Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency

REPORT TO COUNCIL
City of Sacramento
915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2671
www.CityofSacramento.org

STAFF REPORT
October 16, 2007

Honorable Mayor and
Members of the City Council

Title: Update on Housing Element

Location/Council District: Citywide

Recommendation: Staff seeks comments on the process and on the key themes identified to provide context to the upcoming Housing Element.

Contact: Lisa Bates, Deputy Executive Director, SHRA, 440-1316, Cindy Cavanaugh, Assistant Director, Housing and Community Development, SHRA, 440-1317; Tom Pace, Long Range Planning Manager, City of Sacramento, 808-6848; Desmond Parrington, Infill Coordinator, City of Sacramento, 808-5044

Presenters: Emily Halcon, Management Analyst, SHRA

Department: Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency and City Planning

Description/Analysis

Issue: Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) and City Planning staff have been working with the Housing Element consultant, EDAW, to prepare the 2008-2013 Housing Element, which must be adopted by June 30, 2008. State law requires that every City and County in California adopt a Housing Element every five years, subject to State approval, as part of its General Plan. The Housing Element plans for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community through a comprehensive analysis of need, constraints and resources. A core component of the housing element is the requirement to identify enough sites at appropriate densities to meet the community's fair share of regional need based on projected growth as developed by the State and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). Attachment 1 contains current draft projections, also called Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

In addition to meeting the specific requirements of State law, it is staff's intention that this housing element serve as a practical and strategic housing document, consistent with other City initiatives. Given the concurrency of the General Plan,

the City has the opportunity with this Housing Element to integrate these documents and coordinate public outreach efforts. In addition to coordinating with the General Plan's advisory committees, staff has embarked on an aggressive community outreach effort and has established a housing element stakeholder group for expert advice and guidance.

Identified through public outreach, City Council workshops, and departmental collaboration, broad themes have emerged. These themes provide a more meaningful context to the mandated Housing Element components, framing its goals, quantified objectives and policies. These themes are explained further in Attachment 1.

- Enhancing neighborhood sustainability, stability and integration
- Production to meet (or exceed) RHNA goals
- Meeting the needs of extremely low income households
- Providing accessible housing opportunities
- Rehabilitation of existing housing stock
- Creation of homeownership opportunities for modest income households

Current Housing Element Progress

The City must annually report on housing units produced to meet the growth projections contained in the Housing Element. As of the end of 2006, the City's production during the past Housing Element cycle equaled 99 percent of the total goal and 93 percent of the low and very low income goal. These production numbers (summarized in Attachment 1 and detailed in Attachment 2) have placed the City as the top producer of affordable housing in California, consequently receiving the largest Workforce Housing award in the State in 2006.

Policy Considerations: The 2008-2013 Housing Element is closely tied to policy development for the 2030 General Plan and will set the City-wide housing strategies for the next five years. The 2006 Housing Element annual report is also required per state law, and will aid in the development of the new Housing Element through analysis of successes from the previous policy document.

Environmental Considerations: Not a project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) [CEQA Section 21065 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 (b)(4)]. Approval and adoption of the Housing Element will be subject to CEQA approval.

Committee/Commission Action: Staff presented this report to the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Commission on September 19, 2007, and to the City of Sacramento Planning Commission on September 20, 2007.

Rationale for Recommendation: Prior to development of the goals, policies and programs of the Housing Element, staff is seeking input from the Council and the community to ensure that key housing issues are identified.

Financial Considerations: There are no financial impacts associated with the preparing the Housing Element update. Funds have previously been committed for the Housing Element consultant contract. Financial impacts associated with the adoption of the Housing Element and subsequent housing programs will be addressed in those Council reports.

ESBD Considerations: The items discussed in this report have no ESBD impact; therefore, ESBD considerations do not apply.

M/WBE Considerations: The items discussed in this report have no M/WBE impact; therefore, M/WBE considerations do not apply.

Respectfully Submitted by: _____
ANNE M. MOORE
Executive Director

Respectfully Submitted by: _____
CAROL SHEARLY
Director of Planning

Recommendation Approved:

_____
RAY KERRIDGE
City Manager

Table of Contents

	Report	pg. 1
Attachments		
1	Background	pg. 4
2	2006 Housing Element Annual Report	pg. 9
3	Power Point Presentation	pg. 53

Background

The following background information pertains to the preparation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element, scheduled for adoption by June 2008.

I. Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

- State Department of Finance (DOF) and Housing and Community Development determine regional growth expectations for a seven year period, 2006-2013. The local council of governments (SACOG for the Sacramento region) then determines a methodology for allocating the regional growth among the participating jurisdictions. Adopted July 19, 2007, SACOG's methodology contemplates a 50-year trend line toward regional income parity.
- RHNA covers a seven year period, while the corresponding Housing Element covers a five year period. Units produced in the "overlap period" (January 1, 2006 – June 30, 2008) are subtracted from the RHNA to determine housing units to be produced under the Housing Element.
- RHNA looks not only at overall growth projections, but also allocates housing needs in four income categories:
    - very low income (< 50% of area median income (AMI))
    - low income (51% - 80% AMI)
    - moderate income (81% - 120% AMI)
    - above moderate income (> 120% AMI)
- For the first time, the Housing Element must also consider the housing needs for *extremely low income* (< 30% AMI) households. In absence of a better methodology, the jurisdiction must assume that half of the very low income need is extremely low income need.
- The City must show it has sufficient capacity to meet the RHNA through an inventory of appropriately zoned vacant and/or underutilized land. Within the City of Sacramento, land is deemed "appropriate" for the very low and low income needs if it contains a residential zoning designation that allows at least 30 dwelling units/acre. For the moderate and above moderate income categories, any residential zoning designation is allowable to show sufficient capacity.

DRAFT City of Sacramento RHNA 2006-2013 [1]

	Number	Percentage
Very Low Income (> 50% AMI) [2]	3,720	14.1%
Low Income (51 - 80% AMI)	3,871	14.6%
Moderate Income (81- 120% AMI)	5,386	20.4%
Above Moderate Income (> 120% AMI)	13,458	50.9%
TOTAL	**26,435**	**100%**

AMI = Area Median Income

[1] *Draft RHNA as published by SACOG, June, 2007*

[2] *It is assumed that ½ of the VLI need is extremely low income (30% AMI) need.*

- As of 2006, the City of Sacramento has met 99 percent of its total RHNA from the current cycle (2000-2007). The City also exceeded its obligation of very low and moderate income housing units and met 92% of the low income housing requirement.

City of Sacramento Housing Production, 2000-2006

Income Category	2000–2007 RHNA	Units Produced [1]	Remaining RHNA	% of RHNA Goal
Very Low Income	772	772	0	100%
Low Income [2]	2,791	2,564	227	92%
Moderate Income	4,714	7,041	0	100%
Above Moderate	11,036	16,688	0	100%
TOTAL	**19,313**	**25,274**	**227** [3]	**99%**

[1] *Up to 25% of the very low and low income RHNA goal can be met with rehabilitated units.*
[2] *Excess VLI units produced or rehabilitated (1,277) can be used to meet the low income RHNA goal.*
[3] *While overall, the City has exceeded its RHNA goal by almost 6,000 units, there remain 227 units of unmet need in the low income category.*

II. Housing Element Themes

.

- Themes have been identified through stakeholder input, community discussions and from Council input in the context of other housing programs, projects and policies.
- Themes capture broad policy interests of the City related to housing and provide context to the programs developed under the Housing Element.
- Theme development includes providing local context, researching best practices and recommending measurable indicators of success.

- Enhancing neighborhood sustainability, stability and integration:
  - How to better integrate affordable housing in neighborhoods
  - Different housing options to meet demographic changes, including senior housing, small family housing and executive housing
  - The role of housing in achieving economic and racial diversity in our neighborhoods
- Production to meet (or exceed) RHNA goals:
  - What role should the Regional Housing Needs Allocation play in the City's housing goals and policies?
  - New production goals compared to other housing priorities
  - Affordable housing as a local and regional issue
- Meeting the needs of extremely low income households:
  - Determining the level and type of need
  - Identifying the most effective strategies for providing affordable housing for this population

- Providing accessible housing opportunities:
  - Identifying changes in City regulations to increase accessibility in housing
  - How to promote accessibility and universal design without increasing housing cost
- Rehabilitation of existing housing stock: Sacramento is both a new growth city and one with existing older neighborhoods
  - How can existing housing conditions be improved?
  - Rehabilitation as a tool for increasing affordability in existing areas
- Creation of homeownership opportunities for modest income households: Given the changes in Sacramento's housing market, homeownership is now out of reach for many middle income residents.
  - What strategies can be employed to assist those households to own their own home?
  - Identifying financial resources to promote homeownership

III. Community Outreach and "In-reach"

Given the concurrency of the General Plan update, the City has the opportunity with this Housing Element cycle to integrate these documents and coordinate public outreach efforts.

Housing Element team has extensive outreach and "in-reach" opportunities throughout the Housing Element update process.

- General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) – This advisory group will be engaged twice in the process: once in the fall of 2007 as a mid-way update and once in the early spring of 2008 to review the draft Element.
- GPAC Infill, Housing, Finance and Infrastructure Subcommittee - This group will be engaged four times throughout the process to provide input on needs and constraints, react to draft sections of the element, contribute to the preparation of policies and programs and review the draft Element prior to public dissemination.
- General Community Workshops – During the months of August and September, the Housing Element team held a series of five open community workshops throughout the City. The public was provided background on the Housing Element, including its relationship to other key City strategies. Afterwards, the groups were asked to share their thoughts on key housing needs in their community and the City as a whole, provide feedback on the emerging themes and suggest housing programs/strategies to meet the identified needs.
- Population Specific Outreach – In addition to the larger community wide workshops, staff has facilitated smaller discussions with particular communities whose input is vital to a successful Housing Element. To date, staff has held smaller discussions with the Building Industry Association (BIA), lower income residents in South Sacramento and seniors. Along with these smaller group facilitated discussions, staff has made concerted efforts to advertise the

general workshops to a wide variety of community, ethnic and neighborhood groups throughout the City.

- Housing Element Stakeholder Group –This group consists of key leaders in housing, development, social services and community representatives to provide detailed input on the Element. The stakeholders have met once in June 2007 to brainstorm on needs and constraints, once in September 2007 to review the draft community profile and to begin to develop policies and will meet again in early 2008 to review the draft Element prior to public dissemination.
- General Plan Open Houses and Community Convention – The Housing Element will be featured in the September/October series of General Plan open houses throughout the City. This not only provides additional opportunity for public input, but allows the community to consider housing issues in the context of the General Plan City-wide policies. The Housing Element will also be featured at the November General Plan Community Convention.
- "In-reach" efforts – In addition to reaching out to residents and stakeholders outside of the City, the Housing Element team recognizes the valuable partnerships and contributions with our City colleagues in other departments and agencies. The Housing Element team is reviewing current and future programs and policies with the General Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as well as the Inter-agency TAC. These two committees include key staff from a variety of City departments and representatives from partner organizations in the City and region, respectively.

IV. Timeline and Milestones *(items in italics are complete)*

DATE	EVENT/MILESTONE
May 2007	*Engage Housing Element consultant*
May - August, 2007	*Preparation of Community Profile section*
August – September 2007	*General community workshops*
October 2007	City Council update*
June – October 2007	Preparation of the Constraints & Resources section
August – November 2007	Preparation of the Past Performance Section
September – February 2007	Preparation of the Housing Plan
January 2008	Public review of draft Housing Element
February 2008	Boards/commissions review of draft Housing Element
February 21 2008	SACOG Board adopts final RHNA
March 2008	City Council review of draft Housing Element
April – May 2008	HCD review of draft Housing Element
June 2008	City Council adoption of Housing Element
June 2008	HCD certification of Housing Element
* Additional City Council updates may be provided prior to dissemination of public review document.	

V. Key Issues

- Regional Challenge/Change to RHNA – At the July 2007 SACOG Planners meeting, SACOG announced that the State Department of Finance (DOF) had revised its population growth projections such that the SACOG region's overall number was reduced by 30 percent. However, since the draft RHNA was based on the original DOF numbers, SACOG is working with staff of the State Housing and Community Development (HCD) department to determine if the new DOF numbers can be used to revise the RHNA. Regional support for such a change is strong, but there is no precedent for such a change, and the process to allow such a change could be lengthy and complex.

  If SACOG is successful in reducing the regional projections (either through internal approval or through legislation), the expected effect on the City would be a proportional 30 percent reduction in population, which must then be translated into housing units. As of the drafting of this report, SACOG has successfully added language to an assembly bill allowing the use of the new DOF numbers to re-calculate the 2008-2013 RHNA. This bill passed through both the Assembly and Senate and is currently awaiting signature by the Governor. While the bill will result in a reduced RHNA, the bill does not allow for an extension for adoption of the Housing Element. Until the bill is signed by the Governor, the City is proceeding with preparation assuming the larger RHNA and the current timeframe of adoption by June 2008.

- Coordination of environmental review – At a minimum, adoption of the Housing Element will require a negative declaration under CEQA. Should the Housing Element require re-zoning to meet the land inventory requirements, additional environmental review may be necessary. Given that the Housing Element is relying on land designations in the 2030 General Plan and must be consistent with the General Plan, it is staff's expectation that the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) for the General Plan will provide sufficient environmental clearance for the Housing Element.

