ORANGE COUNTY ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE

CITY OF LA HABRA

DRAFT

PREPARED BY THE JURISDICTIONS OF ORANGE COUNTYAND THE LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW

April 6, 2020

Orange County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice Table of Contents

I. Cover Sheet

II. Executive Summary……...3

III. Community Participation Process……..8

IV . Assessment of Past Goals and Actions……9

V . Fair Housing Analysis

A. Demographic Summary……33

B. General Issues

i. Segregation/Integration…….…..95
ii. Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)...…..130
iii. Disparities in Access to Opportunity…….….138
iv. Disproportionate Housing Needs……...……,…171

C. Publicly Supported Housing Analysis……214

D. Disability and Access Analysis……241

E. Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Analysis….…267

VI. Fair Housing Goals and Priorities……...…273

VII. Publicly Supported Housing Appendix……..…….....278

VIII. Glossary……..….…297

IX. Contributing Factors Appendix…….....……..304

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Orange County's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) is a thorough examination of structural barriers to fair housing choice and access to opportunity for members of historically marginalized groups protected from discrimination by the federal Fair Housing Act (FHA). The AI also outlines fair housing priorities and goals to overcome fair housing issues. In addition, the AI lays out meaningful strategies that can be implemented to achieve progress towards the County's obligation to affirmatively furthering fair housing. The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law (Lawyers' Committee), in consultation with Orange County jurisdictions and with input from a wide range of stakeholders through a community participation process, prepared this AI. To provide a foundation for the conclusions and recommendations presented in this AI, the following information was reviewed and analyzed:

- Data from the U.S. Census Bureau and other sources about the demographic, housing, economic, and educational landscape of the County, nearby communities, and the broader Region;
- Various County planning document and ordinances;
- Data reflecting housing discrimination complaints;
- The input of a broad range of stakeholders that deal with the realities of the housing market and the lives of members of protected classes in Orange County.

As required by federal regulations, the AI draws from these sources to conduct an analysis of fair housing issues such as patterns of integration and segregation of members of protected classes, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty regionally, disparities in access to opportunity for protected classes, and disproportionate housing needs. The analysis also examines publicly supported housing in the city as well as fair housing issues for persons with disabilities. Private and public fair housing enforcement, outreach capacity, and resources are evaluated as well. The AI identifies contributing factors to fair housing issues and steps that should be taken to overcome these barriers.

The Orange County AI is a collaborative effort between the following jurisdictions: Aliso Viejo, Anaheim, Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Irvine, Laguna Niguel, La Habra, Lake Forest, La Palma, Mission Viejo, Orange, Rancho San Margarita, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, Santa Ana, Tustin, Westminster, and the County of Orange. Although this is a county-wide AI, there are jurisdiction-specific versions that include goals specific to each jurisdiction.

Overview of Orange County

According to U.S. Census data, the population of Orange County have changed considerably from 1990 to present day. The population has grown from just over 2.4 million in 1990 to nearly 3.2 million people today. The demographics of the County have undergone even more dramatic shifts over this time period: the white population has gone from 76.2% in 1990 to 57.8% in 2010 Census,

with corresponding increases in Hispanic (from 13.5% to 21.2%) and Asian (from 8.6% to 18.3%) populations in that same time period. These trends represent accelerations of the broader Los-Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area (the Region). In the Region, white population percentage has declined from 45.9% percent to under 31.6%, with substantial increases in the percentages of Hispanic (from 34.7% to 44.4%) and Asian (from 10.2% to 16%) from the 1990 to 2010 Censuses.

Within both Orange County and the broader Region, most racial or ethnic minority groups experience higher rates of housing problems, including but not limited to severe housing cost burden, than do non-Hispanic White households. In Orange County, Hispanic households are most likely to experience severe housing cost burden; in the Region, it is Black households.

There are 194,569 households in Orange County experiencing severe housing cost burden, with monthly housing costs exceeding 30 percent of monthly income. 104,196 of these households are families. However, there are only 429 Project-Based Section 8 units and 33 Other Multifamily units with more than one bedroom capable of housing these families. Housing Choice Vouchers are the most utilized form of publicly supported housing for families, with 2,286 multi-bedroom units accessed. Large family households are also disproportionately affected by housing problems as compared with non-family households. Some focus groups have communicated that regulations and cost issues can make Orange County too expensive for families. The high percentage of 0-1 bedroom units in publicly supported housing and the low percentage of households with children in publicly supported housing support this observation.

The federal Fair Housing Act and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act provide Orange County residents with some protections from displacement and work to increase the supply of affordable housing. In addition, jurisdictions throughout Orange County have worked diligently to provide access to fair housing through anti-housing discrimination work, creating housing opportunities designed to enhance resident mobility, providing zoning flexibility where necessary, and working to reduce hate crimes. Even so, these protections and incentives are not enough to stem the loss of affordable housing and meet the housing needs of low- and moderate-income residents.

Contributing Factors to Fair Housing Issues

The AI includes a discussion and analysis of the following contributing factors to fair housing issues:

1. Access to financial services
2. Access for persons with disabilities to proficient schools
3. Access to publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities
4. Access to transportation for persons with disabilities
5. Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing
6. Availability of affordable units in a range of sizes
7. Availability, type, frequency, and reliability of public transportation

8. Community opposition
9. Deteriorated and abandoned properties
10. Displacement of and/or lack of housing support for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking
11. Displacement of residents due to economic pressures
12. Impediments to mobility
13. Inaccessible public or private infrastructure
14. Inaccessible government facilities or services
15. Lack of access to opportunity due to high housing costs
16. Lack of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes
17. Lack of affordable in-home or community-based supportive services
18. Lack of affordable, integrated housing for individuals who need supportive services
19. Lack of assistance for housing accessibility modifications
20. Lack of assistance for transitioning from institutional settings to integrated housing
21. Lack of community revitalization strategies
22. Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement
23. Lack of local public fair housing enforcement
24. Lack of local or regional cooperation
25. Lack of meaningful language access for individuals with limited English proficiency
26. Lack of private investment in specific neighborhoods
27. Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities
28. Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations
29. Lack of state or local fair housing laws
30. Land use and zoning laws
31. Lending discrimination
32. Location of accessible housing
33. Location of employers
34. Location of environmental health hazards
35. Location of proficient schools and school assignment policies
36. Location and type of affordable housing
37. Loss of affordable housing
38. Occupancy codes and restrictions
39. Private discrimination
40. Quality of affordable housing information programs
41. Regulatory barriers to providing housing and supportive services for persons with disabilities
42. Siting selection policies, practices, and decisions for publicly supported housing, including discretionary aspects of Qualified Allocation Plans and other programs
43. Source of income discrimination
44. State or local laws, policies, or practices that discourage individuals with disabilities from living in apartments, family homes, supportive housing and other integrated settings
45. Unresolved violations of fair housing or civil rights law

Proposed Goals and Strategies

To address the contributing factors described above, the AI plan proposes the following goals and actions:

Regional Goals and Strategies

Goal 1: Increase the supply of affordable housing in high opportunity areas.

Strategies:

1. Explore the creation of a new countywide affordable housing bond.
2. Using best practices from other jurisdictions, explore policies and programs that increase the supply affordable housing, such as affordable housing trust funds, linkage fees, inclusionary housing, public land set-aside, community land trusts, transit-oriented development, and expedited permitting and review.
3. Explore providing low-interest loans to single-family homeowners and grants to homeowners with household incomes of up to 80% of the Area Median Income to develop accessory dwelling units with affordability restriction on their property.
4. Review existing zoning policies and explore zoning changes to facilitate the development of affordable housing.
5. Align zoning codes to conform to recent California affordable housing legislation.

Goal 2: Prevent displacement of low- and moderate-income residents with protected characteristics, including Hispanic residents, Vietnamese residents, seniors, and people with disabilities.

Strategies:

1. Explore piloting a Right to Counsel Program to ensure legal representation for tenants in landlord-tenant proceedings, including those involving the application of new laws like A.B. 1482.

Goal 3: Increase community integration for persons with disabilities.

Strategies:

1. Conduct targeted outreach and provide tenant application assistance and support to persons with disabilities, including individuals transitioning from institutional settings and individuals who are at risk of institutionalization. As part of that assistance, maintain a database of housing that is accessible to persons with disabilities.
2. Consider adopting the accessibility standards adopted by the City of Los Angeles, which require at least 15 percent of all new units in city-supported Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) projects to be ADA-accessible with at least 4 percent of total units to be accessible for persons with hearing and/or vision disabilities.

Goal 4: Ensure equal access to housing for persons with protected characteristics, who are disproportionately likely to be lower-income and to experience homelessness.

Strategies:

1. Reduce barriers to accessing rental housing by eliminating application fees for voucher holders and encouraging landlords to follow HUD's guidance on the use of criminal backgrounds in screening tenants.
2. Consider incorporating a fair housing equity analysis into the review of significant rezoning proposals and specific plans.

Goal 5: Expand access to opportunity for protected classes.

Strategies:

1. Explore the voluntary adoption of Small Area Fair Market Rents or exception payment standards in order to increase access to higher opportunity areas for Housing Choice Voucher holders.
2. Explore the creation of a mobility counseling program that informs Housing Choice Voucher holders about their residential options in higher opportunity areas and provides holistic supports to voucher holders seeking to move to higher opportunity areas.
3. Study and make recommendations to improve and expand Orange County's public transportation to ensure that members of protected classes can access jobs in job centers in Anaheim, Santa Ana, and Irvine.
4. Increase support for fair housing enforcement, education, and outreach.

<u>The City of La Habra's Goals and Strategies</u>

a. *Explore the creation of an inclusionary housing ordinance to increase the number of affordable housing units.*
b. *Advocate for increasing the minimum percentage of affordable units at Park La Habra Mobile Home and View Park Mobile Home Estates from 20 percent to 50 percent.*

The AI lays out a series of achievable action steps that will help jurisdictions in Orange County to not only meet its obligation to affirmatively fair housing but to continue to be a model for equity and inclusion in Orange County.

III. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION PROCESS

1. Describe outreach activities undertaken to encourage and broaden meaningful community participation in the AI process, including the types of outreach activities and dates of public hearings or meetings. Identify media outlets used and include a description of efforts made to reach the public, including those representing populations that are typically underrepresented in the planning process such as persons who reside in areas identified as R/ECAPs, persons who are limited English proficient (LEP), and persons with disabilities. Briefly explain how these communications were designed to reach the broadest audience possible. For PHAs, identify your meetings with the Resident Advisory Board.

In order to ensure that the analysis contained in an AI truly reflects conditions in a community and that the goals and strategies are targeted and feasible, the participation of a wide range of stakeholders is of critical importance. A broad array of outreach was conducted through community meetings, focus groups, and public hearings.

In preparing this AI, the Lawyers' Committee reached out to tenants, landlords, homeowners, fair housing organizations, civil rights and advocacy organizations, legal services provers, social services providers, housing developers, and industry groups to hear directly about fair housing issues affecting residents of Orange County.

Beginning in October, 2019, the Lawyers' Committee held meetings with individual stakeholders throughout the County. In January and February 2020, evening community meetings were held in Mission Viejo, Westminster/Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and Fullerton. Also in February, the Lawyers' Committee held a focus group with a wide array of nonprofit organizations and government officials.

Geographically specific community meetings were held across Orange County, including the South, West, Central, and North parts of the County. Additional outreach was conducted for members of protected classes, including the Latino and Vietnamese communities. All community meetings had translation services available if requested in Spanish and Vietnamese. In addition, all meetings were held in locations accessible to people with mobility issues. The Executive Summary of the AI will be translated into Spanish and Vietnamese.

Public hearings will be held in throughout the County during the Spring. All written comments received during the 30-day public comment period will be reviewed and either incorporated into the final AI or addressed as to why they were not incorporated in the Community Participation section.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF PAST GOALS, ACTIONS AND STRATEGIES

a. Indicate what fair housing goals were selected by program participant(s) in recent Analyses of Impediments, Assessments of Fair Housing, or other relevant planning documents.

City of Aliso Viejo (the City became an entitlement community in 2018)

Housing Discrimination

- The City of Aliso Viejo contracted with the Fair Housing Foundation and jointly participated in fair housing outreach and education to renters, homebuyers, lenders, and property managers.

Unfair Lending

- The City contracted with the Fair Housing Foundation to identify lenders and transmit findings to HUD and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Discriminatory Advertising

- The City contracted with the Fair Housing Foundation to support efforts to identify online discriminatory advertising and request that Craigslist and the OC register publish fair housing and reasonable accommodation notices.

City of Anaheim

Housing Discrimination

- The City allocated CDBG funds to the Fair Housing Foundation (FHF) to provide fair housing services to the Anaheim residents and operators of rental properties. These services include holding tenant and landlord workshops, counseling, and resolving any housing issues and allegations of discrimination

Reasonable Accommodations

- In June of 2018, the City's Planning and Building Department amended its fee schedule and removed the reasonable accommodations application fee.

Zoning

- Community Development and Planning staff will continue its review of AB 222 and AB 744 and plan to incorporate the necessary standards and provisions into the next zoning code update.

City of Buena Park

Housing Discrimination

- The Fair Housing Foundation (FHF) conducted 4 tenant, 4 landlord and 4 property manager training.
- FHF participated in the Buena Park Collaborative, North Orange County Chamber of Conference, Annual Super Senior Saturday, Buena Park School District Annual Kinder Faire, and the inaugural Open House and Resource Fair.
- FHF addressed 602 "Housing" issues during the report period. The most common issues were notices, habitability, rent increases, security deposits, lease terms, and rights and responsibilities.

Racial and Ethnic Segregation

- FHF provided fair housing literature in both English and Spanish.
- PSAs were aired on the City's cable station.
- Participated in quarterly OCHA (PHA) Housing Advisory Committee meetings.
- The City does not offer homebuyer assistance programs.

Reasonable Accommodations

- FHF provided fair housing related serves to 490 unduplicated households from tenants, landlords and managers, and property owners.
- 33 fair housing allegations were received by FHF. Protected classes included race (8), familial status (1), and mental and physical disability (22). 22 allegations were resolved – 11 cases were opened and 2 are pending. No evidence was found in 4 cases to sustain allegations; however, 4 cases were opened and ultimately resolved via conciliation.
- FHF conducted 3 landlord and 3 certified property managers trainings.
- FHF developed an "Accommodation & Modification 101 Workshop" for housing providers that covers the legal parameters that housing providers need to know in order to make an informed decision when addressing accommodation & modification requests.

Unfair Lending

- The City no longer offers homebuyer assistance. FHF utilizes the City's quarterly magazine to promote housing rehabilitation programs. The magazine is distributed to each housing unit city-wide.

Density Bonus Incentives

- The City's Zoning code was amended to comply with current state density bonus law during prior report period.

City of Costa Mesa

During the report period the City took the following actions in an effort to overcome the impediments to fair housing choice identified in the AI:

Housing Discrimination

- Fair housing services was provided to 902 Costa Mesa households dealing with general housing issues and allegations of discrimination. Over 669 issues, disputes, and/or inquires were addressed. The majority of general housing issues addressed by the FHF included notices, habitability issues, security deposits, and rent increases.
- 65 housing discrimination inquiries were received by the FHF: 9 based on physical or mental disability, 8 related to race, 2 related to national origin, 2 related to gender, 1 related to sexual orientation, and 5 related to familial status. 45 were counseled/resolved, and 15 cases were opened. Investigations found no evidence of discrimination in 9 cases; 2 were inconclusive; and in 4 cases the allegations were sustained and the investigation is pending for 2 cases and resolved for 2 cases.
- The City worked closely with the FHF to provide certified fair housing training for housing industry realtors and property managers – 7 workshops were conducted during the report period. Additionally, 7 tenant and 7 landlord workshops were conducted in Costa Mesa.

Racial and Ethnic Segregation

- Literature related to fair housing were distributed at these events, at City Hall, community centers, and community events. Literature was provided to the community in English, Spanish and Vietnamese. City staff distributed large numbers of this literature in target neighborhoods in conjunction with other neighborhood improvement efforts.

Reasonable Accommodations

- FHF developed an "Accommodation & Modification 101 Workshop" for housing providers that covers the legal parameters that housing providers need to know in order to make an informed decision when addressing accommodation and modification requests.

Unfair Lending

- The City does not offer homebuyer assistance. Housing Rehab programs are marketed citywide in English and Spanish.

Density Bonus Incentive

- The City's Zone Codes are compliant with current State density bonus laws.

City of Fountain Valley

Housing Discrimination

- Fair housing outreach and training, general counseling and referrals, and testing/audits provided by Fair Housing Council of Orange County (FHCOC).

Racial and Ethnic Segregation

- Fair housing services, education/outreach, and testing in areas of racial/ethnic concentrations provided by FHCOC.
- Grants, rebates and loans are available to low-income, owner-occupied households for repair and rehabilitation through the City's Home Improvement Program.
- The zoning code was updated in 2018 to remain consistent with the California density bonus law.
- The city and FHCOC provide fair housing and neighborhood improvement program information in multiple languages.
- Housing rehabilitation programs are marketed to low income households which include areas of racial/ethnic concentration

Reasonable Accommodations

- Fair housing education and information on reasonable modifications/accommodations are provided to apartment managers and homeowners association by FHCOC.

Discriminatory Advertising

- FHCOC periodically monitors local newspapers and online media outlets to identify potentially discriminatory housing advertisements.

Unfair Lending

- Housing rehabilitation programs are marketed to low income households which include high minority concentrations and limited English speaking proficiency areas.

Zoning

- Fountain Valley's Zoning Code was updated in 2016 to treat transitional and supportive housing as a residential use, subject to the same standards as other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.

Density Bonus Incentives

- Fountain Valley's Zoning Code was updated in 2018 to continually remain consistent with State density bonus law.

City of Fullerton

Addressing cost burden**:** To relieve the cost of rent, the City operates a rental assistance program for seniors over 55. Programs have assisted seniors living in mobile homes (53 residents) and seniors renting residential units (58 residents). The program was expanded to assist senior veterans renting citywide.

New construction: Compass Ross Apartments provides 46 affordable units ranging from one to 3 bedrooms in the Richman Park area.

New construction: Ventana Apartments offers one and two-bedrooms units for low-income seniors. The facility is central to dining, retail and local entertainment. Several amenities are offered including a fitness center and social activities.

Addressing affordable homeownership**:** The City in collaboration with Habitat for Humanity will provide 12 new housing units with affordability restrictions on the property.

Addressing accessibility**:** Fullerton Heights Apartments were developed with 24 affordable/accessible unit for special needs residence with mental disabilities. Units range from one to three bedrooms. The units sit on top of 2,000 square feet of commercial use which is proposed to provide services such as food/coffee that will be easily accessible to the residents. In addition, the facility offers amenities such as laundry facilities, computer lab, and community areas including a garden and large kitchen area that encourages socialization amongst the tenants and their extended families. Accessibility to transit is within 1.2 miles offering bus and train service.

Addressing fair housing/discrimination: All developers and landlords of affordable housing projects in the City are invited to workshops related to fair housing and must provide a Housing Plan to the City. The Plan states that all applications will be reviewed without bias and all applicants will be treated equally. In addition, Fair Housing flyers are provided in multiple languages to the apartment sites.

General fair housing related literature and workshop advertisement was available at City Hall, the Library, community centers, and community events. The lists below summarize accomplishments from July 1, 2015 – January 31, 2020. The accomplishments are summarized as follows: 1) the workshops provide by the Fair Housing Foundation and the number of participants at each workshop, 2) the types of clients and the number of clients in each category (totaling 1,128 unduplicated individuals), and 3) the types of cases and the number of cases in each category.

WORKSHOPS

Fullerton Agency Meetings**:**

- Fullerton Agencies: 3,737

Fullerton Mobile Home Tenant Meetings**:**

- Rancho La Paz Community Meeting: 100 Fullerton residents

Workshops**:** Held at Fullerton Public Library

- Tenant's Rights Workshop: 44
- Certificate Management Training: 70
- Landlord Rights Workshop: 32
- Tester Training: 6
- City Staff Tenant Landlord Training: 20

- Accommodations and Modifications 101 Workshop: 2
- Walk-In Clinic: 13
- Rental Counseling: 12
- Fair Housing Workshop: 10

CLIENTS
- In-Place Tenant: 904
- Landlord/Management: 81
- Other: 58
- Property Owner: 61
- Rental Home Seeker: 14
- Community Organization: 5
- Realtor: 5

CASES
- Familial Status: 3
- Mental Disability: 6
- Physical Disability: 2
- Race: 6
- Age: 1
- National Origin: 1

Land Use: City amended SB 2 Zone and Density Bonus Incentives

City of Garden Grove

Housing Discrimination
- In partnership with the Fair Housing Foundation, the City conducted multi-faceted fair housing outreach to tenants, landlords, property owners, realtors, and property management companies. Methods of outreach included workshops, informational booths at community events, presentations to community groups, staff trainings, and distribution of multi-lingual fair housing literature.
- Conducted focused outreach and education to small property owners/landlords on fair housing, and race, reasonable accommodation and familial status issues in particular. Conducted property manager trainings on a regular basis, targeting managers of smaller properties, and promoted fair housing certificate training.
- Provided general counseling and referrals to address tenant-landlord issues and provided periodic tenant-landlord walk-in clinics at City Hall and other community locations.

Racial and Ethnic Segregation
- Coordinated with the Fair Housing Foundation to focus fair housing services, education/outreach, and/or additional testing in identified areas of racial/ethnic concentrations.

- Offered a variety of housing opportunities to enhance mobility among residents of all races and ethnicities. Facilitate the provision of affordable housing throughout the community through: 1) available financial assistance; 2) flexible development standards; 3) density bonuses; and 4) other zoning tools.
- Promoted equal access to information on the availability of affordable housing by providing information in multiple languages, and through methods that have proven successful in outreaching to the community, particularly those hard-to-reach groups.
- Affirmatively marketed first-time homebuyer and/or housing rehabilitation programs to low- and moderate-income areas, and areas of racial/ethnic concentration.
- Worked collaboratively with local housing authorities to ensure affirmative fair marketing plans and de-concentration policies were implemented.

Reasonable Accommodations

- In partnership with the Fair Housing Foundation, continued to provide fair housing education and information to apartment managers and homeowner associations on why denial of reasonable modifications/accommodations is unlawful.

Discriminatory Advertising

- In partnership with the Fair Housing Foundation, periodically monitored local newspapers and online media outlets to identify potentially discriminatory housing advertisements.
- Took steps to encourage the Orange County Register to publish a Fair Housing Notice and a "no pets" disclaimer that indicates rental housing owners must provide reasonable accommodations, including "service animals" and "companion animals" for disabled persons.

Hate Crimes

- Continued to coordinate with various City and County housing, building and safety, health and sanitation, law enforcement and legal aid offices to offer support services for victims of hate crimes or other violent crimes – inclusive of housing resources.

Unfair Lending

- In partnership with the Fair Housing Foundation, identified potential issues regarding redlining, predatory lending and other illegal lending activities. In addition, the City reviewed agreements annually to make sure that increased and comprehensive services are being provided, and that education and outreach efforts are expanded and affirmatively marketed in low and moderate income and racial concentrated areas.
- Collaborated with local lenders and supported lenders' efforts to work with community groups to help minority households purchase their homes. Ensured that minority groups have access and knowledge of City programs, supportive services, and provide for networking opportunities with these groups.
- Coordinated with local lenders to expand outreach efforts to first time homebuyers in minority neighborhoods.

- Affirmatively marketed first-time homebuyer and/or housing rehabilitation programs in neighborhoods with high denial rates, high minority population concentrations and limited English-speaking proficiency to help increase loan approval rates.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities

- The City has adopted formal policies and procedures in the Municipal Code to reasonably accommodate the housing needs of disabled residents.

Zoning Regulations

- The City has an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance that allows for the production in all residential zones.
- Single-Room Occupancy Housing: the City has specific provisions for SROs in our Zoning Ordinances and has clarified in our Housing Elements how SROs are provided for under other zoning classifications.
- Transitional/Supportive Housing: the City has ordinances and development standards that allow transitional and supportive housing in the manner prescribed by State law, regulated as a residential use and subject to the same permitting and standards as similar residential uses of the same type in the same zone.

Density Bonus Incentives

- The City is amending the Zoning Code to reflect current State density bonus law.

City of Huntington Beach

Housing Discrimination

- The City's Code Enforcement staff provides fair housing information and referrals to tenants in the field.

Racial and Ethnic Segregation

- The City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance allows for developers to be eligible for reduced City fees if projects exceed the minimum (10%) inclusionary requirements on-site.
- In early 2020, the City established an Affordable Housing Overlay within the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan that allows for ministerial (by-right) project approval and other development incentives for projects providing a minimum of 20% of the total units affordable to lower income households on-site.
- Since 2016, the City has approved four density bonus projects.
- In fiscal year 2015/16, the City established a tenant based rental assistance program (TBRA); program assistance includes security deposit and rental assistance paid directly to the landlord as well as housing relocation and stabilization services, case managements, outreach, housing search and placement, legal services, and financial management/credit repair.

Density Bonus Incentives

- The City of Huntington Beach has not updated its zoning code to reflect current state regarding density bonus. However, practically speaking, the City has implemented the state law regarding density bonus.
- Since 2016, the City has received four density bonus requests; all four projects were approved. All four projects were reviewed for compliance with state density bonus law (including the two that have not been incorporated into the City's zoning code).

City of Irvine

Housing Discrimination

- The City provided general housing services to address tenant-landlord issues.
- The City provided fair housing education services in Irvine, including informational booths at community events, overview presentations to community-based organizations, resident associations and government agencies and more detailed workshops tailored to specific audiences such as housing consumers or housing providers.
- The City and its fair housing provider, Fair Housing Foundation, investigated all allegations of housing discrimination to determine if discrimination has occurred and continue advising complainants of their rights and options under the law.

Discriminatory Advertising

- The City monitored local newspapers and online media outlets periodically to identify potentially discriminatory housing advertisements. When identified, contact the individual or firm and provide fair housing education with the goal of eliminating this practice.
- The City, through its fair housing provider, provided fair housing education services in Irvine, including the Certificate Management Training Certificate Management training classes for property owners, managers, management companies and real estate professionals.

Reasonable Accommodations

- The City provided fair housing education workshops such as the "Accommodation and Modification 101 Workshop" to Irvine housing providers on an annual basis.
- The City provided access to Certificate Management classes for rental property owners and managers from Irvine on an annual basis.

Hate Crimes

- Continue to monitor FBI data to determine if there are actions that may be taken by the City or its fair housing service provider to address potential discrimination linked to the bias motivations of hate crimes.
- Continue to coordinate with various City and County housing, building and safety, health and sanitation, law enforcement and legal aid offices to maintain a comprehensive referral list of support services for victims of hate crimes or other violent crimes – inclusive of housing resources.

Unfair Lending

- The City monitors Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data to determine if there are significant shifts in the approval rates for applicants of different race or ethnicities from year to year.
- The City provided/participated in homebuyer workshops in Irvine or the Orange County region to educate potential homebuyers on their rights under the Fair Housing Act with respect to lenders and fair lending practices.

City of Laguna Niguel

Fair Housing Education

- FHCOC regionally conducted/participated in 10 education and outreach activities in Laguna Niguel, reaching a culturally and ethnically diverse audience.
- 85 residents were made aware of fair housing laws and counseling services.
- 2 landlord and 3 tenant workshops on fair housing were held in Laguna Niguel.
- 4 workshops were conducted for consumers and providers in Laguna Nigel.
- The FHCOC produced and provided written fair housing related materials in English, Spanish and Vietnamese to the City of Laguna Niguel.

Fair Housing Enforcement

- FHOC staff received 10 allegations of housing discrimination and opened 3 cases involving Laguna Niguel. FHCOC also conducted 18 paired, on-site, systemic tests for discriminatory rental housing practices in Laguna Niguel.
- Housing Dispute Evaluation & Resolution –FHOC assisted 367 unduplicated households involving 1,151 issues from Laguna Niguel.

Reasonable Accommodations

- 3 inquiries regarding reasonable accommodations and modifications were received by FHCOC that resulted in casework beyond basic counseling.

Web-based Outreach

- FHCOC's multi-language website currently has an on-line housing discrimination complaint-reporting tool that generates an email to FHCOC. It is also used for other, non-discrimination, housing-related issues. The City of Laguna Niguel has a link to the FHCOC website where residents can access this information.

Discriminatory Advertising

- Orange County rentals listed on Craigslist were monitored by FHCOC for discriminatory content (as permitted by staffing limitations). Discriminatory advertisements were flagged and FHCOC responded to these ads in order to inform the poster of possible discriminatory content. FHCOC also brought these ads to the attention of Craigslist via abuse@craigslist.org, or in some cases, the ad was referred to FHCOC's investigators for possible enforcement action. Other on-line rental sites (e.g., OC Register, LA Times) were sporadically monitored; however, the lack of a text search function made monitoring of other sites less efficient. Without exception, identified problematic postings indicated restrictions with regard to children under the age of 18 or improper preference for seniors

or ‘older adults’ for housing opportunities that did not appear qualify as housing for older persons (age 55 and over).

City of La Habra

Housing Discrimination

- La Habra worked with the Fair Housing Foundation (FHF) and previously worked with Fair Housing Council of Orange County to provide education and outreach activities, trainings to owners and managers, general counseling and referrals, and tenant-landlord walk-in clinics.

Racial and Ethnic Segregation

- La Habra has a grant/loan program available for low-income residents to receive assistance in the rehabilitation of owner-occupied properties.
- La Habra’s Zone Codes allow for use of density bonus in order to encourage developers to include units with restricted rents or reduced sales prices for low and moderate-income households.
- La Habra along with the Fair Housing Council of Orange County (2015) and the Fair Housing Foundation (2016-current) provides information in both English and Spanish. La Habra also provides bilingual pay to employees that speak other non-English languages. Finally, La Habra has a contract with Links Sign Language & Interpreting Service to provide translation service for languages in which bilingual staff cannot provide in house including American Sign Language.
- La Habra participates in the Cities Advisory Committee hosted by Orange County Housing Authority to discuss housing issues and housing choice vouchers within the County.
- Although La Habra does not have a down payment assistance program, residents are referred to NeighborWorks of Orange County for down payment assistance.
- La Habra also hosted a homebuyer education workshop with NeighborWorks of Orange County to provide education and training to first-time homebuyers, lenders and realtors. These workshops are marketed to areas of racial/ethnic concentrations within La Habra.

Reasonable Accommodations

- La Habra worked with Fair Housing Council of Orange County and now the Fair Housing Foundation to conduct seminars on reasonable accommodation. n=during Fiscal Year 2015 to provide these services. During Fiscal Year 2016 until current, Fair Housing Foundation provides these services for La Habra.

Discriminatory Advertising

- La Habra worked with both Fair Housing Council of Orange County and the Fair Housing Foundation to monitor local newspapers and online media outlets to identify potentially discriminatory housing advertisements.

Unfair Lending

- La Habra worked with NeighborWorks of Orange County to market first-time homebuyers counseling and other programs. NeighborWorks also provides lender trainings so that lenders make loans available to minorities and limited English-speaking persons.

Density Bonus Incentives

- La Habra's Density Bonus Ordinance was updated in 2010, and per City Attorney, the City's Ordinance remains consistent with State density bonus law.

City of Lake Forest

Fair Housing Education

- FHCOC conducted/participated in 78 education and outreach activities. Individuals were made aware of fair housing laws and services
- 3 landlord and 5 tenant workshops on fair housing were held in Lake Forest.

Fair Housing Enforcement

- FHCOC received 11 allegations of housing discrimination and opened 4 case involved Lake Forest. FHCOC also conducted 18 paired, on-site, systemic tests for discriminatory rental housing practices in Lake Forest.
- Housing Dispute Evaluation & Resolution –FHCOC assisted 314 unduplicated households address 983 issues from Lake Forest.

Reasonable Accommodations

- 1 inquiry regarding reasonable accommodations and modifications was received by FHCOC.
- 4 landlord & 6 tenant fair housing workshops were held in Lake Forest. Topics covered included information regarding reasonable modifications/accommodations.

Web-based Outreach

- FHCOC's multi-language website has an online housing discrimination complaint-reporting tool that generates. The City has a link to the FHCOC website where residents can access this information.

Monitoring Advertising

- A limited number of Orange County rentals listed on Craigslist were monitored by FHCOC. Discriminatory ads were flagged and FHCOC informed the poster of possible discriminatory content. FHCOC also brought ads to the attention of Craigslist or referred the ad to FHCOC's investigators for possible action. Other on-line sites (OC Register, LA Times) were sporadically monitored. Problematic postings indicated restrictions regarding children under the age of 18 or improper preference for seniors for housing that did not appear qualified as housing for persons age 55 and over.

Unfair Lending

- Monitor Home Mortgage Disclosure Act Data – analysis of 2008 HMDA data was included in the 2010-2015 Regional AI. Although subsequent data was available, lack of resources prevented FHCOC from updating the analysis. Analyses of HMDA data from 2008 to 2013, and other mortgage lending practices, were included in the 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional AI, in which Lake Forest was a participant.

Racial and Ethnic Segregation

- FHCOC produced and disseminated written fair housing related materials in English, Spanish and Vietnamese to the City of Lake Forest. Materials were placed in public areas of City Hall. FHCOC also took specific outreach efforts to immigrant populations in low-income neighborhoods.
- Under its Fair Housing Initiatives Program grant, FHCOC targeted fair housing services to the disabled, minority groups, and limited English proficiency immigrants.
- Through its foreclosure prevention activities FHCOC assisted individuals with limited English proficiency.

City of Mission Viejo

During the report period the City took the following actions in an effort to overcome the impediments to fair housing choice identified in the AI:

- The City's website provides links to the City's fair housing provider.
- The City continued to collaborate with the Fair Housing Foundation (FHF) to ensure comprehensive fair housing outreach is carried out in the community and to affirmatively market services:
    - Fair housing services was provided to 292 Mission Viejo households dealing with general housing issues and allegations of discrimination.
    - 10 housing discrimination inquiries were received by the FHF. 4 inquires alleged discrimination based on a physical disability, 1 based on a mental disability, 1 based on race, 3 based on national origin, and 1 based on gender discrimination. 8 cases

were counseled and resolved, but 2 cases were opened. Upon further investigation, 2 case were closed due to a lack of evidence. With respect to general housing issues addressed by the FHF, the majority of housing issues related rights and responsibilities, notices, and habitability issues.

- The City worked closely with the FHF to provide certified fair housing training for housing industry realtors and property managers – 6 workshops were conducted during the report period. Additionally, 10 tenant and 10 landlord workshops were conducted in Mission Viejo. Additionally, four Fair Housing Walk-in Clinics were held in the City during the report period. Literature related to fair housing were distributed at these events, at City Hall, community centers, and community events. Literature was provided to the community in English and Spanish.
- Due to the loss of significant revenue (e.g., redevelopment) and continued reductions in HUD funding, the City did not have the opportunity to collaborate with local lenders to target marketing efforts and services in Low- and Moderate-Income areas of the City.
- The consultant preparing the updated multi-jurisdictional AI provided technical assistance to cities that had identified public sector impediments such as:
  - Family definition inconsistent with fair housing laws;
  - Lack of a definition of disability;
  - Lack of a reasonable accommodation procedure;
  - Lack of zoning regulations for special needs housing;
  - Lack of a fair housing discussion in zoning and planning documents.

City of Rancho Santa Margarita

<u>Fair Housing Outreach and Education</u>

- FHCOC held one education and outreach activity in Rancho Santa Margarita (RSM), reaching a culturally and ethnically diverse audience.

<u>Fair Housing Enforcement</u>

- FHCOC staff received 6 allegations of housing discrimination and opened 4 cases involved housing in RSM. FHCOC also conducted 6 paired, on-site, systemic tests for discriminatory rental housing practices in RSM.

<u>Housing Dispute Evaluation & Resolution</u>

- Services provided by FHCOC included assisting approximately 188 unduplicated hRancho Santa Margarita households.

<u>Racial and Ethnic Segregation</u>

- Literature regarding fair housing was distributed in English, Spanish & Vietnamese.
- FHCOC's website has an online housing discrimination complaint reporting tool that generates an email to FHCOC. It is also used for other, non-discrimination, housing-related issues. RSM has a link to the FHCOC website where residents can access this information.

- The City does not offer homebuyer assistance programs. Housing rehabilitation programs are advertised citywide.
- City attended quarterly meetings the OCHA to discuss a variety of housing issues and assisted housing policies – FHCOC staff also attends quarterly meetings.

Reasonable Accommodations

- On a regional basis, 53 inquiries regarding reasonable accommodations and modifications were received by FHCOC that resulted in casework beyond basic counseling, including 1 from RSM. 8 households received accommodations. FHCOC assisted those denied an accommodation by filing an administrative housing discrimination complaint with the HUD Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. None of these cases involved RSM residents or properties.
- 1 fair housing workshop was held in RSM. Topics covered included information regarding reasonable modifications/accommodations.

Web-based Outreach

- FHCOC's multi-language website currently has an on-line housing discrimination complaint-reporting tool that generates an email to FHCOC. The City of Rancho Santa Margarita has a link to the FHCOC website where residents can access this information.

Monitoring On-line Advertising

- As permitted by staffing limitations, Orange County rentals listed on Craigslist were monitored by FHCOC for discriminatory content. Discriminatory advertisements were flagged and brought to the attention of Craigslist. Some ads were referred to FHCOC's investigators for possible enforcement action. Other on-line rental sites (e.g., OC Register, LA Times) were intermittently monitored. Without exception, problematic postings indicated restrictions regarding children under the age of 18 or improper preference for 'older adults' for housing opportunities that did not appear qualify as housing for individuals age 55 plus.

Unfair Lending

- FHCOC reports that ongoing monitoring of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data continues to be infeasible due to limited resources. Analysis of updated HMDA data from 2008 to 2013, as well as other mortgage lending practices, was included part of the 16 Orange County Cities Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (2015), in which the City of RSM was a participant.
- Presently, the City of RSM does not offer homebuyer assistance programs; however, program staff provides referrals to the Orange County Affordable Housing Clearinghouse and NeighborWorks Orange County.
- FHCOC continued efforts to promote housing affordability within Orange County. It provided services and outreach to organizations involved in the creation and preservation of affordable housing. These groups included the Kennedy Commission, Mental Health Association of Orange County, AIDS Services Foundation, Affordable Housing

Clearinghouse, Jamboree Housing Corporation, Orange County Congregations Community Organizations, and Orange County Community Housing Corporation.

Density Bonus Incentives

- City Planning staff has confirmed that current zoning code is consistent with current State density bonus law.

City of San Clemente

Housing Discrimination

- The Fair Housing Foundation (FHF) provided fair housing services to 261 San Clemente households, most of whom were Hispanic. Issues included housing discrimination, notices received, habitability issues, security deposit disputes, and lease terms.
- 5 housing discrimination inquiries were received and investigated, 4 related to physical or mental disability discrimination and 1 related to marital status. 2 were resolved, 2 cases were opened and then resolved.
- FHF provided 4 property management trainings, 4 landlord trainings, 3 tenant workshops, and 4 walk-in clinics.
- FHF participated in 11 community events.

Racial and Ethnic Segregation

- FHF provided fair housing literature in both English and Spanish.
- PSAs were aired on the City's cable station.
- Participated in quarterly OCHA (PHA) Housing Advisory Committee meetings.

Reasonable Accommodations

- FHF conducted 3 landlord and 3 certified property managers trainings.

City of Santa Ana

Housing Discrimination

- In partnership with the Orange County Fair Housing Council, Inc., the City conducted multi-faceted fair housing outreach to tenants, landlords, property owners, realtors, and property management companies on an annual basis. Methods of outreach included workshops, informational booths, presentations to civic leaders and community groups, staff trainings, and distribution of multi-lingual fair housing literature.
    - The City contracted with the Orange County Fair Housing Council for up to $60,000 per year from 2015-2019 to conduct this outreach. The funds came from the City's administrative funds for the implementation of the CDBG Program.
- The City conducted focused outreach to small property owners/ landlords; conducted property manager trainings on an annual basis and promoted fair housing certificate training.
    - The City held an annual property manager training in February or March of each year.

    - The City sent information on fair housing to property owners and managers who participate in the Housing Choice Voucher Program.
    - In August of each year, the City provided an annual mandatory training on fair housing for all employees in the City's Housing Division in partnership with the Orange County Fair Housing Council.
- The City provided tenant counseling and referrals to address specific tenant-landlord issues.
    - Fair Housing programs and resources were included in all voucher issuance briefings and reasonable accommodation tracking logs updated. Communication was maintained with the Orange County Fair Housing Council, Public Law Center, and Legal Aid, to ensure proper referrals for anyone alleging discrimination.
    - A new DVD on Fair Housing was implemented for all voucher issuance meetings.

<u>Racial and Ethnic Segregation</u>

- The City coordinated with the Orange County Fair Housing Council to focus fair housing services, education/outreach, and additional testing in areas of racial/ethnic concentrations.
    - In addition to its fair housing services funded by the City, the Orange County Fair Housing Council, engaged in additional work to affirmatively further fair housing through its HUD Fair Housing Initiative Program (FHIP) enforcement and education and outreach grants.
    - The City provided an annual mandatory training on fair housing for all employees in the City's Housing Division in partnership with the Orange County Fair Housing Council.
- The City offered a variety of housing opportunities to enhance mobility among residents of all races and ethnicities. The City facilitated the provision of affordable housing throughout the community through: 1) the provision of financial assistance; 2) approving flexible development standards; 3) approving density bonuses; and 4) other zoning tools.
    - In regards to the provision of financial assistance, the City provided rental assistance through the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Specifically:
        - The City administered over $30 million per year in funding from HUD for the Housing Choice Voucher Program. The City also administered additional funding and vouchers as discussed below.
        - In FY 2018, SAHA received an award of 75 HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Project-Based Vouchers (HUD-VASH PBVs) under PIH Notice 2016-11. Following the award, SAHA issued an RFP and awarded the 75 HUD-VASH PBVs to Jamboree Housing for the development of Santa Ana Veterans Village. The Santa Ana Veterans Village is the development of 75 permanent supportive housing units in the City of Santa Ana for homeless veterans. The project includes an investment of 75 HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Project-Based Vouchers from the Santa Ana Housing Authority and $477,345 in HOME Investment Partnerships Program funds. The 62,248 square foot development will provide 70 one-bedroom units and 6 two-bedroom units (of which one will be a manager's unit) serving HUD-VASH eligible residents earning at or below 30% of the Area Median Income. All residents will receive wrap-around supportive services from the Department of

Veterans Affairs and Step Up on Second as the service provider. Following the execution of the PBV HAP Contract with Jamboree for this project, the Annual Contributions Contract for SAHA was increased from 2,699 to 2,774.

- On October 9, 2017, SAHA submitted a Registration of Interest for one hundred (100) HUD-VASH vouchers in response to PIH Notice 2017-17. In FY 2019, SAHA, received an award of 100 HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Project-Based Vouchers (HUD-VASH PBVs) under PIH Notice 2017-17 and an additional award of 105 HUD-VASH tenant-based vouchers under PIH Notice 2018-07. Following the award of HUD-VASH PBVs under PIH Notice 2017-17, SAHA issued an RFP and committed the 100 HUD-VASH PBVs to three affordable housing projects including: 8 HUD-VASH PBVs committed to National CORE for the development of the Legacy Square project which will include 93 total units of which 33 will be permanent supportive housing; 3 HUD-VASH PBVs committed to HomeAid Orange County for the development of the FX Residences project which will include 11 units of permanent supportive housing; and 89 HUD-VASH PBVs committed to Jamboree Housing for the rehabilitation of the North Harbor Village project to create 89 permanent supportive housing units for qualified and eligible homeless veterans. In September 2018, SAHA also received an award of 50 Mainstream Vouchers following a competitive application process under 2017 Mainstream Voucher Program NOFA FR-6100-N-43.
- In November 2019, SAHA received an additional award of seventy (70) Mainstream Vouchers following a competitive application process under the Mainstream Voucher Program NOFA FR-6300-N-43. In November 2019, SAHA also received an award of twenty-five (25) Foster Youth to Independence Tenant-Protection Vouchers following a competitive application process under Notice PIH 2019 -20.

- In regards to financial assistance, flexible development standards, density bonuses; and other zoning tools, the City approved various forms of financial assistance (Housing Successor Agency, CDBG, HOME, Project-Based Vouchers, Inclusionary Housing Funds) and variances to development standards and density bonus agreements for the following affordable housing projects:

First Street Apartments (1440 E. First Street)

Developer	AMCAL Multi-Housing, LLC.
Description	Demolition and new construction of an affordable multifamily apartment complex consisting of 68 units of rental housing serving very-low and extremely-low income families, and 1 manager's unit.
City Funds	Housing Successor Agency ($8,522,740)

Santa Ana Arts Collective (1666 N. Main Street)

Developer	Meta Housing Corporation
Description	Acquisition, adaptive reuse and new construction project comprised of 57 affordable rental units designated for professional artists of all disciplines, and 1 manager's unit. Permanent supportive housing for 15 units will be funded by MHSA/SNHP funds from the County of Orange.
City Funds	Inclusionary Housing ($4,775,000), HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) ($2,627,631), Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) ($500,000)

Santa Ana Veterans Village (3312 W. First Street)

Developer	Jamboree Housing Corporation
Description	New construction of an affordable multifamily apartment complex consisting of 75 units of permanent supportive housing with wrap-around supportive services for HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) eligible homeless veterans and 1 manager's unit.
City Funds	Seventy-five (75) HUD-VASH Project-Based Vouchers, HOME-CHDO ($477,345.90)

Aqua Housing (317 E. 17th Street)

Developer	Community Development Partners with Mercy House as the service provider
Description	Acquisition, demolition and new construction of a former motel yielding 56 units of affordable permanent supportive housing with wrap-around supportive services for chronically homeless individuals and 1 manager's unit. 28 of the 56 units will be funded by MHSA/SNHP funds from the County of Orange.
City Funds	Fifty-six (56) Project-Based Vouchers (PBVs)

Tiny Tim Plaza (2239 West 5th Street)

Developer	Community Development Partners
Description	New construction of an affordable multifamily apartment complex consisting of 50 units of rental housing serving very-low and extremely-low income families, and 1 manager's unit.
City Funds	Inclusionary Housing ($1,300,000), Housing Successor Agency ($4,700,000)

Crossroads at Washington (1126 and 1146 E. Washington Avenue)

Developer	Related Companies of California with A Community of Friends (ACOF) as the service provider
Description	New construction of a 100% affordable multifamily apartment complex consisting of 85 units of rental housing and 1 manager's unit. All units will be

	affordable to households earning less than 30% AMI of which 43 units will be set-aside for permanent supportive housing.
City Funds	HOME Investment Partnerships Program ($3,007,489), Neighborhood Stabilization Program ($963,951), sixty-two (62) year ground lease agreement for 1126 and 1146 E. Washington Avenue (Appraised Value as of September 22, 2019: $4,108,136)

Legacy Square (609 North Spurgeon Street)

Developer	National Community Renaissance with Mercy House as the service provider
Description	New construction of a 100% affordable multifamily apartment complex consisting of 92 units of rental housing and 1 manager's unit. All units will be affordable to households earning less than 60% AMI of which 33 units will be set-aside for permanent supportive housing.
City Funds	Inclusionary Housing ($3,170,547) and eight (8) HUD-VASH PBVs

- In addition, the City also approved a Density Bonus Agreement for each of the following affordable housing projects:
  - Villa Court Senior Apartments – a 418-unit affordable rental project at 2222 East First Street.
  - First Point I and II - a 552-unit affordable rental project at 2110, 2114, and 2020 East First Street
  - First American – a 220-unit residential project which will include 11 affordable units at 114 and 117 East Fifth Street.
  - A Density Bonus Agreement was also approved for the Legacy Square project mentioned above – a 92-unit affordable rental project at 609 North Spurgeon Street.
- The City promoted equal access to information on the availability of affordable housing by providing information in multiple languages, and through methods that have proven successful in outreaching to the community, particularly those hard-to-reach groups.
  - The City provided this information in the office, on it's website and in informational materials provided to residents.
- The City affirmatively marketed first-time homebuyer and/or housing rehabilitation programs to low- and moderate-income areas, and areas of racial/ethnic concentration.
  - The City held a first-time homebuyer workshop on a quarterly basis and promoted the information widely to all residents in the City.
- The City worked collaboratively with local housing authorities to ensure affirmative fair marketing plans and de-concentration policies are implemented.
  - The City convened a quarterly meeting of local housing authorities to discuss efforts and initiatives to reduce homelessness.

<u>Reasonable Accommodations</u>

- Through the Orange County Fair Housing Council, Inc., the City continued to provide fair housing education and information to apartment managers and homeowner associations on why denial of necessary reasonable modifications/accommodations is unlawful.

- The City held an annual property manager training in February or March of each year.
- The City sent information on fair housing to property owners and managers who participate in the Housing Choice Voucher Program.
- The City provided an annual mandatory training on fair housing for all employees in the City's Housing Division in partnership with the Orange County Fair Housing Council.
- Through its HUD Fair Housing Initiative Program (FHIP) grant Orange County Fair Housing Council actively assists disabled persons in requesting and obtaining reasonable accommodations or modifications.

Discriminatory Advertising

- Through a contract with the Orange County Fair Housing Council, the City periodically monitored local print publications and online platforms to identify potentially discriminatory housing advertisements. When identified, the Orange County Fair Housing Council contacted the individual or firm and provided fair housing education or took appropriate enforcement action.

Hate Crimes

- The City monitored FBI data to determine if any hate crimes are housing-related and if there are actions that may be taken by the City. The Orange County Fair Housing Council was available to address any possible issues of housing discrimination linked to the bias motivations of hate crimes.
- The City coordinated with various City and County housing, building and safety, health and sanitation, law enforcement and legal aid offices to maintain a comprehensive referral list of support services for victims of hate crimes or other violent crimes –inclusive of housing resources.
    - For FY 2016, the Santa Ana Housing Authority (SAHA):
        - Updated the definition of the Violence Against Women Act to include sexual assault.
        - Coordinated with the County of Orange Domestic Violence office for referrals and to ensure applicants and participants are informed on all available services.
        - Provided information on VAWA in regards to owner/tenant responsibilities and evictions to all program applicants and participants and also mailed to all owners.
        - SAHA's HCV Administrative Plan details restrictions on terminating assistance for victims of domestic violence, as well as guidelines on terminating assistance for perpetrators of domestic violence.
        - SAHA discussed VAWA with staff at least once annually.
    - For FY 2017, FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020, SAHA:
        - In accordance with the Violence against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (VAWA 2013), SAHA implemented an Emergency Transfer Plan for Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, or Stalking.

- Implemented HUD-5380, Notice of Occupancy Rights under the Violence Against Women Act, HUD-5382, Certification of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, or Stalking, and Alternate Documentation, and HUD-5383, Emergency Transfer Request for Certain Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, or Stalking.
- Coordinated with the County of Orange Domestic Violence office for referrals and to ensure applicants and participants are informed on all available services.
- Provided information on VAWA in regards to owner/tenant responsibilities and evictions to all program applicants and participants; e-mailed the information to all owners.
- SAHA trained staff on VAWA at least once annually. Staff also proactively provided information on VAWA to any program participant or applicant who may show any evidence that information on VAWA is needed.

Unfair Lending

- As resources permitted, the City monitored HMDA data annually using the 2013 HMDA analysis as a benchmark.
- The City, through its contract with the Orange County Fair Housing Council, had access to resources to identify and/or address any potential issues regarding redlining, predatory lending and other illegal lending activities. Through HUD-funded enforcement activities, Orange County Fair Housing Council has engaged in regional paired pre-application testing to uncover possibly discriminatory mortgage lending practices. In addition, the city reviewed their agreements annually to make sure that increased and comprehensive services are being provided, and that education and outreach efforts are expanded and affirmatively marketed in low and moderate income and racial concentrated areas.
- The City ensured that minority groups have access and knowledge of City programs, supportive services by providing information as widely as possible to the community in multiple languages.
- The City coordinate with local lenders to expand outreach efforts to first time homebuyers in minority neighborhoods by providing quarterly workshops to first time homebuyers in partnership with NeighborWorks Orange County.
- The City affirmatively marketed first-time homebuyer and/or housing rehabilitation programs in neighborhoods with high denial rates, high minority population concentrations and limited English speaking proficiency to help increase loan approval rates by providing quarterly workshops to first time homebuyers in partnership with NeighborWorks Orange County and providing information as widely as possible to the community in multiple languages.

Zoning Codes

- The City complied with current State density bonus law even though the municipal code was not updated to reflect current State law for the following projects:
    - Villa Court Senior Apartments – a 418-unit affordable rental project at 2222 East First Street.

- First Point I and II – a 552-unit affordable rental project at 2110, 2114, and 2020 East First Street
- First American – a 220-unit residential project which will include 11 affordable units at 114 and 117 East Fifth Street.
- Legacy Square – a 92-unit affordable rental project at 609 North Spurgeon Street.

