EXHIBIT 1

ANDREW A. BEVERIDGE, Ph.D.
50 MERRIAM AVENUE
BRONXVILLE, NEW YORK 10708
PHONE: 914-337-6237
FAX: 914-337-8210

January 29, 2013

Laurel Impett
Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP
396 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Impett:

I am sending you the information below at the request of Disability Rights California:

QUALIFICATIONS

1) I am a Professor of Sociology at Queens College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York. My primary responsibilities at the College and Graduate Center are teaching statistics and research methods at the graduate and undergraduate level and conducting quantitative, statistically-based social research. In July 2006, I assumed a three-year term as chair of the department and began a second term in July 2009. Trained at Yale University, I have been a professor since 1973, first at Columbia University until 1981 and since then at Queens College and the Graduate Center of CUNY. My areas of expertise include demography, the statistical and quantitative analysis of social science

datasets, most particularly including Census data, survey data and administrative records. I am an expert in the application of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) technology to the analysis of social patterns. I regularly publish results in professional journals and peer reviewed books. Some of my analyses have served as the basis for articles in the *New York Times*, where I serve as a demographic consultant through an agreement between Social Explorer, Inc., the CUNY Research Foundation and the *Times*. I have served as a consultant to a number of public and private entities, where I provide services related to demographic analysis.

2) I have testified as an expert in demographic and statistical analysis, including affidavit testimony and the submission of reports in a number of cases. A list of cases and other matters in which I have provided opinions are listed in my résumé, attached as Exhibit 1.

ASSUMPTIONS

3) The purpose of this letter is to provide my expert analysis of demographic information for the City of Los Angeles, as identified herein, relative to the current draft of the proposed ordinance identified as Los Angeles City Council File 11-0262.

4) My analysis, which is preliminary and done for the purpose of placing relevant information before the Los Angeles City

Council, reflects the following assumptions. In the event the final ordinance does not include these assumptions, I would revisit my analysis to consider if any modifications are appropriate.

5) This report assumes that there are certain changes being proposed to the Los Angeles City Municipal Code, Chapter I (Planning and Zoning Code), Chapter I General Provisions and Zoning, Article 2 Specific Planning - Zoning Comprehensive Zoning Plan, Sec. 12.03, Definitions, and Section 12.24. The proposed changes are attached as Exhibit 2.

6) This report further assumes that:

a. With one exception, the zones that allow "Boarding or Rooming Houses" or prohibit them would not change under the proposed ordinance. See footnote 1, below.

b. However, the definition of "Boarding or Rooming House" would change under the proposed ordinance, with the result that some households will be newly defined as a "Boarding or Rooming Houses" once the ordinance passes.

c. Under the proposed ordinance, groups of four or more renters living together in a building with two or fewer units which do not meet the new definition of "Single Housekeeping Unit" will not be a permitted use in zones that do not permit "Boarding or Rooming Houses."

d. Individuals described in the above paragraph may need to relocate to zones that will continue to allow Rooming and Boarding Houses under the new definitions, or may need to reduce the number of renters in their dwelling.

e. Boarding and Rooming Houses will no longer be a permitted use in RD zones except under very limited circumstances.[1]

f. The new and revised definitions in the pending ordinance, along with the proposed additional revisions to the pending ordinance, will be applied to current structures, dwelling units, and uses, so that

[1] Under the current zoning code, Boarding or Rooming Houses are permitted in RD zones only if there are two or more buildings per lot. The proposed ordinance also prohibits Boarding or Rooming Houses in single-family homes.

those currently living in shared living arrangements, as well as units currently classified as Boarding or Rooming Houses, would be affected.

7) The Los Angeles Zoning Code, L.A.M.C. 12.00 *et seq.* will allow or prohibit Boarding or Rooming Houses in each zone as reflected in Columns 1, 2 and 3 of Exhibit 3.[2]

8) As noted above, to the extent that these assumptions changed, I would need to examine the data in light of those changes.

DATA SOURCES

9) I used publicly available data, including the following:

a. Data produced by the United States Bureau of the Census for the 2010 Census from the Summary File 1. These data present a variety of tabulations or tables based upon the 2010 Census. These data are publicly available in various formats through the Census website www.census.gov.

