



III.M  
TPPC

September 16, 2021

TO: Transportation Planning and Policy Committee

FROM: Ahron Hakimi,  
Executive Director

By: Rochelle Invina-Jayasiri, Regional Planner

SUBJECT: TPPC CONSENT AGENDA ITEM: III.M  
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA) DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

**DESCRIPTION:**

The Kern Council of Governments (Kern COG), acting in the capacity as the state-designated Regional Planning Agency, prepares the state mandated Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Plan. The 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle RHNA Plan is scheduled to be completed in July 2022. This item was presented to the Regional Planning Advisory Committee on September 1, 2021.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Background**

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is required to allocate the region's share of the statewide housing need to Councils of Governments (COG) based on Department of Finance (DOF) population projections and regional population forecasts used in preparing regional transportation plans. Kern COG has the responsibility of developing the state-mandated RHNA Plan.

The RHNA process will identify the number of housing units that each local government must accommodate in the Housing Element of its General Plan (Government Code §65584). As part of the region's planning efforts, Kern COG works with local governments and stakeholders on the RHNA Plan to identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eleven-year projection of the regional housing need. Additionally, the RHNA allocates housing units within the region consistent with the development pattern included in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The development of 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle RHNA Plan will happen in tandem with the Kern COG's 2022 RTP/SCS. The 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle RHNA Plan is scheduled to be completed in July 2022.

**Activities**

In June 2021, Kern COG began the RHNA determination consultation with HCD. In July 2021, Kern COG contracted with Regional Government Services Authority (RGS), Rincon Consultants, Inc. and Mintier

Harnish Planning Consultants to assist with the development of the 6th Cycle RHNA Plan. On August 4<sup>th</sup>, staff presented the RHNA development timeline (Attachment 1) during the RTP/SCS Community Stakeholder Meeting #2. Kern COG has requested an early RHNA determination and received the final determination letter by HCD on August 31, 2021. Staff and the consultant team will be reviewing the final determination and will provide a report in the next RPAC and TPPC meetings.

### ***Draft RHNA Methodologies***

One of the RHNA statutory tasks Kern COG is responsible for is to develop and propose a RHNA methodology for distributing the existing and projected housing regional housing need to the cities and counties within the region. There were several recent legislation changes in the development of the RHNA for this 6<sup>th</sup> cycle. One includes the addition of the 5<sup>th</sup> objective, the requirement of the RHNA plan to “affirmatively further fair-housing.” Which means “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... 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 65584(e)). The consultant team prepared a presentation comparing and analyzing the previous 5<sup>th</sup> cycle RHNA methodology and a draft RHNA methodology for this cycle (Attachment 2). Thomas Pogue of the University of the Pacific discussed the RHNA methodologies during the September RPAC meeting. In addition, Attachment 3 is draft analysis that illustrates the Vacant Land Capacity for Housing Units based on the existing Land Use data. This table illustrates the vacant land designated for housing.

The following is the summary of RHNA objectives from Government Code 65584(d):

1. Increase housing supply and mix of housing types, with the goal of improving housing affordability and equity in all cities and counties within the region.
2. Promote infill development and socioeconomic equity; protect environmental and agricultural resources; encourage efficient development patterns; and achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets.
3. Improve intra-regional jobs-to-housing relationship, including the balance between low wage jobs and affordable housing units for low-wage workers in each jurisdiction.
4. Balance disproportionate household income distributions (more high-income allocation to lower-income areas, and vice-versa)
5. Affirmatively further fair housing

The following is the summary of RHNA factors from Government Code 65584.04(d):

1. Existing and projected jobs and housing relationship, particularly low-wage jobs and affordable housing
2. Lack of capacity for sewer or water service due to decisions outside a jurisdiction’s control
3. The availability of land suitable for urban development
4. Lands protected from urban development under existing federal or state programs
5. County policies to preserve prime agricultural land
6. The distribution of household growth assumed for regional transportation plans and opportunities to maximize use of public transportation and existing transportation infrastructure
7. Agreements between a county and cities in a county to direct growth toward incorporated areas of the county
8. The loss of units in assisted housing developments as a result of expiring affordability contracts.
9. The percentage of existing households paying more than 30 percent and more than 50 percent of their income in rent
10. The rate of overcrowding
11. The housing needs of farmworkers
12. The housing needs generated by the presence of a university within the jurisdiction

