

**California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

	PART I [H&SC Section 33413(b)(1) -----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART II [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2) -----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART III -----TOTALS-----	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
	ALAMEDA COUNTY											
ALAMEDA CITY						8		8	1	0	1	0
EMERYVILLE						50		50	8	3	8	3
FREMONT						232		232	35	14	35	14
HAYWARD						60		60	9	4	9	4
LIVERMORE						2		2	0	0	0	0
OAKLAND						370		370	56	22	56	22
SAN LEANDRO						1		1	0	0	0	0
UNION CITY		8	8	2	1						2	1
County Totals:		8	8	2	1	723		723	108	43	111	45
BUTTE COUNTY												
CHICO		226	226	68	34	47		47	7	3	75	37
OROVILLE												
County Totals:		226	226	68	34	47		47	7	3	75	37
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY												
BRENTWOOD												
CLAYTON												
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY												
OAKLEY						566		566	85	34	85	34
PINOLE												
PITTSBURG						202		202	30	12	30	12
RICHMOND												
SAN PABLO						260		260	39	16	39	16
County Totals:						1,028		1,028	154	62	154	62
FRESNO COUNTY												

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

**California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

	PART I [H&SC Section 33413(b)(1) -----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART II [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2) -----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART III -----TOTALS-----	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
	FRESNO CITY	6	92	98	29	15	22		22	3	1	33
ORANGE COVE												
County Totals:	6	92	98	29	15	22		22	3	1	33	16
HUMBOLDT COUNTY												
ARCATA						44		44	7	3	7	3
EUREKA	50		50	15	8						15	8
County Totals:	50		50	15	8	44		44	7	3	22	10
KERN COUNTY												
BAKERSFIELD	3		3	1	0						1	0
CALIFORNIA CITY												
DELANO												
SHAFTER												
TAFT												
County Totals:	3		3	1	0						1	0
KINGS COUNTY												
LEMOORE												
County Totals:												
LAKE COUNTY												
LAKE COUNTY												
County Totals:												
LOS ANGELES COUNTY												
AZUSA												
BELL GARDENS												
CERRITOS	16		16	5	2						5	2
COVINA						59		59	9	4	9	4

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

**California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

	PART I [H&SC Section 33413(b)(1) -----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART II [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2) -----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART III -----TOTALS-----	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
	HUNTINGTON PARK		4	4	1	1					1	1
LA MIRADA												
LA VERNE												
LANCASTER						110		110	17	7	17	7
LAWDALE												
LONG BEACH						41		41	6	2	6	2
LOS ANGELES CITY						384		384	58	23	58	23
MONROVIA						116		116	17	7	17	7
PALMDALE						131		131	20	8	20	8
PASADENA						31		31	5	2	5	2
POMONA	93		93	28	14					28	14	
SANTA MONICA												
SIERRA MADRE	45		45	14	7					14	7	
SOUTH EL MONTE	17		17	5	3	88		88	13	5	18	8
WALNUT												
WEST COVINA												
WEST HOLLYWOOD												
County Totals:	171	4	175	53	26	960		960	144	58	197	84
MADERA COUNTY												
MADERA CITY												
County Totals:												
MENDOCINO COUNTY												
FORT BRAGG												
County Totals:												

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

**California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

	PART I [H&SC Section 33413(b)(1) -----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART II [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2) -----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART III -----TOTALS-----	
	1. New	2. Sub.	3. Sum	4. Incl Ob	5. Very-Low	6. New	7. Sub.	8. Sum	9. Incl Ob.	10. VLow	11. Sum	12. VLow
	Units	Rehab	#1+#2	#3 x 30%	#4 x 50%	Units	Rehab.	#6+#7	#8 x 15%	#9x 40%	#4+#9*	#5+#10
MERCED COUNTY												
LOS BANOS						51		51	8	3	8	3
MERCED CITY						1		1	0	0	0	0
County Totals:						52		52	8	3	8	3
Monterey COUNTY												
MONTEREY COUNTY						3		3	0	0	0	0
SAND CITY						10		10	2	1	2	1
SOLEDAD												
County Totals:						13		13	2	1	2	1
NEVADA COUNTY												
TRUCKEE						8		8	1	0	1	0
County Totals:						8		8	1	0	1	0
ORANGE COUNTY												
ANAHEIM	68		68	20	10						20	10
BREA						47		47	7	3	7	3
BUENA PARK						17		17	3	1	3	1
CYPRESS						13		13	2	1	2	1
GARDEN GROVE												
HUNTINGTON BEACH												
ORANGE CITY						3		3	0	0	0	0
SANTA ANA												
STANTON												
TUSTIN						60		60	9	4	9	4
County Totals:	68		68	20	10	140		140	21	8	41	19
PLACER COUNTY												