  However, the timing for adoption of the General Plan and associated MEIR is November 2008, five months after state mandated adoption/certification of the Housing Element. The City cannot be expected to adopt a Housing Element without environmental clearance, and should not separate out the environmental document for this element of the General Plan. Therefore, it is likely that the City may have to delay formal adoption of the Housing Element to coincide with adoption of the General Plan. In this instance, staff will submit the complete draft Housing Element with contingent City approval to HCD by the June 2008 deadline, with formal adoption immediately after approval of the General Plan and MEIR.

Department of Housing and Community Development

ANNUAL HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT

City or County Name: City of Sacramento.

Mailing Address: 915 I Street, New City Hall, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Contact Person: Thomas S. Pace. Title: Long Range Planning Division Manager.

Phone: (916) 808-6848. FAX: (916) 808-7185 Email: tpace@cityofsacramento.org

Reporting Period by Calendar Year: from January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006.

These forms and tables must be submitted to HCD and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) on or before April 1, of each year; submit separate reports directly to both HCD and OPR (Government Code Section 65400) at the addresses listed below:

Department of Housing and Community Development
Division of Housing Policy Development
P.O. Box 952053
Sacramento, CA 94252-2053

-and-

Governor's Office of Planning and Research
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Executive Summary

Under State law (Government Code Section 65400(b)), the City is required to prepare an annual report each year detailing the progress it has made during the prior year in meeting its Housing Element goals. This report must be submitted to the state department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). Due to changes in State law the report is now due April 1st rather than October 1st.

As discussed in this report, the City has implemented a wide variety of policies and programs over the years in order to try to address the challenge of providing affordable housing. These include:

- First-time homebuyer programs;
- Housing Trust Fund program;
- Mixed-Income Ordinance;
- Redevelopment programs;
- Rehabilitation programs; and
- Affordable housing preservation, financing, and acquisition.

The City has made substantial progress not only in meeting our share of the regional housing need, but also in providing a wide variety of housing types to serve different ages, households, lifestyles, and income levels. The following discussion provides the total number of building permits issued during calendar year 2006 (Tables A and A2), the affordability of those units, overall progress toward the City's regional housing needs allocation (Table B), and Housing Element program implementation status (Table C).

1. Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress

For the 2000-2007 Housing Element cycle, the City of Sacramento was assigned by SACOG its share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA). Under the Housing Element requirements, the City needs to identify sufficient sites for, and encourage the production of 19,313 housing units by 2007.

Between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2006, the City of Sacramento issued building permits for 4,933 housing units (refer to Table A). Since 2000, the City has added over 25,000 housing units to our inventory, including approximately 11,700 units affordable to very low-, low- and moderate-income households as a result of new development, preservation, and substantial rehabilitation efforts (Table B). In addition, the City also substantially rehabilitated almost 322 units to create housing for very low and low-income households, but which could not be counted under the requirements of the RHNA. Overall, the City has achieved 99% of its RHNA targets. Yet, despite this progress, affordability remains a significant challenge, not only for Sacramento, but also for every city and county in our region and state.

2. Program Implementation Status

The City continues to make substantial progress implementing its Housing Element programs. Major successes in 2006 include substantially rehabilitating 100 affordable multi-family housing units, and approval of 13 inclusionary housing plans for a total of 636 units. Other accomplishments include: completion of most of the phases of the Del Paso Nuevo project in North Sacramento; increased infill development especially in North Sacramento, Oak Park and the Central City; initiated the Pre-Approved Infill House Plan program; and secured approximately $900,000 from the Workforce Housing Grant Program. The City also approved a new SRO program to preserve and build new SRO units throughout the City.

Other noteworthy implementation efforts include the creation of a web-based affordable rental housing search service. SHRA and Community Services Planning Council have created one-stop centers to assist those in search of affordable housing options. The City and SHRA continue to support home ownership assistance programs and provided rehabilitation assistance to 133 low-income homeowners in 2006. SHRA also provided assistance for a 206-unit affordable senior assisted living project. First time homebuyer assistance was provided to 85 households enabling them to purchase their own home in 2006.

Despite the City's progress implementing the Housing Element programs, providing affordable housing to keep up with demand remains difficult. Given increases in construction costs, labor costs, and land costs, assisting with the development of affordable housing is a significant challenge. The City has met its share of the regional housing need for very low-income, moderate, and above moderate-income households, but addressing housing needs of all low-income households continues to be a challenge. In the past, the market had provided more housing that was affordable to low-income households, but with rising rents this is no longer the case in most areas. Even ensuring an adequate supply of housing affordable to moderate-income households has become more challenging.

The City has responded to the low and very low-income housing need by increasing the Housing Trust Fund fee, revising the zoning ordinance to ease some of the standards for residential construction, and has actively sought funding (e.g., HELP funds, Workforce Housing Grants, etc.), to assist with the provision of affordable housing or infrastructure necessary to support housing. The City and SHRA have also provided mortgage credit certificates and first-time homebuyer programs to assist low and moderate-income households.

3. Progress Mitigating Governmental Constraints

There were three broad areas identified in the City's 2002-2007 Housing Element where constraints were present and needed to be addressed. These included: 1) development processing; 2) financing, fees, and infrastructure provision; and 3) housing affordability.

The City has made important progress in streamlining the development process. The new MATRIX program, which is a new approach to processing at the City, brings together all the City departments and divisions involved in project review in order to create a more seamless process. The MATRIX was used successfully for the Central City/East Sacramento area and was expanded citywide on January 1, 2007. As part of the General Plan update and subsequent zoning code update, the City is looking at a variety of ways to provide greater flexibility for development, to encourage infill and innovative types of development, and to lessen the costs of development.

The City has continued to make improvements to infrastructure, facilities, and services. The City secured $900,000 in 2006 from the state Workforce Housing Grant Reward Program, which was used for facility and infrastructure improvements. The City has also made improvements to its levee system in order to provide 100-year flood protection to much of the City. Additional improvements have been made by the City's Utilities Department to the City's infrastructure including water and sewer line improvements, fixes to the combined sewer system, and others. In 2007, the City will begin the development of a comprehensive citywide infrastructure financing plan. This plan will be prepared as part of the General Plan update and will analyze ways of funding the necessary infrastructure, improvements, and maintenance necessary for both infill and greenfield development.

The third category of constraints that the City faces is the continued escalation of land and housing costs in the Sacramento region. In order to ensure that the City has an adequate supply of affordable housing, the City has taken several steps to address affordability. These steps include increases in the Housing Trust Fund fee, changes to the Mixed Income Ordinance to foster affordable condominium development, and the support of regional efforts at promoting affordable housing, including adoption of the SACOG regional housing compact.

Table A
2006 Annual Building Activity Report
Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Units and Mixed-Income Multifamily Projects

Housing Development Information								Housing with Financial Assistance and/or Deed Restrictions		Housing without Financial Assistance or Deed Restrictions	Project Address	APN	Affordable Lot Numbers
1	2	3	4				5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Project Identifier (APN #, or address, and project name)	Unit Category	Tenure R=Renter O=Owner	Affordability by Household Incomes				Total Units per Project	Assistance Programs for Each Development	Deed Restricted Units	Note: Indicate the number of units included in 4 that were also counted in 5, 6, or 7. Show the number of bonus units, if any.	Address	APN (may have multiple)	Affordable Lot Numbers
			Very Low-Income Units	Low-Income Units	Moderate-Income Units	Above Moderate-Income Units		See Instructions	See Instructions				
Westview Ranch Apartments	5+	R	85	42	1		128	MRB, TCAC, HOME	Inc		500 Bankside Way	201-1170-003	
Shenandoah Apartments	5+	R		80			80	MRB, TCAC, HOME	Deed		6205 Riverside Blvd	030-0361-009	AB 438 Substantial Rehab. Units
Valencia Point Apartments	5+	R	110	56	2		168	MRB, TCAC, HTF	Inc		SE corner of Del Paso Rd. and Westlake Pkwy	225-2270-026	
Hurley Creek Senior Apartments	5+	R	138	68	2		208	MRB, TCAC, HOME	Inc		SW corner of Snowy Egret Blvd and El Centro Rd	225-0310-011	
Rio Linda & Nogales Street	SF	O		5	6		11	RDA	Deed		Multiple, around 3536 Rio Linda Blvd		
Habitat for Humanity, 2825 39th St.	SF	O		1			1	RDA	Deed		2825 39th St		
Habitat for Humanity, 3882 3rd Ave	SF	O		1			1	RDA	Deed		3882 3rd Ave.		
Alta Vista Meadows	SF	O	5	3		44	52		Inc		Multiple, SW corner of Main Ave. and Rio Linda	237-0040-026	5A, 5B, 11A, 11B, 20A, 20B, 33A, 33B
Machado Property	SF	O		4		74	78		Inc		Multiple, around 3600 Airport Rd	225-0150-023	2, 21, 31, 38
Riverdale North	SF	O		27		510	537		Inc		Multiple, S of San Juan and E & S of Buchmand	225-0220-026	Villages 1 and 2, Lots 5, 10, 26, 28, 35, 58, 65, 106, 108, 115, 138, 142, 147, 159, 163, 167, 173, 185; Village 3, Lots 6, 18, 23, 29; Village 4, Lots 47, 59, 73, 85, 91
Wickford Square	SF	O	10	5		88	103		Inc		Multiple, NE corner of Calvine and Franklin	117-0160-050	51, 99, 23, 35, 57, 62, 88, 9, 12, 43, 29, 16, 74, 95, 68
Cameron V	SF	O		4		22	26		Inc		Multiple, NE corner of Bruceville and Sheldon	117-0212-045	16, 17, 23, 24
Jessie Avenue Condos	5+	O	3	6		51	60		Inc		470 Jessie Ave	237-0180-060	Specific Units undefined
Wolf Ranch Condos	5+	O	8	16		136	160		Inc		SW corner of Bruceville and Jacinto	117-0140-030	Bldg 2, Units 5, 6, 7, Bldg 3, Units 9, 10, 11, 12, Bldg 4, Units 9, 10, 11, 12, Bldg 5, Units 6, 7, 8, Bldg 7, Units 9, 10, 11, 12, Bldg 9, Units 9, 10, 11, 12, Bldg 10, Units 6, 7
Sheldon Farms	SF	O	10	5		88	103		Inc		Multiple, NW corner of Sheldon Rd. & Lewis Stein	117-0212-006 and -007	4, 8, 12, 17, 26, 29, 34, 43, 44, 56, 60, 86, 93, 98, 103
North Laguna Point Condos	5+	O	8	15		130	153		Inc		NE corner of Bruceville & Sheldon	117-0212-010 and 064	5, 23, 44, 56, 59, 68, 107, 119, 11, 17, 32, 47, 50, 53, 65, 71, 74, 98, 110, 116, 122, 146, 149
Sycamore Park	SF	O		3		17	20		Inc		Multiple, NW corner of Main Ave. & Sutly St.	226-0330-008	4A, 4B, 8A
3273 8th Ave	SF	O			1		1		See note**	1	3273 8th Ave		
3409 42nd Street	SF	O			1		1		See note**	1	3409 42nd Street		
4019 34th Street	SF	O			1		1		See note**	1	4019 34th Street		
1900 Danbrook Dr	5+	O			12		12		See note**	12	1900 Danbrook Dr		
St. Anton Building	5+	R	13	4	48		65	MRB, TCAC, HOME, HTF	Deed See	48	2110 L Street		
Sycamore Creek Apartments	5+	R			225		225		See note**	225	40 Park City Court		
Carefree Natomas	5+	R			192		192		See note**	192	5601 Natomas Blvd		
450 Jessie Avenue	5+	R			30		30		See note**	30	450 Jessie Avenue		
"Projects with 25 Units or Less"	5+	R			43		43		See note**	43			
"Projects with 25 Units or Less"	2-4	R			75		75		See note**	75			
"Projects with 25 Units or Less"	SU	R			45		45		See note**	45			
(9) Total of Above Moderate from Table A2 ► ►			►	►	►		2,354						
(10) Total by income units (Field 5) Table A ► ►			390	345	684	3,514	4,933						

*Inc = Inclusionary units; Deed = Deed restricted units only, not produced through inclusionary program
**Note = affordability of unit determined by using average rents and median sales prices per square foot by zip code as well as household income (using no more than 30% of gross household income).

Table A2

Annual building Activity Report Summary for Above Moderate-Income Units (not including those units reported on Table A)

	Single Family	2 - 4 Units	5+ Units	Second Unit	Mobile Homes	Total
No. of Units Permitted for **Above Moderate**	1,717	74	563	0	0	2,354

Table B

Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress

Permitted Units Issued by Affordability

Enter Calendar Year starting with the first year of the RHNA allocation period. See Example.

