EQUAL HOUSING
OPPORTUNITY

Orange County Regional Assessment of Fair Housing 2025-2029

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to all individuals and organizations that contributed to the planning process, including, but not limited to, the following:

Document Version

Last updated: March 27, 2025

Cover Photo Credit

The cover photograph for this report was provided courtesy of C&C Development. The photograph features *Terraces at Santiago* in the City of Santa Ana's Station District. *Terraces at Santiago* is an award-winning 36-unit urban infill transit-oriented multifamily affordable rental housing development featuring a mix of two-, three-, and five-bedroom apartments. In keeping with surrounding neighborhoods, this property was designed with Spanish/Santa Barbara architectural influences. Exterior detailing accents include wrought iron, decorative gables, wall sconces, decorative arches, decorative wood rafter rails, decorative painted wood shutters, and recessed stucco elements with wrought iron lattice. The building is LEED Gold Certified.

Table of Contents

I.   Executive Summary

The Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) provides communities an opportunity to assess their progress toward the goals of eliminating housing discrimination and promoting access to housing opportunity for both current and future residents. Jurisdictions that receive funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), including Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds, complete an AFH at least once every five years, consistent with the Consolidated Plan cycle, as part of their obligations under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.

As a fair housing planning document, the AFH facilitates HUD grantee compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements to affirmatively further fair housing. Affirmatively furthering fair housing entails taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. The duty to affirmatively further fair housing applies to all activities and programs within a jurisdiction related to housing and urban development.

This AFH is a collaborative effort among the following jurisdictions:

- Orange County and the Urban County Program participating cities of Brea, Cypress, Dana Point, La Palma, Laguna Beach, Laguna Hills, Laguna Woods, Los Alamitos, Placentia, San Juan Capistrano, Seal Beach, Stanton, Villa Park, and Yorba Linda.
- The HUD Entitlement Cities of Aliso Viejo, Anaheim, Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Irvine, La Habra, Laguna Niguel, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, City of Orange, Rancho Santa Margarita, San Clemente, Santa Ana, Tustin, Westminster.

To prepare the AFH, jurisdictions first must identify fair housing issues. A fair housing issue refers to a condition within a specific geographic area that restricts fair housing choice or limits access to opportunity. Fair housing issues may include ongoing local or regional segregation/concentration or lack of integration, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, disparities in access to opportunity, disproportionate housing needs, and evidence of discrimination or violations of civil rights law or regulations related to housing. To identify fair housing issues, HUD recommends that jurisdictions gather and analyze data. For this AFH, the jurisdictions analyzed data on the following topics:

- Demographics
- Segregation or Concentration/Integration
- Racially and/or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty
- Disparities in Access to Opportunity

- Housing Needs
- Discrimination Complaints

The data utilized in the analysis are from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS), HUD's AFFH Data and Mapping Tool, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) AFFH Data Viewer 2.0, housing discrimination complaint data provided by HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO), and information gathered through the community participation process (described below). The ACS data utilized in the assessment are from the 2018-2022 five-year estimates, which were the most current data across all participating jurisdictions at the time the analysis was conducted.

After analyzing the data and identifying fair housing issues, jurisdictions then must identify contributing factors. A contributing factor is any condition that creates, contributes to, perpetuates, or increases the severity of one or more fair housing issues. For each fair housing issue and its contributing factors, jurisdictions must then develop fair housing goals. A fair housing goal is a specific, meaningful action that can reasonably be expected to create meaningful positive change that affirmatively furthers fair housing by increasing fair housing choice or reducing disparities in access to opportunity.

For the contributing factors and fair housing goals in this AFH, the jurisdictions built upon the extensive work they have already done preparing their most recent Housing Elements, which cover an eight-year planning period. As part of the state-mandated Housing Element, California jurisdictions must conduct a fair housing assessment that includes an analysis of fair housing issues, identification of factors that create and/or contribute to those issues, and development of goals and meaningful actions to affirmatively further fair housing. Progress toward reaching the goals identified in the Housing Element must then be periodically reported to the state.

A summary of the fair housing issues, significant contributing factors, and fair housing goals for each jurisdiction can be found in **Section IV** of this AFH.

II. Community Participation Process

To develop the AFH, information was also gathered from residents, housing professionals, and service providers. Incorporating information from these sources is important for ensuring that the AFH reflects community needs and knowledge that may not be discernible from other data sources. The community participation process for this AFH involved the following efforts:

A. Stakeholder Consultation

Four one-on-one interviews, and two focus groups were conducted during January and February 2025 with organizations that provide fair housing services and/or housing and services to protected class groups throughout the County. The interviews and focus group sessions discussed the fair housing issues frequently encountered by the organizations, the underlying causes for those issues, and ongoing efforts currently to address them. Participants also discussed additional actions their organizations would recommend. Invitations to participate in the stakeholder consultation activities were sent to approximately 78 organizations identified by the jurisdictions involved in the planning process. Fourteen organizations, as well as staff from two of the participating jurisdictions, participated in these consultations, including: Fair Housing Council of Orange County, Fair Housing Foundation, Orange County Families Forward, Orange County United Way, Family Assistance Ministry, The HUB OC, National Core, NeighborWorks Orange County, Thomas House Family Shelter, Domus Development, City of Garden Grove, City of Lake Forest, Dayle McIntosh Center, CalOptima, and Assistance League of Orange County. Information gathered through these consultations is incorporated throughout this report.

B. Community Meetings

A total of six community meetings were held in March 2025 to gather public input on the fair housing issues impacting residents of Orange County, and the factors that create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of those issues. These meetings included two virtual meetings and four in-person meetings held at the dates, times, and locations listed below.

In-person community meetings:

- March 5, 2025, from 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. at Santa Ana City Council Chamber, 22 Civic Center Plaza, Santa Ana, CA 92701
- March 5, 2025, from 6:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. at Santa Ana City Council Chamber, 22 Civic Center Plaza, Santa Ana, CA 92701
- March 6, 2025, from 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. at La Habra City Hall, Festival Room, 110 E. La Habra Boulevard, La Habra, CA 90631

- March 6, 2025, from 6:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. at Costa Mesa City Hall, Community Room, 77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Virtual community meetings:

- March 7, 2025, at 6:00 p.m., via Microsoft Teams
- March 13, 2025, at 1:00 p.m., via Microsoft Teams

Outreach to advertise the community meetings included the following efforts:

- City of Anaheim notified the 250 members of their Homeless Collaborative and community stakeholders.
- City of Aliso Viejo posted a copy of the notice to their City website and shared on social media and city newsletters.
- City of Buena Park posted the public notice on the City website and City Hall bulletin board.
- City of Fountain Valley posted the public notice on the City website
- City of Fullerton published the public notice in the Fullerton Observer newspaper, placed the notice on the City of Fullerton website, and placed copies of the notice at various public facilities and libraries as well as over 25 affordable housing sites.
- City of Irvine sent copies of the notice to subrecipient partners and other interested parties.
- City of Laguna Niguel posted the public notice on the City website and social media channels.
- City of Mission Viejo posted the public notice on the City website.
- City of San Clemente posted the public notice on the City website.
- City of Santa Ana published the public notice for the public meetings in six languages (English, Spanish, Vietnamese, Korean, Chinese, and Arabic) including the following publications: Orange County Register, La Opinion, Nguoi Viet Daily News, Korea Times, World Journal, and Beirut Times.
- City of Rancho Santa Margarita posted the public notice on bulletin boards outside City Hall, OCFA Station 45, and Trabuco Canyon Water District.
- County of Orange sent information regarding the virtual community meetings to community centers in the unincorporated areas of the County.

A total of fifteen individuals participated in these meetings to share their knowledge on fair housing issues and contributing factors in Orange County. These included representatives from the following organizations: Equus Workforce Solutions, Project Hope Alliance, Alianza Translatinx, Human Options, Illumination Foundation, The Eli Home, The Cambodian Family, Orange County Families Forward, City of Fountain Valley, and City of Buena Park. Information gathered through these meetings is incorporated throughout this report.

III.   Fair Housing Analysis

A.   Demographic and Housing Summary

Table 1 – Demographics, shows demographic information for the population of Orange County overall, the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions[1], the participating HUD Entitlement Cities, and the region[2]. These data are from the Census Bureau's 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates. Table 2 – Demographic Trends, shows similar data over time, dating back to 1990. These tables indicate the following:

Population

Orange County has a population of 3,175,227. The largest cities in the County are Anaheim (population 347,111), Santa Ana (population 311,379), and Irvine (population 304,527). The Urban County population is 585,178.

Race/Ethnicity

Orange County's population is majority-minority; however, the largest population group is White (38.46%). Hispanic residents comprise the second largest population group (33.93%), followed by Asian American and Pacific Islanders (AAPI), who make up 21.77% of the County population. African Americans account for 1.54% of the County population.

Compared to the region, Orange County has a higher proportion of White and AAPI residents, and a smaller proportion of Hispanic and Black residents.

Among the participating HUD Entitlement Cities, in comparison to the County overall:

- The Urban County, Aliso Viejo, Costa Mesa, Huntington Beach, Laguna Niguel, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, Rancho Santa Margarita, and San Clemente have a significantly higher[3] proportion of White residents.
- Anaheim, La Habra, and Santa Ana have a significantly higher proportion of Hispanic residents.
- Buena Park, Fountain Valley, Garden Grove, Irvine, and Westminster have a higher proportion of AAPI residents.

Since 1990, the County population has become more diverse, transitioning from a White majority in 1990 to a majority-minority population today. The number of White residents in

---

[1] The Orange County Urban County comprises the County unincorporated area, twelve (12) cities with populations under 50,000 (participating cities) and two (2) cities, Placentia and Yorba Linda, with populations over 50,000 (metropolitan cities).

[2] The region is defined by HUD as the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which comprises Los Angeles and Orange counties.

[3] For this analysis, "significantly higher" means that the percentage of residents of a particular race/ethnicity in a city is at least 10% higher than the percentage of residents of the same race/ethnicity in the County overall.

the County declined each decade, while the number of Hispanic and AAPI residents grew. The number of Black residents increased between 1990-2010 but declined over the past decade. These same trends are generally shared with the region and across the Urban County and HUD Entitlement Cities, with the following exceptions:

- In the region, the Black population has been declining since 2000.
- In Aliso Viejo, the population of all racial/ethnic groups, including White, has increased in each decade.
- In Costa Mesa, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, and Newport Beach, the AAPI population has declined over the last decade.
- In Fountain Valley and Garden Grove, the Black population has been declining since 2000.
- In Irvine, the White and Black populations have been increasing since 2000, in addition to growing Hispanic and AAPI populations.
- In La Habra, the Black population continued to grow after 2010.
- In Laguna Niguel and Lake Forest, the White population increased during the 1990s before declining over the subsequent decades, and the Black population has continued to grow over the last decade.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, the White population increased during the 1990s before declining over the last two decades.
- In San Clemente, the White population grew between 1990-2010, before shrinking slightly over the last decade; and the AAPI population fell over the last decade.
- In Santa Ana, the Black population has been falling since 1990, and the Hispanic population has been declining since 2000.
- In Tustin, the Black population has been declining since 1990.

National Origin

Orange County has a foreign-born population of 937,254 (29.52% of the total population[4]). The primary countries of origin for the foreign-born population are Mexico (9.17%) and Vietnam (4.69%).

In the region, 32.52% of the population is foreign born, which is slightly higher than in Orange County.

Among the participating HUD Entitlement Cities, in comparison to the County overall:

- Huntington Beach, Laguna Niguel, Newport Beach, Orange, and San Clemente have significantly lower percentages of foreign-born residents.

---

[4] Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B05006

- Garden Grove, Irvine, Santa Ana, and Westminster have significantly higher percentages of foreign-born residents. In these cities, the main countries of origin for the foreign-born population are:
    - Garden Grove: Vietnam and Mexico
    - Irvine: China (excluding Taiwan), Korea, and India
    - Santa Ana: Mexico and Vietnam
    - Westminster: Vietnam and Mexico

Since 1990, the County's foreign-born population has increased in each decade, with the most dramatic increase occurring during the 1990s. In comparison,

- The foreign-born population in the region grew between 1990-2010 and has been declining since 2010.
- The foreign-born population has declined in the following jurisdictions:
    - The Urban County, Anaheim, La Habra, Orange, and San Clemente, where the foreign-born population has been declining since 2010.
    - Costa Mesa and Santa Ana, where the foreign-born population has been declining since 2000. However, in Santa Ana, foreign-born residents still make up approximately half of the total population.
- In Irvine, the foreign-born population has continued to grow rapidly, nearly doubling since 2010.

