



2023-2031 Housing Element

 Revised Public Draft | November 2023







City of Vallejo

2023-2031 Housing Element

Revised Public Draft | November 2023



Prepared By: PlaceWorks

101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 200
Folsom, California 95630
t 916.245.7500

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
Purpose	1-1
Housing Element Planning Horizon.....	1-1
Housing Element Income Levels.....	1-1
2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....	2-1
Local Stakeholder Consultations.....	2-1
Joint Planning Commission/ City Council Study Session.....	2-2
Focus Group Meeting.....	2-2
Environmental Justice Pop-up Events.....	2-3
Noticing of the Draft Housing Element.....	2-4
Meetings on the Public Draft Housing Element.....	2-4
Public Comment	2-8
State Certification	2-10
3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS.....	3-1
4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS.....	4-1
Housing Resources	4-1
Governmental Constraints on Housing Availability	4-25
Nongovernmental Constraints on Housing Availability	4-59
5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS.....	5-1
Changes in Goals, Policies, and Programs for the Housing Element Update ...	5-1
Goals, Policies, and Programs.....	5-1
6. MEANS TO ACHIEVE CONSISTENCY WITH REMAINDER OF GENERAL PLAN.....	6-1

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1: Regional Public Outreach and Engagement
- Appendix 2: 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Assessment
- Appendix 3: City of Vallejo Assessment of Fair Housing

1. INTRODUCTION

TABLES

TABLE 1	Regional Housing Need Allocation, Projection Period 2023-2031	4-1
TABLE 2	RHNA Progress, Constructed and Under Construction after June 30, 2022	4-2
TABLE 3	Realistic Capacity Project Examples	4-4
TABLE 4	Vacant Sites Inventory	4-5
TABLE 5	Pipeline Projects	4-15
TABLE 6	Summary of Residential Capacity Compared to the 6th Cycle RHNA	4-17
TABLE 7	Summary of Residential Capacity Compared to the 6th Cycle RHNA	4-21
TABLE 8	General Plan Land Use Designations Which Allow Housing, 2017	4-26
TABLE 9	Specific Plans	4-27
TABLE 10	Summary of Basic Zoning Districts of the Zoning Code	4-29
TABLE 11	Residential Development Standards, 2021	4-34
TABLE 12	Vallejo Waterfront Planned Development Master Plan Residential Uses	4-35
TABLE 13	Residential Parking Standards, 2022	4-36
TABLE 14	Provisions for a Variety of Housing Types, by Zone, 2022	4-39
TABLE 15	Building Permit Fees, 2022-2023	4-49
TABLE 16	Development Impact Fees, 2022-2023	4-50
TABLE 17	Planning Fees, 2022-2023	4-51
TABLE 18	Typical Planning Fees for a Single-Family and Multi-Family Projects	4-52
TABLE 19	Typical Impact Fees for a Single-Family and Multi-Family Projects	4-52
TABLE 20	Current Mortgage Rates, June 2022	4-60
TABLE 21	Summary of Quantified Objectives	5-20

FIGURES

Figure 1	City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #1	4-8
Figure 2	City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #2	4-9
Figure 3	City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #3	4-10
Figure 4	City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #4	4-11
Figure 5	City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #5	4-12
Figure 6	City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #6	4-13
Figure 7	City of Vallejo Pipeline Projects and Specific Plan Inventory	4-16
Figure 8	Inland Flooding Risk in Vallejo	4-20

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The Housing Element of the General Plan is a comprehensive statement by the City of Vallejo (hereinafter “Vallejo”) of its current and future housing needs and proposed actions to facilitate the provision of housing to meet those needs at all income levels. The policies contained in this element are an expression of the statewide housing goal of “attaining decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family,” as well as a reflection of the unique concerns of the community. The purpose of the Housing Element is to establish specific objectives, policies, and programs relative to the provision of housing and to adopt an action plan toward this end. In addition, the element identifies and analyzes housing needs, resources, and constraints to meeting these needs.

California Government Code Section 65583 requires the Housing Element to include the following components:

- A review of the previous element’s goals, policies, programs, and objectives to ascertain the effectiveness of each of these components, as well as the overall effectiveness of the Housing Element.
- An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints related to meeting these needs.
- An analysis and program for preserving assisted housing developments.

- A statement of community goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing.
- A program that sets forth an eight-year planning period schedule of actions that the City is undertaking, or intends to undertake, in implementing the policies set forth in the Housing Element.

HOUSING ELEMENT PLANNING HORIZON

The Goals, Policies, Objectives, and implementation programs are intended to guide the City’s actions in the arena of housing during the eight-year Housing Element planning period that extends from January 2023 through January 2031.

HOUSING ELEMENT INCOME LEVELS

There are a variety of housing terms contained within this Housing Element. Generally, housing is considered “Affordable” if a household pays no more than 30 percent of household income on housing costs (rent or mortgage). Household income levels are based on U.S. Census data and are used to identify the housing needs for various

1. INTRODUCTION

income levels in the City of Vallejo (Area). Based on the California Housing and Community Development Department's (HCD's) established 2021 income limits, income limits for a family of four in Solano County are categorized as follows:

Extremely Low-Income Household: Households with an income no greater than 30 percent of area median income (AMI), or \$29,150.

Very Low-Income Household: Households with an income between 30 and 50 percent of the AMI, or \$29,151 and \$48,550.

Low-Income Household: Households with an income between 50 and 80 percent of the AMI, or \$48,551 and \$77,600.

Moderate-Income Household: Households with an income between 80 and 120 percent of the AMI, or \$77,601 and \$119,150.

Above Moderate-Income Household: Households with an income above 120 percent of the AMI, or greater than \$119,150.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Section 65583(c)(9) of the California Government Code specifically requires that the Housing Element “include a diligent effort by the local government to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the Housing Element, and the program shall describe this effort.” Cities and counties must take active steps to inform, involve, and solicit input from the public, particularly low-income and racial and ethnic households that might otherwise not participate in the process.

To meet the requirements of state law, the City completed public outreach at both the local level and as part of the regional Solano County Housing Element Collaborative effort to encourage community involvement. These efforts included:

- Local Stakeholder Consultations
- Regional Stakeholder Consultations
- Community Workshops
- Online Community Survey
- Focus Group Meeting
- Planning Commission and City Council Study Sessions
- Pop-up Events for the Environmental Justice Element

Regional efforts included three sets of community workshops, consultations, and a community survey, all of which are discussed in detail in **Appendix C – Regional Collaboration Effort - Housing Element Public Outreach**.

LOCAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

To ensure that the City solicits feedback from all segments of the community, consultations were conducted with service providers and other stakeholders who represent different socioeconomic groups.

From January through April 2022, staff reached out to four local stakeholder organizations to offer the opportunity for each to provide one-on-one input on housing needs and programs. Feedback was received from three local stakeholders, in addition to feedback from eight regional stakeholders that serve Vallejo residents (summarized in **Appendix C**). Representatives from the following organizations were interviewed as part of local efforts:

- Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California (FHANC), January 6, 2022
- Fighting Back Partnership (FBP), January 12, 2022
- Agency on Aging, January 24, 2022
- Local Historian Brendan Riley, April 25, 2022

Representatives from Agency on Aging and FBP described a variety of challenges and barriers facing residents of Vallejo, such as affordable and accessible units for seniors and persons with disabilities, particularly those with fixed incomes. They also expressed a need for senior housing with wrap-around services and amenities, such as shuttles, open space, community gardens, and senior programming, and a need for more

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

funding to assist local nonprofits working on fall prevention modifications and to assist seniors with home rehabilitations. The Agency on Aging also recommended alternative and affordable housing options such as accessory dwelling units (ADUs), tiny homes, or mobile units, and the need to include wrap-around services and units near transit.

FBP echoed similar barriers to affordable housing, stating that evictions related to COVID-19 were high as clients waited for a response from the Emergency Rental Assistance Program. According to the FBP, there is a shortage of rental housing and ownership opportunities, especially for residents with prior felonies or limited landlord references. Other barriers to affordable housing that were identified included rising rental costs and outdated units needing weatherization.

The one-on-one interviews with fair housing advocates from FHANC raised a number of observations and conditions related to housing issues facing the City. FHANC identified a need for more coordinated and extensive education and enforcement related to fair housing laws and reported that the most common discrimination complaints are regarding denials of reasonable accommodation requests. FHANC reported that discrimination was typically more common among landlords and housing providers of fewer units and suggested that this may be due to a lack of understanding of laws. FHANC recommended the City continue to contract with a fair housing organization to provide direct services to residents and adopt tenant protections.

According to a local historian, Brendan Riley, redlining was prominent in Vallejo during the early to mid-1900s, with non-White residents pushed to certain neighborhoods. According to Riley, many of the homes that were in redlined areas were of poor quality. As a result of market crashes and redlining, Riley noted a lack of generational wealth among many non-White residents. However, despite historic patterns of segregation, Riley reported that, today, Vallejo is a highly integrated and diverse city that can continue to promote further integration and mobility through development of affordable housing options.

JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION/ CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION

On April 18, 2022, the City held a joint study session for the Planning Commission and City Council to introduce the 2023-2031 Housing Element update and to review new state laws. The public was invited to attend and participate. Staff presented an overview of the Housing Element update process and required contents of the element, discussed early strategies and possible sites to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), reviewed new state laws, and solicited feedback from the Planning Commission, City Council, and community members on these strategies and other housing needs in Vallejo. During the discussion and public comment period, Planning Commissioners, City Councilmembers, and community members raised questions asking for clarification on the RHNA process and methodology. Comments received also included a desire to distribute affordable housing citywide and integrate a variety of housing types in neighborhoods, a need for alternative mechanisms to support affordable development and equity building (i.e., an inclusionary housing ordinance, and social equity/impact bonds), general concerns about a lack of generational wealth and challenges in building equity, and requests for additional outreach to community-based organizations.

Based on feedback received during the study session, the City included **Programs H 4.1.1 and D 1.1.1** to incentivize a variety of housing types and improve access to information about financing and other opportunities.

FOCUS GROUP MEETING

On July 21, 2022, the City held a focus group meeting with seven local stakeholders and representatives of community-based organizations and agencies. The attendees were from advocacy groups or community organizations representing the following interest



areas: environmental, climate, housing, transportation, specific ethnic groups, the faith-based community, and equity. At the meeting, the City provided an overview of the Housing Element update process, initial findings related to housing needs specific to Vallejo residents, discussed early strategies to address the City's RHNA, and provided an overview of new Housing Element laws and public outreach efforts in Vallejo.

Following the presentation, group discussion covered the greatest housing needs, homelessness, financing for housing, staff capacity and opportunities, zoning, and solutions for permanently affordable housing and equity building. Participants identified the greatest need for housing as preservation of affordable opportunities, renter protections, and a range of housing types and resources to meet a variety of needs. Participants also expressed a need for additional resources to aid the homeless population, and targeted strategies for different segments of the homeless population rather than assuming similar needs for all homeless individuals and households. Homeless prevention and collaboration with nearby jurisdictions that have faced similar challenges (i.e., Oakland) were discussed as opportunities to address homelessness in Vallejo. A variety of strategies were discussed to address homelessness; however, participants identified zoning as a barrier to some solutions, such as allowing modular housing. In addition to addressing homelessness through zoning, participants expressed a need for more integrated zones that facilitate new housing near schools, transit, and jobs. Permanently affordable housing opportunities discussed included community land trusts, working with the Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America, Habitat for Humanity, and creating alternative opportunities such as adaptive reuse of underutilized buildings for housing.

Feedback received during this focus group meeting was integral to completing the Assessment of Fair Housing for Vallejo, and has been incorporated into **Programs E 1.13, F 1.1.1, and F 1.1.3**

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE POP-UP EVENTS

In addition to outreach specific to the Housing Element, the City also had four pop-up events for the Environmental Justice Element concurrent with the Housing Element update. While the focus of these events was primarily on environmental justice, feedback received from participants at the events overlaps with housing needs, particularly as they relate to fair housing. The pop-up events included:

- Dia de los Ninos event on April 30, 2022
- Vallejo Farmers' Market in Downtown Vallejo on June 26 and November 19, 2022
- Monthly meeting of St. Vincent's Neighborhood Coalition at St. Vinnie's Community Garden on July 27, 2022
- Vallejo Art Walk in Downtown Vallejo on September 10, 2022
- Monthly meeting of Soroptimist International of Vallejo at Buttercup Diner on September 19, 2022

At the June 2022 event, staff distributed a paper survey for participants to respond to. At each of the following events, staff distributed a flyer with a link to an online survey with the same questions as the paper survey. In total, the City received 82 responses. Approximately 47.5 percent of respondents reported that they felt exposure to polluted air, water, and/or land was a "mild problem" in their neighborhood, and 13.8 percent felt it was a "huge problem." Similarly, 43.0 percent felt that the number of homes in their neighborhood with unsafe or unhealthy conditions was a "mild problem," and 15.2 percent felt it was a "huge problem." There were no concrete patterns of these responses compared to the neighborhood that respondents reported living in.

In response to the feedback received at these pop-up events, the City has included **Program D 1.1.1** to implement a program to provide financial subsidies for prospective homeowners in exchange for home rehabilitation through sweat equity, **Program G**

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

2.1.1 to provide rehabilitation assistance and continue to implement the City's Neighborhood Law Program to reduce blight, and **Program F 1.1.2** to take steps to improve access to resources and opportunities citywide.

NOTICING OF THE DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT

Per California Government Code Section 65585, the draft Housing Element was made available for public comment for 30 days, from September 8, 2023, to October 24, 2023. The draft was made available on the City's website and was noticed to residents through the same methods as the Planning Commission and City Council meetings. Additional direct noticing was sent to local housing advocate groups, community-based organizations, and other interested groups and individuals.

MEETINGS ON THE PUBLIC DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT

Planning Commission – September 18, 2023

The City and consultant presented the Public Draft Housing Element at the Planning Commission meeting on September 18th. Comments and questions were received from members of the public and from the commissioners. A summary of the comments and questions is below:

- Program F 1.1.3: Rent Monitoring Program - What is meant by rent monitoring and how does that take place?
- What does objective standards mean? Does that mean that we're going to see buildings that are of a different kind of character?
- How many of the 1,362 4th cycle RHNA units were permitted or built?
- For the RHNA or allocation, the economic splits include very low and low but the allocations for ADUs or projects in the pipeline lump those two categories together. Can you help me understand why?

- On our last annual report our RHNA deficit was in the hundreds for an allotment of 1,396 so its substantial we're not just a few units shy of meeting our allocation.
- Which of the programs you have listed here could we implement as a city would be ones that would address not meeting our allocation previously or ones that are novel and would help us advance towards them now?
- Are there any policies or programs in place that preserve the vacant site capacity for low and very low income housing?
- When you build housing there's infrastructure needs. How do you incentivize developers to provide all the stuff that you really need? There's a lot of apartments going up over in South Vallejo but there's very little infrastructure i.e. some place to buy some food, things like that. What are we doing to incentivize developers to not just provide the housing but to provide a place to live?
- This housing element is really important. Have worked in this field for 30 years. Housing elements are critical. It is not just technical. I would suggest that you print a hard copy of the housing element and really read it through. I printed it today and I'm going to read it.
- I believe before you go to the Planning Commission and the City Council to approve the Housing Element. Your planning commission needs to approve this not just conduct a study session. I'm not sure when you're planning to do that.
- Represent Legal Services of Northern California. A large number of our clients are in Vallejo because that's where we are and we're easily accessible. This is a great opportunity to plan for the needs of our community. I'm sure you've all experienced this, we've experienced it everyday that there's not enough housing for people that need housing and it's not affordable to folks. We are often seeing extremely low income people as the people who are already losing their housing, not close to losing it but already in the process of losing it unless they are some of the few people who are fortunate to have a voucher or live in project based section 8 housing. The needs are vast. The programs are the heart of the document and they need to be specific and measurable and something that can be accomplished and not merely a suggestion or an idea, something that is actually going to be accomplished during this next planning cycle.



Housing & Community Development Commission – October 5, 2023

The City and consultant presented the Public Draft Housing Element at the Housing & Community Development Commission meeting on October 5th. Comments and questions were received from one member of the public and from the commissioners. A summary of the comments and questions is below:

- Public comment:
 - Our office is conducting a thorough review of the entire housing element and we will be providing written and oral public comment prior to and at the city council meeting this month.
 - Today I wanted to call attention to a significant problem that we already identified in our review and that is the sites inventory. Have identified many sites that are not developable at all and many more that would not be developable during this planning period of which were already almost an entire year into. Vallejo's RHNA for very low and low income units is 1059 and if you exclude only the egregiously undevelopable sites the housing element now does not identify enough sites to meet this RHNA.
 - Some examples in Table 4 of the draft element - Site 49 is a parking lot and drive through for the McDonald's on Valley Vista at Sonoma, site 52 is a parking lot for the Food Max on Tuolumne, site 55 is a parking lot for the Home Depot on Admiral Callaghan. Also site 66 is an extremely awkward triangle plot and it was acquired recently by a corporation that builds and operates gas stations. Sites 63 and 64 which are contiguous to each other were both recently acquired by Carlton senior living which provides higher end assisted living to seniors so it would not be appropriate for low income housing.
 - Some of the sites identified for moderate housing actually might be better suited for low income housing because they're better shapes, they're actually located in residential areas not purely commercial areas and are appropriate sizes so best for low income housing is 2 acres to 10 acres to allow the density that's needed. So sites such as 3, 5, and 6 on that table 4 may be more suited for this type of housing.
- Commission comment:
 - Concerned about overall number of units at the different levels and some of your information received from the different focus groups that you held and I get that this is at the Solano County level but it also comes down to the Vallejo level. Concerned that the partners are just at the Solano County level. Need to look the holistic picture when we think about the RHNA and how we're going to work with the unhoused, those who are also low income or at the lowest income. When we think of at risk for homelessness we think of domestic violence and so forth, how does that really play into this picture? Look at what was identified at the county level versus coming down to the local level and serving our families and individuals that actually live in Vallejo. Have we thought about what funding is available to support affordable development already?
 - Regarding Program F 1.1.1 what does this housing discrimination monitoring and referral program look like and what is a rent monitoring program? How will this housing element plan shift some of those services or that access specifically to Vallejo and what is the access to the information and resources?
 - What and how would financing be executed and how are you going to reduce the rates for those who are looking to purchase these properties and how do you identify the replacement of the existing affordable units? What is the process what is the strategy? What areas would you be looking at?
 - How is this element really going to focus on unhoused needs? Is there any sense of urgency or special urgency that you will impose on the government agencies to really focus? They are the number one group to be serviced, there is a tremendous need for that particular area to be take care of.
 - Senior housing is absolutely important also.
 - Programs under Goal G also involves the role of government I know there's a staffing shortage here in all areas of the Vallejo city government, how can this element impress upon the city government to really help with all areas that are listed under Goal G and hire a sufficient amount of staff? Being lax in this area probably slows down the entire process. I'm hoping that in the future moving forward that the housing element would focus on a sense of urgency.
 - I see the timeline however I just wanted to uplift that the public had

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

a hard time accessing the housing element so it feels unfair for us to move forward with this provided the people didn't have the adequate time to access the housing element. It was 300 something pages and for me the link was just available late last week. It would be great if the schedule could be adjusted to give the public time to really digest this.

City Council – October 24, 2023

The City and consultant presented the Public Draft Housing Element at the City Council meeting on October 24th. Comments and questions were received from members of the public and from the Council. A summary of the comments and questions is below:

- Public comment:
 - Represents Legal Services of Northern California. Her organization provided written comments outlining our concerns in detail. The housing element is dense and technical as a document but it's our most important tool to address the city's housing crisis. Some of our advocates will provide comments tonight to highlight our concerns with two crucial components of the document- the sites inventory and the programs. The housing element must plan to accommodate 1,059 new low income units from 2023 to 2031. The draft claims that it meets this obligation but when excluding improper sites or improper projected units it actually falls short by 598 income units so there's not a surplus there's actually a shortfall of almost 600 units.
 - Site is a parking lot and drive through of McDonald's on Valley and Sonoma.
 - Site 52 is the parking lot for Food Max on Tuolumne.
 - Site 55 is the parking lot for the Home Depot on Admiral Callaghan. There are more sites identified that are problematic.
 - Reliance on ADUs to project 118 low income ADUs that will be built from 2023 to 2031 is improper because zero ADUs were built in the last planning cycle for low income households. There were some developed that were categorized for above moderate households but none for low income households.
 - The sites inventory and the related planning must be revised especially considering in the last planning cycle there was only 18.4% of the RHNA satisfied. Only 72 of those were low income units and 442 were moderate or above moderate units. The draft must be revised to accommodate for all income levels including low income households, not just for above moderate and moderate households.
 - The heart of the housing element is its plan to create a more equitable and accessible community through specific programs. These programs should be based on the city's needs, resources, and community. With the 6th cycle housing element the city of Vallejo has the opportunity to commit to thoughtful and bold programs to facilitate housing development. However as drafted, the proposed housing element risks squandering this opportunity by failing to commit to specific programs with actionable outcomes. First numerous programs lack specific steps and outcomes. Secondly, several programs are recycled from the 5th cycle planning cycle after not being fully implemented in the past 8 years. Specifically, inclusionary zoning, commercial linkage, RHNA monitoring, and support for people with developmental disabilities were all proposed in similar form in the 5th planning cycle and were incompletely implemented over the last 8 years.
 - The proposed programs regarding a rent monitoring program, inclusionary zoning, housing choice vouchers and more represent important and appropriate commitments to meet Vallejo's RHNA policy. What is missing is specific deadlines and specific outcomes.
 - While a housing element must include programs with measurable outcomes the draft falls short of discussing how some identified objectives will be achieved. One example is Program B 1.1.1 housing choice voucher or section 8 rental assistance. A major problem that our organization often sees is landlords refusing to rent to voucher holders or otherwise discriminating against them. It is unclear how landlord outreach efforts will address expanding housing mobility opportunities for voucher holders. Some sort of rationale for the city's quantified objectives would be useful for assessing whether the numbers and outcomes listed will be effective and attainable.
 - Several proposed programs only restate the city's pre-existing obligations to comply with California law. Programs such as A 3.1.1,



2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- A 4.1.1, C 1.1.3, and E 1.1.4 merely commit the city to comply with the California government code, California health and safety code, and state and federal fair housing law.
- New state law requires that the housing element put forward steps that the city will take to address past housing discrimination and segregation. I want to specifically point out some issues with how some current sites identified in the housing element reproduce rather than address patterns of segregation. Vallejo as a whole is in the 59th percentile statewide for socio-economic markers and environmental risks. Of the sites identified for low-income housing development, 10 are in census tracts that have lower socioeconomic and more environmental risks than 90% of California. In contrast, the majority of the sites identified for moderate and high-income are near the waterfront in the Solano commercial district and up in the hills. The current draft bases its site identification off of the constraints imposed by our current zoning laws, which restrict larger and more dense developments to the same areas of the city where lower income housing was historically situated, mostly in areas zoned for commercial and mixed uses. These areas are also heavily impacted by pollution and other environmental justice issues due to the proximity to major roads and freeways. The city is required by state law to take meaningful steps to reverse historical patterns of segregation. The first steps in doing this are to identify appropriate locations for affordable housing and to rezone as needed to allow for development to actually occur.
 - The majority of renters have been paying high rents, facing housing insecurities and displacement and dealing with poor and unsafe living conditions. Mentioned that Marina Vista aka Longshore cove is very unsafe. The city should do all they can to pass strong policies to prevent evictions and stop current and ongoing displacement including providing basic tenant protections and making meaningful and concrete comments to preserve and create affordable housing. The draft should include baseline tenant protection s including just cause eviction protections, tenant right to counsel, rent control, and anti-harassment ordinances that include tenant right to organize.
 - The city should include policies that will support the community land trust.
 - We need policy that's going to have direct and actionable items. For the last two decades that I've lived here the city has done nothing to do the work that has to be done in order to provide that affordable housing. We've watched as developers come into the city and promise that they're going to give a percentage to affordable housing and instead has bought out those units that were supposed to be provided and that money never went to address affordable housing within the community. We need to make sure that we include the community land trust. These are ways for us to have alternative housing that will address the need for permanent affordability and that our property is not bought out by developers.
 - Through the work of advocates and resident leaders there has been a 2 million dollar grant brought in from the state and \$400,000 from philanthropic institutions to support community housing. We have approached the city in multiple iterations. We have been turned away when we tried to do things that are innovative. We hope this housing element conversation will finally get us a partner in this.
 - In February 2022 my family and business was displaced here in Vallejo. I tried to find a place to live and a place to reopen my business, and being displaced was frightening. Now I try to help other people in Vallejo and have them not experience what we went through. Protections and tenant rights are needed.
 - Represents Urban Habitat. The city needs to be a bold leader in Solano County. We are facing a housing crisis. During COVID Vallejo had the highest eviction rate in the Bay Area. The draft must include baseline tenant protections, going beyond state minimum standards. We urge you to include policies that support community land trusts. We need your partnership and so far have not had that.
 - Represents Solano Group of the Sierra Club. We see people unhoused, we see people spending half of their income on housing, crime problems, displacement, people not having enough to eat because they are spending so much on rent. We need to prevent more people from being pushed to this limit. We need to build more housing and take care of the folks that can't afford the housing that exists.
 - We have a segregated community. We have diversity with pebbles of segregated communities, and we need to integrate communities. The new developments need to be mixed income. We have to stop putting all low income housing in a handful of census tracts.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- Need to maintain our housing stock. A lot of tenants suffer from substandard maintenance.
- Sister cities in our region enjoy protections such as just cause eviction, and here there is no right to council or rent control. Tenant harassment and gun violence occurs on a daily basis and tenants live in fear. There are no fundamental protections in place and the draft must include these. We are still hoping and waiting for the support of council.
- Council comment:
 - How do we address the length and breadth of the identified legal shortcomings?
 - Could you comment on the identified locations for the low income, and how those properties were identified and what is the plan for converting them to low-income designated properties? Have we looked at reducing fees for low income so we can have more viable builders build low-income housing?
 - The draft estimates that a newly constructed 3 bed 2 bath home in Vallejo costing \$400,00 to build would have another \$50,000 in permitting fees. Is that accurate because that's a big problem in itself.
 - How can we prevent this from happening? We were very delayed on the Housing Element and low in staffing. When these letters come from the state we want to make sure that we pay close attention to it. I want to make sure that the issues that were raised are addressed. What is the definition of affordable housing nowadays in our city?
 - It seems like we've always been chasing our tail with the RHNA numbers. How do we get to the point to fix our numbers?

PUBLIC COMMENT

The City received comments from the public including comments from specific groups: Sierra Club, Public Advocates, Fair Housing Advocates, Public Advocates and Legal Services of Northern California. Public comments included, but were not limited to, the following topics.

Sierra Club Solano Group

- Consider fee reductions to assist moderate income households
- Include Density Bonus targets for low and moderate income seniors
- Consider an impact or commercial linkage fee to fund additional staff to execute affordable housing efforts
- Address the disconnect between job production and housing production to reduce homelessness
- Ensure Solano 360 and Mare Island are accommodating affordable housing
- Improve communication with stakeholders

Public Advocates

- Clarify how the City will determine the feasibility of deferring fees, describe what the density bonus will be, and when to give concessions in development standards.
- Consider adopting Just Cause eviction protections, Rent Stabilization that goes above and beyond state rent caps, and tenant Anti-Harassment protections
- Implement further renter protections like a rent review board, multilingual legal services, just cause eviction protections, and tenant anti-harassment protection
- Implement programs that will enable and encourage the growth and development of Community Land Trusts (CLTs), such as:
 - creating a funding pool for current and future CLTs
 - partnering with CLTs to seek key opportunities for property acquisition for permanently affordable housing
 - fast-tracking CLT permitting and eliminating other development barriers
 - developing a local Surplus Land policy consistent with the state Surplus Land Act that prioritizes sale of city-owned land to CLTs
- **Edit Program H 4.1.1** to commit, at a minimum, to streamlining approval processes for CLTs who have applied to develop housing

Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California

- Strengthen fair housing programs, policies, and goals, including metrics and milestones, as well as explore adding programs to protect Vallejo renters
- Revise Program F 1.1.1 to include detailed metrics and milestones for determining what fair housing goals will be achieved and which are required



2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- Revise the Housing Element to correct an error regarding contractual fair housing services between FHNV and the City of Vallejo
 - Recommends the following meaningful actions be taken by the local Housing Authority:
 - Include state/local fair housing Source Of Income (SOI) discrimination complaint forms in HCV briefing packets (Including the Civil Rights Department Complaint Form)
 - Reach out to owners explaining SOI discrimination laws and assess if voluntary compliance can be achieved prior to a fair housing referral
 - Refer voucher SOI discrimination the local fair housing organization and human rights agency
 - Educate owners about SOI discrimination laws and/or work with fair housing agencies to provide such education
 - Provide housing choice voucher families with information about LIHTC properties in the area
 - Create an internal system to track patterns and trends for SOI discrimination and report data to local fair housing organizations and FHAP agencies for possible testing
 - Recommend eliminating criminal history in obtaining housing due to the practices disparate impact on people of color
 - Request to limit the rent increase to address the displacement of the City's low-income renters.
 - Adoption of a Just Cause Eviction ordinance that includes:
 - Anti-retaliation not limited to reasonable accommodation,
 - Sexual harassment etc., clean safe housing,
 - Rental registry, a tenant commission that has reserved seats for special needs groups
 - Require landlords to give 7-day warning letter before a 3- day notice to pay or quit
 - Prevent just cause eviction for subletting and addition of family members
- Legal Services of Northern California***
- Ensure sufficient capacity to meet the RHNA that is distributed throughout the city with special attention to AFFH
 - Review and revise lower and moderate-income vacant sites and carry over sites from the previous Housing Element
- Clarify inclusion of sites near 5th Street and Sonoma Boulevard that are not listed in the Draft Element's Vacant Sites Inventory
 - Identify lower income sites where housing construction would integrate low-income residents into more resourced neighborhoods
 - Review and revise ADU projections
 - Consider revising the following programs:
 - Program A 1.1.2, to state which specific fees would be eliminated as an incentive and identify the types of concessions or incentives will be provided for affordable projects
 - Program B 2.1.1 to commit the City to prepare and present an inclusionary housing ordinance by June 2024 and propose the draft to City Council by June 2025
 - Program B 2.1.2 to prepare and present the commercial linkage City Council by October 2024 and enact the recommended commercial linkage fee by
 - Program E 1.1.1 and Program E-1.1.5 to add dates by which actions will be taken and outline specific incentives that will be offered, and provide a deadline for implementation of those incentives
 - Program F 1.1.2 commit the City to coordinate with regional transit to increase accessibility to public transportation throughout Vallejo, and that such coordination shall occur by June 2026.
 - Program G 3.1.1. to explore use of CDBG or HOME funds to offer relocation assistance to tenants displaced by uninhabitable premises and propose a plan for use of these funds by March 2024 and draft and propose an ordinance to require landlords or property owners to provide assistance when the tenant is displaced due to an uninhabitable premises.
 - Clarify the actions that will be taken for the following programs A 1.1.2 (Mixed-Use Development), A 3.1.1 (Removal of Governmental Constraints), B 1.1.1 (Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) Rental Assistance), B 2.1.1 (Inclusionary Housing Ordinance), D 1.1.1 (Sweat-Equity Program for Homeownership), E 1.1.1 (Incentives for Special-Needs Housing), E 1.1.3 (Homeless/Unhoused Needs
 - Consider hiring staff to ensure sufficient capacity to implement programs A 1.1.1 (Land Inventory and RHNA Monitoring), B 2.1.2 (Commercial Linkage Fee), B 2.1.1 (Inclusionary Housing Ordinance), D 2.1.1 (Sweat Equity Program for Homeownership), E 1.1.2 (Senior Housing Needs), E 1.1.5. (Support for



2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- Persons with Developmental Disabilities).
- Propose affirmative measures to ensure voucher-holders and other protected classes are able to actually obtain the benefits of the City's efforts to provide affordable housing under program B 1.1.1
- Adopt a program specifically designed to allow multi-family housing sites in the higher opportunity areas, or the areas with a higher median-income with identified and rezoned sites by 2026.
- Adopt a program to increase the reliability and availability of bus services to help increase the feasibility of low-income housing sites in all neighborhoods of Vallejo.
- Review and revise housing constraints section to identify obstacles to development in Vallejo
- Consider addressing the lack of adequate transportation, ongoing issues with the Vallejo Police Department, and the Vallejo school system through Programs F 1.1.2: Improve Access to Resources, H 1.1.1: Neighborhood Park Access Program, H 1.1.2 Neighborhood Services, H 2.1.1: Transit- Oriented Development, and H 2.1.2: Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan and Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan and include additional programs throughout the Housing Element as needed
- Analyze current development constraints and add programs as needed to increase development incentives
- Include an identification and analysis of its current low density zoning sites as a constraint to the development of low-income housing units.
- Review and revise special needs housing for seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons with developmental disabilities separately, and include programs to address the needs identified
- Include a current information such as a list of the emergency shelters currently in operation in Vallejo, the capacity of the facilities, or any other helpful information as well as a program to facilitate development of additional emergency shelter to accommodate the unmet needs of unsheltered individuals in Vallejo. This can include using streams of funding (such as CDBG or other funding streams) to partner with a community organization and support development of new emergency shelter facilities.
- Include a program to enact an ordinance to make it so landlords cannot deny individuals from housing based solely on having an eviction on their record or having poor credit in order to remove barriers preventing ELI Households from accessing stable housing

- Consider enacting a Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) program using its HOME funding and should include a date by which a recommendation would be made to the relevant City commission or City Council about adopting a TBRA program.

Other community input and questions not representing an organization

- Clarification regarding quantified objectives for Programs A 1.1.2, B 2.1.1 and E 1.1.1
- Clarification on the City of Vallejo's late Housing Element and possible repercussions for submitting late and being out of compliance with the state
- Request for clarification on builder's remedy and "by right" projects and design standards
- Clarification regarding quantified objectives for Programs A 1.1.2, B 2.1.1 and E 1.1.1
- Clarification on the City of Vallejo's late Housing Element and possible repercussions for submitting late and being out of compliance with the state
- Request for clarification on builder's remedy and "by right" projects and design standard
- Encourage the City to improve ongoing dialogue between Mare Island residents and Mare Island Co. by ensuring transparency and accountability to the public during the Environmental Impact Report process

STATE CERTIFICATION

Upon adoption by the City Council, the City will submit the updated Housing Element to HCD for review. HCD staff will then determine whether the adopted Housing Element update substantially conforms to State law. Assuming that HCD certifies the Housing Element as complying with State law, the City's responsibility will then be to implement the programs and policies adopted in the document.



REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

3

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
A.1.1.1.	<p>Housing Element Annual Review.</p> <p>Annually, the City will prepare an analysis of its progress in implementing the Housing Element, for submittal to the City Council and to the California Department of Housing and Community Development. As part of this annual review, the City will establish a Housing Element working group, patterned after the Housing Element Advisory Committee, who will collaborate with City staff to implement Goals, Policies, and Programs identified in this Housing Element. If necessary, the City will undertake appropriate actions to expand the inventory of available sites to accommodate the unmet need.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Annually</p>	<p>Each year since 2016, the City has completed and submitted the Annual Progress Report (APR) to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The APR provides the Council and HCD insight on how the City is implementing the General Plan, how many building permits have been issued, and how many units have received a Certificate of Occupancy. The 2021 Zoning Ordinance Update increased base district densities resulting in an overall capacity increase of 11,195 dwelling units. Due to limited staff capacity, the Housing Element working group has not been created.</p>	<p>Modify.</p> <p>New Program A 1.1.1.</p>
A.1.1.2	<p>Vacant Land Inventory.</p> <p>The City of Vallejo will continue to maintain a vacant land inventory for residential, commercial, and industrially zoned parcels. In considering development applications and/or pending changes in local land use policy, the City of Vallejo will place a priority on activities (i.e., expedite permits when possible) that support the City's ability to</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: City staff will review list annually to ensure enough land to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through the 5th cycle planning period and update site information as projects are</p>	<p>The vacant land inventory was originally created with the adoption of the 5th cycle Housing Element update. The City also created a streamlined process to expedite accessory dwelling unit (ADU) construction to help meet the City's share of the regional housing need.</p>	<p>Modify.</p> <p>New Program A 1.1.1.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
	meet its unmet share of the regional housing need.	approved through the Planning Division.		
A.1.1.3	<p>Mixed-Use Development</p> <p>The City will continue to encourage and facilitate residential development in mixed-use zones, particularly units affordable to extremely low-, low- and very low-income households.</p> <p>The City’s vacant land inventory described in Program A 1.1.2 will include a listing of mixed-use and high-density sites appropriate for residential uses. This inventory will be made available to interested developers, including affordable housing developers, to facilitate and encourage them to propose development on these sites.</p> <p>The City will continue to facilitate the construction of residences in the mixed-use developments and high density by doing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discouraging the development of exclusively commercial projects, in areas designated for mixed-use. • Continuing to provide marketing materials on the City’s website that delineate site opportunities for mixed-use and provide technical assistance for interested developers. Technical assistance includes assisting interested developers with obtaining property owner/representative information and information on the available 	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division, Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: General and Grant Funding</p> <p>Schedule: Complete form-based standards by 2016, update Zoning Ordinance by 2016, provide marketing materials, assistance, and update vacant land inventory- ongoing.</p>	<p>The City updated their Zoning Ordinance following the General Plan 2040 update (adopted in 2017). As part of the update, the City held study sessions and community open houses with the Planning Commission to consider policy options for mixed-use, mixed-income housing projects. In 2017, the Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan was adopted and in 2021 the new Zoning Ordinance was adopted.</p> <p>While a form-based code was envisioned in the General Plan 2024 Update, it was later determined that a conventional code would serve the City better. Due to staff shortages and turnover, this was accomplished later than anticipated. The new Zoning Ordinance was adopted in 2021.</p> <p>The new Zoning Ordinance allows residential uses, in the Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMX), Downtown Mixed Use (DMX), Waterfront Mixed Use (WMX), Neighborhood Commercial (NC), and Central Commercial (CC) zones in addition to in residential zones. Multifamily is also permitted with a minor use permit, in the Regional Commercial (RC), Office (O), and Medical (M) districts. By allowing residential uses in most zones, the City has helped facilitate the construction of affordable units.</p> <p>Due to staff capacity and resource constraints, the City was unable to provide marketing materials for mixed-use opportunities. The city has made the GIS mapping system with site information available to the public for research on properties. The City’s Economic Development</p>	<p>Modify.</p> <p>New Program A 1.1.2.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
	<p>development incentives (Program A 2.1.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete form-based design standards for Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan and other areas as appropriate to provide developers a predictable path to entitlement of mixed-use projects. 		<p>Department is in the process of obtaining software to help identify sites available for sale or lease to assist in matching potential developers with property owners.</p>	
A 1.1.4	<p>High Density</p> <p>The City will increase density of High Density Residential (HDR) from 27 to 30 units per acre. This will occur in conjunction with the Zoning Code update process.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund and Grant Funding</p> <p>Schedule: By December 2016</p>	<p>An updated General Plan was adopted in 2017 and the updated Zoning Ordinance was adopted in June 2021. The updated General Plan includes the Primarily Multifamily Designation (R-MF) with a maximum permitted residential density of 40 dwelling units per acre. The comparable Residential High-Density (RHD) zone also allows up to 40 dwelling units per acre. This program has been completed.</p>	<p>Delete, completed.</p>
A.2.1.1	<p>Underutilized Commercial Land Conversion Program</p> <p>The City, through the comprehensive General Plan and Zoning Code update, will expand opportunities for residential and mixed-use development. Through this process the City will offer regulatory incentives, such as expedited permit processing for projects that contain an affordable housing component. The City will also promote the availability of both the underutilized sites and regulatory incentives through the use of the City's website, during preapplication meetings, and during other relevant community outreach workshops/meetings. Lastly, the City will monitor the supply of underutilized sites and evaluate whether the incentives</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund and Grant Funding</p> <p>Schedule: Study and site inventory will be completed by December 2015.</p> <p>General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update by 2016. Promotional materials will be prepared and put on the website by June 2016. Monitor supply of underutilized sites ongoing.</p>	<p>An updated General Plan was adopted in 2017 and the updated Zoning Ordinance was adopted in June 2021. As a part of the General Plan 2040 and Zoning Ordinance updates, City staff evaluated opportunities to remove constraints and streamline housing project approvals. This was achieved through Zoning Ordinance Section 16.214.14, which outlines provisions to help streamline infill projects where at least 50 percent of units are affordable units.</p> <p>The Zoning Ordinance update also included development standards for the Commercial and Corridor zoning districts (NC Neighborhood Commercial, CC Central Corridor Commercial, WC Waterfront Commercial, and RC Regional Commercial) that specifically promote pedestrian- and transit-oriented, medium- and high-density multifamily housing and mixed-use</p>	<p>Delete, complete, ongoing items combined with Modified A.1.1.3.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete
	described above are providing the necessary catalyst to ensure that development is occurring consistent with the RHNA needs. As necessary, the City will make changes to this program to ensure that infill development remains a realistic and viable development strategy.		uses. This includes allowing height exceptions along corridors and allowing additional residential density (up to 25 percent) under certain requirements (Zoning Ordinance Section 16.204.03). Due to staffing limitations, the City was unable to promote the availability of underutilized sites, regulatory incentives, and monitor the supply of underutilized sites throughout the planning period. The City will revise this program to include quantifiable objectives for monitoring of underutilized sites needed to meet the RHNA, if any, and to promote incentives for redevelopment of underutilized sites in conjunction with modified Program A. 1.1.3.
A.3.1.1	<p>Removal of Governmental Constraints</p> <p>The City will review local regulations to remove or mitigate constraints on the production of housing, where possible these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) remove regulations requiring a major conditional use permit for multi-family housing developments with nine or more units b) Currently “group residential” facilities under five persons are permitted with a CUP in High-Density Residential. The City will allow licensed group home and other residential facilities with six or fewer residents by right in residential areas accordance with State law. c) Assembly Bill (AB) 2634 requires the City to identify zoning to encourage housing suitable for extremely low- 	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division and the City Attorney</p> <p>Funding: General Fund and Grant Funding</p> <p>Schedule: December 2016.</p>	<p>In 2018, the City updated their zoning regulations to allow licensed group home and other residential facilities with six or fewer residents by right in residential areas.</p> <p>City Council adopted the updated Zoning Ordinance in June 2021. To remove constraints to the development of affordable housing, the updated Zoning Ordinance (Section 16.214.14) outlines provisions to streamline infill projects where at least 50 percent of units are affordable units. The City removed the requirement for an approved major conditional use permit for multifamily housing developments with three or more units. To help facilitate housing for extremely low-income households, the Zoning Ordinance update outlined provisions for Single-Room Occupancy Units, such units require the approval of a Minor or Major Use Permit and are reviewed by the director. All applications for a major use permit require a public notice and</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
	income households, which includes supportive housing and single-room occupancy (SRO) units. As part of the Zoning Ordinance Update, the City will add a definition of SRO and identify a zone, or zones where SROs will be allowed.		hearing before the Planning Commission pursuant to Chapter 16.602 and may be appealed.	
A.3.1.2	<p>Density Bonus Amendment.</p> <p>The City will amend its Zoning Code Ordinance pursuant to Government Code Section 65915-65918, to incentivize the development of affordable housing in the City, including increased density allowances and reduced parking standards in compliance with State law.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division and the City Attorney</p> <p>Funding: General Fund and Grant Funding</p> <p>Schedule: Complete as part of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update in 2016.</p>	City Council adopted the Zoning Ordinance in June 2021. To comply with State law, the updated Zoning Ordinance includes provisions to apply for a Density Bonus in Section 16.214.03.	Delete, complete
A.4.1.1	<p>Housing Marketing and Promotion.</p> <p>Encourage and facilitate the development of housing that is affordable to households with a wide range of incomes, particularly in the downtown area, by updating land use policies and regulations and marketing and branding the City as an investment opportunity for moderate and above moderate-income households.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing</p>	<p>The Zoning Ordinance was adopted in June 2021. Land use policies that can facilitate housing include the State-mandated Density Bonus and Streamlined Infill Projects incentive. The updated Zoning Ordinance also relaxed parking regulations by eliminating the minimum number of off-street parking spaces for senior housing. Lastly, the 2040 General Plan increased densities in the Primarily Multifamily designation to 40 dwelling units per acre.</p> <p>The Housing Strategic Plan identified the importance of preserving mixed-income developments. The City’s programs for advancing mixed-income housing include leveraging private properties to catalyze housing production and provide affordable housing and by maintaining a list of existing affordable and mixed-income developments that include affordable units.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program H 4.1.1.</p> <p>New Programs H 4.1.1 and H 4.1.2.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
B.1.1.1	<p>Section 8 Rental Subsidy Program (Tenant-Based)</p> <p>Continue to apply to HUD for vouchers, if available, for extremely low-, very low-, and low- income households, making extremely low-income households a priority is (VHA). Continue owner outreach efforts, including the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, a property manager meeting, regular presentations to the Solano Board of Realtors, and participation in the Napa/Solano Advisory Chapter of the California Apartment Association. In addition, the Housing Authority will continue to contract with gosection8.com, an online landlord listing service to attract new landlords VHA.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Vallejo Housing Authority/Housing and Community Development</p> <p>Funding: Housing Authority funds</p> <p>Schedule: Apply for vouchers as they are made available; outreach efforts are ongoing (2015–2023).</p>	<p>The City continued to apply for HUD housing choice vouchers, having distributed an average of 1,876 monthly between 2015 and 2020.</p> <p>In 2020, City council approved an increase of the Tenant Based Rental Assistance vouchers and adopted the City’s Housing Strategy, which prioritized the Family Self-Sufficiency Program to promote economic growth. In 2019, the City launched an outreach campaign to encourage more eligible applicants to participate. These efforts added 23 eligible applicants to the program. In addition, active owner outreach programs are conducted to promote Section 8 acceptance by landlords. The Self-Sufficiency Program has actively promoted economic growth. For example, graduates of the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program are encouraged to use the money that they have earned through the program toward down payment for the purchase a home. me have done that, and some have started their own businesses.</p> <p>In 2023, the City was awarded additional funding for the Family Self-Sufficiency Program which is a subprogram of the Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) Program.</p> <p>This program will be modified to work with the Housing Authority to determine a method to track the number of units available for Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) users.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Programs D 1.1.3 and D 1.1.4.</p> <p>New Program B 1.1.1.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
B.2.1.1	<p>Below-Market-Rate Financing Program (New Construction).</p> <p>Continue to utilize available tax-exempt bond financing, Redevelopment Housing Set-Asides, CDBG and HOME funds, Housing Authority reserves, and other resources to provide financial assistance for housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households. Funds will be prioritized for extremely low-income housing based on project feasibility.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: State/federal grant funds and programs</p> <p>Schedule: Apply for affordable housing funds annually.</p>	<p>In 2017, the City used HUD funds to purchase property. In 2018, the City selected Eden Housing to build 74 permanent supporting housing units. Eden Housing received Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Asset Funds and HOME funds from the City. Eden Housing obtained tax credits. The project will be completed in 2023.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program B 2.1.5.</p> <p>New Program B 2.1.5.</p>
B.2.1.1	<p>Below-Market-Rate Financing Program (New Construction).</p> <p>Continue to utilize available tax-exempt bond financing, Redevelopment Housing Set-Asides, CDBG and HOME funds, Housing Authority reserves, and other resources to provide financial assistance for housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households. Funds will be prioritized for extremely low-income housing based on project feasibility.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: State/federal grant funds and programs</p> <p>Schedule: Apply for affordable housing funds annually.</p>	<p>In 2017, the City used HUD funds to purchase property. In 2018, the City selected Eden Housing to build 74 permanent supporting housing units. Eden Housing received Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Asset Funds and HOME funds from the City. Eden Housing obtained tax credits. The project will be completed in 2023.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program B 2.1.5.</p> <p>New Program B 2.1.5.</p>
B.2.1.2	<p>Housing Impact Fee</p> <p>The development of market rate housing may attract higher income households, which may in turn create lower paying jobs in the service and retail industries, resulting in demand for affordable housing. Housing Impact Fees are fees exacted from developers to ameliorate some of the housing impacts generated from new, market-rate housing and are typically based on an assessment, or ‘Nexus’ study of the extent to which the development of new</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Present to City Council for consideration and feedback by December 2016.</p>	<p>From 2015-2020, the City explored the feasibility of establishing a Housing Impact Fee. In 2016, the staff presented a recommendation for a Housing Impact Fee to City Council for consideration and feedback.</p> <p>In 2020, the City adopted a Housing Strategy that creates a framework to establish policies that will create housing for an array of income levels. The Housing Strategy included exploring the adoption of an inclusionary housing program between 2020 and 2021 as an action under the “Catalyze broad range of affordable housing</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program H 4.1.2.</p> <p>New Program B 2.1.1.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete
	<p>market-rate housing generates additional demand for affordable housing, The City will explore the feasibility of adopting a Housing Impact Fee that would assist in meeting Vallejo’s “fair share” of Regional Housing Needs Allocations. Some of the elements in the Housing Impact Fee could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum number of units threshold of 25 • Nexus study to calculate appropriate fee • Creation of an affordable housing trust fund to be used to preserve and expand the supply of affordable housing 	<p>units throughout Vallejo” program. However, due to staff capacity limitations, this process has not been started. The City will revise this program to include specific milestones for adoption of an inclusionary housing ordinance.</p> <p>The Housing Strategy incorporated relevant policies and information from the Vallejo General Plan, Housing Element, Public Housing Agency Plan, and Consolidated Plan. The Strategy was informed by an evaluation of the City’s housing needs, challenges, and opportunities, which was reviewed and discussed with community stakeholders, and then refined in collaboration with City staff. The overall goal of the strategy is to create housing for an array of different income levels that will assist in meeting Vallejo’s “fair share” of Regional Housing Needs Allocations. This will be accomplished through sustained leadership, preservation of housing affordability, prevention strategies relating to displacement, instability and homelessness, an increased leverage of public lands for increased housing and economic development through enhanced resident self-sufficiency training and employment opportunities.</p>	
B.2.1.3	<p>Commercial Linkage Fee.</p> <p>Commercial Linkage Fees (also known as ‘Jobs-Housing’ fees) are fees exacted from developers to ameliorate some of the housing impacts generated from commercial projects. The City will explore the feasibility of a Commercial Linkage Fee that would provide an additional source of funding for affordable housing based on</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund, to fund initial exploration</p> <p>Schedule: Evaluate</p>	<p>The City has continued to explore the feasibility of a Commercial Linkage Fee that would be aimed at providing a source of funding for affordable housing but has not established one.</p> <p>Continue. New Program B.2.1.2</p>

3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
	<p>demand from construction of new commercial developments and the types of employment generated. Linkage fees can vary by development type, fee level, exemptions, options/thresholds, terms of payment, and results. Some of the elements in the Housing Impact Fee could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum square footage for commercial building subject to fee is 100,000 • Nexus study to calculate appropriate fee • Creation of an affordable housing trust fund to be used to preserve and expand the supply of affordable housing 			
B.2.1.4	<p>Low to Moderate Income Housing Funds.</p> <p>Continue to support very low- and extremely low- income housing development with RDA Successor Agency funds and proactively seek new funding sources for the development of affordable housing. These funds will be administered by the Vallejo Housing Authority and coordinated with private and non-profit developers to guide development in targeted areas</p>	<p>Responsibility: Vallejo Housing Authority (VHA)</p> <p>Funding: RDA Successor Agency Tax Allocation Funds – VHA</p> <p>Schedule: Annually</p>	<p>To support the development of very low- and extremely low-income housing, the City applied for and secured funds. \$1.6 million in Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Asset Funds were loaned to a nonprofit developer for the construction of a 74-unit Permanent Supportive Housing for the homeless at 2118 and 2134-2136 Sacramento Street (Blue Oak Landing).</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Programs B 2.1.1 and B 2.1.5.</p> <p>New Program B 2.1.3.</p>
B.2.1.5	<p>Explore Additional Funding Opportunities</p> <p>Consider ways to mitigate the loss of Redevelopment funding for affordable housing. Support the development of extremely low-income rental housing by seeking additional funding from State and</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: State and federal funds</p>	<p>The Housing Successor Agency continues to receive funding for affordable housing projects which are contained in the Low-to- Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund</p> <p>The City of Vallejo applied for Homekey (in 2022) and No Place Like Home (NPLH) Program funds in</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Programs B 2.1.1 and B 2.1.4.</p> <p>New Program B 2.1.3.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete
	Federal resources, such as funding from the national Housing Trust Funds when funding becomes available, HOME funds, and CDBG.	<p>Schedule: Apply as funding becomes available</p> <p>2020. The City was awarded \$11,621,866 for a HomeKey project with 47 permanently supportive studio units which is currently under construction.</p> <p>The City received/allocated \$9,962,296 in funding for a navigation center from the following sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CDBG 2. State Permanent Local Housing Allocation 3. City ARPA 4. County ARPA 5. Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention 2 (HHAP) 6. HHAP3 7. Emergency Solutions Grant – Coronavirus 2 8. General Fund 	
C 1.1.1	<p>Conversion Monitoring and Response Program</p> <p>The Housing and Community Development Division maintains annual monitoring of the status of units at risk of conversion to market rates through the State-mandated process for owners to provide notice of planned conversions. If notice is received, immediately contact qualified and interested nonprofit organizations to begin developing plans to preserve, acquire, or replace the affordable units and notify tenants of affected properties of their rights and options. The City will consider additional outreach such as hosting workshops and distributing updated</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: Annual monitoring, Housing Authority Funds. Assistance with property funding would be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing; the City will contact owners one year prior to expiration date to determine the best approach to keep the units affordable.</p>	<p>The implementation of the conversion monitoring and response program has ensured the preservation of affordability for units at risk of conversion to market-rate housing. In partnership with HUD, the City renewed the affordability for Ascension Arms, senior apartments, for all units through March 1, 2027. Due to staff capacity limitations, the City was not able to host workshops and conduct other forms of outreach. This program will be amended to include quantified objectives to ensure ongoing success.</p> <p>Modify. New Program C 1.1.1.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
	information on the web. The City will immediately investigate the status of Ascension Arms to ascertain the risk of conversion to market rate, and take immediate action to prevent conversion.			
C 1.1.2	<p>Below-Market-Rate Financing Program (Preservation)</p> <p>Utilize available tax-exempt bond financing, Redevelopment Housing Set- Asides, CDBG and HOME funds, and Housing Authority reserves to acquire and preserve as affordable units at risk of converting to market rate.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Vallejo Redevelopment Agency, Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: Funding will be determined on a case-by-case basis</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing.</p>	The City did not acquire affordable units during the planning period.	Modify. New Program C 1.1.2.
C 2.1.1	<p>Condominium Conversion Ordinance</p> <p>Continue to administer the City's condominium conversion ordinance that was designed to minimize the negative impacts of conversions on the rental market. The City will review the ordinance to consider an amendment to mitigate potential displacement of affordable units and to address complexes with approved condominium maps that are yet to be converted.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Vallejo Housing and Community Development Division and Vallejo Housing Authority</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Review and revise ordinance, as necessary, during the Zoning Ordinance update to be completed in 2016.</p>	<p>As a part of the Zoning Ordinance update, the City evaluated opportunities to remove constraints to housing and streamline housing project approvals. City Council adopted an updated Zoning Ordinance in June 2021.</p> <p>The City continued to implement the Condominium Conversion Ordinance (Section 16.613 of the Zoning Ordinance). Section 16.214.04 outlines density bonuses and other incentives for condominium conversions to preserve affordable units.</p>	Delete, complete.

3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
D 1.1.1	<p>First-Time Homebuyer Program</p> <p>The City will continue the first-Time Homebuyer Program. The program provides low- and moderate-income households with down payment assistance loans and closing cost grants, averaging 5 to 10 closings a year. The City will consider establishing a program to give priority criteria to homes located in older neighborhoods to increase ownership investment in those areas. Provide homeownership opportunities to 5 or more potential homeowners for households at or below 120 percent of the area median income through the Homebuyer Financing programs.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: CDBG/HOME – Housing and Community Development Division funds</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing, subject to funding availability</p>	<p>To encourage homeownership in the City, CDBG and HOME funds were provided to 2 first-time homebuyers during the planning period. In 2020, the City selected Community Housing Development Corporation (CHDC) to provide homebuyer counseling and down payment assistance.</p> <p>Resources don't allow administration of this program during the 6th Housing Element planning period. This program will be deleted.</p>	Delete.
D 1.1.2	<p>Sweat-Equity Program for Homeownership</p> <p>The City will consider implementing a program to provide financial subsidies to prospective homeowners in exchange for investing sweat equity in rehabilitating an existing home that is in need of significant repair. The City will consider targeting the program to foreclosed or blighted dwellings and working with a nonprofit organization such as Habitat for Humanity, which specializes in sweat-equity programs.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: Funding will be determined on a case-by-case basis</p> <p>Schedule: Explore program options and make recommendation to City Council by December 2017.</p>	<p>In 2017, a loan was made to Solano-Napa Habitat for Humanity for the purchase of a parcel for the program.</p> <p>The City continued to consider establishing a sweat equity program throughout the planning period.</p>	Modify. New Program D 1.1.2.



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
D 1.1.3	<p>Section 8 Homebuyer Assistance Program</p> <p>The City will continue to administer a program offering homebuyer classes and financial assistance to Section 8 recipients to help in the purchase of a home.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: Housing Authority fund</p> <p>Schedule: Due to financial and resource limitations this program was suspended. As the economy improves and the City recovers from its financial issues, the City will reinstate this program.</p>	<p>In 2016, the City reinstated its homebuyer and financial assistance classes to Section 8 recipients and continued to offer the classes throughout the planning period. In 2020, the Community Housing Development Corporation (CHDC) provided homebuyer counseling and down payment assistance courses to 8 participants.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program B 1.1.1.</p> <p>New Program B 1.1.1.</p>
D 1.1.4	<p>Family Self-Sufficiency Program</p> <p>The Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program provides opportunities to Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) families to move toward economic independence and self-sufficiency. The FSS Program assists very low-income families receiving assistance through the HCV Program to receive comprehensive supportive services that will enable participants to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency. The Vallejo Housing Authority will continue to administer the program. The maximum number of participants for the city program is 50.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: Housing Authority Funds</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing.</p>	<p>Throughout the planning period, the City continued to offer the Family Self Sufficiency Program. In 2019, the City launched an outreach campaign to encourage more eligible applicants to participate. These efforts added 23 eligible applicants to the program.</p> <p>In 2020, the City adopted a Housing Strategy. The Family Self Sufficiency Program was a prioritized program in the Housing Strategy to continue to support HCV families to move toward economic independence.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program B 1.1.1.</p> <p>New Program B 1.1.1.</p>
D 1.1.5	<p>Mobile Home Permitting</p> <p>The City through the Zoning Ordinance update will clarify that a single mobile home or a manufactured house on a permanent foundation will be processed and permitted the same as conventional single family homes in all zoning districts.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Zoning Ordinance amended June 2021</p>	<p>The Zoning Ordinance was updated June 2021 and outlines provisions for manufactured houses (known as Mobile Homes) on permanent foundation. Manufactured homes are permitted on any lot zoned for single-unit use and is subject to all applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>Delete, complete.</p>

3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete
E 1.1.1	<p>Section 8 Rental Subsidy Program (Tenant Based, Special Needs)</p> <p>The City will meet with service providers on an annual basis to discuss opportunities to expand supportive housing, “affordable housing that provides on-site services to people who may need support to live independently,” for special needs populations, e.g., formerly homeless individuals and families, people with HIV/AIDS or physical disabilities, and young people aging out of foster care.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund, Federal and state funding</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing.</p>	<p>The City continued to assist special-needs populations. In May 2019, the City initiated a service providers, developers, and landlord policy working group. In 2020, the working group established recurring meetings.</p> <p>Modify. Combine with Program B 1.1.1. New Program B 1.1.1.</p>
E 1.1.2	<p>Senior Housing Needs</p> <p>The City will identify the existing and future housing needs of senior citizens including the seniors displaced by the Casa de Vallejo fire. The City will conduct a senior citizen housing survey to determine the need for housing and care facilities for senior citizens. The survey results will help develop a priority list of senior housing needs. Based on the needs identified in the survey, the City will meet with affordable housing/senior housing developers on an annual basis to discuss available sites and senior needs in the community. The City will provide incentives to developers to provide housing and care choices for seniors of all income levels (possible incentives will include reduced setbacks, reduced parking requirements, and technical assistance with applications for funding).</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division, Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: Federal and State Funding</p> <p>Schedule: Apply for funding to complete a senior needs survey annually and/or as Notices of Funding Available (NOFAs) are released. Meet with affordable housing/senior developers annually to discuss potential projects.</p>	<p>Throughout the planning period, the City considered programs to address the needs of seniors, including the seniors impacted by the Casa de Vallejo Fire. Due to staff capacity limitations, a survey of senior housing needs was not completed. This program will be revised to identify milestones and quantified objectives for completing a survey and assessing needs.</p> <p>As a part of the 2021 Zoning Ordinance update, the City removed constraints on affordable senior development by permitting senior housing in multiple zone districts, including residential and commercial zones.</p> <p>Modify. New Program E 1.1.2.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
E 1.1.3	<p>Homeless Needs</p> <p>To identify the number of homeless persons, the City will complete a Point in Time Count to augment the HUD Continuum of Care Report 2013. The City will also partner with these agencies and other community organizations to pursue funding from available sources for homeless services. The City will annually apply for grants where appropriate or will encourage/partner with local and regional nonprofit organizations that wish to apply for such grants.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: Federal, state, and local funding</p> <p>Schedule: The City will meet with organizations that support the homeless population in Vallejo annually and apply for funding or assist these groups in applying for funding for homeless services annually.</p>	<p>From 2016 to 2022, the City continued to identify the number of homeless persons by conducting the Point-in-Time (PIT) count every January. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the PIT count was postponed in 2020 and 2021. In 2020, the City applied for grants to operate a Project Roomkey program in Vallejo and worked with the County to establish a hotel voucher program that assisted 38 persons/households during the planning period. From April 2020 through January 2022, 175 individuals or 143 families were assisted through Room Key, Home Key and the navigation center. The City meets regularly with organizations that support the homeless population to identify needs and opportunities. The City also partnered with the Firm Foundation and Eden Housing to apply for grants to support homeless services.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program E.1.1.4.</p> <p>New Program E 1.1.3.</p>
E 1.1.4	<p>Community Action Partnership of Solano County</p> <p>Continue to be an active member on the Community Action Partnership of Solano County Board (CAP Solano), a joint powers authority, to coordinate homeless services and develop a regional response to homeless needs.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: Federal, state, and local funding</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing.</p>	<p>Throughout the planning period, the City continued to participate in the Community Action Partnership of Solano County (CAP Solano). In 2017, the City participated in CAP Solano’s outreach efforts and development of the county-wide homelessness plan: Neighbors Helping Neighbors: Forward Together, A 5-Year Regional Strategic Plan to Respond to Homelessness in Solano County. In 2020, the City worked with local and countywide service providers to address the needs of unhoused persons.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program E.1.1.3.</p> <p>New Program E 1.1.3.</p>

3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete
E 1.1.5	<p>Reasonable Accommodations</p> <p>As required by both the federal Fair Housing Act and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, the City through the Zoning Ordinance update will establish a procedure for allowing reasonable accommodation requests made by persons with disabilities for exceptions or modifications and other special considerations during the planning process.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Zoning Ordinance amended June 2021</p>	<p>City Council adopted the new Zoning Ordinance in June 2021. The new Zoning Ordinance includes provisions for reasonable accommodation requests, including reasonable accommodation requests to ensure access to housing. Applications for reasonable accommodation to ensure access to housing are reviewed by the Director and can exceed the 25 percent limits set forth in Zoning Ordinance Section 16.608.01. The Director has 30 calendar days to approve, conditionally approve, or deny applications.</p> <p>Modify. Combine with Program E 1.1.6.</p> <p>New Program E 1.1.4.</p>
E 1.1.6	<p>Universal Design</p> <p>The City will inform homebuilders regarding Universal Design features that can be incorporated into new houses, condominiums, and townhomes. Information will be provided on Universal Design on the Planning Division’s website, at the Planning Division’s information counter, and at the Building Division’s permit counters.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division, Building Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing</p>	<p>The City will create a handout to inform builders about Universal Design features that can be incorporated into new houses, condominiums, and townhomes. The City also enforces the 2022 California Building Code as of January 1, 2023, including accessibility requirements.</p> <p>Modify. Combine with Program E 1.1.5.</p> <p>New Program E 1.1.4.</p>
E.1.1.7	<p>Support for Persons with Developmental Disabilities.</p> <p>Explore successful models implemented in other Bay Area cities that encourage the creation of housing for persons with developmental disabilities. Such models could include assisting in housing development through the use of set-asides, scattered site acquisition, new construction, and pooled trusts; providing housing services that educate, advocate, inform, and assist people to locate and maintain housing; and models to assist in the maintenance and repair of housing for</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division, Building Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund and outside sources, as available</p> <p>Schedule: 2017</p>	<p>Due to staff capacity limitations, the City did not pursue models to encourage creation of housing for persons with disabilities. No funds were applied for rehabilitation of homes for those with developmental disabilities. This program will be revised to include quantified objectives and milestones to support development of accessible housing opportunities.</p> <p>Modify.</p> <p>New Program E 1.1.5.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
	persons with developmental disabilities. Seek outside funding sources for housing construction and rehabilitation specifically targeted for housing for persons with disabilities			
E.1.1.8	<p>Employee Housing</p> <p>The City will ensure local zoning, development standards and permitting processes comply with California Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6. Section 17021.5 for Employee Housing</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund and outside sources, as available</p> <p>Schedule: Zoning Ordinance to be adopted in 2019</p>	As a part of the Zoning Ordinance update, the City reviewed its local development standards and permitting processes for compliance with the Employee Housing Act. The Zoning Ordinance was adopted in June 2021.	<p>Modify. Combine with Program A 3.1.1.</p> <p>New Program A 3.1.1.</p>
F.1.1.1	<p>Housing Discrimination Monitoring and Referral Program</p> <p>Through its HUD-required affordable housing activities, the Vallejo Housing Authority publicizes fair housing requirements and the availability of assistance. The Housing Authority also uses public notices in English, Spanish and Tagalog, general circulation newspaper ads, and ads in a Spanish-language newspaper as well as a newsletter serving the Filipino community and outreach activities with community organizations. For Section 8 participants the Housing Authority accepts and investigates complaints of housing discrimination complaints on other cases. Fair Housing Napa Valley assists households alleging discrimination through tenant/landlord mediation and provides referrals to appropriate agencies, such as HUD or the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, for further</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund and outside funding as available</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing.</p>	The City continued the Housing Discrimination Monitoring and Referral Program throughout the planning period and the Housing Authority continued to post information in English, Spanish, and Tagalog through multiple sources. In 2018, the City added Legal Services of Northern California to the local fair housing Resource Guide to expand the availability of that The Housing Authority continues to refer program applicants and participants with complaints of housing discrimination to the Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California.	<p>Modify.</p> <p>New Program F 1.1.1.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete
	investigation and resolution of complaints when needed.		
F 1.1.2	<p>Analysis of Impediments</p> <p>The Housing Authority and the City will coordinate efforts to further fair housing and equal opportunity through an update and revision of the local Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing document (AI) as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: CDBG, HOME, Housing Authority and NSP Funds</p> <p>Schedule: Complete by May 2015.</p>	As of 2016, the City and Housing Authority had completed the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing for the period of 2015 to 2020. In 2021, the City and Housing Authority initiated the process of updating the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Report as required by HUD. The City has completed a draft and has received comments from HUD. The City will submit the final report to HUD as part of the 6th Cycle Housing Element update.
G 1.1.1	<p>Housing Rehabilitation Program</p> <p>The City will provide funds to assist very low-, low-, and moderate-income households to undertake repairs to their homes to bring them into a good state of repair and maintain them as viable units in the local housing stock. The City will give priority for participation in this program to very low-, low-, and moderate-income homeowners who are subject to code enforcement actions that could otherwise lead to displacement of residents.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: HOME and CDBG Funds</p> <p>Schedule: Rehabilitation projects funded through CDBG, and HOME are ongoing.</p>	<p>The City continues to improve the living conditions in the city's neighborhoods through the housing rehabilitation program. In 2019, the City added information about the owner-occupied rehabilitation program to the City website with links to additional information. In 2020, the City released an RFP to hire an operator to administer the owner-occupied rehabilitation program.</p> <p>No households applied for rehabilitation assistance during the planning period. The City will revise this program to include strategies to increase outreach of available programs.</p>
G 1.1.2	<p>Neighborhood Amenities</p> <p>The City will evaluate residential proposals at the time of initial proposal to determine what, if any, project-serving retail or services could be incorporated into the project or concurrently developed adjacent to the project which would offer residents</p>	<p>Responsibility: Housing and Community Development Division, Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing.</p>	Throughout the planning period, the City reviewed applications to identify opportunities to incorporate neighborhood amenities. However, only mixed-use developers provided amenities.



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
	the ability to meet their everyday needs easily and efficiently. Examples of services include, but are not limited to, service commercial uses, carpool facilities, and childcare.			
G 2.1.1	<p>Code Enforcement Program</p> <p>The City will more aggressively enforce its existing codes through its Code Enforcement Program, utilizing all available authorities to compel property owners to correct code violations.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Code Enforcement/Neighborhood Law Program</p> <p>Funding: General Fund CDBG Funds</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing.</p>	During the 5th planning period, the City maintained a full-time code enforcement officer and a building inspector to manage and ensure all building codes were up to date. The City will revise this program to include quantifiable objectives.	Modify. New Program G 3.1.1.
G 3.1.1	<p>Capital Improvement Program</p> <p>When updating their capital improvement budgets, the City will collaborate with Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District to allocate resources to rehabilitate and/or replace infrastructure in older neighborhoods whose infrastructure is approaching obsolescence.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Public Works</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Complete Capital Improvement Program (CIP) updates annually.</p>	Administration of the districts' capital improvement budgets are not programs the City administers. This program will be deleted.	Delete.
G 4.1.1	<p>Rental Property Inspection Program</p> <p>The City will present a resolution of intention to the City Council regarding a rental property inspection program. The program may include the following features: working with local apartment owners, tenants' rights advocates, and other stakeholders, the City will explore the development and implementation of a program to inspect rental properties and enforce basic code requirements to ensure that renter households enjoy decent, safe, and sanitary housing.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Building Division and Code Enforcement</p> <p>Funding: Measure B</p> <p>Schedule: Implement program by late 2015.</p>	In 2018, the City conducted a cost study for a rental property inspection program. The program for market-rate units was determined to be financially infeasible. As a result, an alternate inspection model is being explored with the Housing Authority, Fire Department, and Building Division, and will be recommended in 2023.	Modify. New Program G 5.1.1.



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
G 4.1.2	<p>Crime Prevention Program</p> <p>The City will consider developing a crime-free certificate program to target and help rehabilitate existing multi-family complexes. As part of the program, the City shall work with the Police Department to evaluate existing multi-family complexes and provide rehabilitation recommendations to address crime and safety and to promote the implementation of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) strategies. The program is voluntary and intended to work with landlords to improve housing conditions.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division, Housing and Community Development Division, Code Enforcement, Neighborhood Law Program</p> <p>Funding: Planning Application Fees (paid by property owners of multifamily complexes), General Fund, CDBG</p> <p>Schedule: Existing program will be reinstated by the end of 2015.</p>	<p>In 2016, the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program (CFMHP) was reinstated and continued until 2019. By 2019, 10 properties had been fully certified through the program and an additional 3 were pending certification.</p> <p>In 2020, the program was suspended to transition from CFMHP to the Vallejo Community Public Safety Program (VCPS). In 2020, the VCPS program helped lead public safety information meetings, shared crime data, crime prevention practices, and other public safety information with local neighbors within each specified district.</p>	Modify.
G 5.1.1	<p>Mills Act Program</p> <p>The City will promote the use of Mills Act contracts to ensure the rehabilitation, maintenance, and preservation of historic resources through information located on the City's website.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: Planning Application Fees</p> <p>Schedule: Review as projects are submitted to the Planning Division.</p>	<p>Throughout the planning period, the City continued to advertise on the city website to promote the use of the Mills Act to encourage the rehabilitation, maintenance, and preservation of historic resources.</p> <p>As of 2023, 15 households have applied for and been approved for this program since 2015.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Programs G 1.1.1 and G 5.1.2.</p> <p>New Program G 3.1.1.</p>
G 5.1.2	<p>State Historical Building Code Program</p> <p>Continue the use of the State Historical Building Code to maintain and preserve historic buildings and their character-defining features</p>	<p>Responsibility: Building Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund / Building Permit Application Fees</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing</p>	<p>Between 2016 and 2017, the City continued to implement the State Historical Building Code Program to maintain and preserve historic buildings. This program is implemented on a case-by-case basis as needed by the Building Division.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Programs G 1.1.1 and G 5.1.1.</p> <p>New Program G 3.1.1.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program		Continue, Modify, Delete
H 1.1.1	<p>Neighborhood Park Access Program</p> <p>Based on the need for parks identified in the General Plan update, the City will encourage the development of public neighborhood or pocket parks for new subdivisions and will incorporate the goals of this program into new open space requirements as part of the City wide Zoning Ordinance update. Through conditions of approval, development agreements, and or mitigation measures identified in environmental review, the City will require that developers proposing to build parks and park facilities will do so concurrently with residential construction to ensure these amenities are available to existing and new residents within a reasonable amount of time from project approval.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: Funded through developers and neighborhood associations</p> <p>Schedule: As subdivisions are submitted to the Planning Division.</p>	<p>The City reviewed new residential subdivision applications throughout the planning period.</p> <p>As a part of the Zoning Ordinance update, the City considered opportunities to encourage the development of parks. The updated Zoning Ordinance was adopted in 2021.</p>	Continue.
H 1.1.2	<p>Neighborhood Services</p> <p>The City will evaluate, and if appropriate, encourage the development of services, such as child-care centers, within or adjacent to neighborhoods that will allow residents to minimize vehicle trips and access services close to home. Neighborhood serving uses will be incorporated into the City-wide Zoning Ordinance update.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: As plans are submitted to the Planning Division.</p>	<p>As a part of the Zoning Ordinance update, the City allowed commercial uses, including grocery stores, medical offices, and personal services, as permitted uses with minor-use permits in residential areas. Further, the City updated the Code to allow childcare centers, community gardens, and community assembly spaces as permitted uses in residential zoning districts. The Zoning Ordinance update was adopted in June 2021. No applications for neighborhood-serving uses were submitted during the planning period.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program G 1.1.2.</p> <p>New Program F 1.1.2.</p>
H 2.1.2	<p>Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan and Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan</p> <p>Implement the Downtown Vallejo and Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plans to introduce high-density mixed-use housing</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Update of the Zoning Ordinance in 2016.</p>	<p>In 2017, the Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan was adopted. One of the plan’s primary goals is to encourage the development of mixed-use through making key Zoning Ordinance revisions to allow more flexibility of uses. The Zoning</p>	Continue.