Income Category	2000-2007 RHNA	2000 & 2001			2002			2003			2004			2005			2006 [4]			Remaining RHNA [3]	% of RHNA Goal
		New	Rehab [2]	Total	New	Rehab [2]	Total	New	Rehab [2]	Total	New	Rehab [2]	Total	New	Rehab [2]	Total	New	Rehab [2]	Total		
Very Low																					
Total Units		194	0		260	398		263	17		153	18		320	258		390	20			
(-) Excess "Rollover" Created [1]	772	0	0		0	205		138	17		153	18		320	258		390	20		0	100%
Net Units Towards Goal		194	0	194	260	193	453	125	0	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Low																					
Total Units		55	0		196	2		106	66		102	64		141	290		265	80			
(+) Excess "Rollover" Used	2,791	0	0		0	205		138	17		153	18		320	36		390	20		227	92%
Net Units Towards Goal		55	0	55	196	207	403	244	83	327	255	82	337	461	326	787	655	0	655		
Moderate																					
Total Units		1,789	0		1,423	6		1,707	5		950	4		436	37		684	0			
(-) Excess "Rollover" Created [1]	4,714	0	0		0	0		211	0		950	0		436	0		684	0		0	100%
Net Units Towards Goal		1,789	0	1,789	1,423	6	1,429	1,496	5	1,501	0	4	4	0	37	37	0	0	0		
Above Moderate																					
Total Units		2,574	0		1,409	5		2,856	1		3,953	2		2,382	3		3,514	0			
(+) Excess "Rollover" Used	11,036	0	0		0	0		211	0		25	0		0	0		0	0		0	100%
Net Units Towards Goal		2,574	0	2,574	1,409	5	1,414	3,067	1	3,068	3,978	2	3,980	2,382	3	2,385	3,514	0	3,514		
Total RHNA by COG.	19,313	4,612	0	4,612	3,288	411	3,699	4,932	89	5,021	4,233	88	4,321	2,843	366	3,209	4,169	0	4,169		
Total Units ▶ ▶ ▶			4,612			3,699			5,021			4,321			3,209			4,169		227	99%
Remaining Need for RHNA Period ▶ ▶		▶	▶	▶	▶	▶	▶	▶	▶	▶	▶										

[1] All new construction and substantial rehabilitation beyond 25% of the RHNA for very low and moderate income categories is eligible to "roll over" to help meet the unmet low income and above moderate income goals, respectively.

[2] Substantially rehabilitated units meet the requirements under AB 438 and are used to meet up to 25% of the RHNA goal in each income category. Excess (above the 25% threshold and/or above the total need in the income category) substantially rehabilitated VLI and moderate income units are rolled over to help meet the needs of the low income and above moderate income categories, respectively, up to the 25% threshold within that category.

[3] Remaining RHNA is calculated from the difference between the 2000-2007 RHNA and the total Net Units Towards Goal by income category. Actual production by income category may be less or more; "rolling over" excess units in very low and moderate income categories alleviates some of the discrepancies in production

[4] In 2006, 100 substantially rehabilitated units (20 VLI and 80 LI) are "lost" because the 25% threshold for use of rehabilitated units was hit in 2005 (an additional 222 rollover rehabilitated unit from 2005 were also "lost"). These 100 units cannot count towards the 2000-2007 RHNA, but may be eligible to meet the 2006-2013 RHNA, since the 25% threshold will be "reopened" with the new RHNA.