Limited English Proficiency

Individuals who have Limited English Proficiency (LEP) are those who primarily speak a language other than English and speak English "less than very well." In Orange County, there are 539,484 LEP individuals[5], which is equal to approximately 16.99% of the population. The primary languages spoken by the LEP population in the County are Spanish (11.72%) and Vietnamese (3.45%).

In the region, 21.95% of the population is LEP, which is slightly higher than in Orange County.

Among the participating HUD Entitlement Cities, in comparison to the County overall:

- Aliso Viejo, Newport Beach, and San Clemente, have significantly lower percentages of LEP residents.
- Anaheim, Buena Park, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and Westminster have significantly higher percentages of LEP residents. In these cities, the primary languages spoken by the LEP population are:
    - Anaheim: Spanish and Vietnamese

---

[5] Source: U.S Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1601

- o   Buena Park: Spanish and Korean
- o   Garden Grove: Vietnamese and Spanish
- o   Santa Ana: Spanish and Vietnamese
- o   Westminster: Vietnamese and Spanish

Between 1990-2010, the County's LEP population increased. Since 2010, the County's LEP population has declined, though it remains well above the 1990 LEP population. In comparison:

- The LEP population in the region grew during the 1990s but has been declining since 2000.
- The LEP population has grown each decade since 1990, including since 2010, in the Urban County jurisdictions, Aliso Viejo, Fountain Valley, Irvine, Laguna Niguel, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, and Westminster.
- The LEP population has been declining since 2000 in Anaheim, Costa Mesa, Huntington Beach, and Santa Ana.
- In Garden Grove, Newport Beach, and San Clemente, the LEP population declined between 2000-2010, but has increased since 2010.

Age

Approximately 63.2% of the Orange County population is between the ages of 18 and 64; 15.38% are aged 65 and older, and 21.42% are younger than 18. The age distribution of the population in the region is similar. In comparison to the County overall, the Urban County, Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, and Newport Beach all have slightly older populations, with over one-fifth of their population aged 65 and older.

Since 1990, the County's population has been getting older. Currently, the County's population has a smaller proportion of the population (when compared to 1990) in both the "Under 18" and "18-64" year-old age categories, and a higher proportion of the population in the "65+" age category. The same general trend is evident in the region and all other jurisdictions, except for Aliso Viejo, where the percentage of the population under age 18 has increased, and the percentage of the population aged 65 and older has decreased, since 1990.

Families with Children

In Orange County, approximately 41.56% of families have children. This is slightly higher than the region, where 40.02% of families have children. Among the participating HUD Entitlement Cities, in comparison to the County overall:

- Aliso Viejo and Tustin have significantly higher percentages of families with children (52.06% and 52.64%, respectively), and in Irvine, over half (50.45%) of families have children.

- Laguna Niguel, Huntington Beach, Newport Beach, and Westminster have the lowest percentages of families with children, although the percentages are not significantly lower than those for the County overall.

The percentage of families with children in the County is lower today than it was in 1990, when 48.04% of families had children. This is also true in the region and the other jurisdictions, with the following exceptions:

- Aliso Viejo, Newport Beach, and Tustin, where the current percentage of families with children is higher than it was in 1990.

Table 1 – Demographics

	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA	#	%	Orange County, CA	#	%	Orange County Urban County	#	%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic		3,726,353	28.42%		1,221,176	38.46%		293,264	50.12%
Black, Non-Hispanic		802,053	6.12%		48,898	1.54%		9,107	1.56%
Hispanic		5,914,961	45.11%		1,077,367	33.93%		142,980	24.43%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic		2,164,634	16.51%		691,391	21.77%		111,761	19.10%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		22,433	0.17%		3,771	0.12%		804	0.14%
Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic		420,055	3.20%		121,149	3.82%		25,007	4.27%
Other, Non-Hispanic		61,428	0.47%		11,475	0.36%		2,255	0.39%
National Origin									
#1 country of origin	Mexico	1,443,693	11.01%	Mexico	291,025	9.17%	Mexico	87,088	14.88%
#2 country of origin	Philippines	284,338	2.17%	Vietnam	149,014	4.69%	Korea	16,930	2.89%
#3 country of origin	El Salvador	280,320	2.14%	Korea	65,922	2.08%	Vietnam	14,149	2.42%
#4 country of origin	China, excl. Taiwan	271,037	2.07%	Philippines	54,628	1.72%	Philippines	11,413	1.95%
#5 country of origin	Vietnam	249,604	1.90%	China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan	51,957	1.64%	China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan	8,443	1.44%
#6 country of origin	Korea	203,026	1.55%	India	37,109	1.17%	India	6,686	1.14%
#7 country of origin	Guatemala	192,515	1.47%	Iran	29,601	0.93%	Taiwan	5,013	0.86%
#8 country of origin	Iran	137,414	1.05%	Taiwan	23,424	0.74%	Iran	4,063	0.69%
#9 country of origin	India	94,541	0.72%	El Salvador	19,991	0.63%	El Salvador	1,472	0.25%
#10 country of origin	Taiwan	83,909	0.64%	Guatemala	13,266	0.42%	Guatemala	957	0.16%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Language									
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	1,970,148	15.99%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	342,794	11.72%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	35,150	4.55%
#2 LEP Language	Chinese:	254,682	2.07%	Vietnamese:	100,997	3.45%	Korean:	10,730	1.39%
#3 LEP Language	Korean:	155,641	1.26%	Korean:	44,665	1.53%	Vietnamese:	9,860	1.27%
#4 LEP Language	Vietnamese:	149,579	1.21%	Chinese:	34,770	1.19%	Chinese:	5,904	0.76%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog:	86,250	0.70%	Tagalog:	12,853	0.44%	Tagalog:	2,265	0.29%
#6 LEP Language	Armenian:	85,608	0.69%	Persian:	11,575	0.40%	Persian:	1,846	0.24%
#7 LEP Language	Persian:	42,504	0.34%	Arabic:	7,553	0.26%	Arabic:	967	0.13%
#8 LEP Language	Japanese:	33,228	0.27%	Japanese:	7,371	0.25%	Japanese:	957	0.12%
#9 LEP Language	Russian:	27,784	0.23%	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:	2,939	0.10%	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:	411	0.05%
#10 LEP Language	Arabic:	24,662	0.20%	Other Indic languages:	2,905	0.10%	Other Indic languages:	336	0.04%
Disability Type									
Hearing difficulty		327,938	2.50%		79,275	2.51%		19,027	3.25%
Vision difficulty		254,941	1.94%		49,469	1.57%		9,354	1.60%
Cognitive difficulty		523,200	3.99%		109,210	3.46%		20,087	3.43%
Ambulatory difficulty		686,925	5.24%		138,750	4.39%		30,281	5.17%
Self-care difficulty		351,827	2.68%		70,216	2.22%		14,167	2.42%
Independent living difficulty		566,545	4.32%		115,032	3.64%		22,514	3.85%
Sex									
Male		6,515,114	49.69%		1,578,013	49.70%		283,470	48.44%
Female		6,596,803	50.31%		1,597,214	50.30%		301,708	51.56%
Age									
Under 18		2,773,113	21.15%		680,041	21.42%		125,846	21.51%
18-64		8,434,589	64.33%		2,006,827	63.20%		339,409	58.00%
65+		1,904,215	14.52%		488,359	15.38%		119,923	20.49%
Family Type									
Families with children		1,210,891	40.73%		313,429	41.56%		73,360	37.58%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.
Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.
Note 3: Data Sources: LEP Language data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; All other data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 1 – Demographics (continued)

Race/Ethnicity		Aliso Viejo, CA #	%	Anaheim, CA #	%	Buena Park, CA #	%
White, Non-Hispanic		28,827	55.55%	81,889	23.59%	18,558	22.21%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,344	2.59%	8,241	2.37%	1,795	2.15%
Hispanic		10,392	20.02%	185,162	53.34%	33,448	40.04%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic		8,287	15.97%	61,721	17.78%	27,327	32.71%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		0	0.00%	383	0.11%	27	0.03%
Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic		2,847	5.49%	8,637	2.49%	2,301	2.75%
Other, Non-Hispanic		199	0.38%	1,078	0.31%	86	0.10%
National Origin							
#1 country of origin	Mexico	1,739	3.35%	Mexico 57,566	16.58%	Mexico 7,934	9.50%
#2 country of origin	Iran	1,699	3.27%	Vietnam 14,160	4.08%	Korea 6,779	8.11%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	1,001	1.93%	Philippines 9,783	2.82%	Philippines 4,394	5.26%
#4 country of origin	India	907	1.75%	Korea 4,604	1.33%	India 1,652	1.98%
#5 country of origin	Korea	489	0.94%	El Salvador 3,627	1.04%	Vietnam 1,304	1.56%
#6 country of origin	Vietnam	477	0.92%	India 3,251	0.94%	Taiwan 578	0.69%
#7 country of origin	Taiwan	392	0.76%	Guatemala 2,823	0.81%	China, excl Taiwan 501	0.60%
#8 country of origin	Japan	382	0.74%	Iran 1,806	0.52%	Japan 436	0.52%
#9 country of origin	Lebanon	340	0.66%	China, excl Taiwan 1,498	0.43%	Peru 426	0.51%
#10 country of origin	Canada	305	0.59%	Egypt 1,220	0.35%	El Salvador 341	0.41%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Language							
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	943	2.04%	Spanish or Spanish Creole: 62,112	19.37%	Spanish or Spanish Creole: 12,535	16.26%
#2 LEP Language	Korean:	545	1.18%	Vietnamese: 8,262	2.58%	Korean: 6,233	8.08%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese:	534	1.16%	Korean: 3,496	1.09%	Tagalog: 2,252	2.92%
#4 LEP Language	Persian:	524	1.14%	Tagalog: 2,472	0.77%	Chinese: 767	0.99%
#5 LEP Language	Vietnamese:	339	0.74%	Chinese: 2,323	0.72%	Vietnamese: 634	0.82%
#6 LEP Language	Tagalog:	133	0.29%	Arabic: 1,446	0.45%	Thai: 386	0.50%
#7 LEP Language	Japanese:	127	0.28%	Persian: 676	0.21%	Other Indic languages: 375	0.49%
#8 LEP Language	Other Asian languages:	83	0.18%	Other Indic languages: 584	0.18%	Gujarati: 329	0.43%
#9 LEP Language	Russian:	77	0.17%	African languages: 403	0.13%	Arabic: 179	0.23%
#10 LEP Language	French (incl. Patois, Cajun):	69	0.15%	Hindi: 402	0.13%	Other Pacific Island languages: 175	0.23%
Disability Type							
Hearing difficulty		689	1.33%	8,319	2.40%	2,166	2.59%
Vision difficulty		1,002	1.93%	5,994	1.73%	1,662	1.99%
Cognitive difficulty		1,502	2.89%	13,316	3.84%	3,577	4.28%
Ambulatory difficulty		1,436	2.77%	16,547	4.77%	4,325	5.18%
Self-care difficulty		1,075	2.07%	8,339	2.40%	2,221	2.66%
Independent living difficulty		1,469	2.83%	14,042	4.05%	3,502	4.19%
Sex							
Male		25,069	48.31%	169,425	48.81%	41,846	50.09%
Female		26,827	51.69%	177,686	51.19%	41,696	49.91%
Age							
Under 18		12,826	24.71%	79,516	22.91%	18,424	22.05%
18-64		34,016	65.55%	225,077	64.84%	53,652	64.22%
65+		5,054	9.74%	42,518	12.25%	11,466	13.72%
Family Type							
Families with children		6,880	52.06%	32,802	43.23%	7,636	38.40%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.

Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.

