

Los Angeles

HOUSING ELEMENT

of the General Plan

2021-2029





City of Los Angeles General Plan
Housing Element 2021-2029

The Housing Element is one of the eight State-mandated elements of the General Plan and identifies the City's housing conditions and needs, establishes the goals, objectives, policies, and programs that are the foundation of the City's housing strategy.

Adopted by the Los Angeles City Council
Original Adoption Date: November 2021
Original Effective Date: November 2021

Adoption Date	Amendment	Council File No.	CPC File No.
November 24, 2021	Adoption of the Housing Element 2021-2029	21-1230	CPC-2020-1365 GPA; ENV-2020-6762-EIR
June 14, 2022	Targeted Amendments to the Housing Element 2021-2029 to address HCD feedback	21-1230-S1	CPC-2022-2698-GPA; ENV-2020-6762-EIR-ADD1

**Activity Log is an administrative addition added after Council adoption*

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Executive Summary

Land Acknowledgment

The City of Los Angeles is situated in the ancestral and unceded lands of the Tongva (also known as Yaavitam), the Gabrieleños, the Kizh, the San Fernando Band of Mission Indians, and the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians peoples. We acknowledge their elders, past, present, and future, for their cultural resilience. They are the original caretakers of this land on which the central governing institutions of the City of Los Angeles are constructed. Today, the City of Los Angeles is home to the second largest community of Native Americans in the United States.

Acknowledgements

Mayor

Eric Garcetti

City Council Members

Gil Cedillo, District 1

Paul Krekorian, District 2

Bob Blumenfield, District 3

Nithya Raman, District 4

Paul Koretz, District 5

Nury Martinez, District 6

Monica Rodriguez, District 7

Marqueece Harris-Dawson, District 8

Curren D. Price, Jr., District 9

Mark Ridley-Thomas, District 10

Mike Bonin, District 11

John Lee, District 12

Mitch O'Farrell, District 13

Kevin de León, District 14

Joe Buscaino, District 15

City Planning Commission

Samantha Millman, President

Caroline Choe, Vice President

Renee Dake-Wilson, Commissioner

Jenna Hornstock, Commissioner

Helen Leung, Commissioner

Yvette López-Ledesma, Commissioner

Karen Mack, Commissioner

Dana Perlman, Commissioner

Vacant, Commissioner

Department of City Planning

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP, Director

Kevin Keller, AICP, Executive Officer (former)

Arthi L. Varma, AICP, Deputy Director

Shana M. Bonstin, Deputy Director

Vacant, Deputy Director

Lisa M. Webber, AICP, Deputy Director

CITYWIDE POLICY DIVISION

Nick Maricich, Principal City Planner

Matthew Glesne, Senior City Planner

Blair Smith, City Planner

Ari Briski, City Planner

Cally Hardy, City Planning Associate

Betty Barberena, Planning Assistant

Wajiha Ibrahim, Planning Assistant

Denzel Henderson, Planning Assistant

CONTRIBUTING CITY PLANNING STAFF

Conni Pallini-Tipton, Senior City Planner

Connie Chauv, City Planner

Nuri Cho, City Planner

Eric Claros, City Planner

Ulises Gonzalez, City Planner

Gabriela Juarez, City Planner

Jeff Khau, City Planner

Laura MacPherson, City Planner

Christine Saponara, Senior City Planner

Norali Martinez,
City Planning Associate

Jonathan Chiu, Planning Assistant

Rina Lara, Planning Assistant

Roy Samaan, City Planner

Jack Y. Tsao, OSRA II

Yingshi Huang,
Student Professional Worker

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Betty Dong, GIS Chief

Charles Lee, GIS Supervisor II

Gary L Himan, GIS Supervisor I

Timmy Luong, GIS Supervisor I

Jesus Ramos, GIS Supervisor I

Will Buckhout, GIS Specialist

Kory Sirkin, GIS Specialist

Tom Tran, GIS Specialist

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Yeghig Keshishian,
Chief External Affairs Officer

Jenna Monterrosa, Senior City Planner

Shakeh Boghoskahanian,
Graphics Supervisor II

Louisa Ranick, Graphics Supervisor I

Jessica Alamo, Graphics Designer II

Jacob Lopez, Graphics Designer II

Nora Frost, Public Information Director I

Jaime Espinoza, Planning Associate

Verenice Estrada,
Student Professional Worker

CONSULTANTS

MIG Consulting

FM3 Research

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Fehr & Peers

Terner Center for Housing
Innovation, UC Berkeley

Issi Romem, MetroSight

City Attorney

Mike Feuer, City Attorney

Kathryn C. Phelan,
Deputy City Attorney

Oscar Medellin,
Deputy City Attorney

LOS ANGELES HOUSING DEPARTMENT (LAHD)
(Formerly Housing + Community Investment Department, HCIDLA)

Ann Sewill, General Manager

Tricia Keane, Executive Officer

Anna Ortega,
Interim Assistant General Manager

Daniel Huynh,
Assistant General Manager

Robert Galardi, Acting Director

Claudia Monterrosa, Chief Housing Officer

Edwin Gipson, Director of Housing

Ashley Atkinson,
Sr. Manager, Accessible Housing Program Performance

Nancy Twum-Akwaboah, Housing Planning & Economic Analyst

Maya Abood, Housing, Planning, & Economic Analyst

Jackie Cornejo, Housing, Planning & Economic Analyst

Sara Wall, Community Housing Programs Manager

Marites Cunanan,
Sr. Management Analyst II

Emma Garcia,
Sr. Management Analyst

Danielle Thompson,
Finance Development Officer

Mariano Napa,
Finance Development Officer

Mica O'Brien, Intern

Diego Soler, Intern

Project Partner Agencies

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES (HACLA)

Ann Lynch,
Quality Control Manager

Jenny Scanlin, Chief Strategic Development Officer

Patricia Mendoza, Assistant Director

LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY (LAHSA)

Rita Noorzay,
Sr. Project Manager

Bryan Brown, Project Manager

Alexander Visotzky, Associate Director

Jeffrey Proctor, Associate Director

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY (DBS)

Carolynn Nepomuceno Juacalla,
Structural Engineering Associate

Charmie Huynh,
Assistant Deputy Supervisor

Frank Lara,
Director of Government and Community Relations

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER (LADWP)

Theresa Kim,
Civil Engineering Associate

Delon Kwan, Manager

Jin Hwang,
Civil Engineering Associate

Alvin Bautista, Manager

LA SANITATION

Colette Monell, Environmental Specialist

Nuna Tersibashian,
Environmental Supervisor

Azya Jackson, Environmental Engineer

Deborah Deets, Landscape Architect

CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE (CAO)

Blair Miller, Project Coordinator

Meg Barclay,
City Homelessness Coordinator (former)

Helene Rotolo, Management Analyst (former)

DEPARTMENT OF AGING (DOA)

Mariella Freire-Reyes,
Sr. Management Analyst

Jennifer Ware, Sr. Management Analyst

Laura Trejo, General Manager

DEPARTMENT OF DISABILITY (DOD)

Geoffrey Straniere, Project Manager

Stephen Simon, Executive Director

DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT (DONE)

Semee Park, Project Coordinator

Jose Galdamez, Project Coordinator

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS (DPW) - STREET SERVICES (STREETS)

Colette Monell, Environmental Specialist

Nuna Tersibashian,
Environmental Supervisor

Rachel O'Leary, Intern

BUREAU OF SANITATION (LASAN)

Colette Monell, Environmental Specialist

Nuna Tersibashian,
Environmental Supervisor

Melinda Bartlett, Environmental Affairs

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT (EMD)

Crisanta Gonzalez, Emergency Management Coordinator

Carol Parks,
Assistant General Manager

Patrick Munongo, Emergency Management Coordinator

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (LADOT)

David Somers,
Supervising Transportation Planner I

Rubina Ghazarian,
Supervising Transportation Planner

MAYOR'S OFFICE

Kevin Keller, Deputy Mayor of Economic Development

Amy Anderson, Chief Housing Officer (former)

Melissa Alofaituli, Director of Planning Policy and Development

Claudia Monterrosa, Chief Housing Office

Azeen Khanmalek, Director of Affordable Housing Production

Laura Krawczyk,
Planning & Development Manager

Marisol Romero, Senior Affordable Housing Policy Specialist

Theadora Trindle,
Planning & Development Manager

CIVIL, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY DEPARTMENT

David Price, Director of Racial Equity

ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (EWDD)

Daysi Hernandez,
Chief Grants Administrator

HOUSING RIGHTS CENTER

Chancela Al-Mansour,
Executive Director



Table of Contents

Executive Summary 2

Land Acknowledgment 2

Acknowledgements 2

Housing Element Task Force 7

Executive Summary 8

Housing Element: Purpose and Process 15

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Summary 18

Summary of the Plan to House LA 20

Summary of Public Participation 26

Concepts Phase 29

Draft and Adoption Phase 33

Housing Element Task Force 37

CH 1. Housing Needs Assessment 40

Introduction 40

Population Characteristics 42

Income and Employment 52

Household Characteristics 59

Households with Special Needs 63

Housing Stock Characteristics 77

Housing Costs and Overcrowding 88

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) 98

Summary of Housing Element Assessment of Fair Housing 103

CH 2. Constraints on Housing Maintenance, Improvement, and Development 118

Introduction 118

Constraints Overview 120

Constraints for Housing for People with Disabilities and Special Needs 127

Analysis of Preservation of At-Risk Units 129

CH 3. Opportunities for Conservation in Residential Development 132

Introduction 132

Comprehensive Plans 133

Targeted Initiatives 136

Water Management Plans 140

Residential and Commercial Rebate Programs for Efficient Appliances 141

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies 142

State and Local initiatives 143

CH 4. Adequate Sites for Housing 146

Introduction 146

RHNA Allocation and Target Capacity for Adequate Sites Inventory 148

Overview of Adequate Sites Inventory 151

Vacant and Underutilized Sites 152

Planned and Approved Projects (Development Pipeline) 165

Additional Means of Meeting the RHNA (Non-Site-Specific) 169

Summary of Adequate Sites for Housing and Identification of Rezoning Need 174

Rezoning Program and Inventory of Candidate Sites to Accommodate the Rezoning Need 177

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Analysis 196

CH 5. Review of the 2013-2021 Housing Element 226

Introduction 226

Progress in Meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment 227

Review of 2013-2021 Housing Element Goals, Objectives, and Policies 230

CH 6. Housing Goals, Policies, Objectives, and Programs 240

Background 240

What is a Goal, Policy, Objective and Program? 242

Citywide Vision and Housing Priorities 244

Key Definitions 245

Goals, Objectives and Policies 246

Programs 257

Appendices

0.1 Summaries of Public Outreach

1.1 Housing Element Assessment of Fair Housing

2.1 Governmental, Non-Governmental, and Constraints for People with Disabilities

2.2. Preservation of At Risk Units

2.3 Generalized Summary of Zoning Regulations

2.4 Summary of Case Filing and Building Permitting Fees

2.5 Coastal Zone Building Activity Data 1982-2021

2.6 Summary of Total Number of Affordable Housing Units and Restricted Units

2.7 Expiration of Affordable Housing Unit Restrictions Analysis

2.8 At-Risk Expiring Affordable Housing Inventory October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2031

2.9 List of Qualified Non-Profit Housing Development Entities

4.1 Housing Element Sites Inventory

4.2 Pipeline Projects (Public Land)

4.3 Pipeline Projects (Private Development)

4.4 Detailed AFFH Analysis

4.5 Land Use (Table C)

4.6 Regression Methodology

4.7 Candidate Sites Identified to be Rezoned to Accommodate Housing Shortfall Need (Table B)

4.8 Potential Candidate Sites for Public Land Program

5.1 Evaluation of 2013-2021 Goals, Policies, Objectives, and Programs

6.1 Lead and Supporting Agencies

Housing Element Task Force

Task Force Members

FULL NAME OR ORGANIZATION

A Community of Friends

A. Lenise Kouture, Empowerment Congress

West Neighborhood Development Council

AARP

Abode Communities

Abundant Housing LA

Affordable Living for the Aging

AIA Los Angeles

Alliance for Community Transit- Los Angeles (ACT-LA)

Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE)

Armbruster Goldsmith & Delvac, LLP

Building Industry Association

California Apartment Association

California Community Foundation

California Home Builders

Carl Cade, Market Rate Developer

Cathy Wayne, Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council and Laurel Canyon Association

CDTech

Central City Association of Los Angeles

Clifford Beers Housing, Inc.

Craig Lawson & Co., LLC

Crenshaw Subway Coalition

Disability Rights California

Downtown Women's Center

East LA Community Corporation

Enterprise Community Partners

Esperanza Community Housing Corporation

First 5 LA

Greater Watts Development Corporation

Grounded Solutions Network

Housing Rights Center

Inner City Law Center

James Wen, City of Los Angeles Transgender Advisory Council

Jane Demian, Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council

Kaiser Permanente

Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance (KIWA)

LA Community Action Network (LA CAN)

LA Family Housing

Laisa Caldwell, Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA)- Resident Advisory Council

Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles

Liberty Hill Foundation

Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)

Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce

Los Angeles Conservancy

Los Angeles Tenants Union

Lucille Floresta, Sylmar Neighborhood Council

Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County

National Resources Defense Council (NRDC)

Pacific Urbanism

PATH Ventures

Public Counsel

Renee Dake Wilson, Former City Planning Commissioner, Architect

Southern California Association of Nonprofit Housing (SCANPH)

Standard Communities

Steinberg Hart

Strategic Actions for a Just Economy

Three6ixty

Tomas Steidl, Architect

UCLA Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies

United Way

Universal Standard Housing

USC Price Center for Social Innovation

Venice Community Housing

Walker Wells, Sustainability and Green Building Advisor

Weingart Center Association

Executive Summary

Introduction to the Plan to House LA

The City of Los Angeles has experienced the most severe housing crisis of any major city in the United States for some time now. With a wave of evictions threatening to further increase Los Angeles' homeless count and potentially move more families deeper into poverty, the devastating ways in which our housing crisis exacerbates existing disparities has become all too clear. The critical need for greater housing stability, affordability, equity and opportunity have never been more important.

The 2021-2029 Housing Element of the General Plan (The Plan to House LA) presents a vision where housing in Los Angeles is ample and affordable, where tenants and affordable housing are protected and preserved and where proactive efforts are made to reverse the legacies of discriminatory and racist policies.

In that regard, the Plan to House LA offers an important opportunity to center racial and social equity and to directly address the severe housing disparities and patterns of exclusion that continue to shape who can live where. It reflects a commitment to providing housing initiatives that expand and preserve our affordable housing stock, encourage greater access to housing, minimize the displacement of vulnerable residents, and reform policies and practices that have negatively impacted Angelenos, particularly Communities of Color, including Indigenous, Black, Latinx, and Asian communities.

This Housing Element updates the previous (2013-2021) Housing Element, keeping its general structure in place, while making changes to reflect evolving needs, priorities, resources, and conditions in the City.

"Loving Los Angeles means facing the bitter truth about our past that maps of our city were drawn to protect the wealth of white people and destroy the wealth of Black people and other people of color. Redlining and exclusionary zoning resulted in a city where today Black and Mexican origin families hold 1/90th of the wealth of white families on average, it's a city where Black people are overrepresented among those experiencing homelessness by a factor of four, and where Latino homelessness accounts for the greatest jump of newly homeless Angelenos."


—Mayor Garcetti, State of the City 2021

Background — The Housing Crisis in Los Angeles

Los Angeles is one of the most dynamic cities in the world. However, with its continued growth and economic success has come increasing challenges relating to the need for more affordable housing and support to help homeless Angelenos off the street and into homes. Simply put, over the past 40 years, Los Angeles has welcomed more people without adding enough places for them to live. While the City has made significant progress in the last eight years, much more needs to be done to achieve the kind of City Angelenos have made clear they desire. Housing is key to this vision.

It is a cliché to say that the City of Los Angeles is in a housing crisis. However, the negative impacts resulting from the severe misalignment of housing costs and incomes in this City are hard to overstate. Angelenos pay more of their income on housing, live in more overcrowded conditions, and have the highest rates of unsheltered homelessness of any city in the country. Almost half of all households struggle to pay their rent and mortgage, with more than a third of renters spending half their paycheck on rent . Many workers in the City are forced to live far from their jobs, which worsens commute times, our air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Chart ES.1: **Percentage of Rent Burdened Households, Major US Cities**



Source: American Community Survey; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates


While rising housing costs impact all segments of the housing market, it is particularly dire for those with low incomes, the unhoused, and those with special housing needs. These populations frequently face discrimination, health conditions, lack of transportation, and unemployment that exacerbate difficulties in accessing permanent housing. Despite significant advances in housing individuals that may have lost their

home, and providing for special needs, homelessness continues to increase as people are losing their housing faster than new housing can be provided and obtained.

Displacement pressures are intensifying and Angelenos (particularly families with children) are increasingly leaving the City because, in part, they no longer find it possible to afford the cost of housing. Young people in particular, are not able to form households. With housing options so limited, many households are only able to find affordable housing in traditionally lower income neighborhoods, which intensifies gentrification pressures. Unequal access to neighborhoods with high resources and opportunities such as good jobs, transit, parks, and amenities exacerbates segregation, economic disparities, unhealthy living conditions, and commute times.

Most experts point to a lack of adequate, affordable housing for the population as the root of the local housing crisis. Los Angeles has the second fewest number of homes per adult of major US cities (see Chart ES.2 below). If the City of Los Angeles had the same number of homes per adult as the national average, the City would have an additional 129,000 homes (2019, American Community Survey). This shortage has developed primarily since the 1980s, as the population in Los Angeles grew much faster than the creation of new housing. Downzonings during this period limited the land area and intensities at which housing could be built.

Chart ES.2: **Adults (18+) per Housing Unit, Major US Cities**




Source: 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

To address worsening statewide housing needs California's Housing Element Law has undergone numerous revisions in recent years. These changes include new requirements to account for existing unmet housing needs when planning for housing. As such, the City's new Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation is significantly higher this cycle, reflecting the severe shortage of available and affordable housing in Los Angeles.

Identifying and addressing the causes of the housing shortage is a central part of the Housing Element process (see Constraints Chapter 2). Some factors are out of the City's control (increasing material costs; a shortage of construction labor, etc) but other areas present opportunities to alleviate constraints imposed by the City including regulatory burdens (lengthy approvals, fees), a deficiency of public subsidy, local processes that create risk and uncertainty; and an undersupply of land where affordable housing is allowed to be built. All of these factors overlap and impact where housing can be built, types of housing and local housing market conditions.

The City of Los Angeles has been taking bold strides to address the housing issues of residents, and has begun to see some positive results. Since the adoption of the prior Housing Element, the City has created several important funding and incentive tools that have significantly increased the production of affordable housing over prior levels (as shown in Chart ES. 3), while also adopting many additional tenant protection and affordable housing preservation policies (see Chapters 2 and 5).

Chart ES.3: **Affordable Housing Production by Source of Affordability | 2010-2020**



Source: LAHD and LACP, Annual Progress Reports of the Housing Element, 2010-2020

The Plan's detailed information on the City's housing needs (presented in Chapter 1) shows the considerable challenges but also notes some important progress in reversing some of the worst trends of prior decades (e.g. cost burden, overcrowding, and rent levels). Much more work is needed to make meaningful improvements in the lives of Angelenos.

This Housing Element presents a critical opportunity for the City to reverse housing disparities across geographies, incomes, and racial groups and guarantee the right of safe, secure and affordable housing for all Angelenos. This is not an easy task, as the challenges we face are deep rooted and transformative change is needed; however, the imperative is clear. We must work to build a more affordable, resilient, and just city for all.

Reader's Guide

While the Plan's narrative frames the key concepts and proposals of the Housing Element, the essence of the Plan lies in its goals, objectives, policies, and programs. These declarative statements set forth the City's approach to various issues. Goals, objectives, policies, and action programs are described below.

Goals: A goal is a statement that describes the future condition or "end" state. Goals are outcome-oriented and achievable over time, though not driven by funding.

Objectives: An objective is an aspirational measure of goal attainment. In the Housing Element, the objectives follow the goal and precede the policies. Meeting given objectives will depend on available funding to implement the proposed programs.

Policies: A policy is a clear statement that guides a specific course of action for decision-makers to achieve a desired goal. Each policy in the Plan is labeled with the goal and objective they refer to, and a unique number (e.g., 1.2.3).

Programs: An implementation program is an action, procedure, program or technique that carries out goals and policies. Implementation programs are comprehensive in nature, encompassing amendments of existing and preparation of new ones. Completion of a recommended implementation program will depend on a number of factors such as citizen priorities, finances, and staff availability. These recommendations are suggestions to future decision makers as ways to implement the goals and policies contained in this Housing Element. The listing of recommended implementation programs in the Housing Element does not obligate the City to accomplish them. Chapter 6 contains a list of all the Housing Element implementation programs.

Housing Element Organization

The Housing Element of the General Plan is organized into six chapters. Each chapter is further organized into sections that address specific topics described below:

Introduction and Orientation: This initial chapter describes the role and requirements for the Housing Element. The chapter also outlines the Plan's six goals, highlights the Plan's organizational format, describes the Plan's relationship to the City's General Plan as well as plans developed by other City agencies and regional jurisdictions and includes a glossary of terms. This chapter also includes a summary of the outreach completed while developing the draft.

Chapter 1 — Housing Needs Assessment: Provides a comprehensive overview of the City's population, household, and housing stock characteristics, and an analysis of these factors in order to identify housing needs of the variety of household types and special needs across the City. The analysis highlights low rates of housing affordability and the creation and loss of existing low-cost housing. In addition, demographic changes such as the increase in the senior population and decrease in young families and children are assessed. The Chapter also includes the summary of findings for the Housing Element Assessment of Fair Housing (Appendix 1.1) which includes an analysis of the disproportionate housing needs, segregation patterns, and disparities in access to opportunity by race, income, disability and familial status; along actions and programs intended to promote the City's goals of affirmatively furthering fair housing based on prioritized contributing factors.

Chapter 2 — Constraints on Housing Maintenance, Improvement, and Development: Addresses regulations and conditions that constitute constraints to housing production and preservation, including governmental regulations, infrastructure requirements and non-governmental market conditions such as land, construction and labor costs, opposition to housing, and restricted financing availability.

Chapter 3 — Opportunities for Conservation in Residential Development: State Housing Element law requires cities to identify opportunities for energy conservation in residential development. The City has broadened this analysis to include energy conservation, water conservation, alternative energy sources and sustainable development which supports conservation and reduces demand. These efforts reduce development costs and improve the long-term affordability of housing units. The enactment of the LA Green Building Code and other regulations like the Low-Impact Development Ordinance have greatly strengthened City efforts towards sustainability. Specific City programs include providing rebates for energy efficient appliances, shifting the time of energy use, using alternative sources of energy (i.e., solar power), installing green roofs, requiring more sustainable landscaping and site design, and adopting General Plan land use designations and zoning that facilitate higher-density, compact, infill development near transit.

Chapter 4 — Adequate Sites for Housing: State Housing Element law requires the City to show that it has adequate land zoned to accommodate expected population growth. For the 8-year plan period (2014-2021), the number of housing units estimated to be needed in Los Angeles is 456,643. The figure is called the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).

This Chapter identifies the City's inventory of land suitable for residential development without the need for any legislative action by the City, identifies additional alternative methods of satisfying the RHNA and identifies the need for rezoning programs to accommodate the RHNA allocation. The analysis demonstrates that, during the 6th cycle, the City has an anticipated unit potential of 230,947 units, of which 72,650 units are Lower Income. As a result, the Plan identifies a need for a Rezoning Program to accommodate 255,432 units. The various rezoning strategies to meet this shortfall, as well as their assumptions, are also included. Finally, the Chapter includes an analysis of both the adequate sites and rezoning inventory's compliance with Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements, and finds that the rezoning program would substantially improve access to opportunity.

Chapter 5 — Review of the 2006-2014 Housing Element: Preparation of the Housing Element Update included the essential step of evaluating the previous 2006-2014 Housing Element in order to identify progress and evaluate the effectiveness of previous policies and programs. The review shows that building permits were issued for 117,088 new housing units. The City has therefore already met its overall RHNA target of 82,002 units; however, it is not expected to have produced enough housing in the affordable lower and moderate income categories. The review noted progress in increasing affordable housing production, particularly through mixed-income developments and showed that the goals, objectives and policies of the previous Housing Element remain largely relevant and important. This Housing Element Update builds upon them, reconfiguring and refining some of them to better focus the City's strategy. The updates focused on advancing citywide housing priorities that specifically address the housing shortage, advancing racial equity and access to opportunity, protecting Angelenos from displacement, and promoting sustainability and resilience. Similarly, the evaluation of programs provided insight into which efforts were more effective than others. As a result, many programs have been reconfigured so that going forward, more will be accomplished and a more accurate accounting can occur through the Housing Element's Annual Progress Report.

Chapter 6 — Housing Goals, Policies, Objectives and Programs: The objectives, policies and implementation programs under each goal speak to the diverse housing needs across the City. The City's approach to alleviating housing needs and of creating sustainable mixed-use, mixed-income neighborhoods across the City aim to provide opportunities for housing, jobs, transit and basic amenities for all segments of the population. Each program was crafted to meet particular housing needs of the City, whether they are renters or homeowners, or populations with special needs. The goals, objectives and policies are organized around five issues: housing production; housing preservation; livable and sustainable communities; housing opportunities for all; and ending homelessness.

Housing Element: Purpose and Process

Housing Element and the General Plan

In the State of California, all cities are required to develop a General Plan and the Housing Element is a required component of every city's General Plan. The General Plan can be thought of as a city's "constitution for development," or the foundation upon which all land use decisions are to be based. It establishes policies and programs that assist decision makers as they review planning approvals for a new project or consider a proposed ordinance or policy. As such, the General Plan provides the foundational guide for planning, outlining how land is used and how the City allocates its resources. The General Plan is, however, more than just the legal basis for all local land use decisions; it is the vision for how the City will evolve, reflecting the values and priorities of its communities.

The City of Los Angeles' General Plan consists of 12 Citywide Elements and 35 Community Plans, which collectively serve as the Land Use Element. The Framework Element establishes the overarching vision for the City's future growth, and the long-range strategies, goals, objectives, and policies to implement that vision. The General Plan also includes topic-specific elements, including the Housing Element, which provide detailed goals, policies and programs specific to each area of focus, in consistency with other elements. The Framework Element continues to provide policy direction for future amendments to the Housing Element and the Community Plans, which determine the zoning and land use for each parcel of land in the City.

The Plan to House LA update embodies the existing goals and policies of other General Plan elements and identifies the more detailed strategies the City will implement to achieve them with regards to housing. The update also ensures that housing goals, objectives and policies are integrated and consistent with all of the other elements of the General Plan. Recent changes to state law require the City to review, and update as necessary, the Safety Element alongside the Housing Element. The Safety Element is another topic specific element that details the City's approach to preventing, responding to and recovering from disaster events. Targeted amendments to the Safety Element are being adopted alongside the Plan to House LA to reflect the City's expanded focus on planning for hazards including wildfires, flooding and the impacts of climate change. Additionally, some minor amendments will be adopted into the Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles to clarify that the plan satisfies the state environmental justice requirements of SB 1000.

While fulfilling the statutory requirements of State Housing Element law, the policies and programs herein also foster on-going partnerships among City departments, with other governmental agencies, and with the private sector to respond to ever-changing housing demands and market conditions. The update provides policy guidance relating to housing issues to decision makers at all levels of City government.

State Law Framework

Statutory requirements for the Housing Element are delineated in California State Government Code Section 65580 – 65589.9. The Housing Element is required to be updated every eight years in accordance with a specific schedule of dates established by the State. ThisHousing Element therefore covers the period of October 1, 2021 through October 1, 2029.

Pursuant to State law, the Housing Element must include the following key components:

- An analysis of existing and projected housing needs
- An analysis of potential constraints on housing
- An analysis of assisted housing developments that are “at-risk” and eligible to change from low-income housing uses
- An inventory of land suitable for housing
- An affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH) analysis



- An analysis of any special housing needs
- An analysis of opportunities for residential energy conservation
- An evaluation of the previous Housing Element
- Goals, policies, and implementation programs

Because housing needs are recognized as a matter of statewide concern, the State, through the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), must certify the compliance of every jurisdiction's Housing Element upon adoption. Pursuant to AB 72 (2016), HCD also has new statutory authority to revoke Housing Element compliance if the local government's actions do not comply with state law. In addition, HCD may notify the California Office of the Attorney General that the local jurisdiction is in violation of state law for non-compliance with housing element law (or other state housing laws).

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 686 (2018), the Housing Element must include an analysis and determination of consistency with Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements. AFFH is defined as "taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. These actions must, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replace segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transform racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and foster and maintain compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws."

To comply with these requirements, the implementation programs of the Housing Element must affirmatively further fair housing, and must include an Assessment of Fair Housing. Building on the adopted Assessment of Fair Housing plan (2018-2023), this document includes its own AFH with updated findings and contributing factors based on guidance from HCD, and sets the framework for the 2023-2028 AFH that will be submitted to HUD. Additionally, the adequate sites suitable for housing development must be identified throughout the City in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing (see Chapter Four).


For purposes of the Housing Element sites inventory, this means that sites identified to accommodate the lower-income portion of the RHNA are not concentrated in low-resourced areas (lack of access to high performing schools, proximity to jobs, location disproportionately exposed to pollution or other health impacts) or areas of segregation and concentrations of poverty. A helpful resource is to conduct AFFH analysis is the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC)/California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Opportunity Maps, which can be seen on Map 3.4 (Chapter Two) or accessed at: https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Summary

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) is the State required process that seeks to ensure cities and counties are planning for enough housing to accommodate all economic segments of the community. The State assigns each region in California a housing target (RHNA Allocation) that is distributed to jurisdictions through a methodology prepared by the regional councils of government. The RHNA allocation is further segmented into four income categories based on area median income (AMI). Each local jurisdiction must then identify adequate sites with realistic development potential to demonstrate it can meet its share of the regional housing needs.

The City's RHNA allocation for the previous Housing Element planning period of January 1, 2014 to September 30th, 2021 was 82,002 new housing units. From 2014 to the end of 2020 (7 years), building permits were issued for 117,088 new housing units. The City has therefore already met its overall RHNA target of 82,002 units; however, it is not expected to have produced enough housing in the affordable lower and moderate income categories. Progress on meeting the 5th cycle RHNA is detailed more fully in Chapter 5 and summarized in Chart ES.4 below.

Chart ES.4: **RHNA Allocation by Income Level and Total Units to Date | 2014-2020**



For this current 2021-2029 Housing Element 6th cycle, the regional Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) issued a target of 456,643 housing units for the entire City of Los Angeles, of which 184,721 units (40%) are designated for very low- and low-income households. These figures are more than five times higher than the prior 5th cycle allocation, as seen on Table ES.1 below. This significant increase is primarily the result of changes in state law that included new markers of existing housing needs such as overcrowding and cost burden in the RHNA.

Table ES.1: **Comparison of 6th vs. 5th Cycle RHNA Targets, by Income Level**

Income Level	2013-2021 Target Units	2021-2029 Target Units
Very Low-Income (0-50% AMI)	20,426	115,978*
Low-Income (51-80% AMI)	12,435	68,743
Moderate-Income (81-120% AMI)	13,728	75,091
Above Moderate-Income (Over 120% AMI)	35,412	196,831
Total Units:	**82,002**	**456,643**

**Note: 57,989 (50%) of the Very Low-Income units are considered to be Extremely Low-Income (ELI)*

Through the implementation of the policies and programs set forth in the *Plan to House LA,* the City will pursue the production and preservation of housing for all residents and will strive to meet its RHNA goal of 456,643 new units by October, 2029. However, the lack of adequate resources for Affordable Housing will likely lead to production levels of low and moderate income units that fall short of the RHNA goals.

As described more fully in the RHNA Section of Chapter 1, the City estimates that under current assumptions it will likely be unable to meet its total RHNA targets for new construction. The City is therefore projected to fall short at the affordable (below 120% AMI) income ranges, but may meet the above moderate (market-rate) production levels. While the RHNA allocation suggests that almost 260,000 units affordable to households earning less than 120% AMI will be needed, it is anticipated that approximately 51,000 affordable units may be constructed within the eight year RHNA period at this range (about 20% of the target). This is a reflection that total housing

needs for lower and moderate income households greatly exceeds the ability to meet those needs with existing financial resources and incentive programs. However, it is important to highlight that this Housing Element is projecting a significant increase in housing production at all income ranges compared to prior cycles.

Summary of the Plan to House LA

As described in more detail above (See *State Law Framework* above) Housing Element law requires that each City and County identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs within their jurisdiction and prepare goals, policies, programs and quantified objectives to further the development, improvement, and preservation of housing.

The *Plan to House LA* translates state law requirements into a document that is organized in a logical and readable manner that aligns with the City's General Plan format. The *Plan to House LA* is organized into six chapters and a series of appendices. Each chapter is further organized into sections that address specific topics.

The content of the *Plan to House LA* was influenced by the development of six key "Concepts." These Concepts integrated feedback from the public alongside citywide policy priorities to describe how the City intends to meet increasingly ambitious housing production goals. They center around access to opportunity, housing stability, anti-displacement, equity, affordability, well-being and sustainability. The Plan's six Concepts are listed below in the Public Participation section.

Housing Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs

Los Angeles' housing goals, objectives, policies, and programs are guided by the City's overall housing vision:

It is the overall housing vision of the City of Los Angeles to create housing opportunities that enhance affordability, equity, livability and sustainability by remedying discriminatory housing practices and creating a city with a range of housing types, sizes, and costs in close proximity to jobs, transit, amenities, and services. In keeping with a fundamental belief that housing is a human right, the City will work towards ensuring that housing stability and affordability is provided to all residents.

In line with this vision, all goals, policies and objectives are intended to further certain Citywide Housing Priorities, defined below to include:

Addressing the Housing Shortage: Increase the production of new housing, particularly affordable housing.

Advancing Racial Equity & Access to Opportunity: Proactively address racial and economic segregation in the City by creating housing opportunities that address historic patterns of discrimination and exclusion.

Preventing Displacement: Protect Angelenos—especially persons of color and the disabled—from indirect and direct displacement, and ensure stability of existing vulnerable communities.

Promoting Sustainability & Resilience and Environmental Justice through Housing: Design and regulate housing to promote health and well-being, increase access to amenities, contribute to a sense of place, foster community and belonging, and protect residents from existing and future environmental impacts.

The five goals that will guide the 2021-2029 Housing Element are as follows:

GOAL 1
A City where housing production results in an ample supply of housing to create more equitable and affordable options that meet existing and projected needs.

GOAL 2
A City that preserves and enhances the quality of housing and provides greater housing stability for households of all income levels.

GOAL 3
A City in which housing creates healthy, livable, sustainable, and resilient communities that improve the lives of all Angelenos.

GOAL 4
A City that fosters racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods and corrects the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination of the past and present.

GOAL 5
A City that is committed to preventing and ending homelessness.

Each goal, along with major associated objectives, policies and programs will be summarized below. Please see Chapter 6 for the complete descriptions.

Goal 1 - Housing Production

Goal 1 emphasizes the importance of overall housing production in order to result in an ample supply of housing to better meet both existing and projected housing needs. This goal recognizes that rates of housing production have been insufficient historically and that in order to combat overcrowding and cost-burden, more housing options are needed, particularly those that are more affordable. A lack of adequate funding for deed-restricted Affordable Housing and other subsidies has limited the ability of the City to provide a critical social safety net for those at greatest risk of housing insecurity and homelessness. However, an increasing number of Affordable units are being created in mixed-income housing projects, often serving those at the lowest income categories (extremely low and very low).

Per the 2021-2029 RHNA, the City needs to produce about 57,000 units per year in the the 6th Housing Element Cycle; however, the City has only been producing an average of 16,700 units per year since 2014, indicating substantial changes are needed to achieve these housing goals. Of the City's 2021-2029 RHNA, about 23,000 units/year should be affordable to lower income households (80% AMI and below), however the City has only been producing an average of 1,650 affordable units per year since 2014. While significantly more housing at all income ranges is needed to address the current shortage, it will likely not be sufficient to serve those with the lowest incomes. Therefore, the particular importance of housing production that is affordable to lower income households is emphasized throughout Goal 1, while Goal 2 emphasizes that production must be balanced with strong preservation, replacement and tenant rights policies.

Objectives within the housing production goals are divided into three areas: forecasting and planning for changing housing needs (1.1), facilitating housing production, especially for affordable housing and housing meeting citywide housing priorities (1.2), and promoting a more equitable geographical distribution of affordable housing (1.3).

The policies and programs for production include locating new sources of local financing for affordable housing, targeted loan programs for homeowners and land use changes to increase sites where affordable housing can be built. Changes to production related policies from the prior Housing Element include a greater emphasis on producing a supply of housing that will alleviate existing housing needs, implementing strategies to better align citywide and community level housing planning efforts and reducing racial and economic segregation through a much stronger focus on locating Affordable Housing in all communities, particularly High Opportunity Areas. For example, Program 65 calls for allocating housing targets within Community Plan areas in a way that affirmatively furthers fair housing. Anti-displacement is added as a core component to future planning and land use strategies and the importance of more state and regional coordination is also strengthened.

Goal 2 - Housing Preservation and Housing Stability

The *Plan to House LA* establishes a new Goal 2 focusing on housing preservation and tenant protections in order to elevate critical City priorities around housing stability. This is a recognition of the importance of maintaining existing affordable housing and keeping people housed. Given the substantial cost benefits to preserving existing units as opposed to constructing a new unit, Los Angeles has long been committed to activities that support the preservation of affordable housing.

Objectives within the housing preservation and stability goal are divided into three topic areas: strengthening renter protections and preventing displacement (2.1), promoting more affordable ownership opportunities and ownership retention strategies (2.2), and conserving and improving the quality of housing (2.3). The overall policies within these objectives emphasizes the importance of prioritizing underserved communities and the most vulnerable.

Preservation related policies and programs include a combination of affordable housing preservation, habitability code enforcement, tenant protections, and ownership strategies; funding incentives to rehabilitate and maintain the housing stock; outreach, and education; as well as mechanisms to extend the affordability terms of units facing expiring covenants. There is also an overall increased emphasis on preventing displacement and protecting communities of color, which was not explicitly discussed in the previous Housing Element. New strategies include expanding "no net loss" requirements, affordable housing replacement policies, and a tenant's right to return to any replaced housing unit. Concepts such as extending affordability covenant terms, establishing community preference policies as well as promoting emerging ideas such as community land trusts and tenant/community opportunity to purchase programs were also added. One significant new preservation strategy involves the purchase of naturally affordable housing in order to remove units from the speculative market, help insulate tenants from price increases, and create housing for low-income families. Finally, there is an increased emphasis on education and empowerment for both tenants and homeowners. Specifically, language has been added to help promote homeownership as a wealth building strategy in communities of color through the prevention of predatory real estate practices and the promotion of education around enhancing home equity.

Goal 3 - Healthy, Livable, Sustainable, and Resilient Communities

Goal 3 emphasizes the important role of housing in creating a City that offers healthy, livable, sustainable, and resilient communities that improve the lives of all Angelenos. The goal encompasses an array of policies and actions that both enhance the quality of life and well-being of communities throughout Los Angeles as well as promote overall sustainability and resilience.

The objectives under this goal relate to the use of quality design (3.1), environmental sustainability (3.2) and promoting disaster and climate resilience in citywide housing

efforts (3.3). The design objective recognizes that housing can promote healthy communities and well-being, increase access to amenities, contribute to a sense of place, and foster community and belonging. Advancing environmentally sustainable residential buildings and land use patterns creates the path towards a low-carbon City, green energy future, and implements the City's Green New Deal (Sustainability pLAn) and Citywide Resilience Strategy.

The policies and programs falling under this goal will promote sustainable neighborhoods that lessen impacts on natural resource consumption by directing housing toward jobs and transit and by employing green-building techniques. These efforts will facilitate high quality, healthy housing in neighborhoods that mix incomes and improve accessibility to jobs and services in line with the Framework Element. The focus on health has increased, with new policies guiding development to better orient building siting and features toward beneficial uses and away from polluting or hazardous features. The prior Housing Element's focus on safety has more explicitly been linked to disaster resilience with several new policies on identifying risks to our housing stock and minimizing these risks for communities most at risk.

Goal 4 - Advancing Equity, Inclusion, and Access to Opportunity

Goal 4 strives towards a City that fosters racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods and corrects the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination of the past and present. This goal recognizes that impacts of the affordable housing crisis are not equitably experienced by all Angelenos due to historic and ongoing structural inequities such as redlining, racially restrictive covenants, and exclusionary zoning. The effects of past systematic segregation and exclusion in housing are still apparent in many areas of Los Angeles today. Communities of color remain largely segregated and excluded from areas with more access to opportunities such as high performing schools and jobs. Lower income households, particularly Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, also have much higher rates of housing insecurity and a greater need for affordable housing.

The objectives under this goal relate to ensuring that housing opportunities are accessible to all residents without discrimination (4.1), promoting outreach and education on fair housing practices and accessibility (4.2) and a new affirmatively furthering fair housing objective committing to taking of proactive measures to promote diverse, inclusive communities that grant all Angelenos access to housing in Higher Opportunity Areas (4.3).

The policies and programs under this goal promote and facilitate equal opportunity practices in the construction, provision, sale and rental of housing; including ensuring accessibility to persons with disabilities in City funded affordable housing developments. Policies also aim to expand outreach and education for homebuyers and renters regarding fair housing and other protections in the purchase, rental, and/or modification of housing. Finally, under the third objective, policies and programs call for increasing access and transparency in the lease-up process for affordable housing,

ensuring that all neighborhoods have a range of housing typologies to provide housing options for all and examining land use practices that perpetuate racial exclusion and inequities. Related changes to production related policies and programs include a greater emphasis on locating Affordable Housing in all communities, particularly Higher Opportunity Areas and introducing context-specific land use reforms in a way that affirmatively furthers fair housing.

Goal 5 - Preventing and Ending Homelessness

Goal 5 commits the City to preventing and ending homelessness based on the longstanding vision in Los Angeles that housing is a human right. This goal requires that every individual and family is housed by promoting strategies to prevent residents from losing their housing and by rapidly rehousing those who do fall into homelessness. Unfortunately, the drastic shortfall in affordable housing available to people with the lowest incomes throughout the region has led to more unhoused people in recent years even as the homeless services system has scaled up significantly and become more effective and efficient in response.

The homelessness policies and programs focus on a tiered approach that recognizes the need to provide sufficient temporary and emergency shelters to meet short-term needs while working toward a rapid return to more stable housing or permanent supportive housing over the longer-term. Programs emphasize the need and demand for supportive services and compassionate care as part of the commitment to prevent and end homelessness. Outreach and education efforts under this goal seek both to increase awareness for all City residents about the needs of the homeless and to inform the homeless about housing and service opportunities. More direct policy language was added to specify that supportive services, including housing and temporary facilities, need to be included in all neighborhoods of the City, and there is continued work to remove barriers to siting housing for homeless persons. Finally, policies were added to emphasize the need to compassionately care for individuals experiencing homelessness with facilities like restrooms, showers and drinking fountains.

The Plan's goals, objectives, policies, and programs collectively comprise the City's housing action plan for the 2021-2029 planning period. Together they will guide daily decision-making by City officials and staff, and provide benchmarks on the housing programs that the City carries out to meet its overall housing goals.

Summary of Public Participation

Figure ES.1: **Outreach Process**



Updating the Housing Element requires vital public and stakeholder input that can only be collected through public participation. Government Code 65583(c)(7) mandates local governments to "make a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element" and to describe their public participation efforts. The Department of City Planning and the Los Angeles Housing Department of (LAHD) engaged the public through numerous digital and in-person events (prior to the Covid-19 pandemic), and through other innovative ways, to collect the public's input. This outreach, participation and input has been used to guide and inform the updating process of the Housing Element.

Tens of thousands of people participated in the Housing Element Update outreach process and represented the City's diverse racial and ethnic communities, as well as age groups, income levels, and different housing experiences (i.e. renter versus home-owner). Efforts were taken by staff to provide outreach in Spanish to reach the City's large monolingual community, including bilingual webinars, online tools and a statistically valid survey. An important engagement element was the participation of the Housing Element Task Force, a 63-member group of diverse housing-related professionals, experts and community leaders, to further reach all segments of the City. The different public participation phases of the Housing Element Update are illustrated in Figure ES.1 and are described below. As part of the City's commitment to affirmatively further fair housing, there is a language and culturally inclusive outreach program intended to engage historically underrepresented communities in long range housing and planning processes.

A more detailed description of the outreach methods summarized below, as well as many of the general comments and findings collected as a part of the public participation process, are provided in Appendix 0.1.

Launch/Vision Phase

In October 2019, the City of Los Angeles launched the 2021-2029 update to the Housing Element, also referred to as the Plan to House LA. The Launch phase focused on the citywide introduction of the Housing Element Update and on informing the public on how it shapes housing outcomes in the City. A call for applications to join the Housing Element Task Force was issued and more than 280 persons and organizations applied. A diverse, balanced group of 63 members were selected and a kick-off Task Force meeting was hosted in January 2020 by the City's Director of City Planning and General Manager of LAHD.

In early 2020, the City launched the Visioning phase for the Plan. This phase focused on broadening public participation in the housing conversation and on collecting public feedback and input critical to the Housing Element Update. Community engagement focused on understanding housing needs, reviewing existing goals, and developing a collective vision for housing in Los Angeles.

Between January and July 2020, over 1,800 people clicked, commented, and participated in the Launch/Vision phase of outreach. Participants at all events were asked to share their frustrations with the current housing landscape and their vision for future improvements. Specific feedback and comments received from the public and Task Force during the Launch/Visioning revealed the following common topics:

- Protecting renters & preventing displacement
- Producing more housing, especially affordable housing
- Zoning for inclusive communities
- Serving the most vulnerable
- Addressing the homelessness crisis
- Promoting livable and resilient neighborhoods
- Promoting ownership

Kick-Off Workshops

The City hosted three in-person open house Kick-Off Workshops in February and March 2020 for the public to learn about the current Housing Element and to provide a space where participants could ask questions and share their comments with staff. Participants were engaged in both English and Spanish by bilingual staff in content that

included information on the state of housing in Los Angeles, demographics and socio-economic characteristics, housing characteristics, the City's RHNA allocation and past progress in meeting goals, as well as the 2013-2021 Housing Element's vision, goals, and objectives. Over 150 people attended these Kick-Off Workshops.

People who were not able to attend the in-person Kick-Off Workshops, were able to access an online workshop that provided the same information, materials, and opportunities to submit feedback. This online workshop tool was launched in March 2020 in both English and Spanish, and was viewed over 3,100 times.

Bilingual Webinars with Live Q&A

The City hosted five webinars with live Q&A in May and June 2020. Over 300 people attended these digital meetings. Three webinars were held in English and two in Spanish. Participants at these events were provided information about the Housing Element update and asked to share their thoughts about the current housing landscape and their vision for future improvements. The English and Spanish webinar recordings were published on the DCP website for anyone to watch at a convenient time. City staff was available to take phone calls for participants who were having technical issues, lacked internet access or who are visually impaired.



Launch/Vision Phase Summary and Integration of Comments

These comments led to an early recognition that the prior Housing Element was insufficient with regards to many of the critical topics the public cared most about. Many of these issues were elevated and expanded upon as Plan Concepts (discussed below), which were used to help prioritize elements that would be centered and uplifted as part of the update. These Concepts then guided the update itself, including the creation of new Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs. This is illustrated by the creation of the new Goal 2, which emphasizes housing stability, and the list of new and updated associated policies and programs that link back to this Goal (summarized under Goal 2 discussion above).

Early feedback also emphasized the need for zoning to foster inclusive communities and a more equitable distribution of affordable housing. This theme has similarly been centered and elevated throughout the Plan under the significantly strengthened Goal 4, along with a large number of associated policies and programs that are perhaps best summarized under the AFFH Program (124 in Chapter 6). More specific comments about serving the most vulnerable found their way into specific policies such as Policy 1.2.8 (target incentives for those with the lowest incomes) as well as the "housing first" Policy 5.1.4. An emphasis on more affordable forms of homeownership was also highlighted early on and led to new policies and significant policy updates under Objective 2.2, as well as some creative concepts reflected in Programs 3 and 4 (Innovation in Subdivisions and Shared Equity Models, respectively). Finally, the concern around the need to produce more housing to alleviate existing needs helped inform many of the new policies and programs associated with Goal 1.

Concepts Phase

In late 2020, the City launched the Concepts phase for the 2021-2029 Housing Element. During this phase, an ambitious outreach campaign helped to engage an unprecedented number of people through several targeted outreach efforts, including three webinars, neighborhood council and stakeholder meetings, a statistically valid poll, and a public survey. This phase focused on six Concepts that were developed based on the feedback the City collected during the Vision phase of outreach and the framework of state law.

The Concepts focus on how the Housing Element will address housing-related issues in the City. All six Concepts respond to urgent housing needs including: addressing the housing shortage, advancing racial equity and access to opportunity, and promoting sustainability and resilience. The six Concepts include:

- **Housing Stability and Anti-Displacement:** To protect Angelenos—especially persons of color—from indirect and direct displacement, and ensure stability of existing vulnerable communities.
- **Housing Production:** To increase the production of new housing, particularly affordable housing.
- **Access to Opportunity:** To increase access to opportunities and proactively desegregate the City by planning for more affordable and mixed-income housing in higher-resource areas.
- **Homelessness:** To prevent and end homelessness in a manner that centers human dignity and respect by developing early interventions, significantly expanding permanent housing options, and providing appropriate services and support.
- **Built Environment:** To design and regulate housing to promote health and well-being, increase access to amenities, contribute to a sense of place, foster community and belonging, and plan for a sustainable future.
- **Meeting the Needs of all Angelenos:** To build, operate, and maintain welcoming and accessible housing for Angelenos with unique needs, including those with disabilities, large families, older adults, and other people facing housing barriers.

Between January and July 2021, tens of thousands of people clicked, viewed, interacted, and participated in the Concepts phase of outreach. A more detailed description of the outreach methods summarized below and the findings collected during this outreach phase are provided in Appendix 0.1.

Bilingual Webinars with Live Q&A

The City held three webinars during the fall of 2020, two in English and one in Spanish, to introduce the Concepts and implementation strategies (potential programs) to the public. An audience of over 260 people was reached across all three events. Interactive polls and Q&A sessions were held during the webinars to encourage interactive participation. These webinars were accessible through GoToWebinar and live-streamed on the City's Facebook Page. The English and Spanish webinar recordings were published on the DCP website for anyone to watch at a convenient time. City staff was available to take phone calls for participants who were having technical issues, lacked internet access or are visually impaired. Prior to posting webinars were amended to include closed captioning to better accommodate diverse abilities.

Online Survey

In December 2020, the City released an interactive online digital survey that introduced the six Concepts along with the proposed housing strategies and asked respondents to weigh in with their reactions and suggestions. The survey was made available in English and Spanish. Over 1,800 people responded to the survey. Respondents were well represented from central, west and southwest LA, with less representation from harbor and valley communities. Responses were received from a variety of age groups and ethnicities, though respondents were slightly older and whiter than the City as a whole. Some survey results were de-aggregated to evaluate differences in responses based on criteria such as race or status as a renter or homeowner (tenancy).

Within the survey, each of the six Concepts received overall support from at least 70% of respondents. There was wide agreement among respondents that the availability of housing, and especially affordable housing, is poor within the City of Los Angeles. When asked how to address this shortage respondents demonstrated strong support for tools like adaptive reuse of existing buildings and setting neighborhood level housing production targets, with more divided opinions on tools like targeted rezoning of low density parcels. The results of the survey were published on the Housing Element website in March 2021.



Statistically Valid Poll

The Department of City Planning partnered with FM3 Research to conduct a poll of over 800 randomly selected City residents from November 5th to 18th, 2020, to assess their opinions on housing related issues and proposed responses to the strategies. These polls were conducted in both English and Spanish via email and text message as well as through the use of cell phones and landlines. To capture a statistically representative cross-section of residents, the poll respondents were consistent with the citywide racial, income, household size, renter, owner, and age demographics of the City.

The vast majority of respondents expressed support for the strategy of increasing and accommodating more housing near jobs, transit, and services, and for prioritizing tenant rights and the sheltering of people experiencing homelessness. This balanced group showed a stronger desire than the online Concepts Survey to see more housing near public transit, near job opportunities, high-performing schools, parks, and other amenities, even in areas of the City that comprise mostly of single-family homes.

Educational Video

On February 18, 2018, an animated, minute and a half long educational video was launched on the YouTube channel and social media platforms of the Department of City Planning and the Los Angeles Housing Department. The video explained the City's housing crisis, the on-going update, and participation opportunities in an effort to bring new audiences into the housing conversation. The video highlighted housing-related issues and laid a foundation for the intent and capacity of the goals, policies and programs comprising the Housing Element Update.

This video was viewed over 45,000 times, across all platforms, and generated hundreds of comments and reactions.

Community Stakeholder Meetings

Throughout the Concepts Phase, the Department of City Planning and the Los Angeles Housing Department appeared at eight local stakeholder meetings, including alliances of Neighborhood Councils, community organizations and other local groups. Staff shared the draft Concepts and spent as much time as was needed to answer questions and gather information on proposed housing strategies. These groups include the Alliance of River Communities (ARC): South Los Angeles Alliance of Neighborhood Councils (SLAANC), Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition (LANCC), Plancheck Neighborhood Council Alliance, Harbor Gateway Planning and Land Use Committee, West Valley Neighborhood Alliance on Homelessness, Health Innovation Community Partnership and the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC).

Concepts Phase Summary and Integration of Comments

The Concepts Phase was a critical time for gathering feedback on both the big themes and specific strategies under consideration. In recognition of the difficulty convening groups during the past year and a half, as well as the critical need to draw opinions from a diverse range of Angelenos, the plan employed innovative techniques including the sampling of public opinion through a statistically valid survey (SVS), an online survey tool and videos. The public was asked about specific potential policies and programs and made aware of the trade-offs associated with them. Overall, the Concepts received broad support from members of the public and Task Force, but opinions varied on ways to address them more specifically. Strategies that received strong support in this phase have been reflected in the Plan, including the prioritization of public land and new models for affordable housing production and acquisition (Programs 15, 16 and 30 respectively), as well as the potential for innovative housing typologies like small lots, micro units and coliving and community land trusts to ensure long term affordability (Programs 3, 62, ane 4 respectively). Other community members discussed concerns with the availability of public facilities and services to support significant amounts of new housing and to balance production with other citywide quality of life and sustainability goals. A program to comprehensively evaluate infrastructure needs associated with growth was added to Program 50 and the plan includes many updated policies and programs associated with the ways the production and maintenance of housing can also support goals around tree canopy preservation, parks, sustainable use of building materials, conservation, disaster resilience, good urban design, etc. (see Programs 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, etc). Commenters also stressed the importance of participation in plans for new housing, particularly more vulnerable communities of color, leading to several policies around inclusive outreach and education (Policies 1.1.10, 1.3.3, 2.2.5).

Draft and Adoption Phase


The Departments of City Planning and the Los Angeles Housing Department will continue the effort to maintain and broaden public engagement and participation during the current draft phase. The Housing Element was discussed at meetings of the City Council Housing Committee and Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee in June 2021.

The City held virtual Citywide workshops on July 8 and July 13, 2021 to accompany release of the Public Draft Housing Element. The workshop included a 45 minute presentation on the proposed elements of the draft and rezoning program, followed by over an hour of Q&A. Workshop materials were translated and interpretation services provided in Spanish. 353 individuals attended the webinars which were also streamed on Facebook Live. Over 176 comments/questions were submitted during the two

webinars. To better gauge public support for the City's rezoning strategies, the presentation included two interactive text based polls that allowed both webinar and Facebook Live attendees to participate. Polling showed more than 92% (Chart ES.5 below) of participants surveyed supported more housing in higher opportunity areas. Attendees were also polled on how they would prioritize rezoning strategies such as rezoning commercial and residential corridors, industrial areas, areas near jobs and transit, public and religious land, and existing lower density residential areas to create opportunities for "missing middle" or lower-scale multifamily housing. Results on this prioritization varied between the two webinars, with generally strongest support for rezoning areas near jobs and transit and commercial and residential corridors.

This feedback directly informed the rezoning strategies outlined in Program 121 to prioritize rezoning in high opportunity areas, explore rezoning of corridors, areas near transit, public and faith based owned land, and explore missing middle strategies. Attendees also expressed concerns about the impacts of rezoning in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) and on Historic Resources. As such sites in VHFHSZ were not included within the rezoning program and Historic Resources were generally excluded, with exceptions for programs that include protections and incentives for historic resources such as the Adaptive Reuse Strategy, and Community Plan Updates.

Chart ES.5: **Should the City Focus the Majority of its Rezoning in High Opportunity Areas?**



Webinar survey taken July8, 2021 and July 13, 2021. Total Respondes 161.

Outside of the public meetings, written comments were submitted requesting modifications to the site's inventory assumptions for ADUs and pipeline data as well as general requests to increase the number of parcels included in the rezoning program to 300,000. Staff reviewed the assumptions in the inventory of and made minor corrections to ensure their accuracy. Overall, between the July draft and the September draft release the rezoning number increased from 220,000 to 252,415. Additionally, while a minimum of 252,415 units are required to be rezoned to meet the RHNA, the candidate sites for rezoning identified as part of the draft rezoning program far exceed the required minimum. Comments were also received requesting expanded analysis for cognitive disabilities in the Needs Assessment, this request was reflected in Chapter 1 and in Appendix 1.1.

In addition to traditional notification methods, City staff attended additional stakeholder and community-based meetings to share information about the Housing Element and how to provide input on the plan. Staff attended meetings with Plancheck NC, the Valley Commerce Association, Center City Association, and Los Angeles Business Council.

In order to effectively affirmatively further fair housing and effectively reach communities in a culturally-appropriate, language-inclusive manner, the City utilized Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) grant funding to support outreach across many housing efforts including the Housing Element Update and other strategies initiated by the City of Los Angeles to accelerate housing production and promote equity-based models for increasing affordable housing development.

In August 2021, Liberty Hill Foundation conducted focus groups across four different communities in the City to gather feedback on the Draft Housing Element Plan released in July 2021. Participants were majority renters who reside in the communities of South LA, Pico Union, Westlake, Boyle Heights, Skid Row/Downtown, East Hollywood and North Hollywood. The curriculum, based on the Draft Housing Element, was developed for the program and organizations leading each focus group were encouraged to tailor the presentations to respond to the socioeconomic and geographic context for each neighborhood. The report outlining feedback and recommendations from participants on the Draft Housing Element Plan can be found in Appendix 0.1.

Additional opportunities for feedback occured through virtual public hearings for the Housing Element, Safety Element and Health Element on September 21st and 22nd, 2021. These hearings were conducted in both English and Spanish. A total of 67 people provided verbal comments with about 200 members of the public in attendance.

While there was a wide range of comments and concerns raised during the public hearing, key themes were identified and are presented below.

Several of the public comments reiterated the public need for the Housing Element to reinforce tenant protections, specifically in relation to eviction protection and education to facilitate greater understanding of tenant rights. The City will be exploring and studying ways to increase tenant protections, provide additional education and

outreach, and strengthen replacement requirements and right to return policies. As part of this effort, the City will continue to identify and seek funding to support enhanced tenant rights' enforcement and housing preservation and production.

Additionally, comments urged the City of Los Angeles to acknowledge its history of land use injustices and commit to center efforts around reversing racist land use designations. In response the City included a new program in the Housing Element to conduct a Historic Land Use Study to document the legacy of exclusionary and discriminatory land use and housing decisions in Los Angeles to inform future policies and programs (Program 130).

Many speakers from a local group requested that the Housing Element consider adding a program called the "Livable Communities Initiative," which was described as a way to better integrate planning for housing and transit in tandem on select corridors to include better mobility options and sustainability features along with upzoning for mixed-use and mixed-income housing. To reflect the importance of connecting housing to the public realm and mobility options, a new Program 131 Livable Communities Initiative has been added to the proposed Housing Element.

Comments were also raised in regards to the City's proposed Rezoning Program (121), specifically urging the City to address disparities in the distribution of housing opportunities and promote anti-displacement and protective measures for vulnerable and at-risk communities. The Rezoning Program emphasizes focusing on Higher Opportunity Areas and protection of vulnerable communities, including areas at risk of displacement and environmentally sensitive areas. The AFFH analysis of the Inventory of Candidate Sites for Rezoning (see Chapter 4) concludes the program will affirmatively further fair housing and create a more equitable set of land use regulations for the City.

Comments were also received requesting additional policies and programs that ensure the Housing Element supports place-based strategies in disinvested areas, including affordable housing and health promoting strategies. In response, a new Policy 4.3.2 was added as follows:

- Policy 4.3.2: Advance place based strategies that create opportunities and financial strength in areas of disinvestment and with a history of predatory financial practices through asset-building shared equity homeownership that creates stability and mitigates displacement pressures through community control.

In response to comments relating to persons with disabilities, a number of updates were made, including a revisions to the the program relating to Accommodations for Persons with Disabilities (Program 82) to include a new objective to revise the City Planning Reasonable Accommodation Form as suggested. Also language relating to persons with mental disabilities was revised to specify developmentally and intellectually disabled persons, including in Objective 4.1 and Program 11 and 18.

Common concerns raised included the need for more affordable housing with equitable distribution across the City of Los Angeles, including in high resource areas; going further with addressing climate change and environmental justice; and the implementation of a comprehensive fair share re-zoning strategy. Additional common public comment topics included consideration of community displacement and housing affordability, and infrastructure to support anticipated housing growth.

The majority of public comments pertained to the Housing Element, but topics related to the Safety and Health Elements including climate change, environmental justice, and limiting or prohibiting development in flood prone areas or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

Housing Element Task Force

A core contributor and guide throughout the update process of the Housing Element has been the Task Force. This 63-member Task Force is composed of a diverse group of housing professionals and community leaders, who were selected from over 280 applicants. This group assisted the City in evaluating the viability and impact of potential new and updated policies related to housing preservation and production, tenants' rights, homelessness prevention, zoning as it relates to housing matters, and other important housing-related issues.

The Task Force has four subcommittees representing different themes and needs within the Housing Element:

- Housing Stability and Tenure
- Housing Production and Construction Innovation
- Livability, Sustainability, and Resilience
- Homelessness and Special Needs

As previously mentioned, the Task Force has provided their input throughout the outreach phases of the update. The first Task Force meeting was held in January 2020, for members to share ideas for the 2021-2029 Housing Element update. In April, May, and July of 2020, staff hosted 12 subcommittee meetings to review and discuss:

- Feedback and key themes that emerged from community outreach events
- Visioning ideas for housing security, accessibility, production, and livability

- Existing housing constraints, such as land use and zoning, entitlement and permitting processes, financing, construction costs, and housing opposition
- The RHNA site selection methodology
- Current housing related policies and potential implementation programs
- Other topic areas and data for potential study

The full Task Force was convened again in October 2020 to begin reviewing draft themes and Concepts for the Housing Element Update. To help inform the Site Selection process, staff held a working group meeting for the Task Force members in November 2020. In July 2021 a full Task Force meeting was held to review the draft Housing Element and the Inventory of Adequate Sites.

The Housing Element benefited greatly from sustained and detailed input from the Housing Element Task Force. Early on several Task Force members, along with public comments, focused on the importance of the Inventory of Sites methodology in establishing an accurate baseline of existing zoning capacity to ensure the City can be in the best position to understand actions needed to meet the RHNA. These comments, along with changes in state law, influenced the decision to use an econometric (regression) model to evaluate realistic likelihood of developments based on past production trends. Task Force members also emphasized the equitable distribution of housing and how the Housing Element should establish a methodology to distribute local housing targets to communities based on citywide policy. This concept was incorporated in Program 49 - Targeted Zoning Allocations by Community Plan Area. Task Force members like ACT-LA, a coalition of housing and transportation justice advocates, wrote detailed comment letters with dozens of detailed policy and program prescriptions, emphasizing the need to balance production with deeper community benefits, more tenant protections and the preservation of affordable housing. The vast majority of these strategies have been reflected, in one way or another, in the Plan.



Housing Needs Assessment

Introduction

This chapter contains a comprehensive assessment of the various factors that influence and affect the City's housing needs. Understanding the unique housing needs of the City is vital to the development of housing policies and programs that further the City's housing goals for all residents.

The assessment of housing needs takes stock of the factors that illustrate the existing housing needs in Los Angeles, as well as those that help us identify and plan for future trends. The chapter is organized into the following topic areas:

- Population Characteristics (age, race, ethnicity, special needs, including the unhoused)
- Household Characteristics (household size and composition, tenure and ownership)
- Income and Employment Trends (median income, labor market characteristics, unemployment)
- Housing Stock Characteristics (building typologies, bedroom size, building age)
- Housing Costs and Overcrowding and Tenure (cost burden, overcrowding rates)
- Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Among other findings, this analysis indicates that the City's residents experience the highest rates of housing cost burdens and overcrowding in the nation, one of the lowest homeownership rates, and the rapid loss of existing lower-rent housing. These trends are being compounded by demographic and employment factors such as rapid aging of the population, the continued prevalence of poverty, and low-wage employment.