Table C

Program Implementation Status

Program Description (By Housing Element Program Names)	Housing Programs Progress Report - Government Code Section 65583. Describe progress of all programs including progress in removing regulatory barriers as identified in Housing Element .			
Name of Program	**Objective**	**Timeline in H.E.**	**Task Status**	**Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: B=Complete; C=Partially Complete; D=Ongoing; C=Not Complete)**
Housing Supply 1.1	**Create planned opportunities for an additional 10,000 new housing units.** Maintain and expand the amount of residentially designated and zoned lands within the City with particular attention to expanding the range and mix of housing sites in new growth areas, areas of opportunity for development or reuse, and existing or potential improvement program areas, as designated in the General Plan. Designate sites through the General Plan, Community and Specific Plan amendment process, rezoning process, redevelopment plan amendment process, and the annexation pre-zoning process. New Growth Areas include North Natomas, Airport Meadowview and South Sacramento; Existing and Potential Improvement Areas include older commercial corridors in North Sacramento, South Natomas and South Sacramento; Areas of Opportunity for Development or Reuse include the Railyards/Richards area, Curtis Park Railyards, and R Street Corridor. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council/ Downtown Department/SHRA	**Ongoing.** Jacinto Creek, Railyards/Richards Boulevard Area, North Natomas and R Street Corridor plans adopted.	D	**Currently, the City is comprehensively updating its General Plan as well as the South Area Community Plan. (The new South Area Community Plan combines the Airport-Meadowview area with the western portion of the South Sacramento area.) In both these plans, the City is looking at expanding and enhancing opportunities for residential development, including affordable housing opportunities. Many of the new land use designations that the City is considering for the new General Plan and South Area Plan are mixed-use designations which will allow housing with other uses in many more areas of Sacramento. Furthermore, the City received a development proposal for the Railyards area that includes approximately 10,000 residential units, which will be required to comply with the Mixed Income Ordinance. The City is also looking at other redevelopment areas as well as the City's commercial corridors.** **For example, on November 4, 2003, Council adopted the Commercial Corridor Revitalization Strategy, which included zoning code amendments to encourage housing on commercially zoned properties. In addition, City staff worked with landowners to rezone properties in the Northgate Commercial Corridor to Residential Mixed-Use (RMX) to encourage housing close to services. This strategy was adopted by Council in spring 2006.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Supply 1.2	**Continue to review multi-family site criteria to evaluate suitability for higher density land uses.** Apply location, site, and design criteria for the evaluation of suitable sites for medium to high-density residential development. The City should seek to optimize multi family opportunities on sites meeting the following criteria: (a) proximity to public transit or bus service (b) proximity to commercial and social services (c) parcel size and configuration which enhances the feasibility of development (d) lack of physical constraints (noise, wetlands) (e) provision for a variety of housing types and affordable housing opportunities and (f) other criteria deemed appropriate including integration of multi family units within the larger adjacent neighborhood. Apply the criteria to evaluate rezoning proposals involving multi-family development. **Responsible Entity**: City Planning/City Council	**Ongoing**	◉	**The City continues to review multi-family site criteria when identifying suitable sites for higher density development. The City has done this as part of its planning efforts at light rail stations and is using such criteria as part of the development of the General Plan land use diagram. For example, the City created a Transit Overlay Zone to encourage higher-density housing and other appropriate uses within ¼ mile of transit stations in Sacramento. The City also adopted a Light Rail Station Ordinance, which encourages transit-supportive uses, including high-density housing and residential mixed-use, while restricting non-transit supportive uses. The Ordinance made housing easier near light rail stations including allowing housing in light industrial zones.**
Housing Supply 1.3	**Addition of 2,550 potential housing units within annexation area. Initiate sphere of influence revision studies and annexation proposals.** Continue Comprehensive Annexation Program for land within existing Sphere of Influence. Apply Mixed Income Housing Ordinance to newly annexed areas. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council and LAFCo	**Spring 2004**	◉	**The City attempted to annex the Freeport area in 2005, but the voters in that area rejected this. The Panhandle annexation in the north will be completed in 2007. This project will include approximately 3,000 units. All of these sites are expected to provide substantial opportunities for additional housing development. The City is currently involved in the annexation of the Greenbriar area, which is immediately adjacent to the North Natomas Community Plan area. When developed, this area will likely include 3,500 residential units at densities ranging from 7 du/ac to 29 du/ac. The average density for the project is over 14 du/ac.**
Housing Supply 1.4	**Develop and maintain a system for inventorying all available surplus land and evaluate its suitability for affordable housing production.** Complete inventory of city surplus lands suitable for affordable housing production. **Responsible Entity:** Public Works Department and City Planning	**Spring 2004**	●	**The Planning Department regularly tracks vacant and surplus land as part of its Housing and Population Report. This analysis is done using GIS. The report tracks vacant land and surplus land as well as near-term development (i.e., applications in the pipeline). The Planning Department provides a semi-annual report on land and development. In addition, the City completed an assessment of available of surplus land for residential use in 2005 as part of the preparation of the Land Use Element for the General Plan update.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Supply 1.5	**Update financing and phasing plans, as appropriate, to assure the timely provision of infrastructure to new growth and redevelopment project areas, including but not limited to North Natomas and the Railyards /Richards Boulevard area. Consider housing affordability in addition to other criteria in the imposition and spreading of infrastructure costs and the structuring of the payment of such costs. Amend financing plan for North Natomas and Railyards.** **Responsible Entity:** City Finance/Pubic Works/ City Planning/ City Council	**Ongoing**	◉	**On August 2, 2005, the City updated and amended the financing plan for North Natomas to ensure that infrastructure is in place to facilitate development. The financing plan for the Railyards will be done in coordination with Railyards specific planning In addition, as part of the General Plan update, the City is preparing an infrastructure and financing plan that will evaluate ways to provide financing to provide and improve infrastructure citywide. This plan is expected to be completed in 2008. The City is also working on a focused Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to better coordinate and focus funding in key infill areas.**
Housing Supply 1.6	**Develop standard noise attenuation measures and standards to meet noise standards for residential infill sites.** Implement standard noise mitigation measures to streamline environmental review process. **Responsible Entity:** City Development Services, Environmental Division	Ongoing	●	**The noise mitigation measures have been implemented and are used by the City's environmental services section to streamline environmental review during the development application process.**
Housing Supply 1.7	**Amend the Artist's Live/Work Space Ordinance permitting live/work and residential loft use in all residential and nonresidential zones subject to compliance with development standards.** Amend zoning code to allow more flexibility in the type of Live/Work housing. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council	Fall 2002	◉	**Due to current staff workload, these amendments are not expected to be completed until 2007. However, changes were made in 2005 to the City's zoning code to encourage the development of second units and setbacks were reduced to encourage residential infill development. Review in PUD districts was streamlined to promote live/work unit development in these areas. Finally, home occupation permits are now issued concurrently with business licenses to facilitate live/work uses.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Supply 1.8	**Implement the Transit For Livable Communities (TLC) Recommendations for the South Line, Folsom Line, and the Northeast Line Light Rail Station areas to promote residential mixed-use development.** Plan amendments and rezoning to increase residential holding capacity by approximately 14,500-22,000 new units. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council	Fall 2002 – Fall 2005	○	**The City has developed a work plan for all its light rail stations. This plan addresses land use, infrastructure, and urban design among others. The City is now in the process of implementing the TLC Recommendations at several light rail stations, including the 65th Street Station area and at the Swanston Station. In addition, all four of the stations on the South Line are being analyzed as part of the South Area Community Plan update. Through the Community Plan update, the City will be evaluating land use, infrastructure, and urban design at these stations and will be developing policies to promote residential mixed-use development at these four South Line stations as well as at other stations in the City. Land use changes and rezonings are expected to be complete by 2008/2009. The City also recently received grant funding from Caltrans to develop urban design plans for light rail station areas on the northeast line, which should facilitate the development of housing near light rail stations.**
Housing Supply 1.9	**Implement and rezone appropriate sites to Employment Center (EC) zone, that allows residential in a business park setting (with a maximum 25% of acreage towards residential use). This would apply the EC zone developed in the North Natomas Community Plan Area on a citywide basis.** Application of EC land use in appropriate locations near future transit stations and transportation corridors to integrate residential projects with large employment uses. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning /City Council	Contingent upon rezoning requests or in conjunction with community plan/general plan amendments	○	**As part of the General Plan update, the City is looking at extending the EC designation or a similar mixed-use designation that includes residential in combination with office uses along commercial corridors and around light rail stations. This land use designation and zone will be extended as part of the Land Use Element and subsequent zoning code update. These will likely be extended Citywide in 2007.**
Housing Supply 1.10	**Continue to administer the Mobile Home Park regulations, regarding development of mobile home parks.** Administration of mobile home park regulations. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning Department	Ongoing	◉	**The City has continued to administer its mobile home regulations. However, the City is reviewing its mobile home park regulations, including conversion issues, and may be presenting this issue along with others in an affordable housing workshop with City Council in 2007.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ◉=Complete; ◑=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Supply 1.11	**Provide programs to preserve or offer replacement housing to mobile home park tenants.** Coordinated replacement-housing requirements for displaced mobile home tenants. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning and SHRA	As needed	◉	**The City continues to coordinate with SHRA on a regular basis regarding housing, mobile home parks, and replacement requirements. As noted above, the City is reviewing the need for a Mobile Home Park Conversion Ordinance.**
Housing Supply 1.12	**Consider modifications to the Condominium Conversion Ordinance that regulates the conversion of rental housing to condominiums and new condominium construction.** Allow some conversion of apartments to condos in the Central City Community Plan Area and update vacancy rates. Maintain a reasonable balance of rental vs. ownership housing opportunities in multi-family housing. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	Ongoing existing program	◑	**Beginning in 2005, City staff began a series of workshops on the Condominium Conversion Ordinance and how it works. Based on feedback from Development Oversight Commission, Planning Commission and Council, staff may begin revisions to the ordinance to improve the process, but also wants to ensure that the City maintains a balance of rental and ownership opportunities. Furthermore, the City has completed vacancy rate reports for 2004, 2005, and 2006, which are a requirement of the Condominium Conversion Ordinance.** **A City Council workshop was held in 2006 to discuss revisions to the ordinance. The Council directed staff to provide further information pertaining to the impacts changes of the ordinance would have on the local rental market. Staff has prepared a memo to the Mayor and Council addressing their questions from the workshop.**
Housing Supply 1.13	**Review and update the City's Emergency Shelter Site inventory to determine if the sites are adequate and developable.** Ensure the Emergency Shelter Site Inventory contains sites that are developable. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	Summer 2004	◉	**As part of the General Plan update, particularly in our Land Use and Housing Element updates, the City will assess the adequacy of our emergency shelter site inventory.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Affordability 2.1	**Participate in the Sacramento County Regional Sanitation Board's fee waiver and deferral program to reduce impact fees for very low and low-income housing developments and request waiver of fees for 200 very low-income units per fiscal year in the City and County of Sacramento or 5% of the residential building permits issued in the unincorporated County in the prior fiscal year, whichever is greater, and an extension from June 1, 2000 thru June 2002. There is no cap on deferrals.** Fee reductions for the development up to 200 qualified affordable housing units per year in the City and County. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA/City Council	MOU approved in 1998; Extension Fall 2002	◉	**Through the Regional Sanitation Board's fee waiver and deferral program, SHRA provided fee waivers and deferrals to 200 affordable units in 2006. Typically, every year SHRA uses all fee waivers allocated to it by the Regional Sanitation Board.**
Housing Affordability 2.2	**To the extent feasible, continue to fund and administer the Affordable Housing Fee Reduction Program (or other financing mechanisms) and work with affordable housing developers, other agencies, and districts to review and reduce applicable processing and development impact fees for very low and low-income housing units.** Fee reductions for up to 200 affordable housing units per year. **Responsible Entity:** Budget/City Planning/City Council	Ongoing	◉	**The City budgets $500,000 annually for the Affordable Housing Fee Reduction Program. This program is used in conjunction with the City's Mixed Income Ordinance. The accomplishments of the Mixed Income Ordinance are described later in this report.**
Housing Affordability 2.3	**Adopt and implement a new fee reduction program for single-family infill neighborhoods.** Reduce development costs for up to 30 single-family infill housing units per year in target infill areas. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	Adopted Jan. 2003, Implementation Ongoing	●	**The City adopted the Infill Fee Reduction program that provides fee reductions and other incentives for infill development. Developments can receive up to a maximum of $5,000 in reduced fees. As a result of the prevailing wage laws (SB 975 of 2001 and Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 49 of 2003), concern has been raised that the fee reduction may trigger prevailing wages for infill projects that might not normally be required to provide prevailing wages. As a result, there has been little interest by developers for such fee reductions from the City.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ◉=Complete; ●=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Affordability 2.4	**Implement the City's Economic Development Bank to reduce sewer fees for infill housing.** Reduce fees for up to 1200 Infill Housing Units. **Responsible Entity:** City Economic Development/City Council/ Regional Sanitation District	Ongoing	◉	**The City is currently providing sewer credits through this program. In 2006, the City provided sewer credits to assist the development of approximately 324 units.**
Housing Affordability 2.5	**Continue to utilize and implement Water Development Fee Waiver Program adopted in 1987.** Distribute fee waivers for 50-100 Units annually. **Responsible Entity**: City Planning/ Utilities	Ongoing	◉	**The City provided water development fee waivers to approximately 186 infill housing units in 2006.**
Housing Affordability 2.6	**Continue to provide housing information and referral services on affordable housing opportunities.** Consolidated "one stop" information center for housing information regarding housing availability, programs and services. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA and Community Services Planning Council	Ongoing existing program known as the Community Information Center (CIC)	●	**SHRA has developed the multi-family rental resource on the web that provides people who are looking for affordable rental housing with a one-stop center for housing information (Go to: http://www.shra.org/Content/Housing/AffordableHousingSite/AffHousingTOC.htm). Similarly, the Community Services Planning Council has operated Infoline, a phone referral system for many years and has initiated Beehive, an online information and referral service for social services and housing. (Go to: http://www.thebeehive.org/Templates/Housing/Level3NoRight.aspx?PageId=1.886&LC=40&LG=1). Sacramento Self Help Housing provides another valuable housing referral resource online with emphasis on housing resources for very low-income persons. (Go to: http://www.sacselfhelp.org/).**
Housing Affordability 2.7	**Implement the Supportive Housing Loan Program in collaboration with the County Department of Human Assistance, Health and Human Services, and Mercy Housing.** SHRA will continue to participate in the financing of housing for emancipated foster youth, AIDS/HIV, & other persons with special needs. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**SHRA provides Community Development Block Grant funds to Mercy Housing who provides technical assistance to social service providers that wish to develop supportive housing for special needs groups such as emancipated youths, persons with HIV/AIDS, etc. This funding has proven to be effective in enhancing the capacity of service providers to own, manage and develop permanent supportive housing.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Affordability 2.8	**Aggressively pursue financing and ownership alternatives to protect the quality of public housing, its services to residents, and its affordability to very low-income people.** Innovative approaches will be pursued to protect the financial viability and management of public housing, including modernization and substantial rehabilitation of 120 units and the sale of 60 single-family properties to existing tenants and work incentive programs. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**SHRA rehabilitated and sold 23 housing authority-owned single family homes to low income buyers in 2006.**
Housing Affordability 2.9	**Review and revise the program of operating assistance or pre-development grants for specific projects being carried out by qualified nonprofit housing corporations to create housing for special needs populations including the disabled. Funding is usually provided through CDBG or HOME.** Authorize 1-2 awards per year to corporations to support vital projects particularly for housing for persons with special needs. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**Through Mercy Housing's technical assistance grant, assistance was provided to the multiple providers with potential developments throughout the City and County, including AIDS Housing Alliance, Transitional Living and Community Support, Cottages, Volunteers of America and numerous faith based organizations.**
Housing Affordability 2.10	**Involve the community at-large in participating in the annual update and five year Consolidated Plan for the expenditure of federal funds.** New community needs assessment to guide program funding. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Annual	●	**SHRA worked extensively with the community during the update of its 2003-2007 Consolidated Plan and One-Year Action Plan. This update included a new community needs assessment as well as a strategic plan which will guide the expenditure of CDBG, HOME, Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funds, and other funds during the 2003-2007 time frame. SHRA staff is currently preparing the City's 2008-2013 Consolidated Plan and is doing public outreach for that as well.** **In addition, City staff held workshops on key policy issues associated with affordable housing in the City in 2006. These workshops included public involvement and outreach on a variety of housing policy issues as well as preparation for the Housing Element update. Several additional workshops are scheduled for 2007.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Affordability 2.11	**Maintain and enforce the City Preservation Ordinance as well as maintain financing opportunities for potential purchasers to preserve federally assisted housing with expiring Sec. 8 subsidies.** Preserve affordability and rehabilitate 100 units per year in HUD expiring use projects. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**In 2004, the City Council approved a Housing Preservation Ordinance aimed at preserving federally subsidized affordable units. SHRA has been the lead agency responsible for ordinance implementation. In 2006, no HUD assisted projects were at risk of conversion to market rate.**
Housing Affordability 2.12	**Promote partnerships between lending institutions, equity investors, developers, housing interest groups and the community to encourage sufficient availability of financing for affordable rental and ownership housing projects.** Increase affordable housing lending through marketing efforts with regulated financial institutions and equity investors. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA & Local Lenders	Ongoing	◉	**SHRA has continued to work to promote partnerships among investors and developers to facilitate the development of affordable housing. SHRA markets and offers a number of assistance programs for developers of affordable housing. These include: Multi-Family Mortgage Revenue Bond (MRB) Program, Multi-Family Housing Lending Program Direct Loan Program, and the Investment Property Program, among others. SHRA also provides guides to developers on existing City and SHRA programs to help them with affordable development. In addition to printed materials, this information is made available on SHRA's website (www.shra.org).**
Housing Affordability 2.13	**Maintain flexibility in the use of housing set aside funds for very low, low, and moderate-income households in mixed income revitalization projects in existing and future redevelopment target areas through the Implementation Plans prepared pursuant to Article 16.5 of the Community Redevelopment Law.** Production of 500 new and substantially rehabilitated affordable units by the year 2007 through Redevelopment Implementation Plans. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	●	**As shown in the Tables earlier in this document, SHRA has used redevelopment set-aside funds in combination with other funding sources to assist in the construction or substantial rehabilitation of 1,571 low and very low-income units.**
Housing Affordability 2.14	**Apply to HELP, a new partnership program of the California Housing Finance Agency to acquire and rehabilitate seriously deteriorated problem properties.** Successfully apply for funds to acquire and rehabilitate problem properties under CalHFA's HELP program; accomplish two projects during this time period. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Received three HELP awards. Implementation 2003-2004.	●	**SHRA received three HELP grants from CalHFA. One was for $2 million and was to be used to address code violations and other nuisances at problem properties in the County. The other two grants were to the City for $1.5 million and $1 million respectively. The City grant funds all have been used for Phoenix Park. Both phases of that 360-unit acquisition/rehabilitation project have been completed and the project is fully occupied.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Affordability 2.15	**Implement by ordinance a program to require a mix of housing by income levels in all new growth areas (Map 10-1), the Downtown and Curtis Park Railyards sites and annexation areas of the City. In all new development, 10% of all new housing shall be affordable to very low-income households and 5% affordable to low-income households. Affordability shall be assured for the longest feasible time, but not be less than 30 years.** **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, City Planning and City Council.	Adopted Oct. 2001 (Amendments in Summer 2003)	●	**Since adoption of the Mixed Income Ordinance 34 city inclusionary housing plans have been approved, requiring a total of 1,598 units. Eight of those plans were approved in 2006 requiring a total of 421 units.** **In November 2004 and again in January 2005, the City Council approved amendments to the Mixed Income Ordinance to encourage a variety of housing types within new growth residential projects. These changes included an alternative for "small" single family developments under five gross acres, an alternative for condominium developments of 200 units or less and provisions to encourage alternate housing types by allowing inclusionary units to be built to R-1A standards in the R-1 zone without a rezone. The City has also developed several fee waiver and infill incentive programs designed to assist infill and affordable development in the City. These are also described in this report.**
Housing Affordability 2.16	**2.16 SHRA will work with the Sacramento Valley Rental Housing Association (SVRHA) to educate and more effectively market the Section 8 voucher program so that affordable housing opportunities are made available throughout the City of Sacramento.** Desired result is effective marketing of Section 8 program with landlords. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA and SVRHA	Ongoing	◉	**Although there have been significant federal funding reductions for the Section 8 program, SHRA is actively monitoring and pulling from its waiting list as tenant-based vouchers become available.**
Housing Affordability 2.17	**Annually Update the fee schedule for the Housing Trust Ordinance to reflect the current costs of housing construction.** Maintain the effectiveness of the Housing Trust Ordinance to develop housing for lower income workers employed in new nonresidential development projects. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, City Planning	Summer/Fall 2003	○	**In October 2004, City Council approved an increase in the Housing Trust Fund fee, which resulted in a significant addition of funding available for affordable workforce housing. Furthermore, the fee is now updated annually based on the San Francisco Construction Cost Index (the standard construction index used for City development fees). In April 2006, a new nexus for the Housing Trust Fund was prepared and presented to Council. City staff is currently working with neighboring jurisdictions to coordinate adjustments to the fee level. In addition, in 2007, staff will be bringing forward some technical fixes to make the ordinance easier to understand and administer.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Affordability 2.18	**Develop additional options on how to address the needs of extremely low-income households for affordable housing, including using the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance, and bring these options to the City Council for its consideration.** Develop polices and programs that address the needs of extremely low-income households. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning, SHRA	Summer 2004	○	**The City is currently reviewing options to address the housing needs of extremely low-income households. This issue will be part of the affordable housing policy workshop which staff will hold with Council and the public in spring/summer of 2007 in preparation for the Housing Element update.**
Housing Mix, Balance, and Neighborhood Compatibility 3.1	**Include mixed income housing developments in new growth areas and utilize infill incentives to encourage step-up housing in existing areas, which have predominantly low-income housing. This can be accomplished by planning public amenities (siting parks, golf courses and other facilities to create new market conditions) to support middle and upper end housing in weaker market areas, and by conscientiously working with lenders and developers to invest in the diversification of areas.** **Many neighborhood areas of Sacramento are predominantly low-income. Equally important to the concept of fair share distribution of low-income housing is economic diversification and stabilization of low-income areas. Through actions of SHRA and the City in coordination with lenders and developers, efforts should be made to provide opportunities for step-up housing whenever possible in low-income neighborhoods.** **Responsible Entity:** City Planning (lead) with assistance, SHRA and City Utilities	Ordinance adopted Oct. 2001, Ongoing through inclusionary housing plans.	●	**In November 2004 and January 2005, the City adopted three major changes to the Mixed Income Ordinance. Two of the three major changes promote homeownership opportunities for low- and very low-income households by allowing a different mix of inclusionary units for some smaller projects that provide their affordable units on-site and for-sale. The changes were approved because they encourage homeownership opportunities for lower-income households and also address the needs of smaller developers.** **The City's ordinance originally required 15% of a residential development in a new growth area must be affordable to very low- and low-income households. Ten percent (10%) had to be affordable to very low-income households, while fiver percent (5%) were for low-income households.** **For small projects, especially smaller condominium complexes, the 10% very low-income requirements created a significant challenge for these developers due to higher development costs associated with small single family and condo projects. As a result, this requirement hampered the development of these types of projects and thus the development of the inclusionary (affordable) units.** **To address this, the first change involved requiring 10% of the total units for low-income households and 5% for very low-income households in small condo projects. The second change allowed small single-family developments of less than five acres to meet their 15% inclusionary requirement exclusively with low-income units. Again, this was done to encourage infill development given the higher costs associated with this type of development. The third change allowed developers in R-1 zones to build their inclusionary housing units to R-1A standards, which gives them greater flexibility in meeting development standards, while at the same time providing affordable units.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Mix, Balance, and Neighborhood Compatibility 3.2	**3.2 Enforce the requirements in the North Natomas Community Plan for multiple housing types and target density policies through educational workshops with builders and others as to the existence of these requirements for each development project.** Conduct workshops to identify incentives on promoting Medium Density multiple housing type Housing Developments in North Natomas Community Plan and other areas. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council	Conducted workshops in Fall 2002	●	**In 2003, the City hired Criterion, a consulting firm, to assist staff with an analysis of the effectiveness of the requirements in the North Natomas Community Plan. Using the Index modeling system, staff analyzed the balance of housing types and tenure as well as their proximity to transit, parks, and other amenities. The results of the analysis revealed that the City had been successful in creating a mix of housing types throughout the Community Plan area and in neighborhoods. Furthermore, residential developers have generally achieved target densities for development in this area, particularly in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use category. As a result, residential densities for the Natomas area have been consistent with the Community Plan goals. Development in this area has generated a significant amount of affordable housing throughout the community since it is subject to the City's Mixed Income Ordinance. The Ordinance requires that 15% of the units in new residential projects are affordable to very low and low-income households.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Mix, Balance, and Neighborhood Compatibility 3.3	**Support home ownership among low and moderate-income households through the following SHRA programs or similar activities: down payment assistance loans, mortgage credit certificates, and partnership activities with the Sacramento Home Loan Counseling Center and Neighborhood Housing Service.** Increase owner-occupancy for 2,400 qualified low and moderate-income households. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**The City and SHRA have continued to support home ownership assistance programs. During 2006, SHRA provided first-time homebuyer assistance to 67 low-income households. Additional low and moderate-income households have been assisted through the 18 Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCCs) that were issued in 2006 to households in the City.**
Mitigate Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints in the Development of Housing 4.1	**Continue to implement the preliminary review process whereby City staff and neighborhood groups provide comments and advise the applicant of policy and technical areas that need to be addressed prior to the formal application review.** This is an existing program that helps to identify planning and community issues early in the process so that problems can be identified and addressed and processing time is shortened. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning.	Workshop completed in fall of 2002	●	**The City continues to use the preliminary review process. City staff will meet and advise applicants prior to application submittal in order to provide technical assistance and help ensure that the process is smooth and timely.** **The City has instituted a new program called the MATRIX, which is designed to streamline the entire permitting process. Initially, the MATRIX was used for the Central City/East Sacramento area, but was expanded citywide on January 1, 2007. MATRIX brings together City staff from all disciplines to provide early feedback to the applicant and to ensure that issues are resolved in an expedient manner. The MATRIX also offers and encourages pre-application meetings with staff and the program utilizes an early notification system to identify community issues early in the process.**
Mitigate Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints in the Development of Housing 4.2	**Continue community outreach process for involving neighborhoods in land use decisions affecting their area including notification of planning entitlement applications. Provide forums to encourage and promote dialogue between the applicant/developer and the neighborhood.** Early project notification to neighborhood and business groups and adjacent property owners. **Responsible Entity:** Neighborhoods/ Planning Services	Ongoing	●	**Through the work of planning staff, the community is regularly involved in land use decisions. Staff also notifies residents of planning entitlement applications. Staff consistently encourages communication between the developer and community residents regarding planned developments. The General Plan update effort also incorporates extensive community involvement in citywide land use decisions.** **The City also instituted a new process called "Early Notification", whereby the public is given advanced notice of projects and offered the opportunity to provide comments on these before regular hearings in order to avoid problems or concerns later in the process.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Mitigate Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints in the Development of Housing 4.3	**Conduct interdepartmental committee meetings to coordinate early review of development projects and address policy concerns. The committee consists of the Planning and building, Public Works, and other City departments involved with the building and planning process.** The Interdepartmental Planning Policy Review Committee is in place to coordinate input on new projects. Additionally, the City has recently implemented an Automated Permit System (APS) to expedite development reviews among city departments. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning, Public Works and Utilities	Ongoing	●	**City staff has continued to coordinate the early review of projects through the Matrix Review Committee, which is held with key departments involved in the development application process. The Subdivision Review Committee serves a similar function for tentative maps for subdivisions. As noted earlier, the City has initiated the MATRIX program and handles coordinated review through the Matrix Review Committee (MRC). The City has implemented a new permit tracking system called Accela. This replaced APS and will be better integrated with other City programs. It should be better able to track projects through the process and have greater functionality than the former system.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Mitigate Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints in the Development of Housing 4.4	**Work with SAFCA and other responsible agencies to resolve flood plain restrictions that affect major portions of the City. Actions include: 1) Complete the Sacramento River levee stabilization project, 2) Begin construction of needed improvements along the perimeter levee system protecting Natomas, 3) Implement permanent protection plan along the main stream of the American River** **as authorized by Congress, and 4) Modify operation of Folsom Dam and Reservoir to provide a minimum 100-year level of flood protection on an interim basis until such time as permanent protection is available. Folsom Dam interim re-operation is in place. Work continues on improvements to levees and modifications to Folsom Dam.** **Responsible Entity:** City Manager's Office, Public Works Department, SAFCA and Army Corps of Engineers.	Ongoing	○	**I. Substantial flood control improvement work has been accomplished on Sacramento River, American River and Morrison Creek / Beach Lake levees. In December 2004, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers certified nearly all of the American River levees and Sacramento River levee from American River to the Pocket area as providing 100-year level of flood protection, and new flood insurance rate maps for large portions of Sacramento were issued in February 2005, thereby providing some flood insurance relief to those areas. In January 2007, the Corps of Engineers certified levee, erosion control and floodwall work on Sacramento River Pocket area levee and Morrison Creek to Brookfield Drive as providing 100-year flood protection for portions of southern Sacramento.** **On Feb 21, 2007, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) made effective new flood insurance rate maps for the Pocket-Greenhaven and Meadowview areas of south Sacramento, thereby providing some flood insurance relief to those areas. Some portions of southern Sacramento will remain in the 100-year flood plain until additional work under the South Sacramento County Streams flood control project is accomplished on Morrison, Union House, Florin and Elder Creeks. This flood control project, being constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers in cooperation with the State Reclamation Board and Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), is scheduled to be completed in 2012, subject to funding.** **II. Additional levee work on Natomas and American River levees is being planned consistent with prior authorizations and plans for flood releases from a modified Folsom Dam. The extent of further levee underseepage work on levees protecting Natomas has been evaluated by SAFCA and the Army Corps of Engineers. SAFCA's study findings suggest the risk of failure of levees around Natomas is greater than was previously thought. Almost 20 of 26 miles of levee are susceptible to underseepage at the 200-year flood stage, and at several locations this susceptibility also occurs at the 100-year flood stage. By letter dated July 20, 2006, the Corps of Engineers notified SAFCA and FEMA that the Corps no longer stands behind its 1998 Natomas levee certification because of deep underseepage concerns.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Implementation	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
				On November 21, 2006, the State Department of Water Resources (DWR) sent letters to City of Sacramento and Counties of Sacramento and Sutter noting that the Natomas area is at high risk, and stating it is imperative that additional measures be taken to reduce the threat to public safety and property. DWR recommend: imposing design standards requiring new structures to be elevated; requiring builders to buy flood insurance for their home buyers; encouraging all property owners to buy flood insurance; and conducting more emergency response training and planning. By letter dated December 29, 2006, FEMA informed City that FEMA plans to issue preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) revision with updated data for Natomas Basin by April 2007. That revision is now expected in May 2007. Following a comment period, and a subsequent compliance period, the publication of the revised FIRM is scheduled to become effective in late 2007. The FIRM revision will result in the entire Natomas Basin being placed within a regulatory Special Flood Hazard Area. SAFCA is proceeding with Natomas Levee Improvement Program (NLIP) with goal of restoring 100-year protection in Natomas by 2010, then reach 200-year protection by 2012, at a total cost of about $415 million. Initial funding of $10 million has been arranged via sale of Bond Anticipation Notes to Sacramento City and County ($5 million each). Further funding ($200 million maximum) is anticipated from State flood control bond (Proposition 1E, passed November 2006), a new SAFCA benefit assessment district which was approved in late April 2007, and subsequent Federal reimbursement / crediting. FEMA will work closely with local officials to expedite the removal of the regulatory Special Flood Hazard Area upon completion of the Natomas Levee Improvement Program work being planned to achieve 100-year flood protection. Corps is preparing General Reevaluation Report (GRR) to address deep underseepage on Natomas levees. Indications are the Corps' GRR will take 3 to 4 years to complete. This GRR effort will lead to authorization of a Federal project and pave the way for crediting for SAFCA-funded improvements accomplished in the interim. III. Additional work will likely be required on the Sacramento River levee downstream of American River to attain 200-year flood protection. Using AB 142 funding, DWR plans to evaluate this reach of levee under its levee geotechnical evaluation project to evaluate levees that protect urban areas. Any required work would be the subject of a future GRR as the document for pursuing federal authorization of the work. Likewise, the levees protecting north Sacramento may also require additional work.