13. The housing needs of individuals and families experiencing homelessness
14. The loss of units during a state of emergency that have yet to be rebuilt or replaced at the time of the analysis
15. The region's greenhouse gas emissions targets provided by the State Air Resources Board

### ***Member Jurisdiction Survey***

In development of the RHNA methodology, Kern COG needs to survey each of the member jurisdictions to request information and compile information specified in the RHNA Objectives and Factors in Government Code as listed above. The consultant team prepared a member jurisdiction survey via Survey Monkey that was emailed to RPAC members and member jurisdiction planning staff on August 25, 2021. Staff requests member jurisdictions to complete the survey by September 8, 2021. A PDF of the survey is included in this report (Attachment 4).

Kern COG RHNA development updates and information is available on:

<https://www.kerncog.org/regional-housing-needs/>

If you have any questions or comments regarding the survey or RHNA process, please contact Rochelle Invina-Jayasiri at [rinvina@kerncog.org](mailto:rinvina@kerncog.org).

### **ACTION: Information**

Attachment 1: RHNA Development Timeline

Attachment 2: Draft RHNA Methodology Presentation

Attachment 3 shows the Vacant Land Capacity for Housing Units

Attachment 4: Member Jurisdiction Survey

ATTACHMENT 1

**KERN COG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION SCHEDULE**

**February 2021 – July 2022  
RHNA**

**RHNA development process commenced. Regular updates will be provided during RPAC meetings**

**\*July 21, 2022**

**Proposed 2022 RTP Adoption Due Date**

**June 2021**

- Notify HCD and Caltrans of RTP adoption date
- Begin HCD consultation

**August 2021**

- August 4<sup>th</sup> - Community Stakeholder Meeting to provide RHNA overview and receive community input
- Begin RHNA methodology development
- Conduct survey of member jurisdictions regarding factors in 65584.04(d)

**September 2021**

- September 1<sup>st</sup> RPAC – RHNA adjustment factors and objectives

**November 2021**

- Complete HCD-COG consultation

**December 2021-January 2022**

- HCD determines Kern County Regional Housing Determination
- Kern COG proposes Draft RHNA Methodology (Start 60-day public comment period) and submit to HCD for review
- Community Stakeholder Meeting to present Draft RHNA Methodology

**January 2022**

- Public hearing held for Draft RHNA Methodology

**March 2022**

- Kern COG adopts Final Methodology

**April-May 2022**

- Kern COG releases Draft Regional Housing Needs Allocation to local jurisdictions for 60-day comment period
- Community Stakeholder Meeting to provide draft RHNA allocation overview and receive community input

**July 2022**

- Kern COG adopts Final Regional Housing Allocation Plan
- HCD reviews Proposed Final Regional Housing Allocation Plan

**December 2023**

- Local Governments complete Housing Element Revisions

# Kern Council of Governments Draft 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Cycle Methodology September 1, 2021

Thomas Pogue, Director  
Center for Business and Policy Research  
Pacific.edu/CBPR

UNIVERSITY OF THE  
**PACIFIC**  
Center for Business  
and Policy Research

## Key Components of Kern COG's Draft 6th RHNA Cycle Methodology

<i>RHNA Objectives (rows)/ RHNA Adjustment Factors (columns)</i>	Baseline RTP/SCS Forecast	Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Factor	Income Parity Factor	Jobs-Housing Fit Factor
Increasing the housing supply and mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability	Furthers	Supports	Supports	Supports
Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, protecting environmental and agricultural resources, and encouraging efficient development patters	Furthers	Supports		Supports
Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing	Supports			Furthers
Balancing disproportionate household income distributions		Supports	Furthers	
Affirmatively furthering fair housing		Furthers	Supports	

# RHNA Methodology Differences

- Differences in 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Draft Methodology illustrated in table
- Jurisdiction's forecast population growth between 2024-2032 from RTP/SCS used to determine initial allocation in 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Draft Methodology
- Each jurisdiction's initial allocation is then modified by three adjustment factors:
  - Jobs-Housing Fit
  - Income Parity
  - Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing
- Incorporation of the RTP along with these adjustment factors, necessary to address the five RHNA objectives for the 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA cycle

