

HOUSING ELEMENT

PURPOSE

The Housing Element provides the Town direction in the distribution of housing throughout the community. Of particular concern to the Town is the provision of housing which is affordable to all its residents, both now and in the future. Apple Valley has traditionally been a residential community with a focus on rural character and quality of life. This Housing Element includes goals, policies and programs to assure that the Town's character and quality of life are available to all residents.

BACKGROUND

The Housing Element works hand in hand with the Land Use Element, by assuring that adequate lands are available to provide housing for the period from 2022 through 2029. The Town's land use map includes a broad range of residential densities, and sufficient lands to accommodate all types of housing, from ranches and farms to high density residential development.

The Housing Element is anchored by an analysis of the progress made since the drafting of the last Housing Element, and projections of needs for the current planning period. By looking back at the Town's actions over the last 8 years, it can better understand its needs for the upcoming planning period. The Element also describes existing housing types, the condition of the existing housing stock, overcrowding, overpayment, special housing needs, and the demand for affordable housing in the Town. Statistical data has been drawn from a number of sources, which is particularly important since the results of the 2020 Census were not available at the time the Element was prepared and adopted. The sources of data are cited throughout the document.

California Law

AB 2853, passed in 1980, established Government Code Article 10.6, Section 65580 et. seq. to define the need for, and content of Housing Elements. At its core, the law requires that the "housing element shall consist of an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing" to meet the State's housing goals.

California Government Code requires that every City and County prepare a Housing Element as part of its General Plan. In addition, State law contains specific requirements for the preparation and content of Housing Elements. According to Article 10.6, Section 65580, the Legislature has found that:

- (1) The availability of housing is of vital statewide importance, and the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family is a priority of the highest order.

- (2) The early attainment of this goal requires the cooperative participation of government and the private sector in an effort to expand housing opportunities and accommodate the housing needs of Californians of all economic levels.
- (3) The provision of housing affordable to low and moderate income households requires the cooperation of all levels of government.
- (4) Local and state governments have a responsibility to use the powers vested in them to facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community.
- (5) The legislature recognizes that in carrying out this responsibility, each local government also has the responsibility to consider economic, environmental, and fiscal factors and community goals set forth in the General Plan and to cooperate with other local governments, and the state, in addressing regional housing needs.

Section 65581 of the Government Code states that the intent of the Legislature in enacting these requirements is:

- (1) To assure that local governments recognize their responsibilities in contributing to the attainment of the State housing goal.
- (2) To assure that cities and counties prepare and implement housing elements which, along with federal and State programs, will move toward attainment of the State housing goal.
- (3) To recognize that each locality is best capable of determining what efforts are required by it to contribute to the attainment of the State housing goal as well as regional housing needs.
- (4) To ensure that each local government cooperates with other local governments to address regional housing needs.

The basic components of a Housing Element were established in Section 65583, and required that each Element include:

- An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of local needs.
- A statement of the community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.
- A program that sets forth a schedule of actions to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of the Housing Element to provide housing for all economic segments of the community guided by the following state housing objectives.
- Provision of decent housing for all persons regardless of age, race, sex, marital status, source of income, or other factors.
- Provision of adequate housing by location, type, price and tenure.
- Development of a balanced residential environment including access to jobs, community facilities, and services.

Since that time, Housing Element law has been regularly updated, expanded and modified. The most recent update to Housing Element law occurred in 2017, when a series of bills were passed into law to address the State's determination that California was experiencing a State-wide housing crisis. The laws passed in 2017 addressed a wide range of housing-related issues, including Housing Elements, which are summarized below.

- *SB 2* established a recordation fee for real estate documentation which would fund planning grants for affordable housing and affordable housing projects.
- *SB 3* placed a \$4 billion general obligation bond on the November 2018 ballot to fund affordable housing, farmworker housing, transit-oriented development, infill infrastructure and home ownership.
- *SB 35* mandated a streamlined approval process for infill affordable housing projects in communities that have not, according to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) met their affordable housing allocation (RHNA).
- *AB 72* allowed HCD to find a housing element out of compliance with State law, and to refer the non-compliant element to the State Attorney General for action at any time during a Housing Element planning period.
- *AB 73* provided State-funded financial incentives for local jurisdictions which choose to create a streamlined zoning overlay for certain affordable housing projects.
- *SB 166* required that development proposals on local jurisdictions' sites inventory cannot be reduced in density without findings, and/or the identification of additional sites to result in 'no net loss' of affordable housing units in the sites inventory.
- *SB 540* provided State funding for the planning and implementation of workforce housing opportunity zones for very low, low and moderate income households.
- *AB 571* modified the farmworker tax credit program to allow HCD to advance funds to migrant housing center operators at the beginning of each planting season, and allowed migrant housing to remain open for up to 275 days annually.
- *AB 678* amended the Housing Accountability Act to limit a local jurisdiction's ability to deny low and moderate income housing projects by increasing the required documentation and raising the standard of proof required of a local jurisdiction.
- *AB 686* (approved in 2018) required a public agency to administer its programs and activities relating to housing and community development in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing.
- *AB 879* amended the annual reporting requirements of local jurisdictions to HCD regarding proposed projects, including processing times, number of project applications and approvals, and required approval processes.
- *AB 1397* amended the requirements of adequate sites analysis to assure that sites are not only suitable, but also available, by requiring additional information in site inventories.
- *AB 1505* allowed local jurisdictions to adopt local ordinances that require affordable housing units on- or off-site when approving residential projects.
- *AB 1515* established a 'reasonable person' standard to consistency of affordable housing projects and emergency shelters with local policies and standards.
- *AB 1521* placed restrictions on the owners of affordable housing projects when terminating or selling their projects.

Consistency with the General Plan

The Housing Element, as with all Elements of the General Plan, must be consistent with all other Elements. The Town's procedures for amendment of the General Plan are contained in Chapter I., Introduction and Administration. The Town has reviewed the General Plan for consistency with

policies and programs proposed in this Housing Element. No inconsistencies were identified. The current (2022-2029) update of the Housing Element did not require that the Town amend its Land Use Element or land use map, as sufficient land has been identified to accommodate all housing types. The Town will continue to evaluate any amendment to the General Plan, including updating of the Housing Element as required by State law, to assure that internal consistency is maintained.

Evaluation of Existing Housing Element Policies and Programs

The Town's Housing Element included a number of policies and "action" items to address housing needs for the 2014-2021 planning period. The effectiveness of these policies and their associated action items is reviewed below.

Goal 1

Housing of all types to meet the needs of current and future residents in all income levels.

Policy 1.A

Ensure that new residential development conforms to the voter-approved Measure "N."

Evaluation: Land use densities in the Development Code are consistent with those established by Measure N. Measure N applied only to single family residential land use densities and had no impact on multi-family land uses. Measure N expired on December 31, 2020 and was not included on the ballot for renewal. This policy will not continue into the 2022-2029 planning cycle.

Policy 1.B

Maintain a wide range of residential land use designations, ranging from very low density (1.0 dwelling unit per 5 acres) to medium density (4 to 20 dwelling units per acre) and mixed use (4 to 30 units per acre), on the Land Use Map.

Evaluation: The Development Code includes residential districts ranging from Very Low Residential (R-VLD) (1 dwelling unit per 5 acres) to Mixed-Use (M-U) (up to 30 dwelling units per acre). This policy has been effective in allowing a range of housing densities and types and will be carried forward.

Program 1.B.1

Require that housing constructed expressly for low and moderate income households not be concentrated in any single area of Apple Valley.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: Affordable housing is not concentrated in any single area of Town. The Zoning map establishes Multi-Family Residential (R-M) lands in proximity to commercial, transportation, and school facilities. In addition, during the 2014-2021 planning period, sixteen (16) building permits were issued for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in various locations, but no other affordable housing was built. Currently, one (1) affordable housing project is proposed on Navajo Road. Staff will continue to evaluate development proposals to assure that housing for low and moderate income households is not concentrated in a single area. This program will be continued in the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.B.2

Locate higher density residential development in close proximity to public transportation, community services, and recreational resources.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: The Zoning map places Multi-Family Residential (up to 20 units per acre) and Mixed Use (up to 30 units per acre) lands in close proximity to transportation, community facilities, and recreational facilities. This program has been effective and will be ongoing in the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.B.3

Periodically review the Development Code for possible amendments to reduce housing construction costs without sacrificing basic health and safety considerations.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: 2014, Every 8 years thereafter

Evaluation: The Development Code is updated periodically to facilitate housing as issues arise in development projects. In March 2021, the Town adopted amendments to the Multifamily Residential development standards to encourage the development of multi-family units by making development standards more flexible. Please see the Constraints and Land Inventory sections below for further details on these changes. This program will be continued during the 2022-2029 planning period.

Policy 1.C

Encourage housing for special needs households, including the elderly, single parent households, large households, the disabled and the homeless.

Evaluation: The Development Code permits a variety of housing products in multiple zoning districts, including senior housing, multi-family housing, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), group homes, supportive and transitional housing, and emergency shelters. The Town is currently (2020) working with the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition to provide 100 affordable housing units, and has received an SB2 grant in partnership with the City of Victorville for the development of a Wellness and Recuperative Center which will focus on homelessness and transitional housing. The grant allows the Town to fund the project for a 5-year period, in the amount of \$287,561 annually.

Program 1.C.1

Offer incentives such as density bonus and reductions in parking requirements for senior housing.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: Section 9.28.090.H of the Development Code offers density bonuses for the development of qualifying senior housing developments. For projects with at least 20 units, density bonuses of 20% over the maximum allowable residential density may be granted for market rate senior housing; 20-35% density bonuses for housing with at least 25% of total units restricted for low income seniors; and 20-35% density bonuses for housing with at least 10% of total units restricted for very low income seniors.

Section 9.72.040.C allows the Planning Commission to reduce the number of parking spaces required for senior citizen developments by 25% based on findings that parking demand is reduced due to proximity to a shopping center or public transportation. The number of covered parking spaces may be reduced by up to 50% for housing developments meeting the needs of lower to moderate income seniors.

During the 2014-2021 planning period, no senior housing was built and neither of these incentives was implemented. The incentives are part of the Development Code and will be implemented in the future as appropriate.

Program 1.C.2

Process requests for the establishment of State licensed residential care facilities, in accordance with Section 1566.3 of the Health and Safety Code, as a means of providing long-term transitional housing for very low income persons.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: Section 9.29.110 of the Development Code addresses the development of residential care facilities. Small residential care facilities caring for six (6) or fewer people and licensed by the State are considered a residential use of property and are permitted outright in all residential districts, consistent with the Health and Safety Code. During the 2014-2021 period, no such facilities were proposed or developed. All future proposals will be processed in accordance with the Development Code.

Program 1.C.3

Pursuant to State law, require apartment complexes with 20 or more units to provide a minimum of one handicapped-accessible unit, with two units required of developments over 100 units.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: No apartment complexes with 20 or more units have been developed during the 2014-2021 planning period. The Town would apply this program to project(s) brought forward in the future, and this program will therefore be extended to the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.C.5

Pursuant to State law, require apartment complexes with 16 or more units to provide an on-site property manager.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: No apartment complexes with 16 or more units were built during the 2014-2021 planning period. However, the Town will continue to comply with State law.

Program 1.C.6

Encourage the development of second units, consistent with the requirements of State law and the Development Code, as a means of providing affordable housing opportunities in the single family residential districts.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: Ordinance Nos. 502 (adopted 2018), 504 (adopted 2019), and 530 (adopted 2020) modified the Development Code as it pertains to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and other residential habitable accessory structures. Section 9.29.120 of the Municipal Code addresses development and design of ADUs and junior ADUs. ADUs are permitted outright in all residential districts, including Mixed Use (M-U). The Planning Division no longer requires a separate approval for ADUs; instead, it reviews construction plans in conjunction with the Building and Safety Department. The Town does not collect Development Impact Fees (DIF) from ADUs less than 750 square feet. If DIF is collected, the Town allows the fees to be collected prior to Final, as opposed to at building permit issuance. New ADUs are not subject to the landscaping requirements or design point system pertaining to front façade architectural requirements that are required of new single-family residences.

During the 2014-2021 planning period, sixteen (16) building permits for ADUs were issued. Town staff will continue to evaluate and process ADU proposals consistent with State law and the Development Code in the 2022-2029 planning cycle.

Program 1.C.7

Expedite processing for elderly, low and moderate income housing applications; waive fees for shelters and transitional housing.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: During the 2014-2021 planning period, no proposals for elderly, low or moderate income, or transitional housing projects or shelters were received or processed by Town staff and therefore, no expedited processing was implemented and no fees were waived. This program will be applied to future such project proposals in the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.C.8

Maintain the Down Payment Assistance Program as a tool to increase affordable homeownership opportunities for low and moderate income persons.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Annually with CDBG and HOME fund allocation in budget

Evaluation: As a result of strong real estate market conditions during the 2014-2021 planning cycle, the need for down payment assistance decreased compared to the 2008-2014 cycle. The Town included the Down Payment Assistance Program in its 5-Year Consolidated Plan, but the program has been inactive since 2014 and no loans were approved during the 2014-2021 planning cycle. The lack of funding resulting from the elimination of Redevelopment set-aside funds has also contributed to this program's inactivity. Since no source of funding is foreseen to be available for the program, it will not be carried forward to the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.C.9

Participate in regional, state and federal programs which assist very low, low and moderate income households in buying their own home, and provide information at Town Hall on these programs.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Regular participation in Consortium activities

Evaluation: During the 2014-2021 planning cycle, the Town operated the Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program (RRLP) to assist qualifying very low and low income single-family (up to 4 units) homeowners with no interest deferred loans to pay for the costs of health, safety, code, deferred maintenance, and ADA improvements. A total of 71 loans were approved under the program, and 98 households are on the waiting list. The program helps lower income households maintain safe and operable homes.

In addition, the Town refers residents to County, state, and federal down payment assistance programs and provides flyers and website information and links. The Code Enforcement Department also distributes flyers to Town residents. This program is ongoing and will continue into the 2022-2029 planning cycle.

Policy 1.D

Continue to encourage mobile homes as an affordable housing option for all segments of the community.

Evaluation: In 2020, the Department of Finance reported there were 1,440 mobile homes in Apple Valley. The Development Code includes a Mobile Home Park (MHP) residential district. Mobile home parks are permitted outright in the MHP district and with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the Planned Residential District (PRD). Mobile and manufactured homes are also permitted outright in all residential districts except Mixed Use (M-U). The Town has limited jurisdiction over mobile home parks but establishes development standards in Code Section 9.30 and enforces code compliance as it pertains to health and safety issues.

Program 1.D.1

Allow the placement of mobile and manufactured homes in all single family districts.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: Per the Development Code, mobile and manufactured homes are permitted in all single-family residential districts. Town staff will continue to process development proposals for mobile and manufactured homes in accordance with the Code.

Program 1.D.2

Ensure high quality development standards through the implementation of the new Mobile Home Park zone, consistent with the Development Code in mobile home developments.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: Section 9.30 of the Development Code establishes mobile home park or subdivision standards to ensure developments are compatible and complementary to existing and future residential development in the immediate vicinity and consistent with State law. Standards have been established for subdivision design, skirting and pad requirements, parking, utilities, open spaces, common recreational facilities, walkways, laundry facilities, and other topics. Town staff will continue to evaluate development proposals and enforce standards according to the Development Code.

Policy 1.E

Affordable housing should be distributed throughout the community, and should blend with existing neighborhoods.

Evaluation: Affordable housing is not concentrated in any single area of Town. To the greatest extent practical, the Multi-Family Residential (R-M) District is in proximity to public transportation, community facilities, and shopping and employment centers. Other types of dwelling units that may be affordable to lower and moderate-income households, such as ADUs, are permitted in residential districts that are distributed throughout the community.

Section 9.29.070 establishes Multi-Family Housing development standards, including setbacks and buffer areas, lighting and height limitations, and trash enclosure standards, that assure that development blends with and is compatible with existing neighborhoods. Town staff will continue to evaluate development proposals according to these and other provisions of the Development Code.

Program 1.E.1

Support and encourage local developers to participate in County-sponsored mortgage revenue bond and scattered site housing programs by including the programs in literature provided by the Community Development Department on local and regional housing programs, with a particular focus encouraging the development of housing for extremely low and very low income households. The Town will utilize all available funding sources to meet its extremely low income housing allocation. The Town will consider reducing, waiving or subsidizing development and impact fees for developments targeted toward affordable housing; assisting developers in site identification; or using HOME funds to assist in development of housing for lower income housing, including extremely low income households.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, San Bernardino Housing Authority

Schedule: Annually, with CDBG and HOME funds allocation in budget

Evaluation: The Community Development Department publishes and makes available printed and online information about County and other housing and financing programs. The Town uses HOME, CBDG, and other funding sources to help meet its extremely low-income housing allocation. The following table summarizes HOME and CDBG funds authorized annually between 2014 and 2020.

Table 1
CDBG and HOME Allocations, 2014-2020

<i>Year</i>	<i>Authorized Amount</i>	
	<i>CDBG</i>	<i>HOME</i>
2014	\$531,056	\$504,484
2015	\$564,460	\$501,578
2016	\$559,270	\$538,365
2017	\$541,977	\$535,113
2018	\$624,925	\$772,659
2019	\$625,395	\$721,434
2020	\$596,645	\$783,168

Each year, the Town advertises a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) during November and December for the next year's HOME and CDBG funding allocations. All non-profit agencies and Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) approved agencies are welcome to attend the Town's technical workshop to learn how to apply for funding. These efforts are ongoing, and the Town will continue them in the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.E.2

Support the efforts of non-profit organizations, private developers, and the County of San Bernardino Housing Authority to obtain State and/or Federal funds for the construction of affordable housing for extremely low, very low and low income households by writing letters of support, and expediting permit processing for projects requiring pre-approval of development projects.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, San Bernardino Housing Authority

Schedule: Annually, with CDBG and HOME funds allocation in budget

Evaluation: The Town is currently (2020) working with the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition to develop 100 affordable housing units on a 10-acre parcel on Navajo Road. The Town assisted the organization with site identification, and HOME and NSP3 funds were allocated for the project. Additionally, in 2020, the Town applied for a State PLHA grant that will be used in partnership with the City of Victorville to develop a Wellness and Recuperative Center for homeless and transitional housing assistance. This effort is ongoing and will be continued in the 2022-2029 planning cycle.

Program 1.E.3

New multiple housing projects shall incorporate designs which are compatible with surrounding single family residential neighborhoods, and are consistent with the low-scale, rural character of Apple Valley.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: Section 9.29.070 of the Development Code establishes development standards for housing in the Multi-Family (M-F) Residential district. Standards pertaining to setbacks, buffer areas, height restrictions, shielding of lighting, trash enclosures, and other features help assure that designs are compatible with surrounding single-family neighborhoods. A range of housing

products and densities are permitted in the M-F district that are consistent with the rural character of Apple Valley, including duplexes, triplexes, apartments, condominiums, and townhouses. The Town will continue to evaluate and process Multi-Family housing projects according to the standards of the Development Code.

Policy 1.F

Permit childcare facilities in single-family and multi-family residential zones, as well as in commercial and industrial areas where employment is concentrated.

Evaluation: Per the Development Code, small family day care facilities with 8 or fewer children and large family day care homes with 9 to 14 children are permitted in all residential districts. Childcare centers with 15 or more children are permitted with a CUP in five single-family districts. Day care centers are permitted with a Special Use Permit (SUP) in all commercial districts and the Planned Industrial (I-P) district. The Town will continue to evaluate childcare facility development proposals according to the Development Code in the 2022-2029 planning cycle.

Policy 1.G

New residential development must assure the provision of infrastructure and public services.

Evaluation: All new residential projects are evaluated for their proximity and connection to existing services. While the Town is generally well-served by public service and infrastructure, some parcels in the central part of Town are not connected to the regional sewer system. The Town will evaluate the feasibility of a potential extension of the sewer system to serve all residential parcels, including financing sources and timelines, to assure that new residential development throughout the community are adequately serviced. The Town will continue to encourage well-planned development that results in an efficient and logical connection to utilities and avoids “leap frogging.”

Policy 1.H

Encourage energy-conservation and passive design concepts that make use of the natural climate to increase energy efficiency and reduce housing costs.

Evaluation: The Town adopted an update to its Climate Action Plan (CAP) in 2016. The CAP evaluates existing energy usage and presents future energy conservation and greenhouse gas reduction measures; a CAP update based on 2019 energy usage levels has recently been completed. In addition, the Town has adopted and implements the 2019 California Green Building Code, and new development must comply with these regulations. The Town provides information about energy efficiency home improvements and strategies online and at the public counters of Town Hall. The Town’s Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program (RRLP) can be used by qualifying low and moderate-income residents to fund energy efficiency home improvements.

Program 1.H.1

Utilize the development review process to encourage energy conservation in excess of the CBC’s Title 24 requirements, which incorporate energy conservation techniques into the siting and design of proposed residences.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Building and Safety Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: Town staff evaluates development proposals based on the requirements of the Development Code, Building Code(s), and other applicable requirements and standards. Town staff also promotes the incorporation of CAP implementation strategies into all types of development projects as they are presented for processing. This program has been effective and will be extended to the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.H.2

Continue to allow energy conservation measures as improvements eligible for assistance under the Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: The RRLP provides loans of up to \$50,000 for repair work to single-family owner-occupied homes. The program is available to lower income residents and can be used toward the costs of energy conservation measures. During the 2014-2021 planning period, 71 loans were approved, and 98 families are currently (2020) on the waiting list. The program will be continued into the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.H.3

Provide brochures and contact information to local utilities for energy audits and energy efficient appliance programs, as they are available.

Responsible Agency: Building and Safety Department

Schedule: Regularly restock brochures at Town Hall public counters.

Evaluation: The Town provides brochures, flyers, and online resources pertaining to energy audits, energy efficient appliance programs, and home weatherization programs. Programs include those offered by local utility providers and regional agencies, such as the Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County. This program will continue to be implemented during the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 1.H.4

The Community Development Department shall maintain a brochure which describes the improvements eligible for the Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program, including energy conservation measures, and shall distribute the brochure at Town Hall, the Community Center, the Senior Center, the Library, churches and other sites where they can be available to the community at large.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department and Building and Safety Department

Schedule: Ongoing

Evaluation: Brochures describing the RRLP are provided in the Town Hall lobby and the Development Services Building (DSB). Information is also provided on the Town's website. Additionally, the Housing Division describes the program at local veteran fairs, senior communities, and other public events, and the Code Enforcement Department distributes flyers to residents that may need assistance. This is an ongoing effort that will continue during the 2022-2029 planning period.

Policy 1.I

Provide housing opportunities for the homeless in the community.

Evaluation: The Town participates in the San Bernardino County Continuum of Care (CoC), San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership, Apple Valley/Victorville Consortium, and other organizations to provide emergency services and transitional and supportive housing for the homeless. In 2020, the Town applied for a Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA) grant through the State of California. The Town would receive \$287,561 annually for 5 years to partner with the City of Victorville to develop a Wellness and Recuperative Center in Victorville focusing on homelessness and transitional housing.

Program 1.I.1

The Town shall encourage the development of Homeless Shelters, Transitional Housing and Single Room Occupancy by complying with Government Code Section 65583, which requires these uses to be identified in the Development Code. Application fee waivers shall also be given to these projects proposed in the Town. In addition, those that apply for reasonable accommodations shall also be given fee waivers.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: The Development Code allows emergency housing for the homeless in the Planned Industrial (I-P) district, and in the Service Commercial (C-S) and Village Commercial (C-V) districts with a Special Use Permit (SUP). Transitional housing is permitted in all residential districts, including M-U, subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), consistent with the requirements for similar uses, such as large group homes and community care facilities; it is also permitted in the I-P district, and in the C-S and C-V districts with approval of a SUP. Single-room occupancy (SRO) facilities are permitted with a CUP in all residential districts, including M-U, consistent with the requirements for similar uses, such as group homes; they are also permitted in the I-P district.

No such facilities were proposed during the 2014-2021 planning period and, therefore, no application fee waivers were granted.

Program 1.I.2

The Town shall modify the Development Code so the regulations for transitional and supportive housing are considered the same as a residential use and only subject to those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: 2014-2015

Evaluation: Transitional and supportive housing are permitted in all residential districts subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) consistent with the requirements for similar uses, such as large group homes and community care facilities. This program was completed and will not be carried forward into the 2022-2029 planning period.

Goal 2

Housing which is safe and properly maintained, to assure that the best quality of life is provided to all residents.

Evaluation: Town staff considers safety in its review of all housing development proposals. The Code Enforcement Department provides ongoing enforcement of all applicable health and safety codes and requirements.

Policy 2.A

Maintain the code enforcement program as the primary tool for bringing substandard units into compliance with Town Codes, and for improving overall housing conditions in Apple Valley.

Evaluation: The Code Enforcement Department regularly evaluates housing conditions, issues citations for substandard housing, monitors follow-up repairs actions, and offers resources for assistance, as necessary and appropriate. This is an ongoing effort and will continue throughout the 2022-2029 planning cycle.

Program 2.A.1

Enforce Town codes on property maintenance, building and zoning code compliance.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Code Enforcement Division.

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: The Community Development, Building and Safety, and Code Enforcement Departments continue to enforce Town codes pertaining to zoning and building compliance and property maintenance.

Program 2.A.2

Actively market rehabilitation programs available through CDBG or HOME programs, which provide financial and technical assistance to lower income property owners to make housing repairs, by including them in the brochure described in Program I.H.4, to be distributed throughout the community. Endeavor to assist 130 very low and low income households through these programs.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Quarterly announcements in town-wide publication, quarterly announcements on Town's website

Evaluation: The Community Development Department markets the Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program (RRLP) that uses HOME and CDBG funds to assist lower income property owners making home repairs. Information is provided via flyers at Town Hall and the DSB, the Town's website, handouts distributed by Code Enforcement staff, the Town's quarterly newsletter, and bus shelters throughout the community.

During the 2014-2021 planning cycle, 71 loans were approved, and an additional 98 residents are on the waiting list. Due to high demand for assistance, this program will continue into the 2022-2029 planning cycle. The current goal is to assist 20 households per year.

Program 2.A.3

Continue to pursue CDBG and HOME funds for rehabilitation of single-family and multi-family housing, and provide information on these programs in brochures distributed by the Town to the community.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Annually with HOME fund allocation in budget

Evaluation: The Community Development Department pursues HOME finds annually, as available, and marketing programs are provided on a continuous basis (refer to the Evaluation for Program 2.A.2, above).

Program 2.A.4

Distribute Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) funds as established in the Five Year Consolidated Plan adopted in September 2012 for down payment assistance, single-family unit acquisition and rehabilitation for sale, and the acquisition, rehabilitation and/or construction of multiple family units.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Annually with NSP funding

Evaluation: As of 2020, the Neighborhood Stabilization 1 Program (NSP 1) is to be wrapped up and closed. All remaining balances are to be moved to the CBDG program. The Town will continue to maintain and monitor the existing loan portfolio for all existing loans funded through NSP. NSP 3 funds were used for land acquisition and the Town is currently working with the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition to develop 100 affordable multi-family housing units on Navajo Road.

Policy 2.B

Prohibit housing development in areas subject to significant geologic, flooding, noise and fire hazards, and in environmentally and archaeologically vulnerable areas.

Evaluation: The General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map avoid placing residential land uses in locations subject to environmental hazards, to the greatest extent practical. The Town's development review process also evaluates potential environmental hazards and, where necessary, requires implementation of mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts.

Policy 2.C

Encourage neighborhood watch programs that promote safety and protection in residential neighborhoods.

Evaluation: The Police Department operates the Neighborhood Watch program which has been effective in reducing crime in residential areas. These efforts are ongoing and will continue into the 2022-2029 housing cycle.

Program 2.C.1

Encourage landlords and property managers to participate in the Crime Free Multi-Family Housing Program sponsored by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's office.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Quarterly through Sheriff's Department outreach efforts

Evaluation: The Police Department continues to operate the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program, a coalition of police, property managers, and residents of rental properties that aims to reduce crime in rental communities. This program is ongoing and will continue into the 2022-2029 planning period.

Goal 3

Unrestricted access to housing throughout the community.

Evaluation: The Town evaluates development proposals for, and promotes and enforces regulations pertaining to, fair housing practices and accessibility issues. During the 2014-2021 planning period, the Town's Housing Division conducted community surveys about housing discrimination, developed assessments of fair housing and other reports, hosted fair housing workshops, and worked with government agencies and non-profits to address housing accessibility in the community. The Town funds the Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board through CDBG entitlement dollars to provide landlord/tenant mediation to Town residents. These efforts are ongoing and will continue into the 2022-2029 planning cycle.

Policy 3.A

Continue to promote the removal of architectural barriers in order to provide barrier-free housing for handicapped or disabled persons.

Evaluation: Section 9.29.190 of the Development Code provides individuals with disabilities with a process for requesting reasonable accommodation from various Town regulations, policies, practices, and procedures when warranted and based upon sufficient evidence. Notice of the availability of reasonable accommodation is displayed in the Development Services Building, and Town staff informs potentially eligible residents of the program. This policy is ongoing and will be carried forward to the 2022-2029 planning period.

Program 3.A.1

Enforce the handicapped accessibility requirements of Federal fair housing law that apply to all new multi-family residential projects containing four (4) or more units.

Responsible Agency: Department of Building and Safety

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Evaluation: The Town enforces all federal fair housing laws, including that described above which requires all "covered multi-family dwelling" (i.e. all dwelling units in buildings containing 4 or more units with one or more elevators, and all ground floor units in buildings containing 4 or more units) designed and constructed for first occupancy after March 13, 1991 to be accessible to and usable by people with disabilities. The Building and Safety Department verify compliance with the law as new developments are proposed.

Policy 3.B

Prohibit practices that arbitrarily direct buyers and renters to certain neighborhoods or types of housing.

Evaluation: The Town enforces all federal fair housing laws, and the Development Code facilitates various types of housing products in multiple zoning districts that are geographically distributed throughout the community. These actions help prohibit the practice of directing buyers and renters to certain neighborhoods or types of housing.

Program 3.B.1

Provide fair housing information at Town Hall, the Library, the Senior Center and local churches to inform both landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities. The information shall direct landlords and tenants to the San Bernardino Housing Authority, which has an established dispute resolution program.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, San Bernardino County Housing Authority

Schedule: Regularly restock brochures at all locations.

Evaluation: Brochures with fair housing information are provided and routinely restocked at Town Hall and the DSB by the Town's Housing Division. Information and links are also provided on the Town website. Information about the Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board, which the Town funds with CDBG funds, is included, and the Town hosts annual landlord/tenant workshops in the Town Conference Center. These programs are ongoing and will continue into the 2022-2029 housing cycle.

Effectiveness of Programs

Although limited development of any kind occurred in Apple Valley during the previous planning period, the Town was successful in partnering with the City of Victorville to develop a transitional shelter program to combat homelessness in the region, and has continued to assist with both down payment assistance and home repair assistance for very low and low income households when funds are available. The Town will continue to implement the programs under Policy 1.C, and others in this Housing Element, to assist special needs households in Town.

DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Population Trends

The Town of Apple Valley is in the Victor Valley region of San Bernardino County. Neighboring jurisdictions include the cities of Victorville, Hesperia, and Adelanto. Between 2000 and 2010, the Apple Valley population increased 27.5%, from 54,239 to 69,135. Between 2010 and 2018, it increased 4.7% to 72,359. The percentage increase during this period was comparable to those of neighboring cities and the County as a whole, which ranged between 3.8% and 5.2%.

Table 2
Population Trends – Apple Valley

Year	Population	Numerical Change	Percent Change	Average Annual Growth Rate
2000	54,239	--	--	--
2010	69,135	14,896	27.5%	2.8%
2018	72,359	3,224	4.7%	0.6%

Source: 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census; American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates.

Table 3
Population Trends – Neighboring Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction	2010	2018	Change (2010-2018)	
			Number	Percent
Victor Valley Region:				
Apple Valley	69,135	72,359	3,224	4.7%
Victorville	115,903	121,861	5,958	5.1%
Hesperia	90,173	93,609	3,436	3.8%
Adelanto	31,765	33,416	1,651	5.2%
San Bernardino County	2,035,210	2,135,413	100,203	4.9%

Source: 2010 U.S. Census; American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) prepares population forecasts for jurisdictions within its coverage area as part of future growth policies and programs. SCAG's 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) projects the Apple Valley population will reach 101,400 in 2045. As the Town grows, the demand for a variety of housing products will increase; however, the need for additional housing must be evaluated in light of the slowing annual growth rate that has occurred since 2010.

Race and Ethnicity

The racial/ethnic make-up of Apple Valley residents in 2010 and 2018 is described in the following table. The largest racial group is residents identifying themselves as “white”; this group increased from approximately 69% in 2010 to 79% in 2018. The second most populous racial group changed from “some other race” (12%) in 2010 to “Black or African American” (9%) in 2018. The percentage of American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians, and Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders remained largely unchanged, representing a combined total of about 4% in both years. The percentage of residents identifying as “Some Other Race” decreased the most, from 12.1% in 2010 to 3.6% in 2018. The percentage of Hispanic or Latino residents (of any race) increased from approximately 32% to 36%.

Table 4
Population by Race and Ethnicity

Race	2010		2018	
	Persons	% of Total	Persons	% of Total
One Race				
White	47,762	69.09%	57,199	79.05%
Black or African American	6,321	9.14%	6,477	8.95%
American Indian and Alaska Native	779	1.13%	525	0.73%
Asian	2,020	2.92%	2,115	2.92%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	294	0.43%	26	0.03%
Some Other Race	8,345	12.07%	2,611	3.61%
Two or More Races	3,614	5.22%	3,406	4.71%
Total	69,135	100.00%	72,359	100.00%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	21,940	31.74%	26,246	36.27%

Source: 2010 U.S. Census, Tables P3 and P7; American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05

Age

Table 5 compares Apple Valley’s population by age in 2010 and 2018. The largest age groups in 2018 were young and middle age adults ages 25 to 34 years (12.1% of total population), 45 to 54 years (11.4%), and 35 to 44 years (10.9%). From 2010 to 2018, the age groups with the greatest increase were 25 to 34 years (1.5% increase) and 65 to 74 years (1.2% increase). The age groups with the greatest decrease were 45-55 years (2.3% decrease), 10 to 14 years (1.2% decrease), and 15 to 19 years (1.2% decrease). The median age increased slightly, from 37.0 to 37.3 years.

The data suggest that housing demand is currently highest for young adults and families with children. However, the population is slowly aging. If the aging trend continues, there may be a growing demand for senior housing and programs that promote “aging in place.” The demand for such products will be evaluated over time.

Table 5
Population by Age

Age Group	2010		2018	
	Persons	% of Total	Persons	% of Total
Under 5 years	4,795	6.9%	5,374	7.4%
5 to 9 years	4,894	7.0%	5,376	7.4%
10 to 14 years	5,641	8.2%	5,077	7.0%
15 to 19 years	6,205	9.0%	5,615	7.8%
20 to 24 years	4,265	6.1%	4,279	5.9%
25 to 34 years	7,383	10.6%	8,760	12.1%
35 to 44 years	7,685	11.1%	7,912	10.9%
45 to 54 years	9,498	13.7%	8,221	11.4%
55 to 59 years	4,284	6.2%	4,609	6.4%
60 to 64 years	3,820	5.5%	4,669	6.5%
65 to 74 years	5,868	8.9%	7,342	10.1%
75 to 84 years	3,527	5.1%	3,573	4.9%
85 years and over	1,270	1.8%	1,552	2.1%
Total	69,135	100.0% ¹	72,359	100.0% ¹
Median age (years)	37.0		37.3	

¹ differences due to rounding

Source: 2010 U.S. Census Tables P12 and P13; American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05

Employment

The following table describes employment by industry in Apple Valley in 2018. The data show that 26,030 residents over 16 years were employed in the civilian labor force. The largest percentage was employed in “educational services, health care, social assistance” (24.6%), followed by “retail trade” (15.9%) and “transportation, warehousing, utilities” (10.3%).

**Table 6
Employment by Industry**

Industry Type	2018	
	Persons	% of Total
Civilian employed population 16 years and over:		
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, mining	154	0.6%
Construction	2,011	7.7%
Manufacturing	1,456	5.6%
Wholesale Trade	294	1.1%
Retail Trade	4,121	15.9%
Transportation, warehousing, utilities	2,675	10.3%
Information	370	1.4%
Finance, insurance, real estate, rental, leasing	1,144	4.4%
Professional, scientific, management, admin., waste management	2,439	9.4%
Educational services, health care, social assistance	6,408	24.6%
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, food services	2,135	8.2%
Other services, except public administration	1,104	4.2%
Public administration	1,719	6.6%
Total	26,030	100.0%

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table S2405

As shown in ~~Table 7~~ **Table 7**, approximately 31% of the Apple Valley civilian employed labor force is employed in “management, business, science, and arts” occupations, followed by “sales and office” occupations (23%) and “service” occupations (19%).

**Table 7
Employment by Occupation**

Occupation	2018	
	Persons	% of Total
Civilian employed population 16 years and over:		
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	8,070	31.0%
Service occupations	5,025	19.3%
Sales and office occupations	6,007	23.1%
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations	2,792	10.7%
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	4,136	15.9%
Total	26,030	100.0%

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table DP03

The Apple Valley Unified School District, St. Mary Regional Medical Center, and Wal-Mart Distribution Center are the largest employers in Apple Valley. Combined, they employ a total of 4,276 full-time employees, nearly 74% of total employment within the Town limits. Other principal employers include big box retailers, grocery stores, and a skilled nursing facility. Typical jobs at these facilities include teachers, school administrators and support staff, medical providers and support personnel, and retail clerks and managers.

Table 8
Principal Employers in Apple Valley

Employer	2019	
	Number of Employees ¹	Percent of Total Employment ²
Apple Valley Unified School District	1,574	27.18%
St. Mary Regional Medical Center	1,501	25.92%
Wal-Mart Distribution Center	1,201	20.74%
Target Stores	349	6.03%
Wal-Mart Stores	250	4.32%
Stater Brothers Market	212	3.66%
Winco Foods	171	2.95%
Apple Valley Post Acute Care Center	170	2.94%
Lowe's	140	2.42%
The Home Depot	133	2.30%

¹ does not include part-time employment

² total employment of all employers located within Town limits

Source: Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2019, Town of Apple Valley.

Economic Trends

The Great Recession began in late 2007 and saw high unemployment and job losses throughout much of the country, including southern California, San Bernardino County, and the Victor Valley. Housing constructions levels were far below that needed to meet demand. The Inland Empire (San Bernardino and Riverside Counties combined) lost 140,200 jobs.¹ Unemployment rates in Apple Valley reached 14.4%, 13.7%, and 12.1% in 2010, 2011, and 2012, respectively.²

The economy has rebounded since the recession and San Bernardino County, in particular, has experienced strong economic growth, much of which is associated with residents and businesses being priced out of coastal Southern California and moving inland for more affordable housing and commercial property.³ Between 2010 and 2018, the Inland Empire experienced a 30.2% increase in the number of local jobs, with 2018 total employment being higher than 2007 pre-

¹ "Inland Empire Quarterly Economic Report," Year 31, October 2019, John E. Husing, Ph.D., Economic & Politics, Inc.

² California Economic Development Department annual unemployment rates (labor force), not seasonally adjusted, not preliminary.

³ The Firmest of Housing Market Recoveries," John Mulville, Regional Director, Metrostudy, from The Bradco Companies High Desert Report, Spring 2018, Volume 57.

recession levels.⁴ Regional job growth was especially strong in three industry sectors: logistics, construction, and health care, which were responsible for 47.4% of all new jobs created in the Inland Empire in 2018.⁵ As of 2019, the unemployment rate in the Inland Empire was averaging a record low of 4.2%, and Apple Valley’s unemployment rate was 4.5%.⁶

Between 2018 and 2019, assessed property valuation increased by 5.8% in San Bernardino County and 4.2% in Apple Valley.⁷ Although the housing market has made a strong recovery and regional home sales have increased, a lack of supply in the housing market remains a major economic issue throughout the Inland Empire.⁸

Recent employment gains were realized in Apple Valley with the opening of the Big Lots distribution center in January 2020 that provided 400 new jobs. Future employment opportunities for Apple Valley residents are expected to include thousands of construction, transportation, maintenance, retail, and restaurant jobs associated with the proposed Brightline High Speed Train transit station and maintenance facility at I-15 and Dale Evans Parkway. The project is expected to be operational by 2023 and serve as an economic catalyst that positively impacts long-term local and regional economic development, employment, and housing. Current estimates project that it could create more than 23,000 construction jobs (through 2023) and 6,600 operational jobs (through 2029) in the Victor Valley region.⁹

Additional employment can be expected in conjunction with the continued build out of the 6,600-acre North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan (NAVISP) area with industrial, manufacturing, and logistics industries. Commercial retail, restaurant, service, and hospitality jobs are anticipated as vacant commercial sites develop throughout the Town, particularly in north Apple Valley near I-15 and in the Village Specific Plan area along Highway 18. The region’s health care industry can be expected to continue to grow, bringing a variety of new health-related professional, technical, and support jobs.

Table 9 describes the employment locations of Apple Valley’s employed residents. As shown, 16.6% of the Town’s population works in Apple Valley. The remaining 83% work elsewhere, which could suggest a jobs-housing imbalance within the Town limits.

⁴ “Inland Empire Quarterly Economic Report,” Year 31, October 2019, John E. Husing, Ph.D., Economic & Politics, Inc.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ California Economic Development Department annual unemployment rates (labor force), not seasonally adjusted, not preliminary.

⁷ “Inland Empire Quarterly Economic Report,” Year 31, October 2019, John E. Husing, Ph.D., Economic & Politics, Inc.

⁸ “Ibid.

⁹ “Economic Development Plan, Virgin Trains USA, presentation to CDLAC (California Debt Limit Allocation Committee)” Varshney & Associates, 2020, p. 17, 18.

**Table 9
Commuting Patterns**

Where Apple Valley Residents Work	No. of Apple Valley Commuters	% of Total Commuters
Apple Valley	3,592	16.6%
Victorville	2,831	13.1%
Hesperia	1,305	6.0%
San Bernardino	1,220	5.6%
Los Angeles	1,164	5.4%
Ontario	464	2.1%
Adelanto	443	2.0%
Riverside	442	2.0%
Rancho Cucamonga	381	1.8%
Fontana	309	1.4%
All Other Destinations	9,533	44.0%

Source: "Profile of the Town of Apple Valley," Southern California Association of Governments, May 2019, p. 21. Based on 2016 data.

Income

Incomes vary significantly by region, industry, and type of job. ~~Table 10~~ **Table 10** describes median earnings by occupation in Apple Valley. As shown, the highest-paying occupations are computer/engineering/science, healthcare practitioners, and management/business/financial occupations, with median earnings ranging from about \$62,000 to \$79,000. The lowest-paying occupations are personal care/service and food preparation/serving occupations, with median earnings ranging between \$13,000 and \$15,000.

Table 10
Median Earnings by Occupation

Occupation	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months *
Management, Business, Science, and Arts Occupations:	
Management, business, financial	\$62,718
Computer, engineering, science	\$78,952
Education, legal, community service, arts, media	\$37,258
Healthcare practitioners, technical	\$74,958
Service Occupations:	
Healthcare support	\$13,759
Protective services (firefighting, law enforcement)	\$62,277
Food preparation and serving related	\$15,311
Building/grounds cleaning and maintenance	\$20,907
Personal care and service	\$13,721
Sales and Office Occupations:	
Sales and related	\$23,017
Office and administrative support	\$30,833
Natural Resources, Construction, Maintenance Occupations:	
Farming, fishing, forestry	\$30,787
Construction, extraction	\$39,438
Installation, maintenance, repair	\$55,261
Production, Transportation, Material Moving Occupations:	
Production operations	\$43,049
Transportation operations	\$43,427
Material moving operations	\$20,378

* civilian employed population 16 years and over

Source: American Community Survey 2013-2018 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables, Table B24011

The following table compares median household income in Apple Valley and San Bernardino County in 2010 and 2018. Apple Valley's 2010 median household income was 89.7% of the County's, and its 2018 median household income was 88.1% of the County's. During this period, Apple Valley's median household income increased 5.9% compared to the County's increase of 7.7%. The data suggest that income growth in Apple Valley is lagging behind that of the County.

Table 11
Median Household Income

Jurisdiction	Median Household Income			% of County Median Household Income	
	2010	2018	Percent Increase 2010-2018	2010	2018
Apple Valley	\$50,066	\$53,023	5.9%	89.7%	88.1%
San Bernardino County	\$55,845	\$60,164	7.7%	100%	100%

Source: American Community Survey 2006-2010 and 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table DP03

Households

As shown in the following table, the number of Apple Valley households increased 2.4% between 2010 and 2018, from 23,598 to 24,161. In 2018, the majority of households (53.4%) consisted of married couple families, followed by non-family households (24.0%), female-headed households with no husband present (16.2%), and male-headed households with no wife present (6.4%).

Table 12
Household Growth Trends

Year	Number of Households	Numerical Change	Percent Change
2010	23,598	---	---
2018	24,161	563	2.4%

Sources: 2010 U.S. Census, Table P28; American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table DP02

Table 13
Household Types

Household Type	No. of Households	% of Total
Family households:		
Married couple family	12,900	53.4%
Male householder, no wife present	1,541	6.4%
Female householder, no husband present	3,908	16.2%
Subtotal	18,349	---
Non-family households	5,812	24.0%
Total Households	24,161	100.0%

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table DP02

EXISTING HOUSING STOCK

Housing Units

Apple Valley's housing stock includes 27,077 dwelling units, the majority of which (76.8%) are single-family detached units. Other housing types include single-family attached units (3.2%), mobile homes (5.3%), multi-family complexes with 2-4 units (9.3%) and 5 or more units (5.4%).

The total number of units increased by 960 (3.7%) between 2010 and 2020. The vast majority (95.8%) of new units consisted of single-family detached units; 0.5% were single-family attached units; 0.8% were multi-family units 2-4 units; 2.7% were multi-family with 5+ units; and 0.1% were mobile homes.

Table 14
Housing Unit Trends – 2010 and 2020

Unit Type	2010		2020	
	Number of Units	% Total Units	Number of Units	% Total Units
Single-Family Detached	19,891	76.2%	20,811	76.8%
Single-Family Attached	851	3.2%	856	3.2%
Multi-Family, 2–4 Units	2,501	9.6%	2,509	9.3%
Multi-Family, 5 or More Units	1,435	5.5%	1,461	5.4%
Mobile homes	1,439	5.5%	1,440	5.3%
Total	26,117	100.0%	27,077	100.0%

Source: Department of Finance Table E-5, 2010 and 2020.

Residential Building Permits, 2014-2020

The following table summarizes residential building permits issued from 2014 to 2020. A total of 831 permits were issued. The majority (96.6%) were single-family units and had an average value of \$146,745 per unit. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) accounted for 2.0% of all permits and had an average value of \$51,538 per unit; all ADUs permits were issued in 2017 or later. Multi-family 5+-units accounted for 1.0% of all permits and had an average value of \$92,719 per unit. Multi-family 2-4-units accounted for 0.5% of all permits and had an average value of \$98,049 per unit.

Table 15
Residential Building Permits, 2014-2020

Year	Single-Family		Multi-Family 2-4 Units		Multi-Family 5+ Units		Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) ¹	
	No. of Units	Average Value/Unit	No. of Units	Average Value/Unit	No. of Units	Average Value/Unit	No. of Units	Average Value/Unit
2014	94	\$135,571	4	\$98,049	0	---	0	---
2015	111	\$139,365	0	---	0	---	0	---
2016	126	\$137,032	0	---	0	---	0	---
2017	172	\$142,016	0	---	8	\$92,719	1	\$54,630
2018	132	\$140,148	0	---	0	---	2	\$43,383
2019	87	\$167,660	0	---	0	---	4	\$45,322
2020	81	\$165,423	0	---	0	---	9	\$62,818
Total:	803	\$146,745	4	\$98,049	8	\$92,719	16	\$51,538

¹ includes new and converted ADUs

Housing Conditions

The age of Apple Valley's housing stock can be a key indicator of potential rehabilitation, repair, or demolition needs. An estimated 16,509 housing units (63.2% of all housing units in Apple Valley) were built before 1990 and are, therefore, more than 30 years old. Depending on construction quality and maintenance history, older homes can have problems with inadequate or unsafe mechanical systems and appliances, foundation or roof problems, inefficient windows, the presence of asbestos or lead, or other issues that affect livability and safety.

Table 16
Age of Housing Units

Year Built	No. of Units	% of Total
Built 2014 or later	220	0.8%
Built 2010 to 2013	385	1.5%
Built 2000 to 2009	4,899	18.8%
Built 1990 to 1999	4,106	15.7%
Built 1980 to 1989	9,550	36.6%
Built 1970 to 1979	4,552	17.4%
Built 1960 to 1969	1,038	4.0%
Built 1950 to 1959	975	3.7%
Built 1940 to 1949	208	0.8%
Built 1939 or earlier	186	0.7%
Total units	26,119	100.0%
Total Built before 1990	16,509	63.2%

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04

Another measure of potentially substandard housing is the number of housing units lacking adequate kitchen and plumbing facilities. In Apple Valley in 2018, there were 115 units (0.5% of all units) lacking complete kitchens and 54 units (0.2% of all units) lacking plumbing facilities. All units with deficiencies were renter-occupied. These homes could potentially benefit from rehabilitation programs.

Table 17
Housing Units Lacking Facilities

Type of Deficiency	Owner-Occupied Units			Renter-Occupied Units			Total	
	No.	Total Units in Town	Percent of Total Units	No.	Total Units in Town	Percent of Total Units	No.	Percent of Total Units
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	0	15,576	0.0%	115	8,585	1.3%	115	0.5%
Lacking plumbing facilities	0	15,576	0.0%	54	8,585	0.6%	54	0.2%

Source: 2014-2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25053 and B25049

In October 2020, the Apple Valley Code Enforcement Department conducted a records search of dwelling units with code violations. As shown in the following table, there were approximately 148 open cases citing structural deficiencies, representing 0.9% of the Town's housing stock. Most violations were associated with faulty or hazardous electrical systems (34), faulty plumbing systems (26), dampness of habitable rooms (21), and general dilapidation or deterioration of the structure (20). Also noteworthy were 7 dilapidated/dangerous structures due to decay, faulty construction, fire, flood, earthquake, old age, or neglect; 8 structures detrimental to the public health; and 2 substandard structures.

The records search found 329 open cases citing aesthetic and nuisance violations. Most were associated with trash and debris (160), overgrown/dead/decayed vegetation (92), inoperative or abandoned vehicles (40), and fallen or broken fencing (12).

Table 18
Code Enforcement Violations – Open Cases

Type of Violation	No. of Cases
Structural Deficiencies	
Faulty plumbing (illegally installed, unpermitted, faulty or hazardous)	26
Visible mold	5
Faulty or hazardous electrical	34
Dilapidated, damaged, or dangerous structure resulting from decay, damage, faulty construction, fire, wind, earthquake, flood, old age, or neglect (to be repaired or demolished)	7
Structure detrimental to the public health (maintenance in such condition as to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare)	8

Table 18
Code Enforcement Violations – Open Cases

Type of Violation	No. of Cases
Dampness of habitable rooms	21
General dilapidation or deteriorated structure, or improper maintenance (needs repair, replacement, removal, or proper maintenance)	20
Abandoned/unsecured buildings	6
Lack of utilities (gas, electric, water)	2
Improper occupancy (discontinue using portions of the structure for living, sleeping, cooking, or dining purposes that weren't designed or intended to be used for those occupancies)	1
Substandard building (building shall be maintained in a safe condition)	2
Broken windows	7
Rotted exterior (repair or replace all broken, rotted, split, or buckled exterior wall coverings or roof coverings)	1
Deteriorated roof structure	1
Faulty mechanical equipment	1
Inadequate heating	2
Failed septic	2
Faulty weather protection (paint house facia, trim, and garage area)	2
Aesthetic and Nuisance Violations	
Overgrown, dead, decayed, dry, or hazardous vegetation	92
Trash and debris (including appliances, furniture, containers)	160
Excessive vehicles in public view	8
Inoperative or abandoned vehicle(s)	40
Improper fence maintenance (fallen or broken)	12
Metal cargo container prohibited on property	11
Performance standards, maintenance of open areas (all open areas shall be landscaped, surfaced, or treated, and maintained in a dust free and weed free condition, including rockscape)	2
Abandoned and/or broken equipment	3
Improper outdoor storage, no storage on vacant lots (vehicles, garbage, building materials)	1

Source: Open Case Housing Report, Apple Valley Code Enforcement Department, October 2020.

The Code Enforcement Department annually inspects the exteriors of rental housing to help evaluate conditions and identify deficiencies. The Town's Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program provides no interest deferred HOME loans to improve unsafe living conditions to eligible applicants to assist homeowners and apartment complex owners with home maintenance and repair costs.

During the previous planning period, the Town's Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program (RRLP) provided 71 deferred loans to very low and low income households to help with health and safety repairs and rehabilitation of their properties. There are currently 98 households on the Town's waiting list for this program, awaiting funding. Most of these households correlate to the Code Enforcement actions described above. It can therefore be assumed that 150 housing units in Town

are in need of substantial rehabilitation, and that about 100 of those are occupied by lower income households. In order to address this issue, the Town will maintain its RRLP program, and has committed to assisting 60 very low and 100 low income households throughout the 2022-2029 planning period, as shown in Table 42, and supported in Program 2.A.2.

Vacancy Rates

The housing vacancy rate is the percentage of units that are vacant or unoccupied at a given time. It is directly related to housing supply and demand; a low vacancy rate means there are more occupied units and can indicate higher housing demand and housing values/costs, while a high vacancy rate can indicate excess housing supply and decreased property values. Units may be considered vacant for several reasons, including if they listed for rent or function as vacation or seasonal homes.

As shown in the following table, 24,161 (92.5%) of all housing units in Apple Valley are occupied. The remaining 1,958 (7.5%) units are vacant. The largest category of vacant units are those “for rent,” followed by “other vacant” and “for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.” The homeowner vacancy rate is 1.9%, and the rental vacancy rate is 5.7%.

Table 19
Vacancy Status

Vacancy Status	Units	% of Total
Occupied Units:		
Owner-occupied	15,576	59.6%
Renter-occupied	8,585	32.9%
Subtotal	24,161	---
Vacant Units:		
For rent	518	2.0%
Rented, not occupied	41	0.2%
For sale only	300	1.1%
Sold, not occupied	209	0.8%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	424	1.6%
For migrant workers	0	0.0%
Other vacant	466	1.8%
Subtotal	1,958	---
Total Units	26,119	100%
Vacancy Rate:		
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.9%	
Rental vacancy rate	5.7%	

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Tables DP04 and B25004

Housing Costs and Affordability

Home Values

The following table compares median housing values in the Victor Valley region and San Bernardino County in 2013 and 2018. Apple Valley’s median housing value was \$171,600 in 2013, the highest of all Victor Valley jurisdictions. It increased to \$237,100 in 2018, more than 38% over the 5-year period. This was the lowest percentage increase of all Victor Valley jurisdictions, but the median value remained the highest. In both 2013 and 2018, median housing values in all Victor Valley jurisdictions were substantially lower than those of San Bernardino County as a whole.

