



DRAFT Formula Options

	Measures	Pros	Cons
1	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leverages the most accurate measure of HUD-defined homelessness across LA County. Using a two-year average reduces the volatility of annual changes, which helps cities plan and program services based on projected funding. Aligns very closely with the language of the Measure Drives funding toward the highest concentrations of homelessness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PIT reductions would result in funding reductions if those PIT reductions were out of step with countywide trends. Focuses on homelessness as defined by HUD, which does not include all forms of federally-recognized homelessness (McKinney Vento) and may undercount some forms of family homelessness. Potentially exacerbates inequities and limits service and housing mobility by driving funding toward jurisdictions that already bear the disproportionate burden of homelessness.
2	One-Year PIT Count	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leverages the most recent measure of HUD-defined homelessness across LA County. Aligns very closely with the language of the Measure. Drives funding toward the highest concentrations of homelessness. Drives resources toward cities where PIT count went up relative to peers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly volatile to year-over-year changes. PIT reductions would result in funding reductions if those PIT reductions were out of step with Countywide trends. Focuses on homelessness as defined by HUD. Potentially exacerbates inequities and limits service and housing mobility by driving funding toward jurisdictions that already bear the disproportionate burden of homelessness.
3	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count + Incentive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates an incentive structure for jurisdictions to achieve reductions in homelessness and/or increases in prevention and permanent housing production. Leverages the most accurate measure of HUD-defined homelessness across LA County. Reduced volatility helps cities plan and program services based on projected funding. Equity impacts would largely depend on how the incentive fund is used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focuses on HUD-defined homelessness. Reduces the overall funding that is allocated to cities directly, which would likely disappoint some jurisdictions. Potential for the perception of County conflict of interest as the County would administer the incentive funds and could also be a recipient of the incentive funds. Requires another framework, protocol, and process for administering the incentive funds.
4	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count + MV (ACS Proxy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounts for known gaps in HUD's definition of homelessness by including a temporary proxy for doubled-up households while we wait for McKinney Vento data by City. Leverages the most accurate measure of HUD-defined homelessness across LA County. Reduced volatility helps cities plan and program services based on projected funding. Some cities benefit from including a family-poverty metric (instead of just PIT). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relies on a measure that is a proxy, not a direct measure of doubled-up homelessness. Unincorporated areas are treated as one large average area under the ACS measure, so funds are not equitably distributed across unincorporated areas (e.g. Antelope Valley vs West Athens). Reductions in PIT and ACS would result in reductions in funding if those reductions were out of step with Countywide trends.
5	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count + RHNA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Builds in an incentive structure for jurisdictions who make progress toward their own housing goals for Very Low-Income (VLI) households, as well as rewards them for their relative contribution toward the County's combined VLI RHNA goal. Leverages the most accurate measure of HUD-defined homelessness across LA County. Reduced volatility helps cities plan and program services based on projected funding. Might incentivize the production of affordable housing for Very Low-Income households across LA County. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leans heavily on HUD-defined homelessness. Some cities might disagree with the use of RHNA goals in their Local Solutions Fund methodology – however Measure A is clear that the LSF funds can be used for any lawful purpose outlined in the measure, and affordable housing is one of those purposes.
6	Multi-Year Average PIT Count + ACS + RHNA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounts for known gaps in HUD's definition of homelessness. Builds in an incentive structure for jurisdictions who make progress toward VLI RHNA Goals. Leverages the most accurate measure of HUD-defined homelessness across LA County. Reduced volatility helps cities plan and program services based on projected funding. Might incentivize the production of affordable housing for Very Low Income households across LA County. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some cities might disagree with the use of RHNA goals in their Local Solutions Fund methodology – however Measure A is clear that the LSF funds can be used for any lawful purpose outlined in the measure, and affordable housing is one of those purposes.