[2] This report also assumes that in R2 zones, Boarding or Rooming Houses are permitted on lots adjoining a lot in a commercial or industrial zone "provided that (a) The use, including the accessory buildings and uses and required yards, does not extend more than 65 feet from the boundary of the less restrictive zone which it adjoins; and (b) The lot area per dwelling unit or guest room regulations of the RD1.5 zone shall apply to these uses."

b. Data produced by the Census Bureau from the 2009-2011 American Community Survey, which is a large ongoing survey that has replaced the so-called Census "long form." I used the Public Use Micro-Data Samples, which allowed me to create my own tabulations. These data are available on the Census Website at www.census.gov.

c. SAS, a widely-used data management, analysis, and reporting computer program was used, along with Microsoft EXCEL, a standard spreadsheet package.

d. A Geographic Information System (GIS) software package called Maptitude, with Census boundary files for Census 2010, as well as other mapping data, such as streets and features.

e. A zoning map in computerized form map delineating the zoning of each and every portion of Los Angeles City. This map is available at http://planning.lacity.org/

f. A map of every parcel in Los Angeles County and data from the assessment roll for Los Angeles County, of which data from only Los Angeles City were used.

Boundary Map and Local Roll available from http://assessor.lacounty.gov/extranet/outsidesales/gisdata.aspx.

DATA RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

10) Using these data, I was able to compare both the acreage and the number of parcels in the City of Los Angeles where Boarding or Rooming Houses are permitted to the acreage and number of parcels that do not allow Boarding or Rooming Houses.[3]

11) The third and fourth columns of Exhibit 3 present a tabulation of acreage based upon an analysis of the Los Angeles City zoning map using GIS, and a tabulation of the number of parcels affected based upon a tabulation of the parcels in Los Angeles with a use code from the Local Roll from the County Assessor. The Los Angeles County Assessor provides data on the parcels in residential and other areas. Using the map provided by the Assessor's Office and the Official Los Angeles Zoning map, it is possible to select the parcels that are in the City

[3] In light of the current and proposed restrictions on Boarding or Rooming Houses in R2 and RD zones, I treated them as zones that do not allow Boarding or Rooming Houses in my analysis. Additionally, Hillside zoning as a general matter appears to be an overlay category, but there are some areas in the zoning map where it is coded as the zoning category, and, as noted, there are some parcels in use in those areas. To be conservative, I treated those parcels as allowing Boarding or Rooming Houses in my analysis. However, the number and acres of parcels coded as "Hillside" are very small.

of Los Angeles and identify their zoning classification. The parcel tabulation is based upon zoning classifications, though the actual use may differ.

12) Exhibit 4, which is based upon Exhibit 3, shows the total acreage and the total number of parcels in which Boarding or Rooming Houses are restricted according the zoning code. The third and seventh rows show the acreage and number of parcels that will no longer be available to individuals currently sharing housing in these zones if their living situation were to be considered to be Boarding or Rooming Houses.

13) Some 9.61% of residentially zoned land in Los Angeles (approximately 13,266 acres) allows Boarding or Rooming Houses, while 90.39% of residentially zoned land (approximately 124,416 acres) does not.

14) If the proposed ordinance were to become law, and thus redefine Boarding or Rooming Houses and their permitted locations, there would be a 90.39% reduction in residentially zoned land available to a household sharing housing that became a "Boarding or Rooming Houses" under the proposed ordinance because they would be limited to zones that allow Boarding or Rooming Houses.

15) If you include non-residential zones that allow Boarding or Rooming Houses, such as commercial zones, an additional 17,213

acres (or 59,955 parcels) would be available to such households. However, that would still represent at least an 80.34 percent reduction of acreage and 77.63 percent reduction of parcels.

16) Of the 260,719 acres of zoned land in the City of Los Angeles, 30,479 acres are zoned to allow Boarding or Rooming Houses.

17) However, even this land would not be available on any site where the property owner was unable to add sufficient parking to meet the modified parking requirements in the proposed ordinance.

18)

19) It is possible to arrive at an estimate of the number of units and the number of people that could *potentially* be affected by the relevant provisions of the proposed ordinance by using data from the 2010 Census and from the American Community Survey.

20) However, the Census data does not have categories that allow for a differentiation between a "Single Housekeeping Unit" as defined by the proposed ordinance and other types of households. Definitively ascertaining whether four or more people residing together constitute a "Single Housekeeping Unit" would require access to information on a) the "transient" or "non-transient' nature of individuals in the group ("transient" is

undefined in the proposed ordinance); b) whether the individuals are "interactive" ("interactive" is undefined in the proposed ordinance); c) whether the individuals have joint access to and use of all living, kitchen, and eating areas within the dwelling unit, d) whether the individuals share household activities and responsibilities such as meals, chores, expenses and maintenance, and e) whether the makeup of the household is determined by the members of the unit rather than by the landlord, property manager, or other third party – information that the Census does not collect. Exhibit 5 presents relevant Census definitions regarding living quarters and household relationship.