	Actual 5th RHNA (2013-2023) Allocation	Illustrative 6 <sup>th</sup> RHNA (2024-2032) Allocation	Change in Allocation of Units	% Change in Allocation of Units
Arvin	1,168	1,708	540	46%
Bakersfield	36,290	41,739	5,449	15%
California City	1,268	683	-585	-46%
Delano	1,462	3,101	1,639	112%
Maricopa	35	10	-25	-70%
McFarland	311	527	216	70%
Ridgecrest	1,346	1,420	74	6%
Shafter	2,036	3,708	1,672	82%
Taft	254	497	243	96%
Tehachapi	496	1,053	557	112%
Wasco	1,426	1,660	234	16%
Unincorporated County	21,583	11,566	-10,017	-46%
County RHNA Allocation=>	<b>67,675</b>	<b>67,675</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

Note: The "6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Allocation" in this table is only for comparative purposes

## An Illustration of RHNA Differences in terms of Affordable Housing Units

- Affordable housing units (combined Very Low & Low Income) separated from total in table to the right
- Differences by jurisdiction shows 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Draft Methodology decreases some jurisdiction's affordable housing allocation (such as California City) while increasing the affordable housing allocation in others (such as Bakersfield).
- Overall, the 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Draft Methodology increases the number of affordable housing units

	Actual 5th RHNA (2013-2023) Allocation	Illustrative 6 <sup>th</sup> RHNA (2024- 2032) Allocation	Change in Allocation of Units	% Change in Allocation of Units
Arvin	637	726	89	14%
Bakersfield	15,506	17,243	1,737	11%
California City	385	205	-180	-47%
Delano	673	1,500	827	123%
Maricopa	16	3	-13	-79%
McFarland	166	369	203	122%
Ridgecrest	290	538	248	86%
Shafter	843	1,908	1,065	126%
Taft	78	169	91	116%
Tehachapi	191	402	211	110%
Wasco	625	667	42	7%
Unincorporated County	7,995	4,426	-3,569	-45%
County RHNA Allocation=>	<b>27,405</b>	<b>28,156</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>3%</b>

Note: The "6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Allocation" in this table is only for comparative purposes

# Differences in terms of Draft 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Allocation

Illustrative Comparison of RHNA 6 DRAFT Allocation				
	Actual 5th RHNA Allocation (2013-2023)	Estimate of 6 <sup>th</sup> RHNA Allocation (2024-2032)	Change in Allocation of Units	% Change in Allocation of Units
Arvin	1,168	1,442	274	23%
Bakersfield	36,290	35,235	-1,055	-3%
California City	1,268	577	-691	-55%
Delano	1,462	2,618	1,156	79%
Maricopa	35	9	-26	-75%
McFarland	311	445	134	43%
Ridgecrest	1,346	1,199	-147	-11%
Shafter	2,036	3,130	1,094	54%
Taft	254	419	165	65%
Tehachapi	496	889	393	79%
Wasco	1,426	1,401	-25	-2%
Unincorporated County	21,583	9,764	-11,819	-55%
County RHNA Allocation=>	<b>67,675</b>	<b>57,129</b>	<b>-10,546</b>	<b>-16%</b>

Affordable Allocation (Combined Low + Very Low Income)				
	Actual 5th RHNA Allocation (2013-2023)	Estimate of 6 <sup>th</sup> RHNA Allocation (2024-2032)	Change in Allocation of Units	% Change in Allocation of Units
Arvin	637	613	-24	-4%
Bakersfield	15,506	14,556	-950	-6%
California City	385	173	-212	-55%
Delano	673	1,266	593	88%
Maricopa	16	3	-13	-82%
McFarland	166	311	145	88%
Ridgecrest	290	455	165	57%
Shafter	843	1,611	768	91%
Taft	78	142	64	82%
Tehachapi	191	339	148	78%
Wasco	625	563	-62	-10%
Unincorporated County	7,995	3,736	-4,259	-53%
County RHNA Allocation=>	<b>27,405</b>	<b>23,768</b>	<b>-3,637</b>	<b>-13%</b>

