



BASIC NEEDS

Basic Needs Summary	7
Basic Needs	8
Social Characteristics	14
Poverty Level	15
Self-Sufficiency Income Standards.....	16
Social Services	17
Housing	18
Affordable Housing.....	18
Housing Prices.....	23
Rent Prices and Fair Market Rents.....	23
Homelessness.....	25
Food Security	28
Students Receiving Free or Reduced Price Meals.....	30

Basic Needs Summary

Indicator	Measurement	California	San Luis Obispo County	County Trend
Basic Needs	Percentage of telephone survey respondents who did not go without basic needs in the past year	NA	88.7%	NA
Poverty Level	Percentage of children under 18 living below the Federal Poverty Level	21.2%	14.6%	↔
Affordable Housing	Percentage of telephone survey respondents who used one-third or more of their income to pay for housing	NA	59%	↓
Housing Prices	Median sale price for all home types	NA	\$480,000	↑
Rent Prices and Fair Market Rents	Fair market rent for a two-bedroom house	NA	\$1,310	↑
Homelessness	Number of persons experiencing homelessness	NA	1,515	↓
Food Security	Percentage of those who were able to afford enough food	61.6%	73.1%	↔
Students Receiving Free or Reduced Price Meals	Percentage of school-aged children who were enrolled in the free and reduced price meal program	58.9%	44.2%	↑

↑ Increasing (Upward) trend; ↓ Declining (Downward) trend; ↔ Inconclusive; variable; no clear trend; NA Not applicable or data unavailable. Green arrow indicates positive trend; Red arrow indicates negative trend.

Note: Data presented in table are the most recent data available.

Basic Needs

Access to health care is only one component of creating healthy communities and positive health outcomes for the people who live in those communities. Safe, affordable housing, clean drinking water, healthy, affordable food, access to education, and employment that offers a livable wage are essential components for living a healthy life; all of these factors significantly impact the overall health of the community. Policies that recognize that there is more to health and well-being than health care alone enable society as a whole to flourish. Increased health contributes to increased productivity, a more efficient workforce, reduced expenditure on health care services, and healthy aging.

A number of people experience difficulty obtaining basic needs, such as food, water, shelter, and safety. In a report published by the U.S. Census Bureau, approximately one in five of all types of households experience hardships in meeting basic needs.¹

ACTION telephone survey respondents were asked if they went without any basic needs in the last year. Overall, 6% reported going without health care and 4% went without food. However, Spanish-speaking parents had much higher levels of difficulty: 17% went without health care in the last year, followed by 16% who went without housing, and 11% without food. When Spanish-speaking parents were asked why they went without these basic needs, the majority responded they had “no money to pay for it.”

 In any given month during the past year, did you go without...? (2016)

Response	Overall	North Coast	North County	San Luis Obispo	South County
Health Care	5.6%	6.0%	4.6%	5.2%	6.7%
Food	3.8%	0.9%	3.9%	6.2%	3.4%
Child Care	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%	0.8%	1.6%
Utilities	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%
Housing	1.9%	2.6%	2.3%	2.4%	0.6%
Other	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%
Did Not Go Without Basic Needs	88.7%	89.8%	89.9%	88.0%	87.5%
Total Respondents	1,108	258	273	295	283
Total Responses	1,163	269	284	314	296

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2016). Regional Telephone Survey.

Note: This was a multiple response question which enabled respondents to select more than one response.


¹ Siebens, J. (2013). “Extended Measures of Well-Being: Living Conditions in the United States: 2011 Household Economic Studies.” U.S. Census Bureau.

 In any given month during the past year, did you go without...? (2016)

Response	People Experiencing Homelessness	Spanish-Speaking Parents
Health Care	31.6%	16.9%
Food	42.1%	11.2%
Child Care	5.3%	9.0%
Utilities	29.8%	4.5%
Housing	70.2%	15.7%
Other	5.3%	1.1%
Did Not Go Without Basic Needs	15.8%	69.7%
Total Respondents	57	89
Total Responses	114	114

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2016). Face-to-Face Survey.

Note: This was a multiple response question which enabled respondents to select more than one response.

 Why did you go without food?

Category	2010	2013	2016
People Experiencing Homelessness			
No Money to Pay for It	92.3%	91.1%	91.7%
Don't Know Where to Get It	9.2%	13.3%	8.3%
No Transportation Available to Get It	24.6%	31.1%	12.5%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	10.8%	13.3%	12.5%
Other	3.1%	13.3%	25.0%
Total Respondents	65	45	24
Total Responses	91	73	36
Spanish-Speaking Parents			
No Money to Pay for It	84.2%	94.7%	80.0%
Don't Know Where to Get It	26.3%	10.5%	20.0%
No Transportation Available to Get It	15.8%	26.3%	0.0%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Respondents	19	19	10
Total Responses	25	26	10

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.

Note: This was a multiple response question which enabled respondents to select more than one response.

 Why did you go without child care?