Table 20
Regional Median Housing Value Trends, 2013 - 2018

Jurisdiction	Median Value, owner-occupied units		% Change 2013-2018
	2013	2018	
Victor Valley Region:			
Apple Valley	\$171,600	\$237,100	38.2%
Victorville	\$137,700	\$205,300	49.1%
Hesperia	\$146,200	\$219,600	50.2%
Adelanto	\$95,900	\$181,600	89.4%
San Bernardino County	\$222,300	\$305,400	37.4%

Source: American Community Survey 2009-2013 and 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table B25077

A more recent regional study found that, in Apple Valley in 2019 (3rd quarter), the median price was \$269,928 for existing homes and \$297,500 for new homes.¹⁰

Rental Costs

The rental housing market in Apple Valley includes apartments, townhomes, mobile homes, and single-family homes. **Table 21** shows median gross rent by number of bedrooms, according to the American Community Survey. Median gross rent is \$1,026.

Table 21
Median Gross Rent by Bedrooms

No. of Bedrooms	Median Gross Rent*
No bedroom	\$636
1 bedroom	\$662
2 bedrooms	\$925
3 bedrooms	\$1,236
4 bedrooms	\$1,389
5+ bedrooms	\$1,926
Median Gross Rent:	\$1,026

* estimated, renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent
Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table B25031

¹⁰ “Inland Empire Quarterly Economic Report,” Year 31, Economics & Politics, Inc. October 2019.

Online listings show that current market rental rates are approximately \$1,000 for a studio apartment; \$900 to \$1,400 for a 1-bedroom unit; \$900 to \$1,600 for a 2-bedroom unit; \$1,500 to \$1,700 for a 3-bedroom unit; and \$1,700 to \$2,000 for a 4+-bedroom unit.¹¹

Affordability

Housing costs can represent a major obstacle to housing availability. Federal and State governments offer housing assistance programs and establish maximum income limits for eligibility for those programs, as well as maximum housing costs that can be charged to eligible households.

Income limits for housing assistance programs are established annually on a regional basis by the Department of Housing and Community Development. ~~Table 22~~ **Table 22** provides the current (2020) income limits for the Town of Apple Valley. The San Bernardino County Area Median Income (AMI) for a 4-person household is \$75,300.

Table 22
Income Limits for San Bernardino County, 2020

Income Category	Number of Persons in Household							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Extremely Low Income	\$15,850	\$18,100	\$21,720	\$26,200	\$30,680	\$35,160	\$39,640	\$44,120
Very Low Income	\$26,400	\$30,150	\$33,900	\$37,650	\$40,700	\$43,700	\$46,700	\$49,700
Low Income	\$42,200	\$48,200	\$54,250	\$60,250	\$65,100	\$69,900	\$74,750	\$79,500
Median Income	\$52,700	\$60,250	\$67,750	\$75,300	\$81,300	\$87,350	\$93,350	\$99,400
Moderate Income	\$63,250	\$72,300	\$81,300	\$90,350	\$97,600	\$104,800	\$112,050	\$119,250

~~Table 23~~ **Table 23** describes income limits for various household income categories and “affordable” monthly payments for each category, according to definitions set forth in California Health and Safety Code Sections 50052.5 and 50053. Income limits are based on the area median income (AMI) for San Bernardino County for a family of four, which is \$75,300 for Fiscal Year 2020. An affordable housing payment is considered no more than 30% of gross household income.

¹¹ Rent.com, accessed September 10, 2020.

Table 23
Income Categories and Affordable Housing Costs

Income Category¹	Annual Income Limit²	Maximum Affordable Monthly Payment³	Maximum Affordable Home Purchase Price⁴
Extremely Low Income (0-30% of AMI)	\$26,200	\$655	\$85,100
Very Low Income (30%-50% of AMI)	\$37,650	\$941	\$122,200
Low Income (50%-80% of AMI)	\$60,250	\$1,506	\$195,600
Moderate Income (80%-120% of AMI)	\$90,350	\$2,259	\$293,400
Above Moderate Income (120%+ of AMI)	\$90,350+	\$2,259+	\$293,400+

¹ AMI = area median income. San Bernardino County median income = \$75,300.

² Based on 4-person household.

³ “Affordable housing cost” for lower-income households is defined as not more than 30% of gross household income with variations. “Housing cost” includes rent or mortgage payments, utilities, property taxes, and insurance on owner-occupied housing.

⁴ Converts the maximum affordable monthly payment to a home value, assuming 10% down, 15-year fixed loan, 4.0% interest rate, 1.25% taxes and homeowners insurance monthly.

Source: HCD 2020 State Income Limits

Based on the affordable housing guidelines shown in the table above, an affordable monthly housing payment for a low-income family of four (\$1,506) exceeds the median gross rent for a 3-bedroom unit in Apple Valley (\$1,236). Therefore, rental housing affordability is not considered a barrier for lower income households. As regards homeownership, an affordable home purchase price for a low-income family of four (\$195,600) is less than the median housing value in Apple Valley (\$269,928). Low-income households could face challenges achieving homeownership, and affordability of ownership units should be an important consideration in Apple Valley. For moderate income households, both the median gross rent for a 3 bedroom apartment (\$1,506) and the median home sales price (\$269,928) are affordable for a four-person household. Therefore, moderate income households in Apple Valley will be able to find housing in the broader market, without subsidy.

The Town refers residents needing housing affordability assistance to the Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB), which provides HUD Section 8 rental assistance to lower income renters and operates low-income housing projects in Apple Valley. Homeownership assistance loans are also available at the County and State levels (see Existing Affordable Housing Programs, below). The Town Development Code offers density bonuses and other development-related incentives and concessions to encourage the development of affordable housing (see Density Bonuses, below). Additionally, the Town is currently working with the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition on plans for a future 100-unit affordable housing project for low and moderate income households on Navajo Road.

Overpayment

Overpayment is defined as a household paying more than 30% of its gross income toward housing costs. Severe overpayment occurs when a household pays more than 50% of its gross income on housing. The cost burden of overpayment can fall disproportionately on lower-income households and renters.

The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) database, provided by HUD and based on U.S. Census American Community Survey data, describes the number of households, by income level, that are experiencing housing cost burdens. The latest CHAS data for the 2013-2017 period for Apple Valley are shown in the following table. Of all owner households, 30.8% are overpaying for housing and 13.1% are severely overpaying. Of lower-income owner households, 61.0% are overpaying and 32.5% are severely overpaying.

More renter households than owner households are overpaying and severely overpaying. Of all renter households, 51.5% are overpaying and 27.0% are severely overpaying. Of lower-income renter households, 76.7% are overpaying and 43.0% are severely overpaying.

Table 24
Overpayment by Income Level

Income Category ¹	Owners		Renters	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
Household Income less than or = 30% HAMFI:				
Households overpaying	910		1,840	
Households severely overpaying	760	83.5%	1,575	85.6%
	645	70.9%	1,380	75.0%
Household Income >30% to less than or = 50% HAMFI:				
Households overpaying	1,480		1,680	
Households severely overpaying	950	64.2%	1,535	91.4%
	520	35.1%	695	41.4%
Household Income >50% to less than or = 80% HAMFI:				
Households overpaying	2,945		1,730	
Households severely overpaying	1,540	52.3%	915	52.9%
	570	19.4%	185	10.7%
Subtotal: All lower-income households	5,335		5,250	
Subtotal: All lower-income HH overpaying	3,250	61.0%	4,025	76.7%
Subtotal: All lower-income HH severely overpaying	1,735	32.5%	2,260	43.0%
Household Income >80% to less than or = 100% HAMFI:				
Households overpaying	1,765		610	
Households severely overpaying	705	39.9%	110	18.0%
	255	14.4%	0	0.0%
Household Income >100% HAMFI:				
Households overpaying	8,390		2,550	
Households severely overpaying	815	9.7%	200	7.8%
	45	0.5%	10	0.4%
Total Households	15,490		8,410	
Total Households Overpaying	4,770	30.8%	4,335	51.5%
Total Households Severely Overpaying	2,035	13.1%	2,270	27.0%

¹ HAMFI = HUD Area Median Family Income

“Overpaying” is defined as spending >30% of gross household income on housing costs.

“Severely overpaying” is defined as spending >50% of gross household income on housing costs.

Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, CHAS data for Apple Valley, based on 2013-2017 ACS.

The Town's Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program and the County Housing Authority's (HACSB) Tenant-Based Voucher Program and public housing supply can help reduce the burdens of overpayment for lower income households (see Existing Affordable Housing Programs, below).

Extremely Low-Income Households

Extremely low-income (ELI) households are a subset of the very low-income household category and are defined by HCD as those with incomes less than 30% of the area median income (AMI). The AMI for a 4-person household in San Bernardino County is \$75,300. ELI household incomes are defined by HCD and HUD as those earning less than \$26,200.¹² Many ELI households receive public assistance, such as Social Security insurance, and have a variety of housing needs.

Existing Needs

According to the latest CHAS data, 2,750 households (11.5% of total households) in Apple Valley are considered extremely low-income. Most (67%) ELI households are renters. More than 85% experience housing problems, including incomplete kitchen and plumbing facilities, overcrowding, and/or cost burden greater than 30% of income (overpayment). Nearly 85% are in overpayment situations, and 73.6% are in severe overpayment situations in which housing costs are greater than 50% of household income.

Table 25
Housing Problems for Extremely Low-Income Households

	Owners	Renters	Total
Total Number of ELI Households	910	1,840	2,750
Percent with any housing problems*	85.7%	85.6%	85.6%
Percent with Cost Burden >30% of income	83.5%	85.6%	84.9%
Percent with Cost Burden >50% of income	70.9%	75.0%	73.6%
Total Number of Households	15,490	8,410	23,900

* housing problems include incomplete kitchen facilities, incomplete plumbing facilities, more than 1 person per room (overcrowding), and cost burden greater than 30% of income.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, CHAS data for Apple Valley, based on the 2013-2017 ACS.

Projected Needs

To calculate projected housing needs, the Town assumed 50% of its very low income regional housing need assessment (RHNA) are extremely low income households. From its very low income need of 1,086 units, the Town has a projected need of 543 units for extremely low income households.

Housing types that are suitable for ELI households include rent-restricted affordable units, housing with supportive services, single-room occupancy units, accessory dwelling units, group quarters, and housing with rent subsidies (vouchers). The Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB) manages public housing units and operates the Tenant-Based Voucher

¹² Per HUD, the Extremely Low Income (ELI) income limit is the greater of either: 1) 60% of Very Low Income limit (\$37,650), which equals \$22,590, or 2) poverty guideline established by Dept. of Health and Human Services (HHS), which equals \$26,200.

Rental Assistance Program in Apple Valley. Additionally, the Town's Development Code supports the development of accessory dwelling units, single-room occupancy units, supportive and transitional housing, and group homes (see Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types, below).

Overcrowding

Residential overcrowding has been associated with a higher prevalence of infectious disease, stress, sleep disorders, and other mental health problems, as well as lower educational achievement and vulnerability to homelessness. Overcrowding can indicate an imbalance between housing affordability and income and typically affects renters more than homeowners.

Overcrowding is defined by the U.S. Census as a housing unit with more than one person per room (excluding kitchens, bathrooms, hallways, etc.). According to this definition, Apple Valley has 942 overcrowded housing units, which represents 3.9% of the total 24,161 occupied units in the Town. Of overcrowded units, 72.1% are renter-occupied units and 27.9% are owner-occupied units.

Severely overcrowded units have more than 1.5 persons per room and are a subset of overcrowded units. Approximately 19.3% of all overcrowded units in Apple Valley are severely overcrowded. About 66.5% of them are rental-occupied units, and 33.5% are owner-occupied units.

Table 26
Overcrowding

Persons Per Room	Owner-Occupied Units	Renter-Occupied Units	Total	% of Total
1.01 to 1.50	202	558	760	80.7%
1.51 to 2.00	32	96	128	13.6%
2.01 or more	29	25	54	5.7%
Total Overcrowded	263	679	942	100.0%
% Overcrowded by Tenure	27.9%	72.1%	---	---
Total Severely Overcrowded	61	121	182	19.3%
% Severely Overcrowded by Tenure	33.5%	66.5%	---	---

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table B25014

Apple Valley's Development Code allows the development of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and junior ADUs that provide additional living facilities for one or more persons on lots with a primary residence. ADUs can help alleviate overcrowding in owner-occupied units.

Publicly Supported Housing

Apple Valley does not have any publicly supported housing units at this time.

SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Seniors

Senior residents ages 65 and older are considered a special population because they typically live on fixed or limited incomes, have an increased incidence of physical and memory impairments that can adversely affect independent living, and have higher health care costs. Potential housing problems can include lack of accessibility or independent living support services, lack of affordability, lack of transportation options, and inconvenient distance to appropriate health care facilities.

As shown in the following table, 7,433 households (30.8% of all households) in Apple Valley are 65 years or older. Senior households make up 39.3% of all owner-occupied households, and 15.3% of all renter-occupied households.

Table 27
Senior Households by Tenure

Householder Age	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Households	%	Households	% ¹
Non-Senior Households				
Under 65 years	9,455	60.7%	7,273	84.7%
Senior Households				
65 to 74 years	3,720	23.9%	793	9.2%
75 to 84 years	1,761	11.3%	362	4.2%
85 years and over	640	4.1%	157	1.8%
Subtotal, Senior Households	6,121	39.3%	1,312	15.3%
Total Households	15,576	100.0%	8,585	100.0%

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table B25007

¹ differences due to rounding

According to the American Community Survey, an estimated 974 seniors have incomes below the poverty level, which represents 7.8% of all seniors in Apple Valley. The 2020 federal poverty guideline for one person is \$12,760. The major source of income for most seniors is Social Security, and the average Social Security monthly benefit is \$1,503.¹³ Therefore, a single senior paying 30% of their monthly Social Security income on housing costs would pay \$451 toward housing costs. However, median rent for a one-bedroom unit in Apple Valley is \$662. A two-person senior household would have \$902 available for housing costs, but median rent for a 2-bedroom unit is \$925. Therefore, Social Security alone cannot adequately cover affordable housing costs.

¹³ Social Security Administration Fact Sheet, December 2019 Beneficiary Data.

Table 28
Senior Incomes Below the Poverty Level

Age Group	Income in Past 12 Months Below Poverty Level
	No. of Residents
65 to 74 years	550
75 years and over	424
Total	974

Source: 2014-2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B17001

Numerous senior support services are provided by various organizations, including those listed in the following table. Privately operated assisted living facilities and home care service providers also operated in Apple Valley and the broader Victor Valley.

Table 29
Senior Resources

Organization	Services Provided
Assisted living and home care providers (various private providers)	Housing, personal care, health care, housekeeping, meals
Apple Valley Senior Citizen's Club	Physical fitness programs, social events, games, classes, meals, thrift shop
Inland Counties Legal Services	Non-profit legal assistance for seniors, low-income residents, veterans, residents with disabilities
San Bernardino County Department of Aging and Adult Services	In-home supportive services, nutrition and meal services, employment programs, long-term care ombudsmen, advocacy
Food Banks	Several in Apple Valley and throughout Victor Valley
St. Mary Medical Center	Senior Select Program, health education classes, social events, support groups, driving classes
Salvation Army	Food distribution, thrift stores, community support
Victor Valley Community Services Council	No-cost non-emergency transportation for low-moderate income seniors, veterinary care for the pets of seniors, home repairs and ADA modifications
Victor Valley Transit Authority	TRIP mileage reimbursement service, travel training, ADA paratransit service

Housing types considered appropriate for seniors include apartments, townhomes, duplexes, second units (granny flats), congregate housing with group dining facilities and support services, and assisted living facilities. The Apple Valley Development Code allows residential development at a range of densities, as well as accessory dwelling units (ADUs), group homes, residential care facilities, single-room occupancy units, and manufactured housing, all of which can serve the needs of seniors. The Development Code encourages development of senior housing by offering flexibility in off-street parking requirements where the need is demonstrated. The Town's Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program can help lower income seniors improve their living conditions and install ADA improvements, if needed. The Town is currently working with the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition on plans for the development of a 100-unit affordable housing project on Navajo Road.

People with Disabilities

A “disability” is a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one of more major life activities. A “developmental disability” is defined as a disability that originates before an individual attains 18 years of age; continues, or can be expected to continue indefinitely; and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual.¹⁴ Developmental disabilities include intellectual disabilities, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, autism, and related conditions.

People with disabilities can face unique housing challenges, including lack of affordable units due to fixed or limited incomes, lack of accessible design features such as barrier-free access, lack of in-home supportive medical services, and lack of transportation options and proximity to medical facilities.

According to the American Community Survey, there are 11,804 civilian non-institutionalized residents with a disability in Apple Valley (16.3% of the population). Individuals may be affected by one or more types of disability. ~~Table 30~~**Table 30** describes the number and types of disabilities affecting the population, by age group. As shown, there are 23,650 disabilities affecting the population. The most affected age groups are 18 to 64 years (49.1%) and 65 years and over (46.5%). The most prevalent disability types are ambulatory difficulties (27.5%) and independent living difficulties (19.5%).

¹⁴ California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 4512(a).

Table 30
Disabilities by Age and Type

Disability by Age and Type	Number of Disabilities	% of Total Disabilities
Under Age 18 years		
With a hearing difficulty	41	0.2%
With a vision difficulty	162	0.7%
With a cognitive difficulty	537	2.3%
With an ambulatory difficulty	22	0.1%
With a self-care difficulty	262	1.1%
With an independent living difficulty	*	*
Subtotal	1,024	4.4%
Age 18 to 64 years		
With a hearing difficulty	1,387	5.8%
With a vision difficulty	966	4.1%
With a cognitive difficulty	2,217	9.4%
With an ambulatory difficulty	3,247	13.7%
With a self-care difficulty	1,226	5.2%
With an independent living difficulty	2,571	10.9%
Subtotal	11,614	49.1%
Age 65 years and over		
With a hearing difficulty	2,287	9.7%
With a vision difficulty	792	3.3%
With a cognitive difficulty	1,328	5.6%
With an ambulatory difficulty	3,247	13.7%
With a self-care difficulty	1,316	5.6%
With an independent living difficulty	2,042	8.6%
Subtotal	11,012	46.5%
Total Number of Disabilities	23,650	100.0%
Total Civilian Non-Institutionalized Population with a Disability	11,804	

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table S1810

* data not provided

A variety of support services are available to Apple Valley residents with disabilities:

- The Inland Regional Center (IRC) provides support to people with intellectual disabilities, autism, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy, including day programs, independent and supported living services, family support, educational advocacy, and employment assistance. It serves clients in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. IRC currently (2021) serves 892 clients who are Apple Valley residents.

- The San Bernardino County Department of Aging and Adult Services provides case management, social engagement, outreach services, meal programs, and in-home support services for adults with disabilities. Services include aging-in-place strategies to help residents live safely and independently in their own homes.
- B.E.S.T. Opportunities promotes independence of adults with developmental disabilities from locations in Apple Valley, Hesperia, and Barstow. Its Adult Development Center helps developmentally disabled adults develop social, daily living, vocational, physical education, and academic skills, and organizes community outings, such as visits to local libraries, museums, and grocery stores. It also operates a supported group employment program.
- The Lincoln Training Center provides employment opportunities and job skills training for adults with disabilities and service-disabled veterans. Its local office is on Town Center Drive in Apple Valley.
- The Victor Valley Transit Authority offers complementary paratransit services for all fixed routes and a travel training program. Its TRIP program reimburses volunteer drivers who assist eligible disabled or senior individuals who are unable to drive or access public transportation.
- The Victor Valley Community Services Council offers no-cost non-emergency transportation for low-moderate income seniors or disabled persons.

Housing types that can accommodate people with disabilities include wheelchair accessible units, such as ground floor or single-story units with lowered countertops, roll-in showers, and widened doorways. For those with independent living difficulties, group homes or units with onsite residential assistance may be required for support with housekeeping, medication management, shopping, or transportation. Those with severe disabilities may require intensive 24-hour medical care. Housing affordability is a major concern as many disabled individuals have limited abilities to work and live on fixed or limited incomes.

Fair Housing Accessibility Standards and California Administrative Code Title 24 set forth access and adaptability requirements for individuals with disabilities. In addition, the Town's Residential Rehabilitation Program, which provides no interest deferred loans up to \$25,000 per qualifying household, can be used for ADA improvements. The Apple Valley Development Code provides for the development of single-room occupancy facilities, group homes, residential care facilities, and supportive and transitional housing that can serve the housing needs of individuals with disabilities. Handicapped residential care facilities are permitted in all residential districts, including M-U. Section 9.29.190 of the Development Code addresses Reasonable Accommodations and the process for disabled individuals to request modifications for adaptive features in housing.

Large Households

Large households are defined as those with 5 or more people. Large households can have difficulty finding affordable housing with sufficient bedrooms, which can lead to overcrowding and severe overcrowding.

As shown in the following table, there are 3,391 large households in Apple Valley, or 14% of all households. Of all large households 1,992 (58.7%) are owners, and 1,399 (41.3%) are renters.

Table 31
Household Size by Tenure

Household Size	Owner-Occupied Units		Renter-Occupied Units	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 person	2,888	18.5%	1,847	21.5%
2 persons	6,324	40.6%	2,182	25.4%
3 persons	2,431	15.6%	1,563	18.2%
4 persons	1,941	12.5%	1,594	18.6%
5 persons	959	6.2%	751	8.7%
6 persons	638	4.1%	418	4.9%
7 persons or more	395	2.5%	230	2.7%
Total Households	15,576	100.0%	8,585	100.0%
Total Households with 5+ Persons	1,992	12.8%	1,399	16.3%

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table B25009

To avoid overcrowding, suitable housing products for large families include those with 4 or more bedrooms. As shown in the Table below, there are 5,512 large (4+ bedrooms) owner-occupied units and 1,992 large (5+ persons) owner households in Apple Valley. Supply exceeds demand and, therefore, the number of large units for ownership is considered sufficient to meet the need. However, as regards rental units, there are 1,048 large (4+ bedrooms) rental units and 1,399 large (5+ persons) renter households. The demand for large rental units exceeds the supply, and the lack of larger rental units could contribute to overcrowding.

The Development Code allows Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and junior ADUs which can provide additional living facilities for larger families. Additional programs that assist large families with homeownership could be beneficial. Reduced parking standards for units with 5 or more bedrooms may also incentivize development of new large rental units. Proximity to childcare facilities, schools, recreational areas, and public transit should be considered when developing for large families.

Table 32
Number of Bedrooms by Tenure

No. of Bedrooms	Owner-Occupied Units		Renter-Occupied Units		Total Occupied Units	
	Number	Percent*	Number	Percent*	Number	Percent
0 bedrooms	65	0.4%	183	2.1%	248	1.0%
1 bedroom	126	0.8%	334	3.9%	460	1.9%
2 bedrooms	2,121	13.6%	4,247	49.5%	6,368	26.4%
3 bedrooms	7,752	49.8%	2,773	32.3%	10,525	43.6%
4 bedrooms	4,549	29.2%	910	10.6%	5,459	22.6%
5+ bedrooms	963	6.2%	138	1.6%	1,101	4.5%
Total	15,576	100.0%	8,585	100.0%	24,161	100.0%
Total Units with 4+ bedrooms	5,512	---	1,048	---	6,560	---

* differences due to rounding

Source: 2014-2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B25042

Female-Headed Households

Female-headed households generally have lower incomes, higher rates of poverty, and lower home ownership rates. Income constraints can result in overpayment and severe overpayment, in which housing costs exceed 30% or 50%, respectively, of household income.

As shown in [Table 33](#), there are 5,449 single-parent-headed family households in Apple Valley, or 22.6% of all households. Male-headed family households comprise 6.4% of all households, and female-headed family households comprise 16.2%. As shown in the following table, there are 3,908 female-headed family households in Apple Valley. Approximately 45% of the female-headed households have children under age 18, and 50% of all families with incomes below the poverty level are female-headed households.

Table 33
Female-Headed Household Characteristics

	Number	Percent
Total Households	24,161	100.0%
Female-Headed Households	3,908	16.2%
Female-Headed Households with own children under 18	1,769	---
Female-Headed Households without children under 18	2,139	---
Total Families, Income in the Past 12 Months Below Poverty Level	2,432	100.0%
Female Householders, Income in the Past 12 Months Below Poverty Level	1,217	50.0%

Source: 2014-2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP02; 2018 ACS Supplemental Estimates Detailed Tables, Table K201703

Primary housing needs for this special population include affordability and units of appropriate size for the age and gender mix of children. Other considerations include proximity to schools, childcare facilities, recreation areas, and other family services and amenities. Flexible educational programs and job training services can help householders obtain higher paying jobs.

Section 8 housing programs are available to qualifying residents, including female heads of households. The Town’s Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program (RRLP) is also available for qualified homeowners for the purpose of addressing health and safety code violations, deferred maintenance, and other improvements. During the 2014-2021 planning period, approximately 29 RRLP applicants were female heads of household.

Homeless Persons

People experiencing homelessness need short-term or long-term shelter. Homelessness can have a variety of causes, including a lack of affordable housing in the community, unemployment or reduction in work hours, illness, disability, mental illness, and substance abuse, among others.

The Homeless Point-In-Time (PIT) Count is a federally mandated annual count of homeless individuals used to evaluate the extent of homelessness. The data provide a snapshot of homelessness on a particular date and time. As shown in the following table, according to annual San Bernardino County PIT Counts conducted between 2015 and 2020, the number of homeless individuals counted in Apple Valley ranged from 17 to 45. Fluctuations could be due, in part, to changing survey methods, such as increased coverage by more survey volunteers. However, the data are believed to reflect actual conditions to the extent possible.

Table 34
Apple Valley
Homelessness Trends

Year	No. of Homeless Individuals
2015	22
2016	45
2017	28
2018	17
2019	23
2020	31

Source: San Bernardino County
PIT Counts 2015-2020.

The 2020 PIT Count determined there were 31 homeless individuals in Apple Valley on January 23, 2020.¹⁵ Of these, twenty-four (24) were “unsheltered” without a regular or adequate nighttime residence, and seven (7) were “sheltered” in emergency shelters, transitional housing programs, safe haven programs, or hotels/motels as a result of a voucher program from a social service agency. This represents 1% of all 3,125 homeless individuals counted in San Bernardino County. The number of homeless persons in neighboring jurisdictions totaled 451 in Victorville, 32 in Hesperia, and 24 in Adelanto.

¹⁵ 2020 San Bernardino County Homeless Count and Subpopulation Survey Final Report, San Bernardino Homeless Partnership, page 7.

Twenty unsheltered people in Apple Valley were interviewed as part of the 2020 PIT Count. The results found that most were white (60%), non-Hispanic (90%), male (70%), and adults between 25 and 39 years old (45%).

Table 35
Characteristics of Unsheltered
Homeless Persons in Apple Valley

	Number	Percent of Total
Race		
American Indian	2	10.0%
Asian	0	0.0%
Black or African American	4	20.0%
Native Hawaiian of Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
White	12	60.0%
Multiple Races or Other	2	10.0%
Unknown Race	0	0.0%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	2	10.0%
Non-Hispanic	18	90.0%
Gender		
Male	14	70.0%
Female	6	30.0%
Transgender	0	0.0%
Gender Non-Conforming	0	0.0%
Don't Know or No Recorded Answer	0	0.0%
Age		
18 to 24	4	20.0%
25 to 39	9	45.0%
40 to 49	4	20.0%
50 to 54	0	0.0%
55 to 61	2	10.0%
62+	1	5.0%
TOTAL INDIVIDUALS SURVEYED = 20		

Notes: Data represents unsheltered individuals. Only adults and unaccompanied teenage children who were counted were surveyed; accompanied children in families were not.

Source: 2020 San Bernardino County Homeless Count and Subpopulation Survey Final Report, San Bernardino Homeless Partnership, page 46.

Particularly sensitive homeless subpopulations include veterans, the chronically homeless, those with mental health conditions and physical disabilities, victims of domestic violence, and others. Of the 20 unsheltered individuals interviewed in Apple Valley, the most prevalent characteristics were: 1) release from correctional institutions during the past year (70%); 2) no monthly income (60%); 3) chronically homeless (40%); 4) homelessness for the first time during the past 12 months (40%); and 5) physical disability that seriously limits the ability to live independently (30%).

Table 36
Unsheltered Homeless Subpopulations

Subpopulation	Number¹	Percent of Total
Homeless for the First Time During Past 12 Months	8	40.0%
Chronically Homeless	8	40.0%
Veteran	1	5.0%
Chronic Health Condition That is Life-Threatening, such as Heart, Lung, Liver, Kidney, or Cancerous Disease	5	25.0%
HIV/AIDS	0	0.0%
Physical Disability that Seriously Limits Ability to Live Independently	6	30.0%
Developmental Disability	1	5.0%
Mental Health Disability or Disorder that Seriously Limits Ability to Live Independently	3	15.0%
Substance Use Problem Disability or Disorder that Seriously Limits Ability to Live Independently	5	25.0%
Victim of Domestic Violence (experiencing homelessness because of fleeing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking)	1	5.0%
Released from Correctional Institutions During Past Year	14	70.0%
Monthly Income:		
No Monthly Income	12	60.0%
\$1 - \$250	5	25.0%
\$251 - \$500	0	0.0%
\$501 - \$1,000	2	10.0%
More Than \$1,000	1	5.0%
No Recorded Answer	0	0.0%

¹ Results of interviews with 20 homeless individuals. Actual numbers may be higher as 4 individuals were not interviewed.

Source: 2020 San Bernardino County Homeless Count and Subpopulation Survey Final Report, San Bernardino Homeless Partnership, page 46-47.

Emergency, transitional, and supportive housing facilities and services can serve some of the short- and long-term needs of homeless individuals. Emergency shelters provide temporary shelter, often with minimal supportive services. Supportive housing is linked to support services intended to improve the individual's ability to independently live and work in the community. Transitional housing is provided with financial assistance and support services to help homeless people achieve independent living within 24 months. Supportive and transitional housing are often in apartment-style units.

Numerous organizations in the Victor Valley provide facilities and services for homeless people and those at risk for homelessness. Services include emergency and transitional housing, food pantries and meal services, clothing and toiletry products, educational and job training programs, and financial assistance for rent and utilities, among others. Some organizations focus on serving special populations, such as veterans, at-risk youth and young adults, and victims of domestic violence.

Table 37
Victor Valley Homelessness Resources

Organization	Services Provided
A Better Way Domestic Violence Shelter & Outreach	Shelter, education, advocacy for victims of domestic violence and their children
Catholic Charities (Victorville)	Temporary shelter, food pantries, food and housing vouchers, rent and utility assistance
Desert Communities United Way	Supportive food and educational services for children and families
Family Assistance Program (Victorville): Hope House	24-bed facility serving victims of domestic violence
Family Assistance Program (Victorville): Next Step	Transitional housing for females on probation
Family Assistance Program (Victorville): Our House	Emergency shelter for youth ages 11-17
Feed My Sheep of the Desert (Apple Valley, Hesperia, Victorville)	Food bank
High Desert Homeless Services (Victorville)	Emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid re-housing Meals, clothing, education and employment assistance, thrift store
High Desert Second Chance (Hesperia)	Food, clothing, job assistance, medical benefit assistance
San Bernardino County Housing Authority	Rental assistance for low-income families
Life Community Development (Adelanto)	Per diem transitional housing for veterans, supportive services , job skills, education assistance
Molding Hearts (Apple Valley)	Meals for underserved children, housing, job assistance
Moses House Ministries (Victorville)	Family supportive services, parenting classes, baby supplies, employment development
Rose of Sharon Pregnancy Resource Center (Victorville)	Pregnancy support, parenting education, baby supplies
Salvation Army (Victorville)	Emergency shelter, food, housing and utility assistance
Samaritan's Helping Hand (Victorville)	Transitional housing, motel vouchers for veterans or families with a minor under age 18
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department	Homeless Outreach and Proactive Enforcement (HOPE) program to help homeless people transition from homelessness and reduce homeless related crime. Connects homeless people with resources, service providers, and points of contact at each sheriff's station.
Victor Valley Family Resource Center (Hesperia)	Emergency shelter, Transitional housing, Rapid Re-housing, case management for those experiencing a life-altering event such as addition or incarceration, meals, job training, substance abuse services, education assistance
Victor Valley Rescue Mission	Emergency shelter, food pantry, meals, clothing assistance, recovery program, vocational training

To help prevent homelessness and protect people at risk of homelessness, Apple Valley participates in the San Bernardino County Continuum of Care (CoC) System and the San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership. The CoC provides emergency shelter, supportive services, transitional housing, permanent housing, and a network of resources and services to assist the homeless. The Apple Valley/Victorville Consortium works closely with the Homeless Provider Network (HPN) to advocate for the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless, and the Homeless Outreach and Proactive Enforcement (H.O.P.E.) program operated by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department that connects the homeless population with resources and services to reduce homeless related crimes. Through the CDBG program, the Town contributes funding to local non-profit organizations, including High Desert Homeless Services, Family Assistance Program, Victor Valley Community Services Council, and Cedar House.

The Town's Development Code allows supportive and transitional housing in all residential districts, including M-U, subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP); they are also permitted in the I-P district. Emergency housing for the homeless is permitted without discretion in the I-P district, and with a Special Use Permit in the C-S district. As described in the Land Use Element, there are 624 acres of vacant I-P land in Town, all of which is located on major roadways and distributed in the central and northern areas of Town. There are 179 acres of vacant C-S land in Town, all of which is located immediately north or south of the Highway 18 corridor. Parcel sizes range from 1 to over 100 acres, and would allow a broad range of building sizes. The development standards in the I-P zone have no side yard setbacks, 25 foot front yard setbacks, and a 100 foot building height. There is no limit to floor area ratio in this zone, thereby allowing up to 100% building coverage. The development standards do not pose a constraint to the development of emergency shelters. The Town's parking standards do not include emergency shelter standards. Program 1.I.2 includes a requirement to modify the Development Code to require parking for only employees for emergency shelters.

In 2020, the Town applied for the Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA) grant through the State of California. The Town will receive \$287,561 every year for 5 years and will partner with the City of Victorville to develop a Wellness and Recuperative Center in Victorville focusing on homelessness and transitional housing.

Farmworkers

Although some agricultural production occurs in the Victor Valley, most agricultural land and farmworker housing is located outside of Apple Valley. The Town's General Plan and zoning maps do not designate land for agricultural uses, and there are no zoning policies or restrictions specific to farms or farmworker housing.

According to the American Community Survey, 154 Apple Valley residents were employed in the "agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, mining" industry in 2018, which represents 0.6% of the Town's civilian employed work force.¹⁶ Farm worker households generally fall into low and very low income categories. As with all special needs, Apple Valley provides the opportunity for farm worker households to obtain rental subsidies and provides incentives for developers to maintain affordable units that are available to all segments of the population.

¹⁶ American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-Year Estimates, Table S2405.

EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMS

This section of the Housing Element addresses programs currently available in Apple Valley and the region relating to affordable housing. The Community Development Department operates programs and strategies for affordable housing in Apple Valley.

Town Programs

The Town receives federal block grant funding through two programs:

- 1) HOME Investment Partnership funds can be used for housing activities that serve lower income residents, and
- 2) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds can be used for certain activities that serve lower income residents.

The Town administers the HOME program for itself and the City of Victorville through the Apple Valley/Victorville HOME Consortium. The Annual Action Plan and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) identify overall housing and community development needs and provide a strategy to address those needs.

Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program

Under the Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program (RRLP), the Town provides no interest deferred loans to improve unsafe living conditions or correct code violations in owner-occupied single-family (up to 4 units) homes of very low and low income households. Loans can also be used for ADA improvements, energy conservation upgrades, and repairs necessary for deferred maintenance. The maximum amount available per household is \$50,000 although the program director can approve larger loans if health and safety improvements exceed the limit. Currently, eligible properties cannot be valued higher than \$319,000. Monies for this program are funded through CDBG and HOME sources. The Town's Code Enforcement Department actively markets and distributes flyers to residents needing assistance.

During the 2014-2021 planning period, the Town approved 71 RRLP loans. There are currently (2020) 98 households on the waiting list.

Down Payment Assistance Program

Through the Down Payment Assistant Program, the Town can provide very low and low-income households with deferred loans toward the purchase of a home within Town limits. Monies for this program are funded through CDBG, HOME, CalHOME and NSP3 funding sources. The program is included in the Town's 5-Year Consolidated Plan but has been inactive since 2014, and no loans were approved during the 2014-2021 planning cycle. With possible program income, the Town would re-activate the program for limited use.

Tenant Based Rental Assistance

The Tenant Based Rental Assistance program is approved in the Town's annual Action Plan; however, it is currently inactive. The Consortium may allocate HOME funds toward rental assistance programs for very low and low income renters within the Town.

Emergency Rental Assistance Program

In 2020, the Town operated an Emergency Rental Assistance Program to assist eligible residents whose incomes were adversely affected by the Covid-19 pandemic by job loss, furlough, or reduction of hours. The program provides 2 months security deposit or 3 months of rent and utility bills.

County, State, and Federal Programs

County, State and federal programs available to the Town are described below.

Section 8 Housing Assistance

The Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB) provides HUD Section 8 rental assistance to eligible lower income renters within the Town. The Tenant-Based Voucher Rental Assistance Program (also known as the Housing Choice Voucher Program) allows households to lease a home of their choice from a landlord that partners with HACSB in the regular rental market, and the Project-Based Voucher Program provides assistance to households living in specific housing sites. In Apple Valley in 2019, there were 315 participants in the Tenant-Based Voucher Program, 1 public housing unit owned and managed by HACSB, 7 Housing Authority-owned units, and 59 units developed in partnership with and under the property portfolio of Housing Partners I, Inc., a nonprofit organization.¹⁷

County Homeownership Assistance Program

The Housing Authority of San Bernardino County (HACSB) operates a mortgage assistance program for low and moderate income households that have participated in an eligible Housing Authority affordable housing and rental assistance program for at least one year. The program allows the County to provide low interest mortgages to eligible households.

County Multifamily Rental Housing Revenue Bond Program

The San Bernardino County Community Development and Housing Department operates a Multifamily Residential Rental Housing Revenue Bond (HRB) program for new construction, acquisition, and/or rehabilitation of multifamily housing developments. After initial financing is provided, some units must remain affordable to eligible low income households for a specified time frame.

CalHFA First Mortgage Loan Programs

The California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA) offers a variety of loan programs for low and moderate income first time homebuyers who secure a CalHFA 30-year fixed mortgage.

CalFHA Downpayment Assistance Program

Moderate income households may receive a deferred loan of up to the lesser of 3.5% of the purchase price or appraised value of a home, to be applied to the down payment and/or the closing costs for the residence, with a cap of \$10,000, when funds are available.

¹⁷ Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino Annual Report 2019, pages 12-13.

HomeChoice Program

This State program provides disabled low and moderate income households with a low-interest 30-year mortgage for a first time home.

California Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program

This competitive State program provides tax credits to private sector developers who provide affordable rental units within their projects. The units can consist of all or part of a project, and must meet certain specified criteria. Units must be restricted for a period of at least 55 years.

FAIR HOUSING

In January 2017, Assembly Bill 686 (AB 686) introduced an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) into California state law. AB 686 requires the Town to certify that it will affirmatively further fair housing by taking meaningful actions to overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities. The Bill added an assessment of fair housing to the Housing Element which includes the following components:

- A summary of fair housing issues and assessment of the Town’s fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity;
- An analysis of segregation patterns and disparities in access to opportunities;
- An assessment of contributing factors; and
- An identification of fair housing goals and actions.

The Town prepared an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) in 2016/2017 as part of its participation in the Apple Valley/Victorville HOME Consortium, a partnership between the Town of Apple Valley and City of Victorville established for the purpose of obtaining federal HOME fund entitlement status. The AFH analyzed local (Apple Valley, Victorville) and regional (Riverside/San Bernardino/Ontario) fair housing trends from 1990 to 2016.

In addition, a Regional Assessment of Fair Housing was prepared by the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA, 2021) to assist member jurisdictions in planning and implementing fair housing goals to comply with AB 686 and affirmatively further fair housing. The Regional Assessment includes a high-level analysis of the fair housing issues in San Bernardino County and each subregion of the County, which includes the High Desert region where Apple Valley is located.

The full text of the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) analysis, including the Assessment of Fair Housing, is provided in Appendix B of this Housing Element. Overall, the AFFH analysis found that the Town is committed to continued implementation of fair housing practices. The inventory of land suitable and available for future housing development includes parcels that are distributed throughout the community to help foster integrated living patterns (see Land Inventory, below). A schedule of policies and programs for continuing these efforts through the 2022-2029 planning period is provided in the Goals, Policies and Programs section below. Programs 1.B.1 through 1.B.6 specifically address fair housing issues, while others address housing opportunities for special populations, assistance with home maintenance and repairs, and other actions relative to fair housing.

CONSTRAINTS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING

Governmental and non-governmental factors can be constraints to the provision of adequate and affordable housing. Such factors can result in housing that is not affordable to lower and/or moderate-income households or residential construction that is not economically feasible. The following section evaluates governmental constraints in Apple Valley, including fees, land use controls, and permit processing procedures and timelines, as well as non-governmental constraints, such as land costs, environmental conditions, and energy conservation concerns.

Governmental Constraints

Application Fees

The Town of Apple Valley has a “fee for service” application fee schedule. Actual costs may include direct Town costs, as well as consultant services, where necessary, and contract administration. A deposit is applied to most applications made to the Town. Staff time and expenses are billed against the deposit. In most cases, the deposit is not exceeded, and any unused deposit is returned to the applicant upon completion of the case. Each year, fees are automatically adjusted by a percentage amount that is equal to or less than, as determined by Town Council, the change to the Consumer Price Index for the region for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Earners for the previous twelve months. In compliance with State law, fee increases are only implemented consistent with a fee justification study.

Table 38, below, describes typical Planning Division permit fees. Fees are not unusually high when compared to other communities in San Bernardino County.

Table 38
Planning Division Fees

Permit Type	Initial Deposit
General Plan Amendment	\$13,898
Change of Zone	\$12,027 + \$13/acre
Special Use Permit	\$1,595
Conditional Use Permit, residential	\$2,970 + \$20/unit
Development Permit	\$3,437
Planned Residential Development Permit	\$3,025
Pre-Application ¹	\$1,435
Environmental Assessment (Initial Study)	\$689
Tentative Tract Map	\$8,685 + \$59/lot
Tentative Parcel Map	\$4,675 + \$40/lot

¹ pre-application fee for Conditional Use Permit, Development Permit, Tentative Tract Map/Parcel Map, Zone Change, General Plan Amendment
Source: Town of Apple Valley, Resolution 2019-17

General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Constraints

General Plan Residential Designations

The General Plan Land Use Element includes a number of residential land use densities. Single family home lots are allowed at densities ranging from over 5 acres to 2 per acre. The Land Use Element also includes the Medium Density Residential land use designation (4 to 20 units per acre), Mobile Home Park (5-15 units per acre), and Mixed Use (4 to 30 units per acre). The Mixed Use designation requires that both commercial and residential components be integrated into all proposed projects in the designation, thereby assuring that higher density residential development will occur within commercial projects. This land use designation is applied primarily along major transportation and employment corridors, including Bear Valley Road, Highway 18, and Dale Evans Parkway.

Development Code Residential Standards

The Development Code includes residential zones consistent with the General Plan, as required by law. Single-family residential zones include sub-zones focused on equestrian communities and other specified needs of the community. The development standards allow lot sizes of 5 acres or more, ranging to up to 2 units per acre. The Multi-Family District, which corresponds to the Medium Density Residential land use designation, allows up to 20 units per acre. The Mixed Use District, allows up to 30 units per acre when integrated with a commercial project. The Town's development standards are consistent with those of all surrounding jurisdictions, the County of San Bernardino, and all other communities in southern California. None of the Town's standards can be characterized as excessive or a constraint on the development of affordable housing.

Table 39 ~~Table 39~~ illustrates the development standards in the Low Density, Estate, Single Family, Multi-Family, Mobile Home Park, and Mixed Use districts.

Table 39
Development Standards for Residential Zones

	R-VLD	R-A	R-LD	R-E	R-E ^{3/4}	R-EQ	R-SF	R-M	MHP	M-U
Density (du/ac)	1 du/ 5ac	1 du/ 2.5 ac	1 du/ 2.5-5	1 du/ 1-2.5	1 du/ 0.75	1 du/ 0.4-0.9	1 du/ 0.4-0.9	2-20 du/ac	5-15 du/ac	4-30 du/ac
Min. Lot Area	5 ac	2.5 ac	2.5 ac	1 ac	32,670 sf	18,000 sf	18,000 sf	18,000 sf	---	1 ac
Min. Corner Lot Area	5 ac	2.5 ac	2.5 ac	1 ac	32,670 sf	20,000 sf	20,000 sf	20,000 sf	---	1 ac
Min. Lot Width (ft)	200	150	150	125	125	100	100	100	---	100
Min. Corner Lot Width (ft)	200	150	150	125	100	115	115	115	---	115
Min. Lot Depth (ft)	300	300	300	250	275	150	150	150	---	100
Min. Corner Lot Depth (ft)	300	300	300	250	275	150	150	150	---	150
Min. site frontage (ft)	90	90	90	60	60	60	60	60	---	60
Min. front setback(ft)	50	50	50	45	30	30	30	25	15	35/10
Average front setback(ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	50	35	35	35	25	15	n/a
Min. rear setback (ft)	40	35	35	30	25	25	25	10	---	0
Min. side setback (ft)	25	25	25	20	15/10	15/10	15/10	10	---	0
Min. street side setback (ft)	45	45	45	40	25	25	25	15	---	10
Animal keeping compat. buffer (ft)	25	25	25	25	25	25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Max. Lot Coverage	25%	25%	25%	25%	30%	30%	40%	70%	---	50%
Min. dwelling unit size (sq ft)	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	500- 1,100	---	500- 1,100
Min. Landscape Area	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	---	10%
Min. distance between primary structure & detached accessory structure (ft)	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	10	---	0
Height Limitations (ft)	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35-50	18	50
Parking Required	2/unit	2/unit	2/unit	2/unit	2/unit	2/unit	2/unit	Varies (See below)	2/unit	

For notes, refer to Development Code Tables 9.28.040-A and 9.72.020-A.

Source: Apple Valley Development Code Sections 9.28.040 and 9.72.020.

Multifamily Housing

Multifamily housing, including but not limited to duplexes, triplexes, apartments, condominiums, and townhouses, is permitted in the R-M district with an approved Development Permit. In 2020-2021, the Town undertook a comprehensive review of its development standards in the Multi-Family Residential zone. Amendments were adopted by Town Council in March 2021. These

modifications were undertaken at the Town Council's direction, to explore how the Town could encourage the development of more multi-family projects, particularly larger multi-family projects. In the last 15 years, the Town has seen primarily small (2 to 8 units per project) multi-family projects, and only two large (16 or more units per project) projects proposed. Although this has been due in part to the nature of Apple Valley as a suburban, relatively rural community, the need for multi-family development projects appears to be increasing at all income levels, and the Town Council wanted to assure that the Town was competitive with other surrounding jurisdictions in its appeal to multi-family developers.

Through the establishment of an ad-hoc committee, Planning Commission and Town Council hearings, the Town modified its Multi-Family development standards to encourage a breadth of projects. The modifications include reductions in minimum unit sizes, number of amenities and amount of common area open space required; reductions in setbacks, parking, building separation and buffer distances between multi-family projects and other uses. Finally, the standards now allow building heights of 35 feet for small and medium sized projects (2 to 15 units per project) and 50 feet for large projects (16+ units per project). As a result, three story structures will be allowed for smaller projects, and 4 story structures for large projects, resulting in greater flexibility for the development of more dense projects in the zone. These new standards ensure that the densities allowed in the Multi-Family and Mixed Use zones, ranging from 20 to 30 units per acre, before density bonus provisions, can be effectively built on existing lots. Given that the Town's standards now allow 3 and 4 story construction and building coverage of 70%, a structure of 30,000 square feet could be built on an acre of land, and accommodate 60 studios (500 square feet), 42 one bedroom (700 square feet), 33 2 bedroom (900 square feet), 27 three bedroom (1,100 square feet) or 25 four bedroom (1,200 square feet) per floor. Even with the provision of corridors, stairwells, management units and offices and laundry rooms, the new Multi-Family standards can easily accommodate the 20 to 30 unit per acre density of the Multi-Family and Mixed use zones.

The new standards also reduce parking requirements. For small projects, 2 garage spaces are required, plus one guest space, regardless of unit size; for medium projects, a total of 2.5 covered spaces in total are required, regardless of unit size; and for large projects, 2.25 parking spaces in total are required, regardless of unit size. In addition to the reductions in parking requirements made to the Multi-Family Residential zone, Development Code Section 9.72.040 allows flexibility in off-street parking requirements where reduced need is demonstrated. The Planning Commission may reduce parking requirements for senior citizen housing by up to 25% where the development is within close proximity of a shopping center or adequately serviced by a public transportation system. The number of required covered parking spaces may be reduced by up to 50% for developments meeting the needs of lower and moderate-income senior households. This reduction eliminates any potential constraint by requiring 1 to 1.25 parking spaces per unit for affordable housing projects. For multi-family projects, the cost of providing a covered (carport) parking space is not prohibitive, and is necessary in the high desert's harsh climate. Further, projects approved for funding and constructed in the low desert and in surrounding communities, including all of the projects described in the "Land Inventory" section starting on page 66, have provided carports. With the implementation of net-zero requirements in the Building Code, these carports have a further advantage of providing a location of solar panels, which reduce the costs of utilities for residents with lower incomes. Parking requirements for market housing are consistent in the single family and multi-family zones. The need for carports or garages for market units to serve moderate

or above moderate households is an expected amenity in single family and lower-density multi-family projects for these households, and because of the relatively affordable housing costs (see “Housing Costs and Affordability” section) is a standard feature included in all market housing in the region. The requirement does not significantly impact costs, and is not a constraint to the provision of either lower or moderate income housing. The Town’s changes to the Development Code, which allows reductions of up to 50% for affordable housing projects, eliminates any potential constraint associated with costs for additional parking for affordable housing projects.

Density Bonuses

Section 9.28.090 of the Development Code (Density Bonuses) provides incentives for the development of affordable housing based upon Government Code Section 65915. A density bonus of 20% over the maximum allowable residential density is granted when at least 10% of the total dwelling units are lower income units or at least 5% of the units are very low income units, and the applicant agrees to ensure continued affordability of such units according to the provisions of the Health and Safety Code. A density bonus of 5% over the maximum allowable residential density is granted when at least 10% of total dwelling units are moderate income units and the applicant agrees to maintain affordability. Additional density bonus increases, to a maximum of 35%, may be granted with an increase in the number of affordable units.

Density bonuses can also be granted for residential tentative tract maps, parcel maps, or other residential development when the applicant donates land that meets certain criteria conducive to the development of affordable housing on the site. Other incentives and concessions, such as reductions in setbacks, square footage requirements, or parking space requirements, may also be granted. For example, developers may request reduced parking ratios and/or flexible parking options, such as tandem or uncovered parking. To encourage the provision of housing for senior citizens, additional concessions are available for qualifying senior housing developments, including density bonuses of 20% over the maximum allowable density. Such incentives can translate to significant cost savings for developers of affordable housing.

Effective January 1, 2021, AB 2345 amends the state’s Density Bonus Law to increase the maximum density bonus from 35% to 50% for projects that provide at least: 1) 15% of total units for very low income households, 2) 24% of total units for low income households, or 3) 44% of total for-sale units for moderate income households. AB 2345 also decreases the threshold of set-aside low income units required to qualify for concessions or incentives from zoning or development regulations, and decreases the number of parking spaces required for 2 and 3-bedroom units. Density bonus projects within ½ mile of a major transit stop that provide unobstructed access to the transit stop may also qualify for reduced parking requirements. Program 1.E.4 directs the Town to amend the Development Code to comply with the provisions of AB 2345.

Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types

The Development Code facilitates development of a variety of housing products that can serve the needs of lower income residents and special populations. Most are permitted outright or with approval of a CUP in multiple residential districts, demonstrating that municipal land use controls do not constrain the development of such housing types.

-
- *Accessory Dwelling Units:* ADUs are attached or detached dwelling units that provide complete independent living facilities for one or more persons and are located on a lot with a proposed or existing primary residence. Junior ADUs (JADUs) are residential units that are no more than 500 square feet in size, contained entirely within an existing or proposed single-family structure, include their own sanitation facilities or share them with the single-family structure, and include an efficiency kitchen. ADUs can satisfy the affordable housing needs of lower and moderate-income individuals while providing a source of income for homeowners. They are permitted in all residential districts, including M-U. Design and development standards for ADUs and Junior ADUs are provided in Development Code Section 9.29.120. Generally, on single-family lots, the primary dwelling or ADU must be occupied by the property owner. ADUs and JADUs may be rented separately from the primary residence (for not less than 30 days) but may not be sold or otherwise conveyed separately.

To date, there has not been a significant demand for ADU/JADU development in Apple Valley. However, Program 1.C.6 directs the Town to encourage the development of ADUs and JADUs as a means of providing affordable housing options in single-family districts.

- *Manufactured Housing:* Manufactured housing and mobile homes can serve the needs of lower-income households. Manufactured homes are permitted in all residential districts except M-U. The Mobile Home Park (MHP) district allows densities from 4 to 30 units per acre. Design and development standards are provided in Development Code Section 9.29.060.
- *Employee Housing:* The Town's Development Code does not address employee housing. Program 1.I.2 includes a requirement that the Development Code be modified consistent with Health and Safety Code Section 17000m requiring that employee housing for six or fewer employees be treated as a single-family structure and permitted in the same manner as other dwelling units of the same type in the same zone.
- *Single Room Occupancy Facilities:* SRO facilities provide multiple sleeping or living facilities that accommodate one person per unit. Each unit may have sanitary and/or cooking facilities, or these facilities may be shared with the facility. SROs can serve the housing needs of lower income individuals or specific populations such as the elderly, homeless, disabled, or veterans. SROs are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in all residential districts, including M-U, as well as the Planned Industrial (I-P) district.
- *Group Homes and Residential Care Facilities:* Group homes are residential structures or units, whether operated by an individual for profit or a nonprofit agency, which are not licensed by the State. Residential care facilities can be small (housing 6 or fewer individuals) or large (housing 7 or more individuals) and serve a targeted population, such as the elderly or mentally or physically disabled, or lower-income individuals. Small residential care facilities licensed by the State are permitted in all residential districts (including M-U), and large ones are permitted in all residential districts, subject to approval of a CUP. Group homes not licensed by the State with 2 or more residents are permitted in all residential districts except M-U, subject to approval of a CUP. Handicapped residential care facilities are permitted in all residential districts. Program 1.I.2 provides that the Development Code be amended to allow group homes for 7 or more as a permitted use, subject to a Development Permit.

