TABLE 2 - INCOME CATEGORY DISTRIBUTION - METHODOLOGY #2 SACOG - DISCUSSION DRAFT (as of April 17, 2007) SACOG - DRAFT RHNA ALLOCATION - JANUARY 1, 2006 - JUNE 30, 2013

2000-2050 TRAJECTORY

Color Colo																			
		G	I	-	د	7	-	3	Z	c	7	2	7	U	-	c	<	¥	×
Valence Valence Lincoln Market		Starting Po	int 2000 Cer	sus CHAS	Data ¹	Overall Dist	ribution	Income I	Distribution verylow/l	on - 50 year ow; 4% all	r trajector categorie	ry from 200 es (exceptio)-2050; fl ก Tahoe	oor/ceiling Basin)	30%	Status	s in 2013 if N	Aethod Appl	Œ.
					Since See	Total Ur	i, iš	Very Lo	OW .	Low		Modera	6	Above Mo	erate				
		VL (<50% Median			Median	*	*	#	%	*	%	*	%	*	%				AM (120+) Median
Och 2244, 1455, 1455, 1455, 1457, 1256, 1457, 12	Jurisdiction/SOI/Subarea	Household income)			Income)														Income)
Companion Comp	REGIONAL GOAL	22.4%	16.8%	19.5%	41.3%											22.4%	16.8%	19.5%	41.3%
Procedure	Placerville	30.2%	18.6%	20.3%	31.0%	7 554 1 554	000%	3 70	12.7%	ى ئە	14.5%	706	28.5	148	53.5%	27.2%	24.7%	21.6%	a c
	El Dorado Unios Tobos Basin ³	11.9%	14.5%	20 5%	50.5%	100	2000	375	33 3%	190	16.0%	3 2	17 00/	360	35 8%	18.2%	14.8%	18.0%	46 6
	El Dorado Uninc Tanoe Basin	14.8%	14.2%	20.5%	50.5%	7,120	100.0%	3/5	33.3%	2028	16.0%	207	10.9%	309	32.8%	20.1%	16.0%	10.0%	4 4
1985 1975 2275	El Dorado Uninc	18.0%	14.2% 16.3%	20.5% 20.8%	50.5% 44.9%	13.040	00.0%	3,184 3,929	30.0% 30.1%	2,078	19.6%	2,007	18.9%	3,345 4.156	31.5% 31.9%	21.5%	15.0%	20.0%	4
State Stat		10 00/		35.00/	00/	200		5	3		5	3	,	5	9	20 00/	45 50/	24 70%	
224. 1607. 2267. 1607. 2267. 1407. 1207. 1	Coffax	29.7%	21.4%	22.2%	26.7%	98	100.0%	16	16.3%	14 1	14.2%	18 7	18.3%	50	51.2%	26.1%	19.2%	21.0%	33.7%
State 100% 215% 100% 215% 210% 100%	Lincoln	23.4%	18.0%	23.8%	34.9%	8,983	700.0%	1,930	21.5%	1,460	16.3%	1,728	19.2%	3,865	43.0%	22.1%	16.7%	19.7%	41.4%
Problems 17.55 1	Lincoln SOI	23.4%	18.0%	23.8%	34.9%	5,352	100.0%	1,160	21.7%	883	16.5%	1,077	20.1%	2,232	41.7%	21.8%	16.6%	20.3%	41.3%
Section 13.55 13	Loomis	13.8%	17.0%	21.2% 18.1%	48.1%	209		8363	30.0%	60 34 60 4	16.2%	£ 6	21 7%	964	36.6%	21.3%	15.6%	19.5%	4 6
126 126	Roseville	13.8%	13.4%	20.8%	52.0%	12 686	100 0%	3.806	30.0%	2.576	20.3%	2.363	18.6%	3.941	31.1%	21.2%	16.4%	19.7%	4 5