Category	2010	2013	2016
People Experiencing Homelessness			
No Money to Pay for It	77.3%	100.0%	100.0%
Don't Know Where to Get It	13.6%	0.0%	50.0%
No Transportation Available to Get It	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	13.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Respondents	22	5	2
Total Responses	30	5	3
Spanish-Speaking Parents			
No Money to Pay for It	75.0%	88.9%	75.0%
Don't Know Where to Get It	18.8%	22.2%	0.0%
No Transportation Available to Get It	6.3%	0.0%	12.5%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%
Total Respondents	16	9	8
Total Responses	19	10	8

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.


Note: This was a multiple response question which enabled respondents to select more than one response.

 Why did you go without health care?

Category	2010	2013	2016
People Experiencing Homelessness			
No Money to Pay for It	92.7%	88.1%	77.8%
Don't Know Where to Get It	7.3%	14.3%	22.2%
No Transportation Available to Get It	25.5%	23.8%	33.3%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	5.5%	9.5%	16.7%
Other	0.0%	14.3%	11.1%
Total Respondents	55	42	18
Total Responses	72	63	29
Spanish-Speaking Parents			
No Money to Pay for It	90.0%	85.7%	92.9%
Don't Know Where to Get It	10.0%	21.4%	0.0%
No Transportation Available to Get It	5.0%	10.7%	0.0%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	3.6%	21.4%
Total Respondents	20	28	14
Total Responses	21	35	16

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.

Note: This was a multiple response question which enabled respondents to select more than one response.

 Why did you go without utilities?

Category	2013	2016
People Experiencing Homelessness		
No Money to Pay for It	100.0%	78.6%
Don't Know Where to Get It	9.8%	28.6%
No Transportation Available to Get It	11.8%	21.4%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	11.8%	7.1%
Other	7.8%	28.6%
Total Respondents	51	14
Total Responses	72	23
Spanish-Speaking Parents		
No Money to Pay for It	100.0%	100.0%
Don't Know Where to Get It	25.0%	0.0%
No Transportation Available to Get It	5.0%	0.0%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	10.0%	0.0%
Other	5.0%	0.0%
Total Respondents	20	4
Total Responses	29	4

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.

Note: This was a multiple response question which enabled respondents to select more than one response.


Why did you go without housing?

Category	2010	2013	2016
People Experiencing Homelessness			
No Money to Pay for It	87.8%	100.0%	77.8%
Don't Know Where to Get It	17.6%	9.3%	22.2%
No Transportation Available to Get It	16.2%	6.7%	11.1%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	5.4%	5.3%	8.3%
Other	6.8%	8.0%	25.0%
Total Respondents	74	75	36
Total Responses	99	97	52
Spanish-Speaking Parents			
No Money to Pay for It	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Don't Know Where to Get It	20.0%	22.2%	18.2%
No Transportation Available to Get It	10.0%	11.1%	9.1%
Unable to Travel to Get It/ Home Bound	0.0%	11.1%	9.1%
Other	0.0%	5.6%	9.1%
Total Respondents	10	18	11
Total Responses	11	27	16

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.

Note: This was a multiple response question which enabled respondents to select more than one response.


**Please indicate if each of the following items is a problem for you personally:
(Respondents Answering “Major Problem” among People Experiencing Homelessness)**



Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.


2010 n: Housing=117, Transportation=116, Loneliness/isolation =116; 2013 n: Housing=118, Transportation=111, Loneliness/isolation=109; 2016 n: Housing=58, Transportation=57, Loneliness/isolation=56.

**👤👤👤 Please indicate if each of the following items is a problem for you personally:
(Respondents Answering “Major Problem” among Spanish-Speaking Parents)**



Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.
 2010 n: Housing=84, Transportation=82, Loneliness/Isolation =79; 2013 n: Housing=107, Transportation=108, Loneliness/Isolation =103; 2016 n: Housing=94, Transportation=92, Loneliness/Isolation=91.

👤👤👤 Is there a working telephone where you live? (Respondents Answering “Yes”)



Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.
 2010 n: People Experiencing Homelessness=118, Spanish-Speaking Parents=87; 2013 n: People Experiencing Homelessness=113, Spanish-Speaking Parents=109; 2016 n: People Experiencing Homelessness=56, Spanish-Speaking Parents=92.

Social Characteristics

Social characteristics, such as poverty and self-sufficiency, are essential indicators to assess the overall health and well-being of a community. Levels of poverty and self-sufficiency illuminate social challenges, trends, and overall living conditions that are important considerations for policy and program development. Consideration of these indicators should be reflected in the monitoring and evaluation of policy and program development and help guide social spending. Despite a significant recovery in the post 2008 U.S. economy, low- and moderate-income communities continue to be disproportionately impacted by the social concerns associated with poverty. Far too many individuals continue to experience hardship and difficulty making ends meet, as evidenced by the data presented in this section.