- *Supportive and Transitional Housing:* Supportive housing is occupied by individuals with low incomes and one or more disabilities or chronic health conditions. There are no limits on length of stay; services are provided to help residents improve health status or living/employment skills. Transitional housing is shelter provided to the homeless for an extended period that integrates social services and assists in the transition to self-sufficiency. Supportive and transitional housing is permitted in all residential districts, including M-U, subject to approval of a CUP; they are also permitted in the I-P district. Transitional housing alone is also permitted with a Special Use Permit (SUP) in the C-S and C-V districts. State law now requires that transitional and supportive housing be permitted in the same manner as other residential uses in the zone. Program 1.I.2 requires that the Town modify its Development Code to require transitional and supportive housing as a permitted use in residential zones, subject to the same standards and requirements as other residential uses in that zone. In addition, State law now requires that supportive housing shall be a use by-right in zones where multifamily and mixed uses are permitted, including nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses pursuant to Government Code section 65651; Program 1.I.2 requires modification of the Development Code to address this requirement.
- *Emergency Housing:* Emergency housing provides immediate and short-term housing and minimal supplemental services, such as food or counseling, for the homeless. Occupancy is limited to six months or less. Emergency shelters are permitted outright in the I-P district, and with a SUP in the C-S and C-V districts.
- *Low Barrier Navigation Centers:* AB 101 requires that Low Barrier Navigation Centers (LBNC) be a by-right use in areas zoned for mixed use and nonresidential zoning districts permitting multifamily uses. LBNCs provide temporary room and board with limited barriers to entry while case managers work to connect homeless individuals to income, public benefits, permanent housing, or other shelter. Program 1.I.2 directs the Town to review and revise the Development Code, as necessary, to ensure compliance with AB 101, and to modify the definition of “homeless shelter” to include this use.
- *Definition of family:* The Development Code defines “family” as “One (1) or more individuals occupying a dwelling unit as a single household unit.” This definition does not impose a maximum number of persons in a family, or their relationship, or any other limitation that would pose a constraint to the housing of disabled persons.

Permit Processing

The Town includes its Development Code, including all development standards, and all fee schedules on the Town’s website. Permit processing in Town is consistent for all land use districts. Permitted uses of any kind in any zone require approval of a site plan, which is generally processed in a period of 60 to 120 days, as are tentative tract maps for single-family homes.

Single-family homes on infill lots are not subject to any Planning Division review and require only a building permit. For new subdivisions, the Development Plan review and approval process consists of a review of development standards for consistency at the staff level, and review and approval by the Planning Commission. Per Zoning Code Section 9.17.080, the findings required

to approve a project are consistent with those of all communities in California, and relate to General Plan and Zoning consistency, the physical ability of the site to accommodate the proposed project, and the California Environmental Quality Act, as follows:

- A. That the location, size, design, density and intensity of the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan, the purpose of this Code, the purpose of the zoning district in which the site is located, and the development policies and standards of the Town;
- B. That the location, size and design of the proposed structures and improvements are compatible with the site's natural landforms, surrounding sites, structures and streetscapes, and does not unnecessarily block public views from other buildings or from public ways, or visually dominate its surroundings;
- C. That the materials, textures and details of the proposed construction, to the extent feasible, are compatible with the adjacent and neighboring structures, and that quality in architectural design is maintained in order to enhance the visual environment of the Town;
- D. That the amount, location, and design of open space and landscaping conforms to the requirements of this Code, enhances the visual appeal and is compatible with the design and function of the structure(s), site and surrounding area;
- E. That excessive and unsightly grading of hillsides does not occur, and the character of natural landforms such as knolls and the Mojave River and existing vegetation and Joshua Trees are adequately protected and preserved where feasible as required by this Code.

Finding B, which uses the word “compatible” could be construed to be subjective. A subjective finding is no longer permitted by State law, and is therefore a potential constraint to the provision of housing. Program 1.I.2 includes a requirement that the Development Code be amended to remove this finding.

Single-family homes do not require discretionary review, and are processed through the Building Department, unless part of a master planned community. Should a Conditional Use Permit be required for any reason, it is processed concurrently with the site plan review, and does not extend the permit processing timeline. The Town always provides expedited permit processing, and even when required to process a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, can process applications in less than six months. The Town’s permit processing, therefore, does not represent a constraint on development.

For Multi-Family development projects with 1 to 15 units, administrative review is completed through the plan check process and no additional entitlements are required. Projects with 16 to 50 units require Planning Commission review and approval of a Development Permit. The same findings listed above for single-family development, requiring a Development Permit, ~~is~~are required for the Planning Commission approval of a Development Permit. Projects that include more than 50 units requires a Conditional Use Permit reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. In order to facilitate the development of larger projects, the Development Code will be amended to require only a Development Permit for larger projects consistent with the 16-50 unit category (please see Program 1.I.2). As described above, the Development Permit process is

a review of development standards for conformance, and the Findings for Development Permits are consistent with those applied across California for site plan reviews. The change imposed by Program 1.I.2 will eliminate the constraint of permit processing associated with multi-family development.

Zoning Code Section 9.29.190 addresses Reasonable Accommodation, which allows those with disabilities to request modifications to Development Code and other requirements. It describes applicability, application requirements, findings requirements, decisions, and the appeals processes. No fee is required for a request for reasonable accommodation. Therefore, the Town's regulatory requirements do not constitute a constraint to development of accessible housing.

Infrastructure Requirements

As with most communities, adjacent roadways must be improved to their ultimate half width when a residential tract project is developed. Generally, the Town requires half width improvements to include curb, gutter, and sidewalk; in more rural areas, however, the Planning Commission has the ability to allow rolled curb and/or no sidewalk. Roadway standards for local or local streets require a paved width of 40 feet within a 60-foot right of way. The Town will also allow deviations to these standards, including the narrowing of streets within planned communities.

Water and Sewer Services

Water services are provided by Liberty Utilities and other independent water companies. Sanitary sewer services are managed by the Apple Valley Public Works Department. The Town is a member of the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority, a joint powers agency, which operates a regional sewer interceptor and wastewater reclamation plants.

Lands designated for Multi-Family or Mixed Use development in Town are located on major roadways, which are serviced by water infrastructure, and water purveyors have current capacity or expansion plans sufficient to accommodate future growth, including the Town's regional housing need allocation. However, the municipal sewer system is relatively new and does not connect to some residential parcels in the central part of Town. The VVWRA recently completed a wastewater treatment plant in Town, with a capacity of 1 MGD, and expansion capability to 4 MGD. This is sufficient capacity to accommodate current connections, and all future connections planned in this Element. The Town will continue to evaluate plans to expand sewer infrastructure in the future and ensure adequate capacity to serve new development. According to the 2019 Apple Valley Sewer System Management Plan, each new project not previously included in a sewer assessment district is required to have a sewer feasibility study review. Per Sewer Ordinance No. 478, main-line sewers and pumping plants in Town must comply with the Town's Sewer Master Plan and development standards, which are based on San Bernardino County standards. New and rehabilitated sewer mains and laterals are inspected by the Public Works and Engineering Departments. The Town is also aggressively pursuing the expansion of sewer service through State funding sources, in particular to open Multi-Family lands in the North Apple Valley area to development, in anticipation of the development of the Brightline station and associated mixed use development. This expansion will also benefit Multi-Family lands along Dale Evans parkway, which would provide additional housing sites in the future.

The Town will, as required, provide water purveyors and the Reclamation Authority with copies of the adopted Housing Element. Per SB 1087, these purveyors are required by law to provide priority service to affordable housing projects. The law also prohibits denial or conditioning of the approval of service without adequate findings and requires future water management plans to identify projected water use for lower income residential development.

Development Impact Fees

As new development occurs, it increases the need for Town services and facilities. In order to offset these increased needs, the Town has established Development Impact Fees, as shown in **Table 40**. Fees that are applicable to housing development projects are provided on the Town website, consistent with Government Code §65940.1(a)(1)(A).

Table 40
Development Impact Fees

Fee Type	Fee (per unit)		
	Single-Family Residence	Multi-Family Residence	Mobile Home Unit
Parks	\$3,323.00	\$2,708.00	\$2,162.00
Animal Control Facilities	\$54.84	\$54.84	\$54.84
Aquatics Facilities	\$84.37	\$68.55	\$54.84
Fire Suppression ¹	\$740.00	\$924.00	\$1,581.87
General Government Facilities	\$407.07	\$407.07	\$407.07
Law Enforcement Facilities	\$147.64	\$182.44	\$50.62
Public Meeting Facilities	\$261.54	\$213.03	\$169.79
Storm Drainage Facilities	\$1,581.87	\$373.32	\$274.19
Transportation	\$6,745.00	\$3,912.00	TBD
Sanitary Sewer Facilities	\$2,127.09	\$1,515.43	\$864.76
Recycle Deposit (refundable)	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00

¹ Fire fees are collected by the Town then passed through to the Apple Valley Fire Protection District (AVFPD).

As provided in Development Code Section 3.32.090, the Town waives all Fire Suppression Impact Fees established by any resolution for affordable housing.

In addition to Development Impact Fees, residential developers are responsible for the payment of State-mandated school fees. The current (2020) residential development school fee in the Apple Valley Unified School District is \$3.79 per livable square foot. Developers are also responsible for the payment of connection and/or metering fees for public utilities.

Building Code Requirements

As with most communities in California, the Town has adopted the California Green Building Code (CBC) and updates the Code periodically as State-wide updates are developed. Currently, the Town is enforcing the provisions of the 2019 CBC. The Town cannot adopt standards that are less stringent than the CBC. Since all communities in the State enforce similar provisions, the Town's CBC requirements are not an undue constraint on the development of affordable housing.

In addition to the California Green Building Code, the Town recently completed a 2019 Climate

Action Plan update (CAP) which includes an implementation plan. The CAP requires energy efficiency measures in new development to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as required by AB 32 and SB 375.

Building Permit Fees

The Building Department charges on a per square foot basis for building permit plan checks and inspections. Fees are based on the CBC components, and include electrical, plumbing, structural, and architectural fees.

Economic Constraints

Land and Housing Costs

The cost of land has the potential to impact the overall cost of housing. Vacant land for single-family homes in Apple Valley is available in the \$5,000 to \$65,000 per acre range, with an average of approximately \$18,710.¹⁸ According to the latest American Community Survey, the median sales price for a single-family home in Apple Valley in 2018 was \$237,100, a five-year increase of 38.2% over 2013, when the median listing price stood at \$171,600. The current housing market makes single-family homes affordable to the moderate income household in Apple Valley.

Apartment projects in Apple Valley may be characterized as duplexes or projects of 10 units or less that are privately owned. Such projects for sale in 2020 range in price from \$43,000 to \$153,000 per unit. Vacant land for multi-family projects averages about \$117,216 per acre.¹⁹

The rental rates for typical apartment units in Apple Valley range from \$900 per month for a two-bedroom, one bath unit to \$1,700 for a three-bedroom, 2 bath unit. The latest American Community Survey (2018) indicates that the median gross rent for a 3-bedroom rental in Apple Valley is \$1,236. Rental units are affordable to low income residents.

Construction Costs

Construction costs can vary widely depending on location, unit size, building type and materials, number of bedrooms, finishes, amenities, and wage and hiring requirements, among other factors. Apple Valley and the Coachella Valley share similar suburban desert environments, and construction costs are considered comparable. In the Coachella Valley, single-family construction costs generally range from \$125 to \$145 per square foot (excluding site improvements), and vertical multi-family construction costs generally range from \$125 to \$145 per square foot, based on a typical 50-70 unit project with a 2 to 3-story garden style, Type V wood building.²⁰

Financing Costs

The cost of financing can also impact the development community's ability to fund projects. Mortgage interest rates are near historic lows, making single-family home loans relatively easy to secure. This condition could increase opportunities for developers to fund and construct affordable housing in Town and increase homeownership opportunities for more residents.

¹⁸ Landwatch.com, accessed January 13, 2021.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Gretchen Gutierrez, CEO, Desert Valleys Building Association, March 2021; Chris Killian, Senior Vice President of Construction, National Core, March 2021.

Physical Constraints

Age of Housing Stock

The 2018 American Community Survey determined that 63.2% of the Town's housing stock was built before 1990, meaning that 16,509 units are 30 years old or older. The cost of maintaining older residential units can escalate; however, the mild climate and moderate conditions in Apple Valley help to preserve housing in better condition. The Town maintains a Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program to assist very low and low income homeowner households in making repairs to their properties, including those needed to address health and safety code violations, energy conservation improvements, accessibility improvements for the disabled, and repairs for deferred maintenance.

Environmental Constraints

Stormwater

Apple Valley's primary environmental constraint is associated with storm water management. Although a Master Plan of Drainage was prepared for Apple Valley, its implementation has been limited, and sheet flow flooding during major storms remains an issue of concern. In addition, the Dry Lake area, located in the east-central area of Town, has limited development potential due to flooding. Sites identified for Multi-Family or Mixed Use on the Land Use Map are located outside flood channels and will not be significantly impacted by flooding requirements, other than those imposed on all developments by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).

Water

As with all of California, the Town's water suppliers face continued challenges in providing water in the long term. The Town, as required by law, will provide this Housing Element to all its water providers upon its adoption. As described below under Land Inventory, however, sufficient lands are available to meet the Town's RHNA allocation during the current planning period.

Sewer

As discussed elsewhere in this Element, sanitary sewer services are not available throughout Town. All of the lands included in the City's inventory are located adjacent to water and sewer services, but additional Multi-Family lands in North Apple Valley currently do not have sanitary sewer service available. The Town is aggressively pursuing expansion of the sewer system in this area in anticipation of the development of the Brightline station, which will include mixed-use development, and will provide sewer access to the Multi-Family lands on Dale Evans Parkway.

Biological Resources Protection

Another environmental constraint is associated with the protection of endangered, threatened, and sensitive biological species and habitats. The Town is within the Western Mojave Desert and adjacent to open desert landscapes and linkages occupied by sensitive species. Compliance with the state and federal Endangered Species Acts (CESA and ESA) and obtaining development permits from the wildlife agencies can be time consuming and expensive, often requiring special studies, mitigation measures, and project redesign that many times are cost prohibitive and result in the abandonment of projects by developers.

Since 2007, the Town has been coordinating with the U.S. and State Departments of Fish and Wildlife and San Bernardino County to develop a Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Communities Conservation Plan (MSHCP/NCCP) that would streamline the development permitting process and facilitate buildout of the General Plan (including housing units required by RHNA), while also providing for species and habitat protection over the life of the Plan (30 years). The MSHCP/NCCP is nearing completion, and implementation of the Plan is anticipated by spring of 2022. Adoption of the MSHCP/NCCP will guide the Town's conservation efforts, improve the planning process to accelerate future housing production and other development, and provide long-term mitigation and permitting assurances to developers. The MSHCP/NCCP will play a critical role in achieving the Town's RHNA requirements during the 2022-2029 planning cycle and beyond.

Nongovernmental Constraints

The Town generally sees approved projects submit improvement plans and building permits within 3 to 6 months of receipt of entitlements. This time period is entirely driven by the land owner/developer, and does not pose a constraint to the development of any type in Town.

Energy Conservation

In addition to the requirements of Title 24 of the Building Code, the Town requires the installation of water conserving landscaping for all new projects. Although the cost of installation of energy efficient, “green,” or similar products in a home or apartment may increase costs, cost differentials become smaller as technologies improve, and there are typically long-term cost benefits from decreased energy consumption and lower utility bills. The Town’s Housing Department and website provide information about home improvement energy efficiency programs, including those offering home weatherization upgrades and replacement of old appliances, windows and doors, shower heads with newer energy-efficient models. The Town will continue to work with the development community in implementing energy efficient and green technologies in new projects in the future.

HOUSING NEEDS

Affordable Units at Risk

There are no units at risk of losing their affordability restrictions in Apple Valley in the next ten years.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is a minimum projection of additional housing units needed to accommodate projected household growth of all income levels by the end of the housing element planning period. The State and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) develop RHNA housing allocations for each Housing Element planning period. Apple Valley’s share for the 2022-2029 planning period is shown in the following table.

Table 41
RHNA by Income Category, 2022-2029

Income Category	No. of Units Needed
Extremely Low Income ¹	543
Very Low Income (0-50% of AMI)	543
Low Income (51-80% of AMI)	600
Moderate Income (81-120% of AMI)	747
Above Moderate Income (more than 120% of AMI)	1,857
Total Units Needed	4,290

¹ Extremely Low Income (ELI) category is a subset of the Very Low Income category. ELI households are defined by HCD as those with incomes less than 30% of AMI. The number of units needed is assumed to be 50% of all Very Low-Income units.

Source: SCAG 2021

Quantified Objectives

The following table estimates the number of units likely to be constructed, rehabilitated, or conserved/preserved, by income level, in Apple Valley during the 2022-2029 planning period.

Table 42
Quantified Objectives, 2022-2029

	New Construction	Rehabilitation	Conservation
Extremely Low Income	543		<u>5</u>
Very Low Income	543	60	<u>5</u>
Low Income	600	100	<u>5</u>
Moderate Income	747		
High	1,857		
Total:	4,290	160	<u>15</u>

Land Inventory

The Town's Regional Housing Needs Assessment for 2022-2029 estimates that a total of 4,290 housing units will be built in Apple Valley. Of these, 1,857 are expected to be constructed for those of above moderate income. These units are expected to be market-driven and constructed as single-family units typical of those already in Apple Valley. As shown in the "Housing Costs and Affordability" analysis above, moderate income households in Apple Valley are able to afford market housing in the community. Lands used in Tables 43, 44 and 45 were also listed in the Town's 5th Cycle Housing Element, but have not been used in 2 previous element updates.

The Town will need to assure that sufficient land is available for all extremely low, very low, and low income housing units needed during the planning period (a total of 1,686 units). Land and housing costs make it likely that these units will be of higher density, although they may be either ownership or rental units. As previously stated, land costs for multi-family housing projects in Apple Valley range from \$57,000 to \$226,000 per acre. At a density of 15 units per acre, this equates to \$3,800 to \$15,067 per unit.

No affordable housing development occurred in Apple Valley during the 2014-2021 planning period. Therefore, data from affordable housing developers in the Coachella Valley was used to estimate construction costs of affordable units. The Coachella Valley and Apple Valley share similar suburban desert environments, and construction cost estimates are believed to be comparable. A survey of five (5) current affordable projects in the Coachella Valley found that the average construction cost of affordable housing is approximately \$317,074 per unit. When added to the land costs cited above, this represents a total cost of \$320,874 to \$332,141 per unit. Projects in this cost range can be funded (when including HOME funds, tax credit funds, or other programs) and built in the range of 14 to 16 units per acre. It is important to note that the project currently under way with the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition will be built at a density of 10 units per acre (100 units on 10 acres). This project is being planned for low and moderate income households. In addition, in the City of Hesperia, which is of similar character to the Town and immediately adjacent to it, several affordable housing projects have been built or entitled at similar mid-teen densities, including:

- Villa Apartments West, built during the 2014-2021 planning period, contains 95 very low and low income units at a density of 20.4 units per acre.
- Villa Apartments East, which is approved but not yet constructed, consists of an additional 95 very low and low income units at a density 18.1 units per acre.
- Village at Hesperia II, currently under review, is proposed for 67 very low and low income units at a density of 17.7 units per acre.

On average, these four projects (one in Apple Valley and three in Hesperia) have a density of 16.6 units per acre. Therefore, the density provided below for Multi-Family lands in the Town's inventory is realistic and will allow the construction of affordable units for very low and low income households.

~~Table 43~~ ~~Table 43~~ and ~~Table 44~~ ~~Table 44~~ list vacant parcels in the Multi-Family Residential (R-M) district. They include the Assessor's Parcel Number (APN), acreage, and potential number of units that could be developed on each parcel. Although the Development Code allows for densities up to 20 units per acre in the R-M district, a density of 17 units per acre is assumed in ~~Table 43~~ ~~Table 43~~ to allow for infrastructure and open space. The estimate is based on constructed and approved projects in this district. All of the sites listed in ~~Table 43~~ ~~Table 43~~ are within 100 feet of a sanitary sewer line, and adjacent to all other utilities. No un-serviced lands are considered in the inventory. Additional Multi-Family lands located within ¼ mile of a sewer line would result in availability of land for an additional 2,143 units, as shown in ~~Table 44~~ ~~Table 44~~. However, the extension of sanitary sewer could be a constraint to the development of affordable housing, so these lands have not been included in the Vacant Land Inventory. A program has been added for the Town to work with the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority to expand sanitary sewer service in Town (please also see Constraints section regarding the availability of sanitary sewer). No other known parcel-specific infrastructure, environmental or other constraints have been identified that would impede development during the planning period.

Table 43
Vacant Land Inventory
For Lower Income Units
Multi-Family District within 100' of Water and Sewer

APN	GP	Zoning	Size (RM Acres)	Permitted Density	Realistic Density	Potential Units
44101106	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	3.93 of 10.1	20	17	67
44101107	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	1.69 of 4.5	20	17	29
44101111	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	.89 of 2	20	17	15
44101124	RM	RM	4.8	20	17	82
44101125	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	4.54 of 4.7	20	17	77
44101126	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	4.6 of 4.8	20	17	78
44101130	RM	RM	8.1	20	17	162
44101132	RM	RM	8.1	20	17	162
44101139	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	1.11 of 1.3	20	17	19
44101141	RM	RM	0.9	20	17	18
44101142	RM	RM	1.1	20	17	22
44101143	RM	RM	1.1	20	17	22
44113301	RM	RM	4.6	20	17	92
44114154	RM	RM	5.5	20	17	110
308005105	RM	RM	1.5	20	17	30
308005106	RM	RM	1.2	20	17	24
308005107	RM	RM	1.9	20	17	38
308005108	RM	RM	4.3	20	17	86
308737205	RM	RM	4.7	20	17	94
308740118	RM	RM	12.73	20	17	255
308748106	RM	RM	4.1	20	17	82
308748108	RM	RM	8.8	20	17	176
Totals:						1,739

Table 44
Vacant Land For Lower Income Units
within One Quarter Mile of Sanitary Sewer Service
Multi-Family District

APN	GP	Zoning	Size (RM Acres)	Permitted Density	Realistic Density	Potential Units
43939225	RM	RM	10	20	17	170
43939233	RM	RM	5	20	17	85
43939234	RM	RM	2.5	20	17	43
44101106	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	3.93 of 10.1	20	17	67
44101107	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	1.69 of 4.5	20	17	29
44101108	RVLD	RVLD	0.5	20	17	9
44101111	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	.89 of 2	20	17	15
44101124	RM	RM	4.8	20	17	82
44101125	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	4.54 of 4.7	20	17	77
44101126	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	4.6 of 4.8	20	17	78
44101130	RM	RM	8.1	20	17	138
44101132	RM	RM	8.1	20	17	138
44101139	RVLD, RM	RVLD, RM	1.11 of 1.3	20	17	19
44101141	RM	RM	0.9	20	17	15
44101142	RM	RM	1.1	20	17	19
44101143	RM	RM	1.1	20	17	19
44113301	RM	RM	4.6	20	17	78
44114154	RM	RM	5.5	20	17	94
47234211	RM	RM	37	20	17	629
47234214	RM	RM	34.9	20	17	593
308005107	RM	RM	1.9	20	17	32
308005113	RM	RM	19.76	20	17	336
308737205	RM	RM	4.7	20	17	80
308740118	RM	RM	12.73	20	17	216
308748105	RM	RM	10.1	20	17	172
308748106	RM	RM	4.1	20	17	70
308748108	RM	RM	8.8	20	17	150
308748109	RM	RM	3.1	20	17	53

Table 44
Vacant Land For Lower Income Units
within One Quarter Mile of Sanitary Sewer Service
Multi-Family District

APN	GP	Zoning	Size (RM Acres)	Permitted Density	Realistic Density	Potential Units
308748110	RM	RM	2.5	20	17	43
308748111	RM	RM	6.4	20	17	109
308748112	RM	RM	6.4	20	17	109
308005105	RM	RM	1.5	20	17	26
308005106	RM	RM	1.2	20	17	20
308005108	RM	RM	4.3	20	17	73
Totals:						3,882

A map of vacant lands is provided in Exhibits 1 and 2. As shown on the map, inventory lands are geographically distributed throughout the Town and are not concentrated in any areas. As such, they further fair housing efforts. The Fair Housing analysis concluded that the Town has a low segregation level, equal access to opportunity, and no racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty or disproportionate housing needs. The sites identified in the Land Inventory will not exacerbate any such conditions. Available parcels are served by trunk lines and are along on paved streets. Therefore, there is more than enough land available to meet the Town's RHNA for the 2022-2029 planning period.

Exhibit 1 Multi-Family Vacant Land Map 100' from Water and Sewer





Exhibit 2 Multi-Family Vacant Land Map 1,250' from Water and Sewer



As described in the Land Use Element, there are 459.4 acres of vacant land designated M-U within the Town boundaries. The Residential Land Use Designation Build Out Summary table assumed half (229.7 acres) of vacant M-U acres would develop as residential uses and would have the potential to accommodate 2,068 housing units. The Mixed Use District assumes a density of 22 units per acre on 25% of the parcel, to account for infrastructure and open space, and also for the commercial component of the Mixed Use project. The development standards and policies in the Land Use Element require that residential development be included in all Mixed Use projects, and the maximum density allowed is 30 units per acre. As a result, and consistent with the analysis of realistic capacity described above, the density calculated below, at 22 units per acre, is conservative. As shown in Table II-45, Mixed Use lands within 100 feet of existing water, sewer and dry utilities could generate 1,009 residential units, and Mixed Use land within 1,250 feet of water, sewer and dry utilities could generate an additional 3,376 units. Maps showing the locations of these vacant properties are provided in Exhibits 3 and 4.

Table 45
Vacant Land Inventory
For Lower Income Units
Mixed Use District (Up to 30 Units per Acre)

APN	GP	Zoning	Size (Acres)	Maximum Density (30/acre)	Realistic Density (22/acre)
<u>Vacant/ within 100 ft of sewer</u>					
043404216	MU	MU	1.12	34	26
043495124	MU	MU	2.51	75	55
308005110	MU	MU	18.73	562	412
308005111	MU	MU	18.72	562	412
308720116	MU	MU	4.77	143	105
Totals:			45.86	1,376	1,009
<u>Vacant within 1250 ft of sewer</u>					
043403202	MU	MU	1.31	39	29
043403203	MU	MU	0.97	29	21
043403208	MU	MU	4.78	143	105
043404201	MU	MU	1.32	39	29
043404202	MU	MU	1.04	31	23
043404205	MU	MU	11.78	353	259
043404206	MU	MU	1.72	52	38
043404216	MU	MU	1.12	34	25
043404217	MU	MU	1.12	34	25

Table 45
Vacant Land Inventory
For Lower Income Units
Mixed Use District (Up to 30 Units per Acre)

APN	GP	Zoning	Size (Acres)	Maximum Density (30/acre)	Realistic Density (22/acre)
043404218	MU	MU	1.23	37	27
043404219	MU	MU	1.23	37	27
043404220	MU	MU	4.95	148	109
043404221	MU	MU	4.96	149	109
043404222	MU	MU	4.98	149	110
043405189	MU	MU	3.05	91	67
043405191	MU	MU	3.89 out of 30.70	117	86
043495124	MU	MU	2.51	75	55
043902205	MU	MU	5.70 of 15.74	171	125
308005110	MU	MU	18.73	562	412
308005111	MU	MU	18.72	562	412
308720113	MU	MU	3.75	113	83
308720114	MU	MU	4.77	143	105
308720115	MU	MU	4.81	144	106
308720116	MU	MU	4.77	143	105
311218103	MU	MU	35.21 of 99.50	1,056	775
311246201	MU	MU	5.04	151	111
TOTAL:			153.46	4,604	3,376

When both Multi-Family and Mixed Use lands are considered together, there are vacant lands available to accommodate 2,748 units within 100 feet of water, sewer and dry utilities, and 6,258 units within ¼ mile of water, sewer and dry utilities. Therefore, the Town can accommodate all of its 1,686 extremely low, very low and low income units on lands which have immediate access to water, sewer and dry utilities; and could also accommodate the Town’s moderate income RHNA of 747 units and its 1,857 above moderate income units, although as shown in the “Housing Costs and Affordability” analysis above, moderate income households in Apple Valley are able to afford market housing in the community. In addition to inventory sites, the Town includes over 3,000 acres of Single Family Residential and Estate Residential vacant land which could develop as above moderate income housing on septic systems, and do not require connections to sanitary sewer. The Town has sufficient designated lands to accommodate its RHNA.

A total of three sites within 100 feet of water, sewer and utilities are over 10 acres in size. The State believes that these sites are less likely to develop solely on the basis of size. In order to assure that the Town provides incentives for the subdivision of larger parcels for affordable housing, Program 1.E.5 has been included below.

The Town will direct developers to the Land Inventory and require the construction of the units identified for each parcel, or assure that sufficient land remains or is added to provide for the Town's lower income RHNA. Compliance will be assured through the findings for each project, and the requirements of State law, in particular AB 330.

Exhibit 3 Mixed Use Vacant Land Map 100' from Water and Sewer





Exhibit 4 Mixed Use Vacant Land Map 1,250' from Water and Sewer



PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

California Government Code requires that local governments make a diligent effort to achieve public participation from all economic segments of the community in the development of the Housing Element. The Town's public outreach efforts focused on community and stakeholder workshops, information provided on the Town website, electronic mail notifications, and public hearings.

The Town held two community workshops for the Housing Element. The first, held on January 28th, 2021, was attended by 35 individuals. The workshop was advertised on the Town's website, and email invitations were sent to 67 people, and forwarded by the Board of Realtors to over 500 of its members. The attendees were a mix of affordable housing developers, residents, and representatives from housing advocacy groups. The attendees' concerns included:

- Need for expanded infrastructure.
- Difficulties in finding affordable rentals for limited-income seniors.
- Concerns that development standards and fees can make development difficult.
- Concerns regarding the recent increases in the costs of construction materials in the past year.

A second workshop was held on February 24, 2021 and attended by 13 individuals. Email notifications were sent to 52 people, and the workshop was advertised on the Town's website and Facebook page. Attendees' concerns included:

- Concern about reduced resale value of foundation homes when adjacent to apartment complexes.
- Concerns regarding the extension of services, particularly water and sewer.
- Support of higher densities in the area surrounding the Brightline station.
- Post-COVID economic conditions, and the likely expansion of logistics in the North Apple Valley area, and associated employment opportunities to broaden the Town's job base.

The High Desert Intersections Collaborative provided written comments to the Town in the form of policy recommendations. The Town reviewed these recommendations and modified some programs to reflect their recommendations. Most of the recommendations were already in place as policies and programs, including the Town's existing Mixed Use zone, which already has a minimum requirement set for commercial uses; and developer incentives, including reductions in development standards for affordable multi-family projects, fee waivers, and those already provided in Programs 1C.1 and 1.E.5.. Some of their suggestions did not apply to the Town, and some were not appropriate, including the deferral of property maintenance and repair for NGOs who purchase affordable housing projects, were not considered appropriate, given that this policy would result in sub-standard living conditions for low income households; the Town does not require renter permits from anyone, including NGOs; their recommendation that Crime Free Multi-Family Housing Programs be eliminated on the basis that it "keeps people away from multi-family housing" is not based in fact, and the Program has proven effective in lowering crime in multi-family projects in Town.

The Town posted its second draft Housing Element on the Town’s website prior to resubmittal to HCD, and notified all workshop attendees of its availability for comment from September 29 to October 13, 2021. In addition, the Town announced the comment period on its social media. No additional comments were received. The Town posted the draft Housing Element for public comment again for 10 days prior to Planning Commission hearing, and continuously until the Town Council hearing, 30 days later.

Finally, the Town met with representatives of the Building Industry Association regarding the Housing Element update. That discussion centered on the lapsing of Measure N, and the potential for smaller lot subdivisions in the future, and the improved development standards in the Multi-Family zone, which will allow more flexibility in higher density projects.

The list of invitees, materials presented at the workshops, and related materials are included in Appendix A.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

Goal 1

Housing of all types to meet the needs of current and future residents in all income levels.

Policy 1.A

Maintain a wide range of residential land use designations, ranging from very low density (1.0 dwelling unit per 5 acres) to medium density (4 to 20 dwelling units per acre) and mixed use (4 to 30 units per acre), on the Land Use Map.

Program 1.A.1

Require that housing constructed expressly for low and moderate income households not be concentrated in any single area of Apple Valley.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.A.2

Locate higher density residential development in close proximity to public transportation, community services, and recreational resources.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.A.3

Periodically review the Development Code for possible amendments to reduce housing construction costs without sacrificing basic health and safety considerations.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Annually with Development Code updates

Policy 1.B

The Town shall promote and affirmatively further fair housing opportunities throughout the community for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability, and other characteristics protected by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), Government Code Section 65008, and any other applicable state and federal fair housing and planning law.

Program 1.B.1

Continue to allocate CDBG funds annually to the Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board to assist at least 5 residents, landlords, and other housing professionals annually with housing discrimination, mediation, and finance issues throughout the community, and particularly in the area surrounding Dale Evans Parkway south of Highway 18, and south of Bear Valley Road.

Responsible Agency: Town Manager's Office

Schedule: Annually with budget adoption

Program 1.B.2

Prepare and provide bilingual (English/Spanish) educational resources, including but not limited to publications, internet resources, and workshops, to inform residents, landlords, housing professionals, public officials, and other relevant parties about fair housing rights, services, and responsibilities. The goal will be to reach at least 50 low income residents throughout the community annually throughout the planning period.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development

Schedule: Preparation of materials in 2022, annual updates thereafter

Program 1.B.3

So long as there is a shortage of Housing Choice Voucher assistance for new households, petition for additional assistance from the Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB) and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to increase the County's allocation of vouchers by at least 5 households annually.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development

Schedule: Annually

Program 1.B.4

Collaborate with the Victor Valley Transit Authority to expand services that provide reliable public transportation options to low income, disabled, senior, and other residents with limited access.

Responsible Agency: Town Manager's Office

Schedule: Throughout the planning period through participation in Transit Authority governance

Program 1.B.5

Continue to implement a proactive code enforcement program to help maintain property values in all neighborhoods, particularly those with foreclosed and/or abandoned properties.

Responsible Agency: Code Compliance

Schedule: Ongoing when inspections are conducted or requested

Program 1.B.6

Conduct a Town-wide Fair Housing Assessment (FHA) to include an assessment of fair housing issues, enforcement, outreach, and future goals and opportunities. The FHA shall be prepared consistent with HUD's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Final Rule Guidebook (December 2015) and/or other guidance recommended by HCD.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development

Schedule: ~~2023~~2022, every five years afterwards

Policy 1.C

Encourage housing for special needs households, including the elderly, single parent households, large households, the disabled and the homeless.

Program 1.C.1

Offer incentives such as density bonus and reductions in parking requirements for senior housing and housing for disabled residents. Target assistance to provide 200 very low and low income units throughout the community through these incentives.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Develop list of incentives 2022. Provide on Town website 2022. Provide to developers as projects are proposed.

Program 1.C.2

Process requests for the establishment of State licensed residential care facilities, in accordance with Section 1566.3 of the Health and Safety Code, as a means of providing long-term transitional housing for very low income, disabled and homeless persons.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.C.3

Pursuant to State law, require apartment complexes with 20 or more units to provide a minimum of one handicapped-accessible unit, with two units required of developments over 100 units.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Annually meet with residential care providers active in Apple Valley; and Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.C.5

Pursuant to State law, require apartment complexes with 16 or more units to provide an on-site property manager.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.C.6

Encourage the development of ADUs and JADUs, consistent with the requirements of State law and the Development Code, as a means of providing affordable housing opportunities in the single family residential districts. The goal of the Town is to permit 4 ADUs or JADUs annually through the planning period.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.C.7

Expedite processing for elderly, disabled, low and moderate income housing applications; waive fees for shelters and transitional housing.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Establish fast-track program (including timelines) in 2022. Provide fast-track program on Town's website 2022. Provide to developers as projects are proposed.

Program 1.C.8

Participate in regional, state and federal programs which assist very low, low and moderate income households, disabled and senior households in buying their own home, and provide information at Town Hall on these programs.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Annual participation in Consortium activities. Maintain all assistance programs on Town website.

Policy 1.D

Continue to encourage mobile homes as an affordable housing option for all segments of the community.

Program 1.D.1

Allow the placement of mobile and manufactured homes in all single family districts.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.D.2

Ensure high quality development standards through the implementation of the new Mobile Home Park zone, consistent with the Development Code in mobile home developments.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Policy 1.E

Affordable housing should be distributed throughout the community, and should blend with existing neighborhoods.

Program 1.E.1

Support and encourage local developers to participate in County-sponsored mortgage revenue bond and scattered site housing programs by including the programs in literature provided by the Community Development Department on local and regional housing programs, with a particular focus encouraging the development of housing for extremely low and very low income households. The Town will utilize all available funding sources to meet its extremely low income housing allocation of 543 units. The Town will ~~consider~~reestablish an incentive program that includes reducing, waiving or subsidizing development and impact fees for developments targeted toward affordable housing throughout the community; assisting developers in site identification; or using HOME funds to assist in development of housing for lower income housing, including extremely low income households.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, San Bernardino Housing Authority

Schedule: Establish incentive program by January of 2023. Allocate funds annually, with CDBG and HOME funds allocation in budget

Program 1.E.2

Support the efforts of non-profit organizations, private developers, and the County of San Bernardino Housing Authority to obtain State and/or Federal funds for the construction of affordable housing for extremely low, very low and low income households by writing letters of support, and expediting permit processing for projects requiring pre-approval of development projects.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, San Bernardino Housing Authority

Schedule: Annually, with CDBG and HOME funds allocation in budget

Program 1.E.3

New multiple housing projects shall incorporate designs which are compatible with surrounding single family residential neighborhoods, and provide setbacks and stepbacks to assure compatibility.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.E.4

Amend the Development Code to ensure compliance with the density bonus provisions of AB 2345.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: 2021-2022

Program 1.E.5

In order to encourage and incentivize the subdivisions of the three large sites in the Town's Inventory, the Town shall allow planning fee waivers for the processing of Tentative and Final Tract or Parcel Maps which subdivide these sites to less than 10 acres, and provide affordable housing units for extremely low, very low or low income households on any or all of the subdivided parcels. The Town will implement these incentives by contacting all three land owners and providing them a complete description of the incentive annually starting in 2022.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: 2022, annually thereafter.

Policy 1.F

Permit childcare facilities in single-family and multi-family residential zones, as well as in commercial and industrial areas where employment is concentrated.

Policy 1.G

New residential development must assure the provision of infrastructure and public services.

Program 1.G.1

Actively pursue grants and loans to expand sanitary sewer in Town, particularly in the center of Town where sewer has not been extended, and in North Apple Valley along Dale Evans Parkway.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, Public Works

Schedule: Annually, as grant and loan opportunities are released

Policy 1.H

Encourage energy-conservation and passive design concepts that make use of the natural climate to increase energy efficiency and reduce housing costs.

Program 1.H.1

Encourage development that minimizes greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the latest adopted update of the Apple Valley Climate Action Plan.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Building and Safety Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.H.2

Continue to allow energy conservation measures as improvements eligible for assistance under the Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 1.H.3

Provide brochures, web links and contact information to local utilities for energy audits and energy efficient appliance programs, as they are available.

Responsible Agency: Building and Safety Department

Schedule: Regularly restock brochures at Town Hall public counters.

Program 1.H.4

The Community Development Department shall maintain a brochure which describes the improvements eligible for the Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program, including energy conservation measures, and shall distribute the brochure at Town Hall, the Community Center, the Senior Center, the Library, churches and other sites where they can be available to the community at large.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department and Building and Safety Department

Schedule: Annually update the brochure; restock as needed throughout the year.

Policy 1.I

Provide housing opportunities for the homeless in the community.

Program 1.I.1

The Town shall encourage the development of Homeless Shelters, Transitional Housing and Single Room Occupancy by complying with Government Code Section 65583, which requires these uses to be identified in the Development Code. Application fee waivers shall also be given to these projects proposed in the Town. In addition, those that apply for reasonable accommodations shall also be given fee waivers.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Create website information and post by end of 2022. Meet with NGOs annually to publicize the program. Staff review as proposals are brought forward

Program 1.I.2

Review and amend, as necessary, the Development Code to ensure:

- Compliance with AB 101 as it pertains to Low Barrier Navigation Centers.
- Modify the definition of “homeless shelter” to include this use.
- Amend parking standards to require parking for employees only for emergency shelters.
- Modify permitted uses table in residential zones to assure that transitional and supportive housing shall be subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone.
- Modify Development Code to assure that supportive housing shall be a use by-right in zones where multifamily and mixed uses are permitted, including nonresidential zones

permitting multifamily uses pursuant to Government Code section 65651.

- Modify the Development Code consistent with the Employee Housing Act (Health and Safety Code Section 17000 et. Seq. to require that employee housing for six or fewer employees be treated as a single family structure and permitted in the same manner as other dwellings of the same type in the same zone.
- Modify the Development Code to allow group homes for 7 or more residents as a permitted use in residential zones, subject only to a Development Permit.
- Modify the Development Code to allow multi-family projects of 50+ units with approval of a Development Permit, instead of a Conditional Use Permit.
- Modify the Development Code to remove finding B. for Development Permits.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: 2021-2022

Goal 2

Housing which is safe and properly maintained, to assure that the best quality of life is provided to all residents.

Policy 2.A

Maintain the code enforcement program as the primary tool for bringing substandard units into compliance with Town Codes, and for improving overall housing conditions in Apple Valley.

Program 2.A.1

Enforce Town codes on property maintenance, building and zoning code compliance.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Code Enforcement Division.

Schedule: Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Program 2.A.2

Actively market rehabilitation programs available through CDBG or HOME programs, which provide financial and technical assistance to lower income property owners to make housing repairs, by including them in the brochure described in Program I.H.4, to be distributed throughout the community. Endeavor to assist 160 very low and low income households through these programs.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Quarterly announcements in town-wide publication, quarterly announcements on Town's website

Program 2.A.3

Continue to pursue HOME funds for rehabilitation of single-family and multi-family housing, and provide information on these programs in brochures distributed by the Town to the community.

Endeavor to assist 100 very low and low income households through these programs.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Annually with HOME fund allocation in budget

Policy 2.B

Prohibit housing development in areas subject to significant geologic, flooding, noise and fire hazards, and in environmentally and archaeologically vulnerable areas.

Policy 2.C

Encourage neighborhood watch programs that promote safety and protection in residential neighborhoods.

Program 2.C.1

Encourage landlords and property managers to participate in the Crime Free Multi-Family Housing Program sponsored by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's office.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Schedule: Quarterly through Sheriff's Department outreach efforts

Goal 3

Unrestricted access to housing throughout the community.

Policy 3.A

Continue to promote the removal of architectural barriers in order to provide barrier-free housing for handicapped or disabled persons.

Program 3.A.1

Enforce the handicapped accessibility requirements of Federal fair housing law that apply to all new multi-family residential projects containing four (4) or more units.

Responsible Agency: Department of Building and Safety

Schedule: Through regular Code Compliance inspections throughout the year; and Staff review as development proposals are brought forward

Policy 3.B

Prohibit practices that arbitrarily direct buyers and renters to certain neighborhoods or types of housing.


Program 3.B.1

Provide fair housing information at Town Hall, the Library, the Senior Center and local churches to inform both landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities. The information shall direct landlords and tenants to the San Bernardino Housing Authority, which has an established dispute resolution program.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, San Bernardino County Housing Authority

Schedule: Regularly restock brochures at all locations.

Appendix A
Public Outreach Materials



·VIRTUAL· COMMUNITY WORKSHOP NOTICE

TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY HOUSING ELEMENT COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

Thursday, January 28, 2021 - 3:00 p.m.

A community workshop for the Town's Housing Element Update (2021-2029 planning period) will be held Thursday, January 28, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. via Zoom. At this workshop, the Town will discuss background information regarding its upcoming Housing Element Update including new State Housing Element law, the 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the Town and take public comments on the Update from those attending. All members of the public are encouraged to attend.

The Housing Element is a series of goals, policies, and implementation measures for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, which would apply throughout the Town.

To participate in the workshop via Zoom, please RSVP by email to kcuza@terrانovaplanning.com, by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting (requests received after 10:00 a.m. on meeting day may not be processed). Specific questions regarding the workshop or Housing Element may be directed to Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager, at (760) 240-7000 x 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org.

The Town of Apple Valley promotes fair housing and makes all programs available to low-income families and individuals, regardless of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, political affiliation, sex, age, sexual orientation or other arbitrary factor.

AB 1486 - List of Developers that have notified the Department of Housing and Community Development of Interest in Surplus Land, Table Range A2-J486 Revised: 12/1/2020


County	Organization	CA/HFA Address	City	State	Zip	Contact	Phone	Email Address	City staff:	Zoom RSVF Confirmations	INVITES SENT
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	JA Community of Friends	3701 Wexshire Blvd, Ste 700	Los Angeles	CA	90010	Mae Hsh Risdon	(213) 480-0809	mrisdon@aaci.org			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Affordable Homestead LLC	915 W Foothill Blvd Ste 488C	Claremont	CA	91711	William Leong	(213) 375-8248	wleong@affordablehomestead@gmail.com	Lori Lamson		Zoom link confirmed
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Bibi Foundation	1514 N. Raymond Ave	Fullerton	CA	92831	Riaz Chaudhary	(714) 213-8650	riaz@bibifoundation.com	Daniel Alcayaga		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	City Ventures, LLC	3121 Michelson Drive, Suite 150	Irvine	CA	92612	Aneessha Preeadge		aneessha@cityventures.com	Sylvia Urenda		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Coachella Valley Housing Coalition	45-701 Monroe Street, Suite G	Indio	CA	92201	Julie Bornstein	(760) 347-3157	JulieBornstein@cvhc.org	Pam Cupp, Sr. Planner	Maryann Ybarra	Maryann.Ybarra@cvhc.org
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Cypress Equity Investments	12123 Wexshire Blvd., Suite 801	Los Angeles	CA	90028	Mike Diacos	(310) 406-0314	mikediacos@cypressequity.com	Nicole S Crisler, TN		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Decro Corporation	3431 Wesley Street, Suite F	Culver City	CA	90232	Laura Vandeweghe	(310) 595-4421	lvandeweghe@decro.org	Andrea Randall, TN		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Integrity Housing	4 Venture, Suite 295	Irvine	CA	92618	Paul Carroll	(949) 727-3656	paulc@integrityhousing.org	Kelly Clark, TN		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Oliveca Foundation	329 E. Commonwealth Ave	Fullerton	CA	92832	Rubina Chaudhary	(562) 972-2786	rubina@oliveca.org	Bilan Chen, TN		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	The Kennedy Commission	17701 Cowan Ave, #200	Irvine	CA	92614	Cesar Covarrubias	(949) 250-0900	cesarc@kennedycommission.org			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Universal Standard Housing	350 S Grand Avenue, Suite 3050	Los Angeles	CA	90071	Eduardo Santana	(213) 320-3554	esantana@uhsu.us			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	USA Properties Fund, Inc	3200 Douglas Blvd Ste 200	Roseville	CA	95661	Gabriel Gardner	(916) 239-8458	gardner@usapropertiesfund.com			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Workforce Homebuilders LLC	548 Via Zapata	Riverside	CA	92507	Tony Mize	(951) 330-8171	mize@workforcehomebuilders.com			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	ZMCO Inc.	5660 Panorama Dr	Whittier	CA	90601	William Dobrenen	(562) 858-5856	billdobrenen@aaci.com			
CITY STAKEHOLDERS LIST added 1.12.21kc											
Real Estate Professionals											
						Bob Basen		bob.basen@cburland.com	Bob Basen		bob.basen@cburland.com
						Ryan Travis		ryan@travisgroup.com			
						James Langley		langley@trispac.com			
						Joseph Brady		jbrady@thebradco.companies.com			Offered to forward to 500 plus Commercial brokers, he can't attend as he will be out of town.
	Victor Valley Assn. of Realtors							jdac@vtdaor.com			
Developers											
						Barbara Monroy		barbaramonroy@yahoo.com			
	Rim Properties					Craig Carl		craigc@verizon.net			
						Ian Bryant		ian@aol.com	Ian Bryant		ian@aol.com
Architects/Designers											
	Star-West Homes	13600 Hill Road, #A	Apple Valley	CA	92307	Stan Mullins	phone disconnected no email				
						Mike Pontoux		mpontoux@aol.com			
						Tom and Sophie Steeno		tom@steenodesign.com	Thomas Steeno		tom@steenodesign.com
	Omega Designs					Michael P Wauhob		michael@omegaestategroup.com			
						Ryan McGowan		ryan@rvcodesanddevelopment.com			
	St. Mary's Medical Center					Kevin Mahany, Director		Kevin.Mahany@stmc.org	Kevin Mahany		Kevin.fed'd flyer to: permulli1@msn.com; regina@dvpproject.com; marcos_clark@avusd.org
	Family Assistance Center					Darryl Evley, CEO		darryl@familyassist.org			
	High Desert Homeless					Jimmy Waldron		jimmy@highdeserthomeless.org			
	VVCSC					Midge Nicolson		midge@vvcsc.org			
	Cedar House					Rambhadrachoudhary		ramb@cedarhouse.org			
	Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board IFHMB					Irene Garcia		irene@ifhmb.com			
	Christ of Solid Rock					Israel Riley		israelriley24@yahoo.com			
	Rockin My Disabilities					JoAnn Wilkes		joann@rollingstart.com	JoAnn Wilkes		wilkes@rollingstart.com
	Assistance League of the Victor Valley					Linda Elliott or Sani		grant@assistanceleaguevvc.org			
	AVPAL					Jasheq Alban		jasheq@avpal.org			
	First Assembly of God					Josh Gerbricht		gerbricht@firstassembly.org			
	Victor Valley Domestic Violence					Inger Robertson		inger@vvdv.org			
	Moses House of Ministries					Matthew Coughlin		matthew@moseshouse.org			
	Casa of San Bernardino					Cesar Navarrete		cesar@casasb.org			
AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPERS											
CITY LIST - DUPLICATE	National Community Renaissance	8421 Haven Aven., Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730	CA			Tony Mize, VP- Acquisitions	909-727-2783	tmize@nationalcore.org			
CITY LIST	Urban Housing Communitie	2000 E. Fourth St., #205, Santa Ana, CA 92705	CA			Mark Irving	714-835-3955 ext 114	mirving@public.net			
	Community Housing Opportunities Corporation	5030 Business Center Drive #260, Fairfield, CA 94534	CA			Vince Nicholas Joy Silver Charles Luizzo Yegor Lyshenko Minami Hachiya	707-759-6043	vincoland@chchohousing.org jsilver@chchohousing.org cluizzo@chchohousing.org lyshenko@chchohousing.org mhachiya@chchohousing.org	www.chchohousing.org	Joy Silver	silver@chchohousing.org
	Pacific West	430 E. State Street, Ste 100, Eagle, ID 83616	CA			Darren Berbenian	949-599-6069	darrenb@chchohousing.com	www.tpchousing.com		
RETURNED UNDELIVERABLE											
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services	9551 Pittsburg Avenue	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	91730	Jenny Ortiz	(909) 988-5979	jortiz@npshc.org			
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	Habitat for Humanity for the Coachella Valley	7680 Dinah Shore Dr. #6	Palm Desert	CA	92211		(760) 868-8917	hvh@hvh.org			
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	Coachella Valley Association of Governments	73-770 Fred Waring Drive, Ste 200	Palm Desert	CA	92260	Cheryll Dahlin Tom Cox	(760) 348-1127	cherry@cvag.org			
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	Lift to Rise	73-770 Fred Waring Drive, Suite 100	Palm Desert	CA	92260	Araceli Palatoff	760-636-0420	arcelo@lifttorise.org	www.lifttorise.org		
											Countywide Homeless Provider Network Chair and Board member of the SBC Interagency Council on Homelessness
						Sharon Green		sgreen@vfc.com			
						Jennifer Neri		jennifer.neri@cbalps.org			Kevin sent email saying Thank you, but did not emp. he did forward to Jennifer Neri, whom RSV/Pd yes
						Jessica Leal		jessica.leal@cvhc.org			
						David Yippen		David.Yippen@cvhc.org			
						Don Brown		dbrown@cvhc.org			
						Randy Coe		rcoe@cvhc.org			
						Max O'Donnell		maxodonnell@cvhc.org			
						Stephanie Pazarn		stephanie.pazarn@cvhc.org			
						Dan Tate		dan@maestic-land.com			
						Wendy Hughes		wendy@cvhc.org			
						Tesoro Lopez		tesoro@cvhc.org			
						Joel Harrison		joharrison@cvhc.org			
						Mike Ariss Jr.		mikearissjr@gmail.com			
						Keri Leon		kerileon@cvhc.org			Council Member
						Erinette Martinez		erinette@cvhc.org			
						Gisele White		giselewhite@gmail.com			

ZOOM PARTICIPANTS 1.28.21

Name (Original Name)	Organization	User Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Duration (Minutes)	Guest
*Terra Nova Planning & Research# Inc.	Nicole S. Criste - TN	tnconfrroom@gmail.com	1/28/21 14:54	1/28/21 16:17	83	No
#VM Kline Bess R 27			1/28/21 14:54	1/28/21 16:17	83	Yes
Alma Perez	CVHC		1/28/21 15:32	1/28/21 16:05	33	Yes
Bob Tinsley			1/28/21 14:57	1/28/21 16:17	80	Yes
Brad			1/28/21 15:00	1/28/21 16:17	77	Yes
Brigette Martinez	Family Assistance	brigette@familyassist.org	1/28/21 14:59	1/28/21 16:17	78	Yes
d.alcayaga	Town of Apple Valley	dalcayaga@applevalley.org	1/28/21 15:00	1/28/21 16:17	77	Yes
David Yrigoyen (David)	CVHC	David.Yrigoyen@cvhc.org	1/28/21 15:01	1/28/21 16:17	77	Yes
Diane Carlton		dianecgavar@gmail.com	1/28/21 14:57	1/28/21 16:17	81	Yes
Don Brown	Lee Associaters	dbrown@lee-associates.com	1/28/21 15:02	1/28/21 16:17	75	Yes
Gisele	DUPLICATE devices		1/28/21 15:04	1/28/21 16:17	73	Yes
gisele white		gcwglw04@gmail.com	1/28/21 15:05	1/28/21 16:01	57	Yes
Ian Bryant	Rim Properties	irim@aol.com	1/28/21 15:03	1/28/21 16:17	74	Yes
Israel Riley	Good Will So Cal	iriley@goodwillsocial.org	1/28/21 15:05	1/28/21 15:30	26	Yes
Jennifer Neri	Global IPS	jennifer.neri@globalips.org	1/28/21 15:00	1/28/21 16:17	77	Yes
Jessica Leal	CVHC	jessica.leal@cvhc.org	1/28/21 14:59	1/28/21 16:03	65	Yes
JoAnn Wilkes	Rolling Start	jwilkes@rollingstart.com	1/28/21 15:04	1/28/21 16:13	69	Yes
Joel Harrison		jmharrison1962@gmail.com	1/28/21 14:55	1/28/21 16:17	83	Yes
John's iPad			1/28/21 14:55	1/28/21 15:58	63	Yes
Joy Silver (Joy Silver)	CHOC Housing	joy@joysilverforcalifornia.com	1/28/21 14:57	1/28/21 15:40	43	Yes
judy Wagner			1/28/21 14:59	1/28/21 15:55	57	Yes
Kari Leon	Town Council Member	kleon@applevalley.org	1/28/21 14:56	1/28/21 16:18	82	Yes
Keisha			1/28/21 14:59	1/28/21 16:17	78	Yes
Kevin Mahany	St. Marys Med Center	kevin.Mahany@stjoe.org	1/28/21 15:02	1/28/21 16:17	75	Yes
Lori LAMSON	Town of Apple Valley	lamsonlori@yahoo.com	1/28/21 14:58	1/28/21 16:17	80	Yes
Mary Ann Ybarra	CVHC	Maryann.ybarra@cvhc.org	1/28/21 15:03	1/28/21 15:59	57	Yes
Melissa Hughes	Cedar House	mhughes@cedarhouse.org	1/28/21 14:54	1/28/21 15:37	44	Yes
Nichole			1/28/21 15:01	1/28/21 16:16	76	Yes
pcupp	Town of Apple Valley	PCupp@applevalley.org	1/28/21 15:00	1/28/21 16:17	77	Yes
perrm	Realtor - Fwd from Kevin Mahany of St. Mary's	perrmull1@msn.com	1/28/21 15:11	1/28/21 15:57	47	Yes
Rebecca M. (Rebecca Merrell)			1/28/21 14:54	1/28/21 16:17	83	Yes
Regina Weatherspoon-Bell	Realtor - Fwd from Kevin Mahany of St. Mary's Countrywide Homeless Provider Network Chair and Board member of SBC Interagency Council on	regina@dvlproject.com	1/28/21 14:54	1/28/21 16:17	83	Yes
Sharon Green	Homelessness	sgreen@wvfr.com	1/28/21 15:02	1/28/21 16:17	76	Yes
Silvia Urenda	Town of Apple Valley	surenda@applevalley.org	1/28/21 15:05	1/28/21 16:17	72	Yes
Stephanie Pazarin	Global IPS	stephanie.pazarin@globalips.org	1/28/21 14:59	1/28/21 16:14	76	Yes
TC Amy			1/28/21 15:05	1/28/21 15:51	47	Yes
tom.s	Steen Design	tom@steenodesign.com	1/28/21 14:58	1/28/21 16:17	79	Yes

Subject: Apple Valley Housing Element Update - Virtual Community Workshop Notice - Join us!
Date: Monday, January 18, 2021 at 10:04:03 AM Pacific Standard Time
From: Kimberly Cuza
BCC: mrisdon@acof.org, affordablehomestead@gmail.com, Riaz@marrscorp.com, apreedge@cityventures.com, julie.bornstein@cvhc.org, mdiacos@cypressequity.com, lvandeweghe@decro.org, paul@integrityhousing.org, rubina@olivecs.org, cesarc@kennedycommission.org, esantana@ush.us, ggardner@usapropfund.com, tmize@workforcehomebuilders.com, billdobrenen@aol.com, Maryann Ybarra, bob.basen@cbc inland.com, rtravis@kurschgroup.com, jlanglely@rigelcap.com, jbrady@thebradcocompanies.com, hdaor@hdaor.com, bminvestmentco@yahoo.com, attysdad@verizon.net, irim@aol.com, mpaia@aol.com, tom@steenodesign.com, melissa@omegadesigngroup.com, ryan@civicdesigndevelopment.com, kevin.Mahany@stjoe.org, Darryl@familyassist.org, highdeserthomeless@yahoo.com, vvcsc@vvcsc.com, jlamb@cedarhouse.org, igarcia@ifhmb.com, Israelriley24@yahoo.com, jwilkes@rollingstart.com, christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com, grants@assistanceleaguevv.org, jalban@sbcscd.org, pastorjosh@vfassembly.org, irobertson4abw@vvdvinc.com, matt@moseshouse.org, cesar@casaofsb.org, mirving@uhcllc.net, vnicholas@chochousing.org, JSilver@chochousing.org, CLiuzzo@chochousing.org, YLyashenko@chochousing.org, MHachiya@chochousing.org, DarrenB@tpchousing.com, christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com, operationschoolbell@assistanceleaguevv.org, Sophie@steenodesign.com, Nicole Criste, Lori Lamson, Daniel Alcayaga, Andrea Randall

Attachments: image001.png



***·VIRTUAL· COMMUNITY
WORKSHOP NOTICE***

***TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY HOUSING ELEMENT
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP***

Thursday, January 28, 2021 - 3:00 p.m.