3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
	<p>while revitalizing existing retail and commercial areas. The Specific Plans focuses on improvements to the physical environment through development standards and design guidelines, both for public improvements and for private developments. The City will encourage the development of affordable housing units to implement residential development as part of the Specific Plan goals.</p>	<p>Ordinance was adopted by City Council in June 2021. In this update, the City incorporated mixed-use zones. The NMX Neighborhood allows densities of 16 to 30 units an acre and the DMX Downtown and WMX Waterfront districts allow densities of 30 to 90 units an acre. The increase in density is intended to help facilitate mixed-use development for all incomes.</p> <p>In addition, the City continues to implement the Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan (adopted in 2005) on a project-by-project basis, which aims to revitalize Downtown Vallejo into a high-density, mixed-use district. No mixed-use projects in the Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan were approved during the planning period. In 2022, ARPA funding was allocated to update the Downtown Specific Plan.</p>		
H 2.1.3	<p>Live/Work Ordinance</p> <p>The City currently permits live/work units with an administrative review process and will continue to process applications in this manner to facilitate the development of live/work units.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: As projects are submitted through the Planning Division.</p>	<p>Throughout the planning period, the City continued to facilitate the development of live/work units by permitting applications with an administrative review process.</p> <p>As a part of the Zoning Ordinance update, the City allows live/work units throughout most mixed-use and commercial zoning districts in the city. The updated Zoning Ordinance was adopted in 2021.</p>	Delete, complete.
H 2.1.4	<p>Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)</p> <p>The City will implement the goals of the Mare Island Specific Plan, Waterfront Planned Development Master Plan, and Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan to implement transit-oriented development. The City shall actively support and encourage vacant sites or underutilized</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Support transit-oriented development within the Mare Island Specific Plan, Waterfront Planned Development Master Plan, and Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan</p>	<p>Throughout the planning period, the City continued to implement the goals of the Mare Island Specific Plan, Waterfront Planned Development Master Plan, and Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan to implement TOD.</p> <p>In June 2021, the Zoning Ordinance was updated and adopted by City Council. As a part of the update, the City considered opportunities to</p>	<p>Modify.</p> <p>New Program H 2.1.1.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
	<p>sites near transit stops or along major transit corridors to be rezoned to mixed-use designations by offering regulatory incentives such as relaxed development standards, building setbacks, height, Floor Area Ratios (FAR), and parking), to encourage transit-oriented development. The purpose of TOD development is to stimulate the production of housing developments located near transit stations that include affordable units and increase public transit ridership and minimize automobile trips. TODs also strengthen local transit and promote infill, retail, employment, and residential development around existing and future transit stations, centers, and corridors.</p>	<p>through implementation of TOD goals by December 2016.</p>	<p>facilitate TOD. The City allows a 25 percent increase in the allowed density for the zoning district for residential TOD projects and allows a 25 percent increase in the allowed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for mixed-use projects. These increases require an approved minor use permit. Additionally, eligible TOD projects do require a minimum number of parking spaces.</p> <p>The City is currently updating the Waterfront Specific Plan and the Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan with an anticipated completion date of 2026. In addition, the City is anticipating the submittal of a revised Mare Island Specific Plan in 2023.</p>	
H 3.1.1	<p>Design Review</p> <p>The City, through the City-wide Zoning Code update, will establish design review criteria to use in determining whether proposed infill projects are compatible with the existing neighborhoods in which they are proposed. The purpose of which is to give clear direction for project design and to provide staff and the Planning Commission with clear criteria for decision-making. These criteria could include a pre-application process to provide project direction. As part of the City-wide Zoning Ordinance update, consideration should be given to exempting projects in form-based code areas, as these areas will provide direction on building form, massing, compatibility and the provision of on-site amenities and services as described above.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Update of the Zoning Ordinance in 2016.</p>	<p>The Zoning Ordinance was updated and adopted in June 2021. The updated code outlines procedures and exemptions for the design review process. The updated design review also ensures that decisions on housing development projects are based on objective design standards as required by the State Housing Accountability Act (Government Code Section 65589.5).</p> <p>With the Zoning Ordinance update, a Design Review permit was introduced. With residential projects, 2 to 10 units is a staff-level design review, 11 to 49 units is a Design Review Board recommendation to the Director, and 50 units or more is a Design Review Board recommendation to the Planning Commission. For nonresidential projects, 1 to 4,999 square feet is a staff-level design review and 5,000 square feet or more is Design Review Board review.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with H 3.1.2.</p> <p>New Program H 3.1.1.</p>

3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete	
H.3.1.2	<p>Design Guidelines for Housing Quality.</p> <p>The City will establish residential design guidelines, to ensure residential development projects are consistent with the goals of this Housing Element, produce better housing and neighborhoods, and improve the quality of life for existing and future Vallejo residents. The guidelines may apply to features including, but not limited to: lighting, access, landscaping and the provision of on-site amenities and services, such as community centers, and support, educational or security services. As part of the City-wide Zoning Ordinance update, consideration should be given to exempting projects in form-based code areas, as these areas will provide direction on building form, massing, compatibility and the provision of on-site amenities and services as described above.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Update the Zoning Ordinance in 2016.</p>	<p>As a part of the Zoning Ordinance update, the City made changes to the Design Guidelines. The Zoning Ordinance was updated and adopted in June 2021. The City will update the Design Guidelines to comply with State mandates by 2024.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program H 3.1.1.</p> <p>New Program H 3.1.1.</p>
H 4.1.1	<p>Regulate for Housing Variety</p> <p>Encourage a variety of housing types, including duplexes, townhomes, apartment buildings, and condominiums, in neighborhoods and new subdivisions through updated land use policies and regulations.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Update of the Zoning Ordinance in 2016.</p>	<p>Between 2016 and 2017, the City encouraged a variety of housing types on a regular basis. With the adoption of the Zoning Ordinance in 2021, the City adopted Section 16.202.05 for small-lot development to encourage a variety of housing types.</p>	<p>Modify.</p> <p>New Program H 4.1.1.</p>



3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program			Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete
H.4.1.2	<p>Mixed Income Housing Developments</p> <p>Proactively work with nonprofit and for-profit housing developers to encourage mixed-income housing developments.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Ongoing.</p>	<p>Between 2016 and 2017, the City continued to work with nonprofit and for-profit housing developers to encourage mixed-income housing developments.</p> <p>In the past years, the City has worked with nonprofit organizations to construct affordable housing, approving two residential projects for low-income households. The City is actively working on an inclusionary housing ordinance and is hopeful that ordinance will produce more mixed-income housing developments.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program B 2.1.2.</p> <p>New Program B 2.1.1.</p>
H 4.1.3	<p>Higher Density Residential</p> <p>To de-concentrate poverty, ensure sufficient higher density residential land is available in areas throughout the City.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Planning Division, Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Update of the Zoning Ordinance in 2016 and ongoing.</p>	<p>In 2021, the City adopted a new Zoning Ordinance that allows higher-density in the Residential Medium and High Density Zoning Districts, and allows duplexes by-right in the RLD district to increase density citywide.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Program A 1.1.2.</p> <p>New Program A 1.1.1.</p>
I 1.1.1	<p>Energy Conservation Partnership Program</p> <p>Partner with local utility providers to promote participation in available energy efficiency programs (e.g., BayRen, HERO and California First, PACE, Rising Sun’s California Youth Energy Services (CYES); PG&E Comfort Home Program; rebates for energy-efficient appliances)</p>	<p>Responsibility: Building Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: 2018</p>	<p>The City of Vallejo joined Marin Clean Energy (MCE) in 2019. Vallejo electricity customers began to receive service from MCE in 2021.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Programs I 1.1.2 and I 1.1.3.</p> <p>New Program I 1.1.1.</p>
I 1.1.2	<p>Green Building Code</p> <p>The City will enforce the “Green Building Code” to facilitate the implementation of green building features in new housing units. Staff will consider developing a brochure, which would provide developers with a range of green building design</p>	<p>Responsibility: Building Division, Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Develop brochure by December 2017.</p>	<p>The City continued to enforce the Green Building Code to implement green building features for new residential housing units throughout the planning period. The City adopted the 2022 Green Building Code, which went into effect January 1, 2023.</p>	<p>Modify. Combine with Programs I 1.1.1 and I 1.1.2.</p> <p>New Program I 1.1.1.</p>

3. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS

Existing Housing Element Program		Status of Program	Continue, Modify, Delete
	features to choose from that will satisfy the requirements of the ordinance.		
I 1.1.3	<p>Incentives for Green Building</p> <p>Provide incentives, such as project expediting and a study of fee reductions.</p>	<p>Responsibility: Building Division, Planning Division</p> <p>Funding: General Fund</p> <p>Schedule: Develop incentives by December 2018.</p>	<p>Due to limited staff capacity, the City was not able to establish incentives. This program will be revised to include specific milestones for examining and, if appropriate, implementing incentives.</p> <p>Modify. Combine with Programs I 1.1.1 and I 1.1.2. New Program I 1.1.1.</p>



HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

HOUSING RESOURCES

California law (Government Code Section 65583 [a][3]) requires that the Housing Element contain an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites that can be developed for housing within the planning period and nonvacant (i.e., underutilized) sites having potential for redevelopment. State law also requires an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), prepared in accordance with the provisions of Section 65584 of the California Government Code by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Solano County Subregion, addresses Vallejo's share of the regional housing need by income group for the 2023-2031 projection period.

Councils of governments, including ABAG, are responsible for developing an RHNA Methodology for allocating the Regional Determination to each city and county in their region. This methodology must specifically state objectives, including but not limited to promoting infill, equity, and environmental protection; ensuring jobs-housing balance; and affirmatively furthering fair housing. Of the 441,176 units allocated to the ABAG region, 10,992 were allocated to Solano County. Solano County formed a subregion

and established a methodology to distribute the units to each jurisdiction. Solano County's methodology and unit allocations were approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Solano County City County Coordinating Council in 2021.

The current RHNA for the City established by the Solano County subregion for 2023–2031 is displayed in **Table 1**. Vallejo must plan to accommodate a total of 2,900 units between June 30, 2022, and December 15, 2030. Of the 2,900 total units, the City must plan to accommodate 690 units for very low-income households, 369 units for low-income households, 495 units for moderate-income households, and 1,346 units for above moderate-income households.

TABLE 1 Regional Housing Need Allocation, Projection Period 2023-2031

Income Category	Total Units	Percentage of Share
Extremely Low Income (0–30% AMI)	345	11.9%
Very low income (31–50% AMI)	345	11.9%
Low income (51%–80% AMI)	369	12.7%
Moderate income (80%–120% AMI)	495	17.1%
Above Moderate income (>121% AMI)	1,346	46.4%
Total	2,900	100.0%

Sources: California Department of Housing and Community Development, State Income Limits for Solano County, 2021; Solano County Subregion 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation, Final Methodology

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Note: Per state guidance, extremely low income units are assumed to be 50 percent of the very low income RHNA number.

ABAG projects that Vallejo should plan for 690 very low-income housing units between 2023 and 2031 (see **Table 2**). Based on State law methodology, the City estimates that 50 percent of its very low-income housing allocation are extremely low-income households. Therefore, it is projected that 345 households will be extremely low income.

Housing Unit Construction

Local governments may take credit for units permitted since the June 30, 2022, against the RHNA. Based on building permit data, 149 permits have been issued. These units are assumed to be market rate, and therefore apply to the above-moderate income category. The units have been credited toward the City's RHNA as the first step to determine the remaining need of housing units in each income category.

TABLE 2 RHNA Progress, Constructed and Under Construction after June 30, 2022

Income Category	Total RHNA	Permitted or Constructed	Remaining RHNA
Very low-income (0–50% AMI)	283	47 ¹	236
Low-income (51–80% AMI)	178	0	178
Moderate-income (80–120% AMI)	211	0	211
Above moderate-income (>121% AMI)	690	149	541
Total	1,362	196	1,166

Source: City of Vallejo, Planning Division, 2023.

Notes:

¹ This project received building permits since June 30, 2022 and will provide 47 very-low income deed-restricted units. Project Based Vouchers are being applied for through the Vallejo Housing Authority to deed restrict these units for 55 years.

Inventory of Land Suitable for Residential Development

A key provision of State Housing Element law is a requirement that each local jurisdiction make available a sufficient quantity of land, with appropriate zoning and adequate infrastructure, to accommodate its local fair share of the RHNA during the eight-year planning period. The objective is to ensure adequate sites for new housing construction affordable to all economic segments of the community. Local jurisdictions must ensure sites are available for housing affordable to extremely low, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households as well as above moderate-income households. The State has generally noted that the most appropriate way for local jurisdictions to provide adequate sites to meet the need for lower-income households is to provide land zoned for higher-density multifamily housing. Particularly in urban areas where land is expensive, high-density housing construction allows developers to reduce development costs by building more units on a given site.

As part of this Housing Element, the City has updated the inventory of vacant residential land, including mixed-use sites with potential for residential development. The inventory is used to assist developers with identifying developable land as well as to provide City staff with a tool to monitor RHNA progress between housing element updates.

The complete inventory of vacant land can be found in **Appendix A** and provides a list of vacant residential parcels in the city. This inventory was developed using geographic information system (GIS) data from the City and the County Assessor, as well as a site-by-site review of larger opportunity sites with City staff. The remainder of this section summarizes the inventory of land available in Vallejo to accommodate anticipated housing demand and discusses the appropriateness of this land supply to meet the housing needs of households of various income levels.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Sites Identified in Previous Housing Element(s)

Pursuant to California Government Code Section 65583.2(c), a non-vacant site identified in the previous planning period and a vacant site that has been included in two or more previous consecutive planning periods cannot be used to accommodate the lower-income RHNA unless the site is subject to an action in the Housing Element requiring rezoning within three years of the beginning of the planning period to allow residential use by right for housing developments in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower-income households. There are no sites identified in the 6th cycle inventory to meet the lower-income RHNA that were included in previous cycles at any income category.

Sites Appropriate for Lower-Income Housing

Housing element law requires jurisdictions to provide an analysis showing that zones identified for lower-income households are sufficient to encourage such development. The law provides two options for preparing the analysis: (1) describe market demand and trends, financial feasibility, and recent development experience; or (2) use default density standards deemed adequate to meet the appropriate zoning test. According to Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)(B), the default density standard for Vallejo is 30 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). The City has included available sites (see Table 4) that permit maximum densities between 30 and 90 units per acre and are assumed to accommodate the City's lower-income RHNA.

Realistic Capacity

In determining the realistic capacity (or conservative estimate of the percent of the site that is likely to be available/develop with the residential units) for the City's inventory of sites, the City considered land use controls and site improvements and assumed an 80 percent adjustment to reflect developable acreage due to on-site improvements, including sidewalks, utility easements, and infrastructure improvements (roadway

access, water, sewer, and stormwater). All sites are served by or planned to be served by infrastructure, with no constraints identified that would reduce capacity beyond the 80 percent adjustment. None of the sites have environmental constraints that would prevent the development of the number of units assigned in the inventory during the planning period, including for example, slopes, conservation easements or parking obligations. The City has recently completed an analysis of areas subject to the Hillside Development Standards and determined that they do not pose a constraint to provision of sufficient residential capacity in Vallejo. To further determine an appropriate realistic capacity assumption that takes into account factors beyond those considered to arrive at the 80 percent adjustment discussed above, the City also looked at project examples to not over estimate the realistic unit potential. Projects in Vallejo were approved, on average, at approximately 83.7 percent of maximum allowed density. After considering the 80 percent adjustment factor and build out of recent residential and mixed-use projects, the City decided to take a conservative approach and assume a 57 percent build out on vacant sites for moderate-income units. However, given the substantially higher build out average for lower-income projects (145.9 percent), the City is assuming a 75 percent capacity on sites for lower-income units, also a conservative approach. See **Table 3** for project examples.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 3 Realistic Capacity Project Examples

Project Name	Status	Affordability	Acres	GP/Zoning	Total Units	Allowable Density/ac	Built Density	Buildout Percentage
Oakwood Apartments	Under Construction	Market Rate	4.95	B/LR / PDC ¹	132	50	26.7	53.3%
Sacramento Street Affordable Housing	Under Construction	Very Low	1.34	B/LR / Linear Commercial ¹	75	50	55.9	111.9%
Project HomeKey (Broadway)	Under Construction	Very Low	.53	North Gate District/ Central Corridor Commercial	47	50	90.6	180.0%
Waterstone 2A/2B	Under Construction	Market Rate	47.8	R-SF/RLD	185	9	3.9	43.3%
Costco Housing	Planning Approved 2020	Market Rate	23.8	R-MH / PD	178	25	7.48	29.9%
Average Buildout Percentage for Residential Projects								83.7%
Average Buildout Percentage for Lower-Income Projects								145.9%

Source: City of Vallejo, Planning Division, 2023

B/LR = Business/Limited Residential

PDC = Planned Development Commercial

R-SF = Primarily Single-Family

RLD = Residential Low-Density

R-MH = Mix of Housing Types / Medium Density

PD = Planned Development

Notes:

¹ This project was approved under the previous Zoning Code.

Sites Inventory

Vacant Land

The City prepared an inventory of vacant sites available to accommodate the City's moderate-income RHNA and a portion of the lower-income RHNA. **Table 4** provides the characteristics of each site, including, zoning, General Plan designation, acreage, and realistic capacity for the sites currently zoned for housing at varying densities, and **Figures 1** through **6** map the location of each site in the city. Additionally, all sites included to meet the RHNA have existing or planned water, sewer, and dry utilities

infrastructure available and accessible sufficient to support housing development pursuant to Government Code Section 65583.2(b)(5)(B).



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 4 Vacant Sites Inventory

Site No.	Assessor's Parcel Numbers	Acres	General Plan Designation	Zoning	Max. Allowed Density (du/ac)	Max. Units	Realistic Capacity (57% for Mod, 74% for Low)	Affordability	Infrastructure Constraints
1	0052143210	0.93	R-SF	RLD	9	8.4	5	Moderate	None
2	0074160740	0.71	R-SF	RLD	9	6.4	4	Moderate	None
3	0074110490	2.38	R-SF	RLD	9	21.4	12	Moderate	None
4	0081060250	1.38	R-SF	RLD	9	12.4	7	Moderate	None
5	0061131390	3.03	R-SF	RLD	9	27.3	16	Moderate	None
6	0072234150	2.64	R-SF	RLD	9	23.7	14	Moderate	None
7	0069061420	0.70	R-SF	RLD	9	6.3	4	Moderate	None
8	0052421110	2.28	R-SF	RLD	9	20.5	12	Moderate	None
9	0052421120	0.63	R-SF	RLD	9	5.7	3	Moderate	None
10	0074110500	0.71	R-SF	RLD	9	6.4	4	Moderate	None
11	0072160730	4.03	R-SF	RLD	9	36.3	21	Moderate	None
12	0072160800	4.92	R-SF	RLD	9	44.3	25	Moderate	None
13	0182204010	1.03	R-SF	RLD	12	12.3	7	Moderate	None
14	0182204050	1.05	R-SF	RLD	12	12.6	7	Moderate	None
15	0182215070	1.02	R-SF	RLD	12	12.3	7	Moderate	None
16	0182204020	1.00	R-SF	RLD	12	12.0	7	Moderate	None
17	0182204030	1.00	R-SF	RLD	12	12.1	7	Moderate	None
18	0182263030	0.53	R-SF	RLD	12	6.4	4	Moderate	None
19	0182263020	0.82	R-SF	RLD	12	9.9	6	Moderate	None
20	0182301090	0.50	R-SF	RLD	12	6.0	3	Moderate	None
21	0182163060	0.50	R-SF	RLD	12	6.0	3	Moderate	None
22	0182301010	0.63	R-SF	RLD	12	7.6	4	Moderate	None
23	0182292100	0.65	R-SF	RLD	12	7.8	4	Moderate	None
24	0182173240	1.24	R-SF	RLD	12	14.9	8	Moderate	None
25	0182173040	1.09	R-SF	RLD	12	13.1	7	Moderate	None
26	0182173050	1.01	R-SF	RLD	12	12.1	7	Moderate	None



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Site No.	Assessor's Parcel Numbers	Acres	General Plan Designation	Zoning	Max. Allowed Density (du/ac)	Max. Units	Realistic Capacity (57% for Mod, 74% for Low)	Affordability	Infrastructure Constraints
27	0182173180	1.00	R-SF	RLD	12	11.9	7	Moderate	None
28	0182173190	0.97	R-SF	RLD	12	11.7	7	Moderate	None
29	0182440020	0.98	R-SF	RLD	12	11.8	7	Moderate	None
30	0182440030	1.45	R-SF	RLD	12	17.4	10	Moderate	None
31	0182310030	0.64	P-OS	PROS	12	7.7	4	Moderate	None
32	0182310360	0.56	P-OS	PROS	12	6.7	4	Moderate	None
33	0182310010	1.11	P-OS	PROS	12	13.3	8	Moderate	None
34	0069462030	1.36	R-MH	RMD	25	33.9	19	Moderate	None
35	0069462010	1.47	R-MH	RMD	25	36.8	21	Moderate	None
36	0051181150	0.70	R-MH	RMD	25	17.5	10	Moderate	None
37	0069032240	2.30	R-MH	RMD	25	57.6	33	Moderate	None
38	0053162200	0.85	R-MH	RMD	25	21.3	12	Moderate	None
39	0052282350	1.20	R-MH	RMD	25	30.0	17	Moderate	None
40	0051250230	0.52	R-MH	RMD	25	12.9	7	Moderate	None
41	0052110140	0.94	B/LR	RMD	25	23.6	13	Moderate	None
42	0061211070	0.83	R-MH	RMD	25	20.7	12	Moderate	None
43	0057201340	0.63	NC	NMX	30	18.8	11	Moderate	None
44	0071061220	0.53	NC	NMX	30	15.8	9	Moderate	None
45	0055074140	0.53	B/LR	NMX	30	15.9	9	Moderate	None
46	0056055060	0.53	NC	NMX	30	15.8	9	Moderate	None
47	0069010250	1.38	B/LR	NMX	30	41.5	24	Moderate	None
48	0071142510	0.60	B/LR	NC	50	29.9	22	Lower	None
49	0051080440	0.58	CC	CC	50	29.1	22	Lower	None
50	0053200660	0.81	RE	RC	50	40.6	30	Lower	None
51	0053200830	1.07	RE	RC	50	53.6	40	Lower	None
52	0053200460	1.26	RE	RC	50	62.9	47	Lower	None
53	0052303230	0.62	R-MF	RHD	40	25.0	19	Lower	None
54	0051250460	0.82	B/LR	CC	50	40.8	31	Lower	None

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Site No.	Assessor's Parcel Numbers	Acres	General Plan Designation	Zoning	Max. Allowed Density (du/ac)	Max. Units	Realistic Capacity (57% for Mod, 74% for Low)	Affordability	Infrastructure Constraints
55	0081010370	3.25	RE	RC	50	162.5	122	Lower	None
56	0068191220	1.39	RE	RC	50	69.4	52	Lower	None
57	0068131120	1.05	B/LR	NMX	30	31.6	24	Lower	None
58	0067140160	0.77	D-NG	CC	50	38.3	29	Lower	None
59	0058021120	0.50	CC	DMX	90	45.2	34	Lower	None
60	0056226110	0.54	CC	DMX	90	48.9	37	Lower	None
61	0053152250	0.65	CC	CC	50	32.7	25	Lower	None
62	0051190180	0.55	CC	CC	50	27.6	21	Lower	None
63	0069340450	1.48	B/LR	NMX	30	44.3	33	Lower	None
64	0069340460	6.06	B/LR	NMX	30	181.7	136	Lower	None
65	0052320250	2.32	R-MF	RHD	40	92.8	70	Lower	None
66	0067140050	1.09	D-NG	CC	50	54.4	41	Lower	None
Lower-Income Capacity							835		
Moderate-Income Capacity							461		
Above Moderate-Income Capacity							0		
Total Capacity							1296		

Source: City of Vallejo, Planning Division, 2022.

¹ The allowed density on vacant sites is suitable for lower- and moderate-income development. City's above moderate-income RHNA is being met with pipeline projects (Table 5). Bolded units are not counted in the total numbers and are therefore not being used to meet RHNA

² None of the sites in this table are government-owned.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

FIGURE 1 CITY OF VALLEJO VACANT SITES INVENTORY #1



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023





FIGURE 2 CITY OF VALLEJO VACANT SITES INVENTORY #2



Housing Element Sites

- City of Vallejo
- Housing Element Site
- Vacant Site

Page: 2




Revision Date: 7/31/2023

Source: City of Vallejo, 2023

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

FIGURE 3 CITY OF VALLEJO VACANT SITES INVENTORY #3



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023





FIGURE 4 CITY OF VALLEJO VACANT SITES INVENTORY #4



Housing Element Sites

- City of Vallejo
- Housing Element Site
- Vacant Site

Page: 4




Revision Date: 7/31/2023

Source: City of Vallejo, 2023

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS



FIGURE 5 CITY OF VALLEJO VACANT SITES INVENTORY #5



Housing Element Sites

- City of Vallejo
- Housing Element Site
- Vacant Site


Page: 5



Revision Date: 7/31/2023

Source: City of Vallejo, 2023



FIGURE 6 CITY OF VALLEJO VACANT SITES INVENTORY #6



Housing Element Sites

- City of Vallejo
- Housing Element Site
- Vacant Site

Page: 6



Revision Date: 7/31/2023

Source: City of Vallejo, 2023

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Pipeline Projects

The City is relying on 16 projects currently on the Vallejo Land Use Entitlements (VALUE) list (see **Figure 7**). The VALUE list is a current development list for the City of Vallejo that is updated quarterly and provides a snapshot of projects that are currently in review or that have recently been approved. Sites P-1 through P-16 in **Table 5** are from the City's VALUE list. These projects are all active and are expected to build out within the planning period. Projects on the VALUE list typically move forward and build out quickly.

The projects included in **Table 5** from the VALUE list provide the City with capacity for 250 lower-income units on projects that are guaranteed to be deed-restricted, 25 moderate-income units, and 2,370 above moderate-income units in market-rate projects.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 5 Pipeline Projects


Site ID	Project Name	Affordability	Project Status	General Plan/Zoning	Total Units
P-1	418 Multifamily 5180 Sonoma Blvd.	Above Moderate	Pending	D-NG/CC	418
P-2	Waterstone 2A/2B 0082-010-260	Above Moderate	Under Construction	Primarily SF/RLD	185
P-3	Mixed-Use Development 148 East Lincoln Rd.	Above Moderate	Pending	Retail/ Entertainment/ RC	21
P-4	Permanent Supportive Housing Broadway Village 0067-140-150	Lower	Under Construction	D-NG/CC	47
P-5	Blue Rock Springs 655 Columbus Pkwy.	Above Moderate	Yet to submit	PROS/PROS	500
P-6	Multifamily Development 78 Springs Rd. 0071-061-540	Above Moderate: 28 Lower: 2	Pending	Neighborhood Corridor/NMX	30
P-7	Oakwood Apartments 0061-160-210	Above Moderate	Under Construction	Business/ Limited Residential/RHD	132
P-8	Sacramento Street Affordable Housing	Lower	Under Construction. Completion expected in 2023.	Business/ Limited Residential/NMX	75
P-9	Borges Ranch Residential Subdivision	Above Moderate	Pending	Primarily Single Family/RR	407
P-10	Solano Ranch Mixed-Use Project	Above Moderate	Pending. Beginning CEQA process.	Business/ Limited Residential/RC	264
P-11	Multifamily/Density Bonus Project 480 Fairgrounds Dr.	At least 80 percent lower; up to 20 percent moderate	In Review	Primarily Multi-Family/RHD	127
P-12	Condo Project 1535 Broadway	Above Moderate	Pending	Mix of Housing Types/RMD	28
P-13	Spanos Housing Project 0067-140-200	Above Moderate	Pending	D-NG/CC	202
P-14	1765 Broadway: 111 unit- multi-family residential project on approximately 4-acre site	Above Moderate	Pending	Neighborhood Corridor/ Office	111
P-15	961 Porter St.: Adding an additional 122 units to an existing apartment complex.	Above Moderate and 20 percent lower	Pending	Mix of Housing Types/RMD	122 (98 above moderate and 24 lower)
P-16	Vista Cove	Above Moderate	Pending	Primarily Single Family/RLD	51

Source: City of Vallejo, Planning Division, 2023.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

FIGURE 7 CITY OF VALLEJO PIPELINE PROJECTS AND SPECIFIC PLAN INVENTORY



Source: DWR 2021, Solano County 2021, PlaceWorks 2022, ESRI

Source: City of Vallejo, 2023



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Accessory Dwelling Unit Potential

California Government Code Section 65583.1(a) states that a town, city, or county may identify sites for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) based on the number of ADUs developed in the prior Housing Element planning period, whether the units are permitted by right, the need for ADUs in the community, the resources, or incentives available for their development, and any other relevant factors. Based on recent changes in State law reducing the time to review and approve ADU applications, requiring ADUs that meet requirements to be allowed by right, eliminating discretionary review for most ADUs, and removing other restrictions on ADUs, it is anticipated that the production of ADUs will increase in the 6th cycle Housing Element planning period.

The City issued the following ADU building permits over the last five years:

- 2018 – 20 ADUs received building permits
- 2019 – 21 ADUs received building permits
- 2020 – 23 ADUs received building permits
- 2021 – 36 ADUs received building permits
- 2022 – 23 ADUs received building permits

This analysis assumes that the number of ADU applications and permits will average 25 ADUs per year, and total of 197 ADUs over the eight-year planning period. To promote ADUs, the City has included **Program H 4.1.2** promote the construction of affordable ADUs through several actions.

To determine assumptions on ADU affordability in the ABAG region, ABAG conducted a regional analysis of existing ADU rents and prepared a draft report in September 2021. The analysis resulted in affordability assumptions that allocate 30 percent of ADUs to very low-income households, 30 percent to low-income households, 30

percent to moderate-income households, and 10 percent to above moderate-income households. Affordability of ADUs projected to be built in the city during the planning period were based on the ABAG analysis. Of the 197 ADUs projected to be built, it is estimated that 59 will be for very low-income households, 59 will be for low-income households, 59 for moderate-income households, and 20 for above moderate-income households.

Summary of Capacity to Accommodate the RHNA

Table 6 provides a summary of the City’s capacity to accommodate the RHNA across all income categories. Accounting for pipeline projects, vacant site capacity, and projected ADUs, the City has a total surplus of 1,272 units, including 144 lower-income units, 84 moderate-income units, and 1,044 above moderate-income units.

TABLE 6 Summary of Residential Capacity Compared to the 6th Cycle RHNA

Income Category	RHNA	Vacant Site Capacity	Pipeline Project Capacity	Projected ADUs	Total Capacity	Surplus
Very Low	690	835	250	118	1,203	144
Low	369					
Moderate	495	461	25	59	545	84
Above Moderate	1,346	0	2,370	20	2,390	1,044
Total	2,900	1,296	2,645	197	4,138	1,272

Sources: California Department of Housing and Community Development, State Income Limits for Solano County, 2021; Solano County Subregion 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation, Final Methodology, City of Vallejo, July 2023.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Environmental Constraints

The City of Vallejo, located on San Pablo Bay, has moderate topography and hillside development, and is in the vicinity of known active faults, namely the San Andreas and Hayward Faults. While these environmental constraints may impact some new construction in the city, nearly all of the residential sites identified in the vacant sites inventory are infill sites surrounded by existing development. Additionally, all high-density residential sites with potential for low- and very low-income levels are urban infill sites, surrounded by and with access to existing roads and other development and infrastructure, and are not impeded by significant topography or other restrictive landscape features and therefore may be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). With building mitigation measures readily applied through application of building codes and mitigation measures identified through the CEQA process, environmental constraints do not pose a significant challenge to the feasibility of housing on these sites. Still, as unforeseen environmental constraints may impact development on a site- by-site basis, these factors are considered in the calculation of realistic capacity, as described previously.

Given Vallejo's location, many areas of the city, particularly along the shoreline, are at risk of shoreline flooding or sea level rise. There are 13 properties in the Vacant Sites Inventory that are constrained by environmental conditions: 9 sites are impacted by inland flooding, shoreline flooding, and/or sea level rise, and 4 sites impacted by landslide potential. Five of the impacted sites include lower-income units. The Sacramento Street Affordable Housing Project is also impacted by inland flooding; however this project is currently under construction so the unit count included in the inventory is not impacted. Mitigation included in the Safety Element should address potential impacts on the vacant sites and development will not be constrained during the planning period. Mitigation measures in the Safety Element to address the potential flooding and sea level rise hazards include:

- **Action NBE-5.2A** Continue to provide Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training to residents and business community members.
- **Action NBE-5.4B** Continue to require drainage and erosion control measures for landslide-prone or geologically hazardous hillside areas to minimize risks to downhill areas.
- **Action NBE-5.5A** Continue to partner with neighborhood and community organizations to conduct emergency preparedness exercises.
- **Action NBE-5.6A** Maintain up-to-date Flood Insurance Rate Maps for use in planning and public works decisions.
- **Action NBE-5.6B** Collaborate with the Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District (VSFCD) and Solano County Water Agency (SCWA) to implement comprehensive flood control planning.
- **Action NBE-5.6C** Continue to refer projects in flood prone areas to the VSFCD for review and comment.
- **Action NBE-5.6E** Continue to require that new or modified structures within the 100-year floodplain comply with the City's Flood Management Regulations, including elevation of building pads above the floodplain and flood-proofing of buildings, and continue to prohibit permanent structures in designated floodways.
- **Action NBE-5.6F** Work with FEMA to evaluate levees on the western side of Mare Island to enhance the embankments, as necessary.
- **Action NBE-5.7B** Continue to manage and maintain City-owned storm drainage infrastructure to avoid flooding and reduce the negative effects of stormwater runoff.
- **Action NBE-5.9B** Seek funding to develop and implement sea level rise adaptation strategies and projects.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

- **Action NBE-5.9C** In consultation with Solano County and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), develop a Sea Level Rise Strategy that identifies properties and resources susceptible to sea level rise and includes protection and adaptation strategies, based on the latest sea level rise planning guidance from the State.

Inland flooding is caused by heavy rainfall, long periods of moderate rainfall, or clogged drains during periods of light rainfall. The city experiences chronic inland flooding in several places due to proximity to the shoreline and the compounding impacts of high tides, water tables, flow through the Napa River, and surcharged outfalls. The Vallejo Flood and Wastewater District supports a sandbag program to help residents and businesses prepare for flooding events in the city. As shown in **Figure 8**, inland flooding affects 9 sites in the Vacant Sites Inventory and the Sacramento Street Affordable Housing Project (site P-10) that is currently under construction, as well as existing residential development for various income categories. Areas of the city that are not shown in these maps do have substantial risk of inland flooding.


Given local elevation, most of Vallejo is not susceptible to sea level rise; however, in some areas near White Slough and on the South Waterfront, the impact of sea level rise is relatively unavoidable and some threat of water inundation issues cannot be entirely avoided in the city. Sea level rise and shoreline flooding affect 6 sites in the Vacant Sites Inventory and existing residential development for various income categories in areas at the lower elevation within the city. Many of the areas impacted by inland flooding are also impacted by sea level rise, though in less immediate ways.

Mapped landslide zones in Vallejo are almost exclusively found on steeper hillsides in the northeast part of the community, such as areas near Sulphur Springs Mountain. However, given differences in physical characteristics of slope materials, site-specific analyses are essential when determining actual hazard risk. There are 4 sites in areas with high landslide hazard, though the City has included actions in the Safety Element

to require safety analyses prior to development and mitigation measures to reduce landslide risk.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

FIGURE 8 INLAND FLOODING RISK IN VALLEJO



Source: California Department of Water Resources, 2021; Solano County, 2021; City of Vallejo, 2023



Financial Resources

The City of Vallejo has access to a variety of existing and potential funding sources for affordable housing activities. These include programs from federal, state, local, and private resources. The following section describes the key housing funding sources currently used in the city, which include Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the state and Section 8 rental assistance. **Table 7** lists a range of potential financial resources that may be used in Vallejo.

TABLE 7 Summary of Residential Capacity Compared to the 6th Cycle RHNA

Program Name	Description	Eligible Activities
Federal Programs		
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Grants administered and awarded by the state on behalf of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to cities through an annual competitive process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition • Rehabilitation • Homebuyer Assistance • Economic Development • Infrastructure Improvements • Homeless Assistance • Public Services
HOME Investment Partnership Act Funds	Flexible grant program for affordable housing activities awarded by the state on behalf of HUD to individual cities through an annual competitive process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition • Rehabilitation • Homebuyer Assistance • New Construction
Section 8 Rental Assistance Program	Rental assistance payments to owners of private market-rate units on behalf of very low-income tenants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rental Assistance
Section 203(k)	Single-family home mortgage program allowing acquisition and rehabilitation loans to be combined into a single mortgage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Acquisition • Rehabilitation • Relocation of Unit • Refinancing of Existing Indebtedness



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Program Name	Description	Eligible Activities
State Programs		
Emergency Shelter Grant Program	Program funds to rehabilitate and operate emergency shelters and transitional shelters, provide essential social services, and prevent homelessness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Services • Rehabilitation • Transitional Housing • Supportive Housing
Rural Development Loans and Grants	Capital financing for farmworker housing. Loans are for 33 years at 1 percent interest. Housing grants may cover up to 90 percent of the development costs of housing. Funds are available under the Section 515 (Rental Housing), Section 502 (Homeownership Loan Guarantee), Section 514/516 (Farm Labor Housing), and Section 523 (Mutual Self-Help Housing) programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase • Development/Construction • Improvement • Rehabilitation
Multifamily Housing Program (MHP)	Deferred payment loans for new construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, and preservation of permanent and transitional rental housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Construction • Rehabilitation • Acquisition • Preservation
California Housing Finance Agency (Cal HFA) Residential Development Loan Program	Low interest, short-term loans to local governments for affordable infill, owner-occupied housing developments. Links with CalHFA's Down Payment Assistance Program to provide subordinate loans to first-time buyers. Two funding rounds per year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Construction • Rehabilitation • Acquisition
California Housing Finance Agency (Cal HFA) Homebuyer's Down Payment Assistance Program	CalHFA makes below market loans to first-time homebuyers of up to 3% of sales price. Program operates through participating lenders who originate loans for CalHFA. Funds available upon request to qualified borrowers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homebuyer Assistance
California Housing Finance Agency (Cal HFA) Forgivable Equity Builder Loan	The Forgivable Equity Builder Loan gives first-time homebuyers a head start with immediate equity in their homes via a loan of up to 10% of the purchase price of the home. The loan is forgivable if the borrower continuously occupies the home as their primary residence for five years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homeowner Assistance
Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC)	Tax credits are available to persons and corporations that invest in low-income rental housing. Proceeds from the sale are typically used to create housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Construction • Rehabilitation
California Self-Help Housing Program	State program that provides technical assistance grants and loans as well as deferred payment conditionally forgivable mortgage assistance loans for the rehabilitation or construction of new affordable housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Construction • Rehabilitation



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Program Name	Description	Eligible Activities
CalHOME	Grants to cities and nonprofit developers to offer homebuyer assistance, including down payment assistance, rehabilitation, acquisition/rehabilitation, and homebuyer counseling. Loans to developers for property acquisition, site development, predevelopment, and construction period expenses for homeownership projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predevelopment, Site Development, Site Acquisition • Rehabilitation • Acquisition/rehab • Down Payment Assistance • Mortgage Financing • Homebuyer Counseling
Tax Exempt Housing Revenue Bond	Supports low-income housing development by issuing housing tax-exempt bonds requiring the developer to lease a fixed percentage of the units to low-income families at specified rental rates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Construction • Rehabilitation • Acquisition
Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC)	This program provides grants and/or loans, or any combination, that will achieve GHG emissions reductions and benefit Disadvantaged Communities through increasing accessibility of affordable housing, employment centers, and key destinations via low-carbon transportation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Construction
Local Programs		
Rebuilding Together (Solano County)	RTSC provides necessary home repairs for low-income veterans/ senior / disabled homeowners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation
Catholic Charities of Yolo and Solano	Catholic Charities of Yolo and Solano helps neighbors transition into safe and affordable homes through assistance with rent and move-in costs and a plan to prevent homelessness and poverty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rental Assistance
Solano Habitat for Humanity	Homeownership through sweat equity. Homeowners also receive counseling and training on homeownership and maintenance. Homeowners buy their completed homes from Habitat for Humanity and repay them over 30 years through an affordable mortgage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homebuyer Assistance
Private Resources/Lenders/Bank Financing Programs		
Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) Community Homebuyers Program	Fixed rate mortgages issued by private mortgage insurers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homebuyer Assistance
	Mortgages that fund the purchase and rehabilitation of a home.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homebuyer Assistance • Rehabilitation
	Low down payment mortgages for single-family homes in underserved low-income and minority cities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homebuyer Assistance



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Program Name	Description	Eligible Activities
California Community Reinvestment Corporation (CCRC)	Nonprofit mortgage banking consortium designed to provide long-term debt financing for affordable rental housing. Nonprofit and for-profit developers contact member banks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Construction • Rehabilitation • Acquisition
Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program	Direct subsidies to nonprofit and for-profit developers and public agencies for affordable low-income ownership and rental projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Construction
Freddie Mac	Home Works – Provides first and second mortgages that include rehabilitation loan. County provides gap financing for rehabilitation component. Households earning up to 80% MFI qualify.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homebuyer Assistance Combined with Rehabilitation
Bay Area Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)	Provides recoverable grants and debt financing on favorable terms to support a variety of community development activities including affordable housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition • New Construction • Rehabilitation
Northern California Community Loan Fund (NCCLF)	Offers low-interest loans for the revitalization of low-income communities and affordable housing development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition • New Construction • Rehabilitation
Low-Income Investment Fund (LIIF)	Provides below-market loan financing for all phases of affordable housing development and/or rehabilitation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition • New Construction • Rehabilitation

Source: City of Vallejo, December 2022.



GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS ON HOUSING AVAILABILITY

Local government has limited direct influences on housing production cost factors. The one direct cost affected by local agencies is fees. Lot improvement costs are indirectly influenced by local standards for streets and other site improvements. Planning densities also indirectly affect housing costs. These examples represent constraints to housing production that local government can influence, to some extent, by policies and regulations. Among these are land use and development controls, fees, and local processing and permit procedures. This section discusses potential governmental constraints as well as policies that encourage housing development in Vallejo. Consistent with transparency requirements (Government Code Section 65940.1 subdivisions (a)(1)(A) and (a)(1)(B)), the City's zoning, development standards, and fees are available on the City's website.

Land Use Controls

The City's primary control over where housing can be constructed is the City Zoning Ordinance, Title 16 of the Vallejo Municipal Code. The Zoning Ordinance includes nine categories for residential development, ranging from single-family homes to multifamily dwellings at up to 90 units per acre. With Planned Development (PD) zoning, densities can and do exceed this figure beyond what the General Plan allows for the provision of affordable units, senior units, regional open space or recreation facilities, or interior pedestrian trails or bicycle paths that connect with city trails and paths.

Vallejo General Plan 2040

The Vallejo General Plan 2040 establishes the intended and envisioned land uses for the City. The Land Use Element lists these designations that the City intends to build out by the Plan's horizon year of 2040. Of the Plan's 15 identified land uses, 10 of them allow some type of housing and the intended residential densities range from a maximum of 9 units per acre in the R-SF designation to as high as 90 units per acre in the D-D/W designation. **Table 8** describes the consistent land uses per each designation identified in the City's General Plan. The General Plan itself also describes the consistent zoning designations for each General Plan Land Use category.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 8 General Plan Land Use Designations Which Allow Housing, 2017

Land Use Designation	Description
Primarily Single-Family (R-SF)	Primarily detached single-family homes; although some older areas have attached dwellings and small stores. Typically have front, rear, and side setbacks. Other uses include duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, small commercial spaces, public facilities, and other community facilities. Maximum density: 9 dwelling units (du)/acre
Mix of Housing Types/Medium Density (R-MH)	Primarily either (1) single-family homes with some other housing types or (2) primarily multifamily homes with common outdoor spaces. Typically have front, rear, and side setbacks. Residential types include single-family, duplexes, triplexes, smaller-scale apartment buildings, small commercial spaces, and public facilities. Maximum density: 25 du/acre
Primarily Multifamily (R-MF)	Primarily multi-unit parcels on different floors and some small commercial spaces. May have common space but may also have individual private open space areas. Maximum density: 40 du/acre
District - Downtown/Waterfront (D-D/W)	Vibrant, pedestrian-oriented place that integrates downtown and the waterfront with each other. Allows various scales, intensities, and uses. Maximum floor area ratio (FAR): 6.0 Minimum residential density: 30 du/acre Maximum residential density: 90 du/acre
District - Mare Island (D-MI)	Implements the Mare Island Specific Plan that focuses on creating a vibrant civilian employment center and nearby residential neighborhood. Maximum density: as set forth in the Specific Plan.
District - Solano 360 (D-360)	Applies only to 149-acre County fairgrounds to help implement the Solano360 Specific Plan and create a public entertainment destination with private mixed-use development. Densities and FAR: set by the Solano360 Specific Plan.
District - North Gateway (D-NG)	Envisions pedestrian-oriented place with mixed-use, retail, dining, entertainment, and lodging in the area north of Highway 37 between Sonoma Boulevard and Broadway Street. Maximum FAR: 2.0 Minimum residential density: 30 du/acre Maximum residential density: 50 du/acre
Central Corridor (CC)	Envisions mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, complete streets in the Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan Area. Maximum FAR: 3.0 Minimum residential density: 18 du/acre Maximum residential density: 50 du/acre
Neighborhood Corridor (NC)	Provides pedestrian-oriented services along "Main Street" corridors, that includes multifamily housing. Maximum FAR: 2.0 Minimum residential density: 18 du/acre Maximum residential density 30 du/acre

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Land Use Designation	Description
Business/Limited Residential (B/LR)	Envisions high-quality employment-based businesses in the form of offices; health care and life sciences; research and development; production, distribution, and repair; and light industrial uses. Restaurants and other amenities serving these uses are also allowed as well as residential only or mixed-use buildings with residential space. Maximum FAR: 2.0 Minimum residential density: 25 du/acre Maximum residential density: 50 du/acre

Source: City of Vallejo General Plan Land Use Designations, August 29, 2017. Accessed: June 3, 2022, from: <https://www.cityofvallejo.net/common/pages/DisplayFile.aspx?itemId=17961492>

Specific and Master Plans

The City has several Specific Plans and Master Plans where residential uses are allowed:

Mare Island Specific Plan. The Land Use Plan for this Specific Plan concentrates the largest number of homes (578 residential units) in Reuse Area 6 (North Residential Village) and Reuse Area 8 (South Residential Village; 605 residential units). The North Residential Village (Reuse Area 6) includes higher-density townhomes (17.4 dwelling units [du]/acre), medium-density detached homes (8.7-17.4 du/acre), and low-density duplexes (less than 8.7 du/acre). The South Residential Village (Reuse Area 8) is planned as a residential area and housing products may vary from low-density detached homes to higher-density condominiums (8.7-17.4 du/acre).

Vallejo Waterfront Planned Development Master Plan. This master plan allows up to 1,251 new higher-density residential units and up to 562,000 gross square feet of new private mixed-use commercial, office, research & development/light industrial and developed recreation.

Solano360 Specific Plan. The Entertainment Mixed Use (EMU) zone comprises approximately 18.8 acres of the Specific Plan area and will be largely dedicated to entertainment-oriented commercial uses. However, 50 units of are called for in the

Specific Plan with a Conditional Use Permit. A multilevel parking structure within the EMU area will be needed to accommodate this higher intensity of development.

The allowed uses in each Specific Plan are listed in Table 9.

TABLE 9 Specific Plans

Residential Use Type	Mare Island Specific Plan	Vallejo Waterfront Planned Development	Solano360 Specific Plan
Single-Family Unit, Detached	P ¹	P ¹	-
Duplex	P	-	-
Group	P	-	-
Multi-Unit Residential (three or more units)	P ²	P ²	-
Live-work and work-live units	P	-	-
Mixed-Use	-	-	CUP ³

Source: Mare Island Specific Plan, Vallejo Waterfront Planned Development and Solano Specific Plan.

Notes:

Work/live is primarily a commercially/industrially oriented, single-tenant space combining working and living uses.

¹ May include townhomes, cluster-homes, zero lot line, smallHot detached homes, and similar housing types.

² May include apartments, condominiums, townhomes, and similar housing types.

³ Housing is conditionally allowed within EC or EMU zones.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Residential Use Types in a Variety of Zones

The Zoning Ordinance allows residential units to be constructed in a variety of zones. Section 16.701.02 of the Vallejo Municipal Code provides a list of the residential use types and a description of each of them.

Zoning Districts

The Zoning Ordinance describes the zoning districts within the City and the residential density per acre and the minimum lot size allowed. Among the zoning districts, the maximum allowable residential densities per acre range from 9 du/acre to as high as 90 du/acre..

The type of built density varies from site to site. The City has been supportive in allowing the maximum number of units as long as there are no physical constraints to the site (e.g., topographic, hydrologic, etc.). The city has had a few informal inquiries that were originally proposing lower densities. Staff informed the applicants that density needed to be increased to align with the General Plan and Zoning Code.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 10 Summary of Basic Zoning Districts of the Zoning Code

District Group	District	Corresponding General Plan Land Use	Permitted DU per Gross Acre	Description
Residential	Rural Residential (RR)		9	The RR Zoning District is intended for rural residential, agriculture, open space, and very low-density residential development with necessary supporting public service facilities.
	Residential Low Density (RLD)	Primarily Single-Family (R-SF)	9	The RLD Zoning District is for low-density residential areas in which permanent single-unit residences, including detached and attached (duplexes and townhouses) units, are the primary use. Other residential types including cottages and bungalows around courts may be seen in this district as well as small neighborhood-serving retail. This district also allows a variety of neighborhood supportive services, public and educational facilities, open spaces, and community facilities. The maximum permitted residential density is nine dwelling units per acre, excluding accessory dwelling units (ADUs).
	Residential Medium Density (RMD)	Mix of Housing Types/Medium Density (R-MH)	25	The RMD Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for a district with a mix of housing types, including attached and detached, and small apartment buildings, subject to density limits (up to 25 dwelling units per acre) and design and development standards to ensure land use compatibility. Mixed-use development with residential and small commercial spaces may also be seen in this district. This district also allows a variety of neighborhood supportive services, public and educational facilities, open spaces, and community facilities. Front, corner side, and rear yards are required, and zero-side yard development is permitted subject to discretionary review. In the established neighborhoods of the city, it is the intent of this district to maintain the existing pattern of single-family residences, including attached units and duplexes, while in the undeveloped areas of the city, it is the intent of this district to encourage the creation of multi-unit residential neighborhoods with a variety of housing types.
	Residential High Density (RHD)	Primarily Multi-Family (R-MF), Business/Limited Residential (B/LR)	40	The RHD Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for a high-density residential district, in which a mix of housing types are allowed, subject to density limits (up to 40 dwelling units per acre) and design and development standards to ensure land use compatibility. Mixed-use development with residential and small commercial spaces is allowed. This district also allows a variety of neighborhood supportive services, public and educational facilities, open spaces, and community facilities.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

District Group	District	Corresponding General Plan Land Use	Permitted DU per Gross Acre	Description
Mixed Use	Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMX)	Neighborhood Corridor (NC), Business/Limited Residential (B/LR)	16 to 30	The NMX Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for neighborhood-serving mixed-use areas along the corridors. The neighborhood mixed-use areas include the primary commercial corridors such as Tennessee Street, Solano Avenue, Springs Road, Broadway, Sonoma Boulevard as well as other areas. Design and development standards will ensure that development at neighborhood nodes is appropriately scaled to ensure the physical form relates to and does not overwhelm adjacent single-family residential neighborhoods.
	Downtown Mixed Use (DMX)	District – Downtown/Waterfront (D-D/W), Central Corridor (CC)	30 to 90	The DMX Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations to implement the Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan that will promote a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented place that seamlessly integrates Downtown with the waterfront. A broad range of permitted uses are allowed to provide flexibility in the use of space. Standards for physical form will create an urban character in Downtown, with minimal setbacks and views into groundfloor space to activate frontages.
	Waterfront Mixed Use (WMX)	District – Downtown/Waterfront (D-D/W), Central Corridor (CC) and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (P-OS)	30 to 90	The WMX Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for a waterfront mixed-use district that will allow waterfront shopping and services, and other activities and residential development implementing the Waterfront and Vallejo Station Planned Development Master Plan (Waterfront PDMP). Design and development standards will create a pedestrian-oriented environment that seamlessly integrates the waterfront with downtown. Public access to the shoreline must be provided where development is adjacent to the Mare Island Strait as provided in state and Bay Conservation Development Commission requirements.
Commercial	Neighborhood Commercial (NC)	Primarily Single-Family (R-SF), Neighborhood Corridor (NC)	16 to 50	The NC Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for neighborhoods in which limited retail commercial goods and services are provided on small sites to meet the day-to-day needs of local residents.
	Waterfront Commercial (WC)	Retail/Entertainment (RE)	n/a	The WC Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for areas along the waterfront that provide waterfront-related retail and service uses and visitor accommodations in building forms appropriately scaled to the waterfront. Public access to the shoreline must be provided where development is adjacent to the Napa River, Mare Island Strait, or Carquinez Strait. Residential uses that are permitted include Shopkeepers Units.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

District Group	District	Corresponding General Plan Land Use	Permitted DU per Gross Acre	Description
	Central Corridor (CC)	Central Corridor (CC), District - North Gateway (D-NG), and Business/Limited Residential (B/LR)	16 to 50	The CC Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for community serving mixed-use areas along the Sonoma Boulevard Central Corridor and areas subject to the Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan. Land uses include mixed-use with housing, medium- and high-density residential or nonresidential uses at street level, subject to design and development standards to promote a mixed-use and pedestrian orientation.
	Regional Commercial (RC)	Retail/Entertainment (RE), Business/Limited Residential (B/LR)	18 to 50	The RC Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for sites that provide general retail, services, and commercial recreation and entertainment for local residents as well as consumers and visitors from the region. Design and development standards will accommodate auto-oriented uses and require buffering and transitions to adjacent residential neighborhoods.
Office and Medical	Office (O)	Business/Limited Residential (B/LR), Public Facilities and Institutions (PF), and Neighborhood Corridor (NC)	16 to 30	The O Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for areas having an employment focus, but also supporting a mix of uses, especially business supportive uses. Residential-only development and office development with a residential component are allowed as major uses if design and compatibility standards are met.
	Medical (M)	Business/Limited Residential (B/LR), Public Facilities and Institutions (PF)	16 to 50	The M Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for areas with a concentration of medical facilities and supporting commercial services can be provided without the encroachment of incompatible uses. Design and development standards will ensure land use compatibility and appropriate buffers and transitions to adjacent residential neighborhoods.
Industrial	Limited Industrial (IL)	Business/Limited Industrial (B/LI), Business/Limited Residential (B/LR)	FAR: 2.5	The IL Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for a diverse range of light industrial and supportive uses as well as limited office and live/work uses. This district is primarily intended to accommodate industrial and flex space types of development.
	General Industrial (IG)	Industrial (I)	FAR: 2.0	The IG Zoning District is intended to create and establish regulations for a broad range of industrial activities, including general industrial, heavy industrial, manufacturing, and supportive ancillary offices. This district is intended for activities that may potentially generate more noise, hazards, and truck traffic than those in the IL District and establishes buffering and transition standards for any adjacent residential uses. Uses in this designation may also use rail and ships to transport materials and manufactured goods.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

District Group	District	Corresponding General Plan Land Use	Permitted DU per Gross Acre	Description
Planned Development	Planned Development (PD)	Varies	Identified by General Plan Density for the total area designated for residential use	PD Zoning Districts shall be noted on the zoning map by the designation PD. PD districts must be consistent with the general plan land use designation in which they are located.

Source: City of Vallejo Zoning Ordinance, November 2022

Development Standards

Table 11 provides a summary of the City's residential development standards as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. The residential development standards are created to ensure that the overall health, safety, and welfare of the community are protected while ensuring that the vision, goals, and policies of the General Plan are achieved.

Minimum lot size: Minimum lot sizes range from 2.5 acres in the RR district down to 1,100 square feet in the RHD district. Generally, minimum lot sizes do not impose a constraint for the development of housing; further, all sites included in the inventory exceed the minimum lot size requirements in Vallejo.

Maximum height: When applicable, the City's maximum building heights for residential uses may range from 35 to 102 feet. The DMX district has the highest maximum building height. In some cases, the City also imposes a maximum number of stories in the mixed-use and commercial zones. The NC and WC districts have the lowest maximum number of stories (three), whereas the DMX, CC, and RC districts allow a maximum of up to eight stories. In some cases, only maximum number of stories is dictated, no maximum height.

The City requires a minimum building height for groundfloor residential uses occurring in the commercial zones. Specifically, in the WC, CC, and RC zoning districts, the City

requires that residential uses on the groundfloor have a minimum height of 12 feet. Maximum heights do not constrain development of housing in the city.

Minimum yard setbacks: When required, the minimum yard sizes (setbacks) vary from zone to zone. In the mixed-use and commercial districts, for example, the city may require no yard space, apart from five feet for a rear property line setback, as long as the building or the parcel it sits on is not adjacent to any residential district. When adjacent to a residential district, the city requires that buildings in mixed-use and commercial districts provide 5 to 10 feet of setback distance, depending on if the setback is front-facing or side-facing. Similarly, the Office and Medical districts, Industrial districts, and Public and Semi-Public district vary in their setback distance requirements from 10 to 15 feet for front yard setbacks, or no setback for rear yards provided the building does not face a residential district. The largest required setback distance is a front yard setback for the RR district. Generally, all other setback distances in residential districts range from 5 to 20 feet. Setbacks do not impose a constraint on the development of housing.

Maximum lot coverage: Only the RLD, RMD, RHD, and PS zoning districts specify a maximum lot coverage ratio. RLD is the most restrictive at 50 percent lot coverage and the RHD is the most permissive at 75 percent lot coverage. These lot coverages do not pose a constraint to the development of housing.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

The City has adopted site development standards for all structures constructed in the City. Site development standards have been adopted and are enforced to ensure that the development is of the quality and type desired by the City to meet the goals of the General Plan and provide certainty to residential developers. The City is currently in the process of updating design standards for housing to ensure they are objective rather than subjective. **Table 11** summarizes the basic site development standards in each of the residential zones, as described in the Zoning Ordinance.

In addition to those standards identified in Table 11, the Municipal Code imposes additional standards onto residential development in Vallejo, including, as applicable: fence height limits, lighting, landscaping, street trees, open space, and hillside development restrictions.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 11 Residential Development Standards, 2021

Zoning District	Density (dwelling units per acre) (Min, Max)	FAR	Minimum Lot Area per Unit		Minimum Lot Size		Min. Lot Width (Feet)	Minimum Yard (Feet)				Max Main Bldg. Coverage	Building Height (feet)		
			Acres	Sq. Ft.	Acres	Sq. Ft.		Front	Side (Interior)	Side (Street)	Rear		Maximum	Minimum	Stories
Rural Residential (RR)	9	--	0.11	4,840	2.5	108,900	(¹)	30 (¹)	20 (¹)	20 (¹)	20 (¹)	--	35 (²)	--	--
Residential Low Density (RLD)	9	--	0.11	4,840	0.11	5,000	50	15 (¹)	5 (¹)	10 (¹)	5 (¹)	50.00%	35 (²)	--	--
Residential Medium Density (RMD)	25	--	0.4	1,740	0.11	5,000	50	15 (¹)	5 for the first two stories, 10 thereafter	10 (¹)	10 (¹)	60.00%	50	--	--
Residential High Density (RHD)	40	--	0.3	1,100	0.11	5,000	50	15 (¹)	(¹)	10 (¹)	10 (¹)	75.00%	75	--	--
Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMX)	16, 30	2.00	0.3	1,452	0.11	5,000	50	0	--	--	--	--	75	n/a	5
Downtown Mixed Use (DMX)	30, 90	6.00	0.1	484	--	--	n/a	0-10	0, 5 where abutting R District	--	5, 10 where abutting R District	--	102	n/a	8
Waterfront Mixed Use (WMX)	30, 90	6.00	0.1	484	--	--	n/a	0	--	--	--	--	Per Waterfront PDMP	Per Waterfront PDMP	Per Waterfront PDMP
Neighborhood Commercial (NC)	16, 50	2.00	0.2	871	--	--	n/a	0-8	5 for the first two stories, 10 thereafter (¹)	--	0, 10 where abutting R District	--	--	n/a	3
Central Corridor (CC)	16, 50	3.00	0.2	871	0.11	5,000	50	0-8	5 for the first two stories, 10 thereafter	--	5, 10 where abutting R District	--	--	n/a	8
Regional Commercial (RC)	18, 50	1.50	0.2	871	0.11	5,000	100	0-8	5 for the first two stories, 10 thereafter	--	5, 10 where abutting R District	--	--	n/a	8
Office (O)	16, 30	2.00	0.3	1,452	0.11	5,000	50	15	5 plus 2 ft for every story over 2	10	10, 15 adjacent to R District	--	75; 35 within 50 ft. of an R District	--	--
Medical (M)	16, 50	1.00	0.2	871	0.23	10,000	50	15	--	10	10, 15 adjacent to R District	--	75; 35 within 50 ft. of an R District	--	--
Limited Industrial (LI)	--	2.50	--	--	--	--	--	10	0; 15 where abutting an R district	10	0; 15 where abutting an R district	--	45	--	--
General Industrial (IG)	--	2.50	--	--	--	--	--	10	0; 15 where abutting an R district	10	0; 15 where abutting an R district	--	75	--	--
Planned Development (PD)	*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**

Source: City of Vallejo Municipal Code, Chapter 16, Part II.

Notes:

* The total number of dwelling units in a PD Zoning District shall not exceed the maximum number permitted by the general plan density for the total area designated for residential use, excluding areas devoted to public and private streets.

** Minimum lot area, yard requirements, building heights, and other physical development standards shall be as prescribed by the PD Plan.

¹ The ratio of lot depth to lot width can be no greater than four to one.

² Height shall not exceed 35 feet. Accessory structures shall not exceed 14 feet.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Planned Development Zone Standards

As discussed previously, the City provides developers of residential construction with an alternative to the above site development standards by offering building permits through the Planned Unit Development (PD) process. The PD process intends to implement the policies of the Vallejo General Plan, which calls for the establishment of the specific residential areas where flexibility of design and development of land is appropriate. The PD process offers applicants an opportunity to develop residential uses in areas that have unique characteristics (this opens up residential development rather than constraining it). The PD process also promotes the development of innovative land uses and flexibility with development standards.

All projects proposed under the PD permit procedures are subject to the following standards:

- **Minimum Area.** A PD Zoning District must be no smaller than four contiguous acres, but the City Council may waive this requirement based upon findings set forth in the Zoning Code¹.
- **Residential Unit Density.** The total number of dwelling units must not exceed the maximum number permitted by the General Plan density for the total area designated for residential use. The City allows exceptions to this in the form of density bonuses established in Section 16.209.03 of the Municipal Code (Table 16.209-A).
- **Physical Standards.** A PD Zoning District must describe the minimum lot area, yard requirements, building heights, and other physical attributes of the development in a plan submitted to the City.

Specific Plan Development Standards

Table 12 includes development standards for the Vallejo Waterfront Planned Development Master Plan. According to the Mare Island Specific Plan, new residential buildings must be designed to reflect architectural themes and identified building prototypes (Appendix B.1: Historic Project Guidelines) that characterize specific buildings on Mare Island and in the City of Vallejo. Residential development standards for height and for front, rear, and side yard setbacks are required to be responsive to the established historic character of the surrounding area as part of the Planned Development Unit Plan process. The Development standards for Solano360 Specific Plan will be established during the entitlement process.

TABLE 12 Vallejo Waterfront Planned Development Master Plan Residential Uses¹

	Parcel J	Parcel L	Parcel A
Minimum Lot Size	-	-	-
Permitted Density	-	-	-
Minimum Lot Width	-	-	-
Minimum Lot Coverage	-	-	-
Minimum Setbacks (ft)	-	-	-
Front	-	-	-
Side	-	-	-
Rear	-	-	-
Maximum Height (ft)	45	65 (2-5 stories)	38 ² - 45 ³
Depth	30	-	-
Parking	-	-	-

Notes:

²Southern Residential Neighborhood;

³Northern Residential Neighborhood

Source: Vallejo Waterfront Planned Development Master Plan, 2021

¹ City Council must find that rezoning to PD would provide greater benefits to the general welfare of Vallejo's residents and property owners than development under any base zoning district due to the unique characteristics of the site or the proposed use



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

The City's PD development requirements are minimal and therefore do not impose a constraint on the ability to provide housing in Vallejo.

Residential Parking Requirements

Section 16.508.04 (Table 16.508-B) of the City's Municipal Code establishes and outlines the City's minimum off-street parking requirements for residential uses. The City's residential off-street parking requirements are shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13 Residential Parking Standards, 2022

Unit Type	Parking Requirement
All Residential uses (except as	1 per unit
JADU	None
ADU	0-1 per unit, which may be tandem
Efficiency unit in Mixed-use District	None
Guest parking for developments with 10 or more dwelling units	None
Guest house	1 per unit, which may be tandem
Senior housing ¹	0.5 per unit plus 1 per employee
Residential Care Facility (General OR Senior)	None
Residential Care Facility (Skilled Nursing)	None
Single-Room Occupancy	None
Supportive Housing	None within half-mile public transit stop; otherwise 0.25 per bed
Transitional Housing	None
All Commercial and all Institutional and Community Facilities uses (except as noted below)	2 per 1,000 sq. ft.
Live-Work	1.5 per unit

Unit Type	Parking Requirement
Live-Work in downtown or within half-mile of transit station	None required
Emergency shelters	2
By DMX (Downtown Specific Plan District)	
DMX Districts 1 and 2 Residential and	1 space per unit
DMX Districts 3 and 4 Residential	1 space per unit
DMX District 5 Residential/Marine Vista	Existing parking to be retained
Guest Parking	1 space per 5 units

Source: City of Vallejo Zoning Ordinance, 2022

- 1 Senior housing means housing that is restricted to older adults in which at least one resident of each unit shall be a "senior citizen," as defined in the Vallejo Municipal Code Section 51.3.
- 2 Determined by Section 16.508.03 (Calculation of Parking Requirements).

The City's parking standards for residential uses apply universally to all residences in Vallejo and offer a few deviations for units that are either smaller in size (e.g., junior accessory dwelling unit [JADU], efficiency unit in a mixed-use district, etc.) or have some other condition that might increase or decrease their need for parking. Section 16.508.14 of the Municipal Code provides alternative methods of compliance to the City's minimum off-street parking requirements for developers. Specifically, it allows them to use the following methods:

- Alternative Parking and Loading Plan
- Modification and Reduction of Parking Requirements
- On-Street Parking Credits in Other Districts
- Off-Site Parking
- Valet Parking.

Section 16.508.12 (Table 16.508-D) of the Municipal Code also requires bicycle parking for buildings, including residences. For multifamily and live-work residential land uses,

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

the City requires that the land use provide a minimum of one short-term bicycle parking space plus one additional short-term space for every 20 units. Additionally, these multifamily or live-work land uses must provide a minimum of one long-term bicycle parking space per unit. Group housing land uses require two short-term spaces plus one for every 100 beds and one long-term space for every four beds. For Social Service Center land uses, the City requires the greater of either one short- and long-term bicycle space for every 2,500 square feet or simply two short-term and two long-term spaces outright.

The current automobile parking standards are quite typical of most cities and do not present any additional requirements that would inhibit development on their own. The City even allows developers to submit for alternatives to the City's automobile parking requirements. Similarly, the minimum bicycle parking standards serve to enable active transit modes in Vallejo and do not require onerous efforts or costs on the developer.

Planned Development Zoning

Conventional zoning regulations and their associated site development standards can sometimes preclude development of certain parcels where special conditions are present that make development difficult. The City has used Planned Development (PD) zoning to provide flexibility in meeting zoning requirements for unique projects or sites. The PD zoning also facilitates mixed-use development by allowing the development of mixed residential and nonresidential uses as an integral unit. The PD zoning designation allows flexibility of design for sites that are not being used due to special circumstances that prevent them from being developed through the conventional application of regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. The PD zoning designation can allow for density bonuses for provision of low- or moderate-income housing, senior housing, open space or recreation facilities for nonresidents, or interior pedestrian trails or bicycle paths that connect with city trails and paths.

Planned Development (PD)

Chapter 16.209 (Planned Development District) of the Municipal Code implements the policies of the Vallejo General Plan, which call for the establishment of the specific residential areas where flexibility of design and development of land is appropriate. These areas will be conducive to creative methods of land development, including the application of new technologies or the innovative application of existing technologies relating to resource conservation. These areas will also facilitate the development or redevelopment of land, which is not being used due to special circumstances, which prevent its development or redevelopment through the conventional application of the regulations of the zoning district.

Development in the PD zone is subject to the density standards set forth in the General Plan. However, residential projects developed with housing units affordable to lower- and moderate-income households are awarded density bonuses as provided in the zoning code. Site development standards of projects in the PD district are established through either an approved master plan or unit plan. In addition, PD development provides developers with an opportunity to use sites that would not otherwise be suitable for residential development under basic zoning regulations. The PD district does not constrain the development of lower-income housing development, rather it encourages and promotes such development.

Permitted Uses

Table 14 displays zoning districts that allow residential construction and the types of residential construction allowed. The Zoning Code explicitly establishes the required permits for each residential structure to be constructed. Residential use type construction is allowed in 18 different zones within the City and is permitted as either a permitted use, potentially subject to Zoning Compliance Review determination (P), a use mandatorily subject to Zoning Compliance Review (ZC), a minor use permit (MNP), or a major use permit (MJP). Permitted uses are allowed by right. For example, in **Table 14**, accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are allowed by right without limitations in the RR



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

district, among others. Additional details about required permits for residential development are provided in the Permit Processing subsection later in this chapter.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 14 Provisions for a Variety of Housing Types, by Zone, 2022

Residential Use Type	RR	RLD	RMD	RHD	NMX	DMX	WMX	NC	WC	CC	RC	O	M	IL	IG	PS
Single-unit, Attached	--	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ^(1,3)	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	-	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	-	-	-	-	-
Single-unit, Detached	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	-	-	P ⁽¹⁾	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Duplex	-	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	-	-	-	P ⁽¹⁾	-	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽²⁾	-	-	-	-	-
Multi-Unit Residential (three or more units)	-	-	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	-	P ⁽¹⁾	MNP ^(1,2)	MNP ⁽¹⁾	MNP ⁽¹⁾	-	-	-
Small Lot Development	-	MNP	MNP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Accessory Dwelling Unit	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	-	-	-	-	-
Guest House	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Group Residential, Small (6 persons or less)	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	P	-	P	P	-	-	-	-	-
Group Residential, Large (More than 6 persons)	MNP	MNP	MNP	MNP	MNP	MJP	-	MNP	-	MNP	MNP	-	-	-	-	-
Mobile Home Park	-	MJP	MJP	MJP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mobile and Manufactured Homes	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	P ⁽¹⁾	-	-	P ⁽¹⁾	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Care Facility (Limited)	P	P	P	P	MNP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-
Residential Care Facility (Senior)	P	P	P	P	MNP	MNP ⁽³⁾	MJP	-	-	MNP	MNP	-	MNP	-	-	-
Residential Care Facility (Hospice, General)	MNP	MNP	MNP	MNP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-
Residential Care Facility (Hospice, Limited)	P	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	MNP	P	-	-	-
Residential Care Facility (Skilled Nursing Facility)	MJP	MJP	MJP	MJP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-
Shopkeeper Unit	-	-	-	-	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-
Single Room Occupancy	-	-	MNP	MNP	MNP	MJP ⁽³⁾	-	P	-	MNP	MNP	-	-	-	-	-
Supportive Housing	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	-	-	-	-	-
Transitional Housing	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	-	-	-	-	-
Social Services Center (Small, Less than 5,000 sf)	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	MNP	P	P	-	-	-	-	P



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Residential Use Type	RR	RLD	RMD	RHD	NMX	DMX	WMX	NC	WC	CC	RC	O	M	IL	IG	PS
Social Services Center (Large, 5,000 sf or more)	-	-	-	-	MNP ⁽⁵⁾	MNP	MNP		MNP	MNP	MNP	MNP	-	-	-	MNP
Emergency Shelter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	MJP
Live/Work Unit	-	MNP	MNP	MNP	ZC	ZC	MNP	MNP	MNP	ZC	ZC	MNP ⁽⁴⁾	-	MNP	-	-
Farmworker dwelling unit (six of fewer farmworkers)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Farmworker housing complex (More than six farmworkers; Max. 36 beds or 12 residential units)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low-Barrier Navigation Center	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

¹ 2-10 units permitted subject to director decision. 11-49 units permitted subject to director decision with Design Review Board recommendation. 50 or more units requires Design Review Board recommendation and Planning Commission decision. If project complies with Government Code Section 65589.4, project is exempt from Design Review Board and Planning Commission review.