City of Tustin

Housing Discrimination

- Although the 2015-2020 AI documentation refers to the Fair Housing Council of OC to provide fair housing assistance, the City of Tustin contracts with the Fair Housing Foundation to provide such services. During the 2018-2019 Fiscal Year, the Fair Housing Foundation assisted the City of Tustin with combatting housing discrimination through managing twelve (12) allegation cases and one (1) discrimination case for Tustin residents, providing services to those individuals throughout the case management process. They also provided ample fair housing education and outreach to further prevent discrimination, assisting 127 Tustin landlords/tenants who were provided with either landlord/tenant counseling, mediation, UD assistance, and/or referral services during the last fiscal year. Overall, the Fair Housing Foundation's outreach efforts assisted 672 individuals within City of Tustin limits during the 2018-2019 Fiscal Year.

Discriminatory Advertising

- The City of Tustin partners with the Fair Housing Foundation to address issues such as discriminatory advertising. As allowed by resources, FHF reviews advertising for Orange County rentals and Los Angeles County rentals listed in media such as The Orange County Register, La Opinion, Los Angeles Sentinel, local weekly newspapers, Craigslist and The Penny Saver for discriminatory content. Potential discriminatory advertisements were referred for further investigation and possible enforcement action.

Reasonable Accommodations

- Similarly, the City of Tustin has actively contracted and engaged with the Fair Housing Foundation to provide educational services to owners and managers of apartment complexes on why this practice is unlawful. The Fair Housing Foundation partners with a wide variety of agencies, notably the Tustin Effective Apartment Managers (TEAM) group to provide resources and services directed to affirmatively furthering fair housing. The Fair Housing Foundation has also implemented the "Accommodation & Modification 101 Workshop" to continue strengthening the bonds between the Fair Housing Foundation and housing providers, and to continue to provide education on their fair housing rights. The housing providers who attended this workshop stated that they had a better understanding and a greater sense of knowledge and confidence in knowing the difference in identifying a reasonable an unreasonable accommodation or modification request. As a result of this workshop, housing providers have a better understanding of their responsibilities and disabled residents or rental home seekers will most likely benefit from having requests reviewed and evaluated in a fair manner.

Hate Crimes

- The Fair Housing Foundation has not received notification of any hate crimes within the City of Tustin during the recent reporting period. When the Fair Housing Foundation is contacted by a victim of a hate crime occurring at their place of residence, the Fair Housing Foundation refers them to the O.C. Human Relations Commission, and assists with their fair housing complaint. The Fair Housing Foundation assists by counseling, completing an intake, opening a case, and investigating the allegation(s).

Unfair Lending

- As part of its outreach efforts the Fair Housing Foundation informs individuals and organizations of its services, which include housing counseling for individuals seeking to become ready for a home purchase. The Fair Housing Foundation participates in numerous education and/or outreach activities, reaching a culturally and ethnically diverse audience, in Cities of Costa Mesa, Mission Viejo, San Clemente, and Tustin) which they inform participants of fair housing laws and of their counseling services

City of Westminster

Education and Outreach Activities

- Progress: The Fair Housing Foundation (FHF) provided a comprehensive, extensive and viable education and outreach program. The purpose of this program was to educate managers, tenants, landlords, owners, realtors and property management companies on fair housing laws, to promote media and consumer interest, and to secure grass roots involvement within the communities. FHF specifically aimed its outreach to persons and protected classes that are most likely to encounter housing discrimination.
- The FHF developed new, dynamic, and more effective approaches to bringing fair housing information to residents; including brochures that focused on specific fair housing issues, including discrimination against people with disabilities, discrimination based on national origin, sexual orientation, discrimination against families with children, and sexual harassment. All of FHF's announcements and literature was available in various languages.

III. Fair Housing Analysis

A. Demographic Summary

This Demographic Summary provides an overview of data concerning race and ethnicity, sex, familial status, disability status, limited English proficiency, national origin, and age. The data included reflects the composition of the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim Region, Orange County itself, and thirty-four jurisdictions within it.

1. *Describe demographic patterns in the jurisdiction and region, and describe trends over time (since 1990).*

Orange County is located in Southern California, just south of Los Angeles, with some of the county touching the Pacific Ocean. The county has a plurality white population, with sizable Hispanic and Asian populations.

Table 1.1: Demographics, Orange County

	(Orange County, CA CDBG, ESG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		1,306,398	41.40%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		49,560	1.57%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		1,079,172	34.20%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Is., Non-Hispanic		624,373	19.78%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		6,584	0.21%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		15,367	2.71%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		1,174	0.21%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	345,637	11.21%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Vietnam	146,672	4.75%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Korea	65,579	2.13%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Philippines	53,707	1.74%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	33,226	1.01%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	India	31,063	1.01%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Iran	27,718	1.01%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Taiwan	22,918	0.90%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	El Salvador	17,785	0.58%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Canada	14,179	0.46%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	30,862	5.69%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Korean	9,810	1.81%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Vietnamese	9,411	1.73%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Chinese	5,868	1.08%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Persian	2,230	0.41%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Tagalog	2,146	0.40%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%

#7 LEP Language	Japanese	1,167	0.22%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Arabic	1,054	0.19%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Urdu	644	0.12%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Russian	587	0.11%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		81,297	2.59%		81,297	2.59%
Vision difficulty		51,196	1.63%		51,196	1.63%
Cognitive difficulty		99,317	3.16%		99,317	3.16%
Ambulatory difficulty		133,232	4.24%		133,232	4.24%
Self-care difficulty		61,615	1.96%		61,615	1.96%
Independent living difficulty		104,705	3.34%		104,705	3.34%
Male		274,258	48.38%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		292,676	51.62%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		132,454	23.36%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		349,144	61.58%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		85,336	15.05%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		65,179	44.98%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Orange County has a plurality non-Hispanic White population (41.40%), with large populations of Hispanics (34.20%) and non-Hispanic Asians (19.78%). Black residents comprise only 1.57% of the population, and the non-Hispanic Native American population is 0.21%. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 2.71%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.21%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin within the County is Mexico, with 11.21% of the county population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most countries of origin are, in order, Vietnam, Korea, Philippines, China excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan, India, Iran, Taiwan, El Salvador, and Canada.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in the County with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Korean, Vietnamese, Chinese, Persian, Tagalog, Japanese, Arabic, Urdu, and Russian.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by county residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

County residents are 49.33% male and 50.67% female.

Age

The majority of county residents are between 18-64, with 61.58% of residents falling in this group. 23.36% of county residents are under 18, and 15.05% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 44.98% of the total county population.

Table 1.2: Demographic Trends, Orange County

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	333,978	76.15%	343,270	65.91%	327,498	57.77%
Black, Non-Hispanic	5,751	1.31%	9,452	1.81%	11,226	1.98%
Hispanic	59,040	13.46%	92,933	17.84%	119,893	21.15%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	37,583	8.57%	68,197	13.09%	103,614	18.28%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	1,445	0.33%	3,462	0.66%	3,137	0.55%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	69,203	15.77%	106,966	20.54%	127,864	22.55%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	36,786	8.38%	59,765	11.48%	68,436	12.07%
Sex						
Male	213,945	48.75%	251,328	48.27%	274,258	48.38%
Female	224,946	51.25%	269,332	51.73%	292,676	51.62%
Age						
Under 18	98,846	22.52%	132,717	25.49%	132,454	23.36%
18-64	281,911	64.23%	317,214	60.93%	349,144	61.58%
65+	58,135	13.25%	70,729	13.58%	85,336	15.05%
Family Type						
Families with children	51,109	44.18%	51,615	48.55%	65,179	44.98%

Table 2.1: Demographics, Aliso Viejo

	(Aliso Viejo, Orange County) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		30,503	60.17%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		856	1.69%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		8,932	17.62%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		7831	15.45%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		218	0.43%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		2,274	4.49%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		77	0.15%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	1,530	13.90%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Iran	1,308	11.89%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	894	8.12%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Korea	870	7.91%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Vietnam	749	6.81%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	India	738	6.71%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan	562	5.11%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Canada	290	2.64%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Taiwan	252	2.29%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Peru	233	2.12%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole	943	2.04%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Korean	545	1.18%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Persian	524	1.14%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Vietnamese	339	0.74%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog	133	0.29%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Japanese	127	0.28%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Other Asian languages	83	0.18%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Russian	77	0.17%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	French (incl. Patois, Cajun)	69	0.15%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island languages	61	0.13%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		914	1.8%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		503	1.0%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		1,140	2.4%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		1,148	2.4%		641,347	5.34%

Self-care difficulty	669	1.4%	312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty	913	2.4%	496,105	4.13%
Male	23,780	46.94%	6,328,434	49.33%
Female	26,881	53.06%	6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18	12,868	25.40%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	33,682	66.49%	8,274,594	64.50%
65+	4,111	8.11%	1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children	13,010	69.7%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Aliso Viejo has a majority White population (53.85%), with significant populations of Hispanic (17.62%) and Asian or Pacific Islander (15.45%) residents as well. Black and Native American populations are extremely low in the city, at 1.69% and 0.43% respectively.

National Origin

The most common countries of origin for foreign-born residents in the city are Mexico, at 13.90% and Iran, at 11.89%. The remaining most common countries for foreign-born residents, in order, are the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, India, China excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan, Canada, Taiwan, and Peru.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Aliso Viejo with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish or Spanish Creole. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Korean, Persian, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Japanese, other Asian Languages, Russian, French, and Other Pacific Island Languages.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Aliso Viejo residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, cognitive difficulty, independent living difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Aliso Viejo residents are 46.94% male and 53.06% female.

Age

The majority of Aliso Viejo residents are between 18-64, with 66.49% of residents falling in this group. 25.40% of city residents are under 18, and 8.11% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 69.7% of Aliso Viejo's population.

Table 3.1: Demographics, Anaheim

	(Anaheim, CA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		87,991	25.21%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		7,843	2.25%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		187,931	53.85%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		57,829	16.57%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		401	0.11%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		6,137	1.82%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		623	0.18%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	68,225	19.55%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Vietnam	13,233	3.79%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	8,968	2.57%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Korea	5,674	1.63%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	India	2,725	0.78%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Guatemala	2,674	0.77%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	El Salvador	2,646	0.76%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	1,788	0.51%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Iran	1,313	0.38%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Taiwan	1,001	0.29%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	63,760	20.31%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	7,273	2.32%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Korean	4,117	1.31%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Tagalog	2,591	0.83%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Chinese	2,390	0.76%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Arabic	1,276	0.41%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Persian	644	0.21%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Other Indic Language	533	0.17%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Gujarati	481	0.15%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Other Indo-European Language	479	0.15%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		7,308	2.11%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		4,967	1.43%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		11,360	3.27%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		15,684	4.52%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		7,324	2.11%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		12,332	3.55%		496,105	4.13%

Male	168,317	49.85%	6,328,434	49.33%
Female	169,326	50.15%	6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18	92,481	27.39%	92,481	27.39%
18-64	213,574	63.25%	213,574	63.25%
65+	31,589	9.36%	31,589	9.36%
Families with children	38,282	51.43%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Anaheim has a majority Hispanic population (53.85%), with large populations of non-Hispanic Whites (25.21%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (16.57%). This represents a much larger Hispanic population than the county as a whole (34.20%). Black residents comprise 2.25% of the population, and the non-Hispanic Native American population is 0.11%. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 1.82%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.18%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for those in Anaheim is Mexico, with 19.55% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin are, in order, Vietnam, Philippines, Korea, India, Guatemala, El Salvador, China excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan, Iran, and Taiwan.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Anaheim with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Korean, Tagalog, Chinese, Arabic, Persian, other Indic Languages, Gujarati, and Other Indo-European Languages.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Anaheim residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, self-care difficulty, hearing difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Anaheim residents are 49.85% male and 50.15% female.

Age

The majority of Anaheim residents are between 18-64, with 63.25% of residents falling in this group. 27.39% of city residents are under 18, and 9.36% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 51.43% of Anaheim's population.

Table 3.2: Demographic Trends, Anaheim

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	151,166	56.06%	117,551	35.85%	93,266	27.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic	6,098	2.26%	8,791	2.68%	9,222	2.73%
Hispanic	86,359	32.03%	153,420	46.78%	177,540	52.58%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	24,457	9.07%	43,642	13.31%	55,306	16.38%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	975	0.36%	2,007	0.61%	1,532	0.45%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	76,795	28.49%	123,353	37.62%	127,512	37.77%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	56,117	20.82%	93,273	28.45%	92,680	27.45%
Sex						
Male	136,823	50.75%	164,072	50.04%	168,317	49.85%
Female	132,766	49.25%	163,809	49.96%	169,326	50.15%
Age						
Under 18	70,689	26.22%	101,574	30.98%	92,481	27.39%
18-64	176,977	65.65%	199,651	60.89%	213,574	63.25%
65+	21,923	8.13%	26,656	8.13%	31,589	9.36%
Family Type						
Families with children	32,321	50.08%	37,351	57.02%	38,282	51.43%

Table 4.1: Demographics, Buena Park

	(Buena Park, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction		(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	20,670	24.90%	4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,685	3.23%	859,086	6.70%
Hispanic	33,180	39.97%	5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic	24,447	29.45%	1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.	201	0.24%	25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic	1,794	2.24%	267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic	135	0.17%	30,960	0.24%

#1 country of origin	Mexico	9,682	11.66%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Korea	6,168	7.43%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	4,998	6.02%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	India	1,585	1.91%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Vietnam	1,163	1.40%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Peru	623	0.75%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Thailand	499	0.60%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	El Salvador	436	0.53%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Taiwan	369	0.44%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Afghanistan	368	0.44%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	11,829	15.49%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Korean	6,120	8.01%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Tagalog	1,848	2.42%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Chinese	749	0.98%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Vietnamese	499	0.65%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Other Indic Language	410	0.54%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Thai	409	0.54%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Gujarati	380	0.50%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island Language	276	0.36%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Urdu	213	0.28%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		2,403	2.90%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		1,387	1.68%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		2,290	2.77%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		4,242	5.13%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		1,843	2.23%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		2,793	3.38%		496,105	4.13%
Male		39,425	49.25%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		40,622	50.75%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		20,320	25.39%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		51,322	64.11%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		8,404	10.50%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		8,916	46.83%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Buena Park has a plurality Hispanic population (39.97%), with large populations of non-Hispanic Asian residents (29.45%) and non-Hispanic Whites (24.90%). Black residents comprise 3.23% of the population,

and non-Hispanic Native American population is 0.24%. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 2.24%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.17%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Buena Park residents is Mexico, with 11.66% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin are, in order, Korea, Philippines, India, Vietnam, Peru, Thailand, El Salvador, Taiwan, and Afghanistan.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Buena Park with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Korean, Tagalog, Chinese, Vietnamese, Other Indic Languages, Thai, Gujarati, Other Pacific Island Languages, and Urdu.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Buena Park residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, hearing difficulty, cognitive difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Buena Park residents are 49.25% male and 50.75% female.

Age

The majority of Buena Park residents are between 18-64, with 64.11% of residents falling in this group. 25.39% of city residents are under 18, and 10.50% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 46.83% of Buena Park's population.

Table 4.2: Demographic Trends, Buena Park

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	39,286	58.15%	29,077	37.27%	21,298	26.61%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,774	2.63%	3,290	4.22%	3,272	4.09%
Hispanic	16,909	25.03%	26,955	34.55%	32,288	40.34%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	9,116	13.49%	17,392	22.29%	22,574	28.20%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	327	0.48%	642	0.82%	431	0.54%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	15,358	22.79%	26,072	33.42%	29,903	37.36%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	9,978	14.80%	17,635	22.61%	20,822	26.01%
Sex						
Male	33,549	49.78%	38,549	49.42%	39,425	49.25%
Female	33,852	50.22%	39,460	50.58%	40,622	50.75%
Age						
Under 18	17,690	26.25%	23,458	30.07%	20,320	25.39%
18-64	44,385	65.85%	47,533	60.93%	51,322	64.11%
65+	5,325	7.90%	7,018	9.00%	8,404	10.50%
Family Type						
Families with children	8,496	49.42%	8,540	53.86%	8,916	46.83%

Table 5.1: Demographics, Costa Mesa

	(Costa Mesa, CA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	55,764	49.38%	4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,790	1.59%	859,086	6.70%
Hispanic	41,201	36.48%	5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic	10,613	9.40%	1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.	208	0.18%	25,102	0.20%

Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		2,725	2.48%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		246	0.22%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	14,995	13.28%	Mexico	14,995	13.28%
#2 country of origin	El Salvador	1,418	1.26%	El Salvador	1,418	1.26%
#3 country of origin	Vietnam	1,351	1.20%	Vietnam	1,351	1.20%
#4 country of origin	Philippines	1,219	1.08%	Philippines	1,219	1.08%
#5 country of origin	Japan	954	0.84%	Japan	954	0.84%
#6 country of origin	Guatemala	684	0.61%	Guatemala	684	0.61%
#7 country of origin	Iran	620	0.55%	Iran	620	0.55%
#8 country of origin	Canada	566	0.50%	Canada	566	0.50%
#9 country of origin	India	501	0.44%	India	501	0.44%
#10 country of origin	Korea	477	0.42%	Korea	477	0.42%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	12,486	12.05%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	835	0.81%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Japanese	444	0.43%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Chinese	292	0.28%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog	205	0.20%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Korean	184	0.18%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island Language	122	0.12%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Cambodian	107	0.10%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Arabic	97	0.09%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	German	82	0.08%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		2,462	2.19%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		1,967	1.75%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		3,899	3.47%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		4,401	3.91%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		1,737	1.54%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		3,278	2.91%		496,105	4.13%
Male		55,886	50.87%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		53,971	49.13%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		23,729	21.60%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		75,989	69.17%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		10,139	9.23%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		11,152	48.03%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Costa Mesa has a near-majority White population (49.38%), with a large population of Hispanic residents (36.48%) and a sizable population of non-Hispanic Asian residents (9.40%). Black residents comprise 1.59% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native American population is 0.18%. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 2.48%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.22%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Costa Mesa residents is Mexico, with 13.28% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin are, in order, El Salvador, Vietnam, Philippines, Japan, Guatemala, Iran, Canada, India, and Korea.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Costa Mesa with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Japanese, Chinese, Tagalog, Korean, Other Pacific Island Languages, Cambodian, Arabic, and German.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Costa Mesa residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, cognitive difficulty, independent living difficulty, hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, and self-care difficulty.

Sex

Costa Mesa residents are 50.87% male and 49.13% female.

Age

The majority of Costa Mesa residents are between 18-64, with 69.17% of residents falling in this group. 21.60% of city residents are under 18, and 9.23% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 48.03% of Costa Mesa's population.

Table 5.2: Demographic Trends, Costa Mesa

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	70,120	72.26%	62,285	56.96%	56,901	51.80%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,142	1.18%	1,653	1.51%	1,879	1.71%
Hispanic	19,300	19.89%	34,569	31.61%	39,405	35.87%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	6,024	6.21%	9,204	8.42%	10,680	9.72%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	331	0.34%	771	0.71%	673	0.61%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	20,844	21.50%	31,702	28.98%	29,598	26.94%

LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	12,652	13.05%	21,813	19.94%	17,533	15.96%
Sex						
Male	49,424	50.97%	55,859	51.07%	55,886	50.87%
Female	47,542	49.03%	53,518	48.93%	53,971	49.13%
Age						
Under 18	18,841	19.43%	25,930	23.71%	23,729	21.60%
18-64	70,221	72.42%	74,185	67.83%	75,989	69.17%
65+	7,905	8.15%	9,261	8.47%	10,139	9.23%
Family Type						
Families with children	9,631	43.63%	10,809	50.61%	11,152	48.03%

Table 6.1: Demographics, Fountain Valley

	(Fountain Valley, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction			**(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region**		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		26,433	46.67%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		256	0.45%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		9418	16.63%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		18,565	32.78%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		69	0.12%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		1,601	2.88%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		113	0.20%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Vietnam	7,556	13.34%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Mexico	1,490	2.63%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Taiwan	696	1.23%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Korea	566	1.00%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Philippines	521	0.92%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Japan	485	0.86%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Egypt	454	0.80%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	China, excl. Hong Kong and Taiwan	408	0.72%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	India	402	0.71%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Canada	341	0.60%	India	79,608	0.66%

#1 LEP Language	Vietnamese	4,989	9.32%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Chinese	1,337	2.50%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Spanish	1,251	2.34%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Korean	361	0.67%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Japanese	225	0.42%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Arabic	203	0.38%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Tagalog	182	0.34%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Persian	111	0.21%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Armenian	78	0.15%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	German	71	0.13%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		1,842	3.26%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		685	1.21%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		2,394	4.24%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		3,093	5.48%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		1,266	2.24%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		2,261	4.01%		496,105	4.13%
Male		27,076	48.76%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		28,451	51.24%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		11,794	21.24%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		34,068	61.35%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		9,664	17.40%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		5,656	39.90%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Fountain Valley has a near-majority White population (46.67%), with a large population of non-Hispanic Asian residents (32.78%) and a sizable population of Hispanic residents (16.63%). This represents a large increase in the percentage of non-Hispanic Asian residents as compared to Orange County overall (19.78%) and a large decrease in the percentage of Hispanic residents as compared to the County (34.20%). Black residents comprise 1.57% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.21% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 2.71%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.21%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Fountain Valley residents is Mexico, with 11.21% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin are, in order, Vietnam, Korea, Philippines, China (excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan), India, Iran, Taiwan, El Salvador, and Canada.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Fountain Valley with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Vietnamese – different than the County's most prominent LEP language (Spanish). The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Chinese, Spanish, Korean, Japanese, Arabic, Tagalog, Persian, Armenian, and German.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Fountain Valley residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, cognitive difficulty, independent living difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Fountain Valley residents are 48.76% male and 51.24% female.

Age

The majority of Fountain Valley residents are between 18-64, with 61.35% of residents falling in this group. 21.24% of city residents are under 18, and 17.40% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 39.90% of Fountain Valley's population.

Table 6.2: Demographic Trends, Fountain Valley

	1990 Trend		**2000 Trend**		**2010 Trend**	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	38,801	71.93%	31,386	57.39%	26,642	47.98%
Black, Non-Hispanic	508	0.94%	731	1.34%	692	1.25%
Hispanic	4,884	9.05%	6,490	11.87%	8,071	14.54%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	9,405	17.43%	15,167	27.73%	19,632	35.36%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	257	0.48%	434	0.79%	350	0.63%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	10,915	20.20%	15,516	28.37%	16,514	29.74%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	5,757	10.65%	9,813	17.94%	9,881	17.80%
Sex						
Male	26,814	49.63%	26,709	48.84%	27,076	48.76%
Female	27,215	50.37%	27,980	51.16%	28,451	51.24%
Age						
Under 18	12,767	23.63%	13,344	24.40%	11,794	21.24%

18-64	37,304	69.04%	34,958	63.92%	34,068	61.35%
65+	3,958	7.33%	6,387	11.68%	9,664	17.40%
Family Type						
Families with children	6,674	47.04%	6,185	43.95%	5,656	39.90%

Table 7.1: Demographics, Fullerton

	(Fullerton, CA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	#		%	#		%
White, Non-Hispanic		46145	32.97%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		3800	2.71%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		50957	36.40%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		34692	24.78%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		203	0.15%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		2,959	2.18%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		232	0.17%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	14,379	10.27%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Korea	11,208	8.01%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	2,344	1.67%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	India	1,993	1.42%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	1,836	1.31%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Vietnam	1,475	1.05%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Taiwan	1,105	0.79%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	El Salvador	629	0.45%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Canada	494	0.35%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Japan	473	0.34%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	13,340	10.42%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Korean	7,394	5.78%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	2,134	1.67%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Vietnamese	828	0.65%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Japanese	375	0.29%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Tagalog	372	0.29%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Gujarati	351	0.27%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Arabic	228	0.18%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Other Asian Language	227	0.18%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Other Indo-European Language	204	0.16%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		3,344	2.40%		303,390	2.52%

Vision difficulty	2,406	1.73%	227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty	4,478	3.22%	445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty	6,425	4.62%	641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty	2,683	1.93%	312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty	4,992	3.59%	496,105	4.13%
Male	66,653	49.10%	66,653	49.10%
Female	69,094	50.90%	69,094	50.90%
Under 18	31,953	23.54%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	87,901	64.75%	8,274,594	64.50%
65+	15,893	11.71%	1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children	14,582	46.37%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Fullerton has a plurality Hispanic population (36.40%), with a large population of Whites (32.97%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (24.78%). Black residents comprise 2.71% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.15% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 2.18%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.17%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Fullerton residents is Mexico, with 10.27% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin are, in order, Korea, Philippines, India, China (excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan), Vietnam, Taiwan, El Salvador, Canada, and Japan.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Fullerton with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Korean, Chinese, Vietnamese, Japanese, Tagalog, Gujarati, Arabic, Other Asian Languages, and Other Indo-European Languages.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Fullerton residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Fullerton residents are 49.10% male and 50.90% female.

Age

The majority of Fullerton residents are between 18-64, with 64.75% of residents falling in this group. 23.54% of city residents are under 18, and 11.71% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 46.37% of Fullerton's population.

Table 7.2: Demographic Trends, Fullerton

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	73,647	65.17%	62,021	49.24%	52,356	38.57%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,273	2.01%	3,060	2.43%	3,330	2.45%
Hispanic	23,894	21.14%	38,323	30.43%	47,235	34.80%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	12,608	11.16%	20,690	16.43%	31,810	23.43%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	364	0.32%	927	0.74%	707	0.52%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	25,948	22.98%	35,894	28.49%	39,906	29.40%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	16,188	14.33%	24,576	19.50%	25,536	18.81%
Sex						
Male	56,379	49.92%	62,453	49.57%	66,653	49.10%
Female	56,554	50.08%	63,542	50.43%	69,094	50.90%
Age						
Under 18	25,569	22.64%	32,955	26.16%	31,953	23.54%
18-64	75,660	67.00%	78,816	62.55%	87,901	64.75%
65+	11,703	10.36%	14,224	11.29%	15,893	11.71%
Family Type						
Families with children	12,505	44.91%	11,097	48.22%	14,582	46.37%

Table 8.1: Demographics, Garden Grove

	(Garden Grove, CA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		36,168	20.69%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,607	0.92%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		63,059	36.07%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		69,872	39.97%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		514	0.29%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		2,881	1.66%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		235	0.14%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Vietnam	39,624	22.67%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Mexico	21,168	12.11%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Korea	3,408	1.95%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Philippines	2,743	1.57%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	El Salvador	1,169	0.67%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Guatemala	780	0.45%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Peru	650	0.37%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	594	0.34%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Cambodia	466	0.27%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Egypt	406	0.23%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Vietnamese	28,226	17.39%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Spanish	19,752	12.17%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Korean	2,897	1.78%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Chinese	1,795	1.11%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog	380	0.23%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Cambodian	294	0.18%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island Language	288	0.18%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Arabic	256	0.16%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Japanese	237	0.15%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Hmong	162	0.10%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		5,132	2.95%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		3,044	1.75%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		6,805	3.91%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		8,226	4.73%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		3,996	2.30%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		7,328	4.21%		496,105	4.13%
Male		86,373	49.85%		6,328,434	49.33%

Female	86,888	50.15%	6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18	44,233	25.53%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	110,100	63.55%	8,274,594	64.50%
65+	18,928	10.92%	1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children	18,046	47.97%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Garden Grove has a plurality non-Hispanic Asian population (39.97%), with a large population of Hispanics (36.07%) and Whites (20.69%). This represents a large increase in the percentage of non-Hispanic Asian residents as compared to Orange County overall (19.78%). Black residents comprise 0.92% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.29% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 1.66%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.14%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Garden Grove residents is Vietnam, with 22.67% of the city population comprised of residents from Vietnam. This is distinct from the most common country of origin for Orange County overall (Mexico). The remaining most common countries of origin in Garden Grove are, in order, Mexico, Korea, Philippines, El Salvador, Guatemala, Peru, China (excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan), Cambodia, and Egypt.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Garden Grove with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Vietnamese. This is distinct from the most common LEP language in the broader county (Spanish). The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog, Cambodian, Other Pacific Island Languages, Arabic, Japanese, and Hmong.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Garden Grove residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Garden Grove residents are 49.85% male and 50.15% female.

Age

The majority of Garden Grove residents are between 18-64, with 63.55% of residents falling in this group. 25.53% of city residents are under 18, and 10.92% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 47.97% of Garden Grove's population.

Table 8.2: Demographic Trends, Garden Grove

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	79,750	54.42%	54,141	32.25%	38,900	22.45%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,145	1.46%	2,474	1.47%	2,376	1.37%
Hispanic	34,492	23.54%	55,487	33.06%	64,694	37.34%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	29,209	19.93%	53,793	32.05%	66,272	38.25%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	631	0.43%	1,107	0.66%	725	0.42%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	44,669	30.48%	72,339	43.10%	74,749	43.14%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	32,715	22.32%	57,735	34.40%	56,658	32.70%
Sex						
Male	74,265	50.67%	84,033	50.06%	86,373	49.85%
Female	72,300	49.33%	83,818	49.94%	86,888	50.15%
Age						
Under 18	38,170	26.04%	48,566	28.93%	44,233	25.53%
18-64	95,383	65.08%	103,249	61.51%	110,100	63.55%
65+	13,013	8.88%	16,038	9.55%	18,928	10.92%
Family Type						
Families with children	17,177	48.90%	19,501	53.21%	18,046	47.97%

Table 9.1: Demographics, Huntington Beach

	(Huntington Beach, CA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	126,453	63.10%	4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,510	1.25%	859,086	6.70%
Hispanic	38,773	19.35%	5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic	24,069	12.01%	1,888,969	14.72%

Native American, Non-Hisp.		721	0.36%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		6,008	3.15%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		392	0.21%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	7,734	3.86%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Vietnam	5,826	2.91%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	2,006	1.00%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Canada	1,248	0.62%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Egypt	1,159	0.58%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong and Taiwan	1,140	0.57%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Japan	1,135	0.57%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Korea	1,061	0.53%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	India	664	0.33%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Taiwan	638	0.32%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	7,526	4.10%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	2,822	1.54%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	1,518	0.83%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Korean	741	0.40%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Arabic	730	0.40%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Japanese	533	0.29%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Tagalog	270	0.15%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Portuguese	206	0.11%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Other Indo-European Language	200	0.11%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Thai	150	0.08%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		5,818	2.91%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		3,392	1.70%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		7,239	3.62%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		9,226	4.61%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		3,952	1.98%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		6,816	3.41%		496,105	4.13%
Male		94,733	49.60%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		96,243	50.40%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		39,353	20.61%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		124,400	65.14%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		27,224	14.26%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		20,083	41.45%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Huntington Beach has a majority White population (63.10%) and sizable populations of Hispanics (19.35%) and non-Hispanic Asians (12.01%). This represents a large increase in the percentage of White residents as compared to Orange County overall (41.40%). Black residents comprise 1.25% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.36% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 3.15%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.21%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Huntington Beach residents is Mexico, with 3.86% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in Huntington Beach are, in order, Vietnam, Philippines, Canada, Egypt, China (excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan), Japan, Korea, India, and Taiwan.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Huntington Beach with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Chinese, Korean, Arabic, Japanese, Tagalog, Portuguese, Other Indo-European Languages, and Thai.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Huntington Beach residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, cognitive difficulty, independent living difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Huntington Beach residents are 49.60% male and 50.40% female.

Age

The majority of Huntington Beach residents are between 18-64, with 65.14% of residents falling in this group. 20.61% of city residents are under 18, and 14.26% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 41.45% of Huntington Beach's population.

Table 9.2: Demographic Trends, Huntington Beach

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	144,453	79.16%	137,054	71.80%	127,955	67.00%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,602	0.88%	1,905	1.00%	2,377	1.24%

Hispanic	20,522	11.25%	27,945	14.64%	32,552	17.05%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	14,732	8.07%	20,786	10.89%	25,886	13.55%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	898	0.49%	1,925	1.01%	1,669	0.87%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	27,066	14.84%	32,414	16.99%	30,902	16.18%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	13,562	7.43%	18,168	9.52%	15,869	8.31%
Sex						
Male	91,952	50.40%	95,767	50.18%	94,733	49.60%
Female	90,486	49.60%	95,063	49.82%	96,243	50.40%
Age						
Under 18	37,779	20.71%	43,525	22.81%	39,353	20.61%
18-64	129,499	70.98%	127,288	66.70%	124,400	65.14%
65+	15,160	8.31%	20,017	10.49%	27,224	14.26%
Family Type						
Families with children	20,283	43.80%	19,930	44.46%	20,083	41.45%

Table 10.1: Demographics, Irvine

	(Irvine, CA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		107,202	41.73%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		4,714	1.84%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		25,025	9.74%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		107,337	41.79%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		221	0.09%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		9,526	4.50%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		544	0.26%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Korea	14,066	5.48%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	13,021	5.07%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	India	9,749	3.80%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Iran	9,518	3.71%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%

#5 country of origin	Taiwan	8,648	3.37%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Vietnam	4,945	1.93%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Philippines	4,792	1.87%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Japan	4,752	1.85%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Mexico	2,956	1.15%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Hong Kong	1,977	0.77%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Chinese	8,033	3.83%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Korean	6,701	3.19%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Persian	3,404	1.62%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Spanish	2,522	1.20%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Vietnamese	2,033	0.97%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Japanese	1,947	0.93%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Arabic	875	0.42%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Other Indic Language	715	0.34%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Other Asian Language	578	0.28%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Russian	545	0.26%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		4,154	1.62%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		2,032	0.79%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		5,481	2.14%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		6,719	2.62%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		3,527	1.37%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		5,713	2.23%		496,105	4.13%
Male		103,034	48.71%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		108,498	51.29%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		45,857	21.68%		45,857	21.68%
18-64		146,753	69.38%		146,753	69.38%
65+		18,922	8.95%		18,922	8.95%
Families with children		25,573	49.80%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Irvine has a plurality non-Hispanic Asian population (41.79%) with a large population of White residents (41.73%) and a relatively small population of Hispanic residents (9.74%) as compared to the county (over 34%). Black residents comprise 1.84% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.09% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 4.50%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.26%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Irvine residents is Korea, with 5.48% of the city population comprised of residents from Korea. This is distinct from the County, for which the most common country of origin is Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in Irvine are, in order, China (excluding Hong Kong & Tibet), India, Iran, Taiwan, Vietnam, Philippines, Japan, Mexico, and Hong Kong.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Irvine with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Chinese – distinct from the most common language spoken by those with LEP in the County (Spanish). The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Korean, Persian, Spanish, Vietnamese, Japanese, Arabic, Other Indic Languages, Other Asian Languages, and Russian.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Irvine residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Irvine residents are 48.71% male and 51.29% female.

Age

The majority of Irvine residents are between 18-64, with 69.38% of residents falling in this group. 21.68% of city residents are under 18, and 8.95% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 49.80% of Irvine's population.

Table 10.2: Demographic Trends, Irvine

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	92,181	73.19%	85,972	57.41%	96,467	45.60%
Black, Non-Hispanic	3,263	2.59%	2,573	1.72%	4,514	2.13%
Hispanic	9,685	7.69%	12,271	8.19%	20,401	9.64%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	20,256	16.08%	46,268	30.90%	88,674	41.92%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	316	0.25%	618	0.41%	755	0.36%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	26,301	20.88%	47,114	31.46%	67,886	32.09%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	11,047	8.77%	21,335	14.25%	28,611	13.53%
Sex						
Male	62,975	50.00%	73,019	48.77%	103,034	48.71%
Female	62,976	50.00%	76,715	51.23%	108,498	51.29%
Age						
Under 18	30,335	24.08%	36,552	24.41%	45,857	21.68%

18-64	88,663	70.40%	102,353	68.36%	146,753	69.38%
65+	6,952	5.52%	10,830	7.23%	18,922	8.95%
Family Type						
Families with children	17,137	55.14%	16,168	52.72%	25,573	49.80%

Table 11.1: Demographics, La Habra

	(La Habra, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		15,817	25.53%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		676	1.09%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		36,975	59.67%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		7,514	12.13%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		96	0.15%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		969	1.61%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		90	0.15%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	10,133	16.35%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Korea	2,248	3.63%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	1,379	2.23%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Guatemala	365	0.59%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong and Taiwan	334	0.54%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Indonesia	263	0.42%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	India	233	0.38%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	El Salvador	228	0.37%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Taiwan	220	0.36%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Nicaragua	199	0.32%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	11,038	19.59%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Korean	1,241	2.20%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	245	0.43%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Tagalog	156	0.28%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Vietnamese	105	0.19%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Persian	102	0.18%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Hindi	98	0.17%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island Language	41	0.07%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Russian	41	0.07%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Arabic	38	0.07%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%

Hearing difficulty	1,803	2.92%	303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty	1,044	1.69%	227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty	2,272	3.68%	445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty	3,659	5.93%	641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty	1,530	2.48%	312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty	2,354	3.81%	496,105	4.13%
Male	29,680	49.24%	6,328,434	49.33%
Female	30,594	50.76%	6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18	16,021	26.58%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	37,554	62.31%	8,274,594	64.50%
65+	6,700	11.12%	1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children	6,885	47.85%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

La Habra is majority Hispanic (59.67%) with a large population of Whites (25.53%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (12.13%). This is a significantly larger Hispanic population percentage than the County as a whole (34.20%). Black residents comprise 1.09% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.15% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 1.61%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.15%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for La Habra residents is Mexico, with 16.35% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in La Habra are, in order, Korea, Philippines, Guatemala, China (excluding Hong Kong & Tibet), Indonesia, India, El Salvador, Taiwan, and Nicaragua.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in La Habra with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese, Persian, Hindi, Other Pacific Island Languages, Russian, and Arabic.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by La Habra residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

La Habra residents are 49.24% male and 50.76% female.

Age

The majority of La Habra residents are between 18-64, with 62.31% of residents falling in this group. 26.58% of city residents are under 18, and 11.12% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 47.85% of La Habra's population.

Table 11.2: Demographic Trends, La Habra

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	31,691	60.04%	24,513	41.17%	18,331	30.41%
Black, Non-Hispanic	422	0.80%	941	1.58%	995	1.65%
Hispanic	17,408	32.98%	28,525	47.91%	33,528	55.63%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2,959	5.61%	4,782	8.03%	6,943	11.52%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	201	0.38%	374	0.63%	325	0.54%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	10,852	20.55%	16,382	27.53%	17,238	28.60%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	7,693	14.57%	12,530	21.06%	13,172	21.85%
Sex						
Male	26,272	49.75%	29,148	48.99%	29,680	49.24%
Female	26,539	50.25%	30,349	51.01%	30,594	50.76%
Age						
Under 18	13,363	25.30%	17,662	29.69%	16,021	26.58%
18-64	33,885	64.16%	35,363	59.44%	37,554	62.31%
65+	5,563	10.53%	6,472	10.88%	6,700	11.12%
Family Type						
Families with children	6,424	47.32%	6,353	54.73%	6,885	47.85%

Table 12.1: Demographics, La Palma

	(La Palma, Orange County) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		4,179	26.43%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		833	5.27%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		2,781	17.59%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		7398	46.78%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		83	0.52%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		529	3.35%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		11	0.07%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Korea	1,292	24.53%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	India	803	15.25%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	592	11.24%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Mexico	532	10.10%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Vietnam	499	9.47%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Taiwan	430	8.16%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan	191	3.63%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Pakistan	152	2.89%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Cambodia	67	1.27%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Romania	63	1.20%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Korean	1,115	7.42%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole	675	4.49%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	490	3.26%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	African languages	191	1.27%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog	161	1.07%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Vietnamese	109	0.73%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Gujarati	90	0.60%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Japanese	78	0.52%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Arabic	74	0.49%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Other Indic languages	69	0.46%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		421	2.7%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		262	1.7%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		476	3.1%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		825	5.4%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		496	3.3%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		547	4.2%		496,105	4.13%

Male	7,673	48.54%	6,328,434	49.33%
Female	8,135	51.46%	6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18	2,866	18.13%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	10,101	63.90%	8,274,594	64.50%
65+	2,841	17.97%	1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children	3,999	81.5%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

La Palma has a high Asian or Pacific Islander population at 46.78% of the population. White residents make up 26.43% of the population, Hispanic residents are 17.59%, Black residents are 5.27%, and Native Americans are 0.52%.

National Origin

The most common countries of origin for foreign-born residents in the city are Korea, at 24.53%, and India, at 15.25%. The remaining most common countries for foreign-born residents, in order, are the Philippines, Mexico, Vietnam, Taiwan, China excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan, Pakistan, Cambodia, and Romania.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in La Palma with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Korean. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Spanish or Spanish Creole, Chinese, African languages, Tagalog, Vietnamese, Guajarati, Japanese, Arabic, and Other Indic Languages.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by La Palma residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, self-care difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

La Palma residents are 48.54% male and 51.46% female.

Age

The majority of La Palma residents are between 18-64, with 63.90% of residents falling in this group. 18.13% of city residents are under 18, and 17.97% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 81.5% of La Palma's population.

Table 13.1: Demographics, Laguna Niguel

	(Laguna Niguel, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		43,496	66.48%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,238	1.89%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		11,021	16.84%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		6,613	10.11%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		74	0.11%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		2,176	3.42%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		119	0.19%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Iran	2,065	3.16%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Mexico	1,785	2.73%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	865	1.32%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Philippines	786	1.20%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	El Salvador	693	1.06%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Taiwan	629	0.96%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Canada	583	0.89%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Korea	438	0.67%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Egypt	407	0.62%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Germany	320	0.49%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	2,022	3.36%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Persian	994	1.65%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	503	0.84%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Vietnamese	194	0.32%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Korean	185	0.31%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	French	145	0.24%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Japanese	79	0.13%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Other Slavic Language	70	0.12%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Tagalog	59	0.10%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Russian	57	0.09%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		1,815	2.78%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		807	1.23%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		1,965	3.00%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		1,943	2.97%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		938	1.43%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		1,910	2.92%		496,105	4.13%
Male		30,893	48.50%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		32,803	51.50%		6,500,403	50.67%

Under 18	14,428	22.65%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	41,100	64.53%	8,274,594	64.50%
65+	8,168	12.82%	1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children	7,796	44.73%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Laguna Niguel is majority White (66.48%) with sizable minority populations of Hispanics (16.84%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (10.11%) This is a significantly larger White population than the county as a whole (41.40%). Black residents comprise 1.89% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.11% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 3.42%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.19%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Laguna Niguel residents is Iran, with 3.16% of the city population comprised of residents from Iran. This is distinct from the most common country of origin for county residents overall (Mexico). The remaining most common countries of origin in Laguna Niguel are, in order, Mexico, China (excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan), Philippines, El Salvador, Taiwan, Canada, Korea, Egypt, and Germany.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Laguna Niguel with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Persian, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, French, Japanese, Other Slavic Languages, Tagalog, and Russian.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Laguna Niguel residents is cognitive difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, ambulatory difficulty, independent living difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Laguna Niguel residents are 48.50% male and 51.50% female.

Age

The majority of Laguna Niguel residents are between 18-64, with 64.53% of residents falling in this group. 22.65% of city residents are under 18, and 12.82% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 44.73% of Laguna Niguel's population.

Table 13.2: Demographic Trends, Laguna Niguel

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	37,998	83.58%	49,243	77.33%	46,192	72.52%
Black, Non-Hispanic	517	1.14%	936	1.47%	966	1.52%
Hispanic	3,422	7.53%	6,591	10.35%	8,842	13.88%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	3,364	7.40%	5,875	9.23%	7,203	11.31%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	93	0.20%	310	0.49%	331	0.52%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	6,198	13.60%	11,286	17.67%	13,355	20.97%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	2,169	4.76%	4,238	6.64%	4,317	6.78%
Sex						
Male	22,303	48.94%	31,200	48.85%	30,893	48.50%
Female	23,269	51.06%	32,665	51.15%	32,803	51.50%
Age						
Under 18	10,922	23.97%	17,408	27.26%	14,428	22.65%
18-64	31,371	68.84%	41,029	64.24%	41,100	64.53%
65+	3,280	7.20%	5,429	8.50%	8,168	12.82%
Family Type						
Families with children	6,218	48.60%	7,957	53.94%	7,796	44.73%

Table 14.1: Demographics, Lake Forest

	(Lake Forest, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction		(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	44,160	53.98%	44160	53.98%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,476	1.80%	1476	1.80%
Hispanic	20,057	24.52%	20057	24.52%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic	12,740	15.57%	12740	15.57%
Native American, Non-Hisp.	361	0.44%	361	0.44%

Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		2,393	3.09%		2,393	3.09%
Other, Non-Hispanic		184	0.24%		184	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	4,765	5.82%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Philippines	2,714	3.32%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Vietnam	1,117	1.37%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	India	1,055	1.29%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Iran	753	0.92%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Korea	739	0.90%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	El Salvador	704	0.86%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong and Taiwan	576	0.70%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Canada	509	0.62%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Guatemala	485	0.59%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	5,074	6.89%	Spanish	5,074	6.89%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	684	0.93%	Vietnamese	684	0.93%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	483	0.66%	Chinese	483	0.66%
#4 LEP Language	Tagalog	428	0.58%	Tagalog	428	0.58%
#5 LEP Language	Korean	396	0.54%	Korean	396	0.54%
#6 LEP Language	Persian	385	0.52%	Persian	385	0.52%
#7 LEP Language	Japanese	236	0.32%	Japanese	236	0.32%
#8 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island Language	205	0.28%	Other Pacific Island Language	205	0.28%
#9 LEP Language	Arabic	145	0.20%	Arabic	145	0.20%
#10 LEP Language	Scandinavian Language	96	0.13%	Scandinavian Language	96	0.13%
Hearing difficulty		2,141	2.62%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		715	0.88%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		2,001	2.45%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		2,705	3.31%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		1,371	1.68%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		2,451	3.00%		496,105	4.13%
Male		38,359	49.58%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		39,011	50.42%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		19,017	24.58%		19,017	24.58%
18-64		51,306	66.31%		51,306	66.31%
65+		7,047	9.11%		7,047	9.11%
Families with children		9,581	48.85%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Lake Forest is majority White (53.98%) with sizable minority populations of Hispanics (24.52%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (15.57%) This is a moderately larger White population than the county as a whole (41.40%). Black residents comprise 1.80% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.44% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 3.09%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.24%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Lake Forest residents is Mexico, with 5.82% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in Lake Forest are, in order, Philippines, Vietnam, India, Iran, Korea, El Salvador, China (excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan), Canada, and Guatemala.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Lake Forest with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Chinese, Tagalog, Korean, Persian, Japanese, Other Pacific Island Languages, Arabic, and Scandinavian Languages.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Lake Forest residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, hearing difficulty, cognitive difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Lake Forest residents are 49.58% male and 50.42% female.

Age

The majority of Lake Forest residents are between 18-64, with 66.31% of residents falling in this group. 24.58% of city residents are under 18, and 9.11% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 48.85% of Laguna Niguel's population.

Table 14.2: Demographic Trends, Lake Forest

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	42,174	78.97%	50,433	67.52%	43,702	56.48%
Black, Non-Hispanic	908	1.70%	1,596	2.14%	1,566	2.02%

Hispanic	5,491	10.28%	12,968	17.36%	19,165	24.77%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	4,560	8.54%	8,665	11.60%	12,232	15.81%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	178	0.33%	451	0.60%	481	0.62%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	7,305	13.69%	14,986	20.06%	17,450	22.55%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	3,511	6.58%	7,915	10.59%	8,219	10.62%
Sex						
Male	26,304	49.29%	36,511	48.87%	38,359	49.58%
Female	27,061	50.71%	38,202	51.13%	39,011	50.42%
Age						
Under 18	13,865	25.98%	21,344	28.57%	19,017	24.58%
18-64	35,856	67.19%	47,998	64.24%	51,306	66.31%
65+	3,643	6.83%	5,372	7.19%	7,047	9.11%
Family Type						
Families with children	7,705	53.68%	10,230	56.68%	9,581	48.85%

Table 15.1: Demographics, Mission Viejo

	(Mission Viejo, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		64,552	66.87%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,312	1.36%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		16,350	16.94%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		10,253	10.62%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		201	0.21%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		3,108	3.36%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		185	0.20%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	3,664	3.80%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Iran	2,599	2.69%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	1,653	1.71%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Vietnam	972	1.01%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%

#5 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	690	0.71%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Korea	640	0.66%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Taiwan	581	0.60%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Canada	562	0.58%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	India	374	0.39%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	El Salvador	341	0.35%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	2,626	2.93%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Persian	1,187	1.33%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	635	0.71%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Vietnamese	408	0.46%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Arabic	264	0.30%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Korean	196	0.22%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Japanese	184	0.21%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Tagalog	112	0.13%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island Language	95	0.11%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Russian	78	0.09%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		3,325	3.46%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		1,719	1.79%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		3,474	3.61%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		5,015	5.22%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		2,574	2.68%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		3,937	4.10%		496,105	4.13%
Male		45,368	49.01%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		47,192	50.99%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		21,375	23.09%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		58,357	63.05%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		12,828	13.86%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		10,884	44.01%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Mission Viejo is majority White (66.87%) with sizable minority populations of Hispanics (16.94%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (10.62%) This is a significantly larger White population than the county as a whole (41.40%). Black residents comprise 1.36% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.21% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 3.36%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.20%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Mission Viejo residents is Mexico, with 3.80% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in Mission Viejo are, in order, Iran, Philippines, Vietnam, China (excluding Hong Kong & Taiwan), Korea, Taiwan, Canada, India, and El Salvador.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Mission Viejo with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Persian, Chinese, Vietnamese, Arabic, Korean, Japanese, Tagalog, Other Pacific Island Languages, and Russian.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Mission Viejo residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Mission Viejo residents are 49.01% male and 50.99% female.

Age

The majority of Mission Viejo residents are between 18-64, with 63.05% of residents falling in this group. 23.09% of city residents are under 18, and 13.86% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 44.01% of Mission Viejo's population.

Table 15.2: Demographic Trends, Mission Viejo

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	67,490	83.86%	69,945	75.84%	63,297	68.38%
Black, Non-Hispanic	759	0.94%	1,331	1.44%	1,638	1.77%
Hispanic	6,583	8.18%	11,246	12.19%	16,286	17.60%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	5,327	6.62%	8,512	9.23%	10,597	11.45%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	198	0.25%	507	0.55%	475	0.51%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	10,815	13.44%	15,120	16.39%	16,427	17.75%

LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	4,189	5.21%	6,072	6.58%	6,250	6.75%
Sex						
Male	39,987	49.69%	44,952	48.73%	45,368	49.01%
Female	40,480	50.31%	47,294	51.27%	47,192	50.99%
Age						
Under 18	22,602	28.09%	26,099	28.29%	21,375	23.09%
18-64	51,800	64.37%	56,701	61.47%	58,357	63.05%
65+	6,065	7.54%	9,446	10.24%	12,828	13.86%
Family Type						
Families with children	11,971	53.71%	11,488	51.77%	10,884	44.01%

Table 17.1: Demographics, Orange (City)

	(Orange, CA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	#		%	#		%
White, Non-Hispanic		63,146	45.01%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		2,025	1.44%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		55,293	39.41%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		16,243	11.58%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		292	0.21%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		2,692	1.92%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		258	0.18%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	16,969	12.10%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Vietnam	2,596	1.85%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	2,298	1.64%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Korea	1,039	0.74%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	India	986	0.70%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Guatemala	758	0.54%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Taiwan	682	0.49%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Iran	640	0.46%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong and Taiwan	558	0.40%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	El Salvador	526	0.37%	India	79,608	0.66%

#1 LEP Language	Spanish	18,642	14.45%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	2,048	1.59%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Korean	1,149	0.89%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Chinese	779	0.60%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog	313	0.24%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Arabic	264	0.20%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Japanese	205	0.16%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Gujarati	193	0.15%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Cambodian	192	0.15%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Persian	185	0.14%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		2,921	2.14%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		1,841	1.35%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		4,106	3.01%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		5,357	3.93%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		2,762	2.02%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		4,334	3.18%		496,105	4.13%
Male		68,542	50.29%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		67,753	49.71%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		31,745	23.29%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		89,676	65.80%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		14,874	10.91%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		14,250	45.66%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Orange has a plurality of White residents (45.01%) with significant minority populations of Hispanics (39.41%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (11.58%). Black residents comprise 1.44% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.21% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 1.92%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.18%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Orange residents is Mexico, with 12.10% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in Orange are, in order, Vietnam, Philippines, Korea, India, Guatemala, Taiwan, Iran, China (excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan), and El Salvador.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Orange with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog, Arabic, Japanese, Gujarati, Cambodian, and Persian.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Orange residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Orange residents are 50.29% male and 49.71% female.