Note 3: Data Sources: LEP Language data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; All other data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 1 – Demographics (continued)

Race/Ethnicity	Costa Mesa, CA		#	%	Fountain Valley, CA		#	%	Fullerton, CA		#	%
White, Non-Hispanic			54,367	48.76%			21,830	38.46%			44,905	31.56%
Black, Non-Hispanic			1,425	1.28%			406	0.72%			2,763	1.94%
Hispanic			40,388	36.23%			9,692	17.08%			54,090	38.02%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic			10,136	9.09%			21,711	38.25%			35,662	25.06%
Native American, Non-Hispanic			74	0.07%			82	0.14%			209	0.15%
Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic			4,480	4.02%			2762	4.87%			4,158	2.92%
Other, Non-Hispanic			620	0.56%			271	0.48%			493	0.35%
National Origin												
#1 country of origin	Mexico		11,599	10.40%	Vietnam		8,447	14.88%	Mexico		12,017	8.45%
#2 country of origin	Vietnam		1,934	1.73%	Mexico		1,646	2.90%	Korea		10,956	7.70%
#3 country of origin	El Salvador		1,248	1.12%	Egypt		908	1.60%	Philippines		2,433	1.71%
#4 country of origin	Philippines		1,097	0.98%	Philippines		800	1.41%	India		1,848	1.30%
#5 country of origin	Guatemala		1,004	0.90%	Taiwan		673	1.19%	China, excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan		1,845	1.30%
#6 country of origin	Japan		661	0.59%	China, excl. Taiwan		645	1.14%	Vietnam		1,686	1.18%
#7 country of origin	China, excl. Taiwan		627	0.56%	Japan		576	1.01%	Taiwan		1,236	0.87%
#8 country of origin	Canada		525	0.47%	Korea		535	0.94%	El Salvador		811	0.57%
#9 country of origin	Iran		489	0.44%	India		507	0.89%	Iran		656	0.46%
#10 country of origin	Colombia		479	0.43%	El Salvador		343	0.60%	Peru		617	0.43%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Language												
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:		12,104	11.54%	Vietnamese:		5,435	10.04%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:		13,538	10.39%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese:		711	0.68%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:		1,303	2.41%	Korean:		7,929	6.09%
#3 LEP Language	Japanese:		580	0.55%	Chinese:		1,148	2.12%	Chinese:		2,713	2.08%
#4 LEP Language	Tagalog:		335	0.32%	Korean:		320	0.59%	Vietnamese:		888	0.68%
#5 LEP Language	Chinese:		312	0.30%	Japanese:		296	0.55%	Tagalog:		514	0.39%
#6 LEP Language	Korean:		264	0.25%	Arabic:		251	0.46%	Gujarati:		359	0.28%
#7 LEP Language	Persian:		139	0.13%	Portuguese or Portuguese Creole:		104	0.19%	Hindi:		310	0.24%
#8 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island languag		114	0.11%	Persian:		95	0.18%	Arabic:		295	0.23%
#9 LEP Language	Arabic:		88	0.08%	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:		87	0.16%	Persian:		262	0.20%
#10 LEP Language	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:		86	0.08%	Thai:		84	0.16%	Japanese:		253	0.19%
Disability Type												
Hearing difficulty			2,252	2.02%			1,575	2.78%			2,902	2.04%
Vision difficulty			1,555	1.39%			787	1.39%			2,155	1.51%
Cognitive difficulty			3,673	3.29%			2,151	3.79%			5,084	3.57%
Ambulatory difficulty			4,740	4.25%			2,680	4.72%			5,894	4.14%
Self-care difficulty			2,259	2.03%			1,422	2.51%			2,794	1.96%
Independent living difficulty			4,029	3.61%			2,388	4.21%			5,064	3.56%
Sex												
Male			57,488	51.56%			28,478	50.18%			70,148	49.30%
Female			54,002	48.44%			28,276	49.82%			72,132	50.70%
Age												
Under 18			21,103	18.93%			10,939	19.27%			31,836	22.38%
18-64			75,939	68.11%			34,526	60.83%			90,840	63.85%
65+			14,448	12.96%			11,289	19.89%			19,604	13.78%
Family Type												
Families with children			10,010	41.15%			5,138	37.40%			13,780	41.67%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.

Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.

Note 3: Data Sources: LEP Language data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; All other data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 1 – Demographics (continued)

	Garden Grove, CA			Huntington Beach, CA			Irvine, CA		
Race/Ethnicity		#	%		#	%		#	%
White, Non-Hispanic		29,648	17.27%		118,080	59.79%		108,636	35.67%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,724	1.00%		2,246	1.14%		5,275	1.73%
Hispanic		64,048	37.32%		38,959	19.73%		34,237	11.24%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic		72,135	42.03%		25,116	12.72%		135,560	44.51%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		227	0.13%		435	0.22%		364	0.12%
Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic		3,221	1.88%		11,729	5.94%		19,072	6.26%
Other, Non-Hispanic		634	0.37%		916	0.46%		1,383	0.45%
National Origin									
#1 country of origin	Vietnam	39,594	23.07%	Vietnam	6,752	3.42%	China, excl. Taiwan	26,311	8.64%
#2 country of origin	Mexico	19,384	11.29%	Mexico	4,859	2.46%	Korea	13,665	4.49%
#3 country of origin	Korea	3,369	1.96%	Philippines	1,521	0.77%	India	12,658	4.16%
#4 country of origin	Philippines	2,812	1.64%	China, excl. Taiwan	1,284	0.65%	Iran	9,640	3.17%
#5 country of origin	El Salvador	1,435	0.84%	Taiwan	1,150	0.58%	Taiwan	7,052	2.32%
#6 country of origin	Guatemala	1,053	0.61%	Canada	1,048	0.53%	Vietnam	6,631	2.18%
#7 country of origin	China, excl. Taiwan	755	0.44%	Korea	850	0.43%	Philippines	4,839	1.59%
#8 country of origin	Cambodia	514	0.30%	El Salvador	791	0.40%	Japan	4,201	1.38%
#9 country of origin	India	433	0.25%	England	657	0.33%	Mexico	3,773	1.24%
#10 country of origin	Peru	424	0.25%	Egypt	646	0.33%	Canada	1,949	0.64%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Language									
#1 LEP Language	Vietnamese:	29,899	18.16%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	8,333	4.43%	Chinese:	10,868	4.83%
#2 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	19,694	11.96%	Vietnamese:	2,922	1.55%	Korean:	6,292	2.79%
#3 LEP Language	Korean:	2,948	1.79%	Chinese:	1,293	0.69%	Persian:	3,977	1.77%
#4 LEP Language	Chinese:	1,640	1.00%	Arabic:	632	0.34%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	2,969	1.32%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog:	692	0.42%	Korean:	619	0.33%	Japanese:	2,724	1.21%
#6 LEP Language	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:	385	0.23%	Japanese:	466	0.25%	Vietnamese:	1,870	0.83%
#7 LEP Language	Arabic:	343	0.21%	Tagalog:	186	0.10%	Arabic:	1,790	0.80%
#8 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island languag	210	0.13%	Portuguese or Portuguese Creole:	153	0.08%	Russian:	737	0.33%
#9 LEP Language	Thai:	203	0.12%	Thai:	151	0.08%	Tagalog:	665	0.30%
#10 LEP Language	Laotian:	153	0.09%	Other Indo-European languages:	145	0.08%	Other Indic languages:	604	0.27%
Disability Type									
Hearing difficulty		4,012	2.34%		5,577	2.82%		4,587	1.51%
Vision difficulty		3,500	2.04%		3,076	1.56%		3,081	1.01%
Cognitive difficulty		7,551	4.40%		7,071	3.58%		7,130	2.34%
Ambulatory difficulty		8,995	5.24%		8,728	4.42%		7,092	2.33%
Self-care difficulty		4,754	2.77%		3,684	1.87%		4,489	1.47%
Independent living difficulty		8,377	4.88%		6,990	3.54%		7,198	2.36%
Sex									
Male		86,329	50.30%		99,061	50.16%		150,761	49.51%
Female		85,308	49.70%		98,420	49.84%		153,766	50.49%
Age									
Under 18		36,449	21.24%		35,292	17.87%		66,314	21.78%
18-64		110,715	64.51%		125,355	63.48%		206,414	67.78%
65+		24,473	14.26%		36,834	18.65%		31,799	10.44%
Family Type									
Families with children		18,050	47.97%		17,895	36.25%		35,829	50.45%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.

Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.

Note 3: Data Sources: LEP Language data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; All other data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 1 – Demographics (continued)

Race/Ethnicity		La Habra, CA #	%		Laguna Niguel, CA #	%		Lake Forest, CA #	%
White, Non-Hispanic		15,549	24.72%		41,226	64.16%		41,811	48.85%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,091	1.73%		1,134	1.76%		1,818	2.12%
Hispanic		37,583	59.75%		10,346	16.10%		20,073	23.45%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic		7,379	11.73%		7,218	11.23%		16,885	19.73%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		36	0.06%		8	0.01%		116	0.14%
Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic		1,159	1.84%		3,866	6.02%		4,407	5.15%
Other, Non-Hispanic		107	0.17%		461	0.72%		473	0.55%
National Origin									
#1 country of origin	Mexico	8,114	12.90%	Iran	2,869	4.46%	Mexico	4,998	5.84%
#2 country of origin	Korea	2,060	3.27%	Mexico	2,173	14.50%	Philippines	2,017	2.36%
#3 country of origin	Philippines	1,039	1.65%	Philippines	866	5.78%	China, excl.Taiwan	1,731	2.02%
#4 country of origin	Guatemala	662	1.05%	China, excl. Taiwan	813	5.43%	Vietnam	1,527	1.78%
#5 country of origin	China, excl. Taiwan	489	0.78%	Vietnam	667	4.45%	Iran	1,298	1.52%
#6 country of origin	El Salvador	463	0.74%	United Kingdom, excluding England and S	662	4.42%	India	1,026	1.20%
#7 country of origin	Taiwan	252	0.40%	Germany	622	4.15%	Taiwan	926	1.08%
#8 country of origin	India	201	0.32%	Korea	554	3.70%	Korea	879	1.03%
#9 country of origin	Vietnam	189	0.30%	Taiwan	416	2.78%	Japan	698	0.82%
#10 country of origin	Ecuador	147	0.23%	Canada	401	2.68%	Egypt	630	0.74%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Language									
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	10,755	18.84%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	2,330	3.82%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	5,408	7.18%
#2 LEP Language	Korean:	1,244	2.18%	Persian:	878	1.44%	Tagalog:	622	0.83%
#3 LEP Language	Speak English "very well"	304	0.53%	Chinese:	680	1.11%	Chinese:	524	0.70%
#4 LEP Language	Chinese:	239	0.42%	Korean:	121	0.20%	Vietnamese:	436	0.58%
#5 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island languag	70	0.12%	French (incl. Patois, Cajun):	83	0.14%	Korean:	410	0.54%
#6 LEP Language	Russian:	46	0.08%	Other Slavic languages:	79	0.13%	Persian:	342	0.45%
#7 LEP Language	Persian:	45	0.08%	Russian:	76	0.12%	Arabic:	238	0.32%
#8 LEP Language	Japanese:	42	0.07%	Vietnamese:	75	0.12%	Other Pacific Island languages:	174	0.23%
#9 LEP Language	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:	31	0.05%	Japanese:	74	0.12%	Japanese:	163	0.22%
#10 LEP Language	Other Indic languages:	30	0.05%	Gujarati:	70	0.11%	Scandinavian languages:	78	0.10%
Disability Type									
Hearing difficulty		1,569	2.49%		1,702	2.65%		1,886	2.20%
Vision difficulty		1,368	2.17%		811	1.26%		1,045	1.22%
Cognitive difficulty		2,550	4.05%		1,853	2.88%		2,771	3.24%
Ambulatory difficulty		3,328	5.29%		2,683	4.18%		3,195	3.73%
Self-care difficulty		1,927	3.06%		1,385	2.16%		1,547	1.81%
Independent living difficulty		2,696	4.29%		2,055	3.20%		2,664	3.11%
Sex									
Male		31,681	50.36%		31,080	48.37%		42,347	49.48%
Female		31,223	49.64%		33,179	51.63%		43,236	50.52%
Age									
Under 18		13,799	21.94%		10,919	16.99%		17,484	20.43%
18-64		40,264	64.01%		40,277	62.68%		56,050	65.49%
65+		8,841	14.05%		13,063	20.33%		12,049	14.08%
Family Type									
Families with children		6,074	40.01%		6,011	33.79%		9,452	43.00%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.

Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.