Problems 11.5% 11.5% 12.5% 20.5% 2	Roseville SOI	13.8%	13.4%	20.8%	52.0%	407	100.0%	90	22.1%	68	16.7%	82	20.1%	167	41.0%	17.7%	14.9%	20.5%	46.9%
	Roseville MOU	13.8% 13.8%	13.4%	20.8%	52.0%	987 V	00.0%	1 188	#DIV/0I	800	#DIV/01	1 22 0	#DIV/0!	2 25.7	#DIV/01	% 0.00 W	16.2%	20.2%	4
	Placer Uninc Tahoe Basin ³	15.7%	14.1%	19.9%	50.4%	750	100.0%	225	30.0%	150	20.0%	116	15.5%	259	34.5%	17.7%	14.9%	19.6%	47.9%
1925 225	Placer Uninc	15.7%	14.1%	19.9%	50.4%	24/4	100,0%	742	30.0%	7 395	22.1%	7 751	19.3%	708	28.6%	18.4%	15.3%	19.7%	4 4
1925 22.54 22.54 22.55 22.54 22.55					Tarie e														
	Citrus Heights	19.2%	20.1%	25.4%	35.3%	372	100.0%	112	30.0%	27	7.3%	15	4.0%	219	58.8%	19.7%	19.5%	24.5%	. 4
	Elk Grove*	9.6%	12.2%	22.2%	55.9%	16,067	100.0%	4,820	30.0%	3,176	19.8%	2,910	18.1%	5,161	32.1%	20.4%	16.1%	20.0%	48
22.4% 21.9% 22.9% 24.1% 19.00 1000% 5 4.6% 15 13.8% 16 19.1% 16 19.1% 24.2 42.6% 22.6% 12.6%	Galt	22.4%	21.9%	23.9%	31.8%	802	100.0%	173	21.6%	83	10.4%	118	14.7%	428	53.3%	22.3%	20.0%	22.3%	35
## SOLITION	Galt SOI	22.4%	21.9%	23.9%	31.8%	3 98	1000%	- 13	22.1%	16	16.1%	19	19.1%	42	42.6%	22.4%	19.0%	21.4%	ဒ္မ သ
## SCO	Isleton SOI	94.1%	18.8%	22.9%	24.1%	0 8	100.0%	0 د	#DIV/01		#DIV/0!		#DIV/OI	•	#DIV/DI		VIN.	A'N %	
SSOL 28 SOL 22 1% 22 1% 31.2% 182 MODE 10 2 20% 10 20% 20 1% 22 1% 31.2% 22 20% 10 20% 20 1% 22 20% 10 20% 20 1% 23 20% 20 1% 23 20% 20 1% 23 20% 20 1% 23 20% 21 45 20% 22 20% 17 5% 20 0% bind 22 25% 11 50% 24 4% 38 5% 20 360 14 00% 23 5% 36 5% 20 3% 20 3% 20 36% 20 3	Rancho Cordova ²	26.6%	20.1%	22,1%	31.2%	14.762	100.0%	2,983	20.2%	ij	15.3%	- 1	19.2%	6,689	45.3%	96.60	18.0%	20.7%	37.5%
	Rancho Cordova SOI	26.6%	20.1%	22.1%	31.2%	R	100.0%	12	23.0%	9	17.3%	10	19.2%	21	40.5%	22.5%	17.5%	20.0%	40.1%
Marie 222% 18.0% 21.4% 30.5% 30.5% 30.0%	Joint Vision Area	31.1%	18.9%	19.2%	30.8%	26,205	100.0%	3,660	14.0%	3,828	14.6%	5,352	20.4%	13,365	51.0%	27.3%	18.0%	19.4%	မ္ဘ
215% 16.5% 16.4% 45.7% 4.0 199 22.4% 18.6% 199 22.4% 199	Sacramento Uninc Sacramento County total	22.2% 23.9%	18.0% 17.9%	21.4% 20.9%	38.5%	20,335 83,918	100.0%	4,461 17,782	21.9% 21.2%	3,067 13,569	15.1% 16.2%	3,616 16,035	17.8% 19.1%	9,191 36,533	45.2% 43.5%	23.5%	17.6% 17.6%	20.8%	జ జ
