

Supplementary 1: Protocol for testing the influence of housing plan quality on low-income housing production.

This protocol has two important functions. First, the protocol assesses the objectives in housing plans from California cities. Second, this protocol takes into account the non-mutually exclusive data in order to devise quality measures. In this four-part analysis, I employed NVivo and Microsoft Excel. Part 1 explains how the researcher will employ NVivo to code the objectives under the themes of audience, housing program, planning tool, and evaluation. The brackets indicate the coding agreement statistics of my analysis. Part 2 explains how the researcher will export the assessment data from NVivo into Excel while separating the Special Needs Households from the Everyone Else Households. Part 3 explains how the researcher will employ Excel to combine the assessment data into the three quality measures. Part 4 explains how to calculate Krippendorff's Alpha using NVivo data exported to Excel.

Document Identification

Name of Municipality: _____

Region: _____

Document Title: _____

Did a planning consultant develop the housing plan? _____; If so, then who: _____

Part 1: Criteria for assessing the objectives identified in a California housing plan while using NVivo. In this analysis, you must determine if each objective identifies any of the theme's items. Please note that a housing plan may contain as few as eight objectives to over 100 objectives. Therefore, if the plan has eight objectives, then you must complete part 1 for each of the plan's eight objectives. NVivo will quantitatively organize of the assessment data (by theme, document, region, etc.). In order to calculate use NVivo's Cohen's Kappa utility, you must code the objective by "text," not region. I have provided the interrater calculations adjacent to each item. However, because the second coder only assessed a sample of the housing plans, not all of the items were found in the sample. Therefore, n/a was placed in the missing items. Notes. n/a = Not Available. PA = Percent Agreement, CK = Cohen's Kappa, KA = Krippendorff's Alpha.

1. Audience Items

- *Does the objective identify any of the following (Yes = 1, No = 0):*

1. The Disabled? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 85.8; KA: 77.8]
2. Farm Workers? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a KA: n/a]
3. Female-headed Households? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 100.0; KA: n/a]

4. The Homeless? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 91.4; KA: 100]
5. Large Families? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 98.5; KA: 100]
6. Low-income Households? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.3; CK: 78.5; KA: 97.7]
7. Seniors? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 79.9; KA: 96.4]

Everyone Else Households (EE-HH)

8. Infrastructure? Yes___ No___ [PA:100.0; CK: 100.0; KA: 100]
9. First-Time Home Buyers? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 90.0; KA: 99.1]
10. All Households (none of the above)? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.8; CK: 88.0; KA: 91.0]

2. Housing Program Items

- Does the objective identify any of the following (Yes = 1, No = 0):

1. Construction programming? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.5; CK: 82.4; KA: 91.6]
2. Rehabilitation programming? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.6; CK: 73.8; KA: 98.1]
3. Preservation programming? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.97; CK: 88.2; KA: 85.0]
4. Tangential programming? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.8; CK: 87.39; KA: 51.9]

3. Planning Tool Items

- Does the objective identify any of the following (Yes = 1, No = 0):

1. Accessory Dwellings? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 98.8; KA: 100]
2. Americans with Disabilities Act? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 92.70; KA: 97.0]
3. Annexation, Subdivisions, or Tentative Maps? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 97.5; KA: 100]
4. California Environmental Quality Act? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
5. Capital Projects? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 97.1; KA: 100]
6. Childcare Facilities? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
7. Citizen Participation? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 100.0; KA: 100]
8. Code Enforcement? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 93.0; KA: 98.5]
9. Co-Housing or Limited Equity Ownership? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 61.4; KA: 77.2]
10. (Hampering) Condo Conversions? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 97.8; KA: 100]
11. (Adopting) Covenants? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 90.7; KA: 82.7]
12. Density Bonus? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 93.2; KA: 99.7]
13. Design Review? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 97.1; KA: 100]
14. Development Standards? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.8; CK: 92.9; KA: 99.6]