Note: The "6th RHNA Allocation" is based on the draft RHNA number from HCD

# Impact of RTP/SCS options on base 6<sup>th</sup> RHNA Allocations

Jurisdiction	Base Allocation 1: RTP Pop Growth to RHNA (2024-32)	Base Allocation 2: RTP Population in 2032	Base Allocation 3: RTP Pop Growth (2024-46)	Base Allocation 4: RTP HH Growth to RHNA (2024-32)	Base Allocation 5: RTP HHs in 2032	Base Allocation 6: RTP HH Growth (2024-2046)
Arvin	1,442	1,260	1,296	1,191	999	945
Bakersfield	35,235	26,466	38,573	36,740	26,785	37,918
California City	577	869	520	413	865	470
Delano	2,618	3,223	1,741	1,753	2,270	1,404
Maricopa	9	60	13	13	74	16
McFarland	445	855	880	2,372	860	487
Ridgecrest	1,199	1,674	1,466	1,407	2,171	1,719
Shafter	3,130	1,528	3,805	3,407	1,315	3,754
Taft	419	509	418	488	472	466
Tehachapi	889	831	814	905	742	841
Wasco	1,401	1,692	1,223	1,112	1,258	1,041
Unincorporated	9,764	18,161	6,381	7,327	19,319	8,067
<b>Total</b>			<b>57,219</b>			

Note: The "6th RHNA Allocation" is based on the draft RHNA number from HCD

## ATTACHMENT 3

### Vacant Land Capacity for Housing Units by Jurisdiction (DRAFT)

Jurisdiction	Existing Housing Units (2020)	Residential Units Capacity (Vacant)		
		Medium, High, and Mixed Use Density	Very-Low and Low Density	Total
<b>Arvin</b>	4,884	536	1,025	1,561
<b>Bakersfield</b>	132,697	27,524	64,870	92,394
<b>California City</b>	5,196	48,354	34,947	83,301
<b>Delano</b>	11,572	1,303	3,493	4,796
<b>Maricopa</b>	3,412	-	253	253
<b>McFarland</b>	432	82	449	531
<b>Ridgecrest</b>	12,359	1,784	3,543	5,328
<b>Shafter</b>	5,412	1,303	19,713	21,015
<b>Taft</b>	2,596	1,065	4,289	5,354
<b>Tehachapi</b>	3,784	460	2,305	2,765
<b>Wasco</b>	6,366	242	3,029	3,272
<b>Unincorporated County</b>	301,009	229,230	147,711	376,940
<b>County Total</b>	112,299	311,883	285,627	597,511

The residential units capacity used a GIS analysis of each jurisdiction's latest general plan information (2020) outside urban/built-up areas, and demonstrates sufficient existing capacity to accommodate a variety of density ranges to meet each jurisdiction's housing need.

# Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey

## Introduction

California Government Code requires that each Council of Government must survey its member jurisdictions for information to inform development of the RHNA Methodology and Plan. This survey contains a series of questions related to these Objectives and Factors required for consideration. The Objective and Factors are described below:

Government Code specifies five Objectives all RHNA Plans must further:

1. Increase housing supply and mix of housing types, with the goal of improving housing affordability and equity in all cities and counties within the region.
2. Promote infill development and socioeconomic equity; protect environmental and agricultural resources; encourage efficient development patterns; and achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets.
3. Improve intra-regional jobs-to-housing relationship, including the balance between low-wage jobs and affordable housing units for low-wage workers in each jurisdiction.
4. Balance disproportionate household income distributions (more high-income allocation to lower-income areas, and vice versa)
5. Affirmatively further fair housing to promote fair housing choice and foster inclusive communities that are free from discrimination.

Additionally, Government Code identifies several Factors to be considered when developing the RHNA methodology:

1. Existing and projected jobs and housing relationship, particularly low-wage jobs and affordable housing.
2. Lack of capacity for sewer or water service due to decisions outside jurisdiction's control.
3. Availability of land suitable for urban development.
4. Lands protected from urban development under existing federal or State programs.
5. Policies to preserve or protect land from urban development.
6. Opportunities to maximize use of transit and existing transportation infrastructure.
7. Policies directing growth toward incorporated areas.
8. Existing or projected loss of units contained in affordable housing developments.
9. High housing cost burdens.
10. The rate of overcrowding.
11. Housing needs of farm-workers.
12. Housing needs generated by a university within the jurisdiction.
13. Housing needs of individuals and families experiencing homelessness.
14. Units lost during a state of emergency that have yet to be replaced.
15. The region's SB 375 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets.