Poverty Level

The U.S. government uses two distinct measures regarding poverty:

1. The federal poverty threshold (commonly known as the Federal Poverty Level), which is largely used by the U.S. Census Bureau to determine the percentage of Americans living in poverty, and
2. The federal poverty guidelines, which are the levels used to determine if an individual or family is eligible for government benefits.

The Federal Poverty Level was developed in the 1960s and was based on three times the cost of a nutritionally adequate monthly food plan. It does not, however, consider other factors such as child care, transportation, medical needs, and housing costs.

The federal poverty guidelines are used by federal and state governments to determine eligibility for government assistance. Several programs use these guidelines or percentages of the guidelines (e.g., 125% or 185% of the federal poverty guidelines), such as Head Start, CalFresh, the school lunch program, LIHEAP (Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program), Medi-Cal, and Medicare. In general,

cash assistance, such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Security Insurance (SSI), Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), and Section 8 housing do not use the federal poverty guidelines. The federal poverty guideline for 2015 was \$24,250 for a family of four.

In 2015, there were 14,375 households in San Luis Obispo County living in poverty (14.9% of all households). San Luis Obispo County saw a slight increase in the percentage of children living below the Federal Poverty Level from 13% in 2010 to 15% in 2015, while adults and seniors had a smaller increase during the same time period.

Percentage of Individuals below the Federal Poverty Level

Region/Age Categories	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
San Luis Obispo County	14.4%	15.3%	13.7%	15.3%	14.8%	14.9%
Under 18 Years	12.6%	17.7%	15.1%	14.5%	15.5%	14.6%
18 to 64 Years	16.9%	16.8%	15.1%	18.3%	17.2%	17.5%
65 Years and Over	6.4%	6.3%	6.9%	5.5%	6.1%	7.0%
California	15.8%	16.6%	17.0%	16.8%	16.4%	15.3%
Under 18 Years	22.0%	22.8%	23.8%	23.5%	22.7%	21.2%
18 to 64 Years	14.5%	15.3%	15.6%	15.6%	15.3%	14.3%
65 Years and Over	9.7%	10.0%	10.4%	10.4%	10.6%	9.9%
United States	15.3%	15.9%	15.9%	15.8%	15.5%	14.7%
Under 18 Years	21.6%	22.5%	22.6%	22.2%	21.7%	20.7%
18 to 64 Years	14.2%	14.8%	14.8%	14.8%	14.6%	13.9%
65 Years and Over	9.0%	9.3%	9.5%	9.6%	9.5%	9.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2015 American Community Survey, 1-year estimates.

Percentage of Households below the Federal Poverty Level, San Luis Obispo County

Household Type	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
All Households	12.9%	14.0%	12.4%	14.1%	12.5%	13.7%
Non-Family	22.8%	31.9%	20.4%	24.6%	21.6%	23.1%
Family	7.8%	8.0%	7.8%	8.1%	7.2%	8.2%
Married-Couple Family	4.2%	5.2%	3.8%	3.9%	5.1%	5.0%
Female Householders	21.5%	21.8%	27.3%	27.7%	14.9%	26.2%
Male Householders	17.9%	10.1%	10.6%	11.7%	15.8%	9.2%
Total Number of Households in Poverty	12,873	14,154	12,605	14,804	12,881	14,375

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2015 American Community Survey, 1-year estimates.

Note: Female and male householders refer to family households.

Self-Sufficiency Income Standards

The California Family Economic Self-Sufficiency Standard (Self-Sufficiency Standard) provides information on how much income is needed in different counties in order for families to meet their basic needs without public or private assistance. The Self-Sufficiency Standard provides a more comprehensive measure of income adequacy than federal poverty thresholds by taking into account housing, child care, health care, transportation, food, taxes, and miscellaneous costs as well as accounting for economic differences between counties. It also accounts for changing costs over time and at various rates. For example, food costs, on which the official poverty thresholds are based, have not increased as fast as housing costs. This failure to account for different inflation rates among other non-food basic needs is one reason that the official poverty thresholds are no longer an adequate measure of the money required to meet real needs.²

A single adult in San Luis Obispo County would need to earn \$11.98 per hour in 2014 to be self-sufficient. Whereas a single adult with a teenager and a school-aged child would have to earn \$21.28 per hour.

² Insight Center for Community Economic Development. (2010). CA Family Economic Self-Sufficiency by County.

2014 Self-Sufficiency Income Standards, San Luis Obispo County

Expense Category	Single Adult	Single Adult + 2 Children	Two Adults + 2 Children
Housing	\$941	\$1,215	\$1,215
Child Care	\$0	\$514	\$1,600
Food	\$244	\$646	\$765
Transportation	\$278	\$287	\$543
Health Care	\$137	\$452	\$482
Miscellaneous	\$160	\$311	\$461
Taxes	\$348	\$536	\$914
Earned Income Tax Credit	\$0	\$0	\$0
Child Care Tax Credit (-)	\$0	(\$50)	(\$100)
Child Tax Credit (-)	\$0	(\$167)	(\$167)
Self-Sufficiency Wages:			
Hourly (per adult)	\$11.98	\$21.28	\$16.23
Monthly	\$2,109	\$3,745	\$5,713
Annual	\$25,305	\$44,935	\$68,560

Source: Insight Center for Community Economic Development. (2016). *The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Individuals and Families in San Luis Obispo County, CA, 2014*.