Data Sources And Select Terminology

This assessment is based on analyses of information from a variety of sources, but primarily the US Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) 2019 5-Year estimates. Where otherwise unsourced, the ACS can be presumed to be the data source. The use of ACS 5-year estimates instead of 1-Year estimates is due to their increased statistical reliability and availability. However, the reader should note the limits of the ACS-based analysis because 5-Year estimates may not reflect the most current trends since they include data that was collected over the five years prior.[1] This analysis was prepared prior to the release of the 2020 Census data, and as such does not include 2020 data in the analysis.

To properly analyze the varying housing needs of the City's residents and to acknowledge the long-term housing effects of discriminatory policies, it is essential to examine race and ethnicity. New statutory requirements (Government Code Section 65583(c)(10)) added by AB 686 (2018) also call for a more thorough analysis of race and ethnicity data than previous Housing Elements. Sources such as the US Census rely on the term "Hispanic" to refer to people who speak Spanish, however in the City of Los Angeles, most people of Latin American descent self-identify as "Latino(a)." Throughout the document, we will use the gender-neutral and inclusive term "Latinx."

1. US Census Bureau. Understanding and Using ACS Data: What State and Local Government Users Need to Know: Considerations When Working With ACS Data. August 2020: Page 4. https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2020/acs/acs_state_local_handbook_2020.pdf




Population Characteristics

Population

Since its inception, the City of Los Angeles has remained a growing city. Overall, the City's population has increased by 42.6% since the 1970s. The 2019 ACS 5-year estimate reported a population of 3,966,366. While data from the 2020 decennial census was not available at the time of this document preparation, the City has grown faster this decade than the prior and is forecast to increase considerably faster in the following decades (see Char 1.1t). Specifically, the Southern California Association of Governments expects the City of Los Angeles population to grow by 8.15% during the 2020-2030 time period, with a population estimate of 4,337,394 residents in the City by the end of the Housing Element Cycle (2029). Chart 1.1 illustrates past population growth trends, current forecasts and future growth projections.


Chart 1.1: **Total Population Growth in Los Angeles | 1970-2045**



*Source: *US Decennial Census - Population Characteristics 1970-2010; **CA Department of Finance - 2020 Population Estimates; ***SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS - Demographic and Growth Forecast*

Map 1.1 shows the distribution of population increases in neighborhoods throughout the City of Los Angeles. Within the City, the fastest growing Community Plan areas are Central City and Central City North, followed by Chatsworth-Porter Ranch and Westchester-Playa Del Rey. The areas with negative growth since 2010 include the Bel Air-Beverly Crest, Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon, Venice and West Adams Community Plan areas. The 2010-2019 figures reverse some of the trends of the prior decade, which saw population declines in the central and eastern areas of the City and most growth occurring in the San Fernando Valley. Though still, nearly half of citywide population growth since 2010 has been in the Valley.




Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Northridge
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Santa Monica Mountains
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
East LA
Monterey Park
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
Vernon
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Pacific Ocean
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Compton
Manhattan Beach
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 1.1
2010-2019 Population Change Map
No Data
Increase (20% or more)
Increase (10% - 20%)
Increase (0% - 10%)
Decrease (0% - 10%)
Decrease (10% - 20%)
Decrease (20% or more)
N
0
5
10
Miles

Age

As the City's population increases, the age distribution range significantly affects the housing needs of the City's residents. For example, an aging population generally signals the need for more senior housing, while growing numbers of children and young families would point to the need for more family housing.

The City's population of people over the age of 60 continues to grow, and is estimated to continue to grow over the next few decades. Between 2010 and 2019, the City's population over 60 years old went from 14.3% to 17.6%, representing an increase of approximately 29.3% in the last decade (see Table 1.1). In contrast, the population of people under 19 years of age has decreased by 8.5% since 2010. This indicates a decline in families in the City which may be due to a scarcity of affordable housing options for families, in addition to trends towards fewer children.


The City's median age continues to increase. In 2019 it was 35.4, whereas in 2010, the median age was 33.7. This compares to a national median age of 38.1, up from 36.9. This indicates that the City's population is still relatively young compared to the rest of the country, but is aging at a faster rate. Some neighborhoods in the City have higher numbers of seniors (65+) population, as indicated in Map 1.2 , particularly in the Valley, hillside areas and northeast and southwest LA.



Table 1.1: **Population Change by Age Group, 2010-2019**

Age	**2010** ACS 5 Year Estimate	**2010** Percent of Population	**2019** ACS 5 Year Estimate	**2019** Percent of Population	**2010-2019** Percent Change
Under 5 years	256,940	6.8%	234,263	5.9%	-8.8%
5 to 9 years	236,291	6.3%	225,139	5.7%	-4.7%
10 to 14 years	247,215	6.6%	226,079	5.7%	-8.5%
15 to 19 years	273,419	7.2%	241,773	6.1%	-11.6%
20 to 24 years	304,368	8.1%	301,667	7.6%	-0.9%
25 to 34 years	643,125	17.0%	717,319	18.1%	11.5%
35 to 44 years	578,461	15.3%	569,174	14.3%	-1.6%
45 to 54 years	496,185	13.2%	521,846	13.2%	5.2%
55 to 59 years	196,508	5.2%	231,743	5.8%	17.9%
60 to 64 years	154,190	4.1%	206,335	5.2%	33.8%
65 to 74 years	200,155	5.3%	277,893	7.0%	38.8%
75 to 84 years	131,198	3.5%	144,289	3.6%	10.0%
85 years & up	54,431	1.4%	69,416	1.7%	27.5%


Sources: Us Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 And 2010 Acs 5-Year Estimates, Table Dp05; <Https://Data.census.gov/Cedsci/>


Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Northridge
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Santa Monica Mountains
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Monterey Park
East LA
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
Vernon
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Pacific Ocean
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 1.2
65 and Over Change Map
No Data
0% - 5%
5.1% - 10%
10.1% - 15%
15.1% - 20%
20.1% - 55%
N
0
5
10
Miles

Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration

The City of Los Angeles has a diverse population, with the majority of the population identifying as people of color. Latinx residents make up the largest demographic of the City's population with 1,922,889 persons (48.6%), followed by White residents, who make up over a quarter of the population at 28.5%. Asians make up 11.5% of the population, followed by Black or African Americans at 8.5% of the population, and Native Americans, Pacific Islanders and those who identify as Other make up the remaining 2.8%.

Chart 1.2: **Race and Ethnicity Demographics in Los Angeles**




Source: US Census Bureau ; American Community Survey; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates,Table DP05



Chart 1.3 shows the racial and ethnic breakdown of the City over four decades (1990-2019). Since 2000 there has been a significant decline in the percent of the City's Black population (-15%) and increases among Asian (25%), Latinx (12%) and White populations (3%). Over the last decade, trends have stabilized, with more modest changes among racial and ethnic populations between 2010-2019.

Chart 1.3: **Change in Race and Ethnicity | 1990-2019**



Source: US Census ACS 5-Year Estimates, 2019

Much of the City's diversity is due to immigration. Table 1.2 shows that while the foreign-born population of the City is significant at 36.9%, it did decline by 2.74% between 2010 and 2019. This decline is at odds with the continued nationwide growth in foreign-born population, which increased by about five million (or about 1%) over the same period.

Nonetheless, Latin America and Asia continue to be the main geographies of origin for the City's foreign-born population. However, immigration from Latin America has decreased by approximately 3% while immigration from Asia has increased by approximately 2%, and now represents the fastest growing population of foreign-born residents nationally.

Table 1.2: **U.S. and Foreign-born Population in Los Angeles 2010-2019**

	2010 Population	**2010** Percent of Population	**2019** Population	**2019** Percent of Population	**2010-2019** Percentage Change
US Born	2,277,540	60.4%	2,504,590	63.1%	2.7%
Foreign Born	1,494,946	39.6%	1,462,346	36.9%	-2.7%

Sources: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table DP02



The City of Los Angeles also has a notable population of undocumented immigrants. In 2019, there were 412,522 undocumented persons living in the City, which is equivalent to 10% of the population. The chart shows that most of this population has been living in the City for over 10 years. Being undocumented can affect a household's access to housing and stability. For example, undocumented immigrants are restricted from the following types of federal housing assistance programs: Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers, Section 8, Project-Based housing, and certain affordable housing developments built utilizing certain grant programs. With the rescission of the Trump-era Mixed-Status rule, which dramatically restricted access to critical assistance programs for families with one or more undocumented household members, families with U.S.-born or documented children can participate in housing assistance programs. Nonetheless, many immigrant households remain hesitant to participate in government programs because of Department of Homeland Security's or Department of State's public charge policies, which may impact individuals' ability to apply for legal residency in the future.

Table 1.3: **2018 Undocumented Immigrant Population in the City of Los Angeles**

Time Living in US	Number	Percentage
10 Years of Less	124,644	30.2%
11-20 Years	172,944	41.9%
21-30 Years	96,139	23.3%
30 Years of More	18,795	4.6%
Total Undocumented Population	**412,522**	**100%**

Source: California Immigration Data Portal: City of LA. Composition of the immigrant population by recency of arrival: Los Angeles; 2018.
Note: The California Immigrant Data Portal is an organization that utilizes micro-data from recent US Census 5-Year ACS estimates retrieved from IPUMS USA to provide estimates on the number of undocumented residents in major cities of the US.

Income and Employment

Employment and income play an important role in determining the City's housing needs. Due to the high costs of housing, jobs with higher wages provide greater housing opportunities; while low-paying jobs and access to employment limit housing options.

Jobs in the City of Los Angeles account for approximately 40.6% of all employment in the County (see Table 1.4). The City's civilian labor force consists of persons aged 16 and over who are either working or actively looking for work. Approximately 66.6% of the City's population is in the civilian labor force, up slightly from 66.5% in 2010.[2]

2. Source: US Census Bureau; ACS; 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, TableID S2301..



Table 1.4: **Comparison of LA City and LA County Employment**

Jurisdiction	Employment Numbers	LA City's Employment Share
Los Angeles County	4,459,100	40.6%
Los Angeles City	1,811,600	

Sources: California Employment and Development Department. Labor Force and Unemployment Rate for Cities and Census Designated Places: Annual Averages Historical Data. 2020. https://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/labor-force-and-unemployment-for-cities-and-census-areas.html#CCD

The 2019 ACS 5-year Estimate median annual household income in the City is $62,142, which represents an approximate increase of 26.5% from the 2010 median annual household income estimate of $49,138. Despite this percentage increase, Table 1.5 shows that the City's median household income is still less than that of the County, the State, and the Nation.

Table 1.5: **Median Annual Household Income**

Jurisdiction	2010 ACS 5-Year Estimate	2019 ACS 5-Year Estimate
City of LA	$49,138	$62,142
County of LA	$55,476	$68,044
State of California	$60,883	$75,235
National	$51,914	$62,843

Sources: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table DP02

In determining housing needs, households are generally grouped into five income categories: extremely low-income (ELI), very low-income (VL), low income (Low), moderate-income (Mod), and above moderate-income (Above Mod). These income categories are used by federal, state and local agencies, with some variations, for various funding and incentive programs. Table 1.6 shows the definitions of these categories and the household distribution across the categories for the City.

Table 1.6: **2021 US HUD Income Limits for Households, Los Angeles County**

Income Limit Category	Persons in Family			
	1	2	3	4
Extremely Low Income	$24,850	$28,400	$31,950	$35,450
Very Low Income	$41,400	$47,300	$53,200	$59,100
Low Income	$66,250	$75,700	$85,150	$94,600

Source: US Housing and Urban Development, 2021



The top 5 projected occupations through 2028 in the County all have a median income of less than $31,250, indicating wages are not keeping up with the cost of living in Los Angeles. For example, the occupation with the most job openings (personal care aides) earns a median annual wage of only $24,491, meaning they could only comfortably afford spending approximately $600 a month in rent. This signals an urgent need for housing that is affordable to residents earning such low wages given the City's service-based economy.


Table 1.7: **Top Five Projected Job Openings in Los Angeles County, 2018-2028**

Occupation	Job Openings	Median Income
Personal Care Aides	442,830	$24,491*
Combined Food Preparation and Serving Workers, Including Fast Food	221,570	$24,008*
Cashiers	212,980	$29,362
Retail Salespersons	166,200	$31,221
Waiters and Waitresses	163,210	$29,097

Source: California Employment and Development Department. 2018-2028 Local Employment Projections Highlights: LA County.

**Data retrieved from 2016-2026 projections due to unavailable data for 2018-2028 projections.*

Higher median annual household incomes tend to be concentrated in the western areas of the City, while lower median annual household incomes tend to be concentrated in the central, eastern and southern areas of the City. The median annual household income disparity in the City is geographically illustrated in Map 1.3.



MAP 1.3

Median Household Income By Census Tract Change Map

- No Data
- $30000 and below
- $ 30,001 - 60,000
- $ 60,001 - 90,000
- $ 90,001 - 120,000
- $120,000 and above

N

0 5 10

Miles

Table 1.8 shows the wide variation of incomes present in the City and highlights the high percentage of households with very low incomes. About 22% of the City's households earn less than $25,000 a year and 42% of all households make less than $50,000 a year.

Table 1.8: **Household Incomes in the City of Los Angeles**

Income	2019 Percentage of Population
$10,000 to $14,999	5.8%
$15,000 to $24,999	9.3%
$25,000 to $34,999	8.7%
$35,000 to $49,999	11.5%
$50,000 to $74,999	15.4%
$75,000 to $99,999	11.4%
$100,000 to $149,999	14.4%
$150,000 to $199,999	6.9%
$200,000 or more	10.0%

Sources: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table DP02



According to the California Economic Development Department (EDD), as of April 2021 the City's current unemployment rate is 10.9%.[3] In February of 2020, before the COVID-19 pandemic, the unemployment rate had been steadily falling to 4.6%, while during June 2020 the rate had spiked to nearly 20%. The unemployment rate in the City of Los Angeles, LA County and the State are presented in Table 1.9 . Generally, the City has had slightly higher unemployment rates compared to the State but appears to be recovering slightly better than the County as a whole.

Table 1.9: **Effects of Covid-19 Pandemic on Unemployment**

Month	City of LA	County of LA	State
Feb 2020	4.6%	4.6%	4.3%
Jun 2020	19.8%	19.5%	15.1%
April 2021	10.9%	11.7%	8.5%

California Employment and Development Department. Labor Force and Unemployment Rate for Cities and Census Designated Places: Annual Averages Historical Data. 2020 and 2021. https://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/labor-force-and-unemployment-for-cities-and-census-areas.html#CCD

This employment data indicates that many residents in the City will continue to struggle to keep up with the City's high cost of living. The region is burdened by having extremely high housing costs in relation to incomes. The City of Los Angeles has median incomes similar to more economically depressed cities like Cleveland but has some of the highest housing costs in the country (see for more on cost burden trends). Trends towards increasing low-wage service sector jobs in the region will greatly affect the demand for housing, in particular affordable housing.

3. CA Employment Development Department, May 21, 2021 release; Seasonally unadjusted.

Household Characteristics

This section analyzes household formation and household characteristics, which are both very important to consider planning for housing. A household may be composed of single individuals, families, unrelated individuals, or combinations thereof, each of which have different needs. The analysis highlights trends towards smaller household sizes and non-family composition, continued movement towards rentals and away from ownership, as well as a "missing middle" in terms of both new building scale and affordability. This section also identifies the housing needs and characteristics of persons with special needs, including the unhoused, to better understand the varying housing needs of the City's diverse population.

Household Formation

Household formation (sometimes called "headship rate") measures the rate in which new households are being formed in relation to population growth. Household formation is an important housing indicator as the inability to form a new household indicates a lack of adequate affordable supply. Household formation has been declining in the Southern California region for many years, with younger Angelenos increasingly unable to afford their own housing. Relatedly, many households who historically would have been able to purchase a home or condo are being forced to remain in the rental market which adds pressure as more higher income households compete for limited rentals.[4]

There are approximately 1,383,869 households in the City. This represents an almost 5.0% increase over the approximately 1,318,168 households in 2010. This rate of household growth has largely kept up with population growth (4.7%) in the prior decade; However, there remains a significant longstanding regional deficit that creates systemic problems with regards to housing formation. For example, there are more than 75,000 more Angelenos aged 25-34 in 2019 than in 2010 but 5,000 fewer heads of household in this key age group that is usually at the forefront of starting new households.

4. Myers, Dowell, Ph.D., "Housing Interconnections in Los Angeles: Shortages, Affordability, and Displacement." Population Dynamics Research Group, Sol Price School of Public Policy, University of Southern California, October 2019. https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/sites.usc.edu/dist/6/210/files/2020/04/Haynes-Final-Report-USC-Housing-Interconnections-submitted-100919.pdf

Household Composition and Size

Family sizes have become smaller since 2010, with almost 90,000 additional one and two person households in 2019, and about 43,000 fewer five and more person households (see Table 1.10). Approximately 30% of households consist of one-person, 29% are two-person, 15% are three-person and 26% of households have four or more persons. Smaller household sizes are a result of many social phenomena including the general forbearance of marriage and children. The United States has experienced a gradual decline in its fertility rate since the Great Recession.[5]

Table 1.10: **Number of Persons in Household, 2010-2019**


Number of Persons in Household	**2010** Number of Households	**2019** Number and Percentage of Households	**2019** Percentage of all Households	**2010-2019** Difference in the Number of Households
1 Person	373,529	418,680	30%	45,151
2 Person	356,194	399,841	29%	43,647
3 Person	200,443	212,742	15%	12,299
4 Person	174,043	180,936	13%	6,893
5 Person	101,385	94,650	7%	-6,735
6 Person	52,087	41,370	3%	-10,717
7 or More	60,487	35,650	3%	-24,837

Sources: US Census Bureau; ACS; 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B25009

5. "With a potential 'baby bust' on the horizon, key facts about fertility in the U.S. before the pandemic," Pew Research Center, May 7, 2021. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/05/07/with-a-potential-baby-bust-on-the-horizon-key-facts-about-fertility-in-the-u-s-before-the-pandemic/#:~:text=The%20general%20fertility%20rate%20in,which%20the%20fertility%20rate%20declined

A “family” is defined by the Census as a household made up of two or more people living together who are related by blood, marriage, or adoption, one of whom is the Head of Household. A “non-family household” consists of a person living alone or a householder who shares the home with non-relatives only, such as roommates. As shown in Chart 1.4 , married couple families constitute approximately 38% of all households, followed by people living alone (30%), other families (21%) and other non-family households (10%). Non-family households have increased slightly since 2010, from 39% to 40% from 2010 to 2018.

Chart 1.4: **Household Type**



Source: US Census Bureau ; American Community Survey; 2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates,Table B11001




Owner and Renter Households

The vast majority of households in the City rent the homes they live in. About 868,282 households (approximately 63%) in the City rent their housing units, while approximately 505,582 households (approximately 37%) own their homes.

Changes in tenure have disproportionately affected younger Angelenos. From 2010 to 2019, the share of homeowners age 45 dropped dramatically, by over 25%. It's important to note that this 25% decline did not translate to any increase of renters under age 45 (see Chart 1.5). This indicates that most young people cannot afford to create a household in the City and may be more likely to migrate out to other cities or states, or to live with parents or family. These changes affecting younger residents are largely due to housing cost and availability.[6]

Chart 1.5: **Change in Tenure by Age | 2010-2019**



Sources: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05.

6. How Do Shortages Lead to Dislodgement and Disappearing Renters? (Housing Research Brief 6) by Dowell Myers and JungHo Park, August 2019, USC Sol Price School of Public Policy.

Households with Special Needs

Housing is not equally accessible for all residents throughout the City. Elderly, disabled individuals (including those with developmental disabilities), female-headed households, large families (5 or more persons), farmworkers, and homeless households often face significant barriers in obtaining affordable and accessible housing suitable to their specific needs. Residents in these special needs categories are also sometimes subjected to explicit housing discrimination and face unique housing challenges, also due to other zoning and regulatory barriers impacting access to housing and opportunity. Therefore state Housing Element law requires an analysis of the housing needs of people who have special needs. Significant portions of the City's population and households fall under this category, as indicated by Table 1.11.

Table 1.11: **Special Needs Populations, City of Los Angeles**

	Persons	Households
Seniors (65+)	491,598	281,001
Seniors with Disabilities	179,493	N/A
Non-Seniors with Disabilities (16-64)	217,738	N/A
Large Families (5 or More Persons)	N/A	172,811
Single Female-Headed Households w/ Related Children	N/A	111,054
Persons Living with HIV/AIDS	N/A	N/A
Homeless Persons	41,290**	N/A
Farm Workers	6,621	N/A

*Source: ACS 5-Year Estimate, 2019; * 2009 Estimate by AIDS Coordinator Office, City of Los Angeles; ** 2020 LAHSA Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count*

Senior-Headed Households

As mentioned earlier, the City's population is aging, and addressing the growing housing needs of seniors is imperative. For the purposes of this Housing Element, seniors include persons aged 65 years or older. The housing needs of seniors are particularly challenging and require special attention because of the combination of fixed incomes, varying physical and sensory disabilities, and mobility/transportation limitations, all of which limit access to appropriate, accessible, and affordable housing. Seniors comprise approximately 12% of the City's population (491,598 people), and nearly 20% of all households citywide (281,001) are headed by seniors. Over 44% of these households are seniors who live alone while the rest are households composed of senior heads of households living with other person(s). Over 58% (160,860) of seniors live in owner-occupied housing, while 42% (117,104) are renters.

Table 1.12: **Senior Households by Tenure and Age**


	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied	Total
65-74 Years	88,303	69,687	**157,990**
75 Plus Years	72,557	50,454	**123,011**
Total	**160,860**	**117,104**	**277,964**

Source: US Census Bureau; ACS; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B25007



Of the City's 281,001 senior-headed households, approximately 34% earned less than $25,000 and 61% earned less than $60,000. However, the proportion of seniors living the federally-defined poverty level is lower than that of the total city population. Approximately 16% of the City's seniors were living the poverty level, compared to 19% of the City's working-age population (18-64) who live the poverty line.

Chart 1.6: **Senior Housing Income Distribution in the City of Los Angeles | 2019**



Sources: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05.

The percentage of adults over the age of 55 who are renting has increased much faster than the percentage owning. While the percentage of older adult homeowners has increased by approximately 15%, the percentage of older adult renters has increased by nearly 30%. This indicates rising demand for appropriate and accessible senior rental housing.

Cost Burdens for Seniors

Due to these lower incomes, seniors generally face a greater housing cost burden. Households that pay 30% or more of their monthly income for rent or for owning a home are deemed "cost-burdened," and those that pay 50% or more on rent or mortgage payments are "severely cost-burdened" (a deeper analysis of cost burden is provided later in this chapter). Of senior heads of households who are renters, nearly 65% pay more than 30% of their income on rent. This is a higher rate of rent burden than any other age group, except those between 18 and 24 years of age.

Cost burden is lower among senior homeowners, however still significant. More than 38% of senior homeowners spend over 30% of their income on owner-related housing costs. Households headed by seniors who own their home may face physical and financial barriers in maintaining their properties or retrofitting them to accommodate mobility limitations. Additionally, many senior-headed homeowners in the City are "home-rich and cash-poor," which means they have significant home equity but little income or savings. These seniors are often specifically targeted for reverse mortgages and other predatory home loans, which undermines long-term housing security for them and their families.

Persons with Disabilities

A disability is defined by the Federal Government as "a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of such an individual." (42 U.S.C. § 12102). People with disabilities, which include but are not limited to physical, sensory, or mental health disabilities, often require special housing accommodations. on the prevalence of certain disability types including hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, cognitive difficulty, ambulatory difficulty, self-care difficulty, and independent living difficulty. This data may not capture other psychiatric disabilities or conditions like schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, or post traumatic stress, all of which can severely impact a person's ability to find and maintain housing. Based on the data collected by the Census Bureau, approximately 10% or 395,513 people in Los Angeles have a disability and live in a non-institutional setting. The largest numbers of persons with disabilities are adults aged 18 – 64 (192,460); however the percentage of seniors with disabilities (37%) is far greater than the percentage of non-senior adults with disabilities (7%).

The most common disabilities for people between 18 and 64, are ambulatory difficulties (serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs), cognitive difficulties (due to physical, mental, or emotional condition, having difficulty remembering, concentrating, or making decisions), and vision or hearing difficulties (deaf or having serious difficulty hearing, blind or having serious difficulty seeing, even when wearing glasses). For people over the age of 65, the most common disabilities are ambulatory, vision and hearing difficulties, living independently and difficulties providing self-care, see Table 1.13 . The Census defines people with independent living difficulties as those who need assistance with errands, such as visiting a doctor's office or shopping, due to a physical,

mental, or emotional issue. Similarly, difficulty with self-care is defined as having difficulty bathing or dressing.

Table 1.13 below shows the prevalence of each types of disability among the total population of each age group and among the overall population in the City.

Table 1.13: **Prevalence of Disability by Age and Type of Disability**

Type of Disability	% of the total population under 18	% of the total population Aged 18-64	% of the total population Aged 65+	% of the total population
Hearing Difficulty (Conditions that include blindness or a severe hearing impairment)	0.5	1.2	12.9	2.5
Vision Difficulty (Conditions that include deafness or a severe vision impairment)	0.6	1.6	7.6	2.1
Ambulatory Difficulty (any conditions that limits physical activities such as walking, climbing, stairs, reaching, lifting or carrying)	0.6	3.4	25.61	5.9
Cognitive Difficulty (Any condition that makes it difficult to learn, remember, or concentrate)	3.09	3.5	11.7	4.2
Self-Care Difficulty (Any condition that makes it difficult to dress, bathe, or get around inside the home)	1.1	1.5	12.5	2.8
Independent Living Difficulty (Any condition that makes it difficult to go outside the home alone or visit a doctor's office)	No data available	2.6	19.8	5.2

Source: US Census Bureau: ACS: 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Table S1810

According to the 2012-2017 HUD CHAS Data, approximately 58% of the people with disabilities in the city rent, compared to 65% of people without disabilities. The rate of renters differs slightly by disability type with 55% of people with hearing or vision impairments renting, 58% of people with ambulatory limitations, 61% with cognitive limitations, and 58% with self-care or independent living limitations. Although people with disabilities are slightly less likely to rent than the overall population, they are more likely to be low-income and have higher rates of poverty than Angelenos without disabilities. For example, 35% of Angelenos with a disability are considered extremely low-income (earning 30% or less of the area median income) and 26% live below the federal poverty line.

People with vision and/or hearing disabilities often have particular housing needs, and may need accessible signage, auditory alarms, and service animal accommodations to access their housing. People with hearing disabilities, for example, may need visual alerts and accommodations to enable effective communication. Persons with physical or ambulatory disabilities often require housing with accessible features, such as ramps, grab-bars, and wider doorways. For more information on the housing affordability and accessibility needs of people with disabilities refer to the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Appendix. For more information on housing constraints for persons with disabilities refer to Appendix 2.1.

Persons with Developmental Disabilities

A developmental disability is defined by the State as "a disability that originates before an individual attains age 18 years, continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual. This includes developmental and intellectual disability, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism." In California, a system of regional centers is responsible for coordinating the delivery of supportive services primarily to individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. There are seven centers that serve LA County- The Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center, The Harbor Regional Center, The North Los Angeles County Regional Center, The South Central Los Angeles Regional Center, and the East Los Angeles Regional Center. Based on the 2020 data reported by the seven Regional Centers, approximately 114,000 residents received services of whom approximately 46% had autism, 38% had mild or moderate intellectual disabilities, 12% had cerebral palsy, 12% had epilepsy, and 9% had a severe or profound intellectual disability. Considering the City accounts for approximately 40% of the County's population, approximately an estimated 46,000 people with developmental disabilities live within the City boundaries.

Table 1.14: **Number of People Served by Regional Centers in Los Angeles County**

	Total	Percent
Moderate Intellectual Disability	43,153	37.85%
Autism	51,921	45.54%
Epilepsy	12,772	11.20%
Cerebral Palsy	13,053	11.45%
Severe/Profound Intellectual Disability	9,843	8.63%
Total	**114,000**	

Source: data from the 2020 Regional Performance Contract Reports filed with the Department of Developmental Services for the seven Regional Centers located in LA County

Of the people with developmental disabilities served by the Regional Centers, the vast majority (82%) live with parents or guardians and only 9% live in Community or Intermediate Care Facilities. Parents and guardians who care for people with disabilities are often unable to work full-time and may have to prioritize the cost of needed healthcare and services. This presents significant financial constraints that may make it difficult to find affordable and adequate housing that can serve the needs of the person(s) with developmental disabilities and the needs of the overall household. For a more detailed analysis of the demographics and needs of people with disabilities refer to the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Appendix.

Table 1.15: **Living Arrangement of People with Developmental Disabilities in LA County**

	Number*	Percent
Live with Parent or Guardian	93,195	82%
Community Care Facility (CCF) or Intermediate Care Facility (ICF)	9,851	9%
Independent Living Skills (ILS)/ Supported Living Services (SLS)	7,548	7%
Foster Home	2,358	2%
Other	1,049	1%
Total	**114,000**	**100%**

** Estimates based on percentages reported in 2020 Regional Performance Contract Reports filed with the Department of Developmental Services for the seven Regional Centers located in LA County*

Persons with HIV/AIDS

For persons living with HIV/AIDS, access to safe, accessible and affordable housing is an important measure of overall well-being. For many, the shortage of such housing is a primary barrier to consistent medical care and treatment. According to the LA County Public Health's 2019 Annual HIV Surveillance Report, a total of 52,004 persons were living with a positive HIV diagnosis in Los Angeles County.[7] According to the 2018 Medical Monitoring Project's HIV Surveillance Special Report, four in ten persons with HIV lived in households at or the poverty threshold, and nearly one in 10 experienced homelessness.[8] Black men have the highest rates of HIV and the highest rates of homelessness in the City, which is reflective of the historic and ongoing impacts of systemic racism.

7. HIV Surveillance Annual Report 2019, Division of HIV and STD Programs, Department of Public Health, County of Los Angeles, May 19, 2020; Can be accessed here: http://www.publichealth.lacounty.gov/dhsp/Reports/HIV/2019Annual_HIV_Surveillance_Report_08202020_Final_revised_Sept2020.pdf

8. Centers for Disease Control

Large Households

Large households, defined as those with five or more persons, have special housing needs due to the lack of adequately sized and affordable housing. In 2019, there were 172,580 large family households, representing approximately 13% of total households in the City of Los Angeles. The majority of large households (98%) are family members living together, which could include multi-generational households. Since 2010, the number of large family households decreased by approximately 4% while the number of large non-family households increased by nearly 26%. These trends likely reflect the ongoing housing affordability crisis as larger units are increasingly occupied by adult roommates who typically have a combined household income greater than families, which may include children and elderly persons.

The trend towards more roommate housing arrangements exacerbates the shortage of appropriately-sized housing available to large families, particularly large families seeking rental housing. In 2019, only 12% (163,000) of combined renter- and owner-occupied units contained four or more bedrooms and only 30,000 of these were rentals.



Families with Female Heads of Households

Female-headed households also have specific housing needs given that they generally have lower incomes and higher living expenses, which could be attributed to the systemic gender pay gap that also varies greatly based on race and ethnicity. Female-headed households with minor children may also lack the resources needed for adequate child care or job training services, often making the search for affordable, decent and safe housing more difficult. In the City, there are over 477,000 female headed households, accounting for over 35% of all households. Of these households, over 111,000 households are caring for children (under 18) of relatives. Female Single Custodial Parent households tend to have lower incomes and higher rates of poverty.

Table 1.16: **Female Headed Household Types**

Type of Household	Total
Total Households	**1,373,864**
Total Female-Headed Households	**477,349**
Total Non-Family Households, Female Householder	**278,485**
Total Family Households, Female Householder	**198,864**
Female Heads with Related Children Under 18	**111,054**
Female Heads with Own Children Under 18	**90,658**

Source: US Census Bureau; ACS; 2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Tables B11003, B11004, B11005.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) Households

LGBTQ individuals and households also face higher rates of discrimination and homelessness, particularly transgender individuals, youth, and lower-income LGBTQ households. According to the 2020 LA City Point in Time Count, there are 666 individuals experiencing homelessness who identify as transgender, of whom 531 are unsheltered. The unsheltered rate among transgender homeless individuals is nearly double that of the overall unhoused population (43% compared to 80% respectively). This suggests that transgender people face significant barriers accessing emergency and temporary shelter, and experience serious challenges with housing instability. There are also 4,133 unhoused people who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or queer, and 2,015 (49%) are unsheltered. Service providers and LGBTQ advocacy organizations report that homelessness is particularly common among LGBTQ youth who may be forced out of their homes and have nowhere else to live.

Not all LGBTQ households face the same level of housing barriers. A 2015 statewide study by the Williams Institute at UCLA School of Law found that LGBTQ women, Latinx and Black households, and those who are also undocumented, are all more likely to be lower-income. Approximately 30% of LGBTQ females have incomes under $24,000 a year compared to 23% of males. Similarly, 36% of Latinx and 30% of Black LGBTQ persons have annual incomes lower than $24,000 compared to 15% of White LGBTQ persons. Race, gender, and income disparities within the LGBTQ community are often compounding factors that make finding and maintaining affordable and welcoming housing even more difficult.

Farmworkers


Farmworkers are defined by the Census as "agricultural workers and their supervisors," and represent a very small percentage of the City's total population. According to the Census, there are about 6,621 farmworkers employed in Los Angeles. This constitutes a very small portion of both the total jobs and workers in the City. Farmworkers generally receive much lower wages than other local occupations. Farmworkers and related laborers (agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting) in the City had an annual mean wage of $21,328 in 2019, according to the 2019 ACS. These wages severely limit housing options for farmworkers in Southern California's expensive housing market. Overcrowding and substandard housing conditions are often the only option.



Labor Arrangements for Farmworkers

The USDA 2017 Census of Agriculture documents the labor arrangements between farmworkers and producers, shedding light on their precarious working conditions. Only 39% of workers reported working over 150 days, or roughly 5 months. Approximately 34% of workers working less than 150 days, slightly under 9 percent were contracted migrant workers and approximately 18% were unpaid workers.[9]

Chart 1.7: **Hired Farm Labor in LA County**



Source: 2017 Census of Agriculture, USDA


9. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), 2017 Census of Agriculture, County Data; Table 7: Hired Farm Labor - Workers and Payroll.

Homeless Persons

The number of homeless individuals and households increased significantly since the previous Housing Element. According to the Point in Time Count, between 2015 and 2020, the total number of people experiencing homelessness rose from 25,686 to 41,290 persons, see Chart 1.8. The sheltered population rose in 2020, reflecting various city efforts to open new shelters and increase access to temporary housing; however, nearly 70% of the City's unhoused population still remains unsheltered. While the vast majority of those unhoused are single adults over the age of 25, there was a 56% increase in the number of families experiencing homelessness in a year, totalling 20% of those unhoused in the City of Los Angeles. See Chapter 5 for more information on the City's efforts on homelessness.

Individuals and families are generally considered homeless if they lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. Unhoused people who are sheltered include individuals or families in temporary living arrangements. This includes those who are living in transitional housing, whereas unsheltered people include individuals/families living in a place not meant for permanent human habitation (such as tents, boxes, recreational vehicles, or personal vehicles).


Chart 1.8: **Total Homeless Population**



Source: US Census Bureau ; American Community Survey; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates,Table DP05

Homelessness is not equally experienced across demographic groups. Black people, men, and survivors of domestic violence are disproportionately more likely to experience homelessness. Black residents constitute just 8.6% of the City's overall population, but make up at least 38% of all homeless individuals (see Chart 1.9). Latinx homelessness accounts for the greatest increase in homelessness. The racial disparities related to housing and homelessness are rooted in structural racism and historic and ongoing discrimination.

Chart 1.9: **Homelessness in LA**




Source: 2020 LAHSA Homeless Count

Housing Stock Characteristics

Type and Size

Single-family dwelling units are the most common type of housing in the City. There are approximately 565,000 detached single-family dwelling units in the City, accounting for approximately 38% of the housing stock. One-third of the City's housing stock includes units in low-density, attached multi-family developments with less than 20 units per building. Approximately 28% of the housing stock includes units in larger multi-family housing, more than 20 units per building (See Chart 1.10).

Chart 1.10: **Total Units in Structure by Size of Structure | 2019**



Source: US Census Bureau ; American Community Survey; 2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates,Table B11001

From 2010 to 2019, more than half of all new housing units created have been in larger multi-unit buildings with more than 50 units. This is an increase of 50.6% in this category (see Table 1.17). The second fastest growing housing structure size are 20-49 unit developments, which grew 16.7%. In that same period, the City added 9,734 new single-family detached units, which is a significant numerical gain but represents an 11.5% increase. Units between 2 to 19 units grew between 3 and 6.7%, indicating modest gains in missing middle housing.

Table 1.17: **Change in Units in Structure, 2010-2019**

Number of Units	2010-2019 Change in Units	2010-2019 Percent Change
1, detached	9,734	11.5%
1, attached	541	0.6%
2	4,585	5.4%
3 or 4	2,528	3.0%
5 to 9	5,664	6.7%
10 to 19	3,996	4.7%
20 to 49	14,120	16.7%
50 or more	42,697	50.6%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ACS, 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04



There is a fairly even distribution of housing with varying unit sizes. Nearly one quarter (24%) of all units have one bedroom, about one third have two bedrooms, and another quarter (24%) have three bedrooms. Renter-occupied units tend to be much smaller than owner-occupied housing, roughly half are studios or one-bedroom units. Just about 15% of the renter-occupied housing stock encompasses three or four bedroom units. This is a drastic difference compared to the 70% of owner-occupied housing having three or four bedrooms. As mentioned previously, the lack of three- and four-bedroom rental units makes it difficult for larger households to find appropriate and affordable rental housing.

Table 1.18: **Housing Tenure by Unit Size, 2019**

	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		Total	
	Units	**Percentage**	**Units**	**Percentage**	**Units**	**Percentage**
0 Bedrooms	5,437	1%	130,570	15%	136,007	10%
1 Bedroom	19,599	4%	309,594	36%	329,193	24%
2 Bedrooms	128,217	25%	302,105	35%	430,322	31%
3 Bedrooms	218,297	43%	96,287	11%	314,584	23%
4+ Bedrooms	134,565	27%	29,193	3%	163,758	12%
Total Units	**506,115**	**100%**	**867,749**	**100%**	**1,373,864**	**100%**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ACS, 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B25042

Tenure

The majority of housing units in the City are renter-occupied (approximately 63%). From 2010 to 2019, the total number of renter-occupied housing units increased by 8.9% (71,652 more units) while owner-occupied housing decreased by less than 1% (1,981 fewer units).

Table 1.19: **Change in Tenure, 2010-2019**

	Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied
2019	874,365	509,504
2010	802,713	511,485
2010 - 2019 Change	71,652	-1,981
% Change	**8.9%**	**-0.4%**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ACS, 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B25032

This continued shift in tenure towards rentals is due in large part to the construction of primarily rental units as well as continued conversions of owner-occupied single-family dwellings to rentals. This includes a loss of almost 5,000 owner-occupied single-family (detached and attached) units and a simultaneous increase of over 10,000 in renter-occupied single-family units. Conversion of single-family homes to rentals continues a trend that began during the Great Recession and foreclosure crisis in the latter part of the prior decade, whereby homes were often bought by corporate investors (such as private equity firms and hedge funds) and turned into rental properties. See Table 1.20 to see the change in tenure by size of structure.



Table 1.20: **Tenure by Size of Structure, 2010-2019 Change**

	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		Total	
	Units	**Percentage**	**Units**	**Percentage**	**Units**	**Percentage**
1 unit detached	-2,386	-0.6%	7,549	6.2%	5,163	1.0%
1 unit attached	-2,545	-7.1%	2,686	5.9%	141	0.2%
2 units	101	1.5%	3,188	10.9%	3,289	9.2%
3 or 4 units	-71	-1.1%	3,173	4.4%	3,102	4.0%
5 to 9 units	1,864	26.7%	3,360	3.1%	5,224	4.5%
10 to 19 units	-156	-1.5%	3,947	3.3%	3,791	2.9%
20 to 49 units	740	5.3%	12,010	7.6%	12,750	7.4%
50 or more units	1,166	6.0%	34,874	24.5%	36,040	22.3%
Mobile home, or Boat, RV, van, etc.	-675	-10.3%	690	31.5%	15	0.2%
Total Occupied	**-1,962**	**-0.4%**	**71,477**	**8.9%**	**69,515**	**5.3%**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ACS, 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B25032


Ownership trends vary significantly by age and race/ethnicity. Homeownership is becoming particularly out of reach for younger families, with a 13% decline in the number of owner-occupied households headed by individuals under 45 years old since 2010. With regards to race and ethnicity, the number of Black homeowners has decreased by 11%, while the number of Asian homeowners increased by 14% and Latinx by 4%. White homeownership fell by about 1%, while White renters increased by 14%.

Vacancy Rate

For a housing market to function smoothly, a healthy amount of vacant units are needed. Too low of a vacancy rate means demand is outstripping supply and housing prices therefore typically rise.

The Los Angeles region has had very low vacancy rates for a long time. Prior to COVID-19 (1Q 2020), the Los Angeles metro area had the second lowest rental vacancy rate in the United States and the lowest of major metropolitan areas (2.3%—see Chart 1.11). Vacancy rates have risen since then, as they have in many major cities, due in part to the COVID-19 pandemic.[10] The first quarter vacancy rate of 5.5% is the highest in the last six years. The rise in vacancies since 2020 has coincided with a recent decrease in rents in Los Angeles and many other high-cost cities where vacancies have risen.

Chart 1.11: **Vacancy Rates by Metropolitan Statistical Area | 2020 Q1**



Source: US Census Bureau, Current Population Survey/Housing Vacancy Survey, April 2020

10. As of the publication/writing of this document, it is still unclear what the long-term impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic will be on vacancy rates in the City.


In the 5-year period prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the rental vacancy rate was 3.7%. The distribution of rental vacancy rates throughout the City are shown in the Map 1.3. Analysis conducted by HCIDLA shows vacancies are lowest among rent stabilized and older housing units. Newer units have higher vacancy rates due in part to the lag time in lease-up, as well as the often higher rents found in new construction as compared to older housing stock.

Vacancy is the result of different factors, including the natural turnover of units, but also use for other purposes (e.g., short term rentals). About one-half of all vacant units in Los Angeles are actively for rent or for sale, or already rented or sold but not occupied (see Table 1.21). The "seasonal, recreation or occasional use" vacancy category has increased most from 2010 to 2019, while the "for rent" category has decreased the most. The rental vacancy rate in the ACS (reported above) is the proportion of the rental inventory which is vacant "for rent."

Table 1.21: **Vacancy Status by Housing Type**

Housing Type	Total	Percent
For rent	34,278	31.4%
Rented, not occupied	9,998	9.2%
For sale only	5,636	5.2%
Sold, not occupied	4,500	4.1%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	13,850	12.7%
For migrant workers	92	0.1%
Other vacant	40,885	37.4%
Total	**109,239**	**100%**

Source: Source: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 and 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table DP02.



MAP 1.4

Renter Vacancy Rate Change Map

- No Data
- 0%
- 0.1% - 2.5%
- 2.6% - 5.0%
- 5.1% - 7.5%
- 7.6% - 40%

N


0 5 10

Miles

Age and Condition

Nearly half of the City's housing stock was built prior to 1960 and is now over sixty years old. Approximately one in five housing units (20%) were built before 1939 (See Chart 1.12). The percentage of housing built in the 1990s and 2000s is the lowest of any decade. Rental housing tends to be a bit newer than owner-occupied housing.

Chart 1.12: **Age of Housing Units**



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2014-2018

An aging housing stock requires continual maintenance and is more likely to have significant habitability issues. For example, housing built prior to the 1940s is more prone to have lead paint, mold, and other hazards that can cause significant neurological and respiratory health issues, especially for younger children aged 1 to 5. Older housing is also likely to have significant structural issues and inadequate or unsafe plumbing and electrical systems.

Due to the housing affordability crisis in the City, many residents end up renting unregistered and illegally-constructed units, many of which do not have kitchens and lack proper infrastructure like plumbing. There are also at least 300 single-room occupancies (SROs), also known as residential hotels, with more than 10,000 units (guest rooms) that lack kitchen facilities. In total, nearly 25,000 renter-occupied units in the City do not have a complete kitchen and approximately 7,400 units do not have working plumbing. Many of these units without kitchen facilities are heavily concentrated in the central areas of the City, which historically have a larger share of SROs and residential hotels.

Table 1.22: **Housing Units Lacking Complete Facilities, 2019**

	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Units	**Percentage**	**Units**	**Percentage**
Plumbing	1,161	0.2%	7,441	0.9%
Kitchen	1,776	0.4%	24,524	2.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ACS, 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B25053

Data from the City's Systematic Code Enforcement Program (SCEP) and Rent Escrow Account Program (REAP) further illustrates the dire habitability issues facing many tenants in the City. Based on 2021 SCEP data, there are over 409 multi-family properties in the City that have severe habitability issues and violations (these properties are referred to as "Tier 2"). Most of these properties are concentrated in the neighborhoods of Westlake, East Hollywood, South Park, Vermont Square, and Florence in South and Southeast Los Angeles. If a property owner fails to respond to and correct habitability violations, the property is put into the Rent Escrow Account Program (REAP) which requires that all rent revenue be used to address outstanding violations. As of late 2020, nearly 700 properties throughout the City have been placed into REAP. These properties are disproportionately located in the central and southern neighborhoods of the City.

Protected Units

There are over 620,000 rental units in the City that are regulated by the Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO), which limits rent increases, protects tenants from arbitrary eviction, and requires that evicted tenants receive relocation assistance. The RSO covers most multi-family rental properties constructed before October 2, 1978. As shown in the charts , the older core of the City (including the Wilshire, Hollywood, and South Los Angeles areas) have the most RSO units in the City. By Council District, the highest number of RSO units are located (in order) in Districts 13, 10, 4, 5, 1 and 11.

Table 1.23: **Top Ten Community Plan Areas by Number of RSO Units**

Community Plan Area	Total RSO units
Wilshire	87,415
Hollywood	68,359
South Los Angeles	50,739
West Adams/Baldwin Hills/Leimert	42,218
Southeast Los Angeles	37,251
Northeast Los Angeles	33,238
Van Nuys/N. Sherman Oaks	29,133
Westlake	28,624
North Hollywood/Valley Village	25,917
Palms/Mar Vista/Del Rey	25,837

Source: Housing and Community Investment Department of Los Angeles




Housing Costs and Overcrowding

Housing is generally the largest single expense facing American households. In Los Angeles, the extremely high cost of housing in relation to incomes is a primary cause of many of the City and region's most intractable problems (see the Executive Summary). Better understanding of these costs, both for rental and for-sale housing, is important to making progress to make more housing affordable and attainable. This section will include analysis of past cost trends and comparisons to other major cities in order to provide perspective to the scale of the affordability crisis in the City.

Cost Burden

While housing costs may be higher in some other major cities, the City of Los Angeles has long been one of the least affordable areas in the country when comparing housing costs to median incomes. When households pay more than 30% of their income for housing costs, they are considered "rent burdened" or "cost burdened" because the amount is considered unaffordable. If the total payment is 50% or more of the household's monthly income the term is "severely cost burdened." In 2019, Los Angeles had a higher percentage of cost burdened renter households (59.2%) than any other major American city (see Chart 1.13.)

Chart 1.13: **Percentage of Rent Burdened Household, Major US Cities**



Source: American Community Survey; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

In Los Angeles, almost 52% of total households are considered cost burdened. The overall percentage of cost burdened households has fallen three percentage points since 2010, but risen slightly for renters and decreased significantly for owners (see Table 1.24). The decrease in owner cost burdens is also seen nationwide and may reflect the large number of over-extended owners that existed in the 2010 data and changes to lending standards put in place since the subprime mortgage crisis.

Table 1.24: **Percentage of Cost Burdened Households by Tenure, 2010 and 2019**

	2010	2019
Renter Occupied	58.0%	59.3%
Owner Occupied	49.9%	39.3%
Total Households	**54.8%**	**51.7%**


Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ACS, 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25091 and B25070

Households are most at risk of housing instability if they are paying more than 50% of their income for housing costs. In Los Angeles, there are 362,000 severely cost burdened households (27%). About 32% of renters are severely cost burdened and about 19% of owners.

Housing cost burden is most severe for low- and extremely low-income households. Based on the 2013-2017 HUD CHAS Database, there are approximately 45,345 extremely low-income homeowners in the City, of whom 78% are cost burdened and 67% are severely cost burdened. Similarly of the 261,995 extremely low-income renters, 82% are cost burdened and 69% are severely cost burdened.




Chart 1.14: **Cost Burden by Income for Renters**



Source: HUD CHAS Data 2013-2017

Chart 1.15: **Cost Burden by Income for Owners**




Source: HUD CHAS Data 2013-2017

Rents

Rents in Los Angeles have increased significantly since 2010, though have fallen somewhat over the last couple years. There exists a sizable difference between what households in Los Angeles are paying for rent and current market prices for a new apartment. The 2019 Census (ACS) captures what all Angelenos are paying for rent over a 5-Year period. Online listing platforms like Zillow and Zumper maintain current (and historical) listings for thousands of apartments for rent in the City of Los Angeles but not the actual price the apartments are rented for. Since each source has pros and cons, data from both sources are included in this discussion.

The ACS 5-Year median contract rent reflects the monthly rental cost expenses for renters, not counting utilities, during the period of 2015-2019. Chart 1.16 shows the median rent paid by Angelenos has been increasing steadily. The rise in rents has outpaced the rise in wages for renter households. From 2010 to 2019, contract rents in the City increased by 37% while median income of renters increased by 29%. While this continues to add to the renter cost burden, the ratio is not as unbalanced as it had been in the prior decade, when the figures were a 31% increase in rents and 1% increase in incomes.

Chart 1.16: **Median Contract Rent | 2010-2019**



Source: 2010 and 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

More recent market data shows that asking rents for two-bedroom units have fallen about 17% since highs in 2018, although they appear to be rebounding. The median rent list price for a 2-bedroom apartment in Los Angeles as of June 2021 was $2,750, requiring a household income of about $111,000 annually to be considered affordable, or not cost burdened (Zumper, see Table 1.25). Fewer than 29% of households in the city can afford this median rental rate.

Table 1.25: **Average Rental Listing Prices and Income Needed to Afford Rent**

Unit Size	Average Monthly Rent	Monthly Income Needed to Afford Rent	Annual Income Needed to Afford Rent
Studio	$1,495	$4,980	$59,800
1 Bedroom	$1,995	$6,650	$79,800
2 Bedroom	$2,750	$9,170	$111,000
3 Bedroom	$3,995	$13,320	$159,800
4 Bedroom	$6,750	$22,500	$270,000


Source: Zumper, June 2021 (based on 3,258 listings)

Note: Income needed to afford rent is based on not paying more than 30% of monthly and annual income for rent.



Since 2010, the City has continued to lose thousands of lower cost rental units. Chart 1.17 shows a net reduction of more than 111,000 units with rents $1,035 from 2010 to 2019 (inflation adjusted). During the same period, almost the same amount of units were added in the category of renting above $2,360. The City has experienced a loss of a number of lower priced rental units that have been reset to market rate upon a new occupancy. Over 8,000 RSO units have been removed from the rental market through the Ellis Act and therefore reflect a portion of the loss.[11]

Chart 1.17: **Number of Rental Units with Contract Rents Above or Below Certain Points | 2010-2019**



Source: 5-Year ACS (2010 and 2019); Inflation Adjusted Dollars

Home Prices

For sale home values (including single-family homes, condominiums and other homeownership typologies) have reached historic levels in mid-2021 to an median price of over $864,000 as of May 31, 2021 according to Zillow.com. To afford this median price a household would need to make at least approximately $130,000 and be

11. HCIDLA Ellis Act Data Analysis, 2014-2020.

able to afford a 20% down payment, or $170,000.[12] Only about 23% of households in Los Angeles earn this amount, and many fewer have the needed down payment. This means that the vast majority of homes that are placed on the for-sale market are well out of reach for most residents. Median home prices have doubled since the lows of the foreclosure crisis in 2012, according to Zillow. Changes in home prices vary greatly in different areas of the City. In order to illustrate differences at a census tract level, changes to median home values from the 2010 and 2019 ACS are hown in the Map 1.5.

Overcrowding

Another direct result of not having enough homes for the population is overcrowding. Many families and individuals find themselves forced to live in crowded conditions due to the mismatch between housing costs and incomes discussed above. According to the Census overcrowding occurs when a dwelling unit is occupied by 1.01 or more persons per room (including bedrooms and living spaces). Severely overcrowded units are defined as those occupied by 1.51 persons or more per room.

In 2019, nearly 14% of all households in Los Angeles (approximately 270,000) were overcrowded or severely overcrowded, including 17% of all renter-occupied households (approximately 153,000) and 6% of all owner-occupied households (approximately 29,000). About 80,000 renter households (9%) are considered severely overcrowded (see Table 1.26). This is a much higher rate of overcrowding than any other major city in the United States (see Chart 1.18).

Table 1.26: **Overcrowded Households by Tenure**

	Renter-Occupied	Percentage of Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	Percentage of Owner-Occupied
Overcrowding	152,791	17%	29,365	6%
Severe Overcrowding	80,150	9%	8,297	2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ACS, 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B25014

12. Nerdwallet Affordability Calculator; Can be accessed here: https://www.nerdwallet.com/mortgages/how-much-house-can-i-afford/calculate-affordability




Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Northridge
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Santa Monica Mountains
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Monterey Park
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
East LA
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
Vernon
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Pacific Ocean
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Torrance
Harbor Gateway
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 1.5
2009-2019 Increase in Median Home Value
No Data
$300,000 and below
$300,001 - $400,000
$400,001 - $500,000
$500,001 - $750,000
$750,001 and above
N
0
5
10
Miles

Chart 1.18: **Percentage of Housing that is Overcrowded, Major US Cities**




Source: US Census Bureau ; American Community Survey; 2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates,Table B11001

Overcrowding significantly contributes to health and education inequities. Health experts believe that overcrowded conditions in the City facilitated the spread of the COVID-19 virus during the recent viral pandemic that began in early 2020.[13] Latinx and Black communities in the City disproportionately experienced high COVID-19 infections and mortality rates, due a number of compounding factors, including overcrowding.[14] Communities where the highest proportions of residents are experiencing overcrowding are shown on Map 1.6.

13. The neighborhoods where COVID collides with overcrowded homes," CalMatters, June 26, 2020. https://calmatters.org/projects/california-coronavirus-overcrowded-neighborhoods-homes/

14. See also "When coronavirus invaded their tiny apartment, children desperately tried to protect dad," *Los Angeles Times,* January 29, 2021


Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Northridge
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Santa Monica Mountains
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Monterey Park
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
East LA
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
South Los Angeles
Vernon
Huntington Park
Commerce
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Pacific Ocean
Inglewood
Los Angeles International Airport
South Gate
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 1.6
Overcrowding
No Data
0% - 2%
2.1% - 5%
5.1% - 10%
10.1% - 20%
20.1% - 50%
N
0
5
10
Miles

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

The amount of housing the City of Los Angeles is obligated to plan for depends highly on its Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. The RHNA allocation is set by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and distributed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Every eight years HCD allocates a regional housing target for each region in the State. SCAG is then responsible for allocating a share of the regional housing target to each local jurisdiction within the Southern California region. The 6th RHNA allocation cycle covers the planning period from October 2021 to October 2029.

In the previous 5th Housing Element cycle, projected household growth was used to determine a jurisdiction's allocation. In this cycle, existing unmet housing needs, taking into account factors such as overcrowding and cost burden, were included to better account for the housing deficit. These new factors resulted in significantly larger 6th RHNA cycle allocations

Table 1.27: **Regional Housing Needs Assessment**

	2013-2021 Allocation	**2021-2029** Draft
SCAG Region	421,137 units	1,341,827 units
Los Angeles	82,002 units	456,643 units
Lower Income Units (0-80% Area Median Income)	32,862 units	184,721 units

Source: SCAG and Los Angeles Department of City Planning

The City's 2021-2029 RHNA allocation of 456,643 units is five times greater than the previous allotment and represents approximately 34% of the region's total share. Under State Housing Element Law, local jurisdictions must show that they have adequate land zoned to accommodate the RHNA allocation, or must rezone within three years in order to accommodate the assigned allocations. The methodology used to identify these sites is described in Chapter Three.

In addition to planning for market rate development, roughly 40%, or 184,721 units, of the RHNA allocation are dedicated to planning for lower-income housing (0-80% Area Median Income). This target is also significantly greater than the previous cycle's targets. See the 5th vs. 6th Cycle comparison in Table 1.26 . The RHNA allocation is further segmented into four income categories based on area median income (AMI) according to the chart . The total units are divided by income level as follows: approximately 25.4% Very Low Income, 15.1% Low Income, 16.5% Moderate Income, and 43.1% Above Moderate Income. State law also requires the City to identify the projected need for extremely low-income housing. The City assumes that 50% of the very low-income housing need is equal to the extremely low-income housing need. As such, there is a projected need for 57,989 extremely low-income housing units.

Table 1.28: **RHNA Targets and Progress for 5th and 6th Housing Element Cycles**

Income Level	**2014-2021** RHNA Goal*	**2014-2020** Total Units Permitted	**2014-2020** Average Units Permitted/	**2021-2029** Draft Allocation	**Units/Year Needed to Meet 21-29 RHNA**	**Annual Percentage Increase Needed**
Very Low Income*	20,427	7,012	1,002	115,978	14,497	1347%
Low Income*	12,435	3,727	532	68,743	8,593	1514%
Moderate Income	13,728	827	118	74,091	9,261	7739%
Above Moderate Income	35,412	92,407	13,201	196,831	24,604	86%
Total	**82,002**	**103,973**	**17,329**	**456,643**	**57,080**	**229%**

Source: Permit Data Department of City Planning

** The RHNA goal is for the period between January 1, 2014 to October 1, 2021.*

As described in Chapter 2, the City has limited funding for the construction of Affordable Housing, which means that achieving the RHNA allocation would require substantial legislative reform and public subsidy. A 2019 joint report by the Departments of City Planning and Housing + Community Investment, along with the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, estimated that approximately $3.8 billion in City funds per year and $12 billion in private, state and federal funding would be needed per year to ensure full project financing for the buildout of the RHNA.[15] As this funding is not available, the City is constrained by its financial resources.

The following chart quantifies the units anticipated through implementation of all of the Housing Element programs by income and by type of program. The estimate of the number of units likely to be constructed, rehabilitated, or conserved/preserved by income level during the planning period is called "quantified objectives" under state law. These objectives do not represent a ceiling on development, but rather set a reasonable target goal based on needs, resources, and constraints. The quantified objectives for new construction are compared to the RHNA goals in Table 1.29.

Table 1.29: **Quantified Objectives for New Construction vs. RHNA Goals**

	Extremely Low Income*	Very Low Income*	Low Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total
New Construction	21,000	12,000	29,000	10,000	247,000	310,000
RHNA GOALS	57,989	57,989	68,743	75,091	196,831	456,643

**Note: Extremely Low Income and Very Low Income goals reflect a split of the Very Low income RHNA allocation*

As shown in Table 1.29 above, the City estimates that, under current assumptions, it will likely be unable to meet its total RHNA targets for new construction. The City is projected to fall short at the affordable (120% AMI) income ranges, but meet the above moderate (market-rate) production levels. While the RHNA allocation suggests that almost 260,000 units affordable to households earning less than 120% AMI will be needed, it is anticipated that approximately 62,000 affordable units may be constructed within the eight year RHNA period at this range (about 34% of the target). This is a reflection that total housing needs for lower and moderate income households greatly exceeds the ability to meet those needs with existing financial resources and incentives. However, it is important to highlight that this Housing Element is projecting a significant

15. Office of the City Clerk, City of Los Angeles. Comments on the 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Methodology. https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2019/19-0773_misc_10-25-2019.pdf

increase in housing production at all income ranges compared to prior cycles, due in part, to many of the Programs identified in Chapter 6.

The total projected quantified objective for new construction is based on the amount of housing development potential identified in the adequate sites analysis in Chapter 4 (266,647), along with an increase based on the RHNA Rezoning Program and other Housing Element Programs anticipated to be accomplished during the period (see Chapter 6). The adequate sites figure reflects an analysis of available land, constraints, reasonable development potential, and potential housing projects in the development pipeline. The figures for the affordable income categories are based on the approximate percentages of affordable housing being proposed in housing entitlement applications the last two years (2019-20), broken out by income categories, adjusted based on anticipated fluctuations based on future funding and incentive programs. Objectives for Moderate income units are based on already planned and approved projects, ADUs and public land programs described in Chapter 4 as well as an estimate of market rate new construction. Housing needs and implementation programs described in Chapter Six also help inform the amount of lower and moderate income housing that can potentially be developed through a coordinated effort.

In addition to the required RHNA allocation, the City intends to rehabilitate and conserve/preserve existing housing stock (see Table 1.30). Rehabilitation includes light, moderate and substantial physical rehabilitation of existing housing units in order to



improve the condition of the housing units, including through the Systematic Code Enforcement Program (SCEP). Conservation includes the preservation of existing housing through activities that prevent the loss of housing units, such as zoning provisions that allow for legalization of residential uses, funding strategies and preservation of affordable housing at risk of losing government subsidies and converting to market rate housing. Units that are listed for rehabilitation may also be counted as units under conservation/preservation and vice-versa.

Table 1.30: **Quantified Objectives for Rehabilitation and Conservation/ Preservation vs. RHNA Goals**

	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total
Rehabilitation	280	280	280	*800,000	800,840
Conservation/ Preservation	1,084	2,904	250	250	4,488
RHNA Goals	**115,978**	**68,743**	**75,091**	**196,831**	**456,643**

**The figure refers to the number of housing units inspected every four years as part of the Systematic Code Enforcement Program, which results in compliance with maintenance, use and habitability codes. The exact income break-down of these units is not collected, so all were placed in Above Moderate.*

In addition to the housing units reflected in the above tables, the City is committed to implementing a number of programs that preserve and maintain significant additional housing that cannot be quantified using the State's definition. These include the maintenance and conservation of multi-family buildings by preserving residential and SRO hotels, completing urgent repairs and enforcing nuisance abatement. In addition, these numbers do not reflect the funding and maintenance of short-term housing for homeless persons or rental subsidies provided through various U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding sources.

Reference Chapter Four, Five, and Six for more information on Site Selection, RHNA progress and Rezoning programs.

Summary of Housing Element Assessment of Fair Housing

The need to build a more just and equitable Los Angeles has never been more urgent nor more opportune. Mass mobilizations around racial justice have heightened the awareness of structural racism in urban planning and policy making. Skyrocketing homelessness and a growing affordability crisis has forced cities to reimagine how to accomodate more housing and identify strategies for ending exclusionary zoning. And in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, all levels of government have enacted renter protection and support programs that seemed impossible just a year prior.

The imperative to change housing policy is in direct response to decades of discrimination and racial segregation, inequitable zoning practices, lack of tenant protections, and unjust patterns of investment and disinvestment. Although Los Angeles is a diverse city and home to people from over 140 countries who speak 224 languages, racial and ethnic segregation remains highly entrenched throughout the city, leading to inequitable access to job centers, high performing schools, and environmentally healthy neighborhoods. Seventy years ago the patterns of racial, ethnic, and economic segregation were established by law through financial practices like redlining and restrictive covenants and today these patterns are perpetuated through zoning, inequitable investment, and housing discrimination. By planning for land use reforms and tenant protection policies and programs, the Housing Element can address these historic and ongoing patterns of inequity and create a blueprint for a more inclusive, equitable, and prosperous city.

Through the Housing Element update, the City continues its efforts to better understand and address the racial and socioeconomic disparities stemming from the land use planning and housing investment practices embedded in LA's history. Implicit and explicit forms of discrimination practiced nationwide and goes back to the origins of this country, has excluded communities of color and special needs populations from homeownership and wealth-building opportunities; denied access to educational resources, jobs and healthy neighborhoods; and perpetuated segregation, displacement, inequity and exclusion. In addition to the Housing Element Assessment of Fair Housing described below, LACP has secured consulting services through the Regional Early Action Planning Grant (REAP), to prepare a Historical Housing and Land Use Study detailing the patterns of discriminatory housing and land use policies that have furthered segregation and inequities in Los Angeles, as is described in program 130. This study seeks to evaluate and document the role of city planning, the zoning code, deeds and covenants, lending practices, city investment, urban renewal, housing policy and the siting of and disinvestment in affordable housing in creating and furthering inequities in the City. The findings of this study will inform RHNA related rezoning and our efforts to affirmatively further fair housing.

The Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Assessment includes an analysis of the disproportionate housing needs, segregation patterns, and disparities in access to opportunity by race, income, disability and familial status using data from HCD and the American Community Survey (See Appendix 1.1, forthcoming). A summary of the results, included below, illustrate that reducing racial and economic disparities, increasing access to accessible housing for people with disabilities, and designing housing for various family configurations must be the cornerstones of future housing policies in the city.