² Regulation unspecified.

³ Not permitted within the Georgia Street Corridor between Sonoma Boulevard and Mare Island Way.

⁴ Only permitted above the ground level.

⁵ A Minor Use Permit is required between 2,500 and 5,000 sq. ft. and a Major Use Permit is required for more than 5,000 sq. ft.

P = Permitted, may be subject to Zoning Compliance Review determination; ZC = Zoning Compliance Review required; MNP = Minor Use Permit required; MJP = Major Use Permit Required; "-" = Not Permitted; Numerals = refer to footnotes of table; Blank space = Not regulated.

Source: City of Vallejo Municipal Code, Chapter 16: Zoning, Table 16.301-A.

Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types

Housing for Persons with Disability

As part of a governmental constraints analysis, Housing Elements must analyze constraints on the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities. Housing Element law requires each jurisdiction to analyze potential governmental constraints to the development, improvement, and maintenance of housing for persons with disabilities, demonstrate local efforts to remove any such constraints, and provide for reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities through programs that remove constraints.

Group homes or residential care facilities represent a viable housing type for persons living with a disability and for seniors, providing a supervised group home environment with personal services and assistance with daily activities on-site. The Zoning Code includes provisions for group homes for persons with disabilities and residential care facilities for the elderly.

The City defines Residential Care Facilities (RCF) in Chapter 16.701 of the Zoning Code as: “A type of care facility that is State-licensed and provides permanent living accommodations and twenty-four-hour primarily non-medical care and supervision for persons in need of personal services, supervision, protection, or assistance for sustaining the activities of daily living. Living accommodations are shared living quarters with or without separate kitchen or bathroom facilities for each room or unit. This classification includes facilities that are operated for profit or not-for-profit institutions including group homes for minors, persons with disabilities, people in recovery from alcohol or drug addictions, and hospice facilities.” Expanding on this, the City acknowledges five different types of RCFs (Limited; Senior; Hospice, General; Hospice,

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Limited; and Skilled Nursing Facility). The RCF, Hospice Limited, is intended for use and occupancy by no more than six persons. The RCF, Hospice General, is intended for use and occupancy by seven or more persons. RCF, Senior, is intended for use and occupancy by people at least 60 years of age. RCF, Skilled Nursing Facility, refers to a facility where ongoing skilled nursing care is available to patients, including a physician, nursing staff, dietary support, pharmaceutical services, and an activity program. The City requires a minimum distance from other residential care facilities with six or more persons of 300 feet. In general, non-licensed RCFs are treated like any other residential use.

The City's Zoning Code allows all RCF types in the residential districts either by-right or with some type of use permit: Skilled Nursing Facilities require a major use permit and RCF Hospice, General, require a minor use permit in any residential districts. All mixed-use districts allow RCF, Senior, either with a minor or major use permit. RCF, Limited, is allowed with a minor use permit only in the Neighborhood Mixed-Use District. No other RCF uses may exist in the mixed-use district. Of the commercial districts, the Central Corridor Commercial and Regional Commercial districts allow RCF, Senior, with a minor use permit. The Office district allows RCF Hospice, Limited, uses with a minor use permit. The Medical district allows RCF, Limited; RCF Hospice, General; RCF Hospice, Limited; and RCF, Skilled Nursing Facility as by-right uses and requires a minor use permit for any RCF, Senior, facilities.

In terms of development standards for RCF land uses, the City establishes these standards in Chapter 16.334. Here, the City details that any RCF facilities with six or fewer occupants (RCF Hospice Limited) may only be subject to the development standards and review required for residential uses of the same housing type where the RCF use is located. Any RCF land use with seven or more patients must comply with the City's locally adopted standards, which simply require that no RCF land use be closer than 300 feet from another RCF and that a minimum of 20 square feet of open space per person be available for an RCF's residents. However, the City has included



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Program A 3.1.1 to review open space requirements for compliance with State law and to ensure they do not unduly restrict development of these RCFs.

Additionally, the City ensures that new housing developments comply with California building standards (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations) and federal requirements for accessibility. The City's regulations for RCF facilities are not burdensome and do not impose unique requirements, particularly for RCF facilities with six or fewer residents, and the development requirements for larger RCF facilities exist to simply ensure that neighborhood quality is maintained and that residents living in an RCF in Vallejo have access to open space.

Reasonable Accommodation

The City currently abides by all Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) building requirements and has adopted regulations that incorporate a reasonable accommodations procedure as required by Chapter 671, Statutes of 2001, Senate Bill (SB) 520. This legislation requires jurisdictions to identify whether they have an established reasonable accommodation procedure that allows for the application and permitting of necessary accessibility retrofits for persons with disabilities. Jurisdictions must also analyze whether their current procedure for processing these types of requests may be a constraint to the ability of persons with disabilities to acquiring the necessary accommodations.

Chapter 16.608 of the City's Municipal Code incorporates provisions that provide a process for residents living with a disability who need an exemption from the City's development standards when the granting of a variance for this purpose is not possible. Chapter 16.608.01 allows the planning director to make the following exemptions:

- **Setbacks.** Up to 25 percent of front, side, and rear yard setback standards.
- **Build-to Lines.** Up to 25 percent of the standards for building façade location.

- **Parking.** Up to 25 percent of the dimensional standards for parking spaces, aisles, driveways, landscaping, garages on sloping lots, and parking facility design.
- **Fences.** Up to 25 percent of the standards for the maximum height and location of fences.
- **Lot Coverage.** Up to 25 percent of the maximum amount of lot coverage.
- **Height.** Up to 25 percent or two feet above the maximum building height or other height limitations, whichever is less.
- **Landscaping.** Up to 25 percent of the required landscaping.
- **Other Standards.** Up to 25 percent of other development standards not listed in the identified standards not eligible for exemption.

The code does not allow the City to grant exemptions for any reason from the following development standards:

- Lot area, width, or depth;
- Maximum number of stories;
- Minimum or maximum residential density; or
- Maximum floor-area ratio (FAR).

The City has included **Program E 1.1.4** to assess whether exemptions for these items are necessary for any reasonable accommodations, and, if necessary, to modify development standards of the Zoning Code as needed.

For the director to process and review an application, the following findings must be made:

- The housing will be used by a disabled person(s);
- The requested accommodation is necessary to make specific housing available to a disabled person(s);

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

- The requested accommodation would not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the city;
- The requested accommodation would not require a fundamental alteration in the nature of a city program or law, including, but not limited to, land use and zoning; and
- The design and location of the accommodation is done in a way to minimize impacts on neighboring properties and the design character of the neighborhood to the extent reasonably feasible.

Program E 1.1.4 proposes to remove the fifth finding in the bulleted list above to make the findings objective. The director must return a decision to the applicant within 45 calendar days of the application's completion date. The director can either grant the exemption without qualification, grant the exemption with modifications, or deny the application. If submitted with another application that relates to the Zoning Code's regulations, then both applications must be reviewed and decided concurrently.

Chapter 16.608 of the City's Municipal Code provides clear due process and protocol for submitting application for an exemption from the Zoning Code to make a reasonable accommodation for a resident or householder living with a disability in Vallejo. It does not pose a burden or a constraint on the ability to provide accessible housing stock in the city.

Emergency Shelters

California Health and Safety Code, Section 50801(e), defines an emergency shelter as "housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that is limited to occupancy of six months or less by a homeless person." California Government Code 65583 subdivision (a)(4) was amended in 2022 to add the following to the definition of emergency shelter: "emergency shelter" shall include other interim interventions,

including, but not limited to, a navigation center, bridge housing, and respite or recuperative care.

In effect since January 1, 2008, SB 2 (Cedillo, 2007) requires the City to allow emergency shelters without any discretionary action in at least one zone that is appropriate for permanent emergency shelters (i.e., with commercial uses compatible with residential or light industrial zones in transition), regardless of its demonstrated need. The goal of SB 2 was to ensure that local governments are sharing the responsibility of providing opportunities for the development of emergency shelters. To that end, the legislation also requires that the City demonstrate site capacity in the zone identified to be appropriate for the development of emergency shelters.

The City's Zoning Ordinance was updated in 2015 to comply with SB 2, updating the definition of Emergency Shelter to reflect the appropriate Government Code (Section 16.06.490), and allow Emergency Shelters by-right in the city's Industrial zoning districts: General Industrial and Light Industrial. These zones are primarily along and near Sonoma Boulevard and Curtola Parkway, with a large General Industrial area on northern Mare Island. Those industrial parcels along Sonoma Parkway and Curtola Parkway are interspersed with parks and open space, public buildings, and adjacent to Downtown Mixed Use, Residential Medium Density, and Residential Low Density. While there are other nearby uses, the integration of industrial areas into residential and high resource areas provide proximity to opportunities and services for emergency shelters constructed in industrial zones, similar to those available to neighboring residential zones. However, residential uses are not currently permitted in the General Industrial and Light Industrial zones. Therefore, the City has included **Program A 3.1.1** to amend the Zoning Ordinance to comply with the requirement of Government Code Section 65583(a)(4) that "zoning designations identified to allow emergency shelters as a permitted use without a conditional use or other discretionary permit must allow residential uses. This could include zones that allow mixed uses that permit residential."

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

In Vallejo, there are approximately 5.7 acres of vacant General Industrial land and 43.4 acres of vacant Light Industrial land across 84 parcels. The city has approximately 435 persons without nighttime shelter as of the 2022 Point-in-Time Count conducted by Housing First Solano. Shelters in Vallejo are limited to 50 beds unless a major use permit is obtained. Government Code Section 65583(a)(4)(I) requires a minimum of 200 square feet per person to meet the unsheltered need. For a 500-bed shelter, this would be a minimum of 10,000 square feet. To address the current unmet need of unsheltered people in the city, the city would need an additional approximately 90,800 square feet of additional shelter space. When considering only vacant parcels that meet this criterion, the city has 39 Light Industrial parcels ranging in size from 0.23 to 5.24 acres, and 3 General Industrial parcels ranging in size from 0.58 to 3.75 acres. Therefore, there are sufficient sites in the city to address the potential need for emergency shelters to accommodate 435 unsheltered persons experiencing homelessness.

SB 2 allows for objective development and management standards that are designed to encourage and facilitate the construction of or conversion to an emergency shelter. In compliance with SB 2, the following summarizes the development standards set for Emergency Shelters in the city (Chapter 16.317):

- Emergency shelters must obtain and maintain in good standing all required licenses, permits, and approval from city, county, state, and federal agencies or departments and demonstrate compliance with all applicable building and fire codes.
- Emergency shelters shall conform to all property development standards of the zoning district in which it is located.
- The length of stay of an individual client shall not exceed 6 months within a 12-month period.

- The maximum number of beds shall be 50 unless a major conditional use permit is approved for additional beds.
- External lighting shall be provided for security purposes.
- No more than one emergency shelter shall be permitted within a radius of 300 feet from another. Exceptions may be granted for significant physical features that act as barriers.
- Parking at a minimum of eight spaces shall be designed to provide security for residents. No on-street parking shall be allowed and bicycle parking shall be provided.
- Emergency shelters shall comply with other site and building design standards, such as the provision of adequate storage for personal belongings, client waiting/intake area, screening of outdoor toilets, donations, restrooms, and donation/collection bins.
- Emergency shelters shall submit a Management and Operation Plan for review and approval by the Planning Manager.

Low-Barrier Navigation Centers

In 2019, the California Legislature adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 101, which requires all local governments, including Vallejo, to permit Low-Barrier Navigation Centers for people needing housing as a by-right use in areas that the local government has zoned for mixed uses as well as nonresidential zones that permit multifamily land uses. These centers must provide access to permanent housing options as well as case manager support to connect clients with public benefits (e.g., income, healthcare, shelter, and housing assistance). Local governments may not subject proposed centers within their planning area authority to conditional use permits or discretionary review. The City of Vallejo does not currently identify or define Low-Barrier Navigation Centers as a land

use in its Municipal Code or regulate where they may go in the City's identified zoning districts. **Program A 3.1.1** creates a process for the City to update its Municipal Code to acknowledge, identify siting for, and permit Low-Barrier Navigation Centers in Vallejo.

Transitional and Supportive Housing

Transitional housing is defined in Section 50675.2 of the California Health and Safety Code as rental housing for stays of no less than six months but where the units are recirculated to another program recipient after a set period. It may be designated for a homeless individual or family transitioning to permanent housing. This housing can take many structural forms, such as group housing and multifamily units, and may include supportive services to allow individuals to gain necessary life skills in support of independent living.

Supportive housing is defined by Section 50675.14 of the California Health and Safety Code as housing with linked on-site or off-site services with no limit on the length of stay and occupied by a target population as defined in Health and Safety Code Section 53260 (i.e., low-income person with mental disabilities, AIDS, substance abuse or chronic health conditions, or persons whose disabilities originated before the age of 18). Services linked to supportive housing are usually focused on retaining housing, living and working in the community, and/or health improvement.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65583, transitional and supportive housing must be treated as a residential use and allowed in all zones that allow residential uses, subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. The Vallejo Municipal Code permits these uses by-right in all residential districts (i.e., RR, RLD, RMD, RHD), mixed-use districts (i.e., NMX, DMX, WMX), and all commercial districts that allow residential uses by-right. Per recent changes in State law, Government Code Sections 65650 and 65583 (AB 2162), the City

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

must also allow 100 percent affordable projects that include 25 percent, or 12 units of supportive housing, by right where multi-unit and mixed-use development is permitted. Therefore, the City has included **Program A 3.1.1** to allow transitional and supportive housing with minor use permits in the Office and Medical districts, in the same manner as multifamily residential uses.

Extremely Low-Income Households

AB 2634 (Lieber 2006) requires the quantification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of extremely low-income households. The existing need is demonstrated in **Table 2-39** in the Housing Needs Assessment, and the projected need is shown in **Table 1**. Housing Elements must also identify zoning to encourage and facilitate supportive housing and single-room occupancy units (SROs). The city defines an SRO as "A facility providing dwelling units where each unit meets the requirements of California Health and Safety Code Section 17958.1 as an efficiency unit or guest room. The unit may have kitchen or bathroom facilities and shall be offered on a monthly basis or longer."

The City updated its Zoning Code to include and permit the development of SROs during the last Housing Element cycle. The regulations pertaining to SROs are in the Single-Room Occupancy Units section below.

Accessory Dwelling Units

Vallejo last updated its ADU ordinance October 25, 2018. Section 7.62 of the City's Municipal Code defines an ADU as: "any attached or detached residential dwelling unit which provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, which is not the primary residential structure on the property." The Zoning Code defines ADUs as: "An attached or detached residential dwelling unit as defined by Section 65852.2(j) of the California Code, as may be amended, which provides complete independent



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

living facilities for one or more persons including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation and is situated on the same parcel as the single-unit dwelling with which it is associated. This term also includes an efficiency unit, as defined in Section 17958.1 of the Health and Safety Code, and manufactured home, as defined in Section 18007 of the California Health and Safety Code. This use is distinguished from a duplex, which is not subject to the requirements of state law for accessory dwelling units.” The Zoning Code allows ADUs by right in all residential districts (i.e., RR, RLD, RMD, RHD), all mixed-use districts (i.e., NMX, DMX, WMX), and in two of the commercial districts (i.e., CC and RC). Section 16.303 of the Vallejo Municipal Code provides the zoning and development regulations for ADUs. It identifies its purpose as implementing California Government Code Sections 65852.2 and 65852.22 and specifies that the City will process, review, and approve without condition any proposal for an ADU or JADU submitted to the City that complies with its location and development standards. **Program A 3.1.1** contains provisions that will update the City’s ordinance to incorporate the most up-to-date version of state law.

Single-Room Occupancy Units

SROs may be developed by right in the NC zoning district and are allowed with a minor use permit in the RMD, RHD, NMX, CC, and RC zoning districts. The City requires a major use permit in the DMX zoning district for SROs.

Section 16.336 of the Municipal Code contains the regulations for SROs in Vallejo. These regulations include the following provisions:

- SROs will be sited, developed, and operated pursuant to the standards of the underlying zoning district.
- SROs may not contain more than 120 percent of the maximum residential density of the underlying zoning district where they are located.
- No SRO unit can house three or more people.
- No SRO unit may be smaller in area than 180 square feet or narrower than 12 feet across.
- No SRO may share an entry with another unit, though they may all share the primary entry into the building.
- All SROs must have access to cooking facilities either for each unit or in the form of a community kitchen. Individual cooking facilities in SROs must have at minimum a sink with hot and cold water, a counter with dedicated electrical outlets and a microwave oven or a properly engineered cook top unit pursuant to Building Code requirements, a small refrigerator, and cabinets for storage.
- All SROs must have, at minimum, access to community bathroom facilities, with a toilet, sink, and bathtub or shower, or bathtub/shower combination, with a minimum of one community bathroom facility per floor. Beyond this minimum, individual SROs may contain full or partial bathroom units.
- All SROs must feature in-unit closets.
- All SROs must have access to on-site community areas, provided at a minimum of four square feet of common area per living unit.
- Tenancy of residential hotel units is limited to 30 or more days.
- SROs that have a total of at least 10 units must provide full-time on-site management, and facilities with less than 10 units must at least provide an on-site management office.
- SROs must prepare and submit a management plan during the submission process of its minor or major use permit application for review and approval by the City’s Planning Commission. The plan must address at a minimum:
 - Proposed security and safety features, such as lighting, security cameras, defensible space, central access, and user surveillance.

- Management policies, including desk service, visitation rights, occupancy restrictions, and use of cooking appliances.
- All rental procedures, including the monthly tenancy requirement.
- Maintenance provisions, including sidewalk cleaning and litter control, recycling programs, general upkeep, and the use of durable materials.

Mobile Home Residential

Government Code Section 65852.3(a) requires jurisdictions to allow the development of factory-built and mobile home units with the same development standards applied to stick-built housing. Additionally, a city may not require an administrative permit, planning or development process, or requirement that is not imposed on a conventional single-family dwelling. The Zoning Code definition of a “single-unit dwelling, detached” land use includes, “individual manufactured housing installed on a foundation system, pursuant to Section 18551 of the California Health and Safety Code.” Currently, the City permits single-unit, detached housing in all residential land-use districts by right and therefore allows individual manufactured housing in all of its residential districts as long as they have a foundation system. This is an implementation of the Fifth Cycle Program D 1.1.5, which sought to allow single mobile homes or manufactured houses by right in the LDR zone.

Farmworker and Employee Housing

Under California Health and Safety Code 17021.6 (Employee Housing Act), farmworker housing up to 12 units or 36 beds must be considered an agricultural use and permitted in any zone that permits agricultural uses. In addition, the Employee Housing Act (17021.6) requires employee housing for six or fewer employees to be treated as a single-family use and permitted in the same manner as other dwellings of the same type in the same zone. The Development Code does not explicitly define or allow

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

employee housing in this manner. Program A 3.1.1 is proposed to revise the Development Code to allow employee housing in compliance with the Employee Housing Act.

Local Ordinances Potentially Impacting Housing Supply

Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance

The City does not currently have an inclusionary housing ordinance.

Short-Term Rental

The City does not currently permit short-term rentals.

Growth-Control Ordinance

The City does not have a building moratorium or any other growth-control measures.

Density Bonus

Under current state law (Government Code Section 65915), cities and counties must provide a density increase up to 80 percent over the otherwise maximum allowable residential density under the Municipal Code and the Land Use Element of the General Plan (or bonuses of equivalent financial value) when builders agree to construct housing developments with 100 percent of units affordable to low- or very low-income households.

The Vallejo Municipal Code currently provides a density bonus of up to 35 percent over the otherwise maximum allowable residential density under the municipal code (or

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

bonuses of equivalent financial value) when builders set aside 20 percent or more of their units as affordable, as defined by state law.

Building Codes

The City has adopted the 2022 California Building Standards Code without any local amendments.

Code Enforcement

The City's Code Enforcement Division is responsible for enforcing the Property Maintenance Ordinance (Chapter 7.54) of Title 7, Public Health, Safety, and Welfare, of the Municipal Code. Code Enforcement's main objective is to empower Vallejo residents to assist in helping maintain safe, healthy, and attractive living and working environments. Citizens of Vallejo are encouraged to contact Code Enforcement with violations by telephone, in person, or by completing an online form from the City's website.

Permit Fees

Vallejo building, development impact, and planning fees are shown in Tables 15, 16, and 17. Typical planning and impact fees for a single-family unit and multi-family unit are in Table 18 and 19. The total fees and ratio of fees for total development is in Table 18. Based on a record of building permits issued in 2022 a 3,037-square-foot home with three bedrooms and two bathrooms was valued at \$397,201.89. The planning fees for this unit would be \$4,160.69 and the total impact fees would be \$49,417.99. In the same year, using a 75-unit project example valued at \$50.6 million the total planning fees would total \$3,475 per unit or \$260,649.24 in total. The impact fees would add an additional \$39,701.04 per unit or a total of \$2,977,578.36. In total, fees would account for 5.1 percent of total cost for a single-family unit including connection to sewer and drainage and 5.8 percent of total cost for a 75-unit multi-family project including sewer

and drainage. Compared to the fees established by jurisdictions in and around Solano County, Vallejo's fee schedules are lower and do not place an unreasonable constraint on developers' ability to construct new housing in the city.

Building permit fees are based on the Uniform Building Code and are set at levels designed to offset the City's cost to monitor building construction activities. This is common practice in most jurisdictions.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 15 Building Permit Fees, 2022-2023

Total Valuation	Fee	
1. Building Permit Fee		
\$1.00 to \$2,000	\$218	-
\$2,001 to \$25,000		For the first \$2,000 plus \$16.30 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000
\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$638	For the first \$25,000 plus \$12.92 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$1,000	For the first \$50,000 plus \$6.50 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$1,364	For the first \$100,000 plus \$6.90 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	\$4,456	For the first \$500,000 plus \$5.09 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof
\$1,000,001 valuation and up	\$7,312	For the first \$1,000,000 plus \$5.09 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof above \$1,000,000
2. Excavation Fees		
A. Permit Fees	\$712	
B. Inspection Fees		
1 to 50 ft of open cut	\$912	
51 to 100 ft of open cut	\$1,381	
101 to 200 ft of open cut	\$2,496	
Each add'l 100 ft open cut	\$1,151/100 ft	
3. Grading Inspection Permit Fee		
4. Plan Check Fee	70% of Building Permit Fees	

Source: City of Vallejo Schedule of Fees for Development, July 2022.

Development impact fees are displayed in Table 16. The fees are presented for both single-family and multifamily construction and include fees for sewer/drainage, transportation mitigation, county facilities, park/recreation, inspections, and fire mitigation.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 16 Development Impact Fees, 2022-2023

Fee Designation	Cost	
I. Impact and Connection Fees	Single-Family	Multifamily
a) Basic Permit Fees		
Sewer	\$4,025/unit	\$4,025/unit
Drainage	\$6,850/unit	\$41,135/acre
b) Transportation Impact Mitigation	\$8,479.91/unit	\$4,768.23/unit
c) County Facilities Fee	\$9,263/unit	\$6,662/unit
d) School Impact Fees	\$2.24/sq. ft.	\$2.24/sq. ft.
e) Park and Recreation Fee		
Single-Family Detached	\$15,631	
Single-Family Attached	\$14,094	
Duplex	\$12,761	
Multiple Family (3 or more units)	\$10,710	
Mobile Home	\$9,378	
II. Plan Check Fees		
Preliminary Plan Review Fee	Fee based on current actual hourly rates, times actual time	
III. Annexations	Fee based on current actual hourly rates, times actual time to process. Plus State and County fees.	
V. Excise Tax	\$5,893/unit	
VI. Fire Mitigation Fee	\$134/unit	
VII. Special District Surcharge Fee		
NorthGate Area Fee District	Single-Family: \$2,018 Multifamily: \$1,342	

Source: City of Vallejo Building Division and Planning Division, 2022.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Typical residential planning fees are displayed in Table 17.

TABLE 17 Planning Fees, 2022-2023

Permit Type	Fee
Subdivision Applications	
Lot Line Adjustment	\$2,377
Parcel Map	\$3,172
Parcel Map Amendment	\$2,219
Tentative Map (5-20 lots)	\$10,704
Tentative Map (20+ lots)	\$11,988 + \$255 per lot
Tentative Map Amendment	25% of original fee
Conditional Use Permit	
Major (New and Existing Units)	\$5,179
Minor	\$15,688
Development Review	
Development Review - Major (staff level)	\$5,234
Development Review - Major (PC Public Hearing)	\$3,000 + hourly (max \$6,856)
Development Review - SB 35 and/or Density Bonus	\$4,394
Development Review - Minor	\$782
Environmental	
Environmental Impact Report	Consultant cost + 20%
Mitigated Negative Declaration, Staff Prepared	\$9,555
Mitigated Negative Declaration, Consultant Prepared	Consultant cost + 20%
Other	
Annexation	\$218
Development Agreement	\$218
General Plan Amendment	\$7,816
General Plan Amendment (<5 acres or <.5 FAR)	\$3,907

Permit Type	Fee
Planned Development	\$5,000 + hourly (max \$25,819)
Planned Development - Amendment	\$3,000 + hourly (max \$6,455)
Design Review	\$7,008
Preliminary Review	\$218
Public Notice Mailing (200 & 300 ft.)	\$364
Public Notice Mailing (500 & 1,000 ft.)	\$646
Rezoning/Map Prezoning, Text Amendment	\$5,000 + hourly (max \$10,296)
Specific Plan - New/Amendment	\$218
Major Use Permit	\$5,179
Major Use Permit - Amendment	25% of original fee
Variance	\$7,756
Zoning Compliance Review - Minor (over the counter)	\$63
Zoning Compliance Review - Major	\$255

Source: City of Vallejo Planning Division, 2022.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

TABLE 18 Typical Planning Fees for a Single-Family and Multi-Family Projects

Fee Designation	Cost		
	Single-Family ¹	Entire 75-unit development ²	Per Unit
Preliminary Plan Review Fee	\$356.00	\$356.00	\$4.75
Site Plan Review	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$5.20
Building Permit	\$3,414.69	\$259,903.24	\$3,465.38
Total	\$4,160.69	\$260,649.24	\$3,475.32

Source: City of Vallejo Planning Division and Building Division, 2022.

Notes:

¹Single Family Unit is 3,037 square feet.

²Multi-Family Project is 75 units, approximately 726 square feet.

TABLE 19 Typical Impact Fees for a Single-Family and Multi-Family Projects

Fee Designation	Cost		
	Single-Family ¹	Entire 75-unit development ²	Per Unit
Sewer	\$4,025.00	\$301,875.00	\$4,025.00
Drainage	\$6,850.00	\$41,135.00	\$548.47
Transportation Impact Mitigation	\$8,479.91	\$635,993.25	\$8,479.91
Electrical Permit	\$410.14	\$379,000.00	\$5,053.33
Mechanical Permit	\$512.67	\$64,975.81	\$866.34
Plumping Permit	\$615.21	\$77,970.97	\$1,039.61
CAL Green Building Standards Review	\$205.07	\$25,990.32	\$346.54
County Facilities Fee	\$6,662.00	\$499,650.00	\$6,662.00
Park and Recreation Fee	\$15,631.00	\$803,250.00	\$10,710.00
Excise Tax	\$5,893.00	\$441,975.00	\$5,893.00
Fire Mitigation	\$134.00	\$7,638.00	\$101.84
Total	\$49,417.99	\$2,977,578.36	\$39,701.04

Fee Designation	Cost		
	Single-Family ¹	Entire 75-unit development ²	Per unit
Building Permit Fees	\$4,160.69	\$260,649.24	\$3,475.32
City Development Fees	\$49,417.99	\$2,977,578.4	\$39,701.0
Total Vallejo Fees	\$53,578.68	\$3,238,227.60	\$43,176.37
School District Fee (2.24/ sq. ft.)	\$6,802.88	\$126,847	\$1,691
Total Fees	\$60,381.56	\$3,365,074.32	\$44,867.66
Typical Construction Cost per Unit + Land	\$983,415.23	\$52,520,000	\$700,267
Total Cost (Fees Plus Construction Cost per Unit)	\$1,043,796.79	\$55,885,074.32	\$745,134.32
City Fees as a Percent of Total Cost	5.1%	5.8%	5.8%

Source: City of Vallejo Planning Division and Building Division, 2022.

Notes:

¹Single Family Unit is 3,037 square feet.

²Multi-Family Project is 75 units, approximately 726 square feet.

Permit Processing

The building permit review and approval process can affect housing costs. Lengthy processing of development applications can add to construction costs. Expediting review of developments that will offer lower- and moderate-income housing could be an incentive. Normally, building permit approval of single-family or duplex housing units in an area zoned for Residential Low Density housing development requires the approval from the Planning Division, the Building Division, Fire Prevention, Water Department, Public Works, and from the Vallejo Flood and Wastewater District, and would typically take 10 to 12 weeks, assuming no special site or environmental conditions requiring additional mitigation or study. Normally, construction of a multifamily housing complex in an appropriately zoned area would follow the same regulatory approval process and timeline.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Program A 3.1.1 in the previous Housing Element proposed to revise the municipal code to remove the Use Permit requirement for multifamily projects larger than eight units. This program was accomplished by the adoption of the new Zoning Code in 2021. Multi-Unit Residential (three or more units) is permitted without a Use Permit in the following zoning districts:

- RMD (Residential Medium Density)
- RHD (Residential High Density)
- NMX (Neighborhood Mixed Use)
- DMX (Downtown Mixed Use)
- WMX (Waterfront Mixed Use)
- NC (Neighborhood Commercial)
- CC (Central Corridor Commercial)

Multifamily is also permitted with a Minor Use Permit (no public hearing) in the RC (Regional Commercial), O (Office), and M (Medical) districts.

After the City approves a project, at a Planning Commission or City Council hearing, it becomes the applicant's responsibility to initiate the steps to secure building permits and construct the project. These steps include obtaining all building permit requirements and paying fees as outlined in a project's conditions of approval. Other necessary actions prior to obtaining building permits may include but are not limited to:

- Completing construction drawings
- Recording subdivision (final) maps (applies to ownership projects)
- Retaining contractors
- Obtaining utility approvals, required easements, and rights of entry.

All submitted plans and permit documents are reviewed prior to the issuance of a building permit.

The amount of time between planning approval/entitlement and when an application for a building permit is received is dependent on the applicant. The City has a cost-free application for concurrent processing, should the applicant desire it.

The length of time between a project's approval and building permit issuance in many cases is determined by the applicant. The City's initial review for both civil plans and building permit approval is typically three to four weeks with a subsequent review, if corrections are necessary, to be completed within one to three weeks. The time the applicant takes to make corrections between these reviews varies; however, once a project begins the construction plan review process, the following general timelines can typically be achieved with responsive applicants:

- Civil plan approval (e.g., grading, water, sewer, streets): Three to six months
- Building permit approval: One to three months

City follows state regulations regarding SB 35 and SB 330 and uses the State's forms. Program A.4.1.1 calls for additional steps to ensure information about streamlining under these bills is available to applicants.

Zoning Compliance Review

Chapter 16.301.01 in the Zoning Code defines which types of uses are mandatorily subject to Zoning Compliance Review. Chapter 16.603 of the Municipal Code outlines the purpose and applicability of the Zoning Compliance Review process. Zoning Compliance Review verifies compliance with applicable requirements outlined in the Municipal Code, for each new or expanded use of a structure.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Any proposal for the erection, construction, alteration, repair, or relocation of any structure or building; the use of vacant land; any change of building or land character; or substantial expansions in the use of land or building that the Zoning Code permits are subject to Zoning Compliance Review.

Based on the submitted application, the director must determine whether the proposal is permitted by right, requires further review, or is not allowed under the current Zoning Code. If the proposal is said to be approved by right, then the director will grant a certificate of zoning compliance to the applicant. Otherwise, the director will deny the issuance of the certificate and provide guidance on how the applicant may achieve compliance in an updated application process. Applicants may also appeal the decision of the director to the City's Planning Commission.

Minor and Major Use Permits

Chapter 16.301.01 in the Zoning Code defines which types of uses require either a minor or major use permit. Chapter 16.606 of the Municipal Code details the purpose, applicability, and procedure for granting major and minor use permits to applicants. The purpose of minor or major use permitting is to review and influence development proposals that generally support the City's Zoning Code but may require additional oversight and modifications to fully integrate surrounding existing uses and avoiding creating negative impacts to them.

Determinations on minor use permits may be granted to applicants by the director. If the director determines that the proposal may generate public controversy or involve significant land use policy decision, the application may be referred to the Planning Commission for review. Major use permits require Planning Commission approval. The City must provide public notice for both minor and major use permit decisions and hold a public hearing for a major use permit decision.

To receive the use permit, the City must find that the application/project meets the following findings:

1. The proposed use is conditionally allowed within the applicable zoning district and complies with all other applicable provisions of the Zoning Code and all other titles of the Vallejo Municipal Code;
2. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan or planned development and any other applicable plans;
3. The subject parcel is physically suitable for the type of land use being proposed;
4. The proposed use is compatible with existing and permissible land uses within the zoning district and the general area in which the proposed use is to be located, which may include, but not be limited to, size, intensity, hours of operation, number of employees, or the nature of the operation;
5. The physical location or placement of the use on the site is compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood;
6. The proposed use and related project features will not create any nuisances arising from the emission of odor, dust, gas, noise, vibration, smoke, heat, or glare at a level exceeding ambient conditions and would not otherwise be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, or general welfare; and
7. The project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, if applicable, and the requirements of this chapter.

The relevant review authority for the minor or major use permit is determined by Chapter 16.601 of the City's Municipal Code. The review process requires that applicants submit site plans, architectural drawings, or statements, as well as other additional materials necessary for the review. The City has included **Program H 3.1.1**

to update the required findings for a use permit to be objective, specifically findings four and five in the above list.

Development Review and Design Review

Per Chapter 16.605 of the Zoning Code, Development Review is required for all development in Vallejo. Prior to granting a development review approval, the director, Planning Commission, or Design Review Board must make the following findings for the proposed development:

1. Complies with all applicable specific standards and criteria of this Zoning Code;
2. Is consistent with the General Plan and any applicable approved specific plan or planned development;
3. Complies with any design conditions, standards, or requirements imposed by a discretionary approval, including, but not limited to, a major or minor use permit, variance, specific plan, planned development, or tentative map applicable to the project or the location where it is proposed;
4. Is in substantial compliance with any applicable adopted design guidelines;
5. Will serve to achieve groupings of structures that are well related and which, taken together, will result in a well-composed urban design, with consideration given to site, height, arrangement, texture, material, color, and appurtenances, the relation of these factors to other structures in the immediate area, and the relation of the development to the total setting as seen from key points in the surrounding area; only elements of design which have some significant relationship to outside appearance shall be considered;
6. Will be of a quality and demonstrate thoughtful site planning that will serve to protect the value of private and public investments in the area; and

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

7. That the project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, if applicable, and the requirements of Chapter 16.605.

The City has adopted Design Guidelines that include specific design objectives that serve as standards by which staff evaluates residential development. Under Chapter 16.604, the following residential developments require Design Review.

1. 2 to 10 units - Director decision
2. 11 to 49 units - Design Review Board recommendation to director
3. 50+ units - Design Review Board recommendation to Planning Commission

These provisions establish objectives, standards, and procedures for conducting design review through the development review application process under Chapter 16.605, Development Review, of the Municipal Code. They preserve and enhance the character of Vallejo's existing neighborhoods. According to Section 16.604.03 of the Municipal Code, the director or the Design Review Board will approve, conditionally approve, deny, or make recommendations to the Planning Commission for final design review approval after finding that the application:

1. Is consistent with the purposes of this chapter, the design policies of the General Plan and any applicable specific plan, any adopted applicable design guidelines;
2. Is consistent with any planning or zoning approvals by the director or the Planning Commission;
3. Complies with any other relevant City policies or regulations; and
4. Meets the following criteria:
 - a. The aesthetic design, including its exterior design and landscaping, is appropriate to the function of the project and will provide an attractive and comfortable environment for occupants, visitors, and the general community.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

- b. Project details, colors, materials, and landscaping are fully integrated with one another and used in a manner that is visually consistent with the proposed architectural design.
- c. The project has been designed with consideration of neighboring development.
- d. The project contributes to the creation of an attractive and visually interesting built environment that includes well-articulated structures that present varied building façades, rooflines, and building heights and encourages increased pedestrian activity and transit use.
- e. Street frontages are attractive and interesting for pedestrians, address the street and provide for greater safety by allowing for surveillance of the street by people inside buildings and elsewhere.
- f. The proposed design is compatible with the historical or visual character of any area recognized by the City as having such character.
- g. The aesthetic design preserves significant public views and vistas from public streets and open spaces and enhances them by providing areas for pedestrian activity.
- h. The proposed landscaping plan is suitable for the type of project and will improve the appearance of the community by enhancing the building, minimizing hardscape, and softening walls; and the landscape plan incorporates plant materials that are drought-tolerant, will minimize water usage, and are compatible with Vallejo's climate.
- i. The project has been designed to be energy efficient, including, but not limited to, landscape design and green or eco-friendly design and materials.
- j. The project design protects and integrates natural features, including creeks, open space, significant vegetation, and geologic features.

The City has included **Program H 3.1.1** to review and revise the findings of the design review process, specifically findings 5 and 6 for development review, to be objective.

On/Off-Site Improvements

Chapter 15.06 of the City's Municipal Code establishes the general regulations governing the required on- and off-site improvements of subdivisions. The purpose of the provisions required for subdivision development is to ensure the orderly growth of the city and to protect public health and safety. Upon approval of a final subdivision map, the City may accept a dedication of real property as a means to satisfy required site improvements, including streets, alleys, drainage, and other public easements. There is a selection of improvements that must be provided through real property dedications (identified herein). In the event that the City does not accept proposed dedications, it is the responsibility of the subdivider to provide the site improvements. The following are required site improvements:

- Streets - The width and alignment must be in accordance with any City Council-approved street master plan. In the event that a master plan does not apply, it is the responsibility of the Public Works Director to establish the improvement standards.
- Public Transit - Dedications for public transit services (bus turnouts, benches, shelters, landing pads, and similar items) must be made for subdivision requests in which the maximum density allowed according to the General Plan would allow 200 or more units.
- Bicycle Paths - Subdivisions with 200 or more parcels may be required to provide additional dedications for the development of bicycle paths, depending on the direction of the City Council.
- Sidewalks - The Public Works Director must approve plans to ensure sidewalks will be installed to grades, locations, widths, and cross-sections.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

- Blocks - The maximum length allowed for each block is 1,000 feet and must be sufficient for a maximum layout of two rows of lots according to the provisions of the applicable zoning requirements.
- Easements - The City Council may order that dedications are provided for the installation of utilities, planting strips, and other public purposes. In the event that the subdivider provides the dedication to an agency other than the City, the agency is responsible for implementation.
- Sanitary Sewers - The subdivider shall provide all on-site and off-site sanitary sewer facilities determined necessary by the Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District.
- Storm Drainage - The subdivider shall provide all on-site and off-site storm drainage facilities determined necessary by the Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District.
- Water Mains and Fire Hydrants - Water mains and fire hydrants of design, layout, and locations approved by the Public Works Director connecting to the city water system shall be installed in accordance with the water ordinance of the City.
- Gas and Electric Facilities - The subdivider shall provide all on-site and off-site gas and electric facilities determined necessary by the public utilities company providing service.
- Communication Facilities - The subdivider shall reimburse a telephone corporation and/or cable television system for all costs for the replacement, undergrounding, or permanent or temporary relocation of existing facilities of a telephone corporation and/or cable television system required by the subdivision.
- Mail - The subdivider of a residential subdivision shall provide locations for mail delivery boxes in accordance with U.S. Postal Service requirements.
- Landscaping – Landscaping must remain consistent with the zoning code. Landscaping, including street trees, shall be installed along all streets, highways,

freeways, and other public rights-of-way, which are part of or which border a subdivision.

- Street Lighting - The subdivider may be required by the Public Works Director to dedicate easements for street lighting and to install such lighting.

On approval of the City's subdivision ordinance, the ordinance was determined to be consistent with the City's Zoning Code and General Plan. In addition, the ordinance is consistent with the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act. The on- and off-site improvement requirements do not unreasonably constrain the development of new housing. The site improvement requirements are necessary to ensure that the public health and safety of all residents is protected and that the growth of the city is orderly.

Parkland Dedication and Fees

Chapter 3.18 of the City's Municipal Code, Land Dedication and Fees for Park and Recreational Purposes, includes procedures and establishment of fees for the provision of parks and recreational land to serve the City's residents. The City provides parks based on need determined in the General Plan and the goals and policies of the Vallejo Recreation District, generally via fees and/or parkland dedications, and in accord with the Quimby Act. A developer, owner, or builder may request that the project dedicate an improved park or recreational site rather than dedicating land and/or fees in lieu of land and paying park impact fees and the City may also provide partial credit for the provision of private Open Space. The location of parkland is determined by the Development Services Director in consultation with the greater Vallejo Recreation District. The City provides credit for parkland dedications, to be made concurrent with approval of the final subdivision map, based on a fair-market value determination per acre of land.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Infrastructure Availability

According to the Elections Code 9212 Report prepared by the Stantec Consulting Services published in 2020, the city's current water and sewer capacity will allow for 2040 General Plan buildout and would not exceed the design or permitted capacity of the wastewater treatment plants serving the city. Vallejo also implements a development fee program that collects funds from new development to pay for infrastructure to support that growth. Developers pay school impact, road, and fire mitigation fees. All dry utilities are available to all parcels in the city. Overall, Vallejo anticipates development will not be inhibited due to either a lack or shortage of supporting infrastructure.

To comply with SB 1087, the City will immediately forward its adopted Housing Element to its water and wastewater providers so they can grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include units affordable to lower-income households.

Opportunities for Energy Conservation

With respect to residential construction, opportunities primarily take the form of construction of new homes using energy-efficient designs, materials, fixtures, and appliances, or retrofitting existing homes to be more energy efficient (e.g., weather stripping, upgrading insulation, upgrading to more energy-efficient fixtures and appliances). At a minimum, new housing construction in Vallejo must comply with the State of California Title 24 energy-efficiency standards. These requirements are enforced through the building plan check process. The City has established Program I 1.1.1 to create partnerships with local utility programs that assist residents with saving on energy cost through increased energy efficiency. The City has also established Program I 1.1.2 as a measure to adopt the State's Green Building Code, which was done, and will focus on improving the efficiency of residential structures through design and construction. In addition, the 2022 Building Code, adopted by the City and in effect

as of January 1, 2023, includes many energy-efficient requirements for new construction.

In addition to the design and construction of individual buildings, the development industry is becoming increasingly aware of opportunities for energy conservation at the site planning level and even at the community planning level. New developments are increasingly being planned so that building orientations will take advantage of passive solar energy benefits. Larger-scale land use planning considers the benefits of compact urban form (i.e., higher densities) as a means to reduce auto dependency for transportation, and the benefits of mixed-use land use patterns to make neighborhoods more self-contained so that residents can walk or bicycle to places of work, shopping, or other services. Compact urban development patterns are also necessary to improve the effectiveness of buses, ferries, and other forms of public transit. If effective public transit is available and convenient, energy will be conserved and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced through reduced automobile use. Program H 2.1.4 encourages transit-oriented development, which takes advantage of site location near transportation services, thus reducing residents' dependency on automobile use. The City should consider incorporating these or other sustainable development principles into new developments that are planned in Vallejo as well as provide incentives for builders to construct residential structures that minimize energy use.

Vallejo Housing Strategy

In 2020, the City adopted the Vallejo Housing Strategy to prioritize and guide the City's housing programs over the next five years. The Strategy recommendations were developed with input from more than 100 diverse community stakeholders, including members of the City Council, Planning Commission, Housing and Development Commission, Vallejo Housing Authority (VHA) Resident Advisory Board, and City staff during 2020. The Housing Strategy incorporates relevant policies and information from

the Vallejo General Plan, Housing Element, Public Housing Agency Plan, and Consolidated Plan, and includes the following:

- Program I: Promote sustained city leadership and action on housing.
- Program II: Preserve existing housing and expand affordability.
- Program III: Prevent homelessness and support renters facing housing instability and displacement.
- Program IV: Produce housing affordable to entire spectrum of residents and workers throughout Vallejo.
- Program V: Leverage public lands for housing.
- Program VI: Enhance resident self-sufficiency through training and employment opportunities.

Within the Housing Strategy, the City has identified key actions, steps, and timeframes for implementation of each program to ensure effectiveness in addressing housing needs in Vallejo.

NONGOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS ON HOUSING AVAILABILITY

Major factors within the private market system that contribute to the direct sales prices and rental costs of new housing include land costs, construction costs, and the availability of financing.

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Land Costs

While there is limited vacant residential land available for sale in Vallejo, a few properties were located within the city for which asking prices were quoted. According to Zillow, an online resource advertising undeveloped residential land for sale in the city, land prices vary between \$586,206 and \$4.7 million per acre, a median cost of \$994,943 per acre. Fairfield, which is a neighboring jurisdiction, currently contains land that is selling for less than land in Vallejo. In Fairfield, vacant land ranges from \$10,005 to \$2,153,846 per acre, a median cost of \$359,712 per acre. The higher cost of land in Vallejo relative to Fairfield may be attributed to the location; however, a considerable number of factors influence land values, including improvements and market timing. The median vacant for-sale lot sizes in the two communities differ, however, with the median size in Vallejo equaling 0.17 acres while the median size in Fairfield equals 1.32 acres. This suggests that while vacant for-sale lot sizes in Fairfield are larger overall, that acreage in Vallejo is more valuable. The cost of available land in the city is not considered a constraint on housing production.

Construction Costs

The Craftsman Book Company is a resource that provides construction cost estimates for specific geographic areas by ZIP code. According to the Craftsman Book Company's 2022 estimates, the approximate cost of constructing a 2,000-square-foot single-family, wood-framed, single-story, four-cornered home of good construction quality that includes a two-car garage and forced air and heating in ZIP code 94592 (Vallejo) is \$330,912. This is approximately \$165 per square foot for single-family construction. However, based on feedback from a local developer, a single-family home, valued at \$397,201.89, costs approximately \$130.79 per square foot to construct.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

For multifamily housing, the Craftsman Book Company's 2022 estimates that the cost to build a 3-story, 1,000-square-foot-per-unit, 40-unit apartment complex with a light steel frame and forced air and heating and cooling in ZIP codes 94589, 94590, 94591, and 94592 (Vallejo) is approximately \$4,860,834. This is approximately \$115,590 per unit, or \$121 per square foot. The City received construction cost estimates from local developers of multifamily housing. While one reported construction costs for a typical 3-story wood-frame apartment on-grade, 2- and 3-story walk up, as approximately \$250 to \$275 per square foot, per unit, others estimate construction costs for the same type of unit ranging from \$160,000 to \$220,000 per unit, or approximately \$160 to \$220 per square foot. Based on this, construction costs for multifamily housing are similar to, or higher, than those for single-family housing. In response, the City has included Program B 2.1.2 to seek funding to support construction of affordable housing, which is often multifamily housing, and Program H 4.1.1 alleviating any governmental barriers to construction of multifamily units and other alternative housing types.

Impact fees and permit fees are not calculated in the costs of construction because the market is not responsible for administering those fees; instead, it is the City that imposes such fees. Construction costs alone are not considered a constraint to making affordable housing available.

Availability of Financing

Table 20 displays the current interest rates and APR for homebuyer mortgages in 2023.

Rates are trending upwards, most recently at a peak of 5.75 percent for a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage reported at the beginning of 2022. Inflation generally can cause a concurrent increase in mortgage rates, though they are not always predictive of one another. The average inflation rate for the United States, as a whole, for 2022, was 8.0 percent, a relatively high inflation rate, since 1981, though the current 30-year fixed-rate mortgage is still far below the 1981 rate of 18.45 percent. As inflation increases, the federal government has increased the cost of lending to curb the impact of inflation.

It is not entirely clear whether inflation will continue increasing or begin to decline during 2023. For now, however, the climbing mortgage rates likely pose a constraint on the ability of lower-income households to purchase a home in Vallejo. The State of California runs programs designed to assist first-time homebuyers by providing subsidized or low-interest home purchase loans, down payment assistance, and closing cost assistance, which could help families or individuals struggling to afford home purchase costs in Vallejo.

TABLE 20 Current Mortgage Rates, June 2022

Product	Interest Rate	APR
Jumbo Loans		
7/6-month ARM Jumbo	4.750%	5.965%
15-Year Fixed-Rate Jumbo	5.000%	5.204%
30-Year Fixed-Rate Jumbo	5.000%	5.107%
Conforming Loans		
7/6-month ARM	5.750%	6.557%
15-Year Fixed-Rate	5.000%	5.289%
30-Year Fixed-Rate VA	5.750%	5.333%
30-Year Fixed Rate	5.750%	5.937%

Source: Wells Fargo, Home Mortgage Loans, accessed June 4, 2022, from: <https://www.wellsfargo.com/mortgage/rates/>.

Environmental Constraints

The City of Vallejo, located on the San Pablo Bay, has moderate topography and hillside development, and is in the vicinity of known active faults, namely the San Andreas and Hayward Faults. While these environmental constraints may impact some new construction in the city, nearly all of the residential sites identified in the vacant sites inventory are infill sites surrounded by existing development, and potentially exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act. Specifically, all high-density residential sites with potential for low- and very low-income levels are urban infill sites, surrounded by and with access to existing roads and other development and infrastructure, and are

4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

not impeded by significant topography or other restrictive landscape features. With building mitigation measures readily applied through application of building codes and mitigation measures identified through the California Environmental Quality Act process, environmental constraints do not pose a significant constraint on the feasibility of housing on these sites. Still, as unforeseen environmental constraints may impact development on a site-by-site basis, these factors are considered in the calculation of realistic capacity, as described herein.



4. HOUSING RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

This page intentionally left blank.

GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

This section of the Vallejo Housing Element explains what the City seeks to accomplish with the implementation of the Housing Element in the pursuit of nine broad Goals. The City has established these Goals in consideration of its own local needs and priorities and its obligations under State Housing Element law. A series of Policies are listed under each Goal. These Policies will guide City actions to help achieve the associated Goals. Along with each Policy, there are one or more Programs that state specific accomplishments that the City can use to measure its progress toward meeting its Goals. A summary of specific quantified objectives required by State law follows the Goals, Policies, and Programs.

CHANGES IN GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS FOR THE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Although modifications have been made to update timelines, account for changes in redevelopment law, and to clarify language, the Goals, Policies, and Programs below generally remain intact from the previous Housing Element.

GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL A

Facilitate Production of Housing to Accommodate Vallejo's Fair Share of the Regional Housing Demand.

POLICY A.1: The City of Vallejo strives to provide opportunities for the development of new housing adequate to meet its share of the increasing regional demand for households at all income levels.

Program A 1.1.1: Land Inventory and RHNA Monitoring

The City of Vallejo will continue to maintain a land inventory of parcels that allow residential development. In considering development applications and/or pending changes in local land use policy, the City of Vallejo will place a priority on activities (i.e., expedite permits when possible) that support the City's ability to meet its share of the regional housing need. In keeping with state "no net loss" provisions (Government Code

5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

Section 65863), if development projects are approved at densities lower than anticipated in the sites inventory or with fewer units than listed in the sites inventory, the City will evaluate the availability of sites appropriate for all income levels to address the remaining Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and, if necessary, shall rezone sufficient sites to accommodate the RHNA, ensuring that there is sufficient higher-density residential land available in areas throughout the city.

The City will maintain the available sites inventory list on the City's website to support development of new affordable housing opportunities.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: City staff will review list annually as part of the Housing Element Annual Report to ensure there is sufficient suitably zoned land to accommodate the City's remaining RHNA allocation through the 6th cycle planning period and will update site information as projects are approved through the Planning Division.

Funding Source: General Fund

Program A 1.1.2: Mixed-Use Development

The City shall incentivize development of residential units in mixed-use zones, particularly units affordable to extremely low-, very low- and low-, income households, by doing the following:

- Deferral of development impact or permit fees, where feasible
- Flexibility (concessions/incentives) in development standards, such as parking, setbacks, and landscaping requirements for affordable projects
- Density and intensity bonuses for affordable projects
- Support developers with securing additional financing as necessary

- Continuing to provide marketing materials on the City's website that delineate site opportunities for mixed-use and provide technical assistance for interested developers. Technical assistance includes assisting interested developers with obtaining property owner/representative information and information on the available development incentives.

Responsible Parties: Planning Division, Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Annually starting in April 2024, post on the City's website available incentives. Provide marketing materials, assistance, and update vacant land inventory on an ongoing basis.

Funding Source: General Fund and Grant Funding

Quantified Objective: The goal is that this will result in the entitlement of 30 extremely low- income units, 50 very low-income units, and 50 low-income units to improve access to high-resource areas for lower-income households and reduce displacement risk resulting from overpayment through increased housing mobility opportunities.

POLICY A.2: Convert vacant infill land and surplus, vacant nonresidential properties to housing and mixed use where feasible, economically desirable, and compatible.

POLICY A.3: Monitor, remove, or mitigate governmental constraints to the production of housing within the City of Vallejo.



Program A 3.1.1: Removal of Governmental Constraints

The City will amend the Zoning Ordinance to review and revise standards to comply with State law.

- a. **Residential Care Facilities:** Review open space requirements for compliance with State law (Health and Safety Code Sections 1267.8, 1566.3, and 1568.08) to ensure they do not unduly restrict development of residential care facilities.
- b. **Emergency Shelters:** Allow residential uses in zones that allow emergency shelters without a conditional use permit or other discretionary permit pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(a)(4).
- c. **Low-Barrier Navigation Centers:** Permit low-barrier navigation centers, defined as low-barrier, temporary service-enriched shelters to help homeless individuals and families to quickly obtain permanent housing, by right in zones where mixed uses are allowed or in nonresidential zones that permit multifamily housing (Government Code Section 65662)
- d. **Transitional and Supportive Housing:** Allow in the same manner as other residential uses in the Office and Medical zoning districts in compliance with Government Code Section 65583(a)(5).
- e. **Accessory Dwelling Units:** Amend the Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with the latest state legislation related to accessory dwelling units (ADUs), ensuring that ADUs are permitted in all zones that permit single-family or multifamily uses, specifically the Office and Medical zone districts, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65852.2.
- f. **Employee Housing:** Treat employee/farmworker housing that serves six or fewer persons as a single-family structure and permit it in the same manner as other single-family structures of the same type within the same zone across all zones that allow single-family residential uses. Treat employee/farmworker housing consisting

of no more than 12 units or 36 beds as an agricultural use and permit it in the same manner as other agricultural uses in the same zone, in compliance with the California Employee Housing Act, and allow for a streamlined, ministerial approval process for projects on land designated as agricultural or land that allows agricultural uses (Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5, 17021.6, and 17021.8).

Responsible Party	Planning Division and the City Attorney
Time Frame:	Amend the Zoning Ordinance by December 2024; and as needed thereafter for the ADU ordinance through the remainder of the planning period when changes to state ADU law occur.
Funding:	General Fund and Grant Funding
Quantified Objective:	The goal is that this will result in the entitlement of 100 units; of these, encourage 60 units in areas with close proximity to resources and services to improve access to opportunity for lower-income and special-needs persons.

POLICY A.4: Promote a variety of housing types, including rental and ownership opportunities for moderate- and above-moderate income households.

Program A 4.1.1: Preliminary Applications (Senate Bill [SB] 330) and Streamlined Approval (SB 35)

The City will develop a preliminary application form and procedure or will formally adopt the Preliminary Application Form developed by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), pursuant to Government Code Sections 65941.1, 659095.05, 65913.10, 66300, and 65589.5 (SB 330). The City will also establish a written policy and/or procedure, and other guidance as appropriate, to specify the Government

5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

Code Section 65913.4 (SB 35) streamlining approval process and standards for eligible projects under Government Code Section 65913.4. The applications will be available on the City's website for developers interested in pursuing the streamlined process or vesting rights.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: Develop or adopt HCD's SB 330 preliminary application form by December 2023. Develop an SB 35 streamlined approval process by June 2024 and implement as applications are received.

Funding Source: General Fund

GOAL B

Increase the Range of Affordable Housing Opportunities.

POLICY B.1: Continue to strive to increase the range of housing opportunities for all residents, including those unable to afford market-rate housing within the community.

Program B 1.1.1: Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) Rental Assistance

The Vallejo Housing Authority will continue to apply to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for vouchers for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households, making extremely low-income households a priority. Further, the Housing Authority will seek to expand housing mobility opportunities for voucher

holders by continuing landlord outreach efforts, continuing the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program, conducting property manager meetings, and making regular presentations to the Solano Board of Realtors.

The Vallejo Housing Authority will continue to administer the FSS Program to encourage and facilitate housing mobility. The maximum number of participants for the city program is 50. The City will advertise the program through distribution of printed or digital flyers to HCV households at least annually, or when there are available spots in the program.

Responsible Party: Vallejo Housing Authority / Housing and Community Development

Time Frame: Continue the Housing Choice Voucher program; distribute information on available programs and resources at least annually through the Housing Authority to voucher holders.

Funding Source: Housing Authority funds

Quantified Objective: Provide homebuying assistance and resources to at least 50 households through the FSS program.

POLICY B.2: Provide financial or other forms of assistance for the development of affordable housing units.

Program B 2.1.1: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance

The development of market-rate housing may attract higher-income households, which may in turn create lower-paying jobs in the service and retail industries, resulting in demand for affordable housing. Fees are typically based on an assessment, or 'Nexus' study, of the extent to which the development of new market-rate housing generates additional demand for affordable housing. To address the need for affordable housing, and as outlined by the City's Housing Strategy, the City will prepare a nexus study,



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

research an inclusionary housing ordinance, and seek developer input prior to drafting an ordinance. This ordinance will identify acceptable methods to provide affordable housing such as: (a) construction of housing on-site, (b) construction of housing off-site, (c) dedication of land for housing, and (d) payment of an in-lieu fee. Development of this ordinance requires an analysis of the following variables:

- Limiting the application of the ordinance to developments exceeding a certain size.
- Percentage of housing units required to be set aside as affordable.
- Design and building requirements.
- Timing of affordable unit construction.
- Determination of a fee in lieu of developing affordable units.
- Developer incentives, such as fee deferrals.
- Administration of affordability control.

If an inclusionary housing ordinance is feasible, the City will encourage housing developers to incorporate affordable units into the larger housing project to facilitate mixed-income housing developments.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: Seek developer input, conduct nexus study, and determine the appropriateness of an inclusionary ordinance within two years after adoption of the Housing Element. If determined appropriate, adopt an inclusionary ordinance within one year of making the determination.

Funding Source: General Fund

Quantified Objective: The goal is to create 150 lower- and moderate-income units, aiming for at least 50 of these in mixed-income developments, to promote access to resources and mobility opportunities for target households, prioritizing new opportunities in higher-resource areas and infill opportunities in higher-income neighborhoods.

Program B 2.1.2: Commercial Linkage Fee

Commercial Linkage Fees (also known as 'Jobs-Housing' fees) are fees exacted from developers to ameliorate some of the housing impacts generated from commercial projects. The City will explore the feasibility of a Commercial Linkage Fee that would provide an additional source of funding for affordable housing based on demand from construction of new commercial developments and the types of employment generated. Linkage fees can vary by development type, fee level, exemptions, options/thresholds, terms of payment, and results. Some of the elements in the Housing Impact Fee could include:

- Minimum number of units threshold of 25
- Nexus study to calculate appropriate fee
- Creation of an affordable housing trust fund to be used to preserve and expand the supply of affordable housing

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: Evaluate and consider a Jobs/Housing Nexus Analysis by June 2026.

Funding Source: General Fund, to fund initial exploration.



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

Program B 2.1.3: Seek Funding to Support Affordable Development

Mitigate the loss of redevelopment funding for affordable housing by seeking to leverage financial resources and work with qualified sponsors to support affordable housing through applying for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, Self-Help Housing (CalHome Program), HOME funding, and pursuing other financing resources, as appropriate. A particular emphasis will be placed on pursuing development programs and funds that meet extremely low-, very low-, and low-income needs.

The City is increasing and will continue to increase its competitiveness for these grants through such actions as preparing and adopting a Housing Element that meets state laws, identifying City resources to be used as matching funds for federal and state programs, and coordinating with local service providers regarding state grant opportunities.

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division, Vallejo Housing Authority

Time Frame: Apply for applicable funding as opportunities arise. Organizations may be contacted regarding available funding. City Council will receive an update at least once a year as part of the Housing Element annual reporting process (Government Code Section 65400).

Funding Source: General Fund, HOME funds, CDBG funds, Technical Assistance Grants.

Quantified Objective: The goal will be to identify funding to support the development of 50 lower-income units to support construction of new affordable housing in higher-resource areas and facilitate housing mobility opportunities.

GOAL C

Improve and Preserve the City's Existing Supply of Affordable Housing.

POLICY C.1: Cooperate with other governmental, for-profit, and nonprofit entities to discourage and attempt to prevent loss of existing affordable housing projects to market-rate rents.

Program C 1.1.1: Preservation of At-Risk Housing Units

The City shall maintain and update the affordable housing database as a mechanism to monitor and identify units at risk of losing their affordability subsidies or requirements. For complexes at risk of converting to market rate, the City shall:

- Contact property owners of units at risk of converting to market-rate housing within one year of affordability expiration to discuss the City's desire to preserve complexes as affordable housing.
- Coordinate with owners of expiring subsidies to ensure the required notices to tenants are sent out at 3 years, 12 months, and 6 months.
- Reach out to agencies interested in purchasing and/or managing at-risk units.
- Work with tenants to provide education regarding tenant rights and conversion procedures pursuant to California law.

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division



Time Frame: Annually monitor units at risk of converting; coordinate noticing as required per California law.

Funding Source: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Maintain the affordability of the 42 units currently at-risk of converting to market-rate (see Table 2-43 of the Housing Needs Assessment).

Program C 1.1.2: Below-Market-Rate Financing Program (Preservation)

The City will seek funding, including using available tax-exempt bond financing, CDBG, HOME funds, and Housing Authority reserves, to assist housing operators to acquire and preserve as affordable units at risk of converting to market rates.

Responsible Party: Vallejo Housing and Community Development Division and Vallejo Housing Authority

Time Frame: Meet with potential housing operators at least one year prior to expiration of at-risk units to gauge interest; seek funding within the same timeframe to prevent conversion of units.

Funding Source: Funding will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Program C 1.1.3: Replacement of Existing Affordable Units

In accordance with California Government Code Section 65583.2(g), the City will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of California Government Code Section 65915(c)(3) on sites identified in the sites inventory when any new development (residential, mixed-use, or nonresidential) occurs on a site that has been occupied by or restricted for the use of lower-income households at any time during the previous five years.

This requirement applies to:

- Non-vacant sites
- Vacant sites with previous residential uses that have been vacated or demolished.

Responsible Party: Vallejo Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Ongoing

Funding Source: General Fund

GOAL D

Increase Homeownership Opportunities.

POLICY D.1: Increase the ability of lower- and moderate-income households to become homeowners.

Program D 1.1.1: Sweat-Equity Program for Homeownership

The City will consider implementing a program to provide financial subsidies to prospective homeowners in exchange for investing sweat equity in rehabilitating an existing home that needs significant repair. To develop the program, the City will:

- Meet with a nonprofit organization, such as Habitat for Humanity, which specializes in sweat equity programs by March 2024 to develop a potential program;
- Seek funding for rehabilitation assistance at least annually;
- Develop criteria for a potential program by December 2024;



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

- Distribute informational materials on the program through printed flyers provided to community organizations and placed in public buildings and facilities, particularly in neighborhoods with greater rehabilitation need.

The City will target the program to foreclosed or blighted dwellings.

Responsible Parties: Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Meet with nonprofit organization by March 2024 and develop potential program criteria and informational materials by December 2024.

Funding Source: CDBG and other grant funding

Quantified Objective: Facilitate place-based revitalization by providing subsidies to at least four households to rehabilitate their homes as funding permits.

GOAL E

Encourage Housing to Meet the City's Special-Needs Population.

POLICY E.1: On a citywide basis, expand the supply of housing for senior citizens, persons who are disabled (including those with developmental disabilities), large households, veterans, single-parent households, lower-income teachers employed by the Vallejo City Unified School District, the homeless, and low-income residents.

Program E 1.1.1: Incentives for Special-Needs Housing

The City will work with housing developers to expand opportunities for affordable lower-income housing for special-needs groups, including persons with physical and developmental disabilities, single-parent and female-headed households, large families, farmworker housing, extremely low-income households, seniors, and persons experiencing homelessness by creating partnerships, providing incentives, and pursuing funding opportunities:

- Support affordable housing development for special-needs groups throughout the city, including in areas that are predominantly single-family residential. The target populations of this include seniors; persons with disabilities, including developmental disabilities; single-parent and female-headed households; and homeless persons to reduce the displacement risk for these residents from their existing homes and communities.
- Promote the use of the density bonus ordinance, application process streamlining, and fee deferrals to encourage affordable housing, with an emphasis on encouraging affordable housing in high-resource areas and areas with limited rental opportunities currently.
- Facilitate the approval process for land divisions, lot line adjustments, and/or specific plans or master plans resulting in parcel sizes that enable affordable housing development and process fee deferrals related to the subdivision for projects affordable to lower-income households where appropriate.
- Give priority to permit processing for projects providing affordable housing for special-needs groups.
- Work with public or private sponsors to identify candidate sites for new construction of housing for special needs and take all actions necessary to expedite processing of such projects. Meet with service providers as opportunities arise to discuss possibilities to expand supportive housing.



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

- Provide incentives to builders to provide housing with multiple bedrooms affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, aiming for construction of at least 20 units that meet these sizes, to meet the needs of female-headed households of all income levels (consider possible incentives such as, reduced setbacks, reduced parking requirements, and technical assistance with applications for funding).
- Encourage residential development near parks, open space, transit routes, civic uses, social services, and other health resources.
- Work with nonprofit and for-profit affordable housing developers to support their financing applications for state and federal grant programs, tax-exempt bonds, and other programs that become available.
- Pursue federal, state, and private funding for low- and moderate-income housing by applying for state and federal monies for direct support of lower-income housing construction and rehabilitation, specifically for development of housing affordable to extremely low-income households.
- Pursue partnerships with the North Bay Regional Center to identify funding opportunities and promote housing for persons with disabilities

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Ongoing, as projects are processed by the City. Seek opportunities for funding and engage with North Bay Regional Center.

Funding Source: Where feasible, leverage state and federal financing, including Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, CHFA multifamily housing assistance programs, HCD Multifamily Housing Loans, CDBG funds, HOME funds, and other available financing.

Quantified Objective: 50 lower-income units, at least 5 of which include accessibility modifications, to reduce overpayment and displacement risk for lower-income households and special-needs groups and encourage access to high-resource areas.

Program E 1.1.2: Senior Housing Needs

The City will develop a survey to understand the needs of senior residents by June 2024 and will distribute to senior housing. By December 2024, the City will meet with affordable housing/senior housing developers, senior stakeholder groups, and other senior housing advocates, such as Legal Services of Northern California, at least once to discuss available sites and senior needs in the community.

Based on the results of the survey and discussions, the City may identify incentives to offer to developers to provide housing, care choices, and age-in-place options for seniors of all income levels (possible incentives will include reduced setbacks, reduced parking requirements, and technical assistance with applications for funding). The City will then meet with affordable housing/senior housing developers, senior stakeholder groups, and other senior housing advocates at least annually, beginning in 2026, to assess whether the incentives are helping to meet senior housing needs or develop additional strategies.

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division, Planning Division

Time Frame: Develop a survey of senior housing needs by June 2024. Meet with senior advocates, stakeholders, and housing providers. Evaluate possible incentives for developers to provide housing and services for seniors by December 2025. Meet with advocates, stakeholders, and housing providers annually beginning in 2026 to assess effectiveness of incentives.



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

Funding Source: General fund, grant funding

Program E 1.1.3: Homeless/Unhoused Needs

The City will cooperate with neighboring cities, the County, and other agencies in the development of programs aimed at providing homeless shelters and related services. During this coordination, the City will monitor the demographic composition of the unhoused population to identify needs for targeted resources and determine what efforts to take, such as providing education on the financial assistance and programs available. The City will continue to be an active member on the Community Action Partnership of Solano County Board (CAP Solano), a joint-powers authority, to coordinate homeless services and develop a regional response to homeless needs.

The City will also partner with local homeless service providers, agencies, and other community organizations to pursue funding from available sources for homeless services. The City will annually apply for grants where appropriate or will encourage and work with local and regional nonprofit organizations that wish to apply for such grants.

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Meet with organizations that support the unhoused population of Vallejo every other year and apply for funding or assist these groups in applying for funding for homeless services as needed. Meet with neighboring cities and the County annually to discuss homeless issues and identify actions to address homelessness.

Funding Source: Federal, state, and local funding

Quantified Objective: Assist with program development and funding identification that will assist at least 80 unhoused persons.

Program E 1.1.4: Reasonable Accommodations and Universal Design

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(c)(3), the City will continue to provide a Universal Design Checklist for developers to inform them of design features that can be incorporated into new houses, condominiums, and townhomes to facilitate accessibility for occupants and visitors. Information will continue to be provided on Universal Design on the Planning Division's website, at the Planning Division's information counter, and at the Building Division's permit counters.

The City will also review and revise exemptions to reasonable accommodation requests and findings for reasonable accommodation requests, to ensure they do not pose any barriers to housing for persons with disabilities. Specifically, the City will revise the zoning ordinance to remove the following existing finding to ensure the findings are objective:

- The design and location of the accommodation is done in a way to minimize impacts on neighboring properties and the design character of the neighborhood to the extent reasonably feasible.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: Ongoing, as applications are processed by the City; review and revise exemptions and findings as needed by December 2024.

Funding Source: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Aim to Assist 5 applicants as there is interest in reasonable accommodation requests, to reduce displacement risk and encourage five accessible units to improve housing mobility. Amend zoning to remove finding identified in program by December 2024.



Program E 1.1.5: Support for Persons with Developmental Disabilities

The City will coordinate housing activities and encourage housing providers to designate a portion of new affordable housing developments for persons with disabilities, especially persons with developmental disabilities, to increase housing mobility opportunities and pursue funding sources designated for persons with special needs and disabilities. Models of housing for persons with developmental disabilities could include assisting in housing development through the use of set-asides, scattered site acquisition, new construction, and pooled trusts; providing housing services that educate, advocate, inform, and assist people to locate and maintain housing; and models to assist in the maintenance and repair of housing for persons with developmental disabilities. The City will implement an outreach program that informs families in the city about housing and services available for persons with developmental disabilities, such as developing informational brochures and directing people to service information on the City’s website.

Responsible Party: Planning Division, Building Division

Time Frame: Discuss opportunities with possible agencies for persons with developmental disabilities and develop an outreach plan by June 2024. Develop a brochure and/or post information on the City’s website by October 2024.

Funding Source: General Fund and outside sources, as available

Quantified Objective: 30 housing units for persons with disabilities to reduce displacement risk stemming from availability of accessible units and housing costs.

Program E 1.1.6: Extremely Low-Income Housing

The City will encourage additional housing resources for extremely low-income residents, particularly seniors, farmworkers, and persons with physical or developmental disabilities, through a variety of actions, including:

- Facilitate and encourage the construction of housing affordable to extremely low-income households by assisting nonprofit and for-profit developers with financial and/or technical assistance in a manner that is consistent with the City’s identified housing needs.
- Provide financial support annually, as available, to organizations that provide counseling, information, education, support, housing services/referrals, and/or legal advice to extremely low-income households, persons with disabilities, farmworkers, and persons experiencing homelessness.
- Expand regulatory incentives where feasible for the development of units affordable to extremely low-income households and housing for special-needs groups, including persons with disabilities (including developmental disabilities), and individuals and families needing emergency/transitional housing.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: Ongoing, as projects are processed by the Development Services Department. By December 2024, conduct outreach to organizations that support extremely low-income residents to understand funding needs, and review and prioritize local funding at least twice in the planning period, and support expediting applications as they are submitted.