15. Fair Housing? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 94.9; KA: 17.3]
16. Collecting Fees? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
17. Growth Management? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
18. Historic Preservation? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 100.0; KA: 100]
19. (Providing a) Household Subsidy? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 100.0; KA: 100]
20. Housing Element Monitoring? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 72.1; KA: 77.3]
21. Inclusionary Housing? Yes___ No___ [PA: 98.8; CK: 96.8; KA: 100]
22. Infill or Vacant Land? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 87.8; KA: 85.6]
23. Memorandums of Understanding or Housing Agreements? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 69.6; KA: 64.5]
24. Mixed-Use? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 89.2; KA: 98.3]
25. Mobile or Manufactured Homes? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 94.9; KA: 100]
26. Municipal Purchase or Write Down? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 94.2; KA: 100]
27. Neighborhood Rehabilitation? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
28. Non-Conforming Lots or Uses? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 96.7; KA: 100]
29. Permit Streamlining? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 89.7; KA: 76.7]
30. Planned Unit Development? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 100.0; KA: 100]
31. Relocation or Displacement Policy? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 83.8; KA: 100]
32. Rent Control? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
33. Residential Rehabilitation? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.7; CK: 69.4; KA: 96.2]
34. Reverse Mortgages? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 91.7; KA: 100]
35. Self-Sufficiency? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
36. Single Room Occupancy? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: 100.0; KA: 100]
37. Sites or Density? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.8; CK: 88.9; KA: 83.0]
38. A Specific Plan?i Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 86.1; KA: 97.3]
39. Student Housing? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
40. Providing a Subsidy? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 86.7; KA: 87.5]
41. (Implementing) Tax Fines? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
42. Transit-Oriented Development? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
43. Transitional Housing? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 93.6; KA: 100]
44. Universal Building Code, Energy Standards, or Title 24 Building Code? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 93.6; KA: 95.1]
45. Waived Fees? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.9; CK: 90.0; KA: 87.5]
46. Workforce Housing? Yes___ No___ [PA: 100.0; CK: n/a; KA: n/a]
47. Zone changes or ordinance amendments? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.8; CK: 83.0; KA: 85.5]

4. Evaluation Items (Yes = 1, No = 0)

- *Does the objective identify any of the following (Yes = 1, No = 0):*
 1. A quantitative target? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.1; CK: 67.5; KA: 61.0]
 2. An ongoing target? Yes___ No___ [PA: 99.5; CK: 83.3; KA: 83.3]

Part 2: Procedures for exporting the assessment data into Excel and determining the proportion of objectives that identify a Special Needs Household and/or an Everyone Else Household. After the coding the entire project, select the NVivo Query tab and complete the following Matrix Coding export tasks.

1. For Audience:

- a. The rows contain the individual housing plans,
- b. The columns contain the audience items,
- c. Export the data into Excel,
- d. Calculate the aggregated Special Needs Households identifications (SPN-HH) for each housing plan
- e. Calculate the aggregated Everyone Else Households identifications (EE-HH) for each housing plan
- f. Calculate the Total Audience item identifications (SPN-HH + EE-HH) for each housing plan

2. For Housing Program:

- a. The rows contain the individual housing plans,
- b. The columns contain the housing program items,
- c. To determine the Special Needs Households proportion,
 - i. the “in selected items” filter must contain the Special Needs Households items
 - ii. Export the data into Excel,
- d. To determine the Everyone Else Households proportion,
 - i. the “in selected items” filter must contain the Everyone Else Households items
 - ii. Export the data into Excel,
- e. Calculate the aggregated Special Needs Households identifications (SPN-HH) for each housing plan
- f. Calculate the aggregated Everyone Else Households identifications (EE-HH) for each housing plan
- g. Calculate the Total Housing Program item identifications (SPN-HH + EE-HH) for each housing plan

3. For Planning Tool:

- a. The rows contain the individual housing plans,
- b. The columns contain the planning tool items,
- c. To determine the Special Needs Households proportion,
 - i. the “in selected items” filter contains the Special Needs Households items, then
 - ii. Export the data into Excel,
- d. To determine the Everyone Else Households,
 - i. the “in selected items” filter contains the Everyone Else Households items, then
 - ii. Export the data into Excel,
- e. Calculate the aggregated Special Needs Households identifications (SPN-HH) for each housing plan
- f. Calculate the aggregated Everyone Else Households identifications (EE-HH) for each housing plan
- g. Calculate the Total Planning Tool item identifications (SPN-HH + EE-HH) for each housing plan

