

CHAPTER 8

HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

California Government Code Section 65583(a)(2) states that the housing element must analyze and document household characteristics in Sacramento County, including the level of payment and ability to pay, overcrowding, and the condition of the housing stock. Chapter 5 of this Housing Element, "Population and Housing Characteristics," identifies and documents several of these issues. This chapter summarizes and quantifies Sacramento County's (County's) existing and future housing needs and assesses the County's special housing needs. This chapter includes a review of existing housing needs through the examination of current affordability levels, including an analysis of the ability of Sacramento County's residents to pay for housing and rental costs. In addition, this chapter identifies the number of households in the County whose housing and rental costs are greater than 30 percent of their gross income (overpayment). This chapter also contains an assessment of overcrowding (households with more than 1.0 persons per room).

The special needs of the underserved population, including minority households, seniors, large households, female-headed households, persons with disabilities, farmworkers, and the homeless are also analyzed. In identifying future housing needs, the projected demand for housing for various income groups is analyzed.

The findings of this section include the following:

- Housing prices for new and existing homes have declined slightly from their peak in 2006. However, these declines followed several years of rapid increase, and the median price for a home in 2007 is nearly twice the 2002 median. These increases in housing price have outpaced gains in household income and caused a decline in the percentage of Sacramento County households who can afford the median-priced home. Despite the short-term trend of declining prices, home prices will likely continue to outpace income gains in the long run.
- Rents have risen since 2000, from a 7 percent increase for 2-bedroom units to an almost 27% increase for three-bedroom units. Long-term prospects are for a continuation of this trend over the next 5 years, unless the stock of rental housing increases significantly. This prediction is based both on the overall growth rate for the Sacramento area and the potential for fewer households to afford owner-occupied housing as lending standards become more restrictive.
- Consistent with rapid increases in housing costs during the late 1990s, the 2000 Census reported that overcrowding and overpayment among lower income households increased between 1990 and 2000. Although more recent census figures for overcrowding are not available, overpayment and overcrowding are likely to have further increased since 2000 due to increasing housing costs relative to incomes.²
- Sacramento County will need to plan for and accommodate 15,160 new housing units between 2006 and 2013. See Chapter 6 for a discussion of the Regional Housing Needs Plan as adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments

² Although housing costs have stabilized recently with the decline in the housing market, the long-term trend of a growing gap between housing costs and local incomes could resume once the housing market recovers.

(SACOG) in February 2008. Of these 15,160 housing units, 22 percent (3,339 units) should be affordable to extremely low income (ELI) and very low income (VLI) households earning less than 50 percent of the Sacramento County median income, 15.1 percent (2,293 units) should be affordable to low income (LI) households earning less than 80 percent of the median, 17.8 percent (2,700 units) to households earning 80 to 120 percent of median income and 45.1 percent (6,828 units) to household earning more than 120 percent of median income.

- As the County's population ages, there will be a growing need for housing that meets the changing lifestyle, financial, and physical needs of seniors. The population 65 years and older increased by 25 percent in Sacramento County between 1990 and 2000 and is forecast to increase another 21 percent by 2010 (to a total of 165,157) based on the most recent California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates from July 2007. The County will need to accommodate additional housing with supportive services for seniors, affordable rental housing for low-income seniors, market rate housing designed for accessibility, and financial assistance in rehabilitating and modifying homes owned by seniors.
- Family incomes have lagged compared to nonfamily households. Low-income families with children, especially large families, are at greatest risk of experiencing overcrowding and overpayment. Among family households, female-headed households with children are most at risk of suffering these housing problems because of their extremely low incomes and high poverty rates.
- As the County's population has increased, so has that segment of the population with disabilities and self-care limitations. Part of the increase is a consequence of the aging population.
- Although agriculture in Sacramento County has declined with urbanization, farmworkers still compose a significant part of the labor force—an estimated 6,115 workers in 2000, including 2,831 migrant workers. In 2004, there were an estimated 6,500 workers employed in agriculture in the Sacramento metropolitan area as reported by the California Employment Development Department. Farmworkers tend to have very low income because of the wages paid for most types of farm work. Farmworker families experience high rates of overcrowding, overpayment, and substandard housing conditions because of the lack of affordable housing. Migrant farmworkers face the additional challenge of finding suitable and affordable seasonal shelter, which is in short supply during periods of peak demand. The number of farm labor camps and available farm labor beds have declined steadily since 1999.
- Sacramento County has experienced an increasing homeless population over the past decade. About 4,300 people were homeless at some point during 2006. There are many reasons for homelessness: lack of income, disability, substance abuse, and temporary life events. Despite the increase in resources devoted to addressing homeless needs over the past decade, many homeless individuals and families still face shortages of temporary shelter, supportive services, transitional housing, and affordable permanent housing.

HOUSING NEEDS OF EXISTING RESIDENTS

HOUSING COSTS

The cost of housing in relation to household income determines whether a household will be able to obtain an adequately sized unit in good condition in a chosen area. In Sacramento County, the cost of housing has increased during the past decade faster than local incomes, even accounting for recent declines in sales prices. The increase in the median price of a home in Sacramento County is largely attributed to a strong local economy, rising incomes, and individuals and families relocating to the area, including from the Bay Area and Los Angeles.

Between 2002 and 2006, the median price of an existing home in Sacramento County increased by nearly 115 percent. Median home prices have declined nearly 10 percent between June 2006 and June 2007. However, the overall rise in home price between 2002 and 2007 is still nearly 94 percent. By comparison, the median household income in Sacramento County increased less than 40 percent during the entire decade of the 1990s. The dramatic increase in housing value in Sacramento is typical of many communities in California. Despite the increases, Sacramento County's median home price remains relatively low when compared to price levels for the Bay Area, Los Angeles, and San Diego.

Many home loans which were written during the housing boom of the past several years required little money down. When prices begin to decline, homeowners were left in a situation where they had little or no equity in the house, but must make payments on a loan for more money than the house is worth. This is one of the major factors that led to the recent drop in prices and a corresponding increase in foreclosures. The Sacramento Bee reported that during the first three quarters of 2007, a total of 4,831 foreclosures took place in Sacramento County (including both unincorporated and incorporated areas). Despite the short term decline in home prices seen since 2006 and the continuing effects of foreclosure activity dampening the housing market, the long-term housing trend for Sacramento County is expected to be continued rises in home prices.

Although Sacramento has more affordable home prices on a countywide basis than in the Bay Area or Southern California, median housing prices vary considerably among unincorporated areas, from a low of \$207,500 in North Highlands to \$606,500 in Arden-Arcade (ZIP code 95864). Table 8-1 identifies annual median housing values for the Sacramento area from 2002 to 2007.

YEAR ¹	MEDIAN PRICE
2002	\$169,983
2003	\$205,000
2004	\$252,828
2005	\$324,684
2006	\$365,000
2007	\$329,500
Average Annual Change 2002-2007	14.2%

Source: Sacramento Bee DataQuick Information Systems 2002-2007.