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5	Scenario 6
	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count	Most Recent PIT Count	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count + Incentive	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count + MV (ACS Proxy)	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count + RHNA	Multi-Year Avg. PIT Count + ACS + RHNA
City/Sub-Region	23/24 PIT Count Avg.	2024 PIT Count	90% 23/24 PIT Count Avg. + 10% Incentive	90% 23/24 PIT Count Avg. + 10% ACS Families	90% 23/24 PIT Count + 10% VLI RHNA	90% 23/24 PIT Count + 5% ACS Families + 5% VLI RHNA
Antelope Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lancaster	\$ 2,228,746	\$ 2,370,019	\$ 2,005,872	\$ 2,290,163	\$ 2,237,581	\$ 2,263,872
Palmdale	\$ 1,515,727	\$ 2,114,482	\$ 1,364,154	\$ 1,559,767	\$ 1,629,423	\$ 1,594,595
Gateway Cities	\$ 12,083,661	\$ 12,451,149	\$ 10,875,295	\$ 13,254,696	\$ 12,748,542	\$ 13,001,619
Artesia	\$ 37,669	\$ 41,390	\$ 33,902	\$ 69,746	\$ 33,902	\$ 51,824
Avalon	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49,947	\$ -	\$ 24,974
Bell	\$ 622,435	\$ 638,843	\$ 560,191	\$ 664,504	\$ 560,191	\$ 612,347
Bell Gardens	\$ 168,613	\$ 120,570	\$ 151,752	\$ 260,266	\$ 202,174	\$ 231,220
Bellflower	\$ 386,555	\$ 516,473	\$ 347,900	\$ 435,465	\$ 347,900	\$ 391,682
Cerritos	\$ 190,139	\$ 206,949	\$ 171,125	\$ 211,188	\$ 195,561	\$ 203,375
Commerce	\$ 221,529	\$ 199,751	\$ 199,376	\$ 339,671	\$ 199,376	\$ 269,523
Compton	\$ 595,528	\$ 626,247	\$ 535,975	\$ 694,361	\$ 535,975	\$ 615,168
Cudahy	\$ 44,844	\$ 39,590	\$ 40,360	\$ 195,744	\$ 78,049	\$ 136,897
Downey	\$ 425,121	\$ 329,319	\$ 382,609	\$ 475,496	\$ 384,223	\$ 429,859
Hawaiian Gardens	\$ 69,957	\$ 86,379	\$ 62,961	\$ 114,326	\$ 62,961	\$ 88,643
Huntington Park	\$ 321,083	\$ 403,101	\$ 288,975	\$ 452,471	\$ 288,975	\$ 370,723
La Habra Heights	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,333	\$ 38,643	\$ 36,488
La Mirada	\$ 56,503	\$ 68,383	\$ 50,853	\$ 77,019	\$ 50,853	\$ 63,936
Lakewood	\$ 121,976	\$ 118,771	\$ 109,778	\$ 164,399	\$ 156,004	\$ 160,201
Long Beach	\$ 6,119,411	\$ 6,075,311	\$ 5,507,470	\$ 5,854,519	\$ 5,819,090	\$ 5,836,805
Lynwood	\$ 278,033	\$ 448,090	\$ 250,229	\$ 365,372	\$ 251,629	\$ 308,501
Maywood	\$ 57,400	\$ 57,586	\$ 51,660	\$ 188,287	\$ 51,660	\$ 119,974
Norwalk	\$ 374,896	\$ 503,877	\$ 337,406	\$ 405,305	\$ 546,017	\$ 475,661
Paramount	\$ 96,863	\$ 75,581	\$ 87,177	\$ 176,155	\$ 475,782	\$ 325,968
Pico Rivera	\$ 335,433	\$ 358,112	\$ 301,890	\$ 380,014	\$ 301,890	\$ 340,952
Santa Fe Springs	\$ 599,116	\$ 673,035	\$ 539,204	\$ 585,532	\$ 1,279,130	\$ 932,331
Signal Hill	\$ 128,254	\$ 125,969	\$ 115,428	\$ 150,940	\$ 115,428	\$ 133,184
South Gate	\$ 443,955	\$ 471,484	\$ 399,560	\$ 481,976	\$ 423,613	\$ 452,795
Vernon	\$ 50,225	\$ 55,786	\$ 45,203	\$ 45,203	\$ 45,203	\$ 45,203
Whittier	\$ 338,124	\$ 210,548	\$ 304,311	\$ 382,457	\$ 304,311	\$ 343,384
Las Virgenes-Malibu	\$ 204,489	\$ 268,134	\$ 184,040	\$ 606,299	\$ 627,335	\$ 616,817
Agoura Hills	\$ 26,010	\$ 39,590	\$ 23,409	\$ 71,510	\$ 67,278	\$ 69,394
Calabasas	\$ 14,350	\$ 26,993	\$ 12,915	\$ 129,039	\$ 32,117	\$ 80,578
Hidden Hills	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 73,977	\$ 380,224	\$ 227,100
Malibu	\$ 162,335	\$ 201,551	\$ 146,102	\$ 278,621	\$ 146,102	\$ 212,361
Westlake Village	\$ 1,794	\$ -	\$ 1,614	\$ 53,152	\$ 1,614	\$ 27,383
San Fernando Valley	\$ 1,200,025	\$ 1,153,517	\$ 1,080,023	\$ 1,487,611	\$ 1,365,398	\$ 1,426,505
Burbank	\$ 374,896	\$ 367,110	\$ 337,406	\$ 386,492	\$ 418,473	\$ 402,482
Glendale	\$ 335,433	\$ 322,121	\$ 301,890	\$ 499,165	\$ 498,549	\$ 498,857
San Fernando	\$ 80,719	\$ 61,185	\$ 72,647	\$ 126,204	\$ 79,606	\$ 102,905
Santa Clarita	\$ 408,977	\$ 403,101	\$ 368,079	\$ 475,750	\$ 368,770	\$ 422,260