Funding Source: General Fund



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

Quantified Objective: Assist 50 extremely low-income households to reduce overpayment and displacement risk.

GOAL F

Improve Housing Choice and Access to Opportunities for Vallejo Residents.

POLICY F.1: The City of Vallejo will work to ensure that all population groups have equal access to housing opportunities and will facilitate housing options for a range of income levels, at various densities, and in different styles to meet the diverse needs and preferences of the community.

Program F 1.1.1: Housing Discrimination Monitoring and Referral Program

Through its HUD-required affordable housing activities, the Vallejo Housing Authority publicizes fair-housing requirements and the availability of assistance. The Housing Authority also uses public notices in English, Spanish, and Tagalog, general circulation newspaper ads, and ads in a Spanish-language newspaper as well as a newsletter serving the Filipino community and outreach activities with community organizations. For Section 8 participants, the Housing Authority accepts and investigates complaints of housing discrimination and works with Fair Housing Napa Valley (FHNV) regarding the incidence of housing discrimination complaints on other cases. The City will continue to contract with FHNV to assist households alleging discrimination through tenant/landlord mediation, provide referrals to appropriate agencies, such as HUD or the California Civil

Rights Department (previously Department of Fair Employment and Housing), for further investigation and resolution of complaints when needed, and to conduct trainings for landlords and housing providers at least every other year on fair housing laws, rights, and responsibilities.

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Contract with FHNV annually; offer landlord and housing provider fair housing trainings at least every other year; offer translation services for all public resources and meetings.

Funding Source: General Fund, grant funding

Program F 1.1.2: Improve Access to Resources

The City shall take the following actions to improve access to resources and opportunities citywide, but with a particular emphasis on neighborhoods with a concentration of lower-income residents who often face additional barriers in accessing resources:

- Evaluate proposals for higher-density residential development as projects are proposed to determine what, if any, project-serving retail or services the city could suggest be incorporated into the project or concurrently developed adjacent to the project. Examples of services include, but are not limited to, service commercial uses, carpool facilities, and childcare.
- Meet with school district representatives by December 2024 to analyze whether housing security poses a barrier. Work with the school district to assist in securing grant funding for teacher recruitment and retention bonuses, classroom materials, and other incentives for teachers to facilitate positive learning environments citywide.



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

- Facilitate place-based revitalization and promote healthy environments for new housing by evaluating transitional buffers between residential and industrial uses and highways, and working with developers as projects are proposed to mitigate impacts associated with traffic and industrial emissions.
- Work with Solano Mobility to develop a fact sheet, or similar informational materials, of Solano Mobility programs to be posted on the City's website, social media, and in public buildings by January 2025, updated at least annually thereafter as needed, to help connect seniors, low-income individuals, and other residents to services

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division, Planning Division

Time Frame: Refer to each bulleted action for specific timeframes.

Funding Source: General Fund, grant funding

Program F 1.1.3: Rent Monitoring Program

To reduce displacement risk for renters, particularly lower-income renters, the City will conduct a study of rent stabilization programs, rent mediation boards, and other rent monitoring programs used by jurisdictions throughout the Bay Area (i.e., Alameda, Berkeley, and San Francisco, among others) by June 2026 to assess feasibility for the City of Vallejo. This study may include meeting with staff in jurisdictions with rent monitoring programs to discuss program components, conducting a survey of renters in Vallejo to determine the scale of displacement risk resulting from rent increases, and surveying property owners and landlords to understand frequency and scale of rent increases. If a rent monitoring, stabilization, or mediation program is deemed feasible and useful (based on survey results) in the City of Vallejo, adopt a program or ordinance by June 2027.

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Complete study by June 2026, if deemed feasible, adopt within one year.

Funding Source: General Fund, grant funding

GOAL G

Build and Maintain the City's Quality Residential Environments and Where Necessary Substantially Rehabilitate the City's Aging Housing Stock.

Vallejo seeks to ensure that it maintains and improves the quality of life and historic integrity of its existing neighborhoods. Vallejo also intends that new neighborhoods will contribute to a city-wide balance between residential and commercial uses and that the housing stock within these neighborhoods is maintained in sound condition.

POLICY G.1: The City of Vallejo will undertake a range of efforts to assist the private sector in maintaining and improving the condition of existing housing units and also to maintain and improve the living environments within the city's neighborhoods.

POLICY G.2: Preserve and improve historical and architectural resources by providing appropriate incentives for historic preservation.



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

Program G 2.1.1: Housing Rehabilitation Program

The City will continue to facilitate place-based revitalization and housing preservation by doing the following:

- Continue, as available, to provide funds to assist very low-, low-, and moderate-income households to undertake repairs to their homes.
- Give priority for participation in this program to very low-, low-, and moderate-income homeowners who are subject to code enforcement actions that could otherwise lead to displacement of residents.
- Continue to implement the Neighborhood Law Program to collaborate with City departments, outside governmental agencies, and Vallejo residents to address and eliminate blight and nuisance conditions throughout the city.
- Make informational materials about rehabilitation assistance programs available on the City's website by December 2024 and printed materials in City buildings and distributed to community organizations by June 2024. Distribute materials at local events (i.e., farmers' markets) and in local buildings (i.e., libraries) at least annually.
- Target outreach in neighborhoods with the greatest rehabilitation need and lower incomes.
- Promote the use of Mills Act contracts to ensure the rehabilitation, maintenance, and preservation of historic resources through information on the City's website.
- Continue the use of the State Historical Building Code to maintain and preserve historic buildings and their character-defining features.

Responsible Party: Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Distribute informational materials at least annually.

Funding Source: HOME and CDBG funds

Quantified Objective: As funding permits, rehabilitation of 15 housing units, 8 of these in areas of concentrated poverty or areas with an older housing stock to facilitate place-based revitalization.

POLICY G.3: Enforce existing housing codes and regulations to correct code violations in the most expeditious manner to protect the integrity of the housing while minimizing the displacement of residents. Demolish all dwelling units that cannot be rehabilitated so that hazards will be eliminated and land will become available for new housing.

Program G 3.1.1: Code Enforcement Program

The City will develop a proactive code enforcement policy for ensuring compliance with building and property maintenance codes, which will include property maintenance, abandoned vehicles, housing conditions, overall blight, and health and safety concerns. The City will continue to ensure compliance with building and property maintenance codes. To ensure the City has an accurate percentage of the homes in need of rehabilitation and replacement, the City will seek funding to complete a Housing Conditions Survey in older neighborhoods and neighborhoods with lower incomes, to evaluate rehabilitation need. Based on findings of the focused evaluation, the City will identify measures to encourage housing preservation, conservation, acquisition, and rehabilitation, and mitigate potential costs, displacement, and relocation impacts on residents. These measures may include, but are not limited to:

- Streamline permit review for home repairs on housing units identified during the conditions survey, when implemented.
- Seek funding to offer relocation assistance or require landlords or property owners to offer assistance to low-income tenants displaced during rehabilitation efforts.



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

- Seek funding to develop a housing rehabilitation program (see Program G1.1.1).

Responsible Party: Code Enforcement/Neighborhood Law Program

Time Frame: Seek funding to develop a program to reduce displacement risk as a result of code enforcement within one year of Housing Element adoption; conduct code enforcement on an ongoing basis.

Funding Source: General Fund

Quantified Objective: The goal is to conserve 100 housing units to prevent displacement.

POLICY G.4: Replace infrastructure as needed to conserve older neighborhoods.

Program G 4.1.1: Vallejo Community Public Safety Program

The City will continue the Vallejo Community Public Safety Program (VCPS) to target and help rehabilitate existing and new multi-family complexes. As part of the program, the City shall work with the Police Department to evaluate multi-family complexes and provide rehabilitation and surveillance recommendations to address crime and safety and to promote the implementation of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) strategies. The program is voluntary and intended to work with landlords to improve housing conditions.

Responsible Party: Planning Division, Housing and Community Development Division, Code Enforcement, Neighborhood Law Program

Time Frame: Target complexes at least annually

Funding Source: Planning Application Fees (paid by property owners of multi-family complexes), General Fund, CDBG

POLICY G.5: The City will develop and enforce a program that will ensure that all rental properties are free of health and safety violations and maintained in sound condition.

Program G 5.1.1: Rental Property Inspection Program

The Vallejo Housing Authority is currently pursuing an inspection model for rental units to facilitate place-based revitalization and reduce displacement risk due to housing condition. The program may include working with local apartment owners, tenants' rights advocates, and other stakeholders to ensure that tenants are not retaliated against for reporting violations and enforce basic code requirements to ensure that renter households enjoy decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

Responsible Party: Building Division and Code Enforcement, Vallejo Housing Authority

Time Frame: Recommend inspection model to City Council by December 2023.

Funding Source: Grants, General Fund

GOAL H

Guide Development of Balanced Neighborhoods.

Policy H.1: Provide convenient access to schools, parks, shopping, transportation, and services within neighborhoods.



5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

Program H 1.1.1: Neighborhood Park Access Program

Based on the need for parks identified in the General Plan update, the City will encourage the development of public neighborhood or pocket parks for new subdivisions and will incorporate the goals of this program into new open space requirements as part of the City-wide Zoning Ordinance update. Through conditions of approval, development agreements, and or mitigation measures identified in environmental review, the City will require that developers proposing to build parks and park facilities will do so concurrently with residential construction to ensure these amenities are available to existing and new residents within a reasonable amount of time from project approval.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: As subdivisions are submitted to the Planning Division

Funding Source: Funded through developers and neighborhood associations

Policy H.2: The City will facilitate mixed-use development and the promotion of live/work units through adoption of the Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan and the Zoning Ordinance update.

Program H 2.1.1: Transit-Oriented Development

The City will implement the goals of the Mare Island Specific Plan, and the Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan to implement transit-oriented development (TOD). The City shall also continue to implement Chapter 16.215 of the Vallejo Municipal Code to actively support TOD by offering up to a 25 percent increase in density and 25 percent increase in floor-area ratio for eligible projects. The objective of these options to increase density and FAR is to stimulate the production of housing developments near transit stations that include affordable units, promote access to opportunities and resource, and increase public transit ridership and minimize automobile trips.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: Ongoing, as projects are proposed.

Funding Source: General Fund

Program H 2.1.2: Downtown Vallejo Specific Plan and Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plan

The City will continue to implement the Downtown Vallejo and Sonoma Boulevard Specific Plans to introduce high-density mixed-use housing while revitalizing existing retail and commercial areas. The Specific Plans focus on improvements to the physical environment through development standards and design guidelines, both for public improvements and for private developments. The City will encourage the development of affordable housing units to implement residential development as part of the Specific Plan goals. The City will also update the Downtown Specific Plan during this planning period.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: As projects are submitted through the Planning Division. Complete Downtown Specific Plan Update by 2026

Funding Source: General Fund, ARPA

POLICY H.3: Protect the character of the existing neighborhoods by preserving the existing lot sizes and developing objective standards to facilitate infill projects to be compatible with the existing neighborhoods.



Program H 3.1.1: Objective Standards

The City will update the required findings for housing projects for minor and major use permits, particularly findings 4 and 5 as identified in the Constraints section, to be objective, and will review findings for development and design review for housing projects, particularly findings 5 and 6 of the development review findings as identified in the Constraints section, to ensure they are objective, revising as necessary.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: Review and revise findings, as needed, by December 2024.

Funding Source: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Facilitate construction of 100 units over the planning period.

POLICY H.4: Promote a healthy balance of housing within neighborhoods by encouraging a mix of affordable and market-rate housing.

Program H 4.1.1: Regulate for Housing Variety

The City will encourage a variety of housing types, including duplexes, townhomes, apartment buildings, and condominiums, in neighborhoods and new subdivisions and will identify innovative and alternative housing options that provide greater flexibility and affordability in the housing stock while promoting mixed-income development. This may include consideration for further reduction in regulatory barriers for community land trusts, tiny houses, microhomes, cottage homes, small lot subdivisions, and other alternative housing types, as well as exploration of a variety of densities and housing types in all zoning districts.

The City will use the findings of this program to target development of a variety of housing types in areas of predominantly single-family development and of concentrated overpayment to reduce displacement risk, promote inclusion, and support integration of housing types based on income.

Responsible Party: Planning Division

Time Frame: Identify innovative and alternative housing options to help further housing production by December 2025; amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed.

Funding Source: General Fund

Quantified Objective: 200 lower-income units to improve housing mobility and reduce displacement risk.

Program H 4.1.2: Accessory Dwelling Units

The City will encourage the construction of ADUs throughout the city through the following actions, which are aimed at providing an increased supply of affordable units and therefore to help reduce displacement risk for low-income households resulting from overpayment and facilitating mixed-income neighborhoods:

- Provide guidance and educational materials for building ADUs on the City's website, including permitting procedures and construction resources. Additionally, the City will present homeowner associations with information about the community and neighborhood benefits of ADUs, and inform them that covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) prohibiting ADUs are contrary to state law.
- Proactively advertise the benefits of ADUs by distributing multilingual informational materials on the benefits of ADUs in areas of high opportunity and limited rental opportunities to increase mobility for low-income households by posting flyers at the planning counter, library and online, at least annually.

5. GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS

- Monitor ADU production and affordability every other year and adjust or expand the focus of the education and outreach efforts. If needed, identify additional sites to accommodate the unmet portion of the lower-income RHNA.
- Apply annually, or as grants are available, for funding to provide incentives for homeowners to construct ADUs.

Responsible Party: Planning Division, Housing and Community Development Division

Time Frame: Make ADU materials available by December 2023; evaluate effectiveness of ADU approvals every other year, starting April 2024 and identify additional site capacity, if needed, by December 2025. Apply annually for funding to support ADU incentives.

Funding Source: General Fund

Quantified Objective: 197 ADUs to improve housing mobility and improve proximity to services and employment opportunities for lower- and moderate-income households (177 ADUs are assumed to address the displacement risk), encouraging at least 40 ADUs in higher-income neighborhoods.

GOAL I

Promote Energy Efficiency.

POLICY I.1: The City of Vallejo will promote energy efficiency in residential development within the city, including reduction of energy use through better design and construction in

individual homes and through energy-efficient urban design.

Program I 1.1.1: Promote Energy Conservation

Promote energy efficiency in existing housing and new development:

- Continue and establish new partnerships with local utility providers and other organizations to promote participation in available energy-efficiency programs (e.g., BayREN, HERO and California Frist, PACE, Rising Sun's California Youth Energy Services [CYES]; PG&E Comfort Home Program; rebates for energy-efficient appliances).
- Provide information on the City website and through printed materials at City Hall on the following programs:
 - PG&E's Energy Savings Assistance Program for low-income households who want to make their homes energy efficient;
 - The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) to assist low-income residents with one-time energy bill payments and home weatherization services for improved energy efficiency and health and safety;
 - California's Low-Income Weatherization Program, which provides low-income households with solar photovoltaic (PV) systems and energy-efficiency upgrades at no cost to residents; and
 - Marin Clean Energy's (MCE) residential home energy assessment and electrification programs for single- and multi-family buildings, heat pump water heater contractor rebates, and Low Income Families & Tenants (LIFT) program.
- Enforce the Green Building Code (Cal-Green) to facilitate the implementation of green building features in new housing units.



- Develop a brochure to provide developers with a range of green building design features to choose from that will satisfy the requirements of the ordinance.
- Provide incentives, such as project expediting, and conduct a study of fee reductions to encourage the implementation of features that exceed Cal-Green standards.

Responsible Party: Building Division

Time Frame: Make information available on the City website by December 2023 and print materials available by March 2024. Meet with utility providers at least every other year beginning in 2024. Develop a brochure of green building design features by June 2024.

Funding Source: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Connect 10 lower-income residents with available programs to reduce displacement and facilitate place-based revitalization.

Table 21 summarizes the quantified objectives for the programs in this chapter.

TABLE 21 Summary of Quantified Objectives

	Income Categories					Total
	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
New Construction ¹	345	345	369	495	1,346	2,900
Rehabilitation ²	10	23	36	25	25	119
Preservation/Conservation ³	0	71	21	0	0	92

Notes:

¹ Corresponds to RHNA.

² Corresponds to quantified objective in Programs D 1.1.1, G 2.1.1, and G 3.1.1.

³ 42 of the units to be preserved/conserved correspond to the at-risk assisted units in the city (see Program C 1.1.1 and Table 2-43 in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment) as well as the quantified objectives listed in Program B 1.1.1.



MEANS TO ACHIEVE CONSISTENCY WITH REMAINDER OF GENERAL PLAN

6

The City's 2040 General Plan was adopted in 2017, and the Housing Element has been reviewed for consistency with other General Plan Elements. The policies and programs in this Housing Element are consistent with the policy direction contained in other parts of the General Plan. The City will continue to review and revise the Housing Element, as necessary for consistency, once the comprehensive update is complete and when amendments are made to the General Plan.

Per Assembly Bill (AB) 162 (Government Code Section 65302[g][3]), upon the next revision of the Housing Element on or after January 1, 2014, the Safety Element shall be reviewed and updated as necessary to address the risk of fire for land classified as state responsibility areas, as defined in Section 4102 of the Public Resources Code, and land classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 51177. Senate Bill (SB) 379 (Government Code Section 65302[g][4]) requires that the Safety Element be reviewed and updated as necessary to address climate change adaptation and applicable resiliency strategies. SB 1035 (Government Code Section 65302[g][6]) requires that the Safety Element be reviewed and updated as needed upon each revision of the Housing Element or local hazard mitigation plan, but not less than once every eight years. SB 99 (Government Code Section 65302[g][5]) requires that on or after January 1, 2020, the Safety Element includes information to identify residential developments in hazard areas that do not have at least two evacuation routes.

As of August 2023, the City is currently working to review and update the existing Safety Element and making edits to address Environmental Justice, incorporating all State law changes, including applicable laws and any additional requirements and General Plan guidelines from the State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR).



6. MEANS TO ACHIEVE CONSISTENCY WITH REMAINDER OF GENERAL PLAN

This page intentionally left blank.



APPENDIX 1 – REGIONAL PUBLIC OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 1-1
Project Website 1-1
Stakeholder Consultations 1-1
Housing Element Introduction Workshops..... 1-3
Housing Needs Assessment Workshops..... 1-7
Fair Housing Workshops 1-7
Housing Survey..... 1-11

This page intentionally left blank.

INTRODUCTION

The Solano County Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Housing Element Collaborative completed public outreach at the local and regional levels as part of the regional Solano County Collaborative effort to encourage community involvement and comply with the requirements of state law. These efforts included:

- Project Website
- Stakeholder Consultations
- Housing Element Introduction Workshops
- Housing Needs Assessment Workshops
- Fair Housing Workshops
- Developer Workshops
- Community Survey

PROJECT WEBSITE

The Solano County Housing Element Collaborative project website, www.Solhousingelements.com, is a clearinghouse for all information related to the project, with information in English, Spanish and Tagalog. Community members can visit the site to access all public materials; learn about the latest project updates and opportunities to get involved; sign up for email updates; and submit comments directly. The website also includes recordings of all past meetings.

The project website also includes direct links to each of the Solano County Collaborative jurisdictions' websites to promote each city's and the county's specific outreach, share updates, and highlight upcoming opportunities for involvement, including individual Housing Element meetings. The project web page launched in March 2022 and is regularly updated to reflect ongoing community input opportunities and advertise draft work products.

STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

To ensure that each jurisdiction solicits feedback from all segments of the community, consultations were conducted with service providers and other stakeholders who represent different socioeconomic groups.

From December 2021 through April 2022, staff consulted with 10 stakeholders from 8 organizations that provide services in the Solano County region to obtain input on housing needs and programs. All stakeholders provided feedback via one-on-one interviews or with email responses. Representatives from the following organizations were interviewed:

- North Bay Housing Coalition, December 9, 2021
- Community Action Partnership Solano, Joint Powers Authority (JPA), December 14, 2021

- Legal Services of Northern California, December 22, 2021
- Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California, January 6, 2022
- Solano-Napa Habitat for Humanity, January 28, 2022
- Agency on Aging, January 24, 2022
- Urban Habitat, February 16, 2022
- North Bay Regional Center (NBRC) in April 2022

In each consultation, the stakeholders were asked all or some of the following questions, depending on the type of organization interviewed:

- **Opportunities and Concerns:** What 3 top opportunities do you see for the future of housing in this jurisdiction? What are your 3 top concerns for the future of housing in this jurisdiction?
- **Housing Preferences:** What types of housing do your clients prefer? Is there adequate rental housing in this jurisdiction? Are there opportunities for home ownership? Are there accessible rental units for seniors and persons with disabilities?
- **Housing Barriers/Needs:** What are the biggest barriers to finding affordable, decent housing? What are the unmet housing needs in this jurisdiction?
- **Housing Conditions:** How would you characterize the physical condition of housing in this jurisdiction? What opportunities do you see to improve housing in the future?
- **Equity and Fair Housing:** What factors limit or deny civil rights, fair housing choice, or equitable access to opportunity? What actions can be taken to transform racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity (without displacement)? What actions can be taken to make living patterns more integrated and balanced?
- How has COVID affected the housing situation?

Based on conversations with the Community Action Partnership Solano JPA, there is a need for more permanent supportive housing programs with wrap-around services to support unhoused individuals, populations with mental illness, and the growing number of low-income families. Stakeholders suggested that the Cities and the County leverage the existing momentum in the stakeholder organizations to create a permanent supportive housing program, where the jurisdictions can pool their resources together and equally distribute projects. One stakeholder disclosed that they have funding for assisting jurisdictions with needed affordable housing but finding adequate sites is the barrier. Stakeholders also identified that there are substantial racial disparities in housing among communities of color, recommending that jurisdictions do more through code enforcement, primarily ensuring there is water and heating in low-income housing units, or passing ordinances that protect tenants from living in substandard housing.

Based on a conversation with Fair Housing service providers, there is a need for fair housing education among landlords and tenants, specifically on the topics of enforcement of fair housing laws and rental discrimination practices. Stakeholders encouraged the jurisdictions to contract with fair housing



providers to offer services such as housing resources and tenant protections to vulnerable populations such as seniors, low-income seniors, and disabled residents. Stakeholders also identified that single-family housing stock in need of rehabilitation should be acquired, repaired and rented to supplement the affordable housing shortage.

A demand that was stressed among all stakeholders was the need for more affordable housing and homeownership opportunities. Strategies for achieving this include community land trusts and mixed-use housing. Stakeholders voiced that seniors have experienced isolation as result of the COVID-19 pandemic and are in need of socialization. Housing that supports wrap-around services and is located near transit routes was identified as a strategy. Stakeholders also identified the cost of land as a barrier to developing affordable housing.


Representatives from the North Bay Regional Center and North Bay Housing Coalition expressed that residents with intellectual disabilities typically require supportive services (case management, grocery delivery, and/or other services) to be successful and may even require that a caretaker live with them. As a result, there is a need for more one- to two-bedroom affordable housing units. The lack of affordable housing in the region makes it hard to find affordable one- and two-bedroom units.

HOUSING ELEMENT INTRODUCTION WORKSHOPS


The Solano County Housing Element Collaborative made diligent efforts to encourage public and stakeholder participation in the Housing Element update process at the regional and local scale. The first two workshops introduced the Housing Element requirements and process and were held during the lunch hour on Wednesday, January 26, 2022, and the evening of Thursday, January 27, 2022. There were 13 participants in attendance at the January 26 meeting, and 9 participants in attendance at the January 27 meeting. The Housing Element Introduction workshops were advertised with flyers in English, Spanish, and Tagalog. The workshops were conducted virtually to ensure accessibility for residents throughout the county and in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The focus of these meetings was to provide high level demographic information and an overview of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and to solicit input from stakeholders and the public regarding housing needs and opportunities. Polling was conducted as part of each workshop. The combined results are summarized in the following charts.




3. What is the most important consideration for location?




4. How do you feel about replacing underperforming/obsolete businesses (e.g., big box retail stores) with residential uses and/or community serving uses in retail or office centers?




5. What type of housing do you live in?




6. Do you own or rent your home?



7. What do you consider the biggest issue related to housing?



8. What type of housing is needed?





HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS


The Solano County Housing Element Collaborative held two virtual workshops to present the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment section of the Housing Element. The two workshops were advertised with flyers in English and Spanish. The workshops were conducted virtually to ensure accessibility for residents throughout the county and in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The meetings were held on Wednesday, March 30, during the lunch hour and in the evening. Nineteen participants attended the lunch workshop, and eight participants attended the evening meeting. Spanish translation was offered at both meetings. The presentation included statistics and initial findings from the Housing Needs Assessment for individual jurisdictions as well as for Solano County as a whole. Participants identified teachers as a group with housing needs and were interested in identifying strategies for supporting Community Land Trusts, and for helping seniors to age in place. Participants were also interested in learning more about the consequences jurisdictions face if they do not meet their RHNA, and the methodologies used for identifying overcrowded units.

FAIR HOUSING WORKSHOPS


On June 1, 2022, the Solano County Housing Element Collaborative held two virtual Fair Housing Workshops to present an overview of the requirements of the new Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Requirement (AB 686) in the Housing Element, and to gather feedback from participants on their experiences with fair housing barriers they may have encountered. One workshop was held over the lunch hour, and one was held in the evening to offer two opportunities for participation. Across both workshops, 86 percent were attendees from the Solano County region. The remaining 14 percent noted that they did not live in Solano County but had some other interest in the Housing Element process. Polling was conducted to gather feedback and input on fair housing concerns in the county. The results are summarized in the following charts.




3. Can you easily change your housing situation if needed? (i.e., there are other units available that fit your need based on prize, price, etc.)





4. Have you been able to find housing in a neighborhood or community of your choice?



5. How would you rate the condition of your home?





HOUSING SURVEY

In March 2022, the Solano County Housing Element Collaborative launched a housing survey to gather information on housing needs and concerns in the county. The survey was available on the Solano County Housing Element Collaborative website from March 17, 2022, to June 16, 2022. A countywide email blast was sent three separate times reminding residents of the survey. In addition, each City and the County announced the survey on their individual websites and through their individual distribution lists. The survey was available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog.

The housing survey yielded 156 survey responses, 1 of which was completed in Spanish (only 1 percent of the responses were in Spanish, even though 16.4 percent of residents countywide speak only Spanish). Among respondents, approximately 65 percent lived in the City of Benicia; 9 percent in the City of Suisun City; and the remaining 18 percent resided in the cities of Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Vacaville, and Vallejo and the unincorporated county. About 44 percent of respondents worked in Solano County and 55 percent worked outside of the county. Approximately 29 percent of respondents have lived in their homes for more than 20 years, and 78 percent lived in a single-family home. About half of respondents (52 percent) said their homes were not in need of repairs, and 35 percent answered that their homes needed minor repairs (peeling paint, chipped stucco, etc.). The majority of participants (56 percent) would like to see more small and affordable single-family homes built; 46 percent of respondents said they would like to see more senior housing; and 35 percent would like to see accessory dwelling units.

Participants were asked to select the top three greatest barriers to the availability of adequate housing. The following were the top barriers identified:

- 64 percent cited issues related to high prices in rents
- 35 percent cited sales price
- 21 percent cited lack of adequate infrastructure such as water, sewer, electricity, and internet
- 55 percent of respondents cited roadway improvements
- 44 percent of respondents cited enhancing livability of neighborhoods

Additionally, participants were asked to prioritize population groups based on who needs more housing and support services in Solano County. The responses were ranked as follows:


- 37 percent selected seniors
- 32 percent cited homeless individuals
- 20 percent selected persons with disabilities




These additional comments were received:

- Cities should explore community land trusts to provide more homeownership opportunities.
- More green spaces, parks and such are needed, to provide the neighborhood with much-needed mental-health benefits of nature. Equity, fair housing, complete neighborhoods, improving connectivity between housing and jobs and services are priorities.


- The diversification of housing being built is important, such as by including duplexes or medium density housing. Improving connectivity between housing and jobs and services are priorities.
- Preservation of green and open space is important.
- There are needs for affordable rentals for young adults and/or students.
- Evacuation needs, building equity for disadvantaged communities and promoting environmental justice are priorities.

The following charts summarize the 156 responses to the housing survey.







5. Do you work in Solano County?




6. What type of housing do you currently live in?




7. How would you rate the physical condition of your home?




8. What type of housing would you like to see built in your community?




9. What do you think are the greatest barriers to building additional housing in your community?




10. What are your greatest barriers to obtaining housing in your community?




11. Have you experienced a change in your housing/economic situation due to the COVID-19 pandemic?



12. Prioritize the following population groups based on who needs more housing and support services in Solano County.



13. How important is each of the following concerns to you or to the people you represent in your organization?



This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX 2 – REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix 2 – Regional Housing Needs Assessment	2-i
Introduction.....	2-1
Regional Effort.....	2-1
Data Sources	2-1
Population Characteristics	2-2
Population Trends.....	2-2
Age Characteristics.....	2-3
Race and Ethnicity.....	2-4
Household Characteristics	2-6
Household Types and Size	2-7
Overcrowding.....	2-12
Income Definitions and Income Limits	2-17
Overpayment.....	2-20
Employment Characteristics	2-31
Employment by Industry.....	2-31
Unemployment.....	2-36
Labor Force Trends.....	2-37
Housing Stock Characteristics	2-39
Housing Type	2-39
Housing Tenure.....	2-40
Vacancy Rate.....	2-42

Housing Conditions.....	2-44
Local Knowledge on Housing Conditions.....	2-46
Housing Production	2-46
Housing Cost and Affordability.....	2-48
Special-Needs Populations.....	2-54
Seniors	2-54
Persons with Disabilities	2-59
Persons with Developmental Disabilities	2-61
Large Households	2-65
Single-Parent Households.....	2-69
Farmworkers	2-73
Extremely Low-Income Households	2-78
Homeless	2-80
Analysis of At-Risk Housing.....	2-83
Programs to Address Identified Needs	2-95

Tables

TABLE 2-1	Population Growth Trends, 2000-2021	2-2
TABLE 2-2	Population By Age, 2019.....	2-3
TABLE 2-3	Household Type, 2019	2-7
TABLE 2-4	Households by Children Present, 2019.....	2-9
TABLE 2-5	Householder by Race, 2019	2-10
TABLE 2-6	Households by Size, 2019	2-11
TABLE 2-7	Overcrowding By Tenure, 2015-2019.....	2-13
TABLE 2-8	Overcrowding By RACE, 2019.....	2-16
TABLE 2-9	Maximum Household Income by Household Size, Solano County, 2021	2-17
TABLE 2-10	Households By Household Income, 2017.....	2-19
TABLE 2-11	Overpaying By Tenure, 2015-2019.....	2-21
TABLE 2-12	Lower-Income Households Overpaying: Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield	2-25

TABLE 2-13	Lower-Income Households Overpaying: Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville.....	2-27
TABLE 2-14	Lower-Income Households Overpaying: Vallejo, Solano County.....	2-29
TABLE 2-15	Resident Employment by industry, 2015-2019.....	2-35
TABLE 2-16	Solano County Job Growth by Industry Sector (2018)	2-37
TABLE 2-17	Housing Type, 2021.....	2-39
TABLE 2-18	Housing Tenure, 2019	2-41
TABLE 2-19	Vacancy RATE by Occupancy Status, 2021	2-42
TABLE 2-20	Vacant Units by Type, 2015-2019.....	2-43
TABLE 2-21	Housing Units by Year Structure Was Built.....	2-45
TABLE 2-22	Percentage of Housing Needing Rehabilitation.....	2-46
TABLE 2-23	Housing Permitting 2015-2020	2-47
TABLE 2-24	Home Values of Owner-Occupied Units, 2015-2019	2-48
TABLE 2-25	Median Sales Price, 2021	2-49
TABLE 2-26	Contract Rents for renter-Occupied units, 2015-2019	2-51
TABLE 2-27	Rental Rates, 2021	2-52
TABLE 2-28	Housing Affordability by Income Level.....	2-53
TABLE 2-29	Senior Households by Income and Tenure.....	2-55
TABLE 2-30	Senior Households by Income Level Overpaying For Housing.....	2-57
TABLE 2-31	Population by Disability Status, 2015-2019.....	2-60
TABLE 2-32	Disability by Type, 2015-2019.....	2-61
TABLE 2-33	Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence	2-64
TABLE 2-34	Household Size by Income Level, 2013-2017.....	2-66
TABLE 2-35	Housing Units by Number of Bedroom, 2015-2019	2-68
TABLE 2-36	Single-Parent Households, 2015-2019	2-70
TABLE 2-37	Migrant Worker Student Population.....	2-75
TABLE 2-38	Resources for Farmworkers.....	2-77
TABLE 2-39	Extremely Low Income Household Characteristics	2-79
TABLE 2-40	Characteristics for the Population Experiencing Homelessness.....	2-81
TABLE 2-41	Persons Experiencing Homelessness by Jurisdiction	2-82
TABLE 2-42	Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness	2-83
TABLE 2-43	Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion.....	2-84
TABLE 2-44	Programs to Address Identified Needs.....	2-95

Figures

FIGURE 2-1	Population By Ethnicity, 2015-2019.....	2-5
FIGURE 2-2	Overcrowding Severity, 2019	2-15
FIGURE 2-3	Median Household Incomes in Solano County.....	2-18
FIGURE 2-4	Employment by Industry	2-32
FIGURE 2-5	Unemployment Rate (2021).....	2-36
FIGURE 2-6	Population with Developmental Disabilities by Age	2-63
FIGURE 2-7	Single-Parent Households.....	2-71
FIGURE 2-8	Female-Headed Household by Poverty Status, 2015-2019.....	2-72

INTRODUCTION

The Housing Needs Assessment is the section of the Housing Element that presents the characteristics of the jurisdiction’s population and housing stock as a means of better understanding the nature and extent of unmet housing needs. The Housing Needs Assessment consists of the following components: (1) Population Characteristics, (2) Household Characteristics, (3) Employment Characteristics, (4) Housing Stock Characteristics, and (5) Special Needs Populations.

REGIONAL EFFORT

As a part of the 2023–2031 Housing Element update, the Cities of Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville, Vallejo, and Unincorporated Solano County participated in a collaborative effort to complete a regional housing needs assessment. The following document represents data for the Solano County Housing Element Collaborative.

DATA SOURCES

The main source of the information for the Housing Needs Assessment was the pre-approved data package for Solano County provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), which is noted in the sources for the data tables in this assessment. The pre-approved data package uses several data sources, including the 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) and the California Department of Finance (DOF). Other sources of information in this section include the following: the California Employment Development Department (EDD), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and local and regional economic data (e.g., home sales prices, rents, wages). It is important to note that the ACS data is a multi-year estimate based on sample data and has a large margin of error, especially for smaller cities. It should be noted that when comparing specific information, the timeframe for the ACS (2015- 2019) data and the timeframe for the CHAS data (2015-2017) data slightly differ and therefore the total will slightly vary.

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

POPULATION TRENDS

The DOF provides population estimates for each jurisdiction, shown in **Table 2-1**. Analyzing population change can help assess where there may be a need for new housing and services. As of 2021, more than half the total countywide population were residing in the three most populated jurisdictions (Fairfield, Vallejo, and Vacaville). Rio Vista had the smallest population and Suisun City, Benicia, Dixon and unincorporated County were in the middle. The countywide average annual growth was 0.7 percent between 2000 and 2021. The city with the greatest average annual population changes from 2000 to 2021 was also the smallest city, Rio Vista, with a 5.6-percent increase. Fairfield and Dixon were second and third, with 1.2 and 0.9 percent average annual growth, respectively.

TABLE 2-1 POPULATION GROWTH TRENDS, 2000-2021

Geography	Total Population				2000 - 2021	
	2000	2010	2020	2021	Total Change	Average Annual Growth
Benicia	26,865	26,997	27,175	26,995	0.48%	0.0%
Dixon	16,103	18,351	19,972	19,094	18.57%	0.9%
Fairfield	96,178	105,321	116,981	120,421	25.21%	1.2%
Rio Vista	4,571	7,360	9,987	9,961	117.92%	5.6%
Suisun City	26,118	28,111	29,119	29,266	12.05%	0.6%
Vacaville	88,642	92,428	98,855	101,286	14.26%	0.7%
Vallejo	117,148	115,942	119,063	124,410	6.20%	0.3%
Unincorporated Solano County	19,305	18,834	19,072	18,531	-4.01%	-0.2%
Solano County	394,930	413,344	440,224	449,964	13.94%	0.7%
Bay Area	6,784,348	7,150,739	7,790,537	7,214,162	6.3%	0.3%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- California Department of Finance, E-5 series

AGE CHARACTERISTICS

Although population growth strongly affects total demand for new housing, housing needs are also influenced by age characteristics. Typically, different age groups have distinct lifestyles, family characteristics, and incomes. As people move through each stage of life, their housing needs and preferences also change. Therefore, age characteristics are important in planning for the changing housing needs of residents. **Table 2-2** shows a breakdown of each jurisdiction’s population by age group and median age.

Typical age groups include young children (ages 0-4), school-age children (ages 5-14), high school and college-age students (ages 15-24), young adults (ages 25-34), middle-aged adults (ages 45-54), older adults (55-64), and seniors (ages 65+). A population with a large percentage of seniors may require unique housing near health care, transit, and other services. College students may need more affordable homes. Young adults and middle-aged adults, which make up the workforce, may need homes near employment or transit centers. Dixon and Fairfield have a large proportion of school-age populations and a lower percentage of the workforce populations and seniors. Suisun City, Vacaville, and Vallejo have a large percentage of college-age populations. While Rio Vista has a significantly higher percentage of seniors (median age of 64), Suisun City and Dixon had the lowest median age at about 34, followed by Benicia at 46.

TABLE 2-2 POPULATION BY AGE, 2019

Geography	Age 0-4	Age 5-14	Age 15-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-54	Age 55-64	Age 65-74	Age 75-84	Age 85+	Median Age
Benicia	4.5%	11.5%	9.8%	9.3%	13.3%	14.5%	17.4%	12.5%	5.1%	2.2%	46.1
Dixon	4.8%	17.3%	15.5%	13.9%	13.0%	12.0%	10.4%	6.7%	4.8%	1.4%	34.0
Fairfield	7.3%	13.9%	13.1%	15.9%	12.9%	12.7%	11.9%	7.2%	3.3%	1.7%	35.3
Rio Vista	1.2%	3.9%	7.2%	4.3%	3.5%	9.8%	21.2%	29.0%	14.4%	5.5%	64.4
Suisun City	6.5%	13.2%	14.7%	16.6%	12.6%	12.3%	12.5%	7.1%	2.8%	1.8%	34.4
Vacaville	5.8%	13.3%	12.3%	15.4%	12.9%	13.5%	12.9%	8.5%	3.7%	1.8%	37.6
Vallejo	6.2%	11.1%	13.0%	15.0%	12.4%	12.5%	14.1%	10.0%	4.1%	1.7%	39.7
Unincorporated Solano County	5.0%	9.0%	10.6%	10.5%	11.2%	14.7%	17.4%	13.4%	5.9%	2.2%	—


Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

RACE AND ETHNICITY

Figure 2-1 shows race and ethnicity of residents in Solano County jurisdictions. Racial and ethnic distribution is important because often these characteristics are tied to income, language barriers, and family size. For example, a particular culture may choose to live in a household with multiple generations (grandchildren, parents, grandparents), requiring larger housing units. As shown in **Figure 2-1**, the majority of the population in most jurisdictions – except for the City Suisun City and Vallejo – is White, (non- Hispanic). Countywide, more than half of the population identified as being White non-Hispanic or Latino origin, followed by Hispanic and Asian. The populations of Benicia, Rio Vista, and Unincorporated Solano County were all more than 50 percent White. Vallejo has the lowest percentage of White at 24 percent. The second-largest population group countywide is Hispanic or Latinx, with a high of 42 percent in Dixon, 30 percent in Unincorporated Solano County, and 29 percent in Fairfield. The third-largest population group countywide is Black or African American, with a high of 20 percent in Suisun City and Vallejo. The fourth-largest population group countywide is Asian with a high of 24percent in Vallejo and 20 percent in Suisun City. In comparison, the Bay Area is predominately White, with the remaining population divided between Asian and Hispanic cultures. Overall, Vallejo, Suisun City, and Fairfield were the most racially and ethnically diverse.

As shown in Figure 2-1 the City of Vallejo has a 26.3 percent Hispanic population and 24.1Asian/API population in the city. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, there are a total of 42,048 households in the city, of which 1,378 are Spanish speaking households and 1,160 Asian and Pacific Island language speaking households. When looking at the household language, 2,696 households (6 percent) had limited English speaking, and 39,352 households (94 percent) were not a limited speaking household.

FIGURE 2-1 POPULATION BY RACE AND ETHNICITY, 2015-2019



Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

The US Census defines a household as consisting of all the people who occupy a housing unit. A household includes the related family members and all the unrelated people, if any, such as lodgers, foster children, wards, or employees who share the housing unit. A person living alone in a housing unit, or a group of unrelated people sharing a housing unit, such as partners or roomers, is also counted as a household. Data on households does not include people living in group homes. The US Census defines group quarters as places where people live or stay in a group living arrangement that is owned or managed by an organization providing housing and/or services for the residents. Group quarters include such places as college residence halls, residential treatment centers, skilled nursing facilities, group homes, military barracks, prisons, and worker dormitories.

The US Census defines a family as a group of two or more people (one of whom is the householder) related by birth, marriage, or adoption and residing together. However, to facilitate fair housing, and remove constraints (for example for housing for people with disabilities) under State Housing Element law, local jurisdictions are required to define “family” in a manner that does not distinguish between related and unrelated persons and does not impose limitations on the number of people that may constitute a family.

The US Census defines a family household as a household maintained by a householder who is in a family (as defined above) and includes any unrelated people (unrelated subfamily members and/or secondary individuals) who may be residing there. In US Census data, the number of family households is equal to the number of families. However, the count of family household members differs from the count of family members in that the family household members include all people living in the household, whereas family members include only the householder and his/her relatives. In US Census data, a nonfamily household consists of a householder living alone (a one-person household) or where the householder shares the home exclusively with people to whom he/she is not related.

Families often prefer single-family homes to accommodate children, while single persons often occupy smaller apartments or condominiums. Single-person households often include seniors living alone or young adults.

HOUSEHOLD TYPES AND SIZE

The tables on the following pages describe household types, including households with children under 18 and the race of the householder.

Table 2-3 displays household composition as reported by the 2015-2019 ACS. On average, countywide, approximately half of all households are married-couple family households. Of all jurisdictions in Solano County, Dixon (58.3 percent) and Unincorporated Solano County (59.5 percent) had the highest proportion of married-couple households, while Rio Vista (49.8 percent) and Vallejo (43.1 percent) had the smallest proportions of married-couple households. With an average of 22.2 percent of all households countywide, single-person households are the second most common household type with the largest proportions of single-person households in Rio Vista (35.0 percent), Benicia (25.2 percent) and Vallejo (25.1 percent) and the smallest proportions of single-person households in Dixon (14.8 percent) and Fairfield (18.4 percent).

Single-parent households (which are predominantly female-headed) are one-parent households with children under the age of 18 living at home. For these households, living expenses generally require a larger proportion of income relative to two-parent households. Therefore, finding affordable, decent, and safe housing is often more difficult for single-parent households. Additionally, single-parent households have special needs involving access to daycare or childcare, healthcare, and other supportive services. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, Dixon, Suisun City, and Vallejo had more than 15 percent female-headed households. Male-headed households represented 4.7 to 7.7 percent of households, countywide.

TABLE 2-3 HOUSEHOLD TYPE, 2019

Geography	Female-Headed Family Households	Male-Headed Family Households	Married-Couple Family Households	Other Nonfamily Households	Single-person Households	Total Households
Benicia	1,155	532	6,208	555	2,843	11,293
	10.2%	4.7%	55.0%	4.9%	25.2%	100.0%
Dixon	1,017	321	3,536	291	897	6,062
	16.8%	5.3%	58.3%	4.8%	14.8%	100.0%

Geography	Female-Headed Family Households	Male-Headed Family Households	Married-Couple Family Households	Other Nonfamily Households	Single-person Households	Total Households
Fairfield	5,353	2,720	19,949	1,977	6,752	36,751
	14.6%	7.4%	54.3%	5.4%	18.4%	100.0%
Rio Vista	273	39	2,388	417	1,675	4,792
	5.7%	0.8%	49.8%	8.7%	35.0%	100.0%
Suisun City	1,497	714	4,847	412	1,840	9,310
	16.1%	7.7%	52.1%	4.4%	19.8%	100.0%
Vacaville	4,240	1,646	17,539	1,977	7,296	32,698
	13.0%	5.0%	53.6%	6.0%	22.3%	100.0%
Vallejo	7,224	3,129	18,104	3,027	10,564	42,048
	17.2%	7.4%	43.1%	7.2%	25.1%	100.0%
Unincorporated Solano County	546	385	4,115	529	1,336	6,911
	7.9%	5.6%	59.5%	7.7%	19.3%	100.0%
Solano County	21,305	9,486	76,686	9,185	33,203	149,865
	14.2%	6.3%	51.2%	6.1%	22.2%	100.0%
Bay Area	283,770	131,105	1,399,714	242,258	674,587	2,731,434
	10.4%	4.8%	51.2%	8.9%	24.7%	100.0%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Table 2-4 provides data for the number of households with children. Proportionally, Fairfield and Dixon had the highest number of households with one or more children present. Conversely, Benicia, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville, Vallejo, and Unincorporated Solano County had the highest proportion of non-child households.

TABLE 2-4 HOUSEHOLDS BY CHILDREN PRESENT, 2019

Geography	Households with 1 or More Children Under 18	Households with no Children
Benicia	3,390	7,903
	30.0%	70.0%
Dixon	2,501	3,561
	41.3%	58.74%
Fairfield	14,955	21,796
	40.7%	59.3%
Rio Vista	411	4,381
	8.6%	91.4%
Suisun City	3,651	5,659
	39.2%	60.8%
Vacaville	11,639	21,059
	35.6%	64.4%
Vallejo	13,938	28,110
	33.1%	66.9%
Unincorporated Solano County	1,772	5,139
	25.6%	74.4%
Solano County	52,257	97,608
	34.9%	65.1%
Bay Area	873,704	1,857,730
	32.0%	68.0%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Table 2-5 represents the householder by race. Note that each race category also includes Hispanic or Latinx ethnicity. As shown in the table, White race represents the highest number of householders across all jurisdictions, followed by Asian in Vallejo and Suisun City, and Black or African American in Vallejo, Suisun City, and Fairfield. The highest percentages of Hispanic or Latinx households exist in Dixon, Fairfield, Suisun City, and Vallejo.

TABLE 2-5 HOUSEHOLDER BY RACE, 2019

Geography	White	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/API	Black or African American	Other Race or Multiple Races	Hispanic or Latinx	Total
Benicia	17,256	25	993	439	899	1,035	20,647
	83.6%	0.1%	4.8%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	100.0%
Dixon	8,220	46	314	87	978	1,903	11,548
	71.2%	0.4%	2.7%	0.8%	8.5%	16.5%	100.0%
Fairfield	34,878	148	5832	6,153	4,508	8,575	60,094
	58.0%	0.2%	9.7%	10.2%	7.5%	14.3%	100.0%
Rio Vista	7484	20	343	462	122	255	8,686
	86.2%	0.2%	3.9%	5.3%	1.4%	2.9%	100.0%
Suisun City	7,326	60	1,842	2,021	1045	2,037	14,331
	51.1%	0.4%	12.9%	14.1%	7.3%	14.2%	100.0%
Vacaville	43,766	238	2,382	2,560	3,521	6,388	58,855
	74.4%	0.4%	4.0%	4.3%	6.0%	10.9%	100.0%
Vallejo	31,234	185	9,102	9,759	5,417	8,123	63,820
	48.9%	0.3%	14.3%	15.3%	8.5%	12.7%	100.0%
Unincorporated Solano	9,761	44	325	409	4,508	1,483	16,530
	59.1%	0.3%	2.0%	2.5%	27.3%	9.0%	100.0%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Note: Each race category also includes Hispanic or Latinx ethnicity.

Household size helps determine the size of housing units needed within a jurisdiction. According to **Table 2-6**, for Benicia, Rio Vista, Vacaville, Vallejo, and Unincorporated Solano County, “large” households (containing five or more persons) represented approximately 6.7 to 12.8 percent of all households in 2019. In Dixon, Fairfield, and Suisun City, large households represented between 16 and 23 percent of all households in 2019. In 2019, in Solano County as a whole (cities and unincorporated areas), over half of all households were comprised of one or two people, about a third of all households were comprised of three or four people and 13.1 percent of all households were large households, with five or more people. The majority of households in the Bay Area are made up of two- to four-person households. The total proportion of two- to four-person households in Solano County is similar to that of the Bay Area, even though there is a range of household compositions within individual cities within Solano County. **Table 2-6** provides data on the number of persons per household.

TABLE 2-6 HOUSEHOLDS BY SIZE, 2019

Geography	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-4-Person Household	5-or more Person Household	Total Households
Benicia	2,843	4,274	3,425	751	11,293
	25.2%	37.8%	30.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Dixon	897	1,768	2,001	1,396	6,062
	14.8%	29.2%	33.0%	23.0%	100.0%
Fairfield	6,752	10,927	13,202	5,870	36,751
	18.4%	29.7%	35.9%	16.0%	100.0%
Rio Vista	1,675	2,541	530	46	4,792
	35.0%	53.0%	11.1%	1.0%	100.0%
Suisun City	1,840	2,249	3,722	1,499	9,310
	19.8%	24.2%	40.0%	16.1%	100.0%
Vacaville	7,296	10,500	10,973	3,929	32,698
	22.3%	32.1%	33.6%	12.0%	100.0%
Vallejo	10,564	13,112	12,982	5,390	42,048
	25.1%	31.2%	30.9%	12.8%	100.0%

Geography	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-4-Person Household	5-or more Person Household	Total Households
Unincorporated Solano County	1,336	2,919	1,852	804	6,911
	19.3%	42.2%	26.8%	11.6%	100.0%
Solano County	33,203	48,290	48,687	19,685	149,865
	22.2%	32.2%	32.5%	13.1%	100.0%
Bay Area	674,587	871,002	891,588	294,257	2,731,434
	24.7%	31.9%	32.6%	10.8%	100.0%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

OVERCROWDING

Overcrowding is often closely related to household income and the cost of housing. The U.S. Census Bureau considers a household overcrowded when there is more than one person per room, excluding bathrooms, hallways and kitchens, and to be severely overcrowded when there are more than 1.5 occupants per room. A typical home might have a total of five rooms (three bedrooms, living room, and dining room). If more than five people were living in the home, it would be considered overcrowded. Overcrowding is strongly related to household size, particularly for large households, and the availability of suitably sized housing, although in households with small children, sharing a bedroom is common. Overcrowding in households typically results from either a lack of affordable housing (which forces more than one household to live together) and/or a lack of available housing units of adequate size. Overcrowding increases health and safety concerns and stresses the condition of the housing stock and infrastructure. Overcrowding impacts both owners and renters; however, renters are generally more significantly impacted.

According to the 2015-2019 ACS data, and as shown in **Table 2-7** and **Figure 2-2**, countywide, several cities reported overcrowded conditions that exceeded the county average. Dixon had a significant incidence of overcrowded households (5.7 percent) and a moderate percentage of severely overcrowded households (1.9 percent). Countywide, 6.5 percent of renter-occupied households were overcrowded, in comparison to 1.9 percent of owner-occupied households. Cities with higher proportions of owner overcrowding were Dixon and Vallejo. Countywide, renter overcrowding is close to triple that of owner-occupied households. As shown in **Table 2-7**, Dixon, and Fairfield had the highest incidence of renter overcrowding.

Identifying racial groups experiencing overcrowding can indicate housing needs. As shown in **Table 2-8**, of all the cities in Solano County, Dixon, Fairfield, and Vallejo are the most diverse. On average, countywide of all racial groups in Solano County, Other Race or Multiple Races groups reported 10.9 percent of overcrowding conditions and 6 percent of Hispanic/Latinx households reported overcrowding conditions. Of all the cities in Solano County, the most diverse cities had the highest percentages of overcrowding for Black/African American, Other Race or Multiple Races, Hispanic/Latinx groups with the exception of Unincorporated Solano County. According to **Table 2-8**, of the total racial groups reporting overcrowding, the groups experiencing the most overcrowding were Other Race or Multiple Races (10.4 percent) and Hispanic/Latinx (17.0 percent).


TABLE 2-7 OVERCROWDING BY TENURE, 2015-2019

Geography	Owner Occupied Households		Renter Occupied Households		Total Households	
	Overcrowded	Severely Overcrowded	Overcrowded	Severely Overcrowded	Overcrowded	Severely Overcrowded
Benicia	20	58	88	89	108	147
	0.2%	0.7%	2.8%	2.8%	1.0%	1.3%
Dixon	90	14	254	99	344	113
	2.1%	0.3%	13.9%	5.4%	5.7%	1.9%
Fairfield	402	123	1,320	480	1722	603
	1.8%	0.6%	8.8%	3.2%	4.7%	1.6%
Rio Vista	0	0	27	0	27	0
	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0	0.6%	0.0%
Suisun City	116	80	200	39	316	119
	2.0%	1.4%	5.7%	1.1%	3.4%	1.3%
Vacaville	378	51	349	285	727	336
	1.9%	0.3%	2.8%	2.3%	2.2%	1.0%
Vallejo	710	214	1,213	793	1,923	1,007

Geography	Owner Occupied Households		Renter Occupied Households		Total Households	
	Overcrowded	Severely Overcrowded	Overcrowded	Severely Overcrowded	Overcrowded	Severely Overcrowded
	3.0%	0.9%	6.5%	4.2%	4.6%	2.4%
Unincorporated Solano County	--	--	--	--	--	--
	--	--	--	--	--	--
Solano County	1,791	624	3,747	1806	5,538	2,430
	1.9%	0.7%	6.5%	3.1%	3.7%	1.6%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 – American Community Survey (ACS), 2015-2019

FIGURE 2-2 OVERCROWDING SEVERITY, 2019



Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- American Community Survey (ACS), 2015-2019

TABLE 2-8 OVERCROWDING BY RACE, 2019

Geography	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian / API	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Other Race or Multiple Races	White	White, Non-Hispanic
	More than 1.0 Occupants per Room						
Benicia	0.0%	0.8%	2.5%	6.7%	7.1%	1.9%	1.8%
Dixon	0.0%	0.0%	26.4%	16.8%	10.5%	7.1%	3.2%
Fairfield	0.0%	5.0%	1.8%	17.0%	10.4%	7.2%	2.7%
Rio Vista	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%
Suisun City	0.0%	2.9%	2.3%	11.0%	6.2%	6.2%	3.1%
Vacaville	9.7%	4.5%	1.8%	8.3%	6.2%	2.8%	1.5%
Vallejo	0.0%	8.0%	5.3%	15.6%	17.6%	4.1%	2.2%
Unincorporated Solano County	22.7%	5.8%	0.0%	24.5%	29.3%	3.5%	2.1%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Note – all categories include both Hispanic and Non-Hispanic populations unless otherwise noted.

INCOME DEFINITIONS AND INCOME LIMITS

The state and federal governments classify household income into several categories based on the relationship to the county area median income (AMI), adjusted for household size. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) estimate of AMI is used to set income limits for eligibility in federal housing programs. The income categories include:

- Extremely low-income households: Up to 30 percent AMI
- Very low-income households: 31–50 percent of AMI
- Low-income households: 51–80 percent of AMI
- Moderate-income households: 81–120 percent of AMI
- Above moderate-income households: Above 120 percent of AMI

The term “lower income” refers to all households earning 80 percent or less of AMI. It combines the categories of low-, very-low and extremely low-incomes. Income limits for all counties in California are calculated by HCD for Solano County (see **Table 2-9**). According to HCD, the AMI for a four-person household in Solano County was \$99,300 in 2021.

TABLE 2-9 MAXIMUM HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE, SOLANO COUNTY, 2021


Income Category	Persons Per Household				
	1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Low	\$20,450	\$23,350	\$26,250	\$29,150	\$31,500
Very Low	\$34,000	\$38,850	\$43,700	\$48,550	\$52,450
Low	\$54,350	\$62,100	\$69,850	\$77,600	\$83,850
Median	\$69,500	\$79,450	\$89,350	\$99,300	\$107,250
Moderate	\$83,400	\$95,300	\$107,250	\$119,150	\$128,700

Source: HCD State Income Limits for Solano County, 2021

Figure 2-3 shows the median household income for all jurisdictions in Solano County, as reported by the 2015-2019 ACS. This median income includes all households, regardless of household size. The median household income in the United States was \$62,843 in 2019, lower than the Solano County median of \$81,472. Benicia had the highest median household income in 2019 with \$103,413, well above the county median. The city with the lowest median income was Rio Vista with \$69,604, followed by Vallejo at \$69,405. Median Income for the unincorporated county was not available.

Table 2-10 describes households by income level. Vallejo has the largest proportion of households with lower incomes (43.9 percent), followed by Rio Vista (41.1 percent), Dixon (38.7 percent), Fairfield (36.1 percent), and Suisun City (36.5 percent). Countywide, an average of 36.8 percent of all households were lower-income households. Lower-income households (80 percent or less of AMI) have a greater risk of being displaced from their community, as compared with households with higher incomes. The cities with the greatest proportions of households with lower incomes were Vallejo (33.1 percent), Rio Vista (41.1 percent), and Suisun City (36.5 percent). In contrast, about 75.3 percent of households in Benicia had incomes that were over 80 percent of AMI.

FIGURE 2-3 MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES IN SOLANO COUNTY



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

TABLE 2-10 HOUSEHOLDS BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME, 2017

Geography	Extremely Low- Income 0%-30% of AMI	Very Low - Income 31%-50% of AMI	Low-Income 51%-80% of AMI	Median-Income 81%-100% of AMI	Above Median- Income >100% of AMI	Total Households
Income Level	<\$29,150	<\$48,550	<\$77,600	<\$ 99,300	>\$119,150	
Benicia	968	595	1,200	940	7,490	11,193
	8.6%	5.3%	10.7%	8.4%	66.9%	100.0%
Dixon	629	725	930	510	3,105	5,899
	10.7%	12.3%	15.8%	8.6%	52.6%	100.0%
Fairfield	3,637	3,855	5,425	3,570	19,285	35,772
	10.2%	10.8%	15.2%	10.0%	53.9%	100.0%
Rio Vista	439	535	750	290	2,185	4,199
	10.5%	12.7%	17.9%	6.9%	52.0%	100.0%
Suisun City	848	809	1,719	860	5,009	9,245
	9.2%	8.8%	18.6%	9.3%	54.2%	100.0%
Vacaville	2,994	2,840	4,914	3,224	18,455	32,427
	9.2%	8.8%	15.2%	9.9%	56.9%	100.0%
Vallejo	6,250	5,080	6,949	4,035	19,330	41,644
	15.0%	12.2%	16.7%	9.7%	46.4%	100.0%
Unincorporated Solano County	585	575	1,038	941	3,841	6,980
	8.4%	8.2%	14.9%	13.5%	55.0%	100.0%
Solano County	16,350	15,014	22,925	14,370	78,700	147,359
	11.1%	10.2%	15.6%	9.8%	53.4%	100.0%
Bay Area	396,952	294,189	350,599	245,810	1,413,483	2,701,033
	14.7%	10.9%	13.0%	9.1%	52.3%	100.0%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- CHAS, 2013-2017

Overpayment

State and federal housing law defines overpayment (or cost burdened) as a household paying 30-49 percent of gross income for housing expenses and severe overpayment (or severely cost burdened) as a household paying more than 50 percent of gross income for housing expenses. Housing overpayment and severe overpayment are especially problematic for lower-income households that have limited resources for other living expenses and is an important measure of the affordability of housing within a community. Overpayment and severe overpayment for housing is based on the total cost of shelter compared to a household's income. According to the U.S. Census, shelter cost is the monthly owner costs (mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts to purchase or similar debts on the property, taxes, and insurance) or the gross rent (contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities). Overpayment and severe overpayment are also most often interrelated with income levels; however, there are some households that choose to overpay to live in neighborhoods with good access to services and resources – particularly schools.

As reported in **Table 2-11**, Vallejo had the highest proportion of households overpaying or severely overpaying for housing between 2015 and 2019, with a total of 17,750 households (42.2 percent), followed by Suisun City (3,476 households, 37.3 percent) and Fairfield (13,389 households, 36.4 percent). Overpaying or severely overpaying for housing among homeowners was most common in Vallejo (7,287 , 31.2 percent), Suisun City (1,754 households, 30.2 percent) and Rio Vista (1,096 households, 28.2 percent). Overpaying or severely overpaying for housing among renters was most common in Vallejo (10,463 households, 55.9 percent), Fairfield (7,745 households, 51.8 percent) and Vacaville (6,485 households, 52.2 percent).

TABLE 2-11 OVERPAYING BY TENURE, 2015-2019

Geography	Overpayment Category	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Totals	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Benicia	Not Overpaying	5,809	71.7%	1,445	45.3%	7,254	64.2%
	Overpaying	1,490	18.4%	820	25.7%	2,310	20.5%
	Severely Overpaying	775	9.6%	784	24.6%	1,559	13.8%
	Not Computed	29	0.4%	141	4.4%	170	1.5%
	Total	8,103	100.0%	3,190	100.0%	11,293	100.0%
Dixon	Not Overpaying	3,065	72.3%	1,055	57.8%	4,120	68.0%
	Overpaying	884	20.9%	251	13.8%	1,135	18.7%
	Severely Overpaying	274	6.5%	441	24.2%	715	11.8%
	Not Computed	15	0.4%	77	4.2%	92	1.5%
	Total	4,238	100.0%	1,824	100%	6,062	100.0%
Fairfield	Not Overpaying	16,013	73.5%	6,629	44.3%	22,642	61.6%
	Overpaying	3,450	15.8%	4,320	28.9%	7,770	21.1%
	Severely Overpaying	2,194	10.1%	3,425	22.9%	5,619	15.3%
	Not Computed	132	0.6%	588	3.9%	720	2.0%
	Total	21,789	100.0%	14,962	100.0%	36,751	100.0%
Rio Vista	Not Overpaying	2,697	69.4%	393	43.5%	3,090	64.5%
	Overpaying	648	16.7%	123	13.6%	771	16.1%
	Severely Overpaying	448	11.5%	211	23.3%	659	13.8%
	Not Computed	95	2.4%	177	19.6%	272	5.7%
	Total	3,888	100.0%	904	100.0%	4,792	100.0%
Suisun City	Not Overpaying	4,009	69.3%	1,712	48.5%	5,721	61.5%
	Overpaying	1,154	20.0%	908	25.7%	2,062	22.1%
	Severely Overpaying	600	10.4%	814	23.1%	1,414	15.2%

Solano County Regional Housing Element Collaborative
Appendix 2 – 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Geography	Overpayment Category	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Totals	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
	Not Computed	20	0.3%	93	2.6%	113	1.2%
	Total	5,783	100.0%	3,527	100.0%	9,310	100.0%
Vacaville	Not Overpaying	14,969	73.8%	5,555	44.8%	20,524	62.8%
	Overpaying	3,411	16.8%	3,774	30.4%	7,185	22.0%
	Severely Overpaying	1,802	8.9%	2,711	21.8%	4,513	13.8%
	Not Computed	104	0.5%	372	3.0%	476	1.5%
	Total	20,286	100%	12,412	100.0%	32,698	100.0%
Vallejo	Not Overpaying	15,910	68.2%	7,568	40.5%	23,478	55.8%
	Overpaying	4,457	19.1%	4,588	24.5%	9,045	21.5%
	Severely Overpaying	2,830	12.1%	5,875	31.4%	8,705	20.7%
	Not Computed	142	0.6%	678	3.6%	820	2.0%
	Total	23,339	100.0%	18,709	100.0%	42,048	100.0%
Unincorporated Solano County	Not Overpaying	3,386	71.7%	1,201	54.9%	4,587	66.4%
	Overpaying	651	13.8%	368	16.8%	1,019	14.7%
	Severely Overpaying	633	13.4%	331	15.1%	964	13.9%
	Not Computed	53	1.1%	288	13.2%	341	4.9%
	Total	4,723	100.0%	2,188	100.0%	6,911	100.0%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Lower-Income Households Overpaying

One of the indicators of housing need when analyzing the relationship between income and costs associated with available housing resources is overpayment. Generally, households that pay more than 30 percent of their income on housing cost are considered to be overpaying for housing or cost burdened, while households that pay 50 percent or more are considered to be severely overpaying or severely cost burdened.

Tables 2-12, 2-13, and 2-14 show that countywide, 35.6 percent of the total households spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs with the majority falling into the lower income category, at 24.3 percent of total households. Approximately 15 percent of the County's households are both lower income and severely cost burdened. Extremely low-income households constitute 10 percent of the County's households, of which, more than half overpay for housing, and almost all are severely cost burdened, at 7.9 percent and 7.1 percent of total households respectively. A distinction must be made, however, that not all lower-income households, even extremely low-income households, are cost burdened.

A comparison of renters and homeowners experiencing overpayment puts risk of displacement into better perspective and assists in the establishment of policies and programs to reduce this risk. Renters make up 39.3 percent of the total county households, with almost one-half of renters (19.4 percent of total county households) reporting overpayment of 30 percent of their income. Approximately 50 percent of renter households (19.9 percent of total households) fall within the lower-income categories (less than 80 percent of Area Median Family Income (HAMFI)). Almost all the lower-income rental households, at 15.4 percent of total county households, report overpayment. Lower-income rental households reporting severe overpayment constitute 9.6 percent of total county households. The most at-risk of displacement population are extremely low-income (ELI) rental households (0-30 percent of MFI). ELI households comprise 6.9 percent of the total county households and represent 17.6 percent of renters. Of total renters approximately 80 percent are cost burdened, making up 5.5 percent of total households. This indicates that almost 13 percent of total renters are the most at risk of displacement from overpayment.

Homeowners throughout the county are also affected by overpayment, particularly lower-income households. Homeowners constitute 60.7 percent of the county's households, of which, 26.8 percent (16.3 percent of total households) are overburdened. Approximately 27 percent of owner-occupied households (14.5 percent of total households) fall within the lower-income categories (less than 80 percent of MFI). Almost 60 percent of the lower-income owner households, at 8.9 percent of total county households, report overpayment. Statistics indicate that 38.2 percent of lower-income owner-occupied households report severe overpayment, constituting 5.5 percent of total county households. Extremely low-income (ELI) owner households (0-30 percent of MFI) comprise 3.1 percent of the total County households,

representing just 5.2 percent of owners. Of this group, approximately 75.3 percent are overburdened, embodying 2.4 percent of total households, and 64 percent of ELI owners are severely overburdened. This indicates that 3.3 percent of total homeowners are the most at risk of displacement from overpayment.

Looking at overpayment and income statistics for individual cities, when focusing on the populations most at risk of displacement, a range of differences are evident. In Benicia, owner occupied comprise 71 percent of total households, of which, 23.8 percent report overpayment (16.9 percent). Of the 29 percent rental households, 50 percent are overburdened (14.6 percent of households). Of the overburdened renters, 28.8 percent fall into the ELI category, and 12.4 percent of overburdened owners fall into the ELI category. Over 66 percent of both ELI owners and renters are extremely cost burdened, representing 1.8 and 3.7 percent of the total households respectively.

In comparison, in Vallejo, owner occupied households comprise 54.9 percent of total households, of which, 29.3 percent report overpayment (16.1 percent of households). Of the 45.1-percent of rental households, 53.2 percent are overburdened (24.0 percent of households). Of the overburdened renters, 35.6 percent fall into the ELI category, and 16 percent of overburdened owners fall into the ELI category. Over 32 percent of ELI renters and 14 percent of homeowners are extremely cost burdened, representing 8.5 and 2.6 percent of the total households respectively.

Dixon reports a high percentage of both renter and homeowner households overpaying for housing. Owner households comprise 61.7 percent of total households, of which, 45.6 percent report overpayment (20.1 percent). Of the 20.1 percent rental households, 86.7 percent are overburdened (14.0 percent of households). Of the overburdened renters, 21.8 percent fall into the ELI category, yet only 5.6 percent of overburdened owners fall into the ELI category. Almost all of the ELI renters, at 95.8 percent, and 78.3 percent of ELI homeowners are extremely cost burdened, representing 5.7 and 1.5 percent of the total households respectively.

Regardless of median income in the county and its cities, housing costs remain a challenge for a substantial number of residents. Throughout the county, extremely low-income homeowners, and in particular lower-income renters, experience a cost burden, with a large percentage significantly overpaying for housing. This can be an issue for seniors as well as for working families, single parents, and others who face changing life circumstances. The sudden loss of employment, a health care emergency, or a family crisis can quickly result in a heavy cost burden, with limited affordable options available, putting these populations at risk of displacement, overcrowding, or residing in low-resource areas.

TABLE 2-12 LOWER-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS OVERPAYING: BENICIA, DIXON, FAIRFIELD

Total Household Characteristics	Benicia		Dixon		Fairfield	
	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households
Total occupied units (households)	11,130	100.0%	6,015	1	36,350	36,350
Total Renter households	3,225	29.0%	1,880	31.3%	15,110	41.6%
Total Owner Households	7,905	71.0%	4,135	68.7%	21,235	58.4%
Total lower income (0-80% of HAMFI) households	2,535	22.8%	2,045	34.0%	11,875	32.7%
Lower income renters (0-80%)	1,320	11.9%	1,090	18.1%	7,150	19.7%
Lower income owners (0-80%)	1,215	10.9%	955	15.9%	4,725	13.0%
Extremely low-income (ELI) renters (0-30%)	620	5.6%	355	5.9%	2,215	6.1%
Extremely low-income (ELI) owners (0-30%)	295	2.7%	115	1.9%	925	2.5%
Lower income households paying more than 50%	1,290	11.6%	780	12.97%	5,120	14.1%
Lower income renter HH severely overpaying	730	6.6%	480	8.0%	3,375	9.3%
Lower income owner HH severely overpaying	550	4.9%	295	4.9%	1,745	4.8%
Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	610	5.5%	430	7.1%	2,140	5.9%
ELI Renter HH severely overpaying	415	3.7%	340	5.7%	1,570	4.3%
ELI Owner HH severely overpaying	195	1.8%	90	1.5%	570	1.6%
Income between 30%-50%	285	2.6%	245	4.1%	1,805	5.0%
Income between 50% -80%	395	3.5%	105	1.7%	1,175	3.2%
Lower income households paying more than 30%	1,855	16.7%	1,415	23.5%	8,580	23.6%
Lower income renter HH overpaying	1,020	9.2%	775	12.9%	5,725	15.7%
Lower income owner HH overpaying	820	7.4%	640	10.6%	2,855	7.9%

Total Household Characteristics	Benicia		Dixon		Fairfield	
	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households
Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	710	6.4%	445	7.4%	2,445	6.7%
ELI Renter HH overpaying	470	4.2%	340	5.7%	1,720	4.7%
ELI Owner HH overpaying	235	2.1%	105	1.7%	725	2.0%
Income between 30%-50%	385	3.5%	470	7.8%	3,040	8.4%
Income between 50% -80%	760	6.8%	500	8.3%	500	1.4%
Total Households Overpaying	3,515	31.6%	2,050	34.1%	12,805	35.2%
Total Renter Households Overpaying	1,630	14.6%	840	14.0%	7,555	20.8%
Total Owner Households Overpaying	1,885	16.9%	1,210	20.1%	5,250	14.4%

Source: 2014-2018 CHAS Data Sets <https://www.buduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html>

TABLE 2-13 LOWER-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS OVERPAYING: RIO VISTA, SUISUN CITY, VACAVILLE

Total Household Characteristics	Rio Vista		Suisun City		Vacaville	
	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households
Total occupied units (households)	4,285	100.0%	9,320	100.0%	32,920	100.0%
Total Renter households	745	17.4%	3,655	39.2%	12,960	39.4%
Total Owner Households	3,545	82.7%	5,660	60.7%	19,960	60.6%
Total lower income (0-80% of HAMFI) households	1570	36.6%	3,130	33.6%	10,630	32.3%
Lower income renters (0-80%)	295	6.9%	1,715	18.4%	6,285	19.1%
Lower income owners (0-80%)	1,275	29.8%	1,415	15.2%	4,345	13.2%
Extremely low-income (ELI) renters (0-30%)	140	3.3%	610	6.5%	1,940	5.9%
Extremely low-income (ELI) owners (0-30%)	390	9.1%	225	2.4%	955	2.9%
Lower income households paying more than 50%	575	13.4%	1,275	13.7%	4,280	13.0%
Lower income renter HH severely overpaying	200	4.7%	775	8.3%	2,590	7.9%
Lower income owner HH severely overpaying	365	8.5%	505	5.4%	1,690	5.1%
Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	310	7.2%	580	6.2%	1,925	5.8%
ELI Renter HH severely overpaying	90	2.1%	440	4.7%	1,325	4.0%
ELI Owner HH severely overpaying	260	6.1%	145	1.6%	600	1.8%
Income between 30%-50%	90	2.1%	380	4.1%	1,270	3.9%
Income between 50% -80%	175	4.1%	315	3.4%	1,085	3.3%
Lower income households paying more than 30%	830	19.4%	2,165	23.2%	7,410	22.5%
Lower income renter HH overpaying	200	4.7%	1,300	13.9%	4,695	14.3%
Lower income owner HH overpaying	620	14.5%	870	9.3%	2,720	8.3%
Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	355	8.3%	615	6.6%	2,135	6.5%

Total Household Characteristics	Rio Vista		Suisun City		Vacaville	
	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households
ELI Renter HH overpaying	90	2.1%	465	5.0%	1,445	4.4%
ELI Owner HH overpaying	260	6.1%	155	1.7%	690	2.1%
Income between 30%-50%	140	3.3%	450	4.8%	1,945	5.9%
Income between 50% -80%	335	7.8%	1,100	11.8%	3,330	10.1%
Total Households Overpaying	1,220	28.5%	3,135	33.6%	11,370	34.5%
Total Renter Households Overpaying	245	5.7%	1,595	17.1%	6,195	18.8%
Total Owner Households Overpaying	975	22.8%	1,540	16.5%	5,175	15.7%

Source: 2014-2018 CHAS Data Sets <https://www.buduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html>

TABLE 2-14 LOWER-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS OVERPAYING: VALLEJO, SOLANO COUNTY

Total Household Characteristics	Vallejo		Solano County	
	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households
Total occupied units (households)	41,990	100.0%	149,065	100.0%
Total Renter households	18,930	45.1%	58,645	39.3%
Total Owner Households	23,060	54.9%	90,420	60.7%
Total lower income (0-80% of HAMFI) households	17,360	41.3%	51,215	34.4%
Lower income renters (0-80%)	10,810	25.7%	29,675	19.9%
Lower income owners (0-80%)	6,550	15.6%	21,540	14.5%
Extremely low-income (ELI) renters (0-30%)	4,245	10.1%	10,325	6.9%
Extremely low-income (ELI) owners (0-30%)	1,430	3.4%	4,675	3.1%
Lower income households paying more than 50%	8,365	19.9%	22,495	15.1%
Lower income renter HH severely overpaying	5,770	13.7%	14,260	9.6%
Lower income owner HH severely overpaying	2,595	6.2%	8,235	5.5%
Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	4,215	10.0%	10,580	7.1%
ELI Renter HH severely overpaying	3,265	7.8%	7,585	5.1%
ELI Owner HH severely overpaying	950	2.3%	2,995	2.0%
Income between 30%-50%	2,550	6.1%	6,875	4.6%
Income between 50% -80%	1,600	3.8%	5,040	3.4%
Lower income households paying more than 30%	12,695	30.2%	36,225	24.3%
Lower income renter HH overpaying	8,685	20.7%	23,005	15.4%
Lower income owner HH overpaying	4,005	9.5%	13,220	8.9%
Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	4,670	11.1%	11,785	7.9%
ELI Renter HH overpaying	3,585	8.5%	8,265	5.5%

Total Household Characteristics	Vallejo		Solano County	
	Number	Percentage of Total Households	Number	Percentage of Total Households
ELI Owner HH overpaying	1,085	2.6%	3,520	2.4%
Income between 30%-50%	3,770	9.0%	10,580	7.1%
Income between 50% -80%	4,255	10.1%	13,860	9.3%
Total Households Overpaying	16,835	40.1%	53,120	35.6%
Total Renter Households Overpaying	10,070	24.0%	28,860	19.4%
Total Owner Households Overpaying	6,765	16.1%	24,260	16.3%

Source: 2014-2018 CHAS Data Sets <https://www.buduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html>

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS

The economy has an important impact on housing needs. Employment growth typically results in increased housing demand in areas that serve as regional employment centers. Moreover, the type of occupation and income levels for new employment also affect housing demand. This section describes the economic and employment patterns and how these patterns influence housing needs.




EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY

Occupations held by residents determine the income earned by a household and their corresponding ability to afford housing. Higher-paying jobs provide broader housing opportunities for residents, while lower-paying jobs limit housing options. Understanding employment and occupation patterns can provide insight into present housing needs.




Table 2-15 and **Figure 2-4** shows employment by industry for each jurisdiction. In the following analysis, “residents” refers to those in the civilian, employed population aged 16 and older. Residents of Benicia are most commonly employed in the health and educational services, and financial and professional services sectors (21.7 percent). The health and educational services industry is also the most common sector of employment for residents for all of Solano County.

At 19.3 percent, Dixon is the jurisdiction with the largest proportion of its residents employed in the manufacturing, wholesale, and transportation sector, though Suisun City, Fairfield, Vallejo, and Unincorporated Solano County also have significant proportions of residents employed in that sector. Countywide, only two percent of residents are in the agricultural and natural resources sector; however, most of that is in Unincorporated Solano County, making up eight percent of the employment industry.




FIGURE 2-4 EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY



- Agriculture & Natural Resources
- Construction
- Financial & Professional Services
- Health & Educational Services
- Information
- Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation
- Retail
- Other



- Agriculture & Natural Resources
- Construction
- Financial & Professional Services
- Health & Educational Services
- Information
- Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation
- Retail
- Other



- Agriculture & Natural Resources
- Construction
- Financial & Professional Services
- Health & Educational Services
- Information
- Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation
- Retail
- Other

TABLE 2-15 RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY, 2015-2019

Geography	Agriculture & Natural Resources	Construction	Financial & Professional Services	Health & Educational Services	Information	Manufacturing, Wholesale & Transportation	Retail	Other	Total
Benicia	49	1,322	3,199	4,564	386	2,291	1,260	1,641	14,712
	0.3%	9.0%	21.7%	31.0%	2.6%	15.6%	8.6%	11.2%	100.0%
Dixon	299	1,250	1,214	2,981	146	1,922	1,192	956	9,960
	3.0%	12.6%	12.2%	29.9%	1.5%	19.3%	12.0%	9.6%	100.0%
Fairfield	1,021	4,043	7,802	18,424	943	10,113	6,302	5,757	54,405
	1.9%	7.4%	14.3%	33.9%	1.7%	18.6%	11.6%	10.6%	100.0%
Rio Vista	12	260	413	682	89	283	347	493	2,579
	0.5%	10.1%	16.0%	26.4%	3.5%	11.0%	13.5%	19.1%	100.0%
Suisun City	95	833	2,177	4,445	242	2,767	2,324	1,604	14,487
	0.7%	5.7%	15.0%	30.7%	1.7%	19.1%	16.0%	11.1%	100.0%
Vacaville	295	4,430	6,778	13,714	591	6,908	4,565	6,277	43,558
	0.7%	10.2%	15.6%	31.5%	1.4%	15.9%	10.5%	14.4%	100.0%
Vallejo	496	4,530	8,834	19,956	1,016	10,036	6,619	6,205	57,692
	0.9%	7.9%	15.3%	34.6%	1.8%	17.4%	11.5%	10.8%	100.0%
Unincorporated Solano County	780	1,045	1,431	2,754	129	1,700	883	863	9,585
	8.1%	10.9%	14.9%	28.7%	1.3%	17.7%	9.2%	9.0%	100.0%
Solano County	3,047	17,713	31,848	67,520	3,542	36,020	23,492	23,796	206,978
	1.5%	8.6%	15.4%	32.6%	1.7%	17.4%	11.3%	11.5%	100.0%
Bay Area	30,159	226,029	1,039,526	1,195,343	160,226	670,251	373,083	329,480	4,024,097
	0.7%	5.6%	25.8%	29.7%	4.0%	16.7%	9.3%	8.2%	100.0%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

UNEMPLOYMENT

According to the California Employment Development Department (EDD), in 2021 the statewide unemployment rate was 6.9 percent. Unemployment rates are based off of people filing for unemployment benefits. The unemployment rate reflects individuals 16 years or older, not members of the Armed Services, and are not in institutions such as prisons, mental hospitals, or nursing homes. The unemployment rate in Solano County was lower than the statewide rate at 5.4 percent. **Figure 2-5** shows unemployment in Solano County by jurisdiction. The city with the highest unemployment rate was Rio Vista (6.8 percent), followed by Vallejo (6.3 percent). Benicia had the lowest unemployment rate (3.3 percent), followed by Vacaville (4.7 percent). Both Fairfield and Dixon had an equal unemployment rate of 5.2 percent with Suisun City at 5.6 percent. In comparison, in 2019 the unemployment rates were lower. The City of Rio Vista had the highest unemployment rate, respectively followed by the City of Vallejo at 4.3 percent. effects of the COVID-19 pandemic are still being reflected to an extent for all the cities within Solano County. The pandemic caused a high unemployment rate in 2020 (9.5 percent) for Solano County and decreased in 2021 to 5.4 percent.

FIGURE 2-5 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (2021)



Source: Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places (CDP)– EDD, 2019 and 2021

LABOR FORCE TRENDS

Table 2-18 shows employment projections by industry sector in Solano County from 2018 to 2028. According to EDD data, industry employment in Solano County is expected to grow by 15,300 jobs between 2018 and 2028, to an estimated 168,600 by 2028. Total nonfarm employment is projected to gain approximately 14,500 jobs by 2022. This has potential to impact a segment of residents in the county currently employed in that field of work, contributing towards risk of displacement as manual labor jobs decrease. The healthcare and social assistance; professional and business services; trade, transportation, and utilities; state government; and education sectors are expected to account for more than 50 percent of all nonfarm job growth. The largest projected growth sectors are healthcare and social assistance and educational services industries at 19.7 percent each.

TABLE 2-16 SOLANO COUNTY JOB GROWTH BY INDUSTRY SECTOR (2018)

Industry Title	Estimated Employment 2018 ^{1, 2}	Projected Employment 2028	Percentage Change 2018-2028
Total Employment	153,300	168,600	10.0%
Mining and Logging	600	500	-16.7%
Construction	11,200	12,000	7.1%
Manufacturing	12,700	13,500	6.3%
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	27,800	29,500	6.1%
Information	1,100	1,200	9.1%
Financial Activities	5,200	5,500	5.8%
Professional and Business Services	10,100	11,900	17.8%
Educational Services (Private), Healthcare, and Social Assistance	28,400	34,000	19.7%
Leisure and Hospitality	15,600	17,700	13.5%
Other Services (excludes 814-Private Household Workers)	4,500	4,700	4.4%

Industry Title	Estimated Employment 2018 ^{1, 2}	Projected Employment 2028	Percentage Change 2018-2028
Government	24,900	26,100	4.8%
Federal Government	3,500	4,100	17.1%
State and Local Government	21,300	22,000	3.3%
Type of Employment			
Total Farm	1,700	1,600	-5.9%
Total Nonfarm	142,100	156,600	10.2%
Self-Employment ³	9,400	10,200	8.5%
Private Household Workers ⁴	100	200	100.0%

Source: Employment Development Department, 2018

Notes:

- 1. Data sources: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' Current Employment Statistics (CES) March 2019 benchmark and Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) industry employment.*
- 2. Industry detail may not add up to totals due to independent rounding and suppression.*
- 3. Self-employed persons work for profit or fees in their own business, profession, trade, or farm. Only the unincorporated self-employed are included in this category. The estimated and projected employment numbers include all workers who are primarily self-employed and wage and salary workers who hold a secondary job as a self-employed worker.*
- 4. Private household workers are employed as domestic workers whose primary activities are to maintain the household. Industry employment is based on QCEW.*

HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

This section describes the housing characteristics and conditions that affect housing needs in Solano County. Important housing stock characteristics include housing type, tenure, vacancy rates, age, condition, cost, and affordability.

HOUSING TYPE

According to California’s DOF (see **Table 2-17**), the cities with the highest percentage of single-family units were Rio Vista (93.2 percent), Unincorporated Solano County (90.3), Suisun City (85.8 percent), and Dixon (81.4 percent). The cities with the lowest percentage of single-family units were Vallejo (70.2 percent), Benicia (73.4 percent), and Vacaville (74.6 percent). However, all jurisdictions had very high percentages of single-family units, at above 70 percent across the county. On average for all the cities, about 16.9 percent of the housing stock was composed of multifamily units. Unincorporated Solano County had the highest stock of mobile homes (6.8 percent) followed by Rio Vista (3.5 percent). As a whole, Solano County housing stock is 76.1 percent single-family units, 21 percent multifamily units, and 2.9 percent mobile homes. Much of the single-family housing stock is concentrated in Rio Vista and Unincorporated Solano County.

TABLE 2-17 HOUSING TYPE, 2021

Geography	Single-Family Homes	Multifamily: Two to Four Units	Multifamily: Five-Plus Units	Mobile Homes	Total
Benicia	8,332	1,176	1,611	238	11,357
	73.4%	10.4%	14.2%	2.1%	100.0%
Dixon	5,458	420	782	48	6,708
	81.4%	6.3%	11.7%	0.7%	100.0%
Fairfield	31,060	2,015	6,403	999	40,477
	76.7%	5.0%	15.8%	2.5%	100.0%
Rio Vista	4,764	25	141	179	5,109
	93.2%	0.5%	2.8%	3.5%	100.0%
	8,209	382	788	184	9,563

Geography	Single-Family Homes	Multifamily: Two to Four Units	Multifamily: Five-Plus Units	Mobile Homes	Total
Suisun City	85.8%	4.0%	8.2%	1.9%	100.0%
Vacaville	26,911	2,259	5,747	1,136	36,053
	74.6%	6.3%	15.9%	3.2%	100.0%
Vallejo	31,470	4,863	7,141	1,358	44,832
	70.2%	10.8%	15.9%	3.0%	100.0%
Unincorporated Solano County	6,566	156	56	494	7,272
	90.3%	2.1%	0.8%	6.8%	100.0%
Solano County	122,770	11,296	22,669	4,636	161,371
	76.1%	7.0%	14.0%	2.9%	100.0%

Source: Department of Finance E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2021

HOUSING TENURE

Housing tenure (owner vs. renter) influences several aspects of the local housing market. Residential mobility is influenced by tenure, with ownership housing turning over at a much lower rate than rental housing. This is not directly related to the type of unit, where most single-family units and certain types of multifamily (duplex-fourplex, condos) may be owner-occupied. However, single-family units, especially older stock and multifamily units (duplex-fourplex and condos) are also often converted to rental stock.

As shown in **Table 2-18**, the cities with the highest proportions of owner-occupied households were Rio Vista (81.1. percent), Benicia (71.8 percent), Dixon (69.9 percent), Unincorporated Solano County (68.3 percent), Suisun City (62.1 percent), and Vacaville (62 percent). The cities with the highest proportions of renter-occupied households were Vallejo (44.5 percent) and Fairfield (40.7 percent). Fairfield and Vallejo are split down the middle, respectively.

TABLE 2-18 HOUSING TENURE, 2019

Geography	Total Households	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied	
		Households	Percentage	Households	Percentage
Benicia	11,293	8,103	71.8%	3,190	28.2%
Dixon	6,062	4,238	69.9%	1,824	30.1%
Fairfield	36,751	21,789	59.3%	14,962	40.7%
Rio Vista	4,792	3,888	81.1%	904	18.9%
Suisun City	9,310	5,783	62.1%	3,527	37.9%
Vacaville	32,698	20,286	62.0%	12,412	38.0%
Vallejo	42,048	23,339	55.5%	18,709	44.5%
Unincorporated Solano County	6,911	4,723	68.3%	2,188	31.7%
Solano County	149,865	92,149	61.5%	57,716	38.5%
Bay Area	2,731,434	1,531,955	56.1%	1,199,479	43.9%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

VACANCY RATE

Table 2-19 shows housing units and vacancies in Solano County and the cities according to the California DOF. Vacancy rates of 5.0 to 6.0 percent for rental housing and 1.5 to 2.0 percent for ownership housing are generally considered optimum. A higher vacancy rate may indicate an excess supply of units, a softer market, and result in lower housing prices. A lower vacancy rate may indicate a shortage of housing and high competition for available housing, which generally leads to higher housing prices and diminished affordability. As **Table 2-19** shows, the vacancy rate for all cities within Solano County is 5.3 percent. The cities with the highest vacancy rate are Unincorporated Solano County (8.9 percent), Vallejo (7.3), and Rio Vista (6.6 percent). As shown in **Table 2-20** for units that were “other vacant,” about 40.5 percent of housing units in that category were within Unincorporated Solano County and 39.8 percent were in Vallejo. In addition, as shown in **Table 2-18**, Rio Vista had the highest owner-occupied households and so their high vacancy rate can be attributed to the vacant units by type, where almost 20 percent of vacant units are for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use. The cities with the lowest vacancy rates were Dixon and Suisun City.

TABLE 2-19 VACANCY RATE BY OCCUPANCY STATUS, 2021

Geography	Total Housing Units	Occupied Housing Units	Vacant Housing Units	Vacancy Rate
Benicia	11,035	10,832	203	4.6%
Dixon	6,708	6,505	203	3.0%
Fairfield	40,477	38,829	1,648	4.1%
Rio Vista	5,109	4,773	336	6.6%
Suisun City	9,563	9,231	332	3.5%
Vacaville	36,053	34,521	1,532	4.2%
Vallejo	44,832	41,563	3,269	7.3%
Unincorporated Solano County	7,272	6,623	649	8.9%
Solano County	161,371	152,877	8,494	5.3%

Source: Department of Finance E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2021

Table 2-20 shows the occupancy status of the housing stock according to the 2015-2019 ACS. Many of the cities within Solano County have vacant units that are classified as “other vacant.” For instance, the cities with the highest “other vacant” units were Vacaville (49.5 percent), Fairfield, 48.9 percent, Suisun City (41.8 percent), Unincorporated Solano County (40.5 percent), and Benicia (39.4 percent). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, “other vacant” units are classified as such when the unit does not fit into any of the year-round vacant categories. Other reasons include no one lives in the unit and the owner does not want to sell, unit is being used for storage, owner is elderly and living in a nursing home or with family members, or the unit is foreclosed, being repaired/renovated, or held for settlement of an estate. The seasonal and recreational use (vacation homes) vacancy rate is usually not indicative of underserved populations, but it does contribute toward unavailability of certain types of housing. Unincorporated Solano County and Benicia have the largest proportions of their vacant units classified as seasonal, recreational, or occasional use (32.6 percent and 19.5 percent respectively). It should be noted that new development that occurred after 2019 is not reflected in this data.

TABLE 2-20 VACANT UNITS BY TYPE, 2015-2019

Geography	For Rent	For Sale	For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional use	Other vacant ¹	Rented, Not Occupied	Sold, Not Occupied	Total Vacant Units
Benicia	167	9	96	194	17	10	493
	<i>33.9%</i>	<i>1.8%</i>	<i>19.5%</i>	<i>39.4%</i>	<i>3.4%</i>	<i>2.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Dixon	165	27	0	64	71	0	327
	<i>50.5%</i>	<i>8.3%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>19.6%</i>	<i>21.7%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Fairfield	392	155	119	792	35	128	1,621
	<i>24.2%</i>	<i>9.6%</i>	<i>7.3%</i>	<i>48.9%</i>	<i>2.2%</i>	<i>7.9%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Rio Vista	33	45	50	28	127	55	338
	<i>9.8%</i>	<i>13.3%</i>	<i>14.8%</i>	<i>8.3%</i>	<i>37.6%</i>	<i>16.3%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Suisun City	27	51	48	142	0	72	340
	<i>7.9%</i>	<i>15.0%</i>	<i>14.1%</i>	<i>41.8%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>21.2%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Vacaville	299	103	158	732	95	91	1,478
	<i>20.2%</i>	<i>7.0%</i>	<i>10.7%</i>	<i>49.5%</i>	<i>6.4%</i>	<i>6.2%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

Geography	For Rent	For Sale	For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional use	Other vacant ¹	Rented, Not Occupied	Sold, Not Occupied	Total Vacant Units
Vallejo	924	216	144	992	73	146	2,495
	37.0%	8.7%	5.8%	39.8%	2.9%	5.9%	100.0%
Unincorporated Solano County	66	128	275	341	33	0	843
	7.8%	15.2%	32.6%	40.5%	3.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Solano County	2,073	734	890	3,285	451	502	7,935
	26.1%	9.3%	11.2%	41.4%	5.7%	6.3%	100.0%
Bay Area	41,117	10,057	37,301	61,722	10,647	11,816	172,660
	23.8%	5.8%	21.6%	35.7%	6.2%	6.8%	100.0%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

¹ Common reasons a housing unit is labeled “other vacant” is that no one lives in the unit and the owner does not want to sell, is using the unit for storage, or is elderly and living in a nursing home or with family members. Additional reasons are that the unit is being held for settlement of an estate, is being repaired or renovated, is being foreclosed (foreclosures may appear in any of the vacant or occupied categories).

HOUSING CONDITIONS

Housing conditions are an important indicator of quality of life. Like any physical asset, housing ages and deteriorates over time. If not regularly maintained, structures can deteriorate and discourage reinvestment, depress neighborhood property values, and even become health hazards. Thus, maintaining and improving housing quality is an important goal for communities.

An indication of the quality of the housing stock is its general age. Typically, housing over 30 years old is likely to have rehabilitation needs that may include plumbing, roof repairs, foundation work, and other repairs. In addition, tenure may impact the condition of housing, as landlords may not maintain rental units the same as owners would maintain their homes. Table 2-21 displays the age of Solano County’s housing stock starting from before 1939 up until 2014 and later, according to the 2015-2019 ACS. Of the eight jurisdictions, seven had 50 percent of the housing stock older than 30 years, with the unincorporated county (86.8 percent), Vallejo (81.7 percent), and Benicia (79.1 percent) having the highest percentages. When looking at the housing stock that was 50 year or older, Vallejo (44.1 percent), the unincorporated county (42.3 percent), and Rio Vista has the highest percentages.

TABLE 2-21 HOUSING UNITS BY YEAR STRUCTURE WAS BUILT

Geography	Built 1939 or earlier	Built 1940 to 1949	Built 1950 to 1959	Built 1960 to 1969	Built 1970 to 1979	Built 1980 to 1989	Built 1990 to 1999	Built 2000 to 2009	Built 2010 to 2013	Built 2014 to later	Total	30 years and older (1989)	50 years and older (1969)
Benicia	785	838	250	673	3,211	3,566	1,724	723	16	0	11,786	9,323	2,546
	6.7%	7.1%	2.12%	5.7%	27.2%	30.26%	14.63%	6.13%	0.1%	0	100.0%	79.1%	21.6%
Dixon	274	154	302	305	1,457	769	1,717	1,182	106	123	6,389	3,261	1,035
	4.3%	2.4%	4.7%	4.8%	22.8%	12.0%	26.9%	18.5%	1.7%	1.9%	100.0%	51.0%	16.2%
Fairfield	768	300	2,929	6,301	5,575	8,440	6,369	5,443	1,110	2,632	38,372	24,313	10,298
	1.9%	0.8%	7.35%	15.8%	14.0%	21.2%	16.0%	13.7%	2.8%	6.6%	100.0%	61.0%	25.8%
Rio Vista	311	173	517	357	255	173	853	1,834	320	337	5,130	1,786	1,358
	6.1%	3.4%	10.1%	7.0%	5.0%	3.4%	16.6%	35.8%	6.2%	6.6%	100.0%	34.8%	26.5%
Suisun City	201	25	214	300	2,824	2,676	1,988	1,240	99	83	9,650	6,240	740
	2.1%	0.3%	2.2%	3.1%	29.3%	27.7%	20.6%	12.9%	1.0%	0.9%	100.0%	64.7%	7.7%
Vacaville	478	426	1,838	2,704	8,624	7,262	6,598	4,406	470	2,011	34,176	21,332	5,446
	1.4%	1.2%	5.3%	7.8%	24.8%	20.9%	19.0%	12.65%	1.3%	5.8%	100.0%	61.3%	15.6%
Vallejo	6,334	4,555	4,785	4,248	7,670	9,305	3,920	3,668	674	0	44,543	36,897	19,922
	14.0%	10.1%	10.6%	9.4%	17.0%	20.6%	8.7%	8.1%	1.5%	0.0%	100.0%	81.7%	44.1%
Unincorporated Solano County*	847	47	927	1,143	2,113	1,005	-42	219	-154	901	7,754	6,082	2,964
	12.1%	0.7%	13.2%	16.3%	30.2%	14.3%	-0.6%	3.1%	-2.2%	12.9%	100.0%	86.8%	42.3%
Solano County	9,998	6,518	11,762	16,031	31,729	33,196	23,127	18,715	2,641	6,087	157,800	109,234	44,309
	6.3%	4.1%	7.4%	10.0%	19.9%	20.8%	14.5%	11.7%	1.7%	3.8%	100.0%	68.4%	27.7%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Please note: Unincorporated data was calculated by taking the total county number and subtracting the cities from that data. Therefore, the exact numbers may not represent the exact numbers built by year.

LOCAL KNOWLEDGE ON HOUSING CONDITIONS

Based on conversations with staff, code enforcement, and local police departments, **Table 2-22** provides a percentage of the housing stock needing some type of rehabilitation.

TABLE 2-22 PERCENTAGE OF HOUSING NEEDING REHABILITATION

Geography	Percentage of Housing Needing Rehabilitation
Benicia	0.13%
Dixon	10% ¹
Fairfield	Data Pending
Rio Vista	N/A
Suisun City	Data Pending
Vacaville	<10%
Vallejo	Data Pending
Unincorporated Solano County	10%

Source: Solano County jurisdictions, 2022

1 City of Dixon, 2022 Housing Conditions survey results

HOUSING PRODUCTION

Table 2-23 shows the number of housing units by income level that were developed during the previous planning period (2014-2022). Fairfield, followed by Vacaville, had the most production from 2014-2020 with 3,288 building permits issued and 2,386 building permits issued, respectively. The majority of the new housing was market-rate, affordable only to moderate- and above moderate-income households. Of the 197 total units permitted in unincorporated Solano County 42 percent were affordable to lower income households.

TABLE 2-23 HOUSING PERMITTING 2015-2020

Income Group	Very Low-Income Units	Low Income Units	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate-Income Units	Total Units
Benicia	1	3	8	18	30
	<i>3.3%</i>	<i>10.0%</i>	<i>26.7%</i>	<i>60.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Dixon	0	54	145	350	549
	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>9.8%</i>	<i>26.4%</i>	<i>63.8%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Fairfield	94	95	364	2,735	3,288
	<i>2.9%</i>	<i>2.9%</i>	<i>11.1%</i>	<i>83.2%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Rio Vista	0	4	155	438	597
	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.7%</i>	<i>26.0%</i>	<i>73.4%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Suisun City	0	0	0	85	85
	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Vacaville	48	109	565	1,664	2,386
	<i>2.0%</i>	<i>4.6%</i>	<i>23.7%</i>	<i>69.7%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Vallejo	0	0	0	251	251
	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Unincorporated Solano County	6	83	32	76	197
	<i>3.0%</i>	<i>42.1%</i>	<i>16.2%</i>	<i>38.6%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

Source: HCD 5th Cycle Annual Progress Report Permit Summary

HOUSING COST AND AFFORDABILITY

One of the major barriers to housing availability is the cost of housing. To provide housing to all economic levels in the community, a wide variety of housing opportunities at various prices should be made available. Housing affordability is dependent on income and housing costs. According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and HCD, housing is considered “affordable” if the monthly housing cost is no more than 30 percent of a household’s gross income. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, **Table 2-24** shows the home values of owner-occupied units in Solano County. As of 2019, home values countywide trended much lower than in the Bay Area as a whole. For example, 35 percent of Bay Area homes were valued at over one million dollars, whereas only 2.1 percent of homes throughout Solano County were valued over one million dollars. Those were largely in Unincorporated Solano County, where 17.9 percent of the homes were valued over one million dollars. In all cities in Solano County, that proportion was much smaller (on average, approximately 1.3 percent). The jurisdictions in Solano County with the largest proportions of homes valued under \$500,000 were Rio Vista (94.3 percent), Suisun City (94.1 percent) and Dixon (84.5 percent).

Sales Prices

TABLE 2-24 HOME VALUES OF OWNER-OCCUPIED UNITS, 2015-2019

Geography	Units Valued Less than 250k	Units Valued \$250k-\$500k	Units Valued \$500k-\$750k	Units Valued \$750k-\$1M	Units Valued \$1M-\$1.5M	Units Valued \$1M-\$2M	Units Valued \$2M+
Benicia	7.4%	25.5%	49.8%	13.9%	2.0%	0.9%	0.4%
Dixon	14.9%	69.6%	12.3%	2.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%
Rio Vista	13.0%	81.3%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Suisun City	8.9%	85.2%	3.8%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Vacaville	10.6%	63.7%	22.9%	2.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%
Vallejo	21.2%	59.4%	17.0%	1.3%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%
Fairfield	14.6%	57.3%	23.5%	3.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.6%

Geography	Units Valued Less than 250k	Units Valued \$250k-\$500k	Units Valued \$500k-\$750k	Units Valued \$750k-\$1M	Units Valued \$1M-\$1.5M	Units Valued \$1M-\$2M	Units Valued \$2M+
Unincorporated Solano County	11.9%	20.5%	30.8%	18.9%	12.1%	3.3%	2.5%
Solano County	14.2%	57.9%	21.9%	3.9%	1.2%	0.3%	0.5%
Bay Area	6.1%	16.3%	22.5%	20.1%	17.9%	7.9%	9.2%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

Table 2-25 shows the median sales price for each jurisdiction in Solano County in 2021. According to Zillow and Realtor.com, the majority of jurisdictions in Solano County had relatively consistent median sales price, with the majority ranging from \$552,000 to \$596,000. The jurisdiction with the highest median sales price is Unincorporated Solano County, which is most likely due to the limited data available. The jurisdiction with the second-highest median price is Benicia at \$695,000, followed by Dixon at \$596,500.

TABLE 2-25 MEDIAN SALES PRICE, 2021

Geography	Median Sales Price
Benicia	\$695,000
Dixon	\$596,500
Fairfield	\$575,000
Rio Vista	\$480,000
Suisun City	\$552,500
Vacaville	\$585,000
Vallejo	\$560,000
Solano County	\$569,000

Geography	Median Sales Price
Unincorporated Solano County	\$630,000*
Average Countywide Median Sales Price	\$606,823

Source: Zillow.com and Realtor.com, December 2021

¹ *Due to the limited number of listings, it is important to note that the high and low listing for unincorporated Solano County was \$449,000 and 1.1 million, respectively.*

Rental Prices

Table 2-26 shows contract rents and median contract rent for all the jurisdictions within Solano County. Similar to home values described above, as of 2019, rents countywide trended lower than in the Bay Area as a whole. Median contract rent for the Bay Area as a whole was \$1,849, while throughout Solano County it was \$1,421. As described above, as compared with other jurisdictions in Solano County, Unincorporated Solano County had the largest proportion (17.9 percent) of high value homes (over one million dollars). However, that trend did not continue with rentals. Only three percent of homes in Unincorporated County are higher priced rentals (over \$2,500). Higher priced rentals (over \$2,500) are more common in Benicia, (11.5 percent) and Fairfield (6.1 percent). Jurisdictions in Solano County with the greatest proportion of lower priced rentals (less than \$1,500) were Rio Vista (87.9 percent), Dixon (75.4 percent) and Unincorporated Solano County (65.2 percent). Jurisdictions in Solano County with the greatest proportion of mid-priced rentals (between \$1,500 and \$2,500) were Suisun City (58.1 percent), Benicia (50 percent) and Vacaville (46.3 percent).

TABLE 2-26 CONTRACT RENTS FOR RENTER-OCCUPIED UNITS, 2015-2019

Geography	Rent less than \$500	Rent \$500-\$1,000	Rent \$1,000-\$1,500	Rent \$1,500-\$2,000	Rent \$2,000-\$2,500	Rent \$2,500-\$3,000	Rent \$3,000 or more	Median Contract Rent
Benicia	4.6%	6.7%	27.1%	32.4%	17.7%	8.4%	3.2%	\$1,679
Dixon	3.1%	15.6%	56.6%	15.7%	8.3%	0.7%	0.0%	\$1,277
Fairfield	3.7%	17.4%	34.0%	23.9%	14.8%	4.8%	1.3%	\$1,427
Rio Vista	0.0%	28.7%	59.1%	9.5%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	\$1,172
Suisun City	5.7%	15.6%	19.5%	48.8%	9.2%	1.0%	0.0%	\$1,593
Vacaville	7.3%	14.9%	28.9%	33.4%	12.9%	2.3%	0.4%	\$1,483
Vallejo	5.2%	19.5%	35.1%	28.3%	8.5%	2.9%	0.5%	\$1,348
Unincorporated Solano County	9.7%	24.5%	30.9%	21.6%	10.1%	2.7%	0.4%	\$1,227
Solano County	5.3%	17.2%	32.9%	28.9%	11.6%	3.3%	0.8%	\$1,421
Bay Area	6.1%	10.2%	18.9%	22.8%	17.3%	11.7%	13.0%	\$1,849

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data releases, starting with 2005-2009 through 2015-2019

Table 2-25 shows the rental costs in all the cities within Solano County, based on a survey of listings for available rentals that ranged in size from two to four bedrooms. As shown in **Table 2-18**, about 38.5 percent of Solano County households are renters. Although renters tend to live in multifamily units, the overall housing stock for Solano County is 14 percent multifamily and about 76.1 percent single family. Based on the stock, many single-family units may be used for renting. According to Zillow and Realtor.com, the cities with the highest median rent were Dixon and Fairfield, the prices for homes with two, three or four bedrooms ranged between \$1,850 and \$3,800, respectively. The city with the lowest median rent was Rio Vista at \$2,331. The rest of the cities' median rents were between \$2,603 and \$2,982. Median rents shown in **Table 2-25** are lower than those shown in **Table 2-26**. Although data in **Table 2-25** was drawn from a significantly smaller sample size, the differences between the two tables are likely chiefly attributable to the timeframes when the data was collected (2015-2019 vs. 2021).

TABLE 2-27 RENTAL RATES, 2021

Geography	Median Rent (includes 2-, 3-, & 4- Bedrooms)	Range of Prices	Number of Listings
Benicia	\$2,613	\$1,795 – \$3,700	13
Dixon	\$2,982	\$1,850 – \$3,549	5
Fairfield	\$2,901	\$1,845 – \$3,800	34
Rio Vista	\$2,331	\$1,795 – \$3,300	10
Suisun City	\$2,825	\$1,925 – \$3,300	6
Vacaville	\$2,729	\$1,825 – \$3,549	25
Vallejo	\$2,603	\$1,600 – \$3,655	47
Unincorporated Solano County*	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Zillow and Realtor.com, 2021

*Data for Unincorporated Solano County was not available.

Housing Affordability

Table 2-27 provides the affordable rents and maximum purchase price, based on the HCD income limits for a household of four in Solano County. The table also shows median rents and sales prices. As shown in **Table 2-28**, the maximum affordable rent is \$373 monthly for an acutely low-income household, \$729 monthly for an extremely low-income household, \$1,214 for a very low-income household, \$1,940 for a low-income household, and \$2,979 for a moderate-income household. The average of the median rents in the cities in Solano County (data on Unincorporated County was unavailable) for two-, three-, and four-bedroom units was \$2,712, and therefore out of the affordability range for all lower income groups. Many lower-income households do not have access to affordable large units to accommodate larger families, thus resulting in overcrowding and subject to overpayment leading to potential displacement. The limited availability of affordable housing indicates a need for programs to assist with housing vouchers and other jurisdictional, state, and federal programs for provision of rental housing at prices affordable to lower incomes.

As of December 2021, the average of the median sales prices in each of the jurisdictions in Solano County for all single-family homes \$606,823 (Table 2-25). The maximum affordable purchase price for a four-person household is \$74,050 for an acutely low-income household, \$144,870 for an extremely low-income household, \$241,285 for a very low-income household, \$385,658 for a low-income household, and \$592,154 for a moderate-income household. Looking at the maximum affordable purchase price and the median sales prices for all jurisdictions, moderate- and above moderate-income households in Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville, and Vallejo could afford existing and newly constructed homes. Unincorporated Solano County moderate income households are within reach of the median sales prices. Lower income households are not within reach of an affordable option. Due to lower-income households’ limited income, these households would require assistance through City, County, state, or federal homebuyers’ programs. For example, a down payment assistance loan program can help a household that can afford monthly mortgage payments and other housing related costs but due to their limited income, has difficulty saving enough money for a down payment. A Below Market Rate program can offer a household the opportunity to purchase a home at a price significantly lower than market rate, which can set them up with an affordable monthly mortgage payment. Sometimes these programs can be used in conjunction on the same home purchase.

TABLE 2-28 HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME LEVEL

	Income Level (Based on a 4-Person Household)				
	Acutely Low	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate
Annual Income	\$14,900	\$29,150	\$48,550	\$77,600	\$119,150
Monthly Income	\$1,242	\$2,429	\$4,046	\$6,467	\$9,929
Maximum Monthly Gross Rent ¹	\$373	\$729	\$1,214	\$1,940	\$2,979
Median Rent ³	\$2,712				
Maximum Purchase Price ²	\$74,050	\$144,870	\$241,285	\$385,658	\$592,154
Median Sales Price ⁴	\$606,823				

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development 2021 State Income Limits

Notes:

1. Affordable cost 30 percent of gross household income spent on housing.
2. Affordable housing sales price is based on conventional 30-year loans at 4.88-percent interest and a 5-percent down payment.
3. Average of the median rents in all cities in Solano County (data on Unincorporated Solano County unavailable) (see Table 2-27).
4. Average of the median sales prices in each jurisdiction in Solano County (see Table 2-25).

SPECIAL-NEEDS POPULATIONS

Certain groups have greater difficulty in finding acceptable, affordable housing due to special circumstances relating to employment and income, household characteristics, and disabilities, among others. These “special-needs” groups include seniors, persons with disabilities, large households, single-parent households (female-headed households with children, in particular), homeless persons, and farmworkers.

SENIORS

Seniors have many different housing needs, depending on their age, level of income, current tenure status, cultural background, and health status. Seniors are defined as persons 65 years and older, and senior households are those households headed by a person 65 years and older. Senior households may need assistance with personal and financial affairs, networks of care to provide services and daily assistance, and even possible architectural design features that could accommodate disabilities that would help ensure continued independent living.

According to the 2015-2019 ACS, approximately 48.9 percent of the population (5,792 persons) in Rio Vista were seniors (65 years or older). Followed by 21.6 percent (2,617 residents) in Unincorporated Solano County, 19.8 percent (3,474 persons) in Benicia, 15.8 percent (11,063 persons) in Vallejo, 14 percent (8,052 persons) in Vacaville, 12.9 percent (1,248 persons) in Dixon, 12.2 percent (2,617 persons) in Fairfield, and 11.7 percent (1,678 persons) in Suisun City.

Senior-headed households made up approximately 55.4 percent (2,655 households) of the households in Rio Vista, 37.9 percent in Unincorporated Solano County, above 30 percent in the rest of the cities (30 to 18 percent), and a small proportion (7.1 percent) in Fairfield, respectively. **Table 2-29** shows senior households by income and tenure.

TABLE 2-29 SENIOR HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME AND TENURE

Geography	Tenure	Extremely Low Income 0%-30% of AMI	Very Low Income 31%-50% of AMI	Low Income 51%-80% of AMI	Median Income 81%-100% of AMI	Above Median Income >100% of AMI	Totals All households
Benicia	Owner Occupied	165	210	310	350	1,915	2,950
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>5.6%</i>	<i>7.1%</i>	<i>10.5%</i>	<i>11.9%</i>	<i>64.9%</i>	36.4%
	Renter Occupied	145	80	79	60	160	524
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>27.7%</i>	<i>15.3%</i>	<i>15.1%</i>	<i>11.5%</i>	<i>30.5%</i>	16.4%
Dixon	Owner Occupied	54	150	180	34	675	1,093
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>4.9%</i>	<i>13.7%</i>	<i>16.5%</i>	<i>3.1%</i>	<i>61.8%</i>	25.8%
	Renter Occupied	0	115	10	10	20	155
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>74.2%</i>	<i>6.5%</i>	<i>6.5%</i>	<i>12.9%</i>	8.5%
Fairfield	Owner Occupied	174	150	335	332	1,280	2,271
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>7.7%</i>	<i>6.6%</i>	<i>14.8%</i>	<i>14.6%</i>	<i>56.4%</i>	18.4%
	Renter Occupied	61	91	61	42	101	356
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>25.6%</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>11.8%</i>	<i>28.4%</i>	7.1%
Rio Vista	Owner Occupied	180	310	460	165	1,215	2,330
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>7.7%</i>	<i>13.3%</i>	<i>19.7%</i>	<i>7.1%</i>	<i>52.1%</i>	59.9%
	Renter Occupied	0	65	80	0	180	325
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>20.0%</i>	<i>24.6%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>55.4%</i>	36.0%
Suisun City	Owner Occupied	59	200	250	170	585	1,264
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>4.7%</i>	<i>15.8%</i>	<i>19.8%</i>	<i>13.4%</i>	<i>46.3%</i>	21.9%
	Renter Occupied	79	35	115	30	155	414
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>19.1%</i>	<i>8.5%</i>	<i>27.8%</i>	<i>7.2%</i>	<i>37.4%</i>	11.7%

Geography	Tenure	Extremely Low Income 0%-30% of AMI	Very Low Income 31%-50% of AMI	Low Income 51%-80% of AMI	Median Income 81%-100% of AMI	Above Median Income >100% of AMI	Totals All households
Vacaville	Owner Occupied	533	690	975	650	3,050	5,898
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>9.0%</i>	<i>11.7%</i>	<i>16.5%</i>	<i>11.0%</i>	<i>51.7%</i>	29.1%
	Renter Occupied	535	360	455	244	560	2,154
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>24.8%</i>	<i>16.7%</i>	<i>21.1%</i>	<i>11.3%</i>	<i>26.0%</i>	17.4%
Vallejo	Owner Occupied	835	1045	1495	835	3650	7,860
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>10.6%</i>	<i>13.3%</i>	<i>19.0%</i>	<i>10.6%</i>	<i>46.4%</i>	33.7%
	Renter Occupied	945	720	725	239	574	3,203
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>29.5%</i>	<i>22.5%</i>	<i>22.6%</i>	<i>7.5%</i>	<i>17.9%</i>	25.8%
Unincorporated Solano County	Owner Occupied	174	150	335	322	1280	2,261
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>7.7%</i>	<i>6.6%</i>	<i>14.8%</i>	<i>14.2%</i>	<i>56.6%</i>	47.9%
	Renter Occupied	61	91	61	42	101	356
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>25.6%</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>11.8%</i>	<i>28.4%</i>	16.3%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- CHAS, 2013-2017

Table 2-30 shows overpayment status for the senior-headed households in Solano County (38,850 total households). The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines overpayment (cost burdened) as a household that spends more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs, including utilities. Severely overpaying (severely cost burdened) occurs when a household spends 50 percent or more of their income on housing costs. **Table 2-30** shows the number of households overpaying, paying 30 to 50 percent on housing costs, and the number of households severely overpaying, paying 50 percent or more on housing costs.

As shown in **Table 2-30**, Dixon (26.4 percent), Vallejo (23.4 percent), and Vacaville (19.6 percent) had the highest number of senior households overpaying for housing. When looking at senior households severely overpaying, Vallejo and Fairfield had the highest percentages of households at 21.1 percent and 20.7 percent, respectively. When looking at lower income senior households, in Solano County,

overpayment ranged from 18.6 and 37.7 percent -- Benicia (18.6 percent), Unincorporated Solano County (18.8 percent), Rio Vista (20.3 percent), Fairfield (27.7 percent), Dixon (28.0 percent), Vacaville (29.2 percent), Vallejo (33.1 percent), and Suisun City (37.7 percent).

TABLE 2-30 SENIOR HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME LEVEL OVERPAYING FOR HOUSING

Geography	Tenure	Extremely Low Income 0%-30% of AMI	Very Low Income 31%-50% of AMI	Low Income 51%-80% of AMI	Median Income 81%-100% of AMI	Above Median Income >100% of AMI	Totals All households
Benicia	Owner Occupied	165	210	310	350	1,915	2,950
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>5.6%</i>	<i>7.1%</i>	<i>10.5%</i>	<i>11.9%</i>	<i>64.9%</i>	36.4%
	Renter Occupied	145	80	79	60	160	524
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>27.7%</i>	<i>15.3%</i>	<i>15.1%</i>	<i>11.5%</i>	<i>30.5%</i>	16.4%
Dixon	Owner Occupied	54	150	180	34	675	1,093
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>4.9%</i>	<i>13.7%</i>	<i>16.5%</i>	<i>3.1%</i>	<i>61.8%</i>	25.8%
	Renter Occupied	0	115	10	10	20	155
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>74.2%</i>	<i>6.5%</i>	<i>6.5%</i>	<i>12.9%</i>	8.5%
Fairfield	Owner Occupied	174	150	335	332	1,280	2,271
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>7.7%</i>	<i>6.6%</i>	<i>14.8%</i>	<i>14.6%</i>	<i>56.4%</i>	18.4%
	Renter Occupied	61	91	61	42	101	356
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>25.6%</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>11.8%</i>	<i>28.4%</i>	7.1%
Rio Vista	Owner Occupied	180	310	460	165	1,215	2,330
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>7.7%</i>	<i>13.3%</i>	<i>19.7%</i>	<i>7.1%</i>	<i>52.1%</i>	59.9%
	Renter Occupied	0	65	80	0	180	325
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>20.0%</i>	<i>24.6%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>55.4%</i>	36.0%
Suisun City	Owner Occupied	59	200	250	170	585	1,264
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>4.7%</i>	<i>15.8%</i>	<i>19.8%</i>	<i>13.4%</i>	<i>46.3%</i>	21.9%

Solano County Regional Housing Element Collaborative
Appendix 2 – 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Geography	Tenure	Extremely Low Income 0%-30% of AMI	Very Low Income 31%-50% of AMI	Low Income 51%-80% of AMI	Median Income 81%-100% of AMI	Above Median Income >100% of AMI	Totals All households
	Renter Occupied	79	35	115	30	155	414
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>19.1%</i>	<i>8.5%</i>	<i>27.8%</i>	<i>7.2%</i>	<i>37.4%</i>	<i>11.7%</i>
Vacaville	Owner Occupied	533	690	975	650	3,050	5,898
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>9.0%</i>	<i>11.7%</i>	<i>16.5%</i>	<i>11.0%</i>	<i>51.7%</i>	<i>29.1%</i>
	Renter Occupied	535	360	455	244	560	2,154
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>24.8%</i>	<i>16.7%</i>	<i>21.1%</i>	<i>11.3%</i>	<i>26.0%</i>	<i>17.4%</i>
Vallejo	Owner Occupied	835	1045	1495	835	3650	7,860
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>10.6%</i>	<i>13.3%</i>	<i>19.0%</i>	<i>10.6%</i>	<i>46.4%</i>	<i>33.7%</i>
	Renter Occupied	945	720	725	239	574	3,203
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>29.5%</i>	<i>22.5%</i>	<i>22.6%</i>	<i>7.5%</i>	<i>17.9%</i>	<i>25.8%</i>
Unincorporated Solano County	Owner Occupied	174	150	335	322	1280	2,261
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>7.7%</i>	<i>6.6%</i>	<i>14.8%</i>	<i>14.2%</i>	<i>56.6%</i>	<i>47.9%</i>
	Renter Occupied	61	91	61	42	101	356
	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>25.6%</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>11.8%</i>	<i>28.4%</i>	<i>16.3%</i>

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- CHAS, 2013-2017

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Physical, mental, and/or developmental disabilities may prevent a person from working, may restrict one’s mobility, or may make it difficult to care for oneself. Persons with disabilities have special housing needs often related to the limited ability to earn a sufficient income and a lack of accessible and affordable housing. Some residents have disabilities that require living in a supportive or institutional setting.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) defines an individual with a disability as “as a person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a person who has a history or record of such an impairment, or a person who is perceived by others as having such an impairment.”

The U.S. Census collects data for several categories of disability. The ACS defines six aspects of disability: hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living.

- **Hearing difficulty:** deafness or serious difficulty hearing
- **Vision difficulty:** blindness or serious difficulty seeing even when wearing glasses
- **Cognitive difficulty:** serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions due to a physical, mental, or emotional condition
- **Ambulatory difficulty:** serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs
- **Self-care difficulty:** difficulty dressing or bathing (Activities of Daily Living [ADL])

People with disabilities have distinct housing needs depending on the nature and severity of the disability. People with physical disabilities generally require modifications to housing, such as wheelchair ramps, elevators or lifts, wide doorways, accessible cabinetry, modified fixtures and appliances. If a disability prevents someone from operating a vehicle, then proximity to services and access to public transportation are also important. People with severe or mental disabilities may also require supportive housing, nursing facilities, or care facilities. If a physical disability prevents someone from working or limits their income, then cost of housing and related modifications can be difficult to afford.

Table 2-31 reports the number of persons with a disability in each jurisdiction. Rio Vista had the highest percentage of residents with a disability (26.2 percent), with the remaining jurisdictions at a similar percentage ranging from 11.1 to 12.7 percent. Rio Vista’s high percentages of disability can be attributed to the larger senior population. **Table 2-32** provides a breakdown of the types of disability in each community. It is not uncommon for someone to have more than one type of disability.

TABLE 2-31 POPULATION BY DISABILITY STATUS, 2015-2019

Geography	With a Disability	Percentage	Total Population
Benicia	3,130	11.1%	28,143
Dixon	2,214	11.1%	20,022
Fairfield	13,038	11.6%	112,613
Rio Vista	2,341	26.2%	8,926
Suisun City	3,627	12.5%	29,039
Vacaville	10,709	11.8%	90,559
Vallejo	15,100	12.5%	120,683
Unincorporated Solano County	2,483	12.7%	19,498
Solano County	52,642	12.3%	429,483
Total	735,533	-	7,655,295

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

TABLE 2-32 DISABILITY BY TYPE, 2015-2019

Disability	Ambulatory difficulty	Hearing difficulty	Independent living difficulty	Cognitive difficulty	Vision difficulty	Self-care difficulty
Benicia	5.2%	4.4%	3.3%	3.3%	2.0%	1.5%
Dixon	4.2%	3.5%	3.4%	3.1%	2.6%	1.7%
Fairfield	5.6%	4.3%	3.8%	3.1%	2.5%	1.7%
Rio Vista	13.3%	10.4%	8.0%	7.4%	3.9%	3.8%
Suisun City	5.9%	5.1%	5.1%	2.9%	2.8%	1.7%
Vacaville	5.7%	3.9%	3.5%	3.3%	2.2%	1.2%
Vallejo	6.9%	4.9%	4.7%	3.4%	2.7%	2.1%
Unincorporated Solano County	7.0%	4.8%	4.5%	3.7%	2.1%	1.6%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

PERSONS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

According to Section 4512 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, “developmental disability” means a disability that originates before an individual reaches 18 years of age, continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual. It includes intellectual disabilities, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism. This term also includes disabling conditions found to be closely related to intellectual disability or to require treatment similar to that required for individuals with intellectual disabilities but does not include other conditions that are solely physical in nature. Many people with developmental disabilities can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. People with more severe disabilities require a group living environment where supervision is provided. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are provided. Because developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, the first issue in supportive housing for those with developmental disabilities is the transition from the person’s living situation as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

The California Department of Developmental Services provides community-based services to approximately 360,000 persons with developmental disabilities and their families through a statewide system of regional centers, developmental centers, and community-based facilities. The North Bay Regional Center (NBRC) is 1 of 21 regional centers in California that provides point-of-entry services for people with developmental disabilities. The center is a nonprofit community agency that provides advocacy, services, support, and care coordination to children and adults diagnosed with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families in Napa, Sonoma, and Solano Counties.

NBRC provides services to developmentally disabled persons throughout Napa, Sonoma, and Solano Counties and acts as a coordinating agency for multiple service providers in the region. They provide a resource to those needing diagnosis and evaluation, individual program planning, prevention services, crisis intervention, family support services, as determined on a case-by-case basis, advocacy, consultation with other agencies, program evaluation, community education, community resource development, and coordination of services with community providers such as school, health, welfare, and recreation resources.


A number of housing types are appropriate for people living with a developmental disability: rent-subsidized homes, licensed and unlicensed single-family homes, rentals in combination with Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers, special programs for home purchase, HUD housing, and Senate Bill 962 homes (Senate Bill 962 homes are adult residential homes for persons with specialized health care needs). Supportive housing and group living opportunities for persons with developmental disabilities can be an important resource for those individuals who can transition from the home of a parent or guardian to independent living.

The design of housing-accessibility modifications, the proximity to services and transit, and the availability of group living opportunities represent some of the types of considerations that are important in serving this need group. Incorporating barrier-free design in all new multifamily housing (as required by California and federal fair housing laws) is especially important to provide the widest range of choices for disabled residents. Special consideration should also be given to the affordability of housing, as people with disabilities may be living on a fixed income or cared for by households with limited financial resources.

According to **Figure 2-6** and **Table 2-33** and the most recent data by the California Department of Developmental Services from 2020, there were a total of 4,272 persons with developmental disabilities in Solano County. Within Benicia, Dixon, Rio Vista, and Suisun City, there were 81, 68, 19, and 142 persons under the age of 18, respectively, with a developmental disability. For Vacaville, Vallejo, and Unincorporated Solano County, there were 375, 369, and 212 persons under the age of 18, respectively, with a developmental disability. Based on 2020 consumer count data by the California Department of Developmental Services, 70 to 85 percent of persons with developmental disabilities

were living at home with a parent, family, or guardian. Finding affordable housing with appropriate features and accessibility to supporting services within the household’s affordability range may be a challenge because many persons with disabilities live on disability incomes or fixed income

FIGURE 2-6 POPULATION WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES BY AGE



Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California Age Group (2020)

TABLE 2-33 POPULATION WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES BY RESIDENCE

Geography	Home of Parent / Family /Guardian	Independent / Supported Living	Other	Foster / Family Home	Intermediate Care Facility	Community Care Facility	Totals
Benicia	159	17	5	5	0	0	186
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>85.5%</i>	<i>9.1%</i>	<i>2.7%</i>	<i>2.7%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Dixon	130	12	5	5	0	0	152
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>85.5%</i>	<i>7.9%</i>	<i>3.3%</i>	<i>3.3%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Fairfield	834	177	110	28	15	9	1173
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>71.1%</i>	<i>15.1%</i>	<i>9.4%</i>	<i>2.4%</i>	<i>1.3%</i>	<i>0.8%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Rio Vista	35	5	5	5	0	0	50
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>70.0%</i>	<i>10.0%</i>	<i>10.0%</i>	<i>10.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Suisun City	268	31	28	23	0	0	350
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>76.6%</i>	<i>8.9%</i>	<i>8.0%</i>	<i>6.6%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Vacaville	640	97	57	16	4	4	818
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>78.2%</i>	<i>11.9%</i>	<i>7.0%</i>	<i>2.0%</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Vallejo	736	142	128	56	23	15	1100
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>66.9%</i>	<i>12.9%</i>	<i>11.6%</i>	<i>5.1%</i>	<i>2.1%</i>	<i>1.4%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Unincorporated Solano County	350	50	30	8	3	2	443
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>79.0%</i>	<i>11.3%</i>	<i>6.8%</i>	<i>1.8%</i>	<i>0.7%</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

Source: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Residence Type (2020)

LARGE HOUSEHOLDS

Large households are defined as households with five or more members. Large households comprise a special-needs group because of the need for larger dwelling units with 3 or more bedrooms, which are often in limited supply and therefore command higher prices. To save for other basic necessities, such as food, clothing, and medical care, it is common for lower-income, large households to reside in smaller dwelling units, frequently resulting in overcrowding.

As shown in **Table 2-34**, the jurisdictions in Solano County with the greatest proportion of large households (five or more members) were Dixon (18.3 percent), Fairfield (14.6 percent) and Suisun City (13.4 percent). As shown in **Table 2-35**, a relatively large proportion of each of these three city's housing stocks has three or more bedrooms (75 percent in Dixon, 71 percent in Fairfield and Suisun City 81 percent). Although the supply of units with three or more bedrooms may appear to be adequate to accommodate the needs of large families in these communities (and throughout Solano County), larger households may not actually be residing in these units, as the price for larger units may be a barrier to ownership or rental, leaving a portion of this population underserved. As well, large households may choose to reside in the larger housing units that are above their financial means, thus resulting in overpayment and the potential for displacement. This situation applies to all of the jurisdictions in Solano County.

The U.S. Census Bureau considers a household to be overcrowded when there is more than one person per room, excluding bathrooms, hallways and kitchens. As shown in **Figure 2-2**, the jurisdictions in Solano County with the highest rates of homes that were considered overcrowded were Dixon (7.5 percent), Vallejo (7 percent), Unincorporated Solano County (6.9 percent) and Fairfield (6.3 percent). More larger homes in these communities may be needed.

A majority of Solano County's rental housing stock consists of individual single-family homes for rent, and multifamily multiplex and apartment buildings. In fact, about 70 to 80 percent of the county's housing stock consists of single-family homes, with the remainder multifamily units and mobile homes. According to **Table 2-35**, in Unincorporated Solano County and all cities except in Suisun City, homes with three or more bedrooms are overwhelmingly occupied by owners rather than renters.

TABLE 2-34 HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY INCOME LEVEL, 2013-2017

Geography	Income Level	Large Families of 5+ Persons	
		Number	Percent of Total Households
Benicia	0%-80% AMI	104	0.9%
	81%-100% AMI	55	0.5%
	100%+ AMI	535	4.8%
	All Incomes	694	6.3%
Dixon	0%-80% AMI	619	10.5%
	81%-100% AMI	195	3.3%
	100%+ AMI	260	4.4%
	All Incomes	1,074	18.3%
Fairfield	0%-80% AMI	1,935	5.5%
	81%-100% AMI	630	1.8%
	100%+ AMI	2,625	7.4%
	All Incomes	5,190	14.6%
Rio Vista	0%-80% AMI	48	1.2%
	81%-100% AMI	-	0.0%
	100%+ AMI	60	1.5%
	All Incomes	108	2.6%
Suisun City	0%-80% AMI	455	5.0%
	81%-100% AMI	89	1.0%
	100%+ AMI	685	7.5%
	All Incomes	1,229	13.4%

Geography	Income Level	Large Families of 5+ Persons	
		Number	Percent of Total Households
Vacaville	0%-80% AMI	883	2.7%
	81%-100% AMI	405	1.3%
	100%+ AMI	2,190	6.8%
	All Incomes	3,478	10.8%
Vallejo	0%-80% AMI	1,719	4.2%
	81%-100% AMI	570	1.4%
	100%+ AMI	2,225	5.4%
	All Incomes	4,514	10.9%
Unincorporated Solano	0%-80% AMI	227	3.3%
	81%-100% AMI	221	3.2%
	100%+ AMI	205	3.0%
	All Incomes	653	9.4%

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- CHAS, 2013-2017

TABLE 2-35 HOUSING UNITS BY NUMBER OF BEDROOM, 2015-2019

Number of Bedrooms	0 Bedrooms		1 Bedrooms		2 Bedrooms		3-4 Bedrooms		5 or More Bedrooms		Percent of All Homes in Jurisdiction with 3+ Bedrooms
	Owner	Renter	Owner	Renter	Owner	Renter	Owner	Renter	Owner	Renter	
Benicia	68	149	185	542	1,193	1,324	6,189	1,121	468	54	7,832
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.8%</i>	<i>4.7%</i>	<i>2.3%</i>	<i>17.0%</i>	<i>14.7%</i>	<i>41.5%</i>	<i>76.4%</i>	<i>35.1%</i>	<i>5.8%</i>	<i>1.7%</i>	<i>69%</i>
Dixon	14	45	24	374	351	685	3,692	710	157	10	4,569
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.3%</i>	<i>2.5%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>20.5%</i>	<i>8.3%</i>	<i>37.6%</i>	<i>87.1%</i>	<i>38.9%</i>	<i>3.7%</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>75%</i>
Fairfield	78	545	252	2,718	1,560	5,596	17,514	5,969	2,385	134	2,260
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.4%</i>	<i>3.6%</i>	<i>1.2%</i>	<i>18.2%</i>	<i>7.2%</i>	<i>37.4%</i>	<i>80.4%</i>	<i>39.9%</i>	<i>10.9%</i>	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>71%</i>
Rio Vista	0	21	0	181	2,532	396	1,343	306	13	0	2,260
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>2.3%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>20.0%</i>	<i>65.1%</i>	<i>43.8%</i>	<i>34.5%</i>	<i>33.8%</i>	<i>0.3%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>47%</i>
Suisun City	94	33	0	524	302	820	5,337	2,078	50	72	7,537
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>1.6%</i>	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>14.9%</i>	<i>5.2%</i>	<i>23.2%</i>	<i>92.3%</i>	<i>58.9%</i>	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>2.0%</i>	<i>81%</i>
Vacaville	78	367	289	2,662	2,464	4,364	16,001	4,881	1,454	138	22,474
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.4%</i>	<i>3.0%</i>	<i>1.4%</i>	<i>21.4%</i>	<i>12.1%</i>	<i>35.2%</i>	<i>78.9%</i>	<i>39.3%</i>	<i>7.2%</i>	<i>1.1%</i>	<i>69%</i>
Vallejo	128	990	468	4,178	4,293	6,324	17,289	6,916	1,161	301	4,554
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>5.3%</i>	<i>2.0%</i>	<i>22.3%</i>	<i>18.4%</i>	<i>33.8%</i>	<i>74.1%</i>	<i>37.0%</i>	<i>5.0%</i>	<i>1.6%</i>	<i>75%</i>
Unincorporated Solano County	72	19	261	367	811	827	3,293	915	286	60	4,554
<i>Percentage</i>	<i>1.5%</i>	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>5.5%</i>	<i>16.8%</i>	<i>17.2%</i>	<i>37.8%</i>	<i>69.7%</i>	<i>41.8%</i>	<i>6.1%</i>	<i>2.7%</i>	<i>66%</i>

Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- California Department of Finance, E-5 series

SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

Single-parent households (which are predominantly female-headed) are one-parent households with children under the age of 18 living at home. For these households, living expenses generally require a larger proportion of income relative to two-parent households. Therefore, finding affordable, decent, and safe housing is often more difficult for single-parent households. Additionally, single-parent households have special needs involving access to daycare or childcare, healthcare, and other supportive services.

According to the 2015-2019 ACS, Solano County had about 14.2 percent (21,305) female-headed family households and 6.3 percent (9,486) male-headed family households. In all of Solano County, single-headed households represent approximately 20.5 percent of all family households in Solano County (see **Table 2-36**). In comparison, in the Bay Area, 15.2 percent were single-headed households (male or female). **Figure 2-7** shows single-headed family household types by percentage for Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville, Vallejo, Unincorporated Solano County, and the Bay Area.


Single-parent households, particularly those headed by women, are likely to have greater demand for childcare and other social services than two-parent households. As shown in **Figure 2-8**, an average of about 75 percent of female-headed households in poverty have one or more children and conversely, an average of about a quarter of female-headed households in poverty do not have children in the household. Among female-headed households in poverty, having one or more children in the household was most common in Vacaville, Fairfield, Dixon and Benicia. In Rio Vista it was less common to have children in the households of female-headed households in poverty. Because female-headed, single-parent households often have limited incomes, these households may have trouble finding adequate, affordable housing, or may overpay for housing to accommodate family size or have access to services and resources.

TABLE 2-36 SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS, 2015-2019

Geography	Female-Headed Family Households		Male-Headed Family Households		Total Single-Parent Households	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Benicia	1,155	10.2%	532	4.7%	1,687	14.9%
Dixon	1,017	16.8%	321	5.3%	1,338	22.1%
Rio Vista	273	5.7%	39	0.8%	312	6.5%
Fairfield	5,353	14.6%	2,720	7.4%	2,211	23.7%
Suisun City	1,497	16.1%	714	7.7%	5,886	18.0%
Vacaville	4,240	13.0%	1,646	5.0%	10,353	24.6%
Vallejo	7,224	17.2%	3,129	7.4%	8,073	22.0%
Unincorporated Solano County	546	7.9%	385	5.6%	931	13.5%
Solano County	21,305	14.2%	9,486	6.3%	30,791	20.5%
Bay Area	283,770	10.4%	131,105	4.8%	414,875	15.2%


Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

FIGURE 2-7 SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS



Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

FIGURE 2-8 FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLD BY POVERTY STATUS, 2015-2019




Source: ABAG Data Packet, 2021 -- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019)

FARMWORKERS

Farmworkers are generally considered to have special housing needs because of limited incomes and the unstable nature of employment (i.e., having to move throughout the year from one harvest to the next). According to the 2019 ACS Census, there were 3,047 persons employed in the agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting industry in all of Solano County. Solano County has both a large flux of seasonal workers and a substantial base of year-round farmworkers who reside permanently in the county.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Census of Farmworkers, the number of permanent farm workers in Solano County has significantly decreased from 2002 to 2017, decreasing from 2,735 farmworkers to 1,452 farmworkers over that time frame. However, there was a slight increase from 2012 to 2017, showing an increase from 1,347 farmworkers to 1,453 farmworkers. The seasonal number has also decreased from 2,921 in 2002 to 1,060 in 2017 (see **Figure 2-9**). The overall number of farm workers was about the same in 2017 as in 2002. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Census of Farmworkers also reports that there were 849 farms in Solano County, employing a total of 2,513 workers, in 2017. Of the 2,513 farmworkers in the county, 1,453 workers (58 percent) work 150 days or more each year. The remaining 42 percent work less than 150 days per year. Larger farms provide the main source of farm employment for farmworkers. According to the Census of Agriculture, 954 farmworkers (38 percent) were employed on farms with 10 or more workers. According to the California Department of Education California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), there were about 446 migrant workers throughout Solano County. While these estimates are at the county level (including the cities) and are not specifically for the unincorporated area, it is likely the vast majority of farmworkers work within Unincorporated Solano County where most of the agricultural production in the county takes place. Typically, farmworker positions, unless they own the business, do not pay well and these persons may have trouble finding adequate housing in the county. When looking at Vallejo alone, 0.9 percent, or 496 residents, were employed in Agriculture and Natural Resources, according to the 2015-2019 ACS, representing a very small portion of the workforce.

FIGURE 2-9 FARM LABOR IN SOLANO COUNTY



Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Census of Farmworkers* (2002, 2007, 2012, 2017), Table 7: Hired Farm Labor

Note: Hired farm workers (including direct hires and agricultural service workers who are often hired through labor contractors) are considered seasonal if they work on a farm less than 150 days in a year, while farm workers who work on a farm more than 150 days are considered to be permanent workers for that farm.

Migrant Workers

Farmworkers have a variety of special housing needs in terms of affordability, location, and duration of residence. The increase in farmworkers living in Solano County on a permanent basis increases the need for local, affordable farmworker housing for household types other than single adult men and women, including family housing and all the services and neighborhood amenities associated with raising families and being permanent members of the community.

Farmworkers may face added affordable housing challenges due to immigration status. Federally funded affordable housing projects require the head of household to have documentation of legal resident status, precluding some farmworkers from subsidized farmworker housing. Even seasonal farmworkers may travel with families, with children who at least temporarily enroll in local schools. In Vallejo, the migrant worker student population has stayed at a steady 0 since the 2016-17 school year. However, the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years were higher. Overall, for Solano County as a whole, the migrant worker student population increased by approximately 100 students from the 2016-17 school year to the 2019-20 school year, which shows a need for farmworker housing and resources. (Table 2-37).

TABLE 2-37 MIGRANT WORKER STUDENT POPULATION

Geography	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Benicia	0	0	0	0
Dixon	218	259	242	215
Fairfield	11	47	74	109
Rio Vista	0	0	0	0
Suisun City	0	0	0	0
Vacaville	110	123	138	122
Vallejo	0	0	0	0
Unincorporated Solano County	0	0	0	0
Solano County	339	429	454	446
Bay Area	4,630	4,607	4,075	3,976

Source: California Department of Education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020)

Notes: Total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), public schools. The data used for this table was obtained at the school site level, matched to a file containing school locations, geocoded and assigned to jurisdiction, and finally summarized by geography

Non-English Speakers

California has long been an immigration gateway to the United States, which means that many languages are spoken throughout the State and the Bay Area. Since learning a new language is universally challenging, it is not uncommon for residents who have immigrated to the United States to have limited English proficiency. This limit can lead to additional disparities if there is a disruption in housing, such as an eviction, because residents may not be aware of their rights or may be wary to engage due to immigration status concerns. Regionwide and for Solano County overall, the proportion of residents five years and older with limited English proficiency is eight percent. However, the proportion is higher in Dixon, at approximately 10.5 percent of the total population with limited English proficiency. Because this is a vulnerable population, it is important that tenants' rights outreach and education efforts be conducted in a multi-lingual fashion.

Income

According to the 2015-2019 ACS, the annual median income for the agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting category, was \$22,234 per individual. This income for a one or two person households, would fall into the extremely low-income category.

In Vallejo, Farmworker's housing needs can be met with single family homes, multifamily units, ADUs, and with assistance from Housing Choice Vouchers. While the City of Vallejo and Solano County are limited on the direct resources for farmworkers beyond assistance for lower income households, neighboring Yolo and Sacramento counties as well as the State of California have resources available for farmworkers.

Resources for Farmworkers

The Dixon Migrant Center

The Dixon Migrant Center is in the City of Dixon and managed by Yolo County Housing. The Dixon Migrant Center provides affordable seasonal rental housing and support services (including onsite childcare) during peak growing and harvest season, typically from April through November. However, this can be extended based on the center's needs. There are also three duplexes and one single-family home that are open for families to stay year-round.

While the City has included **Programs A 1.1.2, B 1.1.1, B 2.1.3, E 1.1.1, and E 1.1.6** to assist with needs of very low-income households and special needs groups, including farmworkers, additional resources available to farmworkers are included in **Table 2-38**

TABLE 2-38 RESOURCES FOR FARMWORKERS

Provider	Area Served	Services Available
California AgrAbility	California residents employed with a disability or long-term health condition who works in agriculture	Direct services to farmers and agricultural workers through individual consultations, farm site assessments, safety evaluations, and case management. This technical assistance varies based on the injury and/or disability of each individual and family. Staff help identify and locate resources including low-cost modifications to the farm, home, equipment and work site operations.
Community Action Partnership (CAP Solano)	Solano County	Emergency rental assistance, utility arrears, housing stability case management, and a limited amount of prospective rental assistance.
Mutual Housing at Spring Lake	Solano and Yolo Counties	Permanent employee housing with a capacity of 101 units
Madison Migrant Center	Solano and Yolo Counties	Seasonal migrant center with a capacity of 88 units
Western Center for Agricultural Health and Safety	Solano and Yolo Counties	Education and outreach specialists provide free, participatory, bilingual trainings on topics such as wildfire smoke exposure, heat illness prevention, and injury and illness prevention.
Mahal Plaza	Yuba County	A 98-unit project containing two-, three-, and four-bedroom units where priority is given to resident farmworkers, as well as migrant farmworkers
Western Farmworkers Association	Yuba County	Advocacy, basic needs, legal help, non-emergency medical care, bilingual assistance
Knights Landing Community Center	Yolo County	Food bank and food distribution

EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

An extremely low-income household is defined as a household earning 30 percent or less than the area median. According to HCD, the median income for a four-person household in Solano County was \$99,300 in 2021. Based on the above definition, an extremely low-income household of four earns less than \$29,150 a year. Employees earning the minimum wage in California (\$14 per hour) and working 40 hours a week would be considered extremely low income, as their total annual earnings would be \$29,120.

Households with extremely low incomes have a variety of housing situations and needs. This population includes persons who are homeless, persons with disabilities, farmworkers, college students, single parents, seniors living on fixed incomes, and the long-term unemployed. Some extremely low-income individuals and households are homeless. As noted previously, this population also includes minimum wage workers or part-time employees. For some extremely low-income residents, housing may not be an issue—for example, domestic workers and students may live in in-law units at low (or no) rents. Other extremely low-income residents spend a substantial amount of their monthly incomes on housing or may alternate between homelessness and temporary living arrangements with friends and relatives. Households and individuals with extremely low incomes may experience the greatest challenges in finding suitable, affordable housing. Extremely low-income households often have a combination of housing challenges related to income, credit status, disability or mobility status, family size, household characteristics, supportive service needs, or exacerbated by a lack of affordable housing opportunities. Many extremely low-income households seek rental housing and most likely face overpayment, overcrowding, or substandard housing conditions and also face the risk of displacement. Some extremely low-income households could have members with mental or other disabilities and special needs.

According to 2015-2019 ACS, as shown in **Table 2-10**, Vallejo (15.0 percent), Dixon (10.7 percent), Rio Vista (10.5 percent), and Fairfield (10.2 percent) had the highest percentage of households that fell into the extremely low-income category, followed by Suisun City (9.2 percent), Vacaville (9.2 percent), Benicia (8.6 percent), and the unincorporated County (8.4 percent).

When looking at extremely low-income household characteristics reported by the 2014-2018 CHAS data for Vallejo, extremely low-income households represented 13.5 percent of all the households in the City. Of those, 74.8 percent were renter households, and 25.2 percent were owner occupied households. When looking at extremely low-income households overpaying, 82.3 percent of extremely low-income households were overpaying (spending more than 30 percent on housing costs) and 74.3 percent were severely overpaying (spending more than 50 percent on housing costs). This shows a need for more affordable housing types and housing assistance for extremely low-income

households. Additional details are provided in **Table 2-44** and programs to assist extremely low-income households are included in **Table 2-44**.