Please contact Rochelle Invina-Jayasiri at [rinvina@kerncog.org](mailto:rinvina@kerncog.org) with any questions about the survey or its relationship to the RHNA Methodology and Plan.

\* 1. Please tell us which jurisdiction your responses are for:

**Name of Jurisdiction**

2. Please tell us about yourself and your jurisdiction

**Your Name**


**Your Title**

**Please provide a contact email address**

## Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey

## Jobs and Housing

## Job-Housing Fit Ratio



3. The Jobs-Housing Fit Ratio in the figure above measures the number of lower-wage jobs (jobs with earnings less than \$3,333/month) to affordable housing units (units with rent less than \$1,000/month). For example, a jurisdiction with 20,000 low-wage jobs and 10,000 affordable housing units would have Jobs-Housing Fit Ratio of 2.0  $\leq$  (20,000/10,000). Does this information correspond to your jurisdiction's perceptions?

4. How significant a concern is the balance of low-wage workers to homes affordable to low-wage workers in your jurisdiction?

- Very significant
- Somewhat significant
- Neither significant or insignificant
- Somewhat insignificant
- Very insignificant

5. What would you say are the primary reasons for your jurisdiction's **jobs-housing fit ratio**?

6. Which, if any, of the following impacts does the balance of low-wage workers to homes affordable to low-wage workers have on your jurisdiction? Check all that apply.

- Difficulty for local employers to hire and/or retain workers
- Long commutes to jobs outside of the jurisdiction
- High rates of housing cost burden for residents
- There are no significant impacts
- Long commutes into the jurisdiction
- Other (please specify)

7. Does your jurisdiction use jobs-housing fit data to inform its policy decisions?

- Yes
- No

Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey

Housing Opportunities and Constraints

8. Which of the following apply to your jurisdiction as an opportunity and/or a constraint for development of additional housing by 2032?

	Opportunity	Constraint	Both
Availability of construction workforce	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Availability of parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Availability of public or social services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Availability of schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Availability of surplus public land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Availability of vacant land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Availability of water suitable for consumption	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Construction costs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
County policies to preserve agricultural land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financing/funding for affordable housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact of climate change and natural hazards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lands protected by federal or State programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project labor agreements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sewer Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State requirements to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Suitable land availability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utility connection fees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Weak market conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use the space below to describe other opportunities and/or constraints for your jurisdiction's development of additional housing by 2032.

9. Of the issues that you marked as opportunities in Question 7, list up to three that you feel represent the greatest opportunities for developing additional housing in your jurisdiction by 2031 and explain the reasoning for your selection?

10. Of the issues that you marked as constraints in Question 7, list up to three that you feel represent the greatest constraints for developing additional housing in your jurisdiction by 2031 and explain the reasoning for your selection?

11. What are the primary barriers or gaps your jurisdiction faces in meeting its RHNA goals for producing housing affordable to very low- and low-income households? Check all that apply.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community opposition  | <input type="checkbox"/> Local gap financing for affordable housing development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Federal and State funding availability (market driven – necessitate subsidy to build) | <input type="checkbox"/> Local affordable housing development capacity          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of requisite infrastructure, such as sewer and water                             |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)  |   |


12. The location and type of housing can play a key role in meeting state and regional targets to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. What land use policies or strategies has your jurisdiction implemented to minimize GHG emissions? Check all that apply.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Designating Priority Conservation Areas                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Increasing local employment opportunities to reduce commute lengths for residents         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Designating Priority Development Areas                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Investment in transit expansion   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Encouraging mixed-use development                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Investment in maintaining or improving existing public transportation infrastructure      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Encouraging development near transit                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Investment in pedestrian, bicycle, and active transportation infrastructure               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy efficiency standards in new construction or retrofits | <input type="checkbox"/> Land use changes that encourage a diversity of housing types and/or mixed-use development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Implementing a Climate Action Plan                           |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)                                       |  |

Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey


Housing Affordability and Overcrowding

Percentage of Cost Burdened Households by Ownership Type



13. Please see the cost burden data in the figure above for the percentage of households in your jurisdiction currently paying more than 30% of their income toward housing costs. For example, if a community had 10,000 housing units with a mortgage and 3,500 of those housing units reported monthly ownership cost at 30% or more of their monthly household income, then 35%  $\leq$  (3,500/10,000) of owner-occupied units with a mortgage would be cost burdened. Has your jurisdiction considered what impacts high housing costs and the proportion of rent/owner-burdened households have on residents in your jurisdiction?