4. For Evaluation:

- a. The rows contain the individual housing plans,
- b. the columns contain the evaluation items,
- c. To determine the Special Needs Households proportion,
 - i. the “in selected items” filter contains the Special Needs Households items, then
 - ii. Export the data into Excel,
- d. To determine the Everyone Else Households,
 - i. the “in selected items” filter contains the Everyone Else Households items, then
 - ii. Export the data into Excel,
- e. Calculate the aggregated Special Needs Households identifications (SPN-HH) for each housing plan
- f. Calculate the aggregated Everyone Else Households identifications (EE-HH) for each housing plan
- g. Calculate the Total Evaluation item identifications (SPN-HH + EE-HH) for each housing plan

Part 3: Procedures for scoring a housing plan’s objectives while using Excel. Due to mutually non-exclusive data, I created three quality measures to test various interpretations of California Housing Element Law. All scores had a maximum of 40 points.

1. Narrow Interpretation (QNRW)

The QNRW quality measure is a narrow interpretation of the law that consists of only the Special Needs Households proportions for audience, housing programs, planning tools, and quantitative items.

- a. What proportion of the housing plan's total Audience items identified any Special Needs Household?
 - i. SPN-HH_____
- b. What proportion of the housing plan's total Housing Programs items identified any Special Needs Household and any Construction, Rehabilitation, and/or Preservation program?
 - i. SPN-HH_____
- c. What proportion of the housing plan's total Planning Tool items identified any Special Needs Household?
 - i. SPN-HH_____
- d. What proportion of the housing plan's total Evaluation items identified any Special Needs Household and a quantitative target?
 - i. SPN-HH_____

TOTAL Narrow Interpretation (QNRW) score: _____ x 10 = _____

2. Wide Interpretation (QWDE)

The QWDE quality measure is a wide interpretation of the law and employs QNRW as a base, then adds Tangential programming for Special Needs Households, the Planning Tools for First-Time Home Buyers, and Ongoing items for the Special Needs Households The additional items are underlined.

- a. What proportion of the housing plan's total Audience items identified any Special Needs Household?
 - i. SPN-HH_____
- b. What proportion of the housing plan's total Housing Programs items identified any Special Needs Household and any Construction, Rehabilitation, Preservation, and/or Tangential programs?
 - i. SPN-HH_____
- c. What proportion of the housing plan's total Planning Tool items identified any Special Needs Household and/or First-Time Home Buyers?
 - i. SPN-HH_____
 - ii. FTHB_____
- d. What proportion of the housing plan's total Evaluation items identified any Special Needs Household?
 - i. SPN-HH_____

TOTAL Wide Interpretation (QWDE) score: _____ x 10 = _____

3. Widest Interpretation (QWDST)

The QWDST quality measure is the widest interpretation of the law and employs QWDE as a base, then and adds the Audience, Housing Programs, and Evaluation items for First-Time Home Buyers.

- a. What proportion of the housing plan's total Audience items identified any Special Needs Household and/or First-Time Home Buyers?
 - i. SPN-HH _____
 - ii. FTHB _____
- b. What proportion of the housing plan's total Housing Programs items identified any Special Needs Household or First-Time Home Buyers and any Construction, Rehabilitation, Preservation and/or Tangential programs?
 - i. SPN-HH _____
 - ii. FTHB _____
- c. What proportion of the housing plan's total Planning Tool items identified any Special Needs Household and/or First-Time Home Buyers?
 - i. SPN-HH _____
 - ii. FTHB _____
- d. What proportion of the housing plan's total Evaluation items identified any Special Needs Household and/or First-Time Home Buyers?
 - i. SPN-HH _____
 - ii. FTHB _____

TOTAL Widest Interpretation (QWDST) score: _____ x 10 = _____

Part 4: Procedures for calculating Krippendorff's Alpha. NVivo does not provide the Krippendorff's Alpha statistic, therefore, you must create a Matrix Coding table that separates the data by individual housing plan, protocol items, and coders (i.e., 2 persons and above). After the coding table is exported into Microsoft Excel, the researcher can the import the data into SPSS or a web based utility (as outlined below) to calculate Krippendorff's alpha. After the coding the entire project, select the NVivo Query tab and complete the following Matrix Coding export tasks.