TABLE 2-39 EXTREMELY LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Total Household Characteristics	Vallejo	
	Number	Percentage of Total Households
Total occupied households	41,990	
Total Extremely low-income occupied households	5,675	13.5%
Extremely low-income renters	4,245	74.8%
Extremely low-income owners	1,430	25.2%
Extremely Low-Income Overpaying (>30%)	4,670	82.3%
<i>Extremely Low-Income Renter HH overpaying</i>	3,585	76.8%
<i>Extremely Low-Income Owner HH overpaying</i>	1,085	23.2%
Extremely Low Income Severely Overpaying (>50%)	4,215	74.3%
<i>Extremely Low-Income Renter HH severely overpaying</i>	3,265	77.5%
<i>Extremely Low-Income Owner HH severely overpaying</i>	950	22.5%

Source: 2014-2018 CHAS Data Sets <https://www.buduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html>

As of 2021, there were a total of 375 beds in emergency shelters in Solano County, about 121 beds in transitional housing and 431 beds for permanent housing. Each city works collectively with local non-profits as well as the Community Action Partnership Solano, Joint Powers Authority (CAP Solano JPA) to assist those in need and to help residents locate suitable housing in the area.

In addition, the City currently permits a variety of housing types and included **Program 5.4.1** to continue to identify financial resources to assist with development of affordable housing and reduce displacement risk for extremely low-income households. The City will continue to encourage single-room occupancy housing and other special housing arrangements (**Program 5.3.1**).

HOMELESS

Homeless individuals and families have perhaps the most immediate housing need of any group. They also have one of the most difficult sets of housing needs to meet, due to both the diversity and complexity of factors that lead to homelessness and community opposition to the siting of facilities that serve homeless clients. California law requires that Housing Elements estimate the need for emergency shelter for homeless people.

The Point-in-Time (PIT) Count gathers both sheltered and unsheltered numbers. The sheltered PIT count is conducted on an annual basis and gathers data on the number of persons who are in emergency shelter or transitional housing. The sheltered PIT count collects demographic information such as age, gender, length of time homeless, income, and housing history. The unsheltered PIT count, conducted biannually, gathers data on the number of persons who are observed on the street. The PIT count is conducted on a single day/night during the year and is therefore not meant to represent the overall number of individuals who experience homelessness over the course of a year.

Solano County conducted its 2022 PIT count on February 23, 2022. The total number of individuals experiencing homelessness for 2022 was 1,179, a slight increase (by 28 individuals) from 1,151 individuals experiencing homelessness according to the 2019 PIT. The count is conducted in the winter (January or February), when seasonal demand is likely at its highest. As of 2022, there were a total of 236 beds in emergency shelters in Solano County, about 163 beds in transitional housing, and 503 beds for permanent housing.

Homelessness is often the result of multiple factors that converge in a person's life. The combination of loss of employment, reduced hours at a job, and high housing costs in Solano County has led to some individuals and families losing their housing. Divorce can also lead to the homelessness as a dual income household becomes a single income household. **Table 2-40** provides characteristics for the population experiencing homelessness, showing that of homeless individuals, 22 percent had mental health issues, following closely by alcohol and drug abuse. The data also showed that 92 percent of persons interviewed were individuals and eight percent were families. According to California Housing Partnership, asking rents in Solano County increased by 7.4 percent since 2019 and renters would need to earn 2.4 times the minimum wage to afford the average asking rent in Solano County. From this data, a primary cause of homelessness is the lack of affordable housing and low incomes. **Table 2-41** reflects the number of homeless individuals in each city according to the Chief of Police and other local knowledge.

TABLE 2-40 CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE POPULATION EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS

Jurisdiction	Characteristic	Percentage of Total Count
All Cities and Unincorporated Solano County	Mental Health Issues	22%
	Alcohol/Drug Abuse	21%
	Chronic Health Issues	16%
	Physical Disabilities	14%
	HIV/Aids Related Illness	1%
	Developmental	5%
	Veterans	3%
	Unaccompanied Youth	6%
	Chronically Homeless	17%
	Families	8%
	Individuals	92%

Source: Solano County Point-in-Time Count Executive Summary, 2022

TABLE 2-41 PERSONS EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS BY JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction	2022 PIT			Local Knowledge – Number of Persons Experiencing Homelessness
	Unsheltered	Sheltered	Total	
Benicia	17	0	17	100 ¹
Dixon	35	0	35	+/- 5 ¹
Fairfield	231	196	427	N/A
Rio Vista	22	0	22	3 ¹
Suisun City	41	0	41	N/A
Vacaville	139	33	172	115 ¹
Vallejo	435	19	454	600 ²
Unincorporated Solano County	0	11	11	N/A
Total	920	259	1,179	--

Sources: Solano County Point-in-Time Count Executive Summary and Solano County jurisdictions, 2022

¹Local Police Department/Police Chief

²Resource Connect Solano

Table 2-42 demonstrates the number of students in local schools experiencing homelessness. The cities with the highest number of students in local schools experiencing homelessness are Dixon (205) and Fairfield (206). The cities with the lowest numbers of students in local schools experiencing homeless are Suisun City, Benicia, Rio Vista, and Unincorporated Solano County. In comparison to past years (2018-19, 2017-18, and 2016-17), the number of students experiencing homelessness has decreased. This can be attributed to work by CAP Solano- JPA who have expanded their functions over the years, such as increased grant application and allocation of funding to local youth homeless service providers in Solano County.

TABLE 2-42 STUDENTS IN LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS

Geography	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Benicia	33	54	42	0
Dixon	236	258	235	205
Fairfield	489	443	422	206
Rio Vista	0	0	0	0
Suisun City	112	80	49	16
Vacaville	131	169	196	140
Vallejo	260	302	325	162
Unincorporated Solano County	0	0	0	0
Solano County	1,261	1,306	1,269	729
Bay Area	14,990	15,142	15,427	13,718

Source: California Department of Education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020)

ANALYSIS OF AT-RISK HOUSING

As required by California Government Code Section 65583, the Housing Element must analyze the extent to which below-market rate units are at risk of converting to market-rate housing. If there are at-risk units, the element should include programs to encourage preservation of these units or to replace any that are converted to market rate. The units to be considered are any units that were constructed using federal assistance programs, state or local mortgage revenue bonds, redevelopment tax increments, in-lieu fees or an inclusionary housing ordinance, or density bonuses. Housing is considered to be “at risk” if it is eligible to be converted to non-low-income housing due to: (1) the termination of a rental subsidy contract, (2) mortgage prepayment, or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions. The time period applicable in making this determination is the 10-year period following the last mandated update of the Housing Element, which, in this case with all jurisdictions in Solano County, is January 31, 2023. There are currently 351 units at risk of converting to market rate in the next 10 years (each project at risk is denoted in bold in **Table 2-43**).

Inventory of Affordable Units

All federal and state subsidized rental housing is listed in **Table 2-43**. All cities within Solano County have assisted units and Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, and Vallejo all have units at risk of converting to market rate within the next 10 years. have projects at-risk of converting to market rate.

TABLE 2-43 ASSISTED UNITS AT RISK OF CONVERSION

Name	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Funding	Affordability Expiration
BENICIA					
Casa de Vilarrasa II	921 E 4th St	24	24	HCD	2016
The Calms at Burgess Point	91 Riverview Terrace	56	55	LIHTC	2074
Total Units		80	79		
Total Units At-Risk of Converting			24		
DIXON					
Bristol Apartments	1550 Valley Glen Drive	102	101	LIHTC	2060
Second Street Senior Apartments	211 East D Street	81	80	LIHTC	2061
Lincoln Creek Apartments	1395 North Lincoln Street	172	141	LIHTC	2060
Moonlight Apartments	425 West Chestnut Street	56	55	LIHTC; USDA	2064
Heritage Commons	191 Heritage Lane	59	59	LIHTC; CalHFA	2067
Valley Glen Apartments	1830 Gold St.	59	58	LIHTC; USDA	2067
Heritage Commons Phase 2	193 Heritage Lane	60	59	LIHTC	2068
Heritage Commons Phase III	197 Heritage Lane	44	43	LIHTC	2074
Dixon Manor	1270 Linford Lane	32	6	CalHFA	2031
Total Units		665	602		
Total Units At-Risk of Converting			6		

Solano County Regional Housing Element Collaborative
Appendix 2 – 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Name	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Funding	Affordability Expiration
FAIRFIELD					
Bennington Apartments (AKA Sheffield Green)	2780 North Texas Street	132	27	CalHFA	2024
Avery Parks (AKA Quail Terrace)	2000 Claybank Road	136	33	CalHFA	2025
Woodsong Village Apartments	2999 North Texas Street	112	110	LIHTC	2027
Parkway Plaza	188 E. Alaska Ave	100	99	HUD	2030
Kennedy Court	1401 Union Ave	32	32	LIHTC	2050
Sunset Manor Apartments	855 East Tabor Avenue	148	146	LIHTC	2052
Woodside Court Apartments	555 Alaska Avenue	129	127	LIHTC	2053
Fairfield Vista Apartments	201 Pennsylvania Avenue	60	59	LIHTC	2053
Dover Woods Senior Apartments	2801 Dover Avenue	200	198	LIHTC	2058
Hampton Place / Gateway Village	2000 Pennsylvania Avenue	56	55	LIHTC; HCD	2058
Union Square II	608 Kennedy Court	24	24	LIHTC; HCD	2059
Fairfield Heights Apartments	1917 Grande Circle	52	51	LIHTC	2060
Laurel Gardens Apartments	201 East Alaska Avenue	30	29	LIHTC; HCD	2062
Senior Manor	1101 Union Ave.	84	83	LIHTC	2063
Signature at Fairfield	1189 Tabor Avenue	93	92	LIHTC; CalHFA	2065
Monument Arms Apartments	261 East Alaska Avenue	92	88	LIHTC; HUD	2069
Sunset Creek Apartments	840 E. Travis Boulevard	76	75	LIHTC	2072
Fairfield Apartments (Parkside Villa Apartments & Rockwell Manor Apartments) - Site A	1650 Park Lane	128	126	LIHTC; HUD	2073
One Lake Family Apartments		190	188	LIHTC	2074

Solano County Regional Housing Element Collaborative
Appendix 2 – 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Name	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Funding	Affordability Expiration
Total Units		1,874	1,642		
Total Units At-Risk of Converting			269		
RIO VISTA					
Casitas Del Rio Apartments	250 St. Joseph Street	40	39	LIHTC; USDA	2059
Total Units		40	39		
Total Units At-Risk of Converting			0		
SUISUN CITY					
Village II	506 Civic Center Blvd	106	105	LIHTC; HUD	2065
Cottonwood Creek Apartments	202 Railroad Avenue	94	93	LIHTC; HCD	2062
Breezewood Village Apartments	1359 Worley Road	81	80	LIHTC	2062
Total Units		281	278		
Total Units At-Risk of Converting			0		
VACAVILLE					
Twin Oaks Apartments	2390 Nut Tree Road	46	46	LIHTC; HUD	2067
Vacaville Autumn Leaves	2470 Nut Tree Rd	56	56	HUD	2039
Vacaville Gables	100 Gables Ave.	65	64	LIHTC	2052
Saratoga Senior Apartments	1101 Burton Drive	108	107	LIHTC; CalHFA	2053
Vacaville Meadows	131 Gable Avenue	65	50	LIHTC	2055
Vacaville Hillside Seniors	454 Markham Ave	15	12	LIHTC	2055
Saratoga Senior Apartments Phase II	1151 Burton Drive	120	119	LIHTC	2056
Lincoln Corner Apartments	130 Scoggins Court	134	101	LIHTC; HCD	2058

Solano County Regional Housing Element Collaborative
Appendix 2 – 2023-2031 Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Name	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Funding	Affordability Expiration
Rocky Hill Apartments & Bennett Hill Apartments (Site A)	225 Bennett Hill Court	64	63	LIHTC	2068
Callen Street Apartments	1355 Callen Street	66	65	LIHTC	2068
Rocky Hill Veterans	582 Rocky Hill Road	39	38	LIHTC; HCD	2075
Meadows Court / Holly Lane Apartments (Site A)	531 Rocky Hill Rd	82	80	LIHTC	2070
Alamo Garden Apartments	1501 Alamo Drive	182	181	LIHTC	2071
Pony Express Senior Apartments	220 Aegean Way	60	59	LIHTC	2074
Total Units		1102	1041		
Total Units At-Risk of Converting			0		
VALLEJO					
Longshore Cove Apartments	201 Maine Street	236	234	LIHTC; HUD	2073
Carolina Heights	135 Carolina Street	152	151	LIHTC; HUD	2070
Marina Tower	601 Sacramento Street	151	150	LIHTC; HUD	2060
Marina Towers Annex	575 Sacramento Street	57	56	LIHTC; HUD; CalHFA	2056
Casa De Vallejo Apartments	1825 Sonoma Blvd.	136	136	LIHTC; HUD	2060
Ascension Arms	301 Butte St	75	42	HUD	2029
Seabreeze Apartments	100 Larissa Ln	184	71	HUD	2036
Redwood Shores	400 Redwood Street	120	119	HUD	2037
Friendship Estates Apartments	2700 Tuolumne Street	76	74	LIHTC	2052
Solano Vista Senior Apartments	40 Valle Vista Avenue	96	95	LIHTC	2072
Sereno Village Apartments	750 Sereno Drive	125	124	LIHTC	2057

Name	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Funding	Affordability Expiration
Bay View Vista Apartments	445 Redwood Street	194	192	LIHTC	2055
Avian Glen	301 Avian Drive	87	85	LIHTC; HCD	2064
Temple Art Lofts	707 Main Street	29	28	LIHTC	2067
Harbor Park Apartments	969 Porter Street	182	73	LIHTC	2070
Total Units		1,900	1,630		
Total Units At-Risk of Converting			42		
UNINCORPORATED SOLANO CO.	<i>No Federal or State Assisted Developments</i>				

Sources: California Housing Partnership, Preservation Database 2021.

Preservation Resources

The types of resources needed for preserving at-risk units fall into three categories: (1) financial resources available to purchase existing units or develop replacement units; (2) entities with the intent and ability to purchase and/or manage at-risk units; and (3) programs to provide replacement funding for potentially lost Housing Choice Voucher Program rent subsidies, otherwise known as the Section 8 program.

A variety of federal and state programs are available for potential acquisition, subsidy, or replacement of at-risk units. Due to both the high costs of developing and preserving housing and limitations on the amounts and uses of funds, a variety of funding sources would be required. Several sources of funding are available to Solano County for preservation of assisted, multifamily rental housing units to assist with purchasing units or providing rental subsidies, including Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) or HOME funds. For older buildings with expiring affordability, funding for substantial rehabilitation may also give the County an opportunity to reinstate affordability requirements. HUD may provide Section 8 Tenant Protection Vouchers to subsidize rents for tenants in properties at risk of loss because of expiration due to loss of affordability associated with mortgage prepayment.

When affordable housing units have the potential to convert to market rate, due typically to the expiration of an affordable housing agreement or expiration of funding, there is a risk that tenants in those affordable units will be displaced. Certain companies and organizations can be certified as eligible to purchase buildings where a federally assisted mortgage is due to be prepaid.

Qualified Entities

The following qualified entities were listed as potential purchasers of at-risk units in Solano County:

- ACLC, Inc
- Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition Mutual Housing California
- Affordable Housing Associates SWJ Housing
- Affordable Housing Foundation Volunteers of America National Services
- Sacramento Valley Organizing Community
- Pacific Community Services, Inc.
- Anka Behavioral Health
- Housing Corporation of America
- Mutual Housing California
- SWJ Housing
- Volunteers of America National Services

The Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program is another affordability option that individuals may apply for through the Benicia Housing Authority (BHA), Solano County Housing Authority (SCHA), Suisun City Housing Authority (SCH), and Vacaville Housing Authority (VHA). Section 8 increases affordable housing choices for very low-income households by allowing families to choose privately owned rental housing. Section 8–supported housing may be either project-based for a portion of an entire apartment building, or subsidies may be provided in the form of vouchers for individual, independent units.

The BHA administers approximately 294 active housing choice vouchers. The SCHA allocated 368 vouchers including 45 Veterans Administration Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) Vouchers and 53 Mainstream Vouchers for non-elderly disabled households. The SCH administers approximately 192 housing choice vouchers and the VHA administers approximately 1,366 vouchers and vouchers including the Veterans Administration Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH), Family Unification Program (FUP), Mainstream Voucher Program, and Emergency Housing Voucher Program Vouchers.

Strategies for Preserving Affordable Housing

Acquisition - For units at risk of conversion, qualified non-profit entities must be offered the opportunity to purchase buildings to maintain affordability.

The factors that must be used to determine the cost of preserving low-income housing include property acquisition, rehabilitation, and financing. Actual acquisition costs depend on several variables, such as condition, size, location, existing financing, and availability of financing (governmental and market). Looking at multifamily buildings throughout the county, prices ranged from \$165,000 per unit for a 10-unit building in Suisun City to \$215,000 per unit for a 5-unit multifamily unit in Vallejo. While most units listed for sale in March 2022 were in incorporated jurisdictions of Solano County, purchasing residential units in Unincorporated Solano County will likely have a similar price range depending on where in the county the units are located. Additionally, if the property needs significant rehabilitation, or financing is difficult to obtain, it is important to consider these factors in the cost analysis. It is important to note that a major financing tool, Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), currently do not prioritize acquisition and rehabilitation projects, but instead fund new construction projects. This makes the effort to preserve units much more difficult.

Preservation - Housing affordability can also be preserved by seeking alternative means of subsidizing rents, such as the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program described previously. Under Section 8, HUD pays the difference between what tenants can pay (defined as 30 percent of household income) and what HUD estimates as the fair-market rent on the unit. Based on HUD's 2022 fair-market rents, the total cost to subsidize rental costs for a very low-income four-person household for 20 years would be \$111,180 for a two-bedroom home and \$256,980 for a three-bedroom home. This is typically done through Project Based contracts with the Housing Authority that administers a Project Based Program and has available vouchers.

Replacement with New Construction – Another alternative to preserve the overall number of affordable housing units in the county is to construct new units to replace other affordable housing stock that has been converted to market-rate housing. Multifamily replacement property would be constructed with the same number of units, with the same number of bedrooms and amenities as the one removed from the affordable housing stock.

The cost of new affordable housing can vary greatly depending on factors such as location, density, unit sizes, construction materials, type of construction (fair/good), and on- and off-site improvements. Looking at a sample project with 188 assisted units and one manager's unit, the cost for land acquisition is approximately \$30,319 per unit, or \$5,700,000 total. Costs for multifamily construction are approximately \$162 per square foot. This is based on costs calculated for a two-story building in Solano County with 20 units and an average unit size of 800 square feet each. The total construction costs for the building are \$2,593,864, based on the total cost of building this development, it can be estimated that the per-unit cost to replace low-income housing would be \$124,949 per unit. These construction costs include labor, materials, and equipment but do not include costs of buying land or off-street parking.¹

Cost of Preservation Versus Replacement

The cost to the cities within Solano County of preserving units that are projected to expire between 2024 and 2074 is estimated to be less in most cases than replacing the units through new construction. Replacing the units with rehabilitated units may be cost-effective in some instances. Actual costs involved in each option will depend on the rental and real estate market situations at the time the affordability restrictions on these projects expire.

Extending low-income use restrictions to preserve the units as affordable may require financial incentives to the project owners. Other scenarios for preservation would involve purchase of the affordable units by a nonprofit or public agency, or local subsidies to offset the difference between affordable and market rents. Scenarios for preservation depend on the type of project at risk.

Funding Sources for Preservation

The types of resources needed for preserving at-risk units fall into three categories: financial resources available to purchase existing units or develop replacement units; entities with the intent and ability to purchase and/or manage at-risk units; and programs to provide replacement funding for potential reductions in funding for Housing Choice Voucher Program rent subsidies (previously known as the Section 8 Program).

¹ 2022 National Building Cost Manual and 2022 945-33,91,90,34,89,85,93,71,35,12,92, and 956-87,20,18,94,90,25,96 zip code modifiers Craftsman Book Company.

A variety of federal, state, and local programs are available for potential acquisition, subsidy, or replacement of at-risk units. Due to both the high costs of developing and preserving housing and limitations on the amounts and uses of funds, multiple funding sources would be required. The following summarizes federal and state financial resources available to the cities within Solano County for preservation of assisted, multifamily rental housing units.

Federal Programs

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)—This program is intended to enhance and preserve the jurisdictions affordable housing stock. CDBG funds are awarded to the County on a formula basis for housing and community development activities. Eligible activities include acquisition, rehabilitation, economic development, and public services. CDBG funds benefit primarily persons/households with incomes not exceeding 80 percent of the county median family income.

HOME Investment Partnerships—HOME funding is a flexible grant program that is awarded to the jurisdictions on a formula basis for housing activities that take into account local market conditions, inadequate housing, poverty, and housing production costs. The formula for determining funding amount and eligibility is based on several factors, including the number of units in a jurisdiction that are substandard or unaffordable, the age of a jurisdiction’s housing, and the number of families living below the poverty line. HOME funding is provided to jurisdictions to either assist rental housing or home ownership through acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and/or rehabilitation of affordable housing, as well as possible property acquisition, site improvements, and other expenses related to the provision of affordable housing and projects that serve a group identified as having special needs related to housing.

Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) Program—This program provides rental assistance payments to owners of private market-rate units on behalf of very low-income tenants.

Section 811/202 Program—Nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives are eligible to receive zero-interest capital advances from HUD for the construction of very low-income rental housing for senior citizens and persons with disabilities. Project-based assistance, or capital advances, is also provided in conjunction with this program. Section 811 can be used to develop group homes, independent living facilities, and intermediate care facilities. Eligible activities include acquisition, rehabilitation, new construction, and rental assistance.

HUD Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act (LIHPRHA)—LIHPRHA was enacted in response to concern over the prepayment of HUD-assisted housing. When an assisted housing project pays off the loan, they are then eligible to convert to market-rate, thus resulting in a loss of affordable housing. The legislation addresses the prepayment of units assisted under Section 221(d)(3) and Section 236 (Section 236 replaced the Section 221(d)(3) program in 1968). Generally, the law facilitates the preservation of these low-income units by providing incentives to property owners to either retain their units as low income or to sell the project to priority purchasers (tenants, nonprofits, or governmental agencies.) Pursuant to LIHPRHA, HUD must offer a package of incentives to property owners to extend the low-income use restrictions. These incentives would ensure an 8-percent return for property owners on the recalculated equity of their property, provided the rents necessary to yield this return fall within a specified federal cost limit. The cost limits are either 120 percent of the fair market rate (FMR), or the prevailing rent in the local market. If HUD can provide the owner with this return, the owner cannot prepay the mortgage. The owner must either stay in the program or offer to sell the project (a “voluntary” sale) to a priority purchaser for a 12-month period or other purchasers for an additional 3 months. The owner is required to document this choice in a plan of action.

If HUD cannot provide the owner with the 8-percent return, i.e., the rents required would exceed federal cost limits, the owner may prepay only after offering the sale to priority purchasers for 12 months, or other qualified buyers for an additional 3 months (a “mandatory” sale) and filing a plan of action that demonstrates that conversion will not adversely impact affordable housing or displace tenants. According to the California Housing Partnership Corporation, most projects in California will fall within federal cost limits, except those with exceptionally high rental value or condominium conversion potential.

Projects that are preserved under either of these methods are required to maintain affordability restrictions for the remaining useful life of the project, which is defined minimally as 50 years. Despite these requirements, property owners may still be able to prepay the loan. First, the owner may prepay the property loan if no bona fide offer to purchase the property is made. Second, HUD may not provide some of the discretionary monies to priority purchasers in preservation sales. Finally, the overall success of the preservation efforts is contingent on congressional appropriation of sufficient funding to HUD.

State Programs

California Housing Finance Agency (CHFA) Multiple Rental Housing Programs—This program provides below-market-rate financing to builders and developers of multiple-family and elderly rental housing. Tax-exempt bonds provide below-market-rate mortgage money. Eligible activities include new construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of properties with 20 to 150 units.

Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC)—This program provides grants and/or loans, or any combination t, that will achieve GHG emissions reductions and benefit Disadvantaged Communities through increasing accessibility of affordable housing, employment centers, and key destinations via low-carbon transportation.

Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC)—This program provides tax credits to individuals and corporations that invest in low-income rental housing. Tax credits are sold to corporations and people with high tax liability, and proceeds are used to create housing. Eligible activities include new construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition.

California Community Reinvestment Corporation (CCRC)—This private, nonprofit mortgage banking consortium provides long-term debt financing for affordable multifamily rental housing. Eligible activities include new construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition.

Nonprofit Entities—Nonprofit entities serving the county can be contacted to gauge their interest and ability in acquiring and/or managing units at risk of conversion. (See partial list above in Qualified Entities.)

Program Efforts to Preserve At-Risk Units

The following housing programs have been developed to address the preservation of assisted very low-income units eligible to convert to market rate. Each individual City’s Planning Department, Economic Development Department, and/or Housing Development will be responsible for implementing the programs. Funding for implementation could be provided through the funding sources cited above.

Each city in Solano County will maintain contact with owners of at-risk units as the use restriction expiration dates approach. Each city and Solano County will communicate to the owners the importance of the units to the supply of affordable housing in the county as well as its desire to preserve the units as affordable.

Rental Subsidies—If HUD funding is discontinued at some point within the next planning period to subsidize affordable units and other methods to preserve the at-risk units fail, the County will determine if it can assign financial resources to provide rental assistance to very low-income tenants to cover the difference between their current rents and market rents as well as continue to promote the development of affordable housing. If the owners of a project at risk of converting their units to market rate, the County or cities will evaluate the feasibility of implementing available options to preserve bond-financed units at risk of conversion: (1) offer rental subsidies using HOME or other available funding; (2) work with the property owner to refinance the mortgage at lower interest rates; (3) work with nonprofit entities to evaluate the potential for acquisition of the complex (although, if only a portion of the units are at risk, this may not be feasible); (4) consider acquisition and rehabilitation of the project.

PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS IDENTIFIED NEEDS

The City has identified specific housing needs as a part of the preparation of the Housing Needs Assessment. **Table 2-44** summarizes the identified need and the program reference to address the need detailed in the Housing Element.

TABLE 2-44 PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS IDENTIFIED NEEDS

Identified Need	Housing Element Program Number
Housing Conditions	Programs G 2.1.1, G 3.1.1
Renter Households	Programs B 1.1.1, F 1.1.3, G 5.1.1
Senior Population (65+)	Programs E 1.1.2, E 1.1.6, F 1.1.2
Persons with Disabilities	Programs E 1.1.1, E 1.1.4, E 1.1.5, E 1.1.6
Large Households	Program E 1.1.1
Female and Single Parent Households	Program E 1.1.1
Farmworkers	Programs A 3.1.1, E 1.1.1, E 1.1.6
Extremely Low-Income Households	Programs A 1.1.2, B 1.1.1, B 2.1.3, E 1.1.1, E 1.1.6
Persons Experiencing Homelessness	Programs A 3.1.1, E 1.1.1, E 1.1.3, E 1.1.6
Housing At-Risk of converting to market rate	Program C 1.1.1

Source: City of Vallejo, August 2023

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX 3: ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

INTRODUCTION

Assembly Bill (AB) 686 requires that all housing elements due on or after January 1, 2021, 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 California law, AFFH means “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.”

California Government Code Section 65583 (10)(A)(ii) requires local jurisdictions to analyze racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs, including displacement risk. Although this is the Housing Element for the City of Vallejo, Government Code Section 65583 (subds. (c)(9), (c)(10), 8899.50, subds. (a), (b), (c)) requires all local jurisdictions to address patterns locally and regionally to compare conditions at the local level to the rest of the region. To that end, the Solano County Housing Element Collaborative, comprised of the cities of Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville, Vallejo, and the County of Solano prepared a regional Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) and each participating jurisdiction prepared a local AFH.

This section is organized by fair housing topics. For each topic, the regional assessment is first, followed by the local assessment. Strategies to address the identified issues are included throughout the section. Through discussions with stakeholders, fair housing advocates, and this assessment of fair housing issues, the City of Vallejo identified factors that contribute to fair housing issues. These contributing factors are included in **Table 3-12, Factors that Contribute to Fair Housing Issues** with associated actions to meaningfully affirmatively further fair housing related to these factors. Additional programs to affirmatively further fair housing are included in Section 5, Goals, Policies, and Programs.

This section also includes an analysis of the Housing Element’s sites inventory as compared with fair housing factors. The location of housing in relation to resources and opportunities is integral to addressing disparities in housing needs and opportunity and to fostering inclusive communities where all residents have access to opportunity. This is particularly important for lower-income households. Assembly Bill (AB) 686 added a new requirement for housing elements to analyze the distribution of projected units by income category and access to high resource areas and other fair housing indicators compared to citywide patterns to understand how the projected locations of units will affirmatively further fair housing.

OUTREACH

Regional Outreach Efforts

Workshops


Summary

As discussed in Appendix 1 – Public Outreach and Engagement, the Solano County Collaborative (Collaborative) took diligent efforts to encourage public and stakeholder participation in the Housing Element update process at both the regional and local scale. These efforts included six Housing Element community workshops between January and June 2022 and seven regional stakeholder consultations between December 2021 and February 2022. Each of the workshops was advertised with flyers in English, Spanish, and Tagalog, and conducted virtually to increase accessibility for residents throughout the county and in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Live Spanish translation was offered at the first two sets of workshops, and a pre-recorded version in Tagalog. However, no participants opted for this option at any of the workshops, so the third set of workshops provided pre-recorded Spanish and Tagalog versions rather than live translation, though materials were still made available prior to the workshop in both languages.


Workshop Specifics

The first two workshops were held over two days: during the lunch hour on Wednesday, January 26, 2022, and the evening of Thursday, January 27, 2022, to ensure maximum participation from Solano County jurisdictions, invested stakeholders, and the community. The workshops were held online with a variety of technological methods to connect. The objectives of the workshop were to educate the public about the update process, identify specific needs and opportunities, share information about the Collaborative to help make informed conclusions and identify needs, and allow participants to share their insights on how housing opportunities can be improved locally and on a regional level. To gauge these opinions, participants were polled on topics that focused on housing assets, housing strategies, housing barriers, and preferences for location of new housing. The results of key points of the poll related to fair housing are summarized herein.


What are the greatest barriers to providing housing in your community?




What do you consider the greatest issue related to housing?




What types of housing would you like to see more of?



What populations are most in need of housing?



What populations do you believe are underserved?



Discussion focused on the process, clarifications on the definition of overcrowding, mixed-income on commercial sites, and how mixed-income housing typically has better results than concentrated lower-income development. However, participants expressed that developers and lenders typically do not prefer mixed-income projects, thus presenting an additional barrier to the provision of housing, particularly integrated affordable housing. Overall, the primary fair housing themes that emerged were the costs associated with development of housing, particularly affordable units, the overarching issue of high cost of market-rate housing, shortages of affordable housing, the limited employment opportunities that offer livable wages, the challenges that lower-income households are facing, and providing housing opportunities for underserved populations, particularly those who are experiencing homelessness or are at risk of becoming homeless.

On March 30, 2022, two interactive, online workshops were held. Both workshops were well attended with representatives from the Solano County jurisdictions, various stakeholder organizations, and service providers. The content provided a summary of the analysis conducted in the housing needs assessment and discussions were guided by participant insights on how housing opportunities can be improved locally and on a regional level. Again, feedback on specific needs was sought out. Translation was available by request. During the workshops, the topics mentioned by participants included the relationship between location of affordable housing and access to employment, services, mobility, amenities, and recreation; special-needs populations, particularly seniors and their needs as they age; and the challenges of income discrepancies with the shortage of affordable housing resources throughout the county. Participants established clarity regarding what types of professions lower-income households really encompass, such as educators, public service providers, retail, and hospitality workers, which suggested that the Collaborative foster greater collaboration between jurisdictions to increase supply of housing for this very integral segment of the population.

On June 1, 2022, the Collaborative held two Fair Housing Workshops virtually to present an overview of the Assessment of Fair Housing and gather feedback from participants on their experiences with fair housing. One workshop was held over the lunch hour and one was held in the evening to offer two opportunities for potential participants. Across both workshops, approximately 36.4 percent of participants were from Benicia, 18.2 percent were from Vacaville, 13.6 percent were from Vallejo, 9.1 percent were from Fairfield, and 9.1 percent were from Suisun City. There were no participants from Dixon, Rio Vista, or the unincorporated area, and there were an additional 13.6 percent that did not live in Solano County but had some other interest in the Housing Element process. For both workshops, the Collaborative offered Spanish and Tagalog translation of materials and a recording of the presentation, in addition to hosting the meeting in English. At previous workshops, as discussed, there was no interest in live translation and therefore recordings were determined to be sufficient.

Approximately 35.0 percent of respondents reported that the greatest barrier to obtaining or keeping housing that they, a friend, or relative has experienced is that affordable options are too far from jobs, schools, and other resources. In addition, 15.0 percent identified accessibility issues as a barrier to housing, 10.0 percent identified substandard conditions, and an additional 10.0 percent identified landlord refusal to rent as barriers. Nearly one-third of respondents also reported having experienced overcrowding at some point in Solano County to be able to afford housing costs, meaning more than one person per room living in the home (see “Overcrowding” for more detail). When asked what their experience has been with housing mobility, as it relates to unit size, price, and other factors, 28.6 percent reported that it has been very challenging and 33.3 percent reported that it has been somewhat challenging. This supports feedback from local stakeholders that there is a shortage of appropriately sized and affordable options in Solano County (see “Consultations” summary in this Assessment of Fair Housing for more information on outreach with stakeholders). Further, half of respondents reported that there is no transit or alternative methods of transportation for them to navigate their communities, which furthers concerns about proximity of affordable housing to jobs and schools.

At the end of the workshop, the Collaborative asked participants to identify their top three priorities for increasing housing mobility and access to opportunities, improving the condition of their neighborhood, and reducing displacement risk. The top-three strategies to increase housing mobility were creation of targeted investment programs, such as down payment assistance (19.1 percent of respondents), incentivizing development of mixed-income housing (17.0 percent), and a tie between citywide registries of affordable rental options and targeted outreach to underserved groups to increase awareness of assistance programs (12.8 percent each). However, in open discussion, participants stated that many local, state, and federal assistance programs are already available, the barrier to fair housing is awareness of these opportunities. They identified a need for easier resource navigation for residents. The top strategies for improving neighborhood conditions were implementing proactive code enforcement for substandard housing (17.8 percent) and a three-way tie between targeted investment in parks and other recreational facilities, community committees made up of residents of underserved groups, and addressing the negative impacts of nonresidential uses on residential uses (15.6 percent each). Finally, the top strategies for reducing displacement

were rent stabilization (27.0 percent), rent review or mediation board as well as foreclosure assistance and multilingual legal services (24.3 percent), and expanded density bonuses (18.9 percent).

The feedback received during this workshop informed this analysis and programs identified in this Housing Element.

Survey

The flyers inviting participants to the regional Housing Element workshops included an option for respondents to take a survey similar to the poll conducted at the first two workshops in January 2022, to prioritize their perspective on housing issues facing the county and its jurisdictions. A total of 57 responses were logged, the majority of which were homeowners (71.9 percent). Of participants, approximately 86.0 percent reported living in a single-family detached or attached home and 68.4 percent had lived in Solano County for over five years. However, a smaller proportion (56.1 percent) report working within the county, which may indicate a shortage of jobs suitable for residents within their jurisdiction. The top types of housing that participants wanted to see built throughout the county were small/affordable single-family homes (57.9 percent), senior housing (47.4 percent), supportive housing/assisted living (43.9 percent), accessory dwelling units (ADUs; 35.1 percent), townhomes and condominiums/duplexes (35.1 and 31.6 percent, respectively), tiny homes (29.8 percent), large-acreage detached homes (28.1 percent), and apartments (24.6 percent). Among the respondents, the greatest barriers to building housing in their communities were (in order of ranking): cost of construction, opposition to new housing development projects, lack of adequate infrastructure, lack of availability of land, and lack of jobs to support existing cost of living. Supporting these responses was feedback on what the barriers to obtaining housing were specifically within the respondents' jurisdictions, with 52.6 percent identifying home prices and rents being too high, followed by lack of public infrastructure, and the real-estate market, which ties back to the cost of housing barrier. A desire for yards and green space was also identified as a barrier associated with multifamily and/or higher-density residential types.

Responses to the survey indicated that the top-three underserved populations included homeless residents, seniors, single-parent households, and persons with disabilities. Respondents also indicated across the board a need for integration of affordable housing throughout communities to create mixed-income neighborhoods, roadway improvements, and a diverse range of housing types. Integration of new developments into the existing neighborhood fabric, addressing the "missing middle" housing types, and accessibility were also identified as needs.

Consultations

From December 2021 through February 2022, seven consultations were conducted with local nonprofits and housing stakeholders to receive one-on-one, targeted input from those who provide services for those most in need of housing or with special housing needs. In each of the consultations, stakeholders were asked some or all of the following questions, depending on the type of organization they represented:

Opportunities and concerns: What three top opportunities do you see for the future of housing in Solano County? What are your three top concerns for the future of housing?

Housing preferences: What types of housing do your clients prefer? Is there adequate rental housing in the county? Are there opportunities for home ownership? Are there accessible rental units for seniors and persons with disabilities?

Housing barriers/needs: What are the biggest barriers to finding affordable, decent housing? Are there specific unmet housing needs in the community?

Housing conditions: How do you feel about the physical condition of housing in the county? What opportunities do you see to improve housing in the future?

Unhoused persons: How many unhoused persons are in the county?

Housing equity: What factors limit or deny civil rights, fair housing choice, or equitable access to opportunity? What actions can be taken to transform racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity (without displacement)? What actions can be taken to make living patterns more integrated and balanced?

The Collaborative contacted 12 organizations and received responses from the following:

- North Bay Housing Coalition, December 9, 2021
- Community Action Partnership Solano, Joint Powers Authority, December 14, 2021
- Legal Services of Northern California, December 22, 2021
- Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California, January 6, 2022
- Solano-Napa Habitat for Humanity, January 28, 2022
- Agency on Aging, January 24, 2022
- Urban Habitat, February 16, 2022

The one-on-one interviews with stakeholders raised a number of observations and conditions related to housing issues facing the residents of Solano County, with several common themes emerging. First was the demand for a range of affordable and accessible housing types for the large concentration of special needs populations in the county, including seniors, large families, disabled persons, and low-income

households, many of which were identified as being Hispanic and Latinx. The need for additional rental housing was identified by most stakeholders. Additionally, service providers noted a shortage of housing resources for those who are experiencing homelessness and emphasized the need for a coordinated countywide central agency to be created to provide full-time services based on the growing demand, specifically housing-first projects across the county. This was noted in addition to a growing population of lower-income households and homeless residents, therefore identifying locations for pallet and cargo housing within the jurisdictions, as well as providing permanent supportive housing with wrap-around services and case management is crucial. One stakeholder disclosed that they have funding for assisting jurisdictions with needed affordable housing, acquisition of the actual acreage is the barrier, which is another theme identified in the stakeholder consultations.

Strategies associated with housing condition relating to preservation and maintenance of the existing housing stock for affordable housing opportunities was a second subject of importance among stakeholders. Income constraints often result in people living in substandard or overcrowded housing conditions, most often in rental situations, which stakeholders identified as often resulting in displacement and homelessness. Stakeholders also identified that there are substantial racial disparities in housing among communities of color, recommending that jurisdictions can do more through code enforcement, primarily ensuring there is water and heating in low-income housing units, or passing ordinances that protect tenants from living in substandard housing. During the consultations, stakeholders expressed a need for proactive and “protective” tenant protections, such as rent control, just-cause protections, and other housing protection laws to keep more individuals housed, as eviction is the most common fair housing issue complaint encountered by stakeholders. In situations such as this, tenants require access to additional legal assistance to prevent displacement due to harassment or wrongful eviction.

Additionally, stakeholders identified a need for landlord education and enforcement regarding fair housing laws and rental discrimination practices, in combination with jurisdictions contracting with fair housing providers for a comprehensive system to identify affordable housing resources and tenant protection, particularly for seniors, the disabled, gender equality/familial status, and communities of color. Consultations identified a need for workshops on fair housing laws for residents and housing providers. The goal of these would be to inform housing providers on their rights and responsibilities under fair housing laws, and provide education on discrimination, aiming to reduce the number of instances that result in fair housing complaints throughout the county. A tenant workshop counterpart was also suggested to inform residents on their tenant rights. Stakeholders identified acquisition of older, single-family housing stock, which might require repairs, for conversion to assisted affordable housing units as an opportunity to address shortages.

Barriers to development of affordable housing constitute a third major theme, including land costs, the length of entitlement processes, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements, development fees, and other permitting processes, compounded by severe infrastructure constraints, particularly sewer and septic systems. All housing providers interviewed expressed that new low-income housing simply is not cost effective for developers, and that properties owned by jurisdictions are a valuable resource for providing lower-income

housing, including homeownership opportunities through organizations such as Habitat for Humanity, who assist communities of color and veterans to attain homeownership, which have been historically underserved in the homeowner market, particularly in areas of Solano County. Incentivizing and subsidizing the construction of ADUs on existing residential properties is recommended to help address the barriers associated with cost of land and shortage of viable acreage for development of units for lower-income and disabled and/or senior households. In addition, one stakeholder discussed Community Land Trusts as an underutilized opportunity to create permanent affordability, as well as the availability of CalHome funding for implementing this option.

A final recurring theme around barriers to affordable housing that stakeholders identified was the current and historic challenges lower-income households face in obtaining financial assistance, such as lending discrimination, which was a prevalent issue in Vallejo. On the flip side, it was also noted that there is a disconnect between the number of applicants for Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs) and availability of units that accept them. Education and outreach efforts of current fair housing practices to landlords and sellers was recommended.

Local Outreach Efforts

Study Sessions

On April 18, 2022, the City held a joint Planning Commission and City Council study session to provide information on the Housing Element and solicit input from the community. The City notified the community of this meeting with flyers distributed in English, Spanish, and Tagalog. During the meeting, council members and commissioners expressed an interest in community land trusts and inclusionary housing, redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels and buildings, and integration of lower-income housing citywide. Of particular interest were mechanisms to aid lower-income and first-time homebuyers to build equity and coordination with community-based organizations. Members of the public supported interest in community land trusts but expressed a need for longer-term solutions to homeownership and housing. They identified a lack of generational wealth that has created discrepancies in homeownership opportunities and expressed concern that the diversity in Vallejo will decrease if there are not ownership opportunities accessible for all residents. The City has identified programs in **Table 3-12, Factors that Contribute to Fair Housing Issues**, to address concerns identified at this study session.

Consultations

During the Housing Element update process, staff reached out to six stakeholder organizations to offer the opportunity for each to provide one-on-one input on housing needs and programs in Vallejo and received responses from five. Representatives from the following stakeholders were interviewed:

- Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California (FHANC), January 6, 2022

- Fighting Back Partnership, January 12, 2022
- Agency on Aging, January 24, 2022
- Brendan Riley, Local Historian and Vallejo Times-Herald Columnist, April 25, 2022
- Fair Housing Napa Valley (FHNV), May 10, 2022

Several Vallejo stakeholders described the high cost of housing and shortage of affordable housing available in the city as barriers to fair housing. One stakeholder also emphasized the need for more senior housing in the city, identifying a shortage of lower-income senior housing and that the existing senior housing supply has a shortage of wrap-around services required for adequate senior living. Stakeholders also expressed concerns about the permitting process for ADUs, indicating that it may be a constraint on production and the habitability of homes, due to accessibility, age, and overall condition. In response to this, the City has included **Program H A4.1.2** to review the ADU permitting process to identify strategies to streamline the process for applicants, and **Program G 2.1.1** to continue to implement the Neighborhood Law Program to meet with residents and community organizations to coordinate the efficient use of City resources to eliminate blight and nuisance conditions throughout the city.

In response to steps the City can take to further fair housing, stakeholders identified a need for more education about fair housing laws – rights and requirements – for both tenants and housing providers. Local fair housing organizations stated that lack of awareness about fair housing laws results in increased discrimination cases, confusion about resources that are available to tenants, and more. In particular, a stakeholder is dealing with eviction proceedings onset by the housing moratorium from the COVID-19 pandemic. FHANC indicated that, in general, landlords of fewer units discriminate at a higher rate because they are not informed on fair housing requirements. To address these concerns, the City will continue to contract with a local fair housing and legal aid provider to conduct audits and investigations, and will coordinate biannual trainings for landlords to increase awareness of fair housing resources and laws. Additionally, the City has included **Program F 1.1.1** to ensure all public materials are translated into common languages used by Vallejo residents to improve accessibility to resources for all residents.

Additional information from stakeholder interviews has been incorporated throughout this assessment, particularly to inform the subsequent Enforcement and Outreach Capacity and Other Relevant Factors sections.

FAIR HOUSING ISSUES

Since 2017, the Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) and California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) have developed annual maps of access to resources such as high-paying job opportunities; proficient schools; safe and clean neighborhoods; and other healthy economic, social, and environmental indicators to provide evidence-based research for policy recommendations. This effort has been dubbed “opportunity mapping” and is available to all jurisdictions to assess access to opportunities within their community.


The TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps can help to identify areas within the community that provide strong access to opportunity for residents or, conversely, provide low access to opportunity. The information from the opportunity mapping can help to highlight the need for housing element policies and programs that would help to remediate conditions in low-resource areas and areas of high segregation and poverty and to encourage better access for lower-income households and communities of color to housing in high-resource areas. TCAC/HCD categorized census tracts into high-, moderate-, or low-resource areas based on a composite score of economic, educational, and environmental factors that can perpetuate poverty and segregation, such as school proficiency, median income, and median housing prices. The TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps use a regional index score to determine categorization as high, moderate, and low resource.

Areas designated as “highest resource” are the top 20.0-percent highest-scoring census tracts in the region. It is expected that residents in these census tracts have access to the best outcomes in terms of health, economic opportunities, and education attainment. Census tracts designated “high resource” score in the 21st to 40th percentile compared to the region. Residents of these census tracts have access to highly positive outcomes for health, economic, and education attainment. “Moderate resource” areas are in the 41st to 70th percentile and those designated as “moderate resource (rapidly changing)” have experienced rapid increases in key indicators of opportunity, such as increasing median income, home values, and an increase in job opportunities. Residents in these census tracts have access to either somewhat positive outcomes in terms of health, economic attainment, and education; or positive outcomes in a certain area (e.g., score high for health, education) but not all areas (e.g., may score poorly for economic attainment). Low-resource areas are those that score above the 70th percentile and indicate a lack of access to positive outcomes and poor access to opportunities. The final designation are those areas identified as having “high segregation and poverty;” these are census tracts that have an overrepresentation of people of color compared to the county as a whole, and at least 30.0 percent of the population in these areas is below the federal poverty line (\$26,500 annually for a family of four in 2021).

As seen in **Figure 3-1, Regional TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas**, most of Solano County, particularly in the unincorporated area, is designated as low resource or moderate resource. The City of Vallejo has been designated entirely as a low-resource area, with three pockets identified as areas of high segregation and poverty: the Wilson Park neighborhood southwest of Solano Avenue (which includes a portion of unincorporated territory), the area west of Sutter Street to the waterfront between Florida Street to the north and Curtola

Parkway to the south, and the area north of Florida Street between Sonoma Boulevard and Amador Street along Broadway Street. In contrast, the neighboring City of Benicia is designated entirely as a moderate-resource area. The City of Suisun City and most of Fairfield are designated as low resource, with moderate-resource areas in northeastern Fairfield and the Cordelia area of Fairfield. The City of Vacaville is similarly designated, with low-resource areas along Interstate (I-) 80, northeast of Davis Street, with the remainder designated as moderate resource. The City of Rio Vista is also split, with moderate-resource areas northwest of Church Road and low-resource areas to the southeast. The City of Dixon has the greatest variation in resource area designations among the incorporated cities of Solano County. In Dixon, the southern and eastern areas are primarily moderate-resource areas, high and high-resource areas are in the center of the city with the exception of the Northwest Park neighborhood, east of Parkgreen Drive. Low-resource areas are in the Northwest Park neighborhood and south of W. A Street between Pitt School Road and S. Almond Street. In the unincorporated county, high- and highest-resource areas are generally in the northeast and northwest corners, with low-resource areas surrounding the cities of Dixon and Fairfield, and moderate-resource areas elsewhere. Given that much of Solano County is sparsely populated, with large agricultural areas, the low- and moderate-resource areas may not accurately represent the access to opportunities for residents of unincorporated communities, where there is typically a concentration of resources.

FIGURE 3-1: REGIONAL TCAC/HCD OPPORTUNITY AREAS



Source: TCAC/HCD, 2021

Patterns of Integration and Segregation


Segregation exists when there are concentrations of a population, usually a protected class, located in higher density in a certain area. It can be as a result of local policies, access to housing that meets the needs of that population, or a community culture or amenity that attracts that population. In the context of fair housing, segregation may indicate an issue where it creates disparities in access to opportunity, is a result of negative experiences such as discrimination or disproportionate housing need, or other concerns. Integration, in contrast, usually indicates a more balanced representation of a variety of population characteristics and is often considered to reflect fair housing opportunities and mobility. This analysis assesses four characteristics that may indicate patterns of integration or segregation throughout the region and local Solano County jurisdictions: income distribution, racial and ethnic characteristics, familial status, and disability rates.

Income Distribution

Regional Patterns

At the regional level, income distribution can be measured between jurisdictions. **Figure 3-2, Income Dot Map**, presents the spatial distribution of income groups in Solano County and surrounding Bay Area jurisdictions. There are higher concentrations of very low- and low-income households in Bay Area jurisdictions such as the cities of Emeryville and Oakland, than are found in Solano County. While there are concentrations of lower-income households in the cities of Fairfield and Suisun City, generally the distribution of incomes in Solano County more closely reflects those patterns found in neighboring Napa County than most Bay Area counties.


FIGURE 3-2: INCOME DOT MAP



Source: HUD, 2015, ACS 2011-2015, ABAG, 2022


When comparing income groups between Bay Area counties and neighboring Sacramento region counties (**Figure 3-3, Income Groups in Surrounding Region**), patterns in Solano County closely mirror many of the Bay Area counties, supporting the patterns shown in **Figure 3-2, Income Dot Map**. **Figure 3-4, Regional Median Income**, presents the geographic patterns of median income in Solano County compared to the region. Throughout the region, the highest median income is often found in medium-density urban areas, such as in the cities of Fairfield, Vacaville, Walnut Creek, San Rafael, and others. In areas with a higher-density population and uses, such as along the San Francisco and San Pablo Bays, there are a greater number of lower-income households. Solano County reflects these income distribution trends found in the region.

FIGURE 3-3: INCOME GROUPS IN SURROUNDING REGION



Source: ABAG Data Packets, 2021; HUD CHAS, 2013-2017 release


FIGURE 3-4: REGIONAL MEDIAN INCOME



Source: 2015-2019 ACS


Within Solano County, the City of Benicia has the largest proportion of moderate- and above moderate-income households, earning more than 100.0 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) (**Figure 3-5, Income Groups within Solano County Jurisdictions**). The distribution of income groups within Solano County may be representative of the availability of affordable or accessible housing and other opportunities that create mixed-income communities. As shown in **Figure 3-4, Regional Median Income**, the cities of Fairfield, Suisun City, and Vallejo have several block groups that have median incomes falling into the extremely low- and very low-income categories, corresponding with high rates of poverty shown in **Figure 3-6, Regional Poverty Rates**. While all jurisdictions in Solano County have areas in which at least 10.0 percent of the population falls below the poverty line, the City of Vallejo has the largest concentration of these households.

FIGURE 3-5: INCOME GROUPS WITHIN SOLANO COUNTY JURISDICTIONS



Source: ABAG Data Packets, 2021; HUD CHAS, 2013-2017 release

FIGURE 3-6: REGIONAL POVERTY RATES



Source: 2015-2019 ACS

Local Patterns

Locally, TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Maps designate most census tracts in Vallejo as low resource (**Figure 3-7, Local TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas**). Two tracts partially within city boundaries are designated moderate resource, though parts of these tracts also extend into Benicia, Fairfield, and unincorporated Solano County, and may not accurately reflect conditions specifically for Vallejo residents. Three tracts on Vallejo's west side are designated as areas of high segregation and poverty, indicating that these areas meet the criteria for both poverty (at least 30 percent of the population living below the federal poverty line) and racial segregation (overrepresentation of people of color relative to the county).

The median household income citywide is \$69,405, significantly below the statewide median of \$87,100 and the Solano County median of \$99,300.¹ Vallejo's median household income is the lowest among incorporated Solano County jurisdictions. Vallejo census tracts for which median household income is above the statewide median are found primarily clustered in neighborhoods on the east side of the city, with scattered and isolated higher-income tracts found in the northwest corner of the city and in areas between Broadway Street and I-80 (**Figure 3-8, Local Median Income**). The remainder of the city's census tracts have median household incomes below the statewide median, with the lowest-income tracts (\$21,270, \$23,665, and \$26,181) in the northwest side of the city, in residential areas around White Slough and the Vallejo Ferry Terminal. These neighborhoods are close to commercial and industrial areas and consist of single-unit residences, mobile home parks, and multifamily residences, including the Solano Village Apartments, Olympia Mobile Home Park, Vallejo Mobile Home Community, Solano Vista Senior Apartments, Marina Vista Apartments, Galleria Apartments, Marina Tower Apartments, Gateway Grand Apartments, Legacy at Vallejo Apartments, Duchess of Windsor Apartments, and Accession Arms Apartments, and similar residential developments likely to be among the city's more affordable housing options as compared with the city's neighborhoods where there is a predominance of single-unit residences and few nonresidential uses. As described previously, the city's highest-income tracts are on its east and northeast sides, with the highest incomes in the Hiddenbrooke area where median household income is \$168,750 (**Figure 3-8**). Other neighborhoods with relatively higher incomes include Blue Rock Springs (approximately \$89,000 to \$117,000), Gateway Plaza (\$102,225), Somerset Highlands (\$101,000 to \$115,000), Glencove (\$109,000 to \$119,000), Henry Ranch, (\$89,000 to \$103,000), Skyview (\$93,462), residential areas around Kaiser Permanente-Vallejo (\$103,273), residential areas between Greenfield Avenue and Fleming Avenue (\$90,893), as well as scattered/isolated areas between Tennessee Avenue and the Solano County line between I-80 and the railroad (\$90,000 to \$103,000). Outside of these higher-income neighborhoods, the remaining areas of Vallejo see median household incomes below the statewide median (\$87,100). This indicates that Vallejo is a community with residents who earn a wide range of incomes, and a community with distinctly higher- and lower-income areas. More densely populated areas in South Vallejo closer to nonresidential uses, I-80, State Route (SR-) 37, the railroad, and marina are among the lowest-income areas in Solano County, while areas that are primarily residential toward the east side of the city are higher income. However, according to the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas

¹ 2015-2019 ACS, Table S1901 Income in the Past 12 Months (In Inflation-Adjusted Dollars); HCD 2021 State Income Limits.

Map (**Figure 3-7**), Vallejo residents experience uniformly low access to resources compared to the county, which does not vary by income. This may indicate poor access to positive outcomes related to education, economic, or environmental opportunities regardless of the income level.

In Vallejo, 15.0 percent of households make less than 30.0 percent AMI, which is considered extremely low income.² This is the highest rate among Solano County jurisdictions. At the census-tract level, higher rates are found in the central and western parts of the city, in neighborhoods that coincide with the city's lower-income block groups (**Figure 3-9, Local Poverty Rates**). Particularly high rates of poverty are found in the neighborhood around Vallejo Ferry Terminal and in the neighborhood around White Slough, the city's lowest-income neighborhoods where housing typology and the presence of industrial uses likely accounts for more housing affordability and higher rates of poverty in these areas. These areas have historically been used as shipyard worker housing and were redlined areas, and patterns of low incomes persist in these areas. In general, elevated rates of poverty (above 10.0 percent) are found in the city's lower-income neighborhoods.

The spatial distribution pattern of median household income in Vallejo has not shifted substantially between 2014 and 2019. Lower-income households are found in the west and central side of the city, closer to the commercial areas and along I-80 and the Mare Island Strait. Neighborhoods identified as higher-income based on 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) data were also the city's higher-income areas in 2014, generally on the city's east side. This data confirms that Vallejo has distinct higher- and lower-income areas, the boundaries of which have been generally consistent over time. To improve access to areas of high opportunity for lower-income households, the City will incentive development of residential units in mixed-use zones to facilitate access to resources (**Program A 1.1.2**) will work with developers to expand for housing for lower-income households and special needs groups (**Program E 1.1.1**) and will encourage construction of ADUs across the city to increase housing mobility opportunities (**Program H 4.1.2**).


² ABAG MTC Housing Needs Data Report, 2021

FIGURE 3-7: LOCAL TCAC/HCD OPPORTUNITY AREAS




Source: TCAC/HCD, 2021; City of Vallejo, 2022

FIGURE 3-8: LOCAL MEDIAN INCOME



Source: 2015-2019 ACS; City of Vallejo, 2022

FIGURE 3-9: LOCAL POVERTY RATES



Source: 2015-2019 ACS; City of Vallejo, 2022


Racial and Ethnic Characteristics

Regional Patterns

The Dissimilarity Index measures the percentage of a certain racial or ethnic group's population that would have to move to a different census tract to be evenly distributed within a jurisdiction or region, and thus achieve balanced integration between all racial and ethnic groups within that jurisdiction. The higher the Dissimilarity Index score is, the higher the level of segregation is currently. For example, if a jurisdiction's White/Black Dissimilarity Index was 40, then 40.0 percent of White residents would need to move to a different neighborhood for Black and White residents to be evenly distributed across the jurisdiction. According to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Dissimilarity Indices of less than 39 are considered to indicate low segregation, indicated between 50 and 54 indicate moderate segregation, and indices greater than 55 indicate high segregation.

According to HUD's Dissimilarity Index based on the 2010 Census, Black residents throughout most of the region experience the highest levels of segregation; followed by Hispanic and Latinx residents in most counties; and Asian residents in Napa, Sacramento, and Solano Counties (**Figure 3-10, Dissimilarity Indices in the Region**). Yolo and San Joaquin Counties are the only jurisdictions in which these patterns differ. In Sonoma and Yolo Counties, all racial and ethnic groups face relatively low levels of segregation. Overall, Solano County has greater integration across all racial and ethnic groups than all counties in the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and greater region, with the exception of Marin, Sonoma, and Yolo Counties.


FIGURE 3-10: DISSIMILARITY INDICES IN THE REGION



Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Mapping Tool, 2020; 2010 U.S. Census


While Solano County has relatively low dissimilarity indices compared to the region and surrounding counties, the population is predominantly White in most areas, with the exception of areas within the cities of Vallejo, Fairfield, and Dixon (**Figure 3-11, Regional Racial Demographics**). The northern portion of the ABAG region has similar racial and ethnic patterns, with most of Marin, Sonoma, and Napa Counties being predominantly White, while there is a larger proportion of non-White populations adjacent to the San Francisco Bay in more urbanized areas. Similarly, in Yolo and San Joaquin Counties, and the southwestern portion of Sacramento County, the population predominantly identifies as Hispanic or Latinx. These racial and ethnic trends in the ABAG and Sacramento regions reflect patterns of urbanization and income distribution that reflect the trends in Solano County. Where there is greater urbanization and higher rates of poverty, such as in and near the City of Vallejo, there is greater diversity, meaning a higher proportion on non-White households (**Figure 3-12, Regional Diversity Index, and Figure 3-11, Regional Racial Demographics**).

FIGURE 3-11: REGIONAL RACIAL DEMOGRAPHICS



Source: Esri, 2018


FIGURE 3-12: REGIONAL DIVERSITY INDEX



Source: Esri, 2018


Concentrations of minority populations, or concentrations of affluence, may indicate a lack of fair housing opportunities despite relative integration compared to the region. A racially and ethnically concentrated area of poverty (R/ECAP) is defined by HUD as an area in which 50.0 percent or more of the population identifies as non-White and 40.0 percent or more of households are earning an income below the federal poverty line. While racially concentrated areas of affluence (RCAAs) have not been officially defined by HUD, for the purposes of this analysis, if the percentage of a population in a census tract that identifies as White is 1.5 times the percentage that identifies as White in ABAG as a whole, and the median income is at least 1.25 times greater than the State AMI (\$90,100), or \$112,625, the tract is considered a RCAA. There are two R/ECAPs in Solano County, one within the limits of the City of Vallejo and one within the limits of the City of Fairfield, both of which are discussed in more detail in their respective jurisdictional analysis. The only other R/ECAP in the northern ABAG region is in Marin County, adjacent to the City of Sausalito, while there are several in the urban areas of the southern ABAG region, Sacramento County, and San Joaquin County (see **Figure 3-13, Regional R/ECAPs**). In contrast, there are several possible RCAAs in Solano County (see **Figure 3-14, Regional RCAAs**), including in the cities of Benicia and Vacaville and unincorporated areas, including Green Valley. RCAAs are even more prevalent throughout the ABAG region, such as in the suburban communities of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties as well as much of Santa Clara, San Mateo, Marin, and Napa Counties.

FIGURE 3-13: REGIONAL R/ECAPS



Source: 2006-2010 ACS


FIGURE 3-14: REGIONAL RCAAS



Source: 2015-2019 ACS

At the local level, the University of California (UC) Merced Urban Policy Lab and Association of Bay Area Government/Metropolitan Transportation Council (ABAG/MTC)’s AFFH Segregation Reports for each jurisdiction reports Dissimilarity Index scores based on the 2020 Census, for a current reflection of local integration. As shown in **Figure 3-15, Dissimilarity Indices within Solano County**, the unincorporated area has the greatest level of segregation among all racial groups, while Dixon has the lowest level of segregation. In some jurisdictions, the percentage of the population that identifies as non-White is so low, as shown in the Solano County Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) in Table 2-1, Population by Ethnicity, that dissimilarity indices may not accurately represent their distribution.

FIGURE 3-15: DISSIMILARITY INDICES WITHIN SOLANO COUNTY



Source: ABAG Data Packets, 2021; 2020 Decennial Census

Local Patterns

Vallejo is one of Solano County’s more diverse jurisdictions and has been recognized as one of California’s most diverse cities.³ The city’s largest demographic groups are White non-Hispanic/Latinx, comprising 24.1 percent; Asian non-Hispanic/Latinx residents, comprising 23.2 percent; Black or African American residents, comprising 19.7 percent; residents who identify as Other Hispanic/Latinx, comprising

³ Komar, Chris, “The 10 Most Diverse Cities in California for 2021”, HomeSnacks, <https://www.homesnacks.com/most-diverse-cities-in-california/>


11.6 percent; White Hispanic/Latinx residents, comprising 11.2 percent; and Multiracial non-Hispanic/Latinx, comprising 5.0 percent. All Hispanic/Latinx -identifying residents, including those identifying as White Hispanic/Latinx, comprise 26.3 percent of the city's population. Other demographic groups, including American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian Hispanic/Latinx, Multiracial Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian, and Other are represented by smaller populations, each comprising 2.0 percent or less of the city's population.

In total, non-White residents comprise a combined 64.7 percent of the city's population. White residents comprise majorities by census tract in central neighborhoods between I-80 and the railroad north of Tennessee Avenue. The city's most diverse neighborhoods coincide with the city's lowest-income neighborhoods and neighborhoods designated as having high segregation and poverty. These neighborhoods are found in predominantly Hispanic or Latinx communities in the southeast section of the city (**Figure 3-16, Local Racial Demographics**). This data indicates that Vallejo is home to a diverse population of residents with a wide range of household incomes, with generally higher incomes found in communities with higher proportions of Asian-identifying residents living on the east side of the city, and distinctly lower incomes found in communities with higher proportions of Hispanic/Latinx-identifying residents living on the southwest side of the city, with some neighborhoods experiencing high poverty and segregation. However, the overall low-resource TCAC/HCD designation indicates that Vallejo residents, regardless of demographic group and income status, may have more limited access to resources and opportunities than households with similar incomes living in other parts of the county.

Similar to many Bay Area jurisdictions, Vallejo once experienced redlining, which influenced racial and ethnic patterns in the city (see the section titled Other Relevant Factors). However, in recent decades, Vallejo has experienced dramatic integration and persistent diversity. The 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS data reflect nearly identical proportions of demographic groups, with the only substantial shifts found within the White Hispanic/Latinx category (17.1 percent in 2013, down to 11.2 percent in 2019) and the Other Hispanic/Latinx category (4.0 percent in 2013, up to 11.6 percent in 2019). In general, areas of the city that are the most diverse now were also the city's most diverse since the early 2000s, though these neighborhoods are relatively more diverse today than they were previously.


The spatial distribution of residents according to racial and ethnic demographics found in Vallejo today is consistent with patterns found elsewhere in Solano County. Neighborhoods with higher proportions of non-White residents tend to be in low-resource communities. Vallejo contains one R/ECAP, as defined by HUD, in the area of high segregation and poverty surrounding the Vallejo Ferry Terminal (see the section titled Income Distribution) (**Figure 3-17, Local R/ECAPs**). In areas not meeting the criteria for designation as an R/ECAP, concentrations of lower-income and non-White households may indicate limited economic opportunities for existing households. Vallejo does not contain any RCAAs. To increase housing mobility opportunities for lower- and moderate-income households and non-White households, the City will implement **Program B 2.1.1** to research an inclusionary housing ordinance to support construction of high-density housing in areas with better access to opportunities to facilitate economic mobility for lower-income residents and will promote construction of a range of housing types to meet a variety of needs (**Program H 4.1.1**).

FIGURE 3-16: LOCAL RACIAL DEMOGRAPHICS



Source: Esri, 2018; City of Vallejo, 2022

FIGURE 3-17: LOCAL R/ECAPS



Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Familial Status

Regional Patterns

Patterns of familial status present a potential indicator of fair housing issues, as it relates to availability of appropriately sized or priced housing when certain family types are concentrated. As a protected characteristic, concentrations of family types may also occur as a result of discrimination by housing providers, such as against families with children or unmarried partners. Furthermore, single-parent female-headed households are considered to have a greater risk of experiencing poverty than single-parent male-headed households due to factors including the gender wage gap and difficulty in securing higher-wage jobs.

In 2021, HUD Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) reported the number of housing discrimination cases filed with HUD since January 2013. Of the 41 cases in Solano County that were not dismissed or withdrawn, approximately 12.1 percent (5 cases) alleged familial status discrimination (**Table 3-1, Regional Familial Status Discrimination, 2013-2021**). While it is important to note that some cases may go unreported, five cases in eight years reflects significantly low rates of familial status discrimination in Solano County. Further, the incidence of discrimination against familial status in Solano County is relatively low compared to the region, with only Sacramento, San Francisco, and Sonoma Counties having lower rates.

TABLE 3-1: REGIONAL FAMILIAL STATUS DISCRIMINATION, 2013-2021

County	Total Cases*	Cases Alleging Familial Status Discrimination	
		Number	Percentage of Total Cases
Alameda County	125	21	16.8%
Contra Costa County	94	12	12.8%
Marin County	52	10	19.2%
Napa County	28	12	42.9%
Sacramento County	158	15	9.5%
San Francisco County	133	13	9.8%
San Joaquin County	30	4	13.3%
San Mateo County	64	29	45.3%
Santa Clara County	139	44	31.7%
Solano County	41	5	12.2%
Sonoma County	44	3	6.8%
Yolo County	25	4	16.0%


Source: HUD, 2021

*Cases that were withdrawn by the complainant without resolution, resulted in a no cause determination, or were not pursued as a result of failure of the complainant to respond to follow-up by HUD are not included in this total

While discrimination against familial status does not pose a fair housing issue in Solano County, particularly compared to the region, there are still notable patterns of distribution for varying family types. As seen in **Figure 3-18, Percentage of Children in Married Couple Households in the Region**, most of Solano County has markedly lower rates of this family type, particularly compared to ABAG jurisdictions. The lower rate of families with children found in eastern Solano County is more reflective of northern portions of Yolo and Marin Counties, where residences are typically more dispersed and uses are more agricultural or limited by topography. The highest rates of female-headed households with children in Solano County are in, or immediately adjacent to, incorporated cities, likely where there is better access to schools, transit, and jobs, as well as a greater range in housing types to meet a variety of needs (**Figure 3-19, Percentage of Children in Female-Headed Households in the Region**). This pattern is seen throughout the ABAG and Sacramento Region, with greater concentrations of female-headed households in and near cities, and higher rates of married couples further from urban centers.


Within Solano County, the highest concentration of female-headed households is in the City of Vallejo, with one pocket in the City of Fairfield. In line with this, these cities also have the lowest concentrations of married-couple households with children, which is the dominant family type in the northeastern portion of Vacaville and nearby areas of the unincorporated county. In other jurisdictions in the county, there is a more balanced representation of a variety of family types, though married couples are still the primary family type throughout Solano County and the region.

FIGURE 3-18: PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN MARRIED-COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS IN THE REGION



Source: 2015-2019 ACS

FIGURE 3-19: PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS IN THE REGION



Source: 2015-2019 ACS

Local Patterns


Approximately 74.9 percent of Vallejo households are family households, defined by California law as a household of two or more persons, regardless of relationship status. Approximately 25.1 percent of households consist of residents living alone. Approximately 24.6 percent of family households are headed by single adults.⁴

Among Solano County jurisdictions, Vallejo sees the highest rate and largest number of single-parent, female-headed households, at 17.2 percent (7,224 households). Of female-headed family households, 62.6 percent include children (4,521 households), and 18.8 percent include children and have household incomes below the poverty line (1,360 households). The spatial distribution of single-parent, female-headed households with children as a percentage of total households by census tract is consistent with TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area designations and median household incomes, with higher rates of this household type in lower-resource, lower-income areas. Vallejo's areas of high segregation and poverty have among the highest rates in the city, with the three tracts identified seeing rates of 62.9, 45.2, and 48.1 percent (**Figure 3-20, Single-Parent Female-Headed Households with Children in Vallejo**).

The census tract with the highest rate, 62.9 percent, is the same census tract around the Vallejo Ferry Terminal identified as an R/ECAP and a tract of high segregation and poverty (see the Racial and Ethnic Characteristics section). This data indicates a concentration of single-parent, female-headed households in low-resource, low-income neighborhoods and suggests that children in these households may have more limited access to resources and opportunities as compared with children living in other parts of the county. The City will implement **Program H 4.1.1** to improve access to affordable housing for single-parent female headed households in areas of higher opportunity by encouraging construction of affordable units in a range of sizes, and improve opportunities in low-opportunity areas.

⁴ Housing Needs Assessment, Table 2-3

FIGURE 3-20: SINGLE-PARENT FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN IN VALLEJO




Source: 2015-2019 ACS

Disability Rates

Regional Patterns

Figure 3-21, Population with a Disability in the Region, identifies a large area of eastern Solano County in which nearly 23.8 percent of the population has a disability, one of the largest areas with a high disability rate in the region. However, this tract includes the City of Rio Vista, where nearly half of the population is 65 years or older (see HNA Table 2-2, Population by Age, 2019). As shown in **Table 3-2, Demographic Characteristics of the Population with a Disability**, 44.3 percent of the population in Solano County with a disability falls into this age group, suggesting that the high rate of disability in the southeastern portion of the county is likely due to the concentration of seniors. The second area of concentrated disability in Solano County is in the City of Vacaville, in the tract encompassing Leisure Town, a retirement community restricted to residents aged 50 and older. With the exception of these two areas of senior populations, disability rates in Solano County largely reflect patterns seen throughout the Bay Area (see **Table 3-2, Demographic Characteristics of the Population with a Disability**), with slightly higher rates of disability in more developed areas (**Figure 3-21, Population with a Disability in the Region**). This is likely due to proximity to services and accessible housing options that are often desirable to persons with disabilities. Regional service providers indicate that residents living with disabilities prefer to live independently but limited housing options may restrict options to care facilities. Additionally, senior residents typically make up a substantial share of residents living with disabilities.

FIGURE 3-21: POPULATION WITH A DISABILITY IN THE REGION



Source: 2015-2019 ACS

TABLE 3-2: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION WITH A DISABILITY

Demographic Characteristic	Solano County	Bay Area
Population with a disability	52,642	735,533
<i>Race and Ethnicity</i>		
White, alone	57.0%	56.2%
Black or African American, alone	16.3%	9.8%
Alaska Native/Alaska Native, alone	0.8%	1.0%
Asian, alone	14.3%	20.1%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, alone	0.9%	0.6%
Some other race or multiple races	10.8%	12.4%
Hispanic or Latinx	16.5%	19.4%
<i>Age</i>		
Under 18 years	7.3%	6.3%
18 to 34 years	10.2%	11.5%
35 to 64 years	38.2%	33.9%
65 years and over	44.3%	48.4%
<i>Disability Type</i>		
Hearing Difficulty	29.7%	28.5%
Vision Difficulty	15.1%	17.2%
Cognitive Difficulty	36.1%	38.1%
Ambulatory Difficulty	51.5%	50.3%
Self-Care Difficulty	20.4%	22.8%
Independent Living Difficulty	34.9%	40.7%

Source: 2015-2019 ACS

The characteristics of the population with a disability in Solano County closely reflects patterns throughout the Bay Area (**Figure 3-21, Population with a Disability in the Region**). This is also reflected in the geographic distribution of persons with disabilities, with no notable concentrations of high disability rates in Solano County compared to the ABAG and Sacramento regions, with the exception of the City of Rio Vista (see HNA Table 2-32, Population by Disability Status, 2015-2019).