¹ For January 2002-2005, June 2006-2007. Not adjusted for inflation.

Table 8-2 compares median home prices by zip code for 2005, 2006 and 2007. Home prices have decreased in value in almost every zip code area between July 2005 and July 2006 and July 2006 and July 2007. In fact, the decrease in home value accelerated in many zip code areas during the last year of this time period.

TABLE 8-2. MEDIAN HOME PRICES BY ZIP CODE (JULY 2005-JULY 2007)

COMMUNITY	ZIP CODE	ESTIMATED MEDIAN PRICE JULY 2005 ¹	MEDIAN PRICE JULY 2006	PERCENT CHANGE FROM JULY 2005	MEDIAN PRICE JULY 2007	PERCENT CHANGE FROM JULY 2006
Antelope	95843	\$375,666	\$352,750	-6.1%	\$320,000	-9.3%
Carmichael	95608	\$417,172	\$413,000	-1.0%	\$335,000	-18.9%
Citrus Heights	95610	\$375,403	\$349,500	-6.9%	\$305,250	-12.8%
Citrus Heights	95621	\$337,909	\$320,000	-5.3%	\$257,750	-19.5%
Elk Grove	95624	\$435,130	\$436,000	0.2%	\$363,000	-16.7%
Elk Grove	95757	\$469,856	\$491,000	4.5%	\$400,000	-19.3%
Elk Grove	95758	\$409,321	\$404,000	-1.3%	\$329,000	-18.6%
Elverta	95626	\$357,680	\$333,000	-6.9%	\$272,000	-18.3%
Fair Oaks	95628	\$447,071	\$435,000	-2.7%	\$400,000	-8.0%
Folsom	95630	\$500,000	\$505,000	1.0%	\$470,000	-5.1%
Galt	95632	\$358,948	\$355,000	-1.1%	\$315,000	-11.3%
Herald	95638	\$757,576	\$825,000	8.9%	n/a	n/a
Isleton	95641	\$182,012	\$342,000	87.9%	n/a	n/a
North Highlands	95660	\$283,976	\$280,000	-1.4%	\$207,500	-25.9%
Orangevale	95662	\$388,350	\$360,000	-7.3%	\$304,750	-15.3%
Rancho Cordova	95670	\$342,531	\$360,000	5.1%	\$349,000	-3.1%
Rio Linda	95673	\$316,048	\$289,500	-8.4%	\$278,000	-0.7%
Sacramento (Arden-Arcade)	95821	\$348,145	\$356,500	2.4%	\$297,000	-16.7%
Sacramento (Arden-Arcade)	95825	\$354,873	\$335,000	-5.6%	\$332,500	6.2%
Sacramento (Arden-Arcade)	95864	\$362,524	\$385,000	6.2%	\$606,500	57.5%
Sacramento (City)	95814	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$475,000	n/a
Sacramento (City)	95815	\$270,108	\$225,000	-16.7%	\$224,500	-1.1%
Sacramento (City)	95816	\$506,997	\$398,500	-21.4%	\$385,000	-3.4%
Sacramento (City)	95817	\$273,925	\$274,500	0.2%	\$280,500	3.9%
Sacramento (City)	95818	\$430,079	\$489,000	13.7%	\$457,000	-6.5%
Sacramento (City)	95819	\$479,826	\$440,000	-8.3%	\$430,000	-2.3%
Sacramento (City)	95820	\$261,375	\$270,000	3.3%	\$242,500	-9.9%
Sacramento (City)	95822	\$300,102	\$295,000	-1.7%	\$288,000	-2.4%
Sacramento (City)	95831	\$416,188	\$362,500	-12.9%	\$362,000	-0.8%
Sacramento (City)	95833	\$360,061	\$352,500	-2.1%	\$293,000	-17.5%
Sacramento (City)	95834	\$424,945	\$385,000	-9.4%	\$360,000	-6.5%
Sacramento (City)	95838	\$284,925	\$283,500	-0.5%	\$215,500	-24.4%
Sacramento (City)/ North Natomas	95835	\$508,912	\$542,500	6.6%	\$391,000	-27.9%
Sacramento (City)/ Rancho Cordova	95826	\$340,530	\$347,000	1.9%	\$305,000	-12.1%
Sacramento (City)/ South Sacramento	95823	\$320,641	\$320,000	-0.2%	\$263,250	-17.7%
Sacramento (City)/ South Sacramento	95824	\$269,990	\$273,500	1.3%	\$226,000	-17.4%
Sacramento (Foothill Farms)	95841	\$337,140	\$339,500	0.7%	\$285,000	-16.1%
Sacramento (Foothill Farms/North Highlands)	95842	\$320,554	\$301,000	-6.1%	\$260,500	-14.6%
Sacramento (Freeport)	95832	\$314,385	\$271,000	-13.8%	\$248,000	-8.5%
Sacramento (North Natomas)	95837	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Sacramento (Rancho Cordova)	95827	\$349,948	\$338,750	-3.2%	\$305,000	-10.0%
Sacramento (South Sacramento)	95828	\$344,180	\$325,250	-5.5%	\$266,750	-17.9%
Sacramento (Vineyard)	95829	\$415,282	\$375,000	-9.7%	\$362,000	-3.5%
Sloughhouse	95683	\$625,128	\$609,500	-2.5%	\$597,500	-2.0%
Wilton	95693	\$686,948	\$700,000	1.9%	\$540,000	-22.9%

Source: DataQuick 2007, Median Price July 2005 compiled by EDAW, 2008.

¹ Estimated 2005 Median Price calculated by EDAW using Median Price 2006 and Percent Change data.

NEW HOMES

The median price of a new home in Sacramento County in August 2007 was \$332,000, a decline of 12.5 percent over the past year. In the Sacramento region, the median price for new homes ranged from \$300,000 in Sutter County to \$614,500 in El Dorado County (Table 8-3).

COUNTY	AUGUST 2006	AUGUST 2007	PERCENT CHANGE
Amador	\$344,000	\$346,550	0.7
El Dorado	\$690,500	\$614,500	-11.0
Nevada	\$600,000	\$573,500	-4.4
Placer	\$421,000	\$437,500	3.9
Sacramento	\$379,250	\$332,000	-12.5
Sutter	\$324,500	\$300,000	-7.6
Yolo	\$442,000	\$385,000	-12.9
Yuba	\$336,500	\$310,000	-7.9

Source: Sacramento Bee 2007.

RENTAL HOMES

Costs for rental units increased steadily within the Sacramento metropolitan area from 1990 to 2000. The U.S. Census Bureau reported that gross rental costs (contract rent plus utility costs) increased by approximately 22 percent between 1990 and 2000, from a median gross rent of \$542 to \$659. Table 8-4 shows the distribution of renter-occupied housing units by gross rent.