2.15% 16.5% 16.5% 16.5% 46.7% 4.7% 0 0000 5000 5000 5000 5000 5000 5000			10.00	15.40/	15 78/			- 1	8	- 1	5 70	- 1	3	- 1	30	22.00	10 00/	10 80/	,
25.0% 18.0% 16.8% 40.2% 24.7% 10.00% 79.3 17.7% 651 14.5% 1.104 24.7% 1.930 43.1% 22.8% 17.0% 19.2% 15.5% 18.6% 14.0% 15.5% 55.1% 24.4 100.0% 119.2 26.8% 13.5% 16.5% 16.5% 16.4% 45.7% 4.00 21.5% 16.5% 16.6%	Live Oak SOI		16.5%	16.4%	45.7%	0	00.00		#DIV/0I		#DIV/0	811	#DIV/0!		#DIV/01	N/A	WW 80.0%		WW.
	Yuba City		18.0%	16.8%	40.2%	4,478	100.0%	9	17.7%	280	14.5%	100	24.7%	- 1	43.1%	22.8%	17.0%	19.2%	41.1%
Iodal 21.5% 16.9% 16.4% 45.7% 16.4% 45.7% 16.9% <th< td=""><td>Yuba City SOI</td><td>25.0%</td><td>18.0%</td><td>16.8%</td><td>40.2%</td><td>2.255</td><td>100.0%</td><td>480</td><td>21.3%</td><td>367</td><td>16.3%</td><td>464</td><td>20.6%</td><td>944</td><td>41.9%</td><td>23.3%</td><td>17.3%</td><td>18.5%</td><td>40.9%</td></th<>	Yuba City SOI	25.0%	18.0%	16.8%	40.2%	2.255	100.0%	480	21.3%	367	16.3%	464	20.6%	944	41.9%	23.3%	17.3%	18.5%	40.9%
29.6% 13.5% 14.0% 42.9% 10.00% 10.00% 278 19.9% 243 17.4% 303 21.6% 576 41.1% 23.2% 16.1% 19.1% 10.00% 19.6% 19.6% 278 19.9% 243 17.4% 303 21.6% 576 41.1% 23.2% 16.1% 19.1% 10.00% 19.6% 19.6% 19.6% 24.3% 19.6% 24.3% 19.6% 24.3% 19.6% 25.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 27.5% 19.6% 19.6% 19.5%	Sutter County total	21.5%	16.5%	16.4%	45.7%	8,064	100.0%	1,591	19.7%	1,248	15.5%	1,871	23.2%	3,354	41.6%	21.9%	16.6%	18.6%	42.9%
Page	Davis	%9.66	13.5%	14 0%	42 9%	707	100 0%		6.4%		23.8%	i	30 7%	263	37 2%	26.5%	14.9%	16.4%	42
Ide 29.6% 13.5% 14.0% 42.3% 14.0% 10.0% 22.43% 12.40 100.0% 12.9% 243 17.4% 23.9% 24.3% 15.5% 16.0% 19.9% 24.3% 17.0% 19.9% 24.3% 17.0% 19.9% 24.3% 15.5% 16.0% 16.9% 24.3% 26.7% 10.0% 19.9% 24.3% 24.6% 35.2% 25.68 100.0% 603 22.7% 378 14.2% 339 12.8% 21.2% 17.7% 22.3% 1a.1 27.8% 17.0% 18.9% 26.68 100.0% 603 22.7% 378 14.2% 339 12.8% 21.2% 21.2% 17.7% 22.3% 1a.1 27.5% 17.0% 18.9% 16.0% 24.79 18.3% 2.12% 20.3% 25.9 43.9% 21.2% 17.7% 22.3% 1a.1 27.5% 21.6% 34.4% 19.0% 24.79 18.3% 2.10% 2.56 19.3% 6.284	Davis SOI	29.6%	13.5%	14.0%	42.9%	0			#DIV/OI		#DIV/0!	覆	#DIV/01		#DIV/O	N/A	N/A	NVA	