1. For any single item (node), or a group of items (nodes):

- a. The rows contain the individual housing plans,
- b. The columns contain the item(s)/node(s). However, the column format requires the following steps
 - i. First, select the item(s)/node(s),
 - ii. Second, select the coders by clicking on “By Any Selected Users”,
 - iii. Third, click “select” to select the coders by their initials,
 - iv. Lastly, click “Add to List”
 1. This will add each item by each coder as an individual column.
- c. Click Apply to save the above procedures
- d. Click Run to produce the Matrix Coding table,
- e. Export the data into Excel,
- f. For SPSS,
 - i. format the data as per the SPSS procedures
- g. For a web based utility, you will need to save each item in as single CSV file following the procedures as outlined by (Freelon, 2013; <http://dfreelon.org/utills/recalfront/>)

References:

Freelon, D. (2013). ReCal OIR: Ordinal, Interval, and Ratio Intercoder Reliability as a Web Service. *International Journal of Internet Science*, 8(1).
The Planner’s Guide to Specific Plans. Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. (2001). Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from www.opr.ca.gov/docs/specific_plans.pdf

Supplementary 2: Appendix Data References

In order to complete the quality assessment of housing plans from California cities in the Los Angeles and Sacramento regions, the follow data sources were examined.

1. *City of Alhambra, 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2009: Alhambra, CA.
2. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Azusa 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2010: Azusa, CA. p. 136.
3. *City of Azusa 2000-2005 Housing Element, Final*. 2001: Azusa, CA. p. 68.
4. *Claremont General Plan, 2006-2008 Housing Element*. 2006: Claremont, CA. p. 90.
5. *City of Claremont 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 2001: Claremont, CA. p. 92.
6. PMC Consultants, *City of Davis Adopted Housing Element*. 2010: Davis, CA.