Social Services

The average number of new CalWORKs applications decreased from 921 in fiscal year 2011-12 to 197 in fiscal year 2015-16. Continuing or ongoing active cases also decreased during the same time period. The North Region-Paso Robles had the highest number of CalWORKs continuing cases in fiscal year 2015-16 with 709, while the Coastal Region had the lowest amount at 102.

Average CalWORKs Caseload

Response	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13	FY 2013–14	FY 2014–15	FY 2015–16
Intake ¹	921	258	251	224	197
Continuing ²	2,089	1,954	1,867	1,828	1,735

Source: County of San Luis Obispo Department of Social Services. (2016). *CalWORKs Statistics 2011-2016*.

¹ New CalWORKs applications processed.

² Ongoing active CalWORKs cases.

Average CalWORKs Continuing¹ Caseload, by Region

Region	FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13	FY 2013–14	FY 2014–15	FY 2015–16
North Region–Paso Robles	867	841	801	736	734	694
North Region–Atascadero	418	438	391	376	343	325
Central Region	240	234	198	188	185	247
Coastal Region	164	171	163	139	141	101
South Region–Arroyo Grande	524	510	481	471	428	391
South Region–Nipomo	261	245	224	202	218	207

Source: County of San Luis Obispo Department of Social Services. (2016). CalWORKs Statistics 2011-2016.

¹ Ongoing active CalWORKs cases.

Housing


The availability of affordable, safe, quality housing is central to the health, diversity, and economic vitality of a community. Access to affordable housing enables low- and moderate-income families to put more of their financial resources toward the purchase of nutritious food, medical care, and reliable child care for their children. In addition, the development of affordable housing increases spending and employment in the surrounding community, acts as an important source of revenue for local governments, and reduces the likelihood of foreclosure and its associated costs. Moreover, a sufficient supply of affordable housing increases the likelihood that employers can attract and retain workers, which in turn supports the local economy.³


The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) definition of affordable housing is for a household to pay no more than 30% of its annual income on housing.

Affordable Housing


Fifty-nine percent of ACTION telephone survey respondents reported spending one third or more of their household income on housing costs in 2016, down from 61% of respondents in 2013. Over half (57%) of Spanish-speaking parents spent more than half of their income on housing costs in 2016.


³ Center for Housing Policy and the MacArthur Foundation. (2011). *The Role of Affordable Housing in Creating Jobs and Stimulating Local Economic Development: A Review of the Literature.*

 Is the amount of money you use to pay for housing, including utilities, such as gas and electricity...? **(Respondents Answering One Third or More Their Income)**




Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Telephone Survey.
2010 n: 1,046; 2013 n: 1,022; 2016 n: 1,027

 Is the amount of money you use to pay for housing, including utilities, such as gas and electricity...? **(Respondents Answering One Third or More of Their Income by Owners and Renters)**



Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Telephone Survey.
2013 n: Owners=554, Renters=427, 2016 n: Owners=638, Renters=352.

 Is the amount of money you use to pay for housing, including utilities, such as gas and electricity...?

Category	2010	2013	2016
People Experiencing Homelessness			
Less than One-Third of Your Income	30.2%	43.2%	37.5%
Between One-Third and One-Half of Your Income	27.9%	11.6%	12.5%
More than One-Half of Your Income	41.9%	45.3%	50.0%
Total Respondents	86	95	40
Spanish-Speaking Parents			
Less than One-Third of Your Income	18.4%	15.5%	13.2%
Between One-Third and One-Half of Your Income	44.8%	34.5%	29.7%
More than One-Half of Your Income	36.8%	50.0%	57.1%
Total Respondents	87	110	91

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.

Percentage of Homes Affordable for Median-Income Families (Housing Opportunity Index), Quarter 1

Metropolitan Service Area ¹	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Fresno	67.0%	77.7%	82.3%	76.4%	50.2%	45.9%	50.1%
Merced	82.4%	86.9%	90.5%	90.5%	68.2%	67.6%	46.4%
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura	46.8%	59.7%	67.0%	58.5%	40.7%	32.4%	31.9%
Salinas	56.2%	62.4%	62.6%	44.4%	23.0%	24.6%	17.2%
San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City	23.4%	33.2%	39.9%	28.9%	13.3%	14.1%	10.4%
San Jose- Sunnyvale, Santa Clara	45.1%	53.5%	59.1%	43.3%	27.2%	26.1%	21.5%
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria- Goleta	47.8%	56.7%	60.6%	51.8%	39.5%	39.5%	36.3%
Santa Cruz-Watsonville	34.1%	48.0%	53.8%	37.1%	21.1%	21.6%	16.1%
Visalia-Porterville	72.2%	80.0%	82.9%	81.1%	64.0%	59.9%	47.4%
San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles	32.4%	47.6%	57.2%	46.4%	26.9%	30.2%	23.7%
National	72.2%	74.6%	77.5%	73.7%	65.5%	66.5%	65.0%

Source: National Association of Home Builders. (2016). 2010-2016 NAHB – Wells Fargo Housing Opportunity Index (HOI), 1st Quarter.