AFFH Data Findings

Summary of Findings by Race and Ethnicity:

Housing insecurity affects Latinx, Black, and Asian communities distinctly.[16] The Latinx community has the lowest median income (slightly over $36,500), lowest rates of homeownership (28%), highest rates of overcrowding (26%), largest average household size (3.67), and second highest rate of rent burden (60%). The Black community has similarly high rates of rent burden (66%) and the second lowest median incomes behind Latinx households (at $41,500), and the second lowest homeownership rate (29%). However, unlike Latinx households, Black households have a smaller average household size (2.24) and are not as impacted by overcrowding, with only 5% of households considered overcrowded. Black households are, however, more likely to be impacted by homelessness, more likely to rely on public transit and more likely to have a disability than any other racial group in the city. More than 20% of Black households do not have access to a vehicle (compared to 13% of Latinx and Asian residents and 9% of white residents) and 17% of Black residents have a disability (compared to 8% of Latinx residents, 10% of Asian residents, and 11% of white residents). The rate of Black homelessness is most alarming with over 38% of the unhoused population identifying as Black compared to just 8% of the overall population.

Among the Asian community, there are significant disparities by ethnicity. For example, Filipino and Korean households have significantly lower per capita income than Chinese households ($39,334 and $38,671 respectively compared to $48,503) and much higher rates of overcrowding (14.7% and 10.9% compared with 5.9%). Compared to the Filipino population, Chinese and Korean residents are more likely to live in poverty and rely on public transit. Nearly 20% of Korean residents and 15% of Chinese residents do not have access to a vehicle, compared to 6% of Filipino residents, and the poverty rate of Koreans and Chinese residents is over twice that of Filipino residents (20% and 18% respectively compared to 7%). These differences speak to the need to develop specific and catered strategies to meet the unique needs of each racial and ethnic group. Understanding the nuanced needs by race and ethnicity, including within each ethnic group, will become increasingly important as the city plans for the growing Latinx and Asian populations and develops policies and programs to slow the exodus of Black residents from the city.

16. All statistics are based on ACS 2019 1-Year Summary Data

Analyzing dissimilarity and isolation indices—key demographic measurements of segregation—further reveals the entreched level of racial segregation in the city. They help determine what percentage of a racial and ethnic group would need to move in order to have a distributive population across the city. Black/white and Latinx/white groups each surpass the dissimilarity index threshold score of 60 defining them as highly segregated. Although segregation patterns between Black and white residents have declined since the 1990s, they still remain the largest segregated group in the city. The decreased levels of Black segregation may be less due to increased integration and more due to displacement and out-migration. Since 1990, the share of the Black population has declined by over 35% and nearly 154,000 fewer Black people live in Los Angeles today than did 30 years ago. For Latinx residents, while they have accounted for the largest growth in population within the past three decades, the Latinx/white dissimilarity score has essentially remained the same demonstrating the current pathway towards integration is inadequate. The isolation index scores reinforce comparable findings with the Latinx population having the highest level of isolation of any racial group and steadily increasing within the past four decades. And while the white isolation score has declined during the same period, the City's white residents still rank second highest in isolation.

Economic segregation combined with racial segregation results in Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) defined by HUD as census tracts with a majority non-white population and at the minimum 40% of individuals live at or below the poverty line. Geographically concentrated and racialized poverty has increased substantially since the 1990s and the city now has a greater share of the population living in R/ECAPs than the rest of the metropolitan region. Approximately one in five Black and Latinx residents in the city live in areas considered High Segregation and High Poverty by HCD's Opportunity Map and 15% live in R/ECAPs.

As discussed in a recent paper published by the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Department, Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty are enabled and perpetuated through the ongoing segregation of white, affluent residents who have historically used their influence and privilege over land use and zoning to maintain exclusive neighborhoods and form what are called Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAA).[17] Approximately 7.5% of the census block groups in the city have a majority white population and a median income more than twice that of the rest of the city. As detailed in Chapter 4, approximately 95% of the residentially developable land in these census tracts is zoned for single-family uses, thereby prohibiting multi-family housing, supportive housing or group housing that command lower rents and can house lower-income individuals and families. The presence of these Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence, which have some of the highest performing schools, greatest access to employment, and greatest access to environmental health, reinforce power imbalances and inhibit the equitable redistribution of resources and amenities.

17. Goetz, Edward et al, "Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence: A Preliminary Investigation" . The Fair Housing Act at 50. Volume 21 No 1 https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/cityscpe/vol21num1/article4.html

As a result, neighborhoods that are majority Black and Latinx have lower performing schools, less access to employment, and higher levels of environmental contamination than majority white neighborhoods, and white residents are more likely to live in higher resource areas. Approximately 65% of the white population live in High or Highest Resource areas (as defined by HCD) compared with 41% of Asian residents, 18% of Black residents, and 13% of Latinx residents.

The racial disparities between white and non-white households is evident in the city of Los Angeles. Robust housing policies backed by AFFH analyses will be required to halt and reverse the ongoing trends of Black households rapidly exiting the city, Latinx households continuing to enter the city but remain isolated from white neighbors, and white households almost exclusively thriving in areas of affluence. Racial segregation has clear consequences in harming key qualities of life for lower-income, Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC) while the majority of the city's benefits remain with affluent white households. As discussed more in the contributing factors section of this appendix, ongoing segregation and racialized disparities in access to opportunity is due to exclusionary zoning and land use, a lack of affordable housing, overinvestment in RCAAs and a lack of investment in lower-income, non-white neighborhoods. Evictions and displacement further exacerbate racial inequality and limit the ability of lower-income, BIPOC residents to benefit from greater neighborhood investment.

Summary of Findings by Income

The majority of Angelenos are considered lower-income and the city has a higher proportion of extremely low-income people and people in poverty than the rest of the metro region. Over half (55%) of the households in the city are considered lower-income (meaning they have incomes below 80% of the area median) and 23% are considered Extremely Low-Income (ELI) (meaning they have incomes below 30% of area median). Not surprisingly, low-income people have the highest rates of housing insecurity and over 68% of ELI households spend more than half of their income on rent.

The city's collapse of the aerospace industry in the 1990s led in large part to the exodus of many middle-income jobs. As a result, neighborhood-level income disparities have increased throughout the city, with a greater proportion of people living either in high poverty neighborhoods or very affluent neighborhoods. Then most recently, the severe economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent uneven economic recovery threatens to further exacerbate these trends. Pockets of concentrated wealth are primarily located in West Los Angeles and the West and South San Fernando Valley. In contrast, the greatest concentrations of low and moderate-income households are located in South Los Angeles (particularly Southeast Los Angeles), Boyle Heights, Westlake/Pico Union, Chinatown, and parts of the San Fernando Valley including Pacoima, Panorama City, and Van Nuys.

Economic segregation primarily results in disparities in access to opportunity which perpetuates existing and generational poverty. Over half (58%) of low and moderate-income households in the city live in areas defined by the State of California as "Low Resource" or "High Segregation and Poverty" and nearly two thirds (65%) of people in poverty live in these areas. At the regional level, low and moderate-income residents have slightly more access to higher resource areas than they do within the City of Los Angeles. It is important to note that while economic and racial segregation are highly correlated, racial segregation is more pronounced than economic segregation in the city (based on statistical indices) and research shows that economic factors alone cannot account for the extreme racial disparities described.

Summary of Findings for People with Disabilities

Approximately 10%, or nearly 400,000 residents, have a disability and live in a non-institutional setting in the city. The three largest disability types are ambulatory (26%), independent living (20%), and cognitive (19%). Households with one or more people with disabilities often face significant financial difficulties that limit their ability to find suitable housing. Nearly two-thirds of working-aged people with disabilities in the city are not in the workforce and those who are working have median earnings that are 27% lower than individuals without disabilities. Based on State data, only 16% of people with developmental disabilities work and earn an annual income of just $10,317. As a result of lower labor market participation, lower incomes, ongoing discrimination and ableism, people with disabilities have much higher rates of poverty and are more likely to be homeless.

Although people with disabilities live throughout the city, nearly half of people with disabilities (49%) live in designated Low Resource or High Segregation and High Poverty areas. Most notably, the Skid Row neighborhood of Downtown has a far higher concentration than any other neighborhood of the city, with nearly 45% of residents in the southern portion of Skid Row living with a disability. Many of the residents in Skid Row are unhoused and based on the 2020 Point in Time Count, 38% of unhoused residents living in Skid Row had a serious mental illness, 26% had a physical disability, and 18% had a developmental disability. Because the majority of unhoused residents in Skid Row are also Black, addressing the housing needs of this community requires addressing the ongoing and intersecting role of racism (particularly anti-Black racism), ableism, and classism in housing and service provision.

The disproportionate concentration of people with disabilities in lower resource areas of the city is due both to more accessible housing built in these areas and to a lack of affordable accessible housing in the Higher and Highest resource areas. Of the nearly 2,500 permanent supportive housing units financed through proposition HHH, 76% are located in Low Resource or High Segregation and High Poverty areas. Increasing access for people with disabilities to higher resource areas with higher performing schools is particularly important in order to reduce educational disparities. As detailed in the City's 2018-2023 Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH), people with disabilities have

low levels of academic achievement and face significant barriers accessing needed educational services.

Summary of Findings by Household Size and Type

Of all household types, elderly households and large family households have the highest rates of cost burden at 65% and nearly 60%, respectively, and are the most likely to be low-income. However, while elderly households and large family households have higher rates of housing insecurity, small families and other non-family households (which include non-elderly people living alone or with roommates) still make up the majority of lower income households. Together, they constitute 64% of the total extremely low-income population.

Single-parent households also face significant financial challenges and have a poverty rate nearly triple that of two-parent households (38% compared to 13%). Single-parent households are very common in the city and found in nearly all neighborhoods, but are more concentrated in South Los Angeles. The spatial concentration of single-parent households results in lower access to opportunity. Nearly one-third (30%) of children in single-parent households live in High Segregation and High Poverty areas while only 17% of single-parent households live in High or Highest resource areas.

Large family households are primarily concentrated in the Northeast Valley (including Pacoima and Arleta) and Southeast LA. As discussed previously, these areas are majority Latinx and have higher rates of overcrowding, substandard housing conditions, and lower access to opportunity. Many larger family households also include adult children living with their parents and more than half (54%) of the households live in Low Resource or High Segregation and High Poverty areas.

Summary of Additional Analysis Including Displacement

The city has recently seen an increase in Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) complaints, Ellis Act evictions, and tenant buyout filings. For example, RSO complaints have increased by nearly 40% from 2015 to 2019 and the number of RSO demolitions doubled during the same time period. These trends demonstrate a spike in new development and real estate speculation, which often results in the demolition or remodeling of RSO units and the displacement of long-term tenants to capitalize on rising market rents.

Displacement is often a neighborhood-level phenomenon sparked by changing preferences among higher income people that move into lower income areas and change the financial landscape and/or increased private or public investment (such as public transit, green space, or commercial revitalization efforts). Although the city has not yet developed a methodology to evaluate neighborhood-level displacement risk, initial research by the LAHD and by the Urban Displacement Project suggests that certain neighborhoods in the central part of the city (including East Hollywood, Pico

Union, and Westlake), South LA (including West Adams, Leimert Park, and Jefferson Park) and East/Northeast LA (including Lincoln Heights, Glassell Park, and Boyle Heights) experience some of the greatest displacement pressures. As described in Program 122 in Chapter 6, the city will be conducting a more thorough analysis of displacement and integrating the results in new or enhanced tenant rights and land use policies.

The need for stronger anti-displacement policies is even more urgent now due to the disproportionate impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and the ongoing economic vulnerability experienced by many low-income Black, Indigenous and People of Color in the city. Data from the 2021 Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) indicates that tenants owe nearly $500 million in back rent. Latinx tenants reported the greatest share of back rent at over $149 million and larger families also appear disproportionately impacted by the pandemic. Federal, State and local eviction protections combined with rental assistance and unemployed assistance have helped keep families in place; however, when the protections are lifted, the city may experience a spike in evictions and further displacement.

Contributing Factors

Summary of Contributing Factors

AB 686 requires an identification and prioritization of contributing factors to fair housing issues based on all the previously required analysis (outreach, fair housing assessment, site inventory). This identification and prioritization must give highest priority to factors that limit or deny fair housing choice or access to opportunity or negatively impact fair housing or civil rights. The following factors are listed in order of priority based on an analysis of housing cost burden, housing needs by protected class, displacement risk, and access to opportunity. The analysis also looks particularly at contributing factors for persons with disabilities.

Lack of Access to Opportunity Due to High Housing Costs

Los Angeles has some of the highest rates of housing insecurity in the region, with 68% of ELI households spending more than half of their income on rent. While affordable housing incentive programs such as the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) and Density Bonus programs have had success in increasing the production of affordable housing units in market rate development, studying the feasibility of establishing a citywide or geographically specific, on-site affordable housing requirement could allow the city to develop a more nuanced and geographically specific approach to maximizing inclusive affordable development and create a permanent program that can expand on the TOC program incentives.

Assessing mandatory affordable housing requirements in higher opportunity areas where market-rents are out of reach could open access to ELI households in larger numbers--especially for the disabled community who require housing to meet physical

specifications for complete access and enjoyment to their tenancies. The types of housing that are most likely to be accessible to people with disabilities include multi-family housing that is subject to the design and construction requirements of the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, as well as housing that has received Federal financial assistance and is subject to the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. These types of housing exhibit patterns of concentration. The areas with the highest concentrations of multi-family housing in the city are Downtown Los Angeles; neighborhoods immediately to the west of Downtown such as Pico-Union, Westlake, and Koreatown, East Hollywood; and areas of the San Fernando Valley. The neighborhoods that are likely to have more accessible and affordable housing tend to have low levels of access to high performing schools, greater exposure to poverty, and reduced environmental health.

Land Use and Zoning Laws

Land use and zoning laws are a significant contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs in the city of Los Angeles and the broader region. As stated in Chapter 2, Federal and State laws have been enacted which require updating local regulations to ensure that no city procedures or development standards pose obstacles to the production or preservation of housing for people with disabilities. This includes a variety of housing types, treatment facilities, community facilities, and short- and long-term housing. Protected classes disproportionately occupy high-density housing, and land with zoning to accommodate this type of housing is not widely available.

For purposes of the Housing Element's Inventory of Adequate Sites for Housing (Chapter 4), as advised by HCD, sites identified to accommodate the lower-income portion of the RHNA are to not be concentrated in low-resource areas (lack of access to high performing schools, distant from job centers, location disproportionately exposed to pollution or other health impacts) or areas of segregation and concentrations of poverty. Sites identified to accommodate the lower income RHNA must be distributed throughout the community in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing. Considering all land zoned for residential uses, approximately 76% of residential parcels in High and Highest Resource Areas are limited to single-family uses and approximately 20% are zoned to allow multi-family housing. In contrast, just 18% of the residentially zoned land in the areas considered High Segregation and Poverty is allocated to single-family uses, whereas over 80% allows multi-family development. Strategically rezoning portions of High and Highest Resource areas, while ensuring there are affordable housing requirements and protections for existing residents, would contribute to a more balanced and accessible housing stock in those neighborhoods and would create opportunities to foster residential integration within those neighborhoods, which are predominantly white and are least likely to have restricted, publicly funded affordable and accessible housing for persons with disabilities. This approach is reflected in the Rezoning Program, as discussed in Chapter 4 and Program 121 in Chapter 6.

Availability of Units in a Range of Sizes

The availability, or lack thereof, of affordable housing in a range of family sizes is a significant factor to housing burden and overcrowding among Black and Latinx households, and large families with children in the city. The shortage of affordable housing in Los Angeles is particularly acute for people with disabilities. A significant portion of the affordable, accessible housing in the city consists of Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) units and one-bedroom and studio units in more integrated developments with a permanent supportive housing component. These units meet critical needs, but are not adequately sized and as such do not provide access to affordable housing for families including people with disabilities or for people with disabilities who need the services of a live-in aide to allow persons to live independently in non-institutional settings. The settlement agreement in Independent Living Center of Southern California, et. al v. City of Los Angeles resulted in the creation of the Accessible Housing Program (AcHP) to carry out the obligations under the Corrected Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement requires the city to produce 4,000 accessible units through new construction, substantial rehabilitation or retrofit of existing developments over a ten year period from the effective date of September 6, 2016. For units produced through new construction and substantial rehabilitation, 10% must be mobility units and 4% must be hearing/vision units.

Tenant Protections

Evictions or the threat of eviction causes severe housing instability for thousands of Los Angeles tenants each year, often resulting in displacement or homelessness. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, approximately 60,000 evictions were filed annually countywide. Of this number, an estimated 30,000 were filed in the city of Los Angeles. Early negotiations between landlords and tenants in units subject to the city's Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) can help resolve eviction-related issues before an unlawful detainer is issued. This kind of early intervention, particularly if it is combined with flexible rental assistance, provides a faster and less costly response for tenants and landlords. More than 620,000 of the city's 800,000 multifamily rental units are covered by the RSO. The adoption of AB 1482, effective January 1, 2020, provides some rent stability for units not covered by the RSO by prohibiting landlords from increasing rents beyond five percent plus inflation annually. In addition, the new law's strong renter protections that extend Just Cause protections to tenants that have lived in their units for at least one year will be integrated into the city's Eviction Defense Program, also known as Stay Housed LA. This program consists of a partnership between Los Angeles County, the City of Los Angeles, local community, and legal service providers who assist tenants in understanding their rights and responsibilities as renters and provide legal assistance to ensure residents can remain in their homes.

Violations of the RSO are also a significant contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs. For the 2018-2023 AFH, LAHD analyzed RSO cases by Council District in 2017. This data is consistent with the possibility of racial, ethnic, and national origin disparities in the incidence of violations of the RSO. The Valley and West districts, which have higher concentrations of white residents, have by far the lowest rates of open cases. The East, South, and Wilshire districts, which have a larger concentration of residents of color, have much higher rates of open cases. The especially high rate of open cases in the Wilshire district may reflect higher concentrations of rental housing than in East and South LA along with greater gentrification pressures that incentivize landlords to break the law. Additionally, between 2014 and 2020, there was nearly a 40% increase in the number of RSO open cases. The city's recently adopted Tenant Anti-Harassment Ordinance provides additional protections for tenants experiencing unlawful harassment, and landlords may be fined up to $5,000 if the tenant is older than 65 years or is living with a disability.

Housing Discrimination

Residents that fall into protected classes face disproportionate housing needs due to housing discrimination. The City of Los Angeles relies primarily on a contract with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) to enforce fair housing laws and conduct proactive outreach on fair housing issues. Between 2013-2019, HRC reported over 5,200 fair housing complaints, with close to 80% involving discrimination on the basis of a physical disability, 12% on family status, and 8% on the basis of race. In 2019, the City of Los Angeles entered into a Voluntary Compliance Agreement (VCA) with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and its Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) to provide greater access to affordable housing for Angelenos with disabilities through a multi-billion-dollar program. The VCA, which was executed subsequent to the settlement agreement with the Independent Living Center of Southern California, et al. , requires the city to produce 4,031 accessible units over a ten-year period from an effective date of August 2, 2019. Of the total accessible units, 3,100 must be through the retrofit of existing developments. For the new construction and substantial alteration of developments, 11% must be mobility units and 4% are to be for hearing/vision units.

Under the ten-year VCA the City has agreed to:

- Retrofit hundreds of existing multifamily housing developments across the city to provide 3,100 accessible housing units designed for persons with mobility disabilities, individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing, and individuals who are blind or have low vision, as well as accessible public and common use areas;
- Produce accessible units in new construction and substantial alteration developments at a higher percentage rate than required by State (10% mobility and 4% hearing/vision units) and Federal (5% mobility and 2% hearing/vision units) minimums, to yield an anticipated 1,500 new accessible housing units over ten years from the effective date of August 2, 2019;

- Implement a new Enhanced Accessibility Program to produce state-of-the-art, "super-accessible" units with features that provide greater accessibility than currently required by Federal standards;
- Implement policies to ensure that accessible units designated for occupancy by individuals with disabilities are actually made available for occupancy by the persons who need the accessibility features they provide; and
- Allocate substantial financial resources to provide the funding necessary to accomplish the actions required by the agreement.

In December 2020, The State's TCAC regulations increased the minimum accessible units in new construction developments to 15% mobility units and 10% hearing/vision units. The City of Los Angeles ensures the compliance with these accessibility requirements in TCAC funded affordable housing developments and compliance with the accessibility requirements for senior housing developments set forth in the Unruh Act.

Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures

Displacement of residents due to economic pressures is a significant factor to disproportionate housing needs in the City of Los Angeles, and across Southern California. Loss of affordable housing is a significant contributing factor resulting in displacement of residents and, in particular, housing cost burden continues to be a major issue facing Black and Latinx households. More than one in four Latinx households is overcrowded, and the rate of overcrowding for Latinx households is seven and a half times greater than that of White households and five times the rate of Black households. Overall, Los Angeles County has lost 6,156 of covenanted affordable units between 1997 and 2020.[18] The city currently has 9,412 housing units at risk of losing their affordability use restrictions between October 1, 2021 and September, 30, 2031. Dedicated funding from state and federal funding sources for preserving expiring affordable housing will prove necessary to maintain housing stability for low income residents.

18. California Housing Partnership, "Affordable Homes at Risk," February 2021; https://1p08d91kd0c03rlxhmhtydpr-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Affordable-Homes-At-Risk-Report-2021.pdf

Moreover, unless steps are taken to mitigate the effects of development on low-income BIPOC renters, the city's development policies could have unintended consequences. The continued expansion of LA Metro's transit system with upcoming openings of the Crenshaw/LAX Line, Regional Connector, and construction of the Purple Line to the Westside has increased opportunities for housing development along these transit corridors. If new development is going to further the goals of fair housing and desegregation, measures must be taken to ensure that new development is both available to members of protected classes and benefits are spread widely throughout the city. The city will need to continue to take proactive steps to protect more vulnerable renters, such as ongoing enforcement of the RSO, a robust Eviction Defense Program, and stricter enforcement of Ellis Act provisions to ensure that any new development does not substantially reduce the stock of affordable housing, and additional resources to preserve affordable housing.

Lack of Investment in Communities of Color

The lack of private investments in specific neighborhoods is a significant contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs in the City of Los Angeles and the broader region. Specific neighborhoods with low-income, predominantly people of color populations have the greatest need for private investments to construct or rehabilitate housing, investment in new small businesses, and increased access to community amenities, such as supermarkets, pharmacies, and banks. When assessing the various metrics that reflect lack of private investment in specific neighborhoods, it is predominantly low-income, and predominantly communities of color, that suffer the greatest consequences and are often left without an opportunity for economic mobility.

Lack of affordable in-home or community-based supportive services is a significant contributing factor to segregation for people with disabilities in Los Angeles. For example, of those experiencing homelessness, 29% have serious mental illness, 22% have physical disability, and 13% have a developmental disability. Permanent supportive housing units are also highly concentrated in Skid Row and in neighborhoods near Downtown that include R/ECAPs and offer limited access to opportunity for residents, especially for persons with disabilities. Clearly, there is an unmet need for affordable, integrated housing for individuals who need supportive services.

Greater economic mobility and access to inclusive community amenities for protected class members would reduce rent burden. Generally, the distribution of community problems such as the lack of adequate housing, the lack of high-quality education, the lack of investments in small businesses, and the lack of access to community amenities, impedes economic mobility for low-income people of color and prevents them from accessing high opportunity areas, thus perpetuating patterns of segregation.

Goals and Actions

Select programs identified in Chapter 6 intended to promote the city's goals of affirmatively furthering fair housing are identified below for prioritized contributing factors. Specific actions are either ongoing activities or will be undertaken by LAHD and/or LACP as part of actions to address AFFH issue areas in partnership with key local stakeholders. See Program 124.

Conclusion

More than four decades after Congress passed the Fair Housing Act, fair housing issues remain critical to the pursuit of strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and equal opportunity for all residents. Racial segregation in housing has not only endured, but along with increasing income segregation, has also created areas of concentrated poverty populated predominantly by people of color. Residential segregation carries high costs for individuals, families, and society as a whole, constricting opportunity and life chances and limiting economic growth. These impacts have disproportionate consequences for Black and Latinx residents, low income families, as well as persons with disabilities. The City of Los Angeles aims to increase access to opportunity for all residents by reforming land use policies, prioritizing housing production, especially affordable housing, promoting housing stability for all residents, especially renters, and correcting the harms of explicit and implicit forms of discrimination in housing choice by prioritizing development in high opportunity, high resource areas. Housing production that proactively desegregates parts of the city must be balanced with the significant needs and challenges faced by residents that are part of protected classes residing in distressed, low resource areas and R/ECAPs. This can be accomplished by setting priorities that expressly alleviate the disproportionate factors that negatively impact the quality of life for residents of color in the city through prioritizing more resources and investments in these areas.



Constraints on Housing Maintenance, Improvement, and Development

Introduction

As described in the Executive Summary and Chapter One, the City of Los Angeles is facing a severe housing crisis that negatively affects the health and safety of its residents, the environment, the City's economic and social health, its racial justice and equity goals, and has created a humanitarian emergency on our streets. The dire situation requires a robust analysis of the challenges to producing, maintaining and improving housing that is affordable to households of all income levels and appropriate for special needs populations.

This chapter provides a summary of governmental constraints, non-governmental constraints and constraints for housing for people with disabilities and special needs. This includes an analysis of the preservation of at-risk expiring affordable units. A complete analysis of constraints can be found in Appendix 2.1.

Many housing constraints are out of the City's direct control, while others are due in part to the local requirements and conditions that pose constraints to the production and preservation of housing. Some of the most important constraints include governmental regulations, such as zoning, land use requirements, entitlement and permitting procedures, infrastructure requirements, and fees; as well as non-governmental

constraints such as market conditions, financing, source of funding requirements, opposition to housing, and environmental conditions. There are often sound policy reasons for current fees and regulations, so any changes should be carefully considered with regards to expected effectiveness to meet housing needs and the potential impacts to other General Plan goals.


The City has developed a wide array of responses to counter housing constraints and to facilitate residential development. This section summarizes the key governmental and non-governmental constraints that impact and limit the potential of housing production and preservation in the City, and then the City's strategies to address them. The City continues to proactively explore additional responses to these housing obstacles in the form of new efforts and programs identified in Chapter Six.



Constraints Overview

Constraints are factors that impact the feasibility, costs, and timelines of housing projects, which in turn affect the City's ability to meet the housing needs of all its residents and to affirmatively further fair housing goals. Constraints affect a housing development's location selection, density, design, and permitting process--all of which impact whether or not housing can be developed, maintained or improved. The presence of any one constraint has the potential to prevent housing from being produced or preserved, as illustrated below. Constraints to production also include essential regulations and requirements that provide community benefits such as open space, infrastructure, and design standards. In evaluating constraints, this chapter will also consider the services and benefits that constraints to production provide as well.

Chart 2.1: **Housing Development Constraints**



Source: Los Angeles City Planning


Federal, state, and local land use regulatory requirements, permitting fees, and public funding availability can constrain housing development in the City. Key regulations include the Zoning Code and local planning documents, the Building Code, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). For example, zoning limits where residential uses are permitted in the City, as well as maximum height, required parking and maximum densities. Lengthy and complicated entitlement and permitting

processes lead to delays and uncertainty, driving up costs and preventing many potential projects from being realized. Environmental constraints can also affect and limit housing production, especially in the Very High Fire Severity Hazard Zones and the Coastal Zone.

Non-governmental constraints such as market conditions can increase the cost of land, building materials, and labor necessary for the production of housing. Public opposition to new housing is often strong, and has led to decades of policies that have made housing creation harder and often increased development risk and timelines, particularly in the higher resource areas of the City.

Housing constraints have especially impacted affordable housing production. Zoning capacity and its inequitable distribution throughout the City has limited the production of affordable housing in higher resource areas, and instead concentrated its production in the areas with the lowest resources (see Map 2.1). Existing land use and zoning, combined with high land values, have resulted in conditions that make it infeasible to develop affordable housing in many areas of the City which have the highest incomes, resources, amenities, and access to economic opportunity.




Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Northridge
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Santa Monica Mountains
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
East LA
Monterey Park
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
Vernon
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Pacific Ocean
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 2.1
New Affordable Housing Units Permitted
Low
High
N
0
5
10
Miles

In addition, certain types of zoning laws have played an important role in causing racial disparities in housing. There is now ample research finding a relationship between restrictive land use regulations and racial segregation, higher housing prices, a worsening racial wealth gap and disparities in many other measurable social outcomes.[1]

Appendix 2.1 includes an analysis of an array of potential constraints to the production, maintenance and improvement of housing. This includes the following governmental and non-governmental issues:

Governmental Constraints

- General Plan, Land Use, the Zoning Code, and Neighborhood Implementation Tools
- Entitlement Process
- Building Code and Building Permit Procedures
- On-/Off-Site Improvements and Infrastructure
- Entitlement Appeals
- Fees Affecting Housing Development
- Creation of Affordable Housing Covenants
- Availability of Public Funding for Housing
- Inadequate Public Funding for Homelessness Housing

Non-Governmental Constraints

- Land Costs
- Construction Costs
- Financing Availability

Furthermore, State law requires that jurisdictions demonstrate how they provide for, and do not duly constrain, a variety of important housing types including multi-family rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, housing for agricultural employees, supportive housing, single-room occupancy (SRO) units, emergency shelters, and transitional housing. The full constraints analysis in Appendix 2.1 describes where these uses are permitted and how the City provides for these and other housing types.

---

1. Rouse, C., Bernstein J., Knudsen H., and Zhang J., White House Article, June 17, 2021. "Exclusionary Zoning: Its Effect on Racial Discrimination in the Housing Market," located: https://www.whitehouse.gov/cea/blog/2021/06/17/exclusionary-zoning-its-effect-on-racial-discrimination-in-the-housing-market/

The City has taken many actions over the last eight years to alleviate constraints, including many that were prior Housing Element programs. These include a variety of actions including ordinances, directives, planning efforts, implementation memos, administrative actions and other implementation steps. The following efforts to alleviate constraints are identified and described in Appendix 2.1:

Alleviating Constraints Due to the General Plan, Land Use, Zoning Code, and Neighborhood Implementation Tools

- Mayoral Executive Directives (ED) 13 and 19
- The New Zoning Code (recode:LA)
- Community Plan Updates
- The Density Bonus Ordinance
- Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Program
- Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)
- Unpermitted Dwelling Units (UDUs)
- Emergency Homeless Shelters
- Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Ordinance
- Interim Motel Conversion (IMC) Ordinance
- Floor Area Averaging and Transfer of Floor Area Ratios (TFAR)

Alleviating Constraints Due to the Entitlement Process

- Community Plan Updates and the New Zoning Code
- Process and Procedures Ordinance
- Land Use Incentives Programs
- Density Bonus Memo: Ministerial Review Process for On-Menu Incentives
- Senate Bill 375 and CEQA
- Streamlined Infill Projects (SIP) per Senate Bill 35 and Assembly Bill 2162
- Assembly Bill 1179 and CEQA Exemption for Supportive Housing and Emergency Shelters
- The Expedited Processing Section
- Development Services Case Management (DSCM) Office
- The Priority Housing Project (PHP) Program

- Housing Services Unit
- Implementation of State Law (Housing Accountability Act, The Housing Crisis Act of 2019

Alleviating Constraints due to the Building Code and Building Permit Procedures

- Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Standard Plan Program
- The Parallel Design-Permitting Process
- Development Services Case Management (DSCM)
- Preliminary Plan Check Service
- Early Start Permits

Alleviating Constraints due to On-/Off- Site Improvements and Infrastructure

- Exemptions and Reductions to Improvement Requirements
- Waiver of Dedication and Improvement (WDI)
- Deferring Costs of Required Improvements

Alleviating Constraints Due to Entitlement Appeals

Alleviating Constraints Due to Fees Affecting Housing Development

- Exemptions from Park and Quimby Fees
- Affordable Housing Linkage Fee (AHLF) Exemptions and Credits/Deductions

Alleviating Constraints in the Coastal Zone

- The City's Mello Act Ordinance
- The Venice Local Coastal Program
- Land Use Incentives Programs

Alleviating Constraints due to Inadequate Public Funding for Housing

Alleviating Constraints due to Inadequate Public Funding for the Homeless Housing and Prevention

- Waiting List Limited Preference: Homeless Program
- Waiting List Limited Preference: Tenant-Based Supportive Housing Program
- Permanent Supportive Housing Project-Based Voucher Program
- HUD-VASH Program
- Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHVs)
- Waiting List Limited Preference: Homeless Veterans Initiative
- Continuum of Care (Shelter Plus Care) Program
- Moderate Rehabilitation Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Program
- Moving On Program
- Home For Good
- Homeless Incentive Program (HIP)



Constraints for Housing for People with Disabilities and Special Needs

Federal and State laws have been enacted which require updating local regulations to ensure that no City procedures or development standards pose obstacles to the production or preservation of housing for people with disabilities. This includes a variety of housing types, treatment facilities, community facilities, and short- and long-term housing. In line with those efforts, every five years the City of Los Angeles previously completed an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI), as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This study and subsequent updates assess land use and zoning constraints on housing for individuals with disabilities and compliance with Fair Housing laws, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and other housing laws and court decisions affecting housing rights.

More recently, per HUD's final 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule, the City developed and submitted to HUD its first Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) Plan in 2017, which replaced the previous AI requirement. Los Angeles' 2018-2023 AFH Plan was completed in partnership between the Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department (HCID) and the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA). The City's AFH Plan was adopted by City Council and Mayor in October 2017.

Persons with ambulatory disabilities, including people who use wheelchairs, and people with hearing and vision disabilities often require special housing to accommodate their special conditions. For many who have ambulatory disabilities, features such as handrails, ramps, wider doorways, specially designed cabinetry and electrical outlets, special door and faucet handles, and non-skid flooring are necessary. People who have hearing disabilities may require doorbells and emergency alarms that use flashing light instead of sound, and people who are blind or have a visual disability may require that large print, braille labels, or tactile dots be placed on equipment, tools, facilities, and documents. In addition, people with developmental disabilities may live in small group homes or with a roommate and be provided with support services.

The City's Zoning Code has been developed over many decades and sometimes includes obsolete terminology and provisions that may have unintentionally diminished housing opportunities for people with disabilities. The City's Code includes the following definition of a person with disabilities as a person who has: "(a) physical or mental disabilities, which seriously restricts that person from operating a motor vehicle; (b) is expected to be of long, continued and indefinite duration; (c) substantially impedes his or her ability to live independently; and (d) is of a nature that the ability to live independently could be improved by more suitable housing conditions (LAMC Section 12.21 A.4 (u))".

The siting of disability-related special needs housing is not restricted regarding location. There are no distance requirements in the City regulating the siting of any type of disability-related housing. The Los Angeles Building Code (LABC) incorporates provisions of the California Building Code (CBC) related to needs of people with disabilities. Local amendments to CBC tailor the LABC to local conditions but do not diminish the ability to accommodate people with disabilities.

Another regulatory and practical constraint impacting housing for people with disabilities is the unwillingness of some landlords to comply with state and federal fair housing laws by providing reasonable accommodations and allowing reasonable modifications. Based on data collected citywide, ambulatory disability was the leading cause of fair housing complaint inquiries, accounting for 47% of all inquiries from 2013-2021. Most of these complaints were from in-place tenants requesting assistance with a reasonable accommodation or modification request. Common requests included: a closer or more accessible parking space, breaking the lease, and a companion or service animal in a building that does not allow pets. Requests made after April 2020 are often related to COVID-19 pandemic issues such as restricting entry to units or requiring that management/maintenance wear personal protective equipment (PPE) and maintain social distancing.

The following efforts to alleviate constraints to providing housing for people with disabilities are identified and described in Appendix 2.1:

Alleviating Constraints to Providing Housing for People with Disabilities

- The Reasonable Accommodation Request Ordinance
- Reasonable Accommodation, Congregate and Group Living Arrangements
- Accessible Housing Program (AcHP)
- AcHP Grievance Procedures
- The Enhanced Accessibility Program
- Trainings and Outreach Campaigns
- Services for Homeless Households
- AcHP Challenges

Analysis of Preservation of At-Risk Units

State law requires local governments to include in their Housing Element an analysis of existing, multi-family affordable housing units at risk of conversion to market-rate housing within the next ten years due to termination of a public funding subsidy contract, mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions. While the production of new affordable housing is critical, so is the preservation of existing affordable units to maintain a stock of affordable housing.

The City of Los Angeles currently has approximately 56,698 affordable housing units in more than 1,426 developments, serving very-low, low and moderate-income households (see Appendix 2.6). The majority of these affordable housing units are owned and operated by private entities, and were financed with local, State and Federal public subsidies, administered by State agencies or locally through the LAHD, the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles (CRA/LA), the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA), and the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA). The requirements of the public funding include (but are not limited to) maintaining the affordability for a specific, extended number of years.



The City currently has 9,412 housing units at risk of losing their affordability use restrictions between October 1, 2021 and September, 30 2031. These units were designated as at-risk based on the restrictions established by the primary government funding program used to build or rehabilitate the unit, use agreement, covenant and/or rental subsidy program. In 2020, the average rehabilitation cost per unit to preserve an affordable multi-family building was approximately $108,000 and the construction cost per unit for a new affordable multi-family building in Los Angeles was $353,000. A combination of financial and non-financial strategies for preserving expiring affordable housing will prove necessary for this undertaking.

The affordability of the City's affordable housing units is not permanently assured. Based on the current expiring portfolio, the three major threats to preservation in the City are:

- prepayment or maturity of federally-subsidized mortgages;
- expiration and termination of subsidy contracts (Project-Based Section 8 rental subsidy contracts), and;
- the expiration of use restrictions of City-funded projects.

With most of the at-risk developments under ownership of private entities and the high demand for housing at all income levels across the City, expiring affordable units are at serious risk of converting to market rate units. The continuous demand for rental housing leads to higher rents and therefore a more compelling incentive for landlords who own buildings with at-risk affordable units to pursue opportunities for market-rate rents.

Under the Preservation program, LAHD will focus on preserving 300 units annually. Preservation will happen through various efforts including (a) facilitating the renewals of Project-based Section 8 (or similar) contracts, (b) facilitating the re-structure and/or purchase of properties with Project-based Section 8 (or similar) contracts, and (c) re-capitalizing existing affordable housing projects in exchange for lengthening their current affordability restrictions. Preservation projects will target all populations, including homeless, large families, and seniors. Preservation projects will also have varying levels of affordability citywide or within designated transit-oriented districts (TOD).

The City, through the LAHD, will also continue to dedicate staff time to support the L.A. Preservation Working Group (LAPWG) and other related activities. The LAPWG's mission and goals are to protect and preserve the City's affordable housing stock by sharing information, tracking the expiring inventory, and developing creative preservation strategies and transactions. LAHD will continue to dedicate staff time to support the L.A. Preservation Working Group, and provide information and continue with efforts to establish partnerships with entities qualified to acquire and manage at-risk units.


Metro
Entrance
to Canoga
Station

Opportunities for Conservation in Residential Development

Introduction

This chapter delineates the opportunities that exist for water and energy conservation in residential development as required by California Government Code §65583(a)(8), all of which can reduce development costs and improve the affordability of housing units. The discussion highlights the conservation efforts being made by the City of Los Angeles, which aim to both reduce energy and water consumption at the consumer end through regular usage, as well as to minimize the need or demand for traditional energy and water sources. This chapter also addresses building design and land use planning initiatives which contribute to conservation such as green building programs, the promotion of infill projects and mixed-use development, and transit-oriented sustainable development. Additionally, to comply with SB 379 and related state legislation, the City of Los Angeles details additional goals, policies and programs related to sustainability, resilience and climate change in the Safety Element of the General Plan. Coordination with our public agencies overseeing water and sewer infrastructure requirements, including procedures to grant priority water and sewer service to developments with units affordable to lower income households, is pursuant to SB 1087 (Gov. Code § 65589.7).

Comprehensive Plans

In Los Angeles several City departments and agencies work collectively to advance citywide goals around sustainability, resilience, and conservation. The Mayor's Office works to coordinate these interrelated efforts through citywide plans and implementation efforts.

Sustainability pLAn

The City of Los Angeles released the ever first Sustainability pLAn in 2015 under leadership of Mayor Garcetti, and has committed to annual progress reports and an update to the pLAn every four years. This has become more prescient for the City of Los Angeles due to the immediate and evolving challenges facing our environment and economy. The 2019 Sustainability pLAn, also known as the Los Angeles Green New Deal (GND), is a collection of policies and programs that provides a citywide, interdepartmental framework for conservation and sustainable development. The GND lays the foundation for creating a more resilient and sustainable city by establishing four key principles:

1. A commitment to the Paris Climate Agreement and to act urgently with a scientifically-driven strategy for achieving a zero carbon grid, zero carbon transportation, zero carbon buildings, zero waste, and zero wasted water.
2. A responsibility to deliver environmental justice and equity through an inclusive economy, producing results at the community level, guided by communities themselves.
3. A duty to ensure that every Angeleno has the ability to join the green economy, creating pipelines to good paying, green jobs and a just transition in a changing work environment.
4. A resolve to demonstrate the art of the possible and lead the way, walking the walk and using the City's resources—our people and our budget—to drive change.[1]

The goals and targets outlined in the Sustainability pLAn include renewable energy targets, increased goals for locally-sourced water, reducing building energy use, strategies to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and increasing housing production near public transit.

1. See https://plan.lamayor.org/sites/default/files/pLAn_2019_final.pdf for the Sustainability pLAn..

Resilient Los Angeles

In addition to the Sustainability pLAn, the Mayor's Office produces and implements the Resilient Los Angeles Plan. While the Sustainability pLAn creates a roadmap to further carbon sequestration and clean energy in an effort to diminish the impacts of climate change, the Resilient LA Plan provides guidance on how the City will respond to disaster impacts that cannot be avoided. Through 4 chapters, 15 goals, and 96 actions the Resilient LA Plan outlines a path to address underlying vulnerability in the City's infrastructure and social structure to ensure we are able to prevent, respond to and recover from physical and economic shocks to our city. Specifically, Goal 11 to "Restore, rebuild and modernize Los Angeles' infrastructure" presents a key strategy to improve water and energy conservation across the City.



Los Angeles General Plan

The Housing Element is one of several elements of the City's General Plan. Similar to the planning efforts from the Mayor's Office, General Plan Elements include goals, objectives, policies and programs that reflect the work of several departments. Many of the City's other adopted Elements also touch on efforts to conserve energy and water in residential buildings.

Land Use: The 1996 Framework Element of the General Plan is the City's strategy for growth, setting a citywide context to guide decision-making. The Plan clearly sets forth a vision of sustainable growth in that it focuses on growth occurring in specific areas linked to existing and planned infrastructure and services, with a strong emphasis on creating growth near public transportation and job centers. This vision is carried out each time a Community Plan is updated, where growth considerations including proximity to transit and jobs shape land use designations and zoning. Collectively the City's 35 Community Plans serve as the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

Health: The Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles, adopted in 2015, lays out the City's vision of healthy neighborhoods and satisfies the environmental justice requirements of SB 1000. The plan focuses on several aspects of health, including access to clean and healthy housing, buildings and open spaces. In an effort to meet these health goals the plan establishes programs and quantifiable targets around energy and water conservation to ensure lasting access to clean and healthy buildings.

Mobility: The Mobility Plan serves as the City of Los Angeles' Transportation Element. The plan sets a vision for a comprehensive mobility system that allows people to move around the city through many modes of travel. Combined with the smart growth strategy detailed above, this represents a significant effort to enhance energy and water savings by enabling reduced use of single occupancy vehicles. The plan also has strategies for green enhancements to car infrastructure, such as improved access to electric vehicle charging.

Safety: The Safety Element of the General Plan details the City's efforts to prevent, respond to and recover from disaster events such as fires, earthquakes and floods. In keeping with recent state legislation the Safety Element is being updated alongside the Housing Element, including updates to better reflect efforts to prevent and respond to climate change. Many of the goals, policies and programs detailed in the Sustainability pLAn and Resilient LA will be formally integrated into the Safety Element to satisfy these requirements, ensuring that the water and energy savings framework thoroughly established through these Mayoral plans is additionally reflected in the City's official General Plan.

Targeted Initiatives

In addition to these comprehensive planning efforts, many departments and agencies within the City of Los Angeles undertake targeted campaigns and long range planning campaigns to realize specific conservation goals. The methods described below, as well as those described in Chapter 6, are specific efforts that the City is currently undertaking to reduce energy and water consumption, thereby working towards further reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while investing in critical infrastructure and sustainable housing development. Please note that specific objectives, policies and programs relating to conservation are detailed in Chapter 6 under Goal 3: A City in which housing creates healthy, livable, sustainable, and resilient communities that improve the lives of all Angelenos.

Los Angeles Green Building Code

On January 1, 2011, the Los Angeles Green Building Code (LA Green Code) went into effect citywide. The Code is based primarily on the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), the nation's first statewide green building standards code. Both were direct responses to meeting the goals of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), California's landmark greenhouse gas legislation, which seeks to reduce the energy and water use of construction; reduce waste; and reduce the carbon footprint. The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), established through the State's budget process utilizing cap-and-trade proceeds, is a significant source of funding for vital programs within the City of Los Angeles to reach sustainable development and transportation improvements at the community level, as well as clean energy and energy investments.

The LA Green Code expands upon CALGreen's policies and regulations, incorporating some earlier green provisions in the pre-existing LA Code, as well as replacing some overlapping provisions requiring that certain projects meet a LEED® standard. The LA Green Code exceeds CALGreen by applying not only to all new residential structures, but also to all building additions and alterations with a value in excess of $200,000. It also incorporates some green provisions in the pre-existing Code by requiring "solar ready" roofs and electric vehicle-ready components for all new buildings. In addition, the LA Green Code attempted to clarify various code sections within the CALGreen Code to make it easier to understand and implement.

Since its adoption in 2011, the LA Green Code has undergone multiple revisions during the 2013-2021 Housing Element cycle -- in 2014, 2017 and 2020. The following types of projects are subject to the Los Angeles Green Code:

- All new buildings (residential and non-residential)
- All additions (residential and non-residential)
- Alterations with building valuations of $200,000 or more (residential and non-residential)
- Residential alterations that increase the building's conditioned volume

Updates to the LA Green Code include standards in the following areas:

Solar Energy: Production of electricity from fossil fuels creates pollution, including smog and greenhouse gas emissions. By having a municipally-owned utility, Los Angeles' investment in solar is generating clean power, reducing pollution, and improving grid reliability. This includes incentives to expand solar energy in commercial and multi-family development, as well as opportunities to allow renters to tap into renewable energy programs through programs such as Community Solar. In 2017, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) launched the Solar Rooftops Program (SRP) designed to expand solar access to residential customers who would otherwise not be able to install solar panels due to cost. The program launched in early 2017 and as of May 2019 the SRP has been revised to expand eligibility and the overall scope of the initial program. If approved, customers can get a fixed roof lease payment from LADWP. Agreements are valid for up to 20 years. In 2018, Shared Solar, under the umbrella of LADWP's Community Solar initiatives, enabled residential customers living in multifamily dwellings (apartments, condominiums, duplexes) to fix a portion of their electric bill against rising utility costs for 10 years, as well as support renewable energy, help create local jobs, help reduce the carbon footprint of LADWP's generation portfolio and lessen the impact of global warming. Program participants subscribe for either the minimum of 50 kWh or the maximum of 100 kWh of energy on a monthly basis.

Water Conservation: As drought conditions continue and Los Angeles looks to increase its own local water supply, long-term water conservation changes are needed at every level. New building codes and rebates provide incentives to conserve and adapt to a changing climate. For example, Angelenos can save thousands of gallons by installing water-efficient fixtures/appliances and drought-tolerant landscaping. In 2017, amendments to the LA Green Code also included standards for greywater systems in residential development.

Other Green Building Programs

Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Stations: Transportation is one of the largest and fastest growing contributors to greenhouse gas emissions associated with climate change. In California, the transportation sector contributes more than 40% of statewide greenhouse gas emissions.[2] Through LADWP, the City of Los Angeles provides rebates for commercial and residential customers investing in EV infrastructure. For example, the Charge Up LA! program offers LADWP residential customers rebates to help offset the cost of charging stations for electric vehicles (EV).

Existing Buildings Energy and Water Efficiency Program (EBEWE): On December 13, 2016, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 184674, establishing the Existing Buildings Energy & Water Efficiency Program to reduce energy and water consumption in buildings within the City of Los Angeles.[3] These efficiency improvements will lower energy use, water use, and greenhouse gas emissions citywide.

---

2. Assessing California's Climate Policies, Legislative Analyst's Office, 2018, https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3912

3. Ordinance No. 184674 can be found here: https://www.ladbs.org/docs/default-source/forms/green-building-2017/ord_184674.pdf?sfvrsn=fd6cfe53_12



Cool Roofs: The Los Angeles City Council approved a Cool Roofs Ordinance (Ord. No. 183149) in 2014 that incentivizes this conservation strategy by reducing the need for running air conditioning systems. Cool roofs also are available in a variety of styles: shingle, shake, tile, membrane, and spray-on liquid coatings in residential and commercial buildings.

Waste Hauling: On March 5, 2010, the Los Angeles City Council approved Council File No. 09-3029 pertaining to a Citywide Construction and Demolition (C & D) Waste Recycling Ordinance that requires all mixed C & D waste generated within city limits be taken to City-certified C & D waste processors. LA Sanitation and Environment (LASAN) is responsible for the C & D waste recycling policy. This is an ongoing program that requires an annual certification of approved haulers and reporting of their C & D diversion rate. As of December 2020, all the City's certified haulers had an over 75% diversion rate of C & D material.[4]

Fireplaces: The South Coast Air Basin presently has some of the highest levels of fine particulate pollution in the United States. Public health and air pollution concerns led to the adoption of Rule 445 by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), allowing only install gaseous-fueled fireplaces and stoves in any new residential or commercial development that begins construction on or after March 9, 2009. In addition, other elements of the SCAQMD's Healthy Hearths program ensure that residential building components such as wood-burning devices do not continue to be significant sources of air pollution and pollute indoor air with fine particulates and toxic air pollutants.[5]

Adaptive Reuse: Over the past several decades, the Los Angeles Departments of City Planning, Building and Safety, and others collaborated to remove zoning and building code barriers that prevented developers from retaining existing structures and converting them to a new use. This strategy reduces materials consumption and the overall carbon footprint of a project.

---

4. See LA Sanitation's reporting under the Citywide Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling Ordinance here: https://www.lacitysan.org/san/faces/home/portal/s-lsh-wwd/s-lsh-wwd-s/s-lsh-wwd-s-r/s-lsh-wwd-s-r-cdr?_adf.ctrl-state=2ql4h0anf_544&_afrLoop=9460429905574954#!

5. Rule 445 adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District can be found here: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-445.pdf

Water Management Plans

One Water LA

The One Water LA 2040 Plan (One Water LA) is a comprehensive planning process designed to increase sustainable water management for the City of Los Angeles.[6] In 2018, LASAN and LADWP completed the final draft of the One Water LA Plan, a more comprehensive water management plan for the City of Los Angeles that builds off of the Sustainability pLAn. The total estimated cost of the projects and programs developed for the plan is roughly $13 billion. The Department of City Planning was also involved in the development of the plan.

Urban Water Management Plan

An Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) is prepared and adopted by LADWP every five years to forecast the future water demands and water supplies under average and dry year conditions. The Plan includes sections on water conservation, water recycling, water quality and rates. In regards to water conservation, the Plan formally adopts goals detailed in Executive Directive 5, which mandated City goals and actions in response to the drought, as well as goals from the Sustainability pLAn that pertain to water conservation.

---

6. The complete One Water LA 2040 Plan can be accessed through LA Sanitation here: https://www.lacitysan.org/san/faces/wcnav_externalId/s-lsh-es-owla-r?_adf.ctrl-state=2ql4h0anf_234&_afrLoop=9458442747542397#!



Residential and Commercial Rebate Programs for Efficient Appliances

Implementing conservation measures with regard to energy use will decrease the operating costs of a home or apartment, making it more affordable for the tenant or owner. One means of lowering energy costs is by using more efficient appliances. The US Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star rating program identifies specific manufacturers' appliances that use between 10% and 50% less energy and water than other manufacturers. There are periodic manufacturer's rebates available for these products to off-set their initial cost. In addition, as of April 2013, LADWP offers rebates for the purchase of energy efficient appliances that include refrigerators, air conditioning, weatherization and retrofits, and window upgrades.[7]

7. The complete list of rebates available to residential customers through LADWP can be found here: https://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/faces/ladwp/residential/r-savemoney/r-sm-rebatesandprograms?_adf.ctrl-state=1dvtzc9a0k_4&_afrLoop=496043549217702



Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies

Land use patterns and development can occur in ways that are more sustainable and help to conserve resources. Sustainable development recognizes the connections between land use, natural resources and transportation to reduce energy consumption, reduce dependence on the automobile, and provide long term environmental benefits, health benefits, and cost savings. The 1996 Framework Element of the General Plan is the City's strategy for growth, setting a citywide context to guide decision-making. The Plan clearly sets forth a vision of sustainable growth in that it focuses on growth occurring in specific areas linked to existing and planned infrastructure and services, with a strong emphasis on creating growth near public transportation and job centers. The primary objectives of the policies in the Framework Element's Land Use chapter are to support the viability of the City's residential neighborhoods and commercial districts, and, when growth occurs, to encourage sustainable growth in a number of higher-intensity commercial and mixed-use districts, centers and boulevards and industrial districts particularly in proximity to transportation corridors and transit stations.

Since the adoption of the 2013-2021 Housing Element, the City of Los Angeles has implemented several key programs to holistically address the need for accelerating affordable housing production along with transportation and other infrastructure investments that complement evolving design standards to improve the lives of Angelenos in the most vulnerable communities. This vision is carried out each time a Community Plan is updated, where growth considerations, including proximity to transit and jobs, shape land use designations and zoning. Similarly, the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program has built on the overall vision of the Framework to ensure that much of our recent growth in housing, especially affordable housing, occurs near existing and planned transit.

Measure JJJ & Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Program

In 2016, Los Angeles voters approved Measure JJJ (also known as "Build Better LA"), which among other provisions, required the Department of City Planning (DCP) to create a program to further incentivize affordable housing near transit. DCP developed program guidelines for what is now the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program, which became effective on September 22, 2017 (for more information see Appendix 2.1). The program encourages affordable housing within one-half mile of major transit stops by providing for additional density, reduced parking, and other zoning incentives for projects that include covenanted affordable units. The TOC program is now a major way to produce transit-oriented, mixed-income housing in Los Angeles. Between 2017 and December 2020, the TOC program produced applications for more than 35,000 housing units throughout the City. More than 7,500 (or 22%) of these units are restricted affordable units.

State and Local initiatives

State grant programs are an important component of funding local and community-based initiatives. The programs listed below are examples of local implementation aimed at improving sustainability and affordable housing production in lower income, frontline environmental justice communities.

Transformative Climate Communities

The Transformative Climate Communities Program (TCC) funds community-led development and infrastructure projects that achieve major environmental, health and economic benefits in California's most disadvantaged communities. TCC empowers the communities most impacted by pollution to choose their own goals, strategies and projects to enact transformational change with data driven milestones and measurable outcomes. The California Strategic Growth Council (SGC) awards TCC grants and



partners with the California Department of Conservation to implement them. TCC is part of California Climate Investments (Cap-and-Trade dollars at work). Within the City of Los Angeles, two communities have been part of the TCC program, Watts and the Northeast San Fernando Valley.

Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program

The AHSC Program is a competitive state funding program with the primary objective to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by providing funding for investments in affordable housing development, transportation, and programs that encourage residents to walk, bike, and use public transit. Funded by the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) auction proceeds from California's Cap-and-Trade program, AHSC awards funding to create holistic communities with affordable housing and transportation options near jobs and other key destinations. Established in 2014, AHSC is administered by the SGC and implemented by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). More recently, the SGC has established an annual cycle of AHSC award rounds, with applications due every February and funding awards announced in June. The AHSC Program receives an annual statutory allocation (per Senate Bill 862) of 20% of the GGRF auction proceeds through 2030. To date, the AHSC Program has awarded over $1.1 billion in grant funds for projects across the state, with much more to follow as this program continues. Successful projects are defined as those that substantially reduce GHG emissions by increasing access to affordable housing, employment centers, and key destinations through sustainable transportation options. As a result, projects include both an affordable housing component and a sustainable transportation scope of work. Projects are competitively scored based on established scoring criteria, including GHG emissions reductions efficiency, length of active transportation improvements, and green building status. Combined with the prior AHSC awards, the City has successfully secured approximately $330.8 million to support 28 developments with 2,943 new housing units, of which 2,668 are affordable, and an array of GHG emission-reducing transit infrastructure projects.


307 N. WILMINGTON

Adequate Sites for Housing

Introduction

Under Housing Element law, the City must demonstrate that it has adequate land zoned to accommodate the entirety of its 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation of 456,643 housing units. This Chapter identifies the City's inventory of land suitable for residential development without the need for any legislative action by the City (in accordance with CA Government Code §65583.2), identifies additional alternative methods of satisfying the RHNA (pursuant to CA Government Code §65583.1), provides an analysis of the inventory's compliance with Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements, and identifies the need for rezoning programs to accommodate the RHNA allocation. The methodology used to identify these sites and conduct the AFFH analysis is also described here. This Chapter also includes information on the availability and suitability of infrastructure to support the development of housing.

The analysis demonstrates that, during the 6th cycle, the City has an anticipated unit potential of 230,947 units, of which 72,640 units are lower-income. As a result of the gap between the 6th cycle RHNA Allocation and the City's anticipated unit potential, the City's Housing Element identifies a need to create a Rezoning Program to meet the 255,432-unit shortfall. To accommodate this shortfall, the City proposes a Rezoning Program that prioritizes additional housing capacity, particularly lower-income capacity, in Higher Opportunity Areas, promotes housing near transit, and protects environmentally sensitive areas. The Rezoning Program also proposes to integrate value capture strategies and utilize affordable housing overlays to maximize affordable housing production, promote mixed-income communities, and provide advantages to majority affordable projects. A detailed description of the proposed Rezoning Program, including the methodology used to develop the Inventory of Candidate Sites for Rezoning, is also provided in this Chapter.

This approach to rezoning is informed by an AFFH analysis of the Adequate Sites Inventory, which found that the existing Sites Inventory largely reflects existing disparities in the city's zoning and development patterns. In contrast, AFFH Analysis of the Rezoning Program finds that the proposed approach would significantly improve these conditions and address residential segregation patterns by creating substantial new housing capacity in Higher Opportunity Areas and in Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence. The analysis also highlights concerns about potential displacement, providing support for a strong set of anti-displacement policies and programs. This includes policies and programs described in Chapter 6, such as enforcement of tenant protections, no-net-loss and replacement provisions, and forthcoming anti-displacement strategies that will be studied prior to completion of the Rezoning Program.



RHNA Allocation and Target Capacity for Adequate Sites Inventory

Background on RHNA

The RHNA is the California State-required process that seeks to ensure cities and counties plan for enough housing to accommodate all economic segments of the community. There are three key steps in the RHNA Allocation process.

1. **Regional Determination:** The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) provides each region a Regional Determination of housing need, which includes a total number of units split into four income categories and considers measures of existing housing need in addition to forecast population growth. The City of Los Angeles is within the region covered by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). HCD provided SCAG a Regional Determination of 1,341,827 units for the 6th Cycle RHNA (2021-2029). This is the total number of units that the cities and counties in the SCAG region must collectively plan to accommodate.
2. **RHNA Methodology:** Councils of Governments (COG), including SCAG, are responsible for developing a RHNA Methodology for allocating the Regional Determination to each city and county in the COG's region. This methodology must further specific state objectives, including but not limited to: promoting infill, equity, environmental protection; ensuring a jobs-housing balance; and affirmatively furthering fair housing.
3. **Housing Element Updates:** Each city and county must then adopt a housing element that demonstrates how the jurisdiction can accommodate its assigned RHNA through its zoning or potential rezoning program. HCD reviews each jurisdiction's housing element for compliance with state law.

City of Los Angeles RHNA Allocation

The City of Los Angeles's share of the regional housing need was determined by a RHNA Allocation Methodology prepared by SCAG, adopted in March 2020. In accordance with SCAG's RHNA Allocation Plan, the City must plan to accommodate a total of 456,643 housing units during the sixth cycle. This is equal to a yearly average of approximately 57,080 housing units. Table 4.1 shows the City's RHNA Allocation by income category.

Table 4.1: **City of Los Angeles 6th Cycle RHNA Allocation**

Income Category	Number of Units	Percent of Total
Very Low Income	115,978	25.4%
Low Income	68,743	15.1%
Moderate Income	75,091	16.4%
Above Moderate Income	196,831	43.1%
Total RHNA Allocation	**456,643**	**100.0%**

The City's Housing Element is required to identify sufficient sites that are available and suitable to accommodate the RHNA by income level, or to identify a rezoning program to accommodate any shortfall (Government Code 65583(c)(1)(A)). Sites identified to accommodate the lower-income portion of the RHNA are required to meet specified criteria to demonstrate adequacy of the site for lower income housing, including a requirement that the site be zoned for multi-family densities of 30 dwelling units per acre (du/acre) or greater. The lower-income portion of the RHNA includes the very low-income and low-income categories shown in Table 4.1.

While the City is not required to physically construct the units, it is required to show that adequate zoning capacity exists and to show the sites where that capacity is located.

Target Capacity for Adequate Sites Inventory and Rezoning Program

Senate Bill 166 (No Net Loss Law) requires sufficient adequate sites to be available at all times throughout the RHNA planning period to meet a jurisdiction's remaining unmet housing needs for each income category. During the 8-year cycle, if sites are developed with a non-residential use, developed with a lower number of units at each income level than identified in the Adequate Sites Inventory, or rezoned, the City must demonstrate that there are adequate remaining sites in the inventory to accommodate the remaining RHNA Allocation. If the City finds there is insufficient remaining capacity at each income level, it would be subject to further rezoning requirements.

To ensure that sufficient sites are available in the Housing Element to accommodate the RHNA throughout the planning period, the City has followed HCD guidance and set a target capacity that is 10% higher than the RHNA for lower-income units, and 15% higher than the RHNA for moderate-income units. The buffers are based on anticipated need for additional capacity, based on anticipated production levels of lower-income and moderate-income housing units during the planning period. In addition, the sites included on the Adequate Sites Inventory have an anticipated development potential that is lower than the maximum zoned capacity on each site, which creates an additional buffer at the site-level. This results in a target capacity for the Adequate Sites Inventory and Rezoning Program of 486,379 units. The target capacity by income category is summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Income Category	**RHNA Allocation**	**Target Buffer** (% above RHNA)	**Target Capacity**
Lower Income	184,721	10%	203,193
Moderate Income	75,091	15%	86,355
Above Moderate Income	196,831	0%	196,831
Total	**456,643**	**7%**	**486,379**



Overview of Adequate Sites Inventory

The Adequate Sites Inventory presents an inventory of land suitable and available for residential development to meet the City's RHNA Allocation at all income levels.

Per State law, the City's Inventory consists of undeveloped and underdeveloped sites upon which the required number of housing units is reasonably likely to be built during the planning period without the need for any legislative action (such as a zone change) by the City. The Inventory includes sites that were identified through three key components, including expected development potential on vacant and underutilized sites, planned and approved development projects, and non-site-specific development potential that provide additional alternative means of meeting the RHNA. These components, along with their anticipated capacity, are summarized in Table 4.3. The methodology and conclusions of each component are further discussed in this Chapter.

Table 4.3: **Summary of Adequate Sites for Housing, by Income Category**

Component	Lower Income Units	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate Income Units	Total Units
		Vacant and Underutilized Sites		
Expected Unit Potential	16,965	5,039	20,770	**42,764**
Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan	0	0	10,491	**10,491**
		Planned and Approved Projects (Development Pipeline)		
Public Land	5,606	12	2,273	**7,891**
Private Development Projects	18,987	1,352	97,475	**117,814**
		Additional Means of Meeting the RHNA - Non-Site-Specific		
ADU Development	24,592	2,459	13,935	**40,987**
Project Homekey Expansion	1,000	0	0	**1,000**
Public Land Programs	5,500	4,500	0	**10,000**
Total Development Potential	**72,640**	**13,362**	**144,944**	**230,947**

Vacant and Underutilized Sites

Recent changes to state Housing Element law have strengthened requirements related to the Adequate Sites Inventory. In particular, AB 1397 (2017) requires that, for each site included in the inventory, the City identifies the realistic development potential for the site within the 8-year planning period. In instances where non-vacant sites comprise over 50% of the Adequate Sites Inventory, existing uses are presumed to impede development unless findings with substantial evidence are provided that the use is likely to be discontinued. The City of Los Angeles is predominantly built out, and the majority of sites are non-vacant; therefore, the methodology used to identify realistic development potential must consider factors such as existing uses, past development trends, market conditions, and the availability of regulatory and/or other development incentives.

Due to the complexity of the new statutory requirements and the scope of analysis needed for the large number of potential vacant and underutilized parcels (over 700,000 potential residentially zoned sites), the City consulted with the Terner Center for Housing Innovation, an academic research center at UC Berkeley, to assist in methodology development. Through this partnership, the Terner Center and MetroSight developed an econometric approach for estimating realistic development potential based on the City's past experience, as reflected in building permit data. The model incorporates several factors which are designed to address the state requirements for non-vacant sites.

Methodology

The model draws upon five years of past housing development permits to create a two-step regression model that indicates (1) the likelihood of new housing development occurring on each parcel, and (2) the number of new units that would be expected if development were to occur. The model accounts for a parcel's actual zoned capacity before and after development bonuses, as well as market conditions and various other factors which impact the likelihood for a site to develop into housing, including those the City is required to address per state law. The two-step model is run separately for low density sites (1-4 units), medium density sites (5-50 units), and higher density sites (50+ units), and considers how the factors shown in Table 4.4 influence the likelihood of development occurring on an individual site.