RENT AMOUNT	1990		2000	
	UNITS	PERCENT	UNITS	PERCENT
\$0-\$199	1,576	2%	1,705	2%
\$200-\$299	2,414	2%	1,710	2%
\$300-\$499	31,783	33%	14,026	13%
\$500-\$749	41,560	43%	49,070	46%
\$750-\$999	12,700	13%	26,994	25%
\$1,000 or more	4,014	4%	10,446	10%
No cash rent	2,530	3%	2,796	2%
Total	96,577	100%	106,747	100%
Median Gross Rent	\$542	\$659		

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 1990 and 2000.

As measured by the U.S. Census Bureau, increases in rental costs appeared modest in relation to incomes during the 1990s. Recently, a rental survey of apartments in the Sacramento area was conducted by Hendricks and Partners. The survey calculated that the median rent was \$954 during the second quarter of 2007 (compared to \$784 in 2001). The median rent of \$954 represented a two percent increase since the second quarter of 2006, and about a 22 percent increase since

2001. Average rents in the unincorporated area ranged from \$724 in South Sacramento to \$1,115 in Orangevale.

Table 8-5 summarizes rent increases by community that has occurred since 2000.

TABLE 8-5. AVERAGE RENTS (2001, SECOND QUARTER 2006-2007)¹

COMMUNITY	AVERAGE 2001 RENT	AVERAGE 2ND QUARTER 2006 RENT	AVERAGE 2ND QUARTER 2007 RENT	PERCENT INCREASE 2001-2007	PERCENT INCREASE 2006-2007
Antelope	\$756	\$876	\$909	20%	4%
Carmichael	\$826	\$777	\$767	-7%	-1%
Citrus Heights, Fair Oaks	\$764	\$843	\$863	13%	2%
North Highlands	\$668	\$771	\$760	14%	-1%
Orangevale, Folsom	\$1,029	\$1,103	\$1,115	8%	1%
South Sacramento	\$756	\$713	\$724	-4%	2%
Sacramento Region	\$784	\$931	\$954	22%	2%

Source: Hendricks & Partners 2007.

¹ Average rents reported by Hendricks & Partners are for apartments of 50 units or more.

Table 8-6 compares average rents by apartment size. This data was obtained by Sacramento Self Help Housing. This organization conducts quarterly surveys of specifically low-cost apartment complexes in the region. Table 8-6 presents rents and historic trends for these low-cost apartment complexes from 2001 through 2007.

TABLE 8-6. RENTAL RATES BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA - 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007

UNIT TYPE	2001	2003	2005	2007	% CHANGE 01-07
Studio	\$512	\$522	\$567	\$584	14.1
1 Bedroom	\$615	\$641	\$671	\$667	8.5
2 Bedroom	\$738	\$770	\$784	\$790	7.0
3 Bedroom	\$900	\$1,070	\$1,068	\$1142	26.9

Source: Sacramento Self Help Housing, Rental Reports 2001–2007.

Table 8-7 provides information on rent levels for specific apartment complexes in Sacramento County. These data are not a representative survey, and are intended only to provide an example of the range of options available in various unincorporated communities. The table shows monthly rents ranging from \$550 to \$740 for studio apartments, \$582 to \$885 for one-bedroom apartments, \$692 to \$1,150 for two-bedroom apartments, and \$750 to \$1,195 for three-bedroom apartments.

TABLE 8-7. 2007 RENTS AT SELECTED APARTMENT COMPLEXES IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY					
APARTMENT NAME	STUDIO RENT	1 BED RENT	2 BED RENT	3 BED RENT	BATHS
Sacramento County (Unincorporated)					
Antelope					
North Country Vista	--	\$700	\$805	--	1-2
Spring Meadows	--	\$775	\$850	--	1-2
Antelope Vista	--	\$760	\$940	--	1-2
Antelope Ridge	--	\$825	\$970	\$1,195	1-2
The Arbors at Antelope	--	--	\$1,150	\$1,150	1-2
Carmichael					
Parkwood Apartment Homes	--	\$695	\$850	--	1
The Meridian	--	--	\$925	--	1
Foxworth Apartments	--	\$715	\$795	--	1-2
Crestview North	--	\$630	\$725	--	1-2
Atherton Apartments	--	\$625	\$780	--	1-2
Marconi Woods	--	\$625	\$725	--	1
Country Village	--	\$695	\$795	--	1
Garden Park Apartments	--	--	\$750	--	1
Hastings Ranch	--	\$725	\$885	--	1-2
Terrace at Fair Oaks	--	\$650	\$750	\$1,050	1-2
Fair Oaks					
Fair Oaks Meadows	--	\$760	\$900	--	1-2
Bella Lago	--	\$795	\$950	--	1-2
Oak Meadows	--	\$795	\$1,025	--	1-2
Fountains of Fair Oaks	--	\$740	\$890	--	1-2
Gold River					
Bishop's Court	--	\$770	\$915	\$1,095	1-2
River Pointe Park	--	\$675	\$805	--	1
Reserve at Capital Center	--	\$885	\$1,130	--	1-2
Zinfandel Village	--	\$750	\$910	\$1,090	1-2
North Highlands					
Mesa Verde	\$565	\$665	\$785	--	1-2
Harrison Court	--	--	\$695	--	1
Highland Townhomes	--	--	\$710	\$950	1
Antelope Ranch	--	\$625	\$700	\$800	1
Cottage Meadows	\$550	\$650	\$750	--	1
Orangevale					
Hazel Wood	\$650	\$705	\$820	--	1
Folsom Gateway	--	\$785	\$955	\$1,060	1-2
The Cottages	\$740	\$800	\$975	--	1-2

Source: ForRent.com 2007, Rent.com 2007.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Housing affordability refers to the maximum amount an individual is able to pay for decent, safe, and sanitary housing without sacrificing expenditures on other essential needs. Most housing analysts define “affordable” as housing that can be obtained for 30 percent or less of a household’s income. Despite these rules of thumb, housing affordability depends on a household’s income, financial circumstances, and composition. For example, a single individual with no long-term debt and an income that exceeds 120 percent of median can well afford to spend in excess of 30 percent of their gross income for housing. A low-income family of five with a car payment might find it difficult to devote even 25 percent of its gross income for housing without foregoing other necessary expenditures.

A household can typically qualify to purchase a home that is two and one-half to three times its annual income, depending on the down payment, the level of other long-term obligations (such as a car loan), and interest rates. In practice, the interaction of these factors allows some households to qualify for homes priced at more than three times their annual income, while other households may be limited to purchasing homes no more than two times their annual income. This has been particularly true since the early 2000s, when many lenders and mortgage brokers introduced (or more extensively marketed) loan products that required very little or no downpayment, interest only loans initially, or adjustable rate loans with initial low interest rates for one to five years. These loan products allowed more households to become homeowners and many borrowers to purchase homes representing a higher multiple of their earnings—sometimes four or more times the household’s annual income.