Note 3: Data Sources: LEP Language data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; All other data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 1 – Demographics (continued)

	Mission Viejo, CA			Newport Beach, CA			Orange, CA		
Race/Ethnicity		#	%		#	%		#	%
White, Non-Hispanic		56,825	60.95%		64,785	76.08%		56,896	41.01%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,072	1.15%		553	0.65%		1,801	1.30%
Hispanic		18,341	19.67%		8,912	10.47%		54,176	39.05%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic		12,749	13.67%		6,902	8.10%		18,712	13.49%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		17	0.02%		42	0.05%		301	0.22%
Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic		3,979	4.27%		3,406	4.00%		6,488	4.68%
Other, Non-Hispanic		250	0.27%		559	0.66%		354	0.26%
National Origin									
#1 country of origin	Mexico	3,380	3.63%	Iran	1,293	1.52%	Mexico	11,955	8.62%
#2 country of origin	Iran	2,755	2.95%	Mexico	1,039	1.22%	Philippines	2,858	2.06%
#3 country of origin	Vietnam	1,855	1.99%	Canada	953	1.12%	Vietnam	2,741	1.98%
#4 country of origin	Philippines	1,284	1.38%	Vietnam	733	0.86%	China, excl. Taiwan	1,278	0.92%
#5 country of origin	China, excl. Taiwan	1,060	1.14%	Taiwan	732	0.86%	Korea	1,268	0.91%
#6 country of origin	India	902	0.97%	India	605	0.71%	Guatemala	960	0.69%
#7 country of origin	Taiwan	899	0.96%	Korea	604	0.71%	India	922	0.66%
#8 country of origin	Canada	549	0.59%	China, excl. Taiwan	576	0.68%	Taiwan	922	0.66%
#9 country of origin	Korea	539	0.58%	France	448	0.53%	El Salvador	909	0.66%
#10 country of origin	Guatemala	405	0.43%	England	420	0.49%	Iran	603	0.43%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Language									
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	3,617	3.97%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	983	1.17%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	16,693	12.73%
#2 LEP Language	Persian:	1,378	1.51%	Chinese:	332	0.40%	Vietnamese:	1,474	1.12%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese:	705	0.77%	Persian:	306	0.37%	Korean:	1,162	0.89%
#4 LEP Language	Vietnamese:	373	0.41%	Korean:	271	0.32%	Chinese:	792	0.60%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog:	246	0.27%	Japanese:	188	0.22%	Tagalog:	501	0.38%
#6 LEP Language	Arabic:	241	0.26%	Russian:	167	0.20%	Arabic:	247	0.19%
#7 LEP Language	Japanese:	218	0.24%	Other Slavic languages:	111	0.13%	Persian:	215	0.16%
#8 LEP Language	Korean:	175	0.19%	Tagalog:	104	0.12%	Gujarati:	207	0.16%
#9 LEP Language	Russian:	123	0.13%	French (incl. Patois, Cajun):	80	0.10%	Japanese:	168	0.13%
#10 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island languag	88	0.10%	Vietnamese:	74	0.09%	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:	142	0.11%
Disability Type									
Hearing difficulty		3,005	3.22%		2,689	3.16%		2,803	2.02%
Vision difficulty		1,438	1.54%		838	0.98%		1,785	1.29%
Cognitive difficulty		4,203	4.51%		1,811	2.13%		3,750	2.70%
Ambulatory difficulty		4,989	5.35%		3,282	3.85%		4,865	3.51%
Self-care difficulty		2,920	3.13%		1,625	1.91%		2,455	1.77%
Independent living difficulty		4,320	4.63%		2,770	3.25%		4,350	3.14%
Sex									
Male		46,397	49.76%		41,980	49.30%		70,909	51.11%
Female		46,836	50.24%		43,179	50.70%		67,819	48.89%
Age									
Under 18		18,379	19.71%		14,297	16.79%		28,400	20.47%
18-64		54,279	58.22%		51,037	59.93%		90,276	65.07%
65+		20,575	22.07%		19,825	23.28%		20,052	14.45%
Family Type									
Families with children		10,886	44.01%		7,992	36.53%		13,121	41.80%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.

Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.

Note 3: Data Sources: LEP Language data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; All other data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 1 – Demographics (continued)

	Rancho Santa Margarita, CA	#	%	San Clemente, CA	#	%	Santa Ana, CA	#	%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic		28,334	59.40%		46,139	71.83%		28,223	9.06%
Black, Non-Hispanic		819	1.72%		1,057	1.65%		2,897	0.93%
Hispanic		9,734	20.41%		10,964	17.07%		239,824	77.02%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic		5,801	12.16%		3,098	4.82%		36,906	11.85%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		75	0.16%		34	0.05%		295	0.09%
Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic		2,790	5.85%		2,821	4.39%		2,789	0.90%
Other, Non-Hispanic		149	0.31%		119	0.19%		445	0.14%
National Origin									
#1 country of origin	Mexico	1,657	3.47%	Mexico	2,089	3.25%	Mexico	90,086	28.93%
#2 country of origin	Philippines	1,185	2.48%	India	565	0.88%	Vietnam	16,542	5.31%
#3 country of origin	Canada	817	1.71%	Iran	458	0.71%	El Salvador	4,685	1.50%
#4 country of origin	Iran	705	1.48%	Philippines	377	0.59%	Guatemala	2,845	0.91%
#5 country of origin	India	701	1.47%	England	279	0.43%	Philippines	2,064	0.66%
#6 country of origin	Brazil	463	0.97%	Canada	264	0.41%	China, excl. Taiwan	940	0.30%
#7 country of origin	El Salvador	447	0.94%	Germany	245	0.38%	Cambodia	881	0.28%
#8 country of origin	England	304	0.64%	Australia	241	0.38%	Korea	782	0.25%
#9 country of origin	Vietnam	251	0.53%	Taiwan	145	0.23%	India	669	0.21%
#10 country of origin	Peru	221	0.46%	China, excl. Taiwan	136	0.21%	Bolivia	612	0.20%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Language									
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	2,373	5.19%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	2,762	4.49%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	113,477	37.06%
#2 LEP Language	Chinese:	286	0.63%	Thai:	194	0.32%	Vietnamese:	14,211	4.64%
#3 LEP Language	Persian:	194	0.42%	Korean:	105	0.17%	Chinese:	1,435	0.47%
#4 LEP Language	Arabic:	177	0.39%	Armenian:	98	0.16%	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:	743	0.24%
#5 LEP Language	Vietnamese:	163	0.36%	Vietnamese:	91	0.15%	Tagalog:	651	0.21%
#6 LEP Language	Tagalog:	159	0.35%	Chinese:	56	0.09%	Korean:	427	0.14%
#7 LEP Language	Korean:	85	0.19%	Other Slavic languages:	49	0.08%	Laotian:	287	0.09%
#8 LEP Language	Other Slavic languages:	81	0.18%	Other Pacific Island languages:	38	0.06%	Japanese:	235	0.08%
#9 LEP Language	Japanese:	77	0.17%	Japanese:	37	0.06%	Other Pacific Island languages:	171	0.06%
#10 LEP Language	Thai:	43	0.09%	Persian:	37	0.06%	Other Indic languages:	171	0.06%
Disability Type									
Hearing difficulty		1,059	2.22%		2,302	3.58%		6,809	2.19%
Vision difficulty		634	1.33%		752	1.17%		5,829	1.87%
Cognitive difficulty		1,522	3.19%		2,043	3.18%		11,316	3.63%
Ambulatory difficulty		1,519	3.18%		2,450	3.81%		13,423	4.31%
Self-care difficulty		926	1.94%		1,114	1.73%		7,204	2.31%
Independent living difficulty		1,393	2.92%		2,138	3.33%		10,456	3.36%
Sex									
Male		23,675	49.63%		32,907	51.23%		160,488	51.54%
Female		24,027	50.37%		31,325	48.77%		150,891	48.46%
Age									
Under 18		10,932	22.92%		14,013	21.82%		75,074	24.11%
18-64		31,793	66.65%		37,684	58.67%		203,263	65.28%
65+		4,977	10.43%		12,535	19.52%		33,042	10.61%
Family Type									
Families with children		5,919	46.09%		6,677	39.64%		8,812	45.61%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.

Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.

Note 3: Data Sources: LEP Language data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; All other data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 1 – Demographics (continued)

	Tustin, CA			Westminster, CA		
Race/Ethnicity		#	%		#	%
White, Non-Hispanic		22,538	28.34%		18,846	20.79%
Black, Non-Hispanic		1,649	2.07%		681	0.75%
Hispanic		32,131	40.41%		21,887	24.15%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic		20,208	25.41%		46,117	50.88%
Native American, Non-Hispanic		128	0.16%		114	0.13%
Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic		2,548	3.20%		2,682	2.96%
Other, Non-Hispanic		312	0.39%		311	0.34%
National Origin						
#1 country of origin	Mexico	9,208	11.58%	Vietnam	27,493	30.33%
#2 country of origin	India	2,126	2.67%	Mexico	6,287	6.94%
#3 country of origin	Korea	2,100	2.64%	Philippines	978	1.08%
#4 country of origin	Vietnam	1,786	2.25%	China, excl. Taiwan	586	0.65%
#5 country of origin	China, excl. Taiwan	1,738	2.19%	Egypt	424	0.47%
#6 country of origin	Philippines	1,565	1.97%	Korea	362	0.40%
#7 country of origin	Taiwan	675	0.85%	Peru	360	0.40%
#8 country of origin	Guatemala	563	0.71%	Cambodia	350	0.39%
#9 country of origin	Iran	424	0.53%	El Salvador	309	0.34%
#10 country of origin	Colombia	382	0.48%	Guatemala	293	0.32%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Language						
#1 LEP Language	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	9,311	12.79%	Vietnamese:	21,871	30.05%
#2 LEP Language	Vietnamese:	1,400	1.92%	Spanish or Spanish Creole:	6,404	8.80%
#3 LEP Language	Chinese:	1,146	1.57%	Chinese:	1,073	1.47%
#4 LEP Language	Korean:	1,090	1.50%	Arabic:	291	0.40%
#5 LEP Language	Tagalog:	378	0.52%	Tagalog:	230	0.32%
#6 LEP Language	Other Indic languages:	219	0.30%	Mon-Khmer, Cambodian:	227	0.31%
#7 LEP Language	Other Asian languages:	210	0.29%	Korean:	199	0.27%
#8 LEP Language	Persian:	194	0.27%	Japanese:	171	0.23%
#9 LEP Language	Other Pacific Island languag	150	0.21%	Other Pacific Island languages:	149	0.20%
#10 LEP Language	Arabic:	98	0.13%	Other Indic languages:	142	0.20%
Disability Type						
Hearing difficulty		1,192	1.50%		3,153	3.48%
Vision difficulty		1,050	1.32%		1,753	1.93%
Cognitive difficulty		2,527	3.18%		3,722	4.11%
Ambulatory difficulty		2,680	3.37%		5,618	6.20%
Self-care difficulty		1,393	1.75%		2,516	2.78%
Independent living difficulty		2,304	2.90%		4,313	4.76%
Sex						
Male		39,440	49.60%		45,034	49.69%
Female		40,074	50.40%		45,604	50.31%
Age						
Under 18		18,980	23.87%		19,219	21.20%
18-64		50,239	63.18%		55,722	61.48%
65+		10,295	12.95%		15,697	17.32%
Family Type						
Families with children		9,228	52.64%		7,877	36.92%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.
Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.
Note 3: Data Sources: LEP Language data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; All other data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 2 – Demographic Trends

Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA | Orange County, CA

| | Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA | | | | | | | | Orange County, CA | | | | | | | |
| | 1990 Trend | | 2000 Trend | | 2010 Trend | | 2022 | | 1990 Trend | | 2000 Trend | | 2010 Trend | | 2022 | |
Race/Ethnicity	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White, Non-Hispanic	5,166,768	45.86%	4,417,595	35.72%	4,056,820	31.62%	3,726,353	28.42%	1,535,945	64.37%	1,438,150	51.12%	1,307,843	43.96%	1,221,176	38.46%
Black, Non-Hispanic	971,105	8.62%	1,001,103	8.10%	932,431	7.27%	802,053	6.12%	38,784	1.63%	50,749	1.80%	55,619	1.87%	48,898	1.54%
Hispanic	3,914,001	34.74%	5,117,049	41.38%	5,700,862	44.44%	5,914,961	45.11%	559,267	23.44%	865,093	30.75%	1,000,427	33.63%	1,077,367	33.93%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,146,691	10.18%	1,651,006	13.35%	2,046,118	15.95%	2,164,634	16.51%	239,937	10.06%	422,352	15.01%	588,425	19.78%	691,391	21.77%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	36,210	0.32%	66,029	0.53%	54,362	0.42%	22,433	0.17%	8,199	0.34%	17,973	0.64%	15,187	0.51%	3,771	0.12%
National Origin																
Foreign-born	3,469,567	30.80%	4,299,323	34.77%	4,380,850	34.15%	4,249,090	32.41%	570,423	23.91%	842,151	29.93%	894,985	30.09%	937,254	29.52%
LEP																
Limited English Proficiency	2,430,630	21.57%	3,132,663	25.33%	3,053,077	23.80%	2,694,100	20.55%	382,261	16.02%	584,962	20.79%	594,061	19.97%	539,484	16.99%
Sex																
Male	5,626,077	49.94%	6,107,286	49.39%	6,328,433	49.33%	6,515,114	49.69%	1,201,026	50.33%	1,397,364	49.67%	1,471,211	49.46%	1,578,013	49.70%
Female	5,640,051	50.06%	6,258,058	50.61%	6,500,402	50.67%	6,596,803	50.31%	1,185,153	49.67%	1,416,071	50.33%	1,503,527	50.54%	1,597,214	50.30%
Age																
Under 18	2,911,031	25.84%	3,518,245	28.45%	3,138,866	24.47%	2,773,113	21.15%	581,593	24.37%	778,246	27.66%	727,819	24.47%	680,041	21.42%
18-64	7,280,517	64.62%	7,641,369	61.80%	8,274,592	64.50%	8,434,589	64.33%	1,588,417	66.57%	1,760,632	62.58%	1,902,669	63.96%	2,006,827	63.20%
65+	1,074,580	9.54%	1,205,730	9.75%	1,415,376	11.03%	1,904,215	14.52%	216,169	9.06%	274,558	9.76%	344,245	11.57%	488,359	15.38%
Family Type																
Families with children	1,318,473	50.20%	1,143,222	53.64%	1,388,564	47.84%	1,210,891	40.73%	280,598	48.04%	300,987	52.05%	331,767	47.40%	313,429	41.56%

Orange County Urban County | Aliso Viejo, CA

| | Orange County Urban County | | | | | | | | Aliso Viejo, CA | | | | | | | |
| | 1990 Trend | | 2000 Trend | | 2010 Trend | | 2022 | | 1990 Trend | | 2000 Trend | | 2010 Trend | | 2022 | |
Race/Ethnicity	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White, Non-Hispanic	326,981	75.98%	315,458	65.51%	298,754	57.34%	293,264	50.12%	6,879	84.84%	27,678	70.57%	28,600	62.53%	28,827	55.55%
Black, Non-Hispanic	5,662	1.32%	8,495	1.76%	10,083	1.94%	9,107	1.56%	89	1.10%	957	2.44%	1,142	2.50%	1,344	2.59%
Hispanic	58,438	13.58%	88,070	18.29%	112,468	21.58%	142,980	24.43%	612	7.55%	4,891	12.47%	7,451	16.29%	10,392	20.02%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	37,112	8.62%	63,114	13.11%	95,452	18.32%	111,761	19.10%	465	5.74%	5,066	12.92%	8,144	17.81%	8,287	15.97%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	1,416	0.33%	3,240	0.67%	2,913	0.56%	804	0.14%	29	0.36%	222	0.57%	223	0.49%	0	0.00%
National Origin																
Foreign-born	67,976	15.79%	99,148	20.60%	116,970	22.45%	107,354	18.35%	1,225	14.94%	7,817	19.95%	10,876	23.78%	12,488	24.06%
LEP																
Limited English Proficiency	36,389	8.45%	57,012	11.84%	64,603	12.40%	69,409	11.86%	399	4.87%	2,760	7.04%	3,841	8.40%	4,325	8.33%
Sex																
Male	209,940	48.76%	232,553	48.31%	252,314	48.42%	283,470	48.44%	3,949	48.18%	18,712	47.75%	21,878	47.84%	25,069	48.31%
Female	220,643	51.24%	248,796	51.69%	268,744	51.58%	301,708	51.56%	4,247	51.82%	20,472	52.25%	23,858	52.16%	26,827	51.69%
Age																
Under 18	97,587	22.66%	122,617	25.47%	120,982	23.22%	125,846	21.51%	1,244	15.18%	10,068	25.69%	11,444	25.02%	12,826	24.71%
18-64	275,822	64.06%	289,632	60.17%	317,776	60.99%	339,409	58.00%	6,001	73.22%	27,494	70.17%	31,274	68.38%	34,016	65.55%
65+	57,174	13.28%	69,101	14.36%	82,300	15.79%	119,923	20.49%	951	11.60%	1,622	4.14%	3,018	6.60%	5,054	9.74%
Family Type																
Families with children	50,340	44.34%	47,227	48.00%	58,769	44.09%	73,360	37.58%	761	35.56%	4,378	55.47%	6,393	55.21%	6,880	52.06%

Anaheim, CA | Buena Park, CA

| | Anaheim, CA | | | | | | | | Buena Park, CA | | | | | | | |
| | 1990 Trend | | 2000 Trend | | 2010 Trend | | 2022 | | 1990 Trend | | 2000 Trend | | 2010 Trend | | 2022 | |
Race/Ethnicity	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White, Non-Hispanic	150,775	56.01%	117,083	35.77%	92,711	27.53%	81,889	23.59%	39,286	58.15%	29,077	37.27%	21,298	26.61%	18,558	22.21%
Black, Non-Hispanic	6,095	2.26%	8,787	2.68%	9,214	2.74%	8,241	2.37%	1,774	2.63%	3,290	4.22%	3,272	4.09%	1,795	2.15%
Hispanic	86,323	32.07%	153,366	46.85%	177,414	52.68%	185,162	53.34%	16,909	25.03%	26,955	34.55%	32,288	40.34%	33,448	40.04%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	24,423	9.07%	43,565	13.31%	55,133	16.37%	61,721	17.78%	9,116	13.49%	17,392	22.29%	22,574	28.20%	27,327	32.71%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	975	0.36%	2,003	0.61%	1,528	0.45%	383	0.11%	327	0.48%	642	0.82%	431	0.54%	27	0.03%
National Origin																
Foreign-born	76,749	28.52%	123,280	37.67%	127,374	37.82%	120,206	34.63%	15,358	22.79%	26,072	33.42%	29,903	37.36%	29,914	35.81%
LEP																
Limited English Proficiency	56,097	20.85%	93,227	28.49%	92,608	27.50%	78,835	22.71%	9,978	14.80%	17,635	22.61%	20,822	26.01%	16,557	19.82%
Sex																
Male	136,577	50.75%	163,753	50.04%	167,864	49.84%	169,425	48.81%	33,549	49.78%	38,549	49.42%	39,425	49.25%	41,846	50.09%
Female	132,533	49.25%	163,517	49.96%	168,910	50.16%	177,686	51.19%	33,852	50.22%	39,460	50.58%	40,622	50.75%	41,696	49.91%
Age																
Under 18	70,562	26.22%	101,398	30.98%	92,249	27.39%	79,516	22.91%	17,690	26.25%	23,458	30.07%	20,320	25.39%	18,424	22.05%
18-64	176,654	65.64%	199,264	60.89%	213,036	63.26%	225,077	64.84%	44,385	65.85%	47,533	60.93%	51,322	64.11%	53,652	64.22%
65+	21,895	8.14%	26,608	8.13%	31,488	9.35%	42,518	12.25%	5,325	7.90%	7,018	9.00%	8,404	10.50%	11,466	13.72%
Family Type																
Families with children	32,255	50.08%	37,325	57.02%	38,170	51.44%	32,802	43.23%	8,496	49.42%	8,540	53.86%	8,916	46.83%	7,636	38.40%

Costa Mesa, CA | Fountain Valley, CA

| | Costa Mesa, CA | | | | | | | | Fountain Valley, CA | | | | | | | |
| | 1990 Trend | | 2000 Trend | | 2010 Trend | | 2022 | | 1990 Trend | | 2000 Trend | | 2010 Trend | | 2022 | |
Race/Ethnicity	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White, Non-Hispanic	70,096	72.30%	62,305	57.04%	56,961	51.92%	54,367	48.76%	38,801	71.93%	31,386	57.39%	26,642	47.98%	21,830	38.46%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,132	1.17%	1,645	1.51%	1,874	1.71%	1,425	1.28%	508	0.94%	731	1.34%	692	1.25%	406	0.72%
Hispanic	19,268	19.87%	34,462	31.55%	39,230	35.76%	40,388	36.23%	4,884	9.05%	6,490	11.87%	8,071	14.54%	9,692	17.08%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	6,004	6.19%	9,170	8.40%	10,647	9.71%	10,136	9.09%	9,405	17.43%	15,167	27.73%	19,632	35.36%	21,711	38.25%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	331	0.34%	771	0.71%	673	0.61%	74	0.07%	257	0.48%	434	0.79%	350	0.63%	82	0.14%
National Origin																
Foreign-born	20,791	21.46%	31,634	28.96%	29,511	26.90%	25,863	23.20%	10,915	20.20%	15,516	28.37%	16,514	29.74%	18,055	31.81%
LEP																
Limited English Proficiency	12,625	13.03%	21,770	19.93%	17,444	15.90%	13,672	12.26%	5,757	10.65%	9,813	17.94%	9,881	17.80%	10,091	17.78%
Sex																
Male	49,381	50.97%	55,803	51.08%	55,812	50.88%	57,488	51.56%	26,814	49.63%	26,709	48.84%	27,076	48.76%	28,478	50.18%
Female	47,493	49.03%	53,447	48.92%	53,891	49.12%	54,002	48.44%	27,215	50.37%	27,980	51.16%	28,451	51.24%	28,276	49.82%
Age																
Under 18	18,808	19.41%	25,890	23.70%	23,674	21.58%	21,103	18.93%	12,767	23.63%	13,344	24.40%	11,794	21.24%	10,939	19.27%
18-64	70,162	72.43%	74,095	67.82%	75,887	69.17%	75,939	68.11%	37,304	69.04%	34,958	63.92%	34,068	61.35%	34,526	60.83%
65+	7,905	8.16%	9,265	8.48%	10,142	9.24%	14,448	12.96%	3,958	7.33%	6,387	11.68%	9,664	17.40%	11,289	19.89%
Family Type																
Families with children	9,614	43.59%	10,789	50.57%	11,130	47.99%	10,010	41.15%	6,674	47.04%	6,185	43.95%	5,656	39.90%	5,138	37.40%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.
Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.
Note 3: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; HUD AFFH Tool, Table 2, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 4: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 2 – Demographic Trends (continued)

Fullerton, CA

	1990 Trend #	1990 Trend %	2000 Trend #	2000 Trend %	2010 Trend #	2010 Trend %	2022 #	2022 %
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	73,639	65.17%	62,015	49.24%	52,351	38.57%	44,905	31.56%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,273	2.01%	3,059	2.43%	3,330	2.45%	2,763	1.94%
Hispanic	23,892	21.14%	38,320	30.43%	47,232	34.80%	54,090	38.02%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	12,607	11.16%	20,688	16.43%	31,808	23.43%	35,662	25.06%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	364	0.32%	927	0.74%	707	0.52%	209	0.15%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	25,946	22.98%	35,892	28.49%	39,904	29.40%	41,122	28.90%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	16,187	14.34%	24,574	19.51%	25,535	18.81%	24,436	17.17%
Sex								
Male	56,372	49.92%	62,447	49.57%	66,647	49.10%	70,148	49.30%
Female	56,549	50.08%	63,537	50.43%	69,090	50.90%	72,132	50.70%
Age								
Under 18	25,568	22.64%	32,953	26.16%	31,951	23.54%	31,836	22.38%
18-64	75,650	66.99%	78,807	62.55%	87,893	64.75%	90,840	63.85%
65+	11,703	10.36%	14,224	11.29%	15,893	11.71%	19,604	13.78%
Family Type								
Families with children	12,503	44.91%	11,096	48.22%	14,582	46.38%	13,780	41.67%