19.4% 17.7% 23.9% 39.0% 572 100.0% 137 23.9% 91 15.9% 96 16.8% 248 43.4% 21.2% 17.1% 21.2% 21.7% 18.5% 24.6% 35.2% 26.69 100.00% 60.3 22.7% 37.8 14.2% 33.9 12.8% 1,338 50.3% 21.9% 17.7% 22.3% 27.8% 17.0% 18.9% 36.3% 24.79 12.0% 88 14.2% 33.9 12.8% 1,338 50.3% 23.9% 23.9% 19.1% 27.8% 17.0% 18.9% 36.3% 13.522 100.00% 2.479 18.3% 2,143 15.8% 2.616 19.3% 6,284 46.5% 24.9% 16.9% 19.1% 27.5% 21.6% 17.3% 13.1% 42.0% 19.00% 2.479 18.3% 2,143 15.8% 2.616 19.3% 6,284 46.5% 24.9% 16.9% 19.3% 27.5% 17.3% 13.1% 42.0% 19.00% 2.479 18.5% 26. 16.2% 45.2% 16.5% 19.3% 27.5% 20.5% 18.3% 33.9% 9.423 100.00% 247 21.6% 18.8 16.5% 23.1 20.2% 47.5 41.6% 22.7% 16.9% 19.1% 27.5% 20.5% 17.6% 34.3% 20.00% 1.785 18.9% 1.35% 13.5% 23.1 45.5% 23.1 20.2% 47.5 41.6% 22.4% 16.6% 19.3%	West Sacramento	36.4%	19.8%	19.6%	24.3%	7.594	100.0%	1.292	17.0%	1,175	15.5%	1.527	20.1%	3,600	47.4%	26.7%	17.7%	19.1%	35.9%
tal 22.1% 18.5% 24.6% 36.2% 591 100.0% 22.1% 48.9% 12.8% 12	Winters	19.4%	17.7%	23.9%	39.0%	572	100.0%	137	23.9%	91	15.9%	96	16.8%	248	43.4%	21.2%	17.1%	21.2%	40.6%
tal 27.8% 17.0% 18.9% 36.3% 13,522 100.0% 2,479 18.3% 2,143 15.6% 2,616 19.3% 6,284 46.5% 24.9% 16.9% 19.3% 27.5% 21.6% 16.4% 34.4% 194 100.0% 8 4.0% 8 4.0% 73 37.6% 105 54.3% 25.8% 20.2% 17.7% 27.5% 17.3% 13.1% 42.0% 160 100.0% 25 15.6% 26 62.% 45 28.1% 64 40.1% 22.7% 16.9% 19.1% 27.5% 27.6% 17.3% 13.1% 42.0% 17.6% 24.7 21.5% 18.6% 22.1 22.1% 40.1% 22.7% 16.9% 19.1% 27.5% 20.4% 18.3% 33.9% 100.0% 1.765 18.9% 13.71 14.5% 19.9% 43.92 45.7% 22.9% 17.9% 19.3% 10.1 27.5% 20.5% 17.6%	Yolo Uninc	24.3%	20.4%	19.0%	36.3%	591	100.0%	124	21.0%	88	14.9%	120	20.3%	259	43.9%	23.8%	19.6%	19.1%	37
27.5% 21.6% 16.4% 34.4% 194 100.0% 8 4.0% 8 4.0% 73 37.6% 105 54.3% 25.8% 20.2% 17.7% 27.6% 17.3% 13.1% 42.0% 160 100.0% 25 15.6% 26 16.2% 45 28.1% 64 40.1% 22.7% 16.9% 19.1% 27.5% 20.4% 18.3% 33.9% 94.23 100.0% 17.85 18.9% 1.371 14.5% 20.9% 47.5 41.6% 22.4% 16.6% 19.3% 10.1% 27.5% 20.5% 17.6% 34.3% 10.00% 10.00% 17.85 18.9% 1.371 14.5% 20.9% 4.902 45.7% 23.9% 17.9% 19.3% 10.00% 10.00% 20.65 18.9% 1.593 14.6% 2.314 21.2% 49.47 45.3% 24.0% 18.1% 19.1% 19.3% 10.00% 20.65 18.9% 10.00% 20.65 18.9% 10.5% 20.5% 10.5% 20.9% 4.902 45.7% 23.9% 17.9% 19.3% 10.00% 20.65 18.9% 10.00% 20.65 18.9% 10.00% 20.65 18.9% 20.5% 20.5% 4.947 45.3% 24.0% 18.1% 19.1% 19.1% 10.00% 20.65 18.9% 20.5% 2	Yolo County total	27.8%	17.0%	18.9%	36.3%	13,522	100.0%	2,479	18.3%	2,143	15.8%	2,616	19.3%	6,284	46.5%	24.9%	16.9%	19.3%	38.9%