Age

The majority of Orange residents are between 18-64, with 65.80% of residents falling in this group. 23.29% of city residents are under 18, and 10.91% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 45.66% of Orange's population.

Table 17.2: Demographic Trends, Orange (City)

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	76,480	67.86%	71,105	54.48%	63,698	46.74%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,411	1.25%	2,258	1.73%	2,478	1.82%
Hispanic	26,031	23.10%	42,446	32.52%	52,480	38.50%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	8,193	7.27%	13,081	10.02%	16,512	12.11%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	421	0.37%	840	0.64%	793	0.58%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	22,772	20.22%	33,137	25.40%	35,300	25.90%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	15,638	13.88%	22,812	17.49%	24,965	18.32%
Sex						
Male	56,489	50.15%	64,927	49.77%	68,542	50.29%
Female	56,148	49.85%	65,535	50.23%	67,753	49.71%
Age						
Under 18	27,188	24.14%	35,677	27.35%	31,745	23.29%

18-64	75,361	66.91%	81,767	62.67%	89,676	65.80%
65+	10,089	8.96%	13,018	9.98%	14,874	10.91%
Family Type	76,480	67.86%	71,105	54.48%	63,698	46.74%
Families with children	1,411	1.25%	2,258	1.73%	2,478	1.82%

Table 18.1: Demographics, Rancho Santa Margarita

	(Rancho Santa Margarita, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity		**#**	**%**		**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		31,096	63.36%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,210	2.47%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		9,604	19.57%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		5,137	10.47%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		0	0.00%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		1,604	3.31%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		97	0.20%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	1,379	2.81%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Philippines	901	1.84%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	El Salvador	475	0.97%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Iran	446	0.91%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong and Taiwan	439	0.89%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	India	356	0.73%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Vietnam	345	0.70%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Germany	263	0.54%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Korea	232	0.47%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Argentina	208	0.42%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	2,183	4.80%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	224	0.49%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Korean	223	0.49%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Arabic	192	0.42%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog	190	0.42%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Persian	187	0.41%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Chinese	155	0.34%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Japanese	87	0.19%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Other Slavic Language	54	0.12%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	German	42	0.09%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%

Hearing difficulty	677	1.38%	303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty	442	0.90%	227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty	838	1.71%	445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty	1,108	2.26%	641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty	477	0.97%	312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty	715	1.46%	496,105	4.13%
Male	23,681	48.81%	6,328,434	49.33%
Female	24,839	51.19%	6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18	13,719	28.27%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	31,402	64.72%	8,274,594	64.50%
65+	3,399	7.01%	1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children	7,256	56.76%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Rancho Santa Margarita is majority White (63.36%) with significant minority populations of Hispanics (19.57%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (10.47%). This is a significantly larger White population than the county as a whole (41.40%). Black residents comprise 2.47% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 3.31%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.20%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Rancho Santa Margarita residents is Mexico, with 2.81% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in Rancho Santa Margarita are, in order, Philippines, El Salvador, Iran, China (excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan), India, Vietnam, Germany, Korea, and Argentina.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Rancho Santa Margarita with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Korean, Arabic, Tagalog, Persian, Chinese, Japanese, Other Slavic Languages, and German.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Rancho Santa Margarita residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, cognitive difficulty, independent living difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Rancho Santa Margarita residents are 48.81% male and 51.19% female.

Age

The majority of Rancho Santa Margarita residents are between 18-64, with 64.72% of residents falling in this group. 28.27% of city residents are under 18, and 7.01% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 56.76% of Rancho Santa Margarita's population.

Table 18.2: Demographic Trends, Rancho Santa Margarita

	1990 Trend[1]		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	#	%	#	%	#	%
White, Non-Hispanic	9,721	80.59%	35,728	74.82%	32,644	67.28%
Black, Non-Hispanic	147	1.22%	1,014	2.12%	1,111	2.29%
Hispanic	1,183	9.81%	6,019	12.60%	8,850	18.24%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	932	7.73%	4,350	9.11%	5,521	11.38%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	43	0.36%	325	0.68%	270	0.56%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	1,753	14.49%	6,404	13.40%	7,746	15.97%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	653	5.40%	2,595	5.43%	2,723	5.61%
Sex						
Male	6,055	50.06%	23,527	49.21%	23,681	48.81%
Female	6,041	49.94%	24,281	50.79%	24,839	51.19%
Age						
Under 18	3,118	25.78%	15,827	33.10%	13,719	28.27%
18-64	8,519	70.43%	29,814	62.36%	31,402	64.72%
65+	459	3.79%	2,168	4.53%	3,399	7.01%
Family Type						
Families with children	1,819	54.54%	7,149	64.49%	7,256	56.76%

[1] Rancho Santa Margarita was incorporated in 2000 so boundaries prior to incorporation may be different.

Table 19.1: Demographics, San Clemente

	(San Clemente, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		47,747	73.20%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		433	0.66%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		11,665	17.88%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		2,940	4.51%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		75	0.11%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		1,551	2.49%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		89	0.14%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	2,877	4.41%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Canada	400	0.61%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Iran	363	0.56%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Philippines	321	0.49%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Germany	264	0.40%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	England	202	0.31%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Colombia	198	0.30%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Korea	179	0.27%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	India	175	0.27%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Poland	162	0.25%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	2,672	4.47%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	103	0.17%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Tagalog	91	0.15%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Korean	83	0.14%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Persian	74	0.12%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Japanese	60	0.10%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Chinese	53	0.09%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Greek	34	0.06%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Thai	34	0.06%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island Language	17	0.03%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		1,950	3.01%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		783	1.21%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		1,581	2.44%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		2,060	3.18%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		929	1.43%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		1,675	2.59%		496,105	4.13%
Male		31,315	50.27%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		30,980	49.73%		6,500,403	50.67%

Under 18	14,972	24.03%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	39,094	62.76%	8,274,594	64.50%
65+	8,228	13.21%	1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children	7,482	45.56%	1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

San Clemente is majority White (73.20%) with a significant minority population of Hispanics (17.88%). This is a significantly larger White population than the county as a whole (41.40%). Black residents comprise 0.66% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.11% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 2.49%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.14%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for San Clemente residents is Mexico, with 4.41% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in San Clemente are, in order, Canada, Iran, Philippines, Germany, England, Colombia, Korea, India, and Poland.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in San Clemente with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Korean, Persian, Japanese, Chinese, Greek, Thai, and Other Pacific Island Languages.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by San Clemente residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, hearing difficulty, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

San Clemente residents are 50.27% male and 49.73% female.

Age

The majority of San Clemente residents are between 18-64, with 62.76% of residents falling in this group. 24.03% of city residents are under 18, and 13.21% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 45.56% of San Clemente's population.

Table 19.2: Demographic Trends, San Clemente

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	35,093	83.45%	40,022	78.55%	47,349	76.01%
Black, Non-Hispanic	250	0.59%	442	0.87%	577	0.93%
Hispanic	5,435	12.92%	8,028	15.76%	10,518	16.88%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,074	2.55%	1,802	3.54%	3,236	5.19%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	140	0.33%	419	0.82%	488	0.78%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	5,069	12.11%	6,797	13.34%	7,605	12.21%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	2,552	6.09%	3,666	7.20%	2,694	4.32%
Sex						
Male	21,017	50.19%	26,076	51.18%	31,315	50.27%
Female	20,856	49.81%	24,871	48.82%	30,980	49.73%
Age						
Under 18	9,037	21.58%	12,640	24.81%	14,972	24.03%
18-64	27,570	65.84%	31,879	62.57%	39,094	62.76%
65+	5,267	12.58%	6,428	12.62%	8,228	13.21%
Family Type						
Families with children	4,973	43.73%	4,960	45.52%	7,482	45.56%

Table 20.1: Demographics, San Juan Capistrano

	(San Juan Capistrano, Orange County) Jurisdiction		(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	20,600	57.30%	4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic	32	0.09%	859,086	6.70%
Hispanic	13,073	36.37%	5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic	1186	3.30%	1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.	140	0.39%	25,102	0.20%

Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		595	1.66%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		322	0.90%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	5,627	68.92%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Canada	272	3.33%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	England	271	3.32%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Peru	191	2.34%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Iran	150	1.84%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Cuba	149	1.82%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Philippines	147	1.80%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan	142	1.74%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	India	126	1.54%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Poland	119	1.46%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	5,935	17.65%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Persian:	143	0.43%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese:	102	0.30%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Other Indic languages:	54	0.16%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Vietnamese:	48	0.14%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	German:	33	0.10%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Japanese:	32	0.10%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Russian:	29	0.09%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:	29	0.09%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Tagalog:	28	0.08%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		1,181	3.3%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		744	2.1%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		1,134	3.4%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		2,144	6.4%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		1,251	3.7%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		1,653	6.0%		496,105	4.13%
Male		48.03%	11.0%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		51.97%	9.4%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		8,381	23.35%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		20,925	58.29%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		6,593	18.37%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		8,839	72.3%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

San Juan Capistrano is a majority White city, with 57.30% of residents being White. 0.09% of residents are Black, 36.37% Hispanic, 3.30% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 0.39% Native American.

National Origin

The most common countries of origin for foreign-born residents in the city is Mexico, at 68.92%. The remaining most common countries for foreign-born residents, in order, are Canada, England, Peru, Iran, Cuba, the Philippines, China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan, India, and Poland.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in San Juan Capistrano with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish or Spanish Creole. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Persian, Chinese, other Indic languages, Vietnamese, German, Japanese, Russian, Mon-Khmer Cambodian, and Tagalog.

Disability

The most common types of disability experienced by San Juan Capistrano residents in order are ambulatory, independent living, self-care, cognitive, hearing, and vision.

Sex

San Juan Capistrano residents are 48.03% male and 51.97% female.

Age

The majority of residents are between 18-64, with 58.29% of residents falling in this group. 23.35% of city residents are under 18, and 18.37% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 72.3% of the population.

Table 21.1: Demographics, Santa Ana

	(Santa Ana, CA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction		(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	31,499	9.42%	4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,716	0.81%	859,086	6.70%
Hispanic	258,449	77.27%	5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic	38,872	11.62%	1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.	430	0.13%	25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic	2,184	0.68%	267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic	377	0.12%	30,960	0.24%

#1 country of origin	Mexico	108,270	32.37%	Mexico	108,270	32.37%
#2 country of origin	Vietnam	20,391	6.10%	Vietnam	20,391	6.10%
#3 country of origin	El Salvador	6,021	1.80%	El Salvador	6,021	1.80%
#4 country of origin	Guatemala	3,153	0.94%	Guatemala	3,153	0.94%
#5 country of origin	Philippines	2,234	0.67%	Philippines	2,234	0.67%
#6 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong and Taiwan	1,215	0.36%	China excl. Hong Kong and Taiwan	1,215	0.36%
#7 country of origin	Cambodia	1,211	0.36%	Cambodia	1,211	0.36%
#8 country of origin	Korea	740	0.22%	Korea	740	0.22%
#9 country of origin	Honduras	707	0.21%	Honduras	707	0.21%
#10 country of origin	Peru	494	0.15%	Peru	494	0.15%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	123,215	41.06%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	13,682	4.56%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	984	0.33%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Tagalog	676	0.23%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Cambodian	618	0.21%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Laotian	327	0.11%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Korean	284	0.09%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Japanese	224	0.07%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Other Indic Language	222	0.07%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island Language	171	0.06%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		6,745	2.04%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		9,075	2.74%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		9,177	2.77%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		11,321	3.42%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		5,603	1.69%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		9,146	2.76%		496,105	4.13%
Male		164,857	51.05%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		158,082	48.95%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		99,297	30.75%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		201,647	62.44%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		21,995	6.81%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		34,031	57.04%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Santa Ana is majority Hispanic (77.27%) with a significant minority population of non-Hispanic Asian residents (11.62%). This is a significantly larger Hispanic population than the county as a whole (34.20%). Black residents comprise 0.81% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.13% of

the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 0.68%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.12%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Santa Ana residents is Mexico, with 32.37% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in Santa Ana are, in order, Vietnam, El Salvador, Guatemala, Philippines, China (excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan), Cambodia, Korea, Honduras, and Peru.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Santa Ana with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Chinese, Tagalog, Cambodian, Laotian, Korean, Japanese, Other Indic Languages, and Other Pacific Island Languages.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Santa Ana residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, cognitive difficulty, independent living difficulty, vision difficulty, hearing difficulty, and self-care difficulty.

Sex

Santa Ana residents are 51.05% male and 48.95% female.

Age

The majority of Santa Ana residents are between 18-64, with 62.44% of residents falling in this group. 30.75% of city residents are under 18, and 6.81% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 57.04% of Santa Ana's population.

Table 21.2: Demographic Trends, Santa Ana

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	68,937	23.58%	42,837	12.74%	30,994	9.60%
Black, Non-Hispanic	6,272	2.15%	4,817	1.43%	3,662	1.13%
Hispanic	189,758	64.92%	254,995	75.81%	251,792	77.97%

Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	26,112	8.93%	31,510	9.37%	35,171	10.89%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	671	0.23%	1,333	0.40%	891	0.28%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	148,116	50.69%	178,689	53.13%	159,506	49.39%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	125,596	42.98%	155,759	46.31%	147,471	45.67%
Sex						
Male	155,301	53.15%	174,039	51.75%	164,857	51.05%
Female	136,895	46.85%	162,299	48.25%	158,082	48.95%
Age						
Under 18	89,063	30.48%	118,041	35.10%	99,297	30.75%
18-64	186,981	63.99%	200,328	59.56%	201,647	62.44%
65+	16,151	5.53%	17,969	5.34%	21,995	6.81%
Family Type						
Families with children	32,142	58.43%	35,540	64.63%	34,031	57.04%

Table 22: Demographics, Tustin

	(Tustin, CA CDBG) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	**#**		**%**	**#**		**%**
White, Non-Hispanic		24,289	30.36%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,926	2.41%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		32,982	41.22%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		17,542	21.93%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		418	0.52%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		1,949	2.62%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		169	0.23%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Mexico	11,270	14.09%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Vietnam	2,115	2.64%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	India	2,048	2.56%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	Philippines	1,677	2.10%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Korea	1,446	1.81%	Korea	224,370	1.85%

#6 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	1,250	1.56%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Taiwan	1,040	1.30%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Iran	507	0.63%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Guatemala	405	0.51%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Canada	339	0.42%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Spanish	10,333	14.60%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese	1,665	2.35%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Korean	844	1.19%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Chinese	816	1.15%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog	400	0.57%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%
#6 LEP Language	Other Indic Language	285	0.40%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Hindi	218	0.31%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Persian	216	0.31%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Other Asian Language	183	0.26%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Arabic	165	0.23%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		1,749	2.19%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		1,216	1.52%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		2,308	2.89%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		2,894	3.63%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		1,162	1.46%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		2,353	2.95%		496,105	4.13%
Male		36,263	48.83%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		37,995	51.17%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		19,341	26.05%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		48,704	65.59%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		6,213	8.37%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		9,226	52.64%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Tustin is majority Hispanic (41.22%) with a significant minority population of White residents (30.36%) and non-Hispanic Asian residents (21.93%). Black residents comprise 2.41% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.52% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 2.62%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.23%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Tustin residents is Mexico, with 14.09% of the city population comprised of residents from Mexico. The remaining most common countries of origin in Tustin are, in

order, Vietnam, India, Philippines, Korea, China (excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan), Taiwan, Iran, Guatemala, and Canada.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Tustin with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Spanish. The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Vietnamese, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog, Other Indic Language, Hindi, Persian, Other Asian Language, and Arabic.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Tustin residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, and self-care difficulty.

Sex

Tustin residents are 48.83% male and 51.17% female.

Age

The majority of Tustin residents are between 18-64, with 65.59% of residents falling in this group. 26.05% of city residents are under 18, and 8.37% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 47.84% of Tustin's population.

Table 22.2: Demographic Trends, Tustin

	1990 Trend		**2000 Trend**		**2010 Trend**	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	33,203	64.04%	29,936	45.70%	26,741	36.01%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,546	4.91%	2,001	3.05%	1,879	2.53%
Hispanic	10,687	20.61%	22,177	33.85%	28,873	38.88%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	5,105	9.85%	10,452	15.95%	16,240	21.87%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	197	0.38%	401	0.61%	314	0.42%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	11,250	21.67%	21,580	32.92%	24,470	32.95%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	6,814	13.13%	13,970	21.31%	14,937	20.12%

Sex						
Male	26,403	50.87%	32,163	49.07%	36,263	48.83%
Female	25,502	49.13%	33,386	50.93%	37,995	51.17%
Age						
Under 18	12,604	24.28%	17,885	27.28%	19,341	26.05%
18-64	35,509	68.41%	42,998	65.60%	48,704	65.59%
65+	3,792	7.31%	4,665	7.12%	6,213	8.37%
Family Type						
Families with children	6,634	51.65%	8,043	53.99%	9,226	52.64%

Table 23.1: Demographics, Westminster

	(Westminster, CA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction			(Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA) Region		
Race/Ethnicity	#		%	#		%
White, Non-Hispanic		22,450	24.46%		4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic		797	0.87%		859,086	6.70%
Hispanic		21,783	23.73%		5,700,860	44.44%
Asian/Pacific Island, Non-Hispanic		43,957	47.89%		1,888,969	14.72%
Native American, Non-Hisp.		384	0.42%		25,102	0.20%
Two+ Races, Non-Hispanic		1,858	2.07%		267,038	2.08%
Other, Non-Hispanic		121	0.13%		30,960	0.24%
#1 country of origin	Vietnam	26,801	29.20%	Mexico	1,735,902	14.34%
#2 country of origin	Mexico	7,184	7.83%	Philippines	288,529	2.38%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	906	0.99%	El Salvador	279,381	2.31%
#4 country of origin	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	467	0.51%	Vietnam	234,251	1.93%
#5 country of origin	Egypt	428	0.47%	Korea	224,370	1.85%
#6 country of origin	Cambodia	379	0.41%	Guatemala	188,854	1.56%
#7 country of origin	Peru	294	0.32%	China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan	174,424	1.44%
#8 country of origin	Laos	277	0.30%	Iran	133,596	1.10%
#9 country of origin	Taiwan	273	0.30%	Taiwan	87,643	0.72%
#10 country of origin	Korea	254	0.28%	India	79,608	0.66%
#1 LEP Language	Vietnamese	22,514	26.32%	Spanish	2,033,088	16.79%
#2 LEP Language	Spanish	6,446	7.53%	Chinese	239,576	1.98%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese	1,026	1.20%	Korean	156,343	1.29%
#4 LEP Language	Korean	234	0.27%	Vietnamese	147,472	1.22%
#5 LEP Language	Cambodian	223	0.26%	Armenian	87,201	0.72%

#6 LEP Language	Tagalog	213	0.25%	Tagalog	86,691	0.72%
#7 LEP Language	Laotian	202	0.24%	Persian	41,051	0.34%
#8 LEP Language	Japanese	154	0.18%	Japanese	32,457	0.27%
#9 LEP Language	Arabic	147	0.17%	Russian	28,358	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	Armenian	77	0.09%	Arabic	23,275	0.19%
Hearing difficulty		3,399	3.71%		303,390	2.52%
Vision difficulty		1,959	2.14%		227,927	1.90%
Cognitive difficulty		5,517	6.02%		445,175	3.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		6,308	6.89%		641,347	5.34%
Self-care difficulty		2,964	3.24%		312,961	2.60%
Independent living difficulty		5,665	6.19%		496,105	4.13%
Male		44,523	49.57%		6,328,434	49.33%
Female		45,295	50.43%		6,500,403	50.67%
Under 18		21,014	23.40%		3,138,867	24.47%
18-64		56,236	62.61%		8,274,594	64.50%
65+		12,568	13.99%		1,415,376	11.03%
Families with children		9,079	44.54%		1,388,564	47.84%

Race and Ethnicity

Westminster is majority non-Hispanic Asian residents (47.89%) with a significant minority population of White residents (24.46%) and Hispanic residents (23.73%). This is a significantly higher percentage of non-Hispanic Asian residents than Orange County overall (19.78%). Black residents comprise 0.87% of the population, and non-Hispanic Native Americans comprise 0.42% of the population. The percentage of multi-race non-Hispanic population is 2.07%, and the other non-Hispanic population is 0.13%.

National Origin

The most common country of origin for Westminster residents is Vietnam, with 29.20% of the city population comprised of residents from Vietnam. This is distinct from the most common country of origin for all Orange County residents (Mexico). The remaining most common countries of origin in Westminster are, in order, Mexico, Philippines, China (excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan), Egypt, Cambodia, Peru, Laos, Taiwan, and Korea.

Limited English Proficiency

The most commonly spoken language for those in Westminster with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is Vietnamese. This is distinct from the most common LEP language overall in Orange County (Spanish). The remaining most common languages for those with LEP are, in order, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Cambodian, Tagalog, Laotian, Japanese, Arabic, and Armenian.

Disability

The most common type of disability experienced by Westminster residents is ambulatory difficulty. The remaining most common disabilities are, in order of prevalence, independent living difficulty, cognitive difficulty, hearing difficulty, self-care difficulty, and vision difficulty.

Sex

Westminster residents are 49.57% male and 50.43% female.

Age

The majority of Westminster residents are between 18-64, with 62.61% of residents falling in this group. 23.40% of city residents are under 18, and 13.99% are 65 or older.

Familial Status

Families with children constitute 44.54% of Westminster's population.

Table 23.2: Demographic Trends, Westminster

	1990 Trend		2000 Trend		2010 Trend	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	45,552	57.77%	32,550	36.89%	23,627	26.31%
Black, Non-Hispanic	775	0.98%	985	1.12%	1,047	1.17%
Hispanic	15,131	19.19%	19,678	22.30%	21,709	24.17%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	16,918	21.45%	33,809	38.32%	42,829	47.68%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	357	0.45%	756	0.86%	454	0.51%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	22,718	28.86%	37,094	42.04%	39,808	44.32%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	16,594	21.08%	28,427	32.22%	30,447	33.90%
Sex						
Male	40,162	51.03%	44,216	50.11%	44,523	49.57%
Female	38,546	48.97%	44,019	49.89%	45,295	50.43%
Age						
Under 18	19,745	25.09%	23,821	27.00%	21,014	23.40%
18-64	51,871	65.90%	54,970	62.30%	56,236	62.61%
65+	7,093	9.01%	9,443	10.70%	12,568	13.99%
Family Type						

Families with children	9,049	46.90%	9,753	49.37%	9,079	44.54%

Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim, CA Region

Religion

The most common religious group is Roman Catholic. Approximately 797,473 County residents identify as Roman Catholic, which is 26.49% of the total population. The second most common is nondenominational, which accounts for 122,205 residents, or 4.06% of the total population. Southern Baptist Convention and Mormon account for 2.30% and 2.22% of the population respectively. The remaining religions, which account for less than 1% of the total county population, are Assemblies of God, Buddhism, Muslim, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Church of Christ.

Table 24: Demographic Trends, Region

	1990 Trend		**2000 Trend**		**2010 Trend**	
Race/Ethnicity	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
White, Non-Hispanic	5,166,768	45.86%	4,417,595	35.72%	4,056,820	31.62%
Black, Non-Hispanic	971,105	8.62%	1,001,103	8.10%	932,431	7.27%
Hispanic	3,914,001	34.74%	5,117,049	41.38%	5,700,862	44.44%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,146,691	10.18%	1,651,006	13.35%	2,046,118	15.95%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	36,210	0.32%	66,029	0.53%	54,362	0.42%
National Origin						
Foreign-born	3,469,567	30.80%	4,299,323	34.77%	4,380,850	34.15%
LEP						
Limited English Proficiency	2,430,630	21.57%	3,132,663	25.33%	3,053,077	23.80%
Sex						
Male	5,626,077	49.94%	6,107,286	49.39%	6,328,434	49.33%
Female	5,640,051	50.06%	6,258,058	50.61%	6,500,403	50.67%
Age						
Under 18	2,911,031	25.84%	3,518,245	28.45%	3,138,867	24.47%
18-64	7,280,517	64.62%	7,641,369	61.80%	8,274,594	64.50%

65+	1,074,580	9.54%	1,205,730	9.75%	1,415,376	11.03%
Family Type						
Families with children	1,318,473	50.20%	1,143,222	53.64%	1,388,564	47.84%

Over time, the non-Hispanic white population has dropped over time since 1990 both measured both by percentage change and overall population decline. The white population has dropped by 21.48% since 1990, and has decreased by 1,109,948 people over that span. The white population has gone from representing 45.86% of the region's population to representing 31.62% of the region's population. By contrast, the Hispanic population in Orange County has grown significantly: 1,786,859 more people identify as Hispanic currently as compared to 1990, and Hispanic residents now represent 44.44% of the region's population, up from 34.74% in 1990. The Asian, non-Hispanic population has also increased over this time period, albeit at a slower pace than the Hispanic population: 237,963 more residents are non-Hispanic Asians, and their proportion of the region's population has increased from 10.18% to 14.72% today. The Black population has decreased slightly (from 8.62% to 6.70%), while the Native American population has remained relatively flat (0.32% to 0.20%).

The percentage of population with LEP has seen an increase of approximately 2%. The percentage of the population that are families with children has decreased slightly, by approximately 2.5% since 1990. The population of residents under 18 has remained essentially constant. The population of residents from 18-64 has also remained basically constant, while the percentage of those over 65 years of age has increased slightly (by approximately 1.5%).

A. General Issues

i. Segregation/Integration

1. Analysis

a. *Describe and compare segregation levels in the jurisdiction and region. Identify the racial/ethnic groups that experience the highest levels of segregation.*

Dissimilarity Index

	Value	Level of Segregation
Dissimilarity Index Value (0-100)	0-40	Low Segregation
	41-54	Moderate Segregation
	55-100	High Segregation

The tables below reflect the Dissimilarity Indices for each jurisdiction. The Dissimilarity Index measures the percentage of a certain group's population that would have to move to a different census tract in order to be evenly distributed within a city or metropolitan area in relation to another group. The higher the Dissimilarity Index, the higher the extent of the segregation.

Overall, Orange County experiences moderate levels of segregation, with significant variances in some individual jurisdictions. The Non-White/White value is 44.71, Black/White 46.98, Hispanic/White 52.82, and Asian or Pacific Islander/White 43.19. These values have all increased sharply since 2010, though values had remained consistent from 2000 and 2010. Jurisdictional values tend to indicate low levels of segregation in comparison to the county as a whole, but this is due to the spatial distribution of populations *across* different jurisdictions rather than *within* different jurisdictions.

Areas in central Orange County have the highest Dissimilarity Index values for their populations. Orange City, Santa Ana and Tustin are particularly affected. The Black/White index value for the city of Orange is 42.35, as opposed to a 22.63 Non-White/White index value. Neighboring Santa Ana has a 50.58 Non-White/White index value, and Tustin 48.19. Hispanic residents are affected in Santa Ana, with Dissimilarity Index value of 52.62, and Black and Hispanic residents are especially segregated with values of 66.02 and 57.43, respectively. These measures are relevant because Hispanic residents are more concentrated in Anaheim and Santa Ana, compared to the rest of the county.

Black residents face consistently high Dissimilarity Index values, especially compared to Non-White/White or other populations' index values. They experience higher levels of segregation in La Habra, Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, Orange and Santa Ana, and especially high levels in Newport Beach and Tustin, at 67.68 and 66.02, respectively. This is not represented in county-wide Dissimilarity Index values likely due to Black residents being comparatively more evenly distributed throughout the county than in individual jurisdictions.

Hispanic residents also face somewhat high Dissimilarity Index values, though values in individual jurisdictions are typically below the 40.00 threshold. Noticeable differences are evident in Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley, Santa Ana, and Tustin, which have relatively high levels of segregation. In Santa Ana and Tustin, Dissimilarity Index values for Hispanic residents in relation to White residents are 52.62 and 57.43 respectively.

Dissimilarity Index values for Asian or Pacific Islander residents vary. Some jurisdictions have lower values, and others higher. In Garden Grove, values for Asian or Pacific Islanders are higher than for other groups.

Table 1 Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Orange County

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	30.38	34.71	33.58	44.71
Black/White	32.60	33.63	32.27	46.98
Hispanic/White	36.13	41.08	38.18	52.82
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	32.58	34.31	34.82	43.19

Table 2: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Aliso Viejo

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Current
Non-White/White	13.03
Black/White	50.89
Hispanic/White	22.57
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	14.98

Table 3: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Anaheim

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	29.37	31.67	31.72	31.70
Black/White	22.24	26.01	27.90	39.71
Hispanic/White	38.81	40.34	38.84	38.40
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	13.26	17.36	21.59	25.16

Table 4: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Buena Park

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	18.17	22.07	21.40	23.51
Black/White	21.76	23.51	25.25	42.66
Hispanic/White	26.64	33.21	30.85	36.71
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	11.56	13.87	16.44	15.49

Table 5: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Costa Mesa

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	29.76	36.82	34.36	35.80
Black/White	30.21	27.11	27.72	44.23
Hispanic/White	34.42	45.28	41.93	42.06
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	30.34	31.93	30.60	42.65

Table 6: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Fountain Valley

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	14.25	22.27	23.54	34.00
Black/White	27.24	27.57	26.28	39.71
Hispanic/White	21.64	28.33	29.59	42.15
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	13.85	22.12	23.58	33.68

Table 7: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Fullerton

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	25.53	31.15	30.52	29.76
Black/White	30.59	31.83	26.53	28.59
Hispanic/White	33.72	39.98	38.28	35.96
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	30.41	33.48	35.24	33.56

Table 8: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Garden Grove

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	25.06	31.79	32.16	34.93
Black/White	22.18	23.11	23.45	35.03
Hispanic/White	27.67	32.64	33.20	36.26
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	27.45	34.98	33.98	38.21

Table 9: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Huntington Beach

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	21.11	23.44	21.58	25.52
Black/White	21.45	19.99	24.21	37.58
Hispanic/White	28.10	33.37	30.09	28.86
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	22.86	20.11	18.25	26.26

Table 10: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Irvine

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	16.50	21.56	18.01	19.24
Black/White	43.00	27.84	19.37	39.54
Hispanic/White	21.99	22.81	17.89	26.58
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	18.18	22.57	18.73	73.67

Table 11: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for La Habra

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	28.16	26.70	24.12	25.08
Black/White	12.56	13.23	19.35	40.12
Hispanic/White	33.91	30.92	28.56	30.22
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	40.47	38.68	36.53	27.99

Table 12: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for La Palma

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Current
Non-White/White	9.67
Black/White	17.98
Hispanic/White	1.93
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	13.62

Table 13: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Laguna Niguel

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	9.17	12.98	16.34	20.29
Black/White	13.82	22.75	16.24	45.64

Hispanic/White	13.34	20.76	22.79	27.18
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	13.37	12.68	13.82	18.94

Table 14: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Lake Forest

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	9.39	15.38	17.28	19.97
Black/White	12.43	12.16	9.52	26.59
Hispanic/White	15.72	26.10	27.63	30.04
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	8.84	11.06	13.46	17.18

Table 15: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Mission Viejo

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	13.67	15.18	15.75	29.15
Black/White	18.03	20.63	16.83	43.54
Hispanic/White	12.26	18.75	20.96	20.00
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	20.00	16.83	13.98	16.84

Table 16: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Orange (City)

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	23.79	24.21	22.68	22.63
Black/White	24.12	24.45	24.72	42.35
Hispanic/White	30.24	29.79	26.90	27.94
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	19.54	22.34	22.70	27.55

Table 17: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Rancho Santa Margarita

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	5.43	12.26	14.07	18.27
Black/White	7.18	12.64	13.35	23.56
Hispanic/White	5.73	19.52	23.13	24.53
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	6.70	8.56	9.55	17.95

Table 18: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for San Clemente

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	21.89	25.93	16.76	17.23
Black/White	13.86	19.08	14.93	37.45
Hispanic/White	27.16	32.90	23.71	21.95
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	14.66	14.76	16.56	27.33

Table 20: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Santa Ana

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	47.73	49.25	46.51	50.58
Black/White	36.60	28.03	25.25	42.30
Hispanic/White	53.07	53.60	50.02	52.62
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	43.05	46.79	46.94	43.95

Table 21: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Tustin

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	26.33	36.73	32.93	48.19
Black/White	42.49	35.11	29.03	66.02

Hispanic/White	31.14	48.19	42.55	57.43
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	19.20	17.74	19.76	28.73

Table 22: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Westminster

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	Current
Non-White/White	24.58	28.05	31.59	11.95
Black/White	11.56	14.18	17.62	35.61
Hispanic/White	30.31	29.74	31.83	9.64
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	23.15	29.73	34.65	16.31

b. Explain how these segregation levels have changed over time (since 1990).

In addition to the Dissimilarity Index, social scientists also use the Isolation and Exposure Indices to measure segregation. These indices, when taken together, capture the neighborhood demographics experienced, on average, by members of a particular racial or ethnic groups within a city or metropolitan area. The Isolation Index measures what percentage of the census tract in which a person of a certain racial identity lives is comprised of other persons of that same racial/ethnic group. Values for the Isolation Index range from 0 to 100. The Exposure Index is a group's exposure to all racial groups. Values for the Exposure Index also range from 0 to 100. A larger value means that the average group member lives in a census tract with a higher percentage of people from another group.

Table 23 Isolation Index Values by Race and Ethnicity, Orange County

Isolation Index	Current
White/White	55.16
Black/Black	3.32
Hispanic/Hispanic	52.81
Asian/Asian	31.84

Table 24: Aliso Viejo

Isolation Index	Current
White/White	62.94
Black/Black	3.97
Hispanic/Hispanic	19.52
Asian/Asian	16.32

Table 25: Anaheim

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	78.8	62.1	44.9	37.1	35.8

Black/Black	1.8	3.1	3.6	3.6	3.61
Hispanic/Hispanic	28.6	44.8	58.2	61.7	59.25
Asian/Asian	4.4	10.8	16.5	20	22.66

Table 26: Buena Park

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	76.3	60.3	42.2	31.8	27.37
Black/Black	1.6	3.1	4.7	4.6	5.08
Hispanic/Hispanic	20	29	40.1	45.2	49.04
Asian/Asian	5.2	15.1	24.5	31.6	34.19

Table 27: Costa Mesa

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	84.1	74.8	64.6	59.7	57.38
Black/Black	1.6	1.8	2	2.1	3.18
Hispanic/Hispanic	14.9	29.3	47.7	49.2	45.35
Asian/Asian	6.4	9.7	12.7	14.3	22.27

Table 28: Fountain Valley

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	83.9	73.4	60.6	52.4	45.93
Black/Black	0.8	1.2	1.7	1.5	0.75
Hispanic/Hispanic	7.1	9.2	12.4	15.1	29.93
Asian/Asian	7.6	18.6	30.7	38.8	42.97

Table 29: Fullerton

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	81	68.4	55.9	45.6	40.27
Black/Black	2.8	3	3.1	3	3.19
Hispanic/Hispanic	24.8	33.3	43.7	47.8	47.56
Asian/Asian	7	21	31.4	41	38.19

Table 30: Garden Grove

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	80.4	59	42	34.3	32.11
Black/Black	1.1	1.7	1.8	1.5	2.54
Hispanic/Hispanic	25.4	30.4	39.4	43.4	44.37
Asian/Asian	7.5	24.6	39.8	45.4	45.88

Table 31: Huntington Beach

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	85.4	80.5	74.4	69.8	63.99

Black/Black	1	1.1	1.2	1.7	2.68
Hispanic/Hispanic	9.5	18.3	26.7	26.9	27.39
Asian/Asian	5.9	9.7	12.6	14.8	21.32

Table 32: Irvine

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	84.3	74.5	59.2	47	46.09
Black/Black	3.6	4.4	2.2	2.5	3.19
Hispanic/Hispanic	7.1	7	8	10.4	15.57
Asian/Asian	8.4	19.4	35.1	44.6	41.54

Table 33: La Habra

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	76.6	64.7	46.5	34.7	35.40
Black/Black	0.4	1	1.8	2	1.79
Hispanic/Hispanic	31.2	41.9	55.4	62.7	62.64
Asian/Asian	2.8	5.8	15.4	22.5	18.18

Table 34: Laguna Niguel

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	92.7	83.2	77.9	73.4	68.74
Black/Black	0.4	1.4	1.8	1.7	3.98
Hispanic/Hispanic	4.4	8.4	12.2	16.7	20.88
Asian/Asian	2.2	8.2	9.8	12.3	11.02

Table 35: Lake Forest

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	n/a	n/a	67.9	59.3	54.69
Black/Black	n/a	n/a	2.4	2.2	2.95
Hispanic/Hispanic	n/a	n/a	23.1	30.7	32.32
Asian/Asian	n/a	n/a	11.6	16.2	17.49

Table 36: Mission Viejo

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	89.8	85.2	76.8	70.1	67.55
Black/Black	0.8	1	1.8	2	3.11
Hispanic/Hispanic	5.9	8.2	15.6	20.8	21.55
Asian/Asian	3.4	7	10.2	12.5	12.48

Table 37: Orange (City)

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	82.9	70.3	58.5	50.4	52.18

Black/Black	1.4	1.8	2.3	2.2	2.71
Hispanic/Hispanic	17	30.6	39.7	43.9	44.99
Asian/Asian	3.7	10.2	13.6	15.9	14.10

Table 38: Rancho Santa Margarita

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	n/a	78.3	74.9	68	67.91
Black/Black	n/a	1.4	2.3	2.4	2.28
Hispanic/Hispanic	n/a	11.6	15.1	21.9	21.90
Asian/Asian	n/a	8.2	9.6	11.9	10.65

Table 39: San Clemente

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	88.4	84.5	80.4	77.1	75.50
Black/Black	1.2	0.7	1	1	1.62
Hispanic/Hispanic	10	19.3	25.8	22.4	23.44
Asian/Asian	1.7	2.9	4.1	6.1	6.16

Table 40: Santa Ana

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	58.9	41.7	28.4	20.6	25.46
Black/Black	7.7	3.5	2.4	1.8	2.16
Hispanic/Hispanic	58.5	74.6	81.4	82.4	82.04
Asian/Asian	7	17.7	22.1	25.9	16.90

Table 41: Tustin

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	83.7	66.3	54.3	43.2	52.44
Black/Black	6.1	9.9	3.6	2.7	4.84
Hispanic/Hispanic	10.2	27	51.3	51.9	56.10
Asian/Asian	4.4	12.1	19.6	26.7	19.86

Table 42: Westminster

Isolation Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
White/White	78.2	60.7	43.2	34.3	16.61
Black/Black	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.3	0.78
Hispanic/Hispanic	14.5	24.8	26	28.6	28.35
Asian/Asian	9.5	25.9	45.8	55.4	57.40

Isolation values for different populations vary widely across the county and individual jurisdictions. Values for White residents are generally higher than for other residents, likely due to the larger number of White residents overall. In Orange County, White residents have an

Isolation Index value of 55.16, Black residents 3.32, Hispanic residents 52.81, and Asian residents 31.84. Values for the county are sometimes higher than values in individual jurisdictions for White, Hispanic, and Asian residents, again likely due to higher segregation across jurisdictions rather than within them. Isolation values have generally decreased for White residents over time, increased for Hispanic and Asian residents, and remained low for Black residents.

There are notable exceptions, however. White residents have especially high Isolation values in Aliso Viejo, Costa Mesa, Huntington Beach, Laguna Niguel, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, and San Clemente. While some of those cities have lower non-White populations, Lake Forest's significant Hispanic population suggests that White residents are disproportionately isolated. San Clemente has the highest White Isolation index value at 75.5. Buena Park has the lowest at 27.37.

Isolation index values for Black residents are uniformly low. Values are in the single digits, due to the low Black population across the county. These values have remained low and fairly consistent since the 1980s, with no noticeable exceptions.

Hispanic residents have experienced the highest Isolation Index value change over the last few decades. This is partly due to the increasing size of the population in the county. Certain areas have exceptionally high Hispanic Isolation Index values, however including La Habra at 62.64 and Santa Ana with 82.04.

Table 43 Exposure Index Values for Orange County

Exposure Index	Current
Black/White	38.76
Hispanic/White	27.47
Asian/White	35.78
White/Black	1.47
Hispanic/Black	1.56
Asian/Black	1.64
White/Hispanic	22.69
Black/Hispanic	34.09
Asian/Hispanic	27.54
White/Asian	17.10
Black/Asian	20.66
Hispanic/Asian	15.93

Table 44: Anaheim

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	76.7	57.2	36.7	27.8	25.38
Hispanic/White	65.9	45.4	27.3	21.2	20.8
Asian/White	78.7	61.6	41	31.4	28.44
White/Black	1.1	2.4	2.8	2.9	2.03

Hispanic/Black	1	2.2	2.6	2.7	2.09
Asian/Black	1.2	2.5	3.2	3.2	2.12
White/Hispanic	14.8	25.2	35.6	40.7	40.09
Black/Hispanic	15.8	29.7	43.1	49.9	50.48
Asian/Hispanic	14.2	24.6	37.8	44.8	44.5
White/Asian	3.9	9.8	15.2	18.6	19.66
Black/Asian	4.1	9.4	15.1	18.1	18.31
Hispanic/Asian	3.1	7.1	10.7	13.8	15.96

Table 45: Buena Park

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	70.7	55.1	35.3	25.5	20.09
Hispanic/White	72.8	54.7	33	24.4	20.39
Asian/White	73.7	58.7	39.4	28.6	25.83
White/Black	1	2.2	3.8	3.7	3.01
Hispanic/Black	1.2	2.6	4.4	4.3	4.15
Asian/Black	1.2	2.4	4	3.8	3.12
White/Hispanic	17.1	22.9	29	34.6	34.98
Black/Hispanic	20.5	27.1	36.4	42.2	47.49
Asian/Hispanic	17.7	23.1	30.5	35.3	34.03
White/Asian	4.1	13.8	23.4	29.2	31.53
Black/Asian	5	14	22	27	25.39
Hispanic/Asian	4.2	13	20.6	25.4	24.21

Table 46: Costa Mesa

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	83.3	71.4	57.2	51.6	48.14
Hispanic/White	78.6	63.2	42.6	40.2	39.24
Asian/White	81.4	69.5	57.2	52.7	43.84
White/Black	0.6	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.49
Hispanic/Black	0.6	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.23
Asian/Black	0.6	1.3	1.9	2.1	2.21
White/Hispanic	9.7	17.6	23.8	27.8	25.99
Black/Hispanic	9.8	19.4	28.9	33.3	26.41
Asian/Hispanic	10.2	19.1	26.7	30	28.27
White/Asian	4.2	6	8.5	9.9	11.69
Black/Asian	4	7	10.5	12.1	19.1
Hispanic/Asian	4.3	5.9	7.1	8.2	11.38

Table 47: Fountain Valley

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	83.5	70.8	54.9	47	40.9

Hispanic/White	83.4	71.6	55.4	46.4	29.3
Asian/White	83.3	71.8	55.2	45.9	32.95
White/Black	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.2	0.47
Hispanic/Black	0.7	1.1	1.6	1.4	0.47
Asian/Black	0.7	0.9	1.4	1.2	0.35
White/Hispanic	6.8	8	10.1	12.4	16.67
Black/Hispanic	7	9.6	12.7	15.1	23.22
Asian/Hispanic	6.8	8.1	11	13.3	21.16
White/Asian	7	17.2	26.3	33.2	33.5
Black/Asian	7	17.8	29.1	35.5	31.29
Hispanic/Asian	7	17.4	28.8	36.2	37.8

Table 48: Fullerton

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	73.3	59.5	44.7	37.3	32.48
Hispanic/White	67.9	54.6	40	33	29.88
Asian/White	78.6	60.7	44.3	33.9	30.48
White/Black	1.5	1.9	2.2	2.4	2.39
Hispanic/Black	2.1	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.76
Asian/Black	1.5	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.17
White/Hispanic	11.6	18.1	24.8	29.7	31.92
Black/Hispanic	18.1	26.4	35.6	37.8	40.13
Asian/Hispanic	11.3	16.1	21	22.4	25.69
White/Asian	4.4	11.2	15.7	21.5	21.94
Black/Asian	4.1	11.2	15.2	21.1	21.26
Hispanic/Asian	3.7	9	12	15.8	17.3

Table 49: Garden Grove

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	77	53	32.7	23.4	28.9
Hispanic/White	66.7	48.2	27.9	19.2	17.18
Asian/White	77	50.5	27.6	18.9	17.02
White/Black	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.48
Hispanic/Black	0.8	1.4	1.5	1.3	0.92
Asian/Black	0.9	1.4	1.4	1.3	0.89
White/Hispanic	11.5	20.7	27.8	31.3	31.25
Black/Hispanic	13.8	23.7	33	36.9	32.61
Asian/Hispanic	12.7	22.9	30.2	33.9	34.42
White/Asian	5.6	18.4	27.6	32.4	32.34
Black/Asian	6.2	21	31.4	37.7	32.74
Hispanic/Asian	5.4	19.4	30.2	35.6	35.94

Table 50: Huntington Beach

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	83.9	77.5	69.4	64.5	59.11
Hispanic/White	82.9	71.8	60.4	57.7	52.89
Asian/White	83.4	77.2	70.9	66.3	54.76
White/Black	0.7	0.9	1	1.2	1.26
Hispanic/Black	0.8	1	1.1	1.4	1.3
Asian/Black	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.21
White/Hispanic	7.7	10.2	12.3	14.6	17.18
Black/Hispanic	8.6	12.8	16.1	18.8	19.87
Asian/Hispanic	8.2	11.7	13.8	16.5	18.84
White/Asian	4.7	7.8	10.7	13.2	13.44
Black/Asian	4.8	7.9	11.7	13.9	13.99
Hispanic/Asian	5	8.3	10.3	13	14.24

Table 51: Irvine

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	76.8	70	54.1	43.9	39.74
Hispanic/White	81.2	71.9	55.2	44	42.26
Asian/White	81.7	72.1	53.8	43.4	41.17
White/Black	1.3	1.6	1.6	2.1	1.57
Hispanic/Black	2	2.2	1.9	2.3	1.72
Asian/Black	1.8	1.7	1.8	2.2	1.83
White/Hispanic	5.8	6.1	7.1	8.6	10.98
Black/Hispanic	8.3	7.9	8.2	9.9	11.29
Asian/Hispanic	6.7	6.5	7.6	9.2	10.48
White/Asian	7.3	17.4	30.3	41.3	36.5
Black/Asian	9.6	17.2	33.6	43	41.09
Hispanic/Asian	8.4	18.7	33	42.6	35.75

Table 52: La Habra

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	75.6	63.3	42.5	30.8	30.02
Hispanic/White	65.7	53.6	36.6	27.4	25.8
Asian/White	77.6	63.8	43.5	32.1	34.55
White/Black	0.3	0.9	1.7	1.7	1.09
Hispanic/Black	0.3	0.8	1.6	1.6	1.09
Asian/Black	0.4	0.9	1.8	2.1	0.96
White/Hispanic	19.7	29.8	43.4	51.9	48.56
Black/Hispanic	20.2	30.9	47.1	53.6	56.34
Asian/Hispanic	17.9	29	38.1	42.5	44.47
White/Asian	2.2	4	7	10.8	12.95

Black/Asian	2.6	4.3	7.4	12.8	9.89
Hispanic/Asian	1.7	3.3	5.2	7.6	8.86

Table 53: Laguna Niguel

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	92.4	82.4	75.5	70.9	59.48
Hispanic/White	92.4	82.6	75.1	69.4	62.18
Asian/White	92.1	82.7	76.6	71.2	65.29
White/Black	0.4	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.64
Hispanic/Black	0.4	1.4	1.7	1.6	2.3
Asian/Black	0.4	1.3	1.4	1.6	2.11
White/Hispanic	4.2	7.7	10.1	13.3	15.5
Black/Hispanic	4.3	8.4	11.9	15.1	20.84
Asian/Hispanic	4.4	7.6	10.6	14.2	16.95
White/Asian	2	7.5	9.1	11.1	9.62
Black/Asian	2.1	7.5	9.1	11.6	11.33
Hispanic/Asian	2.1	7.4	9.3	11.5	10.03

Table 54: Lake Forest

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	n/a	n/a	67.3	58.3	52.72
Hispanic/White	n/a	n/a	62.4	52	47.67
Asian/White	n/a	n/a	66.5	57.4	52.56
White/Black	n/a	n/a	2.1	2	2.01
Hispanic/Black	n/a	n/a	2	1.9	2.01
Asian/Black	n/a	n/a	2.2	2	1.87
White/Hispanic	n/a	n/a	17.4	22.4	23.84
Black/Hispanic	n/a	n/a	17.4	23	26.34
Asian/Hispanic	n/a	n/a	18.4	23.5	24
White/Asian	n/a	n/a	11.2	15.5	15.36
Black/Asian	n/a	n/a	11.5	15.6	14.3
Hispanic/Asian	n/a	n/a	11.2	14.7	14.02

Table 55: Mission Viejo

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	88.9	83.9	73.6	67.4	67.06
Hispanic/White	89.1	84.3	72	65	61.99
Asian/White	88.6	83.8	74.5	68	65.26
White/Black	0.7	0.9	1.4	1.7	1.62
Hispanic/Black	0.7	1	1.6	1.9	1.46
Asian/Black	0.7	1	1.6	1.8	1.47
White/Hispanic	5.6	7.6	11.5	16	15.89

Black/Hispanic	5.9	8.2	13.5	18.3	15.45
Asian/Hispanic	6	7.9	12.4	17	16.76
White/Asian	2.8	6	9	11.4	10.9
Black/Asian	3.2	6.5	9.8	11.4	10.12
Hispanic/Asian	3.1	6.2	9.4	11.5	10.92

Table 56: Orange (City)

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	79	35.2	51.7	43.3	43.93
Hispanic/White	76.8	60.6	48	42.2	42.34
Asian/White	81.1	67.4	54.7	47.5	48.65
White/Black	0.9	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.09
Hispanic/Black	1.1	1.4	1.8	1.9	1.28
Asian/Black	0.9	1.2	1.8	1.9	1.16
White/Hispanic	11.6	20.4	28.3	34.4	33.22
Black/Hispanic	14.8	25.2	34	40.5	40.53
Asian/Hispanic	12.9	20.8	28.8	34	33.15
White/Asian	3.2	7.6	10.4	12.8	10.58
Black/Asian	3.2	7.5	10.8	13.2	10.22
Hispanic/Asian	3.4	7	9.3	11.2	9.19

Table 57: Rancho Santa Margarita

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	n/a	78.3	73.2	66	66.49
Hispanic/White	n/a	78.3	72.1	63.6	62.68
Asian/White	n/a	78.3	74	66.6	65.32
White/Black	n/a	1.4	2.1	2.3	1.73
Hispanic/Black	n/a	1.4	2.3	2.4	1.63
Asian/Black	n/a	1.4	2.2	2.4	1.9
White/Hispanic	n/a	11.6	12.6	17.7	16.66
Black/Hispanic	n/a	11.6	14	19.3	16.6
Asian/Hispanic	n/a	11.6	13	18.4	17.99
White/Asian	n/a	8.2	9.2	11.3	9.43
Black/Asian	n/a	8.1	9.3	11.5	10.51
Hispanic/Asian	n/a	8.2	9.2	11.2	9.77

Table 58: San Clemente

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	85.5	82.3	75.9	75.3	76.35
Hispanic/White	86	77.1	68.6	70.8	68.96
Asian/White	87.1	83.6	79.3	76.4	74.08
White/Black	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.75

Hispanic/Black	1.1	0.6	1	0.9	0.63
Asian/Black	1	0.6	0.9	1	0.76
White/Hispanic	8.2	11.9	13.9	15.7	15.89
Black/Hispanic	10.4	13.8	18.2	17	14.78
Asian/Hispanic	9	12.4	14.5	15.5	14.98
White/Asian	1.5	2.6	3.7	5.4	4.29
Black/Asian	1.6	2.8	3.8	5.7	4.45
Hispanic/Asian	1.6	2.5	3.3	4.9	3.77

Table 59: Santa Ana

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	38.2	27.1	19.5	14.5	15.73
Hispanic/White	30.8	15.8	9.3	7.5	8.57
Asian/White	46.2	27.4	15.4	11.1	13.25
White/Black	3.3	2.6	2.3	1.8	1.29
Hispanic/Black	4	2	1.3	1	0.83
Asian/Black	4.8	2.4	1.6	1.2	0.96
White/Hispanic	30.8	44.4	56.7	63.9	60.58
Black/Hispanic	45.6	59.1	66.7	71.8	71.44
Asian/Hispanic	39.2	52.2	60.1	61.5	67.45
White/Asian	4.9	10.8	11.8	13.2	10.72
Black/Asian	5.9	9.9	10.6	11.4	9.44
Hispanic/Asian	4.2	7.3	7.5	8.7	7.72

Table 60: Tustin

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	78	57	40.3	32.5	20.01
Hispanic/White	81.4	56.6	30.8	26.3	23.47
Asian/White	83	62.7	48.9	37.2	39.02
White/Black	2.4	4.9	2.8	2.3	1.36
Hispanic/Black	3	6.3	3.5	2.7	3.49
Asian/Black	2.6	4.6	2.9	2.4	2.56
White/Hispanic	8.5	18.5	23.5	30	25.32
Black/Hispanic	10.2	24	39	42.8	55.54
Asian/Hispanic	8.6	20.1	27.2	33.1	34.8
White/Asian	4	9.8	17.9	23.8	17.08
Black/Asian	4	8.4	15.6	21.4	16.51
Hispanic/Asian	3.9	9.6	13.1	18.5	14.12

Table 61: Westminster

Exposure Index	1980	1990	2000	2010	Current
Black/White	78.8	57.8	38.6	29.6	17.19

Hispanic/White	74.1	52	33.4	24.5	16.4
Asian/White	75	53.8	31.1	21.4	15.21
White/Black	0.7	1	1.2	1.3	0.45
Hispanic/Black	0.6	1	1.1	1.2	0.51
Asian/Black	0.6	1	1	1	0.36
White/Hispanic	11.5	17.3	20	22.6	27.06
Black/Hispanic	11.4	18.7	21.8	25.7	31.71
Asian/Hispanic	12.9	18.8	20.9	21.7	24.54
White/Asian	7.7	20.5	34.1	41.1	53.04
Black/Asian	7.1	21.9	37	42.6	47.49
Hispanic/Asian	8.5	21.6	38.2	45.1	51.88

Exposure Index values are for the most part consistent with proportions of populations in individual jurisdictions. While Non-White/White exposure values are decreasing, exposure to Hispanic and Asian populations is increasing, and to the Black population is remaining the same. Exposure to White residents is exceptionally high in Mission Viejo and San Clemente. Areas with high Hispanic populations have high exposure to Hispanic residents as well, as seen in Santa Ana, but less so in Lake Forest, indicating higher levels of segregation.

c. *Identify areas in the jurisdiction and region with relatively high segregation and integration by race/ethnicity, national origin, or LEP group, and indicate the predominant groups living in each area.*

Race/Ethnicity

Map 1: Race/Ethnicity, North Orange County, CA



Map 2: Race/Ethnicity, Central Orange County, CA



Map 2.1: Hispanic Origin, Central Orange County



Map 3: Race/Ethnicity, South Orange County, CA



Clear patterns of segregation both across and within jurisdictions are visible in the above maps. In general, White residents tend to reside towards the outer edges of the county, while Hispanic and sometimes Asian residents are found more in the center of the county. La Habra, Anaheim, Buena Park, Santa Ana, Tustin, and parts of Costa Mesa have higher concentrations of Hispanic residents, while Fullerton, Westminster, Garden Grove, and Anaheim have higher populations of Asian residents. In areas with high Hispanic or Asian populations are present, segregation within a jurisdiction is more visible. For example, Hispanic residents are found more in northern Anaheim, western Costa Mesa, eastern Tustin, northern Huntington Beach, southeastern Lake Forest, and northwestern San Juan Capistrano. Asian residents are more heavily concentrated in Garden Grove, northern Fullerton, eastern Westminster, and northwestern Irvine.