Note: The Housing Opportunity Index is the share of homes in a particular area that would have been affordable to a family earning the median income. It is based on the median family income, interest rates, and the price distribution of homes sold for each market in a particular quarter of a year. For example, this chart shows that only 46.4% of homes were affordable for families earning \$70,900 or more in San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles MSA in the first quarter of 2013.

¹ Metropolitan Service Area is one of a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. MSAs are relatively free standing and are not closely associated with other metropolitan areas.

Note: National Ranking based on a score of 1 to 225, with 1 being the highest ranking and 225 being the lowest ranking.

New Dwelling Units by Jurisdiction, San Luis Obispo County

Jurisdiction	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total New Dwelling Units 2010-2014
Arroyo Grande	13	14	18	19	22	86
Atascadero	22	9	28	134	223	416
Grover Beach	17	2	2	3	7	31
Morro Bay	11	5	0	12	16	44
Paso Robles	24	117	66	53	107	367
Pismo Beach	17	6	5	7	27	62
San Luis Obispo	105	54	21	91	121	392
Incorporated Cities	209	207	140	319	523	1,398
Unincorporated Total	241	280	182	325	280	1,308
Regional Totals	450	487	322	644	803	2,706

Source: Personal Correspondence (2016). Action for Healthy Communities.

National and Regional Affordability Rankings, Quarter 1

Metropolitan Service Area ¹	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Fresno							
National	187	137	187	137	207	210	210
Regional	46	35	46	35	53	54	49
Merced							
National	94	44	94	44	160	163	215
Regional	5	6	5	6	28	29	52
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura							
National	212	204	212	204	211	214	225
Regional	58	59	58	59	55	58	61
Salinas							
National	205	200	205	200	220	221	232
Regional	54	56	54	56	63	64	68
San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City							
National	224	221	224	221	225	225	236
Regional	68	68	68	68	68	68	72
San Jose-Sunnyvale, Santa Clara							
National	217	213	217	213	217	218	230
Regional	62	62	62	62	61	62	66
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta							
National	210	209	210	209	213	211	221
Regional	56	60	56	60	57	55	58
Santa Cruz-Watsonville							
National	221	215	221	215	222	222	234
Regional	66	63	66	63	65	65	70
Visalia-Porterville							
National	165	121	165	121	174	186	213
Regional	33	29	33	29	35	42	51
San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles							
National	223	217	223	217	218	215	228
Regional	67	64	67	64	62	59	64

Source: National Association of Home Builders. (2016). 2010-2016 NAHB – Wells Fargo Housing Opportunity Index (HOI), 1st Quarter.

Note: National Ranking based on a score of 1 to 236, with 1 being the highest ranking and 236 being the lowest ranking.

¹ Metropolitan Service Area is one of a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. MSAs are relatively free standing and are not closely associated with other metropolitan areas.

Housing Prices

The recession and housing crisis resulted in a decline in median housing prices. Since 2012, however, housing prices have gradually increased. The median sales price of homes in the San Luis Obispo area has increased from \$350,000 in 2010 to \$480,000 in 2016.

Median Sales Price, Quarter 1

Metropolitan Service Area ¹	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Fresno	\$160,000	\$139,000	\$135,000	\$165,000	\$196,000	\$220,000	\$214,000
Merced	\$119,000	\$112,000	\$107,000	\$128,000	\$158,000	\$180,000	\$203,000
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura	\$352,000	\$333,000	\$320,000	\$375,000	\$425,000	\$462,000	\$495,000
Salinas	\$232,000	\$235,000	\$254,000	\$340,000	\$385,000	\$425,000	\$470,000
San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City	\$585,000	\$550,000	\$549,000	\$675,000	\$815,000	\$907,000	\$1,060,000
San Jose- Sunnyvale, Santa Clara	\$431,000	\$425,000	\$420,000	\$550,000	\$631,000	\$696,000	\$765,000
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta	\$294,000	\$269,000	\$270,000	\$337,000	\$412,000	\$465,000	\$470,000
Santa Cruz-Watsonville	\$430,000	\$376,000	\$365,000	\$426,000	\$535,000	\$625,000	\$654,000
Visalia-Porterville	\$141,000	\$125,000	\$118,000	\$134,000	\$160,000	\$169,000	\$189,000
San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles	\$350,000	\$320,000	\$315,000	\$354,000	\$443,000	\$444,000	\$480,000
National	\$175,000	\$165,000	\$162,000	\$184,000	\$195,000	\$210,000	\$223,000

Source: National Association of Home Builders. (2016). 2010-2016 NAHB – Wells Fargo Housing Opportunity Index (HOI), 1st Quarter.