27.6% 17.3% 13.1% 42.0% 160 100.0% 25 15.6% 26 16.2% 45 28.1% 64 40.1% 22.7% 16.9% 19.1% 27.6% 17.3% 13.1% 42.0% 1,141 100.0% 247 21.6% 188 16.5% 231 20.2% 4.75 41.6% 22.4% 16.6% 19.3% 27.5% 20.4% 18.3% 33.9% 9.423 100.0% 1,785 18.9% 1,371 14.5% 19.5% 20.9% 4,302 45.7% 23.9% 17.9% 19.3% 14.1% 12.75% 20.5% 17.6% 34.3% 10.918 100.0% 2,065 18.9% 1,593 14.6% 2,314 21.2% 4,947 45.3% 24.0% 18.1% 19.1% 17.	Marysville	27.5%	21.6%	16.4%	34.4%	5	00.0%	œ	4.0%	œ	4.0%	73	37.6%	105	54.3%	25.8%	20.2%	17.7%	36.3%
27.5% 20.5% 13.1% 42.0% 14.14 100.0% 247 21.5% 18.5% 25.1 20.2% 47.5 41.5% 22.4% 10.5% 19.5% 27.5% 20.5% 18.5% 33.9% 40.29 17.6% 18.9% 1,785 18.9% 1,371 14.5% 19.65 29.9% 43.04 45.5% 24.0% 18.1% 19.1% 27.5% 20.5% 17.6% 34.3% 10.00% 2,065 18.9% 1,593 14.6% 2,314 21.2% 4,947 45.3% 24.0% 18.1% 19.1% 17.6 22.4% 16.8% 19.5% 41.3% 19.00% 38.012 22.4% 28.518 16.8% 32.971 19.5% 69.975 41.3% 29.518 32.974 69.971	Wheatland	27.6%	17.3%	13.1%	42.0%	160	100.0%	25	15.6%	26	16.2%	45	28.1%	4 6	40.1%	22.7%	16.9%	19.1%	41.3%
1 27.5% 20.5% 17.6% 34.3% 10.918 100.00% 2,065 18.9% 1,593 14.6% 2,314 21.2% 4,947 45.3% 24.0% 18.1% 19.1% 1.22.4% 16.8% 19.5% 41.3% 189.476 100.00% 38.012 22.4% 28.518 16.8% 32.971 19.5% 69.975 41.3% 69.971 169.476 100.00% 38.013 28.518 32.974 69.971	Yuba Uninc	27.5%	20.4%	18.3%	33.9%	9.423	100.0%	1,785	18.9%	1,371	14.5%	1,965	20.9%	4,302	45.7%	23.9%	17.9%	19.3%	38.9%
11. 22.4% 16.8% 19.5% 41.3% 169,476 100.0% 38,012 22.4% 28,518 16.8% 32,971 19.5% 69,975 38,013 28,518 32,974 69,971 169,476 100.0% 38,013 28,518 32,974 69,971	Yuba County total	27.5%	20.5%	17.6%	34.3%	10,919	100.0%	2,065	18.9%	1,593	14.6%	2,314	21.2%	4,947	45.3%	24.0%	18.1%	19.1%	38.8%
38,013 28,518 32,974 69,971 769,476 100,0% 38,013 28,518 32,974	REGIONAL TOTAL	22.4%	16.8%	19.5%	41.3%	169,476	100.0%	38,012	22.4%	28,518	16.8%	32,971	19.5%	69,975	41.3%				
	RHNA TARGET	38,013	28,518	32,974	69,971	169,476	100.0%	38,013	_	28,518		32,974		69,971					