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.B.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
				IV. The levees east of Steelhead Creek (Natomas East Main Drainage Canal - NEMDC) protecting portions of north Sacramento were certified in 1998 as providing flood protection for flood insurance purposes. FEMA is updating flood insurance rate maps as part of their map modernization program. This program will develop digital flood insurance rate maps (DFIRMS). As part of this program, FEMA will require up-to-date certification of levees as providing protection from the one-percent-annual chance flood for levees to be recognized in the remapping effort. As part of levee evaluation program with AB 142 funding, DWR plans to conduct explorations on "project" levees to east of Natomas, i.e., NEMDC east levee, Robla / Linda Creek levees, Dry Creek levees, Magpie Creek diversion. DWR plans to conduct exploration program on these levees in spring 2007. DWR expects evaluations will be accomplished in 1 to 1-1/2 years. This information may be used to determine the extent to which these levees meet current flood protection standards. FEMA guidelines allow for these levees to be Provisionally Accredited as providing protection against the one-percent-annual-chance flood because there is no available information to indicate that the levees do not still provide base flood protection. However, levee owners will have up to 24 months to obtain and submit necessary data and documentation to show that their levees continue to provide one-percent-annual-chance flood protection, or the areas behind the levees will be remapped as special flood hazard areas. Preliminary maps for the Sacramento area are tentatively scheduled to be available later in 2007. IV. Congress and the State of California have authorized improvements to Folsom Dam to further increase the level of flood protection to the Sacramento area. Because of potential cost increases for the Folsom Dam work, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), State Reclamation Board, and Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency conducted a Project Alternatives Solutions Study to look at alternatives to improve flood protection and provide an adequate spillway for passing Probable Maximum Flood for Dam Safety purposes. On November 30, 2006, USBR released the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Draft EIS/EIR for public review and comment. Alternatives include features that would address USBR's dam safety objectives and the Corps' flood damage reduction objectives jointly (Joint Federal Project, or JFP), as well as features or increments that would exclusively address dam safety, security, or flood damage reduction objectives. The JFP features are expected to be constructed jointly by USBR and the Corps.

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◑=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
				The increments or features that exclusively address dam safety or flood damage reduction would be constructed by the respective agencies. The Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) is made up of two elements: (1) Six submerged tainter gates (6 STG Element, also characterized as the Joint Federal Plan (JFP) and (2) 3.5-foot dam raise (3.5' DR Element). The Recommended Plan is the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP), but it also includes two added features, (1) Ecosystem restoration components as described in the authorized Folsom Dam Raise Project and (2) A permanent bridge increment. Estimated first costs: Tentatively Selected Plan (6 STG and 3.5' DR Elements): $998.1 million [Non-federal share = $280 million]. Ecosystem Restoration: $49.6 million [Non-federal share = $17.3 million] Permanent Bridge Increment: $67.8 million [Non-federal share = $28 million] Total Recommended Plan: $1,115.4 million [Non-federal share = $325.3 million] USBR is scheduled to complete the report in April 2007. USBR plans to proceed with Dam Safety work that may be accomplished within USBR's current authority and funding. The Corps of Engineers is preparing a Post Authorization Change report to recommend Congressional authorization of the modified plan at the higher cost. V. Increased urbanization over the past 50 years has resulted in frequent flooding in the Magpie Creek area. Magpie and Don Julio Creeks overtop their banks, floodwaters overtop Raley Boulevard, and floodwaters exceed the Magpie Creek Diversion Channel capacity. The existing flood control project does not provide protection to historic Magpie Creek from a one-percent-annual chance flood. The Corps of Engineers, State Reclamation Board, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, and American River Flood Control District have identified a plan for modifying the existing project involving a natural flood detention basin and levee improvement work. These agencies are pursuing more favorable cost sharing of the project with the Corps of Engineers. Pending agreement on cost sharing and implementation of the proposed plan, areas upstream and downstream of the Magpie Creek Diversion Channel continue to be subject to flooding. Implementation of the proposed plan will involve acquisition of floodplain lands upstream of the diversion channel and east of Raley Blvd. Until implementation of the proposed plan or some other flood control improvement plan, development of parcels in and adjacent to the flood plain are required not to reduce the floodplain conveyance capacity or floodplain storage volume.