21) To assess whether or not a household would be considered a "Boarding or Rooming House" under the proposed ordinance, I applied information to determine whether or not the residents had a "family" relationship with the householder, as classified by the Census. Most generally, this would be a blood relative, but in-law relationships and other non-blood family relationships would also be considered "family." (See Exhibit 5 for the Census definitions.)

22) To estimate the potential effects of the proposed ordinance on current households and the number of persons living in those

households, I used the Public Use Microdata Sample from the 2009-2011 American Community Survey.[4] The results are shown in Exhibit 6.

23) Of the households living in a dwelling of two units or less, I determined a) the number of owner-occupied households with four or more renters with a non-"family" relationship with the householder and b) the number of non-owner-occupied households with three or more renters with a non-"family" relationship with the householder. Together, these amounted to 6,335 housing units and 48,122 residents.

24) Because the proposed ordinance would also affect households with four or more renters (regardless of blood or other "family" relationship as defined by the Census) that could not meet the "Single Housekeeping Unit" definition, I examined two other potential sets of units, all of which include the set of units discussed in paragraph 19 above.

25) The first additional set includes the "family" units as described, plus all rental "family" units with four or more persons in the

[4] The estimate assumes that one and two unit dwellings are in areas that are zoned for them. The estimate of the number of units in such zones is generally comparable with the number of units reported in the 2010 Census at the block level, when the zoning areas are allocated to the block (using areal allocation where necessary). Such a special tabulation could easily be ordered from the Census Bureau. However, there is no reason to believe that the results would be materially different than those presented here. The group potentially affected includes those that are in a rental household that includes a family household (as defined by the Census) with three or more non-family members (see Exhibit 5 for definitions), a rental household with four or more non-family members, or in an owner occupied household with four or more non-family members.

households where at least one of them had a non-"family" relationship to the householder. With that definition some 23,089 units with 146,974 residents could be affected.

26) The second includes the "family" units as described, plus all rental "family" units with four or more persons in the household. With that definition, some 82,197 units with 473,396 residents could be affected. (All of these estimates are presented in Exhibit 6.)

27) Beyond individuals living in households, some individuals live in group quarters (see Exhibit 5 for definition). Particularly, those living in the following sort of group quarters may be affected unless the home falls within a specific category of facility protected by the exceptions in the proposed ordinance:

> *Group homes intended for adults (code 801)*—Group homes intended for adults are community-based group living arrangements in residential settings that are able to accommodate three or more clients of a service provider. The group home provides room and board and services, including behavioral, psychological, or social programs. Generally, clients are not related to the caregiver or to each other. Group homes do not include residential treatment centers or facilities operated by or for correctional authorities.

28) To estimate the number of individuals in group quarters I used a very detailed tabulation provided at the census tract level (PCT20) from the Summary File 1 of the Census. Using this and the proportion of

each Census Tract in the various zoning classifications, it is possible to get an estimate of the potential impact on these sorts of group quarters for the zoning restriction. The results of that estimate are the following: 3,182 residents may be in housing that is restricted by the new zoning changes.[5]

Sincerely,

Andrew A. Beveridge, Ph.D.

Attachments:

Exhibit 1, Curriculum Vitae

Exhibit 2, Summary of Select Proposed Changes to Section 12.03 and 12.24 of the Los Angeles Municipal Zoning Code

Exhibit 3, Zoning Classes, Boarding or Rooming House Restrictions, Acres, and Parcels

Exhibit 4, Analysis of Potential Impact of Proposed Ordinance by Acres and Parcels by Location

Exhibit 5, Excerpts from the "Census 2010 Summary File 1 Technical Documentation Subject Definitions" concerning Living Quarters and Households and Relationships

Exhibit 6, Estimates of Number of Units and Residents of Shared Living Arrangements Potentially Disallowed under the Proposed Ordinance Based upon Three Interpretations of the Effects of the Ordinance

[5] The estimate of the population affected used an areal allocation of the zoning classification by census tract. A special tabulation that produced an estimate of both units and population by Census block could be ordered from the relevant Census office. However, there is no reason to believe that the results would be materially different than those presented here.