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

	PART I					PART II					PART III	
	[H&SC Section 33413(b)(1)]					[H&SC Section 33413(b)(2)]					TOTALS	
	-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----					-----	
1. New	2. Sub.	3. Sum	4. Incl Ob	5. Very-Low	6. New	7. Sub.	8. Sum	9. Incl Ob.	10. VLow	11. Sum	12. VLow	
Units	Rehab	#1+#2	#3 x 30%	#4 x 50%	Units	Rehab.	#6+#7	#8 x 15%	#9x 40%	#4+#9*	#5+#10	
PLACER COUNTY												
County Totals:												
RIVERSIDE COUNTY												
CATHEDRAL CITY												
						11	11	2	1	2	1	
DESERT HOT SPRINGS												
PALM DESERT												
	135	135	41	20						41	20	
RIVERSIDE CITY												
	174	174	52	26						52	26	
RIVERSIDE COUNTY												
	2	2	1	0						1	0	
TEMECULA												
					27		27	4	2	4	2	
County Totals:												
	311	311	93	47	27	11	38	6	2	99	49	
SACRAMENTO COUNTY												
SACRAMENTO CITY												
					90		90	14	5	14	5	
County Totals:												
					90		90	14	5	14	5	
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY												
CHINO												
					3		3	0	0	0	0	
COLTON												
		4	4	1	1					1	1	
GRAND TERRACE												
HESPERIA												
					67		67	10	4	10	4	
HIGHLAND												
MONTCLAIR												
					74		74	11	4	11	4	
RANCHO CUCAMONGA												
					88		88	13	5	13	5	
RIALTO												
					158		158	24	9	24	9	
SAN BERNARDINO CITY												
					4		4	1	0	1	0	
VICTORVILLE												
	1	1	0	0						0	0	

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

	PART I [H&SC Section 33413(b)(1) -----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART II [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2) -----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART III -----TOTALS-----	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
County Totals:	1	4	5	2	1	394		394	59	24	61	24
SAN DIEGO COUNTY												
CHULA VISTA						41		41	6	2	6	2
CORONADO						30		30	5	2	5	2
EL CAJON	5		5	2	1						2	1
ESCONDIDO						87		87	13	5	13	5
POWAY												
SAN DIEGO CITY						685		685	103	41	103	41
SAN MARCOS												
SANTEE												
VISTA												
County Totals:	5		5	2	1	843		843	126	51	128	51
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY												
SAN FRANCISCO						130		130	20	8	20	8
County Totals:						130		130	20	8	20	8
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY												
MANTECA												
RIPON												
STOCKTON						178		178	27	11	27	11
County Totals:						178		178	27	11	27	11
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY												
GROVER BEACH												
PASO ROBLES						40		40	6	2	6	2
PISMO BEACH												
County Totals:						40		40	6	2	6	2

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

	PART I					PART II					PART III	
	[H&SC Section 33413(b)(1)]					[H&SC Section 33413(b)(2)]					TOTALS	
	-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----						
1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10	
SAN MATEO COUNTY												
MENLO PARK												
REDWOOD CITY	62		62	19	9	58		58	9	3	27	13
SAN BRUNO						325		325	49	20	49	20
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO						43		43	6	3	6	3
County Totals:	62		62	19	9	426		426	64	26	83	35
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY												
GUADALUPE												
LOMPOC												
SANTA BARBARA CITY						24		24	4	1	4	1
County Totals:						24		24	4	1	4	1
SANTA CLARA COUNTY												
CAMPBELL												
						8		8	1	0	1	0
MILPITAS						137		137	21	8	21	8
MORGAN HILL						8		8	1	0	1	0
SAN JOSE						501		501	75	30	75	30
County Totals:						654		654	98	39	98	39
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY												
CAPITOLA												
	47		47	14	7	55		55	8	3	22	10
SANTA CRUZ CITY												
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	23		23	7	3						7	3
WATSONVILLE	9		9	3	1						3	1
County Totals:	79		79	24	12	55		55	8	3	32	15
SHASTA COUNTY												
REDDING												
	1		1	0	0	2		2	0	0	1	0

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

	PART I					PART II					PART III	
	[H&SC Section 33413(b)(1)]					[H&SC Section 33413(b)(2)]					TOTALS	
	-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----					-----	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
SHASTA LAKE												
County Totals:	1		1	0	0	2		2	0	0	1	0
SOLANO COUNTY												
DIXON												
FAIRFIELD												
SUISUN CITY						5		5	1	0	1	0
County Totals:						5		5	1	0	1	0
SONOMA COUNTY												
HEALDSBURG												
PETALUMA						26		26	4	2	4	2
SANTA ROSA						171		171	26	10	26	10
SEBASTOPOL	1		1	0	0	8		8	1	0	2	1
SONOMA COUNTY												
County Totals:	1		1	0	0	213		213	32	13	32	13
STANISLAUS COUNTY												
STANISLAUS COUNTY												
County Totals:												
TULARE COUNTY												
DINUBA												
	2		2	1	0						1	0
PORTERVILLE						64		64	10	4	10	4
TULARE CITY												
TULARE COUNTY	14	6	20	6	3						6	3
WOODLAKE												
County Totals:	16	6	22	7	3	64		64	10	4	16	7
VENTURA COUNTY												

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

California Redevelopment Agencies
INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS
PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

	PART I [H&SC Section 33413(b)(1) -----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART II [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2) -----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----					PART III -----TOTALS-----	
	1. New	2. Sub.	3. Sum	4. Incl Ob	5. Very-Low	6. New	7. Sub.	8. Sum	9. Incl Ob.	10. VLow	11. Sum	12. VLow
	Units	Rehab	#1+#2	#3 x 30%	#4 x 50%	Units	Rehab.	#6+#7	#8 x 15%	#9x 40%	#4+#9*	#5+#10
OXNARD						5		5	1	0	1	0
PORT HUENEME												
County Totals:						5		5	1	0	1	0
YOLO COUNTY												
DAVIS	52		52	16	8	30		30	5	2	20	10
WEST SACRAMENTO						120		120	18	7	18	7
WINTERS						34		34	5	2	5	2
County Totals:	52		52	16	8	184		184	28	11	43	19
Total Agencies Contributing to this Report: 138	1,060	106	1,166	350	175	6,371	11	6,382	957	383	1,307	558

NOTES

- * Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- * Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- * Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- * Part III #12 is a subset of #11.