¹ Metropolitan Service Area is one of a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. MSAs are relatively free standing and are not closely associated with other metropolitan areas.

Rent Prices and Fair Market Rents

The average cost for a two-bedroom rental in San Luis Obispo County was \$1,310 per month in 2016. Since 2010, the average rent in the county has exceeded the Fair Market Rent, which is the maximum amount the Housing Authority will pay for rental units, as determined by HUD.⁴

Fair Market Rents, San Luis Obispo County

Number of Bedrooms	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
0 Bedrooms	\$805	\$826	\$806	\$761	\$814	\$877	\$864
1 Bedroom	\$952	\$977	\$954	\$880	\$941	\$1,014	\$1,009
2 Bedrooms	\$1,160	\$1,190	\$1,162	\$1,136	\$1,215	\$1,309	\$1,310
3 Bedrooms	\$1,690	\$1,734	\$1,693	\$1,674	\$1,790	\$1,929	\$1,909
4 Bedrooms	\$1,739	\$1,784	\$1,742	\$1,746	\$1,867	\$2,011	\$2,249

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2016). HUD USER Data Sets, 2010-2016.

⁴ <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/fmr.html>

Estimate of Average (50th Percentile) Rents, San Luis Obispo County

Number of Bedrooms	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
0 Bedrooms	\$843	\$864	\$873	\$814	\$866	\$934	\$917
1 Bedroom	\$1,005	\$1,031	\$1,033	\$941	\$1,002	\$1,080	\$1,071
2 Bedrooms	\$1,230	\$1,262	\$1,258	\$1,215	\$1,293	\$1,394	\$1,391
3 Bedrooms	\$1,791	\$1,837	\$1,833	\$1,790	\$1,905	\$2,054	\$2,027
4 Bedrooms	\$1,889	\$1,938	\$1,886	\$1,867	\$1,987	\$2,142	\$2,388

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2010-2016). HUD USER Data Sets.

Section 8¹ Income Limits, San Luis Obispo County

Household or Family Size	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Low-Income Limits (80%)							
1 Person	\$40,600	\$41,650	\$42,250	\$40,150	\$42,150	\$43,200	\$42,800
2 Persons	\$46,400	\$47,600	\$48,250	\$45,900	\$48,150	\$49,400	\$48,900
3 Persons	\$52,200	\$53,550	\$54,300	\$51,650	\$54,150	\$55,550	\$55,000
4 Persons	\$58,000	\$59,500	\$60,300	\$57,350	\$60,150	\$61,700	\$61,100
5 Persons	\$62,650	\$64,300	\$65,150	\$61,950	\$65,000	\$66,650	\$66,000
6 Persons	\$67,300	\$69,050	\$69,950	\$66,550	\$69,800	\$71,600	\$70,900
7 Persons	\$71,950	\$73,800	\$74,800	\$71,150	\$74,600	\$76,550	\$75,800
8 Persons	\$76,600	\$78,550	\$79,600	\$75,750	\$79,400	\$81,450	\$80,700
Very Low-Income Limits (50%)							
1 Person	\$25,400	\$26,050	\$26,400	\$25,100	\$26,350	\$27,000	\$26,750
2 Persons	\$29,000	\$29,800	\$30,200	\$28,700	\$30,100	\$30,850	\$30,600
3 Persons	\$32,650	\$33,500	\$33,950	\$32,300	\$33,850	\$34,700	\$34,400
4 Persons	\$36,250	\$37,200	\$37,700	\$35,850	\$37,600	\$38,550	\$38,200
5 Persons	\$39,150	\$40,200	\$40,750	\$38,750	\$40,650	\$41,650	\$41,300
6 Persons	\$42,050	\$43,200	\$43,750	\$41,600	\$43,650	\$44,750	\$44,350
7 Persons	\$44,950	\$46,150	\$46,750	\$44,500	\$46,650	\$47,850	\$47,400
8 Persons	\$47,850	\$49,150	\$49,800	\$47,350	\$49,650	\$50,900	\$50,450

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2016). HUD Program Income Limits.

¹The Housing Choice Voucher Program (Section 8) is the federal government’s major program for assisting very low-income families, the elderly, and the disabled to afford decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the private market. Housing choice vouchers are administered locally by public housing agencies (PHAs). Eligibility for a housing voucher is determined by the PHA based on the total annual gross income and family size and is limited to U.S. citizens and specified categories of non-citizens who have eligible immigration status. In general, the family’s income may not exceed 50% of the median income for the county or metropolitan area in which the family chooses to live.