Garden Grove, CA

	1990 Trend #	1990 Trend %	2000 Trend #	2000 Trend %	2010 Trend #	2010 Trend %	2022 #	2022 %
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	79,762	54.42%	54,147	32.25%	38,904	22.45%	29,648	17.27%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,146	1.46%	2,474	1.47%	2,376	1.37%	1,724	1.00%
Hispanic	34,498	23.54%	55,501	33.06%	64,712	37.34%	64,048	37.32%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	29,213	19.93%	53,800	32.05%	66,279	38.25%	72,135	42.03%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	631	0.43%	1,107	0.66%	725	0.42%	227	0.13%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	44,676	30.48%	72,353	43.10%	74,763	43.14%	75,419	43.94%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	32,720	22.32%	57,745	34.40%	56,670	32.70%	57,215	33.33%
Sex								
Male	74,276	50.67%	84,048	50.06%	86,387	49.85%	86,329	50.30%
Female	72,312	49.33%	83,832	49.94%	86,903	50.15%	85,308	49.70%
Age								
Under 18	38,176	26.04%	48,574	28.93%	44,241	25.53%	36,449	21.24%
18-64	95,398	65.08%	103,266	61.51%	110,119	63.55%	110,715	64.51%
65+	13,014	8.88%	16,039	9.55%	18,930	10.92%	24,473	14.26%
Family Type								
Families with children	17,180	48.90%	19,505	53.21%	18,050	47.97%	18,050	47.97%

Huntington Beach, CA

	1990 Trend #	1990 Trend %	2000 Trend #	2000 Trend %	2010 Trend #	2010 Trend %	2022 #	2022 %
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	144,452	79.16%	137,053	71.79%	127,955	67.00%	118,080	59.79%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,602	0.88%	1,904	1.00%	2,377	1.24%	2,246	1.14%
Hispanic	20,522	11.25%	27,944	14.64%	32,552	17.05%	38,959	19.73%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	14,731	8.07%	20,786	10.89%	25,886	13.55%	25,116	12.72%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	898	0.49%	1,925	1.01%	1,669	0.87%	435	0.22%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	27,066	14.84%	32,413	16.99%	30,902	16.18%	32,142	16.28%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	13,562	7.43%	18,167	9.52%	15,869	8.31%	13,674	6.92%
Sex								
Male	91,951	50.40%	95,766	50.18%	94,732	49.60%	99,061	50.16%
Female	90,485	49.60%	95,062	49.82%	96,243	50.40%	98,420	49.84%
Age								
Under 18	37,779	20.71%	43,524	22.81%	39,352	20.61%	35,292	17.87%
18-64	129,498	70.98%	127,287	66.70%	124,399	65.14%	125,355	63.48%
65+	15,159	8.31%	20,017	10.49%	27,224	14.26%	36,834	18.65%
Family Type								
Families with children	20,283	43.80%	19,930	44.46%	20,083	41.45%	17,895	36.25%

Irvine, CA

	1990 Trend #	1990 Trend %	2000 Trend #	2000 Trend %	2010 Trend #	2010 Trend %	2022 #	2022 %
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	92,174	73.19%	85,970	57.41%	96,463	45.61%	108,636	35.67%
Black, Non-Hispanic	3,261	2.59%	2,572	1.72%	4,513	2.13%	5,275	1.73%
Hispanic	9,681	7.69%	13,065	8.73%	20,394	9.64%	34,237	11.24%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	20,255	16.08%	46,267	30.90%	88,668	41.92%	135,560	44.51%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	316	0.25%	618	0.41%	755	0.36%	364	0.12%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	26,298	20.88%	47,109	31.46%	67,880	32.09%	120,511	39.57%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	11,045	8.77%	21,331	14.25%	28,607	13.52%	45,787	15.04%
Sex								
Male	62,967	50.00%	73,015	48.77%	103,025	48.71%	150,761	49.51%
Female	62,970	50.00%	76,711	51.23%	108,489	51.29%	153,766	50.49%
Age								
Under 18	30,331	24.08%	36,549	24.41%	45,852	21.68%	66,314	21.78%
18-64	88,654	70.40%	102,347	68.36%	146,741	69.38%	206,414	67.78%
65+	6,952	5.52%	10,830	7.23%	18,921	8.95%	31,799	10.44%
Family Type								
Families with children	17,135	55.14%	16,167	52.72%	25,571	49.80%	35,829	50.45%

La Habra, CA

	1990 Trend #	1990 Trend %	2000 Trend #	2000 Trend %	2010 Trend #	2010 Trend %	2022 #	2022 %
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	31,642	60.03%	24,473	41.16%	18,304	30.41%	15,549	24.72%
Black, Non-Hispanic	421	0.80%	939	1.58%	994	1.65%	1,091	1.73%
Hispanic	17,389	32.99%	28,484	47.91%	33,484	55.62%	37,583	59.75%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2,958	5.61%	4,779	8.04%	6,939	11.53%	7,379	11.73%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	201	0.38%	374	0.63%	325	0.54%	36	0.06%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	10,842	20.56%	16,361	27.54%	17,218	28.60%	15,502	24.64%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	7,686	14.57%	12,513	21.06%	13,156	21.86%	10,777	17.13%
Sex								
Male	26,238	49.75%	29,107	48.99%	29,642	49.24%	31,681	50.36%
Female	26,502	50.25%	30,305	51.01%	30,556	50.76%	31,223	49.64%
Age								
Under 18	13,347	25.31%	17,638	29.69%	16,001	26.58%	13,799	21.94%
18-64	33,842	64.17%	35,318	59.45%	37,507	62.31%	40,264	64.01%
65+	5,550	10.52%	6,456	10.87%	6,690	11.11%	8,841	14.05%
Family Type								
Families with children	6,416	47.33%	6,343	54.74%	6,876	47.85%	6,074	40.01%

Laguna Niguel, CA

	1990 Trend #	1990 Trend %	2000 Trend #	2000 Trend %	2010 Trend #	2010 Trend %	2022 #	2022 %
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	37,998	83.58%	49,243	77.33%	46,192	72.52%	41,226	64.16%
Black, Non-Hispanic	517	1.14%	936	1.47%	966	1.52%	1,134	1.76%
Hispanic	3,422	7.53%	6,591	10.35%	8,842	13.88%	10,346	16.10%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	3,364	7.40%	5,875	9.23%	7,203	11.31%	7,218	11.23%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	93	0.20%	310	0.49%	331	0.52%	8	0.01%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	6,198	13.60%	11,286	17.67%	13,355	20.97%	14,984	23.32%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	2,169	4.76%	4,238	6.64%	4,317	6.78%	5,298	8.24%
Sex								
Male	22,303	48.94%	31,200	48.85%	30,893	48.50%	31,080	48.37%
Female	23,269	51.06%	32,665	51.15%	32,803	51.50%	33,179	51.63%
Age								
Under 18	10,922	23.97%	17,408	27.26%	14,428	22.65%	10,919	16.99%
18-64	31,371	68.84%	41,029	64.24%	41,100	64.53%	40,277	62.68%
65+	3,280	7.20%	5,429	8.50%	8,168	12.82%	13,063	20.33%
Family Type								
Families with children	6,218	48.60%	7,957	53.94%	7,796	44.73%	6,011	33.79%

Lake Forest, CA

	1990 Trend #	1990 Trend %	2000 Trend #	2000 Trend %	2010 Trend #	2010 Trend %	2022 #	2022 %
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	42,174	78.97%	50,433	67.52%	43,702	56.48%	41,811	48.85%
Black, Non-Hispanic	908	1.70%	1,596	2.14%	1,566	2.02%	1,818	2.12%
Hispanic	5,491	10.28%	12,968	17.36%	19,165	24.77%	20,073	23.45%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	4,560	8.54%	8,665	11.60%	12,232	15.81%	16,885	19.73%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	178	0.33%	451	0.60%	481	0.62%	116	0.14%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	7,305	13.69%	14,986	20.06%	17,450	22.55%	22,975	26.85%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	3,511	6.58%	7,915	10.59%	8,219	10.62%	9,762	11.41%
Sex								
Male	26,304	49.29%	36,511	48.87%	38,359	49.58%	42,347	49.48%
Female	27,061	50.71%	38,202	51.13%	39,011	50.42%	43,236	50.52%
Age								
Under 18	13,865	25.98%	21,344	28.57%	19,017	24.58%	17,484	20.43%
18-64	35,856	67.19%	47,998	64.24%	51,306	66.31%	56,050	65.49%
65+	3,643	6.83%	5,372	7.19%	7,047	9.11%	12,049	14.08%
Family Type								
Families with children	7,705	53.68%	10,230	56.68%	9,581	48.85%	9,452	43.00%

Mission Viejo, CA

	1990 Trend #	1990 Trend %	2000 Trend #	2000 Trend %	2010 Trend #	2010 Trend %	2022 #	2022 %
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	67,498	83.86%	69,953	75.84%	63,306	68.39%	56,825	60.95%
Black, Non-Hispanic	759	0.94%	1,331	1.44%	1,638	1.77%	1,072	1.15%
Hispanic	6,584	8.18%	11,246	12.19%	16,288	17.59%	18,341	19.67%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	5,328	6.62%	8,514	9.23%	10,599	11.45%	12,749	13.67%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	198	0.25%	507	0.55%	475	0.51%	17	0.02%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	10,817	13.44%	15,122	16.39%	16,428	17.75%	20,663	22.16%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	4,189	5.21%	6,072	6.58%	6,251	6.75%	8,888	9.53%
Sex								
Male	39,992	49.69%	44,957	48.73%	45,374	49.01%	46,397	49.76%
Female	40,485	50.31%	47,299	51.27%	47,198	50.99%	46,836	50.24%
Age								
Under 18	22,605	28.09%	26,102	28.29%	21,379	23.09%	18,379	19.71%
18-64	51,807	64.37%	56,707	61.47%	58,364	63.05%	54,279	58.22%
65+	6,065	7.54%	9,446	10.24%	12,828	13.86%	20,575	22.07%
Family Type								
Families with children	11,973	53.71%	11,489	51.78%	10,886	44.01%	10,886	44.01%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.
Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.
Note 3: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; HUD AFFH Tool, Table 2, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 4: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 2 – Demographic Trends (continued)

Newport Beach, CA

Race/Ethnicity	1990 Trend #	%	2000 Trend #	%	2010 Trend #	%	2022 #	%
White, Non-Hispanic	64,239	92.10%	69,097	87.72%	69,999	82.15%	64,785	76.08%
Black, Non-Hispanic	221	0.32%	502	0.64%	811	0.95%	553	0.65%
Hispanic	3,055	4.38%	4,032	5.12%	6,306	7.40%	8,912	10.47%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2,003	2.87%	4,373	5.55%	7,492	8.79%	6,902	8.10%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	155	0.22%	362	0.46%	386	0.45%	42	0.05%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	6,475	9.28%	9,306	11.81%	11,250	13.20%	12,725	14.94%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	2,051	2.94%	2,868	3.64%	2,840	3.33%	3,271	3.84%
Sex								
Male	34,616	49.59%	38,824	49.29%	41,985	49.27%	41,980	49.30%
Female	35,186	50.41%	39,943	50.71%	43,221	50.73%	43,179	50.70%
Age								
Under 18	9,401	13.47%	13,226	16.79%	14,721	17.28%	14,297	16.79%
18-64	49,703	71.21%	52,551	66.72%	54,357	63.79%	51,037	59.93%
65+	10,698	15.33%	12,990	16.49%	16,128	18.93%	19,825	23.28%
Family Type								
Families with children	5,493	31.63%	6,037	36.00%	7,828	37.15%	7,992	36.53%

Orange, CA

Race/Ethnicity	1990 Trend #	%	2000 Trend #	%	2010 Trend #	%	2022 #	%
White, Non-Hispanic	76,645	68.05%	71,441	54.70%	64,165	46.97%	56,896	41.01%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,401	1.24%	2,246	1.72%	2,476	1.81%	1,801	1.30%
Hispanic	25,804	22.91%	42,182	32.30%	52,210	38.22%	54,176	39.05%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	8,203	7.28%	13,123	10.05%	16,630	12.17%	18,712	13.49%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	420	0.37%	840	0.64%	794	0.58%	301	0.22%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	22,587	20.06%	33,024	25.29%	35,218	25.78%	29,936	21.58%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	15,484	13.75%	22,708	17.39%	24,853	18.19%	17,388	12.53%
Sex								
Male	56,459	50.15%	64,984	49.77%	68,722	50.31%	70,909	51.11%
Female	56,127	49.85%	65,579	50.23%	67,888	49.69%	67,819	48.89%
Age								
Under 18	27,171	24.13%	35,689	27.33%	31,811	23.29%	28,400	20.47%
18-64	75,359	66.94%	81,857	62.70%	89,868	65.78%	90,276	65.07%
65+	10,055	8.93%	13,017	9.97%	14,931	10.93%	20,052	14.45%
Family Type								
Families with children	12,853	46.10%	12,238	49.01%	14,299	45.65%	13,121	41.80%