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ●=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Mitigate Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints in the Development of Housing 4.5	**Implement City's Development Oversight Commission Recommendations related to improving coordination, information, and streamlining development processes.** Staffing assistance information handouts and service improvements, revised zoning and development processes. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning and Building, Public Works, Utilities, and Fire Department	Dec. 2002 - 2005	●	**City staff has completed implementation of most of the DOC recommendations. The City developed special teams to assess and re-engineer development review processes to make them more streamlined. Other examples of process improvements include: creation of the Citywide MATRIX program; the creation of special process managers for complex projects; the establishment of the Development Services Cabinet composed of all the managers of the disciplines involved in the development process; development of a new permit tracking system (Accela); work on the consolidation of all development service fee collections and the provision of comprehensive fee information on the City website and in pamphlet form, etc.**
Mitigate Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints in the Development of Housing 4.6	**Develop effective infill programs that address the regulatory process, including a streamlined process with reduced levels of review and more flexible regulatory requirements including building code and infrastructure standards and different regulatory requirement for infill development, particularly for traffic levels of service, street standards, and parking.** Provide flexibility in development standards so that new subdivisions are compatible with existing neighborhood conditions. Also provide flexibility in the types of infrastructure improvements necessary. For example, flexibility in roadway widths would, in some instances, reduce costs and allow a more intimate neighborhood environment. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning and Building, Public Works, Utilities, and Fire Department	Hire Infill Coordinator Summer 2003, Ongoing	●	**City planning staff has been working closely with City utilities and transportation departments to reduce street widths and provide flexibility for necessary infrastructure improvements. For example, in 2003, the City adopted pedestrian-friendly street standards. These issues are being further assessed on a citywide basis in the General Plan update. The City also hired an Infill Coordinator in 2003 and has established several programs (described later in this report) to promote infill development.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Mitigate Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints in the Development of Housing 4.7	**Establish Planning Director's Plan Review (PDPR) process for review and approval of smaller multi-family developments. Currently all multi-family proposals require R-review and approval by the Planning Commission, unless the project is located within a design review district or PUD, which creates additional processing times and costs. The PDPR process would utilize the Multi-Family Design Guidelines to assure compliance with minimum design standards. The streamlined process shall provide for notice and community review of proposed projects for City Council review of individual projects. Appropriate maintenance and management requirements should be established to promote the proper operation of rental units.** Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Multi-family R Review. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council	Spring/ Summer 2003	●	**An ordinance establishing Planning Director's Plan Review for multi-family projects with 100 units or less citywide or 200 units or less in a PUD district was adopted by City Council on May 8, 2003.**
Mitigate Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints in the Development of Housing 4.8	**Work with the Building Industry Association and other stakeholders to consider state legislation to change or modify the Subdivision Map Act to address the issue of condominium construction and liability insurance.** Modification of the Subdivision Map Act to encourage the production of condominium housing units. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	2003-2004	◉	**The City continues to work with the BIA and the State legislature to address the condominium construction and construction defect liability issues.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.1	**The City shall continue to expand and improve the Design Review program of the City. In particular, the City shall adopt Design Guidelines for single-family uses to help standardize design expectations and shall investigate alternative administrative processes for small project design review. Additionally, the City has adopted an administrative (staff level) design review process for the north area of Sacramento (north of the American River). This eliminates the need for full Design Review Board review for small projects or projects which reasonably conform to design guidelines. In all these efforts, the City is seeking to streamline the process without sacrificing good quality design and community acceptance.** Adopt and Implement Single-family Design Checklist and other Design Review programs. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	Checklist adopted Fall 2002, Implementation Ongoing	●	**The City adopted citywide Single-Family Design Principles in 2000 and a single-family residential design checklist was adopted in 2003.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.2	**Implement Infill Strategy and implementing ordinances that provide incentives to encourage development that is appropriate for the neighborhood. Accomplish the following objectives:** **· Add policy language and the incentives to promote a quality project that compliments the neighborhood. Quality should be exhibited in product design, type and variety of materials and orientation to the street.**	Spring 2004, Implementation Ongoing	◉	**In conjunction with the City's adopted Smart Growth Principles, the City is working to provide greater flexibility in its Zoning Code to support infill development. Changes were made in 2005 to the City's zoning code to encourage the development of second units and setbacks were reduced to encourage residential infill development. Review in PUD districts was streamlined to promote development in these areas.** **As of 2005, the City implemented the new MATRIX pilot program that streamlines the development review process. The program has been successful in reducing review times and streamlining the development review process. Initially, the MATRIX program covered the Central City and East Sacramento Community Plan areas, but was expanded citywide on January 1, 2007.** **The City also developed an infill strategy and appointed an Infill Coordinator in 2003.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
	· Provide increased flexibility within the Zoning Ordinance to develop in a manner consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. For example, offer flexibility by modification of setback, lot size and lot coverage development standards. · Add the ability to offer a streamlined process for infill projects that are compatible with the neighborhood setting. · Appoint a new Citywide Infill Coordinator to coordinate and promote the program. · Provide updated information about the inventory location of infill areas and targeted infill development sites. · In addition to existing fee waiver and reduction programs, investigate other City and non-City financial incentives for the program such as a reduction in the Quimby Fee Ordinance. · Implement Pre-Approved House Plan Program Update and adopt infill housing policies, ordinances and incentives that streamline the development process and resolve neighborhood concerns regarding infill housing. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning			The City has implemented several fee waiver and incentive programs to encourage affordable housing and infill development. These include the Infill Fee Reduction Program, the Affordable Housing Fee Reduction Program, and the Infill Incentive Fund. As part of the Population and Housing Report and the General Plan update, City staff monitors and maintains the City's supply of vacant land suitable for development. City planning staff is currently completing the final ordinance changes and modifications to the draft Pre-Approved House Plan Program. The program has been approved and it started in the summer of 2006. Six pre-approved house plans have been used and the homes are under construction.
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.3	**Consider amendments to Central City Quimby exactions to facilitate condominium and ownership housing.** Fee reductions to promote Central City ownership housing. **Responsible Entity:** City Parks and Recreation, City Planning	Summer 2003	●	**While the City recently increased park development impact fees, it provided a reduced fee for infill development. In addition, in the City's new 2005-2010 Parks Master Plan, the City has adopted urban park standards for smaller parks such as "pocket parks" to facilitate the use of urban parks close to residential development in infill areas.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.4	**Implement the Citywide Infill Strategy to encourage compatible residential infill development. Create additional incentives for residential infill development, including but not limited to, regulatory concessions and streamlining the permit approval process for quality-designed development that is appropriate for the neighborhood. Pursue funding through the State Jobs Housing Balance Grant.** Develop Streamlining Ordinance by Fall 2003. Create infill Incentive Fund and Infrastructure Assistance Program by Fall 2003. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council	Summer 2003	●	**Rather than a streamlining ordinance, the City has enacted a major overhaul of its development review process. This was done as part of the DOC recommendations and included a complete evaluation and re-engineering of the City's development review process. Furthermore, the City has taken additional steps to streamline the development review process.** **As noted earlier, the City created the new MATRIX program, which brings together representatives from all City departments and divisions that are normally involved in the review of a project. Working as a team, these groups provide a comprehensive review of projects at once rather than have the project go from department to department. In order to maximize efficient and utilize appropriate staff expertise, there are teams for each major type of development (i.e., commercial, office, residential, etc.). In effect since July 2005, the MATRIX program has already made substantial progress in streamlining project review, thus reducing time and costs for developers.** **The City adopted its Infill Strategy in 2002. The City has developed a Shovel Ready Sites program and has allocated $700,000 to this fund. The City is in the process of developing guidelines for the use of the Fund. The guidelines are expected to be complete in 2007. This incentive fund will also be used for infrastructure improvements in infill areas rather than establishing a separate infill assistance program.** **The City secured $2.4 million in grant funds through HCD's Job-Housing Balance Incentive Program and constructed infrastructure and facility improvements to enhance existing areas and support infill development. The City completed streetscape enhancements and streetlight installations in the 65th Street Transit Village, Del Paso Boulevard, Midtown, the Tahoe Park neighborhood, developed new parks in South Natomas and improved water conservation at 16 existing parks, and expanded sewer capacity to support new development in the R Street corridor. These improvements were completed by June 2006.** **In addition, the City pursued two rounds of grant funding through HCD's Workforce Housing Grant program, for a combined total of $1.8 million. These grant funds were applied to park acquisition and development in the R Street corridor to support new development and for infrastructure improvements to support the Globe Mills very low income housing project. These projects will be completed in June 2008/2009.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.5	**Implement the Citywide Infill Strategy to encourage targeted single-family housing within residential neighborhoods.** The desired result is an addition of 30 - 80 units per year. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council/ Utilities	Ongoing	◐	**Implementation of the Citywide Infill Strategy and market conditions have resulted in levels of single family development exceeding targeted levels.** **The City adopted its pilot Infill Housing Plan program with pre-approved model house plans for use in infill neighborhoods, expediting the issuance of permits and reducing costs. Ten pre-approved house plans have been used and the homes are under construction.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.6	**Implement Downtown Redevelopment and Citywide Infill Strategy to encourage opportunities for additional housing and reuse in the Central City.** The desired result is 800 units. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning, Economic Development, SHRA, CADA, and Utilities.	Ongoing	◐	**Refer to status of Program/Action 5.5**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.7	**Implement the Citywide Infill Strategy to encourage Transit Oriented Development that provides additional housing within a 1/4-mile radius of transit stations.** Desired result is 100-200 units annually. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning, Regional Transit, SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**This is an ongoing program, which has been quite successful in encouraging higher density housing near light rail stations. Several recent projects include 9 units in a mixed-use project near the 65th Street Light Rail Station; 142 units planned for 2006 at a second site in the 65th Street Station area; 102 units in the Capitol lofts project planned near the light rail station on R Street; 60 units in Erika's Village planned for the Florin station. As the City's work plan is fully implemented with the accompanying land use and zoning changes, the number of housing units in proximity to transit stations is expected to increase.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.8	**Implement current infill incentives and continue to study potential fee reductions of permit fees to remedy smaller residential project inequities.** In coordination with the Utilities Department review fees associated with smaller projects, particularly infill projects. Reduce any excesses, and where possible provide fee waivers or incentives for projects which meet the goals of the Housing Element or conform to infill development design criteria. Encourage 30-50 infill units annually in small housing projects. **Responsible Entity:** Utilities Departments	Ongoing	◐	**The City has addressed the inequities faced by smaller infill projects through the use of the City's Infill Fee Reduction program, which is described in more detailed in this report. However, as noted above, the prevailing wage requirements associated with the receipt of public funds has limited the attractiveness of this program to developers. Despite this issue, many of the projects developed in the city's residential infill areas have included smaller residential or mixed-use developments that are less than 50 units.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.9	**Investigate the City of Sacramento's use of property liens to increase the production of infill housing development.** Consider modifications to the City's use of liens to provide an incentive for infill property owners to utilize their properties for development or to sell their property to an outside party who will use the property. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning /City Council	Fall 2003	○	**With the increase in land costs and housing prices, property liens in infill areas has become less of an issue and is no longer considered an impediment. The market has essentially addressed this issue and City action is no longer considered a high priority.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.10	**Implement the City's Multifamily Development Guidelines to address site planning, building design and architectural issues.** Multi-Family Design Guidelines implemented in conjunction with action 4.7. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning /City Council	Ongoing	●	**These have been implemented in conjunction with Action 4.7.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.11	**Continue to implement the Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) Program, a multi-departmental effort to improve city neighborhoods and abate various code violations.** Early and efficient resolution of problem property cases such as drug houses and health and safety violations. **Responsible Entity:** City Police Department and Neighborhood Services Department.	Ongoing	○	**In 2006, POP officers worked on the problems at The Tallac Lounge Bar, a neighborhood bar located in the middle of the Tallac Village neighborhood. Incidents at the bar were creating significant quality-of-life problems for the neighbors. The problems peaked when an argument at the bar resulted in a homicide outside. The Crime Analysis Unit compiled statistical information for the neighborhood around the bar for a five year period. Fifteen residents made sworn declarations explaining how the bar had become a neighborhood nuisance that was negatively affecting their daily lives. POP officers coordinated with the City Attorney and filed a civil action against the bar owner. A court ordered injunction was negotiated that returned the neighborhood to a quiet and peaceful place. Police did not receive any complaints about the bar during the last six months of 2006.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.12	**Continue to implement the Neighborhood Reclamation and Protection Plan (NRPP), a multi-departmental program designed to control and rid targeted neighborhoods of gangs and drugs.** Strengthen existing troubled neighborhoods through weeding out of problems and development of positive neighborhood capacities and assets. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA and Neighborhood Services Department	Ongoing	◉	**The City's Police Department handles this program and works to address gangs and other crime-related issues in local neighborhoods. Code enforcement is brought in by the Police Department to handle code violations. Also, refer to the earlier description under the POP Program.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.13	**Implement neighborhood revitalization and preservation recommendations for the Central City.** Implement phase III of the Central City Housing Strategy. Finance and complete at least seven central city mixed income housing projects. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	2003-2004	◐	**The City rezoned property in two phases in the Central City to encourage housing development. There are several projects underway that are expected to be complete by 2007. These include 65 mixed income units at 21st and L Streets, 175 mixed income units at 18th & L Streets, 117 mixed income units in the Fremont Mews projects, and 225 at 800 J Street. Approximately 102 mixed income units at the Capitol Lofts project and 143 mixed income units at Globe Mills project are planned for 2008. Several others are in the development application process.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.14	**Continue systematic building code enforcement through Code Action Team (CAT) to preserve and restore housing and thereby help strengthen residential neighborhoods and link to the SHRA boarded and vacant program.** Proactive and systematic inspections and enforcement of basic health and safety codes and zoning ordinance to preserve housing and prevent neighborhood decline. **Responsible Entity:** City Building Division	Ongoing	◉	**This program is an Ongoing City program. Each year SHRA provides City code enforcement staff a grid showing target areas where staff can concentrate efforts. Code Action Team (CAT) and the Housing and Dangerous Buildings Team target particular neighborhoods throughout the year to address health and safety and zoning violations. Staff performs pro-active and systemic inspections in this area. Staff also provides quarterly reports to SHRA.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.15	**Where needed, implement the Rent Escrow Account Program (REAP) that would enable tenants to voluntarily place rent in an escrow account in the event identified code violations are not resolved by the landlord.** Empower tenants to take immediate action to correct health and safety violations. **Responsible Entity:** Neighborhood Services Department, SHRA.	Ongoing	○	**Staff investigated the feasibility of continuing this program; however, it was determined that the program was no longer feasible for a variety of reasons and was discontinued. Code enforcement has instead pursued aggressive and proactive inspections of multi-family projects to identify and help address code violations.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.16	**Del Paso Nuevo; maintain high priority assistance and coordination for the development of Del Paso Nuevo - a 154 acre new town in the Del Paso Heights Redevelopment Area.** 300 new homes, 2 parks, commercial development and infrastructure development by 2006. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA in partnership with the City of Sacramento, Utilities, and Parks.	1999-2006	◐	**As of 2006, 77 homes have been completed and two tentative subdivision maps have been approved that will result in construction of 176 additional homes. Infrastructure is in place throughout the site and both parks have been completed. A Request for Proposals has been issued for commercial development and SHRA is beginning negotiations on a development agreement. The entire project is expected to be complete in 2009.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.17	**The City, County, and SHRA will allocate some portion of McClellan AFB redevelopment area revenues and city housing funds to correct infrastructure and housing deficiencies at the Parker Homes project. These homes were originally constructed, by the federal government in 1942 as off-base military housing for McClellan AFB, in a manner that fell well short of basic infrastructure and building code requirements.** Housing rehabilitation and adequate infrastructure development. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, and Utilities	2007	○	**SHRA has formed a team to address this issue. The agency has set aside tax increment funds for Parker Homes. The area under study has been expanded to include not only Parker Homes, but the West McClellan area as well. The team has initiated an infrastructure study to identify needs and an assessment of potential land use changes (e.g., industrial to residential). The infrastructure study was completed with in December 2006. The study found that $91 million dollars in infrastructure improvements were needed. A draft EIR will be released in April 2007.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.18	**Continue City's efforts to work with concerned stakeholders and community leaders to revitalize distressed neighborhoods. City programs and planning efforts include:** **· Gardenland Neighborhood Infill Strategic Plan** **· Weed and Seed Program** **· Oak Park Renaissance Plan** **· Dixie Anne Neighborhood Plan** Infill Development and Neighborhood Revitalization **Responsible Entity:** City Planning, SHRA, and Neighborhood Services	Ongoing	◉	**This is an ongoing program. The City and SHRA work with the Redevelopment Advisory Committees, neighborhood groups, business groups, and other community leaders to revitalize neighborhoods.**
Housing Quality and Neighborhood Improvement 5.19	**Develop, adopt, and implement neo-traditional neighborhood design guidelines to address the planning, building, and architectural design issues associated with development on a larger neighborhood scale.** Adoption and implementation of Neighborhood Design Guidelines. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	Fall 2004	●	**In June 2004, the City Council authorized revisions the Residential and Commercial Design Guidelines for the Del Paso Heights, North Sacramento, and Oak Park Design Review Districts. The new guidelines are intended to provide consistent design principles for residential and commercial structures that can contribute to the creation of neighborhoods with a strong, cohesive sense of place; encourage high quality development; provide creative design solutions; provide clear design direction; enhance property values; and facilitate a clear and expedient review process.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.1	**Continue the use of the SHRA Boarded/Vacant Home program, which provides incentives to contractors to purchase these properties, rehabilitate them, and sell them to low and moderate-income homebuyers.** 120 units eliminated from the City's dangerous and substandard building list, rehabilitated, and sold to first time homebuyers. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**The strong housing market of the last few years has provided incentives to small contractors and developers to purchase and rehabilitate boarded and vacant homes. SHRA provided no incentives in 2006 to developers of boarded and vacant homes. SHRA has provided incentives for rehab of 46 Boarded and Vacant homes over the life of the Program.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.2	**Develop and expand successful incentive programs to improve management and maintenance of privately owned rental housing, particularly among four-plex housing and apartments, within older neighborhoods and commercial corridors. Program elements may include improved coordination with neighborhood code enforcement, problem-oriented policing efforts, property management districts and other proactive efforts along commercial corridors in affiliation with business and neighborhood associations.** Adopt Program. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, SVAOA	Summer 2002	●	**SHRA formed a team to focus on improvements to smaller rental housing projects. SHRA staff revised their multi-family loan program to provide better financial terms and incentives for better property management. These changes were approved by City Council in July 2004.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.3	**Continue to finance the rehabilitation of owner-occupied homes through CDBG, HOME, tax increment, and other sources of funds.** 250 low and very low-income homeowners will be able to maintain their homes through attractive financing options, ranging from emergency grants to amortized loans. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**During 2006, SHRA financed the rehabilitation of 133 owner-occupied housing units through the Single Family Rehabilitation Program (22 units), the Single Family Emergency Repair Program (99 Units), and the Single Family Retrofit Program (12 units).**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.4	**Maintain active financing program for acquisition and rehabilitation of multi-family properties to assist in the revitalization of neighborhoods and provide affordable housing. Continue to explore additional funding sources to expand activity.** Add 300 units to very low and low-income affordable housing supply while removing blighting properties from neighborhoods. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**In 2006, SHRA financed the substantial rehabilitation of 737 rental-housing units. Of these, 437 were in the City and 300 were in the County. The agency is continuing to pursue a variety of funding sources to support such acquisition/rehab activities.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.5	**Adopt a proactive rental inspection program to ensure rental housing maintenance. This may require a fee to support inspection services. Careful consideration of the fee structure should be given to avoid increasing the costs of rental housing. Also, consider a "self-certification" program for landlords that participate in a maintenance/ management training program.** Maintain the quality of existing multi-family units and avoid deferred maintenance. **Responsible Entity:** City Council, SHRA, Neighborhood Services	Summer 2003	◉	**After extensive research, City staff has prepared a pilot program for residential rental inspections for properties in focused problem areas. In June 2006, City Council adopted criteria for identifying problem areas which include housing and dangerous building cases, neighborhood code enforcement areas, rental properties, calls for service for Police and Fire. This program will be built upon current code enforcement processes and staff will conduct necessary outreach to inform the community of the program. Results from the pilot program will be evaluated and reported back to Council in summer 2007.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.6	**Preserve privately owned HUD-financed low-income housing projects that are at risk of conversion to market rate housing through the enforcement of the City Housing Preservation Ordinance and through the provision of low-cost financing.** Preserve 100 units annually through restructuring programs; preserve affordability of 100 units annually (and Section 8 assistance) through sales to priority purchasers; and provide enhanced Section 8 vouchers to 85 percent of residents in opt-out projects (estimate 200 units prepaid). **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**In 2004 the City Council adopted a Housing Preservation Ordinance aimed at preserving federally subsidized projects at-risk of conversion to market rate. SHRA has been the lead Agency implementing the ordinance. In addition, the Agency has provided low-cost financing to preserve a number of at-risk projects since 2004. No projects were at risk of conversion to market rate in 2006.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.7	**Preserve affordable units in mortgage revenue bond projects with expiring regulatory agreements through financial incentives including refinancing and issuance of new bonds for acquisition/rehabilitation.** Preservation of 100 affordable units in expiring mortgage revenue bond projects. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**No mortgage revenue bond projects with expiring regulatory agreements were re-financed in 2006. Re-funding and issuing new bonds is an ongoing part of SHRA's business and has preserved affordability on hundreds of units.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.8	**Introduce ordinance to enforce noticing requirements of owners of HUD-subsidized project to give affordable housing developers the opportunity to purchase these units and maintain their affordability.** Maintain affordability of HUD-subsidized projects. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA	Summer 2003	●	**The City adopted this ordinance in early 2004.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.9	**Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the residential hotel new construction standards.** Zoning Ordinance amendment to facilitate the production of affordable living spaces for very low-income people that provide privacy and foster self-sufficiency. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning/City Council	Summer 2005	○	**SHRA is currently working with City staff to provide efficiency apartments rather than traditional SRO in new SRO developments. These units are similar to studio apartments and offer greater privacy to residents.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.10	**Fund and Support Sacramento Heritage Trust Fund.** Sacramento Heritage Program. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA/City Development Services, Preservation Office.	Ongoing	○	**In 2005, the City established the Historic Places Revolving Fund, which is a revolving fund to support the restoration of historic places, such as Memorial Auditorium, throughout Sacramento. In conjunction with Sacramento Heritage and the City Treasurer's Office, staff is developing guidelines for the use of the fund. On May 1, 2007, the City Council will review and take action on a proposal for a pilot Historic Places Matching Grant program; if approved, the Development Services Department and Sacramento Heritage, Inc., are anticipated to begin taking applications in June 2007.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.11	**Implement Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan which includes an inventory of historic preservation resources, policies and programs.** Historic Preservation Inventory. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	Fall 2002	◐	**The Historic Preservation Element was completed in 1997 and was adopted by Council. The Sacramento Register of Historic & Cultural Resources was updated in February 2007, and is available on-line at the City's website.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.12	**Continue to implement the Neighborhood Paint Program.** Affordable means for low and very low-income persons to weatherize and improve their homes. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, Neighborhood Housing Services, Business Association	Ongoing	◉	**SHRA no longer funds this program. The program is being administered by Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) without Agency funds.**
Conserve Sacramento Neighborhoods and Rehabilitate Affordable Housing 6.13	**Implement the Franklin Villa Revitalization Plan (Phoenix Park Project) to restore neighborhood vitality and safety through various financing initiatives.** Acquire +/- 600 privately held properties, rehabilitate and manage them; expand services of Franklin Villa Resource Center and increase educational resources for Parkway Elementary School. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, NPDSD and Police Departments	Acquired +/- 250 properties, Fall 2003	●	**Phases 1 and 2 of the Phoenix Park project are complete and fully occupied. The project includes 360 housing units and a resource center as well as other amenities and services.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs 7.1	**Continue to provide assistance to emergency shelter facilities for the homeless population, including alcohol and drug recovery programs, through the County Department of Human Assistance (DHA) and their non-profit service providers. Expand and reinforce linkages between shelters, providers of transitional housing, and other social service agencies through computerized case management.** Maintain an inventory of the existing network of emergency shelters linked with service providers to provide a secure living environment free from domestic violence, and to stabilize living conditions for homeless children. **Responsible Entity:** DHA	Ongoing	◉	**This is an ongoing effort by the County's Department of Housing Assistance (DHA). DHA is working with Volunteers of America, Lutheran Social Services, and other non-profit service providers to provide counseling and shelter to homeless persons in the City and County. These include the Winter Shelter Program and eight other emergency shelters, which served 3,983 homeless persons in 2006.**
Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs 7.2	**Support transitional and permanent housing programs that enable homeless persons to deal with the issues that led to homelessness and to move toward self-sufficiency.** Purchase and or rehabilitate 80-100 units to house homeless persons in well-managed transitional and permanent housing facilities. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, DHA, nonprofit service providers	Ongoing	◉	**SHRA assisted four permanent supportive housing projects in the County in 2005. These included McClellan Cottages, Mather Community Campus, Bell Street Apartments and the Saybrook project. SHRA and DHA continue to support approximately 18 transitional facilities and 18 permanent supportive housing developments or programs in the City and County. The City is currently assisting a new project, MLK Village Apartments, which is located just outside the City border in the County.**
Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs 7.3	**Review and adopt, as needed, specific recommendations of the Five Year Plan of the Board on Homelessness of the Cities and County of Sacramento. Recommendations include the expansion of permanent housing opportunities for formerly homeless persons in well-managed facilities with supportive services so that progress toward self-sufficiency is maintained.** Continued funding and operation of effective permanent supportive housing programs.	2002-2007	●	**In June 2004, the City Council adopted a resolution in support of developing a Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in Sacramento. In 2005 Mayor Heather Fargo and County Supervisor Roger Dickinson convened a group of community leaders, local officials and representatives of the business, philanthropic and public sectors to oversee development of the Plan. Over the course of six months, this group and a technical working group met to review local, state, and national data, research and best practices related to addressing the challenges faced by chronically homeless persons and the communities in which they live. In December 2005, the draft Plan presented a conceptual approach with "housing first" or "housing plus" as the centerpiece strategy. Drawing upon successful local efforts in Sacramento with service-enriched housing programs, this approach strives to get individuals off the streets and out of shelters as quickly as possible and into permanent housing, providing case management and other support services as needed.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
	Responsible Entity: City Council, SHRA			**Other key strategies of the Plan include prevention through effective discharge planning and an ongoing leadership structure to oversee implementation of the Plan, as well as to help ensure that services for non-chronic homeless individuals and families are effective and well coordinated. Both the City Council and the Board of Supervisors expressed support for the conceptual approach and agreed to have the group continue to work on an implementation framework.** **The leadership structure called for in the Ten Year Plan was established in January of 2007. The Policy Board is made up of public and private sector community leaders and has the task of providing strategic direction, oversight, and advocacy for the Ten Year Plan and for homeless services as a whole. The Interagency Council is made up of government agencies, service providers, and community stakeholders and has the task of planning and coordinating service delivery and recommending policies and strategies to the Policy Board.**
Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs 7.4	**Continue to implement the strategies of the SHRA's Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development. The "Consolidated Plan" discusses several housing initiatives for special needs populations including the development of housing for the homeless, the mentally ill and persons with AIDS. SHRA is actively pursuing funding and programs for these special needs populations.** Provide financing and technical assistance to non-profit service providers to create two additional developments for persons with special needs. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA and affiliated non-profit sponsors.	Ongoing	◉	**SHRA is pursuing financing and providing technical assistance to non-profits to support efforts to create developments for special needs populations. SHRA is currently funding Mercy Housing to provide technical assistance to service agencies that wish to develop supportive housing for special needs populations in the City and County. Through Mercy Housing's technical assistance grant, assistance was provided to multiple providers with potential developments throughout the City and County, including AIDS Housing Alliance (AHA), Transitional Living and Community Support (TLCS), Volunteers of America and numerous faith based organizations. For example, the Martin Luther King project located in the County will house approximately 80 mentally disabled chronically homeless adults in permanent supportive housing. This project will begin construction in Spring 2007.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs 7.5	**Consider adopting a reasonable accommodations process to provide housing opportunities for the disabled. Consider a streamlined approval process for residential facilities which accommodate 6 to 12 individuals and review entitlement processes to achieve the more efficient conversion of motels and other suitable buildings for permanent housing.** Amendments to the zoning code to provide reasonable accommodations for the disabled. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, City Planning, City Council	Spring 2004	○	**The City has not yet adopted amendments to the zoning code to provide a reasonable accommodations process. Staff is currently researching this issue.**
Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs 7.6	**Change SHRA's multifamily lending policies to include the right of borrowers to allow weekly tenancies, so that weekly rental payments could be accepted.** Increase the number of units accessible and affordable to SRO residents. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, City Council	Fall 2003 or Winter 2004	○	**While several policies were made to update SHRA's multi-family lending policies, the change that would allow weekly tenancies was not made. Staff investigated the feasibility of this option; however, weekly tenancies conflict with non-Agency funding sources. In addition, 30-day tenancies are covered by state landlord-tenant law, which offers more protection to tenants than weekly tenancies. Instead, SHRA is planning to finance more permanent supportive housing units, as mentioned in the Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness (refer to Program 7.3).**
Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs 7.7	**Implement the recommendations of the SRO Task Force to investigate boarding homes as an alternative to new construction of residential hotels.** Develop guidelines for the operation of boarding homes for tenants typical of SRO residents. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	Spring 2004	●	**City and SHRA staff have been meeting with the SRO Task Force, the Downtown Partnership, and others to address the issues and recommendations related to SROs. SHRA has released a request for applications under its supportive housing lending program for SRO rehabilitation and development of new efficiency apartments.**
Preserve and Develop Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs 7.8	**Promote and encourage a variety of housing types for senior housing including "age in place" housing complexes, independent and assisted living projects.** Provide more adequate housing units available and affordable to the growing senior population. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning, SHRA	Ongoing	◉	**City staff has been working with developers to encourage a range of housing types in developments including housing types that would benefit an aging population, such as condos, duplexes, and smaller homes. In 2006, SHRA assisted with the development of one affordable independent living senior housing complex. This project included 206 affordable units.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ◉=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Energy Conservation 8.1	**Support SMUD's Energy Efficient New Construction Program which provides financial incentives to builders to exceed minimum energy efficiency standards.** Implementation of new conservation and alternative energy programs to reduce energy costs of new residential buildings. **Responsible Entity:** SMUD	Ongoing (existing program)	◉	**This is an ongoing SMUD program. Staff refers builders to SMUD for more information on this program.**
Energy Conservation 8.2	**Support SMUD and PG&E's program to retrofit existing housing for energy efficiency.** Reduce household energy costs through a variety of insulation, system update and weatherization programs. **Responsible Entity:** SMUD, PG& E and SHRA	Ongoing (existing programs)	◉	**The City and SHRA provide referrals and information about these programs to residents.**
Energy Conservation 8.3	**Continue to administer the Tree Planting Program to provide shade and to help with neighborhood revitalization and beautification.** Provide strategically located shade trees to reduce air conditioning costs. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, SMUD, and the Sacramento Tree Foundation	Ongoing (existing program)	◉	**This is an ongoing SMUD program. SMUD distributes about 50,000 trees to 15,000-20,000 utility customers every year. City and SHRA provide referrals to residents for this program.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ◉=Complete, ◐=Partially Complete; ●=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Promote Equal Housing Opportunity 9.1	**Continue to support enforcement practices of the Human Rights/Fair Housing Commission addressing discrimination against households with special needs, and fair housing education programs offered by other organizations such as the Apartment Owner's Association and the Board of Realtors. Provide for fair-housing information in appropriate public locations and disseminate such information in different languages.** Provide mediation, education and referrals to the State Office of Fair Housing or legal aid centers for cases of housing discrimination or other forms of discrimination in Spanish and other languages by disseminating information through brochures at city public counters. **Responsible Entity:** Human Rights Fair Housing Commission (lead)/ City Planning.	Ongoing (existing program)	◉	**City staff provides referrals to the Human Rights Fair Housing Commission to persons who have fair housing questions or concerns. The Human Rights Fair Housing Commission provides direct assistance to persons who have faced housing or other forms of discrimination and refers those complaints either to legal aid centers (e.g., Legal Services of Northern California) or to the federal Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD) or to the state Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). In 2006, Human Rights Fair Housing Commission received 102 discrimination complaints.** **In 2004, SHRA completed its Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice for the City and County of Sacramento. Deficiencies in fair housing services, including enforcement, education and outreach were identified. SHRA, Human Rights Fair Housing Commission, and Sacramento Housing Alliance staff worked throughout 2005 to alleviate these impediments.**
Promote Equal Housing Opportunity 9.2	**Ensure that residential projects comply with the American with Disabilities Act. To the extent feasible, finance and support public improvements, including curb cuts, sidewalks and traffic signals that provide public access for the disabled.** Ensure positive recourse and corrective action to prevent discrimination against persons with disabilities. **Responsible Entity:** Public Works and Building Division	Ongoing (existing program)	●	**The City has undertaken major street and sidewalk improvements to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and to ensure safe streets and sidewalks for persons with disabilities. Pursuant to a settlement agreement, the City sets aside 20 percent of transportation funds annually for such infrastructure improvements. This amounts to approximately $5.5 to $5.7 million per year. These funds are used for improvements to sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and curb ramps, among others. In addition, the City spends additional funds to improve ADA access to City buildings and facilities.**
Promote Equal Housing Opportunity 9.3	**Support neighborhood efforts to resolve tenant complaints.** Continue to provide alternative dispute resolutions methods for landlord tenant and neighborhood conflicts. **Responsible Entity:** Sacramento Mediation Center	Ongoing (existing program)	◉	**City staff provides referrals to residents to the Sacramento Mediation Center to resolve conflicts/disputes.**