Homelessness


Individuals experiencing homelessness tend to have more health-related concerns than people with stable housing. They have higher rates of preventable illness, longer hospital stays, and higher rates of premature death. It is estimated that those experiencing homelessness stay an average of four days (or 36%) longer per hospital admission than non-homeless patients.⁵

Eighty-six percent of ACTION telephone survey respondents reported that they were “very concerned” or “somewhat concerned” about homelessness in their community in 2016.

A total of 1,515 homeless individuals were counted in San Luis Obispo County on January 26, 2016. The 2015 count represents a 31% decrease from 2,186 individuals who met HUD’s definition of homelessness in 2013. Of the 2015 point-in-time homeless population, the majority (74%) were unsheltered.




How concerned are you about homelessness in your community? (Respondents Answering “Very Concerned” or “Somewhat Concerned”)



Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Telephone Survey.
2010 n: 1,095; 2013 n: 1,097; 2016 n: 1,104.



How concerned are you about homelessness in your community? (Respondents Answering “Very Concerned” or “Somewhat Concerned” by Region)



Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Telephone Survey.
2010 n: North Coast=310, North County=256, San Luis Obispo=243, South County=285; 2013 North Coast=249, North County= 294, San Luis Obispo=291, South County=263; 2016 n: North Coast=257, North County=272, San Luis Obispo=296, South County=281.


⁵ Hwang, S.W., Weaver, J., Aubry, T.D., & Hoch, J.S. (2011). Hospital Costs and Length of Stay among Homeless Patients Admitted to Medical, Surgical, and Psychiatric Services, *Medical Care*, 49(4):350-54. doi: 10.1097/MLR.0b013e318206c50d.

How concerned are you about homelessness in your community?

Category	2010	2013	2016
People Experiencing Homelessness			
Very Concerned	76.9%	78.2%	80.4%
Somewhat Concerned	11.6%	12.6%	3.6%
Not at All Concerned	11.6%	9.2%	16.1%
Total Respondents	121	119	56
Spanish-Speaking Parents			
Very Concerned	23.3%	41.0%	28.4%
Somewhat Concerned	53.5%	35.0%	26.3%
Not at All Concerned	23.3%	23.9%	45.3%
Total Respondents	86	117	95

Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.


Are you currently homeless? (Respondents Answering “Yes”)




Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.

2010 n:86; 2013 n: 107; 2016 n: 93.


Sheltered vs. Unsheltered Homeless Population, San Luis Obispo County



2015 SHELTERED INCLUDES:



2015 UNSHELTERED INCLUDES:



Source: Applied Survey Research. (2015). San Luis Obispo County Homeless Census & Survey. Watsonville, CA.

Total Homeless Census Population by Region and Shelter Status

Response	2013	2015
North County		
Unsheltered	393	452
Sheltered	73	177
Total	466	629
Coast		
Unsheltered	141	141
Sheltered	0	5
Total	141	146
San Luis Obispo		
Unsheltered	602	324
Sheltered	148	158
Total	750	482
South County		
Unsheltered	815	206
Sheltered	14	52
Total	829	258

Source: Applied Survey Research. (2015). San Luis Obispo County Homeless Census. Applied Survey Research. (2013). San Luis Obispo County Homeless Census.

Note: North County region consists of Atascadero, Paso Robles, San Miguel, and Templeton. Coast region includes Cambria, Cayucos, Los Osos, and Morro Bay. San Luis Obispo includes only the City of San Luis Obispo. South County includes Pismo Beach, Grover Beach, Arroyo Grande, Nipomo, and Oceano.

Number of Persons Seeking Shelter through Shelter Over-Capacity¹, Maxine Lewis Memorial Shelter

Community Action Partnership Homeless Services	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
1st Quarter: Jan – Mar	474	54	317	305	197	271	95
2nd Quarter: Apr – Jun	290	36	560	319	237	136	155
3rd Quarter: Jul – Sep	173	100	628	318	529	290	NA
4th Quarter: Oct – Dec	78	326	560	262	183	250	NA
Total Over-Capacity	1,015	516	2,065	1,204	1,146	947	NA

Source: Personal Correspondence. (2016). Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo County, Department of Homeless Services. 2010-2016.

¹These data are for the Maxine Lewis Memorial Shelter, which is operated by the Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo County. Over-capacity refers to the number of individuals seeking shelter that exceeds the number of available beds. The shelter has a regular capacity of 49 beds per night, plus an overflow capacity of 15-35 beds provided in collaboration with the Interfaith Coalition for the Homeless.