Integration

More integrated areas of the County include the city of Orange, Fountain Valley, and Mission Viejo.

National Origin

Map 4: National Origin, North Orange County, CA



Map 5: National Origin, North Orange County, CA



Map 6: National Origin, Central Orange County, CA



Map 7: National Origin, Central Orange County, CA



Map 8: National Origin, South Orange County, CA



Map 9: National Origin, South Orange County, CA



There are some clear patterns of settlement based on national origin in Orange County. The maps above show the largest populations of foreign national origins in both the county overall and in individual jurisdictions. These maps were formed using the top five largest foreign born populations in each jurisdiction, but due to the high levels of overlap across jurisdictions, 12 populations total are represented.

In northern Orange County, there is a high Korean population in La Habra and Fullerton. A very large Vietnamese population exists in the area stretching from Garden Grove into Westminster, and a Filipino population is most populous in Buena Park and Anaheim. Anaheim, along with Santa Ana, also contains a large Mexican population, stretching into south Costa Mesa. Mexican residents are similarly scattered throughout central Orange County, though less are present in Irvine. Irvine has significant populations of all represented populations, and higher numbers of residents from the United Kingdom in particular. Mexican residents are especially present in the area bordering Lake Forest, Mission Viejo and Laguna Hills, and central San Juan Capistrano.

d. *Consider and describe the location of owner and renter occupied housing in the jurisdiction and region in determining whether such housing is located in segregated or integrated areas, and describe trends over time.*

Map 10: North Orange County, Housing Tenure



Map 11: Central Orange County, Housing Tenure



Map 12: South Orange County, Housing Tenure



Housing tenure varies widely across the county. Northern and more rural areas of the county tend to have less renters, as compared to more populous areas towards the center of the county. Anaheim, Santa Ana, Costa Mesa, Seal Beach, and Irvine tend to have much more renters than average. Some of these areas have high populations of Hispanic residents specifically, including Anaheim and Santa Ana. Irvine has a high population of students, which may explain the higher percentages of renters in that city too.

e. Discuss how patterns of segregation have changed over time (since 1990).

Maps 13 & 14: Race/Ethnicity in 1990

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

Maps 15 & 16: Race/Ethnicity in 2000

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

Maps 17 & 18: Race/Ethnicity in 2010

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

The main trends present in residential patterns in the County are in Asian and Hispanic populations. Asian and Hispanic populations were small but significant in 1990, and for the most part constrained to certain sections of the Central part of the County. This was mostly in the vicinity of Garden Grove and Westminster. By the 2000s, the Hispanic population began growing more rapidly in Anaheim, and Hispanic and Asian populations grew more rapidly into other northern parts of the county, including in Buena Park and Fullerton. There are fewer visible changes in residential patterns from 2000 to 2010.

Additional Information

> *Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about segregation in the jurisdiction and region affecting groups with other protected characteristics.*

HUD does not provide and the Census Bureau does not collect data concerning religious affiliation, but religion remains a prohibited basis for discrimination under the Fair Housing Act. Although the data discussed above with respect to national origin and LEP status can provide some insight into residential patterns with respect to religious given correlations between language, national origin, and religion, the resulting picture is merely a rough proxy. It is also a proxy that does not genuinely capture minority religious communities whose members are less likely to be recent immigrants.

The tables below, from USC's Center for Religion and Civic Culture, indicates the number of each type of religious center located in the county's jurisdictions. These numbers roughly correlate to residential patterns based on race/ethnicity and national origin. Areas with higher numbers of Buddhist or Hindu centers, including Anaheim, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, and Irvine, indicate more Asian or Pacific Islander residents or residents of Asian descent in those jurisdictions.

Table 65.1: Religious Centers, Orange County

Religious Center	ALISO VIEJO	ANAHEIM	BUENA PARK	COSTA MESA	FOUNTAIN VALLEY	FULLERTON
BUDDHIST		25	1	8	5	1
CATHOLIC		22	3	2	4	11
CHRISTIAN-OTHER	1	42	10	26	10	28
HINDU		6	3	2		5
JEWISH	2	12	2	3	3	4
MUSLIM		8		1	1	7
ORTHODOX		9		2		5
OTHER		37	4	23	4	13
OTHER-INDIA		9	7			2
OTHER-INTERRELIGIOUS				1		1
OTHER-JAPANESE		5			3	
PENTECOSTAL		1				
PROTESTANT	12	452	143	177	70	266
Grand Total	15	628	173	245	100	343

Table 65.2: Religious Centers, Orange County

Religious Center	GARDEN GROVE	HUNTINGTON BEACH	IRVINE	LA HABRA	LA PALMA	LAGUNA NIGUEL
BUDDHIST	46	1	4			
CATHOLIC	4	18	8	3		2
CHRISTIAN-OTHER	33	20	19	6		8
HINDU	2	3				
JEWISH	2	5	16		1	2
MUSLIM	3	1	1			
ORTHODOX	5		9	2		
OTHER	17	4	18	9		3
OTHER-INDIA			3			
OTHER-INTERRELIGIOUS						
OTHER-JAPANESE						
PENTECOSTAL						
PROTESTANT	301	180	150	124	16	39
Grand Total	413	232	228	144	17	54

Table 65.3: Religious Centers, Orange County

Religious Center	LAKE FOREST	MISSION VIEJO	NEWPORT BEACH	ORANGE	RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA
BUDDHIST		2	1		
CATHOLIC			7	27	1
CHRISTIAN-OTHER	5	13	20	19	5
HINDU	1	1	2		
JEWISH		6	9	2	1
MUSLIM	1			2	
ORTHODOX				1	
OTHER	2	15	13	14	
OTHER-INDIA				2	
OTHER-INTERRELIGIOUS		1	1		
OTHER-JAPANESE				5	
PENTCOSTAL					
PROTESTANT	16	64	51	263	13
Grand Total	25	102	104	335	20

Table 65.4: Religious Centers, Orange County

Religious Center	SAN CLEMENTE	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	TUSTIN	WESTMINSTER
BUDDHIST				23
CATHOLIC	4	5	6	6
CHRISTIAN-OTHER	8	8	13	16
HINDU			2	
JEWISH			6	5
MUSLIM			1	1
ORTHODOX			2	
OTHER	1	11	6	8
OTHER-INDIA		2	2	
OTHER-INTERRELIGIOUS				
OTHER-JAPANESE				
PENTECOSTAL				
PROTESTANT	57	52	98	150
Grand Total	70	78	136	209

Contributing Factors of Segregation

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and Region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of segregation.

Please see the Appendix for the following Contributing Factors to Segregation:

- Community opposition
- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures
- Lack of community revitalization strategies
- Lack of private investment in specific neighborhoods
- Lack of public investment in specific, neighborhoods, including services and amenities
- Lack of local or regional cooperation
- Land use and zoning laws
- Lending discrimination
- Location and type of affordable housing
- Loss of affordable housing
- Occupancy codes and restrictions
- Private discrimination
- Source of income discrimination
- Lack of public investment in specific, neighborhoods, including services and amenities

ii. Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)

R/ECAPs are geographic areas with significant concentrations of poverty and minority populations. HUD has developed a census-tract based definition of R/ECAPs. In terms of racial or ethnic concentration, R/ECAPs are areas with a non-White population of 50 percent or more. With regards to poverty, R/ECAPs are census tracts in which 40 percent or more of individuals are living at or below the poverty limit or that have a poverty rate three times the average poverty rate for the metropolitan area, whichever threshold is lower.

Where one lives has a substantial effect on mental and physical health, education, crime levels, and economic opportunity. Urban areas that are more residentially segregated by race and income tend to have lower levels of upward economic mobility than other areas. Research has found that racial inequality is thus amplified by residential segregation. Concentrated poverty is also associated with higher crime rates and worse health outcomes. However, these areas may also offer some opportunities as well. Individuals may actively choose to settle in neighborhoods containing R/ECAPs due to proximity to job centers and access to public services. Ethnic enclaves in particular may help immigrants build a sense of community and adapt to life in the U.S. The businesses, social networks, and institutions in ethnic enclaves may help immigrants preserve their cultural identities while providing a variety of services that allow them to establish themselves in their new homes. Overall, identifying R/ECAPs is important in order to better understand entrenched patterns of segregation and poverty.

a) *Identify any R/ECAPs or groupings of R/ECAP tracts within the jurisdiction and Region.*

Map 1: R/ECAPs in Orange County



There are four R/ECAPs in Orange County, two of which are found in Santa Ana, two of which are found in Irvine. The two R/ECAPs found in Santa Ana are predominantly Hispanic and found close to the Santa Ana Freeway. The northernmost R/ECAP is located along North Spurgeon Street, while the more southern R/ECAP is found along South Standard Avenue. The R/ECAPs found in Irvine are adjacent to each other and located on the campus of University of California, Irvine, making it likely that they qualify as R/ECAPs due to the high proportions of students. These R/ECAPs have a much more diverse group of residents, with some White, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic and Black residents.

b) *Describe and identify the predominant protected classes residing in R/ECAPs in the jurisdiction and Region. How do these demographics of the R/ECAPs compare with the demographics of the jurisdiction and Region?*

Table 1 - R/ECAP Demographics			
	Jurisdiction		
R/ECAP Race/Ethnicity		**#**	**%**
Total Population in R/ECAPs		33458	
White, Non-Hispanic		7858	23.49%
Black, Non-Hispanic		7858	1.63%
Hispanic			48.50%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic		79300	23.70%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		48	0.14%
R/ECAP Family Type			
Total Families in R/ECAPs		7848	
Families with children		2529	32.22%
R/ECAP National Origin			
Total Population in R/ECAPs			
#1 country of origin	Mexico	5782	17.28%
#2 country of origin	China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan	1387	4.15%
#3 country of origin	Korea	520	1.55%
#4 country of origin	El Salvador	464	1.39%

#5 country of origin	India	459	1.37%
#6 country of origin	Iran	395	1.18%
#7 country of origin	Saudi Arabia	219	0.65%
#8 country of origin	Russia	195	0.58%
#9 country of origin	Cambodia	192	0.57%
#10 country of origin	Taiwan	187	0.56%
Note 1: 10 most populous groups at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.			
Note 2: Data Sources: Decennial Census; ACS			
Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).			

These R/ECAPs primarily contain Asian or Pacific Islander or Hispanic residents. 23.49% of residents are White, 1.63% are Black, 48.50% are Hispanic, 23.70% are Asian or Pacific Islander, and 0.14% are Native American. 32.22% of households are families with children (they are likely located primarily in the Santa Ana R/ECAPs). The most populous countries of origin, in order, are Mexico at 17.28% of the total population, China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan at 4.15%, Korea at 1.55%, El Salvador at 1.39%, India at 1.37%, Iran at 1.18%, Saudi Arabia at 0.65%, Russia at 0.58%, Cambodia at 0.57%, and Taiwan at 0.56%.

c) *Describe how R/ECAPs have changed over time in the jurisdiction and the Region (since 1990).*

Map 2: R/ECAPs 1990, Orange County



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

In 1990, one R/ECAP was present in Orange County, along E La Palma Ave in Yorba Linda. This R/ECAP had a low population, with 82 total residents. 47.56% of the population was Hispanic, 8.54% was Asian, and the remainder were White.

Map 3: R/ECAPs 2000, Orange County



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends
Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

By 2000, the R/ECAP present in Orange County had shifted slightly to the West, in the area between E Orangethorpe Ave and E Frontera St. This R/ECAP remained sparsely populated, with 302 residents, 19.21% of which were White, 0.99% were Native American, 4.64% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 75.17% Hispanic. The original R/ECAP had a larger Hispanic population than before, and a shrinking White population. Another R/ECAP appeared in the northernmost portion of the University of California, Irvine campus, likely due to the presence of students. The R/ECAP had 2672 residents, which were 34.73% White, 1.57% Black, 0.41% Native American, 53.41% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 7.49% Hispanic.

Map 4: R/ECAPs 2010, Orange County



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends
Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Orange County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0004

By 2010, the R/ECAP in Santa Ana was no longer present. The high level of fluctuation in this R/ECAP indicates that the area hovers around the 40% poverty threshold to qualify as a R/ECAP. The second R/ECAP, which appeared on the University of California, Irvine campus is again likely caused by the presence of diverse students, though increasing poverty is also likely a factor. All the areas with R/ECAPs in the maps above once again were present in the most current map of R/ECAPs, suggesting that these will be continued areas for concern in the future.

Contributing Factors of R/ECAPs

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and Region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of R/ECAPs.

Please see the Appendix for the following Contributing Factors to R/ECAPs:

- Community opposition
- Deteriorated and abandoned properties
- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures
- Lack of community revitalization strategies
- Lack of local or regional cooperation
- Lack of private investments in specific neighborhoods

- Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities
- Land use and zoning laws
- Location and type of affordable housing
- Loss of affordable housing
- Occupancy codes and restrictions
- Private discrimination
- Source of income discrimination

iii. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

The following section describes locational differences and disparities experienced by different groups in accessing key features of opportunity: educational quality, economic factors, transportation, and environmental health. Access to neighborhoods with higher levels of opportunity can be more difficult due to discrimination and when there may not be a sufficient range and supply of housing in such neighborhoods. In addition, the continuing legacy of discrimination and segregation can impact the availability of quality infrastructure, educational resources, environmental protections, and economic drivers, all of which can create disparities in access to opportunity.

Three opportunity indices (economic, educational, and environmental) use data assembled by the California Fair Housing Task Force on behalf of the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) for the 2020 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map[1]. The Economic Opportunity Index is a composite of four indicators[2] depicting elements of neighborhood socio-economic character. The Environmental Opportunity Index reflects indicators[3] from the exposures and environmental effects subcomponents of the "pollution burden" domain of CalEnviroScreen 3.0. The Educational Opportunity Index is a composite of four educational indicators[4] capturing information on student proficiency, graduation rates, and student poverty. All indices range from 0 to 100, reflecting percentiles scaled to census tracts in Orange County[5], and with higher values indicating higher levels of opportunity.

The two transportation indicators (transit trips and low transportation cost) analyzed below employ data from version 3.0 of the Location Affordability Index (LAI)[6]. The transit trips index measures how often low-income families in a neighborhood use public transportation. The index ranges from 0 to 100, with higher values indicating a higher likelihood that residents in a neighborhood utilize public transit. The low transportation cost index measures cost of transportation and proximity to public transportation by neighborhood. It too varies from 0 to 100, and higher scores point to lower transportation costs in that neighborhood.

1. Educational Opportunities

1. *For the protected class group(s) HUD has provided data, describe any disparities in access to education in the jurisdiction and region.*

Countywide, there are disparities across racial/ethnic groups in access to educational opportunities as measured by the index. Across all tracts in Orange County, non-Hispanic Whites exhibit the highest exposure to educational opportunity (index score of about 59) and non-Hispanic Asians second-highest (53). Hispanics have the lowest access to these opportunities (31), with non-Hispanic Blacks in between (46).

Several jurisdictions score highly (index values at or above 60) on educational opportunity across all racial categories. These cities include Aliso Viejo, Huntington Beach, Irvine, Laguna Niguel, La Palma, Mission Viejo, and Rancho Santa Margarita.

Other jurisdictions obtain low scores on the index. San Juan Capistrano has low educational opportunity, scoring below 10 on the index for all races/ethnicities. San Clemente, Anaheim, and Santa Ana fare similarly poorly, although non-Hispanic Whites score higher (39) than other race/ethnic groups in that city. Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Garden Grove, Orange City, La Habra

and Westminster are other cities that struggle with educational opportunity, all with scores in the 30s to 40s on the composite education index.

Finally, a few cities have educational opportunity patterns that mirror those of Orange County overall. Non-Hispanic Whites in Fountain Valley have high exposure to educational opportunity (scores of about 60), whereas Hispanics in the city do not (30). In both Fullerton and Tustin, Non-Hispanic Whites and Asians have much higher access than do Blacks and Hispanics.

> 2. *For the protected class group(s) HUD has provided data, describe how the disparities in access to education relate to residential living patterns in the jurisdiction and region.*

Jurisdictions that score low on the education opportunity index exhibit different residential patterns. For instance, Santa Ana has high concentrations of Hispanics and a very light presence of any other racial or ethnic group. Anaheim also has high concentrations of Hispanics in the low-opportunity western neighborhoods of the city, but Whites and Asian/Pacific Islanders also appear to reside in those tracts (although at lower densities). The high opportunity eastern Anaheim neighborhoods are almost exclusively White. Garden Grove, Westminster, Buena Park and La Habra are examples of cities with low educational opportunity and that have a noticeable mix of Hispanics, Asians and Whites. Costa Mesa, San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente are low opportunity jurisdictions with high densities of Whites (although San Juan Capistrano and Costa Mesa have important Hispanic populations as well).

Jurisdictions with the highest educational opportunity also appear to have primarily large concentrations of non-Hispanic Whites and Asian/Pacific Islanders. Irvine, Aliso Viejo and Huntington Beach are good examples of cities with large populations of those two groups. Other high opportunity cities, by contrast appear more segregated and more heavily populated by non-Hispanic Whites. Rancho Santa Margarita and Mission Viejo are two examples of such places.

2. Environmental Opportunities

1. *For the protected class group(s) HUD has provided data, describe any disparities in access to environmental opportunity in the jurisdiction and region.*

Countywide, there are disparities across racial/ethnic groups in access to environmental opportunities, measured as lower exposure to and effects from pollution. Across all tracts in Orange County, non-Hispanic Whites exhibit the highest access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods (index score of about 54). All other racial/ethnic groups obtain lower index scores in the 40s: Hispanics score lowest at 41, followed by non-Hispanic Blacks (45), non-Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islander (47), and non-Hispanic Native American (48).

Several jurisdictions score especially highly on environmental opportunity across all racial categories. Laguna Niguel, Aliso Viejo, Mission Viejo, and Rancho Santa Margarita all have index scores in the 70s to 90s for all racial and ethnic groups. Fountain Valley and Huntington Beach also have higher access to environmental health, scoring in the 50s to low-70s on the index.

Other cities are low-scoring across the board. Orange City, La Habra, and Fullerton are the least environmentally healthy, with index scores in the 20s. Anaheim, Buena Park, Irvine, Santa Ana, and Westminster also have low access to environmental opportunity, scoring in the 30s to 40s on the index.

Other cities have disparate environmental scores between races. One such jurisdiction is Costa Mesa, in which Hispanics, non-Hispanic Whites, and non-Hispanic Native Americans score the highest (50s), while non-Hispanic Blacks (44) and non-Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islanders (35) score lower. Another such city is Tustin, with non-Hispanic Blacks and Hispanics scoring the lowest (20s/30s) and non-Hispanic Whites the highest (55).

> 2. *For the protected class group(s) HUD has provided data, describe how the disparities in access to environmental opportunity relate to residential living patterns in the jurisdiction and region.*

Jurisdictions with the highest environmental opportunity appear to have primarily large concentrations of non-Hispanic Whites and Asian/Pacific Islanders. Laguna Niguel, Aliso Viejo, Fountain Valley and Huntington Beach are good examples of cities with large populations of those two groups. Other high opportunity cities, by contrast appear more segregated and more heavily populated by non-Hispanic Whites. Rancho Santa Margarita and Mission Viejo are two examples of such places.

Lower-scoring cities exhibit a diversity of residential patterns. For example, Orange (city) has concentrations of both Hispanics and non-Hispanic Whites. Similarly, Fullerton has concentrations of Hispanic neighborhoods as well as non-Hispanic Whites and Asian/Pacific Islanders. Anaheim and La Habra follow a similar pattern. By contrast, Santa Ana is a city with low environmental quality that is characterized almost exclusively by dense concentrations of Hispanics.

b. Economic Opportunities

> *1. For the protected class groups HUD has provided data, describe any disparities in access to economic opportunity by protected class groups in the jurisdiction and region*

In Orange County, there are significant disparities in access to economic opportunity. Non-Hispanic White residents have the greatest access to economic opportunity. Asian and Pacific Islander residents (49), Native Americans (46), and Black residents (46) have lower index scores in the high to mid-40s. Hispanic residents (32) have the lowest access to economic opportunity of all racial and ethnic groups in Orange County. Among residents living below the poverty line, there are significant disparities between groups. White residents have the highest economic opportunity score (30) followed by Black residents (27) and Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (23). Poor Native Americans and Hispanic residents have the lowest economic opportunity scores (19).

There are major disparities in economic opportunity scores across racial/ethnic groups in other cities in the County. Generally, Asian and White residents tend to have the highest index scores in these cities. For instance, Tustin has very high scores for non-Hispanic White residents (77) as well as Asian residents (67) but Black and Hispanic residents have significantly lower scores (in the 40s). In Fullerton, Asian residents have the highest score (64) while Black residents have a score of 44 and Hispanic residents have a score of 37. In Santa Ana, White residents have the highest score (41) while Hispanics have the lowest (18). Costa Mesa has relatively high access to economic opportunity for all groups (high 50s to high 60s) but Hispanic residents have a

significantly lower score (42). In La Habra, economic opportunity scores are relatively low for all groups (30s and 40s) but White residents have significantly higher scores than other racial/ethnic groups. Other jurisdictions with relatively large disparities by protected class groups include Anaheim, Buena Park, Fountain Valley, Lake Forest, and Orange City. In these cities, Hispanic residents have significantly lower access to economic opportunity than other racial/ethnic groups.

A number of jurisdictions have relatively little disparity between groups. There are high economic opportunity scores for all racial and ethnic groups in Aliso Viejo and Irvine (high 60s to low 70s), although there are large disparities across racial/ethnic groups for the population living below the poverty line in Irvine. La Palma also has relatively high opportunity and little variation in scores between groups (index values ranging from 60 to 66). Huntington Beach, Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, and Rancho Santa Margarita have moderate economic opportunity scores for all racial/ethnic groups (scores from the mid 40s to mid 50s). San Clemente has moderately low economic opportunity scores with little difference between groups (scores ranging from 40-46). There is low access to economic opportunity for all racial and ethnic groups in Garden Grove (index scores range from 9-25) and Westminster (scores in the 10s).

> *2. For the protected class groups HUD has provided data, describe how disparities in access to employment relate to residential living patterns in the jurisdiction and region*

Economic Opportunity Index scores are generally lower in North Orange County than in South Orange County. Scores are especially low in Westminster, Garden Grove, and much of Santa Ana and Anaheim. Scores are generally high in much of Irvine, La Palma, and Tustin and along the coast from Newport Beach to Laguna Niguel as well as in unincorporated areas near the eastern border with Riverside County.

Areas in Orange County with the highest index scores tend to have large concentrations of non-Hispanic and Asian residents. By contrast, areas with the highest concentration of Hispanic residents tend to have lower economic index scores. Cities such as Fullerton and Costa Mesa are examples of localities with segregated living patterns and significant disparities between racial and ethnic groups. Neighborhoods in these cities with higher Hispanic populations score lower than neighborhoods that are heavily populated by non-Hispanic and Asian residents.

c. Transportation

> *1. For the protected class groups HUD has provided data, describe any disparities in access to transportation related to costs and access to public transit in the jurisdiction and region.*

As previously mentioned, higher scores on the low transportation cost index indicate greater access to low cost transportation. When analyzing Orange County as a whole, non-Hispanic Whites have the lowest scores (34). Asians and Pacific Islanders as well as Native Americans have a score of 38. Black residents have a score of 39 while Hispanic residents have the highest score (42). Regionally, low transportation cost index scores are similar for all racial and ethnic groups. Non-

Hispanic Whites and Native Americans both have a score of 19, Asians/Pacific Islanders as well as Hispanics have a score of 20, and Black residents have a score of 21.

There are no significant disparities between racial/ethnic groups in the low transportation cost index in most jurisdictions in Orange County. Index scores are in the 20s for all groups in Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, and San Clemente. Scores are in the low to mid 30s for all racial/ethnic groups in Buena Park, Lake Forest, La Palma, Orange City. Scores are in the high 30s to low 40s for all groups in Aliso Viejo, Anaheim, Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Irvine, Huntington Beach, La Habra. Scores are moderate (in the high 40s to low 50s) across groups in Costa Mesa, Santa Ana, and Westminster.

In both Tustin and Rancho Santa Margarita, White and Asian residents have significantly lower scores on the low transportation cost index compared to Black and Hispanic residents. These patterns are similar to those of Orange County overall.

Transit index scores do not vary significantly by racial or ethnic group in most jurisdictions in Orange County. Scores are moderate for all groups in Santa Ana with every group having a score in the low 50s. Scores are moderately low (30s to 40s) across the board in Anaheim, Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Irvine, La Habra, La Palma, Orange City, and Westminster. Transit use is extremely low (scores of 3 and lower) for all groups in Aliso Viejo, Laguna Niguel, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, San Clemente, and San Juan Capistrano. There is also little difference in transit index scores by racial or ethnic group in Orange County with all groups scoring in the low 20s.

There is a significant disparity between groups in Tustin and Countywide. Hispanics in Tustin have the highest transit index scores (64) followed closely by African Americans (60). Asian and White residents have significantly lower scores (49 and 42 respectively). Countywide, Hispanics have the highest transit index score (41) while non-Hispanic Whites have a significantly lower score (27) than other racial and ethnic groups.

> *2. For the protected class groups HUD has provided data, describe how disparities in access to transportation related to residential living patterns in the jurisdiction and region*

Low transportation cost index scores as well as transit index scores are generally higher in North Orange County than in South Orange County. Scores are generally higher in jurisdictions with greater levels of density. Generally, North Orange County cities have a variety of residential living patterns with varying levels of density. Additionally, some jurisdictions have highly segregated living patterns while others have a mix of multiple racial and ethnic groups across neighborhoods. Jurisdictions and neighborhoods with greater concentrations of non-Hispanic White residents tend to have lower transit index scores and transportation cost index scores.

South Orange County has a greater concentration of non-White Hispanic residents and has lower levels of transit service than North Orange County. This pattern likely contributes to disparities in transportation cost index and transit index scores between non-Hispanic Whites and other racial and ethnic groups in South Orange County jurisdictions and countywide.

f. Patterns in Disparities in Access to Opportunity

> *1. For the protected class groups HUD has provided data, identify and discuss any overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors. Include how these patterns compare to patterns of segregation, integration, and R/ECAPs. Describe these patterns for the jurisdiction and region*

Generally, access to opportunity is highest for non-Hispanic Whites and Asians/Pacific Islanders in Orange County. By contrast, access to opportunity is generally lower for Black residents than for non-Hispanic Whites and Asians and access is lowest for Hispanics. Metrics are lower on average in census tracts with more of each of these groups. Geographically, access to economic, environmental, and educational opportunity is generally lowest in portions of North Orange County. Anaheim, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and Westminster all have relatively low scores across various dimensions of opportunity. Access to opportunity is also low in San Juan Capistrano. However, access to transportation is generally better in North Orange County than in South Orange County.

Maps and Tables Appendix:

Table 1: Index Values, Aliso Viejo

Aliso Viejo	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	72.30550385	83.83909607	72.71175385	37.90481567	2.982049465
Black, Non-Hispanic	66.52386475	85.23960114	71.72485352	43.27718735	3.305222511
Hispanic	65.70877838	85.67479706	69.67499542	43.99542999	3.4930861
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	71.44657135	87.03471375	72.0605011	38.21439362	3.052240849
Native American, Non-Hispanic	66.95543671	85.84021759	72.0728302	44.31396484	3.418583393
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	72.1219101	76.88407898	76.13404083	40.00963593	3.032668829
Black, Non-Hispanic	73.1000061	82.69999695	66.6000061	30.55382347	2.297693729
Hispanic	67.39414215	84.66527557	75.61569214	42.99341965	3.097574472
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	67.48900604	85.0457077	69.90343475	44.67321396	3.799084425
Native American, Non-Hispanic	73.30000305	88	66.19999695	30.19909286	2.297693729

Table 2: Index Values, Anaheim

Anaheim	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	43.93139267	38.43595505	39.49500275	35.00980759	38.28310013
Black, Non-Hispanic	30.85617065	43.77084732	24.11480904	41.09883118	42.81028366
Hispanic	24.94393539	35.08900452	16.60894966	42.32661819	45.37927628
Asian or Pacific	35.78163528	45.57190704	28.93398666	38.00388718	40.76144028

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	31.95301437	39.92325211	25.63920212	40.02379227	43.23343277
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	31.62712288	41.38234711	26.39390373	40.36358643	42.55496979
Black, Non-Hispanic	21.08607101	37.48281479	15.80590439	42.93815613	42.37175751
Hispanic	18.12784386	35.43183517	11.7365303	44.72396088	48.39587402
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	31.28238106	50.9586525	23.88062859	39.64730453	41.40625763
Native American, Non-Hispanic	19.2225132	23.75654411	28.95340347	40.15534973	44.56227112

Table 3: Index Values, Buena Park

Buena Park	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	46.83927917	44.0955658	42.70969772	33.90605164	37.46681976
Black, Non-Hispanic	32.80804825	33.55254364	34.25307465	36.66135025	37.74475479
Hispanic	28.33981895	29.21013069	30.79724121	37.55573654	37.4323349
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	47.61252594	39.32788467	42.41317368	34.37330246	37.90651321
Native American, Non-Hispanic	40.82292938	40.50382233	38.02802658	34.82195663	37.10214996
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	40.31472397	40.72068405	37.29474258	36.05626297	37.11514664
Black, Non-Hispanic	25.9830513	38.49584198	35.70261765	40.10052872	38.47552109
Hispanic	17.92495918	21.97593117	24.49638939	39.0867157	37.56377792
Asian or Pacific	41.90719986	39.55010986	39.26160431	35.59976578	37.79622269

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	81.6641922	33.69506073	49.20370483	31.88211632	37.17000198

Table 4: Index Values, Costa Mesa

Costa Mesa	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	67.58622742	55.52037811	38.89334488	47.27882385	43.22631836
Black, Non-Hispanic	60.21097183	43.73588943	35.36569214	51.47803497	47.67166901
Hispanic	41.75721741	52.17251968	29.46787262	49.68540573	45.92378235
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	62.83917236	34.57888412	37.24597931	51.76671982	49.81667328
Native American, Non-Hispanic	57.93167114	57.8879776	36.08298874	49.50308228	45.41753769
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	59.96794891	54.49015427	36.67170334	49.62751389	44.84539795
Black, Non-Hispanic	69.71747589	15.24660206	44.42038727	60.94523239	57.05648804
Hispanic	30.79871941	51.77633667	27.76061058	50.66155243	45.77159119
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	65.26630402	45.6599617	37.13913345	51.9749794	47.06335831
Native American, Non-Hispanic	47.94121552	40.6466217	39.73918915	44.072155	50.18476486

Table 5: Index Values, Fountain Valley

Fountain Valley	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	60.60261536	64.15343475	58.0732193	34.88885498	39.57632446
Black, Non-Hispanic	53.71952438	56.91206741	44.76111221	39.96112061	40.72764587
Hispanic	41.24127579	59.6288147	33.37312698	39.45233154	41.81933975
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	44.98392868	58.26979065	41.64525986	37.5691185	40.36568451
Native American, Non-Hispanic	52.49386597	69.90551758	47.91042709	36.09816742	39.42101669
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	64.17408752	71.23667908	61.07992172	32.63380432	39.16001511
Black, Non-Hispanic	64.10958862	65.91918182	73.40000153	42.57266617	40.4589119
Hispanic	31.28120613	67.20317078	28.9899292	39.14260483	41.5614624
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	44.84921646	49.497612	36.71788025	40.1937294	40.57577133
Native American, Non-Hispanic	18	72.09999847	6.900000095	39.88677597	43.88391495

Table 6: Index Values, Fullerton

Fullerton	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	55.78549576	26.03284073	58.12939072	38.56270599	36.36819077
Black, Non-Hispanic	43.93449402	23.39889526	50.62736893	43.17352676	39.78337097
Hispanic	37.14920425	20.28424263	43.05700684	41.48886108	39.47481537
Asian or Pacific	64.09486389	25.70118332	65.7769165	35.43569183	35.37657928

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	42.6170578	22.90802765	48.14080048	41.21847534	38.35867691
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	42.62480927	23.49648094	50.72012711	45.41986847	40.98034668
Black, Non-Hispanic	26.27262497	20.02443314	37.49615479	50.76286316	44.32195663
Hispanic	29.84314728	19.52399254	38.35726547	43.06222916	41.15517044
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	57.70301437	27.73388481	64.75909424	42.01194	39.39395523
Native American, Non-Hispanic	43.26682663	22.70192337	51.35336685	38.76887131	34.99217987

Table 7: Index Values, Garden Grove

Garden Grove	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	36.39666367	47.3960228	40.38077927	36.63133621	39.78887558
Black, Non-Hispanic	27.92678833	47.87880325	33.18390274	41.15602112	41.82769394
Hispanic	22.90080643	47.05417633	29.86315918	41.03567505	42.94892883
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	23.95595741	49.54003143	35.30280304	40.51235199	40.41277313
Native American, Non-Hispanic	27.66724777	46.53165817	34.10087204	41.22572708	41.86322403
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	30.0959301	47.71313477	35.78342056	39.06194305	41.55861664
Black, Non-Hispanic	27.44144821	54.79440689	33.70690918	39.97136688	38.74142075
Hispanic	18.94665909	46.0896759	26.74869919	43.83759689	44.6900177
Asian or Pacific	22.66533279	47.17929077	37.85955429	40.4188385	39.69983673

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	18.80149269	38.3007431	27.1022377	48.05475616	43.73262405

Table 8: Index Values, Huntington Beach

Huntington Beach	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	64.58568573	71.44684601	69.54529572	37.66327667	35.70833206
Black, Non-Hispanic	55.74852371	61.43478394	59.94100952	40.57863235	36.41617966
Hispanic	48.91268921	56.34483719	59.14129257	42.3997879	36.54937363
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	55.79597092	58.89957809	60.11377335	38.13786316	35.30189133
Native American, Non-Hispanic	59.45223999	69.95332336	66.42298126	39.55618668	36.38960266
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	63.94906235	71.72304535	68.93916321	40.83568192	37.38664627
Black, Non-Hispanic	46.80564499	57.03628922	63.21209335	44.36582947	38.40356827
Hispanic	37.6064682	48.60849762	55.68051147	45.98036194	37.06981277
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	55.28670883	58.22230911	58.15016174	42.73658752	36.3033371
Native American, Non-Hispanic	63.99184036	89.20612335	79.1040802	25.95944023	33.74476242

Table 9: Index Values, Irvine

Irvine	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	73.63127136	39.08622742	81.49776459	36.18370819	35.191082
Black, Non-Hispanic	70.55041504	36.09516525	81.03330994	39.19680023	37.68433762
Hispanic	68.2244339	34.8563385	75.89785004	37.90677261	35.78848267
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	73.3141861	38.35515213	85.66765594	37.19092941	37.06846237
Native American, Non-Hispanic	68.81182861	37.30687332	78.0866394	37.68278122	34.32770157
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	62.00982285	41.2605896	81.79143524	41.65803909	40.29730606
Black, Non-Hispanic	78.47797394	30.86845207	85.13333893	36.81203842	36.52822113
Hispanic	45.06617737	43.96442032	84.95259094	44.5932579	42.19712067
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	50.49572372	45.72290802	87.87575531	44.2512207	42.13927078
Native American, Non-Hispanic	34.17985535	56.2374115	91.07769775	53.02960205	50.96051407

Table 10: Index Values, Los Angeles County

Los Angeles County	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	65.67538452	55.94469833	67.478302	18.965065	21.0825634
Black, Non-Hispanic	40.16342545	53.13132858	33.42098999	21.05691338	24.56006813
Hispanic	36.33623123	45.2298851	38.80290604	19.82450485	23.3633194
Asian or Pacific	57.39865494	49.95420074	61.21666336	20.27166367	23.09456062

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	45.30443192	51.25786972	49.35198593	19.37051392	21.6207428
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	57.50989532	51.78505325	59.31045151	23.57732391	25.74990845
Black, Non-Hispanic	31.36289787	50.94706726	26.02533722	23.28333092	27.20900345
Hispanic	31.3007412	42.91162491	31.26461411	22.65198517	26.92627716
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	50.03251266	47.77090454	55.55622864	24.86695862	28.33756065
Native American, Non-Hispanic	34.06453323	48.27433014	35.94702911	22.76408005	26.06622124

Table 11: Index Values, Laguna Niguel

Laguna Niguel	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	51.88405609	94.96172333	69.4879303	26.46920204	2.232567787
Black, Non-Hispanic	49.20069885	94.27303314	70.40055847	27.88728714	2.385162592
Hispanic	46.48111725	94.03167725	69.29504395	29.60008812	2.543926477
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	51.05093765	94.28031921	70.32914734	28.43764305	2.466272593
Native American, Non-Hispanic	52.94462585	95.30413055	70.03966522	27.89173698	2.296560049
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	48.66943741	93.59718323	70.38157654	27.90661812	2.297754049
Black, Non-Hispanic	61.86949158	94.28262329	58.08516693	32.82440567	2.653566122
Hispanic	47.95252228	94.91544342	73.69073486	29.40856171	2.452992439
Asian or Pacific	42.89958572	90.35707855	72.27500153	34.07725906	2.88683486

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 12: Index Values, La Habra

La Habra	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	40.55103683	27.87729454	48.14756012	35.66272736	35.27762604
Black, Non-Hispanic	35.30363846	29.53260612	45.65385437	39.55151749	35.42910004
Hispanic	32.31658936	27.45372391	44.28807068	38.3514595	34.83366394
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	39.38534927	24.85019112	49.1582222	37.03078079	37.28299713
Native American, Non-Hispanic	38.17602921	30.35684967	47.53630066	35.54092407	33.94094467
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	40.29798126	29.05448341	48.00325012	35.98387527	34.38015747
Black, Non-Hispanic	31.18307686	28.36153793	45.95999908	39.51876068	36.60215759
Hispanic	27.1908226	25.55690002	41.80315781	39.25904846	35.26225281
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	32.04285431	28.29251671	42.60680389	37.83418655	36.04021072
Native American, Non-Hispanic	24.10000038	11.80000019	38	44.92282867	41.23970032

Table 13: Index Values, La Palma

La Palma	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	60.54538345	52.2887764	74.90605927	31.26264191	33.98268509
Black, Non-Hispanic	62.44117737	50.76352692	79.34926605	30.94960976	32.45330429
Hispanic	60.14683151	53.11293411	76.4289093	31.19957161	33.79656219
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	59.61754608	54.71827316	80.94405365	30.98505211	33.03434372
Native American, Non-Hispanic	66.49090576	44.5484848	74.41212463	31.03777504	32.16746521
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	56.16556168	58.63651657	78.42116547	31.26299286	34.6687851
Black, Non-Hispanic	62	52.13999939	83.30000305	30.76098061	31.77929115
Hispanic	62.43789673	49.73848724	74.32682037	31.21320152	33.49207687
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	57.32141113	57.53029633	80.26992798	31.11726379	33.91407013
Native American, Non-Hispanic	59.40000153	51.29999924	62.90000153	31.94073486	36.83267593

Table 14: Index Values, Lake Forest

Lake Forest	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	52.10555649	54.81097412	60.88927078	31.83229065	3.096983671
Black, Non-Hispanic	49.18192673	55.03483963	61.46455765	34.36283493	3.168195009
Hispanic	39.65441513	43.67831039	53.05497742	35.60156631	3.339822292
Asian or Pacific	51.61265182	53.55771637	59.62294769	32.0095787	2.971857309

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	45.60740662	53.91375732	59.4603157	34.44470978	3.268085241
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	42.87811661	48.27126312	56.19835281	35.24717331	3.274830103
Black, Non-Hispanic	58.93999863	62.13200378	49.3239975	28.69176102	3.198252678
Hispanic	23.69203186	17.86175346	43.00056839	33.14248276	3.199719906
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	34.96779251	36.78378296	52.04999924	39.137043	3.588968277
Native American, Non-Hispanic	6.400000095	10.10000038	39.90000153	50.44693375	4.321035862

Table 15: Index Values, Mission Viejo

Mission Viejo	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	54.71001434	80.4629364	68.59661865	20.06777954	2.14685297
Black, Non-Hispanic	53.97848892	77.18696594	69.5125351	22.50149727	2.178300142
Hispanic	49.20601654	77.96643066	69.57389832	24.251894	2.186423779
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	56.29401779	79.96483612	69.64553833	20.08021736	2.172489405
Native American, Non-Hispanic	52.15392685	77.70209503	68.03507996	20.00351524	2.125685453
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	52.77148438	79.52762604	68.10930634	20.6295166	2.147603989
Black, Non-Hispanic	47.77692413	72.13846588	60.4153862	30.359375	2.514009476
Hispanic	41.74552917	75.55897522	73.74349976	27.94129181	2.138385296
Asian or Pacific	50.18946457	76.0255127	75.70388031	27.29961014	2.231768131

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 16: Index Values, Orange City

Orange City	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	59.93873978	24.79452133	42.08477402	31.92243958	36.35044479
Black, Non-Hispanic	54.84865952	18.7726078	35.12828445	37.30315018	39.30299377
Hispanic	47.76997757	19.34976578	33.2277832	36.87007141	38.43082809
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	61.62908554	28.02267647	45.12159348	31.81376266	35.78025818
Native American, Non-Hispanic	52.82477188	20.58942604	36.06827545	34.44309235	37.73715973
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	53.57085419	17.67649841	33.95972061	36.44538879	39.62675095
Black, Non-Hispanic	35.50442505	12.76637173	29.51858521	37.15558624	28.86623383
Hispanic	41.78118134	23.23805237	32.39267731	36.83862305	39.01893616
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	61.44256592	21.8933773	41.95364761	37.79168701	37.63070297
Native American, Non-Hispanic	31.33373451	10.93734932	20.50963974	41.80668259	43.29630661

Table 17: Index Values, Orange County

Orange County	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	59.36914825	53.88697052	58.6191597	33.84046555	27.43986702
Black, Non-Hispanic	45.8503685	45.21717072	45.6352005	39.68424606	36.21459579
Hispanic	31.86008644	41.02077866	30.86243248	41.80742645	41.28927612
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	49.36313629	46.78428268	52.50125504	37.48302841	36.11438751
Native American, Non-Hispanic	46.39406204	48.79929352	45.07330704	37.47456741	33.02807617
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	51.70472336	51.01126099	52.13442612	39.18977356	32.26565933
Black, Non-Hispanic	36.25161743	40.4234581	37.29018784	40.77672958	35.60103607
Hispanic	22.65623665	39.02124786	23.81145287	45.65877533	46.35126877
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	38.94393158	46.38044739	48.32249832	41.97251129	39.51419449
Native American, Non-Hispanic	35.89070892	38.62186813	40.92134476	40.15331268	40.17951965

Table 18: Index Values, Rancho Santa Margarita

Rancho Santa Margarita	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	55.31455231	77.42084503	74.73116302	22.26515198	1.739218593
Black, Non-Hispanic	48.5736618	78.66453552	72.82685852	29.90576553	2.138027906
Hispanic	46.87901688	79.68223572	71.21639252	31.94477654	2.276622057
Asian or Pacific	52.71126556	76.4618454	74.23796082	25.72115326	1.882683992

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	52.11122513	76.42857361	73.22245026	27.17526817	1.988348365
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	46.90814972	80.66777802	70.89245605	30.65854645	2.180054665
Black, Non-Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	37.29422379	84.92796326	66.2130661	40.81872559	2.736426592
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	60.54124069	82.12485504	78.08983612	16.653265	1.491689444
Native American, Non-Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 19: Index Values, San Clemente

San Clemente	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	43.86069107	53.53229904	26.15826035	20.86557388	1.323781729
Black, Non-Hispanic	44.58891678	53.67986298	26.91267014	20.62924576	1.308523178
Hispanic	40.03211212	58.22519684	23.51825714	25.35934067	1.459569693
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	46.24467087	51.4276619	27.82583618	19.14149284	1.219676495
Native American, Non-Hispanic	41.8181076	55.99135971	26.10987663	23.12410355	1.460949898
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	40.29958344	52.50610733	22.75804329	23.32270622	1.429345369
Black, Non-Hispanic	21.60899544	46.30582047	12.44285679	22.93115044	1.561009169
Hispanic	38.13341522	59.1672554	19.66854095	25.5105629	1.351897478
Asian or Pacific	36.40293121	78.38371277	26.14299583	19.77955627	0.901919305

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	40.5885849	56.44565201	26.93206596	15.30980492	0.906552672

Table 20: Index Values, San Juan Capistrano

San Juan Capistrano	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	24.8559227	40.60459518	3.96122098	28.67803192	2.159676313
Black, Non-Hispanic	17.48586845	44.83804321	4.980434895	30.27136993	2.118023157
Hispanic	9.223362923	51.43849182	6.480751991	31.45836258	1.975713015
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	24.93882942	43.21843719	4.463120461	27.79998398	2.022916555
Native American, Non-Hispanic	12.91760635	49.70633698	6.045070648	30.53370857	1.976489902
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	24.2220974	38.93087769	3.655807257	29.47362709	2.26116538
Black, Non-Hispanic	53.59999847	39.20000076	2.900000095	17.58180046	1.543227077
Hispanic	8.015656471	53.10263824	6.83494997	31.40584183	1.918851495
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	8.699999809	32.79999924	2.900000095	37.69218826	2.949278355
Native American, Non-Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 21: Index Values, Santa Ana

Santa Ana	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	40.84465027	33.96951294	24.41191101	47.15653229	52.06034851
Black, Non-Hispanic	29.20541	38.66877747	19.36479187	48.0304451	54.12454987
Hispanic	18.03375626	41.18429947	15.26601601	46.74744034	54.8878212
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	25.11046028	46.18630219	18.69794273	47.20291138	54.18437576
Native American, Non-Hispanic	25.56700134	38.30905533	17.4342041	45.30844498	52.30129623
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	31.77580452	34.26587677	19.81741333	48.76362228	52.66421127
Black, Non-Hispanic	25.08537483	23.57221222	20.0210247	50.08654785	50.39803314
Hispanic	14.87970352	41.16586304	15.27909184	50.43182755	57.66402054
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	25.55044937	45.79997253	17.13907242	48.1301918	52.26394272
Native American, Non-Hispanic	16.78843117	43.75597	12.58059692	42.92389297	57.04358673

Table 22: Index Values, Tustin

Tustin	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	77.3833313	55.53118134	57.9779892	37.03637695	41.61579132
Black, Non-Hispanic	49.5615654	33.86757278	33.26813889	54.51399994	60.01934433
Hispanic	42.9604187	28.64287949	27.41756248	56.88419342	63.88144684
Asian or Pacific	67.04686737	46.94258499	49.78988266	44.89656067	48.62200546

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	63.12244797	43.92755127	47.4581604	43.06391144	49.6460228
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	57.39323807	42.8909874	38.77998352	47.96840286	52.79444885
Black, Non-Hispanic	36.90000153	22.5	25.10000038	55.18679047	64.45001984
Hispanic	32.15452576	17.71869659	18.61776543	65.68024445	74.0960083
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	42.37282944	30.59916115	25.81988907	55.87603378	61.07912064
Native American, Non-Hispanic	26.20000076	13.69999981	14.19999981	65.00455475	66.8004303

Table 23: Index Values, Westminster

Westminster	"Economic Opportunity Index"	"Environmental Opportunity Index"	"Educational Opportunity Index"	"Low Transportation Cost Index"	Transit Index
Total Population					
White, Non-Hispanic	13.81653023	42.93841171	35.6662941	44.7712059	37.7172699
Black, Non-Hispanic	10.56679821	38.13873291	32.76600647	45.53092575	37.15086365
Hispanic	11.77696323	40.45322037	32.86334991	44.28075409	36.86459732
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	14.33915138	46.11770248	35.44109344	44.00982666	37.56019592
Native American, Non-Hispanic	15.28125	44.0395813	36.25625229	43.3792572	37.29174042
Population below federal poverty line					
White, Non-Hispanic	15.20829582	44.93229675	37.83362961	45.77521515	38.73999023
Black, Non-Hispanic	8.191836357	21.56734848	37.28163528	40.71427536	33.28907013
Hispanic	10.51876068	37.48429489	28.36954689	43.8158226	36.38402557
Asian or Pacific	12.96408653	44.58031464	32.6651535	44.92889404	37.62247467

Islander, Non-Hispanic					
Native American, Non-Hispanic	25.30000114	48.70000076	52.20000076	45.22904587	41.23970032

Map 1: Economic Opportunity Index, North Orange County



Map 2: Economic Opportunity Index, South Orange County



Map 3: Educational Opportunity Index, North Orange County



Map 4: Educational Opportunity Index, South Orange County



Map 5: Environmental Opportunity Index, North Orange County



Map 6: Environmental Opportunity Index, South Orange County



Map 7: Transportation Cost Index, North Orange County



Map 8: Transportation Cost Index, South Orange County



Map 9: Transit Trips Index, North Orange County



Map 10: Transit Trips Index, South Orange County



iv. Disproportionate Housing Needs [2]

Which groups (by race/ethnicity and family status) experience higher rates of housing cost burden, overcrowding, or substandard housing when compared to other groups? Which groups also experience higher rates of severe housing burdens when compared to other groups?

Across Orange County, many residents face high rates of housing problems, severe housing problems, and severe housing cost burden. The four HUD-designated housing problems include when a "1) housing unit lacks complete kitchen facilities; 2) housing unit lacks complete plumbing facilities; 3) household is overcrowded;[3] and 4) household is cost burdened"[4]. Households are considered to have a housing problem if they experience at least one of the above. This analysis also considers what HUD designates as severe housing problems, which are a lack of kitchen or plumbing, more than one person per room, or cost burden greater than 50%.