Name of Program	Objective	Deadline in H.E.	Task Status	Status of Program Implementation (Task Status: ●=Complete; ◐=Partially Complete; ◉=Ongoing; ○=Not Complete)
Promote Equal Housing Opportunity 9.4	**Consider a program, in consultation with the Building Industry Association, which would incorporate housing visitability standards (including the installation of interior modifications) in newly constructed single-family homes. Include guidelines for exterior and interior modifications including, but not limited to no step entrances and 36-inch wide entries into bathrooms.** Voluntary compliance through the Single-family Design Checklist for universal access to improve accessibility for persons with physical disabilities in single-family developments. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning, SHRA	State Model Ordinance for Universal Access anticipated in 2004	○	**The State Model Ordinance for Universal Access was published in November 2005. Planning staff has collected this information and has referred it to the City's Development Code Team.**
Monitoring and Coordination of Housing Performance 10.1	**Prepare an annual monitoring report to the City Council on implementation of the city housing programs.** Annual report on new construction, rehabilitation, location and other assistance by income group and special need group served all sources of funds. **Responsible Entity:** SHRA, City Planning	Annually starting in July 2003	◉	**The report has been prepared annually and presented to City Council annually since 2003. This report will be presented to Council during summer 2007.**
Monitoring and Coordination of Housing Performance 10.2	**Monitor and publish an annual report on compliance with the jobs to housing balance, housing type and affordability objectives in the North Natomas Community Plan.** Annual reports to City Planning Commission and City Council. **Responsible Entity:** City Planning	Annually starting in 2003	○	**Staff completed the initial analysis of housing issues in the North Natomas Community Plan area. This study was made available to the public in 2005. The analysis found that the Community Plan had achieved a balance of housing types by neighborhood and that it had achieved its affordability objectives. While the jobs-housing balance was slightly lower than the goal identified in the plan, more recent office and commercial development in the area has improved the balance.**
Monitoring and Coordination of Housing Performance 10.3	**Promote policies and programs by county and regional decision making bodies to promote the equitable distribution of affordable housing. Consortium of cities and counties to implement region wide affordable housing programs and objectives.** **Responsible Entity:** City Planning, SHRA, SACOG	Ongoing	○	**Staff has been working with the County and SACOG on this issue. The City adopted the SACOG regional compact for affordable housing in July 2004 to promote the production of affordable housing region wide. The City and SHRA is also working with the County and other neighboring jurisdictions on the update of their Housing Trust Fund fees.**