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA

Race/Ethnicity	1990 Trend #	%	2000 Trend #	%	2010 Trend #	%	2022 #	%
White, Non-Hispanic	9,721	80.59%	35,728	74.82%	32,644	67.28%	28,334	59.40%
Black, Non-Hispanic	147	1.22%	1,014	2.12%	1,111	2.29%	819	1.72%
Hispanic	1,183	9.81%	6,019	12.60%	8,850	18.24%	9,734	20.41%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	932	7.73%	4,350	9.11%	5,521	11.38%	5,801	12.16%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	43	0.36%	325	0.68%	270	0.56%	75	0.16%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	1,753	14.49%	6,404	13.40%	7,746	15.97%	9,905	20.76%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	653	5.40%	2,595	5.43%	2,723	5.61%	3,213	6.74%
Sex								
Male	6,055	50.06%	23,527	49.21%	23,681	48.81%	23,675	49.63%
Female	6,041	49.94%	24,281	50.79%	24,839	51.19%	24,027	50.37%
Age								
Under 18	3,118	25.78%	15,827	33.10%	13,719	28.27%	10,932	22.92%
18-64	8,519	70.43%	29,814	62.36%	31,402	64.72%	31,793	66.65%
65+	459	3.79%	2,168	4.53%	3,399	7.01%	4,977	10.43%
Family Type								
Families with children	1,819	54.54%	7,149	64.49%	7,256	56.76%	5,919	46.09%

San Clemente, CA

Race/Ethnicity	1990 Trend #	%	2000 Trend #	%	2010 Trend #	%	2022 #	%
White, Non-Hispanic	35,093	83.45%	40,022	78.55%	47,349	76.01%	46,139	71.83%
Black, Non-Hispanic	250	0.59%	442	0.87%	577	0.93%	1057	1.65%
Hispanic	5,435	12.92%	8,028	15.76%	10,518	16.88%	10,964	17.07%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,074	2.55%	1,802	3.54%	3,236	5.19%	3,098	4.82%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	140	0.33%	419	0.82%	488	0.78%	34	0.05%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	5,069	12.11%	6,797	13.34%	7,605	12.21%	7,241	11.27%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	2,552	6.09%	3,666	7.20%	2,694	4.32%	2,753	4.29%
Sex								
Male	21,017	50.19%	26,076	51.18%	31,315	50.27%	32,907	51.23%
Female	20,856	49.81%	24,871	48.82%	30,980	49.73%	31,325	48.77%
Age								
Under 18	9,037	21.58%	12,640	24.81%	14,972	24.03%	14,013	21.82%
18-64	27,570	65.84%	31,879	62.57%	39,094	62.76%	37,684	58.67%
65+	5,267	12.58%	6,428	12.62%	8,228	13.21%	12,535	19.52%
Family Type								
Families with children	4,973	43.73%	4,960	45.52%	7,482	45.56%	6,677	39.64%

Santa Ana, CA

Race/Ethnicity	1990 Trend #	%	2000 Trend #	%	2010 Trend #	%	2022 #	%
White, Non-Hispanic	69,328	23.66%	43,100	12.78%	31,171	9.63%	28,223	9.06%
Black, Non-Hispanic	6,295	2.15%	4,842	1.44%	3,680	1.14%	2,897	0.93%
Hispanic	190,056	64.85%	255,418	75.76%	252,363	77.93%	239,824	77.02%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	26,160	8.93%	31,594	9.37%	35,275	10.89%	36,906	11.85%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	673	0.23%	1,338	0.40%	895	0.28%	295	0.09%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	148,406	50.66%	178,953	53.08%	159,834	49.36%	154,148	49.50%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	125,797	42.94%	155,953	46.26%	147,740	45.62%	98,416	31.61%
Sex								
Male	155,693	53.14%	174,439	51.74%	165,285	51.04%	160,488	51.54%
Female	137,273	46.86%	162,703	48.26%	158,530	48.96%	150,891	48.46%
Age								
Under 18	89,262	30.47%	118,288	35.09%	99,552	30.74%	75,074	24.11%
18-64	187,472	63.99%	200,822	59.57%	202,204	62.44%	203,263	65.28%
65+	16,231	5.54%	18,032	5.35%	22,060	6.81%	33,042	10.61%
Family Type								
Families with children	32,222	58.39%	35,644	64.61%	34,136	57.03%	8,812	45.61%

Tustin, CA

Race/Ethnicity	1990 Trend #	%	2000 Trend #	%	2010 Trend #	%	2022 #	%
White, Non-Hispanic	33,210	64.04%	29,938	45.69%	26,745	36.01%	22,538	28.34%
Black, Non-Hispanic	2,548	4.91%	2,002	3.06%	1,880	2.53%	1,649	2.07%
Hispanic	10,690	20.61%	22,182	33.85%	28,880	38.88%	32,131	40.41%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	5,106	9.85%	10,453	15.95%	16,246	21.87%	20,208	25.41%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	197	0.38%	402	0.61%	314	0.42%	128	0.16%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	11,253	21.67%	21,584	32.92%	24,476	32.95%	25,025	31.47%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	6,816	13.13%	13,973	21.31%	14,941	20.12%	13,989	17.59%
Sex								
Male	26,411	50.87%	32,168	49.07%	36,272	48.83%	39,440	49.60%
Female	25,508	49.13%	33,390	50.93%	38,005	51.17%	40,074	50.40%
Age								
Under 18	12,608	24.28%	17,888	27.29%	19,346	26.05%	18,980	23.87%
18-64	35,519	68.41%	43,004	65.60%	48,716	65.59%	50,239	63.18%
65+	3,792	7.30%	4,666	7.12%	6,214	8.37%	10,295	12.95%
Family Type								
Families with children	6,636	51.65%	8,045	54.00%	9,228	52.64%	9,228	52.64%

Westminster, CA

Race/Ethnicity	1990 Trend #	%	2000 Trend #	%	2010 Trend #	%	2022 #	%
White, Non-Hispanic	45,552	57.77%	32,550	36.89%	23,627	26.31%	18,846	20.79%
Black, Non-Hispanic	775	0.98%	985	1.12%	1,047	1.17%	681	0.75%
Hispanic	15,131	19.19%	19,678	22.30%	21,709	24.17%	21,887	24.15%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	16,918	21.45%	33,809	38.32%	42,829	47.68%	46,117	50.88%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	357	0.45%	756	0.86%	454	0.51%	114	0.13%
National Origin								
Foreign-born	22,718	28.86%	37,094	42.04%	39,808	44.32%	41,076	45.32%
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	16,594	21.08%	28,427	32.22%	30,447	33.90%	31,728	35.01%
Sex								
Male	40,162	51.03%	44,216	50.11%	44,523	49.57%	45,034	49.69%
Female	38,546	48.97%	44,019	49.89%	45,295	50.43%	45,604	50.31%
Age								
Under 18	19,745	25.09%	23,821	27.00%	21,014	23.40%	19,219	21.20%
18-64	51,871	65.90%	54,970	62.30%	56,236	62.61%	55,722	61.48%
65+	7,093	9.01%	9,443	10.70%	12,568	13.99%	15,697	17.32%
Family Type								
Families with children	9,049	46.90%	9,753	49.37%	9,079	44.54%	7,877	36.92%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region, except family type, which is out of total families.
Note 2: 10 most populous places of birth and languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as the 10 most populous at the Region level, and are thus labeled separately.
Note 3: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates; HUD AFFH Tool, Table 2, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 4: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

The following paragraphs describe housing patterns, including tenure, cost burden, and the location of renters and owners.

Tenure

Table 3 - Housing Tenure, shows data on housing tenure for the region, Orange County, the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, and each HUD Entitlement City. These data are from the 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. This table indicates the following:

In Orange County overall, the homeownership rate is 56.5%. This is higher than the homeownership for the region, which is 48.7%. Among the jurisdictions,

- The following have a comparable homeownership rate (within five percentage points of the County's rate)
    - Aliso Viejo
    - Buena Park
    - Fullerton
    - Garden Grove
    - Huntington Beach
    - La Habra
    - Newport Beach
    - Orange
    - Westminster
- The following jurisdictions have a homeownership rate that is **lower** than the homeownership rate for the County overall by at least five percentage points, indicating a higher percentage of households are renters:
    - Anaheim
    - Costa Mesa
    - Irvine
    - Santa Ana
    - Tustin
- The following jurisdictions have a homeownership rate that is **higher** than the County overall by at least five percentage points:
    - The Urban County jurisdictions
    - Fountain Valley
    - Laguna Niguel
    - Lake Forest
    - Mission Viejo
    - Rancho Santa Margarita
    - San Clemente

Table 3 – Housing Tenure

Tenure	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA #	%	Orange County, CA #	%	Urban County Jurisdictions #	%	Aliso Viejo, CA #	%
All Occupied Units	4,429,379		1,066,286		210,864		19,300	
Owner-Occupied	2,155,123	48.7%	602,959	56.5%	147,382	69.9%	10,851	56.2%
Renter-Occupied	2,274,256	51.3%	463,327	43.5%	63,482	30.1%	8,449	43.8%

Tenure	Anaheim, CA #	%	Buena Park, CA #	%	Costa Mesa, CA #	%	Fountain Valley, CA #	%
All Occupied Units	104,671		24,283		41,407		18,906	
Owner-Occupied	48,806	46.6%	13,721	56.5%	16,427	39.7%	12,455	65.9%
Renter-Occupied	55,865	53.4%	10,562	43.5%	24,980	60.3%	6,451	34.1%

Tenure	Fullerton, CA #	%	Garden Grove, CA #	%	Huntington Beach, CA #	%	Irvine, CA #	%
All Occupied Units	47,014		48,183		77,641		110,465	
Owner-Occupied	24,259	51.6%	26,039	54.0%	43,236	55.7%	48,451	43.9%
Renter-Occupied	22,755	48.4%	22,144	46.0%	34,405	44.3%	62,014	56.1%

Tenure	Laguna Niguel, CA #	%	La Habra, CA #	%	Lake Forest, CA #	%	Mission Viejo, CA #	%
All Occupied Units	25,239		20,188		30,298		32,650	
Owner-Occupied	16,669	66.0%	11,500	57.0%	21,300	70.3%	25,312	77.5%
Renter-Occupied	8,570	34.0%	8,688	43.0%	8,998	29.7%	7,338	22.5%

Tenure	Newport Beach, CA #	%	Orange, CA #	%	Rancho Santa Margarita, CA #	%	San Clemente, CA #	%
All Occupied Units	38,636		44,336		16,798		23,646	
Owner-Occupied	20,277	52.5%	26,103	58.9%	12,240	72.9%	15,338	64.9%
Renter-Occupied	18,359	47.5%	18,233	41.1%	4,558	27.1%	8,308	35.1%

Tenure	Santa Ana, CA #	%	Tustin, CA #	%	Westminster, CA #	%
All Occupied Units	77,553		26,508		27,700	
Owner-Occupied	34,749	44.8%	13,318	50.2%	14,526	52.4%
Renter-Occupied	42,804	55.2%	13,190	49.8%	13,174	47.6%

Note 1: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Cost Burden

Table 4 – Cost Burden shows data on housing cost burden for the region, Orange County, the Orange County Urban County, and each HUD Entitlement City. These data are from the 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Cost burden is defined as spending more than 30% of monthly gross income on housing-related costs. This table presents the following:

In Orange County overall, over half (53.2%) of all renters are cost burdened. The rate is significantly lower for homeowners (30.3%). These rates are comparable to the experience of owners and renters across the region. Among the jurisdictions,

- The following have a comparable rate of cost burdened renters (within five percentage points of the County's rate)
  - The Urban County jurisdictions
  - Aliso Viejo
  - Buena Park
  - Costa Mesa
  - Fullerton
  - Garden Grove
  - Huntington Beach
  - Irvine
  - Laguna Niguel
  - La Habra
  - Mission Viejo
  - Orange
  - Rancho Santa Margarita
  - Santa Ana
  - Westminster
- The following jurisdictions have a renter cost-burden rate that is **lower** than the rate for the County overall by at least five percentage points:
  - Newport Beach
  - San Clemente
- The following jurisdictions have a renter cost-burden rate that is **higher** than the rate for the County overall, by at least five percentage points, meaning a higher percentage of renters in these jurisdictions are cost burdened compared to the County overall:
  - Anaheim
  - Fountain Valley
  - Lake Forest
  - Tustin