Local Patterns

Approximately 12.5 percent of Vallejo's population lives with one or more types of disability, close to the Solano County average of 12.3 percent and higher than the Bay Area average of 9.6 percent.⁵ The spatial distribution of Vallejo residents living with disabilities is consistent with patterns demonstrated by low-income households, with the lower-income southwestern side of the city seeing generally elevated rates by census tract as compared with relatively higher-income areas in the northeast, northwest, and southeast areas (**Figure 3-22, Percentage of the Population with a Disability in Vallejo**). Rates of disability in census tracts with income below the statewide median generally range between 10.0 and 20.0 percent, while tracts where the median household income exceeds the statewide median generally have rates below 10.0 percent. The R/ECAP census tract surrounding the Vallejo Ferry Terminal has a rate of 18.9 percent, among the highest in the city. The census tracts with the highest median household income, including the Hiddenbrooke and Blue Rock Springs neighborhoods, have disability rates of 8.1 to 8.9 percent, among the lowest citywide. This data indicates that a smaller proportion of residents in Vallejo's relatively higher-income areas are living with disabilities, and that those residents who are living with a disability are more likely to be living in areas of higher poverty and segregation. The spatial distribution of Vallejo residents living with disabilities has not meaningfully shifted between 2014 and 2019. Census tracts around the Vallejo Ferry Terminal and White Slough previously saw, and continue to see, higher rates of disability relative to other areas of the city.

To improve access to housing for senior residents and other residents with disabilities, the City has included **Program E 1.1.4** to encourage all new units to be universally designed so they are accessible for both occupants and visitors.

⁵ Housing Needs Assessment, Table 2-32

FIGURE 3-22: PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION WITH A DISABILITY IN VALLEJO



Source: 2015-2019 ACS; City of Vallejo, 2022

Access to Opportunity


Transit Mobility

Transit mobility refers to an individual's ability to navigate the city and region on a daily basis to access services, employment, schools, and other resources. Indicators of transit mobility include the extent of transit routes, proximity of transit stops to affordable housing, and frequency of transit.

Regional Patterns

AllTransit is a transit and connectivity analytic tool developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology for the advancement of equitable communities and urban sustainability. The tool analyzes the transit frequency, routes, and access to determine an overall transit score at the city, county, and regional levels. **Figure 3-23, AllTransit Transit Access in the Region** depicts where in Solano County transit is available and areas with higher connectivity scores. As shown, public transit in Solano County is largely isolated within incorporated jurisdictions, with little to no available transit between cities or within unincorporated areas. While transit companies such as Amtrak and Greyhound offer connections from Sacramento to San Francisco that have stops along the I-80 corridor, these are not typically used as transit opportunities for daily activities. All residents of Solano County have access to the Clipper Card, a program that works for 24 transit services within the San Francisco Bay Area, including Solano County Transit (SolTrans), Fairfield and Suisun Transit (FAST), and Vacaville City Coach.

FIGURE 3-23: ALLTRANSIT TRANSIT ACCESS



Source: AllTransit.cnt.org, 2022

AllTransit scores geographic regions (i.e., cities, counties, Metropolitan Statistical Areas [MSAs], etc.) on a scale of 0 to 10. The lowest scores in Solano County are in the cities of Dixon (0.9), Rio Vista (1.8), and Benicia (2.5), and higher scores are found in the cities of Fairfield (4.1), Suisun City (4.7), Vacaville (4.9), and Vallejo (5.0). As shown in **Table 3-3, Regional AllTransit Performance Scores**, transit accessibility in Solano County reflects the scores of neighboring counties with large agricultural industries, such as Napa, San Joaquin, and Sonoma Counties, and is far more limited than more urban jurisdictions in the Bay Area and Sacramento regions.

TABLE 3-3: REGIONAL ALLTRANSIT PERFORMANCE SCORES

Jurisdiction/Region	Score
Alameda County	7.1
Contra Costa County	5.0
Marin County	4.8
Napa County	3.3
Sacramento County	4.8
San Francisco County	9.6
San Joaquin County	3.0
San Mateo County	6.1
Santa Clara County	6.5
Solano County	3.9
Sonoma County	3.4
Yolo County	4.6

Source: AllTransit.cnt.org, 2022

In Solano County, there are several transit options available to residents, depending on where they are within the county. SolanoExpress, managed by the Solano Transportation Authority (STA), provides express intercity bus service throughout the county, with many routes operated by local transportation agencies, such as FAST. Transportation services in Solano County include the following:

- SolTrans serving Fairfield, Vallejo, and Benicia with connections outside of the county
- FAST serving Fairfield, Travis Air Force Base, and Suisun City
- Rio Vista Delta Breeze serving Rio Vista, Fairfield, and Suisun City with connections outside of the county
- Vacaville City Coach serving Vacaville
- Solano Mobility serving older adults and persons with disabilities throughout Solano County

In addition to standard fixed routes offered by each transportation agency, there are several specialized programs available as well. SolTrans offers the Subsidized Lyft Program that pays a portion of Lyft rides throughout the City of Benicia and to the Springtown Center in Vallejo for seniors, veterans, and persons with disabilities. The GoGo Grandparent program is a partnership between SolTrans and Solano Mobility that offers help to older adults to access and use Uber and Lyft without a smartphone by scheduling rides for them. Solano Mobility independently offers four additional programs: Travel Training, Solano Older Adults Medical Trip Concierge Service, Vehicle Share Program, and Solano County Intercity Taxi Card Program. The Travel Training program offers individuals or groups training on how to board and ride public transit, navigate routes, and use bus features such as bike racks and wheelchair lifts. The medical concierge service subsidizes Uber and Lyft rides for Solano County residents aged 60 and over to travel to and from medical appointments while the Intercity Taxi Card Program issues pre-paid debit cards to certified riders with disabilities to be used for taxi rides between transit service areas. These cards are loaded with \$100 and available for riders to purchase for \$40, or \$20 for qualified low-income individuals. Faith in Action, the American Cancer Society/Road to Recovery, and Veteran's Affairs (VA) also offer free door-to-door rides for ambulatory seniors aged 60 and older and those under age 60 with specific medical issues. These programs are available to all Solano County residents regardless of location, unless otherwise specified.

In the ABAG region, transit mobility opportunities are typically more readily available in dense urban areas such as the East Bay and San Francisco. In more suburban areas, such as the I-680 corridor in Contra Costa County, there is more limited transit mobility, with AllTransit scores matching those found throughout Solano County. While there are a variety of transit options available in Solano County, residents in many suburban, agricultural, and rural communities are more limited than elsewhere in the ABAG region, which may limit employment opportunities and present a barrier to housing mobility for those households reliant on transit. In the following analysis of transit mobility, the individual jurisdictions have identified programs to address access specific to their transit needs.

Local Patterns

The City of Vallejo is uniquely located near the San Francisco Bay, like the City of Benicia, compared to other Solano County jurisdictions. Its location provides access to the San Francisco Bay Ferry in addition to other public transportation options available throughout Solano County. The San Francisco Bay Ferry has three ferry connections from the City of Vallejo: Oracle Park, Pier 41, and Downtown San Francisco. The ferry route to Oracle Park operates only during baseball season when there are home games for the San Francisco Giants. However, daily ferry service occurs on weekdays and weekends between Vallejo and Downtown San Francisco and Pier 41, with occasional limited Mare Island service. San Francisco Ferry fares and tickets operate on a first-come, first-served basis based on destination. Destinations are grouped into three zones and Short Hop routes. Zone 1 includes service between Alameda Seaplane and Downtown San Francisco, Harbor Bay and Downtown San Francisco, Oakland and Main Street Alameda, and Richmond and Downtown San Francisco; Zone 2 includes service for South San Francisco, Oakland, and Main Street Alameda; Zone 3 includes service for Vallejo and Downtown San Francisco; and the Short Hop route includes Pier 41 and Downtown San Francisco and Main Street Alameda and Oakland. The San Francisco Bay Ferry allows Vallejo residents to have access to a variety of jobs available in the City and County of San Francisco. More

information on fare between the different zones and hops for various rider types are found in **Table 3-4, Fare Costs for San Francisco Bay Area Ferry Service, 2022.**

TABLE 3-4: FARE COSTS FOR SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA FERRY SERVICE, 2022

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Short Hops
Clipper/Mobile Ticket	\$4.50	\$6.75	\$9.00	\$1.00
Discount Clipper/Mobile Ticket ¹	\$2.25	\$3.25	\$4.50	\$0.50
Paper Ticket	\$5.75	\$8.50	\$11.25	\$1.25
Discount Paper Ticket ²	\$2.75	\$4.25	\$5.50	\$0.50
Children under 5	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE

Source: San Francisco Bay Ferry, 2022.

Notes:

1. Discount Clipper includes Clipper START, RTC Clipper, Senior Clipper and Youth Clipper.
2. Discount paper tickets can be used by those 65 or older, 17 or younger, or those with Medicare cards or DMV disabled parking placards.

In addition to the San Francisco Bay Ferry, the residents of, and visitors to, the City of Vallejo also have access to standard SolTrans bus service. SolTrans provides local and express bus services to the cities of Benicia, Vallejo, and Fairfield and regional connections to Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART). The Yellow Line runs from Walnut Creek, with stops along I-680, and operates every weekday from 4:30 am to 12:00 am with limited operating service on Saturday. Of the 16 routes that SolTrans operates, 10 routes provide services in the City of Vallejo. These include four intercity routes (Green, Red, Yellow Lines, and Route 82), connecting riders to destinations ranging from as far south as San Francisco to as far north as the City of Fairfield. Ten routes provide connections throughout the City of Vallejo, including destinations in the neighborhoods of South Vallejo and Rancho Vallejo and along Tennessee Street and Tuolumne Street. The two other routes serve the City of Benicia.

In partnership with Lyft, SolTrans (through the STA) also offers a subsidized Lyft program for Vallejo and Benicia riders. The subsidized rideshare program offers a subsidy for pick-ups or drop-offs for certain areas in Vallejo such as the Vallejo Ferry Terminal, Vallejo Transit Center, Cal Maritime Academy, Caquinez Mobile Park Home, and Mare Island. Riders pay 20.0 percent of Lyft fare plus the difference in fares over \$25. According to AllTransit, Vallejo received a relatively high score of 5.0 for transit connectivity compared to the county, likely due to its public transportation options and proximity to services and employment opportunities outside of the city, such as those in the Bay Area.

Housing Mobility

Regional Patterns

Housing mobility refers to an individual’s or household’s ability to secure affordable housing in areas of high opportunity, move between neighborhoods, and purchase a home if they so choose. Indicators of housing mobility include distribution of HCVs, availability of rental and ownership opportunities throughout the city, and vacancy rates. A “healthy” vacancy rate is considered to be approximately 5.0 percent, indicating that there are available housing units for those seeking housing, but not an oversaturated market that results in homes left unused. In Solano County, the vacancy rate in 2021 was approximately 5.3 percent, indicating a relatively “healthy” vacancy rate and reflecting a similar rate as most counties in the surrounding region (**Table 3-5, Regional Vacancy Rates**). This suggests that residents living in Solano County, or seeking to live in Solano County, have similar mobility options overall compared to most of the region. Mobility based on vacancy varies within Solano County by jurisdiction and is discussed further below.

TABLE 3-5: REGIONAL VACANCY RATES

Geography	Total Housing Units	Occupied Housing Units	Vacancy Rate
Bay Area	3,402,378	3,213,576	5.6%
Alameda County	617,415	585,588	5.2%
Contra Costa County	420,751	398,387	5.3%
Marin County	112,690	105,395	6.5%
Napa County	54,982	48,684	11.5%
Sacramento County	583,631	552,252	5.4%
San Joaquin County	252,686	238,577	5.6%
San Mateo County	282,299	266,650	5.5%
Santa Clara County	680,298	648,665	4.6%
Solano County	161,371	152,877	5.3%
Sonoma County	206,768	189,316	8.4%
Yolo County	79,472	76,555	3.7%

Source: Department of Finance E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2021

HCVs, or Section 8 vouchers, provide assistance to lower-income households to secure housing in the private market that might otherwise be unattainable. In Solano County, vouchers are allocated by the Vacaville Housing Authority, Suisun City Housing Authority, Vallejo Housing Authority, Fairfield Housing Authority, and the Solano County Housing Authority to residents of the unincorporated areas and to the cities of Dixon and Rio Vista. Section 8 participants can use their voucher to find the housing unit of their choice that meets health and safety standards established by the local housing authority. The housing authority will then subsidize an amount up to the Fair-Market Rent (FMR) established by HUD toward the contract rent, with any remainder to be paid by the participant. The subsidy increases housing mobility opportunities for Section 8 participants and ensures that they are provided safe housing options. Solano County falls within the Vallejo-Fairfield MSA, for which HUD establishes FMRs annually to be used as the baseline for Section 8 subsidies (**Table 3-6, Vallejo-Fairfield MSA FMRs, 2022**).

TABLE 3-6: VALLEJO-FAIRFIELD MSA FMRS, 2022

Unit Size	FMR
Studio	\$1,232
1-bedroom	\$1,408
2-bedroom	\$1,677
3-bedroom	\$2,382
4-bedroom	\$2,870

Source: HUD, 2022


Local Patterns

Approximately 44.5 percent of households are renters in Vallejo (see HNA Table 2-19, Housing Tenure, 2019). Vallejo’s renter to owner tenure ratio is the most balanced amongst Solano County jurisdictions. The rental vacancy rate in Vallejo is 4.7 percent, while the ownership unit vacancy rate is 0.9 percent. This rental vacancy rate is amongst the healthiest for Solano County, indicating that the City of Vallejo has mobility opportunities for renters. Despite the healthy rental vacancy rate, Vallejo, like most other incorporated communities in Solano County, has a low homeownership vacancy rate. This may be due to the competitive housing market across Solano County and the rest of the Bay Area. To promote homeownership opportunities, the City will implement a sweat equity program to support prospective homeowners (**Program D 1.1.1**), and will encourage a variety of housing types, including community land trust developments, cottage homes, and small lot subdivisions to support construction of relatively affordable and equity building ownership options (**Program H 4.1.1**).

Across the City of Vallejo, the proportion of renters using a HCV ranges from 5.0 to 15.0 percent of households. An exception to this finding is the eastern part of the City of Vallejo, where no HCVs have been recorded. However, there are two areas of comparatively high HCV concentrations, in the center and most northeastern portions of the city (**Figure 3-24, Housing Choice Voucher Distribution in Vallejo**). In the center of the city, between Georgia Street to the south, I-80 to the east, Tennessee Street to the north, and Amador Street to the west, approximately 15.5 percent of renters use an HCV. In the Crest Ranch Park neighborhood, north of Marine World Parkway, west of Fairground Drive, and east of I-80, approximately 17.0 percent of renters use HCVs. In contrast to the relatively even distribution of vouchers in the western portion of the city, the lack of HCVs in the eastern portion of Vallejo may be due to the abundance of single-family homes in these census tracts and potentially more limited affordable rental opportunities.

Rent for two-, three-, and four-bedroom units in Vallejo ranges from \$1,600 to \$3,655 with the median rent being \$2,603 (see HNA Table 2-28, Rental Rates, 2021). This rental price is in the middle amongst Solano jurisdictions. The FMR for one-bedroom units in the Vallejo-Fairfield MSA, as established by HUD, is \$1,408. Therefore, up to 59.8 percent of studio and one-bedroom units in Vallejo are considered fair-market prices. However, this proportion of units does include those priced up to \$1,500, which would slightly exceed the FMR for a one-bedroom unit. As such, it is assumed that approximately 45.0 to 50.0 percent of units are priced within the FMR range. This indicates that many units are not attainable to lower-income households without the use of HCV, and larger units are unaffordable to all lower-income households. Therefore, to increase housing mobility for voucher holders, the Vallejo Housing Authority by meeting with property managers to encourage landlords and property managers to advertise their units to voucher holders (**Program B 1.1.1**).

FIGURE 3-24: HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER DISTRIBUTION IN VALLEJO



Source: HUD, 2020; City of Vallejo, 2022


Employment Opportunities

Regional Patterns

HUD developed two indices to analyze access to employment opportunities: the jobs proximity index and the labor market engagement index. The jobs proximity index identifies census tracts based on their proximity to employment opportunities and the labor market engagement index scores labor force participation and human capital in each tract, with consideration of unemployment rates and educational attainment. For both indices, a higher score indicates stronger job proximity or labor force participation.


According to these indices, Solano County has more consistent proximity to jobs but lower labor force engagement than many other counties in the ABAG region (**Figure 3-25, Regional Jobs Proximity**, and **Figure 3-26, Regional Labor Market Engagement**). Labor force engagement patterns in Solano County more closely reflect the neighboring counties of Yolo and San Joaquin in the Sacramento region, where population distribution and industries are similar to most of Solano County. The area with the lowest labor force engagement in Solano County, however, is in the tract that includes the City of Rio Vista where there is a sizable senior population, which may include residents who retired early. As shown in **Table 3-7, Regional Unemployment Rates, 2010-2021**, the unemployment rate in Solano County in 2021 was one of the highest in the Bay Area and Sacramento regions, at 5.4 percent. However, Solano County saw one of the largest decreases in unemployment since 2010, surpassed only by San Joaquin and Yolo Counties.

FIGURE 3-25: REGIONAL JOBS PROXIMITY



Source: HUD, 2017

FIGURE 3-26: REGIONAL LABOR MARKET ENGAGEMENT



Source: HUD, 2017

TABLE 3-7: REGIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, 2010-2021

County	2010	2021
Alameda County	11.0%	4.2%
Contra Costa County	11.1%	4.5%
Marin County	8.0%	3.0%
Napa County	10.9%	4.2%
Sacramento County	13.1%	5.1%
San Francisco City and County	9.1%	3.3%
San Joaquin County	17.2%	6.5%
San Mateo County	8.4%	3.0%
Santa Clara County	10.3%	3.2%
Solano County	12.8%	5.4%
Sonoma County	10.9%	3.8%
Yolo County	12.6%	4.3%

Source: California Employment Development Department, 2021


The U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) reports the distance and direction between home and work for residents of each jurisdiction and the ratio between jobs and households. According to LEHD, approximately 40.6 percent of Solano County residents live within 10 miles of their job, with the greatest concentration of these jobs in Fairfield (13.5 percent) and Vacaville (13.5 percent). Approximately 18.1 percent of Solano County residents report commuting more than 50 miles to their job, with 38.2 percent of these residents commuting southeast into San Joaquin County. Overall, approximately 50.4 percent of the individuals that work in Solano County commute in from areas outside of the county. On average, in the comparison jurisdictions that comprise the Bay Area and a portion of the Sacramento region, 42.5 percent of residents live within 10 miles of their job, 15.4 percent live more than 50 miles from their job, and 49.4 live outside of the county in which they work. In Solano County, the jobs-household ratio, which is an indicator of whether there is a balance between the number of jobs and the number of households, was 0.93 in 2018 according to LEHD Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC). This ratio suggests that there was a shortage of jobs in Solano County to support the number of households, which may partially contribute to the number of residents that commute outside of the county for work. In comparison, in the Bay Area, the jobs-household ratio was 1.47, indicating that there is a shortage of housing to support the job base in this region. Generally, Solano County appears to have sufficient housing for those jobs in the county, but still has a slightly higher rate of persons that commute into the county than the region overall.

Local Patterns

The Labor Market Engagement Index score in the City of Vallejo ranges from 5 to 51, which may result from unemployment, retirement, or choosing not to participate in the labor market for other reasons (**Figure 3-27, Local Labor Market Engagement**). According to stakeholders, Vallejo began as a thriving, independent economy based on the employment opportunities at Mare Island. However, following the closure of the shipyard in 1996, Vallejo's economy transitioned to operate as a bedroom community for employees commuting into the San Francisco Bay Area, with a more limited range of opportunities within the city. As shown in **Figure 3-28, Local Jobs Proximity**, jobs are largely concentrated in the northeast portion of the city, in the commercial and business districts along Sonoma Boulevard. According to U.S. Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES), approximately 37.1 percent of Vallejo residents live within 10 miles of their job, though 85.0 percent of residents commute to jobs outside of the city. Given the proximity of Vallejo to major employment centers in the Bay Area, it is likely that some residents choose to live in Vallejo due to slightly lower housing costs and a wider range of housing types and commute to work. However, the unemployment rate in Vallejo is approximately 6.3 percent, the second highest in Solano County, suggesting possible difficulties in accessing economic opportunities. This is supported by a low jobs-household ratio (0.78), which resulted from a shortage of jobs in the city compared to the number of households. However, as a housing destination for employees in the Bay Area, a low jobs-household ratio may not result in limited access to jobs, though the loss of Mare Island jobs in the 1990s may have resulted in the displacement of households reliant on that employment center. To ensure there is access to economic opportunities for all residents, the City has identified economic development strategies in the Economy, Education, and Training Element of the General Plan to promote workforce development and support a strong local economy. These include:


- Action EET-1.1A: Work with Solano Economic Development Corporation (EDC) to attract manufactures in sections such as food and beverage, life-science, clean technology, green technology, and other industries that will provide high quality jobs.
- Action EET-1.1B: Prioritize North Mare Island for development, such as a manufacturing use, including facilitating infrastructure investment and state and regional incentives for job creation.
- Action EET-2.4B: Partner with Solano Workforce Investment Board (WIB) and Solano Community College to promote and prioritize job training programs that offer professional credentials and certifications.

FIGURE 3-27: LOCAL LABOR MARKET ENGAGEMENT



Source: HUD, 2017

FIGURE 3-28: LOCAL JOBS PROXIMITY



Source: HUD, 2017

Educational Opportunities


Regional Patterns

School quality is often tied to housing, with neighborhoods or communities with higher median incomes and home values often having access to higher-performing schools than residents of lower-income neighborhoods. Income distribution influences home values and property taxes, and therefore funding for public schools. As such, school districts with higher concentrations of affordable housing typically have lower test scores in schools, creating a cyclical problem of not offering these students equal educational opportunities. Therefore, disparities in access to strong school opportunities serves as an indicator of fair housing and equal access to opportunities.

Each year, the California Department of Education (DOE) publishes performance metrics for public schools in the state, including student assessment results for English Language Arts and Mathematics as they compare to the state grade-level standards and demographic characteristics of each school's student population. The characteristics reported on include rates of chronic absenteeism and suspension, percentage of students that are socioeconomically disadvantaged, percentage of students that are in foster care, percentage of students learning the English language, and the percentage of high school students that are prepared for college. Chronic absenteeism refers to the percentage of students who are absent for 10.0 percent or more of instructional days that they were enrolled at the school, with the state average being 10.1 percent of students. Students who are eligible for free or reduced-priced meals, or who have parents or guardians who did not receive a diploma, are considered socioeconomically disadvantaged. TCAC and HCD rely on this data from DOE to determine the expected educational outcome in each census tract and block group within the state. TCAC and HCD's educational domain score reflects mathematics proficiency, reading proficiency, high school graduation rates, and student poverty rates of all schools for which this data is available, culminating in a score ranging from 0 to 1, with higher values being the most positive expected educational outcome.

In 2021, TCAC/HCD reported the strongest projected educational outcomes for students in the cities of Benicia and Dixon as well as the unincorporated areas around the City of Vacaville and all eastern portions of the county (**Figure 3-29, Regional TCAC/HCD Educational Domain Scores**). However, the eastern portions of the county, with the highest educational scores according to TCAC/HCD, also have the lowest population density in the county and only one school. As such, for a regional analysis, the TCAC/HCD map may not accurately compare educational opportunity in Solano County to the ABAG region. At the local level, data based on school performance is more readily available and likely more accurate.


FIGURE 3-29: REGIONAL TCAC/HCD EDUCATIONAL DOMAIN SCORES



Source: TCAC/HCD, 2021

The HUD School Proficiency Index more accurately reflects school performance by residential living patterns in the region. The HUD School Proficiency Index ranges from 0 to 100, with higher values indicating better school performance. Though demographic patterns have changed throughout the region slightly since 2010, as discussed for each jurisdiction in this assessment, typically schools in Solano County and throughout the region are more proficient in areas of increased population density and affluence (see **Figure 3-30, HUD School Proficiency Index**). Residents of western Solano County have access to higher-performing schools than the eastern portion, but schools throughout Solano County generally score lower than those in much of Sacramento, Yolo, Marin, and Contra Costa Counties. To ensure all students have access to a quality education, each jurisdiction has identified appropriate programs within the individual assessments.

FIGURE 3-30: HUD SCHOOL PROFICIENCY INDEX



Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, 2017

Local Patterns

Students in Vallejo have access to 23 public schools in the Vallejo Unified School District that are reported on by DOE annually (**Table 3-8, Performance Scores for Vallejo Schools, 2019**). In addition, Vallejo Unified School District also operates Farragut Academy and John Finney High, two continuation or Community Day schools, which do not have performance metrics reported in 2019. Continuation schools typically serve students who have been expelled from other schools or have attendance or behavior problems and provide a valuable resource for furthering their education in a supportive environment.

In 2019, most Vallejo schools have at least 50.0 percent of the population identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged. Approximately 50.0 to 75.0 percent of the student population in 10 schools are considered socioeconomically disadvantaged, compared to more than 75.0 percent in 12 schools. Lincoln Elementary has the highest percentage of socioeconomically disadvantaged students at 93.0 percent. Hogan Middle School had the highest suspension rate among Vallejo schools, at 17.3 percent, while Solano-Widemann Leadership Academy followed closely at 16.3 percent. Further, the English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics scores in these schools are significantly lower than other schools in the City of Vallejo. This may indicate more instability among students at these schools that results in missing school days and lower performance scores. MIT Academy is the only school with a score above state grade-level standards, and only for ELA. To assess whether any instability or performance challenges might be related to housing conditions, the City will coordinate with the school district to survey housing needs of families with school-aged children and, if needed, will prioritize marketing of rehabilitation and other assistance programs to households within the capture areas of these schools (**Program F 1.1.2**).


TABLE 3-8: PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR VALLEJO SCHOOLS, 2019

School Name	ELA Score	Math Score	Chronic Absenteeism Rate	Suspension Rate	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Foster Youth	English Learners
Loma Vista Environmental Science Academy	-80.6	-116.9	23.9%	11.3%	79.4%	0.6%	29.3%
Mare Island Technology Academy	-23.3	-58.4	6.2%	12.6%	60.6%	0.0%	15.5%
Dan Mini Elementary	-38.1	-36.5	17.8%	1.1%	79.8%	0.0%	41.3%
Johnston Cooper Elementary	-78.4	-96.4	30.7%	7.6%	83.0%	1.5%	24.3%
Highland Elementary	-50.3	-60.8	28.8%	3.3%	86.7%	1.3%	36.3%
Vallejo High	-76	-130.3	66.0%	14.0%	74.0%	1.0%	17.0%
Caliber: ChangeMakers Academy	-14.8	-56.6	13.2%	0.0%	64.1%	0.0%	15.0%
Lincoln Elementary	-91.4	-103.3	28.7%	11.7%	93.2%	0.0%	22.2%
MIT Academy	+43.7	-42.5	-	6.2%	59.6%	0.4%	3.4%
Franklin Middle	-63.6	-122.9	30.8%	23.6%	81.8%	1.0%	24.6%
Federal Terrace Elementary	-41.3	-43.9	25.4%	2.9%	79.0%	0.0%	24.6%
Jesse M. Bethel High	-48.3	-123.1	85.6%	0.6%	56.6%	0.9%	8.4%
Joseph H. Wardlaw Elementary	-2.3	-16.9	19.0%	1.7%	52.2%	1.1%	14.3%
Vallejo Charter	-37.7	-57.5	10.1%	4.9%	52.5%	0.0%	10.8%
Cave Language Academy	-14.9	-40	9.3%	2.5%	58.9%	0.3%	34.5%
Hogan Middle	-57.7	-107.1	25.7%	17.5%	66.7%	0.9%	14.8%
Steffan Manor Elementary	-52.8	-62.3	27.0%	1.9%	83.8%	0.5%	26.3%
Annie Pennycook Elementary	-44.5	-61.9	25.5%	8.3%	66.0%	0.8%	11.1%
Beverly Hills Elementary	-43.4	-66.9	23.2%	7.1%	88.7%	0.8%	29.7%
Glen Cove Elementary	-26.1	-40.7	23.6%	3.1%	55.8%	0.8%	13.3%
Mare Island Health and Fitness Academy	-46.3	-75.2	25.2%	7.6%	78.0%	0.5%	23.0%
Grace Patterson Elementary	-31.6	-38.3	24.1%	2.5%	87.5%	0.0%	29.5%
Solano-Widemann Leadership Academy	-93.9	-121.5	21.8%	16.3%	78.2%	1.3%	25.4%

Source: California Department of Education, 2019

The anticipated educational outcomes, according to the TCAC/HCD (**Figure 3-31, Local TCAC/HCD Educational Outcome Percentile Scores**), are relatively low in downtown and central Vallejo, and higher near the perimeter of the city boundaries. However, as seen in **Figure 3-31**, nearly all of the city has scores below the 25th percentile, with the exception of those areas bordering the City of Benicia. The lowest scores are generally found along and east of I-80, with higher scores moving east. Neighborhoods bisected by I-80 or SR-29 have percentile scores ranging from approximately the 5th to 15th percentile. The census tract with Florida Street to the south, Sonoma Boulevard to the west, Valle Vista Avenue to the north, and Amador Street and Broadway Street to the east, scores in the 5th percentile. As shown in **Figure 3-31**, the northeast census tract bounded by Auto Mail Parkway, Redwood Parkway, and Ascot Parkway to the west, Columbus Parkway to the north, Sky Valley Road to the east, and Lake Hernan Road to the south scores in the 15th percentile. In the southeastern-most portion of the city, scores increase to the 32nd percentile near Glen Cove and the 67th percentile southeast of Somerset Highlands Park. However, while the score in the Somerset Highlands Park is significantly higher than the rest of the city, it is important to note that most of this tract is within the City of Benicia, and the score may reflect educational opportunities in Benicia rather than in this neighborhood of Vallejo. Therefore, when considering the rest of the tracts in the city, the expected educational outcome is low throughout Vallejo. To improve educational opportunities for all students, the City will support applications by Vallejo City Unified School District or individual schools to secure grant funding for teacher recruitment and retention bonuses, classroom materials, and other incentives for teachers and will support investment of additional resources directly into math and reading proficiency to improve the improve the performance of the entire district (**Program F 1.1.2**).

FIGURE 3-31: LOCAL TCAC/HCD EDUCATIONAL OUTCOME PERCENTILE SCORES



Source: TCAC/HCD, 2021; City of Vallejo, 2022


Environmental Health

Regional Patterns

A disadvantaged community or environmental justice community (EJ Community) is identified by the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA) as “areas that are disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation,” and may or may not have a concentration of low-income households, high unemployment rates, low homeownership rates, overpayment for housing, or other indicators of disproportionate housing need. In February 2021, the California Office for Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (COEHHA) released the fourth version of CalEnviroScreen, a tool that uses environmental, health, and socioeconomic indicators to map and compare community environmental scores. In the CalEnviroScreen tool, communities that have a cumulative score in the 75th percentile or above (25.0 percent highest score census tracts) are those that have been designated as disadvantaged communities under Senate Bill (SB) 535. The cumulative score that can result in a disadvantaged community designation is calculated based on individual scores from two groups of indicators: Pollution Burden and Population Characteristics. Pollution Burden scores exposure to negative environmental hazards, such as ozone concentrations, PM_{2.5} concentrations, drinking water contaminants, lead risk from housing, traffic impacts, and more. Population Characteristics scores the rate of negative health conditions and access to opportunities, including asthma, cardiovascular disease, poverty, unemployment, and housing cost burden. For each indicator, as with the cumulative impact, a low score reflects positive conditions.

Much of Solano County, particularly the eastern area and the City of Vallejo, have high cumulative scores, as shown in **Figure 3-32, Regional CalEnviroScreen Percentiles**. This is a result of high scores for indicators of both pollution burden and negative population characteristics, though the eastern area is primarily agricultural land with limited residential development so these scores may be a result of agricultural industry practices. In the ABAG region, high percentiles are mostly concentrated in highly urbanized communities along the San Francisco Bay, such as in the cities of Emeryville, Alameda, Oakland, and San Jose. It is unlikely that the factors that contribute to environmental scores in Solano County reflect the factors in urbanized ABAG jurisdictions. Rather, Solano County more closely reflects the agricultural areas of Yuba, Sacramento, and San Joaquin Counties. Within each jurisdiction of Solano County, patterns differ, as described below, as a result of increased urbanization; however, regionally, Solano County reflects areas to the east rather than western ABAG jurisdictions.

FIGURE 3-32: REGIONAL CALENVIROSCREEN PERCENTILES



Source: OEHHA, 2021


Local Patterns

As shown in **Figure 3-33, Local CalEnviroScreen Percentiles**, most of the city east of I-80 scores near or above the 75th percentile, qualifying as a disadvantaged community. Disadvantaged communities in Vallejo, according to OEHHA, include all of South Vallejo and Mare Island, the neighborhood adjacent to the Vallejo Ferry Terminal east to Amador Street and north to Mare Island Causeway, and the areas adjacent to Six Flags Discovery Kingdom and White Slough. While these neighborhoods do experience some pollution burden, it is not significantly higher than other areas of the city, with the exception of South Vallejo and Mare Island, which is disproportionately exposed to impaired waters (93rd percentile), groundwater threats (89th percentile), diesel particulate matter (PM) (86th percentile), and lead in housing (85th percentile). While the water in this area is not used for food or drinking water, the exposure to diesel PM is likely due to proximity to the I-80 and I-780 interchange and lead in housing may be as a result of an older housing stock. As shown in **Figure 3-34, Local TCAC/HCD Environmental Domain**, South Vallejo, Mare Island, and neighborhoods adjacent to Six Flags Discovery Kingdom are expected to have the least positive environmental outcomes, impacting access to opportunity as it relates to healthy living conditions.

In contrast to the eastern portion of Vallejo, western Vallejo typically has significantly higher TCAC/HCD environmental outcome scores and lower indicators of pollution burden according to OEHHA. For example, the neighborhoods west of Oakwood Avenue score between the 80th and 83rd percentiles on TCAC/HCD's Environmental Domain map, indicating access to positive environmental conditions for healthy living conditions. This is supported by OEHHA CalEnviroScreen scores for pollution burden ranging from the 20th to 41st percentiles.


While proximity to industrial and commercial uses, as major traffic corridors, will influence the conditions found in eastern Vallejo, the City has included **Program F 1.1.2** to mitigate existing conditions and facilitate revitalization for current and future residents by identifying best practices to address health risks and impacts associated with I-780, I-80, and industrial uses.

FIGURE 3-33: LOCAL CALENVIROSCREEN PERCENTILES



Source: OEHHA, 2021; City of Vallejo, 2022

FIGURE 3-34: LOCAL TCAC/HCD ENVIRONMENTAL DOMAIN



Source: TCAC/HCD, 2021; City of Vallejo, 2022

Services for Persons with Disabilities

Vallejo residents and visitors are served by SolTrans, which operates an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant Paratransit Bus Service. This service provides pre-scheduled origin-to-destination shared-ride bus service and schedule for eligible residents. In addition to this service, SolTrans offers a subsidized Lyft program, through a partnership with STA and Lyft, that provides subsidies for Lyft rides for qualified participants. Solano Mobility also provides a Local Taxi Card Program to ADA Paratransit certified residents residing in Vallejo or Benicia. This program issues a pre-paid debit card to be used for taxi trips that begin and end in these cities. Funds are purchased in increments of \$10 for \$25 taxi funds for moderate- and above moderate-income qualified residents and \$10 for \$50 taxi funds for low-income qualified residents.

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) licenses 35 adult residential care facilities with a combined capacity of 264 units in the City of Vallejo. The largest residential care facility in Vallejo is Our House, which offers 46 units and is between Richardson Park and Dan Foley Park. On average, the remaining residential care facilities provide six units. In addition to these facilities, there are 58 licensed elderly residential care facilities with a combined capacity of 758 units in the City of Vallejo. The largest residential care facility in Vallejo is The Lodge at Glen Cove with 155 units, while other facilities typically provide 6 units, similar to the number of units that residential care facilities in the city provide. Approximately 12.5 percent of the population of Vallejo has a disability, or approximately 15,100 residents. Of these residents, 4.7 percent have difficulties living independently and 2.1 percent have difficulty with self-care, or approximately 1,026 residents combined (see HNA Table 2-32, Disability by Type 2015-2019). While not all residents with these disabilities will require the care of an assisted living facility, and some residents with other disabilities may require assisted living, the comparison of the number of residents with disabilities to the capacity of existing care facilities suggests a balance between need and capacity.

Disproportionate Housing Need and Displacement Risk

Overcrowding


Regional Patterns

Overcrowding occurs when the number of people living in a household is greater than the home was designed to hold. The U.S. Census Bureau considers a household overcrowded when there is more than one person per room, excluding bathrooms, hallways, and kitchens, and severely overcrowded when there are more than 1.5 occupants per room. A typical home might have a total of five rooms that qualify for habitation under this definition (three bedrooms, living room, and dining room). If more than five people were living in the home, it would be considered overcrowded. Overcrowding is strongly related to household size, particularly for large households, and the availability of suitably sized housing. A small percentage of overcrowded units is not uncommon, and often includes families with children who share rooms or multi-generational households. However, high rates of overcrowding may indicate a fair housing issue resulting from

situations such as two families or households occupying one unit to reduce housing costs (sometimes referred to as “doubling up”). Situations such as this may indicate a shortage of appropriately sized and affordable housing units as overcrowding is often related to the cost and availability of housing and can occur when demand in a jurisdiction or region is high.


In Solano County, as shown in HNA Table 2-7, *Overcrowding by Tenure*, approximately 3.7 percent of households experience overcrowding and 1.6 percent experience severe overcrowding. Overcrowding is a slightly greater problem among renter-occupied households, at 2.5 percent of these households, compared to 1.2 percent of owner-occupied households, but still remains well below the statewide average of 8.2 percent. Further, the overcrowding rates in Solano County are lower than the greater Bay Area, in which 4.4 percent of households are overcrowded and 2.8 percent are severely overcrowded. As shown in **Figure 3-35, Overcrowded Households in the Region**, there are very few areas of concentrated overcrowding in the county compared to jurisdictions to the south in the ABAG region. Solano County has significantly lower overcrowding rates, across tenures, than most Bay Area and Sacramento region counties (**Figure 3-36, Overcrowding Rates in the Region**). Typically, areas with higher rates of lower-income households and more dense housing types have higher rates of overcrowding, as is seen in census tracts adjacent to the San Francisco Bay and to the northeast in the City of Sacramento and southeast in the City of Stockton. The rate and pattern of overcrowding in Solano County reflects the suburban communities in the region, such as eastern portions of Contra Costa and Alameda Counties and all of Marin County. The relatively low rates of overcrowding in Solano County may indicate that there are more appropriately sized housing opportunities at a range of price points to meet housing demand than is found in more urbanized areas of the region.

FIGURE 3-35: OVERCROWDED HOUSEHOLDS IN THE REGION



Source: California Health and Human Services (CHHS), 2020

FIGURE 3-36: OVERCROWDING RATES IN THE REGION



Source: 2015-2019 ACS


Local Patterns

Overall, 7.0 percent of households in Vallejo are considered overcrowded, which is higher than countywide rates, but similar to the ABAG region as a whole. Of these households in Vallejo, 65.6 percent are considered overcrowded, and 34.4 percent are considered severely overcrowded. In Vallejo, overcrowding is seen more amongst those that are renting, with renters comprising 68.5 percent of all overcrowded households. Approximately 6.5 percent of renters are overcrowded, compared to 3.0 percent of homeowners, and 4.2 percent of renters are severely overcrowded, compared to 0.9 percent of homeowners. Overall, households experiencing overcrowding in Vallejo, when combined with income or accessibility challenges, may become at risk for displacement.

Overcrowding also often disproportionately impacts lower-income households. According to Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, 6.9 percent households with incomes between 81.0 and 100.0 percent of the AMI, 6.5 percent of low-income households, 8.1 percent of very low-income households, and 8.1 percent of extremely low-income households experience some level of overcrowding. Conversely, 4.0 percent of households earning an income above the AMI experience some level of overcrowding. Severely overcrowded conditions exist in 1.2 percent of median income households, 1.3 percent of low-income households, 2.4 percent of very low-income households, and 3.6 percent of extremely low-income households. In comparison, 0.9 percent of households above the AMI experience this level of overcrowding. These patterns are also reflected geographically, with higher rates of poverty in areas with lower median incomes. For example, higher overcrowding rates are found around Vallejo Ferry Terminal and in the neighborhood around White Slough, corresponding the city's lowest-income neighborhoods and the three areas designated as high segregation and poverty, where older housing stock, originally constructed to serve the shipyard industry, is mixed with industrial and other nonresidential uses. While some households reported as overcrowded may have chosen to double up inhabitants in one room and therefore the condition may not be based on inability to find and secure adequate housing, severe overcrowding, particularly among the lower-income households in Vallejo, may indicate a more significant potential for displacement.

There are eight tracts in the city with overcrowding rates exceeding 8.2 percent, which typically align closely with neighborhoods with relatively low median incomes (see **Figure 3-37, Overcrowded Households in Vallejo**, and **Figure 3-8, Local Median Income**). Further, three of these tracts are designated as areas of high segregation and poverty (see **Figure 3-7, Local TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas**). The highest rates of overcrowding, ranging from 8.9 to 12.0 percent, are concentrated in the northwest and western portions of the city, and the more densely populated areas in central Vallejo along the railroad and near the Vallejo Ferry Terminal, primarily south of Sears Point Road (SR-37), west of I-80, and east of the Mare Island Strait, including an area northeast of the I-80 and I-780 interchange. These neighborhoods consist of single-family residences, the Olympia and Vallejo Mobile Estates mobile home parks, and a variety of multifamily residences.

FIGURE 3-37: OVERCROWDED HOUSEHOLDS IN VALLEJO



Source: California Health and Human Services (CHHS), 2020; City of Vallejo, 2022

The availability of housing units in Vallejo appropriate to house lower-income large families (five or more persons) within their affordability level may also contribute to overcrowding. The incidence of large-family households in Vallejo, presented in HNA Table 2-6, Households by Size 2019, is lower than most of the other cities in Solano County, at 12.8 percent of households as compared to a countywide representation at 13.6 percent, yet higher than the 10.2 percent throughout the ABAG area. Approximately 57.6 percent of large households are owner households, and 42.4 percent are renters. Further, approximately 17.0 percent of large households are low income, 10.0 percent are very low income, and 11.0 percent are extremely low income. To meet the needs of large families in Vallejo, 75.0 percent of the housing stock has three or more bedrooms. Approximately 71.9 percent of these larger units are owner occupied, comprising 80.4 percent of all of the homeownership stock. Of the total rental stock in Vallejo, 38.6 percent of the units have three or more bedrooms. A 2021 survey of rental listings in Vallejo, shown in HNA Table 2-28, Rental Rates 2021, indicates that the median market rate rent for two-bedroom and larger units is \$2,603 per month, ranging from \$1,600 to \$3,655, are generally above the affordability of a low-income household. Therefore, while there is a large proportion of large units, lower-income households with five or more people may experience challenges in finding adequately sized units within their affordability range, which may result in overcrowded living conditions unless they are able to secure housing in 1 of the 13 assisted affordable complexes in the city or apply HCVs to market-rate, larger rental units.

Vallejo is a very racially and ethnically diverse city, as discussed in the Racial and Ethnic Characteristics section. Most block groups in the city have non-White populations of at least 60.0 percent or more. However, the relationship between diversity, income, tenure, and overcrowding seen in many other jurisdictions in Solano County is not consistently apparent in Vallejo. Many of the areas with the highest diversity indexes, particularly those in the northern subdivisions in the city, including the Country Club Crest neighborhoods, which in the 1940s were promoted to Black and African American households, currently remain predominantly Black with significant proportions of Hispanic and Latinx households; these areas are not reported as areas of significant overcrowding.


The area with the highest rate of overcrowding (12.2 percent) has diversity index scores that range from 88.5 to 94.0 and approximately 83.5 to 96.4 percent of the population identifies as non-White. In the second-highest concentration of overcrowding (12.0 percent of households), 75.3 to 90.9 percent of residents identify as non-White, and in the third-highest concentration (11.2 percent of households), 76.0 to 83.1 percent of residents identify as non-White. While in some areas with extremely low overcrowding, there is a significantly smaller proportion of non-White residents, the pattern doesn't always hold. For example, in the neighborhood with the lowest rate of overcrowding (0.5 percent of households), 63.0 to 72.8 percent of residents identify as non-White. While this is lower than the areas with the highest concentration of overcrowding, it is not a significant difference. Generally, however, neighborhoods west of I-80 have the highest rates of overcrowding (**Figure 3-37, Overcrowded Households in Vallejo**). Therefore, the City will provide incentives to developers, such as streamlined review or parking waivers, that construct affordable housing with larger units in areas of concentrated overcrowding to alleviate housing pressure on households that may be doubling up (**Program E 1.1.1**).

Overpayment

Regional Patterns

HUD considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends less than 30.0 percent of its income on housing costs. A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30.0 percent of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50.0 percent of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.” In the Bay Area, approximately 35.1 percent of all households were cost-burdened in 2019, and 16.3 percent were severely cost-burdened (**Figure 3-38, Overpayment Rates in the Region**). Of these households, a significantly larger proportion of renters experienced overpayment than owners. This trend can be seen throughout both the Bay Area and Sacramento region, on average 27.7 percent of owners and 47.1 percent of renters are cost burdened, and 11.6 percent owners and 24.1 percent of renters are severely cost burdened. In comparison, in Solano County, 26.8 percent of owners and 49.2 percent of renters are cost burdened and 10.4 percent of owners and 25.0 percent of renters are severely cost burdened. While owner overpayment rates in Solano County are slightly lower than the regional average, renter overpayment rates are slightly higher. This reflects feedback from stakeholders and service providers throughout the region that reported a shortage of rental opportunities resulting in disproportionately high prices for tenants.

FIGURE 3-38: OVERPAYMENT RATES IN THE REGION



Source: CHAS 2014-2018

Local Patterns

In Vallejo, 21.5 percent of the households are cost burdened and 20.7 percent are severely cost burdened, for a total of 42.2 percent of the households experiencing some level of overpayment. When looking at overpayment across tenure, homeowners generally experience cost burden at a lesser rate than renters. Approximately 31.8 percent of homeowners are cost burdened, compared to 55.9 percent of renters. More specifically, approximately 25.4 percent of renters are overpaying and 32.1 percent are severely overpaying, compared to 19.2 percent of homeowners overpaying and 12.2 percent severely overpaying.


In many circumstances, overpayment is closely tied to income and lower-income households are most at risk of displacement due to overpayment, as presented in HNA Table 2-12, Lower-Income Households Overpaying. In Vallejo, approximately 41.3 percent of households are lower income. Of these households, approximately 27.0 percent are overpaying and 48.3 percent are severely overpaying. In contrast, of Vallejo residents making more than 100.0 percent of the AMI, 10.0 percent are overpaying and 0.7 percent are severely overpaying. Of the severely cost-burdened lower-income households, 67.5 percent are renters and 32.5 percent are owners. Approximately 35.6 percent of cost-burdened renters in Vallejo are considered to be extremely low income, compared to 14.0 percent of cost-burdened owners. Similarly, 76.9 percent of extremely low-income renters are severely cost burdened, compared to 66.1 percent of extremely low-income households that are homeowners. This indicates that, while renters are more likely to experience cost burden, overpayment is particularly prevalent among lower-income households.

Economic disparities between different demographic groups may also contribute toward a higher risk of housing insecurity, displacement, or homelessness. Proportionally, White Non-Hispanic/Latinx and Asian residents overpaying for housing are fairly comparable at approximately 35.0 percent of each population, while Hispanic and Latinx residents experience a higher rate of overpayment (42.0 percent), and Other and Multiple Race residents (45.0 percent). Black and African American residents exhibit the highest rate of overpayment, at 54.0 percent. There is a correlation between areas of high diversity and rental overpayment in Vallejo. However, as discussed previously, the neighborhoods in the northeastern quadrant of the city, and a few in the southeastern edge of the city, are extremely diverse and have the lowest rates of overpayment in Vallejo, between 20.0 and 40.0 percent. Therefore, there does not appear to be a consistent correlation between non-White households and overpayment in Vallejo.

According to the 2015-2019 ACS, most of the city reflects renter cost burdened rates between 40.0 and 60.0 percent (**Figure 3-39, Renter Overpayment in Vallejo**). The areas with rates above 60.0 percent are found in neighborhoods on both sides of Broadway Street and Sonoma Boulevard north of Florida Street to the northern city boundary; between White Slough on the Napa River to I-80; all of Mare Island; in the central Vallejo neighborhoods adjacent to and east of I-80 between Redwood Parkway and Tennessee Street, where several market-rate multifamily condo and rental complexes are located; and within the Steffan Manor and Home Acres neighborhoods northeast of the intersection of I-80 and I-780. In contrast to renter overpayment, homeowners generally experience cost burden at a lesser rate. The highest rates of homeowner overpayment occur west of I-80 in the Wilson Park neighborhood, where 68.6 percent of homeowners are


overpaying, and in the tract along Broadway Street between Valle Vista Avenue to the north and Florida Street to the south, where 60.6 percent of homeowners are overpaying (**Figure 3-40, Homeowner Overpayment in Vallejo**).

FIGURE 3-39: RENTER OVERPAYMENT IN VALLEJO



Source: 2015-2019 ACS; City of Vallejo, 2022

FIGURE 3-40: HOMEOWNER OVERPAYMENT IN VALLEJO



Source: 2015-2019 ACS; City of Vallejo, 2022

Special-needs groups that may be disproportionately affected by high housing costs include large families, single-parent households, and seniors. As discussed in the Overcrowding section, large-family households often face special housing challenges due to a lack of adequately sized affordable housing available. The higher costs required for homes with multiple bedrooms can result in larger families experiencing a disproportionate cost burden and increase the risk of housing insecurity. However, in Vallejo, 17.7 percent of large-family households are cost burdened and 16.5 percent are severely cost burdened, compared to 20.1 percent of smaller households experiencing overpayment and 22.4 percent experiencing severe overpayment. Therefore, large-family households in Vallejo are not disproportionately impacted by housing costs. While overpayment rates for single-parent households are not available, the ACS reports that 18.3 percent of female-headed, single-parent households are below the poverty threshold. Therefore, these households may have an increased rate of overpayment. Seniors, comprising 15.8 percent of Vallejo's households, often face increased displacement risk due to overpayment as this population more frequently relies on fixed incomes such as retirement savings or social security. As shown in HNA Table 2-31, Senior Households by Income Level Overpaying for Housing, 23.4 percent of seniors overpay for housing and 20.7 percent severely overpay, constituting 44.1 percent of all senior households in Vallejo. Although 16.3 percent of seniors are extremely low-income, 20.2 percent of this population is cost burdened, and 56.1 percent are severely cost burdened. As income levels increase, the proportions of senior households that are overpaying, but not severely overpaying, increases. Conversely, the proportion of seniors that pay over 50.0 percent decreases as income increases. In comparison, 15.2 percent of seniors earning above the AMI are cost burdened and 1.4 percent are severely cost burdened.

The sudden loss of employment, a health care emergency, or a family crisis can quickly result in a heavy cost burden, with limited affordable options available, putting these populations at greater risk of displacement due to overpayment or overcrowding. Residents finding themselves in one of these situations may have had to choose between commuting long distances to their jobs and schools or moving out of the region. To reduce displacement risk as a result of overpayment, the City has identified the following programs:


- Support and incentivize construction of affordable units (**Programs B 2.1.3 and E 1.1.1**)
- Continue outreach efforts to property managers, realtors, and other organizations and agencies related to HCVs (**Program B 1.1.1**)
- Promote a range of housing types (**Program H 4.1.1**)
- Encourage the construction ADUs, particularly in areas with higher median incomes or single-family homes (**Program H 4.1.2**)

Substandard Housing

Regional Patterns

As discussed in the HNA, housing condition can be an indicator of quality of life. Substandard conditions present a barrier to fair housing as occupants are susceptible to health and safety risks associated with poor housing conditions, as well as at risk of displacement if conditions make the unit uninhabitable or if property owners must vacate the property to conduct repairs. As housing units age, they deteriorate without ongoing maintenance, which can present a fair housing issue for occupants, reduce property values, and discourage private reinvestment in neighborhoods dominated by substandard conditions. Typically, housing over 30 years is more likely to need repairs or rehabilitation than newer units. As shown in **Figure 3-41, Age of Housing Stock in the Region**, approximately 31.6 percent of housing units in Solano County are older than 30 years and may need repairs. This is notably higher than the Bay Area as a whole, where 22.9 percent of units are older than 30 years but is comparable to individual jurisdictions in the ABAG and Sacramento regions, including Sacramento, Sonoma, and Yolo Counties. However, with the exception of San Joaquin and Yolo Counties, all other counties in the region have a younger housing stock than Solano County. This may indicate a greater need for rehabilitation in Solano County compared to the greater region. Within individual Solano County jurisdictions, this need has informed the inclusion of several programs in each Housing Element, including rehabilitation assistance, relocation assistance, and more.

FIGURE 3-41: AGE OF HOUSING STOCK IN THE REGION



Source: 2015-2019 ACS

Local Patterns

Approximately 81.7 percent of housing units in Vallejo were built prior to 1990. Of the multifamily complexes in Vallejo, 7.6 percent were built since 2000, 36.4 percent were built between 1980 and 1999, 30.1 percent were constructed between 1960 and 1979, and 25.9 percent were constructed prior to 1960. Additionally, 67.3 percent of mobile homes in Vallejo were built between 1960 and 1979, making them between 40 and 50 years old, an age that may indicate a need of replacement or rehabilitation. Mobile homes typically deteriorate more rapidly than stick-built homes, and as such are more likely to need significant repairs as they age to maintain conditions. Further, these

homes are often more affordable to lower-income households, and the cost of regular repairs can present a barrier to maintaining good housing condition. Therefore, the City will improve communication of rehabilitation assistance programs currently available for lower-income households, including eligible owners of mobile homes, to alleviate substandard conditions before reaching a point of uninhabitability (**Program G 2.1.1**).

In May 2022, a survey of housing units currently listed for sale on Zillow.com conducted by the consultant team in Vallejo indicates that a large proportion of homes in the western portion of the city were built between 1900 and 1930, and exhibit some signs of deteriorated conditions, primarily associated with yards, concrete deterioration on driveways, walkways, sidewalks, and patios, and in some cases the need for paint or stucco repair. Many of these properties are within the section of the city south of Tennessee Avenue, west of Monterey Street, north of Pennsylvania Avenue, and east of Mare Island Way and Santa Clara Avenue and within the Heritage and Historic District. These portions of the city, including the Central Vallejo, Vallejo Heritage, Downtown Vallejo, Heritage Hill, West Vallejo, Washington Park, Solano Avenue to Benicia Avenue, Steffan Manor and Home Acres, generally align with the finding of previous overpayment and overcrowding analysis and communities most at risk for displacement.

According to the 2015-2019 ACS and CHAS data, approximately 26.5 percent of households experience one or more of the following conditions: lacks complete kitchen, lacks complete plumbing, is severely overcrowded, or is severely cost burdened. While this estimate includes households that are overcrowded or cost burdened, but do have a complete kitchen and plumbing, it can be assumed that at least a portion are living in units without these basic facilities, which are indicators of substandard housing conditions. CHAS data estimates that 0.4 percent of homeowner households were living in a unit without complete kitchen facilities, and 0.2 percent without complete plumbing. Approximately 0.8 percent of renters lived in units lacking complete kitchens and 0.8 percent without complete plumbing facilities. Due to the relatively low incidence of kitchen or plumbing problems, most of the households experiencing substandard conditions are attributed to either severe overcrowding, severe overpayment, or both. To address deficient housing conditions and facilitate place-based revitalization of neighborhoods, the City has implemented the Neighborhood Law Program. The NLP puts attorneys on the streets of Vallejo to tackle blight and nuisance conditions. In addition to meeting with residents and community organizations, the NLP lawyers work with the Vallejo Police Department, Code Enforcement Division, and other departments to abate the City's most unfavorable nuisances and improve the quality of life in Vallejo. Residents can submit requests for NLP lawyers to investigate conditions in their neighborhood on the City's website.

Homelessness

In 2019, Housing First Solano, with the support of the Community Action Partnership (CAP) Solano Joint Powers Authority (JAP), conducted a Point-in-Time (PIT) survey of Solano County. This count, conducted in January in communities across the county, assesses the size and characteristics of the homeless population. Typically, the PIT survey is conducted in person every two years to estimate both the sheltered and unsheltered population. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in 2021, the CAP Solano JAP conducted a PIT of sheltered individuals through a demographic questionnaire sent to all emergency shelters and transitional housing providers. The 2021 Sheltered PIT reported 397 homeless individuals, an increase from 230 in 2020 and 219 in 2019. The 2019 PIT counted both sheltered and unsheltered individuals, and found 1,151 homeless persons living in Solano County, an increase of 69 since 2015, though the population peaked at 1,232 in 2017. Of the total homeless population in 2019, many reported sleeping in more than one Solano County incorporated jurisdiction during the previous year. Approximately 53.0 percent of the total homeless population stayed in Fairfield for at least one night during the year, 50.0 percent in Vallejo, 22.0 percent in Vacaville, 14.0 percent in Suisun City, 4.0 percent in Rio Vista, 4.0 percent in Benicia, and 3.0 percent in Dixon. The total of these exceeds 100 percent as some individuals moved around during the year and reported sleeping in multiple jurisdictions. The homeless population in the unincorporated area was not reported. HNA Table 2-39, Local Knowledge on Persons Experiencing Homelessness, reports the estimates, provided by local service providers or police departments on the size of the homeless population in each jurisdiction within Solano County.

Approximately 81.0 percent of the total homeless population of Solano County were unsheltered and 19.0 percent were sheltered. Of the total population, approximately 15.6 percent were chronically homeless, meaning they had been homeless for a year or longer or had experienced at least 4 episodes of homelessness, totaling 12 months in the last 3 years. Additionally, there were approximately 30 families, with at least one child under 18 and one adult over 18, totaling 79 people or 6.9 percent of the population, and there were 5 unaccompanied minors recorded.

The 2019 PIT surveyed for the following protected characteristics: gender identify, sexual orientation, veteran status, race and ethnicity, disability status, and age. **Table 3-9, Demographic Composition of Homeless Population, 2019**, identifies the proportion of each of these protected characteristics compared to the proportion of each jurisdiction's population, to identify whether any protected classes are disproportionately represented as part of the homeless population. However, while gender identity and sexual orientation were reported, this information is not collected for the general population and cannot be used for a comparison of demographic composition. The percentages for a protected characteristic population in **bold** are overrepresented in the homeless population compared to that jurisdiction's total population. It is worth noting that, given the small proportion of the homeless population that reported sleeping in Vallejo, Rio Vista, Benicia, and Dixon, and without a report for the unincorporated county, it is unlikely that all protected characteristics are represented in the homeless populations of these jurisdictions. However, without data available at the jurisdiction level, it is assumed that the percentages of each protected class applies to the local homeless population.

TABLE 3-9: DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION OF HOMELESS POPULATION, 2019

Protected Characteristic	Homeless Population	Benicia	Dixon	Fairfield	Rio Vista	Suisun City	Vacaville	Vallejo	Uninc. Solano County
Veteran	13.0%	7.7%	8.0%	9.4%	19.4%	11.4%	12.4%	7.8%	10.0%
Senior	18.0%	19.8%	12.9%	12.2%	48.9%	11.7%	14.0%	15.8%	21.5%
Disabled	31.0%	11.1%	11.1%	11.6%	26.2%	12.5%	11.8%	12.5%	12.7%
White	39.0%	65.1%	45.0%	31.5%	74.8%	26.0%	50.5%	24.1%	55.1%
Black	37.0%	3.2%	1.9%	14.8%	7.6%	20.9%	9.5%	19.7%	5.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%
Asian / Asian Pacific Islander	7.0%	11.4%	5.4%	17.8%	7.5%	20.0%	84.0%	24.2%	5.5%
Multi-racial or other	14.0%	7.5%	4.8%	6.2%	1.8%	4.9%	6.4%	5.6%	3.3%
Hispanic/Latinx	16.0%	12.8%	42.4%	29.3%	8.1%	26.8%	24.8%	26.3%	30.2%

Sources: Housing First Solano PIT, 2019; ABAG Data Packets, 2021; 2015-2019 ACS

As seen in **Table 3-9, Demographic Composition of Homeless Population, 2019**, all protected characteristics are overrepresented in the majority of Solano County jurisdictions, with individuals with disabilities, American Indian or Alaska Native residents, and residents that identify as multi-racial or another race being overrepresented in all Solano County jurisdictions. Approximately 30.0 percent of homeless individuals that responded to the survey reported that they believe employment assistance would have prevented homelessness for them, approximately 25.0 percent reported alcohol and drug counseling as a prevention tool, 24.0 percent reported rent or mortgage assistance, and 21 percent reported mental health services. For those that were interested in receiving assistance, 20.0 percent did believe they were eligible, 13.0 percent reported that paperwork for assistance was too difficult, and 11.0 percent reported that not having a permanent address was a barrier to assistance.

Homelessness is often a cross-jurisdictional issue, as represented by individuals reporting sleeping in multiple jurisdictions within the year. To address this issue throughout the region, **Program E 1.1.3** has been included to coordinate with all other Solano County jurisdictions to increase the availability of emergency shelters, transitional housing, and homelessness service generally as well as develop targeted assistance and outreach for overrepresented populations.

Displacement Risk

A combination of factors can result in increased displacement risk, particularly for lower-income households. These factors include those listed above, as well as vacancy rates, availability of a variety of housing options, and increasing housing prices compared to wage increases. The Urban Displacement Project, a joint research and action initiative of the UC Berkeley and the University of Toronto, analyzes income patterns and housing availability to determine the gentrification displacement risk at the census tract level. Six displacement typologies exist in Solano County:

- **Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement:** These tracts are predominantly low- or mixed-income, susceptible to changes if housing prices increase.
- **Ongoing Displacement:** These tracts were previously low income, before seeing a significant loss of low-income households between 2000 and 2018.
- **At Risk of Gentrification:** These are low- or mixed-income tracts with housing affordable to lower-income households; however, the tract has seen increases in housing costs or rent values at a greater rate than regional increases or resulting in a larger rent gap locally than regionally.
- **Stable Moderate/Mixed Income:** These tracts are predominantly occupied by moderate-, mixed-moderate, mixed-high, or high-income households.
- **At Risk of Becoming Exclusive:** These tracts are also predominantly occupied by moderate, mixed, or high-income households, with housing affordable to middle- to high-income households but ongoing increases in prices.
- **Stable/Advanced Exclusive:** These are high-income tracts with housing only affordable to high-income households, and marginal or rapid increases in housing costs.

According to the Urban Displacement Project, most of Vallejo west of I-80 and south of SR-37 is considered “Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement” or “At Risk of Gentrification. The exception to this pattern is in the area south of Sereno Drive, east of Broadway Street, and north of Tennessee Street, which is designated as “At Risk of Becoming Exclusive.” This area has also been identified throughout this assessment as having a relatively low poverty rate, the lowest rate of overcrowding, and a relatively low diversity score compared to other Vallejo neighborhoods. North of SR-37 the Chabot Terrace neighborhood is considered “Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement” and the remaining areas considered “At Risk of Becoming Exclusive.” East of I-80, those neighborhoods closest to the highway are considered “Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement” and the rest either “Stable Moderate/Mixed Income” or “At Risk of Becoming Exclusive.” Given these patterns of possible gentrification and exclusivity, the City has identified **Programs H 4.1.2** and **B 2.1.1** to encourage

construction of ADUs and multifamily housing options, as feasible, areas at risk of exclusion and will target marketing of financial assistance programs, such as first-time homebuyer programs and rehabilitation programs, in areas at risk of displacement to reduce that risk while also facilitating place-based revitalization through improved neighborhood conditions.

According to the Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI), the average home value in Vallejo has increased by 213.0 percent between December 2012 and December 2021, from \$180,000 to \$563,000, for an average increase of approximately 23.6 percent annually, the fastest rate of increase in Solano County. Further, the median home price in Vallejo has increased from being affordable to lower- to moderate-income households to only being affordable to above moderate-income households. While rent prices in Vallejo have also increased and present a barrier to lower-income households, it has been at a significantly slower rate than home values. Between 2014 and 2021, the average rent for a two-bedroom unit, for example, increased from \$1,295 to \$1,863 according to a survey of online rent-tracking platforms, resulting in an annual average increase of 6.3 percent. The median rent for a two-bedroom unit in 2021 was affordable to moderate-income households.

While housing costs have increased rapidly, wages have not kept pace. The median income in Vallejo has increased approximately 1.4 percent annually, from \$61,481 in 2010 to \$69,405 in 2019, according to the ACS. The difference in these trends indicates growing unaffordability of housing in Vacaville. To address affordability challenges, the City will encourage and incentivize development of affordable housing units, particularly in high opportunity areas and will develop a program to connect lower-income residents with affordable housing opportunities. (**Programs A 1.1.2 and E 1.1.6**).

Displacement risk increases when a household is paying more for housing than their income can support, their housing condition is unstable or unsafe, and when the household is overcrowded. Each of these presents barriers to stable housing for the occupants. As discussed in the Patterns of Integration and Segregation and Overpayment sections, poverty rates in Vallejo are overall relatively high, particularly when compared to other Solano County jurisdictions.

Other Relevant Factors

In addition to the indicators analyzed above, there are several other factors that can influence housing mobility and access to opportunity in a jurisdiction. For example, historic development patterns may have resulted in neighborhoods that are largely, or exclusively, made up of single-family homes. Given current market trends, these neighborhoods would likely be inaccessible to lower-income households. Other factors may include mortgage lending patterns, public and private investment, and historic policies. Other factors that are considered relevant vary between jurisdiction and are described at the local level herein.

History of Housing in Vallejo

The City of Vallejo was founded as California's first state capitol in 1850 and named for one of the state's pre-eminent native sons, a Mexican military officer, General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, whose land much of the original city was built upon. However, the capitol was moved to Benicia in 1853, and then permanently established in Sacramento, which eventually contributed to the growth of Vallejo as a regional transportation center. As the first United States Naval installation on the west coast in 1854, Mare Island, and the now-closed Mare Island Naval Shipyard, have played an important role in American, Naval, and Vallejo history and served as the major impetus for the city's development. By the mid-1860s, Vallejo had grown into an agricultural community supported by the ship construction industry. The city was further shaped with the organization of the California Pacific Railroad in 1867 for the purpose of building a railroad from Vallejo to Sacramento, allowing passengers to travel via steamboat from San Francisco to Vallejo, then by rail to the state capitol and connection with the transcontinental line. Boasting a temperate climate, a wheat export trade, steady employment at Mare Island and Starr Mills, regular rail service, and inexpensive land, Vallejo experienced its first real estate "boom." Incorporated in 1868, the city was laid out in a grid pattern and homes were built surrounding the downtown business area between the waterfront and Broadway in styles ranging from simple "vernacular" cottages to large Italianate homes. Neighborhoods began to achieve their distinctive appearance according to income. Wealthy manufacturers and merchants populated areas east of downtown, while smaller, "working class" residences and apartments were constructed overlooking the waterfront north of downtown.

After a "stabilization" period following the boom of the 1870s, Vallejo again experienced a period of tremendous growth. This period began with the Spanish-American War of the 1890s and continued through World War I, as the Navy increased the size of the fleet in the Pacific. The well-paid workforce of Mare Island needed homes, stores, bakeries, dentists, doctors, and many of the other amenities of life, and Vallejo quickly grew to meet the needs of its citizens. The City-owned waterworks began operation in 1894. By 1905, one could board a ferry to San Francisco, or an electric railroad car to Napa. Many of the city's older neighborhoods grew up during this time, gaining much of the appearance they have today. Businessman George Wilson commissioned San Francisco architect Julia Morgan to design a large home for his lot on Capitol Street (1909), while renowned Vallejo architect William A. Jones built his home at 403 Alameda Street (1912). Eastern Georgia Street became the address for Vallejo's professionals as doctors, lawyers, and businessmen moved into the large, comfortable homes. Western Georgia and the surrounding streets became the lynchpin for Vallejo's downtown.

In the 1930s, the Home Owners Loan Corporation (HOLC), a federal agency, began "redlining" neighborhoods, a discriminatory practice that designated neighborhoods as "Best," "Still Desirable," "Definitely Declining," and "Hazardous." These were implied indications of security for mortgage lenders, and directly targeted minority populations by designating non-White neighborhoods as hazardous (marked with red on maps) and creating barriers to getting loans for home purchase or maintenance. Paired with racially restrictive covenants in White neighborhoods that prevented minorities from buying homes there, the long-term impacts of this included barriers to building generational wealth as a result of homeownership and disinvestment in non-White neighborhoods. Like many Bay Area jurisdictions, Vallejo was impacted by redlining and racially restrictive covenants. Redlined neighborhoods included Crest in northern Vallejo, which was

predominantly Black and African American during this era. According to local historian Brendan Riley , racial and ethnic segregation that occurred as a result of redlining has since dissipated, with Vallejo now one of the most diverse cities in the state. However, the impacts of disinvestment and barriers to wealth building persist. In redlined neighborhoods, home conditions generally deteriorated and some homeowners lost their homes and the units sat vacant. While residential vacancy rates are low today, many older units, particularly in the neighborhoods that were historically disinvested in through barriers to private loans, still have more homes in poor condition than are found in neighborhoods that were historically White. While the city has seen remarkable integration over recent decades, home conditions still present a lingering fair housing concern.

Following the redlining era, during the height of World War II, Mare Island shipyard employed over 46,000 civilian and military personnel and served as one of the most important ship repair facilities for the Pacific Fleet. Until the closure of the shipyard in 1996, it served as a major employment anchor for the city and shaped its development. According to local stakeholders, the concentration of smaller units and affordable housing in the western portion of the city, particularly in South Vallejo, served shipyard workers. Upon its closure, many of these people left Vallejo, and the city's economy shifted to serve as a bedroom community to the San Francisco Bay Area. As its operation shaped development, its closure also resulted in high vacancy rates in the late 1990s. This resulted in a second phase of disinvestment in housing in these neighborhoods that has lingering impacts on housing conditions today. In response to local concerns about housing conditions, and its impact on tenants, the City has included the following programs:

- Implement targeted marketing of rehabilitation assistance programs in neighborhoods of concentrated need and to lower-income households (**Program G 2.1.1**).
- Develop and implement a proactive code enforcement program for substandard units (**Program G 3.1.1**).
- Seek funding to offer relocation assistance, or require property owners or landlords to offer assistance, to lower-income tenants displaced during rehabilitation efforts (**Program G 3.1.1**).

Land Use and Zoning Patterns

The Othering & Belonging Institute, a UC Berkeley research center, published a report in 2020 analyzing the characteristics of communities in the Bay Area in relation to the degree of single-family zoning.⁶ The research findings identified that in Solano County, and across the Bay Area regionally, cities with high levels of single-family zoning see greater access to resources resulting in positive life outcomes (this comparison is significant even when considering that the Bay Area region is generally wealthy and expensive). Predominance of single-family zoning aligned with higher median incomes, home values, proficient schools, and other factors that are similarly associated with the highest-resource designation in the TCAC/HCD opportunity maps. Single-family zoning predominates residential areas in the Bay Area; the average proportion of residential land zoned only for single-family in Bay Area jurisdictions was found to be 8.05 percent. Only in two jurisdictions of the 101 surveyed (Benicia and Suisun City) did single-family zoning make up less than 40.0 percent of the jurisdiction's land area. However, access to higher quality resources was greatest in jurisdictions with at least 90.0 percent of the land area designated to single-family zoning.

Analysis identified Vallejo as having between 80.0 and 90.0 percent of land area designated to single-family zoning in 2020 categorizing it as a “medium” level of single-family zoning relative to Bay Area jurisdictions. However, in 2021, the City updated the Zoning Ordinance and to increase the allowable types of multifamily units in all residential zones with the exception of the Rural Residential district, which remains a single-family zone. Prior to this change, single-family housing units made up approximately 70.2 percent, or 31,470, of the City's 44,832 housing units. Conversely, multifamily units (two or more units) made up approximately 26.7 percent of Vallejo housing units. While single-family zoning can create highly desirable places to live, higher entry costs associated with this housing type can pose a barrier to access for low- and moderate-income households, restricting access to economic, educational, and other opportunities that are available in higher-resource communities. By doing away with single-family zoning restrictions, the City aims to facilitate integration of neighborhoods through a variety of housing types to meet a range of needs and incomes.

⁶ Menendian, Stephen, Samir Gambhir, Karina French, and Arthur Gailles, “Single-Family Zoning in the San Francisco Bay Area,” Othering & Belonging Institute, University of California, Berkeley, October 2020. <https://belonging.berkeley.edu/single-family-zoning-san-francisco-bay-area>.