Source: SACOG DRAFT RHNA METHODOLOGY #2; April 17, 2007

- G Current % of Very Low Income Households (<50%) from 2000 Census CHAS data 1 H Current % of Low Income Households (50-80%) 2000 Census CHAS data1

- I Current % of Moderate Income Households (80 to 120%) 2000 Census CHAS data1
 J Current % of Above Moderate Income Households (120+%) 2000 Census CHAS data1
 K 2013 DRAFT RHNA growth allocation (COLUMN F TABLE 1)
 L 100% of total allocation per jurisdiction for 2013 (COLUMNS N+P+R+T)
 M Number of RHNA Very Low Income Units allocated for 2006-2013
 N % of total RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Very Low Income category
 O Number of RHNA Low Income Units allocated for 2006-2013
 P % of total RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Low Income category
 Q Number of RHNA Moderate Income Units allocated for 2006-2013
 R % of total RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income Category
 S Number of RHNA Above Moderate Income Units allocated to the Moderate Income Category
 O Number of RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income Category
 O Number of RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income Category
 O Number of RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income Category
 O Number of RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income Category
 O Number of RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income Category
 O Number of RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income Category
 O Number of RHNA 2006-2013 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income Category
-)13 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Moderate Income category e Moderate Income Units allocated for 2006-2013
 13 allocation in each jurisdiction allocated to the Above Moderate Income cate

^{1 -} See written methodology for CHAS description and details.
2 - The cities of Elk Grove and Rancho Cordova incorporated after the 2000 Census was conducted. The 2000 Census CHAS data uses the Elk Grove and Laguna CDPs and the Rancho Cordova CDP data for each respective cities starting point.

^{3 -} Due to strict regulations on building in Tahoe Basin areas, exceptions to the standard SACOG area methodology have been made. Referencing TRPA's Memorandum of December 6, 2006 to the TRPA Governing Board from TRPA Staff as to Recommendation to distribute '2007 Residental All locations'. The following distributions have been made: City of South Lake Tahoe: 100 permits annually - 40 units very low; 31 units low; 9 units moderate; 20 units above moderate. Unincorporated El Dorado County Tahoe Basin portion: 150 permits annually - 50 units very low; 24 units low; 26 units moderate; 50 units above moderate. Unincorporated Placer County Tahoe Basin portion: 100 permits annually - 30 units very low; 20 units low; 15 units above moderate.

SACOG DRAFT METHODOLOGY #2

(Calculations ran: April 17, 2007; notes updated May 10, 2007)

JURISDICTION LEVEL HOUSING UNIT ESTIMATES 2000-2050 FOR RHNA 2006-2013 (HOLDS TAHOE BASIN CONSTANT)