In Sacramento County, the greatest gap between incomes and housing costs occurs in rental units affordable to extremely low and very low-income households, and in home prices affordable to very low- through moderate-income households. According to Table 8-8, the median rent in 2007 exceeded what an extremely low-income household could afford by at least \$450 and exceeded what a very-low income household could afford by at least \$114. Also, the median home price was at least \$160,750 more than what was affordable to a low-income household and at least \$80,200 more than what was affordable to a moderate-income household. There are certain areas in Sacramento County (North Highlands and parts of South Sacramento) that have median sales prices that would be affordable to the upper end of the moderate-income households but in general, home prices in Sacramento County are not affordable to most moderate income households and certainly not affordable to lower income households.

INCOME GROUP	INCOME RANGE (FAMILY OF FOUR)	AFFORDABLE MONTHLY RENT ¹	MEDIAN RENT (2 ND QUARTER 2007)	AFFORDABLE PURCHASE PRICE ²	MEDIAN HOME PRICE (AUGUST 2007)
Extremely Low	\$0-\$20,150	\$0-\$504	\$954	\$60,450	\$322,000
Very Low	\$20,151-\$33,600	\$504-\$840		\$100,800	
Low	\$33,601-\$53,750	\$840-\$1,344		\$161,250	
Moderate	\$53,751-80,600	\$1,344-\$2,015		\$241,800	

Sources: Hendricks & Partners 2007, Sacramento Bee DataQuick Information Systems 2007.

¹ Contract rent plus utilities. Assumes a total of 30 percent of income spent on a combination of rent and utilities.

² Affordable purchase price assumes a value of three times the annual income.

For ownership housing, the trend in housing affordability can be measured by using a housing affordability index. The housing affordability index is a measurement of the percentage of homes that would be affordable to a family earning the median income. It should be noted that the historical trend of housing affordability goes through cycles of increasing to decreasing affordability. Data suggest that the County and region are in a down cycle of affordability. The Sacramento Area Housing Opportunity Index (HOI) is an affordability index prepared by Wells Fargo and the National Association of Home Builders. The HOI figures for the fourth quarter of each year are shown in Table 8-9.

As shown in the Table 8-9, the HOI has dropped from a recent high of 65.5 percent in 1997 to 15 percent in the first quarter of 2007. The long-term impact of the current trend towards lower median home prices on affordability is not clear.

YEAR	INDEX PERCENTAGE (%) ¹
1995	61.1
1997	65.5
1999	56.7
2001	44
2003	25.3
2005	7.3
2007	15

Source: National Association of Home Builders 2007.

¹ Figures are the percentage of homes that would be affordable to a family earning the median income during the fourth quarter of each year (2nd quarter of 2007).

HOUSEHOLDS OVERPAYING

As stated previously, a generally accepted measure of housing affordability is that households should not pay more than 30 percent of their gross incomes for housing expenses. Expenditure in excess of this percentage is defined as "overpayment." The Census 2000 reported that 26 percent of all homeowners and 41 percent of all renters in the unincorporated County paid 30 percent or more of their gross incomes for housing. Overpayment among all homeowners increased slightly from 24 percent in 1990, while overpayment among all renters decreased from 47 percent in 1990.

Table 8-10 shows monthly owner and renter costs as a percentage of household income for all households from the Census 2000. Please refer to Chapter 5 for detailed information on household income.

TABLE 8-10. SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER AND RENTER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF INCOME IN UNINCORPORATED SACRAMENTO COUNTY (CENSUS 2000)

PERCENT OF INCOME SPENT ON HOUSING	OWNERS	RENTERS	TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS
Less than 15%	30%	16%	60,339
15%-19.9%	17%	16%	41,662
20%-24.9%	15%	15%	38,071
25%-29.9%	12%	12%	29,341
30%-34.9%	8%	8%	20,072
35% +	18%	33%	61,486
Total Households	148,767	102,204	250,971

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

Overpayment rates varied among income groups, however. Very low-income households faced the most extreme housing cost pressures, especially those earning less than \$20,000 per year. Among households earning less than \$20,000, 92 percent of renters (24,221) and 71 percent of homeowners (6,901) paid more than 30 percent of their gross income on housing expenses. The overwhelming majority of both renters and owners in this income group paid in excess of 35 percent of their gross income on housing.

Overpayment declined significantly with higher incomes. About half (47 percent) of renters earning between \$20,000 and \$34,999 and nine percent of renters earning between \$35,000 and \$49,999 paid more than 30 percent of their gross income for housing. Overpayment was insignificant among renters earning \$50,000 or more per year.

Homeowners had a different pattern of overpayment than renters at higher income levels. Overpayment was a significant factor for households earning up to \$90,000 or less. Nearly 60 percent of homeowners earning between \$20,000 and \$34,000 paid more than 30 percent for housing, while the rate of overpayment did not drop to insignificant levels until household incomes reached the \$90,000-\$100,000 range.

Different patterns of overpayment among renter and owner households of similar incomes suggest several possible trends, which may be operating simultaneously:

1. Renters can find suitable housing that meets their needs and does not exceed their budgets at lower incomes than can homeowners. Once renter incomes reached 80 percent of median income in 2000, the cost of rental housing was not a significant problem.
2. The cost of homeownership has increased so that a higher proportion of households, even those of moderate income, must spend more than 30 percent of their gross incomes to purchase homes.
3. Increasing numbers of moderate- and above moderate-income owner households are spending more to purchase homes that meet their needs, even if they could find less expensive homes.

Table 8-11 shows overpayment by income level.

TABLE 8-11. OVERPAYMENT BY INCOME AND TENURE ¹							
INCOME LEVEL	PERCENT SPENT ON HOUSING	RENTERS		OWNERS		INCOME CATEGORIES ³	
		NUMBER	PERCENT ²	NUMBER	PERCENT ²		
<\$10,000	<30%	643	6%	202	7%	Very Low Income	
	30-34%	251	2%	150	5%		
	35%+	9,360	91%	2,611	88%		
\$10,000-\$19,999	<30%	1,566	10%	2,657	39%		
	30-34%	1,416	9%	364	5%		
	35%+	13,194	82%	3,776	56%		
\$20,000-\$34,999	<30%	13,128	54%	7,471	42%		Low Income
	30-34%	4,547	19%	1,532	9%		
	35%+	6,850	28%	8,603	49%		
\$35,000-\$49,999	<30%	15,117	90%	13,288	58%	Moderate Income	
	30-34%	1,076	6%	3,369	15%		
	35%+	568	3%	6,316	27%		
\$50,000-\$74,999	<30%	13,624	98%	28,303	79%	Above Moderate Income	
	30-34%	153	1%	3,786	11%		
	35%+	112	1%	3,601	10%		
\$75,000-\$99,999	<30%	4,594	99%	22,035	94%		
	30-34%	0	0%	943	4%		
	35%+	32	1%	506	2%		
\$100,000+(Renters) \$100,000-\$149,999 (Owners)	<30%	3,138	100%	19,154	97%		
	30-34%	0	0%	330	2%		
	35%+	0	0%	263	1%		
\$150,000+	<30%			16,844	99%		
	30-34%			61	1%		
	35%+			24	<1%		

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

¹ Numbers and percentages are exclusive of households for which expenditures were not calculated.

² Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

³ Income definitions for very low, low, moderate, and above moderate are based on the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's 2000 median family income guideline of \$52,900. These are not adjusted for family size.

OVERCROWDING

Overcrowding is a measure of the ability of existing housing to adequately accommodate residents. The U.S. Census Bureau defines overcrowding as a household that lives in a dwelling unit with an average of more than 1.0 person per room, not including bathrooms, porches, balconies, foyers, halls, or half-rooms. Extreme overcrowding is defined as more than 1.5 persons per room. Too many individuals living in housing with inadequate space and number of rooms can result in deterioration of the quality of life and the condition of the dwelling unit from overuse. Overcrowding results when either the costs of available housing with a sufficient number of bedrooms for a family exceeds the family's ability to afford

such housing or unrelated individuals (such as students or low-wage single adult workers) share dwelling units because of high housing costs.

According to the 2000 Census, overcrowding in the unincorporated area of Sacramento County was about 8 percent, compared to 11 percent in the City of Sacramento. Since 1990, overcrowding has increased slightly for homeowners and significantly for renters. In 1990, about 2 percent of homeowners lived in overcrowded conditions, compared to 3 percent in 2000. Overcrowding nearly doubled among renters, from 8 percent in 1990 to 15 percent in 2000. The steep increase in overcrowding among renters may be caused by a sharp rise in rents between 1990 and 2000, which greatly exceeded gains in income. Rents have continued to rise since 2000, from a 7 percent increase for 2-bedroom units to an almost 27% increase for three-bedroom units (See Table 8-6). Tables 8-12 and 8-13 summarize information on overcrowding from the Census 2000.

TABLE 8-12. PERSONS PER ROOM BY TENURE - UNINCORPORATED AREA (2000) ¹

PERSONS	RENTERS	PERCENT ²	OWNERS	PERCENT
1.00 or less	79,723	86%	143,628	97%
1.01 to 1.50	6,341	7%	3,629	2%
1.51 or more	6,801	8%	1,944	1%
Total	92,865	100%	149,201	100%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

¹ Includes the City of Elk Grove, which was not incorporated at the time of the Census 2000.

² Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 8-13. PERSONS PER ROOM IN ALL OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS (2000)

PERSONS	SACRAMENTO CITY	PERCENT	UNINCORPORATED SACRAMENTO COUNTY	PERCENT
1.00 or less	137,450	89%	223,345	92%
1.01 to 1.50	8,407	5%	9,976	4%
1.51 or more	8,708	6%	9,075	4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

FUTURE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION NEEDS, 2006-2013

California Government Code Section 65584 requires that each city and county plan to accommodate a fair share of the region’s housing construction needs. In urban areas, state law provides for councils of governments to prepare regional housing allocation plans that assign a share of a region’s housing construction need to each city and county. In the six-county greater Sacramento region (comprising the counties of Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado, Yolo, Sutter, and Yuba), the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the entity authorized under state law to determine the future housing needs for the region. SACOG adopted the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) on February 21, 2008. This plan covers a period of 7½ years from January 1, 2006 through June 30, 2013.

SACOG’s methodology for distributing the regional housing need among jurisdictions is based on regional population and housing forecasts developed for its transportation model. The numbers of housing units assigned in the plan to each

jurisdiction are goals that are intended to address the minimum new housing construction need from anticipated population growth in the region.

SACOG’s allocation methodology assigns the number of units included in the overall regional need to individual jurisdictions based on their percentage of forecasted growth in the region during the first seven and a half years of a 35-year projection period. The distribution of units by income level is assigned using a base-year income distribution, with the goal that each jurisdiction will approach the State Department of Housing and Community Development’s regional distribution of the average household income over a 50-year time period (2000-2050). This 50-year period uses the housing unit forecasts from the Blueprint Project, supporting policy goals including:

- reaching regional parity,
- promoting infill development,
- encouraging efficient development patterns,
- protecting environmental and agricultural resources, and
- promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

The housing units allocated in the plan to each city and county are considered minimum needs. Most, if not all, jurisdictions have existing unmet housing needs (such as from overcrowding and overpayment) that should be considered during the preparation of a housing element and may result in housing construction objectives that exceed the regional allocation. The city and/or county, however, must use the numbers allocated under the RHNA to identify measures (policies and ordinances) that are consistent with these new construction goals. While the city and/or county must show how it will provide adequate sites for construction of the required units, it is not obligated to build any of the units itself or finance their construction.

According to the February 21, 2008 adopted 2006-2013 SACOG Regional Housing Needs Plan, the unincorporated area of Sacramento County has a total housing construction need of 15,160 units, which equates to an annual need of just over 2,021 units. This total excludes all cities in the County, their spheres of influence, the Natomas Joint Vision Area, and the “Panhandle” between the North Natomas and Robla areas of the City of Sacramento. Table 8-14 shows the unincorporated area of Sacramento County’s 2006-2013 planning period allocation.

INCOME LEVEL	TOTAL NEED 2006-2013	ANNUAL NEED ¹	PERCENT OF TOTAL	UNITS APPROVED SINCE 2006	PERCENT OF TOTAL	REMAINING ALLOCATION
Very Low Income	3,339	605	22%	265	17%	3,074
Low Income	2,293	413	15%	70	4%	2,223
Moderate Income	2,700	485	18%	457	29%	2,243
Above Moderate Income	6,828	1,232	45%	771	49%	6,057
Total	15,160	2,735	100%	1,563	100%	13,597

Source: SACOG 2008.

¹ Total need divided by 7.5 years, the period covered by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation (January 2006 through June 2013).

SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS

In addition to the general housing needs discussed in previous sections of this chapter, state law requires that the Housing Element include an assessment of the housing needs of special population groups within the County. This section will identify the special housing needs of extremely low-income (ELI) households, the elderly, large-family households, female heads of household, persons with physical and/or mental disabilities, farmworkers, and the homeless.

EXTREMELY LOW INCOME (ELI) HOUSEHOLDS

The extremely low income group includes households with an income of 30 percent or less of the median. According to the 2000 CHAS tables, approximately 56,811 households (12.5 percent of the County's total households) were ELI households. Of these 56,811 ELI households, 14,834 households were owners and 41,977 households were renters. These households represented about 52.3 percent of the very low income households in the County.

More than 80 percent of ELI households had housing problems, which are defined by CHAS as a cost burden greater than 30 percent of household income, and/or overcrowding, and/or incomplete kitchen or plumbing facilities. More than 75 percent paid more than 30 percent of their income for housing, including more than 60 percent who paid more than 50 percent of their income. In 2007, the upper threshold of the ELI income category for a family of four was an annual income of \$20,150. Virtually all ELI households are expected to need aid, including housing cost subsidies and social services. The County's programs for addressing homelessness, public housing, and Housing Choice Vouchers (formerly Section 8), are likely to assist ELI households. In addition to these specific programs, the County includes requirements for provision of new ELI rental housing units in many large developments under the County's Affordable Housing Ordinance.