Overcrowding Rate



14. Government Code Section 65584.01(b)(1)(C)(i) defines an “overcrowded” household as a household with more than one resident per room in each room in a dwelling. For example, if a community had 5,000 occupied housing units and 500 of those housing units reported more than one person per room in each room, then  $10\% \leq (500/5,000)$  of occupied housing units would be considered overcrowded. Accordingly, the overcrowding rate in your jurisdiction is reported above for your reference. Has your jurisdiction considered what impacts overcrowding has on residents in your jurisdiction?

## Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey

## Housing Demand

15. Over the course of a typical year, is there a need in your jurisdiction for additional housing for farmworkers?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

16. If you answered yes to Question 14, what are the main reasons for this unmet demand?

17. Is there currently any unmet housing demand in your jurisdiction created by postsecondary educational institutions?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

18. If you answered yes to Question 16, what are the main reasons for this unmet demand?

19. Does your jurisdiction collect data on homelessness within the jurisdiction and demand for transitional housing for those experiencing homelessness?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

20. If you answered yes to Question 18, please provide an estimate for the local homeless population and corresponding need for transitional housing.

21. Has your jurisdiction experienced a loss of units in assisted housing developments in the past 10 years due to expiring affordability contracts or other issues facing at-risk affordable housing units?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

22. If you answered yes to Question 20, please provide an estimate of the number of lost units.

23. Does your jurisdiction anticipate a loss of units in assisted housing developments in the next 10 years?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

24. If you answered yes to Question 22, please estimate how many units will be lost and why.

## Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey

**Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing**

As a result of recent legislation, RHNA and local Housing Elements are now required to “affirmatively further fair housing” [Government Code Section 65584(d)]. Per Government Code 65584(e), affirmatively furthering fair housing 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. 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.”*

To comply with this requirement, Kern COG is collecting information on local jurisdictions’ fair housing issues as well as strategies and actions for achieving fair housing goals. In developing the fair housing questions that follow in this section of the survey, Kern COG relied on guidance documents from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). While recognizing that not all jurisdictions have completed an Analysis of Impediments or Assessment of Fair Housing for HUD, these questions should help jurisdictions understand the analysis framework they will need to use in demonstrating that their Housing Element affirmatively furthers fair housing.

Please answer the questions in this section to the best of your ability using your jurisdiction’s Housing Element, Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, Assessment of Fair Housing, and/or other data sources.

## Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey

## Fair Housing Planning and Data Sources

25. Does your jurisdiction have an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice or an Assessment of Fair Housing due to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requirements?

- Yes  
 No

26. When did your jurisdiction last update the General Plan? Please provide the year.

27. When did your jurisdiction last update the General Plan's Housing Element? Please provide the year.

28. Does your General Plan have an environmental justice/social equity chapter or integrate environmental justice/social equity, per SB 1000?

- Yes  
 No  
 In process

29. If you answered yes or are in process to question 27, how does your General Plan integrate or plan to integrate environmental justice?

- An environmental justice chapter  
 Throughout the General Plan in each chapter  
 Both

Please use the space below to make further comments

30. Which of the following data sources does your jurisdiction maintain or use to assess fair housing issues in the community? Check all that apply.

- Data collected by community-based organizations       Local data sources  
 Data provided by HUD       Publicly available datasets  
 Other (please specify)

31. Are there particular data points that are important to consider in developing the Kern COG RHNP, especially those measuring equity or opportunity in the context of furthering of environmental justice and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing?

32. Which of the following outreach activities has your jurisdiction used to encourage community participation in planning processes related to fair housing? Check all that apply.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Online forum/meeting   | <input type="checkbox"/> Resident surveys               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Open house             | <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder group consultation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public hearings        | <input type="checkbox"/> Town hall                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resident focus groups  |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) |   |

33. Please describe your goals for the process to elicit community participation for fair housing planning.

34. How successful was your jurisdiction in achieving its goals for the process to elicit community participation for fair housing planning?