A community workshop for the Town's Housing Element Update (2021-2022 planning period) will be held Thursday, January 28, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. via Zoom. At this workshop, the Town will discuss background information regarding its upcoming Housing Element Update including new State Housing Element law and the 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the Town and take public comments on the Update from those attending. All members

of the public are encouraged to attend.

The Housing Element is a series of goals, policies, and implementation measures for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, which would apply throughout the Town.

To participate in the workshop via Zoom, please RSVP by email to kcuza@terranovaplanning.com, by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting (requests received after 10:00 a.m. on meeting day may not be processed). Specific questions regarding the workshop or Housing Element may be directed to Dani Alcayaga, Planning Manager, at (760) 240-7000 x 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org.

The Town of Apple Valley promotes fair housing and makes all programs available to low-income families and individuals, regardless of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, political affiliation, sex, age, sexual orientation or other arbitrary factors.



Town of Apple Valley

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP
JANUARY 28, 2021

Background and Requirements

- The Housing Element is one of the Elements required in our General Plan
- It is the only Element that must be updated on a regular schedule.
 - Upcoming planning period: 2022-2029
- The purpose of the Housing Element is to assure that the Town facilitates the development of housing for all economic and social segments within the community.

About Apple Valley

- 2018 Population: 72,359
- Median Age: 37.3 years
- Households: 24,161
- Median Household Income: \$53,023 (below the County median of \$60,164)
- 26,030 residents work (36% of the population)
 - Management (31%)
 - Sales and office (23%)
 - Service (19%)
- 16.6% of residents work in Town

About Apple Valley

- Median housing value is \$237,100
- Median rent is \$1,026
- 959 housing units are overcrowded
 - 218 overcrowded units are owner-occupied.
 - 741 overcrowded units are renter-occupied.
- 9,105 households are overpaying for housing (more than 30% of income)
 - 3,250 lower income owners are overpaying
 - 4,025 lower income renters are overpaying


Regional
Housing Need
Allocation
(RHNA)

RHNA by Income Category, 2022-2029

Extremely Low Income	541
Very Low Income	542
Low Income	599
Moderate Income	745
Above Moderate Income	1,853
Total Units	4,280

Available Sites

- The Town needs to identify sites for 2,427 units for very low, low and moderate income households.
- The Town has identified sites for 6,027 units for these income levels.
- Sites are located throughout Town, and have water and sewer available within 1,000 feet.



Next Steps

- The Housing Element Draft will be completed in early spring, and submitted to the State for review.
- Planning Commission and Town Council hearings are expected in late summer of 2021.

Discussion

We want your input!

- Does housing in Town meet residents' needs now?
- What concerns do you have about housing in Town?
- What do you think are the greatest needs for housing?
- How do you think the Town should help with providing housing for the next 8 years?



VIRTUAL COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY HOUSING ELEMENT 2nd COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

Wednesday, February 24, 2021 - 6:00 p.m.

A second community workshop for the Town's Housing Element Update (2021-2029 planning period) will be held Wednesday, February 24, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom. At this workshop, the Town will discuss background information regarding its upcoming Housing Element Update, the 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the Town. The Town would like your input on the ways that we can facilitate new housing for everyone in Apple Valley. Everyone is encouraged to attend.

The Housing Element is a series of goals, policies, and implementation measures for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, which would apply throughout the Town.

To participate in the workshop via Zoom, please RSVP by email to kcuza@terranovalplanning.com, by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting (requests received after 10:00 a.m. on meeting day may not be processed). Specific questions regarding the workshop or Housing Element may be directed to Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager, at (760) 240-7000 x 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org.

The Town of Apple Valley promotes fair housing and makes all programs available to low-income families and individuals, regardless of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, political affiliation, sex, age, sexual orientation or other arbitrary factor.

Subject: Reminder: Apple Valley Housing Element Update - Virtual Community Workshop Notice - Join us!

Date: Monday, January 25, 2021 at 11:14:06 AM Pacific Standard Time

From: Kimberly Cuza <kcuza@terranovalplanning.com>

BCC: mrisdon@acof.org <mrisdon@acof.org>, affordablehomestead@gmail.com <affordablehomestead@gmail.com>, Riaz@marrscorp.com <Riaz@marrscorp.com>, apreedge@cityventures.com <apreedge@cityventures.com>, julie.bornstein@cvhc.org <julie.bornstein@cvhc.org>, mdiacos@cypressequity.com <mdiacos@cypressequity.com>, lvandeweghe@decro.org <lvandeweghe@decro.org>, paul@integrityhousing.org <paul@integrityhousing.org>, rubina@olivecs.org <rubina@olivecs.org>, cesarc@kennedycommission.org <cesarc@kennedycommission.org>, esantana@ush.us <esantana@ush.us>, ggardner@usapropfund.com <ggardner@usapropfund.com>, tmize@workforcehomebuilders.com <tmize@workforcehomebuilders.com>, billdobrenen@aol.com <billdobrenen@aol.com>, Maryann Ybarra <Maryann.Ybarra@cvhc.org>, bob.basen@cbcinc.com <bob.basen@cbcinc.com>, rtravis@kurschgroup.com <rtravis@kurschgroup.com>, jlangle@rigelcap.com <jlangle@rigelcap.com>, jbrady@thebradco.companies.com <jbrady@thebradco.companies.com>, hdaor@hdaor.com <hdaor@hdaor.com>, bminvestmentco@yahoo.com <bminvestmentco@yahoo.com>, attysdad@verizon.net <attysdad@verizon.net>, irim@aol.com <irim@aol.com>, mpaia@aol.com <mpaia@aol.com>, tom@steenodesign.com <tom@steenodesign.com>, melissa@omegadesigngroup.com <melissa@omegadesigngroup.com>, ryan@civicdesigndevelopment.com <ryan@civicdesigndevelopment.com>, kevin.Mahany@stjoe.org <kevin.Mahany@stjoe.org>, Darryl@familyassist.org <Darryl@familyassist.org>, highdeserthomeless@yahoo.com <highdeserthomeless@yahoo.com>, vvcsc@vvcsc.com <vvcsc@vvcsc.com>, jlamb@cedarhouse.org <jlamb@cedarhouse.org>, igarcia@ifhmb.com <igarcia@ifhmb.com>, Israelriley24@yahoo.com <Israelriley24@yahoo.com>, jwilkes@rollingstart.com <jwilkes@rollingstart.com>, christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com <christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com>, grants@assistanceleaguevv.org <grants@assistanceleaguevv.org>, jalban@sbcisd.org <jalban@sbcisd.org>, pastorjosh@vfassembly.org <pastorjosh@vfassembly.org>, irobertson4abw@vvdvinc.com <irobertson4abw@vvdvinc.com>, matt@moseshouse.org <matt@moseshouse.org>, cesar@casaofsb.org <cesar@casaofsb.org>, mirving@uhcllc.net <mirving@uhcllc.net>, vnicholas@chochousing.org <vnicholas@chochousing.org>, JSilver@chochousing.org <JSilver@chochousing.org>, CLiuzzo@chochousing.org <CLiuzzo@chochousing.org>, YLyashenko@chochousing.org <YLyashenko@chochousing.org>, MHachiya@chochousing.org <MHachiya@chochousing.org>, DarrenB@tpchousing.com <DarrenB@tpchousing.com>, christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com <christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com>, operationschoolbell@assistanceleaguevv.org <operationschoolbell@assistanceleaguevv.org>, Sophie@steenodesign.com <Sophie@steenodesign.com>, Nicole Criste <ncriste@terranovalplanning.com>, Lori Lamson <LLamson@applevalley.org>, Daniel Alcayaga <dalcayaga@applevalley.org>, Andrea Randall <arandall@terranovalplanning.com>

Attachments: image001.png

Good Morning,

This is a **reminder** that the virtual workshop is this Thursday at 3pm.


If you have not yet RSVP'd for the zoom link please do so now.

Thank you!

From: Kimberly Cuza <kcuza@terranovaplanning.com>

Date: Monday, January 18, 2021 at 10:04 AM

Subject: Apple Valley Housing Element Update - Virtual Community Workshop Notice - Join us!



***·VIRTUAL· COMMUNITY
WORKSHOP NOTICE***

***TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY HOUSING ELEMENT
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP***

Thursday, January 28, 2021 - 3:00 p.m.

A community workshop for the Town's Housing Element Update (2021-2022 planning period) will be held Thursday, January 28, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. v Zoom. At this workshop, the Town will discuss background information regarding its upcoming Housing Element Update including new State Housing Element law the 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the Town and take public comments on the Update from those attending. All members of the public are encouraged to attend.

The Housing Element is a series of goals, policies, and implementation measures for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, which would apply throughout the Town.

To participate in the workshop via Zoom, please RSVP by email to kcuza@terranovaplanning.com, by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting (requests received after 10:00 a.m. on meeting day may not be processed). Specific questions regarding the workshop or Housing Element may be directed to Dani Alcayaga, Planning Manager, at (760) 240-7000 x 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org.

The Town of Apple Valley promotes fair housing and makes all programs available to low-income families and individuals, regardless of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, political affiliation, sex, age, sexual orientation or other arbitrary factors.

AB 1486 - List of Developers that have notified the Department of Housing and Community Development of Interest in Surplus Land, Table Range A2:J486 Revised: 12/1/2020

County	Organization	CA/HFA CA Address	City	State	Zip	Contact	Phone	Email Address	City staff:	Zoom RSVP Confirmations	NOTES
										Zoom link confirmed	INVITES SENT
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	A Community of Friends	3701 Wilshire Blvd, Ste 700	Los Angeles	CA	90010	Mee Heh Risdon	(213) 480-0809	mrisdon@aocf.org	Lon Lamson		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Affordable Homestead LLC	915 W Foothill Blvd Ste 488C	Claremont	CA	91711	William Leong	(213) 375-8248	affordablehomestead@gmail.com	Daniel Alcayaga		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Biol Foundation	1514 N. Raymond Ave	Fullerton	CA	92631	Riaz Chaudhary	(714) 213-8650	Riaz@marrscorp.com	Sylvia Urenda		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	City Ventures, LLC	3121 Michelson Drive, Suite 150	Irvine	CA	92612	Anastasia Priedge		apriedge@cityventures.com	Pam Cupp, Sr. Planner		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Coachella Valley Housing Coalition	45-701 Monroe Street, Suite G	Indio	CA	92201	Julie Bornstein	(760) 347-3157	julie.bornstein@cvhc.org, Maryann ybarra@cvhc.org	Maryann Ybarra		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Cypress Equity Investments	12129 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 801	Los Angeles	CA	90025	Mike Diacos	(310) 405-0314	mdiacos@cypresssequity.com	Nicole S Criste, TN		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Decro Corporation	3431 Wesley Street, Suite F	Culver City	CA	90232	Laura Vandeweghe	(310) 595-4421	lvandeweghe@decro.org	Andrea Randall, TN		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Integrity Housing	4 Venture, Suite 295	Irvine	CA	92618	Paul Gampel	(949) 727-9656	paul@integrityhousing.org	Katy Clark, TN		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Olivacs Foundation	328 E. Commonwealth Ave	Fullerton	CA	92832	Rubina Chaudhary	(562) 972-2786	rubina@olivacs.org	Bitan Chen, TN		
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	The Kennedy Commission	17701 Cowan Ave. #200	Irvine	CA	92614	Cesar Covarrubias	(949) 250-0909	cesarc@kennedycommission.org			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Universal Standard Housing	350 S Grand Avenue, Suite 3050	Los Angeles	CA	90071	Eduardo Santiana	(213) 320-3554	esantiana@ush.us			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	USA Properties Fund, Inc.	3200 Douglas Blvd Ste 200	Roseville	CA	95661	Gabriel Gardner	(916) 239-8458	gardner@usapropfund.com			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	Workforce Homebuilders LLC	546 Via Zapata	Riverside	CA	92507	Tony Mize	(951) 530-8171	tmize@workforcehomebuilders.com			
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	ZMCO Inc.	5660 Panorama Dr	Whittier	CA	90601	William Dobrenen	(562) 858-8856	billdobrenen@aol.com			
CITY STAKEHOLDERS LIST added 1.12.21kc											
Real Estate Professionals											
						Bob Basen Ryan Travis James Langley		bob.basen@cbcinland.com rtavis@krschgroup.com jlangley@ncelap.com		Bob Basen	
	Victor Valley Assn. of Realtors					Joseph Brady		jbrady@thebradco.companies.com hdjac@hdjacor.com			Offered to forward to 500 plus Commercial brokers, he can't attend as he will be out of town
Developers						Barbara Monroy Craig Carl Ian Bryant Stan Mullins		bmonvestments@yahoo.com atysdad@verizon.net ian@iail.com		Ian Bryant	
Architects/Designers	Rim Properties Star-West Homes	13600 Hill Road, #A	Apple Valley	CA	92307			phone disconnected no email			
						Mike Pontious		mpaia@aol.com			
	Omega Designs					Tom and Sophie Steeno Michael P Wauhub Ryan McGowan		tom@steenodesign.com, Sophie@steenodesign.com melissa@omegadesigngroup.com ryan@dividedesigndevelopment.com		Thomas Steeno	RSVP Link sent - Tom
	St. Mary's Medical Center Family Assistance Center High Desert Homeless VVCSC Cedar House Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board IFHMB Christ of Solid Rock Rockin My Disabilities Assistance League of the Victor Valley AVPAL First Assembly of God Victor Valley Domestic Violence Moses House of Ministries Casa of San Bernardino					Kevin Mahany, Director Community Health Investment Darryl Evey, CEO Jimmy Waldron Midge Nicosia Jaime Lamb Irene Garcia Israel Riley JoAnn Wilkes Linda Elliott or Sani Maberry Jackie Alban Josh Gerbracht Inger Robertson Matthew Coughlin Cesar Navarete		kevin.mahany@stioe.org Darryl@familyassist.org highdeserthomeless@yahoo.com wscap@vvcsc.com jalamb@cedarhouse.org garcia@ifhmb.com israelriley24@yahoo.com, christofsolidrockec@hotmail.com jwilkes@rollingstart.com gamb@assistanceleaguevvc.org, operationschoolbell@assistanceleaguevvc.org jalban@ebcsd.org pastorjosh@vvassembly.org inger@rockinmydisabilities.org matt@moseshouse.org cesar@casasofb.org		Kevin Mahany	Kevin fwd'd flyer to: permull1@msn.com; regina@vvcproject.com; marcos_dark@vvcvcsd.org
										JoAnn Wilkes	RSVP Link sent mailto:christofsolidrockec@hotmail.com - undeliverable
AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPERS											
CITY LIST - DUPLICATE											
CITY LIST	National Community Renaissance	9421 Haven Ave., Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730	CA			Tony Mize, VP-Acquisitions	909-727-2783	tmize@nationalcra.org			
CITY LIST	Urban Housing Communities	2000 E. Fourth St., #205, Santa Ana, CA 92705	CA			Mark Irving	714-835-3955 ext 114	merving@uhclic.net			
	Community Housing Opportunities Corporation Pacific West	5030 Business Center Drive #280, Fairfield, CA 94534 430 E. State Street, Ste 100, Eagle, ID 83616	CA			Vince Nicholas Joy Silver Charles Liuzzo Yegor Lyashenko Minami Hachiya Darren Berberian	707-759-6043 949-599-6069	vnicholas@chohousing.org jsilver@chohousing.org CLiuzzo@chohousing.org YLyashenko@chohousing.org MHachiya@chohousing.org DarrenB@chohousing.org		Joy Silver	www.chohousing.org www.lchousing.com RSVP Link sent
RETURNED UNDELIVERABLE											
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services	9551 Pittsburgh Avenue	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	91730	Jenny Ortiz	(909) 988-5979	jen@nphnsc.org executive@director@nphvc.org			
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	Habitat for Humanity for the Coachella Valley	72680 Dinah Shore Dr. #6	Palm Desert	CA	92211		(760) 989-6917	info@hfv.org			
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	Coachella Valley Association of Governments	73-710 Fred Waring Drive, Ste 200	Palm Desert	CA	92260	Cheryl Dahlin Tom Cox	(760) 346-1127	toox@cvag.org			
RIVERSIDE COUNTY	Lift to Rise	73-710 Fred Waring Drive, Suite 100	Palm Desert	CA	92260	Araceli Palafox	760-636-0420	info@lifttorise.org			
						Sharon Green		sgreen@vvcfr.com			Countrywide Homeless Provider Network Chair and Board member of the SBC Interagency Council on Homelessness
						Jennifer Neri		jennifer.neri@globalnet.org			Kevin sent email saying Thank you, but did not repv. he did forward to Jennifer Neri, whom RSVP'd yes
						Jessica Leal		jessica.leal@vvcfr.com			
						David Yrigoyen		David.Yrigoyen@vvcfr.com			
						Don Brown		dbrown@re-associates.com			
						Randy Coe		rcoe@re-associates.com			
						Mac O'Donnell		macodonnell@jardadivcs.com			RSVP Link sent
						Stephanie Pazarin		stephanie.pazarin@vvcfr.com			
						Dan Tate		dan@magentic-land.com			
						Melissa Hughes		Melissa@vvcfr.com			
						Tesoro Lopez		Tlopez@vvcfr.com			
						Joel Harrison		joharrison152@gmail.com			
						Mike Arias Jr.		mariarj@vvcfr.com			Council Member
						Kari Leon		kari@vvcfr.com			
						Brigette Martinez		briget@vvcfr.com			
						Gisele White		gwhite@vvcfr.com			RSVP Link sent
						2nd Workshop RSVPs not on list					
						Antonio Brown		antonio-brown@outlook.com			Transportation Planner, Caltrans
						Darlene Mendez		Darlene.Mendez@dot.ca.gov			
						Enrique Arcilla		enrique.arcilla@gmail.com			
						Greg Raven		gregraven@mac.com			
						Gregory Benson		email2benson@yahoo.com			

ZOOM PARTICIPANTS 2.24.21

Name (Original Name)	User Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Duration (Mi	Guest
Terra Nova Planning & Research# Inc.	tnconfrroom@gmail.com	2/24/21 17:50	2/24/21 19:03	73	No
17602175922		2/24/21 18:05	2/24/21 18:06	2	Yes
19518097045		2/24/21 18:03	2/24/21 18:27	25	Yes
Antonio Brown	antonio-brown@outlook.com	2/24/21 17:55	2/24/21 17:55	1	Yes
Antonio Brown	antonio-brown@outlook.com	2/24/21 17:55	2/24/21 18:09	14	Yes
Daniel Alcayaga	dsalcayaga@yahoo.com	2/24/21 18:00	2/24/21 18:00	1	Yes
Daniel Alcayaga	dsalcayaga@yahoo.com	2/24/21 18:00	2/24/21 19:03	64	Yes
Daniel Alcayaga		2/24/21 18:03	2/24/21 18:03	1	Yes
Daniel Alcayaga		2/24/21 18:03	2/24/21 19:03	60	Yes
Danni H.		2/24/21 18:05	2/24/21 18:05	1	Yes
Danni H.	dannivh85@gmail.com	2/24/21 18:05	2/24/21 18:05	1	Yes
Enrique Arcilla	earcilla@ucsd.edu	2/24/21 18:00	2/24/21 18:00	1	Yes
Enrique Arcilla	earcilla@ucsd.edu	2/24/21 18:00	2/24/21 19:03	63	Yes
Greg Raven	gregraven@mac.com	2/24/21 18:57	2/24/21 18:57	1	Yes
Greg Raven	gregraven@mac.com	2/24/21 18:57	2/24/21 19:03	6	Yes
iPad greg benson		2/24/21 18:08	2/24/21 18:08	1	Yes
iPad greg benson		2/24/21 18:08	2/24/21 18:39	31	Yes
Joel		2/24/21 18:04	2/24/21 18:04	1	Yes
Joel		2/24/21 18:04	2/24/21 19:03	60	Yes
Joy Silver	joy@joysilverforcalifornia.com	2/24/21 17:50	2/24/21 17:51	1	Yes
Joy Silver (Joy Silver)	joy@joysilverforcalifornia.com	2/24/21 17:51	2/24/21 19:03	73	Yes
Kevin		2/24/21 18:06	2/24/21 18:06	1	Yes
Kevin		2/24/21 18:06	2/24/21 19:03	57	Yes
Lori LAMSON	lamsonlori@yahoo.com	2/24/21 17:51	2/24/21 17:51	1	Yes
Lori LAMSON	lamsonlori@yahoo.com	2/24/21 17:51	2/24/21 18:30	40	Yes
Lori LAMSON	lamsonlori@yahoo.com	2/24/21 18:50	2/24/21 19:03	13	Yes
Lori LAMSON	lamsonlori@yahoo.com	2/24/21 18:30	2/24/21 18:50	20	Yes
Oasis House		2/24/21 18:10	2/24/21 18:10	1	Yes
Oasis House		2/24/21 18:10	2/24/21 18:33	23	Yes
Orlando Acevedo	oacevedo@applevalley.org	2/24/21 17:58	2/24/21 17:59	1	Yes

Orlando Acevedo	oacevedo@applevalley.org	2/24/21 17:59	2/24/21 19:03	65	Yes
Silvia Caraballo		2/24/21 17:59	2/24/21 17:59	1	Yes
Silvia Caraballo		2/24/21 17:59	2/24/21 18:10	11	Yes
Silvia Caraballo		2/24/21 18:10	2/24/21 18:17	8	Yes
sophie steeno		2/24/21 18:42	2/24/21 18:42	1	Yes
sophie steeno		2/24/21 18:42	2/24/21 19:05	23	Yes
tom.s		2/24/21 18:15	2/24/21 18:15	1	Yes
tom.s		2/24/21 18:15	2/24/21 19:03	48	Yes
User		2/24/21 17:59	2/24/21 17:59	1	Yes
User		2/24/21 17:59	2/24/21 19:03	64	Yes

Apple Valley News

Apple Valley seeks community input on housing plan

Post Date: 02/17/2021



Apple Valley seeks community input on housing plan

Apple Valley, CA – February 17, 2021: Next week, the Town of Apple Valley will host a virtual workshop to update the Town's certified Housing Element plan.

Open to both residents and non-residents, the virtual workshop will be held online via Zoom on Wednesday, Feb. 24, at 6 p.m. The Town is seeking input on the ways the Town can meet housing needs in Apple Valley and to incorporate these comments into the Housing Element update. This second workshop will also focus on the 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the Town.

As part of the Town's General Plan, which serves as a local community's "blueprint" for how it will continue to grow and develop, the Housing Element is a series of goals, policies, and implementation measures for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing in a local community.

Local jurisdictions throughout California, are required to update their local Housing Elements every eight years. During this period, October 2021 to October 2029, the Town must have a State certified Housing Element to be eligible for certain programs and grants. Failure to certify a local Housing Element can result in further loss of local control over housing development decisions by the Town and its residents. The deadline to have a compliant Housing Element Update is October 2021.

To participate in the workshop via Zoom, please RSVP by email to kcuza@terranovalplanning.com, by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting (requests received after 10:00 a.m. on meeting day may not be processed).

Specific questions regarding the workshop or Housing Element may be directed to Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager, at (760) 240-7000 x 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org.

- ▶ Adopt...
- ▶ Apply for
- ▶ Get
- ▶ View
- ▶ Visit
- Volunteer
- Have a yard sale
- Move to Apple Valley
- Pay my business license online
- Pay my trash bill online
- Request a Payoff
- Report a problem or compliment

[How Do I?](#) » [Top Navigation](#)

APPLE VALLEY NEWS

Font Size: + - [Share & Bookmark](#) [Feedback](#) [Print](#)

Apple Valley seeks community input on housing plan

Post Date: 02/17/2021



Apple Valley seeks community input on housing plan

Apple Valley, CA - February 17, 2021: Next week, the Town of Apple Valley will host a virtual workshop to update the Town's certified Housing Element plan.

Open to both residents and non-residents, the virtual workshop will be held online via Zoom on Wednesday, Feb. 24, at 6 p.m. The Town is seeking input on the ways the Town can meet housing needs in Apple Valley and to incorporate these comments into the Housing Element update. This second workshop will also focus on the 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the Town.

As part of the Town's General Plan, which serves as a local community's "blueprint" for how it will continue to grow and develop, the Housing Element is a series of goals, policies, and implementation measures for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing in a local community.

Local jurisdictions throughout California, are required to update their local Housing Elements every eight years. During this period, October 2021 to October 2029, the Town must have a State certified Housing Element to be eligible for certain programs and grants. Failure to certify a local Housing Element can result in further loss of local control over housing development decisions by the Town and its residents. The deadline to have a compliant Housing Element Update is October 2021.

To participate in the workshop via Zoom, please RSVP by email to kuza@terranovaplanning.com, by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting (requests received after 10:00 a.m. on meeting day may not be processed).

Specific questions regarding the workshop or Housing Element may be directed to Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager, at (760) 240-7000 x 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org.



Videos

See All



Choice Medical Group Vaccination

Dial directly at (760) 503-4003 or visit www.sbcovid19.com/vaccine

4:10

Take a peek behind the scenes as Appl...

28

2.2K Views · 2 weeks ago

Upcoming Events

See All



TODAY AT 6 PM PDT

Planning Commission Meeting

Town of Apple Valley, California Networking

Interested



TODAY AT 6:30 PM PDT

Joint Special Meeting

Town of Apple Valley, California Networking

Interested



WED, APR 7 AT 5 PM PDT

Rabies Clinic April 2021

22131 Powhatan Rd, Apple Valley, C... 45 guests

Interested

Page Transparency

See All

Facebook is showing information to help you better understand the purpose of a Page. See actions taken by the people who manage and post content.



Like · Reply · 3w

4

Most Relevant is selected, so some comments may have been filtered out.



Town of Apple Valley, California added an event.

February 17 ·



WED, FEB 24

Virtual Workshop on Housing Element

Interested

14 people interested

2

2 Comments

Like

Comment

Share



Christina McFarland

Reduce mixing apartment complexes with foundation homes. Those who work hard to purchase a home to find out badly when they try to sell, either to better themselves or just wanting move, find out their value is worthless because of the type of developm... See More

Like · Reply · 3w · Edited

1



Town of Apple Valley, California

Christina McFarland Please submit your comments regarding the Housing Element to Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager, at (760) 240-7000 x 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org.

Like · Reply · 3w

1



Write a reply...



Write a comment...



Subject: Apple Valley Housing Element Update - Public Review Notice

Date: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 at 9:06:30 AM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Kimberly Cuza <kcuza@terranovaplanning.com>

BCC: mrisdon@acof.org <mrisdon@acof.org>, affordablehomestead@gmail.com <affordablehomestead@gmail.com>, Riaz@marrscorp.com <Riaz@marrscorp.com>, apreedge@cityventures.com <apreedge@cityventures.com>, julie.bornstein@cvhc.org <julie.bornstein@cvhc.org>, mdiacos@cypressequity.com <mdiacos@cypressequity.com>, lvandeweghe@decro.org <lvandeweghe@decro.org>, paul@integrityhousing.org <paul@integrityhousing.org>, rubina@olivecs.org <rubina@olivecs.org>, cesarc@kennedycommission.org <cesarc@kennedycommission.org>, esantana@ush.us <esantana@ush.us>, ggardner@usapropfund.com <ggardner@usapropfund.com>, tmize@workforcehomebuilders.com <tmize@workforcehomebuilders.com>, billdobrenen@aol.com <billdobrenen@aol.com>, Maryann Ybarra <Maryann.Ybarra@cvhc.org>, bob.basen@cbcinc.com <bob.basen@cbcinc.com>, rtravis@kurschgroup.com <rtravis@kurschgroup.com>, jlangle@rigelcap.com <jlangle@rigelcap.com>, jbrady@thebradco.companies.com <jbrady@thebradco.companies.com>, hdaor@hdaor.com <hdaor@hdaor.com>, bminvestmentco@yahoo.com <bminvestmentco@yahoo.com>, attysdad@verizon.net <attysdad@verizon.net>, irim@aol.com <irim@aol.com>, mpaia@aol.com <mpaia@aol.com>, tom@steenodesign.com <tom@steenodesign.com>, melissa@omegadesigngroup.com <melissa@omegadesigngroup.com>, ryan@civicdesigndevelopment.com <ryan@civicdesigndevelopment.com>, kevin.Mahany@stjoe.org <kevin.Mahany@stjoe.org>, Darryl@familyassist.org <Darryl@familyassist.org>, highdeserthomeless@yahoo.com <highdeserthomeless@yahoo.com>, vvcsc@vvcsc.com <vvcsc@vvcsc.com>, jlamb@cedarhouse.org <jlamb@cedarhouse.org>, igarcia@ifhmb.com <igarcia@ifhmb.com>, Israelriley24@yahoo.com <Israelriley24@yahoo.com>, jwilkes@rollingstart.com <jwilkes@rollingstart.com>, christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com <christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com>, grants@assistanceleaguevv.org <grants@assistanceleaguevv.org>, jalban@sbcisd.org <jalban@sbcisd.org>, irobertson4abw@vvdvinc.com <irobertson4abw@vvdvinc.com>, matt@moseshouse.org <matt@moseshouse.org>, cesar@casaofsb.org <cesar@casaofsb.org>, mirving@uhcllc.net <mirving@uhcllc.net>, vnicholas@chochousing.org <vnicholas@chochousing.org>, JSilver@chochousing.org <JSilver@chochousing.org>, CLiuzzo@chochousing.org <CLiuzzo@chochousing.org>, YLyashenko@chochousing.org <YLyashenko@chochousing.org>, MHachiya@chochousing.org <MHachiya@chochousing.org>, DarrenB@tpchousing.com <DarrenB@tpchousing.com>, christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com <christofsolidrocklec@hotmail.com>, operationschoolbell@assistanceleaguevv.org <operationschoolbell@assistanceleaguevv.org>, Sophie@steenodesign.com <Sophie@steenodesign.com>, Nicole Criste <ncriste@terranovaplanning.com>, Lori Lamson <LLamson@applevalley.org>, Daniel Alcayaga <dalcayaga@applevalley.org>, Andrea Randall <arandall@terranovaplanning.com>, Orlando Acevedo <OAcevedo@applevalley.org>, Cynthia Michaels <cmichaels@terranovaplanning.com>

Attachments: image001.jpg



f 2

As a participant in our community workshops for the Town of Apple Valley's Housing Element Update, we wanted to let you know the draft Housing Element document is available on the town's website for public review, from September 29 – October 13,

2021.

We invite you to review the Element through this link: www.av.town/housingelement

For questions or comments, please contact Daniel Alcayaga, AICP at (760) 240-7000 ext. 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org



CALIFORNIA Town of Apple Valley

- Home
- About Apple Valley
- Residents
- Businesses
- Government
- Services
- How Do I?

▼ Planning Division

Services » [Planning Division](#)

- Agendas
- Applications & Processes
- Public Notices and CEQA Related Documents
- Climate Action Plan
- Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP)
- Development Advisory Board
- Development Code
- Frequently Asked Questions
- ▶ 2009 General Plan
- ▶ **Housing Element**
- Links
- Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan
- Comment Letters
- Multi-Use and Equestrian Trail Standards
- North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan
- The Village Corridor Enhancement Plan
- ▶ Planning Commission
- SPECIFIC PLANS
- Zoning Map & Permitted Use

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE 2021-2029

Font Size: **+** **-** **+** [Share & Bookmark](#) [Feedback](#) [Print](#)

The Housing Element is one of seven required Elements of the General Plan. The General Plan guides growth in the Town and establishes a vision for the community. The purpose of the Housing Element is to adequately plan to meet the housing needs of everyone in the community. Housing Elements must be updated every eight years. California is entering its "sixth housing element cycle" (October 2021-October 2029).

The Town of Apple Valley's [2nd Draft Housing Element](#) is available for review and comment. The deadline to have a compliant Housing Element Update is October 2021.

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is the agency responsible for tracking and determining compliance with the State Housing Law. HCD's approval is required before a local government can adopt its housing element as part of its overall General Plan. Learn more about HCD's requirements [here](#).

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), which is required by state law, is a method of allocating housing units to jurisdictions throughout the State. Using State population data, HCD mandates that a certain amount of housing units be constructed within all regional planning areas throughout the State. The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) under which Hesperia is subject to is Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). SCAG, in collaboration with HCD, calculate the number of existing and projected housing units that must be constructed within the six counties and 191 cities in Southern California. Learn more about SCAGs RHNA process [here](#).

For questions, please contact the Daniel Alcayaga, AICP at (760) 240-7000 ext. 7205 or dalcayaga@applevalley.org

Appendix B

Fair Housing Assessment

Assessment of Fair Housing: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Town of Apple Valley

AB 686 requires that all housing elements due on or after January 1, 2021, must contain an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) consistent with the core elements of the analysis required by the federal Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Final Rule of July 16, 2015.

Under state law, AFFH means “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combatting discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.”

The Town has completed the following:

1. Include a Program that Affirmatively Furthers Fair Housing and Promotes Housing Opportunities throughout the Community for Protected Classes (applies to housing elements beginning January 1, 2019).
2. Conduct an Assessment of Fair Housing, which includes summary of fair housing issues, an analysis of available federal, state, and local data and local knowledge to identify, and an assessment of the contributing factors for the fair housing issues.
3. Prepare the Housing Element Land Inventory and Identification of Sites through the Lens of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.

To comply with AB 686, the Town has completed the following outreach and analysis.

A. Outreach

2016 Assessment of Fair Housing

The Town prepared an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) in 2016/2017 as part of its participation in the Apple Valley/Victorville HOME Consortium, a partnership between the Town of Apple Valley and City of Victorville established for the purpose of obtaining federal HOME fund entitlement status. The AFH analyzed local (Apple Valley, Victorville) and regional (Riverside/San Bernardino/Ontario) fair housing trends from 1990 to 2016.

In 2016, the Apple Valley/Victorville Consortium (“the Consortium”) held community meetings in both English and Spanish, and conducted individual consultations with service providers, stakeholders, and other organizations who serve special needs groups. Stakeholders included those involved with transitional housing and rental assistance, and real estate and lending industries. The Consortium utilized their respective websites and social media accounts to

announce and advertise community meetings, surveys, and hearing dates. A thirty-question survey was disseminated through multiple channels to solicit responses from members of the public who may be harder to reach by methods of face-to-face contact at community events or were possibly not interested in attending a community meeting. Stakeholder organizations received a specific survey to further assist in obtaining additional local or regional data, as well as feedback on housing needs, barriers to fair and affordable housing, and opportunities for development from all economic segments of the community.

Two community meetings were held in July 2016. Both were structured in the same format: participants were introduced to the AFH plan process through a presentation and discussed a series of questions related to housing and community development needs, their presumptions regarding areas considered segregated and/or challenged by poverty, and other fair housing issues and concerns.

Stakeholder meetings were held in August 2016 in a similar format to the community meetings. Stakeholders expressed concern about a variety of fair housing issues during consultation, including homelessness, affordable housing for special populations, safe neighborhoods and the lack of transportation, employment, and an educated work force. The primary concern stakeholders felt needed to be addressed was the lack of homeless shelters in the High Desert area. The High Desert is subject to extreme temperatures that can result in dangerous conditions for the homeless population and most homeless services are in the City of San Bernardino, or other southern jurisdictions, creating a disparity of services available between the High Desert and the surrounding region. Other concerns voiced by community members during the AFH outreach process included:

- Reliable transportation services and access are limited to some lower income households, seniors, and persons with disabilities.
- Safe, affordable housing for seniors, the disabled, and youth is needed, particularly in proximity to transit, grocery stores, and recreation services.
- Lack of maintenance of foreclosed properties.

In response to the issues discussed above, Apple Valley elected to continue contract services (funded through CDBG allocation) with the Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board (IFHMB) to assist residents, landlords, and other housing professionals with housing discrimination, mediation, and finance issues. The Town expanded outreach and education services to inform the public about fair housing rights and services; it offered written materials and workshops for property managers, housing professionals, and elected officials. It continued efforts to petition for additional Housing Choice Voucher assistance from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), as the Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB) has closed its ability to provide additional vouchers to new households. To address the lack of accessible housing for people with disabilities, the Town amended its Zoning Code to establish a Reasonable Accommodation procedure. To expand access to lending programs for homeownership amongst minority populations, particularly black households, The Town agreed to work with government agencies and nonprofit groups to provide credit counseling and

foreclosure workshops, published lending data, and coordinated with minority Chambers of Commerce to promote programs and services. The Consortium has made efforts to expand public transportation services to those with limited access by providing transit maps at public locations and expanding programs for seniors and the disabled about navigating the transit system. It has continued to provide proactive code enforcement to address issues associated with lack of maintenance of foreclosed properties.

See Appendix 1 for the full 2016 Apple Valley Assessment of Fair Housing.

2021 Housing Element Update

In addition to the 2016 AFH outreach efforts, the Town conducted public outreach in 2021 as part of the Housing Element update process. As discussed in the public participation section of this Housing Element, outreach efforts focused on community and stakeholder workshops, public hearings, and disseminating information through electronic mail notifications, social media and postings on the Town's website. Primary concerns raised were the need to expand infrastructure (water and sewer), affordability for limited income seniors, and increased costs of development. Opportunities to address these challenges include the expansion of available assistance programs and streamlining the affordable housing approval process to reduce time and costs for developers.

A full summary of feedback gathered during these meetings and consultations can be found in Appendix 1.

B. Assessment of Fair Housing

California Government Code Section 65583 (10)(A)(ii) requires the Town of Apple Valley to analyze areas of segregation, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs, including displacement risk. High resource areas are those with high index scores for a variety of educational, environmental, and economic indicators. These indicators include high levels of employment and close proximity to jobs, access to effective educational opportunities for both children and adults, low concentration of poverty, and low levels of environmental pollutants, among others. Moderate resource areas have access to many of the same resources as high resource areas but may have longer commutes to places of employment, lower median home values, fewer educational opportunities, or other factors that lower their indices for economic, environmental, and educational indicators. Low resource areas have the most limited access to all resources. Areas of high segregation and poverty are those that have an overrepresentation of people of color compared to the County, and at least 30 percent of the population in these areas is below the federal poverty line (\$26,500 annually for a family of four in 2021).

a. Integration and Segregation Patterns

To assess patterns of segregation and integration, Apple Valley analyzed several characteristics including race and ethnicity, disability, familial status and household income. Analysis of the characteristics above indicate there is no substantial evidence of segregation based on disability, but there is potential for segregation based on income that disproportionately effects minorities and female headed households with children. And while there are no areas of low diversity in the Town, there are opportunities to improve racial segregation. As shown in Figures 4, 5 and 7, the same geographical areas within the Town are subject to lower median income, increased poverty rates, and higher percentages of female headed households with children. In this same area is the Town's only area of "High Segregation and Poverty" (Figure 8), meaning it has an overrepresentation of people of color compared to the county, and at least 30 percent of the population in these areas is below the federal poverty line (\$26,200 annually for a family of four in 2020).

According to the Dissimilarity Index, the Town of Apple Valley has low levels of racial and income segregation. However, other indicators such as poverty level, concentrated areas of minorities, and familial status suggest patterns of concentrated areas may be related to access to opportunities or a disproportion of housing needs.

The following section provides detailed analysis of segregation patterns in the Town of Apple Valley.

Race and Ethnicity

Ethnic and racial composition of a region is useful in analyzing housing demand and any related fair housing concerns, as it tends to demonstrate a relationship with other characteristics such as household size, locational preferences, and mobility.

In 2019, the largest racial/ethnic group in San Bernardino County identified as Hispanic (of any race) at 53 percent and the second largest was White, Non-Hispanic persons at 28 percent. Black persons made up 7.8 percent, Asian persons made up 6.9 percent, and persons of more than one race made up 2.5 percent. According to the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, the County's racial and ethnic composition changed from 2010 to 2019 with the Hispanic population increasing by 19 percent and the White, non-Hispanic population decreasing by 12 percent.¹ The High Desert subregion of the County, where Apple Valley is located, experienced a minor increase in the percentages of Black and Asian populations between 2010 and 2019 at 6 percent and 3 percent, respectively, as well as a significant increase in the percentage of the Hispanic population at 35 percent (the largest increase of all the subregions). Moderate decreases in the White (13 percent), American Indian/Alaskan Native (18 percent), and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (20 percent) populations in this subregion also occurred.

¹ Internal Draft Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, prepared by Michael Baker International. September 15, 2021.

The Town of Apple Valley experienced similar trends as the High Desert subregion with the Hispanic population increasing by 44 percent and the White, non-Hispanic population decreasing by 10 percent.² Currently, the largest racial group in Apple Valley identifies as “White, Non-Hispanic” (48 percent).³ Dominance values are used to measure the degree to which a single race is the predominant race of a particular area or census tract. Values range from 0 to 100 percent, where higher numbers indicate a higher degree of racial predominance of a particular racial group among all groups measured. A predominance value of less than 10 percent is considered a “slim gap,” a value of 10-50 percent is considered a “sizable dominance gap,” and a value more than 50 percent is considered a “predominant gap.” Most of the Town has a White population dominance value of 10-50 percent, which is considered a “sizable gap,” but an overall moderate value rating (see Figure 1).⁴ There are two census tracts with a “predominant gap” (dominance value greater than 50 percent) located along the Town’s southern boundaries and are partially within the boundaries of Hesperia and unincorporated county lands. Both tracts have a population that is 70 percent White/Non-Hispanic. The City of Hesperia, immediately southwest of the Town, appears to be evenly split between predominantly White/Non-Hispanic and Hispanic populations, with the Hispanic population clustered in the northwest portion of the city that borders Victorville. In Victorville, immediately west of the Town, the predominant racial group is Hispanic with only several tracts on the eastern and southern boundaries considered predominantly White/Non-Hispanic. There is one census track with a “slim gap” of less than 10 percent located in the south-central portion of Town.

Between 1990 and 2010, segregation in Apple Valley increased in all racial/ethnic categories, except for a decrease among Asian or Pacific Islander/White populations in the 2000 Census. The 2016 AFH determined that, compared to Victorville, Apple Valley had accommodated less population growth and smaller shares of minority groups and protected classes, including Black, Hispanic, foreign-born, limited English proficiency (LEP) persons, and households with children. This was attributed to Apple Valley’s zoning code that historically focused on rural single-family residential and estate sized lots that offered less affordable rents and home ownership opportunities. However, the report determined that the Town’s currently approved Housing Element provides a variety of land uses to accommodate housing units across all levels of density and affordability.

HUD defines Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) as census tracts with a non-White population over 50 percent and with 40 percent or three times the overall poverty rate. In the High Desert region, there is one R/ECAP located on the outskirts of the Cities of Victorville and Adelanto and one in the City of Barstow. There are no R/ECAPs located within Town boundaries. However, there is one area of “High Segregation and Poverty” centrally located

² Assessment of Fair Housing Data Packet for the Town of Apple Valley, “*Jurisdiction Demographics Table*” prepared by Michael Baker International for the San Bernardino County Transit Authority. June 2021

³ Assessment of Fair Housing Data Packet for the Town of Apple Valley, “*Demographic Profile Table*,” prepared by Michael Baker International for the San Bernardino County Transit Authority. July 2021.

⁴ Assessment of Fair Housing Data Packet for the Town of Apple Valley, “*Predominate Population (2010) Map*,” prepared by Michael Baker International for the San Bernardino County Transit Authority. July 2021.


in Town bounded by Corwin Road to the north and west, Dale Evans Parkway to the east, and Highway 18 to the south (Figure 8).

The area of “High Segregation and Poverty” is a highly diverse (Figure 2) single-family residential neighborhood, is considered an affordable location (Figure 6), and is in proximity to major commercial corridors (Highway 18 and Dale Evans Parkway) with access to transit (VVTA bus routes). The area is currently served by Liberty Utilities for domestic water and Apple Valley Public Works Department for sanitary sewer. There are two parks located within the Area’s boundaries (Thunderbird Park and Corwin Park), and one located immediately east of its boundaries (Brewster Park). Two schools are located within the area’s boundaries, including Phoenix Academy (elementary) and Apple Valley Christian Academy (preschool through 12th grade). All residential roadways in this area are paved; however, the majority have soft shoulders (compacted dirt) and lack paved sidewalks. This condition is not uncommon, as the Town is predominately rural and most roadways in residential neighborhoods have dirt shoulders.

The area of “High Segregation and Poverty” also has a higher percentage of the non-White population (Figure 10), higher percentage of female headed households with children (Figure 7), lower median incomes (Figure 4), and experiences higher rates of poverty (Figure 5) and overpayment (Figures 13 (Renters) and 14 (Owners)). This suggests that access to jobs may not be the dominant factor behind the concentration of lower income households, but rather the type of jobs and housing available and other socioeconomic factors. To address housing affordability, the Town has located fourteen RHNA sites within and immediately adjacent to the area of “High Segregation and Poverty” which will increase access to lower income housing options and help alleviate various economic hardships. Combined, these fourteen sites encompass 60 acres with the potential to add 955 lower income units, as shown below:

- APN: 044101132, 8.10 acres, 162 potential units;
- APN: 044101130, 8.10 acres, 162 potential units;
- APN: 044101124, 4.76 acres, 82 potential units;
- APN: 044101125, 4.74 acres, 77 potential units;
- APN: 044101141, 0.91 acres, 18 potential units;
- APN: 044101143, 1.14 acres, 22 potential units;
- APN: 044101142, 1.14 acres, 22 potential units;
- APN: 044101139, 1.33 acres, 19 potential units;
- APN: 044101106, 10.12 acres, 67 potential units;
- APN: 044101111, 1.84 acres, 15 potential units;
- APN: 044101107, 4.53 acres, 29 potential units;
- APN: 044114154, 4.46 acres, 110 potential units;
- APN: 044113301, 4.60 acres, 92 potential units.

Overall, the Town’s commitment to provide affordable housing options in the area of “High Segregation and Poverty,” the availability of utility infrastructure, and access to community amenities such as parks and schools are indicative of an inclusive and equitable community.



The Dissimilarity Index is used to analyze the relative extent of racial and ethnic segregation within the Town. The Dissimilarity Index is a demographic measure of the evenness with which two groups are distributed across component geographic areas that make up a larger area. Values range from 0 to 100, where higher numbers indicate a higher degree of segregation among the groups measured. Index values of 0 to 39 generally indicate low segregation, values between 40 and 59 generally indicate moderate segregation, and values above 60 generally indicate a high level of segregation.

Most subregions in San Bernardino County, including the High Desert, have low to moderate levels of segregation between White and Hispanic residents, apart from the Mountain region which has a high level of segregation. The indices for Apple Valley and the High Desert from 2013 to 2019 are shown below. As shown in Table 1, both the High Desert subregion and Town of Apple Valley have an overall low to moderate level of segregation. The High Desert has higher levels of segregation, particularly between the Black/White (50.59) and Asian or Pacific Islander/White (47.91) groups. In Apple Valley, the Non-White/White and Black/White populations experienced an 8 percent to 21 percent increase in segregation, however both indices are under 40.00 and are therefore considered relatively low indicators of segregation in the jurisdiction. The Hispanic/White and Asian or Pacific Islander/White populations experienced a 6 to 15 percent decrease in segregation, however the Asian or Pacific Islander/White population has an index of 43.10, which is considered a moderate indicator of segregation. There are no areas of high segregation in the High Desert subregion or the Town.


Table 1: Racial Dissimilarity Index, 2013-2019			
	2013	2019	Change
Town of Apple Valley¹			
Non-White/White	23.23	25.21	+8.5 percent
Black/White	24.00	28.97	+20.7 percent
Hispanic/White	39.16	33.41	-14.6 percent
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	46.30	43.10	-6.9 percent
High Desert Subregion²			
Non-White/White	34.32	33.20	-1.12 percent
Black/White	49.03	50.59	-0.84 percent
Hispanic/White	33.24	32.41	+1.56 percent
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	54.58	47.91	-6.67 percent
Sources:			
1. Dissimilarity Calculations by Race, prepared by Michael Baker International for the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, 2021. Apple Valley Assessment of Fair Housing, 2016.			
2. Internal Draft Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, prepared by Michael Baker International. September 15, 2021.			

In addition to the Dissimilarity Index, the Diversity Index was used to compare the racial and ethnic diversity within the Town and surrounding communities. Diversity values range from 0 to 100, where higher numbers indicate a higher degree of diversity among racial groups. While there are not any racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty in Apple Valley, there is a noticeable contrast between the diversity levels in the Town and surrounding communities. Most of Victorville has a diversity value higher than 85, and Hesperia mostly has a diversity value higher than 70. As shown in Figure 2, Diversity Index, most of the Town has a diversity value greater than 55, which is a moderate value consistent with the Town's moderate racial dominance values, but much lower than surrounding communities. There are several, smaller areas with a diversity value higher than 85, and one area with a value between 40-55. There are no areas with a diversity value lower than 40. The areas of Town with lower diversity values are located along the southwest boundary of the Town and Hesperia. This area has a higher racial (White) dominance value consistent with the lower diversity rating. Overall, Apple Valley is a well-integrated community, and racial/ethnicity divides are not apparent in any tract. It has relatively low indicators of segregation which, for all race/ethnic groups, are lower than those in the High Desert subregion.

In the combined Apple Valley/Victorville area, compared to other racial/ethnic groups, Hispanics have historically experienced overarching patterns of disparity regarding access to opportunity.⁵ In 2016, this group was indexed the lowest on average in all seven categories evaluated: lack of poverty, school proficiency, labor market, transit, low transportation cost, jobs proximity, and environmental health. As shown in Figure 10, higher percentages of the non-White population reside in the geographic areas identified as having concentrations of poverty and lower TCAC access opportunity scores. Although there are no racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty as defined by HUD, this geographic trend is consistent with patterns of disparity shared amongst minorities. To better understand the underlying causes of these concentration patterns, the Town evaluated access to opportunities for similar patterns.

⁵ 2016 Apple Valley Assessment of Fair Housing.

**Figure 2:
Diversity Index, 2018**




Persons with Disability

According to the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, the total percentage of persons with disabilities made up nearly 11 percent of the County overall.⁶ The percentage of the population with a disability generally increased by varying degrees for all subregions and for the County between 2012 and 2019. The greatest increase was experienced in the Morongo Basin and Mountain subregions. In the High Desert subregion, disabilities that experienced the largest increase were relative to the “independent living difficulty,” “self-care difficulty,” and “cognitive disability” categories, at 17 percent, 13 percent, and 10 percent, respectively.

From 2010 to 2019, the percentage of the Town’s population with a disability increased by 8 percent. This increase is most likely due to an aging population because it is consistent with the Town’s overall population increase of 8 percent during the same period. In 2014, the percent of the population with a disability was higher (20-30 percent) in the southern portion of Town than in surrounding areas (10-20 percent); however, according to the 2015–2019 ACS, this concentration shifted to a smaller area in the center of Town north of Highway 18 (see Figure 3, Population with a Disability, 2014 - 2019). Like the previous location, this new central location is in proximity to a variety of services including retail, pharmacies, restaurants, Town facilities, as well as access to transit along Highway 18 and Navajo Road.