[2] The AFFH rule defines "disproportionate housing needs" as "a condition in which there are significant disparities in the proportion of members of a protected class experiencing a category of housing needs when compared to the proportion of members of any other relevant groups or the total population experiencing that category of housing need in the applicable geographic area." 24 C.F.R. § 5.152

[3] Households having more than 1.01 to 1.5 persons per room are considered overcrowded and those having more than 1.51 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded. The person per room analysis excludes bathrooms, porches, foyers, halls, or half-rooms.

[4] https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp/CHAS/bg_chas.html

Housing Problems

Table 1: Housing Problems, Orange County

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	206,658	540,773	38.22%
Black, Non-Hispanic	8,074	16,719	48.29%
Hispanic	152,740	241,841	63.16%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	84,193	186,038	45.26%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	1063	2,179	48.78%
Total	452,728	987,550	45.84%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	228740	576690	39.66%
Family households, 5+ people	95050	145028	65.54%
Non-family households	138270	273662	50.53%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	104324	540,773	19.29%
Black, Non-Hispanic	4816	16,719	28.81%
Hispanic	107752	241,841	44.55%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	50205	186,038	26.99%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	544	2,179	24.97%
Total	267,641	987,550	27.10%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	93564	540,773	17.30%
Black, Non-Hispanic	3774	16,719	22.57%
Hispanic	59920	241,841	24.78%

Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	36879	186,038	19.82%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	432	2,179	19.83%
Total	194,569	987,550	19.70%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	79610	576690	13.80%
Family households, 5+ people	24586	145028	16.95%
Non-family households	39386	273662	14.39%

Table 2: Housing Problems, Aliso Viejo

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	4,840	12,570	38.50%
Black, Non-Hispanic	235	380	61.84%
Hispanic	930	2,120	43.87%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	995	2,830	35.16%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	20	70	28.57%
Total	7,020	17,970	39.07%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	3955	11390	34.72%
Family households, 5+ people	705	1420	49.65%
Non-family households	2635	5605	47.01%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2075	12,570	16.51%

Black, Non-Hispanic	140	380	36.84%
Hispanic	400	2,120	18.87%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	425	2,830	15.02%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	70	0.00%
Total	3,040	17,970	16.92%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	1840	12,570	14.64%
Black, Non-Hispanic	140	380	36.84%
Hispanic	225	2,120	10.61%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	350	2,830	12.37%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	70	0.00%
Total	2,555	17,970	14.22%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1010	11390	8.87%
Family households, 5+ people	150	1420	10.56%
Non-family households	730	5605	13.02%

Table 3: Housing Problems, Anaheim

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**

Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	15,085	36,390	41.45%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,409	2,688	52.42%
Hispanic	28,175	41,509	67.88%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	8,305	17,464	47.55%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	105	170	61.76%
Total	53,079	98,221	54.04%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	24720	53980	45.79%
Family households, 5+ people	15450	20740	74.49%
Non-family households	13885	24384	56.94%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	8425	36,390	23.15%
Black, Non-Hispanic	993	2,688	36.94%
Hispanic	20590	41,509	49.60%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	5065	17,464	29.00%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	85	170	50.00%
Total	35,158	98,221	35.79%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	7210	36,390	19.81%
Black, Non-Hispanic	810	2,688	30.13%
Hispanic	11330	41,509	27.30%

Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	3290	17,464	18.84%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	50	170	29.41%
Total	22,690	98,221	23.10%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	9845	53980	18.24%
Family households, 5+ people	4225	20740	20.37%
Non-family households	4050	24384	16.61%

Table 4: Housing Problems, Buena Park

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2,500	7,540	33.16%
Black, Non-Hispanic	455	835	54.49%
Hispanic	4,725	7,705	61.32%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	3,505	6,830	51.32%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	80	99	80.81%
Total	11,265	23,009	48.96%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	6340	14230	44.55%
Family households, 5+ people	3060	4930	62.07%
Non-family households	2045	3910	52.30%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	1125	7,540	14.92%
Black, Non-Hispanic	300	835	35.93%
Hispanic	3050	7,705	39.58%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2070	6,830	30.31%

Native American, Non-Hispanic	50	99	50.51%
Total	6,595	23,009	28.66%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	955	7,540	12.67%
Black, Non-Hispanic	255	835	30.54%
Hispanic	1780	7,705	23.10%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1515	6,830	22.18%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	50	99	50.51%
Total	4,555	23,009	19.80%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	2445	14230	17.18%
Family households, 5+ people	770	4930	15.62%
Non-family households	569	3910	14.55%

Table 5: Housing Problems, Costa Mesa

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	10,055	25,230	39.85%
Black, Non-Hispanic	320	695	46.04%
Hispanic	6,820	10,105	67.49%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,670	3,870	43.15%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	25	70	35.71%
Total	18,890	39,970	47.26%
Household Type and Size			

Family households, <5 people	8775	20195	43.45%
Family households, 5+ people	3175	4175	76.05%
Non-family households	7325	15975	45.85%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	5335	25,230	21.15%
Black, Non-Hispanic	200	695	28.78%
Hispanic	4650	10,105	46.02%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	804	3,870	20.78%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	15	70	21.43%
Total	11,004	39,970	27.53%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	4905	25,230	19.44%
Black, Non-Hispanic	125	695	17.99%
Hispanic	2960	10,105	29.29%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	610	3,870	15.76%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	15	70	21.43%
Total	8,615	39,970	21.55%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	3460	20195	17.13%
Family households, 5+ people	904	4175	21.65%
Non-family households	2650	15975	16.59%

Table 6: Housing Problems, Fountain Valley

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**

Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	3,910	10,405	37.58%
Black, Non-Hispanic	75	175	42.86%
Hispanic	1,290	2,174	59.34%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2,425	5,785	41.92%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	55	0.00%
Total	7,700	18,594	41.41%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	4625	12275	37.68%
Family households, 5+ people	1110	2200	50.45%
Non-family households	2150	4325	49.71%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	# with severe problems	# households	% with severe problems
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	1860	10,405	17.88%
Black, Non-Hispanic	25	175	14.29%
Hispanic	585	2,174	26.91%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1419	5,785	24.53%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	55	0.00%
Total	3,889	18,594	20.92%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	Jurisdiction		
Race/Ethnicity	# with severe cost burden	# households	% with severe cost burden
White, Non-Hispanic	1630	10,405	15.67%
Black, Non-Hispanic	25	175	14.29%
Hispanic	350	2,174	16.10%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1105	5,785	19.10%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	55	0.00%
Total	3,110	18,594	16.73%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1245	12275	10.14%
Family households, 5+ people	250	2200	11.36%

Non-family households	629	4325	14.54%

Table 7: Housing Problems, Fullerton

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	7,960	20,005	39.79%
Black, Non-Hispanic	655	1,448	45.23%
Hispanic	7,620	11,890	64.09%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	5,085	10,615	47.90%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	20	90	22.22%
Total	21,340	44,048	48.45%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	10595	25185	42.07%
Family households, 5+ people	4450	6275	70.92%
Non-family households	6925	12920	53.60%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	4320	20,005	21.59%
Black, Non-Hispanic	433	1,448	29.90%
Hispanic	5250	11,890	44.15%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	3125	10,615	29.44%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	20	90	22.22%
Total	13,148	44,048	29.85%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	3665	20,005	18.32%
Black, Non-Hispanic	375	1,448	25.90%
Hispanic	2950	11,890	24.81%

Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2495	10,615	23.50%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	90	0.00%
Total	9,485	44,048	21.53%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	3695	25185	14.67%
Family households, 5+ people	1029	6275	16.40%
Non-family households	2664	12920	20.62%

Table 8: Housing Problems, Garden Grove

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	5,055	14,255	35.46%
Black, Non-Hispanic	287	592	48.48%
Hispanic	8,945	13,550	66.01%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	10,303	18,418	55.94%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	130	148	87.84%
Total	24,720	46,963	52.64%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	12495	26390	47.35%
Family households, 5+ people	7515	10735	70.00%
Non-family households	5059	9854	51.34%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2645	14,255	18.55%

Black, Non-Hispanic	173	592	29.22%
Hispanic	6540	13,550	48.27%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	6775	18,418	36.78%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	85	148	57.43%
Total	16,218	46,963	34.53%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	2135	14,255	14.98%
Black, Non-Hispanic	145	592	24.49%
Hispanic	3435	13,550	25.35%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	4685	18,418	25.44%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	85	148	57.43%
Total	10,485	46,963	22.33%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	4950	26390	18.76%
Family households, 5+ people	1945	10735	18.12%
Non-family households	1450	9854	14.71%

Table 9: Housing Problems, Huntington Beach

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			

White, Non-Hispanic	19,865	53,650	37.03%
Black, Non-Hispanic	344	753	45.68%
Hispanic	5,500	10,855	50.67%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	3,089	8,114	38.07%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	74	274	27.01%
Total	28,872	73,646	39.20%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	15230	43760	34.80%
Family households, 5+ people	3035	5995	50.63%
Non-family households	11235	24905	45.11%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	9745	53,650	18.16%
Black, Non-Hispanic	179	753	23.77%
Hispanic	3570	10,855	32.89%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1669	8,114	20.57%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	55	274	20.07%
Total	15,218	73,646	20.66%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	9030	53,650	16.83%
Black, Non-Hispanic	139	753	18.46%
Hispanic	2580	10,855	23.77%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1475	8,114	18.18%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	45	274	16.42%
Total	13,269	73,646	18.02%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	5195	43760	11.87%
Family households, 5+ people	899	5995	15.00%
Non-family households	3245	24905	13.03%

Table 10: Housing Problems, Irvine

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	18,555	45,505	40.78%
Black, Non-Hispanic	865	1,795	48.19%
Hispanic	3,310	6,790	48.75%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	13,955	33,220	42.01%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	65	130	50.00%
Total	36,750	87,440	42.03%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	20175	52685	38.29%
Family households, 5+ people	3630	6270	57.89%
Non-family households	14279	28074	50.86%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	9085	45,505	19.96%
Black, Non-Hispanic	570	1,795	31.75%
Hispanic	1805	6,790	26.58%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	7850	33,220	23.63%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	130	7.69%
Total	19,320	87,440	22.10%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	7700	45,505	16.92%
Black, Non-Hispanic	315	1,795	17.55%
Hispanic	1510	6,790	22.24%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	6110	33,220	18.39%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	130	7.69%
Total	15,645	87,440	17.89%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	6605	52685	12.54%
Family households, 5+ people	1055	6270	16.83%
Non-family households	5460	28074	19.45%

Table 11: Housing Problems, La Habra

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2,910	7,363	39.52%
Black, Non-Hispanic	144	304	47.37%
Hispanic	4,800	8,870	54.11%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	965	2,260	42.70%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	10	100.00%
Total	8,829	18,807	46.95%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	4335	10875	39.86%

Family households, 5+ people	2325	3285	70.78%
Non-family households	2240	4600	48.70%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	1630	7,363	22.14%
Black, Non-Hispanic	59	304	19.41%
Hispanic	3285	8,870	37.03%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	700	2,260	30.97%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	10	100.00%
Total	5,684	18,807	30.22%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	1240	7,363	16.84%
Black, Non-Hispanic	55	304	18.09%
Hispanic	1765	8,870	19.90%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	485	2,260	21.46%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	10	100.00%
Total	3,555	18,807	18.90%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1640	10875	15.08%
Family households, 5+ people	465	3285	14.16%
Non-family households	555	4600	12.07%

Table 12: Housing Problems, La Palma

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			

White, Non-Hispanic	430	1,619	26.56%
Black, Non-Hispanic	150	370	40.54%
Hispanic	320	709	45.13%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	810	2,148	37.71%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	30	30	100.00%
Total	1,740	4,876	35.68%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1015	3220	31.52%
Family households, 5+ people	340	765	44.44%
Non-family households	435	930	46.77%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	210	1,619	12.97%
Black, Non-Hispanic	75	370	20.27%
Hispanic	239	709	33.71%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	434	2,148	20.20%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	30	0.00%
Total	958	4,876	19.65%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	140	1,619	8.65%
Black, Non-Hispanic	70	370	18.92%
Hispanic	175	709	24.68%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	340	2,148	15.83%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	30	0.00%
Total	725	4,876	14.87%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	325	3220	10.09%
Family households, 5+ people	160	765	20.92%
Non-family households	75	930	8.06%

Table 13: Housing Problems, Laguna Niguel

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	7,480	18,280	40.92%
Black, Non-Hispanic	145	395	36.71%
Hispanic	2,010	3,210	62.62%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	835	2,350	35.53%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	65	85	76.47%
Total	10,535	24,320	43.32%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	6000	15965	37.58%
Family households, 5+ people	815	1680	48.51%
Non-family households	3975	6930	57.36%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	3445	18,280	18.85%
Black, Non-Hispanic	65	395	16.46%
Hispanic	1210	3,210	37.69%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	390	2,350	16.60%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	15	85	17.65%
Total	5,125	24,320	21.07%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	3310	18,280	18.11%
Black, Non-Hispanic	35	395	8.86%
Hispanic	905	3,210	28.19%

Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	325	2,350	13.83%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	15	85	17.65%
Total	4,590	24,320	18.87%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1745	15965	10.93%
Family households, 5+ people	265	1680	15.77%
Non-family households	900	6930	12.99%

Table 14: Housing Problems, Lake Forest

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	6,230	18,240	34.16%
Black, Non-Hispanic	235	535	43.93%
Hispanic	2,700	4,370	61.78%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,310	3,870	33.85%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	15	19	78.95%
Total	10,490	27,034	38.80%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	5800	17525	33.10%
Family households, 5+ people	1640	3165	51.82%
Non-family households	3340	6660	50.15%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2740	18,240	15.02%

Black, Non-Hispanic	135	535	25.23%
Hispanic	1855	4,370	42.45%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	660	3,870	17.05%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	15	19	78.95%
Total	5,405	27,034	19.99%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	2395	18,240	13.13%
Black, Non-Hispanic	100	535	18.69%
Hispanic	1340	4,370	30.66%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	435	3,870	11.24%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	15	19	78.95%
Total	4,285	27,034	15.85%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1825	17525	10.41%
Family households, 5+ people	445	3165	14.06%
Non-family households	804	6660	12.07%

Table 15: Housing Problems, Mission Viejo

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			

White, Non-Hispanic	8,690	25,265	34.40%
Black, Non-Hispanic	199	389	51.16%
Hispanic	2,105	4,099	51.35%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	955	3,050	31.31%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	20	30	66.67%
Total	11,969	32,833	36.45%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	7265	22375	32.47%
Family households, 5+ people	950	3305	28.74%
Non-family households	4055	7870	51.52%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	3779	25,265	14.96%
Black, Non-Hispanic	79	389	20.31%
Hispanic	995	4,099	24.27%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	465	3,050	15.25%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	20	30	66.67%
Total	5,338	32,833	16.26%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	3505	25,265	13.87%
Black, Non-Hispanic	60	389	15.42%
Hispanic	865	4,099	21.10%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	335	3,050	10.98%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	20	30	66.67%
Total	4,785	32,833	14.57%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1770	22375	7.91%
Family households, 5+ people	245	3305	7.41%
Non-family households	725	7870	9.21%

Table 16: Housing Problems, Orange (City)

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	8,845	24,095	36.71%
Black, Non-Hispanic	365	530	68.87%
Hispanic	7,255	12,030	60.31%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,810	4,979	36.35%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	45	75	60.00%
Total	18,320	41,709	43.92%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	8815	23870	36.93%
Family households, 5+ people	4080	6705	60.85%
Non-family households	5800	11369	51.02%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	4580	24,095	19.01%
Black, Non-Hispanic	235	530	44.34%
Hispanic	5105	12,030	42.44%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1130	4,979	22.70%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	4	75	5.33%
Total	11,054	41,709	26.50%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden

Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	Jurisdiction		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	4155	24,095	17.24%
Black, Non-Hispanic	195	530	36.79%
Hispanic	2935	12,030	24.40%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	795	4,979	15.97%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	4	75	5.33%
Total	8,084	41,709	19.38%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	3145	23870	13.18%
Family households, 5+ people	1105	6705	16.48%
Non-family households	2185	11369	19.22%

Table 17: Housing Problems, Rancho Santa Margarita

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	4,505	11,890	37.89%
Black, Non-Hispanic	140	285	49.12%
Hispanic	1,629	2,674	60.92%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	565	1,855	30.46%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	0	#DIV/0!
Total	6,839	16,704	40.94%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	4000	11285	35.45%
Family households, 5+ people	745	1720	43.31%

Non-family households	2250	3975	56.60%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2000	11,890	16.82%
Black, Non-Hispanic	84	285	29.47%
Hispanic	720	2,674	26.93%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	175	1,855	9.43%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	0	#DIV/0!
Total	2,979	16,704	17.83%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	1860	11,890	15.64%
Black, Non-Hispanic	85	285	29.82%
Hispanic	500	2,674	18.70%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	130	1,855	7.01%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	0	#DIV/0!
Total	2,575	16,704	15.42%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1220	11285	10.81%
Family households, 5+ people	140	1720	8.14%
Non-family households	570	3975	14.34%

Table 18: Housing Problems, San Clemente

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			

White, Non-Hispanic	7,940	19,490	40.74%
Black, Non-Hispanic	30	125	24.00%
Hispanic	2,005	3,264	61.43%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	310	970	31.96%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	20	50.00%
Total	10,295	23,869	43.13%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	5670	14590	38.86%
Family households, 5+ people	1240	2445	50.72%
Non-family households	3689	7229	51.03%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	4055	19,490	20.81%
Black, Non-Hispanic	20	125	16.00%
Hispanic	1375	3,264	42.13%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	145	970	14.95%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	20	50.00%
Total	5,605	23,869	23.48%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	3685	19,490	18.91%
Black, Non-Hispanic	20	125	16.00%
Hispanic	960	3,264	29.41%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	95	970	9.79%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	20	50.00%
Total	4,770	23,869	19.98%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1855	14590	12.71%
Family households, 5+ people	405	2445	16.56%
Non-family households	1149	7229	15.89%

Table 19: Housing Problems, San Juan Capistrano

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	3,805	8,630	44.09%
Black, Non-Hispanic	0	0	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	1,915	2,725	70.28%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	115	340	33.82%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	30	80	37.50%
Total	5,865	11,775	49.81%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	2945	6970	42.25%
Family households, 5+ people	1425	1925	74.03%
Non-family households	1590	2915	54.55%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2070	8,630	23.99%
Black, Non-Hispanic	0	0	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	1650	2,725	60.55%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	70	340	20.59%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	30	80	37.50%
Total	3,820	11,775	32.44%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden

Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	Jurisdiction		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	2015	8,630	23.35%
Black, Non-Hispanic	0	0	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	1070	2,725	39.27%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	65	340	19.12%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	30	80	37.50%
Total	3,180	11,775	27.01%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	1100	6970	15.78%
Family households, 5+ people	555	1925	28.83%
Non-family households	275	2915	9.43%

Table 20: Housing Problems, Santa Ana

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	4,650	12,430	37.41%
Black, Non-Hispanic	435	899	48.39%
Hispanic	36,965	50,935	72.57%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	5,440	9,959	54.62%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	63	128	49.22%
Total	47,553	74,351	63.96%

Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	18765	34015	55.17%
Family households, 5+ people	22140	27010	81.97%
Non-family households	7055	13590	51.91%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2495	12,430	20.07%
Black, Non-Hispanic	234	899	26.03%
Hispanic	29395	50,935	57.71%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	3450	9,959	34.64%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	8	128	6.25%
Total	35,582	74,351	47.86%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	2130	12,430	17.14%
Black, Non-Hispanic	195	899	21.69%
Hispanic	12800	50,935	25.13%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2155	9,959	21.64%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	128	7.81%
Total	17,290	74,351	23.25%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	8010	34015	23.55%
Family households, 5+ people	4990	27010	18.47%

Non-family households	1809	13590	13.31%

Table 21: Housing Problems, Tustin

Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs			
Disproportionate Housing Needs	**Jurisdiction**		
Households experiencing any of 4 housing problems	**# with problems**	**# households**	**% with problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	4,465	10,495	42.54%
Black, Non-Hispanic	380	609	62.40%
Hispanic	5,485	7,705	71.19%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2,644	6,089	43.42%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	60	120	50.00%
Total	13,034	25,018	52.10%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	6690	14315	46.73%
Family households, 5+ people	2840	3775	75.23%
Non-family households	3825	7465	51.24%
Households experiencing any of 4 Severe Housing Problems	**# with severe problems**	**# households**	**% with severe problems**
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	2085	10,495	19.87%
Black, Non-Hispanic	205	609	33.66%
Hispanic	3915	7,705	50.81%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1519	6,089	24.95%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	10	120	8.33%
Total	7,734	25,018	30.91%

Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden			
Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden	**Jurisdiction**		
Race/Ethnicity	**# with severe cost burden**	**# households**	**% with severe cost burden**
White, Non-Hispanic	1840	10,495	17.53%
Black, Non-Hispanic	170	609	27.91%
Hispanic	1975	7,705	25.63%

Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	969	6,089	15.91%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	0	120	0.00%
Total	4,954	25,018	19.80%
Household Type and Size			
Family households, <5 people	2300	14315	16.07%
Family households, 5+ people	589	3775	15.60%
Non-family households	1025	7465	13.73%

A few trends are immediately clear in housing needs in Orange County. The housing problems data displayed in the charts above include houses that have 1 of 4 housing problems by race/ethnicity and family type, 1 of 4 severe housing problems by race/ethnicity, and severe housing cost burden by race/ethnicity and family type. Overall, across the County, Black and Hispanic residents are more likely to face all of these housing problems, with varying rates across different jurisdictions.

Some figures in the data above may be inaccurate depending on the number of households of a particular group in a jurisdiction. For example, 0 Black households are written in San Juan Capistrano. It may be that this figure was lower than the margin of error, so figures with low or no households should carry less weight in indicating frequency of problems. However, the County data overall gives an idea of housing needs for smaller populations.

In the County, 45.84% of residents overall face 1 of 4 housing problems. White and Asian or Pacific Islander residents have slightly lower rates of housing problems, at 38.22% and 45.26% respectively, while Black residents have a slightly higher rate of 48.29%. Hispanic residents have the highest rates at 63.16% countywide. Native American residents have a rate similar to the average at 48.74%, but the low populations of Native American residents across jurisdictions may lead to misleading data (which is why they are not as frequently discussed here). Housing problems are found in differing rates across family types, with 39.66% for families of 5 or less, 65.59% for families of 5 or more, and 50.53% for non-family households.

Housing problems occur more frequently in more populated areas of the County, including in Anaheim and Santa Ana in particular. There are some more obvious discrepancies in rates of housing problems across different demographic groups. Black residents in Aliso Viejo experience housing problems at a rate of 61.84%, in Orange (city) at 68.87%, in Tustin at 62.40%, and in Buena Park at 54.49%. Hispanic residents experience rates of housing problems that are high overall, but significantly higher in southern Orange County, at 72.57% in Santa Ana, 71.19% in Tustin, and 70.28% in San Juan Capistrano. Asian residents generally experience average or lower rates of housing problems, with exceptions in Garden Grove and Santa Ana, where they experience housing problems at rates of 55.94% and 54.62% respectively.

Rates of severe housing problems are overall lower than housing problems at 27.10%, but more drastic discrepancies exist compared to the white population. White residents face severe housing problems at a rate of 19.29%. Black residents experience them at a rate of 28.81%, Hispanic residents at 44.55%,

Asian or Pacific Islander residents at 26.99%, and Native American residents at 24.97%. Rates of severe housing problems are especially high in parts of north and south Orange County, including Anaheim, Buena Park, Garden Grove, Orange, San Juan Capistrano, and Santa Ana. Black residents experience severe housing problems at rates of 36.84% in Aliso Viejo and 44.34% in Orange (city). Hispanic residents face severe housing problems at significantly high rates of 49.60% in Anaheim, 60.55% in San Juan Capistrano, and 50.81% in Tustin, but also higher than average in Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Garden Grove, La Habra, Laguna Niguel, Lake Forest, Orange and San Clemente. Asian residents face noticeably high rates of severe housing problems in Garden Grove, at 36.78%.

Severe housing cost burden is a large but not as frequent problem for residents in Orange County. The average rate of residents experiencing severe housing cost burden is 19.70% across the county. Overall, White residents have a rate of 17.30%, Black residents 22.57%, Hispanic residents 24.78%, Asian American or Pacific Islander residents 19.82%, and Native American residents 19.83%. Families of 5 or less have a rate of 13.8%, families of 5 or more 16.95%, and non-family households 14.39%. Discrepancies across race/ethnicity or family type are much lower than for housing problems or severe housing problems in the County. Black and Hispanic residents still face higher than average rates of severe housing cost burdens in some individual jurisdictions, however. In Orange (city), Black residents experience severe housing cost burden at a rate of 36.79%. Hispanic residents experience rates of housing cost burden at 30.66% in Lake Forest, and 39.27% in San Juan Capistrano.

Table 17: Percentage of Overcrowded Households by Race or Ethnicity, 2013-2017 American Community Survey

Geography	White, Non-Hispanic	Black	Native American	Asian American or Pacific Islander	Hispanic
Orange County, California	1.95%	6.52%	11.38%	7.76%	25.72%
Aliso Viejo city, California	1.47%	0.00%	0.00%	2.79%	7.47%
Anaheim city, California	3.20%	5.94%	27.51%	9.81%	29.07%
Buena Park city, California	4.33%	8.11%	17.03%	7.17%	23.11%
Costa Mesa city, California	2.70%	9.01%	16.30%	7.20%	25.16%
Fountain Valley city, California	1.93%	0.00%	0.00%	6.46%	15.37%
Fullerton city, California	2.63%	4.20%	23.42%	6.42%	23.52%
Garden Grove city, California	3.46%	9.69%	15.77%	12.23%	30.05%
Huntington Beach city, California	1.50%	6.45%	0.00%	3.16%	14.59%

Irvine city, California	4.21%	11.78%	0.00%	6.79%	6.30%
Laguna Niguel city, California	0.67%	2.91%	0.00%	1.52%	13.74%
La Habra city, California	3.86%	0.00%	5.30%	11.84%	22.09%
Lake Forest city, California	1.95%	8.93%	17.17%	4.68%	16.52%
La Palma city, California	1.70%	0.00%	0.00%	6.63%	14.91%
Mission Viejo city, California	0.72%	5.35%	0.00%	3.76%	6.30%
Orange city, California	1.67%	11.81%	5.02%	8.05%	21.46%
Rancho Santa Margarita city, California	1.40%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%	8.33%
San Clemente city, California	1.36%	0.00%	0.00%	3.52%	18.12%
San Juan Capistrano city, California	0.11%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	26.44%
Santa Ana city, California	3.88%	7.82%	26.59%	14.75%	42.93%
Tustin city, California	1.35%	10.52%	4.35%	7.35%	28.28%

The tables above indicate overcrowdedness in the County and its jurisdictions. Some of these numbers are inaccurate, due to low populations in a given jurisdiction (especially for Black or Native American residents). In the County, White residents experience an overcrowdedness rate of 1.95%, Black residents 6.52%, Native American residents 11.38%, Asian American or Pacific Islander residents 7.76%, and Hispanic residents 25.72%. Hispanic residents face especially high rates of overcrowdedness. This is especially true in Anaheim and Santa Ana, where their overcrowdedness rates are 29.07% and 42.93%, respectively.

Which areas in the jurisdiction and Region experience the greatest housing burdens? Which of these areas align with segregated areas, integrated areas, or R/ECAPs and what are the predominant race/ethnicity or national origin groups in such areas?

Map 1: Housing Problems in North Orange County, Race



Map 2: Housing Problems in Central Orange County, Race



Map 3: Housing Problems in South Orange County, Race



Map 4: Housing Problems in North Orange County, National Origin



Map 5: Housing Problems in Central Orange County, National Origin



Map 6: Housing Problems in South Orange County, National Origin



Map 7: Housing Problems in North Orange County, National Origin



Map 8: Housing Problems in Central Orange County, National Origin



Map 9: Housing Problems in South Orange County, National Origin



Patterns in housing problems described earlier are present in the maps above. While housing problems are generally evenly dispersed throughout the County, there are some exceptions, which tend to have higher numbers of Hispanic residents. This is seen in the high number of Hispanic residents in Anaheim and Santa Ana, both of which have slightly higher percentages of housing problems. In Central Orange County, west Fountain Valley also has higher percentages of households with housing problems in areas with higher numbers of Hispanic residents. The same is the case for Hispanic residents in San Juan Capistrano, Lake Forest and Laguna Woods. While the charts above suggested that Black residents similarly had higher rates of housing problems than White and Asian residents, those patterns are more difficult to view in maps due to the lower population of Black residents overall.

Asian or Pacific Islander residents generally live in areas with fewer housing problems, with one notable exception. Garden Grove, which has slightly higher rates of housing problems than its surroundings, also has a noticeably high population of Asian or Pacific Islander residents.

These patterns are further explained by national origin maps. Map 4 shows that high numbers of Vietnamese residents are found in Garden Grove, which does have slightly higher rates of housing problems. Filipino residents in the areas between Buena Park and Anaheim, similarly reside in areas with higher rates of housing problems. The same holds for Filipino residents in Lake Forest and Laguna Hills, as seen in Map 6. Mexican residents have the most noticeable pattern of living in areas with higher rates of housing problems. Mexican residents in Santa Ana, Anaheim, Costa Mesa, and San Juan Capistrano live in areas with higher rates of housing problems, as seen in Maps 7, 8 and 9.

Additional Information

Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about disproportionate housing needs in the jurisdiction and Region affecting groups with other protected characteristics.

The program participant may also describe other information relevant to its assessment of disproportionate housing needs. For PHAs, such information may include a PHA's overriding housing needs analysis.

Homelessness

Contributing Factors of Disproportionate Housing Needs

Please see the Appendix for the following Contributing Factors to Disproportionate Housing Needs:

- Availability of affordable units in a range of sizes
- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures
- Displacement of and/or lack of housing support for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking
- Lack of access to opportunity due to high housing costs
- Lack of private investments in specific neighborhoods

- Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities
- Land use and zoning laws
- Lending discrimination
- Loss of affordable housing
- Source of income discrimination

C. Publicly Supported Housing Analysis

1. Analysis

a. Publicly Supported Housing Demographics

The Publicly Supported Housing section analyzes federally funded affordable housing and other types of affordable housing, to determine whether the level of need is being met and whether patterns of affordable housing siting concentrate minorities in low opportunity areas, among other things. In Orange County, each category of publicly supported housing (public housing, Project-Based Section 8, Other Multifamily Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit [LIHTC] units) is represented, although that representation varies greatly depending on the individual municipality. Affordable housing (including LIHTC) makes up 5% or less of the total housing stock in all but six of the entitlement jurisdictions in this analysis (Anaheim, Garden Grove, Irvine, La Palma, Santa Ana, and Westminster; incomplete data is available for Buena Park, which likely counts among these as well). In each of these jurisdictions, LIHTC and Housing Choice Voucher units tend to predominate, and there is no Public Housing at all, indicating an overall preference for private housing development. Overall, the amount of publicly supported housing available in Orange County does not rise to meet the level of need, although progress is being made.

Table 1: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Orange County

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	219,058	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	429	0.20%
Other Multifamily	33	0.02%
HCV Program	2,286	1.04%
LIHTC	2,110	0.96%

Table 2: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Aliso Viejo

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	19,786	-
LIHTC	128	0.65%

Table 3: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Anaheim

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	103,787	-

Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	279	0.27%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	5,089	4.90%
LIHTC	3,017	2.91%

Table 4: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Buena Park

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	24,741	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	110	0.44%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	762	3.08%
LIHTC	185	0.75%

Table 5: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Costa Mesa

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	41,933	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	110	0.26%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	604	1.44%
LIHTC	266	0.63%

Table 6: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Fountain Valley

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	19,050	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	71	0.37%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a

HCV Program	502	2.64%
LIHTC	154	0.81%

Table 7: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Fullerton

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	47,991	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	101	0.21%
Other Multifamily	48	0.10%
HCV Program	715	1.49%
LIHTC	858	1.79%

Table 8: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Garden Grove

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	48,499	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	225	0.46%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	2,681	5.53%
LIHTC	671	1.38%

Table 9: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Huntington Beach

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	78,583	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	377	0.48%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	976	1.24%
LIHTC	607	0.77%

Table 10: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Irvine

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	83,616	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	717	0.86%
Other Multifamily	23	0.03%
HCV Program	1,146	1.37%
LIHTC	2,329	2.79

Table 11: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, La Habra

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	19,932	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	148	0.74%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	178	0.89%

Table 12: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, La Palma

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	5,039	-
LIHTC	304	6.03%

Table 13: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Laguna Niguel

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	25,565	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	156	0.61%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	102	0.40%

Table 14: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Lake Forest

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	27,044	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	N/a	N/a
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	275	1.02%
LIHTC	187	0.69%

Table 15: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Mission Viejo

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	34,177	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	N/a	N/a
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	226	0.66%
LIHTC	296	0.87%

Table 16: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Newport Beach

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	44,242	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	100	0.23%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	139	0.31%
LIHTC	205	0.46%

Table 17: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Orange (City)

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	45,363	-

Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	197	0.43%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	642	1.42%
LIHTC	964	2.13%

Table 18: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Rancho Santa Margarita

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	17,408	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	N/a	N/a
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	138	0.79%

Table 19: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, San Clemente

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	25,556	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	72	0.28%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	123	0.48%
LIHTC	393	1.54%

Table 20: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, San Juan Capistrano

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	12,905	-
LIHTC	215	1.67%

Table 21: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Santa Ana

Housing Units	#	%

Total housing units	76,075	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	801	1.05%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	2,773	3.65%
LIHTC	1,092	1.44%

Table 22: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Tustin

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	26,633	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	100	0.38%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	524	1.97%
LIHTC	672	2.52%

Table 23: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category, Westminster

Housing Units	#	%
Total housing units	27,695	-
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-based Section 8	97	0.35%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	2,169	7.83%
LIHTC	439	1.59%

LIHTC

According to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, there are 175 LIHTC developments in Orange County, some of which are designated for specific populations. These developments include 15,092 low-income units, with 2 reserved for At-Risk populations, 79 for large families, 30 Non-Targeted, 46 for Seniors, 8 for Special Needs populations, 4 Single Room Occupancy

(SRO), and 6 which are not categorized. There are no active LIHTC developments in La Habra, Laguna Niguel, or Rancho Santa Margarita.

i. *Are certain racial/ethnic groups more likely to be residing in one program category of publicly supported housing than other program categories (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other Multifamily Assisted developments, and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) in the jurisdiction?*

Please note: rows for which all values are zero or n/a have been deleted for space

Table 24: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Orange County

Orange County	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	164	40.80 %	9	2.24%	88	21.89 %	138	34.33%
Other Multifamily	22	95.65 %	0	0.00%	1	4.35%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	808	35.96 %	156	6.94%	412	18.34 %	866	38.54%
LIHTC	1352	25.12 %	254	4.72%	1621	30.11 %	991	18.41%
Total Households	140,530	67.71 %	2,907	1.40%	30,185	14.54 %	29,767	14.34%
0-30% of AMI	14,094	61.62 %	259	1.13%	4,388	19.18 %	3,541	15.48%
0-50% of AMI	23,293	50.78 %	503	1.10%	9,148	19.94 %	6,728	14.67%
0-80% of AMI	43,952	56.98 %	926	1.20%	14,322	18.57 %	11,131	14.43%
Region	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	683	6.99%	2,627	26.90%	6,110	62.56 %	344	3.52%
Project-Based Section 8	9,154	23.86 %	6,942	18.10%	10,365	27.02 %	11,753	30.64%

Other Multifamily	1,707	33.38 %	465	9.09%	1,094	21.39 %	1,839	35.96%
HCV Program	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
Total Households	1,766,510	41.80 %	333,080	7.88%	1,405,070	33.25 %	629,349	14.89%
0-30% of AMI	215,775	29.59 %	86,225	11.83%	305,885	41.95 %	105,314	14.44%
0-50% of AMI	343,565	26.07 %	135,740	10.30%	587,685	44.60 %	175,814	13.34%
0-80% of AMI	590,895	28.77 %	195,155	9.50%	905,370	44.09 %	272,549	13.27%

Table 25: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Aliso Viejo [5]

Aliso Viejo	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
LIHTC	239	75.39%	22	6.94%	91	28.71%	15	4.73%

Table 26: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Anaheim

Anaheim	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
Project-Based Section 8	60	22.22%	19	7.04%	50	18.52%	141	52.22%
HCV Program	1,328	27.62%	412	8.57%	1,849	38.46%	1,210	25.17%
LIHTC	2029	23.08%	506	5.76%	4720	53.70%	792	9.01%
Total Households	38,125	38.49%	3,014	3.04%	39,630	40.01%	16,470	16.63%
0-30% of AMI	5,245	28.95%	755	4.17%	8,675	47.88%	3,070	16.94%
0-50% of AMI	8,870	25.76%	1,305	3.79%	17,310	50.28%	5,005	14.54%

[5] HUD-provided demographic data for residents of publicly supported housing in Aliso Viejo was not available, but data from CTAC reflecting the demographics of LIHTC residents is reflected above.

0-80% of AMI	15,335	28.28%	1,845	3.40%	26,855	49.52%	7,835	14.45%

Table 27: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Buena Park

Buena Park	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	16	13.91%	1	0.87%	4	3.48%	94	81.74%
HCV Program	194	25.80%	167	22.21%	229	30.45%	161	21.41%
LIHTC	287	21.91%	135	10.31%	374	28.55%	306	23.36%
Total Households	7,755	33.70%	1,120	4.87%	7,060	30.68%	6,669	28.98%
0-30% of AMI	740	21.76%	200	5.88%	1,270	37.35%	1,160	34.12%
0-50% of AMI	1,645	23.40%	285	4.05%	2,885	41.04%	1,864	26.51%
0-80% of AMI	3,015	26.03%	570	4.92%	4,435	38.28%	3,084	26.62%

Table 28: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Costa Mesa

Costa Mesa	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	78	72.22%	0	0.00%	16	14.81%	14	12.96%
HCV Program	377	60.32%	18	2.88%	107	17.12%	122	19.52%
LIHTC	174	52.73%	7	2.12%	34	10.30%	58	17.58%
Total Households	25,410	62.60%	509	1.25%	9,730	23.97%	4,021	9.91%
0-30% of AMI	3,010	50.00%	140	2.33%	2,140	35.55%	600	9.97%
0-50% of AMI	4,980	44.19%	165	1.46%	4,225	37.49%	1,102	9.78%
0-80% of AMI	8,995	48.10%	290	1.55%	6,530	34.92%	1,897	10.14%

Table 29: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Fountain Valley

Fountain Valley	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	10	14.93%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	57	85.07%
HCV Program	107	20.66%	3	0.58%	37	7.14%	369	71.24%
LIHTC	98	49.00%	1	0.50%	24	12.00%	92	46.00%
Total Households	10,548	56.47%	255	1.37%	2,194	11.75%	5,339	28.58%
0-30% of AMI	1,044	48.45%	0	0.00%	215	9.98%	849	39.40%
0-50% of AMI	1,649	41.29%	25	0.63%	519	12.99%	1,354	33.90%
0-80% of AMI	3,388	47.27%	125	1.74%	1,059	14.77%	2,084	29.07%

Table 30: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Fullerton

Fullerton	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	9	8.91%	0	0.00%	1	0.99%	91	90.10%
Other Multifamily	35	76.09%	3	6.52%	6	13.04%	2	4.35%
HCV Program	308	43.08%	88	12.31%	235	32.87%	81	11.33%
LIHTC	919	35.02%	77	2.93%	1212	46.19%	197	7.51%
Total Households	20,560	46.53%	1,338	3.03%	11,365	25.72%	9,904	22.41%
0-30% of AMI	2,625	35.02%	254	3.39%	2,490	33.22%	1,835	24.48%
0-50% of AMI	4,560	34.43%	364	2.75%	4,465	33.71%	2,985	22.54%
0-80% of AMI	7,445	36.45%	544	2.66%	6,935	33.95%	4,420	21.64%

Table 31: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Garden Grove

Garden Grove	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	11	4.91%	2	0.89%	2	0.89%	209	93.30%
HCV Program	140	5.14%	33	1.21%	243	8.92%	2,303	84.51%
LIHTC	192	11.15%	29	1.68%	431	25.03%	552	32.06%
Total Households	14,423	31.41%	549	1.20%	13,059	28.44%	17,061	37.16%
0-30% of AMI	1,685	18.36%	195	2.12%	2,744	29.89%	4,409	48.03%
0-50% of AMI	2,920	18.20%	230	1.43%	5,164	32.19%	6,964	43.41%
0-80% of AMI	5,765	22.38%	335	1.30%	8,594	33.36%	10,128	39.32%

Table 32: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Huntington Beach

Huntington Beach	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	150	39.68%	4	1.06%	41	10.85%	182	48.15%
HCV Program	448	43.92%	35	3.43%	163	15.98%	370	36.27%
LIHTC	580	53.51%	50	4.61%	356	32.84%	45	4.15%
Total Households	54,285	73.20%	558	0.75%	10,165	13.71%	7,589	10.23%
0-30% of AMI	5,115	65.03%	4	0.05%	1,565	19.90%	1,075	13.67%
0-50% of AMI	8,815	57.45%	43	0.28%	3,075	20.04%	1,725	11.24%
0-80% of AMI	17,035	61.80%	108	0.39%	5,505	19.97%	2,960	10.74%

Table 33: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Irvine

Irvine	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	433	60.99%	20	2.82%	39	5.49%	217	30.56%
Other Multifamily	12	52.17%	6	26.09%	0	0.00%	5	21.74%
HCV Program	588	49.45%	212	17.83%	195	16.40%	191	16.06%
LIHTC	1176	25.79%	175	3.84%	568	12.46%	614	13.46%
Total Households	42,999	53.05%	1,485	1.83%	6,714	8.28%	27,793	34.29%
0-30% of AMI	5,079	46.30%	245	2.23%	895	8.16%	4,155	37.88%
0-50% of AMI	7,409	44.73%	465	2.81%	1,665	10.05%	5,460	32.96%
0-80% of AMI	12,664	48.96%	575	2.22%	2,524	9.76%	8,339	32.24%

Table 34: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, La Habra

La Habra	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	46	31.72%	0	0.00%	51	35.17%	48	33.10%
HCV Program	41	24.85%	4	2.42%	113	68.48%	7	4.24%
Total Households	7,415	39.82%	430	2.31%	8,895	47.77%	1,565	8.40%
0-30% of AMI	1,015	34.00%	75	2.51%	1,590	53.27%	255	8.54%
0-50% of AMI	1,645	27.51%	160	2.68%	3,415	57.11%	410	6.86%
0-80% of AMI	3,315	33.60%	205	2.08%	5,305	53.78%	650	6.59%

Table 35: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, La Palma[6]

La Palma	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
LIHTC	144	15.62%	35	3.80%	156	16.92%	454	49.24%

Table 36: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Laguna Niguel

Laguna Niguel	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	122	82.99%	3	2.04%	12	8.16%	10	6.80%
HCV Program	81	79.41%	5	4.90%	11	10.78%	4	3.92%
Total Households	18,550	76.09%	410	1.68%	2,575	10.56%	2,085	8.55%
0-30% of AMI	1,435	68.99%	55	2.64%	235	11.30%	210	10.10%
0-50% of AMI	2,150	52.83%	100	2.46%	485	11.92%	320	7.86%
0-80% of AMI	4,325	59.00%	155	2.11%	1,015	13.85%	600	8.19%

Table 37: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Lake Forest

Lake Forest	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
HCV Program	170	62.04%	36	13.14%	48	17.52%	20	7.30%
LIHTC	38	7.45%	38	7.45%	188	36.86%	28	5.49%
Total Households	17,714	65.95%	560	2.08%	4,310	16.05%	3,539	13.18%

[6] As with Aliso Viejo, HUD-provided demographic data for residents of publicly supported housing was not available for La Palma.

0-30% of AMI	1,129	56.17%	25	1.24%	510	25.37%	319	15.87%
0-50% of AMI	1,954	44.16%	105	2.37%	1,125	25.42%	599	13.54%
0-80% of AMI	4,144	49.57%	235	2.81%	2,135	25.54%	1,134	13.56%

Table 38: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Mission Viejo

Mission Viejo	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
HCV Program	166	73.45%	20	8.85%	28	12.39%	12	5.31%
LIHTC	201	44.47%	4	0.88%	112	24.78%	47	10.40%
Total Households	25,645	77.02%	585	1.76%	3,739	11.23%	2,504	7.52%
0-30% of AMI	1,935	75.73%	45	1.76%	365	14.29%	124	4.85%
0-50% of AMI	3,295	58.84%	70	1.25%	920	16.43%	314	5.61%
0-80% of AMI	6,680	64.11%	270	2.59%	1,635	15.69%	719	6.90%

Table 39: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Newport Beach

Newport Beach	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	85	87.63%	0	0.00%	3	3.09%	9	9.28%
HCV Program	99	70.21%	14	9.93%	15	10.64%	13	9.22%
LIHTC	238	59.20%	8	1.99%	147	36.57%	12	2.99%
Total Households	32,490	84.94%	135	0.35%	2,485	6.50%	2,477	6.48%
0-30% of AMI	3,130	78.54%	0	0.00%	400	10.04%	404	10.14%
0-50% of AMI	4,940	70.07%	0	0.00%	730	10.35%	653	9.26%
0-80% of AMI	8,355	74.90%	40	0.36%	1,030	9.23%	893	8.01%

Table 40: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Orange (City)

Orange (City)	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	89	49.17%	2	1.10%	76	41.99%	13	7.18%
HCV Program	221	35.25%	44	7.02%	218	34.77%	144	22.97%
LIHTC	943	39.03%	47	1.95%	1347	55.75%	104	4.30%
Total Households	24,840	57.94%	430	1.00%	11,370	26.52%	5,535	12.91%
0-30% of AMI	2,880	50.79%	50	0.88%	1,880	33.16%	740	13.05%
0-50% of AMI	4,290	41.67%	65	0.63%	3,785	36.77%	1,270	12.34%
0-80% of AMI	8,130	45.70%	200	1.12%	6,635	37.30%	1,800	10.12%

Table 41: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Rancho Santa Margarita

Rancho Santa Margarita	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
HCV Program	90	64.29%	20	14.29%	22	15.71%	8	5.71%
Total Households	11,575	70.36%	228	1.39%	2,580	15.68%	1,800	10.94%
0-30% of AMI	735	68.37%	24	2.23%	265	24.65%	30	2.79%
0-50% of AMI	1,060	48.07%	64	2.90%	570	25.85%	130	5.90%
0-80% of AMI	2,595	57.10%	114	2.51%	1,110	24.42%	290	6.38%

Table 42: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, San Clemente

San Clemente	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

Project-Based Section 8	56	78.87%	0	0.00%	10	14.08%	5	7.04%
HCV Program	98	78.40%	4	3.20%	20	16.00%	3	2.40%
LIHTC	592	59.80%	13	1.31%	432	43.64%	34	3.43%
Total Households	19,935	82.43%	130	0.54%	2,658	10.99%	880	3.64%
0-30% of AMI	1,795	72.38%	35	1.41%	364	14.68%	125	5.04%
0-50% of AMI	3,080	62.41%	35	0.71%	843	17.08%	190	3.85%
0-80% of AMI	5,730	69.29%	55	0.67%	1,358	16.42%	270	3.26%

Table 43: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, San Juan Capistrano[7]

San Clemente	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
LIHTC	207	81.50%	3	1.18%	30	11.81%	5	1.97%

Table 44: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Santa Ana

Santa Ana	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	45	5.70%	7	0.89%	195	24.68%	496	62.78%
HCV Program	181	10.20%	49	2.76%	557	31.38%	986	55.55%
LIHTC	1659	48.24%	44	1.28%	2990	86.94%	88	2.56%
Total Households	12,725	17.47%	1,299	1.78%	48,985	67.26%	9,002	12.36%
0-30% of AMI	1,370	9.10%	140	0.93%	11,260	74.77%	2,155	14.31%
0-50% of AMI	2,635	8.81%	310	1.04%	22,620	75.66%	3,594	12.02%

[7] As with Aliso Viejo and La Palma, HUD-provided demographic data for residents of publicly supported housing in San Juan Capistrano was not available.

0-80% of AMI	5,370	11.10%	685	1.42%	35,940	74.29%	5,523	11.42%

Table 45: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Tustin

Tustin	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	29	28.71%	0	0.00%	12	11.88%	60	59.41%
HCV Program	181	34.74%	82	15.74%	194	37.24%	62	11.90%
LIHTC	480	24.33%	85	4.31%	1052	53.32%	223	11.30%
Total Households	10,755	43.06%	693	2.77%	7,365	29.49%	5,633	22.55%
0-30% of AMI	1,115	35.07%	104	3.27%	1,385	43.57%	494	15.54%
0-50% of AMI	2,075	31.64%	189	2.88%	2,995	45.66%	974	14.85%
0-80% of AMI	3,635	32.59%	318	2.85%	5,125	45.95%	1,684	15.10%

Table 46: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics, Westminster

Westminster	**White**		**Black**		**Hispanic**		**Asian or Pacific Islander**	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Project-Based Section 8	2	2.08%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	94	97.92%
HCV Program	146	6.33%	17	0.74%	93	4.03%	2,044	88.56%
LIHTC	104	15.16%	18	2.62%	118	17.20%	400	58.31%
Total Households	9,604	35.42%	190	0.70%	5,115	18.86%	11,769	43.40%
0-30% of AMI	1,429	23.80%	25	0.42%	1,080	17.99%	3,445	57.37%
0-50% of AMI	2,359	21.85%	35	0.32%	2,115	19.59%	5,820	53.91%
0-80% of AMI	3,859	24.49%	90	0.57%	3,460	21.96%	7,684	48.77%

In Project-Based Section 8 developments, the majority racial/ethnic group in every entitlement jurisdiction is either White or Asian American and Pacific Islander. In San Clemente, Newport Beach, Laguna Niguel, and Costa Mesa, White residents make up a substantial majority, while in Irvine they make up a majority and in Orange (City) and Orange County they make up a plurality. In La Habra, Hispanics make up a plurality, but Asian American or Pacific Islanders and White residents trail them by 2 and 4 percentage points, respectively. Asian American or Pacific Islanders make up a supermajority in Buena Park, Fountain Valley, Garden Grove, and Westminster, a majority in Anaheim, Santa Ana, and Tustin, and a plurality in Huntington Beach. In Other Multifamily Housing, White residents make up a majority in Irvine and a supermajority in Fullerton and Orange County. By far, Housing Choice Voucher households are the most evenly distributed across racial/ethnic groups. Asian American or Pacific Islanders make up a supermajority of HCV units in Westminster, Fountain Valley, and Garden Grove, and a majority in Santa Ana. They also make up a plurality in Orange County, followed closely by White residents. White residents make up a supermajority in Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, San Clemente, and Newport Beach, a majority in Lake Forest, Rancho Santa Margarita, and Costa Mesa, and a plurality in Fullerton, Huntington Beach, Irvine, and Orange (City, followed closely by Hispanics). Hispanics make up a plurality of HCV residents in Anaheim, Buena Park, and Tustin, and a majority of residents in La Habra. LIHTC developments are also quite diverse, with Hispanics predominating in Anaheim, Buena Park, Fullerton, Lake Forest, Orange (City), Santa Ana, and Tustin, and Asian American or Pacific Islanders predominating in Garden Grove, La Palma, and Westminster, and bringing up a close second in Fountain Valley; the other cities have predominantly-White LIHTC demographics.

ii. *Compare the racial/ethnic demographics of each program category of publicly supported housing for the jurisdiction to the demographics of the same program category in the region.*

In the region, there are several important differences in occupancy between various types of publicly supported housing. Firstly, there is Public Housing in the region, which is predominantly Hispanic, with Black residents making up the next highest share (at a rate that far outstrips the general population). Project-Based Section 8 Housing in the region is fairly evenly spread out across racial/ethnic group, with the largest group (Asian American or Pacific Islanders) making up only 31%. Other Multifamily units are less diverse, and split fairly evenly between White (33%) and Asian American or Pacific Islander (36%) residents, with Hispanic (21%) and Black (9%) residents trailing farther behind. Housing Choice Voucher and LIHTC data are not available at the regional level.

iii. *Compare the demographics, in terms of protected class, of residents of each program category of publicly supported housing (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other Multifamily Assisted developments, and HCV) to the population in general, and persons who meet the income eligibility requirements for the relevant program category of publicly supported housing in the jurisdiction and region. Include in the comparison, a description of whether there is a higher or lower proportion of groups based on protected class.*

In comparison to the demographics of the Urban County and each of the entitlement cities, White residents tend to be either proportionally represented in Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing and to be either proportionally represented or underrepresented among Housing Choice Voucher holders, including when controlling for household income. Data for LIHTC does not offer an apples-to-apples comparison because the state does not disaggregate White, Hispanic residents from White, Non-Hispanic residents. Meanwhile, Hispanics tend to be underrepresented in Project-Based Section 8 developments and among Housing Choice Voucher holders and to be participate in the LIHTC program proportion to their share of the income-eligible population. This may result from eligibility rules for Project-Based Section 8 and the Housing Choice Voucher program that exclude undocumented immigrants. By contrast, the LIHTC program does not bar undocumented immigrants. Asian American or Pacific Islanders tend to be either proportionally represented or overrepresented across types of publicly supported housing, with the greatest overrepresentation in Project-Based Section 8 developments. Black residents make up a disproportionate share of Housing Choice Voucher holders but participate in other programs in proportion to their share of the income-eligible population.