Table 4.4: **Regression Model Variables**

Factors Considered in Model	Included in Step 1	Included in Step 2
Number of base-zoned units allowed (per zoning)	✓	✓
Number of bonus-zoned units allowed (the sum of base-zoned units and any additional units allowed per development bonus)	✓	✓
Ratio of existing units to base-zoned units	✓	
Indicators for residential market area type	✓	✓
Existing use	✓	
Age of existing structure	✓	
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) utilization of existing structure	✓	
Applicability of City's Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) to existing structures	✓	
Ratio of total permitted units to total based-zoned units in the Community Plan Area (CPA), over a 5-year period	✓	✓
Typical estimated home value in the zip code area (Zillow Home Value Index)	✓	✓
Typical estimated asking rent in the zip code area (Zillow Observed Rent Index)	✓	✓
Average rental vacancy rate in the Census Public Use Microdata Area (PUMA) during the prior 5-year period	✓	✓
Average remaining commercial lease duration in the CPA (Compstak)	✓	

Results

The results of both steps of the model are then applied to potential sites that are zoned to permit residential development, to determine the realistic development potential on each site during the 8-year planning period (2021-2029). Every parcel is assigned a maximum density considering any available density bonus (including the City's Transit Oriented Communities Affordable Housing Incentives (TOC)). The model applies the factors in Table 4.4 above to create two percentages that are applied to every parcel: 1) a probability the site will develop into housing in the 8-year period, and 2) the percentage of maximum capacity expected to be built, if developed as housing.

Site Example: A typical R3 zoned site in South LA is allowed 10 units after a density bonus through the TOC program. The regression model assumes the site will get built out at 78% of its allowable density (rounded to 8 units) but only have a 1% chance of being redeveloped into new housing. The site is therefore assigned a realistic development potential of 0.08 units during a 5-year period (10 units x 80% x 1%). Adjusted to 8 years, the site is assigned a realistic development potential of 0.13 units.

Table 4.5 shows how the results are applied to this site example. The full list of sites and their realistic development potential is provided in Appendix 4.1. Importantly, the outcome of the model is that each site is assigned an anticipated development potential that is well below the zoned capacity for the site, as there are many factors which make it difficult to identify precisely which sites will develop with housing over the 8-year period. It is not expected that all sites identified using this model will redevelop with their identified realistic development potential; rather, the much more likely outcome is that a smaller number of sites are developed with their expected build out (outcome of step 2 of the model). To further illustrate, for the site example provided above, the model shows that given 100 similar sites, it would be expected that one site would develop with 8 units during the planning period. As it is not possible to identify precisely which site would redevelop, the model indicates that each site has a small percent chance of redeveloping. This approach inherently incorporates a buffer on each site, consistent with HCD suggested guidance for compliance with SB 166.



Table 4.5: **Application of Model Results to Sample Site**

Model Steps	Sample Site
Community Plan Area	South LA
Zone	R3-1
Base-zoned units	6
Bonus-zoned units	10
Probability site will develop with housing (Step 1)	1.0%
Percent of bonus-zoned capacity expected to be built, if developed (Step 2)	78%
Predicted number of new units, conditional on development occurring (rounded)	8.00
Expected Unit Potential (5-year period)	0.08
Expected Unit Potential (8-year period)	0.13

When applied to vacant and non-vacant sites that permit residential development without legislative action, the model results in an overall expected development potential of 42,764 new units over 8 years, distributed over 198,139 potential sites. Most sites zoned for residential use without known constraints were included in the initial model. Additional sites were removed based on the model results, as they were not found to have a likelihood of redeveloping. In addition, sites which do not permit a net increase in residential units were excluded from the final inventory, as well as vacant sites located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). Additional sites were removed where the existing use is presumed to be unlikely to be discontinued, including institutional uses such as cemeteries, colleges, hospitals, and schools, and active government-owned or -operated uses such as libraries, recreation centers, and police and fire stations.

Table 4.6 shows the total number of units that are expected at each income level. Lower-income units were assigned to sites with qualifying minimum residential densities (a minimum of 30 du/acre permitted by base zoning), and which are of an adequate size to accommodate development of lower-income housing.

There is demonstrated experience of lower-income housing units being built on sites of varying sizes, including small sites of less than a half-acre in size, if the lot permits 5 or more units of base density.[1] This experience includes both 100% affordable housing development, but more commonly, mixed-income housing development. Almost all of Los Angeles multi-family zones that permit at least 30 units/acre (R3+) accommodate at least 3.0:1 FAR (Floor Area Ratio), allowing three times the lot size as a buildable area. Allowable densities are easily buildable within the allowable building envelope, even on relatively small lots. Even the lowest density zoning (R3 and C1) sites used to accommodate the lower-income need can accommodate at least five units, which qualifies for a seven-unit density bonus or TOC project, if the lot is larger than 3,200 square feet (about eight percent of an acre). The next major zoning class (R4 and C2) allows twice this density, thereby allowing sites larger than 1,600 square feet to qualify for incentive programs. Recently created parking reductions through TOC and density bonus projects located near transit have also opened up many small lots that were previously constrained by parking requirements. Furthermore, the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee (2018) established a strong additional incentive to create mixed-income projects on properties that meet these criteria, providing on-site affordable units to qualify for fee exemption. A review of the 108 construction permits for multi-family projects (7+ units) that have been subject to the Linkage Fee shows that all but 3 (97%) provided at least one on-site affordable unit. Due to the low predictive values used in the regression model to establish Site Inventory capacities, the number of on-site affordable lower-income units constructed will almost always exceed the figures provided in the Inventory.

The methodology uses the above logic to exclude small sites that are ineligible for the City's incentive programs from being considered as lower-income sites, using a five-unit base density (rounded up) assumption. In making this assumption, it is also important to note that the Sites Inventory lists sites by the smallest possible parcel identification number (PIN), rather than as part of a larger parcel (APN), which is how most small properties are used, sold, and developed. Viable development sites are often either already tied together or can be easily tied, requiring only a "Lot Tie Affidavit" to proceed with development across multiple lots.

1. There are many examples of proposed and permitted small-site affordable housing developments provided in the Housing Element Annual Progress Reports (APRs) prepared for the 5th Cycle. Some examples include: a 6 unit mixed-income development built on a 0.14-acre site, with 1 very low-income unit and 5 above moderate-income units (APN: 5154005004); a 21-unit, 100% affordable development built on a 0.22 acre site, with 1 very low-income unit, 20 low-income units and 1 above moderate-income manager's unit (APN: 6048004025); and a 57-unit, 100% affordable development built on a 0.26 acre site, with 56 very low-income units and 1 above moderate-income manager's unit (APN: 5101030030).

Moderate-income units were assigned to sites located in low and medium residential market areas, which are zoned for lower density multi-family residential uses (at least 4 units, up to 30 du/acre permitted by base zoning). Above moderate-income units were assigned to all remaining sites identified through the model, including any multi-family zoned sites that are subject to the City's Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO). This step was taken based on feedback from tenants' rights advocates and other stakeholders to ensure that tenant-occupied properties are not specifically targeted for redevelopment, particularly given the by-right provisions that would result from re-use of lower-income sites. Still, the expectation is that these sites, if they do redevelop, will include deed restricted lower-income housing. This reallocation of RSO sites can also be considered an additional conservative assumption with regards to lower-income sites.

Table 4.6: **Expected Unit Potential, Vacant and Underutilized Sites (Regression Analysis)**


	Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total Development Potential
Expected Unit Production	16,955	5,039	20,770	**42,764**


Map 4.1 shows the location and distribution of the total expected unit potential resulting from the regression model. The location and distribution of the lower income units resulting from the analysis is shown in Map 4.2.

Appendix 4.1 includes the detailed list of all sites. The General Plan land use designation and zoning capacity are identified for each site, as well as the number of housing units that the site can realistically accommodate during the planning period.

The inventory also includes the following information for each site:

- Size, in acres
- A description of the existing use
- Whether the site is publicly owned or leased
- Whether the site has available or planned and accessible infrastructure
- Whether the site was identified in a previous planning period site inventory


Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Northridge
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Santa Monica Mountains
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Downtown
East LA
Monterey Park
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
Vernon
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Pacific Ocean
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 4.1
Adequate Sites Inventory
Location of Distribution of Total Unit Potential
Low
High
N
0
5
10
Miles


Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Northridge
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Santa Monica Mountains
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Monterey Park
East LA
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Vernon
Venice
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Pacific Ocean
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 4.2
Adequate Sites Inventory
Location of Distribution of Lower Income Unit Potential
Low
High
N
0
5
10
Miles

Sites Suitability Analysis and Availability of Infrastructure

All identified parcels are suitable for development in the current planning period, pursuant to zoning and building code requirements, and are not subject to any general environmental constraints that would preclude development. Streets and highways are available to all sites in the inventory and in most cases, transit is within close proximity. In addition to its streets and freeways the City of Los Angeles has a heavy rail, light rail, rapid bus, fixed guideway, and an extensive bus transit system.

Parcels included in the inventory have sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities available to support housing development. Water, sewers, and other utilities are available throughout the City of Los Angeles as an urbanized area. The City's infrastructure capacity and availability are being analyzed in the environmental analysis prepared for this Update to the Housing Element.




Environmental or other known features (e.g., presence of floodplains, protected wetlands, VHFHSZ) are not anticipated to impact the development viability of the identified sites on the sites inventory. The City of Los Angeles has a presence of many known environmental features and sites located within those that preclude residential development were removed from the inventory. For example, vacant sites were excluded from the inventory if they were located in the VHFHSZ, as those sites are presumed to have additional environmental conditions such as slopes that have made residential development infeasible up until now. The presence of certain environmental or other known features is not anticipated to preclude development on the identified sites.

The methodology used to develop the Adequate Sites Inventory is designed to consider the suitability and availability of each site for residential development during the planning period. The methodology takes into consideration the suitability of the parcel's size as part of the evaluation of whether a site is likely to be redeveloped, including many suitability factors such as the allowable density and realistic capacity of the site, the existing use, age of existing structure, and the current utilization of existing buildings.

Each housing development will be granted a permit on a site-by-site basis, at which time it is possible that some projects may be required to improve the existing infrastructure or comply with specific environmental regulations (such as certain types of roofing materials in high fire hazard areas). However, the City's environmental laws in general do not preclude development. A project proposed on any site in the Inventory would be allowed if consistent with the zoning provisions for that site, and would be issued a permit by the Department of Building and Safety (provided no extraordinary site-specific health and safety circumstances were found to exist).

Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan

In addition to the sites resulting from the methodology described above, the Adequate Sites Inventory includes development potential located within the boundaries of the Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan Area. The Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan (adopted 2013) adopted zoning regulations in the Warner Center Plan area, in order to promote a mixed-use, transit-oriented district for the Plan area and surrounding communities. The Warner Center Plan area is located in the Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills Community Plan Area in the west San Fernando Valley and is served by the Metro Orange Line (see Map 4.3).



MAP 4.3

Warner Center

Metro Station

Metro - Orange Line

Warner Center

Among other strategies, the Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan aims to promote dense, mixed-use neighborhoods by establishing unlimited residential density on most sites located within the plan area, until the plan's build-out limitation is reached, or the plan horizon year of 2035 is reached. Under the plan, total dwelling units within the plan area can increase from the baseline development condition of 6,200 in 2008 to a maximum of 26,048 in 2035. After the build-out limitation of 26,048 units is reached, sites within the plan area revert to R3 residential density, which is a density equivalent to approximately 54 dwelling units per acre.

In the first 7 years of the 22-year plan period, nearly 60% of the residential build-out limitation has been met through existing, completed, and pending new development (see Table 4.7). By 2029 (the end of the 6th cycle RHNA planning period), there would only be 6 years remaining until the Warner Center Specific Plan horizon is reached in 2035. Given the rate of development activity in the Warner Center Specific Plan Area, the plan is on track to reach the build-out limitation in advance of the plan horizon year. As such, it is reasonable to anticipate that the build-out limitation is likely to be reached during the 6th cycle RHNA planning period. Additional development may occur after the build-out limitation is met and development standards revert to R3 residential density; however, it is not currently possible to estimate the level of development that would occur at that time.

Table 4.7: **Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan, Residential Build-Out Limitation**

	Housing Units	Residential Square Footage (sq. ft.)
Plan Build-Out Limitation (2035)	26,048	32,600,000
Current Existing Development plus Entitled Development Not Yet Built	15,557	19,459,521
Remaining Plan Capacity	10,491	13,140,479

As a result, it is anticipated that a total of 10,491 housing units are reasonably likely to occur in the Warner Center Specific Plan Area during the 6th cycle. Due to the nature of the development regulations in this area, it is anticipated that this development potential is likely to occur, but it is difficult to identify specific sites that are likely to be developed. For the purposes of the Inventory of Adequate Sites, the Warner Center Specific Plan Area is therefore considered to be one master-planned site with a total expected development potential of 10,491 units.

While all sites in the Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan have sufficient density to accommodate development of lower-income housing, based on current development activity in the plan area, no new housing has been developed for lower-income households (although some development projects have proposed to include workforce housing units). The City Council has called for a study of the feasibility of incorporating an inclusionary housing requirement in the plan area; however, this inclusionary requirement has not yet been adopted. As a result, at this time there is no evidence to support an estimate of the future development of lower-income housing in the Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan Area. Table 4.8 displays the anticipated capacity by income category located in the Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan Area.

Table 4.8: **Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan, Anticipated Capacity by Income Category**

	Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total Development Potential
Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan	0	0	10,491	**10,491**



Planned and Approved Projects (Development Pipeline)

The housing element may satisfy its RHNA requirement through a variety of methods other than identifying specific sites (Government Code Section 65583.1). This includes the identification of units permitted, built, entitled, or pending that may occur through planned and approved projects that are already in the development pipeline within the jurisdiction. Following is an analysis of planned and approved projects that are anticipated to occur during the 6th cycle on publicly owned land and through other private development projects.

Publicly Owned Land

There are several ongoing programs at local agencies for the development of affordable and supportive housing on publicly owned land. The Adequate Sites Inventory includes pipeline development projects from three public agencies, including the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (Metro), the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA), and the City of Los Angeles. Specifically, the inventory includes development projects that are part of the following programs:

- **Metro Joint Development Program:** A real estate development program through which Metro collaborates with qualified developers to build transit-oriented developments on Metro-owned properties.
- **HACLA-Project Homekey Sites:** Motels and hotels that will be converted to permanent housing as a part of the first round of the State's Project Homekey program.
- **HACLA-Public Housing Redevelopment:** A program to develop new housing units at existing public housing locations.
- **City of Los Angeles—City Owned Sites Development:** The City's program to develop affordable housing and supportive housing on City-owned properties, in partnership with qualified local affordable housing developers.

All included development projects are expected to be completed within the 6th cycle, as they represent projects which have a defined development program, a commitment of public funds and/or land, a selected developer and development agreement, and/or have received necessary approval from the appropriate oversight board or council to move forward for development. Affordability levels are established by the respective programs and will be ensured by a combination of land use covenants and public subsidy requirements. As shown in Table 4.9, these development projects account for a total of 7,891 housing units, of which 5,606 are lower-income. The full list of

development projects, with information on the current project stage and project schedule, is provided in Appendix 4.2.

Table 4.9: **Summary of Pipeline Development Projects on Public Land, Anticipated Development by Income Level**

	Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total Development Potential
Metro Joint Development (JD)	1,047	0	1,520	**2,567**
Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA)	2,002	0	0	**2,002**
City Sites - Affordable and Supportive Housing	2,557	12	753	**3,322**
Total	**5,606**	**12**	**2,273**	**7,891**

Other Pipeline Residential Development

The City of Los Angeles has a significant pipeline of development projects that are seeking entitlements or are actively pursuing construction. Table 4.10 summarizes the current inventory of residential and mixed-use development projects with active entitlements or pending building permits. As of Fall 2021, there were an estimated 117,814 housing units in the pipeline that are expected to be completed during the planning period and are therefore counted toward meeting the RHNA.

To estimate the number of proposed pipeline development projects that are expected to reach completion during the 6th cycle, the City examined completion rates of pipeline development projects from 2015, which is the earliest date that complete and accurate pipeline data is available. For discretionary entitlements, completion rates were found by drawing upon a representative sample of planning entitlement applications and approvals and finding the percentage of those projects which have obtained a certificate of occupancy (COO) and therefore reached completion. This analysis found that entitlement applications had a completion rate of 64%, while approved entitlements had a completion rate of 70%. For building permit applications and approved permits, completion rates were established based on existing methodology utilized by the Department of Building and Safety in regular reporting of building permit data for new housing units, which found that building permits have a 97% completion rate for issued permits. Those completion rates were then applied to the current pipeline to determine the number that would be expected to be completed within the next eight years.

Table 4.10: **Summary of Expected Pipeline Residential Projects**

Project Type By Income Category	Proposed Units Added	% Units Expected to be Completed	Units Expected to be Completed
	Active Planning Entitlements		
Lower Income	7,704	64%	4,931
Moderate Income	199	64%	128
Above Moderate Income	32,759	64%	20,966
Total Units	**40,662**	**64%**	**26,025**
	Approved Planning Entitlements with No Building Permit		
Lower Income	11,372	70%	7,961
Moderate Income	748	70%	524
Above Moderate Income	72,605	70%	50,824
Total Units	**84,725**	**70%**	**59,309**
	By-Right Building Permit Applications (Permit not Issued)		
Lower Income	3,360	95%	3,192
Moderate Income	260	95%	247
Above Moderate Income	7,955	95%	7,558
Total Units	**11,575**	**95%**	**10,997**
	Approved Building Permits with No Certificate of Occupancy (Since April 2020)		
Lower Income	2,992	97%	2,903
Moderate Income	466	97%	453
Above Moderate Income	18,687	97%	18,127
Total Units	**22,145**	**97%**	**21,483**

Table 4.11 shows the expected breakdown of this pipeline development potential, by expected income category. The income categories for individual development projects are based on the actual proposed affordability level requested or approved as part of the entitlement request. The full list of pipeline development projects, including expected unit counts by income category, is provided in Appendix 4.3.

Table 4.11: **Total Pipeline Development Potential, by Income Category**

	Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total Development Potential
Active Planning Entitlements	4,931	128	20,966	**26,025**
Approved Planning Entitlements with No Building Permit	7,961	524	50,824	**59,309**
By-Right Building Permit Applications (Permit not Issued)	3,192	247	7,558	**10,997**
Approved Building Permits with No COO (Since April 2020)	2,903	453	18,127	**21,483**
Total Pipeline Development Projects	**18,987**	**1,352**	**97,475**	**117,814**

Additional Means of Meeting the RHNA (Non-Site-Specific)

In addition to identifying pipeline development, the housing element may satisfy its RHNA requirement through a variety of methods other than identifying specific sites (Government Code Section 65583.1). Following is an analysis of additional housing units that are anticipated to occur during the 6th cycle through programmatic or other non-site-specific activities, including through Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) production, an expansion of Project Homekey, and new public land development programs.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs)

In addition to considering planned and approved development projects as additional means of meeting the RHNA, cities may also consider the potential for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs).

Since 2017, the State Legislature has passed a series of new laws that have significantly increased the potential for development of new ADUs and JADUs by removing development barriers and requiring their approval through ministerial permits. To determine the potential for ADU and JADU development during the 6th cycle, the City analyzed trends in ADU and JADU production since January 2018. Table 4.12 shows ADU permits issued from 2018 to 2020, during which period an average of 4,099 permits were issued per year.



Table 4.12: **ADU and JADU Permits Issued, City of Los Angeles 2018 to 2020**

Year	2018	2019	2020	Annual Average 2018-2020
Total ADU/JADU Permits Issued	4,079	4,792	3,425	**4,099**

State ADU law was further amended (effective 2020) to allow multiple ADUs on single-family lots and multi-family lots, and these amendments have been incorporated into the City's Zoning Code in LAMC 12.22 A.33. This amendment has dramatically expanded the potential for ADU production within the City of Los Angeles. Additionally, the City continues efforts to expand awareness of new ADU laws and to further facilitate the permitting process. The City's ADU Ordinance allows for Movable Tiny Houses to be used as ADUs, helping to expand the available housing typologies that can be used for ADUs. In March 2021, the City launched the ADU Standard Plan program, which provides a simplified permitting process for the design and construction of ADUs. The use of standard plans reduces the time required for plan check resulting in faster permit issuance, as plans are pre-approved for compliance with the Building, Residential, and Green Codes. As the market is maturing, the City is seeing new innovative ADU typologies and financing models that have further expanded the ability for homeowners to build ADUs.

Based on current interest and demand for ADUs, and ongoing and planned future programs to promote ADU development in the City (see Programs 63 and 64 in Chapter 6), it is anticipated ADU production is reasonably likely to increase by at least 25% above the current annual average, to approximately 5,123 ADUs per year during the 6th cycle.

To provide local governments in the region with assumptions for ADU affordability, SCAG recently conducted a study of ADU market rents.[2] This study was reviewed and pre-certified by HCD on August 27, 2020[3] as compliant with statutory requirements and may be used in 6th cycle Housing Element Updates as the required analysis of ADU affordability. The study reflects the geographic distribution, size, and other characteristics of ADUs across the counties and subregions of SCAG. For purposes of the study, the City of Los Angeles was included in LA County Region 1, which also included Las Virgenes-Malibu, South Bay Cities, and Westside Cities subregions. The results of the study for the City of Los Angeles are summarized in Table 4.13.

2. SCAG, SCAG Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis, https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/adu_affordability_analysis_120120v2.pdf?1606868527

3. HCD letter to SCAG: August 27, 2020, https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/hcd_precertified_localhousingdata_letter082720.pdf?1602114715

Table 4.13: **ADU Affordability Assumptions, LA County Region 1 (Including City of Los Angeles)**

	Extremely Low Income	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income
Percent of ADUs/JADUs	15%	2%	43%	6%	34%

Source: SCAG, 2020

Based on the current annual average production of ADUs, the anticipated increase in ADU production due to recent state amendments, and the ADU affordability assumptions shown above, the total anticipated ADU capacity by income category for the 6th cycle is found in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: **Anticipated ADUs and JADUs, by Income Category**

	Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total Development Potential
ADUs and JADUs	27,592	2,459	13,935	**40,987**

Project Homekey Expansion

Project Homekey is a central part of the state's response to providing housing for persons experiencing homelessness who are at high risk for serious illness and are impacted by COVID-19. Administered by HCD, Project Homekey makes grant funding available to local public entities to purchase and rehabilitate housing, including hotels, motels, vacant apartment buildings, and other buildings and convert them into interim or permanent, long-term housing.

State law allows a credit of up to 25% of the adequate sites requirement per income category to the number of units in a motel, hotel, or hostel that are converted from nonresidential to residential and made available at an affordable cost for lower-income households experiencing homelessness as part of a long-term recovery response to COVID-19.

On September 9, 2021, the Governor announced the release of $2.75 billion to expand the statewide Project Homekey Program. This new funding commitment is expected to fund the creation of 1,000 units of permanent supportive housing in the City, through the purchase and rehabilitation of hotels, motels, and other nonresidential uses. This figure is based on the available committed assistance, including the state funding, project based vouchers, and $60 million in City funds. The figure also aligns with an alternative methodology provided by HCD that includes projecting forward the creation of 150 permanent supportive housing units from nonresidential uses, anticipated in 2021. While it is too early to identify sites to be acquired by the new funding at this time, plans around the number of 55-year, covenanted permanent supportive housing units are reflected as part of Program 89. Table 4.15 shows the anticipated unit potential from the expansion of Project Homekey, by income category.

Table 4.15: **Project Homekey Expansion, Anticipated Capacity by income Category**

	Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total Development Potential
Project Homekey Expansion	1,000	0	0	**1,000**

Public Land Programs

The City was recently awarded a Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) Grant to help develop a program that would streamline and scale up the production of affordable housing on public land, beyond the current levels of anticipated pipeline development discussed under Publicly Owned Land, above. The program is a strategic plan to create 10,000 units of equitable housing on public land within five years. The plan focuses on using 300 acres of public land to drive a scaled housing solution that would utilize modular housing typologies to create ten housing development opportunities with 1,000 units each. The plan would also create a $500 million infrastructure fund to address funding gaps. While the program is currently in the planning process, and no sites have been secured at this time, the City has conducted a preliminary analysis of potentially available City-owned land. A list of potential candidate sites for the Public Land Program is provided in Appendix 4.8.

Preliminary analysis indicates that these sites collectively contain sufficient potential capacity to realistically accommodate the 10,000-unit goal for this program. An initial set of availability criteria has been applied to the potential candidate sites listed on the Public Land Program inventory Appendix 4.8. A more detailed analysis to narrow this list to the sites with the best suitability for housing has not yet been conducted as part of the LEAP grant; however, this work is funded and must be completed by 2023. More than fifty of these sites are under the control of the LAHD and have been identified already for affordable housing use, and therefore have a higher likelihood of moving more quickly as they do not require negotiation with other City Departments who may own the land.

The program focuses on providing equitable housing opportunities that prioritize community engagement in the planning process. As part of this effort, the program proposes to create housing for a mix of incomes that range from extremely low-income housing (30% AMI) to moderate-income workforce housing (150% AMI), and would encompass rental, homeownership, and community land trust opportunities. Table 4.16 shows the anticipated unit potential of this public land program by income category. The land for lower-income housing will be rezoned at required density levels and be subject to other state requirements, as further described below and in the Rezoning Program (121).

Table 4.16: **Public Land Programs, Anticipated Capacity by income Category**

	Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total Development Potential
Public Land Programs	5,500	4,500	0	**10,000**

Summary of Adequate Sites for Housing and Identification of Rezoning Need

Table 4.17 provides a summary of the total anticipated development potential in the inventory of adequate sites for housing, compared to the City's 6th Cycle RHNA Allocation and the target capacity. After consideration of all three components of the Inventory — including development potential on vacant and underutilized sites, planned and approved development projects, and non-site-specific development potential that provide additional alternative means of meeting the RHNA — the City has identified a



total development potential of 230,947 units, which is insufficient capacity to accommodate both the RHNA Allocation of 456,643 units and the target capacity of 486,379 units. Based on the criteria in state Housing Element law, the land inventory includes capacity for 72,640 lower-income units, 13,362 moderate-income units, and 144,944 above moderate-income units. As a result, the Housing Element identifies a shortfall at all income levels. Overall, there is an identified shortfall of 255,432 units, including a shortfall of 130,553 lower-income units, 72,993 moderate-income units, and 51,887 above moderate-income units.

Table 4.17: **Summary of Residential Capacity Compared to 6th Cycle RHNA and Target Capacity by Income**

	Lower Income Units	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate Income Units	Total Units
RHNA Allocation	184,721	75,091	196,831	**456,643**
Target Capacity	203,193	86,355	196,831	**486,379**
Total Development Potential	72,640	13,362	144,944	**230,947**
Shortfall	130,553	72,993	51,887	**255,432**

Chapter 6 provides an overview of the programs needed to be completed by October 2024 in order to accommodate the identified shortfall. The RHNA Rezoning Program (Program 121) describes the rezoning efforts that will be undertaken to accommodate the shortfall. The Program describes the concepts and strategies that were used to identify sites that have the potential to be rezoned and developed for housing within the planning period pursuant to subdivision (h) of Section 65583.2. It has been informed and refined by continued public input, City Council direction, and the conclusions of the AFFH Analysis provided in Chapter 1 and below.

Pursuant to state law, two types of properties will be rezoned to allow by-right (ministerial) approvals when they include 20% or more of the total units as affordable housing for lower-income households. The first set of properties include all sites rezoned to accommodate the shortfall for lower-income households, which will include a minimum density of 20 units per acre and 16 units per site, per CA Govt. Code § 65583.2(i) and will be selected from sites identified in the parcel listing (Appendix 4.7). The second set of sites are those sites identified to meet the lower-income portion of the RHNA that were previously identified on prior Housing Elements, pursuant to Government Code section 65583.2(i). This includes both non vacant sites identified on Appendix 4.1 previously identified in the 5th cycle Housing Element, and the vacant sites identified on Appendix 4.1 as previously identified for both the 4th and 5th cycle housing elements (see Program 61).

The following Rezoning section of this chapter describes the Rezoning Program assumptions and the resulting list of candidate sites to accommodate the rezoning need.



Rezoning Program and Inventory of Candidate Sites to Accommodate the Rezoning Need

Background on the Rezoning Program and Candidate Sites Inventory

According to the analysis of Adequate Sites above, it has been determined there are insufficient sites to accommodate the City's RHNA allocation of 456,643 units. Table 4.17 above identifies a shortfall of 130,553 units for lower-income households, 72,993 units for moderate-income households, and 51,887 units for above moderate-income households. This results in the need for a Rezoning Program and identification of candidate sites for rezoning in order to accommodate the total rezoning need of 255,432 units. The Rezoning Program can be found in Chapter 6 (Program 121), and the Rezoning Program Candidate Sites Inventory is provided in Appendix 4.7.

Housing Element law requires that jurisdictions identify and analyze the candidate sites that will be considered for this future rezoning and include an analysis of suitability and availability. State law requires actions be adopted to make sites available with appropriate zoning, development standards, and infrastructure capacity to accommodate the housing need. These requirements are outlined above under Overview of Adequate Sites Inventory.

Sites identified to meet the lower-income RHNA need have separate requirements. In particular, these sites (identified in Appendix 4.7, columns E and F) must be zoned to permit code compliant multi-family use through a by-right planning process for 20% lower-income affordable housing and be zoned with a minimum density and development standards that permit at least 20 units per acre and 16 units per development site. If at least 50% of the lower-income shortfall (130,553 units) cannot be accommodated on sites designated for residential use (R zones), there are additional requirements to ensure 100% residential use can be allowed on all sites. Of the identified lower-income sites for rezoning more than 200,000 units are located on sites designated for residential use (R Zones), therefore the Rezoning Program meets this 50% threshold, as summarized below.

The Rezoning Program (Program 121) identifies the concepts and strategies that were used to identify candidate sites that have the potential to be rezoned for housing at different income levels within the planning period pursuant to subdivision (h) of Section 65583.2. Rezoning ordinances must be adopted separately through the processes prescribed in the Los Angeles Municipal Code and will include extensive outreach and community input and participation.

Key elements of the rezoning strategy have been informed by public input and City Council direction, as well as the results of the AFFH Analysis. In general, the program emphasizes increasing access to Higher Opportunity areas of the city, particularly near

jobs and transit and along major corridors, while protecting environmentally sensitive areas such as fire zones and areas susceptible to sea level rise. The Program also emphasizes the continued development of innovative value capture strategies to deliver more affordable housing, stronger anti-displacement protections and other community benefits.

The Rezoning Program Candidate Sites Inventory (Candidate Sites Inventory) (Appendix 4.7) identifies potential sites for future rezoning along with state-required information on each of the properties, including the realistic number of housing units that can be accommodated on each site. Sites were selected based on the criteria included in the Rezoning Program description. Because many different strategies and work efforts are planned as a part of the program, the various components are broken out into unique rezoning strategies, which are individually discussed further below (see *Rezoning Program Strategies and Key Assumptions*).

Rezoning Program and Candidate Sites Inventory Assumptions

The following section describes the assumptions that were developed to determine how the number of units (total capacity) were determined for the different types of sites, including the use of minimum densities and adjustments to total capacities based on existing uses, realistic development potential, etc. Sites identified to meet the lower-income RHNA need have separate requirements (described above) and therefore have their own individualized assumptions, which is described as well.

Given the size of Los Angeles, the large rezoning need, and desire to include multiple pathways to achieve the RHNA goals, the Candidate Sites Inventory includes a wide array of sites, with a total of 243,254 sites that were selected based on a variety of criteria and with many different characteristics. It includes most multi-family sites and includes as many site-specific characteristics into the development assumptions as possible to promote accuracy. The various rezoning strategies also include their own set of individualized assumptions regarding availability and suitability of sites and overall capacity. In addition, the following general citywide criteria has also been developed and applied to all candidate sites on the Inventory.

The sites have been analyzed to ensure they have sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities available and accessible. In an urbanized area like Los Angeles, the only sites that lack availability for basic infrastructure are located in remote, fire-prone undeveloped hillside areas, which have been removed from the rezoning inventory by excluding all parcels located in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Areas. In addition, sites in environmentally sensitive areas susceptible to sea level rise or located in zones that do not already allow for residential development (such as Open Space, Public Facilities, or Manufacturing) were generally removed (exceptions include areas that are anticipated to be rezoned to allow residential use, as described below). Adequate water and sewer service is required to obtain building permits in Los Angeles, with a priority for developments with units affordable to lower-income households.

While Los Angeles sees almost all types of sites turn into housing, certain types of uses can be assumed to be extremely unlikely to be discontinued, such as cemeteries, colleges, hospitals, schools (except for the PF Zone strategy described below), condominium sites, libraries, recreation centers, recreational and police and fire stations, as well as a variety of other uses, were excluded altogether. Sites identified in Appendix 4.2 and Appendix 4.3 as pipeline development projects were additionally removed as they cannot be counted twice. Properties located in Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) were also removed from Candidate Sites, and other Historic Cultural Monuments are discounted as less likely to redevelop, as described in Table 4.18.

Non-vacant sites included in the Inventory are not precluded from being developed into housing at the capacities identified in Appendix 4.7, Column Q because existing barriers are being removed by the individualized approaches taken by each rezoning strategy. Sites with no reasonable likelihood or realistic capacity are excluded from the Inventory both through the initial selection criteria, as well as a site-based series of suitability adjustment factors that were selected to ensure potential impediments regarding existing use and market demand are applied to the analysis (see Table 4.18). These additional adjustment factors create the methodology used to determine overall development potential and are designed to account for the major factors that most impact suitability and availability - and therefore likelihood of new housing development. The factors are based in part on some of the strongest findings from the regression model used for the Sites Inventory,[4] as well as knowledge of local development trends.

The model considers the extent to which existing uses may constitute an impediment by incorporating the city's past experience with converting existing uses to higher density multi-family housing, including market-based factors. It also is based on the overall set of existing regulatory standards and incentives, and those proposed in conjunction with the Rezoning Program, to encourage additional residential development on these sites. Assumptions regarding affordability levels are built into specific rezoning programs as described below, but will be individually tailored based on the results of a feasibility analysis the City has secured through a REAP grant to carry out as part of the rezoning effort. Generally, the aim is to require more affordable housing than is typically achieved through existing incentive programs, particularly in Higher Opportunity Areas.

For all candidate sites within the rezoning inventory, the base and maximum allowable number of units is calculated using the following assumptions at a PIN level. Density for residential and commercially zoned parcels is divided by the lot area to result in the Maximum Potential Units. If the proposed FAR is less than or equal to 2:1, FAR is considered a limiting factor; therefore, Maximum Potential Units is calculated by

4. The regression model was unable to be used for this different type of capacity analysis due to resource limitations.

multiplying the proposed FAR by PIN area and dividing by 1,150.[5] In instances where proposed density is unlimited (density noted as "FA" in Appendix 4.7) the same formula is utilized. In Plans and areas that limit the percentage of residential use, such as the Cornfield Arroyo Specific Plan (CASP), density is discounted to account for the percentage of residential area permitted. In most instances, Base and Max Density are calculated utilizing the same assumptions, exceptions include the Boyle Heights Community Plan which proposeds Density increases as a percentage of existing.

In general, development potential on every site is reduced from the maximum allowable units on a site by 80% to result in an expected buildout or realistic capacity figure. The 80% figure is taken from the Sites Inventory regression model's findings that, on average, sites in Los Angeles developed for multi-family (5+ units) housing since 2015 have been built at 80% of the maximum allowable density. This standard capacity reduction is applied to most of the rezoning strategies, apart from Accessory Dwelling Units, R2/RD Zone Update, Adaptive Reuse, Faith-Based Organization, Parking Facility and Parking Zone which are assigned individual assumed reduction factors (see below for explanation).

Lower-income sites (VLI and LI) are allocated according to the State-required minimum density of 20 units per acre and 16 units per site. Unique affordability assumptions are included in many of the diverse rezoning strategies described below, but an additional assumption is included for high-rise development. Due to the additional cost and lack of experience of Los Angeles in building lower-income housing through high-rise developments, sites exceeding 4.5 FAR are assumed to include only 10% of total capacity as lower-income housing (the remaining 90% are assumed to be above moderate). In addition, consistent with the Adequate Sites Inventory, sites subject to the RSO are assigned as moderate- and above moderate-income (see discussion above). Moderate-income sites are allocated assuming a density between two units a site to 20 units an acre. In addition to this criteria, sites within certain programs (see ADU, R2RD, and OPPRC2 below) are assigned as moderate-income. Above moderate-income sites include all sites not meeting the criteria listed above, as well as all sites over 10 acres.

After the realistic capacity is established, the result is subtracted from the number of existing units on a site, to establish potential net gain in units. If the net is less than or equal to zero, the site is removed from the list. The remaining figure is then adjusted based on a series of suitability adjustment factors, selected due to their particular likelihood to impact the potential of housing development.

5. This figure is based on a sample of typical multi-family housing in Los Angeles.

The suitability adjustment factors described in Table 4.18 are applied to the realistic capacity figures in a cumulative fashion, based on the application of a composite percentage score resulting from the applicable factors on each site. In instances where the application of several factors results in more than a 100% reduction in site suitability, the site is removed from consideration.



Table 4.18: **Suitability Adjustment Factors**

Percentage Adjustment	Suitability Adjustment Factor	Explanation of Adjustment
-50%	Presence of a Historic Cultural Monument (HCMs)	Sites with designated HCMs are removed altogether from most strategies, except where preservation, adaptive reuse and TFAR tools that encourage proximate development are applicable (including Adaptive Reuse and the Downtown and Hollywood Plan Updates). HCMs include demolition restrictions but are incentivized for adaptive reuse and, in some cases, may be incorporated into larger housing development projects but at a lower likelihood.
-35%	The ratio of maximum allowable units compared to the number of existing units is less than 4:1	Housing replacement requirements in the City's RSO and State law require most demolished RSO units to be replaced as restricted affordable housing, which likely results in lower redevelopment feasibility as seen in the regression model. Permit data suggests a lower likelihood of new housing being built on sites where the ratio of new to existing homes is less than 4:1. Still the city sees many projects with lower ratios, so these sites cannot be precluded altogether. Was not applied to the ADU or the R2/RD strategies.
-35%	On commercial sites, a lot area utilization rate equal to or greater than 2.0.	Commercial sites with high lot area utilization are less likely to be redeveloped to housing. However, high lot utilization does not preclude redevelopment, particularly as increasing types of uses become less valuable compared to residential use. Assessor valuations are also imperfect as they may reflect older assessments and not current values.
-20%	Sites with buildings constructed in the last 25 years (2000-2021, taken from the mid-point of planning period)	Recently constructed buildings are less likely to be redeveloped overall; however, the regression model found that for higher-density sites the year built did not appear to be statistically significant.
+20%	Sites located in a Higher Opportunity Area (High and Highest Resource Areas using the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps)	The regression analysis found that higher-market areas, which correspond to Higher Opportunity Areas, saw a significantly increased likelihood of development compared to all other market areas.
-10%	Property is subject to the Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO)	The regression analysis found that properties subject to the RSO experienced less development at the most common middle density range of housing projects; however, the impact was negligible on higher density sites and positive on the much more numerous lower density development sites. Therefore, a lighter reduction is applied.

The City's Rezoning Program is largely based on the strategy of incentivizing affordable housing production alongside market-rate housing. This is done by developing unique sets of development standards and affordability requirements like those that have proven to be successful in Los Angeles in creating mixed-income affordable housing at densities that exceed base zoning allowances. In 2020, the vast majority (more than 70%) of units created in 5+ unit multi-family projects in the city utilized development bonuses and built beyond the base density allowed by the site's zoning. This figure is expected to increase significantly to include almost all projects moving forward, as all permitted projects become subject to the City's Affordable Housing Linkage Fee. This is due to the significant shift (also noted above) where nearly all multi-family projects subject to Linkage Fee opt to include on-site affordable units.[6] While not all new development builds to the maximum capacity allowed by the incentives, the density levels are typically beyond the base number of units allowed prior to receipt of a bonus or incentive. These maximum allowable densities are included as part of determining the total site capacity because development trends demonstrate densities higher than the maximum allowable densities, especially for housing including units affordable to lower-income households.

This trend is due to the successful usage of affordable housing incentive programs in Los Angeles, which are somewhat unique to Los Angeles[7] due to careful design of incentive programs, which target common zoning barriers and provide alternative development standards to ensure the maximum densities can be achieved. City programs are tailored to allow for larger density increases than allowed by state density bonus law, particularly at transit-rich locations through use of the City's Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) program; through a citywide Value Capture Ordinance, which provides unlimited density though provision of additional affordable housing; and through Community Planning Implementation Overlays (CPIOs), which refine and often exceed the densities allowed in existing citywide incentives in the TOC. Other residential uses, such as 100% affordable housing and permanent supportive housing, have unlimited densities in most multi-family zoned parts of the city (through AB 1763 and the City's PSH Ordinance). The Rezoning Program anticipates an expansion of these types of successful incentive programs, primarily in Higher Opportunity Areas.

Projects using the City's incentive programs to exceed base density are generally processed ministerially, or through a transparent, objective standard-based discretionary process. Larger projects trigger a discretionary Site Plan Review (discussed as a constraint in Chapter 2), but as part of the Rezoning Program, incentive programs will allow for a larger unit threshold, as bonus units are not included in the

6. A review of the 108 construction permits for multi-family projects (7+ units) that have been subject to the Linkage Fee shows that all but 3 (97%) provided at least one on-site affordable unit.

7. A study by the Terner Center for Housing Innovation at UC Berkeley found that more than 35% of all density bonus projects in the state are located in the City of Los Angeles (despite accounting for about 10% of the state population). Since that time the City has developed the TOC Program, which is resulting in three times as many units as Density Bonus and further reinforces this trend.

discretionary threshold (see discussion under *Plan Updates,* below). The Rezoning Program also plans to address Site Plan Review, as well as other barriers to housing production, through a comprehensive citywide update to the City's incentive programs (see Programs 48 and 54), which will further enhance their utilization.

Because the methodology does not separately count the unique capacity created by various rezoning strategies that may all apply to a given site , but only counts the largest applicable rezoning strategy, the methodology is inherently conservative. In addition, having several new zoning strategies available on a given parcel (e.g., adaptive reuse or building new micro units) increases the likelihood that the site will roduce new housing.

Rezoning Program Strategies and Key Assumptions

Each site identified as a candidate site in Appendix 4.7 is linked to one or more of the following rezoning strategies. Each strategy below includes an abbreviated identifier in parenthesis next to the title (e.g., PU for Plan Update, see below), which is linked to the Appendix in column V). Because each strategy is different, they require several different types of assumptions, though an overall consistency in approach is also applied. Each strategy is presented in more detail below, including the key eligibility criteria and assumptions regarding the types of sites included and the number of units that can be accommodated through the strategy.

It is important to note that the Inventory of Candidate Sites for Rezoning lists many more sites and potential units than are necessary to satisfy the RHNA requirements. This expansive approach is purposeful to allow the flexibility for future refinement of the rezoning strategies and sites. As such, sites included on the list should be considered as potential sites for rezoning consideration, not a final list of sites that will be rezoned. Other sites may be added, and listed sites may be removed or amended. A public review process will help guide future recommendations as to which sites are rezoned at which densities, but should follow the Housing Element's objective of an equitable rezoning program that furthers fair housing goals.

The City has three years to complete required rezoning, and many of the work efforts under the larger Rezoning Program are only now being initiated and developed and will be refined through a community engagement process. As such, important details such as densities, location, development standards and affordable housing requirements are estimated based on reasonable assumptions.

As described above, the density and capacity figures associated with each site and strategy below are based on unique criteria in state Housing Element law and do not directly correspond to other density or capacity figures typically used by the City. For example, the Inventory presents density as a number of units per acre (not number of dwelling units per square foot of lot area, as expressed in the Zoning Code), and overall capacity resulting from the Rezoning Program is calculated based on the number of proposed units compared to the number of existing units on the site. The final capacity

figures therefore are not directly comparable to capacity numbers presented in other General Plan documents such as Community Plans or the Framework Element.

Plan Updates (PU) (e.g., Community Plans and Specific Plans) – 627,638 units

A total of 16 Community Plans (four West Los Angeles plans, three Southeast Valley plans, three Southwest Valley plans, two Downtown plans, the Boyle Heights plan, the Hollywood plan, the Harbor-Gateway plan and the Wilmington plan); as well as three neighborhood Plans (the Orange Line Transit Neighborhood Plan (TNP), the Cornfields Arroyo Seco Specific Plan (CASP) and the Slauson TNP) will be in the process of being updated during the three-year rezoning period. These plans are in various phases of the adoption process, with the Downtown and Hollywood plans in the legislative process and the West LA plans in their concept phase (see timeline of plan schedules in Program 65). Reflective of this, information provided in Appendix 4.7 varies between the proposed plan areas, for instance for 12 of the Community Plans the proposed zoning field is blank because the new zoning code form and frontage standards are still being developed through the comprehensive zoning code revision (Program 60). Six of the proposed plans (two in Downtown LA, Boyle Heights, Hollywood, Harbor-Gateway, and Wilmington) include proposed General Plan Land Use designation (GPLU), Base Density, and Bonus Density, while the 10 other plans (West Los Angeles, Southeast Valley, Southwest Valley) are still refining proposed densities and therefore provide base density as a potential range. To reconcile the differing level of detail between the various plan areas, as well as rezoning strategies, density is calculated as a range. The low range is reflective of the lowest proposed base density and the high range reflective of the maximum density allowed either through a bonus program or the proposed high end of the base density range. Discounted realistic capacity assumptions detailed above are calculated using the maximum allowable density or high end of the range.

Along with other elements of the Rezoning Program, the City's Plan Updates are based upon incentivizing affordable housing production alongside market rate housing. Plan Updates support affordable housing by providing increased development rights through a finely calibrated community benefits system, usually contained in the plan's Community Plan Implementation Overlay (CPIO). CPIO community benefits systems do not undermine or otherwise affect a project's ability to use the state's density bonus law but do include often more refined incentives and ministerial processing for compliant projects using objective standards. For example, the proposed Downtown and Hollywood Community Plans are changing the Site Plan Review (SPR) thresholds for projects in Multi-family Residential and Regional Center CPIO subareas, to increase the SPR thresholds from 50 units up to 200 units in Hollywood and 500 units in Downtown. This incentive is only available for those projects using the draft Plan's CPIO community benefits program. In areas targeted for growth, the CPIO benefits system often results in the doubling (or more) of allowable density and/or floor area. In many CPIOs, base zoning standards are intentionally left lower to ensure residential projects find it advantageous to participate in the incentive program. In these areas, base standards are not used for housing development, particularly as they would result in projects

being subject to the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee. Plan Updates in earlier phases have not yet established whether they intend the proposed maximum densities found in Appendix 4.7 to be achieved through an adjustment to base zoning, or through a CPIO community benefits system. For all these reasons, it would be inappropriate to rely upon base densities in determining realistic capacities for the Plan Updates. Maximum allowable densities are therefore utilized in determining the total capacity because the City has clear reason to assume projects subject to rezoning will be built at densities higher than the base densities when bonuses are being provided. The usual adjustment factors, including the standard 80% maximum capacity reduction and standard suitability/availability discount factors, are applied to these maximum allowable densities.

The Plan Updates will continue to be refined and developed through extensive community outreach over the next three years. Site locations and proposed development standards may vary from those proposed in Appendix 4.7, as a result of continued plan development.

Proposed Zoning Code Amendments and Affordable Housing Incentive Program Updates

Opportunity Corridors. A major focus of the rezoning is on major thoroughfares located in Higher Opportunity Areas (see Key Definitions in Chapter 6). A variety of approaches can be developed through the rezoning to reflect differences in commercially (C) zoned stretches compared to residential (R) zoned areas, reflect the importance of transit-rich locations, and plan around mobility options including corridor/network designations in City's 2035 Mobility Plan. Development standards will be further refined, but the following reasonable assumptions regarding allowable densities and floor area ratios (FAR) are made in order to assess the potential number of units on candidate sites for rezoning.

1. **Residential (R Zoned) Opportunity Corridors (OPP RC and OPPRC2) – 98,546 units.** Residential (R) zoned lots in Higher Opportunity Areas along certain corridors can be rezoned to allow for multi-family development, with an affordable housing requirement. The strategy assumes rezoning will occur on qualified sites fronting all major Boulevards, as well as certain Avenues located on a High Quality Transit Corridor (with 15-minute service all day, including Metro NextGen Lines). Boulevards and Avenue designations are indicated in the City's 2035 Mobility Plan. All Boulevards and Avenues on a High Quality Transit Corridor would qualify for a higher tier of incentives to allow multi-family buildings with minimum densities and mid-rise floor area ratios (3.0:1). Avenues without high quality transit would qualify for a lower scale standard, permitting at least four units per lot with a density bonus to allow six units building to certain contextual low and mid-rise forms (designated as OPP RC2). Sites allowing R3 or less restrictive R zoning are excluded from this Rezoning Program as they largely already allow this intensity of

development and will likely qualify for other Citywide Zoning Ordinance incentives (e.g., DB50).

2. **Commercial (C Zoned) Opportunity Corridors (OPP C) – 5,248 units.** Commercial (C) zoned corridors in Higher Opportunity Areas may be rezoned to allow the densities generally allowed by all Commercial General Plan Land Use designations (1 unit per 400 feet of lot area), and mid-rise floor area ratios (3.0:1), with an affordable housing requirement. This density level already exists on a majority of commercially zoned lots, which are excluded from this list of sites. The increase in site capacity was determined by the difference in the number of currently allowable units under the base density and the rezone to the 1:400 standard. This reflects a more conservative approach to net capacity calculation, compared to finding the difference from the number of existing units, which is used more commonly for other strategies. This is reasonable due to the lack of residential units on most commercial sites.
3. **Transit Opportunity Corridor Areas (TOPP C) – 1,022 units.** Commercially (C) zoned sites in Higher Opportunity Areas located on a High Quality Transit Corridor can be provided additional development bonuses in exchange for affordable housing. The analysis assumes a blend of TOC Tier 3 (height, parking) and Tier 4 (density, floor area) affordable housing incentives.

TOC Expansion in Higher Opportunity Areas (TOC EXP) - 150,402 units. Most Higher Opportunity areas are currently unable to take advantage of the Transit Oriented Community (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program due to density limitations and the five-unit base density threshold needed to qualify for the program. As part of the Rezoning Program, residentially zoned sites including Residential (R) and Commercial (C) zones may be permitted at higher minimum intensities (mid-rise FAR levels up to 2.5) with higher affordability requirements. This strategy includes residentially zoned



areas that fall within current TOC Tier 3 or 4 Areas but are presently unable to construct affordable housing or utilize incentives. Later refinement may limit this strategy to particular Tier 3 or 4 Areas based on other policy criteria.

50% Density Bonus (DB50) – 401,540 units. The Rezoning Program includes a potential update of the City's Density Bonus ordinance to allow for up to 50% density increases citywide in exchange for the maximum amount of affordable housing economically feasible (as determined by a feasibility study). Currently, state law (AB 2345) allows for a similar 50% density bonus; however, due to concerns about undermining the City's existing incentive programs, the state law was designed to not apply to the City of Los Angeles. The City can create its own version of the bonus that does not undermine existing programs by aligning incentives and requirements with the City's programs. An 11% increased capacity assumption was applied to account for the difference between an assumed 35% bonus to a 50% bonus on sites currently eligible for Density Bonus (but not eligible for the TOC Program).

Parking Zones (P) – 4,736 units. Another strategy would allow residential uses on all Parking (P) and Parking Building (PB) zones at the use, area and density standards of any adjacent commercial zone, with a transitional height component in some areas. The capacity figure reflects strong demand to utilize these sites, which are usually adjacent to commercially zoned corridor sites, and that existing parking can typically be replaced without triggering Zoning Code floor area limitations. In addition, this policy anticipates some right- sizing of replacement parking standards where existing parking spaces exceed demand, as well as the development of complementary programs to rezone commercial corridor sites, particularly in Higher Opportunity Areas (see Corridors strategy above). Still, the inventory uses a conservative 20% suitability and availability factor, which assumes that demand for existing commercial use parking may limit redevelopment potential in many areas. In addition, transitional height limits that apply when adjacent to single-family zones leads to a further limiting assumption that only 50% of the lot area of the available sites will be available for housing. An average of 2.5:1 FAR was applied based on the assumption this incentive will work most often in areas already zoned for at least 3.0:1 FAR, as are many commercial areas are (particularly with existing available floor area incentives).

Adaptive Reuse (ARO) – 43,128 units. The Rezoning Program's Adaptive Reuse strategy would expand the current Adaptive Reuse Incentive Areas to apply citywide, and remove additional barriers to streamline the conversion of vacant office and commercial properties to housing, when affordable housing is provided, through a by-right conversion process. It would also expand adaptive reuse incentives to allow higher densities and smaller unit sizes, the conversion of hotels, more recently constructed buildings (more than 25 years in age, or constructed prior to 2000, assuming a 2025 mid-cycle point in time), as well as allow ground floor commercial in most areas.

The capacity assumptions for each adaptive reuse site reflect a heavily discounted portion (10%) of eligible building area as being suitable for residential conversion. This

assumption acknowledges that many commercial/office buildings are not physically suitable for housing, and that existing leases and the presence of existing businesses provides an additional limitation. However, it is also important to note that similar by-right adaptive reuse has proven attractive in areas where it is currently permitted (including Downtown and the other Incentive Areas). This strong experience with implementing adaptive reuse in Los Angeles provides an assurance that many of the common code difficulties have already been addressed by City Departments. As such, most non-residential buildings that meet the age threshold and are included in the rezoning inventory are expected to be eligible to convert to housing. To limit the inventory to the most realistic sites, only certain types of commercial/office building uses were selected as being available and suitable for adaptive reuse. Existing uses such as existing shopping centers, big box stores, theatres, restaurants, small buildings, and other uses not as likely to turn into housing were excluded from the inventory.

Micro Units (MURC) – 21,395 units. On properties with a Regional Center General Plan Land Use designation (which includes many of the city's most intensive areas such as Downtown, Hollywood, and Century City), this strategy would revise development standards to facilitate the creation of smaller, more affordable housing typologies (micro units). This strategy will likely entail relaxing density standards, while requiring affordability set asides, to rely on form-based controls, reducing parking to account for smaller household sizes, as well as prioritizing open space and other per-unit requirements that add limitations to the creation of smaller units. This change will facilitate additional lower-income capacity in the areas of the city where highest intensities are already planned for, and demand is generally strong. The methodology added 50 percent to the current maximum densities, based on removing both direct and indirect density limits, and applied a reduction factor of 25% to account for program utilization, in addition to the standard 80% reduction mentioned above. Sites were removed if they are located in areas where form-based codes allowing micro units already exist, or if they are covered under another rezoning strategy (e.g., Downtown LA and Warner Center).

Missing Middle (Low Scale Infill Housing). Another key focus of the Rezoning Program is on missing middle strategies, which aim to increase opportunities for lower scale infill housing in existing residential areas.

1. **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) – 4,141 units.** One missing middle rezoning strategy involves an update to the City's ADU Ordinance to add an additional allowable ADU on larger sized lots in Higher Opportunity areas, and reduce existing unnecessary barriers that limit ADU development on single-family and multi-family lots. Allowing an extra attached or detached ADU on lots greater than 6,500 sq. ft in Higher Opportunity Areas will create the opportunity for an additional ADU on about 79,000 lots located in Higher Opportunity Areas, once more sensitive areas like Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and historic districts are removed from consideration. A feasibility study will examine whether any type of affordability requirement (including an in-lieu fee) can be applied to the extra ADU without impairing feasibility. While a large number of sites are eligible for this program,

only 10% of eligible parcels were assumed to redevelop based on ADU figures presented above, with a slightly higher percentage due to the higher market rent areas being targeted by this strategy.

2. **R2/RD Zone Update (R2RD) – 18,079 moderate-income units.** Current laws permit the construction of two ADUs on a lot with an existing multiple dwelling structure. This allowance is used most commonly in lower density multi-family R2 (Two-Family) and RD (Restricted Density) zones. These state ADU rules can be modified at the local level to permit more flexibility to achieve better results. For example, current rules incentivize the removal of existing parking for the existing units and prevent the creation of a second story. Backyard duplexes can be better facilitated through targeted zoning code amendments through this strategy. With Senate Bill (SB) 9 now passed into law, there may be a desire to try to improve upon the state law and address community concerns, as raised in Program 3. The methodology assumes that only 25% of R2 and RD zoned sites would be suitable and available for housing and an overall suitability discount of 70%.
3. **Opportunity Avenues. (OPP RC2) – 23,643 units.** As already included under Opportunity residential Corridors above, certain designed Avenues will be rezoned to allow an average of six units per lot intended to facilitate new missing middle forms, including historical/contextual typologies from Los Angeles, largely within existing allowable buildable floor area limits.

Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO) – 45,516 units. Projects that commit to significantly deeper levels of affordable housing should qualify for the largest development incentives. The Rezoning Program anticipates creating development incentives for projects that include at least 50% affordable housing in a wider array of areas of the city. Because this tool will likely only be available to majority deed restricted affordable projects, capacities are heavily adjusted (-80%). Recent experience with a similar state bonus for 100% affordable projects (AB 1763) indicates the private market can find opportunities to build deeply affordable buildings if they are afforded ample incentives and a streamlined, transparent approval process. The overlay is expected to apply on any commercially or residentially zoned parcel, with varying allowable height and floor area depending on the type of site. While the state density bonus law already provides significant incentives for 100% affordable housing on sites that qualify under AB 1763, including density, additional height, and parking reductions, the Rezoning Program would extend incentives into other areas of the city and complement state rules. It is anticipated that these projects will not require a discretionary action, even when it would otherwise be required (similar to streamlining provisions in SB 35). Sites would allow at least 2.5 stories, 1.75:1 FAR, and mid form-based density limits for affordable housing development in most residentially zoned areas of the city. The development standards would allow for the assumed densities described in the inventory and density bonuses will be included. The affordable housing overlay would not be applied in High Segregation and Poverty or Low Resource Areas identified on the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps.

1. **Public Facility Zone (PF) – 7,116 units.** The Affordable Housing Overlay portion of the Rezoning Program will also allow a wider array of 100% affordable housing typologies on a set of publicly owned Public Facility (PF) zoned properties. The allowance is expected to permit joint public-private housing development on publicly owned PF zoned sites at the use, area and density standards of any adjacent zone, along with a minimum set of alternative development standards for other sites where adjacent standards would not permit affordable housing. The capacity figure reflects only sites owned by Los Angeles City or County, Los Angeles Unified School District (which has expressed a commitment to build affordable housing on their land) and Metro. Sites adjacent to heavy manufacturing sites and with joint open space or agricultural designations were removed as were all Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The capacity assumptions recognize that the vast majority of public land (99%) is not suitable for housing development due to existing public use and insufficient public resources to develop 100% affordable housing. When these public lands are built for lower-income housing, they will likely be smaller units and be built to a mid-rise 3.0:1 FAR.

2. **Faith-Based Owned Properties (FBO) – 3,552 units.** Many faith-based organizations have underutilized properties, like parking lots that are empty most of the time, as well as a social mission to provide affordable housing. On land owned by a religious or faith-based institution, as part of the Affordable Housing Overlay, the Rezoning Program would allow affordable housing development at densities required for affordable (lower-income) housing sites. Allowable densities, heights and floor area can be based on the least restrictive adjacent zone, with a minimum FAR and density to permit affordable housing development of at least 20 units per acre and 16 units per development site. This incentive would be paired with local and state incentives including AB 1851 (2020), which provides parking replacement incentives. The methodology assumes that only a small percentage (3%) of faith-based owned sites would be suitable and available for housing and 15% of the land would be available due to pre-existing uses. Buildable area on this limited area would be assumed to be built to an average of a low rise 2.0:1 FAR, recognizing some housing will be built in lower density areas where height will be more limited. The list provided in Appendix 4.7 is based on a religious use identifier from County Assessor data, and did not include a large number of additional sites that appear to be owned by faith-based organizations, so the list likely represents a conservative estimate of total potential capacity that could result from this strategy.

Results of the Rezoning Program and State Law Compliance


A total of at least 243,254 sites containing 1,432,059 units have been identified as part of the Rezoning Program (see Table 4.19 below).[8] These units have been distributed to different income categories using the methodology described above. At least 36,446 sites containing 591,726 units have been identified as meeting the state law criteria as lower-income, meaning they can accommodate at least 16 units per site and can include minimum densities of at least 20 units/acre. At least 130,553 units will be rezoned as lower-income sites at these densities and will permit a multi-family use by-right when at least 20% of the total units are dedicated as lower-income affordable housing. More than fifty percent of the lower-income shortfall is accommodated on sites designated for residential use (R zones). As shown in Maps 4.4 and 4.5, the Rezoning Program primarily creates new development potential in areas located within a Regional Center (such as Downtown Los Angeles), near public transit, along corridors, and in areas of high opportunity (such as in West Los Angeles and the South Valley).


8. Please note this number has been reduced since the September 15th draft, due to further refinement of the inventory to exclude parcels erroneously identified such as certain sea level rise parcels, parcels in HPOZs, and parcels with incompatible existing uses.



Table 4.19: **Results from Rezoning Inventory Model**

Rezoning Strategy	Parcel Count	Very Low Income Units	Low Income Units	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate Income Units	Total Units
Community and Neighborhood Planning (CPU)	33,749	90,473	90,473	2,121	444,572	**627,638**
Residential Opportunity Corridors (OPP RC)	3,477	29,093	29,093	0	16,901	**74,903**
Opportunity Avenues (OPP RC2)	5,316	0	0	23,643	12	**23,643**
Commercial Opportunity Corridors (OPP C)	667	1,194	1,194	0	2,859	**5,248**
Transit Opportunity Corridor Areas (TOPP C)	272	0	0	0	1,022	**1,022**
TOC Expansion in Higher Opportunity Areas (TOC EXP)	11,792	287,811	27,811	0	94,780	**150,402**
50% Density Bonus (DB50)	18,908	123,699	123,699	250	153,892	**401,540**
Parking Zones (P)	1,032	1,978	1,978	0	780	**4,736**
Adaptive Reuse (ARO)	10,153	4,747	4,747	1,595	32,039	**43,128**
Micro Unit Regional Center (MURC)	1,250	3,417	3,417	43	14,518	**21,639**
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)	48,797	0	0	4,141	0	**4,141**
R2/RD Zone Update (R2RD	64,570	0	0	18,080	0	**18,079**
Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO)	34,034	10,198	10,198	0	25,120	**45,516**
Public Facility Zone (PF)	6,407	2,072	2,072	0	2,972	**7,116**
Faith-Based Owned Properties (FBO)	2,865	1,273	1,273	0	1,006	**3,552**
Total	**243,245**	**297,433**	**297,433**	**49,872**	**790,461**	**1,432,059**


Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Northridge
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Santa Monica Mountains
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
East LA
Monterey Park
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
Vernon
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Pacific Ocean
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 4.4
Rezoning Candidate Sites
Distribution of Expected Unit Potential
Low
High
N
0
5
10
Miles


Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Northridge
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Santa Monica Mountains
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Monterey Park
East LA
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Vernon
Venice
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Pacific Ocean
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 4.5
Rezoning Candidate Sites Distribution of Expected Lower-Income Unit Potential
Low
High
N
0
5
10
Miles

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Analysis

Background on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing and the Sites Inventory

Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 686, the Housing Element must include an analysis and determination of consistency with Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements. AFFH means:

"[T]aking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws. (Government Code Section 8899.50(a)(1))

The duty to affirmatively further fair housing extends to a public agency's activities and programs relating to housing and community development, including the Housing Element's analysis of adequate sites for housing. Specifically, the Inventory of Sites suitable for housing development must be identified throughout the City in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing opportunities. The goal is to have identified sites serve the purpose of replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, and ultimately transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity.

For purposes of the housing element site inventory, as advised by HCD, this means that sites identified to accommodate the lower-income portion of the RHNA are not concentrated in low-resourced areas (lack of access to high performing schools, distance from jobs centers, location disproportionately exposed to pollution or other health impacts) or areas of segregation and concentrations of poverty. Sites identified to accommodate the lower income RHNA must be distributed throughout the community in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing.

HCD has provided additional guidance on topics that should be addressed as part of the AFFH Analysis for the Adequate Sites Inventory. This includes the following components:

- **Improved Conditions:** A discussion of how the sites are identified in a manner that better integrates the community with a consideration for the historical patterns and trends, number of existing households, the magnitude (e.g., number of units) of the RHNA by income group and impacts on patterns of socio-economic and racial concentrations.
- **Exacerbated Conditions:** Similar to above, an explanation of identified sites relative to the impact on existing patterns of segregation and number of households relative to the magnitude (e.g., number of units) of the RHNA by income group.
- **Isolation of the RHNA:** An evaluation of whether the RHNA by income group is concentrated in areas of the community.
- **Local Data and Knowledge:** A consideration of current, planned, and past developments, investment, policies, practices, demographic trends, public comment, and other factors.
- **Other Relevant Factors:** Any other factors that influence the impacts of the identification of sites to accommodate the regional housing need on socio-economic patterns and segregation. This requirement should address any pending or approved plans, other elements of the General Plan and relevant portions of the Housing Element and site inventory analysis requirements including, but not limited to, effectiveness of past programs in achieving the goals of the housing element, suitability of sites, existing uses and impacts of additional development potential, including potential for displacement of residents, businesses and other community amenities and infrastructure capacity.