Clients Placed in Permanent Housing, San Luis Obispo County

Community Action Partnership Homeless Services	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Number of Single Adults	82	54	66	57	55	58
Number of Parents	46	52	57	32	27	15
Number of Children	77	79	53	44	35	21
Number of Clients Permanently-Housed	205	185	176	143	127	100
Number of Families	34	39	39	25	20	11

Source: Personal Correspondence. (2016). Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo County, Department of Homeless Services. 2010-2016

Food Security

Access to affordable, healthy food is a critical component for health and well-being. Researchers have found that food insecurity is associated with malnutrition, particularly as it relates to inadequate consumption of nutritious foods, such as fresh fruit and vegetables.⁶ Individuals living in food-insecure households have a higher prevalence of fair or poor health and are more likely to suffer from chronic diseases, such as obesity, type II diabetes, and pulmonary disease. Research also suggests that food insecurity increases the likelihood of hospitalizations, developmental and mental health problems, and poor disease management, as well as increased health care spending. Moreover, research suggests that food insecurity triggers compensatory behaviors, such as skipping meals or binge eating when food is available, often on low-cost and nutritionally poor foods.^{7,8}

In 2014, 27% of San Luis Obispo County residents whose income was less than 200% of the Federal Poverty Level reported they were not able to afford enough food, down from 48% in 2013. The number of new CalFresh applications has decreased from 1,161 in 2013–14 to 1,062 in 2015–16.

Are you able to afford enough food?¹

Response	2011	2012	2013	2014
Able to Afford Enough Food (Food Secure)				
San Luis Obispo County	71.4%	81.8%	52.2%	73.1%
California	58.7%	57.6%	55.1%	61.6%
Not Able to Afford Enough Food (Food Insecure)				
San Luis Obispo County	28.6%	18.2%	47.8%	26.9%
California	41.3%	42.4%	44.9%	38.4%

Source: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. (2015). California Health Interview Survey, 2011–14.

Note: CHIS data is collected continuously over a two-year period. 2011–2012 CHIS data were collected from June 15, 2011 through January 14, 2013.

¹ This question was asked of adults whose incomes are less than 200% of the Federal Poverty Level.


² Data are statistically unstable.

⁶ Drewnowski A., Darmon N. (July 2015). The Economics of Obesity: Dietary Energy Density and Energy Cost. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. Issue#:82 (suppl):265S–73S.

⁷ Edin, K., Boyd, M., Mabli, J., Ohls, J., Worthington, J., Greene, S., Redel N., and Sridharan, S. (2013). SNAP Food Security In-Depth Interview Study: Final Report. Family Programs Report. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service.

⁸ Bruening M., Maclehose R., Loth K., Story M., Neumark Sztainer D. Feeding a Family in a Recession: Food Insecurity among Minnesota Parents. (2012 March). American Journal of Public Health. Issue#: 102(3): Pg. 520–Pg. 526.

👤👤👤 Please indicate if eating nutritious food is a problem for you personally:
(Respondents Answering “Major Problem”)



Source: ACTION for Healthy Communities. (2010, 2013, and 2016). Face-to-Face Survey.
 2010 n: 116-117; 2013 n: 109-117; 2016 n: 58-94.

CalFresh Caseload, San Luis Obispo County

Annual Averages	FY 2013–2014	FY 2014–2015	FY 2015–2016
Caseload	12,075	13,054	14,530
Applications	1,161	1,042	1,062

Source: Personal Correspondence. (2016). County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Social Services. 2013-2016
 Note: Number of applications are those received during the fiscal year.

Students Receiving Free or Reduced Price Meals

The National School Lunch Program provides free meals for children whose families are at or below 130% of the poverty level, while those children with families living between 130% and 185% of the Federal Poverty Level receive reduced-price meals.⁹

Between 2013–14 and 2015–16, participation in school meal programs in San Luis Obispo County decreased from 46% to 44%. These percentages were lower than the state overall, which remained at 59% during the same time period.

Percentage of School-aged Children Enrolled in Free and Reduced Price Meal Program

District	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16
County Office of Education	65.5%	70.5%	70.8%	75.2%	71.4%	74.4%
Atascadero Unified	38.2%	41.8%	42.5%	41.2%	35.6%	35.0%
Cayucos Elementary	28.5%	24.3%	36.9%	35.2%	34.7%	34.3%
Coast Unified	59.1%	59.5%	60.2%	60.8%	58.2%	63.1%
Lucia Mar Unified	49.4%	49.3%	49.5%	52.4%	50.4%	51.6%
Paso Robles Joint Unified	47.5%	47.8%	48.3%	53.8%	46.2%	51.1%
Pleasant Valley Joint Union Elementary	46.8%	40.9%	51.6%	52.4%	48.1%	45.5%
San Luis Coastal Unified	33.8%	35.1%	37.0%	37.0%	37.8%	36.6%
San Miguel Joint Union	61.3%	63.0%	51.1%	54.8%	56.2%	54.2%
Shandon Joint Unified	71.8%	69.8%	64.0%	75.5%	64.0%	75.8%
Templeton Unified	17.7%	18.3%	20.0%	20.6%	16.9%	16.9%
San Luis Obispo County	42.8%	43.6%	44.3%	46.3%	43.1%	44.2%
California	56.7%	57.5%	58.0%	59.4%	58.6%	58.9%

Source: California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. (2016). 2011-2016 Free and Reduced Price Meals, San Luis Obispo County.

⁹ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2009). National School Lunch Fact Sheets. Accessed 2010. From <http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/AboutLunch/NSLPFactSheet.pdf>