There are a few cities with somewhat more stark contrasts between the income-eligible population and the occupancy of particular types of publicly supported housing. In Anaheim, Black residents make up a disproportionate share of occupants of all types of publicly supported housing, not just of Housing Choice Voucher holders. In Buena Park, Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove, and Westminster, the proportion of Project-Based Section 8 residents that is Asian or Pacific Islander is particularly extreme. In Costa Mesa, White residents are highly overrepresented in Project-Based Section 8 housing, which includes a 204-unit predominantly-white senior housing development. In Fullerton, White residents are highly overrepresented in Other Multifamily housing. In La Habra, Hispanic residents are slightly overrepresented among Housing Choice Voucher holders despite being underrepresented in most places. In Laguna Niguel, White residents are strongly overrepresented in both types of publicly supported housing that are present. In the city of Orange, unlike in most cities, Asian or Pacific Islander residents are underrepresented among residents of Project-Based Section 8 housing.

b. Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy

i. Describe patterns in the geographic location of publicly supported housing by program category (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other Multifamily Assisted developments, HCV, and LIHTC) in relation to previously discussed segregated areas and R/ECAPs in the jurisdiction and region.

Map 1: Publicly Supported Housing and Race/Ethnicity

There are four R/ECAPs in Orange County, and only one LIHTC development located within one of them. Overall, publicly supported housing in the County is far more likely to be concentrated in the northernmost part, nearer to Los Angeles, than in the southern part. Developments are concentrated along the main thoroughfare of Highway 5, and are particularly prevalent in Anaheim, Santa Ana, and Irvine. It should be noted that there is a particularly high concentration of Housing Choice Voucher use in the Garden Grove-Westminster area, which does not seem to have a particularly high concentration of hard units of publicly supported housing. These areas

correspond with areas of high Hispanic and Asian American or Pacific Islander segregation and concentration.

In the broader region, Public Housing is concentrated in the cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles and particularly in South LA and East LA. There is also some public housing in West Hollywood as well as in the eastern Los Angeles County cities of Baldwin Park and La Puente. With the exception of West Hollywood, these tend to be areas of concentrated Black and/or Hispanic population. In South LA, East LA, and Long Beach, there is a significant overlap between the location of Public Housing developments and R/ECAPs. Other Multifamily developments are proportionally concentrated in Los Angeles County as opposed to Orange County but are well integrated throughout Los Angeles County. There is a significant number of Other Multifamily developments in communities with West LA and the San Fernando Valley that tend to have relatively little publicly supported housing overall. The part of the region (outside of Orange County) with the least Other Multifamily housing is actually the predominantly Hispanic far eastern portion of Los Angeles County. Project-Based Section 8 developments are also relatively integrated throughout the region, albeit with a slightly higher concentration in Los Angeles County than in Orange County. LIHTC developments are relatively integrated throughout the region but with some concentration near Downtown LA. Downtown LA is fairly segregated and has a concentration of R/ECAPs but is also subject to the most intense gentrification pressures in the region. Housing Choice Voucher utilization is concentrated in South LA and adjacent communities like Westmont, in Norwalk in southeastern Los Angeles County, in Lancaster and Palmdale in northeastern Los Angeles County, and in Anaheim and Westminster within Orange County. There is some overlap with the location of R/ECAPs although the pattern is not as pronounced as for Public Housing. Areas with concentrations of voucher holders in Los Angeles County are especially likely to be areas of Black population concentration.

i. Describe patterns in the geographic location for publicly supported housing that primarily serves families with children, elderly persons, or persons with disabilities in relation to previously discussed segregated areas or R/ECAPs in the jurisdiction and region.

<u>Families with children</u>

Non-Targeted and Large Family developments are the most plentiful in the County, and are most often concentrated in diverse, metropolitan pockets of the County. However, families with children are more likely to occupy LIHTC units or use a Housing Choice Voucher than to reside in Other Multifamily or Project-Based Section 8 units. In the broader region, publicly supported housing for families with children across categories is comparatively likely to be located in R/ECAP areas than in more integrated areas or predominantly White areas.

<u>Elderly</u>

In terms of elderly populations, a significant proportion of Project-Based Section 8 units house elderly residents. Additionally, in Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley, and San Juan Capistrano, all publicly supported housing is either specifically reserved for seniors or records 90-100% elderly residents in their statistics. Each of these communities are near the coast, driving up the cost of real estate. San Juan Capistrano and Costa Mesa are more heavily White and Hispanic, while Fountain Valley is more diverse and have a more significant Asian American or Pacific Islander

population. In the broader region, publicly supported housing for elderly residents across categories is comparatively likely to be located in non-R/ECAP areas.

Persons with disabilities

In terms of residents with disabilities, there are LIHTC developments specifically reserved for people with special needs in the Urban County (Jackson Aisle Apartments), Anaheim (Avenida Villas, Casa Alegre, Diamond Aisle Apartments), Fullerton (Fullerton Heights), Huntington Beach (Pacific Sun Apartments), and Santa Ana (Guest House, Vista Del Rio). Additionally, the percentage of people with disabilities occupying Other Multifamily units in the Urban County, Fullerton, and Irvine is very high compared to the rest of the County. In the broader region, publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities across categories is comparatively likely to be located in non-R/ECAP areas.

ii. How does the demographic composition of occupants of publicly supported housing in R/ECAPS compare to the demographic composition of occupants of publicly supported housing outside of R/ECAPs in the jurisdiction and region?

Only jurisdictions which contain R/ECAPs have been pasted below. Rows with only 0 and/or N/A values have been deleted for space

Table 48: Irvine

Irvine	Total # units (occupied)	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with children	% Elderly	% with a disability
Project-based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	98	60.00%	2.00%	9.00%	29.00%	16.83%	68.32%	6.93%
Non R/ECAP tracts	619	61.15%	2.95%	4.92%	30.82%	14.04%	60.45%	14.04%
Other Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
Non R/ECAP tracts	22	52.17%	26.09%	0.00%	21.74%	0.00%	50.00%	70.83%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	18	85.00%	0.00%	5.00%	10.00%	0.00%	56.52%	43.48%
Non R/ECAP tracts	955	48.79%	18.08%	16.65%	16.20%	34.88%	36.00%	22.48%

There are only four R/ECAPs in Orange County, and they are all located in Irvine or Santa Ana. However, there is only one publicly supported housing development located within one of those R/ECAPs – Wakeham Grant Apartments (LIHTC), in Santa Ana. The data presented by HUD is outdated, as it does not identify the same exact R/ECAPs as this analysis, but it is nevertheless

presented as it may give insight into former R/ECAPs which exhibit similar characteristics. Using the former Irvine R/ECAPs, the occupancy of Project-Based Section 8 units was remarkably similar both within and outside those tracts, with the exception of residents with a disability, who were more plentiful outside of R/ECAPs. With regard to the Housing Choice Voucher Program, the results were markedly different. Surprisingly, the proportion of all voucher holders that were White within R/ECAPS was nearly double that outside of R/ECAPs. This is likely an aberration resulting from the extremely small number of voucher holders in R/ECAPs in Irvine. The percentages of elderly and disabled residents, which often coincide, were similarly high.

Table 49: Santa Ana

Santa Ana	Total # units (occupied)	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with children	% Elderly	% with a disability
Project-based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	N/a	N/a	0.00%	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
Non R/ECAP tracts	790	5.70%	0.89%	24.68%	62.78%	3.60%	92.31%	14.64%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	130	6.02%	3.61%	26.51%	63.86%	22.35%	47.06%	25.88%
Non R/ECAP tracts	2,512	10.40%	2.72%	31.62%	55.14%	25.97%	50.88%	21.17%
LIHTC								
R/ECAP tracts	126	8.83%	1.42%	84.33%	5.98%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	966	52.72%	1.26%	87.24%	2.17%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Like the analysis of Irvine above, the HUD tables provided here are outdated and utilize old R/ECAPs, but they are nevertheless useful in comparing tracts with similar characteristics. The LIHTC data is accurate, however, and reflects the only publicly supported housing development within a R/ECAP – Wakeham Grant Apartments. The outdated data on Housing Choice Vouchers shows a general tendency for the demographic composition of voucher holders to be quite similar inside and outside R/ECAPs, with a slight tendency toward higher Asian American or Pacific Islander representation in R/ECAPs. The LIHTC demographics tell a similar story. It should be noted that LIHTC demographic information has been self-reported to the California state treasurer, and does not always match the way HUD reports demographics, especially when it comes to race versus ethnicity. This might account for the extremely high co-incidence of White and Hispanic residents. Overall, it seems there is not much difference within and outside R/ECAPs for LIHTC units in Santa Ana.

i. *Do any developments of public housing, properties converted under the RAD, and LIHTC developments have a significantly different demographic composition, in terms*

of protected class, than other developments of the same category for the jurisdiction? Describe how these developments differ.

See Tables in Appendix

In Westminster, the Royale Apartments stand out for having a plurality-Hispanic population, while every other LIHTC development has a strong majority of Asian American or Pacific Islander residents. In Orange (City), Casa Ramon stands out as the only Project-Based Section 8 development with a supermajority-Hispanic population, while the others are majority-White. In Newport Beach, Lange Drive Family and Newport Veterans Housing stand out for their majority-Hispanic and large Black populations, respectively, compared to the other far larger developments in the city which are supermajority-White. In Irvine, The Parklands stands out among Project-Based Section 8 developments for its large Asian American or Pacific Islander population, compared to all the other developments which are predominantly White. Similarly, four LIHTC developments have large Asian populations (The Arbor at Woodbury, Montecito Vista Apartment Homes, Doria Apartment Homes Phase I, Anesi Apartments) compared to the other predominantly-White developments. In Huntington Beach, the two Project-Based Section 8 developments are polar opposites, with one 60% White while the other is 63% Asian. Meanwhile, most of the LIHTC developments in Huntington Beach are predominantly White, while Hermosa Vista Apartments is predominantly Hispanic. In Garden Grove, Briar Crest+Rosecrest Apartments and Malabar Apartments stand out at LIHTC developments with large Hispanic populations, while the other developments are predominantly Asian American or Pacific Islander. In Fullerton, Ventana Senior Apartments stands out for its large Asian American or Pacific Islander population, while every other LIHTC development is predominantly White or Hispanic. In Buena Park, Park Landing Apartments and Emerald Gardens Apartments stand out for their large White and Hispanic populations, respectively, compared to the other LIHTC developments which are predominantly Asian American or Pacific Islander. The Project-Based Section 8 developments are markedly different as well, with 73% White residents at Newport House and 91% Asian American or Pacific Islander residents at Casa Santa Maria. In Orange County, Continental Gardens Apartments and Tara Village Apartments stand out for their large Asian American or Pacific Islander populations, while the rest of the LIHTC developments are predominantly White or Hispanic.

i. Provide additional relevant information, if any, about occupancy, by protected class, in other types of publicly supported housing for the jurisdiction and region.

Effective January 2020, the Tenant Protection Act of 2019, a statewide rent gouging law, restricts rent increases to 5% plus the local rate of inflation per year. As of January 2020, the rate of inflation in the region was 3.1%. Additionally, San Juan Capistrano has a Mobile Home Rent Control Ordinance, working to preserve access to a source of unsubsidized affordable housing. However, cutting in the opposite direction, Ellis Act evictions of rent-controlled units have the potential to counteract rent control laws. Data about Ellis Act evictions in the area is not widely available, so it is difficult to estimate the effect they may have.

In October 2019, Governor Newsom signed into law SB 329, prohibiting discrimination in housing based on source of income statewide.

San Clemente, Irvine, Huntington Beach, and Newport Beach all have inclusionary zoning programs. The Anaheim Housing Authority implements the Affordable Housing Program, which consists of multifamily apartment complexes that include affordable units.[8] These units maintain rents at levels below regular market rent rates through agreements with the City, but is not a mandatory program. People on the Interest List are notified as affordable units become available. The Orange County Housing Authority maintains a similar list of deed-restricted units for the entire county.[9] In addition to these housing authorities, several cities maintain similar lists of deed-restricted units and many provide development incentives to develop affordable housing units.

i. *Compare the demographics of occupants of developments in the jurisdiction, for each category of publicly supported housing (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other Multifamily Assisted developments, properties converted under RAD, and LIHTC) to the demographic composition of the areas in which they are located. For the jurisdiction, describe whether developments that are primarily occupied by one race/ethnicity are located in areas occupied largely by the same race/ethnicity. Describe any differences for housing that primarily serves families with children, elderly persons, or persons with disabilities.*

See table in appendix

There is quite a bit of inconsistency when comparing the individual demographics of publicly supported housing developments to the census tracts where they are located. In the Urban County, for example, the tracts tend to be predominantly White, but the developments themselves are far more likely to be majority-Hispanic or majority-Asian American or Pacific Islander. In Anaheim, the developments are consistently located in majority-Hispanic tracts, but the developments themselves do not always mirror those demographics. In Buena Park, on the other hand, the developments tend to be mostly Asian American or Pacific Islander, while located in mostly Hispanic tracts. Similarly, Costa Mesa's developments are located in Hispanic tracts, but the developments are predominantly Asian American or Pacific Islander. Fountain Valley and Fullerton both stand out, with their singular Project-Based Section 8 developments being supermajority Asian American or Pacific Islander, but located in majority-White tracts. In Garden Grove, nearly every LIHTC has an inverse relationship between its tract and development population, with majority-Hispanic developments located in Asian American or Pacific Islander tracts, and vice versa.

Huntington Beach has two specific standouts in Huntington Villa Yorba, which is majority-Asian American or Pacific Islander in a White tract, and Hermosa Vista Apartments, majority-Hispanic in a White tract. In Irvine, several Project-Based Section 8 developments are predominantly White while located in Asian American or Pacific Islander tracts; for LIHTC developments this trend holds. In La Habra, Casa El Centro Apartments is predominantly Asian American or Pacific

[8] https://www.anaheim.net/770/Affordable-Housing
[9] http://www.ochousing.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=39906

Islander, while located in a Hispanic tract. Newport Beach is home to Newport Veterans Housing, which is 15% Black (far greater than the general Black population) in a White tract.

In Orange (City), the Project-Based Section 8 development Casa Ramon is predominantly Hispanic, while located in a White tract. Meanwhile, Casa Del Rio is predominantly-White but located in a Hispanic tract. Nearly every tract containing a LIHTC development is predominantly-Hispanic, while several of the developments' populations are mostly White. In San Clemente, there are three LIHTC developments that are predominantly-Hispanic but are located in White tracts. In San Juan Capistrano, all three LIHTC developments (each restricted to seniors), have predominantly-White populations in Hispanic tracts. In Santa Ana, every development is located in a Hispanic tract, but there are four predominantly-Asian American or Pacific Islander developments and one predominantly-White development. In Tustin, the only Project-Based Section 8 development is predominantly-Asian American or Pacific Islander in a White tract, and every LIHTC development is predominantly-Asian American or Pacific Islander, but located in a White or Hispanic tract. In Westminster, every tract is predominantly-Asian American or Pacific Islander, but the Royales Apartments are predominantly Hispanic.

c. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

i. Describe any disparities in access to opportunity for residents of publicly supported housing in the jurisdiction and region, including within different program categories (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other Multifamily Assisted Developments, HCV, and LIHTC) and between types (housing primarily serving families with children, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities) of publicly supported housing.

Disparities in access to opportunity, when compared to publicly supported housing, cut in conflicting directions. School proficiency, for instance, is very good in the Urban County, along the coast, in the southern part of the County, and on the northeast edge; this cuts out most of the more urban areas, where publicly supported housing is concentrated. Job proximity is far more variable, although with a general tendency to be located along the main thoroughfares – the same as publicly supported housing. The entire County has good low transportation cost index scores, with slightly better scores in the northern part of the County where most of the publicly supported housing is clustered. Environmental health is very poor overall, but better to the south, where there is far less publicly supported housing.

<u>Contributing Factors of Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy</u>

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of fair housing issues related to publicly supported housing, including Segregation, R/ECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs. For each contributing factor that is significant, note which fair housing issue(s) the selected contributing factor relates to.

Please see the Appendix for the following Contributing Factors to Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy:

- Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing
- Community opposition
- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures
- Displacement of and/or lack of housing support for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking
- Impediments to mobility
- Lack of access to opportunity due to high housing costs
- Lack of meaningful language access for individuals with limited English proficiency
- Lack of local or regional cooperation
- Lack of private investment in specific neighborhoods
- Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services and amenities
- Land use and zoning laws
- Loss of affordable housing
- Occupancy codes and restrictions
- Quality of affordable housing information programs
- Siting selection policies, practices, and decisions for publicly supported housing, including discretionary aspects of Qualified Allocation Plans and other programs
- Source of income discrimination

D. Disability and Access

Population Profile

Map 1: Disability by Type, North Orange County



Map 1: Disability by Type, Central Orange County



Map 1: Disability by Type, South Orange County



Table 4: Disability by Type, Orange County, Region

	Orange County		Region	
Disability Type	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
Hearing Difficulty	81,297	2.59%	333,537	2.53%
Vision Difficulty	51,196	1.63%	247,670	1.88%
Cognitive Difficulty	99,317	3.16%	480,601	3.65%
Ambulatory Difficulty	133,232	4.24%	677,592	5.14%
Self-Care Difficulty	61,615	1.96%	327,895	2.49%
Independent Living Difficulty	104,705	3.34%	526,534	4.00%

Table 5: Aliso Viejo

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	914	1.80%
Vision Difficulty	503	0.99%
Cognitive Difficulty	1,140	2.25%
Ambulatory Difficulty	1,148	2.27%
Self-Care Difficulty	669	1.32%
Independent Living Difficulty	913	1.80%

Table 6: Anaheim

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	7,308	2.11%
Vision Difficulty	4,967	1.43%
Cognitive Difficulty	11,360	3.27%
Ambulatory Difficulty	15,684	4.52%
Self-Care Difficulty	7,324	2.11%
Independent Living Difficulty	12,332	3.55%

Table 7: Buena Park

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	2,403	2.90%
Vision Difficulty	1,387	1.68%
Cognitive Difficulty	2,290	2.77%
Ambulatory Difficulty	4,242	5.13%
Self-Care Difficulty	1,843	2.23%
Independent Living Difficulty	2,793	3.38%

Table 8: Costa Mesa

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	2,462	2.19%
Vision Difficulty	1,967	1.75%

Cognitive Difficulty	3,899	3.47%
Ambulatory Difficulty	4,401	3.91%
Self-Care Difficulty	1,737	1.54%
Independent Living Difficulty	3,278	2.91%

Table 9: Fountain Valley

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	1,842	3.26%
Vision Difficulty	685	1.21%
Cognitive Difficulty	2,394	4.24%
Ambulatory Difficulty	3,093	5.48%
Self-Care Difficulty	1,266	2.24%
Independent Living Difficulty	2,261	4.01%

Table 10: Fullerton

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	3,344	2.40%
Vision Difficulty	2,406	1.73%
Cognitive Difficulty	4,478	3.22%
Ambulatory Difficulty	6,425	4.62%
Self-Care Difficulty	2,683	1.93%
Independent Living Difficulty	4,992	3.59%

Table 11: Garden Grove

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	5,132	2.95%
Vision Difficulty	3,044	1.75%
Cognitive Difficulty	6,805	3.91%
Ambulatory Difficulty	8,226	4.73%
Self-Care Difficulty	3,996	2.30%
Independent Living Difficulty	7,328	4.21%

Table 12: Huntington Beach

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	5,818	2.91%
Vision Difficulty	3,392	1.70%
Cognitive Difficulty	7,239	3.62%
Ambulatory Difficulty	9,226	4.61%
Self-Care Difficulty	3,952	1.98%
Independent Living Difficulty	6,816	3.41%

Table 13: Irvine

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	4,154	1.62%
Vision Difficulty	2,032	0.79%
Cognitive Difficulty	5,481	2.14%
Ambulatory Difficulty	6,719	2.62%
Self-Care Difficulty	3,527	1.37%
Independent Living Difficulty	5,713	2.23%

Table 14: La Habra

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	1,803	2.92%
Vision Difficulty	1,044	1.69%
Cognitive Difficulty	2,272	3.68%
Ambulatory Difficulty	3,659	5.93%
Self-Care Difficulty	1,530	2.48%
Independent Living Difficulty	2,354	3.81%

Table 15: La Palma

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	421	2.66%
Vision Difficulty	262	1.66%
Cognitive Difficulty	476	3.01%
Ambulatory Difficulty	825	5.22%
Self-Care Difficulty	496	3.14%
Independent Living Difficulty	547	3.46%

Table 16: Laguna Niguel

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	1,815	2.78%
Vision Difficulty	807	1.23%
Cognitive Difficulty	1,965	3.00%
Ambulatory Difficulty	1,943	2.97%
Self-Care Difficulty	938	1.43%
Independent Living Difficulty	1,910	2.92%

Table 17: Lake Forest

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	2,141	2.62%
Vision Difficulty	715	0.88%
Cognitive Difficulty	2,001	2.45%
Ambulatory Difficulty	2,705	3.31%

Self-Care Difficulty	1,371	1.68%
Independent Living Difficulty	2,451	3.00%

Table 18: Mission Viejo

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	3,325	3.46%
Vision Difficulty	1,719	1.79%
Cognitive Difficulty	3,474	3.61%
Ambulatory Difficulty	5,015	5.22%
Self-Care Difficulty	2,574	2.68%
Independent Living Difficulty	3,937	4.10%

Table 19: Newport Beach

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	2,487	2.87%
Vision Difficulty	1,341	1.55%
Cognitive Difficulty	2,265	2.62%
Ambulatory Difficulty	3,243	3.75%
Self-Care Difficulty	1,330	1.54%
Independent Living Difficulty	2,619	3.03%

Table 20: Orange (City)

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	2,921	2.14%
Vision Difficulty	1,841	1.35%
Cognitive Difficulty	4,106	3.01%
Ambulatory Difficulty	5,357	3.93%
Self-Care Difficulty	2,762	2.02%
Independent Living Difficulty	4,334	3.18%

Table 21: Rancho Santa Margarita

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	677	1.38%
Vision Difficulty	442	0.90%
Cognitive Difficulty	838	1.71%
Ambulatory Difficulty	1,108	2.26%
Self-Care Difficulty	477	0.97%
Independent Living Difficulty	715	1.46%

Table 22: San Clemente

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	1,950	3.01%

Vision Difficulty	783	1.21%
Cognitive Difficulty	1,581	2.44%
Ambulatory Difficulty	2,060	3.18%
Self-Care Difficulty	929	1.43%
Independent Living Difficulty	1,675	2.59%

Table 23: San Juan Capistrano

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	1,181	3.29%
Vision Difficulty	744	2.07%
Cognitive Difficulty	1,134	3.16%
Ambulatory Difficulty	2,144	5.97%
Self-Care Difficulty	1,251	3.48%
Independent Living Difficulty	1,653	4.60%

Table 24: Santa Ana

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	6,745	2.04%
Vision Difficulty	9,075	2.74%
Cognitive Difficulty	9,177	2.77%
Ambulatory Difficulty	11,321	3.42%
Self-Care Difficulty	5,603	1.69%
Independent Living Difficulty	9,146	2.76%

Table 25: Tustin

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	1,749	2.19%
Vision Difficulty	1,216	1.52%
Cognitive Difficulty	2,308	2.89%
Ambulatory Difficulty	2,894	3.63%
Self-Care Difficulty	1,162	1.46%
Independent Living Difficulty	2,353	2.95%

Table 26: Westminster

Disability Type	#	%
Hearing Difficulty	3,399	3.71%
Vision Difficulty	1,959	2.14%
Cognitive Difficulty	5,517	6.02%
Ambulatory Difficulty	6,308	6.89%
Self-Care Difficulty	2,964	3.24%
Independent Living Difficulty	5,665	6.19%

How are people with disabilities geographically dispersed or concentrated in the jurisdiction and region, including R/ECAPs and other segregated areas identified in previous sections?

ACS Disability Information

According to the 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 81,297 residents of Orange County have hearing disabilities, which represents 2.59% of the county's population; 51,196 residents (1.63%) have vision disabilities; 99,317 residents (3.16%) have cognitive disabilities; 133,232 residents (4.24%) have ambulatory disabilities; 61,615 residents (1.96%) have self-care disabilities; and 104,705 residents (3.34) have independent living disabilities. Across the cities collaborating on this Analysis, concentrations of persons with particular types of disabilities vary widely. In Aliso Viejo, Irvine, Laguna Niguel, Lake Forest, Rancho Santa Margarita, San Clemente, Santa Ana, and Tustin, concentrations of persons with various types of disabilities are generally lower than they are countywide. In Anaheim, Buena Park, Fountain Valley, Garden Grove, La Habra, Mission Viejo, San Juan Capistrano, and Westminster, concentrations of persons with various types of disabilities are generally higher than they are countywide. In Costa Mesa, Fullerton, Huntington Beach, La Palma, Newport Beach, and Orange, concentrations of persons with various types of disabilities are generally similar to countywide levels. There are partial exceptions to these overall trends. For example, in Santa Ana, a higher proportion of residents have vision disabilities than is the case countywide despite concentrations of persons with other types of disabilities being lower. Additionally, although some cities have much lower or much higher concentrations of residents with particular types of disabilities, differences in others are more modest. For example, concentrations of persons with various types of disabilities in Westminster are much higher than in Mission Viejo, another city that has higher concentrations of persons with various types of disabilities than Orange County as a whole.

Communities with higher concentrations of persons with disabilities are somewhat more likely to be located in the more racially and ethnically diverse northern portion of the county than they are in the southern portion of the county. Six out of the eight cities that have higher concentrations of persons with disabilities across most types of disabilities are located in the northern part of the county. At the same time, the two exceptions to this trend – Mission Viejo and San Juan Capistrano – are notable in that they are both majority-White cities. Additionally, diverse cities in northern Orange County, like Santa Ana and Tustin, have relatively low concentrations of persons with disabilities. This may stem in part from the fact that these communities have relatively youthful populations and disability status is highly correlated with age. There is no overlap between areas of concentration of persons with disabilities and R/ECAPs.

17.1% of people with disabilities have incomes below the poverty line, as opposed to 11.7% of individuals without disabilities. Although a breakdown of poverty status by type of disability is not available through the American Community Survey (ACS), it is clear that the need for affordable housing is greater among people with disabilities than it is among people without disabilities. Another indicator of disability and limited income are the number of people receiving Supplemental Social Security (SSI) which is limited to people with disabilities. According to the 2013-2017 ACS, 44,540 of households receive SSI (4.3% of total households), which is such a

small subsidy that all of the recipients are extremely low-income. Not all SSI recipients have the types of disabilities that necessitate accessible units.

The broader region, which includes Los Angeles County in addition to Orange County, has higher concentrations of persons with all types of disabilities than Orange County with one exception. The percentage of persons with hearing disabilities is marginally higher in Orange County than in the broader region.

Describe whether these geographic patterns vary for people with each type of disability or for people with disabilities in different age ranges for the jurisdiction and region.

In addition to the broader patterns described above, there are some other patterns of concentration based on both type of disability and disability status by age. Garden Grove has higher concentrations of persons with self-care and independent living disabilities, as well as higher concentrations of elderly persons with disabilities. La Habra has elevated concentrations of persons with ambulatory disabilities while Laguna Niguel has lower concentrations of persons with ambulatory disabilities. All categories of disabilities become more prevalent as individuals age, with the number of people in Orange County 65 and over (131,765) with a disability nearly matches the amount of people under 65 (139,497) with a disability.

Housing Accessibility

Describe whether the jurisdiction and region have sufficient affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes.

Accessibility Requirement for Federally-Funded Housing

HUD's implementation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (24 CFR Part 8) requires that federally financed housing developments have five percent (5%) of total units be accessible to individuals with mobility disabilities and an additional two percent (2%) of total units be accessible to individuals with sensory disabilities. It requires that each property, including site and common areas, meet the Federal Uniform Accessibility Standards (UFAS) or HUD's Alternative Accessibility Standard.

In Orange County, there are 104 Other Multifamily Housing and 4,090 Project-Based Section 8 units that are subject to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. 81 people with disabilities reside in Multifamily Housing, and 549 reside in Project-Based Section 8 units. At this time, we do not know how many accessible units are in Project Based Section 8 units. The HOME Partnership Program is a grant of federal funds for housing, therefore, these units are subject to Section 504. HUD regularly publishes Performance Snapshots of HOME program participants' activities over time. Of HOME program participants in Orange County, Anaheim has produced 16 Section 504 compliant units, Costa Mesa has produced four Section 504 compliant units, Fullerton has produced three Section 504 compliant units, Garden Grove has not produced any Section 504 compliant units, Huntington Beach has produced seven Section 504 compliant units, Irvine has produced 123 Section 504 compliant units, Orange County has produced 27 Section 504 compliant

units, Orange has produced three Section 504 compliant units, Santa Ana has produced 16 Section 504 compliant units, and Westminster has produced one Section 504 compliant unit.

Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Units

According to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC)'s LIHTC database, there are 158 LIHTC developments currently in service. In these 158 developments, there are 16,201 affordable units. All of these developments were put into service after 1991, meaning that they have all been built according to 1991 Fair Housing Act accessibility requirements. LIHTC developments are categorized as non-targeted, large family, senior, SRO, special needs, and at risk. Non-targeted: 32; Large family: 70; Senior: 44; SRO: 4; special needs: 6; at risk: 2; 158 total. Within Orange County, LIHTC developments are not evenly distributed as there are far fewer in the southern portion of Orange County with entire cities such as Rancho Santa Margarita, Mission Viejo, and Lake Forest not having any LIHTC developments. Communities in central and northern Orange County have higher concentrations of LIHTC developments, including in Anaheim, Irvine, and Santa Ana.

In 2015, CTCAC has issued guidance stating that the accessibility requirements of the California Building Code (CBC) for public housing (Chapter 11B) apply to LIHTC developments. Chapter 11B is the California equivalent of the 2010 ADA Standards. Section 1.9.1.2.1. of the CBC states that the accessibility requirements apply to "any building, structure, facility, complex …used by the general public." Facilities made available to the public, included privately owned buildings. CTAC has expanded the requirement so that 10% of total units in a LIHTC development must be accessible to people with mobility disabilities and that 4% be accessible to people with sensory (hearing/vison) disabilities.

Also, effective 2015, CTCAC required that 50% of total units in a new construction project and 25% of all units in a rehabilitation project located on an accessible path will be mobility accessible units in accordance with CBC Chapter 11B. CTAC also provides incentives for developers to include additional accessible units through its Qualified Allocation Plan. LIHTC units comprise an important segment of the supply of affordable, accessible units in Orange County.

Housing Choice Vouchers

5,045 people with disabilities reside in units assisted with Housing Choice Vouchers in Orange County, but this does not represent a proxy for actual affordable, accessible units. Rather, Housing Choice Vouchers are a mechanism for bringing otherwise unaffordable housing, which may or may not be accessible, within reach of low-income people with disabilities. Unless another source of federal financial assistance is present, units assisted with Housing Choice Vouchers are not subject to Section 504 although participating landlords remain subject to the Fair Housing Act's duty to provide reasonable accommodations and to allow tenants to make reasonable modifications at their own expense.

Fair Housing Amendments Act Units

The Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 (FHAA) covers **all** multifamily buildings of four or more units that were first occupied on or after March 13, 1991 – not just affordable housing developments. The FHAA added protections for people with disabilities and prescribed certain basic accessibility standards, such as one building entrance must be accessible; there must be an accessible route throughout the development, and public rooms and common rooms must be accessible to people with disabilities. Although these accessibility requirements are not as intensive as those of Section 504, they were a first step in opening many apartment developments to people with disabilities regardless of income level. The FHAA was also very helpful for middle-income and upper-income people with disabilities also need accessible housing. It is important to note that FHAA units are **not** the same as accessible units under Section 504 or ADA Title II. Therefore, utilizing FHAA units as a proxy for the number of accessible housing units available or required under Section 504 or ADA Title II does not produce an accurate count. Although they are not fully accessible, these units are an important source of housing for people with disabilities who do not need a mobility or hearing/vision unit.

In Orange County, 39,047 units in structures with 5 or more units have been built from 2000 to the present. Additionally, 81,362 units in structures with 5 or more units were built from 1980 through 1999. If it is assumed that 45% of such units were constructed from 1991 through 1999, then there would be an additional 36,613 units in multifamily housing that was subject to the design and construction requirements of the Fair Housing Act at the time of its construction. Combined with the total built from 2000 to the present, that totals a potential 75,660 units in structures covered by the Fair Housing Act's design and construction standards.

Affordable, Accessible Units in a Range of Sizes

Data breaking down affordable, accessible units by number of bedrooms is not available for private housing. For Publicly Supported Housing, a supermajority (74.67%) of Project-Based Section 8 units are 0-1 bedroom units, as are Other Multifamily units (84.54%, the other 15% having 2 bedrooms). A plurality of Housing Choice Vouchers are also limited to 0-1 bedroom units (43.97%). 5,561 households or 26.20% of Housing Choice Voucher occupants are also households with children, the highest of any category of publicly supported housing (followed by Project-Based Section 8, with 9.62%). It appears that affordable, accessible units that can accommodate families with children or individuals with live-in aides are extremely limited in Orange County. Although data reflecting the percentage of families with children that include children with disabilities is not available, about 2.9% of all children in the County have a disability. If children with disabilities are evenly distributed across families with children, about 9,500 families in the County include a child with a disability.

Summary

Based on available data, the supply of affordable, accessible units in Orange County is insufficient to meet the need. In the County, some 81,297 residents have hearing difficulty, 51,196 residents have vision difficulty, and 133,232 residents have ambulatory difficulty, potentially requiring the use of accessible units. Meanwhile, the data indicates there may be roughly 75,660 units that have been produced subject to the Fair Housing Act's design and construction standards and approximately 4,000 units within developments that must include accessible units subject to

Section 504. There is, without question, some overlap between these two categories, some of these units are likely non-compliant, and some accessible units are occupied by individuals who do not have disabilities.

Describe the areas where affordable, accessible housing units are located in the jurisdiction and region. Do they align with R/ECAPs or other areas that are segregated?

Relying on the discussion of Publicly Supported Housing to guide the assessment of which types of housing are most likely to be affordable and accessible, such housing is highly concentrated in the central and northern portions of the county. In particular, units are concentrated in Anaheim, Garden Grove, Irvine, and Santa Ana. Additionally, accessible housing is most likely to be located in places with newer construction and many units, thus conforming to the Fair Housing Act's accessibility standards. Areas with newer construction include the central and southern portions of the county.

Map 4: Median Year Structure Built by Census Tract, Orange County



To what extent are people with different disabilities able to access and live in the different categories of publicly supported housing in the jurisdiction and region?

Table 27: Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category, Orange County

	People with a Disability	
Orange County	**#**	**%**
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	31	7.47%
Other Multifamily	24	72.73%
HCV Program	610	25.33%
Region		
Public Housing	1,407	14.32%

Project-Based Section 8	5,013	12.71%
Other Multifamily	869	15.62%
HCV Program	N/a	N/a

Table 28: Anaheim

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	60	21.82%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	1,100	22.32%

Table 29: Buena Park

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	15	12.71%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	165	21.07%

Table 30: Costa Mesa

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	6	5.36%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	192	29.40%

Table 31: Fountain Valley

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	14	20.59%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	157	29.40%

Table 32: Fullerton

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	4	3.92%
Other Multifamily	40	80.00%
HCV Program	203	26.68%

Table 33: Garden Grove

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	4	1.76%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	516	18.46%

Table 34: Huntington Beach

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	50	13.19%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	270	25.64%

Table 35: Irvine

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	95	13.05%
Other Multifamily	17	70.83%
HCV Program	286	23.08%

Table 36: La Habra

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	6	4.08%

Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	34	17.62%

Table 37: Laguna Niguel

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	45	29.61%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	44	40.00%

Table 38: Lake Forest

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	N/a	N/a
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	95	32.20%

Table 39: Mission Viejo

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	N/a	N/a
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	92	37.86%

Table 40: Newport Beach

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	3	3.03%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	42	27.81%

Table 41: Orange (City)

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	71	36.98%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	167	24.52%

Table 42: Rancho Santa Margarita

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	N/a	N/a
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	56	37.84%

Table 43: San Clemente

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	11	15.07%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	52	39.10%

Table 44: Santa Ana

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	118	14.64%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	397	21.39%

Table 45: Tustin

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	11	10.68%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a
HCV Program	108	19.82%

Table 46: Westminster

	People with a Disability	
	#	%
Public Housing	N/a	N/a
Project-Based Section 8	5	5.10%
Other Multifamily	N/a	N/a

HCV Program	459	19.60%

In Orange County, according to the 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 11.1% of the civilian noninstitutionalized population has a disability. As the tables above reflect, the proportion of people with disabilities with Housing Choice Vouchers exceeds the overall population concentration of people with disabilities. For other programs, the data is more idiosyncratic with disproportionately low concentrations of persons with disabilities in Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing in some cities and disproportionately high concentrations in others. This inconsistency likely results from the differing natures of individual developments that fall under those umbrellas, with some supportive housing – including Section 202 and Section 811 housing – encompassed in Other Multifamily housing and many age-restricted Project-Based Section 8 developments.[10] The table below shows that the extremely low-income population, which is eligible for publicly supported housing across a range of programs, contains a much higher proportion of persons with disabilities than does the population as a whole.

Table 47: Percentage of the population that is income eligible (0-30% AMI) and has a disability, Orange County

Type of Disability	Percentage of Cost-Eligible Population	Number of People in Cost-Eligible Population with a Disability
Hearing or Vision	9.97%	20,220
Ambulatory	13.80%	27,990
Cognitive	8.97%	18,195
Self-Care or Independent Living	12.02%	24,375
No Disability	55.23%	111,985
Total		202,765

Integration of People with Disabilities Living in Institutions and Other Segregated Settings

To what extent do people with disabilities in or from the jurisdiction or region reside in segregated or integrated settings?

Up until a wave of policy reforms and court decisions in the 1960s and 1970s, states, including California, primarily housed people with intellectual and developmental disabilities and

[10] Elderly individuals are significantly more likely to have disabilities than non-elderly individuals.

individuals with psychiatric disabilities in large state-run institutions. In California, institutions for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities are called developmental centers, and institutions for people with psychiatric disabilities are called state hospitals. Within these institutions, people with disabilities have had few opportunities for meaningful interaction with individuals without disabilities, limited access to education and employment, and a lack of individual autonomy. The transition away from housing people with disabilities in institutional settings and toward providing housing and services in home and community-based settings accelerated with the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1991 and the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.* in 1999. In *Olmstead*, the Supreme Court held that, under the regulations of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) implementing Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if a state or local government provides supportive services to people with disabilities, it must do so in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of a person with a disability and consistent with their informed choice. This obligation is not absolute and is subject to the ADA defense that providing services in a more integrated setting would constitute a fundamental alteration of the state or local government's programs.

The transition from widespread institutionalization to community integration has not always been linear, and concepts of what comprises a home and community-based setting have evolved over time. Although it is clear that developmental centers and state hospitals are segregated settings and that an individual's own house or apartment in a development where the vast majority of residents are individuals without disabilities is an integrated setting, significant ambiguities remain. Nursing homes and intermediate care facilities are segregated though not to the same degree as state institutions. Group homes fall somewhere between truly integrated supported housing and such segregated settings, and the degree of integration present in group homes often corresponds to their size.

Below, this assessment includes detailed information about the degree to which people with intellectual and developmental disabilities and individuals with psychiatric disabilities reside in integrated or segregated settings. The selection of these two areas of focus does not mean that people with other types of disabilities are never subject to segregation. Although the State of California did not operate analogous institutions on the same scale for people with ambulatory or sensory disabilities, for example, many people with disabilities of varying types face segregation in nursing homes. Data concerning people with various disabilities residing in nursing homes is not as available as data relating specifically to people with intellectual and developmental disabilities and people with psychiatric disabilities.

Table 48: Performance of Regional Center of Orange County, December 2018

Dec. 2018 Performance Reports	Fewer consumers live in developmental centers	More children live with families	More adults live in home settings	Fewer children live in large facilities (more than 6 people)	Fewer adults live in large facilities (more than 6 people)
State Average	0.12%	99.38%	80.20%	0.04%	2.31%

Regional Center of Orange County	0.26%	99.32%	77.45%	0.03%	2.93%

In California, a system of regional centers is responsible for coordinating the delivery of supportive services primarily to individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. The regional centers serve individuals with intellectual disabilities, individuals with autism spectrum disorder, individuals with epilepsy, and cerebral palsy. These disabilities may be co-occurring. Individuals with intellectual disabilities and individuals with mild/moderate intellectual disability and individuals with autism spectrum disorder make up the lion's share of consumers. All data regarding the regional centers is drawn from their annual performance reports.

On an annual basis, regional centers report to the California Department of Developmental Services on their performance in relation to benchmarks for achieving community integration of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. As reflected in the table above, the Regional Center of Orange County closely tracks the statewide average data though individuals with developmental disabilities in Orange County are slightly more segregated than statewide.

The Fairview Developmental Center was the primary institution serving the region but is now in the process of closing.

Psychiatric Disabilities

In Orange County, Behavioral Health Services (part of the County Health Agency) is responsible for coordinating the provision of supportive services for people with psychiatric disabilities. The Department provides Full Service Partnership programs to allow for the provision of supportive services that facilitate community integration for Children, Transitional Age Youth, Adults, and Older Adults. Data regarding participation in the Full Service Partnership by individuals is not available.

As a result of Proposition 63, a successful 2004 statewide ballot initiative, funding is available for permanent supportive housing for people with psychiatric disabilities through the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA). The Department operates its No Place Like Home, Special Needs Housing, and Mortgage Assistance Programs to increase access to community-based housing for persons with psychiatric disabilities.

Describe the range of options for people with disabilities to access affordable housing and supportive services in the jurisdiction and region.

There are four housing authorities operating within Orange County: Orange County Housing Authority, Anaheim Housing Authority, Garden Grove Housing Authority, and the Housing Authority of the City of Santa Ana. One of the easiest ways for people with disabilities to access affordable housing is for the local housing authorities to implement disability preferences in their HCV programs. The housing authorities for Anaheim and Garden Grove administer preferences that provide a significant advantage in admissions to persons with disabilities. The housing authority for the county has a preference that is weighted relatively lightly in comparison to other factors while Santa Ana's housing authority does not have a preference. Preferences for homeless

individuals and for veterans may significantly overlap with persons with disabilities and thereby reduce concerns about the weakness of existing disability preferences.

Supportive services are primarily provided through programs administered by the Regional Center of Orange County and the Orange County Behavioral Health Department. Additionally, particularly for individuals with types of disabilities other than intellectual and developmental disabilities and psychiatric disabilities, services may be available through a range of health care providers, paid by Medi-Cal, Medicare, or private insurance, or through nursing homes. Payment for supportive services for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities is typically structured as Home and Community-Based Services Medicaid Waivers. These Waivers pay for a wide variety of services necessary to empower individuals to maintain stable residence in home and community-based services. There are, however, only as many Waivers available as there is funding from the federal government and the State of California.

Disparities in Access to Opportunity

To what extent are people with disabilities able to access the following in the jurisdiction and region? Identify major barriers faced concerning:

i. Government services and facilities

This Analysis did not reveal any specific barriers that persons with disabilities face in accessing government services and facilities.

ii. Public infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, pedestrian signals)

This Analysis did not reveal any specific barriers persons with disabilities face in accessing public infrastructure.

iii. Transportation

The relative lack of public transportation, particularly in the southern and coastal portions of the county, disproportionately burdens persons with disabilities who are more likely to rely on public transportation than are individuals who do not have disabilities.

iv. Proficient schools and educational programs

This Analysis did not reveal current systemic policies and practices that contribute to educational disparities for students with disabilities in Orange County; however, data shows that, although suspension rates are lower in Orange County than statewide, students with disabilities still face suspension at twice the rate of other students.

v. Jobs

Data in the table below from the Regional Center of Orange County shows that persons with developmental disabilities obtain earned income at higher rates than individuals with

developmental disabilities statewide but that rate is still very low in comparison to the proportion of all adults with earned income.

Table 49: Employment Metrics for Adults with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities by Regional Center

Regional Center	Percentage of Consumers with Earned Income	Percentage of Adults with Integrated Employment as a Goal in their Individual Program Plan
State Average	17%	27%
Regional Center of Orange County	21%	30%

Describe the processes that exist in the jurisdiction and region for people with disabilities to request and obtain reasonable accommodations and accessibility modifications to address the barriers discussed above.

i. Government services and facilities

Government websites generally have accessibility information on them regarding the accessibility of the websites themselves, but there is not clear, public information regarding how individuals can request accommodations.

ii. Public infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, pedestrian signals)

There is no clear, public information regarding how individuals with disabilities can request accommodations relating to public infrastructure.

iii. Transportation

By contrast, the Orange County Transportation Authority and Metrolink have clear, easily findable information about their accommodation and modification policies.

iv. Proficient schools and educational programs

School districts are more disparate in how they display information relating to their accommodation policies, with some making that information easy to find but others not.

v. Jobs

This Analysis did not reveal information suggesting patterns in how major employers do or do not provide required accommodations in Orange County.

Describe any difficulties in achieving homeownership experienced by people with disabilities and by people with different types of disabilities in the jurisdiction and region.

Persons with disabilities in Orange County are less able to access homeownership than individuals who do not have disabilities, primarily because of the high cost of homeownership and relative differences in income between persons with disabilities and individuals who do not have disabilities. This pattern is slightly undercut by the prevalence of elderly homeowners with disabilities that began in old age. Many of these individuals earned relatively high incomes prior to the onset of their disabilities.

Disproportionate Housing Needs

Describe any disproportionate housing needs experienced by people with disabilities and by people with certain types of disabilities in the jurisdiction and region.

Table 50: Residents experiencing 1 or more housing problems by Disability Type, Orange County

Disability Type	Has 1 or more housing problems	Total	Percent
Hearing or Vision	43,325	93,875	46.15%
Ambulatory	52,675	106,370	49.52%
Cognitive	39,405	72,515	54.34%
Self-Care or Independent Living	46,695	90370	51.67%

CHAS data does not disaggregate data relating to persons with disabilities experiencing overcrowding, incomplete plumbing and kitchen facilities, and cost burden. However, it does disaggregate persons experiencing one or more of those housing problems by type of disability (although it groups together hearing and vision, and self-care and independent living disabilities). The data above indicate that people with disabilities experience very high rates of housing problems, clustering around 50%, and there are no serious differences across the different

disability types. Although it is not possible to disaggregate the individual housing problems by disability, given the age distribution of people with disabilities, it would seem to be unlikely that people with disabilities are disproportionately subject to overcrowding. Just 2.1% of households with elderly heads of household are overcrowded while 5.3% of households with nonelderly heads of household are overcrowded. By contrast, in light of the relatively low earnings of people with disabilities, it is likely that people with disabilities are disproportionately subject to cost burden and severe cost burden.

Additional Information

Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about disability and access issues in the jurisdiction and region including those affecting people with disabilities with other protected characteristics.

This Assessment has made extensive use of local data throughout the Disability and Access section. The sources of data other than HUD-provided data are noted where appropriate.

The program participant may also describe other information relevant to its assessment of disability and access issues.

The discussion above provides a comprehensive overview of information relevant to this Analysis.

Disability and Access Issues Contributing Factors

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of disability and access issues and the fair housing issues, which are Segregation, R/ECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs. For each contributing factor, note which fair housing issue(s) the selected contributing factor relates to.

- Access for persons with disabilities to proficient schools
- Access to publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities
- Access to transportation for persons with disabilities
- Inaccessible government facilities or services
- Inaccessible public or private infrastructure
- Lack of access to opportunity due to high housing costs
- Lack of affordable in-home or community-based supportive services
- Lack of affordable, accessible housing in range of unit sizes
- Lack of affordable, integrated housing for individuals who need supportive services
- Lack of assistance for housing accessibility modifications
- Lack of assistance for transitioning from institutional settings to integrated housing
- Lack of local or regional cooperation
- Land use and zoning laws
- Lending discrimination
- Location of accessible housing

- Loss of affordable housing
- Occupancy codes and restrictions
- Regulatory barriers to providing housing and supportive services for persons with disabilities
- Source of income discrimination
- State or local laws, policies, or practices that discourage individuals with disabilities from living in apartments, family homes, supportive housing and other integrated settings

E. Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity and Resources

List and summarize any of the following that have not been resolved:

- A charge or letter of finding from HUD concerning a violation of a civil rights-related law;
- A cause determination from a substantially equivalent state or local fair housing agency concerning a violation of a state or local fair housing law;
- Any voluntary compliance agreements, conciliation agreements, or settlement agreements entered into with HUD or the Department of Justice;
- A letter of findings issued by or lawsuit filed or joined by the Department of Justice alleging a pattern or practice or systemic violation of a fair housing or civil rights law;
- A claim under the False Claims Act related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, or civil rights generally, including an alleged failure to affirmatively further fair housing;
- Pending administrative complaints or lawsuits against the locality alleging fair housing violations or discrimination.
    - *Watts v. City of Newport Beach,* 790 Fed.Appx. 853 (9th Cir. 2019): The City of Newport Beach was recently sued by a young woman who alleged excessive force, unlawful entry, and unlawful arrest. Upon the decline of her card for a taxi fare, the driver called the police, who threatened to take Watts to jail if she could not produce additional funds to pay. She asked to go to her apartment to get another form of payment, and officers escorted her. When she objected to their entry into her apartment to retrieve the funds, they handcuffed her to the point of injury to her wrists, kicked her legs out from under her, pushed her head into a wall, and took her to jail overnight. The 9th Circuit ruled affirmed that officers were not covered by qualified immunity for unlawful arrest and unlawful entry, but that they were covered for the excessive force claim.
    - *A. K. H by and through Landeros v. City of Tustin*, 837 F.3d 1005 (9th Cir. 2016): In 2014, the city of Tustin was sued by the family of a minor who was shot and killed by a Tustin police officer. The city moved for summary judgement based on qualified immunity. The district court denied that motion. On appeal, the 9th Circuit affirmed the lower court decision, holding that the shooting violated the 4th Amendment, and that the officer was not covered by qualified immunity.

Describe any state or local fair housing laws. What characteristics are protected under each law?

California Laws

The State Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) enforces California laws that provide protection and monetary relief to victims of unlawful housing practices. The Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) (Government Code Section 12955 et seq.) prohibits discrimination and harassment in housing practices, including:

- Advertising

- Application and selection process
- Unlawful evictions
- Terms and conditions of tenancy
- Privileges of occupancy
- Mortgage loans and insurance
- Public and private land use practices (zoning_
- Unlawful restrictive covenants

The following categories are protected by FEHA:

- Race or color
- Ancestry or national origin
- Sex, including Gender, Gender Identity, and Gender Expression
- Marital status
- Source of income
- Sexual orientation
- Familial status (households with children under 18 years of age)
- Religion
- Mental/physical disability
- Medical condition
- Age
- Genetic information

In addition, FEHA contains similar reasonable accommodations, reasonable modifications, and accessibility provisions as the Federal Fair Housing Amendments Act. FEHA explicitly provides that violations can be proven through evidence of the unjustified disparate impact of challenged actions and inactions and establishes the burden-shifting framework that courts and the Department of Fair Employment and Housing must use in evaluating disparate impact claims.

The Unruh Civil Rights Act provides protection from discrimination by all business establishments in California, including housing and accommodations, because of age, ancestry, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation. While the Unruh Civil Rights Act specifically lists "sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, and medical condition" as protected classes, the California Supreme Court has held that protections under the Unruh Act are not necessarily restricted to these characteristics. In practice, this has meant that the law protects against arbitrary discrimination, including discrimination on the basis of personal appearance.

Furthermore, the Ralph Civil Rights Act (California Civil Code Section 51.7) forbids acts of violence or threats of violence because of a person's race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, age, disability, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, or position in a labor dispute. Hate violence can include: verbal or written threats; physical assault or attempted assault; and graffiti, vandalism, or property damage.

The Bane Civil Rights Act (California Civil Code Section 52.1) provides another layer of protection for fair housing choice by protecting all people in California from interference by force or threat of force with an individual's constitutional or statutory rights, including a right to equal access to housing. The Bane Act also includes criminal penalties for hate crimes; however, convictions under the Act may not be imposed for speech alone unless that speech itself threatened violence.