The Town complies with all requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and California Building Code to provide accessible and “barrier free” units for disabled residents. The Apple Valley Development Code provides for the development of single-room occupancy facilities, group homes, residential care facilities, and supportive and transitional housing that can serve the housing needs of individuals with disabilities. Handicapped residential care facilities are permitted in all residential districts, including M-U. Section 9.29.190 of the Development Code addresses Reasonable Accommodations and the process for disabled individuals to request modifications for adaptive features in housing. Ramps, stairs, and similar structures necessary for accessibility are allowed by right, and the Town does not impose any additional requirements on accessible units and housing for the disabled. In addition, the Victor Valley Community Services Council offers no-cost non-emergency transportation for low-moderate income disabled persons. Therefore, despite an overall increase in the population with a disability, they appear to be well integrated in the community and have equal access to all housing and economic opportunities.

⁶ Internal Draft Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, prepared by Michael Baker International. September 15, 2021.



Household Income

The Town also assessed the concentrations of households below the poverty line to determine if there is a potential for segregation based on income.

The State, County, High Desert subregion, and Town of Apple Valley all experienced an increase in median income over the past 10 years. According to HCD, the state median incomes in 2014 and 2019 were \$71,400 and \$87,100, respectively, which is a 22 percent increase. During this same period, the County’s median income increased at a lower rate of 13 percent, from \$55,845 to \$63,362. The High Desert subregion’s median household income increased by 8 percent from \$49,188 to \$52,881.⁷

⁷ Internal Draft Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, prepared by Michael Baker International. September 15, 2021.

The median household income in Apple Valley increased from \$50,066 in 2010 to \$54,537 in 2019, which is a 9 percent increase overall and is 5.3 percent higher than the subregion's 2019 median income.⁸ As shown in Figures 4 and 5, most of the Town appears to have a relatively low percentage of residents (less than 20 percent) who fall below the poverty line (\$26,500 for a family of four in 2021). In fact, several census tracts appear to have populations that make at least the county's medium income or more. Areas with a median income that is higher than the county and state median income appear to be clustered in the central west portion of the Town. The higher percentages (20 percent-40 percent) of residents below the poverty line are limited to two areas; one centrally located and one along the Town's southeast boundaries bordering county lands. As to be expected, these locations coincide with the areas of lower income.


To be considered economically disadvantaged, the median income would need to be 80 percent or less than the statewide average, which is equivalent to a median income of \$60,188 or below. Although there are areas within the Town with incomes that are higher than the county and statewide average, the Town, as a whole, is considered economically disadvantaged because the median income is \$53,023, which is 70.4 percent of the statewide average.

Concentrations of households with similar incomes may suggest a uniform development pattern and need for more varied housing stock. As shown in Table 19: Vacancy Status, 92.5 percent of all housing units in Apple Valley are occupied and 7.5 percent units are vacant. The largest category of vacant units are those "for rent," followed by "other vacant" and "for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use." The homeowner vacancy rate is 1.9 percent, and the rental vacancy rate is 5.7 percent. These vacancy rates are both extremely low, suggesting little room for mobility and high demand for what affordable units there are. If availability and distribution of affordable housing are improved, it will encourage a more economically diverse community.


Concentrations of lower income households are not unique to Apple Valley. The City of Victorville to the west has larger concentrated areas with more than 30 percent population living below the poverty line when compared to Apple Valley or the City of Hesperia. West of Victorville in the City of Adelanto, there appears to be a similar pattern of lower income concentrations; however, Adelanto appears to have a relatively higher percentage of residents (greater than 20 percent) who fall below the poverty line overall. County lands east of Apple Valley also appear to have large areas with more than 20 percent of the population living below the poverty level, however the residential patterns in county lands are highly dispersed and it is unclear if there are specific geographic areas with higher concentrations of residents living below the poverty level.

⁸ Assessment of Fair Housing Data Packet for the Town of Apple Valley, "Demographic Profile Table," prepared by Michael Baker International for the San Bernardino County Transit Authority. July 2021.

**Figure 4:
Median Income, 2019**



**Figure 5:
Poverty Status, 2019**




The State's affordable housing guidelines and Location Affordability Index (LAI) were also used to determine if affordability was a contributing factor behind the concentration of lower income households. The LAI provides estimates of household housing and transportation costs at the neighborhood level. As shown in Figure 6, the entire Town has an affordability index value of under \$1,500, which is considered very affordable. Furthermore, an affordable monthly housing payment for a low-income family of four (\$1,506) exceeds the median gross rent for a 3-bedroom unit in Apple Valley (\$1,236). Therefore, rental housing affordability is not considered a major contributing factor behind the concentration of lower income households.

As regards homeownership, an affordable home purchase price for a low-income family of four (\$195,600) is less than the median housing value in Apple Valley (\$269,928). Low-income households could face challenges achieving homeownership, and affordability of ownership units should be an important consideration in Apple Valley. The Town also participates in regional, state, and federal programs which assist very low-, low- and moderate-income households in buying their own home (Program 1.C.8). The Town refers residents needing housing affordability assistance to the Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino (HACSB), which provides HUD Section 8 rental assistance to lower income renters and operates low-income housing projects in Apple Valley. Homeownership assistance loans are also available at the County and State levels (see section on Existing Affordable Housing Programs for full list). In 2020, the Town operated an Emergency Rental Assistance Program to assist eligible residents whose incomes were adversely affected by the Covid-19 pandemic by job loss, furlough, or reduction of hours.

There are several housing developments within the Town that provided subsidized housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income families, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities. The Park Apple Valley Apartments located on Navajo Road and the Halter Haven Apartments located on Powhatan Road offer affordable units in proximity to the southernmost area identified as having lower income households, and a higher percentage of minority populations. The Town analyzed the sites identified for residential development in this Housing Element through the lens of fair housing to ensure affordable housing opportunities are evenly distributed throughout the community in both low-, moderate- and high resource areas. Several sites located within, and in proximity to, the area of high segregation and poverty, that will increase housing options for those in need and alleviate cost burdens. The Town has included actions in Program 1.A.1 that requires that housing constructed expressly for low- and moderate-income households not be concentrated in any single area to equally provide affordable options throughout the community, especially in high or moderate resource areas.

**Figure 6:
Location Affordability**



6/16/2021, 4:36:07 PM

City/Town Boundaries


(R) Location Affordability Index (HUD) - Tract

<\$1,000

<\$1,500

<\$2,000

1:144,448



The Dissimilarity Index was used to analyze the relative extent of income segregation within the Town. The Dissimilarity Index is a demographic measure of the evenness with which two groups are distributed across component geographic areas that make up a larger area. Values range from 0 to 100, where higher numbers indicate a higher degree of segregation among the groups measured. According to dissimilarity calculations, the Town of Apple Valley has an index value of 30 which is considered a relatively low indicator of income segregation.⁹ Therefore, although the Town is considered economically disadvantaged as a whole and has several areas with higher-than-average concentrations of low-income households, these households appear to be evenly dispersed throughout the community with no indication of substantial geographic segregation.

Familial Status


Familial status refers to the presence of children under the age of 18, whether the child is biologically related to the head of household, and the marital status of the head of households. Single parent households are protected by fair housing law. Families with children may face housing discrimination by landlords who fear that children will cause property damage among other biases. Differential treatments such as limiting the number of children in a complex or confining children to a specific location are also fair housing concerns. Female-headed households generally have lower incomes, higher rates of poverty, and lower home ownership rates. Primary housing needs for this population is affordability and units of appropriate size for the age and gender mix of children. Other considerations include proximity to schools, childcare facilities, recreation areas, and other family services and amenities.

From 2010 to 2019, the County experienced a 9 percent increase of households with children and a 30 percent decreased in single-parent households. The High Desert subregion saw a decrease in single-parent households at a similar rate of 28 percent, while the percent of households with children experienced no significant change.

In 2018, the majority of households (53.4 percent) within Apple Valley consisted of married couple families, followed by non-family households (24.0 percent), female-headed households with no husband present (16.2 percent), and male-headed households with no wife present (6.4 percent). Female-headed households generally have lower incomes, higher rates of poverty, and lower home ownership rates. Approximately 45 percent of the female-headed households have children under age 18, and 50 percent of all families with incomes below the poverty level are female-headed households. Compared to neighboring jurisdictions, the Town has a higher percentage of children in married-couple households but shares similar patterns of concentrated areas with a higher percentage of female headed households with children. As shown in Figure 7, there are two geographic areas where concentration of female headed households with children is between 20-60 percent. As expected, these concentration patterns appear consistent with areas of lower median income and higher rates of poverty. Primary housing needs for this population is affordability and units of appropriate size for the age and gender mix of children. Other considerations include proximity to schools, childcare facilities, recreation areas, and other family services and amenities.

⁹ Assessment of Fair Housing Data Packet for the Town of Apple Valley, “*Dissimilarity Index, Income Table,*” prepared by Michael Baker International for the San Bernardino County Transit Authority. July 2021.

**Figure 7:
Female Headed Households with Children**



b. Access to Opportunity

Access to opportunity oftentimes means both improving the quality of life for residents of low-income communities, as well as supporting mobility and access to ‘high resource’ neighborhoods. Disparities in access to opportunity are generally measured by access to education, employment, transportation, and healthy neighborhoods, though other opportunities may also include low rates of violent crime, safe and decent housing, and recreation.


To assist in the analysis of opportunities, the HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened in the California Fair Housing Task Force (Task Force) to create Opportunity Maps to identify resources levels across the state. These opportunity maps are made from composite scores of three different domains; economic, environmental, and education. These domains are made up of a set of indicators as follows:

- **Economic:** Poverty, adult education, employment, job proximity, and median home value.
- **Environmental:** CalEnviroScreen 4.0 pollution indicators and values
- **Education:** Math proficiency, reading proficiency, high school graduation rates, and study poverty rates.

The more affordable areas of the County are lower in access to opportunity while the more expensive areas of the County have higher access to resources and opportunity. As shown in Figure 8, most of the Town is considered to have low to moderate resources.¹⁰ Low resource areas are concentrated in the central, eastern portion of the Town generally located south of Waalew Road and north of Bear Valley Road. There is one “High Resource” area bounded by Yucca Loma Road to the north, Kiowa Road to the east, Bear Valley Road to the south, and Town limits to the west, with several small pockets of high resource areas located along the Town’s northeastern boundaries. There is one area of “High Segregation and Poverty” centrally located in Town bounded by Corwin Road to the north and west, Dale Evans Road to the east, and Highway 18 to the south. As predicted, the Town’s area of “High Segregation and Poverty” is also located in a low resource area.

¹⁰ Affirmatively furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Resources, California Department of Housing and Community Development. Online database accessed 2021.
<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=4d43b384957d4366b09aeeae3c5a1f60>

**Figure 8:
Opportunity Areas: Composite Score, 2021**



6/16/2021, 4:42:27 PM

City/Town Boundaries

(R) TCAC Opportunity Areas (2021) - Composite Score - Tract


- High Resource
- Moderate Resource
- Low Resource
- High Segregation & Poverty
- Missing/Insufficient Data

1:144,448
0 1.25 2.5 5 mi
0 2.25 4.5 9 km

Educational Opportunities


This index combines math and reading proficiency scores, high school graduation rates, and student poverty data to measure outcomes and quality of education systems in an area. The Regional Assessment of Fair Housing used subregional TCAC education map scores to determine the educational quality per County census tract. Scores range from 0.0 to 1.0, with 1.0 being the highest education score. Educational scores in the High Desert subregion have the lowest scores of the County. As shown in Figure 9, the majority of the Town has a low to low-moderate education score (0 – 0.50).

The funding and success of an education system is often linked to the economic health of an area. For the 2018-2019 school year, 58 percent of Statewide education funding came from the state and 32 percent of funding came from local sources, including property taxes. When compared to Figure 4 Median Household Income, there is a correlation between areas of higher education scores and higher median incomes.



Employment Opportunities

Employment opportunities are concentrated in the southwest corner of the County, specifically the East and West Valley regions. Employment opportunities decrease the farther away from these Valley subregions, especially for those living in the High Desert, North Desert, and Morongo Basin subregions. According to the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, in San Bernardino County, those census tracts with the farthest proximity to jobs are typically the same census tracts with high rates of poverty and are predominantly Hispanic, which is consistent with Town mapping (Figure 5 Poverty Status and Figure 10 Racial Demographics (2018): Percent of Total Non-White Population).



The TCAC uses the following to measure economic opportunity in a census tract: poverty rates, population of adults with a bachelor's degree or higher, employment, proximity to jobs, and median home value. Economic opportunity, as defined by the TCAC, also tend to be higher in the East and West Valley and Mountain subregions, and lower in the Morongo Basin and Desert subregions. This suggests that access to jobs may be a dominant factor behind the concentration of lower income households.

According to local employment trends from 2010 to 2019, all races saw a decrease in unemployment rates except for the White population, which saw a very slight increase (0.4 percent) in unemployment.¹¹ This suggests that in the addition to the access to jobs, the access of higher paying jobs may be a contributing factor behind concentrations of lower income households. The Town has been actively planning for future development and redevelopment to increase local employment opportunities and housing stock. A variety of new jobs will be offered across the Town and the Victor Valley region through the following major projects:


- The Village Specific Plan, which envisions new development and redevelopment in the downtown Village area along the Highway 18 corridor. The Specific Plan encourages development of up to 8 million square feet of commercial, retail, office and industrial development that will create construction, commercial retail, restaurant, and service jobs. The Specific Plan will also facilitate 700 potential new housing units.
- The Brightline High Speed Train transit station and maintenance facility at I-15 and Dale Evans Parkway will bring construction, transportation, maintenance, retail, and restaurant jobs to the Town and region. The project is expected to be operational by 2024/2025 and serve as an economic catalyst that positively impacts long-term local and regional economic development, employment, and housing. Current estimates project that it could create more than 23,000 construction jobs (through 2024) and 6,600 operational jobs (through 2029) in the Victor Valley region.

The region's health care industry can be expected to continue to grow, bringing a variety of new, higher paying health-related professional, technical, and support jobs. These future developments will diversify and increase local job opportunities especially for the central and northern Town areas and improve job proximity for lower income populations. The Town has included actions in Program 1.A.2 that encourages higher density residential development be located in close proximity to public transportation, community services, and recreational resources. To further increase access to job opportunities, the Town collaborates with the Victor Valley Transit Authority to expand services that provide reliable public transportation options to

¹¹ Assessment of Fair Housing Data Packet for the Town of Apple Valley, "Employment Trends Table," prepared by Michael Baker International for the San Bernardino County Transit Authority. July 2021.

low-income households and other residents with limited access (Program 1.B.4). Flexible educational programs and job training services can help householders obtain higher paying jobs.

As shown in Figure 11, The Town has a low to low-moderate economic score, consistent with the education score. Also, areas with lower access to jobs and lower economic opportunity have higher poverty rates and tend to mirror those found in the poverty status maps, as shown in Figure 5. However, the same areas with lower economic scores have higher median household incomes, as shown in Figure 4, and the reason is unclear. It is possible that there is a higher concentration of households with more individuals living under one roof, such as a multi-generational living arrangement, that would contribute to a higher total household income.



Transportation Opportunities


Each County subregion has its own transit authority and services, some of which connect to population and job centers in the County. The Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTa) provides bus service to Apple Valley and the surrounding region. Bus routes cover Highway 18 and many streets within the downtown area. As previously discussed, the downtown area has high percentages of renters, Hispanic/Latino residents, higher levels of poverty, and households with children. Therefore, there does not appear to be any disparity in bus service that would adversely impact a minority or protected group.

Environmental Opportunities

Another potential indicator of social and economic disparity is exposure to pollution. CalEnviroScreen 3.0 is a science-based mapping tool prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) that identifies communities most affected by pollution. It assigns numerical scores to census tracts using environmental, health, and socioeconomic information, where 0 percent represents the lowest pollution burden and 100 percent represents the highest.

Factors that measure environmental health impacts and pollution burden include exposure (levels of ozone, particulate matter, diesel, water quality, pesticide use, traffic density, and toxic releases) and environmental (cleanup sites, groundwater threats, hazardous waste generators and facilities, impaired water bodies, and solid waste sites and facilities) effects. Many of these environmental effects are byproducts of population centers, meaning the more heavily populated subregions of the County, the East and West Valley, experience poor environmental quality.

As shown in Figure 12, Apple Valley has a high environmental score of greater than 50 percent (0.50 = 1.0). Although there appears to be no data available for the center of Town, it can be assumed that this area also has a high environmental score consistent with the immediate area. Therefore, the Town is considered an environmentally favorable area.



c. Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement Risk

As discussed earlier under Existing Housing Stock, 2,750 households (11.5 percent of total households) in Apple Valley are considered extremely low-income. Most (67 percent) ELI households are renters. More than 85 percent experience housing problems, including incomplete kitchen and plumbing facilities, overcrowding, and/or cost burden greater than 30 percent of income (overpayment). Nearly 85 percent are in overpayment situations, and 73.6 percent are in severe overpayment situations in which housing costs are greater than 50 percent of household income.

Disproportionate housing need is defined as a condition in which there are significant disparities in the proportion of members of a protected class experiencing a category of housing needs when compared to the proportion of a member of any other relevant groups or the total population experiencing the category of housing need in the applicable geographic area.’ 24 C.F.R. § 5.152” The analysis is completed by assessing cost burden, severe cost burden, overcrowding, substandard housing, homelessness, and displacement.

Cost Burden

Measuring the portion of a household’s gross income that is spent for housing is an indicator of the dynamics of demand and supply. This measurement is often expressed in terms of “over payers”: households paying an excessive amount of their income for housing, therefore decreasing the amount of disposable income available for other needs. This indicator is an important measurement of local housing market conditions as it reflects the affordability of housing in the community. Overpayment increases the risk of displacement for residents who are no longer able to afford their housing costs. Regional patterns of overpayment among homeowners and renters in the 2015-2019 ACS were similar to those of Apple Valley, with overpayment among homeowners being much lower than renters.

Renters

The cost burden impacts for renter households have steadily increased for all subregions countywide. The number of renter households has also increased countywide, with the greatest increases in the Mountain subregion (68 percent increase), followed by the High Desert subregion (33 percent increase) and the West Valley subregion (26 percent increase.) The number of renter households with a HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) of < 30 percent increased by 24 percent; followed by a 10 percent increase in renter households within the 30 percent to 50 percent HAMFI bracket. County subregions with the largest increase in the <30 percent HAMFI bracket were among rental households in the Mountain subregion at 115 percent and the West Valley subregion at 48 percent. The largest increase of 30 percent to 50 percent HAMFI bracket was among rental households in the Mountain subregion at 3 percent, followed by the High Desert subregion at 1 percent.¹²

The High Desert subregion saw a 33 percent increase in the number of renters from 2010 to 2017. The number of renter households Basin-wide with a HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) of < 30 percent increased by 37 percent; followed by an 18 percent increase in renter households within the 30 percent to 50 percent HAMFI bracket.


In Apple Valley, the total number of renter occupied households increased by 52 percent from 6,559 in 2010 to 9,980 in 2017.¹³ Race/ethnicities with the largest increase in the <30 percent HAMFI bracket among rental households was Other Race/Non-Hispanics (120 percent increase)

¹² Internal Draft Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, prepared by Michael Baker International. September 15, 2021.

¹³ Tenure, HUD Consolidated Planning/CHAS Data (2010 and 2017) excel worksheet compiled by Michael Baker International, June 2021.

and Black/Non-Hispanic (106 percent increase). Hispanics saw a 4 percent increase in the <30 percent HAMFI bracket among rental households. All other racial/ethnic groups either experienced a decrease or no change in the <30 percent HAMFI bracket among rental households.

Figure 13 shows the percentage of households in renter occupied housing units by census tract that have a cost burden. Of all renter households, 51.5 percent are overpaying, and 27 percent are severely overpaying. Of lower-income renter households, 76.7 percent are overpaying, and 43 percent are severely overpaying. A majority of the census tracts in the Town have 40 percent to 80 percent of the renter households overpaying for their housing unit and only a few census tracts have 20 percent to 40 percent of renter households overpaying for housing. When compared to Figure 5, there is a strong correlation between poverty status and renter household overpayment. The same census tracts are also located in a low resource opportunity area (Figure 8), highlighting the need for more affordable housing and services in this area.



Owners


The median home sales price in San Bernardino County rose from approximately \$175,000 in 2012 to \$439,000 currently, which is primarily due to the economic recovery that followed the 2008 recession. There was an overall decrease in owner households (2010 to 2017) for all subregions with the exception of the Mountain subregion which saw a 14 percent increase in owner households. The largest decrease in owner households is found in the Morongo Basin subregion (14 percent) followed by the High Desert subregion (6 percent). Overall, the County experienced a 5 percent decrease in owner households during this period.¹⁴

In Apple Valley the total number of owner-occupied households increased by 1 percent from 15,157 in 2010 to 15,157 in 2017.¹⁵ The only racial/ethnic groups to see a decrease in the <30 percent HAMFI bracket among rental households was White/Non-Hispanics (49 percent increase) and Black/Non-Hispanic (42 percent increase). Hispanics were the only ethnic group to experience an increase (13 percent) in the <30 percent HAMFI bracket among rental households, all other racial/ethnic groups experienced no change.

Figure 14 shows the percent of owner households in Apple Valley that have a mortgage or mortgages with monthly owner costs that are 30 percent or more of household income. The Town appears equally split the 20 percent to 40 percent and the 60 percent to 80 percent brackets of household owner population overpaying. Like the renter group, the census tracts with higher rates of overpayment are located in a low resource opportunity areas (Figure 8), areas with high rates of poverty (Figure 5) and low medium incomes (Figure 4), highlighting the need for more affordable housing and services in this area.

¹⁴ Internal Draft Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, prepared by Michael Baker International. September 15, 2021.

¹⁵ Tenure, HUD Consolidated Planning/CHAS Data (2010 and 2017) excel worksheet compiled by Michael Baker International, June 2021.



Overcrowding

Currently, overcrowding is not a significant issue in the Town of Apple Valley. Apple Valley has 942 overcrowded housing units, which represents 3.9 percent of the total 24,161 occupied units in the Town. Of overcrowded units, 72.1 percent are renter-occupied units and 27.9 percent are owner-occupied units. The median gross rent for a family of four in Apple Valley is \$1,026, which exceeds the median gross rent for a 3-bedroom (\$1,236), meaning rental housing affordability is not considered a barrier to low-income families. However, as is shown in Table 24 for lower income households, 61 percent of owners and 76.7 percent of renters are still overpaying for housing (at least 30 percent of income).

Substandard Conditions

HUD defines substandard housing as “housing, which was dilapidated, without operable indoor plumbing or a usable flush toilet or bathtub inside the unit for the family’s exclusive use, without electricity or with inadequate or unsafe electrical service, without a safe or adequate source of heat, and should but does not have a kitchen, or has otherwise been declared unfit for habitation by the government.” A household is considered substandard if it has one or more of the following problems:

1. The lack complete kitchen facilities,
2. The lack complete plumbing facilities,
3. If the unit is overcrowded, and
4. Household cost burden.

From 2010 to 2017, the County experienced a 5 percent decrease in the number of substandard households. All subregions within the County saw a minor decrease in housing substandard conditions, including the Morongo Basin which saw a 3 percent decrease overall in substandard housing units. Race and ethnicities that saw the largest decrease in substandard households were Hispanics (13 percent decrease), and White/Non-Hispanics (3 percent decrease). However, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander/Non-Hispanics saw a 10 percent increase in substandard households, followed by Asian/Non-Hispanics (4 percent increase) and Other Races/Non-Hispanics (3 percent decrease). Black and Indian Non-Hispanics experienced no change.¹⁶

According to the 2016 AFH, the Town’s Black Non-Hispanic population comprised 6 percent of the total population but experienced 76 percent of housing issues, including incomplete kitchen or plumbing facilities, overcrowding, or housing cost burdens that exceed 30 percent of the monthly income. This is followed by Hispanics with 50 percent of housing issues. In cases where housing cost burden exceeds 50 percent of the monthly income, the highest rates are also among Black and Hispanic populations, which experience 42 percent and 35 percent of housing problems, respectively. Areas with the greatest housing burdens overlap with low-income areas.

Approximately 63.2 percent of the housing stock in Apple Valley is older than 30 years, with approximately 26.6 percent over 50 years old. The age of housing is often an indicator of the need for some type of repair or rehabilitation. Another measure of potentially substandard housing is the number of housing units lacking adequate kitchen and plumbing facilities. In Apple Valley in 2018, there were 115 units (0.5 percent of all units) lacking complete kitchens and 54 units (0.2 percent of all units) lacking plumbing facilities. All units with deficiencies were renter-occupied. In some cases, the cost of repairs can be prohibitive, resulting in the owner or renter living in unhealthy, substandard housing conditions or being displaced if the house is designated as uninhabitable and the owner does not complete repairs. To prevent these situations, the Town actively markets rehabilitation programs available through CDBG or HOME programs, which

¹⁶ Internal Draft Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, prepared by Michael Baker International. September 15, 2021.

provide financial and technical assistance to lower income property owners to make housing repairs, by including them in the brochure described in Program I.H.4, to be distributed throughout the community.

The Housing Choice Voucher program, operated by the County Housing Authority, is currently the only available source of publicly supported housing assistance in Apple Valley. The racial/ethnic group receiving the highest percentage (50 percent) of vouchers is Black Non-Hispanic residents. Seniors receive nearly 20 percent of all vouchers, and residents with a disability receive 22 percent of all vouchers.

Homelessness

Between 2013 and 2019, the County homeless count increased by 286 persons or 12 percent from 2,321 to 2,607. According to the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, 67 percent of the County's homeless population are within the East and West Valley regions. The Town of Apple Valley homeless count increased by 22 persons or 22 percent from 1 to 23 during the same time period.¹⁷

To help prevent homelessness, the Town participates in the San Bernardino County Continuum of Care (CoC) System, known as the San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership. The CoC provides emergency shelter, supportive services, transitional housing, permanent housing, and a network of resources and services to assist the homeless. The Apple Valley/Victorville Consortium works closely with the Homeless Provider Network (HPN) to advocate for the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless, and the Homeless Outreach and Proactive Enforcement (H.O.P.E.) program operated by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department that connects the homeless population with resources and services to reduce homeless related crimes. Through the CDBG program, the Town contributes funding to local non-profit organizations, including High Desert Homeless Services, Family Assistance Program, Victor Valley Community Services Council, and Cedar House.

(See discussion of Special Populations, Homeless Persons for detailed discussion).

Displacement Risk

HCD defines sensitive communities as "communities [that] currently have populations vulnerable to displacement in the event of increased development or drastic shifts in housing cost." The following characteristics define a vulnerable community:

- The share of very low-income residents is above 20 percent; and
- The tract meets two of the following criteria:
 - Share of renters is above 40 percent,
 - Share of people of color is above 50 percent,

¹⁷ Homelessness, San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership 2013 and 2019 Point In Time Counts excel worksheet compiled by Michael Baker International, June 2021.

- Share of very low-income households (50 percent AMI or below) that are severely rent burdened households is above the county median,
- They or areas in close proximity have been experiencing displacement pressures (percent change in rent above County median for rent increases), or
- Difference between tract median rent and median rent for surrounding tracts above median for all tracts in county (rent gap).

According to the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, overpayment and median income were the main factors contributing to displacement. In all subregions, rental households experienced little to no decrease in overpayment of rental expenses while homeowner households experienced a moderate decrease in overpayment percentages. Rental and homeowner households that experienced a decrease in median income from 2014 to 2019 also experienced a decrease in overpayment percentage. However, rental households that experienced an increase in median income also experienced an increase in overpayment percentage.


Within the Town, there are several areas or “sensitive communities” that are vulnerable to displacement. As shown in Figure 15, the same communities experience higher rates of poverty, lower medium income, low opportunity scores, higher percentage of female-headed households with children, and higher rates of housing overpayment.

Additional Local Knowledge

The Victor Valley region began to see sustained growth in the post-World War II era turning this sparsely settled stretch of desert land (present Apple Valley) into a western-themed town of 11,000 residents. In 1988, the Town of Apple Valley was incorporated with a population of approximately 41,000 and an area of 78 square miles. The region is not metropolitan, has a relatively short urban development history, and does not have a large African American population (e.g. 8.95% of total Town population in 2018) or cultural presence. Gradual buildout and economic growth were the driving factors for neighborhood development patterns in contrast to metropolitan areas where public policy, such as redlining, may have been a driving factor.

The Town’s current development pattern consists primarily of lower density residential developments and several major corridors of commercial development. There are large areas of vacant land located primarily north Corwin Road and east of the I-15 freeway zoned for a mix of residential and non-residential uses. Although land availability isn’t necessarily a constraint in the Town, availability of necessary infrastructure is, including water and sewer. The Town has managed to locate existing affordable housing sites in areas currently served by water and sewer, and in areas experiencing higher rates of segregation and poverty. The Town will benefit from future development of vacant lands because it will create job opportunities and increase housing options but this type of development and expansion will most likely be market driven and depend heavily on private developers.

**Figure 15:
Displacement Risk**



d. Sites Inventory

The Town's Regional Housing Needs Assessment for 2022-2029 estimates that a total of 4,290 housing units will be built in Apple Valley (see Table 35). Of these, 1,686 units are allocated for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households. As shown in Tables 43 and 45, the Town has identified enough sites to accommodate 2,748 housing units, which is 1,062 units more than the required RHNA for lower income units.

As seen in Exhibit 1 of the Housing Element Update (Vacant Land Map), the majority of sites identified for the inventory are distributed across the Town in areas zoned for multi-family residential. Vacant sites that are zoned for multi-family residential are found throughout the Town, which combats patterns of segregation and concentrations of poverty by encouraging mixed income neighborhoods and a variety of housing types to meet the needs of residents in these areas. Additionally, most of the sites identified are near transit, commercial centers, and educational services, which make them ideal locations for affordable housing.

As shown in Figure 16, inventory sites lands that are within 100 feet of sewer and water infrastructure are geographically distributed throughout the Town however they primarily serve the central and southeast-central portions of Town. These areas are identified as having lower income households, higher rates of poverty, and disproportionate housing needs. As shown on Exhibit Figure 11 Opportunity Index: Economic Score, these sites are generally located in areas of lower job proximity and economic opportunity scores; however, most of the sites are near major roadways such as Highway 18, Navajo Road, Bear Valley Road and Thunderbird Road that provide direct access to transit stops and are in proximity to commercial centers offering employment opportunities and access to personal services. These locations are also in the vicinity to a number of educational services including pre-schools, elementary through high schools, as well as adult schooling. The transit routes in these areas also circulate residents to many other schools, public services, healthcare facilities and commercial areas not in the immediate vicinity. As shown in Figure 16, fourteen low-income inventory sites¹⁸ are located within and immediately adjacent to the area of "High Segregation and Poverty" which will increase access to lower income housing options and help alleviate various economic hardships for the lower income population. Combined, these fourteen sites encompass 60 acres with the potential to add 955 lower income units.


The Town has also located eight RHNA sites within and immediately adjacent to the area of "High Segregation and Poverty" which will increase access to lower income housing options and help alleviate various economic hardships. Combined, these eight sites encompass 30.5 acres with the potential to add 607 lower income units. The remaining 21 sites are located along Bear Valley Road, a four-lane roadway with access to mix of residential and commercial uses. Combined, these 21 sites have the potential to add 1,794 lower income units and will improve the conditions for this portion of the population.

¹⁸ Inventory sites within 100 feet of water and sewer infrastructure.

The Town reviewed the opportunity area map prepared by HCD and TCAC (Figures 8, 9, 11, 12) when selecting sites for affordable housing. The opportunity area map delineates areas across the state where research has shown there is support for positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children. As previously discussed, the Town primarily consists of “Low Resource” or “Moderate Resource” areas, with only one area considered “High Resource.” This made site selection more difficult when considering vacant land options in proximity to higher resource areas. Nonetheless, the Town was able to identify sufficient sites for the 2022-2029 cycle in areas identified as having a need for affordable housing based on patterns of segregation, poverty, low-income houses, displacement risk, access to opportunity, and local knowledge. Thus, the sites identified in the Land Inventory will not exacerbate any such fair housing related conditions.

The Town assessed environmental constraints, including stormwater management, biological resource protection, and access to the water and sewer services, and confirmed that none of the sites identified are at risk of any environmental hazards. All sites identified are located adjacent to water and sewer services and are located outside of flood channels. All development is required to undergo environmental review to assess potential hazards and mitigate impacts as necessary (Policy 2.B).

**Figure 16:
Low Income Inventory Sites
Within 100' of Sewer and Water**



e. Enforcement and Outreach Capacity

Assistance in the enforcement of fair housing law is carried out through HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO), the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH), and other fair housing service organizations working to assist and protect households from discrimination through education and legal assistance. The Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board (IFHMB) is the fair housing service provider serving the County of San Bernardino and cities in the region, including the Town of Apple Valley. The FHEO, DFEH, and IFHMB investigate complaints from households claiming discrimination.

At the federal level, the FHEO may issue findings from the investigation of reported complaints and the HUD or the Department of Justice may take legal action to enforce the law in response to violations. Depending on the type of complaint filed, the FHEO may follow a different investigative process, such as referring the matter to a Fair Housing Assistance Program partner.

At the State Level, DFEH enforces state fair housing laws, including but not limited to:

- The California Fair Employment and Housing Act, which prohibits discrimination and harassment in all aspects of housing including sales and rentals, evictions, terms and conditions, mortgage loans and insurance, and land use and zoning.
- The Rumford Housing Act, which prohibits housing discrimination toward all classes protected under Title III and adds marital status as a protected class.
- The Unruh Civil Rights Act, which covers and applies to most housing accommodations in California and prohibits discrimination in all business establishments in California, including housing and public accommodations based on age, ancestry, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation.
- The Ralph Civil Rights Act (California Civil Code Section 51.7), which forbids acts of violence or threats of violence because of a person's race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, age, disability, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, or position in a labor dispute. Hate violence can be verbal or written threats, physical assault or attempted assault, and graffiti, vandalism, or property damage.
- The Bane Civil Rights Act (California Civil Code Section 52.1), which provides protection for fair housing choice by protecting all people in California from interference by force or threat of force with an individual's constitutional or statutory rights, including a right to equal access to housing. The Bane Act also includes criminal penalties for hate crimes; however, convictions under the act are not allowed for speech alone unless that speech itself threatened violence.

The Town reviews periodically its policies and code for compliance with State law on fair housing and enforces fair housing through investigation of fair housing complaints. In addition to fair housing issues related to development standards, fair housing issues can also include discriminatory behaviors by landlords such as refusal to grant reasonable accommodation

requests, not allowing service animals, discrimination against familial status, sex, religion, or other protected class, and more. During the 2014-2021 planning period, the Town's Housing Division conducted community surveys about housing discrimination and other fair housing issues. The Town funds the Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board through CDBG entitlement dollars to provide landlord/tenant mediation to Town residents

In the combined Apple Valley/Victorville area in 2016, data from the Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board (IFHMB) showed that fair housing complaints by individuals with a disability seem to be disproportionately higher than other protected groups. The number of complaints in Apple Valley increased from 7 in 2011, to 15 in 2015. As of July 2021, the IFHMB has reported no new complaints.¹⁹

Recently, HUD's Region IX Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) provided case records for Apple Valley from January 2014 to July 2021.²⁰ Nine fair housing cases filed with their office during the previous planning period, six based on disability, one based on familial status, one based on national origin, and one based on a combination of sexual identity and disability. These complaints are consistent with the previous pattern of disproportionately higher complaints by those with a disability. Seven of these cases were closed due to "no cause determination," one was closed because "complainant failed to cooperate," and one was closed after "conciliation/settlement successful. Two cases were handled through HUD directly, and seven cases were handled through the Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP), in which HUD funds state and local agencies that administer fair housing laws that HUD has determined to be substantially equivalent to the Fair Housing Act. California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) is the only certified agency for FHAP in California. Because state law has additional protected classes than federal law, DFEH may have additional case records. A request was made in July to DFEH, but they were not able to provide data as of September 2021.

C. Contributing Factors

Regional

According to the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, contributing factors to fair housing issues specifically within the High Desert subregion include the following:

¹⁹ Assessment of Fair Housing Data Packet for the Town of Apple Valley, "Fair Housing Table," prepared by Michael Baker International for the San Bernardino County Transit Authority. July 2021.

²⁰ Letter Response for Freedom of Information Act Request from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Received July 27, 2021.

Table 2 Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors within the High Desert Subregion, San Bernardino County	
Fair Housing Issue	Contributing Factors
Persons with disabilities face discrimination and opposition to accommodations in the rental housing market.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private discrimination • Lack of effective accommodations for unhoused people with disabilities • Land use and zoning laws
Jurisdictions' zoning ordinance/development standards may not comply with state housing law	Land use and zoning laws
Areas of high segregation and concentrations of poverty have less access to educational opportunity.	Location of proficient schools and school assignment policies
Areas of high segregation and concentrations of poverty are farther away from job opportunities and have lower access to economic opportunities.	Location of employers.
High proportion of persons with disabilities are living in areas of high segregation and concentrated poverty and minimal opportunity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities. • Lack of effective accommodations for unhoused people with disabilities.
Inadequate supply of housing options for persons with disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities • Lack of affordable, accessible housing in range of unit sizes
Significant unsheltered homelessness population in the County.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displacement of residents due to economic pressures. • Lack of renter protections. • The availability of affordable units in a range of sizes. • Lack of rental relief programs for people at risk of homelessness. • Lack of effective accommodations for unhoused people with disabilities.
Source: Internal Draft Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, prepared by Michael Baker International. September 15, 2021.	

Based on the analysis and findings of contributing factors in the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing, the following goals were identified to further housing equity in the County:

- Provide support to public housing agencies in order to produce more housing
- Provide marketing plan to improve perception of government-owned and affordable housing
- Aggressively pursue grant funding to build affordable housing
- Form countywide Housing Trust Fund to 1) build affordable housing, 2) rehabilitate existing housing, 3) hire staff to pursue grant funding
- Form public-private partnerships to develop affordable housing
- Amend land use/zoning regulations to increase housing supply at all income levels.
- Adopt rental protections and control:
- Provide programming to increase homeownership (e.g., first-time homebuyer programs, down-payment assistance)
- Provide programming to convert privately owned mobile home parks to coop ownership, require coop-style ownership of all new mobile home parks.
- Sweat equity – people help build their own houses over 2-3 years
- Provide opportunities for alternative building practices (e.g., straw housing, mini housing)
- Adopt regulations requiring all rental units to have local owners/landlords (within City limits)
- Adopt local taxes on all residential landlords and provide tax relief if units are occupied by low-income tenants.
- Adopt vacancy tax on all unoccupied rental units.
- Adopt an inclusionary housing ordinance.
- Restrict large developments
- Expand partnership between IFHMB and County to provide additional support to the community

Town of Apple Valley

Discussions with community organizations, fair housing advocates, and the assessment of fair housing issues identified several factors that contribute to fair housing issues in Apple Valley, including:

- Lack of public and private investments in specific neighborhoods,
- Location and type of affordable housing,
- Evidence of illegal discrimination or violations of civil rights laws, regulations, or guidance.
- Housing condition and the cost of repairs where needed,
- Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement
- Quality of affordable housing information programs, and
- Low-vacancy rates with limited availability of affordable housing options

As identified in this assessment, the greatest barrier to fair housing and equal access to opportunity is the supply of housing at affordable prices in proximity to higher paying job centers. The inventory of land suitable and available for future housing development includes parcels that are distributed throughout the community to help foster integrated living patterns. A schedule of policies and programs for continuing these efforts through the 2022-2029 planning period is provided in the Goals, Policies and Programs section. Programs 1.B.1 through 1.B.6 specifically address fair housing issues, while others address housing opportunities for special populations and other actions that are relevant to the issues described above.

Additional analysis of the area of “High Segregation and Poverty” conducted in August 2022 during the HCD Housing Element review process confirmed that the contributing factors and their priority set forth above correctly represent issues facing the community.

APPENDIX 1:

2016 Fair Housing Assessment
Town of Apple Valley

Review Submission

Review the content of your AFH before completing the certification and submission to HUD.

Cover

Assessment Id 98
Assessment Title AFFH AV/VV Consortium 6_16_17


Sole or Lead Submitter
Contact Information

Name Christopher Moore
Title HCD Specialist
Department Community Development
Street Address 14955 Dale Evans Pkwy
Street Address 2
City Apple Valley
State California
Zip Code 92307

Program Participants

Participant Id	Name	Lead?	Submission Due Date
330338303	Apple Valley, California	Yes	10/04/2016
952235918	Victorville, California	No	10/04/2016

Executive Summary

 Instructions

II.1. Summarize the fair housing issues, significant contributing factors, and goals. Also include an overview of the process and analysis used to reach the goals.

Revised (Click for previous text)

The Town of Apple Valley was incorporated in 1988 and consists of 78 square miles. The City of Victorville was incorporated in 1962 and encompasses 74 square miles. Since 1997, both cities have received an annual allocations of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

In 2003, the Town of Apple Valley and City formed the HOME Investment Partnership Program Consortium (the “HOME Consortium”) in order to meet the threshold of obtaining HOME entitlement status with HUD. Both the City and the Town receive CDBG and HOME funding annually. For the purpose of this Assessment to Fair Housing (AFH) plan, the Town of Apple Valley and the City of Victorville may be collectively referenced as “Communities” and “Jurisdictions”.

As Entitlement Jurisdictions, both the City and Town are required to prepare and adopt a Consolidated Plan (Con Plan) and an AFH plan. The AFH replaces the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) to assist the Communities in identifying fair housing issues and related contributing factors to achieve comprehensive community development goals and affirmatively further fair housing. The Con Plan and AFH are also required to have a strategy for resident and citizen participation in the planning process. According to 24 CFR § 91.105 and as a condition of federal funding, the Communities must adopt and follow a Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) describing how the City will encourage participation from residents and citizens of all ages, genders, economic levels, races, ethnicities and special needs to provide them with equal access in the development of the Con Plan, Annual Action Plan (AP) and AFH, and to ensure their issues and concerns are adequately addressed. Prior to the development of the AFH, the Consortium is required to amend its Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) to incorporate the legal requirement that federal grantees shall affirmatively further fair housing by “taking meaningful actions” in addition to combating discrimination to overcome patters of segregation and integrating racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into the areas of opportunity, and addressing disparities in housing needs by providing access to opportunities. Both Communities amended their respective CPP’s. Below summarizes fair housing issues, significant contributing factors, and goals. Also included is an overview of the process and analysis used to reach the goals.

Fair Housing Issues:

1. Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs) in the jurisdiction and region:

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty, R/ECAP, means a geographic area with significant concentrations of poverty and minority populations. The rule does not define “significant” or give metrics. However, the proto-type mapping system demonstrated by HUD suggests that R/ECAPs will be outlined on maps and provided in data tables. The R/ECAP only includes Census Tracts 99.05 which is within Victorville’s geographical boundaries.

2. Segregation:

- The data show that Victorville has accommodated the majority of the Consortium’s population growth, and Victorville is providing a broader range of housing choices. This appears to be a major factor contributing to the existing pattern of segregation between the two jurisdictions and, given the demographic shifts in the county and region over the past couple decades, it seems likely to become exacerbated if the current situation doesn’t change (Location and type of affordable housing- Contributing Factor).
- The AFFH data show that Between 1990 and the present, Victorville has accommodated 73% of the Consortium’s population growth. During that same time, Victorville has accommodated even higher shares of certain protected class groups in the Consortium, including:

- 77% of black population growth in the Consortium
 - 75% of Hispanic population growth in the Consortium
 - 83% of foreign-born population growth in the Consortium
 - 85% of LEP population growth in the Consortium
 - 86% of Consortium's growth in the number of households with children
- RHNA production over the previous Housing Element cycle shows that Victorville did a much better job expanding housing supply. During the previous cycle, Victorville's allocation was over half of the Consortium's, and produced over 80% of the units in its allocation. Apple Valley met 50% of its much smaller target. 85% of the multifamily housing added to the Consortium during that time was built in Victorville as well, which is a significant reason why Victorville is home to over 60% of renters in the Consortium, and over 70% of HCV-assisted households (Location and type of affordable housing- contributing factor).
 - Zoning has traditionally been focused towards lower density residential uses in Apple Valley. The jurisdiction was founded on the basis of rural single-family residential and estate sized lots. The glorification of ranch-style living has been a recurrent theme in Apple Valley's history and has carried over to the present day via minimum half acre lot sizes throughout the jurisdiction. However, when compared to the region, affordability for both rents and home ownership is considerably lower in Apple Valley than most all areas in the most southern parts of the two-county region and prices are comparative with our local neighbors, Hesperia and Victorville, who have more desirable access and proximity to Interstate-15. The Town of Apple Valley has an approved Housing Element that provides for enough variety in land uses to accommodate housing units across all levels of density and affordability.
 - Since we see that population growth in the region overall is increasingly comprised of minority ethnic groups and other protected classes, it is no surprise that accommodating population growth will lead to more diversity. We also expect to see growth in parts of the population that, in the Inland Empire, are more likely to rent and disproportionately earn lower incomes. If these trends in housing supply don't change, the racial/ethnic divide between the cities seems likely to deepen. The Consortia is committed studying the issue & impact of public policy relating to the barriers to certain households in AV. (Land Use and Zoning Laws- Contributing Factor)

3. Significant disparities in access to opportunities:

Significant disparities in access to opportunities means substantial and measurable differences in access to education, transportation, economic, and other important opportunities in a community, based on protected class related to housing. When compared to other Race/Ethnic groups, Hispanics appear to be experiencing overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors within the Consortia. Of the opportunities measured, Hispanics were indexed the lowest on average of the seven measured categories (Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities- Contributing Factor).

Significant contributing factors:

- Lack Community Revitalization Strategies
- Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities
- Location and type of affordable housing
- Evidence of illegal discrimination or violations of civil rights laws, regulations, or guidance.

Goals and analysis used to reach the goals

Goal #1: Improve the housing condition and access to social services within the Consortia's R/ECAP (Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty)

Process and Analysis: The Consortia reviewed AFH provided data and maps, as well as reviewed citizen comments and other relevant data and plans. As indicated by the analysis, several housing units and neighborhoods in this area are older construction, and require either rehabilitation or conservation to be maintained as viable dwelling units. Within these neighborhoods, Hispanics experienced highest

rate of housing cost burden, overcrowding, and substandard housing when compared to other groups in the Consortia.

The poverty rate of this area which disproportionately effects Hispanics also necessitates a high priority. The Consortia will use CDBG funding to fund social service agencies and programs to assist in reducing the poverty level of residents within the R/ECAP.

Goal #2: Continue to provide fair housing services within the consortia with an emphasis on reducing the number of fair housing complaints based on disability.

Process and Analysis: Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement as well as private discrimination are a contributing factor of high priority because of its significant effect on fair housing choice for all protected groups. In reviewing fair housing data from the Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board, fair housing complaints by individuals with a disability seem to be disproportionately higher than other protected groups.

Goal #3 :Increase levels of integration by Hispanic residents within higher opportunity neighborhoods.

Process and Analysis: According to AFH maps used in the analysis, from 1990 to 2000, the Consortia's Racial/ Ethnic demographics were primarily Whites and Hispanics, and integrated. However, from 2000 to 2010, a clear lack of integration by Hispanics in the Consortia's eastern and higher opportunity neighborhoods existed.

Lack of integration was a pattern that took shape over a decade long period. The Consortia understands that achieving significant results will require prolong efforts (i.e., mobility programs, land use assessments, etc,) beyond the 5-year planning period.

Community Participation Process

Instructions

III.1. Describe outreach activities undertaken to encourage and broaden meaningful community participation in the AFH process, including the types of outreach activities and dates of public hearings or meetings. Identify media outlets used and include a description of efforts made to reach the public, including those representing populations that are typically underrepresented in the planning process such as persons who reside in areas identified as R/ECAPs, persons who are limited English proficient (LEP), and persons with disabilities. Briefly explain how these communications were designed to reach the broadest audience possible. For PHAs, identify your meetings with the Resident Advisory Board.

Instructions

Consortium. As a part of the CPP, the Consortium encouraged participation to include community-based and regionally-based organizations that represent and assist protected class members and organizations that enforce fair housing laws. The Consortium also consulted with local fair housing enforcement agencies, fair housing organizations and other nonprofit organizations that receive

funding under the Fair Housing Initiative Program, and other public and private fair housing service agencies that operate within the City's jurisdiction.

For the preparation of this AFH, the Apple Valley/Victorville HOME Consortium, utilized their respective websites, social media accounts such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and Instagram accounts, to announce and advertise community meetings, surveys and public meetings and hearings. The Town of Apple Valley has been able to secure a strong response rate in the past considering the Town's Facebook account has a following of over 10,000 strong; approximately 1/7th of Apple Valley's population 70,000 residents.

The AFH surveys, as well as the invitation to the workshops, were also emailed to approximately 1,200 community and regional contacts in hopes of gleaning their interest in attending one of the meetings and asking them to spread the word within their own organizations and share the survey with those they serve. Stakeholder organizations received a specific survey to further assist the Consortium in obtaining additional local or regional data and knowledge.

The ability to provide ease of access to the survey was important to the Consortium. Both Jurisdictions, in the capacity of the Consortium, made the survey available online via Survey Monkey between June 29, 2016 and August 1, 2016, in both English and Spanish. Hard copy surveys and flyers, also in both languages, advertising both the online survey as well as the community meetings were distributed to the Town of Apple Valley and City of Victorville office locations, and the San Bernardino County Apple Valley Branch Library. Hard copy surveys were also made available to the public at community events and meetings, a homebuyer's workshop, and a fair housing disability workshop that staff attended during the time frame that AFH input from the public was sought. Additionally, approximately 200 hard copy surveys were mailed to former loan and grant recipients of Victorville Housing Programs. The surveys were also provided to Victorville residents and business owners who attended an Old Town Revitalization Forum meeting. This combined effort generated a total of 121 community respondents.

Community outreach meetings specific to the AFH were also held. In addition to being translated in both English and Spanish, flyers also acknowledged that if accommodations were needed to attend the meeting to inform staff of either jurisdiction of those needs. The first meeting occurred on July 12, 2016 at 1:00 PM in the Town of Apple Valley Council Chambers located at 14955 Dale Evans Pkwy., Apple Valley, CA 92307. The second was held at the City of Victorville offices at 14343 Civic Dr., Victorville, CA 92392 at 6:00 PM.

These were not especially well attended, but the several community members present at each were very responsive and involved in the questions posed to them about their communities.

Stakeholder meetings were held at City of Victorville offices on August 9, 2016 at 10:00 AM to noon and 2:00 PM to 4:00 PM for those involved with transitional housing and rental assistance, and real estate and lending industries, respectively. With staff present from both Victorville and Apple Valley, a short questionnaire was disseminated to attendees who provided insight from the perspective of their organizations and professions. Another stakeholder meeting was hosted on August 11, 2016 at 10:00 AM by the City of Victorville, to focus topic questions regarding education and youth.

III.2. Provide a list of organizations consulted during the community participation process.

Instructions

The stakeholder meetings were broken up into three meetings, each addressing a different group or service provider type. One meeting was for utility assistance and transitional housing providers, another meeting included realtors, lenders and fair housing providers. Lastly, the third meeting focused on education and youth services. For the stakeholder meetings, invitations were emailed and calls were made to the following organizations:

- Court Appointed Special Advocates of San Bernardino County
- High Desert Transitional Living
- No Drugs America Association
- Olive Crest Foster Family
- Options for Youth
- Catholic Charities
- High Desert Homeless Services
- Knowledge and Education for Your Success
- Orenda Foundation
- Patient Care Systems
- Samaritan's Helping Hand
- St. John of God Health Care Services
- Victor Valley Community Services Council
- Victor Valley Rescue Mission
- Katherine Santifer Realty
- SPS Realty Group
- Berkshire Hathway Home Services
- Sunset Breeze Real Estate
- HomeStrong USA
- Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services, Inc.
- Neighborhood Housing Services of the Inland Empire
- High Desert Association of Realtors
- Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board
- Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino
- Moses House Ministries
- San Bernardino Sexual Assault Services
- Victor Valley Domestic Violence
- San Bernardino County, Economic Development and Housing
- Volsch Enterprises, Real Estate Broker
- City of Hesperia
- Housing Authority, San Bernardino County
- St. Joseph Health, St. Mary's Hospital
- Oak Hills Realty
- Hamilton Landon, Realtor
- High Desert Association of Realtors
- Rock Springs Residential Care
- Apple Valley Senior Center


III.3. How successful were the efforts at eliciting meaningful community participation? If there was low participation, provide the reasons.

 Instructions

Consortium. Low participation was problematic at AFH community meetings. A lack of involvement from the community to attend meetings, outside of regular council meetings, has always been an issue for the Jurisdictions. To accommodate the needs for attendees, meetings were held at various locations and times of day, including the evening hours. This did not prove to be any more successful than the daytime meeting. Some of the reasons for not being able to attend any of the meetings by agencies/nonprofits included having limited staff, conflicting meetings and commencement of new fiscal year or program year.

Although attendance was low, key community stakeholders were in attendance and gave vast input in the community needs and discrimination faced by protected classes. Between circulating AFH surveys at other community events and online, utilizing social media, sending email blasts to community members and organizations, direct mailings, and phone interviews, a wide-breadth of information and input deemed our multi-channel efforts a great success overall.

III.4. Summarize all comments obtained in the community participation process. Include a summary of any comments or views not accepted and the reasons why.

 Instructions

In reviewing the comments received at these meetings, the following key issues were identified:

Community Workshops Summary. Two community meetings were held in July 2016 – Apple Valley (July 12th early afternoon) and Victorville (July 13th evening). The community meetings were held to glean local input and knowledge from residents of the respective Jurisdictions, including fair housing issues and concerns. Each community meeting was structured in the same format: participants were introduced to the Con Plan and AFH (AFH) plan process through a presentation and then asked to discuss a series of questions related to housing and community development needs, their presumptions regarding areas considered segregated and/or challenged by poverty, including fair housing issues and concerns.

Community Survey Summaries. In addition to the meetings, a Fair Housing Survey was also created. A thirty question survey was disseminated through multi-channel methods to seek responses from members of the public who may be harder to reach by methods of face-to-face contact at events in the community or were possibly not interested in attending a community meeting. The Fair Housing Survey sought to gain knowledge about the nature and extent of fair housing issues experienced by Apple Valley and Victorville residents as well as their opinions concerning the existence, or lack of, racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, or areas deemed as disadvantaged within the Jurisdictions. The survey questions were also designed to gather information on a person's experience with fair housing issues and perception of fair housing issues in his/her neighborhood. The survey and flyers were available in English and Spanish, and distributed via the following methods:

- Survey made available in online format via survey monkey.
- Online survey link posted to Apple Valley Facebook and Twitter accounts.
- Hard copy information flyers and surveys placed at various community locations and public counters.
- Posted on the municipal websites of both Apple Valley and Victorville.
- Solicited the participation of service providers and stakeholders via mass emails to also make the survey flyer, with survey web address and information on the community meetings, available in their offices and to distribute the information to their clients and other members of the community they felt would be receptive and responsive.