TOTAL HOUSING UNITS

TOTAL HOUSING UNITS	Α	В	С	Date:	E	F
Jurlsdiction/SOI/Sub-area	2000 Census	2005 MTP	2013 MTP	2005-2013 MTR Growth Increment	% Regional Growth in 2005-2013	2006-2013 RHNA ALLOCATION (% regional growth *166,851)
Placerville	4,242	4,400	4,971	571	0.33%	551
South Lake Tahoe ¹	14,005	14,505	15,305	AT A COURT OF STREET	0.00%	750
El Dorado Uninc 1 Tahoe Basin	8,010	8,760	9,960	1,200	0.00%	1,125
El Dorado Uninc not TB Total El Dorado uninc	45,021 53,031	<i>56,471</i> 65,231	<i>67,473</i> 77,433	11,002 12,202	6.36% 6.35%	10,614 11,739
El Dorado County total	7 1,278	84,136	97,709	13,573	6.68%	13,040
Auburn	5,457	6,144	6,596	452	0.26%	436
Colfax	647	718	820		0.06%	
Lincoln	4,152	10,159	19,471	9,312	5.38%	1. (1995年19.18) 2011年19. (1995年19.18) 1. (199
Lincoln SOI	351	347	5,895		3.21%	
Loomis	2,277	2,304	2,521	217	0.13%	
Rocklin Roseville	14,428	19,658	22,952 55 568		1.90% 7.60%	
Roseville Roseville SOI	31,978 478	42,418 478	55,568 900	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7.60% 0.24%	12,686 407
Roseville MOU	7/0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Southwest Placer Subarea	813	867	6,504	5,637	3.26%	5,438
Placer Uninc 1 Tahoe Basin	11,481	11,981	12,781	800	0.00%	750
Placer uninc not TB	35,178	36,744	39,309	2,565	1.48%	2,474
Total Placer uninc	46,659	48,725	52,090	3.5 (C) F 10 24 (C) 4 (B) 25 (F Th) (B) 284 (T) (A) 4 (C)	1.47%	3,224
Placer County total	107,240	131,818	173,317	41,499	23.52%	40,013
0	24.274	0.4.07.4	0.4.700		0.000/	
Citrus Heights ³	34,374	34,374	34,760	THE STATE OF THE S	0.22%	The second of th
Elk Grove ²	29,903	38,196	54,851	16,655	9.63%	TOTAL SECTION OF THE STATE OF T
Folsom	17,968	22,716	28,017	TAXABLE SALES AND SERVICE SALE	3.06% 0.48%	5,114
Galt Galt SOI	6,211 699	6,621 1,284	7,452 1,387		0.46%	802 99
Isleton⁴	383	374	487	SECURITION OF THE PROPERTY OF	0.07%	109
Isleton SOI ⁴	128	278	278	7 (2014) [11] [12] [13] [244]	0.00%	2017 9 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
Rancho Cordova ²	20,322	20,322	35,624	Color Marie Marie Andrea	8.85%	The 1964 April 1965 April 2014
Rancho Cordova SOI	4	28	82	54	0.03%	THE RESERVE OF THE SECOND PROPERTY.
Sacramento + Panhandle + Natomas Joint Vision Area	163,596	173,052	200,216	10.00000000000000000000000000000000000	15.71%	 (i) 4.5% (25.6%) 15.5% (25.6%) 12.5% (25.6%) (25.5%) (25.5%) (25.5%) (25.5%) (25.5%)
Natomas Joint Vision Area					ĺ	The Ministry of the
Sacramento Uninc ³	201,226	208,656	229,735		12.19%	20,335
Sacramento County total	474,814	505,901	592,889	86,988	50.30%	83,918
Live Oak	1,818	1,838	2,757	919	0.53%	887
Live Oak SOI	362	513	513	Constitute Page of March 2001 Fig. 10 Card 1-45	0.00%	107-75-23-34-04 CV 24-16-17-20-16-16-23-24-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-23-
Yuba City	17,893	19,162	23,804	1. A59 HE RESULT & BEARAGERS SEED FOR RE-		
Yuba City SOI	2,890	2,950	5,288			1 F # PC SECURE A 2021 F F F F 2021 F F R0.82 F F F R6 VECTOR A
Sutter Uninc	5,224	5,224	5,684	460	0.27%	
Sutter County total	28,187	29,687	38,046	8,359	4.83%	8,064
Davis	22.722	22.722	22.466	799	0.42%	707
Davis SOI	22,733 643	22,733 815	23,466 815	2000年以200日第二年日本主任公司工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工	0.42%	THE PROPERTY AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PERSON
University	793	940	2,391		0.84%	HEALTH STREET, STORY STORY STORY STORY STORY STORY
West Sacramento	12,133	15,448	23,320	2.500 (4.4	4.55%	
Winters	1,954	2,508	3,101	593	0.34%	572
Woodland	17,121	17,370	20,125			72 Feb. 20, 10 A3 40 St. To Brown Black St. 1925; 474 s.
Yolo Uninc	6,210	6,735	7,348			 In this see it will be seen in the second of the second of
Yolo County total	61,587	66,549	80,566	14,017	8.10%	13,522
Marysville	4,890	4,890	5,091	201	0.12%	194
Wheatland	827	1,263	1,429			THE PERSON NAMED OF COMMENTS OF THE PERSON NAMED OF THE PERSON NAM
Wheatland SOI	187	252	1,435	1,183	0.68%	ALCOHOLOGICAL PROPERTY OF A LOCAL PROPERTY OF
Yuba Uninc	16,732	18,478	28,246	9,768	5.65%	而。這個的 的方式是被對於 的關鍵的所可以可能對
Yuba County total	22,636	24,883	36,201	11,318	6.54%	10,919
SACOG REGIONAL TOTAL Tahoe Basin	765,742	842,974	1,018,728	172,954 2,800		166,851 2,625
TOTALS				175,754		169,476