Summary of Conclusions and Approach to Policies and Programs: Based on the outcomes of the analysis, the element must summarize conclusions and directly identify policies and programs needed to address identifying and making available adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing.

Methodology

To evaluate the location and concentration of sites identified through the Adequate Sites Inventory and the Rezoning Program, the AFFH Analysis consists of two key steps. First, the analysis presents an examination of current conditions, as reflected in the components of the Adequate Sites Inventory, as well as recent development trends and existing residential zoning patterns. Second, the analysis presents an examination of the proposed Rezoning Program (Program 121), and evaluates how existing conditions are anticipated to be improved as a result.

The information presented in this Chapter represents the key findings of the analysis, including those that most clearly convey how the Adequate Sites Inventory and Rezoning Program work together to improve conditions related to fair housing, segregation, and access to opportunity. Further data analysis that responds to all topics required to be addressed as part of the AFFH Analysis is provided in Appendix 4.4.

Data sources used to conduct the analysis include U.S. Census American Community Survey data, including household level demographic data and data on protected classes, such as population by race, disability, and familial status.


As required by Housing Element law, the analysis also includes an assessment of the share of identified development potential in Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) and Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAA). Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP) is a category of neighborhood defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to measure neighborhoods that experience both racial and ethnic concentration as well as high rates of poverty. According to HUD, R/ECAP Census Tracts must meet two criteria: (1) have a majority non-white population of over 50%, and (2) have 40% or more of individuals living at or below the poverty line, or have three or more times the average tract poverty rate for the metropolitan/micropolitan area, whichever threshold is lower.[9] At the time of preparing this analysis, the State had not issued a final methodology to define Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAA). Based on the demographic data in the City of Los Angeles, staff have chosen to define RCAAs as Census Block Groups with a median income greater than $125,000 and are of more than 50% white. The $125,000 income threshold is roughly double the median income of the city and the 50% white threshold represents significant concentration since the population of the city overall is only 28% white.

As shown in Map 4.6, R/ECAPs are primarily located in Southeast LA, Westlake, parts of Downtown, Boyle Heights, and Wilmington, while RCAAs are primarily located in West LA, the Southernmost San Fernando Valley (in and around Encino, Tarzana, Sherman Oaks, and Studio City), and the Northwest Valley (in and around Woodland Hills, Porter Ranch, and Granada Hills).

The analysis also utilizes the 2021 California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC)/California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Opportunity Map, which is shown in Map 4.7.

The TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map is developed by the state as a way to measure and visualize place-based characteristics linked to critical life outcomes, such as educational attainment, earnings from employment, and economic mobility. The Opportunity Area categories are assigned based on a composite score that considers

9. "Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)," arcgis.com (US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), 2017), https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=56de4edea8264fe5a344da9811ef5d6e.




MAP 4.6

Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Affluence

RCAA (Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence)

R/ECAP (Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty)


Santa Clarita
Sylmar
San Fernando
Granada Hills - Knollwood
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Northridge
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Santa Monica Mountains
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
East LA
Monterey Park
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Boyle Heights
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
Vernon
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Pacific Ocean
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 4.7
TCAC / HCD Opportunity Map
City of Los Angeles
Highest Resource
High Resource
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)
Moderate Resource
Low Resource
High Segregation & Poverty
No Data
N
0
5
10
Miles

indicators from three domains: economic, environmental, and education. The data and mapping tool are updated annually by the state. Additional information on the methodology used to create the map can be accessed at https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp

Existing Conditions: Analysis of Adequate Sites Inventory

The following analysis relates to the existing development potential that is found in the Inventory of Adequate Sites to accommodate a portion of the RHNA. The AFFH Analysis of existing conditions was conducted by considering locations and concentrations of the total expected development potential identified in the Adequate Sites Inventory, as well as the locations and concentrations of the lower-income development potential. This analysis includes locations and concentrations of development potential that resulted from the vacant and non-vacant site analysis. To analyze data compared to Census data, expected development potential was aggregated from all individual sites identified within a Census Tract boundary. Census tracts were then categorized based on their total expected unit potential into three categories, from the lowest capacity neighborhoods to the highest, as shown in Table 4.20. Selected tables resulting from the AFFH analysis are included in this Chapter. For the full data results, see Appendix 4.4. Because the distribution of lower-income development potential is consistent with the overall distribution of total expected development potential, a detailed data analysis of the lower-income development potential is provided in Appendix 4.4. The findings presented in this Chapter are applicable to the locations of lower-income development potential as well.

Table 4.20: **Existing Conditions Analysis: Census Tracts by Expected Unit Potential and Expected Lower-Income Unit Potential**

Census Tract Category	Total Unit Potential	Total Lower Income Unit Potential
Low Capacity Neighborhoods	0 - 15	0 - 5
Medium Capacity Neighborhoods	15 - 50	6 - 25
Higher Capacity Neighborhoods	50+	26+

Concentration of Development Potential

Table 4.21 shows a summary of the share of census tracts assigned to each category based on total existing development potential, as well as their respective share of the

total expected unit potential identified in the Adequate Sites Inventory. Most of the expected development potential identified in the Adequate Sites Inventory is concentrated in a relatively small proportion of neighborhoods in the city. The higher capacity neighborhoods account for 67% of the city's expected production of new units, despite comprising just 30% of the total census tracts in the city. Meanwhile, the low-capacity neighborhoods comprise a larger share of the city's geography (33%) but have very little expected development potential (5%).

Table 4.21: **Existing Conditions Analysis: Summary of Census Tracts by Assigned Category, Total Development Potential**

Census Tract Category	Percent of Total City Census Tracts	Percent of Total Unit Potential
Low Capacity Neighborhoods	33%	5%
Medium Capacity Neighborhoods	37%	28%
Higher Capacity Neighborhoods	30%	67%

When considering only the lower-income unit potential identified in the Adequate Sites Inventory, this trend is similarly pronounced. Table 4.22 shows the respective share of the total expected unit potential identified in the Adequate Sites Inventory for each Census Tract category. The neighborhoods with the highest capacity for lower-income housing account for 64% of the city's expected production of new units, despite comprising just 19% of the total census tracts in the city. Meanwhile, the neighborhoods with the lowest capacity for lower-income housing comprise nearly half of the city's geography (41%) but have very little expected potential for lower-income housing (4%).

Table 4.22: **Existing Conditions Analysis: Summary of Census Tracts by Assigned Category, Lower-Income (LI) Development Potential**

Census Tract Category	Percent of Total Census Tracts	Percent of Lower Income Unit Potential
Low LI Capacity Neighborhoods	41%	4%
Medium LI Capacity Neighborhoods	39%	32%
Higher LI Capacity Neighborhoods	19%	64%

Race/Ethnicity

Table 4.23 shows the share of total population in each group of census tracts that identify as white, Black/African American, Latinx, or Asian, compared to citywide racial/ethnic demographics. With the city's current zoning designations, this analysis shows that neighborhoods with the lowest identified development potential have a higher share of white residents, compared to the city. By contrast, the neighborhoods with the highest share of identified development potential have a substantially higher share of population of Black/African American residents, compared to the rest of the city. Latinx residents are relatively dispersed throughout, though are somewhat overrepresented in the higher capacity neighborhoods.

Table 4.23: **Existing Conditions Analysis: Racial / Ethnic Composition of Neighborhoods Identified in Existing Sites Inventory**

Census Tract Category	Percent Population White (Non-Latinx)	Percent Population Black/African American (Non-Latinx)	Percent Population Latinx	Percent Population Asian (Non-Latinx)
Citywide Average	28%	9%	49%	11%
Low Capacity Neighborhoods	35%	5%	45%	12%
Medium Capacity Neighborhoods	30%	8%	49%	11%
Higher Capacity Neighborhoods	20%	14%	52%	11%

Source: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates.

Tenure and Income

Table 4.24 shows the tenure and median household income of neighborhoods identified in the Sites Inventory. All neighborhoods except those with the lowest identified total development potential have a higher share of renters than the citywide average. In addition, there is a clear relationship between anticipated development potential and median household income. Lower capacity neighborhoods have a disproportionately higher median household income ($81,913, compared to $64,065 citywide), while the higher capacity neighborhoods have a disproportionately lower median household income ($50,660). While renter households have a lower overall median household income, the data follow the same trend across lower and higher capacity neighborhoods.

Looking at the distribution of low- and moderate-income households, the data follow a similar trend. Citywide, 61% of households are considered low- and moderate-income. Neighborhoods with the lowest identified development potential have a lower percentage of low- and moderate-income households (50%), while the highest capacity neighborhoods have a disproportionately high share of low- and moderate-income households (71%).

Table 4.24: **Existing Conditions Analysis: Tenure and Median Household Income of Neighborhoods Identified in Existing Sites Inventory, Total Unit Potential**

Census Tract Category	Percent Renter Households	Median Household Income	Median Household Income - Renter Households	Percent Low/ Moderate Income Households
Citywide Average	63%	$64,065	$50,404	61%
Low Capacity Neighborhoods	44%	$80,913	$59,281	50%
Medium Capacity Neighborhoods	68%	$59,284	$45,548	63%
Higher Capacity Neighborhoods	76%	$50,660	$43,430	71%

Source: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates.

Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Affluence

These trends are more evident when considering the share of identified development potential located in Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs), compared to that within Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs). Table 4.25 shows that, compared to the overall share of the city located within a R/ECAP (10.5%), the total development potential and lower-income development potential are disproportionately located in these areas, at 13.9% and 15.6% respectively. Even more dramatic is the underrepresentation of development potential identified in RCAAs, which comprise over 7 percent of the city but less than 3 percent of the identified development potential.

Table 4.25: **Share of Development Potential Located in a R/ECAP or RCAA, Existing Sites Inventory**

	Percent of City's Census Tracts	Total Development Potential	Lower-Income Development Potential
R/ECAP – Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty	10.5%	13.9%	15.6%
RCAA – Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence	7.5%	2.2%	2.3%

Source: HUD, ACS 2019 5-year Summary Data



Transit Access

Overall, the majority of housing units anticipated as part of the Adequate Sites Inventory are expected to be located in areas with high quality transit access. Table 4.26 demonstrates that, considering both the total unit potential as well as the total lower-income unit potential, 99% is located within a High Quality Transit Area (HQTA), meaning that it is within one half-mile of a well-serviced transit stop or a transit corridor with 15-minute or less service frequency during peak commute hours.

Table 4.26: **Transit Access, Existing Sites Inventory**

	Total Unit Potential	Lower-Income Unit Potential
Located within a High Quality Transit Area (HQTA)	99%	99%
Located outside a High Quality Transit Area (HQTA)	1%	1%

Source: HQTA 2045, SCAG

Opportunity Areas

Table 4.27 shows the distribution of the total sites, total existing development potential, and total lower-income development potential by TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area. For most TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area categories, the share of total development potential and total lower-income development potential by TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area is consistent with the city as a whole; however, the High Segregation and Poverty tracts are overrepresented in terms of overall unit potential as well as lower-income unit potential. In addition, the Moderate, High and Highest Resource tracts are underrepresented in terms of lower-income development potential.

Table 4.27: **Existing Conditions Analysis: Existing Sites Inventory Analysis by TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area**

TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area	Percent of City's Census Tracts	Percent of Sites on Inventory	Percent of Total Unit Potential	Percent of Lower Income Unit Potential
Highest Resource	19%	17%	18%	15%
High Resource	15%	11%	11%	10%
Moderate Resource	17%	15%	14%	14%
Moderate Resource Rapidly Changing	5%	5%	6%	6%
Low Resource	28%	29%	28%	27%
High Segregation and Poverty	16%	22%	23%	27%
Unknown	1%	1%	1%	1%

Source: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map, 2021

As a point of comparison, Table 4.28 shows the distribution of pipeline development potential by TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area categories. This reflects actual locations of anticipated pipeline development that is expected to occur during the sixth cycle. Compared to the distribution of the development pipeline by opportunity area, the Sites Inventory represents a modest improvement in terms of providing greater development in High and Highest Resource Areas; however, both disproportionately anticipate development in the Low Resource and High Segregation & Poverty areas of the city. This pattern is reflected in residential zoning patterns, as shown in Table 4.30, below and is further reflected in recent trends in affordable housing financing and development, as shown in Table 4.31. This suggests that while the Sites Inventory does not actively improve conditions, it does not exacerbate them. Rather, it is a fairly accurate representation of existing conditions in the city.

Table 4.28: **Existing Conditions Analysis: Pipeline Development by TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area**

TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area	Percent of City's Census Tracts	Percent of Sites on Inventory	Percent of Total Unit Potential	Percent of Lower Income Unit Potential
Highest Resource	**19%**	23%	15%	11%
High Resource	**15%**	16%	13%	7%
Moderate Resource	**17%**	19%	15%	10%
Moderate Resource Rapidly Changing	**5%**	4%	5%	7%
Low Resource	**28%**	27%	21%	31%
High Segregation and Poverty	**16%**	11%	29%	33%
Unknown	**1%**	1%	2%	1%

Source: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map, 2021



These disparities are also evident when considering the component scores within the three domains that comprise the overall Opportunity Area score, as shown in Table 4.29. Lower capacity neighborhoods are found to have higher environmental domain and educational domain scores than the rest of the city (0.53 and 0.48 respectively, compared to 0.44 and 0.39 average citywide), while higher capacity neighborhoods are lower than the citywide average (0.34 and 0.29, respectively). The economic domain score is relatively consistent across all neighborhood types but is slightly higher in the medium capacity neighborhoods (0.55).

Table 4.29: **Existing Conditions Analysis: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Domains, Average Score by Neighborhoods Identified in Existing Sites Inventory**

Census Tract Category	Average Economic Domain Score	Average Environmental Domain Score	Average Educational Domain Score
Citywide Average	**0.53**	**0.44**	**0.39**
Low Capacity Neighborhoods	0.52	0.53	0.48
Medium Capacity Neighborhoods	0.55	0.44	0.40
Higher Capacity Neighborhoods	0.53	0.34	0.29

Source: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map, 2021

Existing Conditions: Analysis of Zoning

Overall, the findings above are reflective of overall discrepancies in the distribution of residential zoning in the city. Considering all land zoned to allow residential uses, approximately 81% of residentially zoned land in the Highest Resource Areas is limited to single-family uses and approximately 19% is zoned to allow multi-family (see Table 4.30). In contrast, just 18% of the residentially zoned land in the areas considered High Segregation and Poverty is allocated to single-family uses, whereas 82% allows multi-family development. This disparity is starker when considering residentially zoned land in Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence, where 95% is limited to single-family use and only 5% permits other residential uses.

Additional details with respect to ecologically sensitive or hazardous areas, including high risk for fire and sea level rise, as well as impacts on communities of color, should also be noted. Much of the city's single-family zoning is in ecologically sensitive and hazardous areas of the city. In fact, approximately 35% of the parcels of the city's single-family zoning are in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) or areas with vulnerability to Sea Level Rise (SLR) exposure.[10] In addition, the prevalence of single-family housing in Los Angeles means that this component of the housing stock exists across nearly all communities in the city, including many established Black communities and communities of color.

Table 4.30: **Existing Conditions Analysis: Share of Residential Land Zoned for Single-Family Residential Use by TCAC/HCD Resource Category**

Resource Category	Percent of Residentially Zoned Land Restricted to Single-Family Housing*	Percent of Residentially Zoned Land that Allows Multi-family Housing**
Citywide	**72%**	**28%**
Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence	95%	5%
Highest Resource	81%	19%
High Resource	74%	26%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	51%	49%
Moderate Resource	74%	26%
Low Resource	54%	46%
High Segregation & Poverty	18%	82%

**Single-family residential use includes all zones in which residential uses are restricted to one-family dwellings (as well as accessory dwelling units).*

***Includes all other zones where residential uses are permitted, including Commercial (C) zoned parcels, which generally allow 100% residential uses.*

Source: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map, 2020; U.S. Census

10. Areas with vulnerability to SLR exposure are identified as 100-year SLR areas. University of Southern California Sea Grant Program, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Study for the City of Los Angeles, 2013, https://dornsife.usc.edu/assets/sites/291/docs/pdfs/City_of_LA_SLR_Vulnerability_Study_FINAL_Summary_Report_Online_Hyperlinks.pdf.

As will be further explored in the Historic Land Use Study (Program 130), these disparities are the direct result of past and continuing inequitable land use practices. As discussed below, the Rezoning Program has an obligation to reverse these harms and affirmatively further fair housing.

Existing Conditions: Analysis of Development Trends


Recent development trends have shown similar discrepancies. Map 4.8 shows the location and distribution of affordable housing development from 2009 to 2020. As shown in Table 4.31, relatively little affordable housing has been developed in Higher Opportunity Areas (including High and Highest Resource Areas). Of the affordable units permitted in the last ten years, only 14% (almost 1,600 units) were produced in the city's High or Highest Resource Areas, while 62% were located in the Low Resource and High Segregation and Poverty areas. In Higher Opportunity Areas, mixed-income affordable housing is more likely to be built than 100% Affordable Housing developments. Overall, mixed-income projects supported by land use incentives have a much higher rate of producing affordable housing in Higher Opportunity Areas, compared to those produced through financial subsidy alone. Nearly half (46%) of the non-subsidized affordable housing units produced through land-use incentives were in the Higher Opportunity Areas, whereas only 6% of subsidized affordable projects were built in these areas. Overall, subsidized affordable developments are overwhelmingly located in lower resourced neighborhoods.

Table 4.31: **Affordable Units Permitted in the City by TCAC/HCD Resource Category, 2009-2018**

Resource Category	Affordable Units	% of Total	% of City Tracts*
High Segregation & Poverty	4,104	35%	24%
Low Resource	3,160	27%	23%
Moderate Resource	2,737	24%	18%
High Resource	1,038	9%	18%
Highest Resource	553	5%	17%
Insufficient/Missing Info*	11	<1%	0%
Total	**11,603**	**100%**	**100%**

**Excludes 13 census tracts that were not evaluated because of insufficient data*

Source: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map, 2019


Santa Clarita
Sylmar
Granada Hills - Knollwood
San Fernando
Angeles National Forest
Simi Valley
Arleta - Pacoima
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon
Chatsworth - Porter Ranch
Northridge
Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills
Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon
La Cañada Flintridge
Reseda - West Van Nuys
Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills
Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks
North Hollywood - Valley Village
Burbank
Encino - Tarzana
Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Glendale
Pasadena
Calabasas
Hollywood
Northeast Los Angeles
South Pasadena
Bel Air - Beverly Crest
Santa Monica Mountains
Brentwood - Pacific Palisades
West Hollywood
Silver Lake - Echo Park - Elysian Valley
Alhambra
Beverly Hills
Westwood
Wilshire
Westlake
Malibu
West Los Angeles
Downtown
East LA
Monterey Park
Boyle Heights
Santa Monica
Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert
Culver City
Montebello
Venice
Vernon
South Los Angeles
Huntington Park
Commerce
Westchester - Playa del Rey
Pacific Ocean
Inglewood
South Gate
Los Angeles International Airport
Southeast Los Angeles
Lynwood
El Segundo
Hawthorne
Gardena
Manhattan Beach
Compton
Redondo Beach
Carson
Harbor Gateway
Torrance
Hawaiian Gardens
Lomita
Wilmington - Harbor City
Long Beach
Rancho Palos Verdes
San Pedro
Port of Los Angeles
MAP 4.8
New Affordable Housing Units Permitted
Low
High
N
0
5
10
Miles

Analysis of Additional Alternative Means of Meeting the RHNA

Another component of the Adequate Sites analysis is the non-site-specific development potential that exists as additional alternative means of meeting the RHNA. These include the Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan area, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), and ongoing programs at local agencies for the development of affordable and supportive housing on publicly owned land (see above for more detail on each of these components).

- The **Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan** area is an area zoned largely for higher capacity located in an area with a mix of Highest, High, Moderate and Low Resource Areas (per the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps). As such, the analysis for those factors described above is relevant.
- **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)** are being constructed in a variety of mostly lower capacity neighborhoods in Los Angeles. As such, the conclusions should not be significantly different from those described for those areas above.
- **Public land programs** are intended to facilitate the identification of less costly housing typologies, conduct modeling and site analysis of publicly owned land, and negotiate and execute interagency agreements to maximize the construction of affordable housing on public land. The locations are not known at this time; however, it is anticipated that development resulting from the public land programs will be distributed throughout the city in a manner consistent with the overall distribution of expected development potential. As a result, it is premature to draw substantially different conclusions regarding these programs.
- Established during the Covid-19 pandemic, **Project Homekey** is a state program that provides funding to cities to acquire hotels, and motels for the purpose of housing homeless individuals to expedite access to housing for the most vulnerable residents. The City is in the process of developing a more robust program to acquire, or through exploring Lease to Own agreements, hotels, and motels to expand the pipeline of Permanent Supportive Housing. The locations are not known at this time; however, it is anticipated that development resulting from an expansion of Project Homekey will be distributed throughout the city in a manner consistent with the overall distribution of expected development potential. As a result, it is too soon to draw substantially different conclusions regarding this program.

Analysis of Candidate Sites for Rezoning

The AFFH Analysis of candidate sites for rezoning follows a similar methodology as that described above for the Adequate Sites Inventory. The analysis considers the locations and concentrations of the total added rezoned development potential identified as part of the RHNA Rezoning Program (Program 121) in Appendix 4.7, as well as the locations and concentrations of the lower-income development potential. This analysis includes locations and concentrations of development potential that resulted from the identification of candidate sites for future rezoning, and represents the net expected development potential (i.e., added capacity) attributed to those candidate sites. To analyze data compared to Census data, expected development potential was aggregated from all individual sites identified within a census tract boundary. Census tracts were then categorized based on their total expected unit potential into five categories, from the lowest capacity neighborhoods to the highest, as shown in Table 4.32. Selected tables resulting from the AFFH analysis are included in this Chapter. For the full data results, see Appendix 4.4.

Table 4.32: **Rezoning Analysis: Summary of Census Tracts by Assigned Category, Total Rezoned Development Potential**

Census Tract Category	Total Rezoned Development Potential	Percent of Total City Census Tracts	Percent of Total Rezoned Development Potential
Lowest Capacity Neighborhoods	0 - 50	19%	0.2%
Lower Capacity Neighborhoods	51 - 500	31%	4%
Moderate Capacity Neighborhoods	501 - 1,500	21%	11%
Higher Capacity Neighborhoods	1,501 - 5,000	21%	35%
Highest Capacity Neighborhoods	5,001+	8%	49%

Tenure and Income

Table 4.33 shows the tenure and median household income of neighborhoods identified in the Inventory of Candidate Sites for Rezoning. This shows a clear reversal of the trend found in the Inventory of Adequate Sites, above. Considering rezoned sites, neighborhoods with the highest added development potential have a lower share of renters compared to the citywide average. In addition, there is a clear relationship between rezoned development potential and median household income. Neighborhoods with higher and highest added development potential have median household incomes well above the citywide average ($70,276 to $83,332). Again, while renter households have a lower overall median household income, the data follow the same trend.

Table 4.33: **Rezoning Analysis: Tenure and Median Household Income of Neighborhoods Identified in Rezoning Inventory, Total Rezoned Development Potential**

Census Tract Category	Percent Renter Households	Median Household Income	Median Household Income-Renter Households	Percent Low/Moderate-Income Households
Citywide Average	**63%**	**$64,065**	**$50,404**	**61%**
Lowest Capacity Neighborhoods	73%	$49,768	$40,910	71%
Lower Capacity Neighborhoods	61%	$62,745	$48,862	65%
Moderate Capacity Neighborhoods	64%	$65,178	$51,945	60%
Higher Capacity Neighborhoods	60%	$71,452	$56,176	54%
Highest Capacity Neighborhoods	60%	$84,539	$63,748	46%

Source: US Census Bureau; American Community Survey; 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates.

Race/Ethnicity

Table 4.34 shows the extent of over- and underrepresentation of each neighborhood racial type (as determined by HCD), based on the amount of expected development potential identified in both the Adequate Sites Inventory and the Inventory of Candidate Sites for Rezoning. Representation is based on the percentage of the identified development potential in each neighborhood type compared to the share of that neighborhood overall in the city. For example, “Mostly white” neighborhoods make up 5.2% of the total census tracts but are estimated to accommodate 3.8% of the overall rezoning capacity and 5% of the lower-income rezoning capacity. As a result, these neighborhoods are under-represented in the overall rezoning effort by 1.4% and overrepresented by 0.2% for lower-income rezoning. As another example, "Black-Latinx" neighborhoods make up approximately 12.4% of the total census tracts in the city but are estimated to have approximately 1.8% of the total rezoning capacity and 1.7% of the lower-income rezoning category. This means that the "Black-Latinx" neighborhoods are underrepresented by 10.7% in overall rezoning and 10.8% for lower-income rezoning capacity. Underrepresentation is indicated in Table 4.34 using negative percentages.

Compared to their relative share of the city, the overall rezoning effort would shift a much larger share of capacity towards neighborhoods considered “Asian-white”, “Diverse” (meaning they contain a sizable percentage of Black, Latinx, white, and Asian residents), “Black-Latinx-white”, “Latinx-white”, and “Mostly white.” The increased share of capacity in “Mostly white,” “Latinx-white,” and “Asian-white” neighborhood types is a notable change since these neighborhoods are among the most underrepresented areas in the existing Sites Inventory. This pattern is due to the significant additional zoning capacity proposed to be added in West LA and the South Valley. As shown in Map 4A-2 in Appendix 4.4, the West LA and South Valley areas have the greatest concentrations of “Mostly white” and “Asian-white” neighborhoods. The San Fernando Valley neighborhoods in and around Van Nuys, North Hollywood, Panorama City and Northridge contain the largest portion of Latinx-white neighborhoods. All (100%) of the “Mostly white” census tracts are considered High or Highest Resource, as are 97% of the “Asian-white” census tracts, 52% of the “Diverse” census tracts and 37% of "Latinx-white" census tracts.

The rezoning effort also identifies a lower proportional share of added housing development potential in “Black-Latinx,” “Majority Latinx,” “Asian-Latinx”, and “Asian-Latinx-white” neighborhoods. The decreased share of capacity in “Black-Latinx” neighborhoods is particularly notable since these areas are found to be overrepresented in the existing Sites Inventory. “Black-Latinx” neighborhoods are almost entirely located in South LA and there are no “Black-Latinx” census that are considered High or Highest Resource. “Mostly Latinx” neighborhoods are primarily located in Historic South Central and Southeast LA, Boyle Heights/East LA, the Northeast San Fernando Valley, and Wilmington. Like “Latinx-Black” neighborhoods, there are no High or Highest Resource neighborhoods that are majority Latinx. “Asian-Latinx” neighborhoods are primarily located in and around Koreatown, Historic Filipinotown, and Northeast LA and only 1% of these kinds of neighborhoods are

considered High or Highest Resource. "Asian-Latinx-white" neighborhoods located primarily in Northeast LA and the Northwest Valley and approximately half of these areas are High or Highest Resource. These areas are underrepresented in the rezoning effort because a significant share of the Higher Opportunity “Asian-Latinx-white” areas are located in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.



Table 4.34: **Comparative Representation of Neighborhood Types by Development Potential, Candidate Sites for Rezoning Compared to Existing Sites Inventory**

	Total Development Potential		Lower-Income Development Potential	
Neighborhood Type	**Rezoning**	**Existing Inventory**	**Rezoning**	**Existing Inventory**
Diverse	6.75%	4.5%	4.0%	3.3%
Asian-white	6.5%	-0.6%	3.5%	-0.3%
Black-Latinx-white	4.9%	1.6%	0.7%	1.5%
Latinx-white	3.3%	-4.0%	8.8%	-4.1%
Mostly Asian	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%
Black-Asian-White	-0.1%	0.0%	-0.1%	0.1%
Diverse	-0.1%	0.1%	-0.1%	0.1%
Other-White	-0.1%	-0.1%	-0.1%	-0.2%
Mostly Black	-0.2%	-0.2%	-0.2%	0.0%
Black-White	-0.3%	-0.2%	-0.3%	-0.1%
Black-Asian-Latinx	-0.9%	1.0%	-1.0%	0.1%
Mostly White	-1.4%	-3.0%	-0.2%	-3.4%
Asian-Latinx-White	-4.1%	-4.5%	-0.3%	-4.1%
Asian-Latinx	-4.7%	1.3%	-5.1%	3.9%
Mostly Latinx	-7.4%	-1.8%	-6.5%	-3.0%
Black-Latinx	-10.7%	7.9%	-10.8%	5.3%

Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Affluence

Table 4.35 shows that, compared to the overall share of the city located within a R / ECAP (10.5%), a similar share of the total development potential created through the Rezoning Program (12.3%) is located in these areas, but a much lower share of the lower-income rezoned development potential (7.9%) is located in a R/ECAP. Considering RCAAs, a roughly equal share of total rezoned development potential is located in these areas, based on their overall share of the city (both approximately 7%); however, a substantially larger share of lower-income rezoned development potential is located in a RCAA (12%).

Compared to the existing Sites Inventory, this analysis shows there is a significantly greater share of capacity, particularly lower-income capacity allocated to RCAAs. There is also significantly less lower-income capacity identified in R/ECAPs. Because a significant number of RCAAs are located in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, it is difficult to add substantial amounts of additional housing capacity in these areas while balancing environmental and climate change considerations. The rezoned development potential that is identified in R/ECAPs is primarily a result of the Downtown and Boyle Heights Community Plans, which are in-progress work efforts that reflect additional policy priorities such as promoting a jobs/housing balance, reducing VMT, and planning for additional housing capacity near transit. These examples reflect the importance of balancing a range of policy considerations and reflect the need to increase fair housing choice by providing both residential opportunities in Higher Opportunity Areas and investing holistically in lower-income, Black, Indigenous and People of Color Communities to meet the needs of the existing residents.

Table 4.35: **Share of Development Potential Located in a R/ECAP or RCAA, Candidate Sites for Rezoning Compared to Existing Sites Inventory**

		Total Development Potential		Lower-Income Development Potential	
	Percent of City	**Rezoning**	**Existing Inventory**	**Rezoning**	**Existing Inventory**
R/ECAP - Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty	**10.5%**	12.3%	13.9%	7.9%	15.6%
RCAA - Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence	**7.5%**	7.8%	2.2%	12.2%	2.3%

Source: HUD, ACS 2019 5-year Summary Data

Transit Access

Considering the locations of housing units expected as part of the Candidate Sites for Rezoning, the majority are expected to be located in a High Quality Transit Area (HQTA). Table 4.36 shows that 95% of the overall rezoned development potential is located in a HQTA, while 92% of the lower-income rezoned development potential is located in these areas. While this is a significant majority of the added development potential, it is somewhat lower than the share of existing development potential located in a HQTA. This analysis shows that, to increase housing potential in Higher Opportunity Areas, there may be a slight dip in overall transit access.

Table 4.36: **Transit Access, Candidate Sites for Rezoning**

	Total Rezoned Development Potential	Lower-Income Rezoned Development Potential
Located within a High Quality Transit Area (HQTA)	95%	92%
Located outside a High Quality Transit Area (HQTA)	5%	8%

Source: HQTA 2045, SCAG

Displacement Risk

In 2016, the Mayor's Office's Innovation Team (I-Team) developed a Displacement Pressure Index to predict where displacement may be most likely to occur.[11] The methodology uses a combination of factors such as transportation investment, home price appreciation, percent of rent-burdened households, and affordable units at risk of converting to market rate. Each factor is weighted based on its predictive power and then each neighborhood is given a composite score based on the sum of all weighted factors. The areas identified as being at the highest risk of displacement are primarily located in Downtown, Hollywood, Baldwin Village, Crenshaw corridor, North Hollywood, East LA, and Northeast LA. This methodology is somewhat outdated and does not include data on actual displacement such as Ellis evictions and Tenant Buyout Agreements. It also does not consider existing policies such as the Residential Hotel

11. https://www.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?panel=gallery&suggestField=true&layers=70ed646893f642ddbca858c381471fa2

Conversion Ordinance that prevents displacement in many parts of Downtown. As described in Program 122, the City will be conducting an additional analysis of displacement which will further inform the Rezoning Programs. However, for the purposes of this analysis, the Displacement Index is the best available source of data to conduct a preliminary analysis of the displacement risk associated with the existing Sites Inventory and the candidate sites for rezoning.

Table 4.37 shows that approximately 25% of the total rezoning capacity and 10% of the total low-income rezoning capacity is located in areas considered by the methodology to be "very high displacement pressure" and an additional 8% of total rezoning capacity and 7.5% of lower-income capacity is located in areas considered to have "high displacement pressure." This is due in part to the significant amount of capacity proposed for the Downtown area as part of the Downtown Community Plan update. When compared to the existing Sites Inventory, the proposed Rezoning Program somewhat shifts development capacity (particularly lower-income development capacity) away from areas with displacement pressure. Whereas 41% of the existing inventory's capacity and 46% of the existing inventory's lower-income capacity was located in areas with very high or high displacement pressure, only 33% of overall rezoning capacity and 18% of lower-income rezoning capacity are located in these areas.

Table 4.37: **Comparative Distribution of Neighborhood Displacement Pressure by Development Potential, Candidate Sites for Rezoning Compared to Existing Sites Inventory**

	Total Development Potential		Lower-Income Development Potential	
Displacement Index	**Rezoning**	**Existing Inventory**	**Rezoning**	**Existing Inventory**
Very High Displacement Pressure (>.377)	25.5%	22.1%	10.1%	27.3%
High Displacement Pressure (.284-.377)	8.0%	18.5%	7.5%	18.3%
Medium Displacement Pressure (.203-.284)	6.1%	16.9%	5.6%	16.0%
Medium/Low Displacement Pressure (.162-.203)	9.9%	14.1%	13.3%	12.7%
Low Displacement Pressure (<.162)	9.5%	8.3%	14.8%	7.1%
Above Income Threshold	32.4%	27.6%	48.5%	17.9%

Source: LA Mayor's Office I-Team Index of Displacement Pressure

Opportunity Areas

Table 4.38 shows the distribution of the total candidate sites for rezoning, total added rezoning development potential, and total added lower-income rezoning development potential by TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area. Compared to the same analysis presented above for existing conditions, the analysis reflects a reprioritization in creating new development potential, especially lower-income development potential, in the High and Highest Resource areas. Combined, these areas represent 43% of the total added development potential, and 56% of the total added lower-income development potential. While the Rezoning Program includes efforts that would increase development potential in the other Opportunity Area categories, these areas are deprioritized and are underrepresented in terms of their overall share of the city's census tracts.

Approximately 20% of the total rezoned capacity and 11% of lower-income capacity is located in High Segregation and Poverty areas. This is primarily due to the fact that some portions of the city currently undergoing Community Plan Updates include areas considered High Segregation and Poverty. Community Plan Updates provide an opportunity to create more nuanced land use strategies focused on meeting the overall needs of residents in these areas that are disproportionately impacted by overcrowding, rent burden, environmental contaminants, and substandard housing conditions. Overall, these results indicate that the proposed Rezoning Program would create a balanced strategy that would create significant new housing capacity in Higher Opportunity Areas, while accounting for existing housing need in neighborhoods.

Table 4.38: **Rezoning Analysis: Candidate Sites for Rezoning by TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area**

TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area	Percent of City's Census Tracts	Percent of Candidate Sites	Percent of Rezoned Development Potential	Percent of Lower-Income Rezoned Development Potential
Highest Resource	**19%**	23%	22%	29%
High Resource	**15%**	23%	21%	27%
Moderate Resource	**17%**	14%	12%	11%
Moderate Resource Rapidly Changing	**5%**	2%	2%	2%
Low Resource	**28%**	18%	21%	20%
High Segregation and Poverty	**16%**	20%	20%	11%
Unknown	**1%**	1%	1%	1%

Source: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map, 2021

Key Conclusions and Summary of Actions Needed to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing

Because the Sites Inventory is so reliant on existing zoning capacity as well as recent development patterns, it is largely a reflection of these existing conditions. As a result, the disparities found in the Sites Inventory reflect existing disparities in the city's zoning and development patterns. Therefore, as stated, the Sites Inventory does not exacerbate existing conditions. However, there is significant opportunity for programs and rezoning efforts to improve these conditions which is required to affirmatively further fair housing.

Additionally, the analysis shows that the RHNA is largely accommodated in relatively few parts of the city, which are primarily those that are zoned for multi-family residential uses and have more active residential development activity.

The results of the rezoning analysis show that, with implementation of the Rezoning Program, there would be an overall improvement to existing conditions. The Rezoning Program places a strong emphasis on expanding housing capacity — especially affordable housing capacity — in Higher Opportunity Areas. As a result of this emphasis, the analysis finds that the Rezoning Program provides substantially more affordable housing opportunities in Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs), which are majority white.

The Rezoning Program will also add capacity in areas considered High Segregation and Poverty and areas considered Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty; however, most of the added capacity in these areas is proposed through the current Community Plans underway, in particular in Downtown Los Angeles. Community Plans, unlike citywide housing initiatives, can be more responsive to the place-based needs of residents and plan for other amenities such as increased green space, mobility improvements, and employment centers. Thoughtful planning for additional housing and amenities in majority low-income, Black, Indigenous, and People of Color neighborhoods is essential in meeting the needs of these communities' residents and essential in meaningfully advancing fair housing choice.

With implementation of the Rezoning Program, it is anticipated that the plan will affirmatively further fair housing and work to create a more equitable set of land use regulations for the City. However, due to the pervasive risk of displacement, it is critical that the Rezoning Program is paired with a robust set of programs aimed at protecting existing housing stock and increasing tenant protections.

Chapter 6 introduces the Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs centered in racial equity, environmental justice, and resilience pertaining to deficiencies found in the city's zoning and Inventory of Adequate Sites for Housing. In particular, the analysis provided in this Chapter provides support for a strong set of anti-displacement policies and programs, paired with the need for a citywide Rezoning Program that focuses on creating significant new opportunities for housing development, particularly affordable

housing development, in areas of High Opportunity. Together, these goals, objectives, policies, and programs comprise the City's housing action plan for the 2021-2029 planning period. Informed by this chapter's analysis, Chapter 6 is designed to guide daily decision-making by City officials and staff and will provide benchmarks on the housing programs that the City initiated to meet its overall housing goals


ONE WILSHIRE
LEASING
SHEKARCHI
RESTAURANT

Review of the 2013-2021 Housing Element

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of the 2013-2021 Housing Element and evaluates the City's progress in meeting its housing needs during the planning period. It identifies the number of housing units built compared to the City's target for new construction, as established through the 2013-2021 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation, and evaluates the progress, effectiveness and appropriateness of each of the Housing Element goals, objectives and policies in meeting identified needs and quantified objectives. This chapter is organized by the four housing goals established in the previous Housing Element.

A detailed evaluation of each policy and program within the four goal areas is included as **Appendix 5.1**.

The review of the previous Housing Element helps shape the Update in four key ways: (1) It identifies goals, objectives, policies and programs that were either missing or inadequate to address Los Angeles' housing needs; (2) it identifies policies that needed to be strengthened or clarified to better reflect their importance; and (3) it identifies redundancies and areas of overlap and confusion that should be eliminated in order to provide a clearer focus on programs and policies that are the most significant. The goals, objectives and policies that are being carried over into the 2021-2029 Housing Element Update uphold the strategies to address the City's housing needs defined in this cycle.

Progress in Meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the previous Housing Element planning period of January 1, 2013 - September 30th, 2021 was 82,002 new housing units. This is broken down by income categories, into 46,590 affordable units and 35,412 market-rate units. The affordable units are further broken out into 20,427 very low income units, 12,435 low income units and 13,728 moderate income units. More information on RHNA, including how goals are allocated and definitions of income categories, are available in Chapter 1: Needs Assessment Analysis and Chapter 4: Inventory of Sites.

From 2014 to the end of 2020 (7 years), building permits were issued for 117,088 new housing units. The City has therefore already met its overall RHNA target of 82,002 units; however, it is not expected to have produced enough housing in the lower and moderate income categories. Table 5.1 presents the City's progress towards meeting its RHNA through 2020, which is one year short of the full eight year RHNA period.

Table 5.1 : **New Housing Units by Income Category, 2014-2020**


RHNA Income Category	RHNA Goal (2014 -2021)	Units Built (2014-2020)	Remaining RHNA
Very Low	20,427	7,012	13,415
Low	12,435	3,727	8,708
Moderate	13,728	827	12,901
Above Moderate Rate	35,412	105,522	-
Total	82,002	117,088	-

Source: LAHD, DCP.
**The RHNA goal is for the period between January 1, 2014 to October 1, 2021.*

In 2018 and 2019, the City permitted the highest number of units the City has seen since the mid 1980s. This is largely due to a strong economy and high housing prices, in addition to continued efforts by the City and State to promote housing production. However, the majority of new construction during the 2014-2020 period was for above moderate, or market-rate, housing. As illustrated in Table 5.1 above, the RHNA goals target nearly 40% of all new units for households with low incomes or below, whereas only about 9% of the actual new units produced in the prior RHNA served these households. The gap is even larger at the moderate income category. This distribution reflects the current orientation of housing funding sources and other incentives and highlights the ongoing need for significantly more funding and additional land use incentives and requirements to achieve the City's housing goals.

In 2020, the City saw a significant increase in affordable housing production - to nearly 3,000 units, more than double the prior five-year average (see Chart 5.1 below) and triple the figures seen from 2010-2014. The significant increase in affordable housing production in 2020 is attributed primarily both to the permitting of Measure HHH projects, as well as a doubling in unsubsidized affordable units in incentivized mixed-income projects. Both types of development have been facilitated by the introduction of the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program in 2017. The TOC program has resulted in approvals of projects containing over 35,000 housing units approvals, almost 25% of which are affordable (mostly for extremely low income households). The introduction of the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee has also compelled many projects into using the City's housing incentive programs such as TOC or Density Bonus to provide on-site units and avoid the fee.

Chart 5.1: **Affordable Housing Production by Source of Affordability | 2010-2020**



Source: HCID and LACP, Annual Progress Reports of the Housing Element, 2010-2020

Future housing pipeline indicators such as recent planning approvals also indicate that greater increases in affordable units may be possible in future years. For example, City Planning has approved an average of more than 5,200 affordable units per year in 2019 and 2020, compared to about 1,300 affordable units in 2014-2016. Again, these figures are likely the positive result of Measure HHH as well as the TOC and Linkage Fee programs. If these positive affordable housing production trends continue, the City could see an increase in the number of affordable units produced in the next RHNA period.

The development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) has also increased housing production since state reforms were introduced in 2017. Since that time, the City has permitted more than 14,000 ADUs through December 2020, with more than 19,000 total permit applications. Based on recent research by SCAG, 55% of these ADUs are believed to be rented at affordable income levels (15% Extremely Low, 1% Very Low, 27% Low and 12% Moderate) but are not counted towards the RHNA progress since these units are not typically deed restricted.[1]

Although the number and percentage of non-subsidized affordable units produced through land use incentives has increased substantially in recent years, the majority of affordable units produced since 2014 have been through a public subsidy. Since 2013, the City and County have approved a variety of local funding sources to support affordable housing development including Proposition HHH, Measure H, and the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee. The funding from Proposition HHH and Measure H is now fully allocated and the City will need to identify additional funding sources to maintain current affordable housing production levels. To increase affordable housing production to a level required to meet the new RHNA goals will require significant resources.

1. SCAG Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis. 2020



Review of 2013-2021 Housing Element Goals, Objectives, and Policies

The City began the Housing Element update process by revisiting the 2013-2021 Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs, sharing them at public workshops, online webinars and with the Housing Element Task Force. Individuals were asked to comment on which aspects of the 2013-2021 framework worked well, and which considerations needed to be better emphasized or were missing entirely.

Based on this process the City developed six *"Concepts"* to guide the Housing Element Update. These Concepts integrate feedback from the public alongside requirements from the state to illustrate how the City will shift its policy focus to meet increasingly ambitious housing goals.

Housing Element *Concepts* to Guide the Housing Element Review and Update

- Housing Stability and Anti-Displacement: Protect Angelenos - especially persons of color - from indirect and direct displacement, and ensure the stability of existing vulnerable communities.
- Housing Production: Increase the production of new housing, particularly affordable housing.
- Access to Opportunity: Increase access to opportunities and proactively desegregate the City by planning for more affordable and mixed-income housing in higher-resource areas.
- Homelessness: Prevent and end homelessness in a manner that centers human dignity and respect by developing early interventions, significantly expanding permanent housing options, and providing appropriate services and support.
- Built Environment: Design and regulate housing to promote health and well-being, increase access to amenities, contribute to a sense of place, foster community and belonging, and plan for a sustainable future.
- Meeting the Needs of all Angelenos: Build, operate, and maintain welcoming and accessible housing for Angelenos with unique needs, including those with disabilities, large families, older adults, and other people facing housing barriers.

The prior Housing Element's Vision, Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs were all evaluated against these six *Concepts* to determine how best to update this policy framework for the 2021-2029 Housing Element.

Housing Element Vision

Los Angeles' housing Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs are guided by the City's overall housing Vision. The Vision established in the prior Housing Element read:

It is the overall housing vision of the City of Los Angeles to create for all residents a city of livable and sustainable neighborhoods with a range of housing types, sizes and costs in proximity to jobs, amenities and services. In keeping with decades of federal Housing Acts and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that declared housing as a human right, the City will work towards ensuring that housing is provided to all residents.

The prior vision included the importance of viewing housing as a human right that must be provided for all residents. It also stressed the importance of housing in meeting the City's important livability and sustainability goals as well as the need for an array of housing types in proximity to amenities and jobs to meet these goals. However, when compared to the Housing Element Concepts above, the importance of undoing past discriminatory practices and creating greater access to housing opportunities were perhaps not sufficiently emphasized. In addition to adding these Concepts into the Vision, a new term called Citywide Housing Priorities has been created to help summarize the mix of Concepts and introduce them into selected policies below to better implement the Vision. These Citywide Housing Priorities specifically address the housing shortage, advancing racial equity and access to opportunity, protecting Angelenos from displacement, and promoting sustainability and resilience.



Prior Goal 1: Housing Production and Preservation

The goal established to address housing production and preservation was as follows:

A City where housing production and preservation result in an adequate supply of ownership and rental housing that is safe, healthy, and affordable to people of all income levels, races, ages, and suitable for their various needs.

The Previous Housing Element combined housing production with housing preservation in Goal 1 to consider them together as encompassing the total housing supply. The results of the production part of the goal can be seen as progress toward RHNA (see above).

The City also made significant progress toward preservation. The Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) was updated several times, and LAHD undertook an ambitious campaign to better inform tenants of RSO protections. Housing replacement requirements that ensure a "no net loss" and a tenant's "right of first refusal" are now in place for most, but not all, types of projects. Short-term rentals are now regulated through the Home-Sharing Ordinance and the number of online listings in the City has dropped by about 90%, though enforcement challenges remain. The City also adopted an Unpermitted Dwelling Unit (UDU) Ordinance that provides a pathway for units to be legalized instead of vacated.

An adequate supply of homes is necessary to achieving both housing affordability and greater stability. The 2013-2021 goal recognizes the importance of both constructing new units and preserving those affordable units we already have. The two issues are often intertwined; however, they do require distinct strategies. The 2013-2021 Objectives, Policies and Programs beneath Goal 1 are largely separated as either related to production or preservation/protection. To more clearly expand upon and delineate both Goals, production and preservation have been separated as individual Goals for 2021-2029.

The production related parts of the Goal have been modified in a number of key ways. First, the 2013-2021 document consistently targeted an "adequate" supply of housing. In keeping with the RHNA discussion above, this language has been modified to target an "ample" supply of housing that also meets the tremendous existing housing needs, as expressed through rates of overcrowding and cost burden, not just those a result of projected (future) growth. The production focus of Goal 1 also requires less emphasis on health and safety, as these elements are covered by the building code and are more relevant to the preservation and livability goals. Instead, equity and affordability are highlighted in the revised goal and its related objectives.

The production related objectives listed under Goal 1 largely remained relevant and were retained, including the focus on forecasting and planning for changing housing needs (1.1), facilitating housing production, especially for Affordable Housing and housing meeting Citywide Housing Priorities (1.2), and promoting a more equitable

distribution of housing (1.3). The prior order was changed to place planning for housing first to reflect its order in the chronology of addressing housing needs, as well as the increased importance of the RHNA. The importance of creating affordable housing was clarified by adding a newly defined term "Affordable Housing," which refers specifically to income-restricted units. Finally, the defined term Citywide Housing Priorities was also added to all three Objectives to ensure each one reflects the need to address the overarching Housing Element vision and Concepts described above.

Policies and programs that focused on housing production have largely remained relevant and are continuing in the Housing Element Update. However, the scale of the housing crisis and its impact on already marginalized communities requires further advancements.

Changes to production related policies and programs include a greater emphasis on alleviating existing housing needs and implementing strategies to better align citywide and community level housing planning efforts. To reduce racial and economic segregation, this update includes a much stronger focus on locating Affordable Housing in all communities, creating more housing in Higher Opportunity Areas and allocating housing targets within Community Plan areas in a way that affirmatively furthers fair housing. Anti-displacement is added as a core component to future planning and land use strategies and the importance of more state and regional coordination is also strengthened.

The new Goal 2 related to preservation has been restructured to reflect the broader emphasis on promoting housing stability, which requires a combination of affordable housing preservation, habitability code enforcement, tenant protections, and homeownership strategies. There is an overall increased emphasis on preventing displacement and protecting communities of color, which was not explicitly discussed in the previous Housing Element. New strategies include an Eviction Defense Program, a Just Cause Eviction Program, adopting a Tenant Anti-Harassment Ordinance, a Housing Stability Program, strengthening enforcement of the Ellis Act and RSO, and expanding "no net loss" requirements, affordable housing replacement policies and a tenant's right to return to any new housing construction on the site of a demolition. Concepts such as extending affordability covenant terms, establishing community/tenant preference policies as well as promoting emerging ideas such as community land trusts and tenant/community opportunity to purchase programs were also added. One new preservation strategy involves the purchase of naturally affordable housing in order to remove units from the speculative market, help insulate tenants from price increases, and create housing for low-income families. Finally, the focus on promoting homeownership has been broadened and relocated from the production goal to this goal, with a new focus on protecting communities (especially communities of color) from predatory real estate practices and using homeownership as a tool to increase community stability and build intergenerational wealth.

Prior Goal 2: Creating Safe, Livable Communities

The livable communities goal sought to preserve, stabilize and enhance livability/ sustainability in all neighborhoods throughout the City as follows:

A City in which housing helps to create safe, livable, and sustainable neighborhoods.

The second goal of the 2013-2021 Housing Element placed a strong focus on complete communities, illustrating the role of housing in creating and preserving vibrant neighborhoods. The City has seen advancement in many of the programs under this goal. The TOC program continues to concentrate housing growth near transit, working toward the city's Sustainability objectives. The focus on health, wellness and equity was further emphasized in the Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles (The Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan) when it was adopted in 2015. A revised Baseline Mansionization Ordinance, Citywide Design Guidelines, and the adoption of five new HPOZs helped further some of the design objectives of this goal. Finally, Community Plans drafted and adopted during this cycle each introduced a local set of design guidelines and requirements for each geography.

The policies and programs falling under this goal promote sustainable neighborhoods that lessen impacts on natural resource consumption by directing housing toward locations near jobs and transit and employing green-building techniques. These efforts facilitate high quality, healthy housing in neighborhoods that mix incomes and improve accessibility to jobs and services have been carried over into the 2021-2029 Housing Element.



While the general focus of this goal on equity, livability and sustainability has been preserved, a few key details have been further developed for the 2021-2029 update. The focus on health has increased, with new policies guiding development to better orient building siting and features toward beneficial uses and away from polluting or hazardous features. The existing focus on safety has shifted to disaster resilience and has been elevated to a unique objective with several new policies. References to "neighborhood character," which have been criticized as being too vague, have been replaced with language about architectural context and diverse cultural heritages within communities.

Prior Goal 3: Housing Opportunity

The housing opportunity goal addressed the provision of equal housing opportunities for everyone as follows:

A City where there are housing opportunities for all without discrimination.

Evaluating and responding to fair housing issues and meeting the varied needs of special needs households is a continued priority for the City of Los Angeles. During the prior Housing Element Cycle, LAHD and HACLA conducted an extensive Assessment of Fair Housing that for the first time included an assessment of racial and economic segregation and analyzed racial and ethnic disparities in accessing opportunity. The goals, objectives, and strategies from that document helped inform and lay the foundation for the City's 2021 Housing Element Update.

The City's policies and programs relating to the housing needs of persons and households with special needs made significant progress during the planning period. For example, the City has initiated a wide-ranging Accessible Housing Program (AcHP) that applies to new and existing developments to add to the supply of affordable accessible units and ensure compliance with the City's Fair Housing Policies. The City has committed to retrofitting hundreds of existing multifamily housing developments across the City to provide 3,100 accessible housing units designed for persons with mobility disabilities. In addition, the LAHD has implemented policies to ensure that accessible units designated for occupancy by individuals with disabilities are actually made available for occupancy by the persons who need the accessibility features they provide. LAHD has enhanced training for the public and landlords/developers on Fair Housing and updated and improved the grievance tracking system. A live hotline and public counters for assistance in applying for affordable and accessible housing has also been created. The City's recently adopted Tenant Anti-Harassment Ordinance provides additional protections for tenants with special needs experiencing unlawful harassment, including fines up to $5,000 if the tenant is older than 65 years or is living with a disability. Additionally, the LAHD renewed and expanded a contract with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) to conduct fair housing testing and respond to fair housing complaints by people of protected classes, including people with disabilities. Through Mayor Garcetti's Executive Directive 17 a Purposeful Aging LA initiative was launched, convening a Purposeful Aging Task Force among many stakeholders

including AARP. The task force completed a Purposeful Aging Age-Friendly Action Plan, which was used to help to refine programs for the next housing element cycle.

A new Objective (4.3) was added that commits the City to proactive measures to promote diverse, inclusive communities that grant all Angelenos access to housing. Given changes to federal and state law, including a State requirement to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing and a statewide ban on discrimination based on source of income, it is essential that the City continue to implement and expand effective programs that prevent and respond to individual and systemic-level discrimination. As such, previous policies and programs such as facilitating access to equal housing opportunities by promoting responsible community lending, encouraging education about fair housing practices, and collecting and reporting data on housing discrimination complaints have been continued here, as well as added to other Goals, Objectives and Policies (discussed above).

Many programs have been added or expanded to overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities. All Housing Element programs that have been identified to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) are identified as part of the AFFH Program (126) in Chapter 6. These include programs that range from creating more affordable housing opportunities in Higher Opportunity Areas, to protecting tenants, and ensuring broader and more transparent access to the affordable housing opportunities that are created.

Revisions for the Housing Element update include the addition of policies that take proactive measures to affirmatively further fair housing and promote diverse and inclusive communities by developing housing solutions that increase access to opportunity in high resource areas. To emphasize the importance of these new policies they have been developed under a new objective specifically focused on affirmatively furthering fair housing. Additionally, revisions to the policies place emphasis on identifying unmet housing needs (especially for large families, multigenerational households, and aging populations) which were not clearly addressed in the previous Housing Element. Finally, language has been added to address populations that face housing discrimination but fall outside of the definition of a "protected class," such as individuals that have been formerly incarcerated.

Prior Goal 4: Ending and Preventing Homelessness

The goal to end and prevent homelessness is as follows:

A City committed to preventing and ending homelessness.

The previous Housing Element (2013-2021) made it clear that the issue of homelessness should be elevated in importance and confronted as a problem that can be solved. This goal reiterates the City's vision to see every homeless individual and family housed by preventing them from becoming homeless and by rapidly rehousing those who do fall into homelessness. Despite this, homelessness in the City of Los

Angeles has risen sharply since the last Housing Element, reaching a total of 41,290 people experiencing homelessness in the City according to the 2020 Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count. While the continued increase has come as a result of several factors, most notably including a drastic shortfall in available affordable housing available to people with the lowest incomes throughout the region, the homeless services system has scaled up and become more effective and efficient in response.

The policies and programs focus on a tiered approach that recognizes the need to provide sufficient temporary and emergency shelters to meet short-term needs while working toward a rapid return to more stable housing or permanent supportive housing over the longer-term. Outreach and education efforts under this goal seek both to increase awareness for all City residents about the needs of the homeless and to inform the homeless about housing and service opportunities. These policies and programs also strive to remove barriers to siting housing for homeless persons throughout the City. This focus is largely maintained in the 2021-2029 policy framework.

Most objectives and policies from the previous Housing Element were preserved in the current cycle. However, revisions were made to emphasize the need and demand for supportive services and compassionate care as part of the commitment to prevent and end homelessness. Additionally, revisions were made to enhance outreach and education on the root causes of homelessness and effective approaches to help as a means to correct common misconceptions. More direct policy language was added to specify that supportive services, including housing and temporary facilities, need to be included in all neighborhoods of the City. Finally, policies were added to emphasize the need to compassionately care for individuals experiencing homelessness with facilities like restrooms, showers and drinking fountains.

Programs relevant to Goal 4 were largely retained but revised to address changing needs and approaches. In an effort to further streamline programs and combine efforts aiming to achieve similar goals, many programs were combined to strike an efficient balance. For example, programs relating to rental assistance for homeless households, supportive services for persons living with HIV/AIDS and certain homeless count services were combined. Additionally, the City of Los Angeles' Comprehensive Homeless Strategy, adopted by the Los Angeles City Council in 2016, serves as a comprehensive approach to address short- and long-term homelessness issues and is adopted in tandem with the Homeless Initiative approved concurrently by the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors. It reflects the collaborative efforts of the City Council, its Homelessness and Poverty Committee, the Office of the Mayor, City Departments, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, the County of Los Angeles, homeless service providers and the public. With inflow into homelessness identified as a key driver of the increasing number of people on the street, the City began scaling more homelessness prevention programs to prevent people from falling into homleessness before they enter the homeless services system. Some examples include the Problem Solving program led by LAHSA, which identifies people experiencing a housing crisis by working with mainstream social services systems to

provide support before they fall into homelessness. In identifying similar homlessness prevention programs, like LAHSA'S Problem Solving Program or Coordinated Entry System Program (see Appendix 2.1), the City aims to slow inflow into homelessness and allow the interventions moving people out of homlessness — like rapid rehousing or supportive housing — to actually reduce the overall numbers of people experiencing homelessness.

The City of LA has also worked to instill a data-driven approach to the Homeless Services System, conducting annual "gaps analysis" to determine what interventions are most needed in the system, and what balance between different interventions (such as shelter vs. rental assistance) can best maximize the number of housing placements. All of this has coincided with rapid increases in funding for service providers, which has enabled the City of LA to invest in capacity building for existing service providers while lowering barriers to bring new service providers into the system.



Housing Goals, Policies, Objectives, and Programs

Background

The Housing Element plays a unique role in charting the course for a more fair, equitable, and just Los Angeles for future generations.The City of Los Angeles is committed to providing housing initiatives that expand and preserve our affordable housing stock, encourage greater access to housing, minimize the displacement of vulnerable residents, and dismantle policies and practices that have negatively impacted Angeleno communities of color, including Indigenous Peoples, Black, Latinx, and Asian communities.

In the last eight years, the severity of the housing crisis has continued to grow. The most stark consequences of LA's housing issues are reflected by the over 40,000 Angelenos that are homeless or sleeping in temporary shelters at any given night. Additionally we see that, while not homeless, more than thirty percent of Angelenos see more than half of their paychecks going towards rising housing costs. This cost burden is most disproportionately felt by women, the disabled, and communities of color who are already at a greater risk of displacement and gentrification pressures. We also find that an entire generation of middle-class and higher-income Los Angeles residents are afflicted by the housing crisis. Today, the average home in LA costs more than seven times what the average household makes. While high costs make saving for down payments that much more difficult, the opportunities for renting for middle-income households are just as unaffordable.

The events of the past year have been a moment of reckoning for our City and created an opportunity for planners to acknowledge the role the planning profession has played in creating and implementing discriminatory practices in both the past and present that leave communities of color vulnerable to homelessness, displacement, and limit access to opportunities, advancement and achievement. Coupled with the COVID-19

pandemic, 2020 not only exacerbated LA's long standing housing needs but also magnified housing disparities as outlined in the Needs Assessment Chapter 1 and Appendix 1.1.

To respond to the increasing housing pressures facing Los Angeles, the Housing Element Update presents goals, objectives, policies and programs centered in racial equity, environmental justice, and resilience pertaining to housing access, preservation, stability, and production. Together, these goals, objectives, policies and programs comprise the City's housing action plan for the 2021-2029 planning period. The content of this Chapter will guide daily decision-making by City officials and staff and will provide benchmarks on the housing programs that the City initiated to meet its overall housing goals.



What is a Goal, Policy, Objective and Program?

The Goals, Policies and Objectives of this document serve as the foundational components that transform the City's progressive rhetoric into impactful action.

Goal: A goal is a statement that describes a desired future condition or "end" state. Goals are meant to be aspirational and are change- and outcome-oriented, based on a combination of needs and constraints.

The five goals that will guide the 2021-2029 Housing Element are as follows:

Goal 1: A City where housing production results in an ample supply of housing to create more equitable and affordable options that meet existing and projected needs.

Goal 2: A City that preserves and enhances the quality of housing and provides greater housing stability for households of all income levels.

Goal 3: A City in which housing creates healthy, livable, sustainable, and resilient communities that improve the lives of all Angelenos.

Goal 4: A City that fosters racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods and corrects the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination of the past and present.

Goal 5: A City that is committed to preventing and ending homelessness.

Objective: An objective is a statement of specific actions that assist in reaching its goals.

Policy: A policy is a clear statement that guides a specific course of action for decision makers to achieve a desired goal. Policies may refer to existing programs or call for the establishment of new ones.

Programs: An implementation program is an action, procedure, program or technique that carries out goals and policies. The listing of recommended implementation programs does not obligate the City to accomplish them.

The Housing Element 2021-2029 policies and programs that support these goals will be implemented by many City Departments and agencies. Programs are subject to the review and direction of the City Council and Mayor, as well as the relevant City Departments, subsequent to City's approval of the Housing Element 2021-2029 Update. With each program description herein, the City Departments responsible for implementation are identified as "Lead Agencies" and "Supporting Agencies." A brief description of each of these Departments is contained in Appendix 6.1.

Program implementation actions include a combination of ordinances, programs, policies, resolutions, and incentives, as well as outreach and education activities. Successful program development is often contingent on the availability of funding and staff resources, which is likely to change over time due to economic conditions, the priorities of federal and regional governments and funding agencies, and other conditions. The programs will be reviewed annually through an Annual Progress Report (APR) and prioritized, where necessary, to reflect funding limitations and the City's objectives. When General Plan Updates are considered, they will have to be evaluated for consistency with the Housing Element. Not all plan policies can be achieved in any single action, and, in relation to any decision, some goals may be more compelling than others. On a program-by-program basis, taking into consideration factual circumstances, decision makers will determine how best to implement the adopted policies of the General Plan in any way which best serves the public health, safety, and general welfare. The City also recognizes that upon further outreach and monitoring, it may become necessary to modify certain actions as circumstances change over time as there may be multiple ways to achieve the desired outcomes. Amounts and sources of funding, initiation dates, responsible agencies, and the detailed work scope of programs may be changed without requesting amendments to the Housing Element. Before items are presented to the City Council, a robust outreach effort will take place for each proposal. Anticipated timelines and schedules of specific actions are indicated alongside program objectives, or if not, it can be assumed the work will continue throughout the eight-year planning period.

Citywide Vision and Housing Priorities

Los Angeles' housing goals, objectives, policies and programs are guided by the City's overall housing vision:

It is the overall housing vision of the City of Los Angeles to create housing opportunities that enhance affordability, equity, livability and sustainability by remedying discriminatory housing practices and creating a city with a range of housing types, sizes, and costs in close proximity to jobs, transit, amenities, and services. In keeping with a fundamental belief that housing is a human right, the City will work towards ensuring that housing stability and affordability is provided to all residents.

In line with this vision, the goals, policies and objectives are intended to further certain Citywide Housing Priorities, defined below to include:

- Addressing the Housing Shortage: Increase the production of new housing, particularly affordable housing.
- Advancing Racial Equity & Access to Opportunity: Proactively address racial and economic segregation in the city by creating housing opportunities that address historic patterns of discrimination and exclusion.
- Preventing Displacement: Protect Angelenos—especially persons of color and the disabled—from indirect and direct displacement, and ensure stability of existing vulnerable communities.
- Promoting Sustainability & Resilience and Environmental Justice through Housing: Design and regulate housing to promote health and well-being, increase access to amenities, contribute to a sense of place, foster community and belonging, and protect residents from existing and future environmental impacts.