- Surveys were solicited at a Homebuyers Resource Fair that was held on Saturday, June 4, 2016 at the San Bernardino County Fairgrounds. This event was in partnership between the High Desert Association of REALTORS® and First District Supervisor, Robert A Lovingood, County of San Bernardino.

Stakeholder Meetings Summary. Three stakeholder meetings were held in August 2016 – all in Victorville, with staff from both Jurisdictions present. The stakeholder meetings were also held to discuss priority housing and community development needs in the respective Jurisdictions, including fair housing issues and concerns. Each stakeholder workshop was structured in the same format: participants were introduced to the AFH plan process by staff and then asked to discuss a series of questions related to housing and community development needs, including fair housing issues and concerns.

A comprehensive summary of housing-related issues identified by submitted surveys, community meetings, and workshops held, is found below.

Homelessness. Homelessness was one of the primary issues discussed by participants at the Victorville meeting. Participants noted the lack of Homeless Shelters in the High Desert. There is just one in Victorville that serves a sphere of influence of approximately 500,000 residents. The High Desert is subject to extreme temperatures that can result in dangerous conditions for homeless persons. Most homeless services are located “down the hill” in the City of San Bernardino, or other southern jurisdictions, creating a disparity in services available between the High Desert and the surrounding region.

Affordable Housing, Senior Housing, Reasonable Accommodation for Disabled Persons and Youth. Though segregation was not identified as an issue through various means of community contact, housing in general was still identified as a major need discussed by participants at the meetings. Community members were primarily concerned about housing affordability and availability for seniors, the disabled and youth. Participants discussed the housing needs of seniors with limited income, and the condition of existing housing; in particular about existing unmaintained rental apartments. A stakeholder noted that location of the most affordable housing has that to offer, but very little, in terms of amenities, are available within walking distance to some of the poorest neighborhoods in the High Desert. Access to transit, grocery stores, recreation services and safety were expressed as some of the services or opportunities that people must give up in order to live in an area that is affordable enough for their household.

Neighborhoods. Participants stated the importance of crime-free, safe neighborhoods. The importance of maintaining a safe, well-maintained community was emphasized at the meetings. If a community is safe and there are places for people to go (commercial and community-based), then residents will tend to remain in the community instead of seeking a way out. Non-reporting of crime was noted on several occasions as a barrier to an undesirable neighborhood being able to rebound. Whether actual or perceived fear of retaliation prevents crime reporting, the effects can be detrimental to a neighborhood if it becomes known for unresolved crime activity.

Transportation. Many participants expressed their concerns as to the lack of transportation available throughout the High Desert. Participants communicated how many low-income families and people in the Town of Apple Valley and City of Victorville areas struggle to find reliable transportation. The result is missed appointments and poor illness management, even when care is readily available. Some households don't have a vehicle, or share one among multiple family members, and for those who are disabled, obese, or chronically ill, riding the bus can be a difficult undertaking. As a result, some people may find themselves without a way home after an emergency trip to the hospital; miss opportunities to schools, family or community events or simply miss a doctor's appointment because they don't have a way to get there.

During the community participation process all comments and views were considered and have been incorporated into this AFH. No comments were considered as immaterial or insignificant.

Economic Development - Lack of sufficient local employment in career level employment sectors continues to be an impediment to the local community and economy.

Education - Lack of an educated work force continues to be an impediment to business attraction and employment opportunities.

Assessment of Past Goals, Actions and Strategies

IV.1. Indicate what fair housing goals were selected by program participant(s) in recent Analyses of Impediments, Assessments of Fair Housing, or other relevant planning documents:

IV.1.a. Discuss what progress has been made toward their achievement.

Instructions

During the last Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI), both Communities experienced similar impediments that continued to impact the Apple Valley/Victorville Consortium areas. The impediments and strategies on how to reduce their impacts, and accomplishments are listed below:

Housing discrimination towards disability, race, and familial status has been a reoccurring issue for both communities. As a continued service, both communities elected to continue contract services with Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board (IFHMB). IFHMB assist both Jurisdictions in providing fair housing services to residents, landlords, and other housing professionals. Available services, newsletters, and special event flyers are routinely posted on each respective Jurisdiction's website. In addition, both the Town and the City assisted in promoting special events by distributing informational pamphlets and flyers throughout public-owned buildings. Recently, July 2016, the City of Victorville hosted and participated in a special workshop held by IFHMB to educate and assist tenants, property owners and other housing professionals on fair housing issues specifically for persons with disabilities. Discussion involved fair housing laws, introduction to the affirmatively furthering fair housing final ruling and requirements, reasonable accommodations or modification request allowable fees associated with reasonable accommodation or modification request. The Consortium anticipates it will continue its participation in supporting special events held by IFHMB on a continual basis. This event was highly successful, many interested persons, property owners and tenants attended. Persons who attended expressed their gratitude to the City for hosting the event. Their questions and concerns were addressed and real estate professionals felt they were more educated on how to assist persons with disabilities, particularly in providing reasonable accommodations.

Accordingly, both communities provide CDBG funding to IFHMB to provide its residents with fair housing and landlord tenant mediation service and assistance. Along with these services, IFHMB assist City of Victorville with its first-time homebuyer program, Mortgage Assistance Program (MA) by providing homebuyer education and certification. Persons who receive their homebuyer education course by IFHMB receive information and training in the complete process of purchasing a home, budgeting, credit, mortgage loans, and how to keep your home. On behalf of the communities, IFHMB distributes fair housing materials, holds workshops on fair housing throughout the High Desert and San Bernardino County. IFHMB's services have assisted an array of residents within the Communities.

Many of which have received 'one-on-one' assistance in assisting homeowners who are at risk of losing their home by exploring many available options including loan modification, special forbearance, partial claims, loan repayment plans, loan reinstate plans, short sale options including the Homeowner Assistance Foreclosure Alternative (HAFA), and the Homeowner Assistance Refinance Program.

In addition to the above accomplishments, the communities supported and actively promoted the National Fair Housing Month held in April of each year. The City of Victorville posted HUD created posters and flyers throughout city hall, city website and social media outlets celebrating the National Fair Housing month.

Public Outreach is a concern that needs to be address by both communities. Many residents, landlords and tenants are not aware of fair housing rights and services available. When encountered with fair housing issues, many do not believe reporting the incidents would help the situation. Some are also afraid of retaliation by the landlord. With this in mind, some of the strategies both Communities adopted is to (1) provide fair housing outreach and education services that will include, but not be limited to at least one of the following components: press releases, public service announcements, cable TV, radio, and newspaper outreach, updates in newsletters and/or other publications, events at the annual fair housing celebration, organized meetings or events relating to fair housing, and participation in community events such as fairs and trade shows; (2) initiate half-day fair housing workshops at Town Hall and City Hall annually, targeting residents, landlords, disadvantaged groups, and housing professionals; (3) outreach and education specifically for housing providers (i.e., landlords, property managers, realtors, lending institutions, and managers of public housing); (4) workshops to assist elected and appointed officials of each jurisdiction; and the general public. In addition, publicizing outcomes of fair housing lawsuits to encourage reporting of fair housing issues by residents and coordinate with minority Chambers of Commerce to promote Town programs and services are also objectives both communities anticipate launching. The City of Victorville also utilizes its City-owned electronic message board located on the east-side of Interstate-15 to make public service announcements (PSA). The City recently approved a message for the High Desert Crime Prevention & Neighborhood Watch Program event that will held at City Hall on August 24th. The City routinely promotes PSA for non-profits, such as the High Desert Association of Realtors® and special County of San Bernardino events, etc.

Housing Choice Vouchers and Affordable Housing Units are limited resources to Hispanic households. Because many residents have been on the Housing Authority of County of San Bernardino's (HACSB) waiting lists for choice vouchers for several years in hopes of qualifying for the Housing Choice Voucher program, HACSB has closed its ability to provide additional vouchers to new households who may reflect the current demographic profile of the County and communities within the Consortium.

Although these choice voucher resources are limited, HACSB provides other affordable housing opportunities through other affordable housing developments it maintains. Currently, HACSB has an open waiting list. Additionally, the City of Victorville also provides financial assistance to facilitate the construction of affordable housing. These affordable housing complexes are privately owned, but contain affordable housing covenants to secure housing for very-low and low income households for several years. In support of HACSB's efforts, both communities will continue efforts in petitioning for additional voucher assistance from HUD. As the Consortium, the Town and City promote any and all available resources to households in need. When opportunities arise, both Jurisdictions attempt to require rental property owners receiving financial assistance from the City or Town to affirm their commitment to comply with fair housing laws, and attend fair housing training.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities. Accessible housing units and other housing options (such as transitional and supportive housing) for persons with disabilities are limited in supply. In a recent study carried out by IFHMB, the majority of discrimination indicated this issue increase. In past AI's, both communities have amended their respective Zoning Code's to establish either a (1) Reasonable Accommodation procedure, or (2) address the transitional housing and supportive housing provision according to State Housing Element Law. Both Communities anticipate it will increase its efforts in awareness and training to further assist persons with disabilities with fair housing rights. Additionally, IFHMB has assisted residents living within the Consortium with fair housing mediation services concerning reasonable accommodations.

Lending Practices. Overall, minority households in Apple Valley and Victorville rely more heavily on smaller, lesser known lenders for mortgage financing, which tend to have more liberal underwriting criteria. While this may promote homeownership to minority households, it may also encourage certain households to overextend financially. Furthermore, most of these lenders do not have local offices, making it hard to mortgage applicants to have in-person meetings with the lenders.

Black households in general, seem to have more difficulty accessing financing. They experienced lower approval rates than other households in the same income group. Since 2007, the rate spreads for all race/ethnic groups have decreased significantly except for Black households. The rate spread for Black households remained the highest among all groups and actually has increased since 2007.

Among the top lenders, minority households also have high fallout rates (not completing or withdrawing an application). Some actions adopted by the Communities since the last AI are; (1) work with government agencies and nonprofit groups that provide credit counseling and foreclosure workshops to conduct workshops in the High Desert area; (2) conduct lender workshops to provide outreach, education and encourage increasing pool of lenders participating in the down payment assistance programs; (3) continue contract services with IFHMB to monitor lending activities and contact lenders to address potential issues; (4) publicize results of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data review to bring attention to the lending community, housing advocates, and the general public; (5) continue coordinating efforts with minority Chambers of Commerce to promote Town, City and County programs and services, including home buying down payment assistance, credit counseling, foreclosure counseling, etc. The City of Victorville has recently met with real estate professionals in strategizing its marketing efforts to promote its Mortgage Assistance Program (MAP), Senior Home Repair (SHRP) and Owner-occupied Rehabilitation (OOR) Programs. Additionally, the City of Victorville has met with Lenders to conduct "one-on-one" training to ensure their knowledge of the City's MAP is accurate and lending opportunities are given to all persons equally and fairly. The City anticipates it will launch a large Lender-Real estate professional training workshop in November 2016 to promote equal opportunity to home ownership among the very-low, low and moderate income households. The City anticipates in concentrating its efforts to the Old Town Area where home ownership is low among minorities.

Public Transportation System throughout the High Desert Area, including areas of the Consortium, is limited. Many lower income households, seniors and persons with disabilities have many opportunities to housing resources offered and funded by the County of San Bernardino however, access difficulties arise as they are dependent on the public transportation system. Many of these residents find that the public transportation system in the High Desert is difficult to navigate through and use. Therefore, the Consortium has made many efforts to expand public transportation by (1) petitioning to the County of San Bernardino to expand housing programs and services to the High Desert area vs. "down the hill"; (2) provide public transportation maps at public locations (currently, maps of transportation routes are available at City Hall); and (3) include navigating the public transportation system in programs and activities designed for seniors and disabled.

Foreclosures. Both Apple Valley and Victorville are impacted by the large number of foreclosures. Abandoned and foreclosed homes are often vandalized and trespassed, negatively impacting neighborhood safety and conditions. The lack of maintenance of foreclosed properties is a serious issue expressed by many participants of public meetings conducted as part of this AI. Goals and actions proposed and carried out by both communities includes: (1) continue proactive code enforcement activities to address issues associated with abandoned and foreclosed homes; and (2) work with lenders holding the homes to ensure a reasonable level of safety and condition is maintained.

Real Estate Advertising. Previous AI indicated that advertising of for-sale homes and particularly rental listings contained potentially discriminatory language. Often such language encourages or discourages a particular group to inquire about the housing available.

Given the market condition, many homes are being used as rentals. Owners of these units may not be professional landlords and therefore are not familiar with fair housing rights and responsibilities. Some actions taken by the Consortium includes: (1) continued contract services with IFHMB to monitor the advertising of for-sale and for-rent units; and (2) publicize fair housing rights and

responsibilities on Town and City websites, newsletters, or other publications as a way of outreaching to landlords new to the rental business.

Accessibility of Public Facilities. Not all public buildings are accessible to persons with disabilities. Accessible sidewalks with ramps and curb cuts are also needed to allow circulation from one location to another. The Consortium is working on improving accessibility in and to public buildings to facilitate participation in civic decisions by persons with disabilities. Annual evaluations of accessibility improvement needs of public facilities through the Capital Improvement Plan process to identify priority projects for funding have been started.

In October 2015, the City of Victorville City Council approved a Voluntary Compliance Agreement with HUD requiring a Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan that will identify ADA compliance barriers in City programs, activities and facilities. In addition, the Plan would provide with a timeline for completion of modifications to provide equal access. The deadline for the completion of the review and update is 240 days upon execution of the Voluntary Compliance Agreement. The May 2016 deadline has been extended to January 30, 2017. The City has acquired the assistance of a firm, Disability Access Consultants (DAC) to assist with the Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan. Additionally, the City is working with Caltrans in developing an ADA Transition plan for facilities in the public right of way to be eligible to receive federal transportation funds. This plan is currently underway.

IV.1.b. Discuss how you have been successful in achieving past goals, and/or how you have fallen short of achieving those goals (including potentially harmful unintended consequences); and

The Town of Apple Valley, City of Victorville and fair housing service providers have successfully implemented ongoing consultation, education and workshops for the community. Affirmatively furthering fair housing continues to be a priority though recent community surveys have reflected less concern in relation to other priorities than in years past. Past goals and issues are starting points for current and future goals and strategies and included in surveys, questionnaires and community meetings to develop dialogue identify current concerns and plan strategies to be implemented in consolidated plan and annual action plans. The Housing Authority, County of San Bernardino administers affordable housing units in the Victor Valley which includes Apple Valley and Victorville. Affordable units are limited to funding, yet the area is generally more affordable at market rates than the regional area. Accessibility to public facilities remains a high priority and improvements continue as funding becomes available.

The City of Victorville has achieved many successes in assisting and maintaining affordable housing to its senior and permanently disabled population. Programs offered by the City, such as the Senior Home Repair (SHRP) and Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR) Programs, and the Town of Apple Valley's OOR Program has provided residents with opportunities to make eligible repairs to their homes. Many repairs include ADA, health and safety improvements. These residents normally do not have the financial means to make these repairs on their own; therefore, these programs remain in high demand. Both Communities anticipate continuing to fund these programs in future years. Additionally, the City is in the process of expanding its programs that will help unrepresented protected classes, such as disabled persons, that are low and very-low income, make necessary repairs and improvements.

IV.1.c. Discuss any additional policies, actions, or steps that you could take to achieve past goals, or mitigate the problems you have experienced.

 Instructions

In future AFH processes, efforts will be made to collaborate with public agencies and housing authorities that share the regional area of influence, to include the County of San Bernardino, Housing Authority of San Bernardino County and the City of Hesperia. As first submitters, the Town of Apple Valley and City of Victorville were the only local agencies required to submit at this time. Once these agencies initiate their AFH process, the City will collaborate with them to consider future policies, actions or measures they will be proposing to supplement the Consortiums efforts.

IV.1.d. Discuss how the experience of program participant(s) with past goals has influenced the selection of current goals.

i Instructions

Community input is sought every five years for the AFH plan (formerly Analysis of Impediments) and the Consolidated Plan as well as annually for the Action Plan. As the Consortium moves forward, this input shapes the strategies and sets priorities each year for the 5 year and annual plans. Each year activities are reviewed and assessed as to success and impact which is shared with the community through the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).

Fair Housing Analysis

Fair Housing Analysis > Demographic Summary

V.A.1. Describe demographic patterns in the jurisdiction and region, and describe trends over time (since 1990).

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Race/Ethnicity

Table 2 (Demographic Trends) for the Consortia shows the ethnic distribution for Consortia and Riverside County from 1990 through 2010. From 1990 to 2000, White (non-Hispanic) remained the majority Ethnic/ Racial groups in both the Region and Consortia. However, in 2010 Hispanics eclipsed Whites as the majority population in both the Region and Consortia. This pattern remains the same today with the Hispanic population representing 41 percent versus 39 percent for Whites for the Consortia. For the Region, Hispanics represent 47 percent versus 37 percent for Whites. It's important to note that Whites (non-Hispanic) was the only racial /ethnic group to lose population in both geographic areas. Starting in 2010, Whites (non-Hispanic) became the minority population in both geographic areas.

The metro region, Consortium, and Victorville have all become majority-minority areas since 1990. Counter to these trends, Apple Valley remains a majority non-Hispanic white population center, and its white population has actually increased in absolute terms. In 1990, both jurisdictions were very similar in size and demographic profile. Today, Victorville is much larger than AV and its demographics mirror trends in the region as a whole, unlike Apple Valley.

National Origin

Currently, the foreign-born population in the Consortia is 14 percent versus only 8 percent in 1990. For the Region, the current foreign born population is 22 percent versus only 14% in 1990.

Limited English Proficiency

Similar to the foreign-born population in both areas, there was a steady rise in Limited English Proficiency (LEP) from 1990-2010. After the 2010 Census, there was slight decrease in LEP by .5 percent for the Region and .2 percent for the Consortia. Currently, 9 percent of the Consortia's population and 15 percent of the Region's population are LEP.

While the Hispanic population increased by 31 percent from 2000 to 2010, the foreign-born population increased by less than 5 percent, which indicates that the Consortia's increased population over the Census periods is largely a result of people moving within the U.S. or new births.

Sex, Age and Family Type

Both the Consortia and Region's male and female population remained relatively even (50/50%) from 1990 to present. In terms of age, individuals 18-64 have represented more than 54 percent of the population since 1990 for both the Consortia and Region. Seniors (65+) remained the smallest population for both areas since 1990. Today, the percentage of seniors for both areas are relatively the same (11% Consortia/ 10% Region).

Like the 18-64 population, households with children have been the majority family type since 1990 for both the Consortia and Region. Today, the percentage for this family type are relatively the same for both areas (52% Consortia/ 51 % Region).

Racial/Ethnic Population. (Individual Jurisdictions)

In Apple Valley, in 2010, the largest racial/ethnic demographic is White, Non-Hispanic, with nearly 38,671 persons or 55.58 percent of the population. Since 1990, that demographic has decreased from 80.91%. Hispanics make up the second largest demographic with more than 20,279 persons, or 29.14%, and has increased from 12.02% in 1990. Black, Non-Hispanic rounds out the top three with 5,974 persons at 8.59%, which also increased from 3.72 in 1990. By comparison, in 2010 the region's largest demographic is Hispanic with 1.55 million or 47.25%, up from 26.48% in 1990, followed by White, Non-Hispanic at 36.61%, down from 62.41% in 1990, and rounding out the top three, Black, Non-Hispanic at 7.1%, up slightly from 6.52% in 1990. Apple Valley has become more diverse over the span of 1990-2010. Though population has increased significantly across all races and ethnic backgrounds over this time period, the population of white residents has trended down while black and Hispanic residents have trended upward. This is also true of the Riverside- San Bernardino-Ontario, CBSA on the whole.

The U.S. Census Bureau reported Victorville's population at 122,225 as of July 1, 2015. Victorville experienced a tremendous growth between 2000 and 2010. The table below illustrates Victorville's population growth.

Victorville's Population Growth

				Highest percent
1990	2000	2010	2015	change

40,674 64,029 115,903 122,225 81% (2000-2010)

The City of Victorville has increased in population and in diversity over the last 25 years. These trends are similar of other communities throughout California. Table 1 and 2 illustrate Victorville's demographics and demographic trends. In 1990, White made up 65.94% of the population. The percentage dropped to 48.38% in 2000 with another significant drop in 2010 to only 28.88% of the population. The largest increase in population was among the Hispanic population. In 1990, Hispanic only made up 22.41% of the population. The Hispanic population increased to 33.75% on 2000 and significantly increased to 47.42% of the population in 2010. 2010 was an increase about 13.6% alone. The lowest population growth was among Native Americans, with an actual decrease in population of .15% from 1990 to 2010.

Race and Ethnicity	1990	2000	2010	2015
White	25,827	30,382	56,258	35,299
Black	3,750	7,431	19,483	19,312
Native American	323	380	1,665	794
Asian/Pacific Islander	1,352	2,202	5,130	4,950
Other	69	143	33,367	293
Hispanic	9,353	21,426	55,359	61,577

National Origin Population. In Apple Valley, in 2010, Mexico is the #1 Country of Origin with 2,400 persons, 3.5 percent, followed by Philippines at .4%, and rounding out the top three Canada with .39%. Overall, Apple Valley's Foreign Born persons increased from 5.55% in 1990 to 7.64 in 2010. By comparison, the region's top three Countries of Origin in 2010 are: Mexico with 553,493 persons or 13.1%,; Philippines, 1.8%, and El Salvador, .72%. Overall, the region's Foreign Born resident population nearly tripled from 360,666 (13.93%) in 1990 to 920,860 (21.80%) in 2010.

AFH Table 1 (Demographics) indicates similar results for Victorville as to Apple Valley. Mexico is the #1 Country of Origin comprising 12,423 people of Victorville's overall population. Table 1 also indicates that the next highest Country of Origin is El Salvador at 1.24%, followed by Philippines at 0.94%. In total, Mexico, El Salvador, Cuba (.30%), Colombia (.22%), Nicaragua (.22%) and Guatemala (.17%) encompass the majority National Origins explaining why Victorville's Hispanic population has been the most prominent throughout the years. All these Countries make up 12.75% of Victorville Latin/Hispanic Origin. Other Countries of Origin are below 0.50%, Korea (.34), Cambodia (.28%), and Vietnam at 0.23%.

Limited English Proficiency. In Apple Valley, in 2010, Spanish is the #1 LEP language with 2,400 persons,3.7 percent, followed by Korean at .19% and Chinese at .11%. Overall, Apple Valley's LEP population increased from 2.69% in 1990 to 4.15% in 2010. By comparison, the region's top three are Spanish at 533,544 or 12.63%, Chinese at .49%, and Tagalog at .4%. Overall, the region's LEP population increased from 9.73% in 1990 to 15.17% in 2010.

With the growth in the Hispanic population residing in Victorville, the limited LEP population has grown as well. In 1990 the LEP population made up 7.15% of the population. By 2010 the percentage of LEP population increased to 12.15%. The majority of the LEP population primarily speaks Spanish. Foreign born residents make up 17.36% of the population in 2010, an increase of 6.96% from 2010, most being from Mexico.

Disability Type. In Apple Valley, in 2010, Ambulatory Difficulty is the highest Disability Type with 5,751 or 8.98%, followed by Hearing Difficulty with 3,771 residents or 5.89%, followed by Vision rounding out the top three at 3.69%. By comparison, the region's top three Disability Types are Ambulatory at 241,262 residents or 6.18%, Independent Living Difficulty at 4.37%, and Cognitive Difficulty at 4.36%. Victorville has a small disabled population. Current demographics indicate the largest populations of disabled individuals have ambulatory difficulty at 5.98%. This poses a need for ADA modifications of government buildings and the addition of sidewalks. Vision and Hearing disabled persons make up about 6.21% of Victorville's demographic. It's because this population, the City continues to fund its Senior Home Repair Program. Through the SHRP, many residents have been able to qualify for ADA improvements in their homes.

Families with Children. Families with children make up a substantial percentage of the population in Apple Valley and Victorville. In Apple Valley alone, in 2010, there were 7,872 families with children at 44.17 percent of the population, down from 50.11% in 1990. In the region, in 2010, 500,062 families with children at 50.99 percent, up slightly from 50.68 in 1990. Victorville's Family Type encompassed 51.38% of the population in 1990. This percentage has gradually increased throughout the years. In 2000, there was an increase of almost 4.7% and a small 1.16% increase in 2010 totaling 57.20% of Victorville entire population.

V.A.2. Describe the location of homeowners and renters in the jurisdiction and region, and describe trends over time.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

AFH map 16 (Housing Tenure) below shows the primary location of owners within the Consortia by Census tracts. The darkest gray census tracts indicate more than 79 percent of the Consortia's households as owners. As illustrated by the map below, the location of these owners is primarily outside the core of the Consortia. The R/ECAP area has the lowest percentage of owners at less than 29 percent. The map below shows the primary location of renters within the Consortia by Census tracts. The darkest gray census tracts indicate more than 70 percent of the Consortia's households as renters. Unlike the previous map, the location of these renters is primarily northwest and near the core of the Consortia. The highest percentage of renters (>70) is located within the R/ECAP area

Home Value

According to the most recent ACS data available for both jurisdictions, Victorville's home value increase by 92%, more than 17% higher than the County between 2000 and 2013. Precipitous rise in housing costs could lead to many residents, particularly households with incomes below the moderate income level and first-time home buyers, unable to afford housing within the jurisdiction.

Conversely, Apple Valley's home values remain some of the lowest in the Region. Although Apple Valleys home value increased by 51% over the 13 year period, it was still lower than the County's (-24%) and much lower than Victorville's (-41%).

Rents

Medium contract rents in the Consortia remained relatively low (Victorville 31% and Apple Valley 22%) compared to the 69% increase for the County between 2000 and 2013. Similar to home values, Apple Valley's rents increase was 46% less than the County's and 9% less than Victorville over the 13-year period.

Victorville	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2013	% Change	San Bernardino County % Increase (2000-2013)	% Difference between changes in county v. jurisdiction, correct?
Median Home Value	\$95,600	\$183,800	92%	75%	+17%
Median Contract Rent	\$896	\$1,178	31%	69%	- 38%
Apple Valley	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2013	% Change		
Median Home Value	\$109,500	\$165,300	51%	75%	-24%
Median Contract Rent	\$818	\$1,000	22%	69%	-46%

Source 2000 Census and 2013 ACS Data

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Renters are most prominently found in two census tracts of Apple Valley where Residential Multi-Family (R-MF) zoning is the most dominant developed land use. These areas include Census Tracts 97.10 and 97.16. Housing Choice Vouchers are also in greatest supply in these areas due to the higher density of rental units found in these tracts. The combined effect has produced a strong trend of rental units in those areas since Apple Valley incorporated in 1988. Local knowledge of the area supports that homeowner and renter households are otherwise spread throughout Apple Valley without clear dominance in any other areas.

Victorville. Race and ethnicity can have implications for housing choice, as certain demographic and economic variables correlate with race. Old Town Victorville has always been viewed as a predominately Hispanic neighborhood. Currently, there are only a limited number of housing options available for these residents: rental or owner housing in Old Town planning area, or mobile home parks. Because of low income earnings and high housing costs in the community, many households are unable to buy or rent housing that provides sufficient living space for their needs, and therefore are faced with overcrowding. Although, this may be the case for the residents living in Old Town, the cultural amenities, such as specialty markets and local small businesses catering to the Hispanic community, provide the conveniences these families seek. Special bakeries known as “panaderias” and stores selling piñatas are commonly found in Old Town. The oldest Catholic Church in Victorville is at the center of Old Town Victorville, offering several Spanish masses.

Brentwood was a development community that was built in the late 1990’s. The new development included an elementary school and a spacious park. During the housing crisis, Brentwood was one of the hardest hit communities with foreclosures. Investors purchased a great amount of these foreclosures and turned them into rentals. With affordable rents for larger homes were available, Victorville experienced a large Black population growth in this area. This once sought after community began to experience high crime rates and code enforcement issues, such as lack on landscape maintenance and disabled vehicles. Local pizza restaurants implemented a no delivery after 5:00 p.m. for this area because of the multiple muggings of their drivers. Since the housing market has seen an increase in sales prices, many of the rental homes in Brentwood have sold to homeowners. Currently, 71% of the homes in this area are owner occupied.


A continued depressed area in Victorville is in the east side of Victorville, cross streets of Rodeo Drive and Seneca. This area contains multiple, older apartment complexes. It also contains smaller, older single family residences. The demographic makeup of the area is predominately very low and low income Black and Hispanic population.

Region. According to Census QuickFacts, the owner occupied housing rate for 2010-2014 was 67.1% for Apple Valley and only 60.1% for San Bernardino County. Though the jurisdiction retains a higher owner- occupied rate than the region, homeownership is on the decline as increasing home values have also priced out lower-income persons from being able to enter the housing market.

Fair Housing Analysis > General Issues

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Segregation/Integration

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Segregation/Integration > Analysis

 Instructions

V.B.i.1. Analysis

V.B.i.1.a. Describe and compare segregation levels in the jurisdiction and region. Identify the racial/ethnic groups that experience the highest levels of segregation.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

The index of dissimilarity is a demographic measure of the evenness with which two groups are distributed across component geographic areas that make up a larger area. Values range from 0 to 100, where higher numbers indicate a higher degree of segregation among the groups measured. Dissimilarity index values of 0 to 39 generally indicate low segregation, values between 40 and 54 generally indicate moderate segregation, and values between 55 and 100 generally indicate a high level of segregation.


Apple Valley. Historically, Table 3 shows that the Dissimilarity Index has been trending upward in almost all of the racial/ethnic categories from 1990 through 2010 for Apple Valley. Black/White populations experience the highest rates of segregation in the jurisdiction with an Index of 24.46. This and the other categories are under 40.0 and are therefore considered relatively low indicators of segregation in the jurisdiction. However, segregation at the Consortium level is 10+ points higher for each group than in either Jurisdiction alone. Segregation in Apple Valley has increased significantly, even as segregation in neighboring Victorville has decreased.

Victorville. Table three (3) illustrates the racial and ethnic dissimilarity trends in Victorville and the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Region. Trends indicate that the Victorville area has a very low degree of segregation, with the lowest percentage of segregation among the non-white and white population at 14.50%. The highest segregation index was among the black and white population with an index percent of 18.46, still within a low segregation range.

Region. On a regional basis, the Dissimilarity Index indicates moderate segregation across all populations with the highest being Black/White populations at 47.66 in 2010.

V.B.i.1.b. Explain how these segregation levels have changed over time (since 1990).

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

According to the Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends table below, both Consortia and the Region segregation index rose for all racial/ethnic groups from 1990-2010. The exception was Asian or Pacific Islander within the Consortia which had a slight decrease in level of segregation in 2000. Currently, all racial/ ethnic groups in the Consortia segregation index dropped for their 2010 levels, except for Asian or Pacific Islanders which rose by approximately 2 percent.

When comparing the average level of segregation over the three Census periods, no group in Consortia experienced higher than “low segregation”. However, for the Region, Blacks and Hispanics experienced “moderate” levels of segregation. It is important to note, that Blacks were the only group within the Region that experienced higher than “low” segregation in all three Census periods (1990,2000, 2010). Currently, all groups are experiencing moderate segregation within the Region. Blacks had the highest moderate segregation index of 47.66.

As pointed out in the Demographic Summary, the metro region, Consortium, and Victorville have all become majority-minority areas since 1990. Counter to these trends, Apple Valley remains a majority non-Hispanic white population center, and its white population has increased in absolute terms. In 1990, both jurisdictions were very similar in size and demographic profile. Today, Victorville is much larger than Apple Valley and its demographics mirror trends in the region as a whole, unlike Apple Valley.

Table 3 - Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends

Racial/Ethnic Index	Dissimilarity	(Cnsrt-Apple Valley, CA CONSORTIA)				(Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA) Region			
		1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White		20.82	24.27	30.52	29.14	32.92	38.90	38.95	41.29
Black/White		32.44	25.74	36.38	34.02	43.74	45.48	43.96	47.66
Hispanic/White		20.43	26.70	30.35	28.59	35.57	42.40	42.36	43.96
Asian or Pacific Islander/White		23.08	17.89	23.76	25.88	33.17	37.31	38.31	43.07

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Since 1990, all population categories, except the 2000 census for the category of Asian Pacific Islander/White, have trended upward with each census year in the Apple Valley jurisdiction.

Victorville. Table 3 provides Racial/Ethnic Trends for the Jurisdiction. Among the non-White and White population there was a fluctuation on dissimilarity trends since 1990 to 2010. In 1990 the dissimilarity index was 14.22%; in 2000 there was an increase to 18.80, indicating a larger degree in segregation between these categories. The gap decreased in 2010 when the index dropped to 14.50%.

The Black and White population experienced a higher degree of segregation with an index of 26.40%. Integration began to happen in 2000 when the index dropped to 22.24% and even more so in 2010 when the index dropped to 18.46%. This was the largest change in the dissimilarity index showing a greater increase in integration among these populations.

Victorville numbers for residents of Hispanic and White race/ethnic backgrounds grew and dropped. In 1990 the dissimilarity index was at 17.63% and increased to 19.97% in 2000. The index decreased significantly in 2010 to 14.53%. Among the Asian or Pacific Islander and White population experienced a fluctuation in index numbers as well. In 1990 the dissimilarity index was 22.54% with a significant decrease in 2000 to 13.44%.

This number increased in 2010 to 17.48%. Although Victorville’s Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends have fluctuated throughout the years of 1990, 2000 and 2010, its Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index remained significantly lower than that of the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Regions. On average, the Regions dissimilarity index’s averaged over 40.0 for 2010 for all Races/Ethnicities.

Region. All population categories (Non-White/White, Black/White, Hispanic/White, and Asian or Pacific Islander/White) have also continued an upward trend over the same time period in the region. As a result, all categories indicate moderate segregation in the region as whole. If that trend continues to the next census, some populations could be on the cusp of high segregation (55.0+).

V.B.i.1.c. Identify areas with relatively high segregation and integration by race/ethnicity, national origin, or LEP group, and indicate the predominant groups living in each area.

V.B.i.1.c. Identify areas with relatively high segregation and integration by race/ethnicity, national origin, or LEP group, and indicate the predominant groups living in each area.

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

The presence of residential segregation may appear as clusters of a single color of dots representing one protected class, or as clusters of more than one color of dots representing a number of protected classes but still excluding one or more protected classes. According to Map 2 below, Census year 2010 illustrated a higher segregation of Hispanics (blue dots) within the western region of the Consortia. In the southeastern area of the Consortia, the map illustrates a higher cluster of Whites (orange dots). This lack of integration of protected classes in this area could be an issue if it is a “higher opportunity area” compared to the Consortia as a whole. Further analysis regarding this issue will take place later in this AFH.

Individual Jurisdictions

Race/Ethnicity. Apple Valley shows all the signs of being a well-integrated jurisdiction. Divides of Race/Ethnicity are not apparent in any tract. Areas of greatest population density do have economic challenges that will be addressed elsewhere, though they remain just as integrated as the surrounding areas of Apple Valley. In 1990, it is apparent that there was a far higher predominance of Whites in the population, but integration was still achieved then, as well as in 2000.

In 1990, Victorville was a predominantly White community, making up 65.94% of the population. In 2000, Whites made up 48.38% of the population. In 2010, there was a large race growth in the Hispanic community making up 47.42% of the population while the white population dropped to 28.88%. This is evident in Map 2, which shows a large White population during 1990.

Victorville’s Map 1 depicts a more integrated jurisdiction as of 2010. The increase in the Hispanic population is evident in this map. The largest Hispanic population has increased in the south-west area of Victorville, which includes the development known as Liberty Village and Brentwood.

Country of Origin. When examining Apple Valley, Map 3 (National Origin) shows that the most populous country of origin in the jurisdiction is Mexico. Though this population is wholly represented throughout the Town, the areas displayed with boundaries of Waalew Road to the north, Highway 18 to the south, Joshua Road to the east and Corwin Road to the west in the jurisdiction, are almost exclusively represented by Mexican origin. Mexico is followed by the Philippines, Canada, China, and Germany. However, very few representatives of these populations reside in the boundary predominantly represented by those with national origin of Mexico.


Map 3, National Origin, depicts that the most populous country of origin for Victorville is Mexico, with El Salvador and Philippines second and third, respectively. All three national origin countries tend to be located in the southeast area of Victorville, mostly in Liberty Village, a development that was built in the mid 1980’s and in the Old Town area.

Limited English Proficiency. The population of those who are of LEP, Map 4, is becoming a greater concern for Apple Valley. There is evidence that the Spanish speaking population continues to grow. The 2010 Census shows 3.69% of Apple Valley as Spanish speakers with LEP.

The largest population of LEP is the Spanish speaking population at 13.06% of Victorville's populations. Tagalog is second but only represents 0.38% of the population. Public notices and workshop flyers are available to the Spanish speaking population including City notices, such as water rate changes.

Region. The Region has significant areas of segregation in pockets of both Riverside and San Bernardino Counties compared to the communities within the Consortium.

V.B.i.1.d. Consider and describe the location of owner and renter occupied housing in determining whether such housing is located in segregated or integrated areas.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

As described in Section V1.2 above, the location of owner occupied housing is primarily outside the core of the Consortia. When examining the location of protected classes, there doesn't seem to be an issue of segregation or integration as it relates to owner-occupied housing. The Consortia's owner occupied housing is also well represented in higher clustered Hispanic areas.

However, the identified R/ECAP area had the highest percentage of renters with more than 70 percent. Based on the analysis completed in the previous section, this R/ECAP area also has a high cluster of Hispanics compared to the Consortia as a whole. The presence of residential segregation may appear as clusters of a single color of dots representing one protected class. Therefore, renter housing is located primarily in a segregated area of the Consortia.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Though the jurisdiction does not have areas of racial/ethnic segregation, there are multi-family residential zoned areas in low-income census tracts, where there is also a predominance of rental apartment units. These areas, Census Tracts 97.16 and 97.10, consist of many two (2) to four (4) unit complexes as well as eight (8) unit and larger complexes, depending on the parcel size. Though the multi-family units co-exist among many single-family residential homes on R-MF parcels, these also have a greater tendency to be rental units. Ownership is otherwise spread through all areas of Town and does not seem more prevalent in any areas, aside from where the presence of multi-family units is greater due to the land-use designation.

Victorville. As previously mentioned Brentwood rental housing rate is at 29% of the areas housing units. Brentwood continues to be predominately Black neighborhoods. In addition the majority of the residents living in Victorville's Old Town area are predominantly Hispanic.

V.B.i.1.e. Discuss how patterns of segregation have changed over time (since 1990).

 Instructions

i Relevant Data

🗨 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Since 1990, the Consortia has had Whites and Hispanics as its principal populations. Based on the Race/Ethnicity trends maps presented below, Whites and Hispanic households were fairly evenly distributed throughout the Consortia. However, in 2000 a pattern of Hispanics clustering near the western region of the Consortia begins to take shape. In 2010, a clear segregation of Hispanics in the western region is represented by a cluster of blue dots.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Maps 1, and 2, depict a landscape of population growth across all tracts between 1990 and present day. The recurring theme is that the White population did not grow in Apple Valley at a rate near, or close to that, of the Hispanic population. Table 1 reiterates this showing White population rose only 14% in population over that period of time, while Black residents rose 282% and Hispanics an even higher gain of 301%.

Map 3 shows that the tracts in the central and east parts of Town north of Highway 18, have the greatest representation of residents whose national origin is Mexico. When reviewing Map 4, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) among Spanish speakers is the most prevalent in these same areas. Though also represented elsewhere, there is a lack of other languages being represented in those areas as well.

V.B.i.1.f. Discuss whether there are any demographic trends, policies, or practices that could lead to higher segregation in the jurisdiction in the future.

i Instructions

🗨 Revised (Click for previous text)

As pointed out in the Demographic Summary, the metro region, Consortium, and Victorville have all become majority-minority areas since 1990. Counter to these trends, Apple Valley remains a majority non-Hispanic white population center, and its white population has increased in absolute terms. In 1990, both Jurisdictions were very similar in size and demographic profile. Today, Victorville is much larger than AV and its demographics mirror trends in the region as a whole, unlike Apple Valley.

Land-Use.

Apple Valley's zoning has traditionally been focused towards lower density residential uses in Apple Valley. The jurisdiction was founded on the basis of rural single-family residential and estate sized lots. The glorification of ranch-style living has been a recurrent theme in Apple Valley's history and has carried over to the present day via minimum half acre lot sizes throughout the jurisdiction. However, when compared to the region, affordability for both rents and home ownership is considerably lower in Apple Valley than most all areas in the

most southern parts of the two-county region and prices are comparative with our local neighbors, Hesperia and Victorville, who have more desirable access and proximity to Interstate-15. The Town of Apple Valley has an approved Housing Element that provides for enough variety in land uses to accommodate housing units across all levels of density and affordability.

Victorville. The Victorville General Plan and Zoning Ordinance provide for a range of housing types and densities with adequate amounts of available land for development. The City offers varying zoning standards to encourage lower cost housing.


In August 2006, the City of Victorville adopted a Reasonable Accommodation in Housing to Disabled or Handicapped Individuals Ordinance. The purpose of this ordinance was to provide a process for individuals with disabilities to make request for and be provided, reasonable accommodation in the application of zoning regulations to housing. This ordinance with Fair Housing Laws is administered by the City's Development Department.

The City of Victorville is currently working towards the Revitalization of Old Town/Midtown Area. The City invested financial resources to develop and update the previous Old Town Specific Plan dated April 1995. Revitalization efforts are being considered to address old and unsafe housing stock, crime and blight, outdated and poorly functioning infrastructure, and declining of property values. City staff is currently researching and developing a comprehensive and strategic plan that involves the review of land use to make the Old Town area a way that pedestrian traffic will support retail businesses, increase residential development to support retail business and encourage business development. This will promote integration of compatible land uses; encourage greater recreational use of the existing open space; establish a location for cottage industry, live/work providing more opportunities for people of lower income and disabilities; and to address the adjacent transit station as a focal point in the Downtown area. Revitalization of Old Town will consider existing Downtown Development Codes, Capital Improvement, encourage a sales tax sharing program and promote infill housing development. The goal to revitalize Old Town is to improve safety and provide more opportunities to minorities, such as the Hispanic population that currently resides in Old Town.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Segregation/Integration > Additional Information

V.B.i.2. Additional Information

V.B.i.2.a. Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about segregation in the jurisdiction and region affecting groups with other protected characteristics.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Apple Valley. Community input gathered via meetings and surveys did not reveal an indication of segregation among protected classes. However, there were strong feelings over the treatment of some protected classes when seeking housing throughout the jurisdiction. Denials based upon race and source of income were the most common reported instances of discrimination. Though not apparent in survey results, Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board also reported the following concerns:

Based on fair housing data, disparities may exist in the jurisdiction and region for groups of the disability protected characteristic. Apple Valley saw an increase in the numbers of reported disability discrimination cases from IFHMB over this four-year period. For instance, in Apple Valley in 2011 there were seven (7) disability related cases that were opened and in 2015 there were fifteen (15) cases that were opened for the year, an increase of 114%.

Victorville. One of the questions asked in the Survey was if residents thought the neighborhood they lived in was segregated. Close to 83% of the respondents stated that their neighborhoods are integrated and people of all backgrounds are welcome. With less than 7% respondents that thought their neighborhood was segregated stated that it was a result to high housing sales or rental pricing.

Input from the stakeholder meetings, specifically with real estate professionals, indicates there is no evidence of segregation. The community has a good balance of integration between race and ethnic groups. A common comment received by real estate professionals and community members is that people tend to gravitate and want to live near people that are like them, such as people with similar interest or occupations. This is evident in the surrounding community of Spring Valley Lake. This community is in the San Bernardino County pocket in Victorville. The community consists of a man-made lake and other resort like amenities. People that are interested in boating, water sports and fishing seek homes in this area.

In addition, research indicates that families do better when they live in a strong and supportive community. Many people relocate from other surrounding areas in the County of San Bernardino to Victorville because of the proximity to Interstate-15, health care facilities, large shopping centers and restaurants, entertainment options, and location to the Victor Valley Community College. Local knowledge has indicated that other surrounding communities do not offer the amenities that Victorville has. It's apparent that these are just a few reasons why Victorville has become diverse over the years. Past local knowledge has indicated that surrounding communities have been more segregated due to the cost of housing, professional backgrounds and language spoken. The Revitalization of Old Town Victorville will also encourage place-based investments and increase mobility options for minority and other protected class groups.

V.B.i.2.b. The program participant may also describe other information relevant to its assessment of segregation, including activities such as place-based investments and mobility options for protected class groups.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Apple Valley. Despite the dissolution of Redevelopment in California in 2012, the Town of Apple Valley was able to set-aside various properties to hold for future affordable housing development. Enlisting the expertise of experienced affordable housing developers, staff is confident that the first of several projects will be to develop a 10 (ten) acre site near Navajo and Sioux Roads as a two phased senior and family complex. With great proximity to a grocery store, transit, schools, a medical clinic and a park, the project will serve as an attractive neighborhood investment for many years to come and a key to revitalizing the area.

Victorville. Place-based investments often referred to as “community-change initiatives” and are led by nonprofits or governments seeking to improve conditions in targeted low income communities. By supplying tailored social services, technical assistance, grants and capacity building resources in a specific geographic area, place-based initiatives intend to benefit residents directly through improved services and indirectly through strengthened social networks. Currently, the City’s Economic Development Department is developing a plan to assist the Old Town Area of Victorville with an overall revitalization of the area. The area includes older housing stock and abandoned commercial buildings. Neighborhood Stabilization Program income funds are being earmarked for a possible mixed use project. The objective to revitalize Old Town Victorville is to create opportunities for residents of all protected class levels, develop beautiful and safe neighborhoods, and create positive economic and social outcomes through federal, state and private investments, particularly for those experiencing decline or disadvantages.


The City has launched two city-wide loan programs to assist property owners, both owner occupied and rental property, with assistance to correct code violations and improve curb appeal to their property.


Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA) offers a Sunday delivery program for the handicapped for direct routes around the High Desert. It can sometimes take a half to full day to navigate the bus lines to get somewhere and VVTA has identified that that is an impediment to the disabled.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Segregation/Integration > Contributing Factors of Segregation

V.B.i.3. Contributing Factors of Segregation

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of segregation.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous responses)

- Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities
- Land use and zoning laws
- Location and type of affordable housing

V.B.i.3. Contributing Factors of Segregation - Other

 Revised (Click for previous text)


The data show that Victorville has accommodated the majority of the Consortium's population growth, and Victorville is providing a broader range of housing choices. This appears to be a major factor contributing to the existing pattern of segregation between the two jurisdictions and, given the demographic shifts in the county and region over the past couple decades, it seems likely to become exacerbated if the current situation doesn't change (Location and type of affordable housing- Contributing Factor).

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > R/ECAPs

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > R/ECAPs > Analysis

V.B.ii.1. Analysis

V.B.ii.1.a. Identify any R/ECAPs or groupings of R/ECAP tracts within the jurisdiction.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data


 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia


Currently, the Consortia has a small R/ECAP area, which is included in a much larger R/ECAP containing unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. The R/ECAP only includes Census Tracts 99.05 which is within Victorville's geographical boundaries. Census Tract 99.05 encompasses 3.89 square miles. The current population is 7,575 and includes 2,417 housing units. The geographical area that falls within this R/ECAP starts on the north side of Mojave Drive ending at Air Expressway, boundaries are west side of Interstate 15 and east side of Llana Avenue. This area is commonly referred to as the Village Drive Area.

In 2000 the City of Victorville had a small R/ECAP area. This area was located in what is commonly known as Old Town Victorville. The area is in Census Tract 98 and encompasses 1.29 miles. The current population in the Census Tract is 5,017. It contains 1,648 housing units. As of the 2010 Census this specific area is no longer an R/ECAP area.

V.B.ii.1.b. Which protected classes disproportionately reside in R/ECAPs compared to the jurisdiction and region?

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Table 4 R/ECAP Demographics states that the population comprising a portion of Census Tract 99.05 is 7,575. The race/ethnic make-up population located within the R/ECAP area is Hispanic 53.61%, White – 23.50%, Black – 15.50%, and Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic – 3.80%. Compared to the Region's R/ECAP Demographics, these percentages drop with the exception of Hispanics exceeding and making-up 70% of the entire 216,883 population. Comparing Table 1 Demographics for the entire City of Victorville, the Hispanic community almost encompasses half of the entire population, at 47.42%. Regionally, the Hispanic community percentage is similar to Victorville's, 47.25%. Similarly, the White community is the second highest race.

Region. The region does have R/ECAPs outside of the one shared by Victorville and Adelanto area. The next closest R/ECAP in San Bernardino County is located to the North in Barstow. The rest are located to the south in San Bernardino City, Ontario, Fontana and Colton. Several others are located in the south and central areas of Riverside County (City of Riverside, Moreno Valley, Perris, Hemet, Indio, and Coachella Valley/Thermal).

The largest race/ethnicity categories, that make-up the two-county regional population of over 4.13 million people, consists of 47.25% Hispanic, and 36.61% White, Non-Hispanic. The total population of all the R/ECAPs in the region is 216,883 persons. Compared to the region-wide demographics, the White, Non- Hispanic population is significantly underrepresented in R/ECAPs consisting of only 14.65% of the population while Hispanics are considerably overrepresented (69.33%). Black, Non Hispanic populations are also slightly overrepresented in the R/ECAP areas; 7.14% is the regional population and 9.53% is the R/ECAP population.


Families with children represent approximately 50.99% of the families in the region. However, in the R/ECAPs, they disproportionately represent 63.04% of all families. The most dominant country of national origin is Mexico with a regional population of over 550,000 persons (or 13.10%). Unfortunately, R/ECAPs also carry a significantly larger proportion of this population with 23.29% of the 216,883 persons.

In R/ECAP Census Tract 99.05 total population is 7,575., The race/ethnic make-up of the area are: White – 49%, Black – 16%, Native American – 0.01%, Hispanic – 22% and Other – 7c.

V.B.ii.1.c. Describe how R/ECAPs have changed over time (since 1990).

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)


Consortia

Map 2 depicts that in 1990 there were no R/ECAPS. However, in 2000, Map 2 shows that a small R/ECAP formed encompassing Census Tract 98, more commonly known as Old Town. This R/ECAP no longer exists. On the other hand, Map 1, illustrates how in 2010 another small area of the City of Victorville fell within a larger San Bernardino County Area R/ECAP. The majority of this R/ECAP is unincorporated San Bernardino County pockets. The R/ECAP includes Victorville Census Tract 99.05, which is commonly known as West City Planning Area and partially Southern California Logistics Airport (SCLA) Planning Area. In addition, two small areas of Census Tract 91.17 and 91.16 include industrial and commercial areas of SCLA; however residential properties are not located within these Census Tracts. It would be safe to say that the R/ECAP areas predominantly found in Census Tracts 91.17 and 91.16 are probably County areas.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > R/ECAPs > Additional Information

V.B.ii.2. Additional Information

V.B.ii.2.a. Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about R/ECAPs in the jurisdiction and region affecting groups with other protected characteristics.

 Instructions


 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Census Tract 99.05 village area is within the City of Victorville's West City Planning Area and is an older established community, which has a predominately White population. In addition, this Census Tract also includes a Mojave Vistas Planning area which is north of I-15, south of Rancho Road and west of National Trails Highway. The 2006 Mojave Vistas Planning Area Specific Plan allows for the opportunity of a wide variety of housing unit types varying from cluster units to R-1. The Mojave Vista Plan proposes over 53 acres of cluster housing, and almost 60 acres of R-1 residential, and 47.6 acres of R-1. Based on these housing development types, the Mojave Vista Plan allows for a wide range of housing price, type of product and lot size for an array of residents.

Region. The R/ECAP's throughout the region of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties have been adequately addressed through other sections of this document. There is no additional relevant information that has been identified.

V.B.ii.2.b. The program participant may also describe other information relevant to its assessment of R/ECAPs, including activities such as place-based investments and mobility options for protected class groups.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

In an attempt to remove the R/ECAP that incorporates Census Tract 99.05, the Consortia will utilize HOME funding and other housing programs to remove barriers that prevent people from accessing affordable housing. For instance, the City of Victorville's Residential Code Correction loan program is meant to assist property owners, owner occupied and rental property, to correct code violations. A significant number of low income residents have expressed financial hardship that prevents them from correcting code violations, specifically connecting their failing septic system to the City's sewer system. The newly developed program will assist property owners with these delayed repairs.


With the implementation of the Mojave Vistas Specific Plan, public and private neighborhoods will include recreation centers and facilities including, but not limited to swimming pools, tennis courts, clubhouse and trails. The Plan provides for religious group development, public facilities (fire/police stations) and development of new schools. Neighborhood retail and commercial and administrative professional offices will be in close proximity.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > R/ECAPs > Contributing Factors of R/ECAPs

V.B.ii.3. Contributing Factors of R/ECAPs

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of R/ECAPs.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous responses)

Lack of community revitalization strategies

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

V.B.ii.3. Contributing Factors of R/ECAPs - Other

Revised (Click for previous text)

Lack of Community Revitalization Strategies

The Consortia has a small R/ECAP area, which is included in a much larger R/ECAP containing unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. The R/ECAP only includes Census Tracts 99.05 which is within Victorville’s geographical boundaries. The Consortia’s knowledge of the R/ECAP as it relates to the housing and social service needs of the area is limited. In fiscal year 2017-18, The Consortia will perform a community assessment to better understand the needs of the area which will lead to strategic investments using CDBG and HOME funding.

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

A significant number of low income residents have expressed financial hardship that prevents them from correcting code violations, specifically connecting their failing septic system to the City’s sewer system. In an attempt to remove the R/ECAP that incorporates Census Tract 99.05, the Consortia will utilize HOME funding and other housing programs to remove barriers that prevent people from accessing affordable housing. For instance, the City of Victorville’s Residential Code Correction loan program is meant to assist property owners, owner occupied and rental property, to correct code violations.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Analysis


V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Analysis > Educational Opportunities

V.B.iii.1. Analysis

V.B.iii.1.a. Educational Opportunities

V.B.iii.1.a.i. Describe any disparities in access to proficient schools based on race/ethnicity, national origin, and family status.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

Consortia

Table 12 index scores shows that Blacks/ Non-Hispanics had the lowest access to opportunity to proficient schools compared to other groups. When poverty level is factored in, Blacks/ Non-Hispanics continued to have the lowest access to opportunity in the Consortia, followed by Hispanics. In the Region, the index score for Hispanic’s access to proficient schools is lower when compared to other race/ethnic groups. This continues to be the case in the Region when examining Hispanics below the poverty line.

Individual Jurisdictions

The school proficiency index uses school-level data on the performance of 4th grade students on state exams to describe which neighborhoods have high-performing elementary schools nearby and which are near lower performing elementary schools. The school proficiency index is a function of the percent of 4th grade students proficient in reading and math on state test scores for up to three schools within 1.5 miles of the block-group. The higher the index score, the higher the school system quality is in a neighborhood. Values are percentile ranked and range from 0 to 99 max; average is 49.

