

The numbers shown in the table reflect the RHNA targets for housing for all income levels. A distribution by income endorsed by a SCAG committee for consideration by the SCAG Regional Council is estimated by City staff to allocate the 1,650 housing unit target for Moorpark as follows:

- 367 units affordable to very low income households (less than 50% of county median household income)
- 297 units affordable to low income households (between 50% and 80% of county median household income)
- 341 units affordable to median income households (between 80% and 120% of county median household income)
- 645 units affordable to high income households (greater than 120% of county median household income).

The City's Housing Element would have to be updated by June 30, 2008 to reflect the new RHNA targets, which will be finalized by SCAG in June 2007. A preliminary review by City staff of projects in process and under construction show that substantial additional local efforts will be needed to achieve the draft housing targets for very low income, low income and moderate income households. Current State housing law does not require the targets to be achieved, only that it is the intent that cities and counties should undertake all necessary actions to encourage, promote, and facilitate the development of housing to accommodate the entire regional housing need.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and file.

Attachment: December 20, 2006 Staff Report

**MOORPARK CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA REPORT**

TO: Honorable City Council

FROM: Barry K. Hogan, Community Development Director 
Prepared By: David A. Bobardt, Planning Manager

DATE: December 19, 2006 (CC Meeting of 12/20/2006)

SUBJECT: Consider Draft 2006-2014 Regional Housing Needs Assessment

BACKGROUND

State General Plan law (Government Code §65300 et seq.) requires each City and County to have a General Plan composed of seven (7) mandatory elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Noise, Conservation, Open Space, and Safety. These elements, along with any optional elements adopted by the local agency, form the constitution for future development within each jurisdiction. While State law allows each local agency to establish its own goals and policies for most elements, it has established the availability of housing for every Californian as a statewide goal, and has directed that each local agency bear responsibility to meet this goal through the Housing Element. The State Department of Housing and Community Development has the responsibility for determining existing and projected housing needs for each region in the state for a given planning period. The regional Council of Governments (SCAG for the six-county Southern California region) is then responsible for distributing the housing need among jurisdictions. This distribution is known as the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). Each local agency must then prepare a Housing Element to demonstrate how that housing need can be achieved, and the Housing Element must be certified by a certain deadline for the agency's General Plan to be valid.

DISCUSSION

The current planning period for the SCAG region is 2006 to 2014; the deadline for SCAG to finalize the RHNA distribution for this period is June 2007, and the deadline for each agency to update the local Housing Element is June 2008. SCAG has taken the regional housing need of 733,329 housing units and prepared a preliminary draft distribution among jurisdictions. Of the total units, 28,481 housing units (3.88%) have been distributed to the Ventura County subregion. The following table shows the preliminary distribution among the ten Cities and County for the 2006-2014 planning

period, compared to the previous 1998-2005 planning period, as well as the City and County staff estimates for development during the 2006-2014 planning period.

Jurisdiction	1998-2005 RHNA	% of County-wide Total	Draft RHNA 2006-2014	% of County-wide Total	2006-2014 City Dev. Estimates	% of County-wide Total
Camarillo	1800	9.1%	4853	17.0%	3150	13.6%
Fillmore	808	4.1%	608	2.1%	1081	4.7%
Moorpark	1255	6.4%	939	3.3%	1615	7.0%
Ojai	209	1.1%	383	1.3%	144	0.6%
Oxnard	3298	16.7%	7345	25.8%	7000	30.2%
Port Hueneme	254	1.3%	516	1.8%	177	0.8%
Ventura	1950	9.9%	3422	12.0%	3600	15.5%
Santa Paula	1393	7.1%	1856	6.5%	1200	5.2%
Simi Valley	2767	14.0%	5086	17.9%	2417	10.4%
Thousand Oaks	4322	21.9%	1072	3.8%	1400	6.0%
County	1678	8.5%	2401	8.4%	1400	6.0%
TOTAL	19734	100.0%	28481	100.0%	23184	100.0%

Community Development staff from several cities in Ventura County have expressed concern that the draft RHNA distribution bears no relation to what is likely to occur within the jurisdiction, based on either expected development, natural constraints, and development policy. As noted in the table, estimated development falls short of the RHNA for the Ventura County as a whole, although some cities are expecting to meet the preliminary draft RHNA targets. SCAG staff has made it clear that the RHNA number for Ventura County as a whole would not be adjusted, though they would consider one appeal from each jurisdiction, based on limited factors specified in the Government Code (i.e. availability of land, jobs/housing balance, lack of sewer or water service, lands protected under State or Federal programs, County agricultural preservation policies for unincorporated areas, agreements between Counties and Cities to direct growth to Cities, high housing costs, farmworker housing needs, market demand for housing, and RTP growth distribution), and may redistribute the RHNA among the Ventura County jurisdictions.

One option allowed by SCAG is for each subregion to take over the responsibility for distribution of the RHNA. If Ventura County Cities and the County opt for this approach, distribution of the 28,481 housing units, as well as consideration of appeals, would be handled by VCOG instead of SCAG. The benefit of this approach, if Cities and the County can agree on RHNA distribution, is the provision of certainty in the process; the RHNA would not be redistributed to any local agency by SCAG based on appeals from other jurisdictions. The Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG) has been considering this option. Staff from the ten Cities and Ventura County have also been working together to try to develop a formula based on a number of different factors including General Plan capacity, jobs/housing balance, recent growth trends, vacant land, projected employment growth. Agreement among staff on the most equitable formula

Honorable City Council
December 20, 2006
Page 3

has not yet been achieved. A meeting with staff and the VCOG Board is scheduled for early January 2007 to try to resolve the differences.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Direct staff as deemed appropriate.