^{1 -} The Tahoe Basin areas of the city of South Lake Tahoe, portions of Unincorporated El Dorado and Placer Counties are under the auspices of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). Due to strict regulations on building in these areas exceptions have been made in the determination The MTP numbers do not include growth project are based on a discussion with TRPA that a reasonable number of annual permits will be 100 each for South Lake Tahoe, and Unincorporated Placer County and 150 annual permits in Unincorporated El Dorado County in the Tahoe Basin. Tahoe Basin numbers are held constant throughout the calculations.

Source: SACOG DRAFT RHNA METHODOLOGY #2; May 10, 2007

IMPORTANT NOTE #1: There are two situations that are outside the control of SACOG and local jurisdictions that could change the calculations on this table. First, the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) is reviewing the flood levees and may redesignate and impose a federal moratorium on residential development. If during the RHNA update process a jurisdiction receives a FEMA designation that prohibits near-term development, the entire RHNA may need to be recalculated to redistribute the regional allocation among all jurisdictions.

IMPORTANT NOTE #2: Development and growth of residential units in the Tahoe Basin is regulated by federal and state laws. The three jurisdictions in basin - the city of South Lake Tahoe, and the Tahoe Basin portions of El Dorado and Placer Counties - have no control on development applications. The allocations for these jurisdictions may change idependently of the RHNA methodology. If they do change, then the rest of the region will need to be reallocated. The maximum effect of a reallocation could not exceed the combined total current allocation for these three jurisdictions, which is 2625 units, or 1.5% of all units.

^{2 - 2000} Census Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova and unincorporated Sacramento County housing unit counts calculated from block geography of 2000 Census. CHAS splits done for Elk Grove by combining the Elk Grove and Laguna CDPs; Rancho Cordova comes from the Rancho Cordova

^{3 -} Citrus Heights has been allocated 381 units between 2005-2013; we added this 381 on top of DOFs 2006 number as our PLACE3S 2005 number is considerably lower and was causing a negative growth rate.

^{4 -} Isleton is expecting growth within it's city boundaries as well as within it's SOI. The expected numbers are shown here, but have not yet been updated into the MTP projections.

A - 2000 number of housing units from Census

B - 2005 DRAFT MTP housing units

C - 2013 DRAFT MTP housing units

D - 2005-2013 DRAFT MTP Growth Increment for the 8-year period is 172,954 units. Estimated growth in the Tahoe Basin is 2,625 units over the 8-year period for a total of 175,754 units.

E - Percentage of MTP Regional Growth of 172,954 units over the 8-year period 2005-2013 that each area is projected to grow.

F - Distribution of 2006-2013 RHNA Allocation. Of the target 169,476 units by HCD, estimated growth in the Tahoe Basin is 2,625 units over the 7 1/2 year period. The remaining 166,851 units necessary to meet HCD's target of 169,476 units is arrived at by multiplying the 166,851 by column E - the % of regional growth.