7. *City of Davis 2002 Housing Element*. 2004: Davis, CA.
8. Blodgett Baylosis Associates, *City of Irwindale General Plan, Housing Element*. 2011: Irwindale, CA.
9. *City of Irwindale 2020 General Plan, Housing Element*. 2000: Irwindale, CA. p. 42.
10. *City of La Puente 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2008: La Puente, CA.
11. *City of La Puente 1998-2005 Housing Element*. 2000: La Puente, CA. p. 96.
12. *City of La Verne 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2010: La Verne, Ca. p. 245.
13. *City of La Verne 2000 Housing Element*. 1997: La Verne, CA.
14. EDAW, *City of Live Oak Housing Element 2008-2013, final*. 2010: Live Oak, CA.
15. *City of Live Oak Housing Element 2002-2007*. 2002: Live Oak, CA.
16. *City of Los Angeles 2006-2014 Housing Element*. 2009: Los Angeles, CA. p. 258.
17. *City of Los Angeles 1998-2005 Housing Element*, Department of City Planning, Editor. 2002: Los Angeles, CA. p. 316.
18. Hogle-Ireland and Veronica Tam & Associates, *City of Monterey Park 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2009: Monterey Park, CA. p. 129.
19. *City of Monterey Park 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 2000: Monterey Park, CA.
20. *City of Pomona Housing Element of the General Plan, 2008-2014*. 2011: Pomona, CA. p. 142.
21. *City of Pomona Housing Element of the General Plan 1998-2005*. 2001: Pomona, CA. p. 102.
22. *City of Rocklin Housing Element 2008-2013*. 2009: Rocklin, CA.
23. *City of Rocklin Housing Element 2002-2007*. 2004: Rocklin, CA.
24. *City of Roseville Housing Element 2008-2013*. 2009: Roseville, CA.
25. *City of Roseville Housing Element 2002-2007*. 2002: Roseville, CA.
26. EDAW, *City of Sacramento Housing Element, 2008-2013*. 2008: Sacramento, CA.
27. *City of Sacramento Housing Element, 2002-2007*. 2003: Sacramento, CA.
28. Blodgett Baylosis Associates, *City of South El Monte Housing Element, Final*. 2010: South El Monte, CA. p. 113.
29. *City of South El Monte General Plan Housing Element*. 2000: South El Monte. p. 27.
30. Karen Warner Associates and Casteneda & Associates, *Temple City Revised Draft Housing Element*. 2009: Temple City, CA. p. 264.
31. *Temple City Housing Element*. 2000: Temple City, CA. p. 45.
32. EDAW, *City of West Sacramento Housing Element 2008-2013*. 2008: West Sacramento, CA.
33. *City of West Sacramento Housing Element*. 2003: West Sacramento, CA.
34. *City of Arcadia 2008-2014 Housing Element Technical Background Report*. 2010: Arcadia, CA p. 156.
35. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Arcadia 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 2001: Arcadia, CA. p. 127.
36. Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates Inc, *City of Auburn 2003-2004 Housing Element*. 2004: Auburn, CA.
37. Stuart & Graham Associates, *City of Auburn 2008-2013 Housing Element*. 2008: Auburn, CA.
38. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Baldwin Park 2020 General Plan Housing Element*. 2000: Baldwin Park, CA. p. 117.
39. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Baldwin Park 2008-2014 Housing Element (HCD Submittal Draft)*. 2008: Baldwin Park, CA. p. 117.
40. LDM Associates, *City of Bradbury Housing Element 2000*. 2000: Bradbury, CA. p. 105.

41. LDM Associates, *City of Bradbury Housing Element 2008*. 2008: Bradbury, CA. p. 105.
42. Laurin Associates, *City of Colfax Housing Element 2003-2008*. 2004: Colfax, CA.
43. Laurin Associates, *City of Colfax Housing Element Update, final draft*. 2009: Colfax, CA.
44. Conexus, *City of Diamond Bar 2008-2014 Housing Element, revised draft*. 2010: Diamond Bar, CA. p. 121.
45. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Diamond Bar Housing Element*. 2000: Diamond Bar, CA. p. 118.
46. Art Rangel & Associates, *City of Duarte General Plan 2005-2020 Housing Element*. 2004: Duarte, CA.
47. Karen Warner Associates, *City of Duarte 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2011: Duarte, CA.
48. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of El Monte 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 2001: El Monte, CA. p. 109.
49. The Planning Center, *City of El Monte Housing Element Technical Report*. 2007: El Monte, CA. p. 75.
50. *City of Galt, Housing Element 2008-2013*. 2013: Galt, CA.
51. Campion, C., *City of Galt Annual 2030 Galt General Plan and Housing Element Progress Report: 2010*. 2011, Community Development Department,: Galt, CA.
52. Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates Inc, *City of Galt, Housing Element 2002-2007*. 2003: Galt, CA.
53. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Glendora 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 2002: Glendora, CA. p. 96.
54. Veronica Tam & Associates, *City of Glendora 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2009: Glendora, CA. p. 126.
55. The Planning Center, *City of Industry 2006-2014 Housing Element*. 2007: Industry, CA. p. 148.
56. The Planning Center, *City of Industry 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 1999: Industry, CA. p. 167.
57. *City of Lincoln Housing Element, Background Report*. 2010: Lincoln, CA.
58. Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates Inc and Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Lincoln Housing Element*. 2003: Lincoln, CA.
59. Crawford Multari Clark & Associates, *Town of Loomis Housing Element 2001-2008*. 2006: Loomis, CA.
60. Lisa Wise & Consultants, *Town of Loomis Housing Element 2006-2013, public review draft*. 2010: Loomis, CA.
61. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Marysville Housing Element 2003-2008*. 2003: Marysville, CA.
62. Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates Inc, *City of Monrovia 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 2003: Monrovia, CA. p. 70.
63. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Pasadena 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 2002: Pasadena.
64. The Planning Center and Karen Warner Associates, *City of Pasadena 2008-2014 Housing Element, draft* 2009: Pasadena, CA. p. 211.
65. GRC Associates, *City of Rosemead General Plan, Housing Element*. 2000: Rosemead, CA. p. 98.
66. GRC Associates, *City of Rosemead 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2010: Rosemead, CA. p. 135.
67. Karen Warner Associates, *City of San Dimas 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2008: San Dimas. p. 143.
68. Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates Inc, *City of San Dimas General Plan Housing Element 2000*. 2002: San Dimas, CA. p. 38.
69. Conexus, *City of San Gabriel 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2010: San Gabriel, CA. p. 119.
70. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of San Gabriel 2000 Housing Element*. 2002: San Gabriel, CA. p. 99.
71. The Planning Center, *City of San Marino Housing Element Update*. 2001: San Marino, CA. p. 77.
72. *City of San Marino Housing Element Update, Administrative Final*. 2009: San Marino, CA. p. 77.
73. Simon Eisner & Associates, *City of South Pasadena General Plan, Housing Element*. 2001: South Pasadena, CA. p. 56.