- Successful
- Somewhat successful
- Somewhat unsuccessful
- Unsuccessful

Describe the reasons for the success or lack of success of your jurisdiction's community engagement efforts.

Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey

Fair Housing Issues

35. Which of the following factors contribute to fair housing issues in your jurisdiction? Check all that apply.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Zoning/Land Use restrictions (density/intensity/ height limits, parking requirements, minimum lot size)              | <input type="checkbox"/> Foreclosure patterns                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Occupancy restrictions   | <input type="checkbox"/> Municipal or State services and amenities                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The availability of affordable units in a range of sizes (especially larger units)                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Availability, frequency, and reliability of public transit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Residential real estate steerings  | <input type="checkbox"/> Access to healthcare facilities and medical services       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deteriorated or abandoned properties   | <input type="checkbox"/> Access to grocery stores and healthy food options          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of private investments in low-income neighborhoods and/or communities of color, including services or amenities | <input type="checkbox"/> Creation and retention of high-quality jobs                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Access to financial services   | <input type="checkbox"/> Range of job opportunities available                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Location of affordable housing   | <input type="checkbox"/> CEQA and the land use entitlement process                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Location of employers  | <input type="checkbox"/> Community opposition to proposed or existing developments  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)   |   |

36. To what extent could the following factors be barriers to the production of more affordable housing types (i.e., subsidized affordable, missing middle, multifamily) in high opportunity areas? Check all that apply.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Zoning/Land Use restrictions (density/intensity/ height limits, parking requirements, minimum lot size) | <input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved violations of fair housing or civil rights laws    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Opposition  | <input type="checkbox"/> Discrimination in the housing market                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Costs  | <input type="checkbox"/> Support or opposition from public officials                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of market demand   | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of fair housing education                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure needs  | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)  |  |

Kern COG\_RHNA6\_Survey

Fair Housing Goals and Actions

37. What actions/steps has your jurisdiction taken to overcome historical patterns of segregation or remove barriers to equal housing opportunity? Check all that apply.

	In Use	Under Council/Board Consideration	Potential Council/Board Interest
Dedicated local funding source for affordable housing development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensuring affirmative marketing of affordable housing is targeted to all segments of the community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exploring partnerships with Community Development Financial Institutions, large regional employers, and investors to add to the financial resources available for the creation and preservation of deed-restricted affordable housing units	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Funding rehabilitation and accessibility improvements for low-income homeowners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Funding and supporting outreach services for homeowners and renters at risk of losing their homes and/or experiencing fair housing impediments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Implementing a rent stabilization policy and staffing a rent stabilization board	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Land use changes to allow a greater variety of housing types	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	In Use	Under Council/Board Consideration	Potential Council/Board Interest
Streamlining entitlements processes and/or removing development fees for affordable housing construction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for affordable housing development near transit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for the development of affordable housing for special needs populations (seniors, the disabled, those experiencing homelessness, those with mental health and/or substance abuse issues, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for the development of larger affordable housing units that can accommodate families (2- and 3-bedroom units, or larger)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for the development of affordable housing on publicly owned land.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Providing financial support or other resources for low-income home buyers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>		

38. How successful were your jurisdiction's past actions in achieving goals for overcoming historical patterns of segregation or removing barriers to equal housing opportunity?

Successful  
 Somewhat successful  
 Somewhat unsuccessful  
 Unsuccessful

39. Describe the reasons for the success or lack of success of your jurisdiction's actions to overcome historical patterns of segregation or remove barriers to equal housing opportunity.

40. Which of the following policies, programs, or actions does your jurisdiction use to prevent or mitigate the displacement of low-income households? Check all that apply.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rent stabilization/rent control          | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing counseling    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mobile home rent control                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Long term covenants   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foreclosure assistance                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Promoting streamlined processing of ADUs | <input type="checkbox"/> Relocation assistance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fair housing legal services              |  |

41. What are your public outreach strategies to reach disadvantaged communities? Check all that apply.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership with advocacy/non-profit organizations | <input type="checkbox"/> Variety of venues to hold community meetings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership with schools                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Door-to-door interaction                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership with health institutions               | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased mobile phone app engagement        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)                             |   |