Elderly

The populations for the 55 and above age cohort and the 65 and above age cohort have both increased in Sacramento County during 1990-2000. Between 1990 and 2000, Sacramento County experienced a 20 percent increase in the population age 55 or more, and a 23 percent increase in the population age 65 or more. Table 8-15 presents data showing the increase in the County's population over 55 years of age. However, the proportion of the population that comprises people age 55 and older has increased only by 1 percent. This could be explained by the fact that most of Sacramento County's population increase was due to the development of new growth areas. The new neighborhoods in these new growth areas tend to attract young families with children. This factor probably negated any potential proportional growth of the senior population caused by the aging "baby boomer" generation. It will be interesting to see if any acceleration in the increase of the aging "baby boomer" population since 2000 occurs and whether the County will finally see a significant increase in the percentage of the population that are senior citizens (age 55+).

**TABLE 8-15. SACRAMENTO COUNTY'S INCREASE IN AGING POPULATION
(1990-2000)**

	1990	2000	PERCENT CHANGE
Total Population	1,041,219	1,223,499	18%
Population 55+	191,444	230,536	20%
Population 65+	110,258	135,875	23%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 1990 and 2000.

The elderly face special housing challenges related to physical and financial conditions. Older adults face declining mobility and self-care capabilities that create special housing needs and challenges. Many older adults, even those owning their own homes, face financial challenges because of limited incomes from Social Security and other retirement benefits.

A high percentage of seniors are homeowners (76 percent in 2000) and are retired or are on fixed incomes. As the cost of owning a home continues to rise, senior residents will find it increasingly difficult to meet these costs, and many senior residents may choose to defer the maintenance of their home to save on expenses. Over time, this deferment of maintenance may lead to the dilapidation of many homes owned and occupied by seniors, creating unsafe or unhealthy living conditions.

Many seniors are renters. In 2000, 20,652 people with a head of household age 65 or older lived in rental units. These households face a difficult housing situation in terms of unit availability and affordability. Many of the studio and one-bedroom market rate units in the County are not affordable for low-income seniors who have fixed incomes and are paying for health care, food, and general living expenses.

Based on the previous paragraphs, older adults may need assistance related to:

- repair and maintenance of owned dwelling units,
- modifications to existing homes to better meet mobility and self-care limitation,
- financial assistance to meet rising rental housing costs for those who do not own, and
- supportive services to meet daily needs, such as those provided at assisted care residences

One common special need for a growing portion of the population age 65 and over is for assisted living facilities that combine meal, medical, and daily living assistance in a residential environment. Several licensed care facilities from the State Department of Social Services were identified as providing services in Sacramento County. Table 8-16a summarizes the total number of facilities and beds and distributes the facilities based on the number of beds. Table 8-16b presents the number of facilities distributed among various areas of the County.

TABLE 8-16A. LICENSED ELDERLY CARE FACILITIES FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES					
JURISDICTION	TOTAL FACILITIES	FACILITIES WITH 6 OR FEWER BEDS	FACILITIES WITH MORE THAN 6 BEDS	TOTAL CAPACITY	RANGE OF CAPACITY
Sacramento County	494	425	69	7,410	2-500

Source: California Community Care Licensing Division 2007.

TABLE 8-16B. LOCATION OF LICENSED ELDERLY CARE FACILITIES FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES	
AREA	TOTAL FACILITIES
Antelope	13
Carmichael	45
Citrus Heights	70
Elk Grove	81
Elverta	2
Fair Oaks	44
Folsom	17
Galt	1
Gold River	1
North Highlands	10
Orangevale	28
Rancho Cordova	6
Rio Linda	4
Sacramento	171
Wilton	1
Total	494

Source: California Community Care Licensing Division 2007.

LARGE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS

The California Department of Housing and Community Development defines large-family households as households having five or more persons. Large families have special needs relating to household size and income. Large families require three, four, or more bedrooms to avoid overcrowding. Many large families also have low incomes and must devote substantially more than 30 percent of their incomes to secure suitable housing. Many large families experience both overcrowding and overpayment because of the combination of large household size and frequently lower incomes. In 1990, the unincorporated area of Sacramento County had 24,411 large families, representing 10 percent of all households. By 2000, the number of large families increased to over 29,000, or 12 percent of the population. Most large families (60 percent) own their homes.

Table 8-17 summarizes information on large families from the Census 2000.

**TABLE 8-17. LARGE FAMILIES IN UNINCORPORATED SACRAMENTO COUNTY (2000)
TOTALS AND PERCENTAGE OF RENTERS VS. OWNERS BY HOUSEHOLD
SIZE**

HOUSEHOLD SIZE	TOTAL	RENTERS		OWNERS	
Five	16,476	6,182	38%	10,294	63%
Six	7,271	2,884	40%	4,387	60%
Seven or More	5,329	2,520	47%	2,809	53%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

Large families who rent are most likely to experience problems of overpayment and overcrowding because renter households are more likely than homeowners to have low-incomes, and there are fewer rental housing units with three or more bedrooms to meet the space needs of large families. As indicated in Table 8-17, the proportion of large families who are renters increases as the family gets bigger. Very large renter families (seven members or more) which comprises almost half of all very large families face the most difficulty in finding affordable housing. Such renter families will likely experience the highest rates of overcrowding and overpayment of any population group.

FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD

Female heads of households have been steadily increasing in number and as a percentage of total households in Sacramento County. The majority of female-headed households consist of single women, many of whom are seniors and single women with children. Female-headed households represent a special needs group because they have high rates of poverty or are low-income, often lack access to child care and other supportive services for independent living, and frequently face discrimination in housing (an issue that is addressed separately in Chapter 7, "Nongovernmental Constraints").

At the time of the 2000 Census, there were 72,981 female-headed households in unincorporated Sacramento County. This total includes 23,619 female-headed households with children under the age of 18 (eight percent of all households). Fifty-five percent of female-headed households with children under 18 earned an income below the federal poverty level, an increase of four percent since the 1990 Census.

Elderly female householders comprise a special needs subgroup group because of their income and age. Most senior female householders living alone have low incomes and often require housing and supportive services to meet their changing physical capacity. The U.S. Census Bureau reported for the entire county, nearly 12,800 such households in 2000.

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Seventeen percent of the County's noninstitutionalized residents have physical conditions that affect their abilities to live independently in conventional residential settings according to the 2000 Census. These individuals have mobility impairments, self-care limitations, or other conditions that may require special housing accommodations or financial assistance. According to the Alta California

Regional Center, a quasi-public agency that coordinates programs and services for individuals with disabilities in the greater Sacramento region, such individuals can have a number of special needs that distinguish them from the population at large. As evidence of the need in Sacramento County, Alta California Regional Center served a total of 9,922 Sacramento County residents as of June 2007.