Apple Valley. Table 12 (attached) shows that Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanics, have the best access to proficient schools (54.03) while Hispanics have the lowest access (44.49). Regardless of what race/ethnicities have better access, overall the proficiency index is low across all races/ethnicities. Therefore access to proficient schools is poor across all races and ethnicities. National origin and family status appear to be equally underserved.

Victorville. HUD provided Table 12 and Map 9 depicts a below average school proficiency index throughout the City. School Proficiency Index among all races/ethnicity are close in range, with the lowest being Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic at 32.52. Native American, Non-Hispanic are the highest at 37.54.

In Census Tract 98 (Old Town Area), Schools Proficiency Indexes is within the 20. 1-30. Although the School Proficiency Index appears to be much lower than the overall jurisdiction, this Census Tract has a predominately Hispanic population. Overall, Victorville has a low School Proficiency Index in all race/ethnic categories. Therefore, access to proficient school is poor across all races and ethnicities.

Table 12 - Opportunity Indicators, by Race/Ethnicity


(Cnsrt-Apple Valley, CA CONSORTIA) Jurisdiction	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Cost Index	Transportation Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population								
White, Non-Hispanic	33.43	43.86	18.18	29.14	17.15		53.79	83.01
Black, Non-Hispanic	24.77	36.74	15.17	29.58	18.83		54.56	80.43
Hispanic	25.43	36.92	15.37	29.16	17.76		52.37	79.45
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	31.24	39.36	18.85	28.23	16.07		51.84	82.56
Native American, Non-Hispanic	28.19	41.43	13.18	29.78	18.59		59.89	80.40
Population below federal poverty line								
White, Non-Hispanic	25.44	37.44	12.97	31.85	19.80		50.18	82.57


Black, Non-Hispanic	20.41	35.59	13.43	30.48	20.36	53.50	80.18
Hispanic	20.67	36.63	11.22	31.09	22.08	53.44	78.40
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	18.45	37.24	12.54	31.62	21.28	53.24	82.48
Native American, Non-Hispanic	39.64	44.86	19.74	24.09	12.45	46.98	83.50
(Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA) Region							
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	52.61	53.16	34.50	37.96	25.75	49.50	61.98
Black, Non-Hispanic	42.80	43.79	27.18	42.55	31.82	49.72	52.97
Hispanic	37.51	41.01	24.20	43.12	32.68	47.81	52.59
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	60.42	59.23	43.02	41.92	29.18	48.25	52.51
Native American, Non-Hispanic	41.19	45.54	25.06	36.84	26.34	50.16	61.60
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	38.39	44.64	25.55	38.74	29.20	49.95	62.31
Black, Non-Hispanic	27.15	35.04	17.39	43.48	34.78	48.95	51.90
Hispanic	23.78	34.76	16.42	44.76	36.54	49.34	52.37
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	42.30	44.82	30.51	45.00	37.05	51.32	49.15
Native American, Non-Hispanic	30.24	39.41	20.61	39.17	32.05	52.23	58.72

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census; ACS; Great Schools; Common Core of Data; SABINS; LAI; LEHD; NATA

Note 2: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info).

V.B.iii.1.a.ii. Describe the relationship between the residency patterns of racial/ethnic, national origin, and family status groups and their proximity to proficient schools.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

The below map illustrate school proficiency for the Consortia with race/ethnicity, national origin, and family status. The darker the shaded area, the higher the school's proficiency. Based on the maps, the area with the lowest school proficiency was located primarily in the western region of the Consortia (Victorville). The highest school proficiency was located in the eastern region of the Consortia (Apple Valley). Based on map 7, there seem to be a relationship between the residency patterns of racial/ethnic and national origin (Mexico) and proximity to proficient schools. Hispanics and individuals with Mexico as their national origin are clustered primarily west of the Consortia, which demonstrates their proximately to lower performing schools. However, there does not seem to be a relationship between family status and proximity to proficient schools.

Many pundits believe that areas segregated by lower-income ethnic groups often have underperforming schools due to inadequate attention to negative factors facing students in their community. According to a 2015 article, Race and Schools: The Need for Action, by Gary Orefield, Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, University of California–Los Angeles, schools are expected to create equal outcomes for students who leave their homes severely disadvantaged by family and community poverty, and arrive at their schools to find sometimes unqualified or inexperienced teachers, and leave those schools as soon as they can. Moreover, in many schools with Black and Latino students who are almost entirely poor and teachers who have little or no help in addressing the consequences of deep tensions that often exist in neighborhoods heavily affected by immigration, gangs, and other issues.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. The jurisdiction is well integrated. The southeast portion of Apple Valley has lower population density than other areas and lower school proficiency. When reviewing National Origin information on Map 9, there is a greater likeliness that those areas are populated with residents who are originally from Mexico.

Victorville is a fairly racially integrated jurisdiction. Access to proficient schools is available to all residents. The school districts visionary mission statement is the following: “Victor Elementary School District is committed to inspiring purposeful learners who create their futures with confidence, curiosity, innovation, and integrity through engaging learning experiences in safe environments within a supportive culture.”

V.B.iii.1.a.iii. Describe how school-related policies, such as school enrollment policies, affect a student's ability to attend a proficient school
Which protected class groups are least successful in accessing proficient schools?

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Apple Valley. School enrollment policies in the Apple Valley Unified School District are not discriminatory or exclusionary. A report conducted by the American Civil Liberties Union that mentioned the Academy of Academic Excellence (AAE) as an independent charter that discriminated against undocumented students, was highly refuted by Principal of AAE, Lisa Lamb, in an article by The Daily Press, Staff Writer Charity Lindsey: “[AAE is the...] only independent charter mentioned in our area.” Lindsey clarified that the school operates as its own district where the others are dependent charters, but are using the same enrollment practices that every school within that district are using, which the report doesn't

disclose. Lindsey further notes that Lamb further reiterated that AAE “does not deny enrollment to any student for the reasons listed in the report.” Therefore, the reason that AAE was singled-out is unfounded.

As previously indicated, Map 9, School Proficiency and National Origin, shows that residents accessing lower proficiency schools in the southeast region of Town, have an almost exclusive representation of originating from Mexico. Otherwise, access to schools appears to be evenly balanced between all protected classes.

Victorville. State average for English proficiency is 44%. This is based on test scores of low income students. Victorville elementary schools score between 15% - 26%. State average for math proficiency is 33%. Victorville elementary schools score between 7% - 11%.

The higher scoring schools are charter schools specializing in science, sports, art and music. The Victor Elementary School District has made a policy that makes school an option to all residents. All the school sites are “Schools of Choice”. The District’s policy breaks schools up into four (4) areas called quadrants. Students have the opportunity to choose any school within the quadrant in which they live based on their interest. The policy’s flexibility even provides transportation to any school within the quadrants by the District.

Another policy that may affect a student’s ability to attend a proficient school is the school’s approach to homework. Some schools may provide links between home and school. Some specialty schools may believe that completing assignments independently at home using today’s technology educates and prepares students as adults, connects education with the home environment. Assignments therefore, can be integrated in the home learning experience. The disadvantage to this is that not all households have accessibility to computers or internet, which is a minimum requirement in taking advantage of such a policy.

Grading policies have positive and negative effects on students that can also impact their ability to attend a proficient or better performing school. For instance, an approach where grades have no meaning to a harsh grading policy affects the student’s future, critics the school and educators. Policies like this may impact a student’s ability to be accepted into another district, particularly those that have above average school proficiency indices.

Based on the HUD provided Map 9, it appears Hispanic families (Mexican and El Salvador Origin) would have the least successful rates in accessing proficient schools for the Victorville population.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Analysis > Employment Opportunities

V.B.iii.1.b. Employment Opportunities

V.B.iii.1.b.i. Describe any disparities in access to jobs and labor markets by protected class groups.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

The Labor Market Engagement Index provides a measure of unemployment rate, labor-force participation rate, and percent of the population ages 25 and above with at least a bachelor's degree, by neighborhood. Values are percentile ranked with values ranging from 0 to 100. The higher the index value, the better the employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.

The Jobs Proximity Index measures the physical distances between place of residence and jobs by race\ethnicity. The higher the score, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in a neighborhood. Human capital means the skills, knowledge and experience possessed by an individual or population.

Consortia

According to Table 12 (consortia) above, all groups had relatively low opportunity to the labor market, averaging an index score of only 15.64. In addition, the disparity gap in access to the labor market by protected class is relatively small. Native Americans had the lowest access to the labor market at 13.18, while Asians had the highest at 18.85.

Protected class in the Region also had relatively lower opportunity to the labor market, averaging an index score of 30. However, it was more than 10 points higher than the protected classes within the Consortia disparity gap in access for the highest and lowest group is more pronounced. Asians had the highest access index in the Region (43.02), which was more than twice that of Asians located in the Consortia (18.85).

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Table 12, Opportunity Indicators for Labor Market Index, shows that Hispanics have the lowest opportunity with 16.44. Of those below the Federal poverty line, Hispanics remain the lowest at 10.12. Overall, the highest categories consist of Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic populations at 22.18 and White, Non-Hispanics with 20.42.

Map 10, Job Proximity and Race/Ethnicity, indicates that the northern and southwestern parts of the Town have the highest job proximity index scores. These areas have closer proximity to retail and commercial centers. The central parts of Town indicate the least access to job opportunities. This location is not nearly as walkable to the major commercial hubs within the Town boundaries.

Victorville. Table 12, Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity, Labor Market Index column, shows that Native American, Non-Hispanic population has the lowest opportunity at 10.81. The highest opportunity is available to Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic with an indicator of 17.49 followed by White, non-Hispanic at 16.12. Based on Map 10, there is generally a greater labor market in the south part of the City. This area consists of the Mall of Victor Valley and Restaurant Row. The White population in this area has the closest proximity to employment from their homes. Map 10 also depicts that the Mexican National Origin community may be the highest labor-force within this area of Victorville.

Map 10, Job Proximity Index, for the R/ECAP Area within the City of Victorville's jurisdiction depicts that Mexican and El Salvador National Origins; White, Non-Hispanic, Black, Non-Hispanic, and Hispanic appear have high index values to better access of employment opportunities. Table 12, Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity states Job Proximity Index for Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic have the lowest job proximity index at 49.57.

Unincorporated areas of the City near City area appear have a Job Proximity Index between 20. 1-30 and 30. 1-40, significantly lower than other City areas. Although an integrated City, these areas appear to impact the White, Non-Hispanic, Hispanic and Black races/ethnicities.

V.B.iii.1.b.ii. How does a person's place of residence affect their ability to obtain a job?

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

📄 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Proximity to jobs can affect the employment outcomes of residents. People who live closer to jobs are more likely to work. They also face shorter job searches and spells of joblessness. Proximity to employment proves particularly important to certain kinds of workers and residents. For instance, the duration of joblessness among black, female, and older workers tends to be more sensitive to job accessibility than it is for other kinds of workers. For poor residents, living closer to jobs increases the likelihood of working and leaving welfare. Proximity matters for lower-income, lower-skill workers in particular because they tend to be more constrained by the cost of housing and commuting. They are more likely to face spatial barriers to employment; thus their job search areas tend to be smaller and commute distances shorter. In contrast, higher-income, higher-skill workers, who can afford to commute by car and exercise more choice in where they work and live, have more prospects than just the jobs near their neighborhoods and commute longer distances on average (The growing distance between people and jobs in metropolitan America- Elizabeth Kneebone and Natalie Holmes Brookings Institute 2015).

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. White, Hispanic, and Black populations seem to reside equally in areas of low job proximity according to Map 10. National Origin does not seem to have any higher weight in low proximity areas than higher proximity areas either. However, families do appear to have greater concentration in low job proximity areas where housing is denser in availability. These areas are also less expensive, so it appears that families, in the pursuit of rental housing, are unfortunately gravitating towards areas that happen to have less proximity to jobs.

Victorville. Map 10 depicts that the Hispanic and Black population are farther in proximity to better jobs. These races tend to live in lower proximity index areas. The concentration of these race/ethnic groups tend to live in older housing stock that is more affordable for them but job opportunities are very meager.

A person's place of residence may be directly correlated to the opportunities they have in obtaining employment. In Victorville, for instance, many residents commute to other cities within the San Bernardino County and other surrounding counties. Because the Victor Valley is considered as one of the most affordable housing areas in Southern California people, may choose to commute in order to have lower mortgage or rent payments.

V.B.iii.1.b.iii. Which racial/ethnic, national origin, or family status groups are least successful in accessing employment?

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Maps below illustrates job proximity index by racial/ethnic groups. The darker the shaded Census Tract, the more likely the opportunity to access job opportunities. According to the map, the Consortia's northern and central areas have the highest opportunity to access job opportunities. Based on a relatively even distribution of racial/ethnic dots, there doesn't seem to be one group least successful in accessing employment within the Consortia. This also the case when assessing national origin and family status.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Though Table 12 shows that Hispanic persons have the lowest proximity to job opportunities, it is not as apparent when examining Map 10. Overall, families appear in the greatest concentration in areas where access to employment is the lowest in the community.

Victorville. According to Map 10 Percentage of Households that are Families with Children live in areas where job proximity is high. This could be attributed to affordable housing for their family size; however some residents may have a longer commute to better jobs. Families within the 40.1 – 60.1% percentile appear to be unsuccessful in accessing employment. These families are not within the top five (5) National Origins for the City of Victorville. The Native American, non-Hispanic population seems to have the lowest labor market index at 10.81 percent. This population seems to be least successful in obtaining employment.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Analysis > Transportation Opportunities

V.B.iii.1.c. Transportation Opportunities

V.B.iii.1.c.i. Describe any disparities in access to transportation based on place of residence, cost, or other transportation related factors.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

Revised (Click for previous text)

The Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA) is the local public transit agency providing fixed route bus service to the cities of Adelanto, Apple Valley, Hesperia, Victorville and portions of San Bernardino County, including Lucerne Valley, Phelan, Wrightwood, Pinon Hills Oro Grand, and Helendale. Weekday bus service also extends from Barstow to Victorville and down into the San Bernardino Valley at Fontana and City of San Bernardino. VVTA provides bus route service, commuter bus, paratransit to eligible persons, and vanpool services to High Desert commuters who commute throughout Southern California. The Transit Authority's service area spans over 950 square miles.


Apple Valley. Transit trips tend to be more frequent in the most densely populated areas of the Town according to Map 12. The area with the second highest number of transit trips correlates as part of an area where residents also experience lower access to job opportunities and lower incomes. According to Map 13, transit trips are also most frequent in areas with a greater influx of families.

Victorville.

Low Transportation Cost index measures the cost of transport and proximity to public transportation by neighborhood. The Transit Trips Index measures how often low-income families in a neighborhood use public transportation. Based on the HUD provided Table 12, Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity –, the Transit Index for Victorville’s federal low income population compared to the Region (Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario) is significantly less. The Native American, Non-Hispanic race in this same category in Victorville has a Transit Index of 21.0 compared to the Region’s 39.17. This could be a result of the Victor Valley’s limited access to transportation and routes within each community. Similar to other jurisdictions in the Victor Valley, many City of Victorville low-income residents struggle to find reliable transportation regardless of place of residence or cost. The need for more local and functional transit service to travel throughout the City for personal, work and recreational activities is very limited. Currently it may take several hours to make short trips due to route structures and low frequency of service. In addition, transportation service hours are short and only certain routes operate on Sunday.

Additionally, the Low Transportation Cost Index is also very low in Victorville compared to the Region meaning that the cost of transportation in Victorville is relatively higher. This may be a result to Victorville’s high commuter population. A recent study reviewing the High Desert’s Workforce briefly mentioned that residents living in Victorville who commute make up about 70% of its work-force population. Of the active workers, totaling almost 38,000 people, over 11,000 are employed within the High Desert communities, but over 26,000 Victorville residents commute. The majority of commuters drive to the San Bernardino County areas, but some as far as Los Angeles and San Diego.. Therefore, cost of transportation in Victorville is relatively higher.

V.B.iii.1.c.ii. Which racial/ethnic, national origin or family status groups are most affected by the lack of a reliable, affordable transportation connection between their place of residence and opportunities?

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

According to Table 12 (Consortia) above, Asians (16.07) are most affected by the lack of a reliable, affordable transportation connection between their place of residence and opportunities in the Consortia. However, Native Americans below the federal poverty line were affected the most with an index of 12.5.

Regionally, all protected groups are less affected by the lack of a reliable, affordable transportation connection between their place of residence and opportunities (index 30) when compared to the Consortia (index19). Within the Region, Native Americans were most affected with an index of 26.34. Similar to the Consortia, Native Americans below the federal poverty line were also affected the most with an index of 32.5.


Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Table 12 shows that the transit trips index is relatively equal across all Race/Ethnicity categories. Those with National Origin of Mexico appear to have a slightly skewed representation in areas where transit trips are more frequent. However, families appear to have the most significant representation in areas where transit trips are highest. In pursuit of less expensive housing costs, families are locating to areas further from walkable resources and jobs that require them to rely more heavily on transit services if they don't have other means of transportation.

Victorville. As mentioned above the public transit system is limited in the City of Victorville causing all racial and ethnic households to be negatively impacted. Transportation accessibility based on Map 12, Demographics and Transit Trips, among households with children between the 40.01 – 80% percentiles located within the eastside of Victorville have the highest Transit Trips Index (30.1 – 40) indicating these households use public transportation more often than other categories. Additionally, the Mexican National Origin Transit Trips Index is highest ranging between 30.01 – 40. Transportation within the R/ECAP area located within the City of Victorville appears to have a low index, 20.1 – 30, mainly Mexican Origin. Based on the data provided, both indexes are still relatively low.

Because both Transit and Low Transportation Cost Indexes are low throughout all races and other protected categories, such as disabled persons, causing residents of the City of Victorville and surrounding jurisdictions to be limited in opportunities. The High Desert's Workforce study recently reported that Victorville workers median age for males is 37.6 and females 38.4.

V.B.iii.1.c.iii. Describe how the jurisdiction's and region's policies, such as public transportation routes or transportation systems designed for use personal vehicles, affect the ability of protected class groups to access transportation.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

VVTA provides both fixed routes and ADA paratransit service within the Victor Valley area. Their services include: 10 local routes within the Victorville/Apple Valley area; 3 county routes including services to neighboring communities; and direct access ADA paratransit service. Because public transportation is a key component for ensuring that disabled persons have an equal opportunity in the employment industry, education, and access to facilities, the lack thereof leaves many adults with disabilities to fully participate in society. The passage of the 1990 ADA Act requires that all new public transit vehicles and facilities be accessible, disparities remain. Transportation buses have low-floor, ramps, grab bars and large signage; some transit agencies fail to comply with the requirement to announce bus stops making it difficult for visually and cognitive impaired persons. Paratransit eligibility criteria's may be too restrictive, trip denials, and late or no show buses are additional barriers for disabled individuals.

Typically, people living in small urban and rural areas have fewer public transportation options than those in larger urban areas. Based on the US Census Bureau, research indicates that as communities grow in population, public transit service significantly declines. Regionally, public transit services and access may be limited due to challenges in transportation spending patterns. As transportation cost increase, low-income households have less to spend on housing, education and other needs. Transportation costs are particularly burdensome for low-income households because they use a larger amount of their income to transportation expenses than higher-income households. In addition, rail transportation service, which typically serves higher-income riders, compared to bus service, may be funded and supported

more so by metropolitan areas and states than in non-metropolitan areas. This creates inequities between bus service that serves more low- income riders regionally and locally. In addition, expanding highways or rail service lines may also increase property values, making difficult for minorities and low-income households to afford housing in those areas.


Regionally and locally, minority and low-income individuals are also faced with language and information barriers. Some minorities and low-income individuals are unable to learn about transit options or have little voice in transportation planning because of language barriers or lack of information. Transportation policy makers make efforts to seek out and consider the needs of low-income and minority households, but effective mechanisms are not placed.

Other issues that create poor access and ability to use public transportation among the protected class groups are “green” gas emissions, transportation management, public safety and education to the benefits of using public transportation.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Analysis > Low Poverty Exposure Opportunities

V.B.iii.1.d. Low Poverty Exposure Opportunities

V.B.iii.1.d.i. Describe any disparities in exposure to poverty by protected class groups.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

The Low Poverty Index captures the depth and intensity of poverty in a given neighborhood. The index uses both family poverty rates and public assistance receipt. The resulting values range from 0 to 100. The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in a neighborhood.

Consortia

Based on Table 12 (Consortia), Blacks had the highest exposure to poverty based on protected class within the Consortia. However, for residents below the federal poverty line, Asians/Pacific Islanders had the highest exposure to poverty. For the Region, Hispanics had the highest exposure to poverty amongst protected class, including groups below the federal poverty level.


Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. As shown by Table 12, groups with the highest exposure to poverty are Black, Non- Hispanic (33.53) and Hispanic (33.91) populations. Of those below the federal poverty line, the same two groups both have an index right around 22.0, further indicating that these groups are the most exposed to poverty in their respective neighborhoods of Apple Valley. Map 14, Poverty and Family Status, reinforces that areas containing a propensity for multi-family residential properties have some of the highest rates of poverty, combined with the highest rates of families with children, ranging from 60.1%-80.0%.

Victorville. Map 14 illustrates demographics and low poverty index. The map includes R/ECAP Census Tract 99.05. This area has a very low poverty index with an integrated population consisting of Whites, Blacks, Hispanics and Native American, non-Hispanic. However, MAP 14, Low Poverty Index with Race/Ethnicity depicts that the Mexican Race has the lowest poverty index among Hispanics, approximately below 10.01, within the R/ECAP. This may indicate that income inequality among the Hispanic races/ethnicities is higher among Hispanics than among non-Hispanic whites.

The Federal Poverty Level (FPL) is the minimum amount of gross income that a family needs for food, clothing, transportation, shelter and other necessities. Although still low, the Native American population below federal poverty line index is 31.71%, the highest among all others. This may indicate that the Native American, Non-Hispanic race/ethnicity is less exposed to poverty compared to other races in Victorville and the Region. This population also shows a labor market index of 19.50%, the highest index within the federal poverty line. Other races/ethnicities have higher opportunities and lower exposure to poverty Regionally than in Victorville.

V.B.iii.1.d.ii. What role does a person's place of residence play in their exposure to poverty?

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Apple Valley. Map 14, relating Poverty and Race/Ethnicity, does not show a clear propensity for poverty in any singular neighborhood or tract. All demographic groups are evenly represented. However, when the Poverty and National Origin map is singled out, Mexico becomes the standout country of origin in areas where the low poverty index indicates higher rates of poverty. As discussed previously, these areas have a higher magnitude of multi-family properties that tend to be occupied predominantly by tenants that are paying lower rent prices than they would to rent a single-family residence. The apartments are clustered in such a way that neighborhoods naturally have a higher likeliness for exposure to poverty.

Victorville. Populations that fall the federally poverty line tend to live where they can afford, often times not the most desirable neighborhoods in a community. Low income residents live in older housing stock as well as these homes tend to be more affordable. The southeast area of Victorville has a large low poverty index.

V.B.iii.1.d.iii. Which racial/ethnic, national origin or family status groups are most affected by these poverty indicators?

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

The map below illustrates location and degree of poverty based on census tracts. The darker shaded census tracts indicate lower exposure to poverty. According to the map, residence within or near the Consortia's core and western region had the highest exposure to poverty. With Hispanics primarily clustered near both regions, a place of residence for an ethnic/ racial group does seem to play a role in exposure to poverty in the Consortia.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. As shown by Table 12, groups with the highest exposure to poverty are Black, Non- Hispanic (33.53) and Hispanic (33.91) populations. Of those below the federal poverty line, the same two groups both have an index right around 22.0, further indicating that these groups are exposed to poverty in their respective neighborhoods of Apple Valley, more so than other race/ethnicity categories. Mexico is the standout country of origin in areas where the low poverty index indicates higher rates of poverty in the north and central sections of Town.

Victorville. Table 12 indicates that the racial/ethnic groups most affected by the supplied data is the Native American, non-Hispanic (31.71%) population, followed by White, non-Hispanic (22.34%). The lowest poverty index populations are among Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic (16.33%) and Hispanic (19.23%). Residents with large families with children are in the low poverty index areas as depicted in Map 14.

V.B.iii.1.d.iv. Describe how the jurisdiction's and region's policies affect the ability of protected class groups to access low poverty areas

 Instructions

Revised (Click for previous text)

Apple Valley. The Town of Apple Valley relies upon the availability of Housing Choice Vouchers provided through the Housing Authority. Unfortunately, the waitlist for Apple Valley is rarely open. This program is also reliant upon landlords to voluntarily choose to accept Housing Choice Vouchers. They are not required to accept a tenant's application for housing if they are not willing to work with the voucher program. According to stakeholder groups, this practice can lead to discrimination based upon source of income.

Victorville. Access to lower poverty areas is limited to residents in Victorville because of the limited opportunities in labor, transportation and education. Although housing is affordable in the Victorville area, residents who are within the lower poverty indexes have fewer opportunities to find higher paying employment. Typically, these households have limited financial resources to travel to better opportunities because they have elected to live in an area where housing is more affordable than other areas within the Region or High Desert. In an effort to create more opportunities for residents, the City of Victorville is making neighborhood revitalization efforts, which are critical to these areas experiencing high poverty levels.

Region.


The Housing Choice Voucher waitlist concerns extend to the entire region with lists for higher poverty areas opening far more regularly, or never closing, while areas that have greater access to opportunity do not open up as often. This limits the choices available to house anyone who may need to apply. For example, if a household wants to locate near other family members for ease of child care, this may be problematic if the family members live in a more desirable area where HCV lists rarely open.

A national problem is also created by the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) programs. Mixed income developments have been identified as a best practice for structuring balance and community within a given housing development. However, with approvals for the LIHTC financing tool being highly competitive, a project is often forced to apply as a 100 percent affordable project. This is a disservice to the residents who will eventually call it their home. Mixed-income projects should be more widely encouraged and rewarded by this program or a continuous cycle of encircling poverty with poverty is further perpetuated.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Analysis > Environmentally Healthy Neighborhood Opportunities and Patterns in Disparities in Access to Opportunity

V.B.iii.1.e. Environmentally Healthy Neighborhood Opportunities

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

V.B.iii.1.e.i. Describe any disparities in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods by protected class groups.

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

The Environmental Health Index measures exposure based on EPA estimates of air quality carcinogenic, respiratory and neurological toxins by neighborhood. According to Table 12 (Consortia), access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods among all groups is indexed as the highest amongst all assessed opportunities indicators within the Consortia, averaging an index 81 out 100. Indexed at 80, Hispanics were the least likely to have access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods by protected class group.

For the Region, protected classes were more likely to be exposed to environmentally unhealthy neighborhoods. Average index amongst protective classes for the Region was 55. Asian/Pacific Islanders were also least likely to have access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods by protected class group. This lack of access is 13 index points lower than Native Americans who were the most likely


group within the Region to reside in environmentally healthy neighborhoods.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. According to Table 12, environmental health does not appear to create any disparity between protected class groups such as Race/Ethnicity, National Origin, or Family Status within the Town of Apple Valley. Furthermore, it does not even appear to adversely influence those who are below the federal poverty line. The range is 63.54 for Native American populations living below the poverty line and 66.34 for White, Non-Hispanic, below the poverty line. The indicator for environmental health falls in between these two numbers for all Race/Ethnicity groups, regardless of poverty level status.

Victorville. Overall Map 15 and Table 12 depict an environmentally healthy jurisdiction. The area with the highest environmental health index is the Southern California Logistics Airport (SCLA), approximately at 80.1 - 90. The Airport was formally known as the George Air Force Base, and is now predominately aerospace, industrial and commercial park. A wastewater treatment facility is located in this area as well. Areas with low environmental health indexes are in the east part of Victorville. The majority of the population in this area is White, Blacks and Hispanics.

V.B.iii.1.e.ii. Which racial/ethnic, national origin or family status groups have the least access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods?

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Map 13 shows location of racial/ethnic groups level of exposure to environmental health hazards for the Consortia. Consistent with Table 12 (Consortia), the map doesn't appear to show a significant difference in accessing environmentally healthy neighborhoods based on racial/ethnic groups.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. According to Table 12, the lowest environmental indicator is 63.54 for Native American populations living below the poverty line. The indicator for environmental health is relatively high for all Race/Ethnicity groups, regardless of poverty level status, and is far greater within the jurisdiction than the region as a whole.

Victorville. The area with a moderate environmental health index is in the west side of Victorville, which includes the mall and restaurants. The largest population in this area is Hispanic, White and Black. Larger households with children mostly live in the east side of Victorville which has a lower environmental health index.

V.B.iii.1.f. Patterns in Disparities in Access to Opportunity

V.B.iii.1.f.i. Identify and discuss any overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors based on race/ethnicity, national origin or familial status. Identify areas that experience an aggregate of poor access to opportunity and high exposure to adverse factors. Include how these patterns compare to patterns of segregation and R/ECAPs.

i Instructions

Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortium

When compared to other Race/Ethnic groups, Hispanics appear to be experiencing overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors within the Consortia. Of the opportunities measured below, Hispanics were indexed the lowest on average of the seven-categories below.

(Cnsrt-Apple Valley, CONSORTIA) Jurisdiction	CA Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index	Index Average
Total Population								
White, Non-Hispanic	33.43	43.86	18.18	29.14	17.15	53.79	83.01	
Black, Non-Hispanic	24.77	36.74	15.17	29.58	18.83	54.56	80.43	65.02
Hispanic	25.43	36.92	15.37	29.16	17.76	52.37	79.45	64.12
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	31.24	39.36	18.85	28.23	16.07	51.84	82.56	67.04
Native American, Non-Hispanic	28.19	41.43	13.18	29.78	18.59	59.89	80.40	67.87

Individual Jurisdictions


Apple Valley. Improvements to schools would be of great benefit to residents in areas with lower access to quality schools within the district. Transit schedules could be more frequent to improve the ability for residents to access better quality employment. Quality job growth, combined with wider offerings of job training programs, are needed for those who have the lowest ability to access other higher education opportunities. Lower-paying retail jobs are accessible but do not pay well and will only perpetuate poverty. Segregation is not an issue in Apple Valley at this time as there are no R/ECAPs. However, opportunity must exist to ensure that poverty does not continue to grow in neighborhoods where it is prevalent already.

Victorville. Similar to the Town of Apple Valley, some disparities in access to opportunities begin with limitations to proficient schools, job proximity, and high cost of transportation. Accesses to greater opportunities are low among all race/ethnicities and familial status.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Additional Information

V.B.iii.2. Additional Information

V.B.iii.2.a. Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about disparities in access to opportunity in the jurisdiction and region affecting groups with other protected characteristics.

 Instructions

During the community meeting transportation was an issue brought up several times. The lack of an effective public transportation system is of major concern to the community. An insufficient public transit affects many protected classes. Lack of more bus routes and short hours affect resident's ability to find and maintain decent employment. For those with disabilities or the elderly, the lack of proper infrastructure prevents them to getting to a bus stop, in turn making them miss critical medical or social service appointments.

V.B.iii.2.b. The program participant may also describe other information relevant to its assessment of disparities in access to opportunity, including any activities aimed at improving access to opportunities for areas that may lack such access, or in promoting access to opportunity (e.g., proficient schools, employment opportunities, and transportation).

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)


Apple Valley. During the recent recession, unemployment numbers in the region grew to over 15%, with Apple Valley's hovering around 12%. Moreover, a recent workforce study released by a local municipality revealed that more than 80,000 regional residents commute "down the hill" to areas of Southern California, including Los Angeles, Riverside and Orange counties. These facts reveal a low level of available jobs in Apple Valley and the region as a whole, disproportionately impacting employment opportunities for protected class persons.

Victorville. In March 2014, Victor Elementary school district announced that all 18 elementary schools in the district would be open as "Schools of Choice. This change took effect starting the 2014-2015 school year. This gave parents an opportunity to make a better choice of school for their student to attend within their neighborhood quadrant. This gives children is lower performing an opportunity to attend a higher performing school while still being provided bus service.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Contributing Factors of Disparities in Access to Opportunity

V.B.iii.3. Contributing Factors of Disparities in Access to Opportunity

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of disparities in access to opportunity.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous responses)

Lack of private investments in specific neighborhoods

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

Land use and zoning laws

V.B.iii.3. Contributing Factors of Disparities in Access to Opportunity - Other

 Revised (Click for previous text)

The goal of Increasing Access to Opportunity Areas for low income Hispanics located in the Consortia will address the fair housing issues of significant disparities in access to opportunities and segregation. Based on the AFH analysis, Victorville had significant disparities in access to opportunities compared to Apple Valley. This is particularly the case for low-income Hispanics. When compared to other Race/Ethnic groups, Hispanics appear to be experiencing overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors within the Consortia. Of the opportunities measured, Hispanics were indexed the lowest on average of the seven-categories. Contributing factors to these fair housing issues include, Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods including services or amenities; Location and type of affordable housing; and. Land Use and Zoning Laws.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disproportionate Housing Needs

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disproportionate Housing Needs > Analysis

V.B.iv.1. Analysis

V.B.iv.1.a. Which groups (by race/ethnicity and family status) experience higher rates of housing cost burden, overcrowding, or substandard housing when compared to other groups? Which groups also experience higher rates of severe housing burdens when compared to other groups?

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortium

Housing Problems

- For extremely low income households (0-30% AMI), 84% of the Consortia population experienced a housing problem. A disproportionately greater need exists within this category for American Indian/ Alaskan Native, with 100% of population experiencing a housing problem.
- In income categories 30%-50% AMI, Black/African American (92%) as well as American Indian/ Alaskan Native (100%) experienced a disproportionate greater need.
- In income categories 50% -80% AMI, Black/African American (80%) and Asians (75%) experienced a disproportionate greater need, compared to 60% of the population in that income group as a whole.
- Within the 80-100% AMI categories no group experienced a disproportionately greater need.
- It should be noted that only African Americans appeared more than once in income categories as having a disproportionate greater need relating to 1 of 4 housing problems. Conversely, Hispanics was the only racial group not to have a disproportionate need in any income category. Pacific Islanders data was not available.

Severe Housing Problems

- For extremely low income households (0-30% AMI), 77% of the Consortia population experienced a severe housing problem. A disproportionately greater need exists within this category for American Indian/ Alaskan Native, with 100% of population experiencing a severe housing problem.
- In income categories 30%-50% AMI, Black/African American (70%) as well as Asians (79%) experienced a disproportionate greater need.
- In income categories 50% -80% AMI, only Asians (37%) experienced a disproportionate greater need, compared to 60% of the population in that income group as a whole.
- Within the 80-100% AMI categories no group experienced a disproportionately greater need.

Cost Burden

When comparing the jurisdiction as a whole, Whites (48%) and Hispanics (32%) experienced disproportionately greater housing cost burden (Paying 30-50% on housing) than other racial/ethnic groups in the Consortia. However only Whites (39%) are disproportionality effected as it relates to severe cost burden (paying >50% on housing). It should be noted that only Whites have a disproportionate need as it relates to housing cost burden and severe housing cost burden compared to the Consortia as a whole.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. For purposes of analysis, housing issues are considered to include four categories: incomplete kitchen facilities, incomplete plumbing facilities, overcrowding, or housing cost burdens that exceed 30% of monthly income. Table 9 was reviewed for any overrepresented Race/Ethnicity categories. Black, Non-Hispanics were by far the highest percentage of the population that has a housing issue(s) with 76.13%. Only representing 8.59% of the population, this shows that housing problems overwhelmingly affect the Black population in the jurisdiction. The next highest Race/Ethnicity experiencing housing was Hispanics with just over half of the population experiencing one or more housing issues. Family households of over 5 people consist of 56.67% of all households with one or more housing issues.

When looking at severe housing problems (that accounts for all other issues previously mentioned except housing cost burden is raised to over 50%), Table 9 continues to show that Black and Hispanic populations have very high rates of housing problems, 42.48% and 34.82%, respectively. When Table 10 is examined just for the Race/Ethnicity of those experiencing this severe housing cost burden alone, it is revealed that the trend of Black and Hispanic populations being most severely affected continues; 38.66% for Black households and 30.56% for Hispanics. However, when cost burden and familial situation is reviewed, non-family households actually have the highest rate of housing costs with 29.50% of the population paying more than 50% of their income to rent or mortgage payments.

Victorville. Table 9 and 10 were examined to determine the highest rates in the above mentioned categories. The race/ethnic group experiencing the highest disproportionate housing needs is among the Black population at 61.89%. This represents households experiencing any four housing issues that include incomplete kitchen facilities, incomplete plumbing facilities, more than 1 person per room (overcrowding) or cost burden greater than 30%. The lowest population experiencing housing issues is in the Other, non-Hispanic population at 40.80%.

Severe disproportionate housing needs include any four housing issues that include incomplete kitchen facilities, incomplete plumbing facilities, more than 1 person per room (overcrowding) or cost burden greater than 50%. The race/ethnicity population experiencing severe housing problems is the Native American, non-Hispanic population at 42.86%. The population that falls under the severe housing problems with the lowest percentage is the Other, non-Hispanic population at 24.92%. Families with household's sizes of 5+ experience a disproportionate need at 65.05% of the population.

Severe housing burden is defined as having a housing cost greater than 50% of the household's income. The Black, non-Hispanic population suffer the largest severe housing burden cost at 38.79% Families with a household size of 5 + people experience a severe housing burden cost at 26.05% of the population.

V.B.iv.1.b. Which areas in the jurisdiction and region experience the greatest housing burdens? Which of these areas align with segregated areas, integrated areas, or R/ECAPs and what are the predominant race/ethnicity or national origin groups in such areas?

i Instructions

i Relevant Data


Revised (Click for previous text)

Apple Valley. Though the Town does not have any RECAPs, according to Maps 7 and 8, areas with the greatest housing burdens also overlap with low income areas. This is concerning for the reason that even though these area have the lowest housing costs in the community, many may be substandard rental or aged single-family units with incomplete facilities or, despite the low rents or purchase prices, housing costs may still not be low enough for some households. Within the Jurisdiction. there does not appear to be any correlation between Race/Ethnicity and housing burdens. However, some areas with higher housing burdens are likely to have residents with a National Origin of Mexico. Since Mexico is the highest representation of National Origin in Apple Valley, it makes sense that there would be greater number of this population also represented in areas where housing burdens are most prevalent.

Victorville. Map 7 illustrates the largest area with households experiencing housing burdens falls in the City's R/ECAP area, Census Tract 99.05. The percent of the population in this area is experiencing a housing burden is >63.28% of the area's population. This area is predominantly White (as indicated by the orange dots), Hispanic (as indicated by the blue dots) and Native American (as indicated by the black dots). Map 8 illustrates the national origin of this population. Residents of Mexican (as indicated by the orange dots) origin are the highest population.

The area located within Census Tract 99.08 appears to be <33.33% Households experiencing one more housing burden in the Jurisdiction. This area appears to be White, Non-Hispanic, Black, Non-Hispanic and Hispanic. This area is east Highway 395 north Bear Valley Road, south La Mesa and east Amethyst Road.

V.B.iv.1.c. Compare the needs of families with children for housing units with two, and three or more bedrooms with the available existing housing stock in each category of publicly supported housing.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data


Revised (Click for previous text)

Apple Valley. Table 11 shows the families with children that live in households that utilize the Housing Choice Voucher program. Nearly half (46.92%) of HCV recipients are families with children. Zero - 1 bedroom units represent 4.45 % (13 households), 2 bedroom units represent 59.25% (173 households), and 32.88% are 3+ bedroom households (96). HCV's are the only form of publicly supported housing available in Apple Valley at this time.

Victorville. Table 11 illustrates the housing needs in publicly supported housing. Households with children represent 73.10% of the families living in publicly supported housing. 15 households in 0 – 1 bedroom units represent 7.61%, 134 households in 2 bedroom units represent 68.02% and 45 households in 3+ units represent 22.84 % of these households.

Households receiving Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) break down as follows: 74 households in 0-1 bedrooms represents 9.89%, 180 households represent 24.06% in 2 bedrooms units, 476 households in 3+ bedroom units represents 63.64%. Of these households, 462 or 61.76% are households with children.

V.B.iv.1.d. Describe the differences in rates of renter and owner occupied housing by race/ethnicity in the jurisdiction and region.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

According to Table 16 (Consortia) below, the largest percentage of home owners and renters by protected class in both the Consortia and Region were Hispanics. Whites were the only group that had a higher percentage of homeowners than renters in both the Consortia and Region. Conversely, Blacks/Non Hispanics was the only group in the Consortia which percentage of renters were more than 5 percent higher than rate of homeownership compared to the population as a whole. While they represented nearly one out of every four renters (21%) in the Consortia, only 9 percent were homeowners.

Table 16 - Homeownership and Rental Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	(Cnsrt-Apple Valley, CA CONSORTIA) Jurisdiction (Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA) Region							
	Homeowners		Renters		Homeowners		Renters	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White, Non-Hispanic	19,060	54.59%	7,415	37.43%	446,425	53.90%	169,245	36.89%
Black, Non-Hispanic	3,250	9.31%	4,185	21.13%	43,075	5.20%	53,295	11.62%
Hispanic	10,770	30.85%	7,095	35.82%	268,520	32.42%	200,830	43.78%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,235	3.54%	705	3.56%	53,205	6.42%	22,550	4.92%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	25	0.07%	100	0.50%	3,275	0.40%	2,590	0.56%
Other, Non-Hispanic	570	1.63%	315	1.59%	13,770	1.66%	10,245	2.23%
Total Household Units	34,915	-	19,810	-	828,270	-	458,755	-

Note 1: Data presented are numbers of households, not individuals.

Note 2: Data Sources: CHAS

Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info).

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Housing is 67.1% owner-occupied in Apple Valley according to Census Quick Facts. The location of rentals in Apple Valley is spread evenly through Town, with only a slight dominance in ownership in the farthest west areas of Town bordering the Mojave River.

Victorville has a minimal overcrowding suggesting the City has an adequate supply of larger homes to accommodate larger households. Overcrowded households tend to be those of renters. Unit overcrowding is caused by the combined effect of low earnings and high housing cost.

Region. There was no data located that adequately reflected the most prominent areas where rentals are located through the region. However, the Region has an overall ownership rate of 60.9% for San Bernardino County and slightly higher for Riverside County at 65.9%.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disproportionate Housing Needs > Additional Information

V.B.iv.2. Additional Information

V.B.iv.2.a. Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about disproportionate housing needs in the jurisdiction and region affecting groups with other protected characteristics.

 Instructions

Apple Valley. HCV's are only minimally available in Apple Valley as the list for the area rarely opens up to accept interested households to the program. Only 282 vouchers are assisting Apple Valley residents.

The City of Victorville has a large number of Housing Choice Vouchers with 912 vouchers assisting very low and low income residents need their housing needs. The HCV is administered by the County of San Bernardino's Housing Authority.

V.B.iv.2.b. The program participant may also describe other information relevant to its assessment of disproportionate housing needs. For PHAs, such information may include a PHA's overriding housing needs analysis.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

State law requires jurisdictions to provide for their share of regional housing needs. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) determines the housing growth needs by income category for cities within its jurisdiction, which includes the City of Victorville and Town Apple Valley. Victorville is required to provide adequate sites for the construction of 7,371 new dwelling units during the planning period 2014-21. Of these new units, 1,698 should be affordable to Very Low Income households, 1,207 to Low Income households, 1,342 to Moderate income households, and 3,124 to above moderate income households. The Town of Apple Valley has to construct 3,334 units. Of these, 382 are for Extremely Low income; 382 Very Low Income; 541 Low Income; 622 Moderate Income; and 1,407 Above Moderate Income.

Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. With a high senior population in Apple Valley, the Town is looking to expand housing availability to seniors. Community meetings revealed that the unexpected passing of a significant other can drastically reduce the income available to the living spouse. When income decreases and housing costs remain the same, the housing cost burden may no longer be sustainable for the household or there may not be enough funds to make necessary repairs and maintenance on a home. The Town is involved in a 50-unit senior apartment complex with an affordable housing developer to resolve some issues that place extra burdens on seniors. Also, the Town continues to offer the Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program to qualifying Apple Valley homeowners to address health, safety, code issues and necessary repairs.


Victorville. Revitalization efforts are planned for the Old Town area. Assistance will be provided to income qualified residents in form of a loan in order to correct code violations and make curb appeal improvements. This will preserve the existing housing stock. A concern heard during the citizen participation plan was the availability of affordable housing stock for senior citizens. With many baby boomers reaching retirement age and above, many are looking to downsize from their once practical home. Victorville has a limited supply of senior housing.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disproportionate Housing Needs > Contributing Factors of Disproportionate Housing Needs

V.B.iv.3. Contributing Factors of Disproportionate Housing Needs

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of disparities in access to opportunity.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous responses)

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

V.B.iv.3. Contributing Factors of Disproportionate Housing Needs - Other

 Revised (Click for previous text)

As indicated by the analysis, several housing units and neighborhoods in this area are older construction, and require either rehabilitation or conservation to be maintained as viable dwelling units. Within these neighborhoods, Hispanics experienced highest rate of housing cost burden, overcrowding, and substandard housing when compared to other groups in the Consortia.

Fair Housing Analysis > Publicly Supported Housing Analysis


Fair Housing Analysis > Publicly Supported Housing Analysis > Analysis

Fair Housing Analysis > Publicly Supported Housing Analysis > Analysis > Publicly Supported Housing Demographics

V.C.1. Analysis

V.C.1.a. Publicly Supported Housing Demographics

V.C.1.a.i. Are certain racial/ethnic groups more likely to be residing in one category of publicly supported housing than other categories (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other HUD Multifamily Assisted developments, and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV))?

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Based on lowest opportunity indicators for categories “low poverty rate” and “access to labor markets”, the racial/ethnic groups more likely to be residing in one category of publicly supported are Asians.

Low	Labor	Average
Poverty	Market	Index
Index	Index	

Population below federal poverty line

White, Non-Hispanic	25.44	12.97	38.41
Black, Non-Hispanic	20.41	13.43	33.84
Hispanic	20.67	11.22	31.89
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	18.45	12.54	30.99
Native American, Non-Hispanic	39.64	19.74	59.38


Individual Jurisdictions

Apple Valley. Housing Choice Voucher programs, operated by the Housing Authority, are currently the only available source of Publicly Supported Housing opportunities in Apple Valley. According to Table

6, HCV serves a disproportionately high rate of Black, Non-Hispanic residents who receive over half of all available vouchers in Apple Valley while only making-up 8.59 % of the Town's population. White, Non- Hispanic residents are underrepresented in the program with only 29.09% of all vouchers assisting their households.

Victorville. Table 6 illustrates the percentage of housing choice vouchers (HCV) distributed throughout Victorville. The highest concentration of HCV is in the west side of the city. This area is predominantly White, Black and Hispanic. Table 7 illustrates housing burden and race/ethnicity. Victorville's R/ECAP Census Tract 99.05 has the highest percent of the population experiencing one or more housing burden. The population in this area is White, Hispanic and Black.

V.C.1.a.ii. Compare the demographics, in terms of protected class, of residents of each category of publicly supported housing (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other HUD Multifamily Assisted developments, and HCV) to the population in general, and persons who meet the income eligibility requirements for the relevant category of publicly supported housing. Include in the comparison, a description of whether there is a higher or lower proportion of groups based on protected class.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Apple Valley. As the only source of publicly supported housing in Apple Valley at this time, information concerning only Housing Choice Vouchers is available in Tables 6 and 7. Table 7 reveals that there are 337 households receiving HCV assistance. Of those 337, Table 6 shows that the HCV program serves 53.45% Black, Non-Hispanic residents; over half of all available vouchers. This race makes up only 8.59 % of the Town's population. Meanwhile, Hispanic and White, Non-Hispanic populations are underrepresented in the program, receiving 17.45% and 29.09% of all vouchers, respectively. Hispanic households represent 29.14% of the overall population and White,

non-Hispanics, 55.58%. Though they represent a small percentage of the population (3.17%) no Asian or Pacific Islanders are receiving HCV assistance at this time. Families represent 46.92% of the households receiving assistance under HCV. Seniors receive nearly 20.0% of all vouchers. Recipients with a disability consist of 21.92% of all voucher holders.

Victorville. Table 6 illustrates publicly supported housing residents by race and ethnicity. Residents whose income is 0 – 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) are the following: Hispanics have the highest percentage at 37.19, followed by Whites at 28.49% and Blacks at 28.30%. Asian or Pacific Islanders have the lowest percentage of very low income residents at 3.82%. Residents who's AMI is 50% of AMI are as follow: Hispanic have the highest percentage at 34.19%, followed by White at 26.40% and Black at 25.71%. Asian or Pacific Islanders have the lowest percentage of low income residents at 4.15%. Residents who's AMI is 80% of AMI are as follow: Hispanic have the highest percentage at 39.19%, followed by White at 29.53% and Black at 19.94%. Asian or Pacific Islanders have the lowest percentage of median income residents at 4.56%.

Fair Housing Analysis > Publicly Supported Housing Analysis > Analysis > Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy and Disparities in Access to Opportunity

V.C.1.b. Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy

V.C.1.b.i. Describe patterns in the geographic location of publicly supported housing by program category (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other HUD Multifamily Assisted developments, HCV, and LIHTC) in relation to previously discussed segregated areas and R/ECAPs.

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

Map 5 Publicly Supported Housing and Race/Ethnicity

Map 6 Housing Choice Vouchers and Race/Ethnicity

Jurisdictions Map 5 shows that Apple Valley does not have any publicly supported housing units at this time. Map 6 shows that the areas known for a dominant rental market also carry the highest HCV rates in the jurisdiction. These areas are comprised of census tracts 97.16 and 97.10. They have an HCV rate between 7.29% and 11.92% of all housing units in the area. These areas do not have a clear predominance of any race and are well integrated. Apple Valley does not have a R/ECAP to compare these areas to within Town boundaries. Victorville does not have any public housing units. The majority of multi family housing, project based section 8 housing and

low income housing tax credit units are located in the east side of the city. These area have predominantly White population. Ironically, the majority of HCV are not distributed in these areas. They are further south and west of these areas. No publicly supported housing is in Victorville's R/ECAP area.

Consortium Map 5 reveals that within the Consortium boundaries, Victorville alone has both Project-Based Section 8 and LIHTC housing activities. These projects are generally along the I-15 corridor but do not have any identifiable relation to jurisdictional demographic segregation. However, this general population density map reveals that as a whole per the Consortium map, Apple Valley does not equally host these types of public housing projects as does Victorville and in a comparison of regional minority demographics could suggest that Victorville hosts these projects due to its higher minority demographic concentrations. Victorville does have higher density residential zoning options and nearly 50,000 more residents which may attribute to this occurrence more than due to Race/Ethnicity demographic composition.

Map 6 reveals only scattered presence of Housing Choice Vouchers throughout the Consortium area and does not provide a strong correlation to density or stronger presence in any one individual jurisdiction. Poverty-level households are generally concentrated in areas where higher intensity housing (and therefore lower costs) and access to public transportation is more readily available.

V.C.1.b.ii. Describe patterns in the geographic location for publicly supported housing that primarily serves families with children, elderly persons, or persons with disabilities in relation to previously discussed segregated areas or R/ECAPs?

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

Apple Valley has no publicly supported housing within the Town boundaries.

Victorville has no publicly supported housing in its R/ECAP area.

V.C.1.b.iii. How does the demographic composition of occupants of publicly supported housing in R/ECAPS compare to the demographic composition of occupants of publicly supported housing outside of R/ECAPs?


i Instructions


i Relevant Data

Apple Valley. No publicly supported housing exists in Apple Valley and the Town boundaries do not contain R/ECAPs.

Victorville. No publicly supported housing is in Victorville's R/ECAP area. The demographic composition of the area that contains the publicly supported housing is predominately White, Black and Hispanic.

V.C.1.b.iv.(A). Do any developments of public housing, properties converted under the RAD, and LIHTC developments have a significantly different demographic composition, in terms of protected class, than other developments of the same category? Describe how these developments differ.


 Instructions

 Relevant Data

Apple Valley. No publicly supported housing, properties converted under RAD, or LIHTC developments, currently exist in Apple Valley and the Town boundaries.

Victorville. Table 8 illustrates the demographics of publicly supported housing developments by program category. The projects mentioned are project-based section 8 multifamily units. Sherwood Villas has 101 units with the demographic makeup as follows: White – 17%, Black – 53%, Hispanic – 24% and Asian – 2%. Rodeo Drive Apartments has 99 units and the demographic makeup as follows: White – 7%, Black – 52%, Hispanic 36% and Asian 1%. The demographic makeup of these two complexes are very similar in percentages with a slight difference in White and Hispanic population.

V.C.1.b.iv.(B) Provide additional relevant information, if any, about occupancy, by protected class, in other types of publicly supported housing.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

No additional information.

V.C.1.b.v. Compare the demographics of occupants of developments, for each category of publicly supported housing (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other HUD Multifamily Assisted developments, properties converted under RAD, and LIHTC) to the demographic composition of the areas in which they are located. Describe whether developments that are primarily occupied by one

race/ethnicity are located in areas occupied largely by the same race/ethnicity. Describe any differences for housing that primarily serves families with children, elderly persons, or persons with disabilities.

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

Apple Valley. The Town of Apple Valley does not currently have any publicly supported housing developments. The one multi-family facility shown in Apple Valley, the Apple Valley Care Center, does not show any available demographic information to analyze.

Victorville. The area that contains most of the publicly supported housing contains other multifamily complexes. These areas tend to have lower income residents. Historically and currently these area have a high Black population although Map 5 depicts the area population to be predominantly White.

Because most senior citizens are on a fixed income, several mobile home parks in Victorville are affordable and residents must income qualify to live in the park. One park in particular is in the north outskirts of town. Fortunately there is a bus stop right in front of the park but the park is located far from any grocery stores or other services. Residents must rely on a car in order to go grocery shopping or medical appointments.

V.C.1.c. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

V.C.1.c.i. Describe any disparities in access to opportunity for residents of publicly supported housing, including within different program categories (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other HUD Multifamily Assisted Developments, HCV, and LIHTC) and between types (housing primarily serving families with children, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities) of publicly supported housing.

i Instructions


i Relevant Data

None of the publicly supported housing primarily serves the senior or disabled population.

The Housing Authority has prioritized serving homeless veterans and their families through programs they offer such as Veterans Affairs supportive services, Supportive services for Veterans Families and the Continuum of Care.

V.C.2. Additional Information

V.C.2.a. Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about publicly supported housing in the jurisdiction and region, particularly information about groups with other protected characteristics and about housing not captured in the HUD-provided data.

 Instructions

The San Bernardino County Housing Authority received a \$2.41 million renewal grant from HUD in 2015 for its various Continuum of Care programs that serve homeless families and individuals with disabilities. Through the same grant Knowledge and Education for Your Success (KEYS), a non-profit affiliate of the Housing Authority, received \$236,605 for housing navigators. KEYS housing navigators provide families with case management and other support services referrals.

V.C.2.b. The program participant may also describe other information relevant to its assessment of publicly supported housing. Information may include relevant programs, actions, or activities, such as tenant self-sufficiency, place-based investments, or mobility programs.


 Instructions


In an effort to create more housing opportunities for families in the Housing Authorities waiting list, the department implemented a new initiative in April 2015 to transition families who have an annual income which exceeds 80% of the area median income (over income) off of housing assistance. Over income families are given a six month grace period to transition off housing assistance.