Investment Patterns

Public and private investment typically includes construction, maintenance, and improvements to public facilities, including infrastructure; acquisition of land; and major equipment. Historically, investment in Vallejo has been prioritized based on need and available funding, which has prevented disinvestment in any particular area of the city. However, any infrastructure or facilities in need of improvement are identified for investment in the City's 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The CIP is funded from a variety of sources that can each be used for specific purposes. These funds are allocated to improve roadways and other transportation infrastructure and water infrastructure, amongst other projects. Projects identified for public investment are considered based on the following factors:

- Support for neighborhoods with the highest need
- Consistency with other formal long-range plans
- Recommendations of City Councils and/or Commissions
- Input from residents and business owners
- Consistency with General Plans
- Consistency with local Consolidated Plans for federal funds like Community Development Block Grants
- Consistency with adopted master plans
- State, federal, or other legal mandates
- Potential impacts on operating budgets
- Benefits to communities
- Mitigation of health or safety issues

Priority is based on projects that will result in the greatest community benefit, mitigate existing issues, and address public demand and need, therefore, ensuring that projects occur throughout the city. Recent target areas for investment include, but are not limited to:

- Pavement Maintenance and Rehabilitation
- Annual ADA Curb Ramps
- Greater Vallejo Recreation District
- Green Infrastructure
- Active Transportation Program (ATP) Safe Routes to School

These projects, among others, improve connections between neighborhoods, availability of and accessibility to community resources and facilities, and more. Vallejo will continue public investment throughout their jurisdictions, and will encourage the same from private investment, so all residents have access to improved transportation, safer streets, additional recreational amenities, and other outcomes of public and private investment.

Mortgage Loan Denial Rates

Data related to home loan applications are made available annually through the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA). It is important to note, however, that this data does not reflect all lenders, particularly local financial institutions, and does not provide a comparison of applicants based on qualifications, such as income and credit, to determine whether there are factors other than racial or ethnic identity that may have influenced the success rate of securing a mortgage loan. Additionally, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau provides mortgage data specific to census tracts as opposed to jurisdiction boundaries, so data for Vallejo includes portions of unincorporated Solano County and Benicia in tracts that expand beyond city limits, particularly to the east.

In 2020, White applicants accounted for 5.3 percent of all mortgage loan applications for home purchase and 9.0 percent of all originated loans in Vallejo, accounting for a significantly smaller proportion of loans than of the total population. Similarly, Hispanic and Latinx residents, who make up 26.3 percent of Vallejo's ethnic composition, accounted for 8.7 percent of loan applications and 14.7 percent of originated loans. Black residents represent 19.7 percent of Vallejo's racial composition, compared to approximately 6.1 percent of loan applications and 10.3 percent of originated loans. While Asian residents represented 24.2 percent of Vallejo's racial composition, Asian applicants made up 9.6 percent of loan applicants and 16.2 percent of originated loans. Other applicants (e.g., American Indian, Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, two or more race, and other) represented less than 1.0 percent of both loan applications and originated loans. While there are discrepancies between the proportion of loans and proportion of the city's population for most racial and ethnic group, those presented are equally represented compared to each other. As such, it appears that no racial or ethnic groups have disproportionate access to applying for home mortgage loans in Vallejo.

In 2020, applicants from Vallejo applied for four types of loans for home purchase: conventional, Federal Housing Administration (FHA), Veterans Administration (VA), and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Denial rates, shown in **Table 3-10, Mortgage Loan Denial Rates, Vallejo**, indicate that Hispanic and Latinx residents experience higher denial rates for conventional and VA loans compared to other racial and ethnic groups and Black residents experience higher denial rates for FHA loans.

TABLE 3-10: MORTGAGE LOAN DENIAL RATES, VALLEJO

Loan Type	White	Hispanic/Latinx	Black	Asian	Native American or Pacific Islander	American Indian or Alaska Native	Two or More Minority Races	Total
Conventional								
Total Applications	354	242	158	282	0	4	3	1,043
Denial Rate	7.9%	13.2%	12.7%	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%
Federal Housing Administration (FHA)								
Total Applications	86	123	104	62	0	1	0	376
Denial Rate	2.3%	4.9%	8.7%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%
Veterans Administration (VA)								
Total Applications	26	7	8	16	0	0	2	59
Denial Rate	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)								
Total Applications	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Denial Rate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council's (FFIEC), Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HDMA), 2020

The City has included **Program D 1.1.1** to support homeownership access and opportunities. The City will also work with legal service providers to ensure all residents have access to legal counseling and representation in cases of discriminatory lending practices and other fair housing issues (**Program F 1.1.1**).

Enforcement and Outreach Capacity

Compliance with Fair Housing Laws

In addition to assessing demographic characteristics as indicators of fair housing, jurisdictions must identify how they currently comply with fair housing laws or identify programs to become in compliance. The City of Vallejo enforces fair housing and comply with fair housing laws and regulations through a twofold process: review of local policies and codes for compliance with state law, and referral of fair housing complaints to appropriate agencies. The following identify how the City complies with the following fair housing laws:

- **Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915).** The City will amend the density bonus ordinance as needed for compliance with state law.
- **No-Net-Loss (Government Code Section 65863).** The City has identified a surplus of sites available to meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation. In total, the City’s surplus unit capacity is 1,115 units, composed of 39 lower-income units, 29 moderate-income units, and 1,047 above moderate-income units.
- **Housing Accountability Act (HAA) (Government Code Section 65589.5).** The City does not condition the approval of housing development projects for very low-, low-, or moderate-income households or emergency shelters unless specified written findings are made. Currently, emergency shelters are allowed by-right, without limitations, in the General Industrial and Light Industrial zones.
- **Senate Bill 35 (Government Code Section 65913.4).** The City will comply with SB 35 (Government Code Section 65913.4) by establishing a written policy or procedure, as well as other guidance as appropriate, to streamline the approval process and standards for eligible projects by September 2023 (**Program A 4.1.1**).
- **Senate Bill 330 (Government Code Section 65589.5).** The City complies with SB 330 (Government Code Section 65589.5), relying on regulations set forth in the law for processing preliminary application for housing development projects, conducting no more than five hearings for housing projects that comply with objective general plan and development standards, and making a decision on a residential project within 90 days after certification of an environmental impact report or 60 days after adoption of a mitigated negative declaration or an environmental report for an affordable housing project.
- **California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) and Federal Fair Housing Act.** The City complies by providing Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, as available, to FHANC to provide legal assistance to residents, counseling for landlords and tenants, regular audits and investigations of discrimination, and other services to enforce fair housing in the city.

- **Review Processes (Government Code Section 65008).** The City reviews affordable development projects in the same manner as market-rate developments, except in cases where affordable housing projects are eligible for preferential treatment including, but not limited to, on residential sites subject to Assembly Bill (AB) 1397.
- **Assembly Bill 686 (Government Code Section 8899.50):** The City has completed this Assessment of Fair Housing and identified programs to address identified fair housing issues in **Table 3-12, Factors that Contribute to Fair Housing Issues.**
- **Equal Access (Government Code Section 11135 et seq.):** The City provides translation services for all public meetings and materials and offers accessibility accommodations to ensure equal access to all programs and activities operated, administered, or funded with financial assistance from the state, regardless of membership or perceived membership in a protected class.

Fair Housing Outreach

In addition to assessing fair housing issues related to development standards, fair housing issues can include disproportionate loan rates by race, housing design that is a barrier to individuals with a disability, discrimination against race, national origin, familial status, disability, religion, or sex when renting or selling a housing unit, and more. The City of Vallejo ensures dissemination of fair housing information and available services through the City's website and has identified programs to improve equal access to all governmental programs and activities. The City will continue to contract with Fair Housing Napa Valley (FHNV) to provide residents access to legal services to address fair housing issues (**Program F 1.1.1**).

Vallejo residents are served by three local fair housing organizations to help enforce fair housing laws, in addition to the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) and HUD Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO): Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California (FHANC), Legal Services of Northern California (LSNC), and FHNV. FHANC is contracted by the City of Vallejo to provide direct services to residents, audits and investigations related to discrimination, fair housing counseling services, and assistance in filing housing discrimination complaints to homeowners and renters, with resources available at no charge in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Between July 1, 2020, and June 30, 2021, FHANC provided counseling or education to 2,930 tenants, homeowners, homebuyers, housing providers, children, social service providers, and advocates across Marin, Sonoma, and Solano counties. Of the fair housing clients assisted by FHANC, 94.0 percent of clients were extremely low-, very low-, or low-income individuals. In addition, 27.0 percent were Hispanic or Latinx, 13.0 percent of whom spoke no English, and 20.0 percent were Black or African American. LSNC provides free legal services and assistance to qualifying clients with cases involving tenants' rights, evictions and lock outs, foreclosures, quality of housing, mobile homes, mitigation of homelessness, termination of utilities, unsafe housing, and loss of shelter because of natural disasters. As part of regional outreach efforts, consultations were conducted with FHANC and LSNC for feedback both regionally and locally for each jurisdiction.

In December 2021, LSNC reported that they had received 450 discrimination cases in 2021 from residents of Solano County. The organization identified the most common issue as disability discrimination, most frequently due to failure to make reasonable accommodations, followed by gender-based discrimination, usually resulting from unfair treatment of victims of domestic violence, such as terminating the lease of the entire family for a domestic violence disturbance. LSNC identifies gender-based discrimination as the most common complaint they receive from residents of Vacaville and habitability issues as a greater issue among non-English speakers in Fairfield than White, English-speaking residents. The primary concerns related to barriers to fair housing the LSNC reported include a substantial lack of affordable housing, resulting in a myriad of other issues, including substandard units being the only affordable options remaining and absentee landlords due to low vacancy rates so little concern about having a tenant regardless of conditions. LSNC reported that the increase in real estate investors in Solano County has further depleted the limited affordable, substandard stock as properties are remodeled and sold at higher prices. As a result of these concerns and issues, LSNC expressed a need of mechanisms to promote homeownership, reduce property turnover, and support tenants of units that are cited for negative conditions, such as requiring the owner to cover relocation costs. Overall, LSNC identified a need for stronger tenant protections throughout the region, better response to discrimination complaints through contracted service providers, a need for inclusionary housing ordinances, and other mechanisms to support affordable development.

In January 2022, FHANC provided extensive feedback on fair housing issues and needs in Solano County, particularly in Vallejo and Fairfield where the organization is contracted to provide services. Through testing and audits of housing providers, FHANC has identified a great need for more coordinated and extensive education and enforcement related to fair housing laws. For example, in 2021, FHANC tested housing providers to determine whether disability discrimination was an issue and found that approximately half of landlords did not allow exceptions for service animals. Further, FHANC reiterated what LSNC had reported, that the most common discrimination complaints are regarding denials of reasonable accommodations requests. Through testing, FHANC found that landlords and housing providers of fewer units discriminated at a higher rate, identifying a lack of understanding of laws as the most likely cause. The number of new laws related to fair housing has resulted in an increased need for education for both tenants and housing providers on requirements as well as resources available to them. FHANC expressed a need for coordinated resource management in Solano County so residents can easily access resources and know where to go to find services. The primary actions that FHANC recommended jurisdictions take to affirmatively further fair housing include contracting a fair housing organization to provide direct services to residents and adoption of tenant protections, such as a just-cause ordinance, and protections for residents with criminal backgrounds, such as an ordinance ensuring a fair chance to access housing. FHANC emphasized the importance of having fair housing service providers that are separate from the local housing authority, as the housing authority is also a housing provider, which may present a barrier to tenants who feel discriminated against. For example, in 2021, FHANC negotiated a settlement against the Suisun City Housing Authority on behalf of a client, as a result of disability discrimination.

In addition to general feedback, FHANC also shared the results of their 2019-2020 and 2021 audits of discrimination in rental units in Marin, Sonoma, and Solano Counties, as well as information on lawsuits they jointly filed with other fair housing organizations against banks for the maintenance and marketing of foreclosed properties. For their 2019-2020 audit, FHANC investigated 63 rental properties, through 139 individual tests, for discrimination against national origin and source of income. Forty-five tests were conducted on rental properties in Marin County, 29 in Solano County, and 45 in Sonoma County, testing the extent to which Hispanic and Latinx and HCV holders were discriminated against. FHANC found that approximately 82.5 percent of all housing providers tested discriminated on the basis of national origin and/or source of income. In Solano County, 81.0 percent of housing providers tested discriminated against one or both protected classes: 52.4 percent discriminated based on source of income, 19.0 percent on the basis of national origin, and 9.5 percent on both national origin and source of income. The remaining 19.0 percent of housing providers did not show discrimination against either protected class. The results of these tests indicate a need for education of landlords on source of income discrimination and requirements to accept Section 8 vouchers, as well as providing information on the benefits of participating in the voucher program, such as dependable payments from the public housing authority and regular inspections to check on the condition of the units.

In the May 2021 Audit Report, FHANC reported on discrimination on the basis of disability in the tri-county region, based on testing of 111 rental properties: 32 in Marin County, 39 in Solano County, and 40 in Sonoma County. Solano County properties were in Fairfield, Vallejo, Vacaville, Benicia, and Suisun City. These tests were based on housing providers allowing emotional support animals and/or service animals at properties listed as prohibiting or limiting animals. Approximately 30.7 percent of housing providers in Solano County showed clear evidence of discrimination, 15.4 percent showed some or potential evidence of discrimination, and 53.8 percent showed no evidence of discrimination. The rate of discrimination in Solano County was the lowest in the tri-county region, with 59.4 percent of housing providers in Marin County and 60.0 percent in Sonoma County showing total discrimination. Across all tested properties, FHANC found that discrimination rates were higher among properties with fewer than 11 units, indicating a need for increased education for these housing providers.

In addition to the audit reports, FHANC shared press releases from 2016, 2017, and 2018 that reported on lawsuits filed by FHANC and other fair housing organizations against Fannie Mae, Bank of America, Deutsche Bank, Ocwen Financial, and Altisource companies, alleging racial discrimination based on how banks maintain and market foreclosed properties. In each case, the fair housing organizations compiled data from multiple metropolitan areas throughout the nation, including the Vallejo-Fairfield MSA, that clearly indicated that bank-held properties in neighborhoods of color were consistently neglected and poorly maintained compared to those in White neighborhoods. In the Fannie Mae lawsuit of 2016, 68 properties in the Vallejo-Fairfield MSA were investigated: 1 in a predominantly Hispanic and Latinx community, 48 in predominantly non-White communities, and 19 in predominantly White communities. Approximately 47.0 percent of foreclosed properties in White communities in the Vallejo-Fairfield MSA had fewer than 5 maintenance or marketing deficiencies, compared to 35.0 percent of properties in communities of color. Further, 12.0 percent of foreclosed properties in communities of color had 10 or more deficiencies, while no properties in White communities had this extent of deficiencies. Similar

findings were reported throughout the Bay Area and across the nation in the case against Fannie Mae, as well as the banks. While the findings reported are a national issue, the impacts are seen in Solano County and the greater Bay Area region, presenting fair housing issues for local communities of color. FHANC expressed that the City may help reduce impacts, and in turn affirmatively further fair housing, through strict code enforcement of Fannie Mae properties, and other foreclosed homes, to ensure they are properly maintained and do not negatively impact the neighborhood they are located in. To address this concern, the City adopted the Vacant Real Property and Vegetation Prevention Ordinances in March, 2020. The Vacant Real Property Ordinance (Chapter 7.62) requires that foreclosed and vacant lots and commercial buildings be registered with Code Enforcement within 10 days of recording a notice of default or the real property becomes vacant, and applies retroactively to properties that were vacant at the time of ordinance adoption, and requires monthly inspections of the property be submitted to Code Enforcement Division. Therefore, the City is currently implementing a proactive code enforcement program, including monitoring of vacant and foreclosed properties.

In May 2022, FHNV noted that their organization receives race and national origin discrimination cases at a higher rate from Vallejo residents than other jurisdictions within their service area. They identified that this is likely as a result of increased diversity in Vallejo compared to the region, particularly the Napa Valley, and stated that discrimination based on race or national origin is not necessarily against non-White households but can occur between any racial or ethnic identity. FHNV also expressed that the increased diversity in Vallejo can, and should, influence how outreach is conducted there. Outreach and education should be available in a variety of languages and should focus on going to the community, such as through attending community events, distributing resources, and other strategies. The second most common issue that FHNV receives complaints on is regarding the quality and condition of the housing stock and noted that this issue is not isolated to Vallejo. Investing in improving the condition of the housing stock will help support longevity of tenure and improve accessibility. FHNV also noted that, while rental options are in greater demand currently, this is predominantly due to financial constraints and barriers to accessing credit. They recommended the City consider homeownership assistance programs, but also partnering with banks and other financial institutions to support programs to help residents build credit that will increase the rate of sustainable homeownership opportunities and avoid future foreclosures.

Throughout the region, stakeholders and service providers identified a need for stronger enforcement of code violations related to substandard housing conditions and better communication of available resources for a range of programs. Urban Habitat and Habitat for Humanity both identified coordination and partnerships between jurisdiction and non-profit staff as an opportunity to reduce barriers to housing through shared resources and outreach capacity. There are a range of services and programs available throughout the county and in individual jurisdictions; however, stakeholders expressed that they often hear from residents who are unaware of these opportunities. Improved outreach and communication efforts will help connect residents with appropriate services and programs, which may aid them in remaining in their home or identifying new opportunities.

Discrimination Cases

In their 2020 Annual Report, DFEH reported that they received 8 housing complaints from residents of Solano County, approximately 0.9 percent of the total number of housing cases in the state that year (880). As part of the Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP), DFEH also dual-files fair housing cases with HUD's Region IX FHEO, which are reported by the origin of the issue.

HUD FHEO reported that 35 cases were filed by residents of the City of Vallejo between January 2013 and April 2021, the largest number of cases of any jurisdiction in Solano County. One of the complaints was against public entities, though it was resolved after HUD was unable to locate the complainant. Of all complaints, several alleged discrimination on multiple bases. The 12 cases that were closed following conciliation or successful settlement included 8 allegations of discrimination on the basis of disability, 2 on the basis of race, 2 on the basis of familial status, 2 on the basis of sex, 1 on the basis of retaliation, and 1 on the basis of color. Two cases, including the one against a public entity, were closed after HUD was unable to locate the complainant. However, both of these cases alleged discrimination on the basis of disability. One case alleging discrimination on the basis of disability was withdrawn by the complainant without a resolution, one on the basis of national origin was withdrawn after resolution, and one that alleged discrimination the bases of race, color, and religion was closed by HUD when the complainant failed to cooperate. The remaining 17 cases were closed following no cause determinations. Of the cases that were of cause, the most common allegation was discrimination on the basis of disability.

In addition to formal complaints, 64 inquiries were made during the same time. Six of these were against a public entity; however, three were determined to have no valid issues, one had no valid basis, one claimant failed to respond to HUD, and one inquiry had another disposition, according to HUD. Of all the inquires, 26 had no valid issues, 22 claimants failed to respond to HUD, 10 had no valid bases, 5 had other dispositions, and 1 claimant decided not to pursue further. While the cases filed during this period did not have cause, that does not necessarily mean there is no discrimination occurring. Therefore, the City has identified **Program F 1.1.1** to ensure residents and housing providers are aware of fair housing laws, rights, and requirements as well as resources available to residents should they experience discrimination. Further, the City will work with local and regional fair housing providers to facilitate training for housing providers to prevent discriminatory actions and behaviors.


SITES INVENTORY ANALYSIS

The location of housing in relation to resources and opportunities is integral to addressing disparities in housing needs and opportunity and to fostering inclusive communities where all residents have access to opportunity. This is particularly important for lower-income households. Government Code Section 65583(c)(10)(A) added a new requirement for housing elements to analyze the location of lower-income sites in relation to areas of high opportunity. As discussed throughout this Assessment of Fair Housing, TCAC and HCD have designated almost all of Vallejo as low resource, with segments of moderate-resource tracts along the eastern boundary of the city, which include unincorporated county area or are primarily undeveloped and directly adjacent to the City of Benicia.

Figure 3-42, Census Tracts in Vallejo, and Table 3-11, Distribution of RHNA Capacity by Census Tract, present the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) capacity by census tracts in the city, and the existing conditions of each tract as they relate to indicators of fair housing. As shown, no sites have been identified in tracts 2506.04, 2518.04, 2511, and 2510. Tract 2518.04 is primarily developed with residential neighborhoods and open space adjacent to the mouth of the Napa River and tract 2506.04 is residential neighborhoods and open space adjacent to the Benicia city border, whereas tract 2511 is made up of older residential neighborhoods, of which, a large portion are within an unincorporated county island surrounded by incorporated neighborhoods. Tract 2510 includes those areas east of the downtown, north of Curtola Parkway and Solano Avenue, south of Florida Street, west of Amador Street, and east of Sutter Street in neighborhoods that are already developed with older single-family and small multifamily residential, as well as commercial uses along Georgia Street. The remaining tracts, which do include viable and available land for residential development, have units identified at a mix of affordability levels. The identified unit capacity in all tracts will be incorporated into neighborhoods with existing infrastructure.

The largest proportion of the RHNA unit capacity is identified in tract 2501.06 in the northeast corner of the city, with 22.4 percent of total unit capacity, made up of 34.4 percent of the above moderate-income units, and 13.0 percent of the moderate-income units, with no lower-income units, due to zoning, topography, and available lot sizes. This tract has the highest current median income at \$148,646, a low poverty rate of 3.9 percent, and the lowest proportion of renter households in the city, at 10.2 percent, of which, 25.5 percent are cost burdened (equivalent to 2.6 percent of households in the tract). This tract has a non-White population of 74.6 percent, predominantly Asian at 45.5 percent, with a non-Hispanic White population of 25.4 percent. The integration of moderate-income units into the most affluent area of the city will provide housing mobility opportunities for moderate-income households and facilitate more mixed-income neighborhoods, as well as provide additional housing opportunities for above moderate-income households with three above moderate-income sites having direct access to I-80. The City will encourage higher-density and affordable housing development in areas with higher incomes and access to resources by promoting the use of density bonus for affordable housing in higher-income and resource areas, construction of ADUs in higher-income single-family neighborhoods, and adoption of an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to promote access to resources and mobility opportunities for lower-income households, prioritizing new infill and development of vacant land opportunities in higher-income neighborhoods in northeast Vallejo (**Program B2.1.1. Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and Program H4.1.2 Accessory Dwelling Units**).

FIGURE 3-42, CENSUS TRACTS IN VALLEJO



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau, 2010

The tract with the second-highest proportion of the RHNA unit capacity (16.8 percent) is tract 2518.03 at the northwestern edge of the city, all of which is within the above moderate-income category (27.9 percent of above moderate-income units within two sites). This tract has a median income of \$77,739, making it a lower-income area in Vallejo, and a non-White population of 85.2 percent, the poverty rate is low at 3.1 percent, and the majority of households are homeowners, with renters comprising 31.7 percent. It is notable that 70.4 percent of renters are cost burdened, as compared to 30.9 percent of homeowners. This tract has a high jobs proximity index score due to its proximity to the downtown and northern commercial areas of the city, although its location at the mouth of the Napa River, combined with the single-access route to Mare Island bisecting the tract results in an environmental percentile ranking just below the threshold of a disadvantaged community. The inclusion of higher-income units in tract 2518.03 will aid in creating a more mixed-income neighborhood to reduce the concentration of lower- and moderate-income households.

Tract 2519.03 contains 13.1 percent of the unit capacity, with 18.3 percent of above moderate-income units and 7.8 percent of lower-income capacity. The population in this tract, just west of I-80 at the northern edge of the city, is 90.0 percent non-White, predominantly Black, followed by Hispanic and Asian residents, and has a low median income of \$74,506. However, the poverty rate is relatively low at 5.7 percent. The majority of households are homeowners, 44.4 percent of whom are cost burdened. A higher percentage of renter households are cost burdened at 58.1 percent, comprising 28.4 percent of total households in the tract. The City aims to reduce displacement risk for these households with the integration of two additional housing opportunity sites targeting lower-income households. The inclusion of above moderate-income capacity in the Borges Ranch subdivision will facilitate income integration and combat patterns of concentrated poverty within the tract and throughout the city.

Tract 2509 has the highest poverty rate in the city, at 53.4 percent, correlating with a TCAC/HCD High Segregation and Poverty and a HUD R/ECAP designation. Median income is extremely low at \$22,188, 80.9 percent of the population is non-White, and the disability rate is one of the highest in the city, at 18.9 percent. The tract is made up almost entirely of renter households, of which, almost 60.0 percent are cost burdened. However, while this tract includes six affordable housing complexes, the high rates of overpayment suggest a shortage of affordable rental resources. The inclusion of two lower-income sites here, 7.8 percent of lower-income capacity, will help to reduce existing overpayment rates, although there are no moderate or above moderate-income sites identified in this tract, the City has included **Program A 3.1.2: Density Bonus Amendment, Program A 1.1.2: Mixed-Use Development, Program A 4.1.1 Preliminary Applications (SB330) and Streamlined Approval (SB 35), Program B 1.1.1 Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance, Program B 2.1.1 Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, and Program B 2.1.2: Seek Funding to Support Affordable Development** to foster income-integration and reduce the concentration of households in poverty.

TABLE 3-11: DISTRIBUTION OF RHNA CAPACITY BY CENSUS TRACT

Census Tract	Existing Households	RHNA Capacity			AFFH Indicators												
		Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	Integration and Segregation					Access to Opportunity			Displacement Risk				
					Median Income	Poverty Rate	Low- to Moderate-Income Population	Non-White Population	Disability Rate	R/ ECAP	Resource Designation	Jobs Proximity Index	CalEnviro Screen Percentile	Overcrowding Rate	Renter Overpayment Rate	Homeowner Overpayment Rate	Renter Overpayment
2010.04	1959	76			\$77,739	3.1%	34.1%	78.7%	6.2%	No	Low	1	24.3	3.0%	70.4%	30.9%	17.5%
2501.03	1547		61		\$73,862	10.9%	34.7%	79.4%	14.3%	No	Low	30 - 59	55.3	7.2%	70.6%	27.4%	40.2%
2501.04	814		7		\$100,333	7.7%	16.0%	75.9%	14.7%	No	Low	23	19.6	3.5%	58.8%	18.9%	28.1%
2501.05	2207	291			\$94,233	6.4%	13.8%	79.4%	8.2%	No	Low	57 - 73	44.7	3.9%	35.4%	43.7%	37.1%
2501.06	1396		61	764	\$148,646	3.9%	14.3%	74.6%	8.9%	No	Low	49	24.8	1.4%	25.5%	44.1%	10.2%
2502	1472		49	24	\$61,739	11.0%	57.9%	67.5%	16.7%	No	Low	18 - 21	42.5	44.9%	51.3%	27.7%	51.8%
2504	1034	22	4		\$63,291	9.8%	44.0%	46.1%	18.2%	No	Low	26 - 28	57.9	10.0%	72.0%	39.1%	38.8%
2505.01	776		4		\$85,625	13.1%	45.3%	63.0%	13.6%	No	Low	14	43.8	6.8%	34.9%	31.1%	32.7%
2505.02	1000		60		\$83,194	8.3%	37.4%	76.4%	11.1%	No	Low	5 - 10	41.2	2.5%	47.6%	46.3%	30.1%
2506.01	1560		12		\$80,083	15.1%	35.6%	82.3%	9.6%	No	Low	17 - 22	58.2	4.6%	53.5%	35.1%	34.8%
2506.05	1577		4		\$96,333	5.9%	8.9%	68.0%	6.9%	No	Low	6	33.5	3.5%	33.6%	35.9%	30.8%
2507.01	1132	23	28		\$64,441	13.0%	55.3%	82.5%	17.4%	No	Low	35 - 52	97.9	12.0%	52.0%	17.1%	43.6%
2508.01	1436			37	\$64,299	17.3%	54.0%	75.1%	14.1%	No	Low	34 - 93	86.2	1.8%	69.4%	38.8%	48.0%
2509	1207	71			\$22,188	53.4%	82.8%	80.9%	18.9%	Yes	High Segregation and Poverty	77	94	9.3%	58.4%	14.4%	91.6%
2512	1282		11		\$58,611	16.3%	57.6%	78.3%	12.8%	No	Low	47	77.9	11.2%	54.4%	35.9%	58.3%
2514	2126	206	17	127	\$71,224	8.8%	40.3%	56.3%	9.4%	No	Low	82	59.6	5.2%	39.9%	36.1%	37.2%
2515	1464		9		\$40,174	24.0%	63.2%	81.0%	15.4%	No	High Segregation and Poverty	86	77.2	10.3%	63.2%	38.6%	73.0%
2516	1069		9		\$41,699	27.6%	56.0%	71.5%	12.7%	No	Low	84	75.2	1.9%	46.9%	34.6%	82.9%
2517.01	1368	118	10		\$57,634	21.8%	53.7%	63.1%	14.6%	No	Low	92	69.4	8.9%	53.2%	28.0%	62.5%
2518.02	1213	56	37	28	\$26,181	32.7%	73.0%	86.2%	18.3%	No	Low	95	90.6	3.9%	73.5%	73.9%	74.4%
2518.03	1384			620	\$77,739	3.1%	43.4%	85.2%	6.2%	No	Low	83	72.7	5.8%	70.4%	30.9%	31.7%
2519.01	1829		15		\$56,116	18.8%	48.6%	82.8%	20.0%	No	Low	81	78.5	5.6%	60.9%	45.5%	60.1%
2519.02	1773	41			\$62,222	13.5%	48.2%	89.8%	11.6%	No	Low	45	77.7	12.2%	66.1%	45.0%	43.2%
2519.03	1653	76		407	\$74,506	5.7%	46.0%	90.0%	9.4%	No	Low	44 - 62	63.2	7.2%	58.1%	44.4%	31.6%
2521.03	1980			28	\$91,389	5.5%	36.2%	76.7%	13.2%	No	Low	12	28.7	5.2%	59.8%	26.7%	49.8%
2521.04	1812			185	\$145,943	5.4%	14.0%	50.6%	7.5%	No	Moderate	8	28.2	0.9%	58.6%	33.0%	14.4%
2522.02	3191		73		\$116,775	6.8%	13.2%	69.2%	8.1%	No	Moderate	58	24.7	2.3%	41.0%	29.7%	17.3%

Sources: 2015-2019 ACS; Esri, 2018; TCAC/HCD 2021; HUD, 2020; OEHHA, 2021; CHHS, 2022

Tract 2514 between Sereno Drive and Greenfield Avenue, west of I-80 and east of Broadway Street, identifies housing units within all three income categories. Approximately 9.5 percent of total RHNA capacity has been identified in existing residential and commercial areas along Redwood and Fairgrounds Drives. The majority of the unit capacity is for lower-income units (21.0 percent of lower-income unit capacity) integrated with 3.6 percent of moderate-income and 5.7 percent of above moderate-income unit capacity projects. This tract is lower income, with a median income of \$71,224, has a poverty rate of 8.8 percent, and a 43.7 percent non-Hispanic White population, the third-highest representation in the city. The majority of households in this tract are homeowners (62.8 percent), and overpayment for both renters and homeowners is below 40.0 percent. The sites are near the I-80 interchange with Redwood Parkway and have accessibility to commercial centers along Redwood Street and the Kaiser Medical Complex at the corner of Sereno Avenue and Broadway Street. The inclusion of lower-income units here will help to reduce existing overpayment rates, which are moderate compared to elsewhere in the city, therefore reducing displacement risk, and the inclusion of moderate- and above moderate-income units will advance housing mobility and income-integration near employment centers and health services.

The only other tract that includes unit capacity at all three income levels is tract 2518.02, with 3.3 percent of total RHNA capacity. This tract is one of the two TCAC/HCD Areas of High Segregation and Poverty in the city, with a median income of \$26,181 and a 32.7 percent poverty rate. The population is predominantly non-White, at 86.2 percent of the population, and is nearly 75.0 percent renter households, of which, 73.9 percent are cost burdened. There are four affordable housing complexes within this tract providing 530 affordable units, which may contribute to the extremely low median income in this tract. The mix of units at all income levels has been identified in this tract in an effort to reduce the concentration of lower- and moderate-income households while still maintaining income integration and providing housing opportunities to reduce displacement risk of existing residents.

The remainder of the census tracts identify either a combination of lower- and moderate-income site capacity; moderate- and above moderate-income unit capacity, or lower- and above moderate-income unit capacity. In those tracts with moderate and above median incomes, the identification of lower-income unit capacity provides housing mobility opportunities for lower-income households that may have higher environmental, educational outcome or economic outcome rankings, while helping to reduce concentrations of poverty and lower-income populations in more socioeconomically impacted areas of the city. Conversely, the inclusion of moderate- and above moderate-income sites in lower-performing tracts is to facilitate income-integration and combat patterns of concentrated poverty.

This distribution of sites has been identified based on available land that is suitably zoned for residential development. **Table 3-11** presents how the distribution of sites by income will help to combat existing fair housing issues in Vallejo through facilitation of mixed-income neighborhoods, providing opportunities for additional housing opportunities in the limited moderate resource areas, thus reducing concentrations of affluence and promoting housing mobility, and providing additional housing opportunities in areas that will reduce the displacement risk resulting from overpayment and overcrowding in combination with Program B 1.1.1: Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) Rental Assistance, Program B 2.1.1: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Program E.1.1.1: Incentives for Special Needs Housing, Program

E 1.1.4: Reasonable Accommodations and Universal Design, Program E 1.1.6: Extremely Low-Income Housing, and Program F 1.1.3: Rent Monitoring Program, Program G 2.1.1: Housing Rehabilitation Program, Program G 3.1.1: Code Enforcement Program, and Program H 4.1.2: Accessory Dwelling Units. To confirm whether the sites identified in the Housing Element inventory will affirmatively further fair housing, the City examined the TCAC/HCD opportunity area map as well as specific geographic patterns of resources. As the vast majority of the City of Vallejo has been designated as a low-resource area by TCAC and HCD, the City primarily relied on other indicators to determine whether the sites inventory affirmatively furthers fair housing.

Figures 3-43 through 3-54 compare the total RHNA capacity to citywide indicators of fair housing for a comprehensive comparison of how the sites inventory will influence existing patterns. For the purpose of this analysis, “vacant” refers to sites that are currently undeveloped without any plans for development and “pipeline projects” are projects that are currently on the Vallejo Land Use Entitlements (VALUE) list as a proposed or pending project.


Potential Effect on Patterns of Integration and Segregation

Capacity for 3,671 total units, including 980 lower-, 471 moderate-, and 2,220 above moderate-income units, has been identified to meet the City’s RHNA. Much of the identified capacity is within approved project sites, some of which are final phases of larger developments. As shown on **Figures 1 through 7, Land Inventory Sites, in Chapter 4, and Table 3-11, Distribution of Site Capacity by Census Tract**, the sites identified to accommodate the majority of the lower-income RHNA are primarily to the west of I-80, with a few scattered sites east of I-80 at intersections with major circulation routes. Approximately 42.5 percent of the lower-income RHNA is identified in the northwest portion of the city north of Sereno Drive/Turner Parkway (see **Chapter 4, Housing Resources and Constraints, Figure 1 City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #1**); 45.7 percent is identified in the central western section between Turner Parkway and Solano Avenue/Springs Road (see **Figure 3: City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #3**); and 11.8 percent is identified in the southwestern portion of the city on either side of I-80 south of Georgia Street (see **Figure 5, City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #5**).

Capacity for 471 moderate-income RHNA units is spread throughout the city with 8.5 percent of moderate-income units in the northwest section; 29.3 percent within the central west section; and 9.3 percent in the southwest section. Moderate-income RHNA sites are also identified east of I-80, with capacity for 28.5 percent of units in the northeast section north of Columbus Parkway (see **Figure 2, City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #2**); 10.0 percent of unit capacity in the central eastern portion of the city between Turner Parkway and Springs Road (see **Figure 4, City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #4**); and 14.4 percent of moderate-income unit capacity within the southeastern portion of the city south of Georgia Street along Columbus Parkway and I-780 (see **Figure 6, City of Vallejo Vacant Sites Inventory #6**). Approximately 10.2 percent of the moderate-income unit capacity is identified in the moderate resource designation at the northeast edge of the city.

Sites with capacity for 2,373 above moderate-income sites are identified primarily within approved pipeline projects. Approximately 43.3 percent of above moderate-income unit capacity is identified in the northwest section of the city (see **Figure 7: Pipeline Projects**); 8.7 percent within the central west section; and 8.0 percent in the southwest section, inclusive of Mare Island. Above moderate-income RHNA sites are also identified east of I-80, with capacity for 11.1 percent of units in the northeast section north of Columbus Parkway; 21.1 percent of unit capacity in the central eastern portion of the city between Turner Parkway and Springs Road; and 7.8 percent of above moderate-income unit capacity within the southeastern portion of the city south of Georgia Street at the boundary with Benicia east of Columbus Parkway within a moderate-resource designation.

FIGURE 3-43, PERCENT UNIT CAPACITY BY TCAC/HCD RESOURCE DESIGNATION



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

The sites to meet the RHNA identify development opportunities on vacant land, infill on residential sites, and underutilized or vacant commercial properties. As shown on **Figure 3-43, Percentage Unit Capacity by TCAC/HCD Resource Designation**, 91.2 percent of unit capacity is within a low resource designation, with 2.1 percent of the sites within the two Areas of High Segregation and Poverty, and 6.7 percent of sites within the moderate-resource designations along the east side of the city. The majority of the above moderate-income sites are approved projects, with 92.2 percent in low-resource areas and 7.8 percent in moderate-resource designations at the northeast and southeast corners of the city. Approximately 8.7 percent of the lower-income unit capacity is in pipeline projects, with 7.2 percent of the unit capacity identified within the Areas of High Segregation and Poverty, which will assist in meeting the existing needs of lower-income households in securing affordable housing. The highest proportion of units identified within the moderate-resource designation are moderate income (15.5 percent), which facilitates housing mobility opportunities, with 1.9 percent of moderate-income unit capacity within Areas of High Segregation and Poverty facilitating income integration. Otherwise, all sites with the exception of those discussed previously are within a low-resource designation.

Income


As shown in **Figure 3-44, Percentage Unit Capacity by Median Income**, the City has identified capacity for 42.3 percent of the units in the Sites Inventory in areas that have lower median incomes below \$77,600 and higher rates of overcrowding and overpayment; 26.4 percent are identified in Vallejo's highest-income block groups east of I-80, and 31.3 percent of the city's RHNA unit capacity is identified within moderate-income areas (see **Figure 3-8, Local Median Income**). While approximately 62.6 percent of the lower-income capacity has been identified on sites with lower median incomes, these sites aim to reduce displacement risk for residents in these areas that currently face a shortage of affordable options. Approximately 31.8 percent of the above moderate-income, and 53.1 percent of moderate-income unit capacity are also identified in lower-income neighborhoods. The distribution of these sites accommodating higher-income units will help facilitate mixed-income communities without concentrating lower-income units in lower-income areas.

Block groups that correlate to moderate incomes are primarily found east of I-80 north of Redwood Parkway and along Oakwood Avenue north of Tennessee Street, along the eastern perimeter of the city east of Columbus Parkway, and north and south of I-780 in the southeastern corner of the city, as well as clusters in the northwest corner of the city and north of Griffin Drive. Fairly comparable proportions of lower-income unit capacity (37.4 percent) and moderate-income unit capacity (34.0 percent) have been identified for sites within moderate-income areas of the city. These increased housing mobility opportunities north of Griffin Road and east of I-80 may alleviate pressure on the existing lower-income housing stock in the city that has resulted in renter overpayment and will aid in preventing displacement of residents from the community. The City aims to combat potential income segregation spurred by the siting of a greater proportion of affordable multifamily developments east and north of the older central core of the city. Additionally, it addresses the prevalence of more affordable single-family homeowner and renter opportunities being located in older residential neighborhoods along I-80 and in the vicinity of downtown, which may be in greater need of regular maintenance. In addition, 28.2 percent of above moderate-income unit capacity identified within moderate-income neighborhoods in the northwest and eastern edges of the city will facilitate mixed-

income neighborhoods and serve as a mechanism for achieving income integration, as well as providing additional housing mobility opportunities for above moderate-income residents.

While there is no lower-income unit capacity within the highest-income area of the city north of Columbia Parkway, 13.0 percent of moderate-income and 40.0 percent of above moderate-income unit capacity is associated with sites in this portion of the city, increasing the housing opportunities for higher-income households in newly developing neighborhoods while integrating moderate-income socioeconomic groups into these hillside communities, some of which are designated moderate resource by TCAC/HCD.

FIGURE 3-44: PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY MEDIAN INCOME




Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

In Vallejo, 15.0 percent of households make less than 30.0 percent of the AMI, which is considered extremely low income. Rates of poverty are below 10.0 percent in the eastern, northwestern, and southeastern portions of the city as well as a cluster of centrally located neighborhoods south of Sereno Drive, north of Tennessee Street, east of Broadway, and west of I-80. Low rates of poverty in these localities may indicate that high costs of housing are a barrier to access for lower-income households seeking housing, forcing these households to seek housing in more affordable areas. At the census-tract level, higher rates are found in the central and western parts of the city, in neighborhoods that coincide with the city's lower-income block groups (**Figure 3-9, Local Poverty Rates**). Particularly high rates of poverty are found in the neighborhood around Vallejo Ferry Terminal and in the neighborhood around White Slough, the city's lowest-income neighborhoods where housing typology and the presence of industrial uses likely accounts for more housing affordability and higher rates of poverty in these areas. These areas have historically been used as shipyard worker housing and were redlined areas, and patterns of low incomes persist in these areas.

As shown in **Figure 3-45, Percent Unit Capacity by Poverty Rate**, 79.2 percent of the total unit capacity has been identified on sites where rates of poverty are below 10.0 percent, and 12.0 percent of unit capacity is identified in neighborhoods with a poverty rate between 10.0 and 19.9 percent of households. A small portion of the unit capacity falls north of the ferry landing in the older residential neighborhoods within the 20.0 to 29.9 percent poverty rate tracts, and the remaining 5.0 percent are identified in the tracts with the highest poverty rate correlating to the TCAC/HCD Areas of High Segregation and Poverty. The inclusion of 1.2 percent of above moderate-income and 13.8 percent of moderate-income unit capacity in the higher poverty rate block groups encompassed within and in-between the Areas of High Segregation helps integrate higher-income households into these areas where a concentration of lower-income households and populations of color currently exists. This will promote income integration in these communities where the majority of existing affordable multifamily complexes have contributed to the concentration of lower-income households. The inclusion of 25.0 percent of lower-income unit capacity within these high poverty rate neighborhoods will help facilitate housing mobility opportunities and reduce displacement risk for lower-income households residing in these neighborhoods with access to commercial uses, services, and amenities in the city center, whereas sites for lower-income households within the low poverty rate portions of the city contribute to the reduction of concentration of affordable housing complexes and correlation of these resources with high poverty rates.

FIGURE 3-45, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY POVERTY RATE



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS


Race and Ethnicity

As discussed previously, Vallejo is one of the most diverse cities in Solano County, with non-White residents comprising 76.9 percent of the city’s population. White residents comprise majorities by census tract in central neighborhoods between I-80 and the railroad north of Tennessee Avenue, which also corresponds with low poverty rates and generally moderate-income households. The city’s most diverse neighborhoods coincide with the city’s lowest-income and high segregation and poverty neighborhoods, predominantly Hispanic or Latinx communities in the southeast section of the city (**Figure 3-16, Local Racial Demographics**), which tend to be found closer to

nonresidential uses. Neighborhoods in the northern and northeastern sections of the city are heavily non-White, predominantly Asian communities.

Additional lower- and moderate-income units in the city will improve access to housing in the city for residents who would otherwise be priced out of the housing market or experience cost-burden or overcrowding, a category that has historically included communities of color. As shown in **Figure 3-46, Percentage Unit Capacity by Non-White Population**, 14.7 percent of the unit capacity is within tracts with the lowest non-White population below 60.0 percent, primarily in the southeastern corner of the city. Almost one-half (47.6 percent) of the unit capacity falls in areas with a non-White population between 60.0 and 79.0 percent, primarily along the western waterfront inland to Broadway Street; between Sereno Drive and Redwood Street; and between Tennessee Street to Solano Avenue; and in the East Central Vallejo, Central Vallejo, Tennessee and Avian, and Woodbridge/Summit neighborhoods east of I-80; as well as the northeastern and southeastern portions of the city. The remaining sites are identified within the 37.7 percent of the city with a non-White population above 80.0 percent, mainly in the northwest, neighborhoods surrounding Gateway Plaza, the Steffan Manor neighborhood east of I-80 and the adjacent neighborhood directly west of I-80, and the Beverly Hills and Swanzy Dam Road neighborhoods at the junction of I-80 and Curtola Parkway.

FIGURE 3-46, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY NON-WHITE POPULATION




Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

Disability

As shown on **Figure 3-22, Population with a Disability**, approximately 12.5 percent of Vallejo’s population lives with one or more types of disabilities, with rates reaching 18.9 percent in the downtown tract correlating to a concentration of six affordable housing complexes and the TCAC/HCD High Segregation and Poverty designation; and 20.0 percent in the tract encompassing Six Flags amusement parks, an affordable housing complex, and the Sutter Solano Medical Center, access to which might contribute to the high rate of disability in this tract. ACS data indicates that a higher proportion of residents who are living with a disability are residing in lower-income areas, where they may have more limited access to opportunities, or conversely, increased access to more affordable housing stock.

As shown on **Figure 3-47, Percent Unit Capacity by Disability Rate**, the City has identified a capacity for 76.9 percent of potential units to meet the RHNA in census tracts with a 5.0 to 9.9 percent disability rate, primarily in the northwestern, northeastern, and southeastern sections of the city, as well as the centrally located Holiday Gardens, Northwest Vallejo, Fleming Estates, the Kingdom of Hermosa, Valle Vista End, Grant Mahoney Park, Amador, and the Vista neighborhoods between Sereno Drive and Nebraska Street. A large portion of lower-income unit capacity (66.2 percent) is identified within these tracts, which generally correspond to higher median incomes and lower poverty rates, with five sites north of Griffin Drive with close access to the Sutter Solano Medical Center; along Broadway, Redwood Parkway, and Fairgrounds Drive major commercial corridors, and sites with direct access to interchanges along I-80. This distribution is intended to improve accessibility for lower-income individuals with disabilities to new housing opportunities that are required to comply with current development standards and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards and which will help to improve access for and accommodate the needs of persons living with disabilities, who, often being seniors and on a fixed income, benefit from close access to services and amenities as well as proximity to transit. Lower-income unit capacity in tracts with higher rates of disabilities above 10.0 percent, primarily along Sonoma Boulevard, Sacramento Street, Curtola Parkway, and Georgia Street will provide housing mobility opportunities for current lower-income residents with disabilities to move to housing that will be ADA compliant and will provide housing opportunities for those experiencing homelessness. As well, those west of I-80 are accessible to commercial uses and services in the downtown area.

FIGURE 3-47, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY DISABILITY RATE



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS


Approximately 13.5 percent of the RHNA capacity is identified on sites within tracts with 10.0 to 14.9 percent of the population experiencing disabilities, which are generally east of I-80, south of Redwood Parkway and east of Oakwood Drive, Mare Island, and tracts north of Marine World Parkway. A large proportion of moderate-income unit capacity (34.4 percent) falls within the central areas in the eastern section of the city, as well as 8.3 percent of the above-moderate unit capacity in these tracts, providing mobility opportunities for moderate- and higher-income persons with disabilities in new structures that are ADA compliant and built to universal design standards.

Familial Status

As previously discussed, some areas of Vallejo have a higher rate of female-headed households with children and no spouse or partner present, and senior households living alone. Female-headed households with children and no spouse or partner (10.8 percent of households) often face particular challenges to housing access and are at elevated risk of displacement. Approximately 30.0 percent of female-headed households with children have incomes below the poverty line.

Similar to other indicators of fair housing, 43.1 percent of the RHNA capacity is identified on sites in northwestern, eastern, southwestern, Mare Island, and north central neighborhoods (east of I-80, north of Redwood, and southwest of Columbus Parkway) of the city in which up to 19.9 percent of children are in female-headed households (**Figure 3-48, Percentage Unit Capacity by Children in Female-Headed Households**). One of these tracts, south of Marine World Parkway and west of Broadway Street in the vicinity of White Slough, is designated an Area of High Segregation and Poverty, with 25.9 percent of the households made up of persons living alone. Almost one-half (47.3 percent) of the lower-income unit capacity is identified in these tracts, with the majority of these sites at the northwestern boundary between Broadway Street and Sonoma Boulevard, Gateway Plaza, and the White Slough neighborhoods, increasing the opportunities for female-headed households currently experiencing overpayment and/or overcrowding, to acquire affordable, and adequately sized housing while promoting a reduction in the concentration of female-headed households in other parts of the city. As well, 42.9 percent of above moderate-income unit capacity is identified in these tracts, primarily east of Columbus Parkway, in the southwest Carquinez Heights neighborhoods, Mare Island, and within the northwestern edge of the city between Broadway Street and Sonoma Boulevard, with one site identified in the Area of High Segregation and Poverty. While a lower proportion (27.3 percent) of moderate-income unit capacity is within these tracts, concentrations of sites are identified in the moderate-resource area in the northeast corner of the city, providing housing mobility for moderate-income female-headed households, and 7.9 percent of moderate-income unit capacity is identified in the Area of High Segregation and Poverty, facilitating income integration.

FIGURE 3-48, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY CHILDREN IN FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

An additional 43.8 percent of RHNA capacity is identified on sites in which 20.0 to 39.9 percent of children reside in households headed by single females. These tracts are generally in the northeast corner of the city, in the central neighborhoods on both sides of I-80, as far south as I-780 on the east side of I-80, south of Curtola Parkway to its interchange with I-80, and along the western edge of the city, (with the exception of the downtown tract west of Sutter Street designated an Area of High Segregation and Poverty), many of which correspond to lower-income populations. The identification of 49.3 percent of above moderate-income housing capacity and 55.8 percent of moderate-income unit capacity in these areas increases mobility opportunities for moderate and higher-income single-female-headed households from within and outside of the city to find appropriate units, while decreasing competition for housing within these neighborhoods, and facilitates mixed-income integration in the lower-income neighborhoods.

Areas with the highest concentration of children in a tract (above 40.0 percent) residing in female-headed households vary in median income from extremely low- to the upper ranges of moderate-income, and include the downtown Area of High Segregation and Poverty; central tracts on both sides of Broadway Street between Valle Vista and Florida Street; east of Broadway to I-80 between Marine World Parkway and Redwood Avenue; and the neighborhoods between Oakwood Avenue, Columbus Parkway, Tennessee, and Georgia Streets. While 13.1 percent of the total RHNA unit capacity is identified in these neighborhoods, 28.3 percent of lower-income unit capacity, 15.9 percent of moderate-income capacity, and 6.4 percent of above moderate-income unit capacity is identified, so female-headed households of any economic status will have access to new housing opportunities in the neighborhoods in which they currently live. By adding moderate- and above moderate-income units throughout the city, and particularly by co-locating lower-income units with these moderate- and above moderate-income units to provide access to existing and new amenities and resources, Vallejo will become more accessible to female-headed households with children and no spouse or partner present, as well as other single-parent households or lower-income families.

Approximately 25.1 percent of households in the city consist of residents living alone. Many of these households are seniors who are often more socially isolated from the rest of the community, and they may lack communication or transportation access and social connections, thereby making access to supportive housing and resources more difficult. Senior households often have a fixed income as well, which limits their financial resources and housing choices. Approximately 44.0 percent of the total senior households in Vallejo are cost-burdened, particularly lower-income seniors. As discussed in the prior disability analysis, the sites distribution is intended to expand housing mobility opportunities for lower-income households and alleviate cost burden in areas of higher senior populations. Increasing affordable housing opportunities and integration will be achieved by encouraging above moderate-income, moderate-income, and lower-income housing throughout the city.

Potential Effect on Access to Opportunity

Mobility

As previously discussed, 44.0 percent of households in Vallejo are renters. The rental vacancy rate is 4.9 percent, while the ownership unit vacancy rate is 0.9 percent. The very low ownership unit vacancy rate indicates a shortage of for-sale homes available in Vallejo. While renters are the minority tenure citywide, there are eight census tracts in the city where renters comprise over 60.0 percent of households, and one in which 58.4 percent of households are renters. Within six of these census tracts, over 10.0 percent of the renters use HCVs, as shown by **Figure 3-24, Housing Choice Vouchers**, with an additional tract in the downtown with an HCV rate of 9.7 percent, and one tract including the Millerville and Amador South neighborhoods with an HCV rate over 15.0 percent. Also, there are two other census tracts in the city that have HCV rates above 15.0 percent, although renter households comprise less than 30.0 percent of total households in the northern tract and 14.4 percent in the southeastern tract. Approximately 26.7 percent of the total above moderate-income unit capacity is identified in these two tracts, fostering income-integration and reduction in the concentration of non-White populations within

the northernmost tract, as well as maximizing access to proximity to I-80. In addition, 7.8 percent of low-income unit capacity is identified in the northernmost tract, which will provide additional housing mobility opportunities for lower-income households that do not currently hold HCVs. However, a large portion of the southernmost tract is split between Vallejo and Benicia, encompassing the Benicia Community Park outside of Vallejo city limits and the residential neighborhoods surrounding Lake Herman, whereas only a few streets are included within Vallejo itself, and therefore it is not possible to determine what portion of units within Vallejo are renter occupied, and if any of the HCVs are used for these units. Although this tract has one of the lowest proportions of non-White residents and concentration of populations of color is not a fair housing issue, these units will increase housing mobility opportunities for above moderate-income households with proximity to I-780 and further promote mixed-income neighborhoods.

The majority of the remainder of the city has HCV usage rates between 5.0 and 15.0 percent. Sites to meet the lower-income RHNA are identified throughout the city in areas where they will provide housing mobility opportunities in higher-income neighborhoods, which also helps reduce existing concentrations of lower-income households and populations of color, as well as within lower-income sections of the city, including the two Areas of High Segregation and Poverty, to provide housing mobility opportunities that deter potential displacement of existing residents at risk of losing their housing. Lower-income sites are generally in the older section of the city in the vicinity of downtown with access to the city center, along Broadway Street, Sonoma Boulevard, Curtola Parkway, and Redwood Parkway major commercial corridors, I-80, and commercial amenities in Gateway Plaza. Many of the lower-income units are co-located with above moderate-income units and moderate-income units to facilitate income-integrated neighborhoods and support the development of improved resource and economic mobility opportunities., which affirmatively furthers fair housing.

The sites identified to meet the RHNA will provide lower-, moderate-, and above moderate-income opportunities in the southwestern tip of the city, which has the lowest rate of HCV usage, which will facilitate additional housing mobility opportunities for lower-income households and assist in reducing the high renter overpayment rate in that tract with or without HCV assistance.


Employment Opportunities

As discussed in this assessment, jobs are largely concentrated in the northeast portion of the city, in the commercial and business districts along Sonoma Boulevard. According to LODES data, approximately 37.1 percent of Vallejo residents live within 10 miles of their job, though 85.0 percent of residents commute to jobs outside of the city. The city has a low jobs-household ratio (0.78), suggesting a shortage of jobs compared to households. Following the closure of the Mare Island shipyard in 1996, Vallejo's economy transitioned to operate as a bedroom community for employees commuting into the heart of the San Francisco Bay Area, with a more limited range of opportunities within the city. As well, the dominance of residential uses in Vallejo reflects the relatively low scores for HUD's Jobs Proximity Index, particularly in the eastern and southern predominantly residential neighborhoods, although these areas have the greatest commuting accessibility to employment in Contra Costa County and the San Francisco Bay Area. The combination of employment factors in Vallejo

indicates that the jobs in the city may not meet the needs of residents, based on those commuting out of the city, while the shortage of affordable housing stock presents a barrier to those employed in the city, based on the jobs-household ratio.

As shown in **Figure 3-49, Percentage Unit Capacity by Jobs Proximity Index Score**, the City has identified the greatest capacity (41.2 percent of the RHNA capacity) for lower-, moderate-, and above moderate-income units (68.6, 20.6, and 34.2 percent of their total capacities, respectively) in areas that have a score above the 60th percentile relating to proximity to jobs within the city, which generally includes the portion of the city west of I-80; south of, and adjacent to both sides of Marine World Parkway; to Mare Island Way/Solano Avenue/Springs Road, and the Gateway Plaza neighborhood. The high proportion of lower-income unit capacity supports direct access to commercial and service employment opportunities, as well as access to employment opportunities in adjacent cities of American Canyon and Napa via SR-29 and I-80. This distribution also provides higher-income residents and residents currently commuting out of town for their jobs access to above moderate-income housing units to support employment opportunities in the city that were not available previously. Although 41.2 percent of the total RHNA unit capacity falls within the 40th to 59th percentile range, the majority of this unit capacity is within above moderate- and moderate-income sites in the northeast, and moderate-income sites within lower-income tracts east of I-80 between Redwood Parkway and Tennessee Street, and west of I-80 between Springs Road and Georgia Street, and in the vicinity of the Curtola Parkway/I-80 interchange.

FIGURE 3-49, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY JOBS PROXIMITY INDEX SCORE



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS


Although only 17.1 percent of the RHNA unit capacity is identified in the tracts with the farthest job proximity indexes in the southeastern portion of the city, this distribution will support all income households by providing them with housing that supports mobility and access to employment opportunities by car or public transportation, with bus connections from the Vallejo Transit Center to the Walnut Creek BART station, with a stop in Benicia and the El Cerrito BART station.

Educational Opportunities

According to the DOE, most Vallejo schools are below the state educational standards for ELA and mathematics at each grade level, with most areas of the city below the 25th percentile, indicating that students generally have access to similarly performing schools, regardless of income. The anticipated educational outcomes, according to the TCAC/HCD (**Figure 3-31, Local TCAC/HCD Educational Outcome Percentile Scores**), are lowest in downtown and central Vallejo, and higher near the perimeter of the city boundaries, correlating to the TCAC/HCD Resource designations.

As shown in **Figure 3-50, Percentage Unit Capacity by TCAC/HCD Educational Domain Scores**, the existing patterns of access to opportunity related to educational resources indicate that 93.1 percent of the city's RHNA capacity falls within the least positive educational outcome percentiles, and 6.7 percent falls between the 50th and 75th percentile at the far northeastern and southeastern edges of the city, correlating to median income and TCAC/HCD economic outcome scores. While 100.0 percent of the lower-income unit capacity is identified on sites with less positive educational outcomes, the identification of 92.2 percent of above moderate-income and 83.7 percent of moderate-income unit capacity within these neighborhoods promotes the development of housing units in lower-performing neighborhoods. The integration of income levels increases potential for increased educational domain scores and resource designation, as access to educational opportunities with higher attainment scores is generally associated with higher-income, higher-resource areas. The identification of 15.5 and 7.8 percent of moderate and above moderate-income unit capacity respectively will provide housing mobility opportunities in the two tracts with more positive educational domain outcomes adjacent to Benicia.

FIGURE 3-50, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY TCAC/HCD EDUCATIONAL DOMAIN PERCENTILE



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

RHNA capacity has been identified in areas that facilitate housing mobility opportunities for lower-income households, and also so that all schools can benefit from increased diversity and income-integration to raise educational outcomes. Overall, however, current and future residents across the city will have fairly equivalent access to educational opportunities. To increase access to higher educational attainment opportunities, Program E.1.1.1: Incentives for Special Needs Housing, expands opportunities for affordable lower-income housing for special-needs groups, including lower-income teachers employed by the Vallejo City Unified School District; and Program F 1.1.2: Improve Access to Resources, which commits the City to meet with school district representatives to analyze whether housing security poses a barrier to resources, and to work with the school district to assist in securing grant funding for teacher recruitment and retention bonuses, classroom materials, and other incentives for teachers to facilitate positive learning environments citywide.

Environmental Health


As shown in **Figure 3-33, Local CalEnviroScreen Percentiles**, most of the city east of I-80 scores between the 50th to above the 75th percentile. Tracts with scores above the 75th percentile qualify as a disadvantaged community, impacting access to opportunity as it relates to healthy living conditions. Tracts with scores above the 75th percentile are found within the two TCAC/HCD Areas of High Segregation and Poverty and surrounding downtown neighborhoods, south of Curtola Parkway along the Carquinez Strait, north and south of Marine World Parkway on both sides of Sonoma Parkway, and Mare Island. Conversely, all but one tract in central Vallejo east of I-80 have CalEnviroScreen percentile scores below the 50th percentile.

As shown in **Figure 3-51, Percentage of Unit Capacity by CalEnviroScreen Scores**, approximately 42.6 percent of the RHNA capacity is identified in the tracts scoring below the 50th percentile. Approximately 54.7 percent of moderate-income unit capacity and 42.2 percent of above moderate-income capacity are identified in the tracts with the lowest scores in the northeast and eastern perimeter of the city, with 37.5 percent of lower-income unit capacity in the vicinity of Gateway Plaza and one site on Sonoma Boulevard at the border of the city with Napa County, facilitating housing mobility opportunities for households at all income levels to live in the healthiest environments in the city and contributing to reduction of concentrations of lower-income households in the most environmentally impacted areas of the city. 44.4 percent of the RHNA capacity (49.5 percent of above moderate-income, 22.1 percent of moderate-income, and 43.0 percent of lower-income households) is on sites within the 50th to 74th percentile. While these areas do not qualify as a disadvantaged community, there may be a concentration of a number of factors in addition to increased exposure to particulate matter and ozone concentrations from adjacency to I-80 as the dominant environmental influence. These factors may include lower incomes, poverty rates between 10.0 and 20.0 percent of the households, concentrations of single female-headed households with children, high rates of non-White populations, low rates of educational attainment, and a high rate of unemployment as well as older homes conditions and lead in housing. While these factors may not reflect all neighborhoods in this percentile range, they do represent an area of potential concern regarding fair housing and disproportionate exposure to environmental hazards and a concentration of vulnerable populations, which is mitigated by Program A 1.1.1: Land Inventory and RHNA Monitoring, Program A 1.1.2: Mixed-Use Development, Program B 2.1.1: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Program B 2.1.2: Seek Funding to Support Affordable Development, Program E 1.1.1: Incentives for Special Needs Housing, Program E 1.1.6: Extremely Low-Income Housing, Program F 1.1.2: Improve Access to Resources, Program G 2.1.1: Housing Rehabilitation, Program G 3.1.1: Code Enforcement, and Program G 5.1.1: Rental Property Inspection. The identification of moderate- and above moderate-income unit capacity in these tracts with less positive environmental outcome scores (i.e., corresponding to a higher percentile) will facilitate income integration and reduction of concentrations of lower-income households and households in poverty, which, as discussed previously, are factors that contribute to higher CalEnviroScreen scores.

The remaining capacity, 13.0 percent, is identified on sites scoring above the 75th percentile range in areas considered disadvantaged. While the moderate- and above moderate-income unit capacity (23.1 and 8.3 percent respectively) will contribute to income-integrated neighborhoods and reduction in the concentration of lower-income households with associated indicators of disadvantaged communities

in these tracts, the 19.5 percent of lower-income unit capacity will facilitate housing mobility for lower-income households within their existing neighborhoods and reduce displacement potential for households at risk of losing their homes.

FIGURE 3-51, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY CALENVIROSCREEN PERCENTILE



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

Potential Effect on Displacement Risk

Overcrowding


Overall, 7.0 percent of households in Vallejo are considered overcrowded, 65.6 percent are considered overcrowded, and 34.4 percent are considered severely overcrowded. Overcrowding is seen more amongst those that are renting, whereas 6.5 percent of renters are overcrowded, 3.0 percent of homeowners experience overcrowding. Overall, households experiencing overcrowding in Vallejo, when combined with income or accessibility challenges, may become at risk for displacement. Higher overcrowding rates are concentrated in the northwest and western portions of the city, and the more densely populated areas in central Vallejo along the railroad, near the Vallejo

Ferry Terminal and in the neighborhood around White Slough, corresponding to the city's lowest-income neighborhoods, including the three areas designated as High Segregation and Poverty, where older housing stock, originally constructed to serve the shipyard industry, is mixed with industrial and other nonresidential uses. the Vallejo Ferry Terminal, primarily south of Sears Point Road (SR-37), west of I-80, and east of the Mare Island Strait, including an area northeast of the I-80 and I-780 interchange. These neighborhoods consist of single-family residences, the Olympia and Vallejo Mobile Estates mobile home parks, and a variety of multifamily residences.

The tract east of Broadway and west of Flosden Road, including the Napa Olympia, Canyon Creek, and Chesapeake subdivisions has the highest rate of overcrowding at 12.2 percent.

As shown in **Figure 3-52, Percentage Unit Capacity by Rate of Overcrowded Households**, the city has identified 50.4 percent of total RHNA unit capacity in tracts with low rates of overcrowding, and 46.7 percent in rates with 5.0 to 9.9 percent of households experiencing overcrowding. An estimated 43.2 percent of the lower-income unit capacity, 66.2 percent of the moderate-income unit capacity, and 50.2 percent of the above moderate-income unit capacity is identified in tracts with rates of overcrowding below 5.0 percent, therefore providing housing mobility opportunities for households of all incomes experiencing overcrowding in other areas of the city. Approximately 50.3 percent of the low-income RHNA unit capacity is identified in the tracts surrounding the downtown between the Mare Island Strait and I-80; extending into the Steffan Manor and Home Acres neighborhoods in the vicinity of the I-80 and I-780 interchange; and in the southwestern portion of the city below Curtola Parkway to the junction of Curtola Parkway and I-80 with overcrowding rates between 5.0 and 9.9 percent, providing housing mobility opportunities for existing residents to units that may be both affordable and of adequate size to meet the needs of lower-income households.

FIGURE 3-52, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY RATE OF OVERCROWDED HOUSEHOLDS



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

The remaining 10.2 percent moderate-income unit capacity, and 6.5 percent of lower-income capacity is identified in the central northern tract with the highest rate of overcrowding, which helps relieve pressure on the existing inventory of housing units in that area to meet needs of residents experiencing overcrowding while remaining in their own familiar neighborhood. Overall, the mix of income housing opportunities identified in the sites inventory will help to facilitate additional affordable and market-rate housing mobility opportunities at a range of sizes and locations for those few households that are currently experiencing overcrowding.

Overpayment


In Vallejo, 21.5 percent of the households are cost burdened and 20.7 percent are severely cost burdened, for a total of 42.2 percent of the households experiencing some level of overpayment. Approximately 31.8 percent of all homeowners are overpaying for housing; in contrast, 55.9 percent of all renters are cost burdened, and, in most circumstances, overpayment is closely tied to income, and in many

cases, but not consistently, proportion of populations of color, with lower-income renters experiencing the highest incidence of overpayment and most at risk of displacement. Additionally, previous analysis has identified that special-needs populations, including female-headed households, large families, persons with disabilities, and seniors, often fall into the lower-income category and may be particularly at risk of displacement when housing opportunities at affordable costs, sizes, or access to resources are not available.

According to the 2015-2019 ACS, most of the city reflects renter cost burdened rates between 40.0 and 60.0 percent (**Figure 3-39, Renter Overpayment in Vallejo**). The areas with rates above 60.0 percent are found in neighborhoods on both sides of Broadway Street and Sonoma Boulevard north of Florida Street to the northern city boundary; between White Slough on the Napa River to I-80; all of Mare Island; in the central Vallejo neighborhoods adjacent to and east of I-80 between Redwood Parkway and Tennessee Street, where several market-rate multifamily condo and rental complexes are located; and within the Steffan Manor and Home Acres neighborhoods northeast of the intersection of I-80 and I-780.

As shown in **Figure 3-53, Percentage Unit Capacity by Renter Overpayment**, and **Figure 3-54, Unit Capacity by Homeowner Overpayment**, 57.7 percent of the city's RHNA capacity is identified in tracts with a renter overpayment rate over 50.0 percent; conversely, 38.6 percent of the RHNA capacity has renter overpayment rates up to 39.0 percent. The remaining 3.7 percent includes rates of renter overpayment between 40.0 and 49.0 percent. The majority of lower-income RHNA units have been identified on sites in areas in which approximately 30.0 to 39.0 percent of renters are overpaying for housing. The remainder of the unit capacity is identified on sites where 29.4 percent of renter overpayment is between 50.0 and 59.0 percent, and 19.9 percent of the unit capacity is found on sites where renters overpay by 60.0 percent or more along Sonoma Boulevard, Georgia Street, and Redwood Parkway. Additional affordable rental resources in these areas will facilitate housing mobility opportunities for renters currently overpaying and at risk of displacement, whereas the identification of sites to accommodate over one-half of the lower-income units in locales with lower overpayment rates contributes toward reducing concentrations of renter overpayment by providing housing mobility opportunities, fosters income-integration in neighborhoods that have more positive economic conditions. In addition, 34.4 percent of above moderate-income pipeline projects and 26.8 percent of moderate-income unit capacity are on sites within the tracts with higher rates of renter overpayment, which promotes income-integrated neighborhoods and reduces the concentration of severely cost-burdened households overpaying for housing. Overall, an increase in the supply of lower- and moderate-income housing throughout the city, particularly those in close proximity to commercial uses and services, will help to alleviate conditions that contribute to overpayment by reducing the gap between supply and demand for this type of housing.

FIGURE 3-53, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY RENTER OVERPAYMENT




Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

In contrast to renter overpayment, homeowners generally experience cost burden at a lesser rate. The highest rates of homeowner overpayment occur in the tract along Broadway Street in the White Slough neighborhood, which is designated by TCAC/HCD as an Area of High Segregation and Poverty where 73.9 percent of homeowners are cost burdened (**Figure 3-40, Homeowner Overpayment in Vallejo**). As shown on **Figure 3-54, Percentage Unit Capacity by Homeowner Overpayment**, the distribution of RHNA units, regardless of income category, is closely divided between sites in areas in which approximately 20.0 to 39.0 percent of homeowners are cost burdened and sites on which over 40.0 percent of homeowners overpay. Although only a small proportion of unit capacity (3.1 percent) is identified in the White Slough neighborhood, the predominantly moderate- and lower-income units will potentially reduce displacement risk and overcrowding for these households as more units become available.

The identification of 51.5 percent of above moderate-income pipeline projects in neighborhoods with higher rates of overpayment above 40.0 percent, largely concentrated (17.2 percent of total above moderate-income units) in the residential neighborhood directly west of I-80 and north of Marine World Parkway; throughout the northeastern communities north of Redwood Parkway, and in the Steffan Manor neighborhood will help to alleviate this issue by increasing the ownership housing supply, while the lower- and moderate-income capacity will facilitate housing mobility opportunities throughout the city near services and resources in commercial areas, easing pressure on the housing stock.

FIGURE 3-54, PERCENTAGE UNIT CAPACITY BY HOMEOWNER OVERPAYMENT



Source: City of Vallejo, 2023; 2015-2019 ACS

The addition of these units will help to alleviate existing overpayment by offering lower- and moderate-income units to current and future residents where there is need and increasing the housing stock overall to alleviate the demand on an existing shortage of housing at affordable price points. Additionally, the site capacity and distribution of units by income category will facilitate mobility opportunities for all households.

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

Through discussions with stakeholders, fair housing advocates, and this assessment of fair housing issues, the City identified factors that contribute to fair housing issues, as shown in **Table 3-12, Factors that Contribute to Fair Housing Issues**. While there are several strategies identified to address the fair housing issues, the most pressing issues are displacement risk due to substandard conditions and rising housing costs as well as barriers to homeownership. Prioritized contributing factors are **bolded** in **Table 3-12** and associated actions to meaningfully affirmatively further fair housing related to these factors are ***bold and italicized***. Additional programs to affirmatively further fair housing are included in Chapter 5, Goals, Policies, and Programs.

TABLE 3-12: FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO FAIR HOUSING ISSUES

AFH Identified Issues	Contributing Factors	Meaningful Actions
Presence of a R/ECAP	<p>Concentration of lower-income households Concentration of female-headed, single-parent households</p> <p>Older housing stock and areas with poor housing conditions, resulting in lower housing costs compared to other cities High rates of diversity compared to the region and state High rate of HCV holders</p>	<p><i>Encourage development of affordable housing options east of I-780</i> (Programs A1.1.2, B2.1.1, B2.1.2, E.1.1.1, E1.1.6, F1.1.2, H4.1.1, H4.1.2)</p> <p>Incentivize a range of unit types to meet a variety of needs throughout the city (Programs A1.1.2, A4.1.1, B2.1.1, E.1.1.1, E1.1.6, H2.1.1, H4.1.2).</p> <p><i>Provide assistance with rehabilitation</i> (Programs D1.1.1, E.1.1.1, G2.1.1, G3.1.1)</p> <p><i>Implement a proactive code enforcement program for substandard units</i> (Programs G3.1.1, G5.1.1).</p>
Barriers to homeownership, particularly for communities of color	<p>Historic barriers to building generational wealth Shortage of affordable homeownership opportunities</p>	<p><i>Support development of community land trusts</i> (Program H 4.1.1)</p> <p>Work with local financial institutions to educate residents on homeownership tools (Programs D.1.1.1)</p> <p><i>Create webpage and printed materials on housing resources and programs</i> (Programs A 1.1.2, A 4.1.1, B1.1.1, F1.1.1, G 2.1.1).</p>
Displacement risk particularly for lower-income households	<p>Absentee landlords and older housing stock resulting in poor conditions Cost of repairs and rehabilitation Smaller housing units resulting in overcrowding</p> <p>Limited homeownership opportunities Historic barriers to building generational wealth Outside demand for housing near San Francisco increasing prices</p>	<p>Encourage larger affordable units (Programs B1.1.1, E.1.1.1)</p> <p><i>Implement a proactive code enforcement program for substandard units</i> (Programs G2.1.1, G.3.1.1, G5.1.1)</p> <p><i>Require landlords of substandard units to provide relocation assistance for tenants</i> (Programs G3.1.1, G5.1.1).</p> <p><i>Implement an occupancy ordinance that restricts “flipping” homes or incentivizes selling at affordable rates</i> (Programs C1.1.1, C1.1.2, C1.1.3, F1.1.3).</p>





101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 200
Folsom, California 95630
t 916.245.7500

www.placeworks.com