Individuals with mobility difficulties (such as those confined to wheelchairs) may require special accommodations or modifications to their homes to allow for continued independent living. Such modifications are often called "handicapped access." Also, Individuals with self-care limitations (which can include persons with mobility difficulties) may require residential environments that include in-home or on-site support services, ranging from congregate to convalescent care. Support services can include medical therapy, daily living assistance, congregate dining, and related services.

According to Census 2000 data, there were 113,510 noninstitutionalized persons in the unincorporated area of Sacramento County with mobility or self-care limitations that might require special housing accommodations and supportive services, about 17 percent of the total population. Of the disabilities recorded by the Census 2000:

- about one-fourth were physical disabilities,
- about one-fourth were work-related disabilities,
- nearly 20 percent were disabilities limiting the individual's ability to leave the home,
- about 16 percent were mental disabilities,
- ten percent were sensory disabilities (such as sight and/or hearing limitations), and
- eight percent were disabilities affecting an individual's ability to live independently (self care).

Individuals with disabilities may require financial assistance to meet their housing needs because typically a higher percentage are lower income than the population at large and their special housing needs are often more costly than conventional housing. Some people with mobility and/or self-care limitations are able to live with their families, who can assist in meeting housing and daily living needs. However, a segment of the disabled population, particularly low-income and retired individuals, may not have the financial capacity to pay for needed accommodations or modifications to their homes. In addition, even those able to pay for special housing accommodations may find them unavailable in the County. Some disabled persons may experience financial difficulty in locating suitable housing because of the cost of modifications to meet their daily living needs or they may have difficulty in finding appropriate housing near places of employment. Although the California Administrative Code (Title 24) requires that all public buildings be accessible to the public through architectural standards such as ramps, large doors, and restroom modifications to enable handicap access, not all available housing units have these features. In addition, there are other types of physical and design modifications that may be necessary to accommodate various types of disabilities.

With the implementation of the 1988 Federal Fair Housing laws, newly constructed multifamily units are to be built to accommodate the disabled population of the

community. Apartments and condominiums are now required to be equipped with special features such as ramps and oversized halls, entryways, and bathrooms to increase accessibility for disabled persons. The Americans with Disabilities Act require handicapped access in all public buildings, including multifamily complexes.

While regulations adopted by the State require all ground floor units of new apartment complexes with five or more units to be accessible to persons with disabilities, single-family units have no accessibility requirements. The Americans with Disabilities Act has no special provisions that require the installations of such amenities for single-family units. As the number of persons with disabilities is likely to increase in Sacramento County, special attention should be given to architectural design and hardware that improves access to and within all housing units, especially single-family units. Design standards for accessibility and future adaptability of housing units for persons with disabilities are often referred to as "Universal Design."

FARMWORKERS

Data on farmworkers and farmworker housing is scarce. The State Economic Development Department has estimated that farmworker employment in Sacramento County averages approximately 4,000 farmworkers per quarter. Farmworkers are grouped into two categories: migrant and settled farmworkers. Migrant farmworkers travel from one geographic location to another, depending on where and when farm work is available. Settled farmworkers usually live in rental housing in the community in which they work. Settled farmworkers often live in subsidized housing on a site provided by the farmer.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services commissioned an enumeration study on migrant and seasonal farmworkers in California in 2000. This study estimates a total of 6,115 farmworkers in Sacramento County, including 2,831 migrant and 3,284 seasonal workers. An additional 4,766 individuals were estimated to be living in farmworker households.

In Sacramento County, the vast majority of farmworkers work in the southern portion of the County near the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and the City of Galt. If migrant workers are brought into the County through the services of the Employment Development Department, the farmer is required to provide privately financed housing facilities. Table 8-18 provides information on the number and capacity of farm labor camps in Sacramento County according to the County Department of Environmental Health, which licenses and inspects these facilities.

YEAR	NUMBER OF ACTIVE CAMPS	TOTAL FARM LABORERS HOUSED
1999	37	1,174
2003	31	981
2007	25	709

Source: Frey, Ann pers. comm. 2007.

Most farm labor camps are fully occupied only during peak harvest periods and are vacant during the remaining months. The farmworker population has been declining in Sacramento County over the past several years. This is consistent with state

projections. Two major reasons account for this decline: the rapid urbanization in most parts of unincorporated Sacramento County and the increased use of machines for what was previously labor-intensive farming activities. The Sacramento County Department of Environmental Health reported both an overall decline in the number of farmworkers in the County and an increase in workers commuting day to day from other locations, primarily Lodi and Stockton in San Joaquin County.

HOMELESS

Homeless persons are those in need of temporary or emergency shelter. They are individuals who lack a fixed income and regular nighttime residence. Some are in need of short-term (immediate crisis) shelter, while others have long-term (chronic) needs. The homeless represent a broad category including single men and women, couples, families, displaced youths without parents, and seniors. They can include individuals who are victims of economic dislocation, physically disabled, teen parents with children, veterans, hospital and jail discharges, alcohol and drug abusers, survivors of domestic violence, persons with AIDS, immigrants, refugees, and farm labor workers.

As part of their efforts to continually monitor, understand and appropriately plan for housing and service needs for the homeless population, the City and County, through the County Department of Human Assistance (DHA), undertake a single day (or a "point-in-time") count of the homeless. This project has numerous contributing partners, including but not limited to the following: the Downtown Sacramento Partnership, law enforcement (police, sheriff and park rangers), community volunteers, and the Interagency Council of the Ten Year Plan.³ The homeless population is varied and complex, and enumerating this population is difficult. The count is conducted for two reasons. First, it is required by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as part of the annual application for McKinney-Vento funding. Secondly, the count is conducted as part of the ongoing monitoring for the Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness. The count relies on a methodology that allows for focused geographic counting and extrapolation of that count to the broader geography of the County. Although DHA has been conducting point-in-time counts since 2003, this research-based methodology was first utilized for the 2007 and 2008 counts.

On January 30, 2007, the County Department of Human Assistance (DHA) conducted a homeless count to determine the size of the homeless population throughout the County in shelters, transitional housing, and on streets. This point-in-time count documented 2,452 individuals, including 709 in emergency shelters, 738 in transitional shelters, and 1,005 on the streets. At the time of the 2007 count, 74 percent of homeless people had at least one disability, such as mental illness (28 percent) or alcohol/drug dependency (54 percent). About 16 percent of homeless people were veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces, although the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that approximately one-third of homeless people are veterans.)

The Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness focuses on the "housing first" model, which aims to get homeless individuals and families into permanent housing. However, through the Continuum of Care, the City and County also

³ The Interagency Council is one component of the leadership structure created to implement the Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness and is staffed by the Community Services Planning Council. Please see the Ten Year Plan website for more information about the structure:
<http://www.communitycouncil.org/homelessplan/>.

recognize the great need to provide emergency and transitional shelter facilities. Countywide data indicating the estimated shelter needs for homeless individuals and families is presented in Table 8-19 and existing beds available is presented in Table 8-20.