V.C.3. Contributing Factors of Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of fair housing issues related to publicly supported housing, including Segregation, R/ECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs. For each contributing factor that is significant, note which fair

housing issue(s) the selected contributing factor relates to.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous responses)

Quality of affordable housing information programs

V.C.3. Contributing Factors of Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy - Other

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis > Analysis

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis > Analysis > Population Profile

V.D.1. Population Profile

V.D.1.a. How are persons with disabilities geographically dispersed or concentrated in the jurisdiction and region, including R/ECAPs and other segregated areas identified in previous sections?

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Based on Maps 14 and 15 (consortia) , persons with disabilities are geographically dispersed evenly throughout the Consortia, including R/ECAPs and other segregated areas identified in previous sections.


Individual Jurisdiction

Apple Valley. Map 16 shows that persons with disabilities residing in Apple Valley are geographically dispersed and are not concentrated in any specific area. There are no RE/CAPs in Apple Valley of which to compare to. Despite having a higher percentage of disabled residents across all types of disabilities than the region does, Apple Valley's more densely populated, multi-family areas, that also have higher concentrations of rental housing and low-income persons, do not show any apparent concentration of disabled persons.

Victorville. Map 16 Disability by type notes the disbursement of the population with hearing, vision and cognitive disabilities. A small concentration of disabled individuals resides in the R/ECAP Census Tract 99.05. The largest population has a vision disability. Residents with cognitive disability are mostly located in the southern part of the City. The area has a large number of medical facilities, including heart specialist, physical therapist, dialysis center, imaging, dental, laboratories, urgent care and other specialized medical offices and hospital.

Other amenities within the area are grocery stores, public transit services, banks, clothing stores and restaurants, both sit down and fast food establishments.

V.D.1.b. Describe whether these geographic patterns vary for persons with each type of disability or for persons with disabilities in different age ranges.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Consortia

Based on Maps 14 and 15 (consortia), persons with disabilities are geographically dispersed evenly throughout the Consortia, including R/ECAPs and other segregated areas identified in previous sections.


Individual Jurisdiction

Apple Valley. Table 14 shows the age ranges of disabled persons. The largest share of the total population with a disability is 18-64 year olds, who consist of 8.77% of residents. Maps 16 and 17 show that geographic locations of disabled persons do not vary significantly by age range or type of disability. Disabled persons do not appear concentrated in any one area and do not appear to be unable to access housing in any area of the Town boundaries. Community survey response of 8% disabled compares to area population percentage.

Victorville. Map 17 depicts disabilities by age groups. Disabled residents living in the above mentioned area fall in the 5 – 17 age range and 18 – 64 age range. Amenities and human services are available in close proximity to these individuals. The few disabled residents that are over 64 years of age are scattered throughout Victorville.

V.D.2. Housing Accessibility

V.D.2.a. Describe whether the jurisdiction and region have sufficient affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes.

 Instructions

Apple Valley. There is potential for an affordable housing project to be developed that will adhere to all ADA requirements necessary to accommodate disabled persons on and around the premises or their individual unit. One phase of the project is tentatively planned as a senior development and may incorporate 100% accessible units for that reason. The second phase is open to all low-income households, but it has not been determined how many units will be reserved as accessible at this time. However, the Town does not currently have any affordable housing units designated for the disabled, or otherwise.

Victorville. Access and affordability are the major housing needs of a disabled person. Physically disabled persons often require specially designed dwellings to permit access within the unit, as well as to and from the property. The disabled, like the elderly have special needs with regard to location. Because of their limited mobility, the disabled often need to live close or have transportation assistance to shopping and medical facilities. Similar to many communities, sufficient accessible and affordable housing in a variety of unit size is limited. In 2011, an affordable apartment complex, consisting of 48 units was built, having varying unit sizes from two to four bedroom units. The complex includes four handicap accessible units that serve disabled individuals and families.

Although Victorville may not have large quantities of accessible and affordable housing units for persons with disabilities, the City's approach to meeting disable needs are as follows:

Senior Home Repair Program (SHRP) – This program is a one-time grant in the amount of \$15,000, of labor and materials for eligible senior or permanently disabled persons. Many residents have benefited from this program by addressing health and safety violations, or simply making ADA improvements. Repairs and improvements vary from roof repair to ramp way installation, restroom modifications, etc.

Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR) Program – Similar to the SHRP, homeowners who income qualifies may be eligible to receive a low interest deferred loan to make repairs that include ADA improvements or home repairs. Loans may be provided in the amount not to exceed \$25,000.

In addition, the City Adopted a Reasonable Accommodations in Housing to Disabled or Handicapped Individuals Ordinance. The ordinance is to provide a process for individuals with disabilities to make request for, and be provided, reasonable accommodation in the application of zoning regulations to housing.

Region. In speaking of the region on the whole, some community members expressed dissent for the condition of some senior and disabled housing complexes while praising others they have seen. It varies by community, but no comments were provided concerning the size of units or availability.

Affordability is the main concern as it was expressed that nothing is affordable enough for a senior or disabled person who is living on their own or who has lost their spouse, and therefore their Social Security income, after they pass on. This is not acceptable and each community must do what is within their power to ensure adequate housing availability for at-risk groups. The Housing Authority has a waiting list of thousands for Housing Choice Vouchers and affordable housing. Units are limited for all households.

V.D.2.b. Describe the areas where affordable accessible housing units are located. Do they align with R/ECAPs or other areas that are segregated?

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

Apple Valley. The Town does not have any affordable housing units at this time. There is potential for an affordable housing project to be developed near the intersection of Navajo and Sioux Roads in census tract 97.10. The project will adhere to all ADA requirements necessary to accommodate disabled persons on and around the premises or their individual unit. One phase of the project is tentatively planned as a senior development and is likely to incorporate many accessible units for that reason. The second phase is open to all low-income households, but it has not been determined how many units will be reserved as accessible at this early stage.

The Town has a large availability of multi-family apartment complexes. However, like the majority of all housing stock in the Town boundaries, most were constructed in the 1980's and may not meet requirements established by the Fair Housing Act.

Victorville. The City's affordable housing units are not located within the R/ECAP laying within Census Tract 99.05. However, located within Census Tract 99.04, south from 99.05, and HUD Map 5 (Publicly Supported Housing) is one Public Housing complex known as the Sherwood Villa Apartments, and two low income housing tax credit complexes, Gold West and Summer Breeze. Further north from Census Tract 99.05 is another low income housing tax credit complex known as Northgate Village Apartments. Although, these complexes are close in proximity to the R/ECAP area, the City is overall integrated, including the areas where these complexes are located. Additional, other affordable housing units are scattered throughout the City, but are also in integrated areas. No additional R/ECAPs are located within the City of Victorville.

V.D.2.c. To what extent are persons with different disabilities able to access and live in the different categories of publicly supported housing?

i Instructions

i Relevant Data

Apple Valley. The Town does not have publicly supported housing options, aside from the HCV program at this time. Of those served by the Housing Authority in Apple Valley, 21.92% are disabled persons.

Victorville. Although the publicly supported housing units are in areas with sidewalks and ADA curb cutouts, including access public transportation, persons with disabilities may encounter the following barriers when trying to obtain publicly supported housing:

- Ability to access ADA housing may take too long due to long waiting lists;
- Policies in determining priority placement;
- Providers discriminate against people with disabilities; such as the treatment of people with physical disabilities and people with hearing impairments;
- Public housing design;
- Policies or procedures requiring the disabled person to make ADA improvements beyond what the policy considers a “reasonable accommodation”. The disabled person may not be able to afford the improvements
- ADA improvements one disabled person may need may not be adequate for another (availability of different accessibility features);
- Person who is disabled may not be aware of housing availability
- Lack of disabled units for disabled persons

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis > Analysis > Integration of Persons with Disabilities Living in Institutions and Other Segregated Settings

V.D.3. Integration of Persons with Disabilities Living in Institutions and Other Segregated Settings

V.D.3.a. To what extent do persons with disabilities in or from the jurisdiction or region reside in segregated or integrated settings?

Apple Valley. Apple Valley is well integrated and does not appear to have areas where disabled persons reside in concentration of disability. There are Assisted Living Facilities throughout Apple Valley. These also do not appear to be in any concentrated area of the jurisdiction.

Victorville. Currently, the City of Victorville has approximately 15 adult home facilities providing care to disabled individuals. These facilities are licensed to care for up to 77 people. Although, addresses for these facilities are not available to determine if any segregation is apparent, based on the HUD data the City overall appears to be integrated.

Victorville has three assisted living facilities for the elderly. The facilities are located in the Green Tree area and Ridgecrest area of Victorville. The facilities offer independent and assisted living.

Region. There are numerous programs available statewide that aim to further integrate disabled persons:

In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) is available statewide to qualifying disabled and elderly persons who require basic assistance with errands and doctor appointments in order to stay in their residence to age in place. This program allows persons with disabilities to also remain living with a family member who can be assigned as their caregiver. The caregiver is compensated for the time it takes

to care for the family member, further benefiting the disabled or elderly person so they remain an active part of their family and society instead of being forced to enter a care facility.

California Community Transitions (CCT). California Community Transitions (CCT) is California's Money Follows the Person demonstration to transition long-term residents from long-term care facilities to community environments. CCT lead organizations include Independent Living Centers, Home Health Agencies, Area Agencies on Aging and Multipurpose Senior Services Program providers as well as the Department of Developmental Services. Fifteen lead organizations are currently serving potential demonstration participants in 42 counties. Another seven providers are actively pursuing lead organization status. The Department of Developmental Services serves as lead for all California Community Transitions facilitated by regional centers. Through October 2010, lead organizations and the Department of Developmental Services have supported 286 individuals in their transitions with 244 individuals currently in various stages of transition planning.

V.D.3.b. Describe the range of options for persons with disabilities to access affordable housing and supportive services.

Apple Valley. Assisted living facilities for senior or adult disabled persons are available throughout Apple Valley. These vary from large residential care facilities to smaller in-home care facilities for less than 8 persons, depending on the individual state license held.

Given the high percentage of disabled persons in Apple Valley, the majority do not live in care facilities. Most remain in their homes under their own care, or the care of a family member. In-Home Supportive Services is an excellent program for qualifying persons to secure a caregiver to fulfill their day-to-day needs. This may be someone that is assigned to them, or a person within their family that is compensated with state minimum hourly wages to care for the individual to which they are assigned for a designated number of hours to which they require care.

Victorville. The adult assisted living housing for disabled or elderly provides an array of services. Most offer 24-hour nursing, support groups, diabetic management, assisted living, memory care, and respite care. These facilities are within proximity of three major hospitals, two of which are within the City of Victorville, and the other in Apple Valley. Because of the amenities and services provided by these adult living facilities, some persons with disabilities may not be able to afford these housing facilities. Many, seniors or persons with disabilities are on limited incomes and choose to rent a home.

For those seniors or disable persons who own their homes, such as a mobile home, the City's Senior Home Repair Program assists them make modifications and improvements to their homes so that they live in a safe and accessible environment. The SHRP is a \$15,000 one-time grant program and has assisted over 300 seniors or persons who are permanently disabled. In addition, the City has allocated funding to Victor Valley Community Services Council to assist low-income seniors make minor home repairs.

As previously mentioned, the County of San Bernardino administers human services such as WIC, Cal-Fresh, Medi-Cal and other assistance based programs. Satellite offices have been opened in Victorville, Hesperia and Adelanto so residents do not have to travel to San Bernardino, which is a 40 minute drive by car. Public transportation is available to and from these offices.

The Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) is a San Bernardino agency is dedicated to helping seniors and at risk individuals to improve or maintain choice, independence and quality of life. DAAS offers an array of services, such as Adult Protective Services, Family Caregiver Support Program, In-Home Supportive Services, Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program, Nutrition and Provider Services, and the Multipurpose Senior Services Program. The purpose of these programs is to ensure seniors and adults with disabilities have the right to age in place in the least restrictive environment.

The Multipurpose Senior Services Program, for instance, works to avoid or delay the inappropriate placement of persons in nursing facilities while fostering independent living in the community. The Family Caregiver Support Program was created by the Title III-E of the Older Americans Act to serve caregivers (spouses, daughters, sons, grandparents, etc.) that have been providing care on an informal basis. The In-Home Supportive Services is a federal, state and locally funded program designed to help pay for services provided to seniors so that they can remain safely in their own homes. Some services include housecleaning, meal preparation, laundry, grocery shopping, etc. These are a just a few examples of options for disabled and adult persons in Victorville.

Region. According to the State of California's Olmstead Plan, the following programs are available statewide:

Independent Living Centers. The State Independent Living Plan identifies transition services as part of its 2010-2013 priorities. Approximately \$150,000 is allocated annually for independent living centers to provide necessary services to individuals they are assisting to transition to the community, limited to \$4,000 per individual. Individuals served do not need to be on Medi-Cal. These efforts funded by the Rehabilitation Act, Title VIIB, have transitioned hundreds of people with disabilities back to community living. 5

Mental Health Services Act Housing Program. The Department of Health Care Services and the California Housing Finance Administration jointly administer the Mental Health Services Act Housing Program. This program is funded by revenue from the state Mental Health Services Act (passed by California voters as Proposition 63 in 2004) for the development, acquisition, and rehabilitation of permanent supportive housing for individuals with mental illness and their families, especially homeless individuals with mental illness and their families. Approximately \$400 million in Mental Health Services Act funding has been set aside for this program

California Community Choices (Choices). California Community Choices (the Choices project) was housed at the California Health and Humane Services Agency, Office of the Secretary and was fully funded. It focused on developing California's long-term care infrastructure to increase access to home and community-based services and to help divert persons with disabilities and older adults from unnecessary institutionalization. Funding supported infrastructure development, including development of a pilot website, CalCareNet, a "one-stop shop" for information about long-term services and supports, features regional services in Riverside County, as well as statewide information about licensed care facilities and alcohol and drug programs. The site provides general education and tips for anyone seeking information about long-term services and supports.

The California (Medi-Cal) Working Disabled Program. The Department of Health Care Services established the 250 Percent Working Disabled Program, effective April 1, 2000. This program allows employed individuals with disabilities to earn up to 250 percent of the federal poverty level in countable income and maintain Medi-Cal eligibility by paying a monthly premium. A Medicaid Infrastructure Grant has supported outreach and education so that people with disabilities receiving critical Medi-Cal long-term services and supports are aware they can work and earn incomes above poverty levels without losing eligibility.

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis > Analysis > Disparities in Access to Opportunity

V.D.4. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

V.D.4.a. To what extent are persons with disabilities able to access the following?

Identify major barriers faced concerning:
i. Government services and facilities

- ii. Public infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, pedestrian signals)
- iii. Transportation
- iv. Proficient schools and educational programs
- v. Jobs

i. Government services and facilities

Apple Valley - Reasonable Accommodation

In accordance with the federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("Acts"), it is the purpose of this Section to provide individuals with disabilities reasonable accommodation in the application of the Town of Apple Valley's regulations, policies, practices, and procedures, as necessary to allow disabled persons to use and enjoy a dwelling. This Section provides a process for individuals with disabilities to make requests for, and to be provided, reasonable accommodation from the various Town regulations, policies, practices, and procedures, including zoning and land use regulations, when reasonable accommodation is warranted based upon sufficient evidence.

Victorville. Fair Housing Accessibility Standards and California Administrative Code Title 24 sets forth access and adaptability requirements for the physically handicapped (disabled). These regulations apply to public building such as hotels, employee housing, factory built housing and privately funded newly constructed apartment complexes containing five or more units. The regulations require that ramp ways, larger door widths, restroom modifications, etc. be designed to enable free access.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, special assistance to participate in meetings or events held in government facilities, reasonable accommodations may be made. A 48-hour advanced notice is request prior to accessing the facility.

i. Public infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, pedestrian signals)

Apple Valley. Historically a low density rural area, infrastructure improvements until recently have not been required. New commercial and residential areas as well as rebuilt roads include curb, sidewalks, gutter and drainage. Accessibility improvements are being included or added as well.

Victorville. As previously mentioned, Victorville still has a large amount of areas with no sidewalks. This makes it difficult for disabled and senior citizens to safely get around independently. Only a number of cutouts have the sensory bumps. The City is in the process of completing its Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan. The City has contracted with Disability Access Consultants (DAC) to conduct a review of City buildings and parks, and public rights-of-way. The study includes accessibility requirements for Americans With Disabilities, Caltrans requirements, California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CAMUTCD) and the Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG).

i. Transportation

Apple Valley. Victor Valley Transit Authority provides disabled individuals with Dial-A-Ride services to get them to and from appointments and also a Sunday Delivery program that actually takes them on a direct route to where they need to go. Routes that take a half to a full-day to navigate a person where they need to go, are not always sufficient for the needs of the elderly and disabled.

Victorville. Transportation has been an issue for disabled individuals in Victorville, Schedules and transfers make to and from major human services difficult. Residents express that many times an appointment will take all day because of the travel time.

Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA) offers complementary fixed route bus service to individuals who meet the Americans With Disabilities Act requirements and are certified. Low-cost curb to curb service is also offered. VVTA Transit Ambassadors assist seniors and person with disabilities by providing travel assistance to those that are new to the fixed-route service.

The Victor Valley Community Services Council provides free transportation to low income senior citizens and disabled persons. This service provider is funded through the City of Victorville in assisting seniors with emergency minor home repairs.

The Orenda Foundation provides military veterans assistance, including 12 step recovery, employment and transportation services for Veterans with disabilities.

The Family Resource Center works with at-risk youth by providing mental, sociological and educational services, including transportation services.

Foothill AIDS Project provides education, support and transportation services for those with HIV-AIDS.

i. Proficient schools and educational programs

Apple Valley. Local public and charter schools are eligible for Intradistrict Transfer Requests via Apple Valley Unified School District.

Victorville. With the introduction and implementation of the School of Choice program in the elementary school district, parents are able to choose a school that falls within their geographical area. Transportation is provided to the students. A bus route is available to the community college.

i. Jobs

Victorville. The U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, states that many persons with a disability who were not working reported some type of barrier to employment. Lack of education or training, lack of transportation, the need for special features at the job, and a person's own disability were just a few examples mentioned. Additionally, persons who were employed but are disabled experienced some form of difficulty in completing their job duties.

V.D.4.b. Describe the processes that exist in the jurisdiction and region for persons with disabilities to request and obtain reasonable accommodations and accessibility modifications to address the barriers discussed above.

Apple Valley. In accordance with the federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("Acts"), it is the purpose of this Section to provide individuals with disabilities reasonable accommodation in the application of the Town of Apple Valley's regulations, policies, practices, and procedures, as necessary to allow disabled persons to use and enjoy a dwelling. This Section provides a process for individuals with disabilities to make requests for, and to be provided, reasonable accommodation from the various Town regulations, policies, practices, and procedures, including zoning and land use regulations, when reasonable accommodation is warranted based upon sufficient evidence.

Victorville. In August 2006, the City adopted a Reasonable Accommodations in Housing to Disabled or Handicapped Individuals Ordinance. The purpose of this ordinance is to provide a process for individuals with disabilities to make a request for, and be provided, reasonable accommodation in the application of zoning regulations to housing. This ordinance will comply with Fair Housing

Laws, and is administered by the City Development Department.

V.D.4.c. Describe any difficulties in achieving homeownership experienced by persons with disabilities and by persons with different types of disabilities.

Apple Valley. Aging housing stock does not often have accessible design elements. Purchasing a home and then being required to spend thousands of dollars on remodeling costs can be out of reach for any new homeowner, let alone a disabled person on a fixed income.

Victorville. Physical and mental disabilities can hinder access to housing units of conventional design as well as limit the ability of the disabled individuals to earn an adequate income in order to purchase and maintain a house.

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis > Analysis > Disproportionate Housing Needs

V.D.5. Disproportionate Housing Needs

V.D.5.a. Describe any disproportionate housing needs experienced by persons with disabilities and by persons with certain types of disabilities.

 Instructions

 Relevant Data

Apple Valley. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) defines a disability as a “physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities.” Fair housing choice for persons with disabilities can be compromised based on the nature of their disability. Persons with physical disabilities may face discrimination in the housing market because of the use of wheelchairs, need for home modifications to improve accessibility, or other forms of assistance. Landlords/owners sometimes fear that a unit may sustain wheelchair damage or may refuse to exempt disabled tenants with service/guide animals from a no-pet policy. A major barrier to housing for people with mental disabilities is opposition based on the stigma of mental disability. Landlords often refuse to rent to tenants with a history of mental illness. Neighbors may object when a house becomes a group home for persons with mental disabilities. While housing discrimination is not covered by the ADA, the Fair Housing Act prohibits housing discrimination against persons with disabilities, including persons with HIV/AIDS.

According to HUD data from Table 1, 34 percent of the Apple Valley population have one or more disabilities. Special housing needs for persons with disabilities fall into two general categories: physical design to address mobility impairments and in-home social, educational, and medical support to address developmental and mental impairments.

Oftentimes, disabilities present an employment obstacle, making it difficult for the disabled to earn adequate incomes. Since the majority of the disabled population relies on fixed monthly disability incomes that are rarely sufficient to pay market rate rents, supportive housing options, including group housing and shared housing, are important means for meeting the needs of persons with disabilities. Such housing options typically include supportive services onsite to also meet the social needs of persons with disabilities. According to the State Community Care Licensing Division, there are 26 residential care facilities for adults and 15 residential care facilities for the elderly in the Apple Valley area for a total of 41 residential care facilities with a combined capacity of 424 persons.

Victorville. People with disabilities tend to be on a limited fixed income. Lower income residents may have to pay for more than they can afford causing severe housing burden or live in substandard housing.

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis > Additional Information

V.D.6. Additional Information

V.D.6.a. Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about disability and access issues in the jurisdiction and region affecting groups with other protected characteristics.


 Instructions

Apple Valley. The location of housing and availability of transportation is also important because disabled people may require access to a variety of social and specialized services. Amendments to the Fair Housing Act, as well as state law, require ground-floor units of new multi-family construction with more than four units to be accessible to persons with disabilities. However, units built prior to 1989 are not required to be accessible to persons with disabilities. Older units, particularly in older multi-family structures, are very expensive to retrofit for disabled occupants because space is rarely available for elevator shafts, ramps, or widened doorways, etc. The site, parking areas, and walkways may also need modifications to install ramps and widen walkways and gates.

Affordability, design, location, and discrimination significantly limit the supply of housing available to persons with disabilities. Most homes are inaccessible to people with mobility and sensory limitations. There is a need for housing with widened doorways and hallways, access ramps, larger bedrooms, lowered countertops, and other features necessary for accessibility. Location of housing is also a factor, as many persons with disabilities often rely on public transportation

Victorville. People who use wheelchairs, scooters and other mobility aids often find that some government facilities have parking, routes to and through buildings, high service counters and restrooms that are not accessible. Due to physical barriers, some people with mobility impairments may have to rely on others to assist them when transacting their business or they may not participate in activities in which they would otherwise be interested.

V.D.6.b. The program participant may also describe other information relevant to its assessment of disability and access issues.

 Instructions

Apple Valley. Acknowledging the aging housing stock in the Town boundaries, a Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program (RRLP) is available to low-income qualifying homeowners for health, safety, and code repairs; including modifications for accessibility concerns for the . This program is in operation town-wide and does not restrict assistance to any area of our boundaries.


Victorville. The City is currently preparing a study of all the accessibility deficiencies in the jurisdiction. This study includes all public facilities and infrastructure. Once the study is completed, the City will assess the deficiencies and begin addressing them. Residents have long voice their concern over lack of sidewalks in the city.

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis > Disability and Access Issues Contributing Factors

V.D.7. Disability and Access Issues Contributing Factors

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of disability and access issues and the fair housing issues, which are Segregation, R/ECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs. For each contributing factor, note which fair housing issue(s) the selected contributing factor relates to.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous responses)

V.D.7. Disability and Access Issues Contributing Factors - Other

 Revised (Click for previous text)

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement:

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement as well as private discrimination are a contributing factor of high priority because of its significant effect on fair housing choice for all protected groups. However, fair housing complaints by individuals with a disability seem to be disproportionately higher than other protected groups.

V.E.1. List and summarize any of the following that have not been resolved: a charge or letter of finding from HUD concerning a violation of a civil rights-related law, a cause determination from a substantially equivalent state or local fair housing agency concerning a violation of a state or local fair housing law, a letter of findings issued by or lawsuit filed or joined by the Department of Justice alleging a pattern or practice or systemic violation of a fair housing or civil rights law, or a claim under the False Claims Act related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, or civil rights generally, including an alleged failure to affirmatively further fair housing.

 Instructions

Apple Valley. The Town of Apple Valley has not received any charge or letter of finding from HUD or from any state or local fair housing agency, or Department of Justice lawsuits.

Victorville. The City of Victorville has not had any findings from HUD concerning violations of civil rights-related laws, or determinations from a substantially equivalent state or local fair housing agency concerning fair housing law.

V.E.2. Describe any state or local fair housing laws. What characteristics are protected under each law?

 Instructions

The Federal Fair Housing Act of 1968 and Amendment Act of 1988 prohibit discrimination in the sale, rental and financing of dwellings, and in other housing-related transactions on the basis of any of the following criteria's, also known as "protected categories": race or color, religion, national origin, familial status, disability or age.

There are several Acts that expand on the prohibition of discrimination based on disability in any federal funded program or activity (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 also prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin in federally funded or assisted programs or activities. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibits the discrimination based on disability in programs, services, and or activities provided or made available by any public entity. The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 also prohibits the discrimination of the basis of age in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance.

California fair housing protection laws are expanded in the state by codes that incorporate additional protected classes beyond Federal. For instance, the State of California uses the terms disabled and disability as opposed to the federal terms of handicap and handicapped. Primary fair housing laws are the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) and the Unruh Act. A significant difference between Federal fair housing laws and State of California is that FEHA covers the following protected classes from discrimination:

- Ancestry
- Marital status
- Sexual orientation
- Source of income
- Age
- Arbitrary (Unruh)

In addition, the FEHA prohibits discrimination and harassment in areas of housing, such as: (1) sales and rentals, (2) evictions; (3) terms and conditions, (4) mortgage loans, (5) insurance, (6) land use and zoning, (7) housing providers are required to make reasonable accommodation in rules and practices to permit individuals with disabilities to use and enjoy a dwelling and make reasonable modifications to the premises, and (8) retaliation against any person that has filed a complaint with the State, has participated in a Department investigation or has opposed any activity illegal under the FEHA is prohibited

Unruh Civil Rights Act protects against discrimination by any business, housing and public accommodations based on (1) age, (2) ancestry, (3) color, (4) disability, (5) national origin, (6) political affiliation, (7) position in a labor dispute, (8) race, (9) religion, (10) sex, (11) sexual orientation and (12) source of income.

FEHA also prohibits discrimination in all areas of housing (rental, lease, terms and conditions, etc.) because of the presence of children in the household (familial status). Familial status is having one or more individuals under 18 years of age living with a parent or another individual having legal custody of that individual (including foster parents) or with a designee of the parent or legal custodian. This status also includes pregnant women and individuals in the process of adopting or otherwise securing legal custody of any minor under 18 years of age.

V.E.3. Identify any local and regional agencies and organizations that provide fair housing information, outreach, and enforcement, including their capacity and the resources available to them.

 Instructions

The California Department of Consumer Affairs provides information on fair housing. The Department provides assistance in unlawful discrimination, resolving housing discrimination problems, and resources to organizations and associations that can assist with complaints or investigations. California Department of Fair Employment and Housing investigates complaints of unlawful discrimination (<http://www.dca.ca.gov/publications/landlordbook/glossary.shtml#discrimination>) in housing and employment.

The Legal Aid Association of California also maintains a directory of legal aid organizations at www.calegaladvocates.org (<http://www.calegaladvocates.org/>). Legal aid organizations (<http://www.dca.ca.gov/publications/landlordbook/glossary.shtml#legalaidorganizations>) provide free legal advice, representation, and

other legal services in noncriminal cases to economically disadvantaged persons. Legal aid organizations are located throughout the state.

Local government agencies, such as the City of Victorville and Town of Apple Valley, provide fair housing information, outreach and enforcement resources through its contractor Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board (IFHMB). IFHMB provides fair housing, mediation, housing counseling, alternative dispute resolution, senior services program, and many other services.

The National Fair Housing Alliance (NFHA) provides education and outreach conferences, workshops and in-service training programs to provide solutions for combating housing discrimination. NFHA and its member organizations conduct national and regional investigations of discriminatory rental, sales, lending and insurance policies and practices. This Alliance also provides confidential consulting, training and compliance services to rental housing providers, real estate companies, mortgage lenders, homeowner's insurance companies and governmental agencies. Membership services are also available for technical support and enforcement.

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) enforces the federal fair housing law, which prohibits discrimination based on sex, race, color, religion, national origin, familial status, and handicap (disability). To contact HUD, look in the white pages of the phone book under United States Government Offices, or visit their web site (<http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD>).

Fair Housing Analysis > Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Analysis > Additional Information

V.E.4. Additional Information

V.E.4.a. Provide additional relevant information, if any, about fair housing enforcement, outreach capacity, and resources in the jurisdiction and region.

Fair Housing enforcement organizations engage in activities that promote housing choice, advocate for antidiscriminatory housing policies, undertake initiatives to build inclusive communities, and provide fair housing training and education. The Town of Apple Valley and City of Victorville strive to encourage and support local agencies that promote and advocate for fair housing choice. Since receiving its Entitlement status of CDBG funds, the City of Victorville has funded Inland Fair Housing & Mediation Board to carry out and support its citizens through any housing discrimination. IFHMB enforces the federal and state fair housing acts through investigations, testing, and implementation of strategies and structures of federal and state regulations.

V.E.4.b. The program participant may also include information relevant to programs, actions, or activities to promote fair housing outcomes and capacity.

The City of Victorville and Town of Apple Valley planning approach to “take meaningful action” to overcome historic patterns of segregation, promote fair housing choice, and cultivate communities that are free from discrimination beginnings with establishing a standardized fair housing assessment and planning process through this AFH plan.

Through the AFH process, the Jurisdictions will identify and examine fair housing issues and contributing factors that cause disparities in housing needs and in community opportunities. Goals and priorities that are set by the Consortium will be incorporated into the Con Plan and future AFH. Public participation will be part of the development of the AFH.


Strategies such as encouraging the development and expansion of affordable housing in areas of opportunity, encourage community revitalization through place-based strategies, and continue the preservation of existing affordable housing will promote and maximize fair housing.

Access and affordability are major housing needs of a disabled person.

Fair Housing Analysis > Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Analysis > Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Contributing Factors

V.E.5. Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Contributing Factors

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of fair housing enforcement, outreach capacity, and resources and the fair housing issues, which are Segregation, RECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs. For each significant contributing factor, note which fair housing issue(s) the selected contributing factor impacts.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous responses)

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement

V.E.5. Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Contributing Factors - Other


 Revised (Click for previous text)

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement as well as private discrimination are a contributing factor of high priority because of its significant effect on fair housing choice for all protected groups. However, fair housing complaints by individuals with a disability seem to be disproportionately higher than other protected groups.

Fair Housing Goals and Priorities > Prioritization of Contributing Factors

VI.1. For each fair housing issue, prioritize the identified contributing factors. Justify the prioritization of the contributing factors that will be addressed by the goals set below in Question 2. Give the highest priority to those factors that limit or deny fair housing choice or access to

opportunity, or negatively impact fair housing or civil rights compliance.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for previous text)

<u>Fair Housing Issue</u>	<u>Contributing Factors</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Justification</u>
			Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement as well as private discrimination are a contributing factor of high priority because of its significant effect on fair housing choice for all protected groups. However, fair housing complaints by individuals with a disability seem to be disproportionately higher than other protected groups.
Evidence of illegal discrimination or violations of civil rights laws, regulations, or guidance.	Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement	High	This issue is high priority because fair housing services have assisted an array of Consortia residents who are of protective class and those that are low income. Many Consortia residents have received 'one-on-one' assistance in assisting homeowners who are at risk of losing their home by exploring many available options including loan modification, special forbearance, partial claims, loan repayment plans, loan reinstate plans, short sale options including the Homeowner Assistance Foreclosure Alternative (HAFA), and the Homeowner Assistance Refinance Program.
		High	
<u>Fair Housing Issue</u>	<u>Contributing Factors</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Justification</u>

<p>Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs) in the jurisdiction and region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of Community Revitalization Strategies Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities 	<p>High</p>	<p>Improve the housing condition and access to social services within the Consortia's R/ECAP has been selected as a high priority.</p> <p>As indicated by the analysis, several housing units and neighborhoods in this area are older construction, and require either rehabilitation or conservation to be maintained as viable dwelling units. Within these neighborhoods, Hispanics experienced highest rate of housing cost burden, overcrowding, and substandard housing when compared to other groups in the Consortia.</p> <p>The poverty rate of this area which disproportionately effects Hispanics also necessitates a high priority. The Consortia will use CDBG funding to fund social service agencies and programs to assist in reducing the poverty level of residents within the R/ECAP.</p>
---	--	-------------	--

<u>Fair Housing Issue</u>	<u>Contributing Factors</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Justification</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Segregation Significant disparities in access to opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities Location and type of affordable housing Land Use and Zoning Laws 	<p>Moderate.</p>	<p>According to AFH maps used in the analysis, from 1990 to 2000, the Consortia's Racial/Ethnic demographics were primarily Whites and Hispanics, and integrated. However, from 2000 to 2010, a clear lack of integration by Hispanics in the Consortia's eastern and higher opportunity neighborhoods existed.</p> <p>Lack of integration was a pattern that took shape over a decade long period. The Consortia understands that achieving significant results will require prolonged efforts (i.e., mobility programs, land use assessments, etc.) beyond the 5-year planning period. Therefore, this goal has been assigned a moderate priority.</p>

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

Land use and zoning laws

Location and type of affordable housing

The data show that Victorville has accommodated the majority of the Consortium's population growth, and Victorville is providing a broader range of housing choices. This appears to be a major factor contributing to the existing pattern of segregation between the two jurisdictions and, given the demographic shifts in the county and region over the past couple decades, it seems likely to become exacerbated if the current situation doesn't change (Location and type of affordable housing- Contributing Factor).

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > R/ECAPs > Contributing Factors of R/ECAPs

Lack of community revitalization strategies

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

Lack of Community Revitalization Strategies

The Consortia has a small R/ECAP area, which is included in a much larger R/ECAP containing unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. The R/ECAP only includes Census Tracts 99.05 which is within Victorville's geographical boundaries. The Consortia's knowledge of the R/ECAP as it relates to the housing and social service needs of the area is limited. In fiscal year 2017-18, The Consortia will perform a community assessment to better understand the needs of the area which will lead to strategic investments using CDBG and HOME funding.

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

A significant number of low income residents have expressed financial hardship that prevents them from correcting code violations, specifically connecting their failing septic system to the City's sewer system. In an attempt to remove the R/ECAP that incorporates Census Tract 99.05, the Consortia will utilize HOME funding and other housing programs to remove barriers that prevent people from accessing affordable housing. For instance, the City of Victorville's Residential Code Correction loan program is meant to assist property owners, owner occupied and rental property, to correct code violations.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disparities in Access to Opportunity > Contributing Factors of Disparities in Access to Opportunity

Lack of private investments in specific neighborhoods

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

Land use and zoning laws

The goal of Increasing Access to Opportunity Areas for low income Hispanics located in the Consortia will address the fair housing issues of significant disparities in access to opportunities and segregation. Based on the AFH analysis, Victorville had significant disparities in access to opportunities compared to Apple Valley. This is particularly the case for low-income Hispanics. When compared to other Race/Ethnic groups, Hispanics appear to be experiencing overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors within the Consortia. Of the opportunities measured, Hispanics were indexed the lowest on average of the seven-categories. Contributing factors to these fair housing issues include, Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods including services or amenities; Location and type of affordable housing; and. Land Use and Zoning Laws.

V. Fair Housing Analysis > B. General Issues > Disproportionate Housing Needs > Contributing Factors of Disproportionate Housing Needs

Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

As indicated by the analysis, several housing units and neighborhoods in this area are older construction, and require either rehabilitation or conservation to be maintained as viable dwelling units. Within these neighborhoods, Hispanics experienced highest rate of housing cost burden, overcrowding, and substandard housing when compared to other groups in the Consortia.

Fair Housing Analysis > Publicly Supported Housing Analysis > Contributing Factors of Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy

Quality of affordable housing information programs

Fair Housing Analysis > Disability and Access Analysis > Disability and Access Issues Contributing Factors

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement:

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement as well as private discrimination are a contributing factor of high priority because of its significant effect on fair housing choice for all protected groups. However, fair housing complaints by individuals with a disability seem to be disproportionately higher than other protected groups.

Fair Housing Analysis > Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Analysis > Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Contributing Factors


Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement as well as private discrimination are a contributing factor of high priority because of its significant effect on fair housing choice for all protected groups. However, fair housing complaints by individuals with a disability seem to be disproportionately higher than other protected groups.

Fair Housing Goals and Priorities > Fair Housing Goals

VI.2. For each fair housing issue with significant contributing factors identified in Question 1, set one or more goals. Explain how each goal is designed to overcome the identified contributing factor and related fair housing issue(s). For goals designed to overcome more than one fair housing issue, explain how the goal will overcome each issue and the related contributing factors. For each goal, identify metrics and milestones for determining what fair housing results will be achieved, and indicate the timeframe for achievement.

 Instructions

 Revised (Click for the previous goal)

Goal

Goal

Improve the housing condition and access to social services within the Consortia's R/ECAP (Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty)

Contributing Factors

- Lack Community Revitalization Strategies
- Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

Fair Housing Issues

Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs) in the jurisdiction and region.

Metrics, Milestones, and Timeframe for Achievement

- During the first year of the ConPlan implementation period, the Consortia will conduct a R/ECAP Needs Assessment and Action Plan to better understand the current housing and social service needs of the area. A baseline for improvement will also be established.
- By the 2nd year of the ConPlan implementation period, the Consortia will program HOME funding to provide a Residential Rehabilitation Loan Program to qualifying R/ECAPs homeowners to address health, safety, code issues and necessary repairs. This programming will continue in years 3 to 5 based on funding availability.
- By the 2nd year of the ConPlan implementation period, the Consortia will program CDBG funding to address social service needs within the R/ECAPs. This programming will continue in years 3 to 5 based on funding availability.
- Starting in year 3, the Consortia will conduct an annual assessment of the impact of HOME, CDBG and other investment within the R/ECAP area based on baseline data established in year 1.

Responsible Program Participant(s)

Apple Valley, CA
Victorville, CA

Discussion

- Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty, R/ECAP, means a geographic area with significant concentrations of poverty and minority populations. The rule does not define “significant” or give metrics. However, the proto-type mapping system demonstrated by HUD suggests that R/ECAPs will be outlined on maps and provided in data tables.

- Lack of Community Revitalization Strategies

The Consortia has a small R/ECAP area, which is included in a much larger R/ECAP containing unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. The R/ECAP only includes Census Tracts 99.05 which is within Victorville’s geographical boundaries. The Consortia’s knowledge of the R/ECAP as it relates to the housing and social service needs of the area is limited. In fiscal year 2017-18, The Consortia will perform a community assessment to better understand the needs of the area which will lead to strategic investments using CDBG and HOME funding. The objective is to show an improvement in the housing and social service needs of the area prior to the end of the 5 year ConPlan period.

- Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities

In an attempt to remove the R/ECAP that incorporates Census Tract 99.05, the Consortia will utilize HOME funding and other housing programs to remove barriers that prevent people from accessing affordable housing. For instance, the City of Victorville’s Residential Code Correction loan program is meant to assist property owners, owner occupied and rental property, to correct code violations. A significant number of low income residents have expressed financial hardship that prevents them from correcting code violations, specifically connecting their failing septic system to the City’s sewer system. The newly developed program will assist property owners with these delayed repairs.

📄 Revised (Click for the previous goal)

Goal

Goal

Increase Access to Opportunity Areas for low income Hispanics located in the Consortia.

Contributing Factors

- Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities
- Location and type of affordable housing
- Land Use and Zoning Laws

Fair Housing Issues

- Segregation
- Significant disparities in access to opportunities

Metrics, Milestones, and Timeframe for Achievement

- Within the 1st year of the ConPlan implementation period, the Consortia will work with the Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board (IFHMB) to create a Mobility Counseling program which will include a range of options including, working with first-time HCV holders that currently reside in a neighborhood with a poverty level greater than 30 percent to locate to a higher opportunity area within the Consortia.
- Starting Year 2, the Consortia will track mobility counseling outcomes by tracking the percentage of households receiving counseling who successfully move to higher opportunity areas. This metric will help the Consortia & IFHMB determine whether the program is effective at meeting the goal of increase levels of integration by Hispanic residents within higher opportunity neighborhoods. A high rate of successful moves could lead to expanding the program, while a low rate of successful moves might indicate the need to change the counseling curriculum or investigate what other factors pose barriers to integration.
- By year 2, work with IFHB to provide testing of multifamily housing market in higher opportunity neighborhoods and census tracts to determine levels of discrimination based on source of income, including SSDI, Housing Choice Vouchers, or other tenant-based rental assistance.
- By the end of the 2nd year of the ConPlan period, the Consortia will conduct an Assessment to studying the issue & impact of public policy relating to barriers to certain households (i.e protected class) in Apple Valley. The result will be an Action Plan to increase affordable housing stock with in the jurisdiction.

Responsible Program Participant(s)

Apple Valley, CA

Victorville, CA

Discussion

The goal of Increasing Access to Opportunity Areas for low income Hispanics located in the Consortia will address the fair housing issues of significant disparities in access to opportunities and segregation. Based on the AFH analysis, Victorville had significant disparities in access to opportunities compared to Apple Valley. This is particularly the case for low-income Hispanics. When compared to other Race/Ethnic groups, Hispanics appear to be experiencing overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors within the Consortia. Of the opportunities measured, Hispanics were indexed the lowest on average of the seven-categories. Contributing factors to these fair housing issues include, Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods including services or amenities; Location and type of affordable housing; and. Land Use and Zoning Laws.

Fair Housing Issues:

Segregation

- The data show that Victorville has accommodated the majority of the Consortium's population growth, and Victorville is providing a broader range of housing choices. This appears to be a major factor contributing to the existing pattern of segregation between the two jurisdictions and, given the demographic shifts in the county and region over the past couple decades, it seems likely to become exacerbated if the current situation doesn't change (Location and type of affordable housing- Contributing Factor).
- The AFFH data show that Between 1990 and the present, Victorville has accommodated 73% of the Consortium's population growth. During that same time, Victorville has accommodated even higher shares of certain protected class groups in the Consortium, including:
 - 77% of black population growth in the Consortium
 - 75% of Hispanic population growth in the Consortium
 - 83% of foreign-born population growth in the Consortium
 - 85% of LEP population growth in the Consortium
 - 86% of Consortium's growth in the number of households with children
- RHNA production over the previous Housing Element cycle shows that Victorville did a much better job expanding housing supply. During the previous cycle, Victorville's allocation was over half of the Consortium's, and produced over 80% of the units in its allocation. Apple Valley met 50% of its much smaller target. 85% of the multifamily housing added to the Consortium during that time was built in Victorville as well, which is a significant reason why Victorville is home to over 60% of renters in the Consortium, and over 70% of HCV-assisted households (Location and type of affordable housing- contributing factor).
- Since we see that population growth in the region overall is increasingly comprised of minority ethnic groups and other protected classes, it is no surprise that accommodating population growth will lead to more diversity. We also expect to see growth in parts of the population that, in the Inland Empire, are more likely to rent and disproportionately earn lower incomes. If these trends in housing supply don't change, the racial/ethnic divide between the cities seems likely to deepen. The Consortia is committed studying the issue & impact of public policy relating to the barriers to certain households in AV. (Land Use and Zoning Laws- Contributing Factor)
- Significant disparities in access to opportunities

Significant disparities in access to opportunities means substantial and measurable differences in access to education, transportation, economic, and other important opportunities in a community, based on protected class related to housing. When compared to other Race/Ethnic groups, Hispanics appear to be experiencing overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors within the Consortia. Of the opportunities measured, Hispanics were indexed the lowest on average of the seven measured categories (Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities- Contributing Factor)

- Milestones and Metrics

The Consortia will implement a Mobility Program which will assist to reduce barriers faced by individuals and families when attempting to move to a neighborhood or area of their choice, especially integrated areas and areas of opportunity. A focus of the program will be low income Hispanics and housing choice voucher holders.

To buttress the program, IFHMB will provide testing in FY 18-19 of multifamily housing market in higher opportunity neighborhoods and census tracts to determine levels of discrimination or other barriers to mobility.

🚩 Revised (Click for the previous goal)

Goal

Goal

Continue to provide fair housing services within the consortia with an emphasis on reducing the number of fair housing complaints based on disability

Contributing Factors

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement

Fair Housing Issues

Evidence of illegal discrimination or violations of civil rights laws, regulations, or guidance.

Metrics, Milestones, and Timeframe for Achievement

- Within the 1st year of the ConPLan implementation period, the Consortia will work with the IFHMB to implement a targeted campaign of engaging housing providers and tenants in the Consortia with education and outreach materials to address the issue.
- Annually, the Consortia will review fair housing complaints based on disabilities to determine annual reductions as measured by 2016 levels.

Responsible Program Participant(s)
 Apple Valley, CA
 Victorville, CA

Discussion

The Consortia provides fair housing information, outreach and enforcement resources through its contractor Inland Fair Housing and Mediation Board (IFHMB). IFHMB provides fair housing, mediation, housing counseling, alternative dispute resolution, senior services program, and many other services.

Based on fair housing data, disparities may exist in the Consortia for groups of the disability protected characteristic. For example, Apple Valley saw an increase of 114% in reported disability discrimination cases from 2011 to 2015. During this 5-year planning period, the Consortia will continue to contract for fair housing services with an emphasis of reducing the number of fair housing complaints based on disabilities to determine annual reduction as measured by 2016 levels.

Documents			
File	Description	Uploaded	User
Fair Housing Goals and Priorities Table, Apple Valley.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/494)	Appendix A - Fair Housing Goals and Priorities Table, Apple Valley (VI.1.)	3/8/2017 5:35:18 PM	MWG714
Fair Housing Goals and Priorities Table, Victorville.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/495)	Appendix A - Fair housing Goals and Priorities Table, Victorville (VI.1.)	3/8/2017 5:35:19 PM	MWG714
Amended CPP Apple Valley.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/496)	Appendix E - Amended Citizen Participation Plan, Apple Valley (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:19 PM	MWG714
CDCAC approval of AFH.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/497)	Appendix E - Community Development Citizens Advisory Committee, Approval of AFH (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:19 PM	MWG714
Amended CPP Victorville.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/498)	Appendix E - Amended Citizen Participation Plan, Victorville (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:19 PM	MWG714

File	Description	Uploaded	User
16 08 08 Daily Press Notice of PH for CPP.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/499)	Appendix E - Proof of publication, Public Notice Amended CPP Victorville (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:20 PM	MWG714
16 07 30 Notice of PH for Citizen Part Plan Comments final.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/500)	Appendix E - Public Notice Amended CPP Victorville (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:20 PM	MWG714
Cover Sheet with executive approval, TOAV and VV.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/501)	Appendix F - AFH Executive Approval (I .Coversheet Certification with Signatures)	3/8/2017 5:35:20 PM	MWG714
Lead Agency Certification of Council Approval.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/502)	Appendix F - AFH Lead Agency Council Approval	3/8/2017 5:35:20 PM	MWG714
Resolution No. 16-052, Victorville approval of AFH.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/503)	Appendix F - Victorville Council Approval of AFH	3/8/2017 5:35:20 PM	MWG714
AFFH chronology 2015-2016.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/504)	Appendix F - AFFH Chronology (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:21 PM	MWG714
AFFH Survey and Community meeting flyer.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/505)	Appendix F - AFFH survey and community meeting flyer (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:21 PM	MWG714
AFFH Survey and Community meeting flyer - Spanish.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/506)	Appendix F - AFFH survey and community meeting flyer, Spanish (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:21 PM	MWG714
AFFH Survey 6-14-16.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/507)	Appendix F - AFFH Hard Copy Survey (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:21 PM	MWG714
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing 2016 Online Survey.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/508)	Appendix F - AFFH Online Survey (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:21 PM	MWG714
Survey Monkey Results Excel updated 8-2-16.xls.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/509)	Appendix F - AFFH Online Survey Results (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:21 PM	MWG714
AFFH Community Workshop 7-12-16.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/510)	Appendix F - AFFH Community Workshop powerpoint (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:21 PM	MWG714
Stakeholder Focus Group contacts.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/511)	Appendix F - Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting Contacts (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:22 PM	MWG714
Stakeholder Meeting Sign-In Sheets.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/512)	Appendix F - Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting Sign-In Sheets (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:22 PM	MWG714
AFHQuestionnaire 1.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/513)	Appendix F - AFH Focus Group Questionnaire 1 (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:22 PM	MWG714

File	Description	Uploaded	User
AFHQuestionnaire 2.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/514)	Appendix F - AFH Focus Group Questionnaire 2 (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:22 PM	MWG714
AFHQuestionnaire 3.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/515)	Appendix F - AFH Focus Group Questionnaire 3 (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:22 PM	MWG714
affh assessment tool questionnaire stakeholders 6-22-16.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/516)	Appendix F - AFFH Stakeholder Questionnaire (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:23 PM	MWG714
CDCAC Agenda.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/517)	Appendix E - CDCAC Meeting Agenda (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:23 PM	MWG714
Inland Fair Housing Mediation Board data.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/518)	Appendix F - IFHMB data (V.1.a., V.B.i.2.a., V.B.ii.1.b.)	3/8/2017 5:35:23 PM	MWG714
Disability Workshop Flyer-Apple Valley Victorville.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/519)	Appendix F - Disability Workshop flyer (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:24 PM	MWG714
Disability Workshop Flyer Spanish.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/520)	Appendix F - Disability Workshop flyer, Spanish (III.)	3/8/2017 5:35:24 PM	MWG714
Rental Housing Program, TOAV Code Enforcement.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/521)	Appendix F - Apple Valley Rental Housing Program List (V.A.2., V.B.iv.1.d.)	3/8/2017 5:35:24 PM	MWG714
Location of Rental Housing Program Properties.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/522)	Appendix F - Location of Rental Housing in Apple Valley (VI.A.2., VI.iv.1.d.)	3/8/2017 5:35:25 PM	MWG714
TOAV Reasonable Accommodation Application.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/523)	Appendix F - Apple Valley Reasonable Accommodation Application (II.1., IV.1.a., V.D.4.a., V.D.4.b.)	3/8/2017 5:35:25 PM	MWG714
Notice of Public Hearing.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/524)	Appendix G - Apple Valley Notice of Public Hearing AFH	3/8/2017 5:35:25 PM	MWG714
proof of publication, AFFH 8-26-16.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/525)	Appendix G - Apple Valley Proof of Publication, Notice of Public Hearing AFH	3/8/2017 5:35:26 PM	MWG714
16 07 28 Notice of PH for AFFH Related Data.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/526)	Appendix G - Victorville Notice of AFH Related Data	3/8/2017 5:35:26 PM	MWG714
16 07 27 Public Notice AFH 30-day commenting Final.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/527)	Appendix G - Apple Valley/Victorville 30-day public comment and hearing AFH	3/8/2017 5:35:26 PM	MWG714
16 08 23Notice of 30-Day Comm for AFH - English.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/528)	Appendix G - Apple Valley/Victorville Proof of publication of 30-day notice for public comment	3/8/2017 5:35:26 PM	MWG714

File	Description	Uploaded	User
16 08 10 Notice of Public Hearing for AFH Plan Spanish.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/529)	Appendix G - Apple Valley/Victorville 30-day public comment and hearing AFH, Spanish	3/8/2017 5:35:26 PM	MWG714
16 08 23 Notice of 30 Day Comm for AFH - Spanish.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/530)	Appendix G - Apple Valley/Victorville Proof of publication of 30-day notice for public comment, Spanish	3/8/2017 5:35:26 PM	MWG714
16 08 10 Notice of Public Hearing for AFH Plan.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/531)	Appendix G - Apple Valley/Victorville Notice of Public Hearing AFH	3/8/2017 5:35:26 PM	MWG714
16 08 10 Notice of Public Hearing for AFH Plan Spanish.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/532)	Appendix G - Apple Valley/Victorville Notice of Public Hearing AFH, Spansih	3/8/2017 5:35:27 PM	MWG714
16 09 09 Notice of PH Proof of Publication for AFH.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/533)	Appendix G - Apple Valley/Victorville Proof of publication Notice of PH for AFH, English and Spanish	3/8/2017 5:35:27 PM	MWG714
Map 5 Consortium.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/534)	Map 5, Consortium	3/8/2017 5:35:27 PM	MXG402
Map 6 Consortium.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/535)	Map 6, Consortium	3/8/2017 5:35:27 PM	MXG402
Map 4 Consortium.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/536)	Map 4 Consortium	3/8/2017 5:35:27 PM	MXG402
Map 3 Consortium.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/537)	Map 3 Consortium	3/8/2017 5:35:28 PM	MXG402
Map 2 Consortium.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/538)	Map 2 Consortium	3/8/2017 5:35:28 PM	MXG402
Map 1 Consortium.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/539)	Map 1 Consortium	3/8/2017 5:35:28 PM	MXG402
AFH Revisions Cover Letter.pdf (/Afh/Document/View/540)	Signature Sheet	3/8/2017 5:35:29 PM	MXG402

Maps
<p>Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity (Race/Ethnicity) Apple Valley, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/100/060108/J) Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/100/060108/R) Victorville, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/100/063900/J)</p>

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/100/063900/R)

Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends (Race/Ethnicity Trends, 1990 and Race/Ethnicity Trends, 2000)

Race/Ethnicity Trends, 1990

Apple Valley, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/200/060108/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/200/060108/R)

Victorville, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/200/063900/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/200/063900/R)

Race/Ethnicity Trends, 2000

Apple Valley, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/201/060108/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/201/060108/R)

Victorville, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/201/063900/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/201/063900/R)

Map 3 - National Origin (National Origin)

Apple Valley, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/300/060108/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/300/060108/R)

Victorville, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/300/063900/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/300/063900/R)

Map 4 - LEP (Limited English Proficiency)

Apple Valley, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/400/060108/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/400/060108/R)

Victorville, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/400/063900/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/400/063900/R)

Map 5 - Publicly Supported Housing and Race/Ethnicity (Publicly Supported Housing and Race/Ethnicity)

Apple Valley, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/500/060108/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/500/060108/R)

Victorville, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/500/063900/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/500/063900/R)

Map 6 - Housing Choice Vouchers and Race/Ethnicity (Housing Choice Vouchers and Race/Ethnicity)

Apple Valley, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/600/060108/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/600/060108/R)

Victorville, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/600/063900/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/600/063900/R)

Map 7 - Housing Burden and Race/Ethnicity (Housing Burden and Race/Ethnicity)

Apple Valley, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/700/060108/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/700/060108/R)

Victorville, California Jurisdiction (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/700/063900/J)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Region (.../ArcGisV03/Map/V03/700/063900/R)