Key Definitions

Throughout this document terms that are formally defined are noted through capitalization:

- "Affordable Housing," used with capitalization in this document, is any housing unit that has a formal covenant or other legal protection that guarantees that the housing unit can only be occupied by someone within a set schedule of income. These units can be located in a building that is entirely income restricted, or in a mixed-income building where only a certain percentage of the units are restricted.
- "affordable housing," used without capitalization in the document, refers to housing that is affordable or rented at below-market rates to residents with or without a formal covenant or regulatory agreement (unsubsidized), and includes Affordable Housing, naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) and rent stabilized (RSO) housing.
- "Higher Opportunity Areas" have a dense concentration of place-based characteristics linked to critical life outcomes, such as educational attainment, earnings from employment, health and life expectancy, and economic mobility. Each year the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee and the California Department of Housing and Community Development release maps that identify "high resource " and "highest resource," areas state-wide, called TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas Maps. These maps can be used to guide local jurisdictions in identifying Higher Opportunity Areas, though other growth considerations outlined in the General Plan, including the location of high quality transit, jobs, hazard areas, and ecologically sensitive areas, also need to be considered.
- "Citywide Housing Priorities" are defined as: addressing the housing shortage, advancing racial equity & access to opportunity, protecting Angelenos, and promoting sustainability & resilience through housing. More detail on these priorities is included in the introduction to this chapter.

Goals, Objectives and Policies

GOAL 1

A City where housing production results in an ample supply of housing to create more equitable and affordable options that meet existing and projected needs.

Objective 1.1:

Forecast and plan for existing and projected housing needs over time with the intention of furthering Citywide Housing Priorities.

Policies

1.1.1: Collect, report, and analyze existing housing needs (such as overcrowding, cost burden and vacancy rates) and use this information to project and plan for housing needs at a local and citywide level balancing other factors such as job and transit access.

1.1.2: Plan for appropriate land use designations and density to accommodate an ample supply of housing units by type, cost, and size within the City to meet housing needs, according to Citywide Housing Priorities and the City's General Plan.

1.1.3: Account for existing housing needs when planning for future development by conducting analysis to develop and incorporate a buffer above household projections.

1.1.4: Plan for and provide sufficient services and amenities to support the existing and planned population.

1.1.5: Strengthen efforts to achieve regional housing goals by collaborating, planning and advocating at regional, state and federal levels.

1.1.6: Allocate citywide housing targets across Community Plan areas in a way that seeks to address patterns of racial and economic segregation, promote jobs/housing balance, provide ample housing opportunities, and affirmatively further fair housing.

1.1.7: Incentivize production of mixed-income and 100% Affordable Housing projects by rezoning for more inclusive development at densities that enable their construction in every geography.

1.1.8: Introduce more flexible zoning and incentives for existing lower density residential areas to create opportunities for more "missing middle" low-scale housing typologies, particularly in Higher Opportunity Areas.

1.1.9: Develop and integrate anti-displacement strategies that further Citywide Housing Priorities into land use and planning strategies.

1.1.10: Amplify and prioritize underrepresented voices and communities of color in the City's planning engagement processes to result in more equitable outcomes.

Objective 1.2:

Facilitate the production of housing, especially projects that include Affordable Housing and/or meet Citywide Housing Priorities.

Policies

1.2.1: Expand rental and for-sale housing for people of all income levels. Prioritize housing developments that result in a net gain of Affordable Housing and serve those with the greatest needs.

1.2.2: Facilitate the construction of a range of different housing types that addresses the particular needs of the city's diverse households.

1.2.3: Facilitate innovative housing models and promote regulatory reforms that reduce the costs of housing production while also promoting broader Citywide Housing Priorities.

1.2.4: Strengthen the capacity of housing providers to build Affordable Housing.

1.2.5: Streamline the housing approval process, particularly for Affordable Housing, throughout City departments.

1.2.6: Create new citywide and local land use incentives and programs that maximize the net gain of affordable housing and produce housing that meets Citywide Housing Priorities. Explore varied affordability ratios, the feasibility of inclusionary zoning requirements, and a greater mix of incomes based on market areas.

1.2.7: Develop and facilitate the dedication of financial resources for new construction of Affordable Housing.

1.2.8: Develop and implement new land use and financing tools to promote more housing that is affordable to those with the lowest incomes and for longer periods of time.

1.2.9: Allow for zoning flexibility for Affordable Housing at the project review and planning levels when broader Citywide Priorities are being advanced.

1.2.10: Prioritize the development of Affordable Housing on public land.

Objective 1.3:

Promote a more equitable distribution of affordable housing opportunities throughout the city, with a focus on increasing Affordable Housing in Higher Opportunity Areas and in ways that further Citywide Housing Priorities.

Policies

1.3.1: Prioritize housing capacity, resources, policies and incentives to include Affordable Housing in residential development, particularly near transit, jobs, and in Higher Opportunity Areas.

1.3.2: Prioritize the development of new Affordable Housing in all communities, particularly those that currently have fewer Affordable units.

1.3.3: Provide accessible and inclusive outreach and education to community members on the history of racist policies, planning, zoning and real estate practices and how they are reflected in today's land use patterns and socio-economic disparities.



GOAL 2

A City that preserves and enhances the quality of housing and provides greater housing stability for households of all income levels.

Objective 2.1:

Strengthen renter protections, prevent displacement and increase the stock of affordable housing.

Policies

2.1.1: Incentivize and/or require the preservation and replacement of affordable housing, so demolitions and conversions do not result in the net loss of the City's stock of accessible, safe, healthy and affordable housing.

2.1.2: Preserve the affordability of publicly-assisted rental and ownership housing.

2.1.3: Provide resources that enable the creation of Affordable Housing from existing unrestricted housing, including facilitating community stewardship and control, tenant management and/or tenant ownership.

2.1.4: Strengthen tenant protections by expanding tenants' rights, enforcement, and legal assistance needed to access those rights.

2.1.5: Expand the right of first refusal to ensure displaced households may occupy replacement housing units that are comparable in size, location, cost, and rent control protection.

2.1.6: Promote the use of housing for long-term residents and limit practices such as short-term rentals, conversions to hotels, and prolonged vacancies.

2.1.7: Develop localized anti-displacement strategies to accompany new transformative investments.

2.1.8: Facilitate the renewal of existing Affordable Housing covenants and promote opportunities for acquisition of units with expiring covenants to preserve affordability.

Objective 2.2:

Promote more affordable ownership opportunities and ownership retention strategies, with an emphasis on stability and wealth building for underserved communities.

Policies

2.2.1: Expand ownership models that increase the ability for households to attain homeownership, including alternative forms of shared- and limited-equity ownership.

2.2.2: Develop strategies that support current homeowners in retaining their homes, protect tenants from eviction if a property is foreclosed, and prevent neighborhood instability resulting from foreclosures.

2.2.3: Expand ownership and wealth generation opportunities through accessible education and technical assistance, especially in communities of color.

2.2.4: Partner with homeowners and community organizations, especially in communities of color, to expand knowledge and dialogue about land use regulations and individual and community equity.

2.2.5: Protect communities, especially communities of color, from predatory lending, land acquisition, speculative real estate transactions, and any other practices that undermine intergenerational wealth accumulation and housing stability through outreach and education programs.

Objective 2.3:

Preserve, conserve and improve the quality of housing.

Policies

2.3.1: Enforce and facilitate the maintenance of existing housing in decent, safe and healthy conditions.

2.3.2: Rehabilitate and/or replace substandard housing with housing that is decent, safe, healthy and affordable.

2.3.3: Strengthen the capacity of the owners of existing rental housing to preserve and manage rental housing.



GOAL 3

A City in which housing creates healthy, livable, sustainable, and resilient communities that improve the lives of all Angelenos.

Objective 3.1:

Use design to create a sense of place, promote health, foster community belonging, and promote racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods.

Policies

3.1.1: Provide incentives and financial support for the preservation of historic residential structures, particularly for lower-income households.

3.1.2: Promote new development that furthers Citywide Housing Priorities in balance with the existing architectural and cultural context.

3.1.3: Develop and implement design standards that promote quality residential development.

3.1.4: Site buildings and orient building features to maximize benefit of nearby amenities and minimize exposure to features that may result in negative health or environmental impacts.

3.1.5: Develop and implement environmentally sustainable urban design standards and pedestrian-centered improvements in development of a project and within the public and private realm such as shade trees, parkways and comfortable sidewalks.

3.1.6: Establish plans and development standards that promote positive health outcomes for the most vulnerable communities and populations.

3.1.7: Promote complete neighborhoods by planning for housing that includes open space, and other amenities.

3.1.8: Expand designation of historic, architectural, and cultural resources in neighborhoods with a high concentration of historic properties and few historic protections, particularly in communities of color.

3.1.9: Encourage "convertible design" of above ground parking structures in transit-rich areas so they can later be converted to housing.

Objective 3.2:

Promote environmentally sustainable buildings and land use patterns that support a mix of uses, housing for various income levels and provide access to jobs, amenities, services and transportation options.

Policies:

3.2.1: Promote the integration of housing with other compatible land uses at both the building and neighborhood level.

3.2.2: Promote new multi-family housing, particularly Affordable and mixed-income housing, in areas near transit, jobs and Higher Opportunity Areas, in order to facilitate a better jobs-housing balance, help shorten commutes, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

3.2.3: Provide outreach and education to the public about the need to address housing needs in relation to other important outcomes, including health, transportation, and the environment, to support overall sustainability goals.

3.2.4: Provide streamlining, incentives and flexibility for residential buildings that promote energy and resource conservation particularly those that exceed existing green building standards.

3.2.5: Promote and facilitate the reduction of water, energy, carbon and waste consumption in new and existing housing.

3.2.6: Promote outreach and education to property owners, tenants and homebuilders regarding environmentally sustainable residential development practices.

3.2.7: Provide environmentally sustainable development standards and incorporate sustainable best practice in building and zoning code updates.

3.2.8: Provide incentives and promote flexibility for the conversion of non-residential structures to new housing in order to reduce the carbon footprint resulting from demolition and new construction.

3.2.9: Consider accommodating new residential uses, including live/work and mixed-use, in less-productive industrial, office, and commercial areas when the site can accommodate housing in keeping with citywide industrial land, jobs-housing and jobs preservation priorities, and when sites have been appropriately tested and remediated, if necessary.

Objective 3.3:

Promote disaster and climate resilience in citywide housing efforts.

Policies

3.3.1: Identify risks to our housing stock related to disasters and other unplanned events, especially those likely to accelerate as a result of climate change.

3.3.2: Establish plans, incentives, and development standards that eliminate or minimize disaster risk and promote positive health outcomes for communities most at risk.

3.3.3: Plan for emergency housing needs that will result from disasters and climate events.

3.3.4: Plan for post-disaster housing recovery that promotes equity, resilience, environmental sustainability and safety. Work to ensure a right of return for existing residents if housing is retrofitted or reconstructed after a disaster.

3.3.5: Identifying funding and other resources to support the retrofitting of existing buildings to improve resilience and health.

3.3.6: Educate homeowners, tenants and landlords about disaster risk and mitigations.

3.3.7: Provide assistance to mitigate the impacts and financial disruption of emergencies in order to support Angelenos to stay in their homes.

GOAL 4

A City that fosters racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods and corrects the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination of the past and present.

Objective 4.1:

Ensure that housing opportunities are accessible to all residents without discrimination on the basis of race, color, ancestry, sex, national origin, color, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, immigration status, family status, age, intellectual, developmental, and physical disability, source of income and student status or other arbitrary reason.

Policies

4.1.1: Promote and facilitate equal opportunity practices in the construction, provision, sale and rental of housing.

4.1.2: Promote responsible mortgage lending that meets community credit needs and the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA).

4.1.3: Ensure that people with disabilities have an equal opportunity to rent, use, and enjoy Affordable Housing that has received financial or other assistance from the City or the former CRA/LA.

4.1.4: Identify and assist populations that are experiencing systemic housing discrimination, including those outside of designated protected classes.

4.1.5: Eliminate housing accessibility barriers that disproportionately affect populations in protected classes and special needs populations.

Objective 4.2:

Promote outreach and education on fair housing practices and accessibility among residents, community stakeholders and those involved in the production, preservation and operation of housing.

Policies

4.2.1: Provide outreach and education for homebuyers and renters regarding rights, financing options, rental subsidies available and protections in the purchase, rental, and/or modification of a housing unit.

4.2.2: Provide outreach and education for the broader community of residents, residential property owners and operators regarding fair housing practices and requirements.

4.2.3: Collect and report findings on discrimination in the sale and rental of housing.

Objective 4.3:

Affirmatively further fair housing in all housing and land use programs by taking proactive measures to promote diverse, inclusive communities that grant all Angelenos access to housing, particularly in Higher Opportunity Areas, increase place-based strategies to encourage community revitalization and protect existing residents from displacement.

Policies

4.3.1: Increase access and transparency in the lease-up process for restricted Affordable Housing units, particularly for those who have experienced or are at-risk of displacement and those who may not be aware of Affordable Housing choices.

4.3.2: Ensure that all neighborhoods have a range of housing typologies to provide housing options for residents to remain in the same community, when and if their needs change.

4.3.3: Examine land use practices that perpetuate racial exclusion and inequities including but not limited to: single-family / low density zoning, minimum lot size requirements, location of noxious uses, and subjective design review standards. Introduce context specific reforms that further Citywide Housing Priorities

4.3.4: Advance place-based strategies that create opportunities and financial strength in areas of disinvestment and with a history of predatory financial practices through asset-building shared equity homeownership that creates stability and mitigates displacement pressures through community control

GOAL 5

A City that is committed to preventing and ending homelessness.

Objective 5.1:

Provide an adequate supply of short-term and permanent housing in addition to supportive services throughout the City that are appropriate for and meet the specific needs of all persons who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness.

Policies

5.1.1: Ensure an adequate supply of emergency and transitional housing for people who are homeless or are at a risk of becoming homeless, including people with disabilities.

5.1.2: Promote and facilitate prevention, placement and support programs and strategies that reduce the likelihood of residents experiencing homelessness, as well as shorten the time someone experiences homelessness.

5.1.3: Expand permanent supportive housing options with services for homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and the most vulnerable, to ensure that they remain housed and get the individualized help they may need.

5.1.4: Implement a Housing-First approach and coordinate service provision, appropriate housing and the efficient access to information so as to rapidly match available services and housing to those most in need.

5.1.5: Expand housing, shelter, and supportive services for the homeless and special needs populations in all communities, and reduce zoning and other regulatory barriers to their placement and operation.

5.1.6: Invest in additional accommodations such as water fountains, showers, kitchen facilities, storage, cooling centers, and restrooms to care for the needs of unhoused residents.

Objective 5.2:

Promote outreach and education to: homeless populations; community stakeholders; health, social service and housing providers and funders; criminal justice system agencies; and communities in which facilities and services for unhoused populations will be located.

Policies

5.2.1: Identify and assess the needs of people living in unsheltered locations and connect them to services and housing opportunities including security, hygiene, and safe sleeping resources.

5.2.2: Provide a high level of outreach targeted to chronically homeless people to inform them of their rights and opportunities to move into safe, permanent housing with appropriate support services.

5.2.3: Provide opportunities for communities to dialogue and learn about root causes of homelessness, ways to help, and effective approaches to preventing and ending homeless, in an effort to correct common misunderstandings.

5.2.4: Strengthen the capacity of the Affordable Housing development community to locate, construct and manage housing facilities for the homeless.

5.2.5: In accordance with the Federal HEARTH Act, target outreach and permanent supportive housing resources to the chronically homeless so as to assist them in moving from the streets into permanent housing with appropriate supportive services.

5.2.6: Promote and facilitate a planning process that includes input from homeless persons, formerly homeless and providers of housing and services for the homeless.

5.2.7: Identify and remove barriers to permitting, preserving, and expanding licensed community care facilities such as Adult Residential Facilities and Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly that provide a significant housing resource for people at-risk of homelessness, with special needs or who benefit from alternative and group living arrangements.



Programs

1. HOMEBUYER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: Federal: CDBG, HOME, ADDI, ARRA. State: BEGIN, CalHOME, CDLAC, SB 2 PLHA

Objective: Promote neighborhood stability and economic empowerment, by providing 75 loans for first-time, low-income homebuyers earning up to 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) and 75 loans for first-time moderate-income homebuyers earning between 81% - 150%. Coordinate homebuyer education courses to help homebuyers prepare for and attain homeownership.

Respective Policy: 2.2.1, 2.2.3, 4.1.1

Provide assistance in the form of subordinate, deferred-payment "soft second" loans to cover down-payment, closing costs, and acquisition. Currently, lends up to $90,000 for low-income households earning up to 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) though a program called Low-Income Purchase Assistance (LIPA),, up to $60,000 for moderate-income households earning between 81%-120% of AMI, and up to $35,000 for households earning between 121% - 150% of AMI through a program called Moderate-Income Purchase Assistance (MIPA). Based on data from 2012-2021, approximately 70% of households that received down payment assistance purchased homes located in low resource or high segregation and poverty areas. Increasing homeownership helps stabilize these areas and provides economic opportunity for the home purchasers.

2. HOMEOWNERSHIP FOR VOUCHER HOLDERS

Goal #: 2, 4

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Funding Source: HUD

Objective: Increase homeownership opportunities among voucher holders.

Respective Policy: 2.2.1, 2.2.3

Allow Section 8 participants to become homeowners by using their Vouchers to purchase a home. Depending on funding levels and lender support, HACLA will continue to explore the feasibility of utilizing the homeownership program within the context of public housing revitalization activity.

3. INNOVATIONS IN SUBDIVISIONS

Goal #: 1, 3, 4

Lead Agencies: LACP

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: For Small Lot Subdivisions: facilitate development of 800 market-rate units and; 90 lower-income units each year; Report and make recommendations on new types of standards and procedures by 2023. Amend the zoning code by 2023 to facilitate further innovation in subdivisions. With SB 9 (2021) adopted into law, prepare a local implementation ordinance by 2024 to maximize potential positive benefits and address community concerns. Create accessible online and physical educational resources and partner with community organizations, especially in gentrifying communities and communities of color, to assist existing or prospective homeowners to understand options to increase ownership options and wealth creation by 2023.

Respective Policy: 2.3.1, 2.2.3, 2.2.4

Facilitate the development of smaller and new types of subdivisions that permit detached, fee simple home ownership, thus providing more affordable alternatives of for-sale housing types. Identify continued obstacles and opportunities in developing Small Lot Subdivisions and propose measures to improve results, with a particular aim on increasing affordability, reducing displacement, increasing replacement requirements, and expanding the use of this tool to preserve existing properties. Evaluate whether to extend (or revise, if needed) SB 330 replacement and tenant protections past SB 330's sunset date in 2030 for Small Lot projects (see Program 29). Additionally, consider new types of subdivision standards and procedures for lot splits in areas where potential for displacement would be lessened and opportunity for affordability would be increased. Review minimum lot size requirements for standard projects to identify potential opportunities for more affordable housing typologies. Creating a ministerial process for smaller subdivisions to facilitate more affordable ownership opportunities. Prepare a local SB 9 (2021) implementation ordinance

to maximize potential positive benefits and address community concerns. The Department of City Planning will create accessible online and physical educational resources and partner with community organizations, especially in gentrifying communities and communities of color, to assist existing or prospective homeowners by 2023, as well as continue to provide site specific consultation and advice to prospective subdividers.

4. SHARED EQUITY MODELS

Goal #: 2, 4

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: CLA, LAHD, HACLA, CAO

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: CLA will report on the feasibility of developing a citywide Community Land Trust (CLT) program in 2022. Include into Rezoning Program (#121) by 2024. Use these models as a tool to facilitate affordable homeownership.

Respective Policy: 2.2.1, 4.3.4

The CLA, in consultation with the LA CLT Coalition and other City agencies, will report on the feasibility of developing a citywide Community Land Trust (CLT) program, including the resources needed to acquire land, enter into long-term leases, or partner with existing CLTs to develop multifamily housing that would be maintained affordable in perpetuity, and include a review of CLT best practices. In addition, consider new ways to incentivize the development of shared-equity ownership models such as Limited Equity Housing Cooperatives (LEHCs), Community Apartments and housing owned by CLTs or Tenancy in Common (TICs) in the Municipal Code and housing funding processes. Potential policies could include special incentives for shared equity development and a new requirement that on-site affordable for-sale units in mixed-income projects be sold to a qualified nonprofit, with an emphasis on CLTs. Promote the State property tax exemption for property that is owned by a CLT and that is being—or will be—developed or rehabilitated as rental housing, LEHCs, or owner-occupied housing per Section 214.18 of the Revenue and Taxation Code. Explore securing tax-defaulted properties through Chapter 8 Agreement Sales for Community Land Trusts (CLTs) to create long-term affordable housing. Explore conveying public land / tax foreclosed / receivership properties to CLTs and prioritize CLTs in current acquisition and rehabilitation programs.

5. PRE-DEVELOPMENT/ACQUISITION FINANCING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Goal #: 1, 4

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: Outside City agencies

Funding Source: New Generation Fund, Supportive Housing Loan Fund

Objective: Provide acquisition and pre-development funding through the New Generation Fund and the Supportive Housing Loan Fund

Respective Policy: 1.2.4, 1.2.7, 4.1.1

In 2008, a public-private partnership consisting of the LAHD, the Enterprise Community Partners, Inc, and syndication of private banks created the New Generation Fund (NGF) to provide flexible acquisition, predevelopment, and moderate rehab financing for affordable housing developers. Eligible affordable housing projects can include rental units targeted to households earning at or below 80 percent of AMI levels established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The low-interest rate loans are to be repaid once developers qualify for permanent financing.

Also in 2008, a partnership between the LAHD and the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) created the Supportive Housing Loan Fund (SHLF) to deliver flexible acquisition and pre-development financing to developers to help them acquire prime properties for supportive housing and to cover the costs of developing architectural plans and obtaining entitlement approvals. Eligible projects can also target the same income levels as the NGF.

Both the NGF and SHLF support the City's Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline (AHMP) and Proposition HHH Supportive Housing Loan Program (HHH) and promote new loan transactions. Since its inception, the NGF has loaned more than $185 million to 31 affordable housing developments; and SHLF has loaned more than $171 million to 69 supportive housing developments. Several projects include on-site services that extend benefits to the surrounding community - including health clinics, grocery stores, pharmacies, and community rooms that serve both building residents and neighbors. The NGF and SHLF have had good utilization due to the pipeline of projects that are developed through the AHMP and HHH.

6. NEW PRODUCTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING THROUGH THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING MANAGED PIPELINE

Goal #: 1, 4

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: HOME, HOPWA, City's Affordable Housing Linkage Fee, and eventually state SB2 funds are used to leverage millions of dollars from other public and private lenders and tax credit investors

Objective: Prepare annual NOFA biannually, 500 units produced per year, with priority scoring for projects in Higher Opportunity Areas with the goal of funding at least 8% of units in Higher Opportunity Areas and at least 80% of units near transit. Achieving a higher percentage goal depends on federal and state funding regulations. Set-aside of 250 units of supportive housing

Respective Policy: 1.2.4, 1.2.5, 1.2.7, 4.1.1

In 2013 with the approval of the Mayor and City Council, LAHD established the Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline Program (AHMP). The AHMP was created to provide for the ability to leverage and attract the investment dollars of other public and private entities for the development of affordable housing within the City. In addition, on January 23, 2013, the City of Los Angeles was designated by California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) as the 11th region to have its own geographic allocation of nine percent (9%) Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC). The City's goal, through the AHMP is to create housing for low and very-low-income households within the City. The housing created through the AHMP is intended to serve all populations identified by the California State Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC), the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC), the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and HUD. The housing created should not only provide additional housing opportunities, but should also attempt to revitalize neighborhoods and remove blight. Irrespective of the funding scenarios, all projects should seek to leverage limited City funding to the greatest extent possible.

In 2021, LAHD added priority scoring for projects located in Higher Opportunity Areas and in TOD areas. Based on these changes the department anticipates that 8-10% of new units will be located in Higher Opportunity Areas and approximately 80% of units will be within a half mile of a transit station. LAHD will reevaluate this goal annually and increase this goal if State and Federal funding sources commit to longer-term regulatory changes that address the funding needs and constraints of developing subsidized affordable housing in Higher Opportunity Areas.

7. OPPORTUNITIES TO INCREASE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PROMOTE EQUITY THROUGH MAJOR ENTITLEMENTS

Goal #: 1, 2, 3, 4

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Prepare a code amendment prior to Measure JJJ's 2026 sunset date that includes enhanced affordability requirements for housing developments seeking major legislative entitlements; Approve at least 350 affordable units per year in major entitlements in both high opportunity areas and in lower/moderate resource areas, when accompanied by amenities and needed investments.

Respective Policy: 1.1.2, 1.1.7

Continue to follow the proportional approach to density and affordable housing used in the Value Capture Ordinance. Require higher levels of affordable housing and other community benefits for projects that receive major legislative entitlements to grant additional residential density beyond current incentive programs or to allow residential uses where not previously allowed. Continue the affordability requirements for projects requesting a Zone Change pursuant to Measure JJJ and draft an ordinance expanding and deepening the current affordability requirements past the current sunset date in 2026. As part of the code amendment, evaluate new requirements for certain types of major projects to require applicants assess and mitigate displacement risk, housing impacts, racial impact, and historic exclusion in the areas where they plan to build. Based on these assessments, and an analysis of how the proposed project relates to the goals and strategies to affirmatively further fair housing, staff would recommend appropriate affordability and anti-displacement options, including more affordable housing, payment of linkage fees, deepening the level of affordability, creating more family-size units, instituting a preference policy for housing voucher-holders, and/or
other measures.

8. ACCESSIBLE HOUSING PROGRAM (AcHP)

Goal #: 2, 3, 4, 5

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: LACP, LADBS, DOD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Work with new and existing developments to add to the supply of accessible units in affordable housing developments. providing for 4,031 accessible affordable units by September 2026. Approximately 11% of all new affordable units will be accessible for individuals with mobility disabilities and 4% will be for individuals with hearing/vision disabilities. Maintaining a 90% certified compliance rate among more than 900 currently-covered housing developments and all new covered developments. Conduct at least 24 annual Fair Housing and Disability trainings, resolve approximately 200 grievances per year; Continue to operate and improve a waiting list for persons with disabilities (10,000 users) through the Affordable and Accessible Housing Registry (AAHR) to target available units to persons with disabilities. Establish public counters for assistance in applying for affordable and accessible housing by 2024

Respective Policy: 1.2.2, 2.1.4, 2.3.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.2.2, 5.1.3

LAHD's accessible Housing Program (AcHP) ensures that people with disabilities have equal opportunity to rent, use, and enjoy housing that has received financial or other assistance from the City of Los Angeles (City) or the former Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles (CRA/LA). The AcHP covers 900+ affordable rental housing developments, including those built before April 2016, and new housing developments with five or more housing units that are designed, constructed, altered, operated, administered, or financed by the City. Specifically, the program reviews plans for new developments; assists developers in retrofitting existing properties; provides training to project and City staff related to Fair Housing policies for people with disabilities; monitors compliance with and enforces the City's Fair Housing Policies; processes and tracks tenant grievances; and maintains the online Affordable & Accessible Housing Registry. During the Housing Element cycle, the City will continue to operate and improve the online Affordable & Accessible Housing Registry serving nearly 10,000 users who have submitted pre-applications for accessible units. The City will also establish public counters for assistance in applying for affordable and accessible housing.

9. AHSC (AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PROGRAM)

Goal #: 3

Lead: LAHD

Funding Source: Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC)

Objective: The Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program is a competitive state funding program. Its primary goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by funding the creation of new affordable housing along public transit in conjunction with sustainable transportation improvements to reduce vehicle miles traveled and to increase pedestrian and bike pathways to access public transportation. The City has applied for AHSC funding since the first round of funding in 2015, and to date it has been successful in securing over $330 Million in both loan and grant funding. The AHSC program funding is available on an annual basis and every year the City sets a goal to successfully secure a minimum of 15% of all AHSC funding available per NOFA round.

Respective Policy: 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.2.1

The Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program provides funding for affordable housing development and related infrastructure, as well as transportation-related amenities, and programs that encourage residents to walk, bike and use transit. Funded by auction proceeds from California's Cap-and-Trade program, AHSC helps create holistic communities with affordable housing and transportation options near jobs and other key destinations. AHSC is administered by the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) and implemented by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. With the extension of Cap-and-Trade through 2030, the AHSC Program will continue to receive a 20 percent appropriation of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds. Since launching in 2015, AHSC has invested over $1.7 billion in affordable housing and sustainable transportation improvements across the state. AHSC awarded over $1.2 billion to support 102 projects in the first four rounds of the program. These 102 awards will support over 9,400 housing units, more than 85 percent of which are affordable; more than 150 miles of new or improved bike lanes; and more than 1,000 new or improved crosswalks. Overall, this has led to a reduction of 2.1 million metric tons of CO2-equivalents and about 223,000 pounds of criteria air pollutants. From Round 1 to Round 5, the City Of Los Angeles has successfully secured approximately $330.8 million to support 28 developments with 2,943 new housing units, of which 2,668 are affordable, and an array of GHG emission-reducing transit infrastructure projects.

10. AFFORDABLE HOUSING LINKAGE FEE

Goal #: 2

Lead: LAHD

Supporting: LADBS, LACP

Funding Sources: AHLF

Objectives: Subsidize the production and preservation of affordable rental and homeownership units annually based on annual revenues collected (estimated $17.2 million collected in FY 21-22, and $58.7 million to date); Refine spending priorities annually through the AHLF Oversight Committee to ensure dedicated funding for low and moderate income homeownership, 20% of the revenue supporting the preservation of affordable housing in lower resource communities, and fund affordable housing production with priority scoring for Higher Opportunity Areas; By 2023, update Linkage Fee market areas to accurately reflect market conditions and maximize revenue generation.

Respective Policy: 1.2.4, 1.2.7, 1.2.8, 1.3.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.4

The Los Angeles City Council adopted the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee Ordinance (AHLF) (No. 185342) on December 13, 2017. The Ordinance places a fee on certain new market-rate residential and commercial developments to generate local funding for affordable housing production and preservation. The fee was phased in beginning on June 18, 2018 and the amount of the fee varies by the type of use and by geography across the city. High market areas are subject to higher fees than lower market areas, where investment incentives are more needed. The AHLF also includes various exemptions and deductions based on place-based community revitalization goals, including exemptions for projects located in the SLATE-Z South Los Angeles Promise Zone Area, hospitals, community-serving uses such as schools and museums, and new grocery stores located in food deserts. Linkage Fee revenue is added to the City's Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline (See Program 6) Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), which includes priority scoring for projects located in Higher Opportunity Areas and punitive scoring for projects that result in tenant displacement. AHLF revenue is also used to help fund the City's first-time homebuyer purchasing program which provides down payment assistance for low and moderate income households, which helps stabilize housing and provide wealth-building opportunities in low and moderate-resource areas of the city (see Program 1). As needed, pursue code amendments to balance new opportunities for revenue creation with the potential for additional discounts, credits and exemptions for project types that bring needed investments and meet community revitalization priorities, particularly in lower market areas.

11. LAND USE AND BUILDING CODE POLICIES TO SUPPORT AGING IN PLACE AND SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Goal #: 1, 2, 3, 4

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LADoA, LADBS, DOD, LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Incentivize and streamline affordable, accessible units occupied by persons with special needs particularly through land use incentive programs; Produce 1,750 Eldercare units to meet different senior housing needs; Create new incentives for senior and other special needs housing through the update to the Density Bonus Ordinance by 2024.

Respective Policy: 1.1.3, 4.1.4, 5.2.6

Assist developers in creating housing for seniors and for physically, intellectually, and developmentally disabled persons through streamlined land use entitlement procedures for a variety of housing types, including: Independent Senior Housing, Assisted Living Care Housing, Skilled Nursing Care Housing and Alzheimer's/ Dementia Care Housing, pursuant to the Eldercare Facilities Ordinance. Give senior and physical, intellectual, and developmental disabled housing projects preferential access to Development Services Case Management (development review service). Implement form-based codes, which can be used to promote livable, age-friendly communities that integrate diverse housing types and mixed-use developments; universal design, which ensures housing can be used by people throughout their lifespan; and support multigenerational urban planning, which incorporates an age-friendly approach into community development, so that communities have the features and resources to support aging in place (in keeping with the Age Friendly Action Plan Recommendation #25). Use data collected through program 51, Database of Housing Need, to identify sections of the city where demographics do not align with housing stock, such as areas with large aging populations and exclusively larger housing units. Incentivising housing that meets these changing needs. Further incentivize physically, intellectually, and developmentally disabled and senior housing through density bonus update (see program #48).

12. INTERNATIONAL BUILDING EXHIBITION (IBA) FOR LOS ANGELES

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: Mayor's Office

Supporting Agencies: LACP, LAHD, HACLA

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Create a cross sectoral dialogue and visioning process for Los Angeles housing leaders with their counterparts in other cities in 2022. Recommendation document for use in rezoning efforts and policy development by Summer 2023.

Respective Policy: 1.2.3

Collaborate in pursuit of the creation of an International Building Exhibition (IBA) for housing in Los Angeles. In the tradition of IBAs across Europe and Australia, the goal of an IBA is to develop evidence-based toolkits and frameworks that policymakers can access to plan for their future, particularly with regards to issues of housing. IBA Los Angeles is proposed as a city-wide, cross-institutional project that aims to bring international perspective and new ideas to affect the transformation of housing provision in Los Angeles through demonstration and engagement with the public, academics and researchers, architects, planners, housing advocates, etc. To pursue this goal the City will seek support from educational, business and philanthropic institutions; create a cross sectoral dialogue and visioning process for Los Angeles housing leaders with their IBA counterparts in other countries; initiate a series of convenings to study alternative housing models (such as social housing) and place it in the context of Los Angeles's housing industry; hold professional exchanges for practitioners; engage in dialogue with community members, and hold a cross sector symposium on affordable housing in different cities such as Vienna that showcases best practice place making and housing while supporting diversity, social inclusion and well-being. The research and learning from this learning experience will be captured and disseminated through a mixed media report that includes the perspectives of those involved.

13. ADAPTIVE REUSE

Goal #: 1, 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Funding Source: General Fund

Supporting Agencies: LADBS

Objective: Revisions to the Citywide Adaptive Reuse Ordinance and/or the Density Bonus Ordinance, to include incentives and provisions for adaptive re-use by 2023.

Respective Policy: 1.1.2, 1.1.6, 3.2.8

Expand the opportunities for adaptive reuse of commercial and office buildings for housing. Explore additional incentives to facilitate affordable unit and supportive housing production and additional adaptive reuse projects through the expansion of by-right processes, reduced minimum unit sizes, reduced parking standards, flexible building standards, and increased flexibility on the types of uses (e.g. hotels/motels, office and commercial) and locations that can be converted to support proposed developments.

14. REMEDIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS

Goal #: 1, 3

Lead Agencies: DPW (LASAN)

Funding Source: General Fund

Supporting Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Objective: Environmental clean-up of at least five brownfield sites; 50 environmental assessments, create opportunity for 100 units, including 10 very-low and 10 low-income units. Identify new or increased sources of funding for brownfield clean up. Present an ordinance to the City Planning Commission by 2023, prohibiting new oil and gas extraction and declaring extraction activities a non-conforming use citywide.

Respective Policy: 1.1.4, 3.1.4

Through LASAN's Citywide Brownfields Program, provide technical assistance and resources to combat challenges associated with brownfields, primarily in underserved areas with Environmental Justice concerns within the City. Conduct environmental assessments and cleanups to enable the reuse and redevelopment of brownfields into affordable housing projects, mixed-use projects, public amenities, and parks. Advocate for the funding that would be necessary to clean up the several thousands of brownfield sites in the City of Los Angeles. Build partnerships across departments and sectors to facilitate brownfield transformation. Explore ways to improve notification about environmental assessment and brownfield recovery funds to aid developers in building housing on formerly contaminated sites. Prepare an ordinance prohibiting new oil and gas extraction and declaring extraction activities a non-conforming use for public feedback in 2022 and adoption in 2023. The ordinance will improve the noxious health and physical impacts of oil uses adjacent to residential zones, which disproportionately affect lower-income communities of color in the Harbor, South Los Angeles, and the North Valley.

15. PUBLIC LAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Goal #: 1, 4, 5

Lead Agencies: CAO, City Council

Supporting Agencies: GSD, LAHD, LACP, Mayor's Office

Funding Source: General Fund, LEAP

Objective: Increase the utilization of public land for affordable housing with particular emphasis in high resource and gentrifying areas; Identify publicly owned housing opportunity sites and issue RFPs to develop the sites by 2023; and annually thereafter; Rezone PF (Public Facility) zoned land to allow affordable housing by-right by 2024 (see Program 121 and 48); Maintain a publicly accessible citywide inventory of publicly owned sites; Revise the Asset Management Evaluation Framework to add AFFH criteria into the property review and evaluation process.

Respective Policy: 1.2.10

Expand the redevelopment of publicly owned land, as well as joint use of other public facility sites, which may be appropriate for housing. Assess and report on the underutilization of all City-owned properties and the feasibility of using them for Affordable Housing Opportunity Sites. In general, the CAO is responsible for identifying and evaluating City-owned sites for development, and the LAHD is responsible for selecting developers and negotiating disposition development agreements. The agencies and departments that own public sites within the City limits include, but are not limited to, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (U.S. ACE), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro), the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA), the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LA Flood) and more. The Office of the Controller will maintain a database and map of publicly owned land, currently called Property Panel LA. This inventory should be periodically reconciled with inventories of other city owned land kept by other departments, including GSD and LAHD. Additional City departments will work to create inventories of underutilized land under their control that may be appropriate for affordable housing development. Examine site suitability under the City's Asset Management Framework. The CAO and LAHD will additionally work to expand the City's capability to assess properties identified by City departments, include AFFH into the Asset Management Evaluation Framework, convey identified City-owned properties for affordable housing development, and to streamline the City' management of its real estate assets and allow for a more proactive approach to land acquisition that can leverage the City's existing resources. City Planning will

facilitate changes to zoning and/or create incentives to ensure that public land, when it has been designated for housing, can be efficiently used to maximize the number of affordable units appropriate for the site. City Planning and LAHD will ensure that City-owned land used for housing is 100% affordable, or otherwise maximizes the number of affordable units. In conjunction with LAUSD, explore the potential to rezone and reconfigure older school sites in order to make land available for affordable housing. Additionally, support the use of existing capital tools such as the New Generation Fund (NGF), Metro Affordable Transit Connected Housing Program (MATCH), and Golden State Acquisition Fund (GSAF) are used efficiently to purchase vacant land, finance pre-development activities, and acquire multifamily properties of all sizes.

Building on the recently passed AB 1486 (which amended the Surplus Land Act), LAHD intends to create, using Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) grant funds, an interdisciplinary team to identify opportunity sites, and build partnerships with public agencies with surplus public land available for affordable housing development. Developers for these sites will be chosen through a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP). The goal for the first RFP is to release sites entitled for 1,000 affordable housing units, while the strategy aims to develop at least 10,000 housing units affordable to households earning very low, low, or moderate incomes on public land with limited reliance on public subsidies.

16. NEW MODELS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: CLA, CAO, LACP

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Report back to City Council on social/public housing models to consider in Los Angeles and necessary resources in 2022. Begin construction of at least 1,000 restricted affordable units on public owned or leased land. Strengthen the existing Public Land Multi-Departmental Workgroup.

Respective Policy: 1.2.5. 1.2.10

Pursue new models and approaches to developing affordable housing on public land. Including identifying the most likely sites for rapid housing development, rezoning the sites to maximize by-right development, grouping the sites into a “Scattered Site Development Opportunities” plan, and conducting program

environmental review and clearance on multiple sites. The program also seeks to identify less costly housing typologies, conduct parametric modeling and site analysis of publicly owned land, and negotiate and execute interagency agreements for housing development on public land and explore considerations for the prioritization of public land for new models of affordable housing development and control, including Community Land Trusts or social/public housing.

17. ADVOCATE FOR HOUSING FUNDS

Goal #: 1, 2, 5

Lead Agencies: CLA / Mayor's Office

Supporting Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Support State and Federal bills that provide funds for affordable housing development and preservation in Los Angeles City in each legislative session; Increase the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Respective Policy: 1.1.5

Advocate for adequate levels of affordable housing development and preservation funds from State, Federal and local sources. Support a permanent source of funding for the City, State and Federal housing trust funds and explore new methods for generating funds locally (see Program 20). Obtain City Council support for State and Federal legislation and voter initiatives that create funding programs, create new sources of funds (i.e., bond initiatives, tax increment, etc.) and ensure that ongoing updates to funding regulations do not disadvantage the City. Advocate for changes in the state property tax welfare exemption to allow more affordable housing to qualify.

18. FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR HOMELESS PERSONS

Goal #: 5

Lead: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: HACLA, LAHSA

Funding Source: HHH, AHLF, SB 2, HOME, and Section 8 Vouchers

Objective: Finance an average of 500 units per year with priority scoring for projects located in Higher Opportunity areas.

Respective Policy: 5.1.3, 5.1.5

Finance long-term housing with supportive services designed to enable homeless persons with developmental, intellectual, and physical disabilities to live as independently as possible in a permanent setting.

19. STREET OUTREACH (UNIFIED HOMELESSNESS RESPONSE CENTER)

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: Mayor's Office, LAHSA

Supporting Agencies: CAO, BOS, LAFD, RAP

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Increase the number of people engaged who are linked to housing resources by City Funded Outreach Teams, as well as the number of people connected to CES as measured by a new VI-SPDAT survey.

Respective Policy: 5.1.2, 5.1.4, 5.2.1

The Mayor's Office Coordinates the City's Unified Homelessness Response Center (UHRC), which co-locates leadership from critical City departments, LAHSA, and other partners in the same room at the Emergency Operations Center to respond to the street-based homelessness crisis together, in real-time, with services and engagement to bring people indoors. The UHRC provides a space for a more timely and effective response to street-based homelessness, leading with services and grounded in a unified incident command structure. LAHSA and other outreach partners will identify and assess the needs of people living in unsheltered locations and connect them to services and housing opportunities including security, hygiene, and safe sleeping resources. LAHSA provides: 1) Homeless outreach services via its Homeless Engagement Teams (HET) generalists, CARE-assigned outreach teams, and its Homeless Roadmap teams, 2) Participates in the UHRC, 3) Macro outreach coordination 4) Broader Coordinated Entry System (CES) and programmatic support for programs that serve people who are experiencing street-based homelessness, 5) supports

the City's connection to, and integration with, other homeless service providers, and 6) homeless program guidance. LAPD officers work with LAHSA and BOS and other City departments in support of the Cleaning and Rapid Engagement (CARE) program and other UHRC functions. LAPD regularly engages with the community around the impact of unsheltered homelessness. RAP coordinates with LAHSA and UHRC to provide services to encampments located in parks and provides resources at public facing counters. LAFD's EMS provides first-response medical services for health emergencies for the people that are unsheltered, collaborates with LAHSA to link people to services, and provides support during Red Flag days and during actual emergency situations, like brush fires, heavy rain, and extreme heat or cold. UHRC COVID-19 Response, which includes a number of the aforementioned departments, as well as other partners, like Community Organized Relief Effort (CORE), provides on-going testing and vaccinations for people experiencing homelessness.

20. NEW REVENUE TO INCREASE AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Goal #: 1, 2, 5

Lead Agencies: Mayor's Office

Supporting Agencies: LACP, EWDD, CLA, LAHD, HACLA

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Increase funding to support affordable housing throughout the city in a way that prioritizes those most in need and supports AFFH, including prioritizing affordable production in Higher Opportunity Areas. Adopt a council resolution each legislative cycle that supports state and federal initiatives that increase funding for affordable housing development and preservation in Los Angeles Advocate for state and federal funding sources to include priority scoring for projects located in high resource areas and advocate against measures that would inhibit the City's ability to build Affordable Housing in Higher Opportunity Areas. To serve the needs of R/ECAP and other High Segregation & Poverty areas, advocate for the creation and expansion of programs that integrate housing funding with broader community development investments leveraged with state and federal funding programs (e.g. AHSC, IIG, etc.).

Respective Policy: 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 2,1.3

Support additional permanent sources of affordable housing and renter protection funding for the City. Advocate for new and existing resources to support the creation of affordable housing in Higher Opportunity Areas,

preservation strategies to address displacement, and integrated housing and community development programs that meet the needs of R/ECAP and other High Segregation & Poverty Areas. Implement any local ballot measures to generate funds locally, including a progressive real estate documentary transfer tax, vacancy/empty land tax or speculation/flipping tax. Obtain City Council support for County, State and Federal legislation and voter initiatives that create funding programs or new sources of funds (i.e., bond initiatives, tax increment financing, support removal of barriers for affordable housing (e.g., repeal Article 34), upzoning programs, state surplus funding, new state affordable housing bonds, increasing HTF funding, etc.). Continue to advocate to allocate General Plan funding to new and existing affordable housing and housing stability programs.

21. INNOVATIVE PARKING / MOBILITY STRATEGIES IN HOUSING

Goal #: 1, 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LADBS, LADOT

Funding Source: General Fund, Parking Revenue Bonds, Special Parking Revenue Fund

Objective: Incorporate updated parking recommendations and strategies into Community Plans, Specific Plans, the revised zoning code and Transit Neighborhood Plans. Monitor the effects of reduced parking incentives in programs such as TOC, 100% Affordable Housing and micro-unit development projects. Adopt a revised Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance including new requirements or incentives by 2022.

Respective Policy: 1.1.6, 1.1.2, 1.1.4

Encourage the utilization of alternatives to current parking standards that lower the cost of housing, support GHG and VMT goals and recognize the emergence of shared and alternative mobility. This includes provisions in the Modified Parking Requirements District Ordinance (2012), the updated Bicycle Parking Ordinance (2018), state Density Bonus law, affordable housing incentive programs, the development of mechanical and automatic parking structures and the establishment of parking impact trust funds as a means to fund shared parking facilities/structures. Establish new options for parking minimums in the new Zoning Code and evaluate the appropriateness of existing parking minimums citywide and during Community Plan Updates. Monitor the experience of low

or no parking TOC and PSH developments, as well as changes in other major CA cities that have removed residential parking requirements and proposed recommendations to expand similar standards citywide. With new planning efforts, evaluate the current practice of counting above grade structures towards Floor Area Ratio (FAR), or instituting parking maximums in transit-served areas. Include, as a part of future planning efforts, the exploration of ways parking structures can more easily be converted to housing in the future as needs change, particularly in transit-rich areas. Explore removing covered parking requirements and prohibitions on parking in driveways. Encourage unbundling the cost of parking from the cost of housing. Enact a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance to require certain new development projects to implement strategies such as supporting transit, telecommuting, walking, carshare, neighborhood shuttles, parking management and other strategies that reduce vehicle trips. Consider regulations or incentives to improve mobility access to housing for people with disabilities, beyond existing requirements, including through accessible bicycle and vehicle parking. Accommodate alternative mobility devices, including bicycles and scooters, in parking facilities. Consider provision of discount parking passes or other incentives for shared vehicles. Facilitate the use of electric cars, shared vehicles and mobility devices. Prioritize parking for sustainable mobility modes, including private and shared bicycles and scooters, in parking facilities. Facilitate the use of electric cars, e-bikes, shared vehicles, and micro mobility devices.

22. SYSTEMATIC CODE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM (SCEP)

Goal #: 2, 3

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: SCEP Fees

Objective: Inspect up to 200,000 multi-family residential rental units annually for compliance with state health and safety codes and the Los Angeles Housing Code. Achieve code compliance with habitability standards within 120 days of systematic inspection. Initiate contact for complaint inspections within 72 hours of complaint receipt 80% of the time. Partner with community-based organizations to provide additional support and outreach to tenants in low-resource, and high segregation and poverty areas.

Respective Policy: 2.3.1, 2.3.2

SCEP conducts proactive inspection of all multi-family rental housing regarding maintenance, use and habitability for compliance with the Housing Code and the California Health and Safety Code at least once every four years. Re-inspection of

non-compliant properties is conducted until compliance is achieved. In addition to regular systematic inspections, complaints about code violations in individual units or common areas can be filed at any time by renters or property owners. In 2019 LAHD launched a TIER-based inspection program that establishes a two year frequency of inspections for properties that performed poorly in the previous 4-year cycle. In addition, SCEP provides an opportunity to property owners who are willing and able to legalize their illegal units through UDU and/or ADU Programs (see Programs 56 and 64 respectively), thereby avoiding displacement of occupants.

23. HANDYWORKER PROGRAM

Goal #: 2, 3, 4

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: CDBG

Objective: Enroll and assess potential repairs for a minimum of 120 households annually

Respective Policy: 2.3.2, 4.1.4

Provide up to $5,000 in home repairs for homeowners to improve safety, security and comfort for older adults age 62+. Some of these home improvements include wheelchair ramps, disabled access toilets, handrails, quick releases for bars on windows, ground fault circuit interrupter outlets, smoke and carbon monoxide detectors. Some services are also available to renters for up to $300 of repairs (hand held showers, bath/shower seats, and grab bars)

24. RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATION OF PUBLIC HOUSING

Goal #: 2,4

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Funding Source: Public/Private Mix

Objective: 2,401 housing units replaced, created, or rehabilitated for low income and moderate income households (185 units developed on Rose Hill Courts site; 1,329 units developed on Jordan Downs site; 274 units developed through initial

three phases of Rancho San Pedro; 377 units rehabilitated at Pueblo Del Sol; and 236 units rehabilitated at first two phases of Dana Strand)

Respective Policy: 2.1.1, 2.1.2

Identify public housing sites in need of major rehabilitation, redesign, and/or demolition and replacement, including modifications to housing units, office and community spaces. Improvements include changes in density, unit mix, site design, amenities, traffic circulation, and parking patterns without a net loss of affordable housing at current levels of affordability. Integrate enhanced programming, community and recreational spaces, and a mixture of uses in certain locations to promote community economic development. Promote the HACLA Vision Plan goals of preserving affordability, increasing the number of Affordable Housing units, revitalizing communities, strengthening partnerships and improving housing stock. Provide new construction affordable homeownership options as part of repositioning public housing sites. Complete rehabilitation of Pueblo Del Sol and Dana Strand. Complete all phases of revitalization efforts at Rose Hill Courts and Jordan Downs, and complete initial phases of Rancho San Pedro revitalization. Complete transformation plan, specific plan, and program plan for William Mead, identify funding sources, and begin initial phases of revitalization.

25. UTILITY MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

Goal #: 2, 3

Lead Agencies: LADWP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: RSO Fees and SCEP Fees

Objective: LADWP-referred cases annually: 30; DWP utility shut-offs prevented through issuance of payments annually: 130

Respective Policy: 2.3.3

Prevent termination of utility service and displacement of tenants in multi-family master-metered properties when owners fail to pay utility bills. Apartment buildings are referred to the program, and tenants pay rent to the City and avoid utility shut-off, until the property owner pays all delinquent utility bills. If tenants choose not to participate in UMP, electric and water services are subject to disconnection.

26. MOBILE HOME PARKS

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LACP

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Assist 100 mobile park tenants by 2029; 250 market-rate mobile home park pads are preserved.

Respective Policy: 2.1.1, 2.2.5

Preserve and expand residential use of mobile home parks within residential areas. Identify mobile home parks, including non-conforming, and identify protections through the community planning process. Support legislation that expands local authority over conversion of mobile home parks to ownership structures. Provide relocation benefits to mobile home park occupants. Facilitate access to purchase and mortgage assistance to tenants in the event of conversion to ownership. Consider expanding areas and zoning designations where mobile homes, park trailers (tiny homes) and recreation vehicles can be used for habitation. Protect mobile home tenants from predatory housing practices, including buying mobile home land and evicting tenants.

27. PRESERVATION OF RESTRICTED UNITS AT-RISK OF CONVERTING TO MARKET RATE

Goal #: 2, 4

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: AHLF and SB 2

Objective: Preserve and/or extend the affordability of 300 deed-restricted affordable housing units annually. Monitor the risk of converting to market rate for 9,412 units. Contract a non-profit to enforce state noticing laws.

Respective Policy: 2.2.1

The City's Preservation Program, administered by LAHD, is focused on maintaining the livability and affordability of units "at-risk" of conversion to market rate due to expiring covenants. The Preservation Program uses HUD's definition

of “at-risk units,” which is those with covenants set to expire in five years or less. HCD defines “at-risk” as those units set to expire in ten years or less. The program provides gap financing to projects using 4% LIHTC financing, which are occupied. Rehabilitation is defined as repairs, improvements, replacements, alterations, and additions to existing properties. The purpose of the program is to monitor and report on assisted affordable housing at-risk of conversion; involve property owners and residents of identified at-risk units in preservation efforts; create non-financial strategies and support Citywide and inter-agency efforts to create strategies for preserving at-risk housing; and provide gap financing to affordable housing developments at risk of converting to market rate within the next five to ten years.

LAHD is pursuing initiatives, which include research of legislative and administrative measures to require that rental housing with expiring federal and/or state subsidies and/or affordability protections are offered for sale first to qualified preservation purchasers at market value. In addition, LAHD will secure an entity to design the program guidelines of the Preservation Program that will be used to direct future AHLF and SB 2 PLHA (Permanent Local Housing Allocation) funding. Guidelines will identify the target population, type of financial assistance that will be provided, eligible uses, and requirements for eligibility.

28. REPLACEMENT UNIT PROGRAM FOR SELECTED SITES

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Supporting Agencies: LADBS

Funding Source: General Fund, LAHD Replacement Determination Fees

Objective: In order to mitigate the loss of affordable housing units, require new housing developments on selected sites to replace all affordable housing units lost due to new development. Adopt policy and implementation guidance upon Housing Element Adoption in 2021.

Respective Policy: 2.2.1

The City will, upon adoption of the Housing Element, adopt a policy and will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(3) on all sites identified in the site inventory when any new development (residential, mixed-use or nonresidential) occurs on a site that is identified in the inventory meeting the following conditions: 1) currently

has residential uses or within the past five years has had residential uses that have been vacated or demolished, and 2) was subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of low or very low-income, or 3) subject to any other form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power, or 4) occupied by low or very low-income households

29. ENFORCEMENT OF NO NET LOSS AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING REPLACEMENTS REQUIREMENT

Goal #: 2, 4

Lead Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund, Developer Fees

Supporting Agencies: LADBS

Objective: Complete approximately 92 new AB 2556/AB 2222 replacement determinations per year. Complete approximately 200 new SB 330 replacement determinations per year. Prepare and record approximately 200 affordable housing covenants per year. Consider extending SB 330 requirements in 2030 and changing to 1:1 requirements as part of the Density Bonus update by 2024.

Respective Policy: 2.2.1

Implement no net loss and affordable housing replacement requirements for CA HSC §65915(c)(3)(A) for affordable housing incentive program projects (Density Bonus, TOC, etc,) and projects built on any property in the Inventory of Sites (see Appendix 4.1). In addition, through 2029, enforce these same state requirements for all discretionary multifamily projects subject to SB 330 (2019), as well as enforce a tenant's right to return to a comparable unit in the new building and the right to remain in a unit for up to six months prior to demolition. Evaluate whether to extend (or revise, if needed) SB 330 replacement and tenant protections past SB 330's sunset date in 2030. Also study the financial and programmatic feasibility of amending the City's policy regarding replacement of RSO units to require 1:1 replacement as lower income units under the existing optional provisions of CA HSC §65915(c)(3)(A).

The City will adopt a policy and will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of Government Code section 65915, subdivision (c)(3) on sites identified in the site inventory (see Program 28 and 46).

30. NEW MODELS OF ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Funding: HACLA and City sources such as the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee. Additional private and non-profit debt and equity partners will be identified in the strategy.

Objective: HACLA will aim to increase its portfolio through acquisition with a goal of 750 units by 2022, 2,500 units by 2025, and 5,000 units by 2030. HACLA will primarily acquire existing, naturally occurring affordable housing buildings in lower resource areas.

Respective Policy: 2.1.3, 2.1.2, 2.2.2

Continue to create public and private partnerships to facilitate the preservation of naturally occurring affordable housing by taking it off the private market and into public ownership, community land trusts or other socially-minded entities by leveraging available resources such as the low-income housing welfare tax exemption, HACLA's local government ownership property tax exemption and housing revenue bond issuance authority for low- to moderate-income housing, new SB 1079 (2020) requirements around foreclosed small multifamily properties, as well as other programs. HACLA will utilize its own financial resources, including its line of credit, internal reserves, and/or its ability to issue mortgage revenue bonds, to pilot and advance acquisition and infill strategies to increase the number of units HACLA offers for affordable housing. Additionally, HACLA will explore mixed-income acquisitions, with a portion of market rate units that will generate revenue to subsidize income restricted units. HACLA will work to expand access to capital by forging new partnerships with conventional equity investors, lenders, nonprofit and for-profit sponsors, funds, and developers seeking to leverage HACLA's resources and/or development and asset experience to create and preserve affordable housing. HACLA will also work to identify partnership projects in which it will hold an equity position that will allow for it to receive acquisition and developer fees and a share in ongoing cash flow, which it may reinvest into additional properties.

31. RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM FOR RSO HOUSING

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: RSO Fees

Objective: Process approximately 1,200 rent adjustment applications annually; Approve $80 million in property improvements annually.

Respective Policy: 2.1.2

Administer six RSO programs that permit owners to recover partial costs and adjust rents through either temporary or permanent rent increases. These programs work to preserve the City's rental housing stock by encouraging landlords to reinvest in their rental units by providing a reasonable return on their investments, while protecting tenants against unwarranted rent increases.

32. RSO ENFORCEMENT

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: OCA

Funding Source: RSO Fees

Objective: Investigate and identify violations of the RSO in order to ensure tenant protections afforded under the RSO. Ensure renters can maintain residence in safe rental units without the threat of arbitrary eviction. Ensure renters can afford to stay in their rental residences by stabilizing rents. Investigate and enforce 10,000 annual complaints of RSO violations and refer non-compliant cases to the City Attorney's office for further enforcement. Partner with community-based organizations to target outreach to areas with high displacement risk and High Segregation & Poverty areas.

Respective Policy: 2.1.4, 2.2.1, 2.3.1

Enforce registration of rental units and rent levels, prevent unlawful evictions, identify illegal rent increases and preserve stabilized rents, obtain reimbursements for any and all overpayment in rent beyond the allowable annual percentages, obtain monetary or service replacements for services reduced or lost, ensure relocation assistance monies for eligible tenancies, enforce posting of RSO notice on site, and enforce lawful methods of rent payment.

33. RSO INVENTORY MONITORING

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Objective: Identify properties newly subject to the RSO and make the information publicly accessible on an ongoing basis.

Respective Policy: 2.2.1

Research and investigate property records, such as properties with new additions/construction, or property RSO designation disputes to identify properties subject to the RSO. Issue RSO determinations and require registration of RSO units and payment of annual fees. Maintain records of properties exempt from the RSO and rent registration requirements. Track demolitions and conversions of RSO properties. Monitor rental units removed from the rental housing market. Share RSO information with the public through an RSO hotline an on the ZIMAS website.

34. PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL INSPECTIONS

Goal #: 2, 3

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Funding Source: HACLA Operating Funds

Objective: All public housing units are inspected annually. All Section 8 units inspected annually. Abate lead-based paint hazards in 280 units.

Respective Policy: 2.1.1

Conduct annual inspections of public housing units and ensure that needed repairs are completed. Conduct annual/biennial inspections of units supported by Section 8 rental assistance. Conduct environmental assessments and testing for lead-based paint at public housing sites and within individual units as necessary and abate lead-based paint hazards as identified.

35. HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD-SAFE HOUSING

Goal #: 2,3

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: HUD rehabilitation loan sources

Objective: 80 households will be remediated annually and made lead safe to prevent lead poisoning in children under the age of six.

Respective Policy: 1.2.1

Provides grants to property owners to make their properties lead-safe and to eliminate health and safety hazards. Grants are primarily targeted to low-income families with children under the age of six. The program also provides education regarding the dangers of lead-based paint and health and safety hazards.

36. URGENT REPAIR PROGRAM

Goal #: 2,3

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: CDBG, SCEP Fees

Objective: To immediately address critical habitability problems in multi-family buildings, such as lack of heat, lack of sanitation, and lack of weather protection, where the landlords have refused to address these problems thereby preventing substandard/hazardous living conditions.

Respective Policy: 2.1.2

The Urgent Repair Program addresses immediate critical habitability issues in multi-family buildings where the landlords have refused to address these issues, and thereby protects tenants from living in substandard/hazardous conditions.

37. VIRTUAL INSPECTION PILOT PROGRAM

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LADBS

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Perform 8,000 virtual inspections annually

Respective Policy: 2.1.2

The Virtual Inspection (VI) Program was launched on June 11, 2020 in response to Mayor Garcetti's Safer at Home emergency order to provide LADBS customers and inspection staff with an innovative way to achieve timely inspections through real-time video streaming from construction sites. The VI Program is anticipated to reduce wait times, improve efficiency, and promote the health and safety of LADBS customers and staff. Since the VI Program inception to March 1, 2021, LADBS has successfully conducted 2,485 inspections. This new method will improve customer service with a more convenient and timely process for inspections related to smoke/CO detectors, residential photovoltaic systems, water heathers, electrical panel, and HVAC replacement, temp power pole (CTS), residential solar water heating systems, patios/decks, demolitions and sewer caps, re-roofing, window replacemnts, minor pad footings, masonry walls, and re-inspection of corrections.

38. RENT ESCROW ACCOUNT PROGRAM (REAP)/UTILITY MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

Goal #: 2, 5

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Objectives: Monitor active REAP Cases and ensure timely closure for compliance. Prevent 50 essential service shut-offs annually through the release of REAP/UMP funds. Contract with community-based organizations to conduct proactive outreach to tenants in REAP buildings, particularly in high segregation and poverty areas and areas facing displacement.

Respective Policy: 2.1.2

With the Rent Escrow Account Program (REAP), established in 1988, tenants may voluntarily place their rents into an escrow account when the landlord has failed to correct cited housing code violations and other deficiencies within the time permitted (LAMC Section 162.00 et seq.). REAP provides a just, equitable and practical method, in conjunction with and in addition to existing City and State Building and Safety Codes, to provide economic incentives for a landlord to quickly bring their buildings into compliance. The REAP program administers escrow accounts for substandard residential buildings and prevents termination

of essential services when owners fail to pay utility bills. The REAP program contracts with landlord and tenant outreach organizations to provide educational information to landlords and tenants in the REAP program.

39. MAINTAIN PROPERTY OWNERSHIP DATA FOR LOS ANGELES RENTAL PROPERTIES

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Objective: Maintain current and historical property ownership data records for all Los Angeles residential rental property for program revenue purposes and a reference source to support other LAHD programs.

Respective Policy: 1.1.1

The Billing Information Management System (BIMS) application was designed and developed to monitor, track, and interact in the billing and collections of RSO, SCEP, and Code Services' Program fees. BIMS houses critical data on property profiles, along with historical and current ownership data for more than 1.2 million residential units subject to these Programs. Additionally, the data is validated to ensure the integrity in the issuance of Certificates of RSO Registration, that lawfully permits the collection of rents in the City of Los Angeles. BIMS provides historical data on program and unit-specific subjectivity and eligibility; ownership, fees billed/paid, APN status (active/obsolete) and supports the goals and mission of the Department.

40. DUE PROCESS HEARING

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Objectives: Conduct 1,300 hearings annually.

Respective Policy: 2.1.2

The LAHD administers General Manager (GM) hearings and Rent Adjustment Commission (RAC) appeal hearings under the authority of and in accordance with the Housing Regulations (Chapter XVI), Rent Stabilization Ordinance (LAMC, Chapter XV) and the RAC Regulations, thus affording the landlords, tenants

and other interested parties their due process rights. At the hearings, parties have the opportunity to present their case in a public and safe forum. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, hearings have been converted to remote hearings with parties participating by phone or computer. Translation services are provided if needed for any party in dozens of languages. There are 14 types of hearings, which include: Code; Rent Escrow Account Program (REAP); Utility Maintenance Program (UMP); REAP and UMP Release of Escrow; Urgent Repair Program (URP), Tenant Relocation Assistance; Tenant Habitability Program (THP); Primary Renovation; Capital Improvement; Just and Reasonable; Luxury Exemption; Income-Based Relocation Payment; Residential Hotel; and Relocation Assistance.

41. HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM

Goal #: 2, 4

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Funding: HUD Section 8 funds

Objective: Maintain 51,163 Section 8 vouchers for very low-income households over an eight-year period.

Respective Policy: 2.2.1, 2.2.2

Provide rental assistance to 51,163 very low-income families in the form of vouchers that cover a share of the monthly rental payment of privately-owned market rate rental housing. Continue outreach to potential landlords and to streamline the program administration. HACLA will continue to assess effectiveness of voucher assistance and mobility-related services to families with children to encourage such families to move to lower-poverty areas, to expand their access to opportunity areas, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies pursued under HUD's Mobility Demonstration Voucher NOFA.

42. SECTION 8 VOUCHERS FOR DISABLED AND ELDERLY HOUSEHOLDS

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Objective: Continue to provide 375 vouchers annually.

Respective Policy: 4.1.3, 5.1.1

Under specialized programs, provide rental assistance to very low-income persons with disabilities and to elderly persons in the form of vouchers that cover a share of the monthly rental payment of privately-owned market rate housing. Specialized programs include: Aftercare Program for persons in rehabilitation programs and/or receiving supportive services related to their disability; Hope for Elderly Independence Program for frail elderly persons who have difficulty performing daily living activities; Mainstream Housing Opportunities for persons with disabilities; Medicaid Waiver Program for Medicaid-eligible disabled persons to continue living in their homes rather than being placed in care facilities.

43. HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Expand the number of HPOZs and HCMs. Process 25 Mills Act applications each year. Conduct an assessment of the Mills Act program to inform new implementation and processing strategies (including a consideration of waiving fees to lower income applicants). Expand the use of objective standards. Launch of a historic rehabilitation grant program for low-income homeowners in HPOZs. Partner with a non-profit beginning in 2021 to create a historic property rehabilitation technical assistance program to encourage and facilitate maintenance and restoration of historic properties in lower income communities.

Respective Policy: 3.1.1

Designate historic and culturally significant neighborhoods as Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) and individual buildings as Historic-Cultural Monuments (HCMs). Such designations allow historic residential buildings to qualify for tax incentives and other incentives for their rehabilitation and adaptive reuse. Prioritize the initiation of proactive nominations of new Historic-Cultural Monuments that reflect the histories of communities of color within Los Angeles. Explore the provision of additional incentives for the rehabilitation of affordable housing and for low-income homeowners of historic properties in HPOZs. Expand the use of objective review standards in HPOZ Preservation Plans for Accessory Dwelling Units and other entitlements that require ministerial review. Administer the Mills Act to allow qualifying owners of historic properties to receive a potential property tax reduction and use the savings to help rehabilitate, restore and maintain their homes. Utilize the results of Survey LA to inform future preservation decisions including identifying future HPOZs, conservation districts or HCM designation for single-family and multi-family buildings.

44. PROPERTY MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

Lead: LAHD

Objective: Advise property owners on how to improve the management of their properties.

Respective Policy: 2.1.3

The Property Management Training Program instructs property owners on how to improve the management of their properties. The training encompasses marketing, preparing units for rental, repair and maintenance of the property, techniques on early detection of drug and gang activity, and the use of rental agreements and leases to enforce house rules.

45. ENFORCE, MONITOR, AND PRESERVE AFFORDABLE HOUSING COVENANTS

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: LACP, HACLA

Objective: Maintain a database to monitor affordable housing covenants, Annual reports on the status of the affordable housing inventory (Housing Element APR); Monitor and enforce compliance with affordability covenants and accessibility covenants (LAHD); Preserve and/or extend the affordability of 500 units annually currently part of the City of Los Angeles affordable housing stock.

Funding Source: General Fund

Respective Policy: 1.1.1

LAHD will continue to maintain a database of existing housing units citywide serving very low-, low- and moderate-income households, including the location, affordability expiration date, income level served and mechanism used to create the units. Ensure affordable units are occupied by tenants that income-qualify to live in the unit. Provide occupancy monitoring for the City's deed-restricted affordable and accessible housing stock. Track new construction, conversion, preservation affordability and accessibility covenants, and demolition of affordable housing units, including affordable housing production in relation to the City's Article 34 production targets. Create and monitor regulatory agreements and land use covenants for compliance with affordability and

accessibility restrictions which have been produced with loans, grants and/or land use incentives/requirements. Monitor and report on identified assisted affordable housing at-risk of conversion annually through the Annual Progress Report. Involve property owners and residents of identified at-risk units in preservation efforts. Create non-financial strategies and support Citywide and inter-agency efforts to create strategies for preserving at-risk housing. Publish annual reports on the creation of affordable and accesible housing, i.e. the Annual Progress Report on the Housing Element (APR). Adjust goals and program priorities in accordance with changing needs and resources. Facilitate reports that include information on the local and citywide affordable housing inventory.

46. HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY UPDATE

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Housing Element Site Identification added onto ZIMAS in 2021. Create a guide for project planners to make findings on Inventory Parcels. Develop internal tracking of development on Housing Element Sites (2021-2022).

Respective Policy: 1.1.1

Identify parcels that have been included in the Housing Element Inventory of Sites on ZIMAS with a Zoning Information (ZI) designation indicating the number of units at each income category as well as any additional Housing Element law allowances and requirements (e.g., replacement requirements for all sites and a by-right allowance with 20% affordable at Lower income for sites identified in two consecutive cycles). Monitor and track the redevelopment of sites on the inventory to maintain adequate sites throughout the planning period. If approving a development of a parcel identified in its Housing Element sites inventory with fewer units than shown in the Housing Element, either make findings that the Housing Element's remaining sites have sufficient capacity to accommodate the remaining unmet RHNA by each income level, or identify and make available sufficient sites to accommodate the remaining unmet RHNA for each income category. Make adjustments in the next inventory of sites to better reflect realistic capacity and likelihood of redevelopment and inform the development of the citywide growth strategy in Program 50.

47. MONITOR AND REPORT ON HOUSING PRODUCTION GOALS

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD, HACLA, LADBS

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Quarterly and annual summaries on residential building activity. Annual Progress Report on the City's housing production and preservation goals and accomplishments (Housing Element APR). Maintain interactive housing dashboard websites and open data portals to display some of the most commonly requested and important housing related information. Expand sharing of public data on other topics.

Respective Policy: 1.1.1

Track progress toward Housing Element programs for each department (Housing Element APR). Identify and track new residential development, including affordable housing (by income category), single-family and multifamily units, additions and alterations. Monitor and track demolitions and conversions citywide and by Community Plan Area. Publish regular summaries and reports on changes in the residential stock. Monitor housing production in relation to RHNA goals through the Annual Progress Report (APR), and publish data for the public through the Open Data website as well as agency websites, such as the LACP Data Dashboard. Monitor the inventory of affordable and RSO units within Community Plan Areas subject to Measure JJJ. Maintain and expand citywide housing data dashboards for topics of public interest and develop tracking systems and reporting to facilitate monitoring housing production and preservation programs. (LAHD's dashboard currently tracks Measure HHH, Ellis Act removals, RSO units and THP; City Planning's tracks Density Bonus, TOC, ADUs, as well as units proposed and approved). Continue to staff the Eviction Data Task Force (LAHD, LACP, LADBS) to better monitor and report data related to Ellis Act removals, particularly with regards to development activities. Use this data to inform policy. Continue to maintain the Citywide Housing Production System and develop reports to facilitate tracking the City's housing production and any covenants which address affordability requirements, such as restrictions on land use, occupant income, rent levels and sales prices.

48. UPDATE DENSITY BONUS AND OTHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: REAP, SB 2

Objective: Develop annual reports on affordable housing units produced as a result of land use incentives. Make revisions to the density bonus provisions in the Code. Update the Affordable Housing Incentives Guidelines by 2024.

Respective Policy: 1.1.1

As part of the RHNA Rezoning Program 121, pursue an update to the Density Bonus Ordinance, which should also seek to incorporate other citywide land use incentive programs such as Transit Oriented Communities (TOC), Value Capture Ordinance, CPIO, PSH Ordinance, etc. Develop strategies to promote greater affordability, particularly in strong market areas; strengthen anti-displacement, housing replacement and right to return requirements, and explore ways to prioritize those who were displaced by Ellis Act no-fault evictions in the rental of affordable units. Explore permanent or 99-year affordability terms for affordable units in mixed-income projects; and create more incentives for certain important housing typologies including 50%-100% affordable projects, senior/disabled/large family housing, housing along Commercial corridors and adjacent Parking (P/PB) zones, micro units in Regional Centers, missing middle housing typologies, and affordable housing on public land, religious and educational institutional land, land donation, CLTs etc. Also update the Affordable Housing Incentives Program Guidelines to provide greater guidance and clarity about available incentives and requirements. Consider ways to satisfy affordable housing requirements through alternative means that result in greater benefit, including the preservation of affordable units. Track the production of affordable housing units produced as a result of density bonus requests.

49. TARGETED ZONING ALLOCATIONS BY COMMUNITY PLAN AREA

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: REAP

Objective: Create a Citywide Housing Needs Assessment by Community Plan Area, including a methodology to allocate housing capacity targets and Affordable Housing units that prioritizes equity, access to opportunity, and anti-displacement. Release draft methodology for public review by 2023, and bring to the City Planning Commission for action by 2024. Utilize these numerical targets as a basis for all local planning efforts around housing goals, with the goal of achieving an equitable distribution of multi-family zoning capacity and affordable housing production across the City, as measured by the factors and weights developed in the allocation methodology.

Respective Policy: 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.6, 1.3.1, 1.3.2

Pursue the creation of a community housing needs assessment process that allocates the citywide RHNA to Community Plan Areas based on a methodology that reflects citywide priorities, including traditional growth criteria (proximity to transit, jobs and amenities) as well as considerations regarding equity, access to opportunity, and anti-displacement. More guidance should also be provided regarding the development of local incentive programs and policies to address local needs. Consider other ways to align regional, citywide, and local planning for housing, such as aligning capacity methodologies and assumptions. Identify the housing needs of each community when each Community Plan is updated and address them in alignment with Citywide Housing Priorities. Concurrently, LAHD is developing an Affordable Housing Sites Analysis tool, intended to complement citywide RHNA, that will identify parcels that are most competitive for local, state and federal funding programs and meet low-income housing goals.

As part of the current Housing Element update, adopt a program for the future update to the City's General Plan growth strategy to create a new community housing needs assessment methodology to establish housing goals and zoning targets for each Community Plan Area, by income category. The process could be based upon citywide housing production goals and utilize a methodology that would balance traditional factors such as job and transit access and evironmental concerns with a new prioritization for high opportunity areas, preventing displacement and other fair housing considerations. The outcome of this process would include the creation of equitable numerical housing goals and zoning targets for each Community Plan Area, and subareas, by income category to be used for local planning efforts.

50. UPDATE THE CITYWIDE GROWTH STRATEGY TO MEET HOUSING NEEDS

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP,

Supporting Agencies: All (ED 19 Cabinet)

Funding Source: REAP, General Fund

Objective: Prepare background studies and create an engagement tool to help evaluate and communicate the trade offs of different growth scenarios; Draft and adopt an updated growth strategy (Framework Element) by 2028.

Respective Policy: 1.1.1

Update the citywide growth strategy (currently called the Framework Element) as part of an update to the citywide Land Use Element of the General Plan. With regards to housing, prepare background studies on historical land use/housing inequities, infrastructure needs to support housing, economic/market demand, anti-displacement strategies, sustainability, resilience and other important issues. Organize information into a web-based format that allows the public to explore different growth considerations and offer feedback on which criteria they would like to see prioritized. Evaluate total citywide capacity for housing in relation to existing and proposed citywide housing needs and establish production targets to ensure that the City can realistically accommodate the planned housing. Ensure that the growth and land use distribution strategy aligns with citywide goals around equity and sustainability. Implement strategies to better align the citywide housing needs assessment with citywide and community level housing growth targets and priorities (see Programs 49 and 65).

51. DATA FOR EVALUATING HOUSING NEED

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD, ITA, SCAG

Funding Source: General Fund,

Objective: Maintain database of current socioeconomic and demographic data on the LACP website. Publish periodic reports of socioeconomic and demographic

data, including updates based on Census / ACS data. Collaborate on regional demographic projections every four years as part of the RTP/SCS.

Respective Policy: 1.1.1

Maintain a public database of demographic data (including population, employment, income, and housing) within the City and within each Community Plan Area to enable the ongoing evaluation of citywide and local housing needs. Publish regular reports of socioeconomic and demographic data on a citywide basis and by Community Plan Area. Publish special reports of socioeconomic and demographic data in response to unique requests. Provide socioeconomic and demographic data to the public through various outlets, including the LACP website. Assist the U.S. Census Bureau with outreach and education to the community in order to obtain more complete and accurate data collection and reporting in the 2030 Census, particularly with regard to data necessary for assessing the City's Housing needs. Collaborate with Federal, State, regional and County agencies to produce and collect data to support the City's planning purposes and to provide local inputs to ensure accuracy. Track data that correlates with an unhealthy housing market, such as high rates of overcrowding and low rates of vacancy, to understand the changing severity of the housing crisis. LAHD will continue to assist with providing local housing data such as the Affordable Housing Registry, RSO, and Ellis Eviction data.

52. INTEGRATE THE HOUSING ELEMENT AND THE CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS

Goal #: 1, 2, 3

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: LAHSA, HACLA

Funding Source: CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA General Fund

Objective: Integrate the Housing Element with the 1 and 5-year Consolidated Plan (2022 and 2027) by using the goals and strategies of the Housing Element to inform the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans. For the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan allocate $165 million to stabilize and revitalize low-income neighborhoods and $56 million to improve local employment for low-income residents. Determine similar levels of funding goals in 2022 and 2023 as part of the new consolidated plan and prioritize community development investments in High Segregation and Poverty Areas and/or Racially Concentrated Areas of Poverty.

Respective Policy: 1.1.1, 1.1.9, 4.3.4, 5.2.6

The Consolidated Plan is an assessment of affordable housing and community development needs and market conditions required by HUD to help make data driven, place-based investment decisions. The Plan requires the City to assess housing needs and barriers to housing and outlines the funding priorities for the use of Federal programs including CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA. The next 5-year plan (2023-2027) will integrate the needs and constraints section of this Housing Element and build off Citywide Housing Priorities and AFFH the goals when determining place-based community revitalization incentives.

53. DISASTER RESILIENCE AND RECOVERY

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD, HACLA, LADBS, EMD, LAFD

Funding Source: General Fund, DHS/FEMA, AHTF

Objective: Support property owners in safely rebuilding residential properties after a disaster. Support tenants in finding and maintaining safe, permanent housing following a disaster. Ensure that hazard information from safety documents is integrated into land use decisions.

Respective Policy: 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4

Provide assistance in obtaining land use entitlement approvals, building permits, emergency funds, coordinating inspections and other necessary activities in order to facilitate the required demolition of hazards and the repair, restoration and rebuilding of damaged structures when it is safe to rebuild (as provided for in L.A.M.C. Sections 12.23 A.4, 12.23 A.5, and 12.24 X.16). Allow for a temporary use of land permit to allow a Recreation Vehicle to be used for temporary shelter when the existing dwelling on the same lot has been destroyed by a disaster LAMC 12.22 A.17. Assist tenants displaced by a disaster in obtaining the right to return for rebuilt units. In the event of a natural disaster, connect tenants and landlords with resources to repair buildings quickly and return residents to their homes as soon as it is safe. Seek emergency funds from Federal and State sources. Integrate hazard information into the process of making land use decisions. Evaluate how best to adapt housing to changing climate conditions and protect vulnerable residents from repeat loss events through programs included in the Venice Local Coastal Program, Community Plan Updates and

other geographically specific plans. Use local pilot programs to inform broader citywide considerations of climate change and hazard areas. Explore ways to amend codes in very high fire hazard severity zones and other hazard areas to better protect life and safety.

54. EXPEDITE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LADBS, LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Prioritize affordable housing projects to expedite processing of permits and any related entitlements. Reduce the need for entitlements and reduce entitlement and permit processing times for affordable housing projects by up to 12 months, as part of Programs 48 and 121, by 2024. Adopt amendments to the Affordable Housing Incentives Program Guidelines to facilitate better understanding of the various affordable housing incentive programs by 2024. Assist 50 affordable housing projects per year through the Priority Housing Program. Reduce entitlement processing time for PHP projects by up to three months.

Respective Policy: 1.1.1

All City agencies will assist publicly-assisted affordable housing projects to receive priority treatment in the building permit and entitlement process. LACP will provide priority case processing under the Priority Housing Program (PHP) program for 10+ unit projects that provide at least 20% lower income affordable housing as well as provide one-on-one assistance to all affordable housing projects. Assign additional staff when case demand is high to ensure at least 25% faster timelines than regular projects. Create processes that allow projects within a certain threshold of affordability to proceed along a faster entitlement path, avoiding discretionary review. LADBS will provide expedited services through their Affordable Housing Section under the Housing Streamlined Approval Process (HSAP), which is an optional streamlined process that allows applicants to submit the project in phases (zoning only, architectural, structural) instead of requiring a full complete set of plans for submittal. Departments will follow the inter-departmental coordinated review plan contained in the 2020 Funding Form Instructions for Affordable Projects memo (until superseded). Allow projects to take advantage of the Parallel Design Permitting Program (PDPP)

and Development Services Case Management (DSCM) at lower thresholds than projects without affordable housing. Explore creation of a homeless and affordable housing strike team, working across departmental and jurisdictional lines to speed up every aspect of the process. Consider unique procedural requirements for qualified Affordable Housing projects including shorter appeal times and modifying Site Plan Review thresholds to an administrative review process.

55. IMPLEMENT CEQA STREAMLINING MEASURES

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Funding Sources: General Fund

Objective: Allow for streamlined environmental review (e.g. SCEA required for Infill and Transit Priority Projects). Assist 10 Transit Priority Projects and Infill Projects per year. Adopt "uniformly applicable development policies" as well as additional CEQA streamlining tool and templates by 2026.

Respective Policy: 1.2.5, 1.2.1, 3.2.2

Facilitate the utilization of Statewide CEQA streamlining measures, including those that implement the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy (SB 375) and those that promote infill projects (SB 226). Promote Transit Priority Projects by completing program-level Environmental Impact Reports that analyze potential impacts when undertaking community planning efforts. Adopt "uniformly applicable development measures" that would substantially mitigate the effects of infill projects. Create necessary policies and procedures to facilitate streamlining efforts. Develop templates for such streamlining tools as SCEAs and SCPEs. Aim to make more projects that achieve Citywide Housing Priorities to be exempt from or receive CEQA streamlining.

56. UNAPPROVED DWELLING UNITS (UDU)

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Process 65 applications per year to preserve 100 affordable units and prevent tenant displacement as a result of zoning code violations related to unapproved rental units. Identify requirements that pose compliance difficulties for legalization projects and adopt amendments to the Zoning Code to alleviate continued challenges to legalization and expedite the process, by 2024. Conduct proactive outreach on the benefits of the UDU program to landlords, particularly when tenant displacement would otherwise occur, through the SCEP Program (Program 22) when inspecting multifamily rental units and zoning code violations are identified.

Respective Policies: 2.1.3, 2.2.3

Identify Zoning Code requirements that typically pose challenges in the preservation, rehabilitation and legalization of existing housing. Amend the Zoning Code to facilitate rehabilitation of housing to habitable levels rather than encouraging demolition or disinvestment. Examine the effectiveness of the Unapproved Dwelling Unit (UDU) Ordinance and identify remaining barriers towards the preservation of unpermitted units. Promote legalizations of existing units through ADU law, and implement state law on allowing time to legalize illegal ADUs and unpermitted dwelling units.

57. IMPROVEMENTS TO DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LADBS, LADOT, Bureau of Engineering, LAFD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Increase the number of cases processed as ADM Clearances and Ministerial cases, while decreasing the percent of projects processed as discretionary entitlements through a variety of efforts. Development of a multi-departmental case clearance system by 2026.

Respective Policies: 1.2.5

Look for opportunities to reduce project review time. Coordinate the review and clearance process across departments, allowing applicants to easily identify which clearances are needed and how to obtain them through an all inclusive, clear, predictable, customer-based, project-oriented process from pre-development to occupancy. Provide more centralized information sources on

the housing development process. Identify opportunities to place projects on a faster city planning review timeline, reducing the total number of discretionary entitlements in favor of objective standards, ministerial entitlements and administrative clearances that achieve better results. Foster more regular information sharing between departments at the Development Services Center. Undertake regular fee studies in order to achieve full cost recovery and timely processing of applications. Revise procedures to ensure processing time limits in accordance with the Permit Streamlining Act and Housing Accountability Act. Transition applications to electronic review and stamping.

58. DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LADBS, LADOT, BOE and Bureau of Street Services (Streets LA)

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Develop new frontage regulations and CPIOs in all Community Plans adopted by 2029.

Respective Policies: 1.2.5, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.5

Adopt implementation tools, such as form and frontage regulations, Community Plan Implementation Overlay districts zones and design standards, to guide new development, create objective standards, promote pedestrian oriented design, and acknowledge existing architectural context. Utilize the new zoning code to explore mechanisms to address better transitions between single-family and multi-family development, between commercial and residential development, and between industrial and residential development. Promote the use of the Citywide Design Guidelines and develop new design tools and overlays to better regulate the design of buildings at all scales. Introduce character frontages, in areas with unique character to better regulate the design of infill structures. Support the work of the Urban Design Studio (see Program 79).

59. LOW-RISE INFILL HOUSING RESEARCH AND DESIGN INITIATIVE

Goal #: 3, 1

Lead Agencies: Mayor's Office

Supporting Agencies: LACP, LAHD, HACLA

Funding Source: Mayor's Fund

Objective: Create a White Paper with at least five potential high value recommendations regarding low-rise infill housing alongside new findings on the underlying economics and market potential of such housing for potential use in rezoning efforts and policy development by 2022

Respective Policies: 3.1.3

As a partner component to the Mayor's Low Rise Design Competition (2021), the Mayor's Office has been working with the Urban Institute Housing Finance Policy Center to conduct quantitative and qualitative research and will be publishing a White Paper in 2021 to articulate the potential of housing units produced at a low-rise moderate-density scale and to identify high-potential policies at the local and state level to maximize these benefits. This paper will help guide the focus, priorities, and projects for future policies and programs related to approximately 2-4 unit (per lot) housing development within low-rise neighborhoods. The overall initiative has a goal of improving knowledge and awareness of the potential affordability, ownership accessibility, sustainability, and public health benefits that new housing units produced in low-rise, moderate-density contexts could provide for low- and moderate- income households in Los Angeles and demonstrating how innovative design can help increase the housing supply, build agency, prevent displacement of existing communities, and reduce overcrowding that poses a threat to public health and well-being.

60. ZONING CODE REVISION

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LADBS

General Fund: General Fund

Objective: Adopt ordinances and a brand new Zoning Code that establishes clear and predictable regulations. Apply to all Community Plans adopted by 2029. Facilitate 2,000 housing units in mixed-use developments.

Respective Policies: 1.1.2, 1.1.6

Complete a comprehensive revision of the City's Zoning Code that includes the following major deliverables: a clear and predictable Zoning Code that will apply to Los Angeles's diverse needs and neighborhoods; and an online Zoning Code that will allow for a customized and interactive online experience. Among other improvements, the new Zoning Code is anticipated to improve flexibility in creating new Zones with variable density, forms, frontages, transitions, and design standards. Facilitate the development of mixed-use projects through the use of incentives and regulations, such as Residential Accessory Services (RAS) zones, Community Plan Implementation Overlay districts (CPIOs), ground floor commercial requirements and Mixed-Use Overlay Districts, density bonus and TOC incentives and other citywide ordinances (Affordable Housing Linkage Fee). Utilize the new zoning system to adopt appropriate ordinances, guidelines, and implementation mechanisms in conjunction with Community Plans. Encourage and incentivize community amenities such as day care, green space, grocery stores, etc. as part of housing developments. Work alongside communities to identify which amenities are most desirable. Completion of this project will result in transparent, more accessible land use regulations, understandable to stakeholders at all levels of familiarity with the Zoning Code.

61. PROVIDE ADEQUATE SITES FOR LOWER INCOME HOUSEHOLDS ON NONVACANT AND VACANT SITES PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Create opportunity for at least 98,806 units of rental housing for lower income households on at least 16,918 sites by 2024. Develop process for identifying sites for development by 2024.

Respective Policies: 1.1.6, 1.2.1

The City will rezone to allow developments by-right pursuant to Government Code section 65583.2(i) when 20 percent or more of the units are affordable to lower income households on sites identified in Appendix 4.1 Table A to accommodate the lower income RHNA that was previously identified in past housing elements. Specifically, the City will rezone the non vacant lower income sites identified on Appendix 4.1 previously identified in the 5th cycle housing element, and the

vacant lower income sites identified on Appendix 4.1 as previously identified for both the 4th and 5th cycle housing elements.

62. FACILITATE HOUSING INNOVATION

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Funding Sources: General Fund

Objective: Adopt various amendments to the Zoning Code to accommodate innovative multifamily housing types.

Respective Policies: 1.1.2,1.2.3

Identify modifications needed in the Zoning Code to incentivize and facilitate innovative housing types, such as shared housing (co-living), cooperative housing, modular and prefabricated housing, adaptive reuse, interim housing, tiny homes, micro units, ADUs, co-living and group quarters.

63. ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: Mayor, LADBS

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Permit 5,123 ADUs annually; Adopt amendments to the Zoning Code to alleviate challenges by 2024; Continue to produce new information to assist homeowners and ADU builders in understanding their options, and partner on programs to incentivize and accelerate the production of Affordable ADUs. Continue the work of the multi-agency ADU Quarterly Roundtable, convened by the Mayor's Office to identify and resolve barriers. Expand incentives for the production of affordable ADUs, including preparing a code amendment to expand the density bonus program in higher opportunity areas by 2024. Implement the LA ADU Accelerator program to incentivize use of ADUs to house lower-income seniors.

Respective Policies: 1.1.2, 2.3.1

Identify development standards and code requirements that pose unnecessary compliance difficulties to additional ADUs and propose ways, including code amendments and public information, to address these obstacles. Provide greater resources and support to applicants who are seeking City approval for ADUs. Continue to expand the ADU Accelerator program to incentivize use of ADUs to house lower-income seniors by scaling up outreach.. Expand incentives for affordable ADUs, including exploring a density bonus program and ADU innovation program funded by the Linkage Fee. Partner with community organizations and nonprofits to promote the production of ADUs and Affordable Housing. Expand the use of ADU's in multi-family properties. LADBS will implement the ADU Standard Plan Program (Program 64).

64. ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) STANDARD PLAN PROGRAM

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LADBS, Mayor's Office

Supporting Agencies: LACP

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Creation of 200 Standard Plan ADUs per year.

Respective Policies: 1.1.2, 2.3.1

The ADU Standard Plan Program launched on March 5, 2020 to provide customers a simplified permitting process for the design and construction of ADUs. The program offers builders and homeowners a variety of pre-approved ADU building plans and designs, which reduces the time required for plan check resulting in faster permit issuance. Under the ADU Standard Plan Program, plans are designed by private licensed architects and engineers to accommodate various site conditions. Plans are then reviewed and pre-approved by LADBS for compliance with the Building, Residential, and Green Codes. When the applicant selects an approved Standard Plan, LADBS staff will review site-specific factors for the property, including compliance with the Zoning Code and foundation requirements.

65. PLAN FOR HOUSING GROWTH AND PLACE-BASED STRATEGIES IN COMMUNITY PLAN AREAS

Goal #: 4,3,1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Identify targeted growth areas and incorporate appropriate land use designations and policies in the adoption of 16 Community Plans and at least 3 neighborhood plans by 2029. (see timelines below). Prioritize rezoning at densities that allow creation of affordable housing in areas near transit, jobs and in Higher Opportunity Areas, while balancing the preservation of stable multifamily neighborhoods. Create and incorporate tailored place-based land use strategies and programs in each plan (see below for a range of implementation tools). Ensure that updates to Community Plans and neighborhood plans are consistent with Citywide Housing Priorities.

Respective Policies: 1.1.2, 1.1.6, 3.2.2, 4.3.2

Update Community Plans, Transit Neighborhood Plans, Specific Plans and citywide ordinances to establish appropriate land uses, densities, and mixes of housing types and levels of affordability in areas targeted for growth by the General Plan, including areas well served by public transit, and employment/activity centers, particularly in Higher Opportunity Areas and areas where potential for displacement is minimized. Evaluate existing housing needs when planning for future development by conducting analysis to develop and incorporate a buffer above household projections (see Program 49). Conduct studies to identify housing opportunities and market potential for the neighborhoods around rail and bus rapid transit stops in the City. Evaluate housing production barriers such as Q limitations, D limitations, and general plan footnotes and update them as part of Community Plan Updates. Change land use designations, initiate zone changes and adopt Community Plan Implementation Overlay districts. Adopt minimum density requirements and reduced or zero parking requirements where appropriate. Attach community benefits, including affordable housing and other place-based amenities and investments, to significant bonuses in floor area and density (see Program 81).

Create community plan implementation overlays that include Community Benefits Program and Community Benefits Fund, as appropriate, to provide additional affordable housing programs, mobility and street improvements, local parks and open space, support for workforce training, economic development

and jobs, business recovery strategies for local businesses, needed community amenities such as health services, grocery stores and corner markets, amenities for people who are experiencing homelessness, remediation strategies for discontinued oil wells, and increasing access to the Los Angeles River.

Evaluate specific plans and overlays that may be limiting the production of housing and make revisions that allow for greater housing opportunity while maintaining community and design concerns (e.g. CASP). Identify areas of high opportunity where development potential is limited by hazard concerns and ecological conservation priorities. Study and explore alternative tools that allow for the development of more affordable housing in these areas, such as affordable ADUs, subdividing larger properties and clustering or planned unit development.

Currently there are 16 active Community Plan Updates and 3 Neighborhood Plans. Active plans are clustered into the following geographic programs with varying timelines for adoption. As timing for completion is dependent on the legislative adoption process, timelines listed below are reflective of when programs are expected to begin the adoption process with a City Planning Commission (CPC) Hearing:

- Hollywood, CPC held in 2021, currently in the adoption process
- Downtown (Central City, Central City North), CPC held in 2021, currently in the adoption process
- Boyle Heights, adoption process beginning in 2021-2022
- Harbor Plans (Harbor Gateway, Wilmington-Harbor City), adoption process beginning in 2022
- Southeast Valley (North Hollywood - Valley Village, Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass, Van Nuys - North Sherman Oaks), adoption process beginning in 2022-2023
- Southwest Valley (Encino - Tarzana, Reseda - West Van Nuys, Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills), adoption process beginning in 2022-2023
- West Los Angeles (West Los Angeles, Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey, Venice, Westchester - Playa del Rey), adoption process beginning in 2023

In addition to current Community Planning efforts described above, updates to the following plans will also be initiated during the Housing Element Cycle: Wilshire & Westlake CPA, Northeast Los Angeles & Silverlake CPA, the Northwest Valley geography, the Northeast Valley geography, and the Westside North geography.

Active Neighborhood Plans include the Cornfields Arroyo Seco Specific Plan (CASP), the Orange Line Transit Neighborhood Plan, and the Slauson Transit Neighborhood Plan, all which will begin the adoption process in 2022.

66. REDEVELOPMENT TOOLS (TAX INCREMENT FINANCING)

Goal #: 1,3

Lead Agencies: CAO

Supporting Agencies: EWDD, HACLA, LAHD, LACP, Mayor

Funding Sources: General Fund, Metro TOD Grant

Objective: Create new funding sources through tax increment financing and associated bond issuance by 2029.

Respective Policies: 1.2.6, 1.2.7, 3.2.2

Reinstate funding sources that can be obtained through tax increment financing and associated bond issuance powers based on the newer state legislative mechanisms that have materialized in the wake of redevelopment agency dissolution. These new tools include Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts and Community Revitalization Investment Areas (CRIAs). Tax increment financing allows agencies to utilize growth in tax revenue, or tax increment, to finance certain projects, including at least 20% for affordable housing, within a limited geographic area. EWDD has established a process and criteria to pursue an EIFD (EIFD Establishment and Investment Policy). HACLA will explore utilizing its bond authority and legislation promoting infrastructure to develop finance districts to create new mechanisms to help fund affordable housing. HACLA, together with its development partners, has received a grant from SCAG to plan for the establishment of an EIFD for the Harbor Area around Rancho San Pedro and continues to explore new opportunities to issue bonds for affordable housing production. Additionally, the City will consider the results of a Downtown Los Angeles TIF Feasibility Study that is currently underway that is examining areas around transit stations to determine how the City may finance transit-supporting infrastructure and affordable housing. HACLA and the City will engage in extensive stakeholder outreach before intent to form any specific redevelopment tool.

67. EDUCATION ON HOUSING TOPICS INCLUDING: GROWTH, DISCRIMINATORY HOUSING PRACTICES, HOUSING NEED, MIXED USE AND MIXED-INCOME NEIGHBORHOODS

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: HACLA, DONE

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Provide 50 training sessions/workshops; 100 participating neighborhood council members and community organization members annually.

Respective Policies: 1.1.10, 1.3.3, 4.2.2

Provide training to neighborhood councils, public housing resident advisory councils, community groups, and the general public regarding the planning process and accommodating and responding to growth, including the siting of housing, affordable housing and special needs housing, mixed-use and mixed-income development. LACP will provide "Planning 101" training and focus groups to residents and stakeholders on issues such as zoning, housing and mobility, as well as provide access to data and information on entitlements and land use decisions. Expand the curriculum of existing training to include a focus on educating homeowners about the development potential of their sites, including ADU or potential for a second unit. Prepare materials that describe and analyze past racist housing and land use practices and how they shape today's land use patterns. Partner with Community Based Organizations and utilize technology to reach individuals and groups who historically have not been represented in planning efforts. Share information on social media platforms and via email to engage a broader audience in the housing conversation. The EmpowerLA Leadership Academy provided by DONE will provide training to neighborhood councils on issues of City governance, conflict resolution, planning and development as well as provide a reference library and online classroom for instant access to helpful topics.

68. SERVICES IN PUBLIC HOUSING

Goal #: 2,4

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Funding Source: Public Housing Budget, CDBG, Grants

Objective: Provide 50 residential clients served by educational assistance Programs annually; 100 residential clients served by computer training programs annually; 100 youth served by recreational, educational and cultural programs annually; 1,600 residential clients served by career assistance programs annually; Submit application for Workforce Investment Act Recertification as required.

Respective Policies: 2.2.3, 4.1.4

Provide educational and career assistance including tutoring, assistance with financial aid applications, help to re-enter school and college, computer training, job training, mentoring and career counseling in publicly assisted housing developments. Incorporate recreational, education and cultural programs into publicly assisted housing for youth ages 8-21.

69. ACHIEVING WATER USE EFFICIENCY WITH CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LADWP

Supporting Agencies: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWDSC)

Objective: Achieving water use efficiency and increasing water savings through outreach, education, and incentives in order to achieve the goal of 100 gallons per capita per day (GPCD) by 2035.

Respective Policies: 3.2.6

LADWP promotes and advances water conservation and water use efficiency to make LA more sustainable in its water use. Educational and public awareness/ support campaigns are promoted to empower customers to become water use efficiency advocates. Additionally, measures for water savings have been implemented by incentivizing customers to install water saving devices in their homes and businesses. The water saving measures include premium high efficiency toilets, waterless urinals, low-flow showerheads, low-flow faucet aerators, high-efficiency clothes washers, rain barrels, cisterns, weather-based irrigation controllers, efficient sprinkler nozzles, and turf replacement. These multifaceted programs of incentives, education, and outreach continue to effectively reduce water demand despite LA's growing population and help LADWP achieve its goal of 100 GPCD by 2035.

70. INCENTIVES TO CONSERVE ENERGY

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LADWP

Supporting Agencies: SOCAL GAS

Funding Source: LADWP Public Benefit Program

Objective: Seek out and install cost-effective electric solutions that will improve the performance of customers' homes and give them additional control over their energy expenses throughout the eight-year period.

Respective Policies: 3.2.6

LADWP's overarching energy efficiency strategy is to utilize various delivery channels and partners to ensure that it has something to offer to all its customers and provide maximum benefit to all its customer segments in all Council Districts. Programs are designed to educate and encourage LADWP residential customers to purchase and install qualifying products in their homes. The Department offers incentives for measures for whole-house solutions, including but not limited to Energy Star® dual pane windows, room and central air conditioners, cool roofs, refrigerators, pool pumps, programmable thermostats, and to turn-in old refrigerators and freezers, for recycling. Eligible low-income customers under LADWP's Low-Income Program or its Senior Citizen/Disability Lifeline Rates will also receive tangible economic benefits of energy efficiency through the mass adoption of proven, economical low-income energy efficiency measures. The Refrigerator Exchange Program (REP) provides free new and efficient refrigerators and pick-up and recycling of existing refrigerators. The benefits to the environment are the permanent reduction of GHGs from older, inefficient refrigerators, as well as recycling of materials such as Chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) refrigerants, mercury, polyurethane foam insulation with CFC 11, glass, oil and steel that can be safely recycled at recycling centers for new uses, diverting these potential pollutants from our landfills.

71. ENCOURAGE ENERGY CONSERVATION THROUGH PRICING

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LADWP

Funding Source: Rate Payer Fee

Objective: Charge 10,000 residential customers on the Time-Of-Use (TOU) rate annually.

Respective Policies: 3.2.5

Reduce electricity use by adjusting the pricing and timing of use by customers. Propose rate restructure to shift rate from demand based pricing to energy based pricing, so customers can manage their usage and save money. Set rate policy to Time-Of-Use (TOU) Rate, which charges a higher price for energy during the peak period, and reduces the price during the base period to encourage conservation. Residential customers whose monthly energy use exceeds 3,000 kWh are now required to use TOU pricing.

72. RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LADWP

Funding Source: Supplemental Rate Payer Fee

Objective: The Renewable Energy programs were designed to increase renewable power generation in LA and to help the City meet its renewable portfolio standard goals; help customers join the solar economy and benefit from renewable energy projects. Increase renewable power generation in LA. Help the city meet its renewable portfolio standard goals.

Respective Policies: 3.2.5

LADWP continues to continue implementing initiatives to help customers join the solar economy and benefit from renewable energy projects, as shown in the programs outlined below. The programs were also designed to increase renewable power generation in LA and to help the City meet its renewable portfolio standard goals. Implement Several Programs to increase the supply of renewable energy: Green Power for a Green LA offers households the opportunity to subscribe to programs that purchase energy from renewable energy sources (e.g. solar, wind and water) in place of traditional sources for a small premium. LADWP distributed free energy efficient products to encourage customers to take advantage of this program. Solar Rooftops Programs (SRP) offers residential customers a fixed roof lease payment from the LADWP. Solar Rooftops installations provide energy directly to the grid to help LADWP meet the clean energy goals of Los Angeles and California. LADWP performs home evaluations, issues permits, develops designs, and installs the SRP systems at zero cost to

customers. The Shared Solar Program enables residential customers living in multi-family dwellings (e.g. apartments, condominiums, duplexes) to fix a portion of their electric bill against rising utility costs for 10 years. Solar Feed-in Tariff incentivizes local renewable development through public-private partnerships while helping LADWP to achieve its Renewable Portfolio Standard mandates and overall clean energy goals. LADWP's customer-based Net Energy Metering Program (NEM) is a program that helps to offset our customer's energy use with local solar resources. LADWP provides streamlined interconnection services to enable customers to tap into the City's abundant sunshine and provide residents and businesses alike with the ability to generate their own power. The Virtual Net Energy Metering (VNEM) allows property owners and developers to install solar photovoltaic systems on multifamily dwellings. The solar energy generated is then sold to LADWP.

73. CITY PLANTS

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LACP, LADBS, LADWP

Supporting Agencies: Mayor's Office

Funding Source: CDBG, Cal Fire Grants, CA Natural Resources Agency Grants, Private Donations, LADWP Funds

Objective: Provide free shade trees for residents and property owners along with information on where to plant the trees for maximum energy efficiency benefits throughout the eight-year period.

Respective Policies: 3.1.5

In partnership with the Board of Public Works, LADWP offers the City Plants (CP) Program. The program provides free shade trees for residents and property owners in Los Angeles to promote the planting of trees to improve the City's tree canopy, air quality, stormwater retention, and importantly, building energy efficiency. Through City Plants, City residents and property owners are eligible to request and receive up to seven shade trees to plant on their property. Property owners may also request trees to be planted in the parkway in front of their house or business with a commitment to water and care for the tree for three-years until the root system is well established.

74. BUILDING DESIGN AND MATERIALS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LACP, LADBS, LADWP

Supporting Agencies: Mayor's Office

Funding Source: General Fund, LADWP Funds

Objective: Ensure guidelines are developed and updated. Integrate guidelines into all project reviews. Develop and maintain an outreach website.

Respective Policies: 3.1.5, 3.2.5

Provide technical assistance and disseminate information and guidelines to residential developers to encourage energy-efficient residential building design, including: systems that reduce the need for energy use (such as tankless water heaters, green roofs, shade trees, operable windows); building orientation that takes advantage of solar and natural ventilation opportunities; energy-efficient building products for windows, insulation, roofing and other building components. Implement the sustainable building materials requirements of the new LA Green Building Code. Provide technical assistance and disseminate information and guidelines to the residential development community to encourage the use of quality building materials, sustainable materials and practices to protect air quality, water conservation, energy efficiency, etc. Develop and maintain outreach websites on LA's sustainability programs. Publish data regarding energy and water consumption and the need to reduce consumption. Conduct workshops and other education forums.Provide technical assistance and disseminate information and guidelines to residential developers to encourage improved air quality in residential development, including: building orientation that takes advantage of natural ventilation opportunities; filtered air systems; landscaping, venting appliances to the outside; use of low-emitting construction and finish materials.

LADWP's programs encourage developers to build more sustainably by providing financial incentives for commercial and high-rise multifamily new construction projects which exceed Title 24 or industry standards. The program design offers incentives for property owners and design teams. The owner incentives help offset the added costs of building more efficiently. The design teams' incentives encourage attaining aggressive energy savings goals. In addition, applicants receive complimentary design assistance and review to aid them in realizing their projects' maximum efficiency potential.

75. RECYCLING COLLECTION IN RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: DPW (LASAN), Mayor's Office

Funding Source: Citywide Recycling Trust Fund (Private waste hauler fees)

Objective: Provide on-site recycling bins and weekly pickup for all residential developments, Increase landfill diversion to 90% by 2025, Launch residential food scrap collection, by 2025.

Respective Policies: 3.2.5

Provide on-site recycling bins and weekly curbside pickup for all residential developments. Single-family homes and multi-family complexes under five-units are provided with recycling service directly from the City's Bureau of Sanitation. Expand recycling programs citywide to all multi-family complexes on a voluntary basis through a City-contracted waste hauler. In keeping with targets set through the 2019 Green New Deal improve residential waste diversion through programs like composting, recycling and landfill diversion.

76. DIRECT INSTALLATION TO CONSERVE ENERGY AND/OR WATER

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LADWP

Funding Source: LADWP

Objective: Offer ongoing energy efficiency and water conservation opportunities to all of LADWP's residential customers either by energy and water efficiency upgrades, home energy and water assessments with conservation recommendations, or participation in another program. Develop green building incentives programs for existing buildings.

Respective Policies: 3.2.5

LADWP offers its customer free installation service to help residential customers to better control their energy and water consumption and costs. Program offerings include:

- The Home Energy Improvement Program (HEIP) is a comprehensive direct install whole-house retrofit program that offers residential customers a full suite of free products and services to improve the energy and water efficiency in the home by upgrading/retrofitting the home's envelope and core systems. HEIP also reduces water usage resulting in energy savings along with a reduction in associated greenhouse gas emissions. These energy savings and reduction in greenhouse gas emissions are reported as Embedded Energy in Active Water Measures.
- The Air Conditioning Optimization Program (ACOP) provides services by certified Air Conditioning technicians to analyze cooling systems and provide basic maintenance and efficiency services.
- The Residential Lighting Efficiency Program (RLEP) provides free light-emitting diode (LED) lamps to customers to assist in reducing their home electrical use. The distribution of the LED lamps is by way of Direct-to-Door to residential customers in LADWP service territory

Explore ways to encourage additional green building solutions in existing buildings. Strategies might include incentives for existing buildings to perform energy audits and retrofits to Green Building Program standards. Develop a funding program to support green retrofitting of residential structures.

77. COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Goal #: 4, 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: DONE

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Duplicate case files provided to CNCs for proposed projects. Provide notifications to CNCs for filed applications bi-weekly. Post case filing activity on LACP website bi-weekly.

Respective Policies: 4.1.1, 3.2.6, 4.2.2

Maintain the Early Notification System to inform Angelenos and Neighborhood Councils of applications filed at City Planning and completed discretionary cases that have been approved or denied by the Department. Continue providing direct links between City Planning's case reports and Planning Documents Information

System (PDIS) to allow Neighborhood Councils and others to obtain project information online. In addition to paper mailings, continue emailing hearing notices and Letters of Determination (LODs) to applicants, interested parties, relevant council offices, and Neighborhood Councils. Continue posting all public hearing notices and LODs on the Planning website as soon as they are mailed out. Facilitate access to and communication with the Department of City Planning through a Neighborhood Council Liaison position in LACP.

78. URBAN DESIGN STUDIO

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LADBS, BOE, LADOT, Mayor's Office (Chief Design Officer),

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Maintain Urban Design Studio as a division within the LACP; Maintain the Professional Volunteer Program (PVP) and Urban Design Advisory Committee. Develop a Healthy Building Design toolkit by 2022.

Respective Policies: 3.1.3, 3.1.4

Continue to promote and maintain the Urban Design Studio as a resource to review and provide early consultation and guidance on the design of residential and mixed-use projects centered on three design approaches: Pedestrian First Design, 360 Degree Design, and Climate Adapted Design. Continue to utilize the Professional Volunteer Program (PVP) and Urban Design Advisory Committee as a forum for raising the quality of design and enhancing sustainability standards in private development equally throughout the City. Develop a Healthy Building Design toolkit that implements the Health Element to enhance opportunities for healthy and sustainable design in new construction. Identify opportunities to promote environmental justice through design, building on work including the Freeway Adjacency advisory and Clean Up Green Up (CUGU) program.

79. HOUSING AND ECOLOGY

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LADWP, LADBS

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Integrate Landscape Ordinance and Low Impact Development ordinance into project review process. Adopt Wildlife Pilot Study by 2022.

Respective Policies: 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5

Plan for housing that accommodates the unique ecological needs of the City and responds to the climate crisis. In accordance with the City's Landscape Ordinance, promote and facilitate landscape design standards that reduce heat island effects and reduce water and electricity consumption through the inclusion of non-paved areas, shade-producing trees and drought-resistant landscaping. Capture, treat and infiltrate stormwater and urban runoff utilizing the Low Impact Development Ordinance, as well as additional water conservation measures outlined in Programs 70, 77, and 80. Develop and implement design standards that foster ecological diversity in the City's hillsides, riverine and coastal areas, open spaces and Significant Ecological Areas through programs including the Wildlife Pilot Study Ordinance. Evaluate opportunities to further conservation and ecological goals in tandem with housing goals through programs like the Los Angeles River Overlay (RIO). Continue to study and explore how to retain trees and open spaces in new developments to facilitate enhanced health and environmental benefits through collaboration on the Urban Forestry Master Plan. Potentially expand to include passive heating and cooling integration into new developments to ensure health benefits to new inhabitants as well as lower pollution from traditional heating and cooling practices.

80. AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE COASTAL ZONE (MELLO ACT IMPLEMENTATION)

Goal #: 1,2

Lead Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Supporting Agencies: LADWP

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Adopt amendments to the Zoning Code in 2021 to implement inclusionary and replacement housing requirements in the Coastal Zone (Mello Act Ordinance) that result in 250 very low income units; 100 low income units; 75 moderate income units over the course of this Housing Element Cycle.

Respective Policies: 1.1.9, 2.1.1

In accordance with State law (the "Mello Act"), the proposed ordinance aims to to help protect and ensure access to affordable housing in the city's coastal zones by preserving existing affordable housing as well as building the supply of new affordable units. The permanent Ordinance would amend the Zoning Code and the Affordable Housing Incentives Program Guidelines to create requirements for all residential units to either be preserved or replaced onsite at the same income category. Additionally, projects including 5 or more new units would be required to provide new inclusionary units at the same rates required by the Density Bonus Ordinance. Replacement Units and Inclusionary units require recordation of covenants to ensure provision of the required affordable housing units for at least 55 years.

81. COMMUNITY LEVEL AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMS

Goal #: 1,2

Lead Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: By 2029, establish community-level affordable housing programs through the adoption of Community Plan updates and other neighborhood plans. Achieve an increased production of affordable housing units in updated Community Plan and neighborhood plan areas, over current production levels. Track affordable housing production in areas with community level affordable housing programs and areas with established overlays, to ensure that identified goals are met. Through annual monitoring, lidentify additional identify plans that are not producing the amount of anticipated units and propose amendments.

Respective Policies: 1.1.2, 1.1.6, 1.1.7, 1.2.6, 1.3.2, 2.1.1

With each major community or local planning effort (e.g. Community Plans, CPIOs, Specific Plans, TNPs, and Zoning ordinances) balance the facilitation of new residential development, preservation of naturally affordable multi-family housing and the inclusion of affordable housing in new residential development. Use data collected through Program 51, Database for Evaluating Housing Need, to identify sections of the city where demographics do not align with housing stock, such as areas with large aging populations and lack of certain housing types. Make improvements to the local density bonus and TOC programs by providing more tailored land-use incentives and market-based affordable housing provisions to meet local needs, such as large family units, senior units, and

evolving multi-generational living. Facilitate affordable housing development in existing Specific Plans that include such provisions, including Playa Vista, Central City West and Cornfield Arroyo Seco (CASP), various CPIOs, and TNPs. The Downtown Community Plan proposes a Community Benefits Program that provides a path for development projects to build larger buildings, in exchange for providing community benefits that prioritizes affordable housing, followed by a mix of other benefit types (see Program 65). Explore the feasibility of creating inclusionary requirements in the Warner Center Specific Plan, the Downtown Community Plan, and other areas identified in an inclusionary study where such a requirement can add value by complementing existing incentive programs and, the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee and result in more affordable housing overall.

82. ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: DOD

Funding Source: General Fund, Building Permit Fees, CDBG

Objective: Foster and maintain compliance with fair housing law by making reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities and making improvements to outreach and process. Train all project planning and development services City Planning staff on facilitating Reasonable Accommodation requests; Produce and disseminate informational materials regarding Reasonable Accommodation process at development services centers; Process 5 requests annually based on applications received; Amend the Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance Instructions and Findings in 2022.

Respective Policies: 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.5

DOD will work with City Departments to coordinate the City's compliance with the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Monitor compliance and ensure reasonable accommodation to people who use all City programs and facilities. LACP will assess the need for amendments to the reasonable accommodation provision in the Zoning Code which facilitates modifications to housing units occupied by persons with disabilities. Develop staff training resources regarding implementation of the reasonable accommodation provision. Improve application forms, outreach, advertising and informational materials to increase use of the reasonable accommodation provision by people with disabilities. Amend the Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance Instructions and Findings form to allow

options for those persons with disabilities unable to submit their request in writing and make clear that written responses to the required findings section are an optional opportunity to provide information and not required.

83. OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROGRAM (DRP)

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: OCA

Objective: Refer and resolve 20 housing-related disputes annually.

Respective Policies: 4.1.4

Refer persons with landlord/tenant and neighbor/neighbor housing-related conflicts, and housing disputes concerning physical access (i.e., architectural) and HIV/AIDS discrimination (i.e., rental discrimination) and who utilize DOD's referral services to the OCA's Dispute Resolution Program for mediation, conciliation and facilitation services.

84. CITYWIDE FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Objective: Receive 800 fair housing inquiries annually. Resolve 500 fair housing investigations annually. Conduct 50 fair housing training sessions annually. Train 6 full-time new fair housing testers annually. Maintain the Housing Hotline. The Citywide Fair Housing program will also reduce disparities in access to opportunity by providing education and outreach through social media platforms, literature distribution and discussion groups.

Respective Policies: 4.1.4, 4.1.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3

Through a contract with a fair housing agency for the City, the Citywide Fair Housing Program will reach over 50,000 households by providing tenants' rights education. The program will also provide resolution to illegal housing discrimination by accepting and investigating housing discrimination complaints that allege a violation of federal, state, or local fair housing law (i.e. complaints concerning advertising, lending, insurance, steering, blockbusting and hate crimes). Provide remedies for valid complaints, including conciliations, legal

action and administrative referrals to state and federal fair housing agencies. Provide counseling, education, and training about fair housing laws rights, and responsibilities to persons residing, seeking housing, or providing housing in the City of Los Angeles. These trainings include information about reasonable accomodations and ADA requirements. Conduct proactive testing to determine patterns and practices of discrimination. Provide information about home equity fraud and predatory lending scams to residents through a free telephone hotline and other information tools.

85. JUST CAUSE EVICTION PROGRAM

Goal #: 2, 5

Lead: LAHD

Objectives: Present a Just Cause Eviction report to the City Council by 2023 in order to stabilize neighborhoods and, prevent tenant displacement and arbitrary evictions for tenants in an estimated 220,000 non-RSO rental units.

Respective Policies: 2.1.4, 4.1.4, 5.1.2

Prepare a Just Cause Eviction report by 2023. If adopted by the City Council, a Just Cause eviction ordinance would provide eviction protections for tenants of approximately 220,000 non-rent stabilized rental units (non-RSO), as permitted under the California Tenant Protection Act of 2019 (AB 1482), which provides modest eviction protections for rental units constructed more than 15 years ago, and permits local jurisdictions to adopt more robust tenant protections on evictions. Such protections could include the requirement for relocation assistance for no-fault evictions; requirements for landlords to file notifications with LAHD for no-fault evictions from rental units; and provide remedies for illegal evictions to renters in non-RSO rental units.

86. TENANT ANTI-HARASSMENT

Goal #: 2, 4

Lead: LAHD

Objectives: Beginning in 2021, prevent and deter harassment and constructive eviction of tenants through illegal actions by implementing the newly adopted Tenant Anti-Harassment Ordinance. Partner with community-based organizations to target outreach to areas with high displacement risk (as identified through Program 122) and in Low-Resource and High Segregation & Poverty areas.

Respective Policies: 2.1.4, 4.1.4

In 2021, the City passed a Tenant Anti-Harassment Ordinance that was strongly supported by tenant rights' organizations. The City, in partnership with tenant organizations, are now conducting outreach and education on the Ordinance to inform the public on what constitutes tenant harassment, inform tenants of their legal rights and how to prevent and respond to tenant harassment and refer tenant complaints to appropriate programs or agencies for resolution. The City is also maintaining records of harassment complaints and referrals in order to assess future staffing and program needs. Based on initial data from the Police Department, tenant harassment disproportionately impacts BIPOC tenants and tenants in lower-income areas and areas facing displacement pressure.

87. STRENGTHEN ENFORCEMENT OF ELLIS ACT PROVISIONS

Goal #: 2

Lead: LAHD

Objectives: Identify Ellis Replacement units. Continue to process Ellis filings of yearly average of 584. Strengthen monitoring and enforcement efforts by aligning Ellis related tenant protections with SB 8 tenant protections beginning in 2021, revising tenant and landlord communications by June 2023 to improve the understanding of tenant rights, increasing relocation amounts to adjust for CPI annually and conducting a fee study in 2022 to determine changes to relocation amounts.

Respective Policies: 2.1.4, 2.1.5

The City has implemented various amendments to the Ellis Act to strengthen tenant protections and no net loss of affordable housing units including: adding failure to comply with RSO Ellis requirements as affirmative defense in unlawful detainer proceedings, providing a right to return to displaced tenants if withdrawn units are re-rented within 10 years; and requiring a higher percent of required affordable units in order to qualify for an RSO exemption. During the next eight years, the City will continue monitoring of Ellis withdrawals and enforcement of the LAMC to preserve RSO units, prevent displacement of tenants, and ensure relocation assistance to tenants. Beginning in 2021, the City will align Ellis related tenant protections with SB 8 tenant protections to ensure extended tenancies, relocation payment and right of return. The City will start a fee study to assess changes to the relocation amounts.

88. EVICTION DEFENSE PROGRAM

Goal #: 2

Lead: LAHD

Funding Sources: Federal funds, SB 2 Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA)

Objectives: Conduct outreach to 200,000 tenants through 'Know-Your-Rights' workshops and legal referrals each year and provide full and limited-scope legal service to 6,000 low-income tenants per year. Prioritize outreach and service-delivery in High Segregation & Poverty Areas and areas facing displacement pressure by partnering with organizations with a trusted history of serving these communities

Respective Policies: 2.1.4, 1.1.9

In 2021, the City launched a COVID-response Eviction Defense Program (EDP) using COVID Relief funding from the Federal Government. The Eviction Defense Program aims to promote housing stability by implementing and monitoring a set of services including: education and outreach for landlords and tenants through 'Know-Your-Rights' educational materials and tenant clinics, as well as pre-eviction and ongoing legal assistance paired with the option of short-term rental assistance. The program is implemented through a network of community-based organizations that have a history of and commitment to serving the needs of lower-income renters and BIPOC communities. The EDP implementation process will include data evaluation of program services delivered and client demographics. The City is now exploring funding options to extend the program in subsequent years and will evaluate the feasibility of establishing a tenant's "Right to Counsel" Program. Through 2026, some households at or below 30% AMI receiving support will be eligible for rental assistance to help stabilize families experiencing extreme economic hardship.

89. RSO TENANT/LANDLORD OUTREACH AND EDUCATION PROGRAM

Goal: #2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Objective: Conduct or facilitate at least 200 annual public presentations, including Property Management Training Program presentations, community presentations, landlord/tenant workshops/webinars, drop-in sessions, and fair housing clinics. Partner with community-based organizations to target outreach to areas with high displacement risk and High Segregation & Poverty areas.

Respective Policies: 2.1.4, 2.2.4, 4.2.1, 4.2.2

Educate landlords, brokers, property managers, tenants, and the general public on the RSO and Code Enforcement programs as well as their rights and responsibilities under the Los Angeles Municipal Code through a combination of state of the art technology and traditional community outreach methods. Distribute information through print materials and media outlets. In-person outreach efforts shifted to online due to COVID-19 pandemic. Social media platforms, webinars, etc. were utilized to raise awareness and continue the outreach endeavor. Partner with community-based organizations to target outreach to areas with high displacement risk and High Segregation & Poverty areas. Ensure that outreach is conducted in a way that affirmatively furthers fair housing by incorporating language justice principles and accessibility considerations and modifications for people with disabilities.

90. TENANT/COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITY TO PURCHASE

Goal #: 2

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: LACP

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Report to City Council on the potential for a citiwide COPA/TOPA ordinance by 2025.

Respective Policies: 2.2.1, 4.2.1, 1.2.1

Promote the use of SB 1079 (2020), which created a new foreclosure sale process for 2-4 unit buildings that allows qualified parties a means to purchase property in foreclosure, subject to certain requirements. Provide technical assistance and support to SB 1079 implementation efforts to achieve an effective notification system. Building off this state law, consider creation of a local tenant/community opportunity to purchase (TOPA/COPA) ordinance that would cover a wider array of buildings outside of foreclosure, including rental housing with expiring federal and/or state subsidies and/or affordability protections. Pursue funding sources, including grants and loans, to assist tenant and community based organizations purchase multi-family buildings. Require purchasers to preserve units as permanently affordable. Promote the creation of City or non-profit ownership entities that could acquire affordable ownership units and

buildings. Assist former tenants in purchasing units converted to condos per LAMC 12.95.

91. HOUSING LEGAL SERVICES FOR SENIORS

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: LADoA

Funding Source: CDBG

Objective: Assist 200 seniors with legal advice each year

Respective Policies: 4.1.4

Citywide legal services available at 16 Multipurpose Senior Centers (MPC) to assist seniors in various legal issues including housing related laws, landlord/tenant disputes, government benefits, nursing home law and powers of attorney.

92. COMPREHENSIVE HOMELESS STRATEGY

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: CAO, LAHD, LACP, HACLA, OCA

Supporting Agencies: LAHSA, Mayor's Office, All

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Continue to monitor and report quarterly on the ongoing responsibilities and measurable actions the City of Los Angeles (City) is taking to combat homelessness. Make adjustments or additions based on emerging challenges and opportunities.

Respective Policies: 5.1.2, 5.1.4

The enhanced Comprehensive Homeless Strategy (CHS), adopted by the Mayor and City Council on March 19, 2019, describes ongoing responsibilities and measurable actions the City of Los Angeles is taking to combat homelessness. The enhanced CHS builds upon the original CHS adopted in February 2016, and serves as a blueprint for City Departments to achieve the City's goal to achieve

functional zero homelessness. The Enhanced CHS is organized into six functional strategies: (1) Governance, Accountability and Budget; (2) Planning, Coordination, Modeling and Prioritization; (3) Policy; (4) Program/Systems; (5) Annual Evaluation; and (6) Partner Acknowledgement and Awards. These functional strategies are designed to include the actions needed for an effective response to homelessness, and ensure communication and collaboration between City Departments, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) and the County of Los Angeles. This structure also accurately represents the work of strategy leads and will more clearly present the outcomes of this work throughout implementation. The CHS is designed to be a living document that can be adjusted as conditions change or lessons are learned during implementation. As Policy strategies are implemented they may lead to changes and adjustments in Program/Systems Strategies. Likewise, challenges encountered during Programs/Systems strategy implementation may point to the need for adjustments to Policy strategies. Compile Quarterly Performance Reports on the Enhaced CHS relating to status updates, action steps and updateing strategy metrics.

93. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SHELTER PROGRAM

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: CIFD

Objective: Provide 1,500 individuals with access to public services annually. Maintain 580 shelter and transitional beds annually for domestic violence victims.

Respective Policies: 5.1.3

Provide safe and secure emergency and transitional shelter, case management and related supportive services to domestic violence survivors and their children through contracted operators. Assist persons in crisis situations with counseling, job skill and job search training, and other services.

94. HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH AIDS (HOPWA)

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Objective: Provide between 2,618-4,613 clients with supportive services annually. Assist between 25,140 - 36,000 clients seeking HIV/AIDS housing information annually.

Respective Policies: 4.1.1, 4.1.4

Provide low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS with services to help locate, obtain, and maintain appropriate and affordable housing, and improve/obtain financial resources and benefits, employment, health care, food and nutrition services, mental health and substance abuse counseling, and legal services. Finance long-term housing with supportive services designed to enable homeless persons with mental and physical disabilities to live as independently as possible in a permanent setting.

95. PROBLEM SOLVING INTERVENTIONS

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Reduce the number of people experiencing homelessness through ongoing training to frontline staff providing assistance.

Respective Policies: 5.1.2, 5.1.3

LAHSA's Problem Solving program has provided training to staff in other County and City departments to assist people they interface with in navigating a housing crisis, and when necessary, providing them with access to one-time flexible financial assistance to solve that housing crisis. The program aims to reduce the overall number of people experiencing homelessness. Identifies people experiencing a housing crisis by working with mainstream social services systems before they fall into homelessness.

96. EMERGENCY SHELTER AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FACILITIES

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Supporting Agencies: CAO, HACLA

Funding Source: Countk Measure H, State CoC HEAP and HHAP

Objective: Fund 6,205 existing emergency shelter beds (including winter shelter) annually. Fund 980 existing transitional housing beds annually. Create 1000 permanent supportive and transitional housing units from nonresidential uses such as hotels and motels.

Respective Policies: 5.1.1, 5.1.5

Fund the operating and supportive services costs of existing facilities and programs providing emergency and transitional housing to homeless persons citywide, including A Bridge Home City-constructed interim housing facilities. The CAO will coordinate review of potential A Bridge Home sites and convenes a weekly Interim Housing/Temporary Structures Working Group to expedite implementation of A Bridge Home Initiative. HACLA will partner with other housing organizations to provide transitional housing opportunities using a variety of models: bridge housing, safe parking locations, and motel/hotel conversions. HACLA is currently leasing a property on Imperial to City of LA for a 100-bed bridge housing site which will be co-located with the HACLA Watts/Los Angeles WorkSource Center (the first in the City/County), partnering with WLCAC to use 50 parking spaces in one of its office parking lots for the Safe Parking program, partnering with Caltrans to use 26 single-family homes and duplexes in El Sereno for a family-based transitional housing program, and participating in providing transitional housing through Project Homekey sites. Utilize Project Homekey funding, along with project based vouchers and City funding to create 1000 permanent supportive and transitional housing from nonresidential uses like hotels, motels, and on public land. HACLA through its Strategic Growth Council grant, Transforming Climate Communities will be planting trees to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Watts and will be adding the Electric Vehicle charging stations as part of its EV Car Share pilot for residents and for HACLA's commercial vehicle fleet. HACLA will continue to evaluate the success of these programs and its alignment with Regional initiatives to gauge for expansion opportunities city-wide. Assess the need for additional interim strategies and implement short- and medium-term strategies to address unanticipated critical needs while long-term solutions are implemented.

97. OVERNIGHT SHELTER (WINTER SHELTER AND YEAR-ROUND SHELTER)

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Funding Source: ESG, City and County General Fund

Objective: Provide 5,036 temporary shelter beds year round and 1,169 temporary winter shelter beds annually.

Respective Policies: 5.1.1, 5.1.4

Provide temporary shelter to homeless men and women through a Winter Shelter program (December 1st through March 15th) for a single night at a time (14 hour stay), and to men, women and families through a Year Round shelter program. Provide vouchers for low cost hotels/motels for persons not suited to large group shelters including elderly persons and people with communicable diseases.

98. FAMILY SOLUTIONS SYSTEM

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: ESG, HPI

Objective: Initiate seven regional Family Solution Systems throughout the Los Angeles Continuum of Care (CoC). Serve approximately 1,200 homeless and at-risk persons per year.

Respective Policies: 5.1.2, 5.1.4

The Family Solutions System (FSS) is a new system of service delivery in Los Angeles County, developed to improve and expedite the delivery of housing and other supportive services to homeless families in Los Angeles County. The Family Solutions System (FSS) was developed by a collaboration of partner organizations and adopted in 2013 by the Los Angeles Homeless Continuum of Care. Key to the Family Solutions System (FSS) is standardized assessment and coordinated access, which reduces the time it takes for families to find the appropriate and right-sized services they need. FSS provides families with services that keep them together and connected to their own local community. In addition to direct services, the FSS also has the added ability to provide direct financial assistance for rapid rehousing, including a security deposit for an apartment; partial rent for three months or a motel voucher and utilities, etc.

99. HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION AND RAPID RE-HOUSING PROGRAM (HPRP)

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: Mayor's Office, LAHSA

Supporting Agencies: CAO, HACLA, LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Increase the number of persons or households enrolled in RRH and those who have moved into permanent housing.