74. Linn & Associates, *City of South Pasadena 2006-2014 Housing Element, draft*. 2009: South Pasadena, CA. p. 85.
75. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of Walnut 2000-2005 Housing Element*. 2001: Walnut, CA. p. 96.
76. Veronica Tam & Associates, *City of Walnut 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2009: Walnut, CA. p. 102.
77. Cotton Bridges & Associates, *City of West Covina 2002 Housing Element*. 2003: West Covina.
78. Hogle-Ireland, *City of West Covina 2008-2014 Housing Element*. 2012: West Covina, CA.
79. Mintier & Associates and Raney Planning & Management, *City of Wheatland Housing Element Update, Policy Report*. 2005: Wheatland, CA.
80. Mintier & Associates and Raney Planning & Management, *City of Wheatland Housing Element Update, Background Report*. 2005: Wheatland, CA.
81. Mintier & Associates, *General Plan Background Report*. 2006: Wheatland, CA.
82. Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates Inc, *City of Winters Housing Element*. 2004: Winters, CA.
83. EPS, *City of Winters Housing Element Update, final draft*. 2009: Winters, CA.
84. Dyett & Bhatia, *City of Yuba Housing Element*. 2003: Yuba City, CA.
85. Stuart & Graham Associates, *City of Yuba Housing Element*. 2009: Yuba City, CA.
86. *Municipal Boundaries*, Southern California Association of Governments and GIS & Data Services, Editors. 2009: Los Angeles, CA.
87. Luo, R., *Housing Element Compliance and Building Permit Issuance in the SCAG Region*, Planning and Policy Department and Community Planning Division, Editors. 2004, Southern California Association of Governments: Los Angeles, CA. p. 38.
88. *RHNA Tables 2000-2007*, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Editor. 2001: Sacramento, CA. p. 19-20.
89. *Administrative Boundaries*, Sacramento Area Council of Governments and Regional GIS Clearing House, Editors. 2009: Sacramento, CA.
90. *Cities Annual Report*, State of California and State Controller's Office, Editors. 1991-2008: Sacramento, CA.
91. *American Factfinder*, U.S. Census Bureau, Editor. 2000: Washington DC.
92. State of California and Department of Housing and Community Development, *Housing Element Status Reports*. 1990-2007: Sacramento, CA.
93. *FTM Plan Quality Data*, Center for Social Studies Inc., Editor. 2017: Northampton, MA.

ⁱ In California, a specific plan is a precise or technical plan that is intentionally created to facilitate the development of either a limited or a wide range of land-uses for either a small or a large geographic area. The nature of the plan is dependent upon the context of the locality's need. However, a specific plan is subordinate to either a general or comprehensive plan (*The Planner's Guide to Specific Plans*, 2001).