City of Sacramento Housing Element Update

City Council
October 16, 2007

OBJECTIVES

- Review WHAT WE KNOW
- Frame WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW
- Discuss WHERE WE ARE GOING
  - Thematic approach
  - Timeline and reporting back

Designed in 28 pt font but printed in readable font to conserve paper

WHAT WE KNOW

- Required element of General Plan
- Five year prospective document
- Overall City housing "constitution"
- Adoption by June, 2008

WHAT WE KNOW

- Housing Element to mirror General Plan
  - Inclusive
  - Strategic
  - Connected
  - Approachable

Designed in 28 pt font but printed in readable font to conserve paper

WHAT WE KNOW

- Progress under current RHNA
- 2000 – 2006, City met 99% of RHNA

	RHNA goal	Units Produced	% of RHNA
VLI	772	772	100%
LI	2,791	2,564	92%
Mod.	4,714	7,041	100% +
> Mod.	11,036	16,688	100% +
Total	**19,313**	**25,274**	**99%**

WHAT WE KNOW

- 2006-2013 DRAFT RHNA

	RHNA Need	% of Total
VLI	3,720	14.1%
LI	3,871	14.6%
Mod.	5,386	20.4%
> Mod.	13,458	50.9%
Total	**26,435**	**100%**

- Half of VLI need = ELI need

Designed in 28 pt font but printed in readable font to conserve paper

WHAT WE KNOW

- 50% of all households are lower income
- 65% + of existing housing is 30 + years old
- 43% of all households "overpay" for housing
- 11% of all households are overcrowded
- Job opportunities in government & service
- 13% of households can afford to purchase a median income home

Sources: HUD, EDD, US Census Bureau

WHAT WE KNOW

- Community Concerns
  - Desire for "complete" neighborhoods
  - Economic integration
  - Homeownership opportunities
  - Senior and student housing needs
  - Safety of housing and neighborhoods
  - Linking affordable housing with services
  - Rehabilitation of existing housing

Designed in 28 pt font but printed in readable font to conserve paper

WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

- Vacant Land Inventory
  - Required for housing element compliance
  - Must accommodate anticipated growth
  - Must be zoned and have infrastructure
  - Land "suitable" for VLI and LI at 30 du/acre

WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

- Final Regional Housing Needs Allocation
  - State released new regional growth numbers
  - Population decrease of 30% region-wide
  - Legislation passed to modify RHNA
  - Bill in front of Governor for signature

Designed in 28 pt font but printed in readable font to conserve paper

WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

- Environmental Review
  - Housing Element requires Neg. Dec.
  - General Plan MEIR can cover Housing Element
  - Timing issues:
    - MEIR approval ≈November, 2008
    - Housing Element approval = June, 2008
  - Alternatives
    - Delay Housing Element approval
    - Housing Element specific review

WHERE WE ARE GOING

- Interaction with General Plan process
- Elevation to strategic planning document
- Thematic approach
  - Provide context
  - Link programs to needs
  - Link Housing Element to other City goals

Designed in 28 pt font but printed in readable font to conserve paper

WHERE WE ARE GOING

- Neighborhood sustainability, stability, integration
- Production to meet (or exceed) RHNA
  - 2006 - most affordable housing production statewi
- Extremely Low Income needs
  - 17% of households in Sacramento
  - Most critical housing needs

WHERE WE ARE GOING

- Accessible Housing
  - 20% of Sacramento residents are disabled
- Rehabilitation
  - 65% of existing housing over 30 years old
- Homeownership Opportunities
  - 13% of households can purchase median home

Designed in 28 pt font but printed in readable font to conserve paper

WHERE WE ARE GOING

- Timeline and Milestones
  - Council workshop (January) to discuss policies
  - Council workshop (March) to review draft
  - Council approval of Element – June, 2008

City of Sacramento Housing Element Update

City Council
October 16, 2007

Designed in 28 pt font but printed in readable font to conserve paper