Finally, California Civil Code Section 1940.3 prohibits landlords from questioning potential residents about their immigration or citizenship status. In addition, this law forbids local jurisdictions from passing laws that direct landlords to make inquiries about a person's citizenship or immigration status.

In addition to these acts, Government Code Sections 11135, 65008, and 65580-65589.8 prohibit discrimination in programs funded by the State and in any land use decisions. Specifically, recent changes to Sections 65580-65589.8 require local jurisdictions to address the provision of housing options for special needs groups, including:

- Housing for persons with disabilities (SB 520)
- Housing for homeless persons, including emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing (SB 2)
- Housing for extremely low-income households, including single-room occupancy units (AB 2634)
- Housing for persons with developmental disabilities (SB 812)

Jurisdiction-Specific Laws

Aliso Viejo
In 2013, the city of Aliso Viejo adopted housing and reasonable accommodation regulations and procedures.

Buena Park
As part of the zoning code, the city of Buena Park describes specific procedures for reasonable accommodations in land use, zoning regulations, rules, policies, practices and procedures through the completion of a Fair Housing Accommodation Request form.

Costa Mesa
As part of the zoning code, the city of Costa Mesa allows for reasonable accommodations in land use and zoning regulations.

Irvine
The Irvine Municipal Code prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status or physical handicap of any individual in the realms of employment,

real estate transactions, and educational institutions. Regarding housing, it is prohibits discrimination in financial transactions, advertising, or give differential treatment and terms.

La Palma
La Palma specifically provides for reasonable accommodations for person with disabilities in "land use, zoning and building regulations, policies, practices and procedures of the City."[11]

Newport Beach
Newport Beach requires provision of reasonable accommodation during the permit review process for new development.

Orange
The city of Orange provides for reasonable accommodations in the application of land use and zoning laws for those with disabilities.

Rancho Santa Margarita
Rancho Santa Margarita allows for reasonable accommodations in the application of land use and zoning laws for those with disabilities.

Santa Ana
The Santa Ana municipal code allows for modification of land use or zoning regulations if necessary to provide a reasonable accommodation to persons with disabilities.

Tustin
Tustin allows for reasonable accommodations in the land use and zoning process for developers of housing for persons with disabilities.

Westminster
Westminster allows for reasonable accommodations in land use and zoning when necessary to accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities.

Additional Information

Provide additional relevant information, if any, about fair housing enforcement, outreach capacity, and resources in the jurisdiction and region.

California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH)

[11] https://library.municode.com/ca/la_palma/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COOR_CH44ZO_ARTVPEPLCE_DIV15REACRE

DFEH accepts, investigates, conciliates, mediates, and prosecutes complaints under FEHA, the Disabled Persons Act, the Unruh Civil Rights Act, and the Ralph Civil Rights Act. DFEH investigates complaints of employment and housing discrimination based on race, sex, including gender, gender identity, and gender expression, religious creed, color, national origin, familiar status, medical condition (cured cancer only), ancestry, physical or mental disability, marital status, or age (over 40 only), and sexual orientation, DFEH established a program in May 2003 for mediating housing discrimination complaints, which is among the largest fair housing mediation program in the nation to be developed under HUD's Partnership Initiative with state fair housing enforcement agencies. The program provides California's tenants, landlords, and property owners and managers with a means of resolving housing discrimination cases in a fair, confidential, and cost-effective manner. Key features of the program are: 1) it is free of charge to the parties; and 2) mediation takes place within the first 30 days of the filing of the complaint, often avoiding the financial and emotional costs associated with a full DFEH investigation and potential litigation.

Fair Housing Council of Orange County

Founded in 1965, the Fair Housing Council of Orange County is a non-profit operating throughout the county with a mission of ensuring access to housing and preserving human rights. The council provides a variety of services including community outreach and education, homebuyer education, mortgage default counseling, landlord-tenant mediation, and limited low-cost advocacy. Their services are provided in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese. In addition to these client services, the Fair Housing Council investigates claims of housing discrimination and assists with referrals to DFEH. The Council may also occasionally assist with or be part of litigation challenging housing practices.

Fair Housing Foundation

The Fair Housing Foundation serves parts of Los Angeles County and several cities in Orange County. Of the jurisdictions included in this analysis, the following are covered by the Fair Housing Foundation's service area: Anaheim, Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Irvine, La Habra, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, Orange (city), San Clemente, Tustin, and Westminster. The Foundation provides landlord-tenant counseling and mediation, rental housing counseling, and community outreach and education. In addition, the Foundation screens fair housing complaints, investigates through testing, and will engage in conciliation or mediation efforts or refer the complaints to the appropriate administrative agencies where appropriate.

Community Legal Aid SoCal

Community Legal Aid SoCal is a holistic legal services provider serving low-income people Orange County and Southeast Los Angeles County. Overall, community legal aid provides direct representation, as well as engaging in policy advocacy and impact litigation. The advocates in the housing program provide legal assistance across a broad range of fair housing issues, including "eviction, federally or otherwise publicly subsidized housing, substandard housing,

landlord/tenant issues, homeownership issues, homeowners association issues mobile homes, housing discrimination, an predatory lending practices."[12] The main office is located in Santa Ana, with additional offices in Norwalk, Anaheim, and Compton. Across four offices, the organization has 100 staff members and 30 attorneys. Like other Legal Aid offices, Community Legal Aid SoCal is funded by the Legal Services Corporation, which carries restrictions against representing undocumented clients.

Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Contributing Factors

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the jurisdiction and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the lack of fair housing enforcement, outreach capacity, and resources and the severity of fair housing issues, which are Segregation, R/ECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs. For each significant contributing factor, note which fair housing issue(s) the selected contributing factor impacts.

- Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement
- Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations
- Lack of state or local fair housing laws

[12] https://www.communitylegalsocal.org/programs-services/area-of-law/housing/

VI. Fair Housing Goals and Priorities

If implemented, the goals and strategies below will serve as an effective basis for affirmatively furthering fair housing by reducing patterns of segregation, mitigating displacement, addressing disproportionate housing needs, and increasing access to opportunity for members of protected classes. The first six overarching goals below, multiple of which have several strategies listed for implementation, are cross-jurisdictional goals. Orange County and the participating jurisdictions all have a role to play in implementing those goals. Following those goals, this section includes individual goals for Orange County, the participating jurisdictions, and the housing authorities that may not be applicable to other jurisdictions because they respond to local circumstances.

Cross-Jurisdictional Goals

I. *Goal #1: Increase the supply of affordable housing in high opportunity areas.*

Orange County's high and rapidly rising housing costs, along with the unequal distribution of affordable housing across its communities, are some of the leading drivers of fair housing issues for members of protected classes in the area. Data indicates that Hispanic residents, Vietnamese residents, and persons with disabilities experience these problems most acutely.

Many households are rent burdened, and some households pay more than 50% of their incomes towards rent. In many high opportunity areas, current payment standards are far too low for families with housing choice vouchers to move to these areas. Additionally, there has been vocal community opposition to affordable housing throughout the county. These data reflect a need to expand the both the supply and geographical diversity of affordable housing.

a. Explore the creation of a new countywide affordable housing bond.

The State of California has approved several measures to issue bonds for affordable housing. Orange County should consider the issuance of affordable housing bonds to meet the widening gap for affordable rental housing through a ballot initiative or other county-wide or local means.

b. Using best practices from other jurisdictions, explore policies and programs that increase the supply affordable housing, such as affordable housing trust funds, linkage fees, inclusionary housing, public land set-aside, community land trusts, transit-oriented development, and expedited permitting and review.

The above policies and practices have resulted in an increase in affordable housing in jurisdictions throughout the country and in California in particular. In Orange County, there has been an increase in the supply of affordable housing in cities that have adopted these best practices.

c. Explore providing low-interest loans to single-family homeowners and grants to homeowners with household incomes of up to 80% of the Area Median Income to develop accessory dwelling units with affordability restriction on their property.

In 2019, the California Legislature passed AB 68 and AB 881 which permit the placement of two accessory dwelling units (ADUs), including one "junior ADU," on a lot with an existing or proposed single-family home statewide. Due to high construction costs and high demand, the small size of ADUs may not be sufficient to ensure that they will be affordable by design. Local governments may need to provide financial assistance in order to incentivize homeowners to make their ADUs affordable. Because it can be difficult for homeowners to access bank financing to build ADUs, there may be a need for such incentives among homeowners. As a condition of receiving assistance, jurisdictions should require homeowners to attend fair housing training and to maintain records that facilitate audits of their compliance with non-discrimination laws. The need to educate individual homeowners, who do not have experience as landlords and knowledge of the law, may prevent unintentional and intentional violations of fair housing laws.

d. Review existing zoning policies and explore zoning changes to facilitate the development of affordable housing.

In several jurisdictions in Orange County, the prevalence of single-family residential zoning makes it challenging to develop housing that could offer housing opportunities to members of protected classes. Many cities across the country are increasing higher density zoning near transit. Increased higher density zoning near transit in high opportunity areas, coupled with an affordable housing set-aside, would provide additional mixed-income rental housing.

e. Align zoning codes to conform to recent California affordable housing legislation.

California passed several affordable housing bills that became effective on January 1, 2020. Examples include as AB 1763, which expands existing density bonus law for 100% affordable housing projects to include unlimited density around transit hubs with an additional three stories or 33 feet of height, and AB 68, which allows two ADUs on a single lot, as well as multiple ADUs on multifamily lots with limited design requirement that cities can impose and an approval process of 60 days. This and other legislation necessitate changes to each jurisdiction's zoning code.

II. *Goal 2: Prevent displacement of low- and moderate-income residents with protected characteristics, including Hispanic residents, Vietnamese residents, seniors, and people with disabilities.*

a. Explore piloting a Right to Counsel Program to ensure legal representation for tenants in landlord-tenant proceedings, including those involving the application of new laws like A.B. 1482.

Thousands of residents in the county are displaced annually due to evictions. According to legal services and fair housing organizations, many evictions occur because tenants do not understand their rights and/or their obligations. It is estimated that only a small percentage of tenants facing eviction have legal representation, and those without representation almost always are evicted, regardless of a viable defense. Recently, other high cost cities such as New York, San Francisco,

Philadelphia, and soon Los Angeles have guaranteed a right to counsel at eviction hearings. There are several legal providers in the county such as Community Legal Aid SoCal and Public Law Center that are well-positioned to serve low-income tenants with financial support. Although there would be an up-front investment, legal representation is less costly than serving homeless families.

III. *Goal 3: Increase community integration for persons with disabilities*

a. Conduct targeted outreach and provide tenant application assistance and support to persons with disabilities, including individuals transitioning from institutional settings and individuals who are at risk of institutionalization. As part of that assistance, maintain a database of housing that is accessible to persons with disabilities.

Lack of access to housing is a significant impediment to full community integration for persons with disabilities in the county. Stakeholders expressed frustration with the lack of information on accessible affordable housing units and are required to call individual landlords to obtain this information.

b. Consider adopting the accessibility standards adopted by the City of Los Angeles, which require 15 percent of all new units in city-supported LIHTC projects to be ADA-accessible with at 4 percent of total units to be accessible for persons with hearing and/or vision disabilities.

In order to align with the Voluntary Compliance Agreement (VCA) between the City of Los Angeles and HUD,[13] Orange County should consider adopting the same standards; nearby Santa Monica is also planning to confirm to the requirements in the VCA.

IV. *Goal 4: Ensure equal access to housing for persons with protected characteristics, who are disproportionately likely to be lower-income and to experience homelessness.*

a. Reduce barriers to accessing rental housing by eliminating application fees for voucher holders and encouraging landlords to follow HUD's guidance on the use of criminal backgrounds in screening tenants.

Stakeholders reported that high application fees for rental housing are a significant barrier for voucher holders. Additionally, some landlords to continue to refuse rental housing to prospective tenants based on decades-old criminal background checks or minor misdemeanors.

b. Consider incorporating a fair housing equity analysis into the review of significant rezoning proposals and specific plans.

At times, large scale development and redevelopment efforts have not sufficiently addressed the needs of large families with children, persons with disabilities, and Hispanic and Vietnamese residents, in particular. By incorporating a fair housing analysis in the review process for redevelopment plans at an early stage, planning staff for municipalities could catch issues such as the distribution of unit sizes in proposed developments while it is still feasible to amend plans.

[13] https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/Main/documents/HUD-City-of-Los-Angeles-VCA.pdf

V. *Goal 5: Expand access to opportunity for protected classes.*

a. Explore the voluntary adoption of Small Area Fair Market Rents or exception payment standards in order to increase access to higher opportunity areas for Housing Choice Voucher holders.

A significant barrier in the county is the lack of affordable housing and the sufficiency of payment standards to provide geographic options to voucher holders. Orange County Housing Authority has three payment standards; basic, central, and restricted. HUD's Small Area FMRs for Orange County permit certain zip codes to have higher payment standards than those currently used.

b. Explore the creation of a mobility counseling program that informs Housing Choice Voucher holders about their residential options in higher opportunity areas and provides holistic supports to voucher holders seeking to move to higher opportunity areas.

The housing authorities located in Orange County currently lack funding to implement full-scale housing mobility programs. A formal counseling program, as found in Chicago, Dallas, Baltimore, and elsewhere, can make a significant difference in the settlement patterns of HCV households. These programs generally identify opportunity areas, while assisting voucher holders to find new residences within them. Workshops and information sessions allow for participants to ask questions, find higher-performing schools and locate areas of lower crime. Individual counselors may provide assistance to families to find units in opportunity areas, while also following up post-move to ensure the family is adjusting well to their new neighborhood.

c. Study and make recommendations to improve and expand Orange County's public transportation to ensure that members of protected classes can access jobs in job centers in Anaheim, Santa Ana, and Irvine.

There are few viable and reliable public transportation options in Orange County. It is important that there is a match between where low- and moderate-income members of protected classes, who are more likely to use public transportation, are able to commute to county job centers. Part of this study should include ensuring that people with disabilities are able to access transportation to jobs and services.

d. Increase support for fair housing enforcement, education, and outreach.

Nonprofit fair housing organizations and legal services providers play a critical role in fair housing enforcement, education, and outreach but struggle to meet the full needs of victims of discrimination due to limited financial and staff capacity. By supporting these organizations, jurisdictions can help ensure that these organizations can address existing and critical emerging issues, like those that have stemmed from the passage of S.B. 329, which extends source of income protections to Housing Choice Voucher holders, and A.B. 1482, which caps annual rent increases in at 5% plus the regionally-adjusted Consumer Price Index and requires landlords to have "just cause" in order to evict tenants. It would also make proactive audit testing of housing providers rather than reactive complaint-based testing more feasible.

VI. *La Habra-Specific Goals*

a. *Explore the creation of an inclusionary zoning program to increase the number of affordable housing units.*

b. *Advocate for increasing the minimum percentage of affordable units at Park La Habra Mobile Home (110 units) and View Park Mobile Home Estates (140 units) from 20 percent to 50 percent.*

VII. PUBLICLY SUPPORTED HOUSING APPENDIX

Table 1: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics and Surrounding Census Tract Demographics, Orange County

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Laurel Park Manor	70		22%	N/a	4%	74%	N/a	1101.13	49.1%	2.5%	18.7%	22.1%	5.6%
Project-Based Section 8	Villa La Jolla	55		36%	2%	36%	26%	45%	0117.20	4.5%	2%	89.2%	3.2%	29.1%
Project-Based Section 8	Vista Aliso	70		88%	N/a	6%	4%	N/a	0626.32	81.6%	0.2%	8.9%	3.9%	4.1%
Project-Based Section 8	Rancho Moulton	51		27%	8%	45%	20%	34%	0626.25	52.4%	0%	34%	11.1%	17.9%
Project-Based Section 8	Rancho Niguel	51		14%	4%	58%	18%	26%	0626.25	52.4%	0%	34%	11.1%	17.9%
Project-Based Section 8	Cypress Sunrise	74		30%	N/a	4%	66%	N/a	1101.04	36.7%	2%	20%	38%	8.5%
Project-Based Section 8	Imperial Villas	58		61%	6%	24%	9%	30%	0117.17	54.3%	1.6%	20.4%	20.1%	3.5%
Other Multifamily	Hagan Place	24		92%	N/a	8%	N/a	N/a	626.05	84.2%	1.8%	8.7%	4.8%	10.6%
Other Multifamily	Stanton Accessible	9		N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	878.01	25.3%	1.8%	45.4%	24.9%	11.7%
LIHTC	Stonegate II	25	26	0.00%	6.52%	21.74%	0.00%	Large Family	878.05	16.1%	4.0%	55.7%	22.9%	16.2%
LIHTC	Birch Hills Apartments	114	115	22.82%	5.63%	62.82%	13.80%	Large Family	218.14	47.7%	1.2%	24.3%	22.3%	4.4%
LIHTC	Bonterra Apartments Homes	93	94	26.13%	5.23%	40.07%	6.97%	Large Family	218.15	42.7%	3.0%	17.9%	31.8%	2.6%
LIHTC	Imperial Park Apartments	91	92	10.95%	1.09%	31.75%	0.36%	Non Targeted	15.03	48.5%	0.8%	35.8%	11.4%	15.4%
LIHTC	Vintage Canyon Sr. Apartments	104	105	64.41%	3.39%	16.95%	17.80%	Senior	15.06	48.3%	0.0%	23.6%	25.5%	12.2%
LIHTC	Walnut Village Apartments	46	46	6.76%	2.03%	33.78%	0.00%	Large Family	15.03	48.5%	0.8%	35.8%	11.4%	15.4%

LIHTC	Tara Village Apartments	168	170	12.85%	4.80%	8.05%	73.53%	Large Family	1101.04	36.7%	2.0%	20.0%	38.8%	8.5%
LIHTC	Glenneyre Apartments	26	27	84.62%	3.85%	11.54%	7.69%	SRO	626.05	84.2%	1.8%	8.7%	4.9%	10.6%
LIHTC	Jackson Aisle Apartments	29	30	76.67%	10.00%	16.67%	6.67%	Special Needs	997.02	21.2%	0.9%	23.8%	51.1%	21.2%
LIHTC	Park Stanton Seniors Apts	335	335	31.19%	5.31%	9.29%	13.50%	Senior	881.01	27.8%	5.7%	43.1%	20.7%	10.9%
LIHTC	Plaza Court	102	103	4.64%	0.55%	67.49%	1.09%	Large Family	879.01	16.3%	1.5%	41.4%	39.6%	21.7%
LIHTC	Continental Gardens Apartments	297	297	0.00%	0.00%	2.37%	32.69%	Non Targeted	878.03	7.9%	0.8%	65.3%	23.0%	33.3%
LIHTC	Oakcrest Heights (Savi Ranch II)	53	54					Large Family	219.24	45.2%	4.3%	22.4%	23.1%	5.8%
LIHTC	Oakcrest Terrace	68	69	60.61%	3.03%	51.52%	2.02%	Large Family	219.24	45.2%	4.3%	22.4%	23.1%	5.8%
LIHTC	Parkwood Apartments	100	101	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Senior	218.09	68.8%	1.0%	15.0%	9.1%	2.9%
LIHTC	Villa Plumosa	75	76	55.10%	0.00%	58.50%	0.68%	Large Family	218.02	60.8%	0.3%	28.0%	8.1%	9.5%
LIHTC	Vintage at Stonehaven Apartments	124	125	57.24%	1.97%	9.21%	7.89%	Seniors	218.25	65.1%	0.3%	16.2%	16.3%	4.2%
LIHTC	Yorba Linda Palms Apartments	43	44	31.58%	9.21%	33.55%	5.92%	Large Family	218.02	60.8%	0.3%	28.0%	8.1%	9.5%
LIHTC	Sendero Bluffs	106	107	58.91%	1.55%	14.73%	6.20%	Seniors	320.56	61.8%	1.4%	17.8%	12.6%	4.2%
LIHTC	Esencia Norte Apartments	111	112	50.82%	6.01%	53.28%	4.10%	Large Family	320.56	61.8%	1.4%	17.8%	12.6%	4.2%

Table 2: Aliso Viejo

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project	Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate

LIHTC	Woodpark Apartments	128	128	75.39%	6.94%	28.71%	4.73%	Large Family	626.39	62.9%	4.3%	11.7%	14.4%	4.0%

Table 3: Anaheim

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Village Center Apts	100		11%	N/a	8%	81%	N/a	0873.00	16.2%	0.8%	69.1%	11.7%	19.7%
Project-Based Section 8	Westchester Housing	64		16%	25%	48%	11%	49%	0869.01	17.3%	6.1%	50.4%	24.6%	26.4%
Project-Based Section 8	Anaheim Memorial Manor	75		19%	1%	5%	73%	N/a	0873.00	16.2%	0.8%	69.1%	11.7%	19.7%
Project-Based Section 8	Carbon Creek Shores	40		66%	11%	24%	N/a	14%	864.07	18.9%	1.3%	63.7%	9.8%	15.7%
LIHTC	Anton Monaco Apartments	229	232	26.39%	9.99%	50.21%	9.13%	Non-Targeted	871.02	16.8%	4.3%	62.1%	13.6%	17.9%
LIHTC	Arbor View Apartments	45	46	56.07%	4.62%	65.32%	2.89%	Large Family	870.02	24.9%	3.0%	48.9%	21.5%	13.5%
LIHTC	Avenida Villas	28	29	41.67%	19.44%	13.89%	11.11%	Special Needs	877.01	19.8%	1.4%	57.4%	18.3%	12.4%
LIHTC	Avon Dakota Phase I	15	16	28.33%	3.33%	90.00%	0.00%	Large Family	874.04	4.1%	1.0%	91.5%	3.5%	24.9%
LIHTC	Belage Manor Apartments	177	180	32.88%	7.66%	23.87%	22.97%	Senior	871.05	25.8%	0.5%	40.8%	24.7%	21.7%
LIHTC	Broadway Village	45	46	79.40%	0.00%	95.98%	0.00%	Large Family	863.01	17.2%	1.2%	69.7%	11.2%	15.7%
LIHTC	Calendula Court	31	32	24.04%	16.35%	36.54%	11.54%	Large Family	870.02	24.9%	3.0%	48.9%	21.5%	13.5%
LIHTC	California Villas	33	34	31.11%	2.22%	26.67%	35.56%	Senior	870.02	24.9%	3.0%	48.9%	21.5%	13.5%
LIHTC	Casa Alegre	22	23	41.38%	10.34%	31.03%	10.34%	Special Needs	870.01	17.8%	9.5%	51.9%	18.7%	18.8%
LIHTC	Cerritos Avenue Apartments	59	60	16.48%	6.25%	13.07%	2.84%	Large Family	877.03	22.3%	1.9%	40.9%	29.7%	16.9%
LIHTC	Cornerstone	48	49	2.41%	1.20%	9.64%	0.00%	Large Family	877.01	19.8%	1.4%	57.4%	18.3%	12.4%
LIHTC	Diamond Aisle	24	25	54.84%	12.90%	19.35%	6.45%	Special Needs	872	22.6%	4.4%	61.7%	9.6%	15.9%

	Apartments													
LIHTC	Elm Street Commons	51	52	68.69%	4.55%	77.78%	2.02%	Large Family	873	16.2%	0.8%	69.1%	11.8%	19.7%
LIHTC	Greenleaf Apartments	19	20	55.56%	11.11%	55.56%	4.76%	Large Family	867.02	13.6%	2.5%	68.5%	11.9%	23.1%
LIHTC	Hermosa Village aka Jeffrey-Lynne Perimeter Re	111	118	18.40%	5.10%	72.28%	3.55%	Large Family	875.05	15.9%	1.1%	63.8%	15.2%	24.3%
LIHTC	Jeffrey Lynne Neighborhood Revitalization Phase IV	36	36	22.96%	8.89%	86.67%	1.48%	Large Family	875.05	15.9%	1.1%	63.8%	15.2%	24.3%
LIHTC	Jeffrey-Lynne Apartments Phase I	192	200	9.51%	7.61%	74.46%	2.58%	Large Family	875.05	15.9%	1.1%	63.8%	15.2%	24.3%
LIHTC	Jeffrey-Lynne Neighborhood Revitalization Phase 3	76	85	11.90%	13.49%	64.29%	10.71%	Large Family	875.05	15.9%	1.1%	63.8%	15.2%	24.3%
LIHTC	Jeffrey-Lynne Neighborhood Revitalization PhaseII	99	100	20.67%	3.35%	73.46%	6.15%	Large Family	875.05	15.9%	1.1%	63.8%	15.2%	24.3%
LIHTC	Linbrook Court	80	81	17.39%	0.00%	0.00%	78.26%	Senior	871.01	25.4%	5.3%	40.1%	26.1%	11.0%
LIHTC	Lincoln Anaheim Phase I	71	72	31.29%	4.68%	35.97%	9.71%	Large Family	873	16.2%	0.8%	69.1%	11.8%	19.7%
LIHTC	Lincoln Anaheim Phase II	73	74	41.44%	4.79%	59.93%	6.51%	Large Family	873	16.2%	0.8%	69.1%	11.8%	19.7%
LIHTC	Magnolia Acres	40	40	90.00%	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	Senior	870.01	17.8%	9.5%	51.9%	18.7%	18.8%
LIHTC	Monarch Pointe Apartment Homes	62	63	62.76%	7.14%	72.96%	5.10%	Large Family	867.02	13.6%	2.5%	68.5%	11.9%	23.1%
LIHTC	Palm West Apartments	57	58	22.82%	7.38%	33.56%	14.09%	Non-Targeted	1102.02	28.5%	3.8%	37.6%	26.0%	24.2%
LIHTC	Park Vista Apartments	390	392	2.95%	1.82%	63.14%	1.13%	Non-Targeted	866.01	6.8%	3.4%	82.5%	5.8%	26.0%
LIHTC	Paseo Village Family Apartments	174	174	2.82%	7.13%	82.92%	2.82%	Large Family	866.01	6.8%	3.4%	82.5%	5.8%	26.0%
LIHTC	Pebble Cove	110	111	31.58%	6.58%	37.28%	14.91%	Non-Targeted	878.06	18.7%	2.0%	56.6%	17.5%	17.2%
LIHTC	Renaissaance Park	124	126	8.27%	8.27%	24.41%	3.94%	Non-Targeted	869.01	17.3%	6.1%	50.4%	24.6%	26.4%

	Apartments aka Monterey Apts.													
LIHTC	Rockwood Apartments			51.43%	9.80%	54.29%	4.49%							
LIHTC	Solara Court	131	132	14.86%	0.57%	11.43%	76.00%	Senior	1102.01	26.7%	4.1%	27.3%	38.3%	17.3%
LIHTC	South Street Anaheim Housing Partners LP	91	92	30.47%	5.26%	40.72%	14.68%	Large Family	874.01	20.5%	1.1%	53.7%	21.6%	8.7%
LIHTC	Stonegate	37	38	9.87%	4.61%	9.87%	1.32%	Large Family	878.06	18.7%	2.0%	56.6%	17.5%	17.2%
LIHTC	The Crossings at Cherry Orchard	44	44	4.46%	0.00%	8.28%	1.27%	Large Family	1102.01	26.7%	4.1%	27.3%	38.3%	17.3%
LIHTC	The Vineyard Townhomes			50.00%	14.29%	85.71%	0.00%		873.00	16.2%	0.8%	69.1%	11.7%	19.7%
LIHTC	Tyrol Plaza Senior Apartments	59	60	71.62%	6.76%	27.03%	13.51%	Senior	863.01	17.2%	1.2%	69.7%	11.2%	15.7%
LIHTC	Villa Anaheim	134	135	26.44%	0.57%	18.97%	37.36%	Senior	1102.01	26.7%	4.1%	27.3%	38.3%	17.3%

Table 4: Buena Park

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Newport House	10		73%	7%	13%	7%	N/a	1103.03	36.1%	0.8%	40.2%	18.2%	5.2%
Project-Based Section 8	Casa Santa Maria	100		6%	N/a	3%	91%	N/a	1105.00	15.2%	5.9%	54.9%	20.7%	25.5%
LIHTC	City Yard Workforce Housing			8.05%	15.44%	24.16%	35.57%							
LIHTC	Dorado Senior Apartments			32.65%	2.04%	15.31%	53.06%		868.03	25.2%	1.3%	44.9%	26.0%	17.6%
LIHTC	Emerald Gardens Apartments			18.21%	10.49%	42.28%	7.10%		1102.01	26.7%	4.1%	27.3%	38.3%	17.3%
LIHTC	Harmony Park Apartments			12.00%	4.00%	6.67%	61.33%		1105.00	15.2%	5.9%	54.9%	20.7%	25.5%
LIHTC	Park Landing			42.33%	18.60%	40.93%	22.33%		868.01	29.3%	3.7%	40.7%	25.0%	5.3%

	Apartments													
LIHTC	Walden Glen Apartments	185	186	14.81%	8.83%	22.22%	9.12%	Non-targeted	1105	15.2%	5.9%	54.9%	20.7%	25.5%

Table 5: Costa Mesa

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Casa Bella	74		68%	1%	17%	14%	N/a	0637.02	35.1%	0.7%	56.5%	4.7%	17%
Project-Based Section 8	St. Johns Manor	36		77%	N/a	9%	14%	N/a	0632.02	35.1%	0.7%	56.5%	4.7%	17%
LIHTC	Tower on 19th	266	269	52.73%	2.12%	10.30%	17.58%	Seniors	637.01	17.4%	0.8%	78.4%	2.5%	31.7%

Table 6: Fountain Valley

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Our Lady of Guadalupe		71	15%	N/a	1%	84%	N/a	0992.33	51.4%	0%	10.7%	37.1%	4.4%
LIHTC	Fountain Valley Senior The Jasmine	154	156	49.00%	0.50%	12.00%	46.00%	Senior	992.50	39.5%	1.2%	28.5%	28.6%	16.6%

Table 7: Fullerton

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Amerige Villa Apts	101		9%	N/a	1%	90%	N/a	0112.00	50.6%	1.4%	34.4%	9.8%	15.8%
Other Multifamily	Casa Maria Del Rio	24		73%	N/a	23%	4%	N/a	0115.02	30%	1.8%	46.1%	19%	16.7%
Other Multifamily	Harbor View Terrace	24		71%	13%	8%	8%	4%	0017.06	50.1%	0.2%	10.1%	34.8%	8.9%
LIHTC	Courtyard Apartments	108	108	64.43%	3.08%	60.78%	26.89%	Large Family	112	50.6%	1.4%	34.4%	9.8%	15.8%
LIHTC	East Fullerton Villas	26	27	10.64%	2.13%	82.98%	6.38%	Large Family	115.02	30%	1.8%	46.1%	19%	16.7%
LIHTC	Fullerton City Lights Residential Hotel	134	137	63.19%	9.03%	13.89%	4.17%	SRO	113	58.7%	4.3%	19.3%	11.1%	12.0%
LIHTC	Fullerton Family Housing	54	55	30.61%	15.65%	60.54%	12.93%	Large Family	113	58.7%	4.3%	19.3%	11.1%	12.0%
LIHTC	Fullerton Heights	35	36	43.18%	9.09%	39.77%	12.50%	Special Needs	1162					
LIHTC	Garnet Lane Apartments	17	18	2.60%	0.00%	61.04%	0.00%	Large Family	117.11	30.6%	3.6%	43.7%	20.2%	11.7%
LIHTC	Klimpel Manor	58	59	48.00%	2.00%	22.00%	32.00%	Senior	113	58.7%	4.3%	19.3%	11.1%	12.0%
LIHTC	North Hills Apartments	203	204	54.76%	1.57%	67.91%	0.60%	Non-Targeted	16.01	44.8%	2.3%	23.3%	26.6%	9.2%
LIHTC	Palm Garden Apartments	223	224	0.28%	0.00%	20.51%	0.14%	Non-Targeted	116.01	9.4%	5.3%	75.1%	9.5%	30.1%
LIHTC	Ventana Senior Apartments			18.25%	4.76%	4.76%	29.37%	Senior						

Table 8: Garden Grove

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project	Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate

								Development Type						
Project-Based Section 8	Donald Jordan Senior Manor	65		8%	2%	2%	89%	N/a	0886.02	19.7%	1.1%	35.6%	39.1%	12.4%
Project-Based Section 8	Acacia Villa Apts	160		4%	1%	1%	94%	N/a	0886.01	18.7%	1.4%	30.2%	47.8%	12.5%
LIHTC	Briar Crest+ Rosecrest Apartments	40	41	53.78%	0.00%	89.92%	0.84%	Large Family	885.01	14.6%	0.8%	54.4%	28.8%	16.6%
LIHTC	Garden Grove Senior Apartments	84	85	13.79%	0.86%	6.90%	74.14%	Senior	885.02	12.0%	0.7%	47.0%	36.8%	21.1%
LIHTC	Grove Park Apartments	103	104	3.30%	6.60%	33.02%	55.66%	At-Risk	891.04	2.2%	0.2%	79.8%	17.5%	22.7%
LIHTC	Malabar Apartments	125	125	12.90%	2.30%	26.04%	3.00%	Large Family	882.03	25.3%	0.6%	30.4%	37.2%	18.6%
LIHTC	Stuart Drive Apts. Rose Garden Apts.	239	239	2.16%	0.00%	16.19%	39.41%	Non-Targeted	885.01	14.6%	0.8%	54.4%	28.8%	16.6%
LIHTC	Sungrove Sr. Apts	80	82	33.00%	4.00%	13.00%	42.00%	Senior	885.02	12.0%	0.7%	47.0%	36.8%	21.1%

Table 9: Huntington Beach

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Huntington Gardens	185		60%	2%	5%	33%	N/a	0994.13	64.3%	0.2%	17.5%	16.5%	12.9%
Project-Based Section 8	Huntington Villa Yorba	192		20%	1%	17%	63%	12%	0992.41	43.9%	3%	21%	27.1%	9.5%
LIHTC	Beachview Villa	106	107	39.05%	5.71%	18.10%	3.81%	SRO	992.35	66.7%	2.2%	20.5%	8.5%	12.4%
LIHTC	Bowen Court	20	20	60.87%	0.00%	17.39%	26.09%	Senior	993.05	57.1%	0.7%	30.1%	5.4%	7.3%
LIHTC	Emerald Cove Senior Apartments	162	164	20.71%	1.78%	0.59%	0.00%	Senior	994.13	64.3%	0.2%	17.5%	16.5%	12.9%
LIHTC	Hermosa Vista Apartments	87	88	50.71%	1.90%	62.56%	7.58%	Non Targeted	996.05	57.6%	0.0%	20.7%	16.7%	5.2%
LIHTC	Oceana Apartments	77	78	52.63%	14.04%	39.04%	1.32%	Large Family	994.13	64.3%	0.2%	17.5%	16.5%	12.9%
LIHTC	Pacific Court	47	48	88.96%	0.00%	48.05%	0.65%	Large Family	993.05	57.1%	0.7%	30.1%	5.4%	7.3%

	Apartments													
LIHTC	Pacific Sun Apartments	6	6	34.78%	0.00%	13.04%	0.00%	Special Needs	994.02	20.0%	0.4%	68.3%	6.6%	35.4%
LIHTC	Quo Vadis Apartments	102	104	69.01%	2.92%	19.88%	8.77%	Non Targeted	994.13	64.3%	0.2%	17.5%	16.5%	12.9%

Table 10: Irvine

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Woodbridge Manor I, Ii & Iii	165		64%	N/a	1%	34%	N/a	0525.11	54.7%	1.9%	6.4%	30.3%	6.2%
Project-Based Section 8	Access Irvine, Inc.(aka Skyloft)	39		64%	8%	5%	23%	N/a	0626.11	35.3%	6.8%	9.9%	43.9%	34.7%
Project-Based Section 8	The Parklands	120		41%	4%	8%	48%	25%	0525.25	31.3%	1.9%	9.6%	49.9%	9.7%
Project-Based Section 8	Windwood Knoll	60		49%	10%	11%	30%	14%	0525.27	37.1%	5.6%	7.5%	42.1%	8.5%
Project-Based Section 8	Woodbridge Oaks	120		68%	1%	6%	25%	21%	0525.14	50.9%	0.2%	13.8%	31.7%	8.9%
Project-Based Section 8	Woodbridge Villas	60		73%	5%	3%	17%	18%	0525.19	51.4%	2.5%	5.8%	33.4%	10.8%
Project-Based Section 8	Orchard Park Apts	59		58%	5%	10%	27%	27%	0525.17	44.2%	5.6%	4.5%	42.2%	9.2%
Project-Based Section 8	Harvard Manor	100		60%	2%	9%	29%	17%	0626.27	33.4%	1.9%	13.1%	47.9%	38.3%
Project-Based Section 8	Sutton Irvine Residences	9		100%	N/a	0%	N/a	N/a	525.26	38.8%	0.9%	16.4%	37.5%	5.8%
Other Multifamily	Villa Hermosa - Irvine	24		50%	25%	4%	21%	4%	0525.27	37.1%	5.6%	7.5%	42.1%	8.5%
LIHTC	Anesi Apartments (aka Alegre Apts)	102	104	21.52%	7.62%	21.19%	36.42%	Large Family	525.18	61.0%	1.8%	6.6%	26.8%	11.3%
LIHTC	Anton Portola Apartments	253	256	9.04%	1.69%	3.95%	3.58%	Non-Targeted	524.04	30.2%	2.9%	29.7%	37.3%	0.0%
LIHTC	Cadence Family Irvine Housing	81	82	36.06%	3.35%	14.50%	7.43%	Large Family	524.04	30.2%	2.9%	29.7%	37.3%	0.0%

	(aka Luminara)													
LIHTC	D1 Senior Irvine Housing (aka Luxaira)	156	156	18.66%	0.48%	4.31%	15.31%	Seniors	524.04	30.2%	2.9%	29.7%	37.3%	0.0%
LIHTC	Parc Derian Apartments	79	80	67.38%	10.73%	31.76%	10.30%	Large Family	755.15	27.4%	1.1%	36.0%	31.7%	19.4%
LIHTC	Doria Apartment Homes Phase I	59	60	18.31%	3.52%	12.68%	23.94%	Large Family	524.26	45.10%	0.50%	9.50%	39.70%	6.1%
LIHTC	Doria Apartments Homes Phase II	74	74	21.84%	1.72%	9.77%	15.52%	Large Family	755.05	41.5%	2.8%	38.8%	12.5%	8.3%
LIHTC	Granite Court	71	71	45.36%	1.64%	20.22%	9.29%	Non Targeted	755.15	27.4%	1.1%	36.0%	31.7%	19.4%
LIHTC	Irvine Inn	192	192	19.05%	2.65%	2.65%	4.76%	SRO	755.15	27.4%	1.1%	36.0%	31.7%	19.4%
LIHTC	Laguna Canyon Apartments	120	120	47.57%	0.00%	30.10%	4.85%	Large Family	525.18	61.0%	1.8%	6.6%	26.8%	11.3%
LIHTC	Montecito Vista Apartment Homes	161	162	9.24%	8.84%	14.86%	17.27%	Large Family	525.25	31.3%	1.9%	9.6%	50.6%	9.7%
LIHTC	Paramount Family Irvine Housing Partners LP (aka Espaira)	83	84	21.82%	4.89%	15.31%	5.21%	Large Family	524.04	30.2%	2.9%	29.7%	37.3%	0.0%
LIHTC	Pavilion Park Senior I Housing Partners LP (aka Solaira)	219	221	19.54%	0.99%	1.99%	15.56%	Seniors	524.26	45.1%	0.5%	9.5%	39.7%	6.1%
LIHTC	San Paulo Apartments	153	382	37.31%	2.09%	11.94%	5.67%	Non Targeted	525.21	38.3%	3.6%	20.1%	33.8%	15.6%
LIHTC	Santa Alicia Apartments	84	84	31.82%	0.00%	10.00%	18.18%	Large Family	525.15	36.9%	0.3%	9.0%	46.7%	12.7%
LIHTC	The Arbor at Woodbury	90	90	2.12%	6.36%	8.05%	24.15%	Large Family	524.18	32.6%	3.0%	6.5%	53.8%	14.0%
LIHTC	The Inn At Woodbridge	120	120	64.05%	1.31%	7.84%	15.03%	Senior	525.21	38.3%	3.6%	20.1%	33.8%	15.6%
LIHTC	Windrow Apartments	96	96	21.80%	4.51%	18.80%	16.54%	Large Family	524.17	37.0%	1.2%	7.5%	49.9%	9.8%

LIHTC	Woodbury Walk	150	150	49.01%	0.00%	12.58%	17.88%	Large Family	524.18	32.6%	3.0%	6.5%	53.8%	14.0%

Table 11: La Habra

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project	Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Las Lomas Gardens	93	44%	1%	44%	11%	47%	0013.03	24.3%	1.4%	59.1%	13.6%	9.2%
Project-Based Section 8	Casa El Centro Apts.	55	11%	N/a	21%	68%	N/a	0012.02	12.7%	0.2%	85.1%	1.8%	15.1%

Table 12: La Palma

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
LIHTC	Camden Place Apartments	35	35	9.30%	9.30%	9.30%	65.12%	Senior	1101.16	24.5%	5.6%	17.6%	47.0%	8.4%
LIHTC	Casa La Palma Apartments	269	269	15.93%	3.53%	17.29%	48.46%	Non Targeted	1101.16	24.5%	5.6%	17.6%	47.0%	8.4%

Table 13: Lake Forest

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
LIHTC	Baker Ranch Affordable (aka Arroyo at Baker Ranch)	187	189	7.45%	7.45%	36.86%	5.49%	Large Family	524.22	55.5%	2%	20.2%	13.7%	7%

Table 14: Laguna Niguel

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project	Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Village La Paz	100	84%	2%	7%	7%	11%	0423.34	55.5%	2%	20.2%	13.7%	7%
Project-Based Section 8	Alicia Park Apartments	56	75%	4%	13%	8%	17%	0423.26	62%	4.7%	19.1%	8%	8.6%

Table 15: Mission Viejo

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
LIHTC	Arroyo Vista Apartments	155	155	64.75%	1.36%	37.97%	15.93%	Large Family	320.22	38.9%	1.4%	47.2%	8.3%	7.5%
LIHTC	Heritage Villas Senior Housing	141	143	6.37%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Non Targeted	320.13	74.5%	4.3%	10.0%	3.3%	4.8%

Table 16: Newport Beach

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Seaview Lutheran Plaza	100		86%	N/a	4%	10%	N/a	0626.44	84.4%	0%	6%	8.9%	9.2%
LIHTC	Bayview Landing	119	120	79.43%	1.42%	6.38%	5.67%	Senior	630.04	82.3%	2.9%	7.4%	6.6%	4.8%
LIHTC	Lange Drive Family	74	74	50.81%	1.61%	55.24%	1.61%	Large Family	740.03	20.7%	1.6%	64.9%	11.3%	12.2%
LIHTC	Newport Veterans Housing	12	12	0.00%	15.38%	7.69%	0.00%	Non-Targeted	636.03	75.8%	0.3%	15.7%	4.7%	6.1%

Table 17: Orange (City)

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project	Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Triangle Terrace	75	57%	3%	24%	15%	N/a	0759.02	56.3%	1%	37.3%	3.7%	18.3%
Project-Based	Casa Ramon	75	19%	N/a	77%	3%	37%	0759.01	51.9%	1.4%	41.9%	2.8%	24.1%

Section 8														
Project-Based Section 8	Casas Del Rio	39		89%	N/a	8%	N/a	N/a	758.06	46.6%	0.4%	47.6%	3.8%	15.7%
Project-Based Section 8	Friendly Center	8		N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	759.01	51.9%	1.4%	41.9%	2.8%	24.1%
LIHTC	Buena Vista Apartments	17	17	66.18%	0.00%	64.71%	1.47%	Large Family	762.02	52.7%	1.0%	38.3%	7.1%	7.4%
LIHTC	Chestnut Place (Fairway Manor LP)	49	50	46.15%	1.54%	15.38%	24.62%	Large Family	758.06	46.6%	0.4%	47.6%	3.8%	15.7%
LIHTC	Citrus Grove Apartments	56	57	85.65%	3.59%	81.17%	0.00%	Large Family	762.04	11.6%	1.3%	79.6%	5.7%	23.1%
LIHTC	Community Garden Towers	332	333	2.44%	0.00%	0.44%	4.44%	Senior	761.02	28.7%	7.0%	47.1%	16.1%	19.4%
LIHTC	Harmony Creek Apartments	83	83	39.13%	1.09%	13.04%	9.78%	Senior	758.06	46.6%	0.4%	47.6%	3.8%	15.7%
LIHTC	Orangevale Apartments	64	64	9.76%	1.63%	82.52%	2.44%	Non Targeted	762.05	52.0%	0.7%	32.5%	11.0%	14.0%
LIHTC	Serrano Woods	62	63	83.81%	2.02%	85.02%	0.00%	Large Family	758.11	35.2%	0.2%	53.7%	9.6%	18.1%
LIHTC	Stonegate Senior Apartments	19	20	62.50%	4.17%	37.50%	0.00%	Senior	758.16	34.7%	1.7%	47.1%	11.0%	17.2%
LIHTC	The Knolls Apartments aka Villa Santiago	260	260	33.80%	2.66%	71.18%	5.90%	Non Targeted	758.16	34.7%	1.7%	47.1%	11.0%	17.2%
LIHTC	Walnut-Pixley	22	22	88.89%	1.85%	72.22%	1.85%	Large Family	760	33.1%	2.5%	49.9%	12.9%	15.1%

Table 18: San Clemente

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Casa De Seniors	72		78%	N/a	15%	7%	N/a	0421.13	82.8%	0.4%	15.2%	1%	9.4%
LIHTC	Cottons Point Senior			75.82%	0.00%	7.69%	7.69%							

	Apartments													
LIHTC	Las Palmas Village (aka Avenida Serra)	18	19	30.77%	0.00%	42.31%	3.85%	Large Family	421.08	69.9%	0.0%	26.3%	1.4%	12.1%
LIHTC	Talega Jamboree Apartments Phase I	123	124	48.60%	1.40%	64.02%	1.87%	Large Family	320.23	75.5%	0.7%	11.4%	6.3%	2.2%
LIHTC	Talega Jamboree Apt Ph. II Mendocino at Talega II	61	62	52.25%	2.25%	51.35%	2.70%	Large Family	320.23	75.5%	0.7%	11.4%	6.3%	2.2%
LIHTC	The Presidio (formerly known as Wycliffe Casa de S	71	72	76.74%	0.00%	16.28%	10.47%	Seniors	421.13	82.8%	0.4%	15.2%	1%	9.4%
LIHTC	Vintage Shores	120	122	91.24%	1.46%	8.76%	2.19%	Senior	422.06	79.5%	2.8%	14.3%	1.9%	4.2%

Table 19: San Juan Capistrano

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
LIHTC	Seasons Senior Apartments at San Juan Capistrano	112	112	78.99%	1.45%	10.87%	2.17%	Senior	423.12	25.2%	0.0%	68.0%	3.0%	19.4%
LIHTC	Villa Paloma Senior Apartments	66	84	85.14%	0.00%	16.22%	2.70%	Senior	423.12	25.2%	0.0%	68.0%	3.0%	19.4%
LIHTC	Seasons II Senior Apartments	37	38	83.33%	2.38%	7.14%	0.00%	Senior	423.12	25.2%	0.0%	68.0%	3.0%	19.4%

Table 20: Santa Ana

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project	Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate

Project-Based Section 8	Flower Terrace	140		7%	1%	13%	78%	N/a	0751.00	17.3%	1.2%	77%	3.7%	23.8%
Project-Based Section 8	Flower Park Plaza	199		3%	1%	14%	59%	N/a	0749.01	0.9%	0%	94.7%	4.3%	25.8%
Project-Based Section 8	Highland Manor Apts.	12		18%	N/a	82%	N/a	36%	749.02	2.9%	0.1%	95.8%	1.3%	26.9%
Project-Based Section 8	Rosswood Villa	198		3%	1%	33%	62%	N/a	0750.02	6%	0.3%	86.5%	5.8%	37.8%
Project-Based Section 8	Santa Ana Towers	198		4%	2%	24%	69%	N/a	0750.02	6%	0.3%	86.5%	5.8%	37.8%
Project-Based Section 8	Sullivan Manor	54		33%	N/a	52%	15%	49%	0748.02	1.6%	0.5%	88.1%	9.3%	25.5%
LIHTC	Andalucia Apartments (aka 815 N. Harbor)	56	70	70.00%	2.35%	85.00%	2.65%	Large Family	891.05	1.7%	0.0%	89.1%	9.2%	27.0%
LIHTC	City Gardens Apartments	274	274	7.24%	0.30%	84.77%	1.36%	Non Targeted	753.01	21.1%	1.5%	66.6%	9.5%	16.6%
LIHTC	Depot at Santiago Apartments	69	70	89.80%	0.78%	91.37%	1.57%	Large Family	744.05	5.3%	1.3%	89.8%	2.8%	20.8%
LIHTC	Guest House	71	72	1.22%	10.98%	30.49%	1.22%	Special Needs	749.01	0.9%	0.0%	94.7%	4.3%	25.8%
LIHTC	Heninger Village Apartments	57	58	17.33%	5.33%	45.33%	37.33%	Senior	750.02	6.0%	0.3%	86.5%	5.9%	37.8%
LIHTC	La Gema Del Barrio	6	6	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	Large Family	740.03	20.70%	1.60%	64.90%	11.30%	12.2%
LIHTC	Lacy & Raitt Apartments	34	35	86.32%	0.85%	88.03%	0.00%	Large Family	748.06	1.4%	1.3%	93.0%	4.3%	30.8%
LIHTC	Raitt Street Apartments	6	6	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	Large Family	748.02	1.6%	0.5%	88.1%	9.5%	25.5%
LIHTC	Ross_Durant Apartments	48	49	78.95%	0.00%	88.89%	0.00%	Large Family	750.03	2.5%	0.1%	94.8%	1.6%	32.3%
LIHTC	Santa Ana Infill	50	51	94.00%	0.00%	95.60%	3.20%	Large Family	750.02	6.0%	0.3%	86.5%	5.9%	37.8%
LIHTC	Santa Ana Station District Phase I	73	74	10.09%	1.26%	95.58%	0.32%	Large Family	744.05	5.3%	1.3%	89.8%	2.8%	20.8%
LIHTC	Santa Ana Station District Phase II	39	40	16.46%	1.27%	89.24%	0.00%	Large Family	744.05	5.3%	1.3%	89.8%	2.8%	20.8%
LIHTC	Vista Del Rio Apartments	40	41	78.33%	11.67%	41.67%	1.67%	Special Needs	891.07	8.9%	0.0%	55.4%	35.2%	8.3%

LIHTC	Wakeham Grant Apartments	126	127	8.83%	1.42%	84.33%	5.98%	Non Targeted	745.01	1.0%	0.9%	91.2%	6.6%	39.8%
LIHTC	Wilshire & Minnie Apartments	143	144	97.57%	0.00%	97.76%	1.12%	Large Family	744.03	3.6%	0.0%	93.9%	2.5%	28.8%

Table 21: Tustin

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Tustin Gardens	100		29%	N/a	12%	59%	N/a	755.05	41.5%	2.8%	38.8%	9.2%	8.3%
LIHTC	Anton Legacy Apartments	161	225	37.90%	7.83%	33.10%	16.90%	Non-Targeted	755.15	27.4%	1.1%	36.0%	31.7%	19.4%
LIHTC	Coventry Court	97	240	40.47%	5.06%	8.56%	26.85%	Senior	755.07	31.1%	3.8%	45.0%	16.7%	13.2%
LIHTC	Hampton Square Apartments	212	350	12.16%	1.54%	78.08%	1.03%	Non-Targeted	744.07	10.8%	1.3%	84.1%	2.0%	22.9%
LIHTC	Heritage Place At Tustin	53	54	38.81%	2.99%	13.43%	25.37%	Senior	755.15	27.4%	1.1%	36.0%	31.7%	19.4%
LIHTC	Westchester Park	149	150	13.12%	3.38%	75.35%	7.16%	Non Targeted	755.13	14.4%	3.6%	57.9%	20.5%	9.8%

Table 22: Westminster

Program Type	Project Name	Low Income Units vs. Units in Project		Property White (%)	Property Black (%)	Property Hispanic (%)	Property Asian (%)	Households with children in the development OR Development Type	Census Tract Number	Tract White %	Tract Black (%)	Tract Hispanic (%)	Tract Asian (%)	Census Tract Poverty Rate
Project-Based Section 8	Pacific Terrace Apts	97		3%	N/a	1%	96%	N/a	0997.02	21.2%	0.9%	23.8%	51.1%	21.2%
LIHTC	Cambridge Heights Senior Apartments	21	22	33.33%	0.00%	3.70%	55.56%	Senior	998.02	14.5%	1.0%	32.1%	49.7%	30.3%
LIHTC	Coventry Heights	75	76	9.90%	0.00%	3.96%	67.33%	Senior	998.02	14.5%	1.0%	32.1%	49.7%	30.3%
LIHTC	Royale Apartments	35	36	18.05%	5.26%	49.62%	12.03%	Large Family	998.01	14.5%	0.6%	40.4%	44.2%	26.7%

LIHTC	The Rose Gardens	132	133	9.15%	0.61%	3.05%	84.76%	Large Family	998.03	17.5%	0.0%	24.4%	54.3%	23.0%
LIHTC	Westminster Senior Apartments	91	91	9.38%	0.00%	4.69%	81.25%	Senior	998.02	14.5%	1.0%	32.1%	49.7%	30.3%
LIHTC	Windsor Court - Stratford Place	85	86	20.30%	5.08%	19.80%	55.84%	Large Family	998.03	17.5%	0.0%	24.4%	54.3%	23.0%

VIII. GLOSSARY

Accessibility: whether a physical structure, object, or technology is able to be used by people with disabilities such as mobility issues, hearing impairment, or vision impairment. Accessibility features include wheelchair ramps, audible crosswalk signals, and TTY numbers. See: TTY

Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH): a requirement under the Fair Housing Act that local governments take steps to further fair housing, especially in places that have been historically segregated. See: Segregation

American Community Survey (ACS): a survey conducted by the US Census Bureau that regularly gathers information about demographics, education, income, language proficiency, disability, employment, and housing. Unlike the Census, ACS surveys are conducted both yearly and across multiple years. The surveys study samples of the population, rather than counting every person in the U.S. like the Census.

Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA): federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities.

Annual Action Plan: an annual plan used by local jurisdictions that receive money from HUD to plan how they will spend the funds to address fair housing and community development. The Annual Action Plan carries out the larger Consolidated Plan. See also: Consolidated Plan

CDBG: Community Development Block Grant. Money that local governments receive from HUD to spend of housing and community improvement

Census Tract: small subdivisions of cities, towns, and rural areas that the Census uses to group residents together and accurately evaluate the demographics of a community. Several census tracts, put together, make up a town, city, or rural area.

Consent Decree: a settlement agreement that resolves a dispute between two parties without admitting guilt or liability. The court maintains supervision over the implementation of the consent decree, including any payments or actions taken as required by the consent decree.

Consolidated Plan (Con Plan): a plan that helps local governments evaluate their affordable housing and community development needs and market conditions. Local governments must use their Consolidated Plan to identify how they will spend money from HUD to address fair housing and community development. Any local government that receives money from HUD in the form of CDBG, HOME, ESG, or HOPWA grants must have a Consolidated Plan. Consolidated Plans are carried out through annual Action Plans. See: Action Plan, CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA.

Consortium: in this analysis, the terms “the Consortium” and “the Taunton Consortium” are used interchangeably. The Consortium refers to the cities of Taunton and Attleboro, and the towns of Berkley, Carver, Dighton, Freetown, Lakeville, Mansfield, Middleboro, North Attleboro, Norton, Plainville, Raynham, and Seekonk.

Continuum of Care (CoC): a HUD program designed to promote commitment to the goal of ending homelessness. The program provides funding to nonprofits and state and local governments to quickly rehouse homeless individuals and families, promote access to and effect utilization of mainstream programs by homeless individuals, and optimize self-sufficiency among individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

Data and Mapping Tool (AFFHT): an online HUD resource that combines Census data and American Community Surveys data to generate maps and tables evaluating the demographics of an area for a variety of categories, including race, national origin, disability, Limited English Proficiency, housing problems, environmental health, and school proficiency, etc.

De Facto Segregation: segregation that is not created by the law, but which forms a pattern as a result of various outside factors, including former laws.

De Jure Segregation: segregation that is created and enforced by the law. Segregation is currently illegal.

Density Bonus: an incentive for developers that allows developers to increase the maximum amount of units allowed at a building site in exchange for either affordable housing funds or making a certain percentage of the units affordable.

Disparate Impact: practices in housing that negatively affect one group of people with a protected characteristic (such as race, sex, or disability, etc.) more than other people without that characteristic, even though the rules applied by landlords do not single out that group.

Dissimilarity Index: measures the percentage of a certain group's population that would have to move to a different census tract in order to be evenly distributed with a city or metropolitan area in relation to another group. The higher the Dissimilarity Index, the higher the level of segregation. For example, if a city's Black/White Dissimilarity Index was 65, then 65% of Black residents would need to move to another neighborhood in order for Blacks and Whites to be evenly distributed across all neighborhoods in the city.

ESG: Emergency Solutions Grant. Funding provided by HUD to 1) engage homeless individuals and families living on the street, 2) improve the number and quality of emergency shelters for homeless individuals and families, 3) help operate these shelters, 4) provide essential services to shelter residents, 5) rapidly re-house homeless individuals and families, and 6) prevent families/individuals from becoming homeless

Entitlement Jurisdiction: a local government that receives funds from HUD to be spent on housing and community development. See also: HUD Grantee

Environmental Health Index: a HUD calculation based on potential exposure to harmful toxins at a neighborhood level. This includes air quality carcinogenic, respiratory, and neurological hazards. The higher the number, the less exposure to toxins harmful to human health.

Environmental Justice: the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, especially minorities, in the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental

laws, regulations, and policies. In the past, environmental hazards have been concentrated near segregated neighborhoods, making minorities more likely to experience negative health effects. Recognizing this history and working to make changes in future environmental planning are important pieces of environmental justice.

Exclusionary Zoning: the use of zoning ordinances to prevent certain land uses, especially the building of large and affordable apartment buildings for low-income people. A city with exclusionary zoning might only allow single-family homes to be built in the city, excluding people who cannot afford to buy a house.

Exposure Index: a measurement of how much the typical person of a specific race is exposed to people of other races. A higher number means that the average person of that race lives in a census tract with a higher percentage of people from another group.

Fair Housing Act: a federal civil rights law that prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of race, class, sex, religion, national origin, or familial status. See also: Housing Discrimination.

Federal Uniform Accessibility Standards (UFAS): a guide to uniform standards for design, construction, and alternation of buildings so that physically handicapped people will be able to access and use such buildings.

Gentrification: the process of renovating or improving a house or neighborhood to make it more attractive to middle-class residents. Gentrification often causes the cost of living in the neighborhood to rise, pushing out lower-income residents and attracting middle-class residents. Often, these effects which are driven by housing costs have a corresponding change in the racial demographics of an area.

High Opportunity Areas/Low Opportunity Areas: High Opportunity Areas are communities with low poverty, high access to jobs, and low concentrations of existing affordable housing. Often, local governments try to build new affordable housing options in High Opportunity Areas so that the residents will have access to better resources, and in an effort to desegregate a community, as minorities are often concentrated in low opportunity areas and in existing affordable housing sites.

HOME: HOME Investment Partnership. HOME provides grants to States and localities that communities use (often in partnership with nonprofits) to fund activities such as building, buying, and/or rehabilitating affordable housing for rent or ownership, or providing direct rental assistance to low-income people.

Housing Choice Voucher (HCV)/Section 8 Voucher: a HUD voucher issued to a low-income household that promises to pay a certain amount of the household's rent. Prices are set based on the rent in the metropolitan area, and voucher households must pay any difference between the rent and the voucher amount. Voucher holders are often the subject of source of income discrimination. See also: Source of Income Discrimination.

Housing Discrimination: the refusal to rent to or inform a potential tenant about the availability of housing. Housing discrimination also applies to buying a home or getting a loan to buy a home. The Fair Housing Act makes it illegal to discriminate against a potential tenant/buyer/lendee based on that person's race, class, sex, religion, national origin, or familial status.

HUD Grantee: a jurisdiction (city, country, consortium, state, etc.) that receives money from HUD. See also: Entitlement Jurisdiction

Inclusionary Zoning: a zoning ordinance that requires that a certain percentage of any newly built housing must be affordable to people with low and moderate incomes.

Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA): a federal civil rights law that ensures students with a disability are provided with Free Appropriate Public Education that is tailored to their individual needs.

Integration: the process of reversing trends of racial or other segregation in housing patterns. Often, segregation patterns continue even though enforced segregation is now illegal, and integration may require affirmative steps to encourage people to move out of their historic neighborhoods and mix with other groups in the community.

Isolation Index: a measurement of how much the typical person of a specific race is only exposed to people of the same race. For example, an 80% isolation index value for White people would mean that the population of people the typical White person is exposed to is 80% White.

Jobs Proximity Index: a HUD calculation based on distances to all job locations, distance from any single job location, size of employment at that location, and labor supply to that location. The higher the number, the better the access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.

Labor Market Engagement Index: a HUD calculation based on level of employment, labor force participation, and educational attainment in a census tract. The higher the number, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in the neighborhood.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP): residents who do not speak English as a first language, and who speak English less than "very well"

Local Data: any data used in this analysis that is not provided by HUD through the Data and Mapping Tool (AFFHT), or through the Census or American Community Survey

Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC): provides tax incentives to encourage individual and corporate investors to invest in the development, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable rental housing.

Low Poverty Index: a HUD calculation using both family poverty rates and public assistance receipt in the form of cash-welfare (such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

(TANF)). This is calculated at the Census Tract level. The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in the neighborhood.

Low Transportation Cost Index: a HUD calculation that estimates transportation costs for a family of 3, with a single parent, with an income at 50% of the median income for renters for the region. The higher the number, the lower the cost of transportation in the neighborhood.

Market Rate Housing: housing that is not restricted by affordable housing laws. A market rate unit can be rented for any price that the market can support.

NIMBY: Not In My Back Yard. A social and political movement that opposes housing or commercial development in local communities NIMBY complaints often involve affordable housing, with reasons ranging from traffic concerns to small town quality to, in some cases, thinly-veiled racism.

Poverty Line: the minimum level of yearly income needed to allow a household to afford the necessities of life such as housing, clothing, and food. The poverty line is defined on a national basis. The US poverty line for a family of 4 with 2 children under 18 is $22,162.

Project-Based Section 8: a government-funded program that provides rental housing to low-income households in privately owned and managed rental units. The funding is specific to the building. If you move out of the building, you will no longer receive the funding.

Publicly Supported Housing: housing assisted with funding through federal, State, or local agencies or programs, as well as housing that is financed or administered by or through any such agencies or programs.

Quintile: twenty percent of a population; one-fifth of a population divided into five equal groups

Reasonable Accommodation: a change to rules, policies, practices, or services which would allow a handicapped person an equal opportunity to use and enjoy their housing, including in public and common use areas. It is a violation of the Fair Housing Act to refuse to make a reasonable accommodation when such accommodation is necessary for the handicapped person to have equal use and enjoyment of the housing.

R/ECAPs: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty. This is a HUD-defined term indicating a census tract that has more than 50% Non-White residents, and 40% or more of the population is in poverty OR where the poverty rate is greater than three times the average poverty rate in the area. In the HUD Data and Mapping Tool (AFFHT), R/ECAPS are outlined in pink. See also: Census Tract

Region: the Taunton Consortium is located within the HUD-designated Taunton Consortium Custom Region, which covers Bristol, Plymouth, and Norfolk Counties. However, the individual CDBG jurisdictions of Attleboro and Taunton are actually part of the Providence-Warwick, RI-MA Region. Both Regions are used in this analysis, but are always clearly delineated by name and with maps.

Rehabilitation Act (Section 504): a federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in programs conducted by federal agencies, in programs receiving federal financial assistance, in federal employment and in the employment practices of federal contractors.

School Proficiency Index: a HUD calculation based on performance of 4th grade students on state exams to describe which neighborhoods have high-performing elementary schools nearby and which are near lower performing elementary schools. The higher the number, the higher the school system quality is in a neighborhood.

Segregation: the illegal separation of racial or other groups in the location of housing and neighborhoods. Segregation can occur within a city or town, or in comparing multiple cities. Even though segregation is now illegal, often, housing continues to be segregated because of factors that make certain neighborhoods more attractive and expensive than others, and therefore more accessible to affluent White residents. See also: Integration.

Source of Income Discrimination: housing discrimination based on whether a potential tenant plans to use a Housing Choice Voucher/Section 8 Voucher to pay part of their rent. Source of income discrimination is illegal under Massachusetts state law. See also: Housing Choice Voucher/Section 8 Voucher.

Superfund Sites: any land in the U.S. that has been contaminated by hazardous waste and identified by the EPA as a candidate for cleanup because it poses a risk to human health and/or the environment

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): benefits paid to disabled adults and children who have limited income and resources, or to people 65 and older without disabilities who meet the financial limits.

Testers: people who apply for housing to determine whether the landlord is illegally discriminating. For example, Black and White testers will both apply for housing with the same landlord, and if they are treated differently or given different information about available housing, their experiences are compared to show evidence of discrimination.

Transit Trips Index: a HUD calculation that estimates transit trips taken for a family of 3, with a single parent, with an income of 50% of the median income for renters for the region. The higher the number, the more likely residents in that neighborhood utilize public transit.

TTY/TDD: Text Telephone/Telecommunication Device for the Deaf. TTY is the more widely used term. People who are deaf or hard of hearing can use a text telephone to communicate with other people who have a TTY number and device. TTY services are an important resource for government offices to have so that deaf or hard of hearing people can easily communicate with them.

Violence Against Women Act (VAWA): a federal law protecting women who have experienced domestic and/or sexual violence. The law establishes several programs and services including a federal rape shield law, community violence prevention programs,

protections for victims who are evicted because of events related to domestic violence or stalking, funding for victim assistance services, like rape crisis centers and hotlines, programs to meet the needs of immigrant women and women of different races or ethnicities, programs and services for victims with disabilities, and legal aid for survivors of domestic violence.

IX. Contributing Factors Appendix

Access for Students with Disabilities to Proficient Schools

Access for students with disabilities to proficient schools may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues. There are more than 600 public schools in Orange County, part of 27 school districts. There is a history of barriers to education for persons with disabilities in Orange County.[14] These included issues with school districts in Garden Grove, Los Alamitos, and Orange, as well as the Capistrano Unified School District which crosses city boundaries. However, this Analysis did not reveal more recent systemic policies or practices driving disparities for students with disabilities. At the same time, school discipline data for Orange County reveals a 4.5% suspension rate for students with disabilities as compared to a 1.9% suspension rate for students who do not have disabilities. Both rates are lower than statewide but still show that students with disabilities face barriers in accessing education that others do not encounter. This data calls for affirmative strategies to reduce school discipline disparities and avoid unnecessary suspensions of students with disabilities.

Access to Transportation for Persons with Disabilities

Access to transportation for persons with disabilities may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. The main barrier to transportation for persons with disabilities in Orange County is the lack of public transportation infrastructure generally, including the lack of east-west rail service and rail service in coastal communities and long wait times for buses in the southern portion of the county. Because many persons with disabilities are dependent on public transportation, these problems hit persons with disabilities especially hard. This Analysis did not reveal any systemic problems with the accessibility of major providers' services, such as Metrolink or the Orange County Transportation Authority. Each agency's vehicles generally appear to meet accessibility requirements, and the Orange County Transportation Authority provides required paratransit service through OC Flex.

Access to Financial Services

Access to financial services may be a contributing factor to fair housing issues for Hispanic residents of Orange County. Although this Analysis did not undertake a comprehensive analysis of bank branch locations in Orange County, a limited review of the banks ranked as the three best in Orange County by the Orange County Register revealed disparities in locations served.[15] The highest ranked bank, California Bank & Trust, has nine locations in Orange County, none of which are located in the cities of Anaheim and Santa Ana,[16] the two largest cities in the county and areas with concentrations of Hispanic population. Although larger banks like Chase and Bank of

[14] Rex Dalton, *OC Families Face Fierce Fight for Special Ed Services*, VOICE OF OC (Sep. 25, 2012), https://voiceofoc.org/2012/09/oc-families-face-fierce-fight-for-special-ed-services/.
[15] Kenya Barrett, *Best of Orange County 2019: Best Bank*, THE ORANGE COUNTY REGISTER (Sep. 19, 2019), https://www.ocregister.com/2019/09/19/best-of-orange-county-2019-best-bank/.
[16] https://www.calbanktrust.com/locations/

America have branches in Anaheim and Santa Ana, there are still disproportionately few branches in those locations than in smaller, less heavily Hispanic cities like Irvine and Huntington Beach. For example, there are 16 Chase branches in Irvine and seven in Huntington Beach as opposed to five in Anaheim and one in Santa Ana. Bank of America's distribution of service is somewhat more balanced (though not when accounting for population) with six branches in Santa Ana, eight in Anaheim, eight in Irvine, and six in Huntington Beach. Lack of access to conventional financial services like those offered by banks can prevent residents of underserved neighborhoods from building credit that will help them attain homeownership and can leave residents with few options but to patronize predatory financial services providers like payday lenders. A 2016 report from the California Department of Business Oversight noted that, while 38.7% of California's population was Hispanic, the average percentage of Hispanic residents in zip codes with six or more storefront payday lenders was 53%.[17] Payday loans often lead to a cycle of debt that impedes individuals' access to opportunity and economic mobility more generally. In Orange County, that phenomenon appears to be especially likely to harm Hispanic residents, particularly in Santa Ana.

Access to Publicly Supported Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Access to publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Although persons with disabilities are generally able to access Housing Choice Vouchers at rates that are commensurate with their share of the income-eligible population, access to Project-Based Section 8 is more limited in many cities. For Project-Based Section 8, cities with disproportionately low concentrations of residents with disabilities include Costa Mesa, Garden Grove, La Habra, and Westminster.

Admissions and Occupancy Policies and Procedures, Including Preferences in Publicly Supported Housing

Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. In particular, housing authorities, including the Orange County Housing Authority, provide live-work preferences to applicants for Housing Choice Vouchers. Given that Los Angeles County is significantly more heavily Black than Orange County, live-work preferences in Orange County may have the effect of disproportionately excluding Black families that might want to move to Orange County. Housing authorities also have some criminal background screening policies that might be overly restrictive. For example, the Orange County Housing Authority and the Anaheim Housing Authority consider violent criminal activity that occurred as long as five years ago, even if that activity consisted of minor misdemeanor conduct. The Garden Grove Housing Authority also denies assistance based on arrest records alone in certain cases, a policy that contradicts applicable HUD guidance.

[17] *The Demographics of California Payday Lending: A Zip Code Analysis of Storefront Locations*, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS OVERSIGHT (2016), https://dbo.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/296/2019/02/The-Demographics-of-CA-Payday-Lending-A-Zip-Code-Analysis-of-Storefront-Locations.pdf.

Availability of Affordable Units in a Range of Sizes

The availability of affordable units in a range of sizes may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Overcrowding in Orange County is very high, at 9.51% overall, expanding to 15.97% for renters. Broken down by race, White, Black, and Asian American residents live in overcrowded conditions at a rate of 6 or 7%, while Hispanic residents are overcrowded at a rate of 26% countywide. For Publicly Supported Housing, a supermajority (74.67%) of Project-Based Section 8 units are 0-1 bedroom units, as are Other Multifamily units (84.54%, the other 15% having 2 bedrooms). A plurality of Housing Choice Vouchers are also limited to 0-1 bedroom units (43.97%). 5,561 households or 26.20% of Housing Choice Voucher occupants are also households with children, the highest of any category of publicly supported housing (followed by Project-Based Section 8, with 9.62%). Overall, most housing units in the county contain 2 (28%), 3 (30%), or 4 (21%) bedrooms, indicating that on paper, accessing housing units with enough bedrooms to house families or live-in aides using a voucher is likely. However, these numbers do not speak to affordability and/or whether these units are within the payment standards for vouchers. Source of income discrimination was recently outlawed statewide, so even more units within the payment standards should be available to voucher users in the future.

Availability, Type, Frequency, and Reliability of Public Transportation

The availability, type, frequency, and reliability of public transportation may be contributing factors to fair housing issues in Orange County. Public transportation in Orange County primarily consists of bus service operated by the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and Metrolink light rail service. Additionally, more geographically limited service is available through Anaheim Resort Transportation's bus system and the OC Streetcar, connecting Garden Grove and Santa Ana. Paratransit service is available through OC Flex. This public transportation has two important shortcomings that have ramifications for fair housing issues. First, Metrolink does not provide service to coastal communities in the central and northern portions of Orange County. These communities, such as Huntington Beach, Newport Beach, and Laguna Beach are disproportionately White in comparison to the county as a whole. The relative lack of public transportation in these areas may deter members of protected classes who do not have cars and are reliant on public transportation from choosing to live there, thus reinforcing patterns of segregation. Second, although the OCTA offers bus service throughout the county, none of its high-frequency lines, which run every 15 minutes during weekday rush hour, serve the southern half of the county. As with the lack of light rail service in coastal communities, poorer quality bus service in the disproportionately White southern half of the county may deter households from making residential choices that would further integration. The low frequency and sparse bus lines in southern Orange County also burden low-income households that disproportionately consist of protected class members and make their lives more difficult.

Community Opposition

Community Opposition may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. The County is now only plurality White,[18] but recent political and demographic change have not slowed opposition to affordable housing in Orange County, as residents have mobilized to delay and prevent affordable housing efforts. Some Orange County cities have voted to oppose or are preparing to oppose statewide plans to add 22,000 affordable housing units in the County.[19] For the most part, residents, community planners, and elected officers opposed to the plan have cited procedural concerns such as insufficient concern for local participation.[20] Opposition to multifamily housing and housing for the homeless and affordable housing generally betrays a wider opposition to such initiatives based on "NIMBY" ("Not In My Backyard") sentiments.

In Fullerton, for example, residents recently mobilized to stop the creation of an affordable housing complex, citing concerns that the complex would reduce property values, create danger to children, and "attract people from other cities" that would become the responsibility of Fullerton residents.[21] Additionally, in early 2019, opposition to state plans to increase affordable housing forced California to sue the City of Huntington Beach to force compliance.[22] Finally, State and regional landlord associations have organized to oppose rent control and anti-eviction legislation.[23] Overall, despite demographic and political changes, community opposition to fair housing in Orange County remains robust.

Deteriorated and Abandoned Properties

Deteriorated and abandoned properties are not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Although there was a surge in deteriorated and abandoned properties in the wake of the foreclosure crisis, particularly in heavily Hispanic areas and with significant harmful consequences for communities,[24] that issue has gradually abated over the ensuring years. The table below reflects the proportion of vacant housing units in each city in Orange County that is categorized as "Other Vacant" in the American Community Survey. These are the vacant units that are most likely to be abandoned rather than capturing vacation rentals and units that are currently on the rental or sales market.

---

[18] *QuickFacts: Orange County, California*, UNITED STATES CENSUS BUREAU, https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/orangecountycalifornia (last visited Jan. 16, 2020).
[19] See, e.g.,Hosam Elattar and Noah Biesiada, *OC Cities Pushing Back Against Housing Target Increases*, VOICE OF OC (Jan. 14, 2020), https://voiceofoc.org/2020/01/oc-cities-pushing-back-against-housing-target-increases/.
[20] *Id.* Complaints included that the state plan's "methodology was unfair" and not done in "good faith."
[21] Jill Replogle, '*Not In My Backyard': What the Shouting Down of One Homeless Housing Complex Means For Us All*, LAIST (Oct. 15, 2018), https://projects.scpr.org/interactives/fullerton-nimby/.
[22] Don Thompson, *California Sues Wealthy Coastal City Over Low-Income Housing*, ASSOCIATED PRESS (Jan. 25, 2019), https://apnews.com/f5c6edc6bd31442082f5b4964a0bc51d.
[23] Marisa Kendall, *California-Wide Rent Cap Advances Despite Landlord Opposition*, O.C. REGISTER (July 10, 2019), https://www.ocregister.com/2019/07/10/ab-1482-set-for-senate-hearing/.
[24] Alejandra Molina, *No More Eyesores: Santa Ana Asks Courts to Intervene and Fix Abandoned Properties*, O.C. REGISTER (Mar. 11, 2015), https://www.ocregister.com/2015/03/11/no-more-eyesores-santa-ana-asks-courts-to-intervene-and-fix-abandoned-properties/.

Table: Other Vacant Housing Units by City, 2013-2017 American Community Survey

City	Number of Other Vacant Units	% of Vacant Units That Are Other Vacant Units
Aliso Viejo	150	13.3%
Anaheim	599	14.1%
Brea	74	14.3%
Buena Park	447	47.5%
Costa Mesa	300	15.6%
Cypress	144	33.8%
Dana Point	196	7.5%
Fountain Valley	180	36.3%
Fullerton	485	20.1%
Garden Grove	373	30.5%
Huntington Beach	835	18.9%
Irvine	628	11.4%
Laguna Beach	640	23.7%
Laguna Hills	26	4.6%
Laguna Niguel	453	27.8%
Laguna Woods	327	22.4%
La Habra	144	19.0%
Lake Forest	120	11.8%
La Palma	38	28.8%
Los Alamitos	12	9.2%
Mission Viejo	239	20.6%
Newport Beach	982	14.6%
Orange	548	33.7%
Placentia	155	38.3%
Rancho Santa Margarita	0	0.0%
San Clemente	397	12.0%
San Juan Capistrano	312	46.2%
Santa Ana	599	30.3%
Seal Beach	315	27.3%
Stanton	109	25.7%
Tustin	162	13.8%
Villa Park	45	43.3%
Westminster	213	24.9%
Yorba Linda	173	21.0%

These Other Vacant units do not appear to be disproportionately concentrated in communities with high concentrations of Hispanic households and low White Populations. Villa Park and Fountain Valley have relatively low Hispanic population concentrations while San Juan Capistrano and Buena Park have similar concentrations to the county as a whole. Additionally, although Santa Ana has a fairly high concentration of Other Vacant units among its vacant units, overall vacancy

is very low there in relation to the county as a whole. This is consistent with a picture of housing market that is very tight for low-income residents even in the lowest income parts of the area.

Displacement and Lack of Housing Support for Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking

Displacement and lack of housing support for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking are not significant contributing factors to fair housing issues in Orange County. California state law protects victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking, or abused elder or dependent adult who terminates their lease early.[25] The tenant must provide written notice to the landlord, along with a copy of a temporary restraining order, emergency protective order, or protective order that protects the household member from further domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking, or abuse of an elder or dependent adult. Alternatively, proof may be shown by submitting a copy of a written report by a peace officer stating that the victim has filed an official report, or documentation from a qualified third party acting in their professional capacity to indicate the resident is seeking assistance for physical or mental injuries or abuse stemming from the abuse at issue. Notice to terminate the tenancy must be given within 180 days of the issuance date of the qualifying order or within 180 days of the date that any qualifying written report is made. This Analysis did not reveal specific evidence of noncompliance with these requirements in Orange County or of other barriers faced by domestic violence survivors.

Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures

Displacement of residents due to economic pressures may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County and, in particular, in parts of Orange County that have historically had concentrations of low-income Hispanic and Vietnamese residents. The map below from the Urban Displacement Project at the University of California Berkeley shows census tracts that experienced gentrification both between 1990 and 2000 and between 2000 and 2015 (in red), census tracts that experienced gentrification between 2000 and 2015 (in light blue), census tracts that experienced gentrification between 1990 and 2000 (in dark blue), and disadvantaged communities that have not gentrified (in tan). Although there are no census tracts in Orange County coded as having experienced gentrification in both time periods, there are several census tracts that have undergone gentrification at some point since 1990 including in Anaheim, Costa Mesa, Dana Point, Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Irvine, Orange, San Clemente, and Villa Park. Though the Urban Displacement Project does not map the risk of future gentrification in displacement in Southern California as it does in the Bay Area, the areas most vulnerable to gentrification and displacement in Orange County – going forward – are disadvantaged areas located near areas that have already gentrified and disadvantaged areas located near major transit assets as well as anchor institutions like universities and hospitals. Because the southern and coastal portions of Orange County have relatively few disadvantaged areas, displacement risk is therefore concentrated in inland portions of central and northern Orange

[25] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=CIV&sectionNum=1946.7

County such as Anaheim, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Irvine, Orange, Santa Ana, and Westminster. These areas also tend to have higher Hispanic and Asian population concentrations than the county as a whole, illustrating the fair housing implications of displacement.

Impediments to Mobility

Impediments to mobility may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Specifically, Housing Choice Voucher payment standards that make it difficult to secure housing in many, disproportionately White parts of the county contribute to segregation and disparities in access to opportunity. Some housing authorities within the county have gone to tiered rent systems that provide greater nuance than region-wide payment standards, but their payment standards still are not as generous as Small Area Fair Market Rents would be. For example, the Anaheim Housing Authority has two tiers, one for zip code 92808 and one for all other zip codes. In zip code 92808, the payment standard for a two-bedroom unit is $2,438 while, in all other zip codes, it is $2,106. Yet the hypothetical Small Area Fair Market Rent for a two-bedroom unit in zip code 92808, which is located in the Anaheim Hills, would be $2,790. Additionally, zip codes 92806 and 92807, which also cover the eastern half of the city but do not benefit from the higher payment standard, would have Small Area Fair Market Rents of $2,380 and $2,660 respectively, far higher than $2,106. A similar phenomenon pervades the Orange County Housing Authority's administration of the voucher program. That agency has three tiers based on city rather than zip code, but the highest tier - $2,280 for two-bedroom units in selected cities – falls far short of Small Area Fair Market Rents and leaves some cities targeted for that payment standard out of reach. For example, in zip code 92660, located in Newport Beach, the Small Area Fair Market Rent for two-bedroom units would be $3,120. A Zillow search for that zip code revealed advertised two-bedroom units in only two complexes available for under $2,280 but many more available between $2,280 and $3,120.

Inaccessible Government Facilities or Services

Inaccessible government facilities or services are not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. This Analysis did not reveal examples of government facilities or services in Orange County that are inaccessible.

Inaccessible Public or Private Infrastructure

Inaccessible public or private infrastructure is not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. This Analysis did not reveal examples of public or private infrastructure in Orange County that is infrastructure.

Lack of Access to Opportunity Due to High Housing Costs

Lack of access to opportunity due to high housing costs may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. In particular, as the Disparities in Access to Opportunity section of this Analysis reveals, coastal areas of Orange County as far eastern portions of the county have greater access to educational, economic, and environmental opportunity than do most areas in between, with the partial exception of Irvine. Additionally, environmental quality is higher in predominantly White southern Orange County than in the more diverse areas to the north. In general, the disproportionately White coastal and hillside communities with better educational, economic, and environmental outcomes are also areas with high housing costs. Increasing housing affordability in these areas would make it easier for low-income households, disproportionately including Hispanic and Vietnamese households, to access the types of services and amenities that further social mobility.

Lack of Affordable, Accessible Housing in a Range of Unit Sizes

Lack of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. As discussed in connection with several other contributing factors, there is a general shortage of affordable housing in the county. This is exacerbated by the fact that, as discussed in relation to the availability of affordable units in a range of sizes, the vast majority of publicly supported housing units are one-bedroom units. Low-income households that need larger units are dependent upon the Housing Choice Voucher program to access housing. However, unlike with Project-Based Section 8 units, for example, there is no requirement that privately owned and managed units that tenants use vouchers to rent meet the heightened accessibility requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. This shortage has a particular effect on low-income families in which at least one member has a disability that requires accessibility features, and persons with disabilities who require the services of live-in aides.

Lack of Affordable In-Home or Community-Based Supportive Services

Lack of affordable in-home or community-based supportive services may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Due to the absence of any waiting list for Home and Community-Based Services for persons with developmental disabilities, this issue primarily affects people with psychiatric disabilities. A robust array of services, including the most

intensive models of community-based services like Assertive Community Treatment,[26] are available. Nonetheless, many people have trouble accessing needed services, and service providers are not always able to reach vulnerable populations through street outreach. Additionally, across types of disabilities, undocumented adults face barriers due to federal restrictions of Medicaid assistance for undocumented people. The California Legislature has approved state funding for Medi-Cal services for undocumented people until they reach the age of 26, a critical investment that exceeds that of any other state, but there remains a funding gap for services for most undocumented adults.

Lack of Affordable, Integrated Housing for Individuals Who Need Supportive Services

Lack of affordable, integrated housing for individuals who need supportive services may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. This is a significant contributing factor for two reasons. First, the shortage of permanent supportive housing throughout Orange County in comparison to the total need is characteristic of the broader shortage of affordable housing generally. Second, although there are some programs that specifically focus on providing permanent supportive housing to individuals with disabilities including developments built with Mental Health Services Act funds and Mainstream Housing Choice Vouchers, there has not been a concerted effort to raise local bond funds for affordable housing and then to prioritize permanent supportive housing with a portion of bond proceeds like there has been in some other California jurisdictions, including Los Angeles County and Santa Clara County.

Lack of Assistance for Transitioning from Institutional Settings to Integrated Housing

Lack of assistance for transitioning from institutional settings to integrated housing is not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. The Dayle McIntosh Center provides robust services to individuals transitioning from institutional settings to integrated housing, and there is no indication that they are unable to meet the total need for such services.

Lack of Community Revitalization Strategies

Lack of community revitalization strategies is not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. In communities with significant revitalization needs, such as in disproportionately low-income and heavily Hispanic and Vietnamese neighborhoods in Anaheim, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and Westminster, there is no shortage of private investment interest that would enhance or has enhanced community amenities. The more pressing problem is the risk of displacement that would prevent long-time residents enjoying new amenities in recently revitalized communities.

[26] Assertive community treatment (ACT) is a form of community-based mental health care that provides community-based, multi-disciplinary mental health treatment for individuals with severe and persistent mental illness.

Lack of Local or Regional Cooperation

Lack of local or regional cooperation may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Although the infrastructure for collaboration across jurisdictions exists, as demonstrated by this county-wide Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, there remains a problem with local governments not taking the steps to achieve regionally determined goals like progress toward meeting each jurisdictions Regional Housing Needs Allocation for very low-income and low-income households. This gap has resulted in litigation between the City of Huntington Beach and the State of California.[27]

Lack of Local Private Fair Housing Outreach and Enforcement

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Although Orange County is served by two, high-quality private, non-profit fair housing organizations, they are underfunded and understaffed in comparison to the total need for their services. Victims of discrimination would be more able to exercise their rights, thus deterring future discrimination, if the capacity of existing organizations grew to meet the scale of the problem.

Lack of Local Public Fair Housing Outreach and Enforcement

Lack of local public fair housing outreach and enforcement may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. There are no local public entities that conduct fair housing outreach and enforcement, with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing and HUD constituting the only public enforcement bodies that operate in Orange County. Advocates across Orange County and the state of California have reported issues with the timeline of the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing's investigations and the standards that it applies in making probable cause determinations. A local public enforcement agency, if created, would have the potential to be more responsive to victims of discrimination in Orange County than either the state or HUD.

Lack of Meaningful Language Access for Individuals with Limited English Proficiency

Lack of meaningful language access for individuals with limited English proficiency may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Private landlords generally are not required to provide leases or other key documents or communications in the primary languages of individuals with limited English proficiency (LEP). This can create confusion about individuals' rights. Housing authorities frequently have staff who are fluent in Spanish and/or Vietnamese, but LEP speakers of other languages may have limited options, with housing authorities relying on paid translation or interpretation services to communicate.

[27] Priscella Vega et al., *State Sues Huntington Beach over Blocked Homebuilding*, L.A. TIMES (Jan. 25, 2019), https://www.latimes.com/socal/daily-pilot/news/tn-dpt-me-hb-housing-lawsuit-20190125-story.html.

Lack of Private Investment in Specific Neighborhoods

Lack of private investment in specific neighborhoods is not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. There are neighborhoods, particularly disproportionately low-income, predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods, that have historically been subject to disinvestment by the private sector. Santa Ana had long been emblematic of that pattern, but it has begun to see a return of private capital, and accompanying gentrification risk, in recent years.[28]

Lack of Public Investment in Specific Neighborhoods

Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods is not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Although there is a history of disparities in public infrastructure in Orange County between areas that are predominantly White and more heavily Hispanic communities, this Analysis did not reveal evidence of the current extent of this potential problem nor if the interrelationship of that issue to patterns of segregation and displacement. This Analysis addresses the public resources available to schools in the contributing factor relating to the location of proficient schools and school assignment policies.

Lack of Resources for Fair Housing Agencies and Organizations

Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Two robust fair housing organizations operate in Orange County, provide services to residents, and engage in enforcement, outreach, and education. However, the size of the federal Fair Housing Initiatives Program, the primary funding program for fair housing organizations, has failed to keep up with inflation, making Congress's appropriations worth less over time. In order to meet the needs of residents of a large and diverse county, local fair housing agencies and organizations require greater levels of resourcing.

Lack of State or Local Fair Housing Laws

Lack of state or local fair housing laws is not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Although no jurisdictions in Orange County had prohibited source of income discrimination against Housing Choice Voucher holders prior to the California Legislature passing SB 222 and SB 329 banning the practice statewide, that step by the State means that there are not significant gaps in non-discrimination protections for residents of Orange County.

Land Use and Zoning Laws

Land use and zoning laws may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. With some exceptions, communities in Orange County that have relatively high concentrations of White residents and relatively low concentrations of Hispanic residents tend to have zoning that allows for limited opportunities to develop multifamily housing. include Dana

[28] Erualdo R. González et al., *The Gentrification of Santa Ana: From Origin to Resistance*, KCET (Sep. 13, 2017), https://www.kcet.org/shows/city-rising/the-gentrification-of-santa-ana-from-origin-to-resistance.

Point, Laguna Beach, Mission Viejo, Villa Park, and Yorba Linda. In the absence of multifamily zoning, it is generally infeasible to develop affordable housing for which occupancy is likely to disproportionately consist of protected class members. The zoning map of Laguna Beach, shown below, illustrates the high proportion of land that is reserved for low-density residential development.

Zoning Map for the City of Laguna Beach



Villa Park appears to be a particularly extreme case. As the map below shows, multifamily housing is not permitted in any location in the city.

Zoning in City of Villa Park



Zoning

- R-1 (8,000-13,500)
- E-4-17
- E-4-18
- E-4-19
- E-4 Small Estate Residential
- PC-Martinique
- PC-Orchards
- Commercial Professional
- Neighborhood Commercial
- School
- Public Institution
- Orange County Flood Control District

Source: City of , SCAG, 2015 | Date: 12/10/2015
C:\Villa_Park\Villa_Park_ZN1.mxd

0 0.05 0.1 0.2 Miles

Lending Discrimination

Lending discrimination may be a contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Given the scarcity of affordable rental housing and high cost of living within Orange County, loan opportunities for home improvement, purchase, and refinancing are important tools for moderate and low-income households. Using Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data, the tables below show the racial discrepancies in the likelihood that a person's loan application, based on their race, will result in an originated loan or a denial.

Percentage of Loan Applications Resulting in Originated Loans by Race or Ethnicity and Loan Purpose in Orange County, 2014-2017 Home Mortgage Disclosure Act Data

Race or Ethnicity	Home Purchase	Refinancing	Home Improvement
White, Not Hispanic	66.56%	59.12%	61.96%
Black, Not Hispanic	61.93%	49.62%	49.49%
Asian, Not Hispanic	63.95%	55.35%	51.26%
Hispanic/Latino	59.54%	50.57%	51.60%

Percentage of Loan Applications Denied by Race or Ethnicity and Loan Purpose in Orange County, 2014-2017 Home Mortgage Disclosure Act Data

Race or Ethnicity	Home Purchase	Refinancing	Home Improvement
White, Not Hispanic	9.09%	16.30%	17.60%
Black, Not Hispanic	12.03%	22.04%	31.74%
Asian, Not Hispanic	9.75%	16.65%	23.21%
Hispanic/Latino	12.38%	20.75%	28.12%

Across all ethnic groups and loan types, White residents are the most likely to have their loan applications result in originated loans. Disparities across racial or ethnic groups are not very significant, however. For Home Purchase, approval rates range between 59.54% and 66.56%. Home Purchase loans also have the highest rate of approval, which is important in ensuring equal access to the homeownership market. Refinancing and Home Improvement loans have similar approval rates, with Black borrowers approved at about 49%, while White borrowers are approved at 59% and 62%, respectively. In a county where 57% of housing units are owner occupied and the median price for a sold home is $721,400,[29] the lack of a significant disparity in loan origination for home purchase loans is noteworthy.

More disparities emerge when looking at the other types of loans. Across refinancing and home improvement loan applications, Hispanics are less likely to have a loan originate, and roughly 10% more likely to have a home improvement loan application denied and 4% more likely to have a refinancing loan denied. All ethnic groups are more likely than White residents to have their loan applications denied. Black residents are roughly 6% more likely to have refinancing loan application denied. More drastic disparities appear for home improvement loans. Black residents

[29] https://www.zillow.com/orange-county-ca/home-values/

are nearly twice as likely to have a home improvement loan denied than White residents, Asian residents are 5% more likely

In addition, the HMDA data indicates the rates at which certain races receive high-priced loans. In Orange County, White and Asian borrowers are least likely to be given a high cost loan. Meanwhile, Black residents are nearly twice as likely to receive subprime loans, and Hispanics are nearly 2.5 times more likely. Lack of access to loans, or loans that are not high-priced, for Black and Hispanic borrowers can often price these households out of owner-occupied single-family homes, and increases the cost burden over time as rent continues to increase across the county.

Percentage of Originated Loans That Were High-Cost by Race or Ethnicity in Orange County, 2014-2017 Home Mortgage Disclosure Act Data

Race or Ethnicity	Number of Loans Originated	Percentage High-Cost
White, Not Hispanic	3,408	2.06%
Black, Not Hispanic	102	3.79%
Asian, Not Hispanic	1,277	2.07%
Hispanic/Latino	1,757	4.90%

Location and Type of Affordable Housing

The location and type of affordable housing may be significant contributing factors to fair housing issues in Orange County. With respect to the location of affordable housing, at a high level, there is relatively little such housing in coastal areas, hillside communities, or in the southern portion of the county, all areas that are disproportionately White and have relatively low Hispanic population concentrations. Within some cities that have patterns of intra-jurisdictional segregation, affordable housing is concentrated in particular areas that tend to be more heavily Hispanic. This is especially true in Anaheim, where affordable housing is concentrated in the heavily Hispanic western portion of the city rather than in the mostly White Anaheim Hills. Similarly, in Fullerton, affordable housing is more concentrated in the disproportionately Hispanic southern portion of the city, and, in Garden Grove, affordable housing is concentrated in the disproportionately Hispanic eastern portion of the city. With respect to the role of the type of affordable housing in causing fair housing issues, the total lack of public housing in Orange County, which tends to be more accessible to members of protected classes than do Low Income Housing Tax Credit developments, may play a role in perpetuating segregation.

Location of Accessible Housing

The location of accessible housing may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. With a few exceptions the location of accessible housing tends to track areas where there are concentrations of publicly supported housing. In Orange County, publicly supported housing tends to be concentrated in areas that are disproportionately Hispanic and/or Vietnamese and that have relatively limited access to educational opportunity and environmental health. Irvine, which has a substantial supply of publicly supported housing, is a limited exception

to this trend. Market-rate multifamily housing is also more likely to be accessible, though to a lesser standard than publicly supported housing, due to the design and construction standards of the Fair Housing Act. Multifamily housing tends to be concentrated in communities of color, but there are some predominantly White communities that have significant amounts of market-rate multifamily housing that may be accessible and affordable to middle-income and high-income persons with disabilities. These areas include Aliso Viejo, Laguna Woods (which primarily consists of a large retirement community), Newport Beach, and Seal Beach. Overall, permitting more multifamily housing and assisting more publicly supported housing in predominantly White communities with proficient schools would help ensure that persons with disabilities who need accessibility features in their homes have a full range of neighborhood choices available to them.

Location of Employers

The location of employers is not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. There does not appear to be any clear relationship between patterns of occupancy by race or ethnicity and where major job centers are in Orange County. In fact, there are areas of Hispanic population concentration, particularly in Anaheim and Santa Ana, that are located near major employment centers. Additionally, heavily Hispanic communities in Orange County have greater access to job centers in Los Angeles County than do predominantly White communities due to the routing of Metrolink through the central portion of the county rather than along the coast or through the hills.

Location of Environmental Health Hazards

The location of environmental health hazards may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Data indicates communities with a high concentration of Hispanics experience higher levels of environmental harms; exposure primarily stems from vehicle emissions due to the proximity of major freeways and the settling of smog in the area between the coast and the hills rather than the location of major industrial facilities. As a county that developed as a predominantly suburban area, there is no long history of heavy industrial activity in the area. Of the county's four Superfund sites, one – Orange County North Basin on the border of Fullerton and Anaheim – is located in a heavily Hispanic area. In light of these circumstances, efforts to reduce vehicle emissions and efforts to increase access to coastal and hillside communities for Hispanic residents would be most likely to reduce environmental health disparities.

Location of Proficient Schools and School Assignment Policies

The location of proficient schools and school assignment policies may be significant contributing factors to fair housing issues in Orange County. The schools with the highest proficiency in Orange County are generally located in coastal areas and hillside areas rather than in the center of the county, though Irvine is an exception. This distribution of proficient schools maps on to patterns of residential racial and ethnic segregation, with disproportionately White population in areas with high performing schools and relatively low Hispanic population in those areas. Public education in Orange County is highly fragmented with 27 school districts serving the county's students.

District boundaries frequently map onto municipal boundaries, which in turn correlate to patterns of segregation. Inter-district transfers are only available for extremely limited circumstances. This Analysis did not reveal school assignment policies that contribute to segregation within individual school districts.

Loss of Affordable Housing

The loss of affordable housing is a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. When subsidy contracts expire, the housing providers that often have the least economic incentive to renew their affordability restrictions are those that are located in higher opportunity areas or in areas that are gentrifying or at risk of gentrification. In Orange County, according to the National Affordable Housing Preservation Database, there are 69 subsidized properties with affordability restrictions that are scheduled to expire between now and the end of 2024. The loss of the developments among these that are most likely to be converted to market-rate occupancy could contribute to segregation and fuel displacement.

Occupancy Codes and Restrictions

Occupancy codes and restrictions may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Specifically, there is a substantial recent history of municipal ordinances targeting group homes, in general, and community residences for people in recovery from alcohol or substance abuse disorders, in particular. In 2015, the City of Newport Beach entered into a $5.25 million settlement of a challenge to its ordinance, but that settlement did not including injunctive relief calling for a repeal of that ordinance.[30] Group home operators have also challenged the City of Costa Mesa's ordinance, though a jury found in the City's favor.[31] Following the jury's verdict in that case, there were reports that Orange County was considering similar restrictions for its unincorporated areas.[32] Although municipalities have an interest in protecting the health and safety of group home residents, these types of restrictions may be burdensome for ethical, high-quality group home operators. Occupancy codes and restrictions are not as high priority of a barrier as the factors that hinder the development of permanent supportive housing, as group homes are generally less integrated than independent living settings.

Private Discrimination

Private discrimination may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Although complaint data from local fair housing organizations was available, stakeholders

[30] Hannah Fry, *Newport Will Pay Group Homes $5.25 Million Settlement*, L.A. TIMES (July 16, 2015), https://www.latimes.com/socal/daily-pilot/news/tn-dpt-me-0716-newport-group-home-settlement-20150716-story.html.
[31] Alicia Robinson, *Federal Jury Sides with Costa Mesa in Sober Living Case*, O.C. REGISTER (Dec. 7, 2018), https://www.ocregister.com/2018/12/07/federal-jury-sides-with-costa-mesa-in-sober-living-case/.
[32] Teri Sforza, *Orange County, Following Costa Mesa's Lead, May Regulate Sober Living Homes*, O.C. REGISTER (Sep. 20, 2019), https://www.ocregister.com/2019/09/20/orange-county-following-costa-mesas-lead-may-regulate-sober-living-homes/.

reported the persistent nature of housing discrimination, as revealed through individual complaints and through fair housing testing.

Quality of Affordable Housing Information Programs

The quality of affordable housing information programs may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. None of the housing authorities serving Housing Choice Voucher holders in Orange County operate mobility counseling programs. Mobility counseling programs that help inform voucher holders of opportunities to use their assistance in higher opportunity areas, assist with applying for units in higher opportunity areas, and provide support in adjusting to life in different neighborhoods have demonstrated effectiveness in helping voucher holders make moves that foster integration.[33] The lack of mobility counseling is not the only barrier to voucher holders accessing higher opportunity areas, but, as the discussion of impediments to mobility reveals, there may be some rental units available within housing authority payment standards in higher opportunity areas, but the availability would be greater if housing authorities implemented Small Area Fair Market Rents.

Regulatory Barriers to Providing Housing and Supportive Services for Persons with Disabilities

Regulatory barriers to providing housing and supportive services for persons with disabilities are not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues for persons with disabilities in Orange County. The amount of affordable housing available (and its cost), the extent of outreach and capacity among service providers, and the scope of service provision may be the major causes of segregation for persons with disabilities. To the extent that barriers are regulatory in nature, they typically overlap with the zoning and land use barriers to the construction of affordable housing. This Analysis discusses those in detail in the analysis of the land use and zoning laws contributing factor. This Analysis also discusses restrictions on group homes and community residences in connection with the occupancy codes and restrictions contributing factor.

Siting Selection Policies, Practices, and Decisions for Publicly Supported Housing, Including Discretionary Aspects of Qualified Allocation Plans and Other Programs

Siting selection policies, practices, and decisions for public supported housing, including discretionary aspects of Qualified Allocation Plans and other programs may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues. The main policy-driven factor related to the siting of publicly supported housing is the heavy focus of affordable housing development efforts throughout the state on transit-oriented development. Access to transportation is very uneven throughout the county, and disproportionately White areas, which tend to have more proficient schools and better environmental health, tend to have limited access to transportation. When real affordability is built into transit-oriented development, these investments may have a positive effect on stable integration in areas undergoing gentrification by arresting the process of

[33] Mary K. Cunningham et al., *Moving to Better Neighborhoods with Mobility Counseling*, URBAN INSTITUTE (Mar. 2005), https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/51506/311146-Moving-to-Better-Neighborhoods-with-Mobility-Counseling.PDF.

displacement. Additionally, transit expansion to higher opportunity areas may also help ensure that prioritizing transit-oriented development contributes to integration.

The California Tax Credit Allocation Committee's Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) incentivizes family-occupancy Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) development in what it terms "High Resource" or "Highest Resource" areas. As the map below illustrates, these areas are generally high opportunity areas that are disproportionately white. LIHTC development in these areas would contribute to greater residential racial integration. Developers have reported that the incentives to build affordable housing in these areas may not be sufficient to overcome differences in land costs between higher opportunity areas and historically disinvested areas. Nonetheless, in light of the incentives for LIHTC development in High Resource and Highest Resource areas, the QAP does not currently contribute to segregation. Other policy interventions, such as the donation of public land and land held by charitable organizations, are necessary to ensure the efficacy of existing incentives. As an additional note, the QAP includes a set-aside pool for Orange County of 7.3%, which is slightly less than its share in the population of the state (8.1%).



Source of Income Discrimination

Source of income discrimination is a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. In October of 2019, Governor Newsom signed into law SB 329, which prohibits discrimination in housing based on use of a Housing Choice Voucher or other tenant-based rental assistance. Previously, no protections for voucher holders had existed in Orange County. News reports have indicated a high degree of difficulty in accessing housing that would accept a subsidy in Orange County.[34] Specifically, if a voucher holder does not access housing within a four month window, they lose their voucher to the next person on the waiting list. Within the Orange County

[34] Jeff Collins, *No Voucher, No Vacancy, No Help: The Cruel Realities of Section 8 Housing in Orange County*, O.C. REGISTER (Oct. 5, 2016), https://www.ocregister.com/2016/10/05/no-voucher-no-vacancy-no-help-the-cruel-realities-of-section-8-housing-in-orange-county/.

Housing Authority as well as the Garden Grove Housing Authority, the rate of voucher loss was 22% in 2016. In Anaheim, the rate of voucher loss was 33%, and in Santa Ana it was a whopping 64%. Additionally, the vacancy rate in Orange County is only about 4%, with rent rising at a rate of about 3% a year; even without source of income discrimination, it is nevertheless a difficult market in which to use a voucher. As the source of income discrimination law has just been passed, it is difficult to say whether (now) illegal discrimination will continue in Orange County. A comprehensive landlord education campaign could help avert this, as well as comprehensive voucher counseling to help voucher holders navigate this difficult market.

State of Local Laws, Policies, or Practices That Discourage Individuals with Disabilities from Living in Apartments, Family Homes, Supportive Housing, and Other Integrated Settings

State or local laws, policies, or practices that discourage individuals with disabilities from living in apartments, family homes, supportive housing, and other integrated settings are not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. A severe shortage of available, integrated affordable housing is the primary driver of the segregation of persons with disabilities, rather than laws, policies, or practices that discourage persons with disabilities from living in integrated housing. This Analysis discusses restrictions on group homes and community residences in connection with the occupancy codes and restrictions contributing factor.

Unresolved Violations of Fair Housing or Civil Rights Law

Unresolved violations of fair housing or civil rights law are not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Although concerning, the only unresolved violations or substantial allegations uncovered through this Analysis related to subject matter that is not closely related to fair housing issues.