Respective Policies: 5.1.1, 5.1.3, 5.1.4

Expand homelessness prevention, diversion and rapid re-housing (RRH) efforts through strengthening coordination with LAHSA and Los Angeles County, developing policies to support innovative approaches and practices, increasing capacity to serve homeless persons/households, and enhancing access to RRH services. LAHSA will strengthen collaboration efforts with supporting agencies and RRH programs; Identify and maintain inventory of all known and available RRH programs; Perform sound fiscal administration to ensure access to rental assistance and other financial assistance when needed; Determine and update appropriate supportive services (e.g. case management and financial assistance) for all RRH programs and their participants; Coordinate landlord/ property management recruitment and engagement activities; Through the LeaseUp program, provide information to homeless service providers to connect homeless voucher holders with newly constructed Extremely Low Income units in TOC projects; Match participants to RRH resources through the LA County Coordinated Entry System (CES); Strengthen coordination efforts with HACLA and other City/County departments in order to facilitate program transfers to PSH and other forms of subsidized permanent housing with intensive supportive services.

100. VETERANS AFFAIRS SUPPORTIVE HOUSING (VASH)

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Supporting Agencies: LAHSA

Funding Source: HUD, VA

Objective: Maintain 3,000 housing vouchers for formerly homeless Veterans.

Respective Policies: 5.1.1, 5.1.3

The HUD Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program combines Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) rental assistance for homeless Veterans with case management and clinical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). VA provides these services for participating Veterans at VA medical centers (VAMCs) and community-based outreach clinics.

101. JOB TRAINING AND PLACEMENT FOR HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Objective: Provide educational/vocational training and employment placement/ retention services to 1000 homeless persons annually.

Respective Policies: 5.1.1, 5.1.2

Increase economic opportunity for homeless persons through educational or vocational training, employment placement and retention services through the shelter system and affordable housing developments.

102. MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION VOUCHER

Goal #: 2, 4, 5

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Supporting Agencies: LACDA

Funding Sources: HUD (NOFA Mobility Demonstration Voucher)

Objective: Provide voucher assistance and mobility-related services to families with children to encourage such families to better access low-poverty neighborhoods with high-performing schools and other strong community resources. Together with the Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA), provide 1,950 new Mobility Demonstration Vouchers per year for six years beginning in 2022 for households interested in living in high opportunity areas. This goal will be reevaluated annually based on federal funding availability.

Respective Policies: 2.1.2, 3.2.2, 4.1.4, 5.1.2

The Section 8 Department was awarded $4.8M under HUD's NOFA Mobility Demonstration Voucher, including 37 new vouchers. This award will provide voucher assistance and mobility-related services to families with children to encourage such families to move to lower-poverty areas, to expand their access to opportunity areas, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies pursued under the Demonstration. The award includes a significant budget allocation to provide comprehensive and selected mobility-related services to participant families, including but not limited to, pre- and post-move supports, family financial assistance (e.g., security deposits), property owner outreach, and housing search assistance and navigation in low poverty areas, as well as administrative policies such as adequate payment standards in opportunity areas and extended voucher search times. The Mobility Demonstration Program will take place over the course of six years. This program will be administered in partnership with Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA), with HACLA as lead agency. It is expected that over the course of these six years approximately 1,950 vouchers will be provided

103. MISSING MIDDLE

Goal #: 1, 4

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agency: LADBS

Funding Sources: General Fund, REAP Grant

Objective: Assess and facilitate efforts to find alternative housing solutions for senior citizens.

Respective Policies: 1.1.8, 4.3.2., 4.3.3

As identified in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, Los Angeles produces very little Missing Middle housing stock due to the many barriers for its development. Missing Middle housing, refers to a variety of low-scale multi-family housing typologies (typically from three to 20 units on a regular sized residential lot). Through a variety of implementation actions, City Planning will seek to introduce more flexible zoning standards and incentives to create opportunities for more low-scale multi-unit housing typologies, particularly in Higher Opportunity Areas. These typologies include multiplexes, townhomes/rowhouses, additional affordable ADUs, bungalow courts, and other contextual/historical Los Angeles typologies. Efforts to enable missing middle housing include updates to the zoning code, community planning, building process streamlining, and citywide

efforts. The Zoning Code revision (Program 60) is creating the necessary planning tools, developing new types of zoning and development standards more amenable to a variety of missing middle typologies. New zoning standards and incentives will be introduced through local planning efforts such as Community Plans and Transit Neighborhood Plans (Program 65), as well as through the citywide Rezoning Program and affordable housing incentive update (Programs 48 and 121). While missing middle typologies are typically more naturally affordable than the type of housing they replace and present challenges to the implementation of typical value capture approaches, different types of creative affordability requirements will be evaluated through a planned economic feasibility study as part of these citywide programs (see CF 21-0037). The Mayor's Office and LADBS plan to develop standardized plans similar to that for ADUs (see Program 60) for certain types of low rise multifamily including duplexes, fourplexes, bungalow courts, townhomes, rowhouses, etc. pursuant to CF 21-0061. This program may additionally overlap with Program 3 to enable more affordable types of ownership in smaller scale typologies. Also see Programs 48, 59, 60, 62, 65, and 121.

104. RENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS HOUSEHOLDS

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Objective: Maintain 4,615 Housing Choice Vouchers to homeless individuals or households annually.

Respective Policies: 5.1.2, 5.2.4

Provide HUD Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers to qualifying homeless families. Provide supportive services to help homeless households make the transition to stable, affordable housing. Pursue local administrative changes in order to expedite application processes and facilitate voucher portability across jurisdictions.

105. RENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS HOUSEHOLDS WITH DISABILITIES

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: CAO, HACLA

Objective: Maintain housing for 2,400 homeless households with disabilities annually.

Respective Policies: 5.1.1, 5.1.3, 5.1.5

Provide rental assistance and supportive services for homeless persons with disabilities, specifically those with serious mental illness, chronic substance abuse problems and/or HIV/AIDS through four components: 1) tenant-based rental assistance; 2) sponsor-based rental assistance; 3) project-based rental assistance; and 4) SRO moderate rehabilitation rental assistance. Pursue local administrative changes in order to expedite application processes and facilitate voucher portability across jurisdictions. Pursue coordination with LAHD to improve and facilitate utilization of project-based Shelter Plus Care assistance.

106. RESOURCES FOR HOUSING SERVING THE MENTALLY ILL

Goal #: 1,4

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Supporting Agencies: LAHD, HACLA, Mayor's Office

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Pursue funding toward permanent housing units for homeless mentally ill annually.

Respective Policies: 1.1.5, 4.1.4

Coordinate with the Federal, State and County Governments to access and leverage mental health funding.

107. PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR HOMELESS PERSONS

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Objective: Maintain 1,477 permanent supportive housing units for homeless households annually.

Respective Policies: 5.1.1, 5.1.3, 5.2.4

Provide long-term housing with supportive services designed to enable homeless persons with mental and physical disabilities to live as independently as possible in a permanent setting. Target the regular turnover of Permanent Supportive Housing units to place and serve the chronically homeless in those units. Fund the maintenance and operating and supportive services costs of Permanent Supportive Housing serving homeless persons with special needs citywide. Allocate funds to ensure integrated case management series will continue at PSH units, especially after Measure H sunsets.

108. HOMELESS HOUSING AND SERVICES COORDINATION (NO WRONG DOOR)

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: Mayor's Office, LAHSA

Funding Source: General Fund, Home for Good Initiative, LA County

Objective: Implement "No Wrong Door" policy citywide annually. Provide 7,500 annual referrals to supportive services from several sources, including referrals to services from outreach teams, from City-funded FamilySource Centers, and from City-funded access centers, and other sources. Provide 5,000 annual referrals to interim housing from outreach teams, City-funded FamilySource Centers, City funded access centers, and other sources.

Respective Policies: 5.1.4, 5.2.2

Coordinate with LAHSA, the County, and other government and non-profit agencies to develop plans to reduce and end homelessness and to implement homeless policies and programs. Facilitate implementation of "No Wrong Door" strategy whereby a homeless individual can connect to adequate homeless services regardless what Department the person contacts. Participate in regular coordinating efforts and ensure that the needs of all sectors of the homeless population are addressed. Coordinate the local distribution of public funding sources for the effective use of resources and program implementation. Monitor LAHSA's financial and contract management to ensure effective, efficient program implementation consistent with the City's goals. Provide access to "No Wrong Door" materials to participating departments and oversee Citywide implementation of "No Wrong Door." Collect metrics from participating departments and share progress of implementation and reach of campaign. Facilitate the development and implementation of a training course for frontdesk and field staff who may interact directly with, or support community members' interactions with, individuals who are seeking resources. LAHSA will provide expertise in refinement and development of informational materials that are effective in connecting homeless persons interacting with City departments

with needed non-City resources. LAHSA will also assist in developing messaging around access to the Coordinated Entry System and the broader resources available to support participants in City services who are experiencing or at risk of homelessness.

109. COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM (CES)

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Supporting Agencies: CAO

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Decrease the average need and acuity level of persons or households who have obtained permanent housing (acuity score), as well as the average length of time from housing match to actual housing move-in (days). Increase the number of households matched to permanent supportive housing resources through CES.

Respective Policies: 5.1.4, 5.2.2, 5.2.4

Strengthen the Coordinated Entry System to function as a tool to efficiently and effectively place homeless persons into housing and/or services that meet their needs and choices. LAHSA will develop procedures, tools, and training needed to effectively implement CES Policies and build the capacity of existing and new CES participating agencies. Improve CES access, system connection, and collaboration across populations and systems to support vulnerable persons experiencing or at risk of homelessness accessing CES (i.e. adults, families with children, transition aged youth, veterans, victims of domestic violence). Enhance matching infrastructure to ensure timely and efficient placement into housing matched through CES. Improve data collection and quality of key system indicators for tracking homelessness. Strengthen regional coordination activities to ensure a consistent and coordinated regional response to homelessness.

110. ACCESS NEW RESOURCES AND SERVICES FOR THE HOMELESS

Goal #: 5,4

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Supporting Agencies: Mayor's Office, CAO, CLA

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Regular reports on financial management; Regular reports on contract management and program implementation; Report on applicability of Standards for Excellence criteria being developed by Home for Good.

Respective Policies: 5.1.1, 5.1.4, 5.2.2

Monitor Federal, State and County legislative and budgetary initiatives that affect homeless persons, including homeless subpopulations with special needs, such as persons with disabilities. Report on such initiatives and make recommendations to the City. Engage in legislative advocacy efforts. Explore new resources and services for homeless persons with special needs.

111. BIENNIAL HOMELESS COUNT

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Supporting Agencies: Mayor's Office

Funding Source: HUD

Objective: Biennial count and survey of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons residing in the Los Angeles CoC area. Periodic reports on homeless housing and service delivery and recommendations for improvement.

Respective Policies: 5.2.1

Coordinate the biennial point-in-time Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count for the Los Angeles Continuum of Care (CoC) as part of the national effort to enumerate the homeless population required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Continue to include the following components in order to further capture as accurate a count as possible: 1) The Unsheltered Street Count; 2) The Sheltered and Institution Count; 3) The Demographic Survey; and 4) The Survey to Identify the Hidden Homeless. Provide a City Homeless Coordinator (seperate from CAO's homeless coordinator) to: regularly convene stakeholders; conduct research and evaluation; identify gaps in housing and services; improve access to and delivery of services. Liaise with the County and regional agencies that provide housing and services to homeless persons.

112. HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (HMIS) DATA COLLECTION

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Objective: All providers receiving City funding shall participate in HMIS. The standard performance target for Emergency Shelter sites is the maintenance of an average bed utilization rate of 95%.

Respective Policies: 5.2.1

Support homeless service providers in the implementation of the HUD-required HMIS to gather data on individuals and families who use homeless service systems. Collect and analyze data over time to better identify service needs, barriers to accessing services, and program-, region-, and system-wide results. Share data on clients with other service providers. Continue HMIS User Group Forums, a discussion series that helps generate ideas for further innovations to help ease use of the system. Develop and expand a comprehensive Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP- See Program 99) data quality process to ensure that information collected exceeds HUD's quality standards.

113. TEMPORARY HOUSING FACILITIES FOR DISASTER RESPONSE

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: EMD
Supporting Agencies: EOO, RAP, LAHD, LAUSD

Funding Source: DHS/FEMA, General Fund

Objective: Establish coordination of facilities and services throughout the City within 24 hours of a disaster.

Respective Policies: 3.3.3

Establish partnerships with supporting City Departments and community organizations to develop a disaster preparedness, response and recovery plan to meet temporary housing needs in the event of a disaster, including: identification of hotels/motels and short term rentals for emergency stays; identification of recreation centers and school sites to be used as temporary shelters and/

or providing furnishings (such as beds, chairs) as well as activating the EOC and BOC processes which include facilitating donations for victims of disaster. Establish housing information and referral services which are activated in the event of a disaster. Coordinate special needs services to assist with issues such as accessibility of sites/ facilities and services for the elderly, disabled and evacuees with pets. Conduct safety (damage) assessment inspection of buildings.

114. OUTREACH AND TRAINING FOR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: EMD

Supporting Agencies: EOO, LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Conduct four fairs during Emergency Preparedness Month annually and outreach to neighborhood and community groups as requested.

Respective Policies: 3.3.1, 3.3.2

Conduct in-person and virtual outreach activities such as webinar series with councilmembers and elected officials and training with neighborhood and community groups to prepare residents and businesses for emergencies. Disseminate information through EMD publications, outreach activities and the internet. Implement and expand the Ready your LA Neighborhood (RYLAN) Program to encourage communities to develop disaster planning resources and networks. Provide citywide training programs. Provide emergency management training to City employees.

115. ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR HOMELESS HOUSING

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHSA

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Adopt amendment to zoning code to facilitate by-right siting of shelter and transitional housing facilities by 2025. Identify areas with lower concentrations of shelter, transitional and permanent supportive housing and create zoning provisions to ease restrictions in these geographies.

Respective Policies: 5.1.5

Identify and adopt changes to the Zoning Code to facilitate by-right siting of a greater variety of shelter, transitional and permanent supportive housing facilities throughout the City (such as larger facilities, different development standards, different performance standards, etc.). Identify citywide land use initiatives to facilitate shorter development timelines and reduce costs for the development of affordable housing projects for persons at-risk of homelessness to be adopted as appropriate. Continue to facilitate the easier conversion of hotel/motels and other non-conforming buildings to homeless housing using the Adaptive Reuse Ordiance (see Program 13). Utilize public sites identified in the citywide inventory (Program 15) to identify locations for temporary and permanent facilities for homeless individuals. Identify zoning provisions that help service providers prioritize development in sections of the city that currently have less shelter, transitional and permanent supportive housing.

116. ZONING FOR HEALTH-BASED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: DOD

Funding Source: General Fund

Objective: Adopt amendments to Zoning Code to remove restrictions on locations of community care, public health and residential treatment program facilities by 2025.

Respective Policies: 5.1.5, 5.2.6

Facilitate siting of housing and services for all persons, including those with special needs. Implement SB 2 (2007) to remove barriers for transitional and supportive housing that includes on or off-site supportive services, including health care facilities. Eliminate Zoning Code provisions that restrict locations of public health, community care facilities and residential-based treatment

programs, in order to comply with federal and state fair housing laws and facilitate different residential types for those with special needs.

117. ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS PERSONS IN ACCESSING HOUSING AND SERVICES

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Funding Source: SHP, CDBG

Objective: Continue funding 9 organizations to reach 300 or more homeless individuals; Explore expanding outreach funding to community based organizations within the City.

Respective Policies: 5.2.1, 5.2.2

Fund community-based organizations to provide outreach and referral assistance to homeless persons including: housing referrals; food, blankets and other necessities; needs assessment and engagement in social services; medical, mental health and/or substance abuse services. Assist clients to move off the streets or out of places not meant for human habitation and into any form of housing.

118. COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION CENTER/INFORMATION & REFERRALS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Goal #: 3

Lead Agencies: DOD

Objective: Assist 150 or more clients seeking homeless services, landlord/tenant dispute resolution assistance, and housing resource referrals annually.

Respective Policies: 5.1.4, 5.1.5

Provide assistance to callers seeking social service programs for homeless services and housing resource referrals in times of need and crisis. Assess the need/crisis via client intake, locate appropriate resource/service provider, and explain programs offered by the community-based organization and/or government agency.

119. NEIGHBORHOOD AWARENESS OF SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Goal #: 4, 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Funding Source: CDBG, General Fund

Objective: Establish outreach curriculum; Pursue ongoing funding for training program.

Respective Policies: 4.1.4, 5.2.2

Pursue funding for community organizations and advocates to conduct outreach and disseminate information regarding housing approaches for special needs populations.

120. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO HOMELESS HOUSING PROVIDERS

Goal #: 5

Lead Agencies: LAHSA

Funding Source: CDBG

Objective: Provide Technical assistance to 50 providers annually

Respective Policies: 5.2.3

Fund technical assistance training to new and existing homeless housing providers regarding the development and funding of emergency, transitional and permanent housing facilities for homeless persons. Distribute informational material and conduct workshops. Provide outcomes report training for funding recipients. Fund outside agencies to provide technical assistance to LAHSA in a variety of areas relating to homeless services. These areas include: assistance with the completion of the Continuum of Care SuperNOFA; 6-78 Adopted December 3, 2013 Los Angeles Department of City Planning Chapter 6 Housing Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs Housing Element 2013-2021 program analysis and development; executive level assistance to LAHSA and the City of Los Angeles; Short-Term housing directory; program linkages & workshops; state policy and support for homeless re-entry program.

121. RHNA RE-ZONING

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grant

Objective: Citywide Rezoning to meet RHNA Targets by 2024. Annual reporting to indicate any loss in capacity that could require additional rezoning.

Respective Policies: 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3.1

To accommodate the remaining RHNA of 255,432 units, LACP will identify and recommend rezoning for a minimum of 124,880 moderate and above moderate units and a minimum of 130,553 lower income (VLI and LI) units by October 30, 2024. More than 50% of lower income rezoning will occur on sites with exclusively residential uses or allowing 100% residential uses. All lower income sites will have a density allowance of at least a minimum 20 units per acre. Rezoned sites will permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily uses by right pursuant to CA Govt. Code § 65583.2(i) for developments in which 20 percent or more of the units are affordable to lower income households and will be selected from sites identified in the parcel listing (Appendix 4.7). As reflected in Appendix 4.7, each development site has the capacity to accommodate at least 16 units and will be available for development in the planning period where water, sewer, and dry utilities can be provided.

The Rezoning Program is anticipated to be implemented through a number of work efforts including updates to up to 16 Community Plans (four West LA plans and six SE/SW Valley plans, two Downtown plans, Boyle Heights, Hollywood, Harbor-Gateway and Wilmington), two Specific Plans (CASP and Slauson TNP) as well as at least one citywide ordinance that will create additional zoning capacity through an expansion of affordable housing incentive programs (Density Bonus Update - See Program 48) or other zoning code amendments, as further described below.

The Program will respond to the findings of the AFFH analysis in Chapter 1 and Chapter 4 by including strategies that advance equity. It is anticipated to focus a majority of the additional capacity in Higher Opportunity areas with good access to jobs and/or transit, with protections for vulnerable communities and environmentally sensitive areas, such as areas vulnerable to Sea Level Rise and wildfire risk. The program will carefully consider the creation of a diversity of housing types to expand more naturally affordable and deed-restricted affordable

options. The Program will explore the creation of enhanced community benefits for rezoned properties, including longer affordability terms, more affordable units of a greater income mix, displacement avoidance of RSO tenants, strengthened housing replacement and right to return requirements, sustainability features, as well as additional incentives for projects being developed by community land trust, public agencies, cooperatives, non-profit, etc. It is the overall intent to prioritize rezoning in Higher Opportunity areas and ensure the maximum amount of affordable housing that is economically feasible is provided on-site (not off-site or through payment of a fee).

Specific Rezoning Program strategies (described in greater detail in Chapter 4) that will be further developed with significant community input include focusing rezoning on commercial and residential corridors, areas zoned for Parking (P), transitional residential areas off commercial boulevards, in existing regional centers, on public and religious-owned land, and in other areas where multifamily, and therefore affordable housing, is not permitted today. The Rezoning Program may also include more flexible zoning and incentives for existing single-family or lower density residential areas to create opportunities for a variety of "missing middle" low-scale housing typologies including fourplexes, townhomes/ rowhouse, additional affordable ADUs, bungalow courts, and other contextual Los Angeles typologies. In addition, the Program will update and expand the City's affordable housing incentive programs (including Density Bonus, TOC, among others) to include a wider array of areas and project types and create more inclusive developments. These existing incentive-based programs will continue to set a floor for affordable housing development. Opportunities for greater streamlining will also be explored through expansion of adaptive reuse and micro unit housing, current value capture efforts and additional incentives for 50-100% affordable and supportive housing projects, senior housing, and special needs housing. The Program will examine housing opportunities in areas that have been historically downzoned; areas served by jobs and transit, including commercial corridors served by Metro NextGen; lower density areas residential areas fronting Boulevards and Avenues, certain industrial areas; and properties with certain characteristics including alleyways, large lots, and/or residential corners, etc.

122. ANTI-DISPLACEMENT STRATEGIES

Goal #: 1, 2, 3, 5

Lead Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Funding Source: Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grant

Objective: Identify areas facing displacement to better target tenants' rights outreach and education efforts, affordable housing preservation, and affordable housing subsidy programs. Incorporate findings into existing tenant rights' and

affordable housing programs by 2023. Develop policy recommendations in Equitable Development and Anti-Displacement Study for use in future General Plan updates, rezoning efforts, and policy development by Summer 2023. Incorporate displacement prevention strategies into the General Plan by 2029.

Respective Policies: 1.1.6, 1.1.9, 2.1.7, 3.3.5, 5.1.2

LA City Planning and LAHD will, with extensive community outreach, conduct Equitable Development and Anti-Displacement studies that will inform as well as provide recommended strategies to preserve and increase the City's affordable housing stock. Through funding provided by the Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) grant program, two studies will be conducted in collaboration and coordination, but each with a focus on areas within the purview of each Department. The LACP-led study will include recommendations relating to land use, zoning and the City's growth strategy. The study will analyze the impacts on displacement related to Los Angeles' land use/housing policies and housing needs and incorporate policy recommendations in future planning efforts including updates to the General Plan, Community Plans, and other planning efforts. Consider an array of potential policies from best practices including anti-displacement overlay zones in areas where current policies are insufficient, as well as housing assessments for major project entitlements per Program 7. LAHD will develop a displacement prevention tool that will identify areas and parcels at greatest risk of displacement, which include those with higher percentages of naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH), lower homeownership rates, higher rates of foreclosure, older housing stock and at-risk properties subject to the RSO, and an increase in investments from large scale developers. The displacement prevention tool will be integrated into a report outlining recommended strategies intended to minimize significant impacts to vulnerable communities, while at the same time proactively increasing housing production throughout the city. Both departments will work together to ensure reports complement citywide efforts to strengthen tenant protections including preventing tenant harassment, eviction defense, COVID relief, housing replacement requirements, no net loss requirements and right to return.

123. ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING (AFH)

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: LAHD, HACLA

Supporting Agencies: LACP

Funding Sources: Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grant

Objective: Compliance with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) new guidelines for the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Rule. Produce Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) in 2022 - 2023 and provide an annual progress report on the goals, metrics, and measures listed in the AFH action plan as part of the Housing Element's Annual Progress Report

Respective Policies: 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.2.3, 4.3.2

Develop an updated Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) Plan consistent with the new final guidelines that are expected to be released by HUD some time in 2021. The AFH will cover the following required components:

- Summary of fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity;
- Integration and segregation patterns, and trends related to people with protected characteristics;
- Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty;
- Disparities in access to opportunity for people with protected characteristics, including persons with developmental and physical disabilities; and
- Disproportionate housing needs within the jurisdiction, including displacement risk.

The resulting plan is to reflect five-year housing goals and strategies accompanied by realistic metrics and milestones. Completion, submission, and HUD approval of the City's AFH Plan places the City in compliance and eligible to receive ongoing federal funds that are entitled to Los Angeles. The AFH Plan also serves as a model/foundation for the City's five-year Consolidated Plan. The Plan sets forth commitments to invest in place-based strategies that create opportunities in areas of disinvestment (such as investments in housing, enhanced infrastructure, services, schools, jobs, and many other community needs).

124. AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING (AFFH) PROGRAM

Goal #: 4,1

Lead Agencies: LACP, LAHD

Supporting Agencies: HACLA

Funding Sources: Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grant

Objective: Compliance with US Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and AB 686 (2018). Individual metrics, timelines, commitments and AFFH components are summarized in the table below. Please also see the individually referenced Programs for additional details in the objectives and project descriptions. In addition to this program, the City will report on the goals and strategies of the federally-required Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) as part of Program 123: Assessment of Fair Housing.

Respective Policies: 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.2.3, 4.3.2, 1.1.6, 1.1.7, 1.1.9, 1.1.10, 1.3.1

Promote and affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) opportunities throughout the community in all housing, planning and community development activities. Take a variety of actions to overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity to promote diverse communities that grant all Angelenos access to housing. Increase place-based strategies to encourage community revitalization and protect existing residents from displacement through various policies, programs, and goal setting (e.g., AFH Plan).

AFFH Categories

1. Mobility and Inclusion - Enhancing mobility strategies and promoting inclusion for protected classes
2. Access to Opportunity - New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity / Encouraging development of new affordable housing in high-resource areas
3. Place-based Strategies - Strategies to Encourage Community Development and Revitalization
4. Anti-Displacement - Protecting existing residents from displacement

Contributing Factors

1. Lack of Access to Opportunity Due to High Housing Costs
2. Land Use and Zoning Laws
3. Availability of Affordable and Accessible Units in a Range of Sizes
4. Lack of Affordable Housing
5. Insufficient Tenant Protections
6. Housing Discrimination

7. Violations of the Rent Stabilization Ordinance
8. Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures
9. Lack of Private Investment in Specific Neighborhoods
10. Lack of Public Investment in Specific Neighborhoods, Including Services and Amenities

The following specific strategies and actions are identified to address the primary contributing factors and AFFH issue areas, in partnership with key local stakeholders.

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
A. Prioritize and expand housing choices for those with the greatest housing needs, including those with the lowest incomes, persons with disabilities, seniors, large families, and victims of domestic violence.	**3.** Affordable and Accessible Units in a Range of Sizes **6.** Housing Discrimination	**8:** Exceed state and federal law requirements by adding more accessible units in affordable housing developments, providing for 4,031 accessible affordable units by September 2026. Operate and improve a waiting list/registry for persons with disabilities and others through the Accessible and Affordable Housing Registry to target available units to persons in need. By 2024, establish public counters for assistance in applying for affordable and accessible housing. **48 and 121:** Create new incentives for senior and other special needs housing through the update to the city's affordable housing incentive programs by 2024. **42:** Provide 375 vouchers annually to very low-income seniors and people with disabilities. **81:** Create tailored affordability incentives that account for identified local needs such as insufficient senior, large family units, or multi-generational living, as local plans are adopted. Ensure local plans increase the production and availability of Affordable and accessible housing. **82:** Amend the Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance Instructions and Findings in 2022 to further remove barriers towards applying for reasonable accommodation. **84:** Provide remedies for fair housing complaints, by receiving 800 fair housing inquiries and resolving 500 fair housing investigations annually; Provide program outreach through 50 fair housing training sessions annually and through social media platforms, literature distribution and discussion groups. **93:** Provide safe and secure emergency and transitional shelter, case management and related supportive services to domestic violence survivors and their children through contracted operators.	**1.** Mobility and Inclusion **2.** Access to Opportunity

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
B. Address the severe housing needs of persons experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness in all areas of the city.	**4.** Lack of Affordable Housing	**96:** Fund 6,205 existing emergency shelter beds (including winter shelter) annually. Fund 980 existing transitional housing beds annually. Create 1,000 permanent supportive and transitional housing units from nonresidential uses such as hotels and motels. **18:** Finance an average of 500 permanent supportive housing units per year, along with supportive services, designed to enable homeless persons with developmental, intellectual, and physical disabilities to live as independently as possible in a permanent setting. Continue to provide priority scoring for projects located in Higher Opportunity Areas. **98:** Initiate seven regional Family Solution Systems throughout the Los Angeles Continuum of Care (CoC). Serve approximately 1,200 homeless and at-risk persons per year. **108:** Implement "No Wrong Door" policy citywide annually. Provide 7,500 annual referrals to supportive services from several sources, including referrals to services from outreach teams, from City-funded FamilySource Centers, and from City-funded access centers, and other sources. Provide 5,000 annual referrals to interim housing from outreach teams, City-funded FamilySource Centers, City funded access centers, and other sources.	**1.** Mobility and Inclusion

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
C. Provide housing vouchers, voucher assistance and mobility-related services to expand access to Higher Opportunity Areas.	**1.** Lack of Access to Opportunity **4.** Lack of Affordable Housing	**102:** Provide 1,950 Mobility Demonstration Vouchers per year beginning in 2022 for low-income city and county residents interested in living in Higher Opportunity Areas. **128:** Provide 3,365 Emergency Housing Vouchers annually to qualifying households (homeless, at-risk, those fleeing domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking or human trafficking; or recently homeless). Prioritize the Most Disadvantaged Communities (using CalEnviroScreen data), chronically homeless and justice-system involved individuals. **99:** Provide information to homeless service providers to connect homeless voucher holders with newly constructed Extremely Low Income units in projects located near transit.	**1.** Mobility and Inclusion

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
D. Promote a more equitable distribution of affordable housing opportunities throughout the city, with a focus on incentivizing or requiring Affordable Housing in Higher Opportunity Areas.	**1.** Lack of Access to Opportunity Due to High Housing Costs **2.** Land Use and Zoning Laws **4.** Lack of Affordable Housing	**49:** Create new citywide housing targets across Community Plan Areas in a way that seeks to address patterns of racial and economic segregation and affirmatively further fair housing by 2024. Achieve an equitable distribution of multi-family zoning capacity and affordable housing production across the City, when accounting for environmentally sensitive areas. **48, 65 and 121:** Create a tailored set of streamlining and development incentives to prioritize 100% affordable housing projects. Expand where mixed-income projects may be created, with a particular focus in Higher Opportunity Areas, by 2024. Introduce context specific reforms to zoning and land use practices to increase housing choices and affordability, particularly in Higher Opportunity Areas (see figures in Chapter 4, the candidate sites for rezoning in Appendix 4.7 and associated website maps). Target more than half of rezoning efforts in Higher Opportunity Areas. **63:** Expand incentives for affordable ADUs, including creation of a density bonus program to incentivize an additional ADU in Higher Opportunity Areas by 2024. **80:** Adopt amendments to the Zoning Code in 2021 to implement inclusionary and replacement housing requirements in the Coastal Zone (Mello Act Ordinance). **81:** Create locally tailored affordable programs that increase the amount of affordable housing that can be created and AFFH, as local plans are updated. **7:** Prepare an ordinance that includes enhanced requirements for major entitlements including, fair housing, tailored affordable housing, and other community benefits requirements which will vary based on the project's access to opportunity.	**1.** Mobility and Inclusion **2.** Access to Opportunity

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
E. Prioritize local resources, such as funding and public land, in areas of high opportunity, and evaluate revisions to funding metrics or policies that may act as a barrier to projects locating in high resource areas. Seek partnerships with other public and private entities to facilitate new potential development sites in these areas for affordable housing.	**1.** Lack of Access to Opportunity Due to High Housing Costs **3.** Affordable and Accessible Units in a Range of Sizes **4.** Lack of Affordable Housing	**6:** Prepare annual NOFA biannually, 500 units produced per year. Set-aside of 250 units of supportive housing include priority scoring for projects in high resource areas with the goal of funding at least 8% of units in Higher Opportunity Areas. **15:** Increase the utilization of public land for affordable housing with particular emphasis in high resource and gentrifying areas; Identify publicly owned housing opportunity sites and issue RFPs to develop the sites by 2023, and annually thereafter; Ensure AFFH is incorporated into the public land selection process. Rezone PF (Public Facility) zoned public to allow affordable housing by-right through rezoning process by 2024; Maintain a publicly accessible citywide inventory of publicly owned sites. Prioritize public land for new models of affordable housing development and control (see Program 16). **30:** Prioritize the acquisition of naturally occurring affordable housing properties in Higher Opportunity Areas.	**1.** Mobility and Inclusion **2.** Access to Opportunity

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
F. Develop pathways to homeownership for lower and moderate income households, including targeted down payment assistance and increasing opportunities for community ownership of housing.	**1.** Lack of Access to Opportunity Due to High Housing Costs **4.** Lack of Affordable Housing **8.** Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures	**1 and 10:** Increase funding annually for lower and moderate income homeownership down payment assistance in annual updates to the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee spending priorities. Promote neighborhood stability and economic empowerment by providing 75 loans for first-time, low-income homebuyers earning up to 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) and 75 loans for first-time moderate-income homebuyers earning between 81% - 150%. Coordinate homebuyer education courses to help homebuyers prepare for and attain homeownership. **3 and 4:** Facilitate new types of subdivisions and shared ownership models to encourage more affordable ownership typologies. Prepare an amendment to the zoning code by 2024 to facilitate innovation in more affordable types of for-sale subdivisions. Create accessible online and physical educational resources, and partner with community organizations, especially in gentrifying communities and communities of color, to assist existing or prospective homeowners to better understand options to increase equity and wealth creation by 2023.	**2.** Access to Opportunity **3.** Place-based Strategies

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
G. Target investment, incentives, and other programs in Low Resource and High Segregation and Poverty areas in order to improve community assets that enhance quality of life and address Environmental Justice.	**1.** Lack of Access to Opportunity Due to High Housing Costs **4.** Lack of Affordable Housing **8.** Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures **9.** Lack of Private Investment in Specific Neighborhoods **10.** Lack of Public Investment in Specific Neighborhoods, Including Services and Amenities	**133:** Increase investment in areas most in need to support residents including infrastructure, community facilities, employment and workforce development, parks, schools, etc. Change the way local funding decisions are made in a way that prioritizes equity and disadvantaged communities in decisions about infrastructure improvements. **134:** Promote workforce development and economic revitalization in areas of high unemployment and poverty through the creation of at least 10 place-based initiatives by 2029, deploy at least $100 million in grants and loans to small businesses targeting these high need areas and serve approximately 120,000 people annually through the City's Worksource Centers in order to connect residents in high unemployment areas to jobs. **135:** Increase investment in areas most in need to improve community assets that support residents including transportation, infrastructure, community facilities, parks, schools, etc. Carry out racial equity analyses and audits in 2022 of existing City programs, policies, and practices and to develop a citywide Strategic Action Plan that identifies systemic barriers in accessing benefits and opportunities available across the City. **24:** Integrate enhanced programming, community and recreational spaces, and a mixture of uses in certain locations to promote community economic development in the redevelopment of public housing. **52:** Integrate Citywide Housing Priorities and AFFH principles into the next 5-year Consolidated Plan (2023-2027) when assessing housing needs and identifying the funding priorities for the use of Federal programs including CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA. For the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan, allocate $165 million to stabilize and revitalize low-income neighborhoods and $56 million to improve local employment for low-income residents. Determine similar levels of funding goals in 2022 and 2023 as part of the new consolidated plan and prioritize community development investments in High Segregation and Poverty Areas and/or Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty.	**3.** Place-based Strategies

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
		65: Create and incorporate tailored place-based land use strategies and programs in each plan (see program description for a range of implementation tools). **68:** Provide educational assistance, computer training programs, recreational, educational and cultural programs and career assistance programs for 1,850 residents in public housing developments annually. **14:** Conduct environmental assessments and clean-ups to enable the reuse and redevelopment of brownfields into affordable housing, amenities and parks. Clean up of at least five brownfield sites; 50 environmental assessments, create opportunity for 100 units, including 10 very-low and 10 low-income units. Identify new or increased sources of funding for brownfield clean up. Present an ordinance to the City Planning Commission by 2023, prohibiting new oil and gas extraction and declaring extraction activities a non-conforming use citywide. **123:** Conduct an Assessment of Fair Housing beginning in 2022 to identify additional community development needs in low-income and high-poverty neighborhoods, which include designated Racial and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) and prioritize funding to meet those needs. Report on the status of the Fair Housing Action plan as part of the Annual Progress Report.	

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
H. Develop new sources of financing for affordable housing production and preservation, including sources that also enhance the built environment through transportation, amenities, and infrastructure investments.	**1.** Lack of Access to Opportunity Due to High Housing Costs **4.** Lack of Affordable Housing **9.** Lack of Private Investment in Specific Neighborhoods **10.** Lack of Public Investment in Specific Neighborhoods, Including Services and Amenities	**9:** Secure at least 15% of statewide Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities (AHSC) funding for affordable housing development and related infrastructure, including transportation-related amenities, and programs that encourage greater access to jobs, housing and amenities. **20:** Adopt a council resolution each year that supports state and federal initiatives that increase funding for affordable housing development and preservation. In all new funding opportunities and advocacy, ensure new funds support City Housing Priorities and AFFH, including prioritizing populations most in need, projects located in high resource areas and integration of housing with broader community development investments. **133:** Prioritize investments in infrastructure and mobility services that aim to meet the transportation needs of residents in lower-income neighborhoods through 2030.	**2.** Access to Opportunity **3.** Place-based Strategies

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
I. Expand efforts for the preservation and rehabilitation of deed-restricted affordable housing, naturally occurring affordable housing, RSO units, residential hotels and mobile home parks	**8.** Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures	**27:** Preserve and/or extend the affordability of 300 deed-restricted affordable housing units annually. Monitor the risk of converting to market rate for 9,412 units. Contract a non-profit to enforce state noticing laws. **10:** Allocate 20% of Linkage Fee Revenue to support affordable housing preservation. **30, 24, and 68:** Acquire 5,000 units by 2030, primarily existing naturally occurring affordable housing in lower resource areas. Replace 2,401 housing units replaced, created, or rehabilitated for low income and moderate income households. Train and hire public housing residents to provide new solar roofs and energy efficiency retrofits to households in Watts who are income-eligible. **32:** Ensure renters can maintain residence in safe rental units without the threat of arbitrary eviction and by stabilizing rents. Investigate and enforce 10,000 annual complaints of RSO violations and refer non-compliant cases to the City Attorney's office for further enforcement. Partner with community-based organizations to target outreach to areas with high displacement risk and High Segregation & Poverty areas. **26:** Assist 100 mobile park tenants. 250 market-rate mobile home park pads in residential areas are preserved.	**3.** Place-based Strategies **4.** Anti-Displacement

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
J. Carry out Equitable Development and Anti-Displacement Studies that includes recommendations relating to land use, the City's growth strategy, and opportunities to build affordable housing and prevent displacement of protected classes	**2.** Land Use and Zoning Laws **5.** Insufficient Tenant Protections **8.** Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures **9.** Lack of Private Investment in Specific Neighborhoods **10.** Lack of Public Investment in Specific Neighborhoods, Including Services and Amenities	**122:** Identify areas facing displacement to better target tenants' rights outreach and education efforts, affordable housing preservation, and affordable housing subsidy programs. incorporating findings into existing tenant rights' and affordable housing programs by 2023. Develop policy recommendations to address housing needs in areas facing displacement pressure in an Equitable Development and Anti-Displacement Study for use in future General Plan updates, rezoning efforts, and policy development by Summer 2023.	**2.** Access to Opportunity **4.** Anti-Displacement
K. Require the replacement of affordable housing and the right to return for existing residents, including relocation expenses	**4.** Lack of Affordable Housing **7.** Violations of the Rent Stabilization Ordinance **8.** Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures	**28 and 29:** Require new housing developments to replace all affordable housing units lost due to new development. Record approximately 200 affordable housing replacement covenants per year. Extend replacement and right to return requirements prior to expiration of Housing Crisis Act in 2030 and evaluate best way to strengthen current requirements in order to make enhancements part of the Density Bonus update by 2024.	**2.** Access to Opportunity **3.** Place-based Strategies **4.** Anti-Displacement

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
L. Conduct code enforcement in a way that prevents and addresses habitability violations while minimizing displacement and preserving naturally occurring affordable housing	**8.** Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures 8 **10.** Lack of Public Investment in Specific Neighborhoods, Including Services and Amenities	**22 and 56:** Proactively inspect all multi-family residential rental units every three to fours years to ensure compliance with habitability standards. Initiate contact for complaint-based inspections within 72 hours 80% of the time. Preserve 100 units a year, while preventing 100 tenants from being displaced and creating 100 deed-restricted affordable housing units, in cases where code enforcement of zoning code would have otherwise required eviction and loss of the housing. Partner with community-based organizations to provide additional support and outreach to tenants in low-resource and high segregation and poverty areas. **38:** Monitor active REAP Cases and ensure timely closure for compliance. Prevent 50 essential service shut-offs annually through the release of REAP/UMP funds. Contract with community-based organizations to conduct proactive outreach to tenants in REAP buildings, particularly in high segregation and poverty areas and areas facing displacement.	**3.** Place-based Strategies **4.** Anti-Displacement
M. Implement existing tenant rights policies and continue to develop greater tenant protections for City Council consideration, including rental assistance and legal representation services for lower-income households that result in greater housing stability for protected classes	**5.** Insufficient Tenant Protections **6.** Housing Discrimination **7.** Violations of the Rent Stabilization Ordinance **8.** Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures	**32:** Investigate and enforce 10,000 annual complaints of RSO violations and refer non-compliant cases to the City Attorney's office for further enforcement. **89:** Facilitate at least 200 annual public presentations on the Rent Stabilization Ordinance, including Property Management Training Program presentations, community presentations, landlord/tenant workshops/webinars, drop-in sessions, and fair housing clinics. Partner with community-based organizations to target outreach to areas with high displacement risk and High Segregation & Poverty areas. **85:** Prepare a Just Cause Eviction Ordinance report for City Council consideration by 2023. **86:** Beginning in 2021, prevent and deter tenant harassment by implementing the newly adopted Tenant Anti-Harassment Ordinance.	**1.** Mobility and Inclusion **4.** Anti-Displacement

Table 6.1: **Target Capacity for Inventory of Sites and Rezoning Program**

Strategies and Actions	Primary Contributing Factor(s)	Implementing Program Summaries (see individual Programs for detailed Objectives and Program Descriptions)	AFFH Category
		87: Strengthen Ellis monitoring and enforcement (per SB 8) beginning in 2021, extend a contract with a relocation consultant in 2023, increase relocation amounts to adjust for CPI annually and conduct a fee study in 2022 to determine changes to relocation amounts. **88:** Conduct initial outreach to 100,000 residents. Host or co-host 80 tenant educational events per year. Provide tenant navigation services (ongoing, one-on-one support) to 1,600 tenants per year in order to prevent homelessness and eviction. Through Family Source Centers, provide case management services (ongoing support) to 600 households and housing stability services to 480 households per year. Prioritize outreach and service-delivery in High Segregation & Poverty areas and areas facing displacement pressure. **91:** Assist 200 seniors with housing-related legal advice at Multipurpose Senior Centers in low-income neighborhoods. **122:** Identify areas facing displacement to better target tenants' rights outreach and education efforts, affordable housing preservation, and affordable housing subsidy programs. incorporating findings into existing tenant rights' and affordable housing programs by 2023.	

125. TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITIES

Goal #: 1, 3

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Sources: General Fund

Objective: Provide incentives to encourage transit oriented, mixed-income development to permit 5000 above market and 1,750 covenanted lower income (ELI, VLI, LI) units annually.

Respective Policies: 1.1.7, 1.3.1, 3.2.2

Continue implementation of the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) program to encourage transit oriented mixed-income development. Report annually on the production of covenanted affordable units as described in program 45. Explore extension and expansion of the TOC program as described in programs 48, 81, and 121.

126. INCLUSIONARY ZONING FEASIBILITY STUDY

Goal #: 1

Lead Agencies: LAHD, LACP

Supporting Agencies: CAO

Funding Sources: General Fund, AHLF

Objective: Conduct a feasibility study in 2021-22 and develop policy recommendations on inclusionary zoning in 2022.

Respective Policies: 1.1.1, 1.2.6

Conduct a two-phased feasibility study to analyze the financial and programmatic feasibility of introducing an inclusionary zoning policy. The City will complete a detailed analysis of the current and projected utilization of existing affordable housing programs (including TOC, Density Bonus, and the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee) and the potential value added of a mandatory inclusionary

requirement. The study can evaluate the creation of a citywide affordability requirement that could vary based on local geographies such as Community Plan areas, as well as the evaluation of local areas of the City that may particularly benefit from local inclusionary requirements. The study should also consider how such a requirement could complement and work alongside existing/proposed incentive programs, as well as the City's Affordable Housing Linkage Fee, and what types of changes would be needed to result in more overall affordable housing while supporting market production. Afterwards, a report back on findings will be prepared and presented to the City Council for direction. The study will provide policy recommendations consistent with economic feasibility study requirements of AB 1505, such as the percentage of affordable housing that could be required in each of the City's market areas, Community Plan Areas, or other geographic boundaries, as well as potential alternative means of compliance.

127. NEIGHBORHOOD SUSTAINABILITY & EQUITY

Goal #: 3,4

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Funding Sources: General Fund

Objective: Provide new solar roofs and energy efficiency retrofits to income qualifying households in the Watts neighborhood.

Respective Policies: 3.2.6, 4.1.5

Work with non-profit partners via direct MOUs to train and hire HACLA residents to provide new solar roofs and energy efficiency retrofits to households in Watts who are income-eligible. The residential retrofits are intended to help low-income homeowners stay in their homes, reduce utility bills and reduce the carbon footprint with the potential for increased equity in the surrounding housing stock. Preventing foreclosure and increasing economic well-being.

128. EMERGENCY HOUSING VOUCHERS

Goal #: 2,5

Lead Agencies: HACLA

Funding Sources: HUD (American Rescue Plan Act)

Objective: Provide 3,365 Emergency Housing Vouchers to qualifying households annually.

Respective Policies: 2.1.2, 5.1.2

HACLA was awarded 3,365 Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHVs) to be effective July 1, 2021. This award represents almost 20% of all vouchers allocated to the State of California and it is the second largest award at the national level. These EHVs are limited to individuals and families who are (1) homeless; (2) at risk of homelessness; (3) fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking or human trafficking; or (4) recently homeless and for whom providing rental assistance will prevent the family's homelessness or having high risk of housing instability.

129. HOUSING ACCESS FOR SENIORS

Goal #: 2,4

Lead Agencies: LADoA

Supporting Agencies: LADBS, LACP, Mayor's Office, CAO

Funding Source: CDBG

Objective: Assess and facilitate efforts to find alternative housing solutions for senior citizens

Respective Policy: 2.1.2, 4.1.4, 4.1.5

Support seniors in accessing greater housing opportunities. Partner with community groups and nonprofits that offer innovative solutions on senior housing, such as programs that connect seniors with extra space and a fixed income with other seniors looking to rent a room or ADU (see ADU Accelerator Program in the ADU Program 63). Implement the Age Friendly Action Plan, specifically: supporting aging in place and ensure the needs of older adults and multigenerational households are prioritized through plans, zoning regulation and Building Codes; foster housing designed according to universal design principles, and consider the impact of demographics on housing needs during the community plan process. In keeping with the Age Friendly Action Plan recommendation #23: Assess efforts to date under the County and City's Homeless Initiatives to prevent and address homelessness among older adults, and to identify strategies to expand inclusion of the older adult population as part of these Initiatives, including through implementation of the ordinance authorizing

Accessory Dwelling Units (also known as "Granny Flats"), by targeting additional resources to serve older adults who are homeless (or at risk of homelessness), and by examining new and innovative strategies that may benefit older adults, such as how the County and City could develop or encourage development of alternative housing types such as co-op housing, co-housing, or other multi-generational living arrangements that could also help reduce housing costs, and mitigate social isolation as residents age (See Programs 11 and 62). In keeping with the Age Friendly Action Plan recommendation #24: Develop a Housing Assistance Program – building off existing County and City Home Improvement Programs, such as the County Housing Authority's Handyworker Program – focused on medium and low-income older adults that would provide various services, such as rent gap assistance, housing repairs/up-grades, retrofitting/ assistive devices, and other housing-related supports intended to help prevent homelessness, and assist older adults who wish to age in place in their homes.

130. HISTORIC HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY

Goal #: 4

Lead Agencies: LACP

Supporting Agencies: LAHD

Funding Source: Regional Early Action Planning Grant (REAP)

Objective: Conduct a Historic Housing and Land Use Study in 2021, incorporate findings of the study into RHNA rezoning program 121

Respective Policy: 4.3.3

DCP staff will secure a consultant to prepare a narrative documenting the legacy of exclusionary and discriminatory land use and housing decisions in Los Angeles to inform future rezoning programs necessary for RHNA compliance (described in program 121). This study will analyze past public and private practices that have contributed to housing discrimination and lack of opportunity. This study will evaluate and document the role of city planning, the zoning code, deeds and covenants, lending practices, city investment, urban renewal, housing policy and the siting of and disinvestment in affordable housing in creating and furthering inequities in the City. Findings from the study will provide context to the housing needs and constraints in Los Angeles and help implement AFFH requirements in RHNA and required rezoning programs. The study was initiated in Spring 2021 and will be completed in late 2021.

131. LIVABLE COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE

Goal #: 1, 3, 4

Lead Agencies: LACP, LADOT

Supporting Agencies: BOE, Bureau of Street Services (Streets LA), LAHD

Funding Source: General Fund, Potential State grant funds

Objective: Secure funding to identify opportunities. Coordinate with agencies to ensure effective responses to federal, state, and regional funding opportunities around efforts to holistically plan for housing, mobility and sustainability improvements.

Respective Policy: 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5

Identify opportunities to advance a holistic vision for livable, healthy, and sustainable communities along the City's transit-rich corridors utilizing mixed-use, mixed-income housing combined with opportunities to transform the street and public realm by adding or improving wide sidewalks, tree canopy, outdoor dining, bicycle infrastructure, transit shelters, fast and frequent transit, and public seating and plazas.

Pursue ways to better integrate rezoning and community planning efforts with implementation of Mobility Plan 2035, by coordinating across agencies to identify mobility investment needs through LADOT's Mobility Investment Program and LACP's Community Plan Update Program, as well as Metro's Transit Oriented Communities Policy. Coordinate between agencies as part of a multi-agency funding strategy to fund investments where the City is targeting new housing at a scale to complete corridor-wide and network-level investments. Example strategies include applying for grant opportunities such as the Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) and the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities (AHSC) programs (see Program 9), as well as potential significant new federal grants targeting housing-linked mobility and sustainability grants under consideration in the current budget reconciliation bill to fund investments where the city is targeting new housing at a scale to complete corridor-wide and network-level investments.

Explore other opportunities to proportionately leverage investments through land use development by linking mobility investment fees, such as the West LA Transportation Improvement and Mitigation (TIMP) Specific Plan and Coastal Transportation Corridor (TIMP) Specific Plan, and committing dedications, and improvements to the public right of way where such investments advance the goals of the Mobility Plan 2035 and provide safe, livable, and dignified space in

the public realm. Consider a fee study to examine opportunities to link rezonings with desired transportation improvements to ensure adequate public realm improvements and access to new housing through safe and well-connected pedestrian infrastructure. Also, promote corridor wide or network-level mobility investment in the list of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies for rezoning program areas, through citywide regulations, and/or neighborhood plan (like the LADOT Downtown Los Angeles Mobility Investment Plan), specific plans, LADOT's Mobility Investment Program, or others.

132. FORECLOSURE REGISTRY

Goal #: 2, 3

Lead Agencies: LAHD

Supporting Agencies: LADBS

Funding Source: Foreclosure Registration Fees

Objective: Maintain a database of contact information of all residential properties within the City of Los Angeles that are subject to Ordinance No. 183, 281 (Amended 2014).

Respective Policy: 2.2.2

Maintain and enhance a dashboard to show results and identify trends impacting neighborhoods, including statistics on initial foreclosure recordings (Notices of Default - NOD) and on the portion of those defaults which proceed to foreclosure (Real Estate Owned - REO); continue education and awareness of Ordinance and increase outreach to over 95% of responsible parties on all new foreclosures recorded in the calendar year; Integrate the foreclosure dashboard into anti-displacement studies and programs.

The Foreclosure Registry Ordinance (183281, Amended in 2014) was established in 2010 as a mechanism to protect residential neighborhoods, including abandoned properties, from blight through the lack of adequate maintenance and security as a result of the foreclosure crisis. Any lender (or beneficiary or trustee who holds or has an interest in a deed of trust) who either issues a notice of default or forecloses upon on a residential property located within the City of Los Angeles must register that property with and provide contact information to the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD) in case any exterior blight issues arise on the property in relation to foreclosure, along with completing required monthly lender inspections for as long as the property remains in foreclosure.

133. MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS IN LOWER-INCOME AREAS

Goal #: 3, 4

Lead Agencies: LADOT

Funding Source:

Objective: Have at least 75% of existing transportation investments (through Vision Zero, Great Streets, Active Transportation, Stress Free Connections, Safe Routes to Schools, Safe Routes for Seniors, and AHSC Programs) serve Mobility Equity Zones through 2030. Collaborate with community-based organizations to provide culturally relevant constituent engagement for major transportation investments. By 2025, implement a "Universal Basic Mobility Program" in a Disadvantaged Community, and expand public car-sharing in Disadvantaged Communities by at least 50 stations.

Respective Policy: 3.14, 3.17, 4.3.4

Through the Mobility Investment Program, the City of Los Angeles prioritizes investments in infrastructure and mobility services that aim to meet the transportation needs of residents in lower-income neighborhoods. The City strategically applies for and receives funding from programs that directly aim to invest in the State's most disadvantaged communities areas such as Transformative Climate Communities, the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities, and Active Transportation Program. As an example, in the FY16-17 funding cycle, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles was awarded $35 million for the Watts Rising Collaborative that included transformative transportation investment in Watts.

The City's equity-informed prioritization has resulted in active transportation and street improvement projects along Western Avenue and Watts Central Ave in South Los Angeles and along Osborn Street in Pacoima. To link lower-income areas with micro-mobility programs (like dockless scooters) the City identified "mobility equity zones" which are areas with access to bicycle infrastructure and high-frequency transit as well as high concentrations of households living in poverty, overcrowded housing, unemployment, and low educational attainment. Users who begin their trips in these zones have free access to micro mobility services and LADOT requires operators to engage in at least one financial partnership with a community-based organization (CBO) to develop and implement a culturally relevant customer engagement. In 2021, LADOT was also awarded nearly $14 million in funding from the State of California Climate Investment Program to launch a "Universal Basic Mobility" pilot program in South Los Angeles. This pilot program integrates access across existing and new transportation options, introduces new shared mobility options for residents

and workers, expands and integrates fare payment subsidies, and expands electrification to advance Universal Basic Mobility for South LA residents. All of these projects and programs serve residents in low-income communities of color.

In 2019 the City also launched The Downtown Los Angeles Mobility Investment Plan (DTLA MIP) which builds upon the DTLA 2040 Downtown Community Plan update and prioritizes inclusive, equitable, sustainable, and healthy growth for DTLA. The DTLA MIP will provide critical mobility improvements in Downtown Los Angeles with a focus on populations of high need that include Skid Row, which as discussed in Appendix 1.1 is the only area of the City with a concentration of people with disabilities. The DTLA MIP is developed through a community first engagement process that prioritizes inclusive engagement and planning. The DTLA MIP plans transportation investments that support existing and future residents and employees. It also develops a funding strategy to fund priority projects. Priorities will be determined through a set of criteria that include advancing the City's equity goals such as making sure all people have access to dignified mobility solutions.

134. PROMOTE EQUITABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN HIGH POVERTY AND HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

Goal #: 3, 4

Lead Agencies: Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD)

Funding Source: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Economic Development Administration (EDA),

Objective: Promote workforce development and economic revitalization in areas with high unemployment and poverty through the creation of at least 10 place-based initiatives by 2029, deploy at least $100 million in grants and loans to small businesses targeting these high need areas and serve approximately 120,000 people annually through the City's Worksource Centers in order to connect residents in high unemployment areas to jobs.

Respective Policy: 1.16, 1.31, 3.2.2, 4.3.4

The City of Los Angeles has various economic development strategies targeted to areas with high unemployment and high poverty. In 2020, the City established the Jobs and Economic Development Incentive Zones (JEDI) Program that provides greater access to capital, a reduction in fees for development projects, facade improvements, and microloans to businesses located in these targeted areas that have been historically underinvested and that are under economic distress. Criteria to establish JEDI Zones include economic factors such as

poverty, unemployment and blight. In addition to the JEDI program, the City currently has two federally recognized Promise Zones - SLATE Z and LA Promise Zone. These areas receive preference for competitive federal grant programs and tax incentives. In addition to place based strategies, EWDD also operates sixteen Worksource Centers which assist vulnerable populations such as dislocated workers, veterans, the homeless and re-entry individuals and ten YouthSource Centers that offer youth services such as career planning, job skills training and mentoring. Furthermore, through its ten BusinessSource Centers, located in strategic areas of the City, EWDD provides support and services to small business owners to promote economic opportunities and job creation for low-income persons. EWDD also administers various programs to facilitate access to capital to entrepreneurs who are not able to obtain financing through traditional programs. The City's programs include microloans, small business loans and loans for major development projects.

135. PLACE BASED COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION EFFORTS

Goal #: 3, 4

Lead Agencies: CAO, Mayor's Office, LACP, Civil + Human Rights and Equity Dept.

Funding Source: Los Angeles Reforms for Equity and Public Acknowledgment of Institutional Racism (L.A. REPAIR) Innovation Fund participatory budgeting pilot program.

Objective: Increase investment in areas most in need to improve community assets that support residents including transportation, infrastructure, community facilities, employment and workforce development, parks, schools, etc annually. Change the way local funding decisions are made in a way that prioritizes equity and disadvantaged communities in decisions about infrastructure improvements by 2029.

Respective Policy: 3.2.2, 4.3.4

Dedicate and seek funding for place-based community revitalization strategies that conserve and improve assets in areas of lower opportunity and concentrated poverty. These include targeted investment programs to facilitate neighborhood revitalization, preserving or rehabilitating existing affordable housing, improving infrastructure, schools, employment, parks, transportation and other community amenities. These programs include (but are not limited to):

LA REPAIR Innovation Fund - Through the City's first Participatory Budgeting process, spend $8.5 million in 2022 on community led grants in 9 of the most under resourced communities called LA REPAIR Zones (Skid Row, South LA,

Southeast LA, Wilmington-Harbor Gateway, West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park, Westlake, Arleta-Pacoima, Mission Hills-Panorama City-West Hills). Funding will be decided entirely by the community through a democratic process known as a Participatory Budget. Community members in each REPAIR Zone will submit ideas that everyone in the neighborhood can vote on, empowering individuals to decide how dollars are spent in their community.

Racial Equity Audit - Launch a citywide racial equity audit in 2022 of existing City programs, policies, and practices and to develop a citywide Strategic Action Plan that identifies systemic barriers in accessing benefits and opportunities available across the City, and other programmatic objectives (see CF 21-0702).

Racial Equity Action Plans - All City Departments/Offices will adopt and implement Racial Equity Action Plans for and appoint a Racial Equity Officer. Develop specific equity indicators and a description of how the Department/ Office will track progress on racial equity. Annually develop and implement strategies to ensure infrastructure and program spending is directed to the sections of the city with the highest need. The availability of funding at the state and federal level presents an opportunity to expedite this work by submitting competitive grants to identify and fund community revitalization programs (See the Mayor's Executive Directive 27).

Park Equity Ballot Measure - City Council has directed Recreation and Parks to hire a consultant to assist in the development of a ballot measure to provide funding for the purposes identified in the "Parks Condition Assessment Report" and Mayor's Executive Directive 31, "Achieving Park Equity".

Los Angeles County Safe Clean Neighborhood Parks and Beaches (Measure A) Measure A allocates approximately $97 million in funds to cities and park development agencies to create new park space and improve existing parks and amenities. The measure is also aimed at improving park equity, with 30% of the funds set aside through a formula for projects in high and very high need ("park poor") study areas.

Parks Fee - Recreation and Parks will collect park fees and allocate revenues annually from the Parks Fee Ordinance, which was enacted in 2017 to amend the way park fees are assessed on new residential projects. Park Fee revenues may now be spent in a wider geography to strengthen the equitable distribution of parks, so park improvements are less concentrated where new market rate development is happening. In addition, the ordinance encourages more on-site parks dedication as part of large development projects.

Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) - Metro will implement the TOC Policy to strengthen synergies between transit and the surrounding streets, public spaces and developments to support transit benefits to all, and capture value created by transit. Implement the First/Last Mile policy to develop a set of community-

supported improvements along key pathways to Metro stations and bus stops. Implement the Joint-Development Policy adopted in 2021 to maximize the ability to develop affordable housing on Metro-owned properties quickly and equitable, including prioritizing the development of 100% income-restricted housing on sites where the need is the greatest and where the greatest benefits may be realized fastest, use local income and rent data to set rents for income-restricted units to address gentrification and displacement concerns, and giving preference to development proposals that include Community-Based Organizations and Small Business Enterprises.

Clean Streets - To quickly address illegal dumping, the Bureau of Sanitation is hiring 61 positions, to keep city sidewalks and public areas clean, sanitary, safe and accessible by removing abandoned waste, prioritizing low-income, disadvantaged communities with the highest incidents reported of illegal dumping. The Department will also conduct a multi-lingual and multi-platform education campaign about illegal dumping, to inform Angelenos of resources including 3-1-1 and bulky item pick up.

Great Streets Initiative - LADOT will carry out improvements on 28 corridors identified as "Great Streets," where the City is working alongside community groups to energize public space, provide economic revitalization, increase public safety, enhance local culture, improve infrastructure and support great neighborhoods. Great streets designation is prioritized for high injury network segments and disadvantaged communities, with all 28 of the program corridors currently located on high injury networks,

Resilience - Address negative impacts from climate change through interventions in communities identified as having greater physical and social vulnerability. As described in Safety Element Program 15, develop land use mitigations specific to hazard areas. The Safety Element places a specific emphasis on Hillside areas, which are subject to multiple hazards, with direction to evaluate and expand evacuation capacity and building and land use regulations. The Safety Element additionally focuses on areas with compounding social and physical vulnerability with direction including: identify and mitigate oil drilling impacts (Program 6), expand the Clean Up Green Up pilot (Program 15), expand Cool Neighborhoods (Program 18) and building economic resilience and prosperity in disadvantaged communities (Programs 24 and 25).

Cool Streets - Address negative impacts from climate change through investments in adaptation measures such as cool streets and urban forestry, etc. in disadvantaged communities. Pilot five cool neighborhood projects in vulnerable communities across Los Angeles that incorporate cooling elements such as cool pavement, shade trees, and bus shelters. Initiate the program in 2022.

Sidewalk and Transit Amenities Program (STAP) - Streets LA will replace and expand upon the existing street furniture contract to provide sidewalk and transit

amenities to create a world-class, self-sustaining program that provides shelter, shade, safety, and comfort with furniture that supports an increased use of transit and alternative transportation, local economic activity and the shared use of City sidewalks.

Climate Vulnerability Assessment (CVA) - The recently formed Climate Emergency Mobilization Office (CEMO), in partnership with City Planning and Emergency Management, is working to commission a Citywide Climate Vulnerability Assessment that identifies areas of elevated physical vulnerability, in addition to areas of elevated social vulnerability. The CVA is expected to begin in 2023 and will inform a Climate Action Plan (CAP) once completed. CEMO has plans to overlay social and physical vulnerability and target engagement to high needs communities, in keeping with Safety Element guidance.

Other Housing Related Programs - See other targeted place-based housing-related strategies in Program 9 (Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities), Program 14 (Redevelopment of Brownfield Sites), Program 22 (SCEP), Program 24 (Residential Rehabilitation of Public Housing), Program 52. (Consolidated Planning Process), Program 66 (Redevelopment Tools), Program 68 (Services in Public Housing), Program 72 (Renewable Energy Programs), Program 73 (City Plants).

136. SOLID GROUND PROGRAM

Goal #: 2, 5

Lead Agencies: CIFD

Funding Source: Federal funds

Objective: Provide comprehensive case management and housing stability services to 1,500 households at imminent risk or at risk of homelessness per year in partnership with 16 FamilySource Centers through the Community Investment For Families Department's Solid Ground Program. Prevention services may be received as a "Brief Service" (one day) or "Full Service" (up to 12 months of case management).

Respective Policy: 2.1.4, 1.1.9

The Solid Ground program aims to prevent 1,500 households at risk of homelessness from becoming homeless. Participants seeking prevention services must be at imminent risk (delinquent on rent) or at risk of homelessness (facing a financial hardship that could result in homelessness) and have an income at or below 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI). The program uses

evidence-based results to identify the most vulnerable households likely to experience homelessness based on housing status, vulnerabilities and barriers to stable housing, and local policy priorities such as history of intimate partner violence. Participants receive up to three months of financial assistance for security deposits, rental assistance/arrears, utility arrears, move-in expenses, transportation costs, and/or food, and a year of wraparound services. Wraparound services include financial coaching, counseling, and aid in opening a savings account, establishing or improving credit, and reducing debt. To better serve families at imminent risk or at risk of homelessness, CIFD is expanding the Solid Ground program from eight FSC service areas to sixteen in 2022.