TABLE 8-19. SACRAMENTO COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE GAPS ANALYSIS - POPULATION			
HOMELESS POPULATIONS	ESTIMATED NEED	CURRENT INVENTORY	UNMET NEED/GAP
Chronically Homeless	626	432	194
Seriously Mentally Ill	293	222	71
Chronic Substance Abuse	773	534	239
Veterans	201	104	97
Persons with HIV/AIDS	29	16	13
Victims of Domestic Violence	122	90	32
Youth	19	6	13

Source: Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance 2006.

TABLE 8-20. SACRAMENTO COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE GAPS ANALYSIS - NUMBER OF BEDS				
HOMELESS POPULATIONS	ESTIMATED NEED	CURRENT INVENTORY	UNMET NEED/GAP	
Beds: Individuals	Emergency Shelter	530	459	71
	Transitional Housing	993	673	320
	Permanent Supportive Housing	2,477	714	1,763
	Total	4,000	1,846	2,154
Beds: Families	Emergency Shelter	151	130	21
	Transitional Housing	469	425	44
	Permanent Supportive Housing	1,063	756	307
	Total	1,683	1,311	372

Source: Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance 2006.

Shelter Facilities: Sacramento's emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing are listed in Tables 8-21, 8-22 and 8-23. The 2006 Continuum of Care Report counted 3,157 shelter beds for individuals and families during the warm weather months, with an additional 160 shelter beds available during the winter overflow period (November to March). These facilities serve the homeless throughout Sacramento County, although they are scattered throughout the City and unincorporated portions of the County. The current inventory includes 749 emergency beds, 1,098 transitional beds and 1,470 permanent beds for homeless in Sacramento. Despite the significant numbers and variety of housing options, shelter providers report serving a growing number of homeless individuals and turning away increasing numbers of homeless persons.

TABLE 8-21. SACRAMENTO COUNTY EMERGENCY SHELTER FACILITIES	
SINGLE-PERSON SHELTERS	NUMBER OF BEDS
Diogenes Youth and Family Services Temporary	6
Loaves and Fishes, Sister Nora's Place	13
Sac Area Emergency Housing Center Women's Refuge	12
St. John's Emergency Shelter Program	40
The Salvation Army Women's Program	32
The Salvation Army Lodge Program	80
The Salvation Army Adult Protective Services	4
Union Gospel Mission Emergency Shelter	86
Volunteers of America North A Street Aid-in-Kind	60
Volunteers of America Bannon Street Aid-in-Kind	62
Volunteers of America Open Arms (HIV)	12
WIND Youth Center	16
The Salvation Army Interim Care Program	18
FAMILY SHELTERS	NUMBER OF BEDS
Sac Area Emergency Housing Center Family Shelter	54
St. John's Emergency Shelter Program	60
Women Escaping a Violent Environment Emergency	2
Interfaith Network Family Promise Center	14
SHELTER FOR THE MENTALLY ILL	NUMBER OF BEDS
Transitional Living & Community Support for Mentally Ill Women & Men (Carol's Place)	18
WINTER OVERFLOW SHELTERS (NOVEMBER TO MARCH)	NUMBER OF BEDS
Volunteers of America Winter Program	160
Grand Total Shelter Beds	749

Source: Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance 2006.

TABLE 8-22. SACRAMENTO COUNTY TRANSITIONAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES	
SINGLE PERSON	NUMBER OF BEDS
AIDS Housing Alliance Cornerstone/Hidden Cove	7
Antelope Christian Center Lydia's House	6
Chemical Dependency Center for Women New Horizons	30
Clean and Sober New Start	70
Clean and Sober New Life	50
Diogenes Youth Services Connections	4
Diogenes Youth Services Transitional Housing Program	12
Resources for Independent Living Transitional Center	6
Sac Area Emergency Housing Center Women's ESP	6
Sac Children's Home Crisis Nursery	4
Sac Cottage Housing Inc. Quinn Cottages	50
Sac County DHA Mather Community Campus	200
Sac County DHHS Homeless Intervention Program	10
Sac County DHHS River City Community Homeless	47
Sac Veterans Resource Center Men's Transitional	30
Sac Veterans Resource Center Women's Transitional	8
Self Help Housing Cathedral/Downtown Housing	5
Transitional Living and Community Support Palmer	9
Transitional Living and Community Support MICA Palmer	39
Volunteers of America Adolfo TH for Foster Youth	10
Volunteers of America Adolfo TH for Foster Youth (HUD)	10
Volunteers of America Independent Living Readiness	58
Walking the Village Tubman House	2
FAMILY	NUMBER OF BEDS
AIDS Housing Alliance Cornerstone/Hidden Cove	6
Chemical Dependency Center for Women New Horizons	8
Diogenes Youth Services Connections	4
Diogenes Youth Services Transitional Housing Program	8
Lutheran Social Services Transitional Housing Families	35
Powerhouse Ministries Transitional Center	20
Sac Cottage Housing Inc. Quinn Cottages	20
Sac County DHA Mather Community Campus	146
Sac Food Bank and Family Services Havens Transitional	35
Transitional Living Community Support MICA Families	9
Traveler's Aid Families Beyond Transition	52
Grand Total Transitional Beds	1,098

Source: Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance 2006.

¹ Transitional housing includes apartment units and support services with residency limited to 2 years. Permanent housing has no residency limitation.

TABLE 8-23. SACRAMENTO COUNTY PERMANENT HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES TARGETED TO VERY LOW-INCOME AND/OR FORMERLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES	
SINGLE PERSON	NUMBER OF BEDS
AIDS Housing Alliance Avalon	6
AIDS Housing Alliance Hidden Cove	6
AIDS Housing Alliance Steven Place	10
Glory House PSH	7
Lutheran Social Services Saybrook	5
MAAP Inc Las Casitas	4
Sac Area Emergency Housing Center Omega Project	15
Sac County DHHS River City Community Homeless	103
Sac County DHHS Homeless Intervention Program	140
Sac County DHA LaVerne Adolfo PSH	20
Sac County DHA Shelter Plus Care	198
SHRA Midtown Manor	20
Sac Self Help Housing Shared Housing Program	88
Shasta Hotel Cooperative Shelter Plus Care	18
Transitional Living Community Support Southside House	9
Transitional Living Community Support WORK	25
Volunteers of America Nova House	12
Volunteers of America Halcyon Place	22
Volunteers of America Harbor House	6
FAMILY	NUMBER OF BEDS
AIDS Housing Alliance Steven Place	14
Lutheran Social Services Saybrook	172
MAAP Inc. Las Casitas	2
Sac Area Emergency Housing Center Omega Project	42
Sac Cottage Housing Inc. Serna Village	136
Sac County DHA LaVerne Adolfo PSH	8
Sac County DHA Shelter Plus Care	370
Sac Self Help Housing Shared Housing Program	12
Grand Total Permanent Beds	1,470

Source: SHRA 2006.

¹ Transitional housing includes apartment units and support services with residency limited to two years. Permanent housing has no residency limitation.