Table 4 – Cost Burden

	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA		Orange County, CA		Urban County Jurisdictions		Aliso Viejo, CA	
Cost Burden	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Units	1,954,525	44.1%	429,231	40.3%	79,513	37.7%	7,740	40.1%
Owner-Occupied	722,015	33.5%	182,888	30.3%	45,935	31.2%	3,049	28.1%
Renter-Occupied	1,232,510	54.2%	246,343	53.2%	33,578	52.9%	4,691	55.5%

	Anaheim, CA		Buena Park, CA		Costa Mesa, CA		Fountain Valley, CA	
Cost Burden	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Units	47,204	45.1%	9,383	38.6%	17,292	41.8%	7,432	39.3%
Owner-Occupied	14,566	29.8%	3,703	27.0%	4,942	30.1%	3,369	27.0%
Renter-Occupied	32,638	58.4%	5,680	53.8%	12,350	49.4%	4,063	63.0%

	Fullerton, CA		Garden Grove, CA		Huntington Beach, CA		Irvine, CA	
Cost Burden	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Units	19,977	42.5%	20,778	43.1%	29,166	37.6%	45,440	41.1%
Owner-Occupied	7,025	29.0%	8,395	32.2%	12,458	28.8%	14,595	30.1%
Renter-Occupied	12,952	56.9%	12,383	55.9%	16,708	48.6%	30,845	49.7%

	Laguna Niguel, CA		La Habra, CA		Lake Forest, CA		Mission Viejo, CA	
Cost Burden	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Units	9,729	38.5%	8,359	41.4%	11,618	38.3%	11,096	34.0%
Owner-Occupied	5,086	30.5%	4,164	36.2%	6,204	29.1%	7,156	28.3%
Renter-Occupied	4,643	54.2%	4,195	48.3%	5,414	60.2%	3,940	53.7%

	Newport Beach, CA		Orange, CA		Rancho Santa Margarita, CA		San Clemente, CA	
Cost Burden	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Units	15,470	40.0%	17,207	38.8%	5,495	32.7%	9,096	38.5%
Owner-Occupied	6,780	33.4%	8,134	31.2%	3,106	25.4%	5,134	33.5%
Renter-Occupied	8,690	47.3%	9,073	49.8%	2,389	52.4%	3,962	47.7%

	Santa Ana, CA		Tustin, CA		Westminster, CA			
Cost Burden	#	%	#	%	#	%		
All Occupied Units	33,523	43.2%	11,381	42.9%	12,332	44.5%		
Owner-Occupied	10,668	30.7%	3,706	27.8%	4,713	32.4%		
Renter-Occupied	22,855	53.4%	7,675	58.2%	7,619	57.8%		

Note 1: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Location of Renters and Owners

Map 1 – Housing Tenure. is a series of maps showing the distribution of renter households in the region, and in northern, central, and southern Orange County. These maps were produced by California HCD to facilitate the fair housing planning process[6]. On the maps, the darker shaded areas have a higher proportion of renter households. These maps reflect the following:

- In Orange County overall, renters are concentrated in the north, west, and central parts of the County. Moving east and south from the border with Los Angeles County, a higher percentage of housing units are owner-occupied.

Within the participating jurisdictions, there are concentrations of renter-occupied and owner-occupied housing in the following areas:

- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions there are relatively few areas with a high percentage of renter households, with the exceptions of Placentia, which has high concentrations of renter households in the southwest corner of the city and in parts of the city near CSU-Fullerton; and Los Alamitos, which has a high concentration of renters in the neighborhood north of Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos and west of Lexington Drive. Conversely, there are various parts of the Urban County jurisdictions with relatively high concentrations of owner households, including Yorba Linda and the unincorporated area to the east of Yorba Linda, North Tustin, Seal Beach (outside the Naval Weapons Station), Rossmoor, Villa Park, Orange Park Acres, and Northwest Brea.
- In Aliso Viejo there is a relatively high percentage of renter households south of SR-73 between Aliso Viejo Parkway and Woodfield Park, and a relatively high percentage of owner households along the southern and western edges of city, south of SR-73 and west of Pacific Park Drive and Wood Canyon Drive.
- In Anaheim there are relatively high percentages of renter households in the Census Tracts north of SR-91 in Northeast Anaheim; between the Convention Center and I-5, and around Angel Stadium, in the southeastern part of the city; and in the Census Tract south of I-5 bounded by Lincoln Avenue and Brookhurst Street, in the northwestern part of the city. There is a relatively high percentage of owner households in Anaheim Hills.
- In Buena Park there is a relatively high percentage of renters in the Census Tracts just north of I-5.

---

[6] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing

- In Costa Mesa there are relatively high concentrations of renter households north of SR-55 in the downtown area, and west of Orange Coast College; and there is a relatively high percentage of owner households north of Adams Avenue.
- In Fountain Valley there are relatively high percentages of owner households in the neighborhoods south of Talbert Avenue and west of Brookhurst Street, and in the neighborhood just to the west of Mile Square Regional Park.
- In Fullerton there are relatively high percentages of renter households in and around CSU Fullerton and along Highland Ave between SR-91 and Orangethorpe Avenue (adjacent to the Fullerton Metrocenter shopping mall); and there are relatively high percentages of owner households in Census Tracts between CSU Fullerton and Brea Boulevard, and between Harbor Boulevard and the Robert E. Ward Nature Preserve.
- In Garden Grove, there is a relatively high percentage of owner households in West Garden Grove, compared to the rest of the city.
- In Huntington Beach there are high percentages of owner households in the eastern half of the city, as well as in the area surrounding the Huntington Club country club.
- In Irvine there are relatively high percentages of renter households in the southwestern part of the city—specifically in the Census Tracts west of Harvard Ave, around San Remo Park, and north of UC Irvine in University Town Center; and near the I-5/I-405 interchange—specifically in the Census Tracts encompassing the Irvine Medical and Science Complex, the Irvine Spectrum Center, and East Irvine.
- In La Habra there are a relatively high percentage of owner households in the neighborhoods south of SR-90 and west of Euclid St.
- In Laguna Niguel there are relatively high percentages of owner households in the southeast corner of the city (bordering San Juan Capistrano and Dana Point), adjacent to the El Niguel County Club, and in the neighborhoods between Crown Valley Pkwy and Alicia Pkwy.
- In Lake Forest there are relatively high percentages of owner households in the northeast of the city (to the north of SR-24) and in the southwest of the city (south of Trabuco Rd and west of Ridge Route Dr).
- In Mission Viejo there are relatively high percentages of owner households throughout the city, with some renters located in the southern part of the city.
- In Newport Beach there is a relatively high percentage of owner households in the Newport Coast community, and a relatively high percentage of renters around the Newport Beach Country Club.
- In the City of Orange there are relatively high percentages of renter households in the southwestern corner of the city, west of SR-57 and I-5, and relatively high percentages of owner households in the eastern half of the city.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita there is a relatively high percentage of owner households throughout the city, with some renters located in the neighborhoods just to the east of SR-241 between Antonio Pkwy and Santa Margarita Pkwy.

- In San Clemente there is a relatively high percentage of renter households in the neighborhoods south of Max Berg Plaza Park, and relatively high percentages of homeowners in a number of neighborhoods to the north and northwest.
- In Santa Ana there are relatively high percentages of renter households in the downtown area and in the neighborhoods southeast of downtown.
- In Tustin there are relatively high percentages of renter households in the neighborhoods adjacent to SR-55 south of I-5, and relatively high percentages of owner households in the northeast part of the city.
- In Westminster there are relatively high percentages of renters in the neighborhoods just north and south of Westminster Blvd between Hoover St. and Beach Blvd.

Map 1 – Housing Tenure – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 1 – Housing Tenure – North Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 1 – Housing Tenure – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 1 – Housing Tenure – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

The following analysis describes the demographics of residents of publicly supported housing.

Table 5 – Publicly Supported Households by Race/Ethnicity, provides the demographics of residents of different types of publicly support housing programs, including Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, Other Multifamily, and the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program. This table shows that, in Orange County:

- The majority of publicly supported housing is provided through the HCV Program (over 20,000 households with HCVs countywide). Additionally, there are approximately 4,000 units in Project-based Section 8 properties and approximately 100 units in Other Multifamily properties. There are no Public Housing units in the County.
- A significant portion of households with HCVs are headed by an AAPI individual (41.16%), followed by households headed by a White individual (25.32%), then Hispanic-headed households (21.12%), and then Black households (7.06%).
- Project-based Section 8 units have a similar racial composition to the HCV Program overall; however, the percentages of households headed by AAPI and White individuals are higher (47.11% and 33.06% respectively), and households headed by Hispanic and Black individuals are lower (15.19% and 1.77% respectively).

Within the participating jurisdictions, the racial/ethnic composition of publicly supported housing units varies:

- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, the racial/ethnic composition of households in the HCV Program and in Project-based Section 8 units matches the County overall, with the one exception being that the number of AAPI and White households in Project-based Section 8 units are equal (each comprise 36.75% of those units).
- In Aliso Viejo, the only publicly supported housing available is through the HCV Program. Two-thirds of households using HCVs in the city are White.
- In Anaheim, there are Project-based Section 8 developments in addition to households using HCVs. In the Project-based Section 8 units, the majority of households are AAPI. In the HCV Program, Hispanic households make up the largest single group of voucher recipients, followed by AAPI and White households.
- In Buena Park, the overwhelming majority of households in Project-based Section 8 units are AAPI. In the HCV Program, approximately one-third of households are Hispanic, 25% AAPI, 25% White, and nearly one-fifth of households are Black.
- In Costa Mesa, the majority of households in both Project-based Section 8 housing and the HCV Program are White, and there are no Black households in Project-based Section 8 units.

- In Fountain Valley, the majority of households in both Project-based Section 8 housing and the HCV Program are AAPI, and there are no Black households in Project-based Section 8 units.
- In Fullerton, nearly all of the households in Project-based Section 8 units are AAPI and the majority of households in Other Multifamily program units are White. In the HCV Program, White and Hispanic families each make up approximately one-third of households, and Black and AAPI families each make up approximately 14% of households.
- In Garden Grove, a large majority of households in both Project-based Section 8 housing and the HCV Program are AAPI (over 80% in each program).
- In Huntington Beach, over 50% of households in Project-based Section 8 units are AAPI and around one-third are White. In the HCV Program, over 40% of households are White and around one-third are AAPI.
- In Irvine, White households are the majority in Project-based Section 8 and Other Multifamily program units and are the largest share of households in the HCV Program (46.76%). In the HCV Program, Black households are the second largest racial/ethnic group, comprising approximately one-fifth of households.
- In La Habra, Hispanic households are the majority of HCV Program participants. The second largest racial/ethnic group is White households, who comprise 25% of households in the program. In Project-based Section 8 units, Hispanic, White, and AAPI each comprise approximately one-third of households.
- In Laguna Niguel, the majority of households in both Project-based Section 8 housing and the HCV Program are White.
- In Lake Forest, the majority of households in the HCV Program are White. There are no other types of publicly supported housing in the city.
- In Mission Viejo, the majority of households in the HCV Program are White. There are no other types of publicly supported housing included in the HUD-provided data. (However, per the City's Housing Element and other local sources, there are various publicly supported housing developments in the city.)
- In Newport Beach, the majority of households in both Project-based Section 8 housing and the HCV Program are White.
- In Orange, White and Hispanic households each comprise a slightly more than 40% of households in Project-based Section 8 units, and approximately one-third of households in the HCV Program. AAPI households make up around 25% of households in the HCV Program.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, the majority of households in the HCV Program are White. There are no other types of publicly supported housing in the city.
- In San Clemente, the majority of households in both Project-based Section 8 housing and the HCV Program are White.

- In Santa Ana, the majority of households in Project-based Section 8 units and in the HCV Program are AAPI. The second largest racial/ethnic group in each of these programs is Hispanic households.
- In Tustin, the majority of households in Project-based Section 8 units are AAPI (over 70%) and approximately one-fifth are White. In the HCV Program, Hispanic households are the largest group (38%), followed by White households (33%).
- In Westminster, AAPI households are the majority in both Project-based Section 8 units and in the HCV Program.

Table 5 – Publicly Supported Households by Race/Ethnicity

Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA	Race/Ethnicity							
	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	653	6.67%	2,696	27.54%	6,055	61.84%	374	3.82%
Project-Based Section 8	9,108	23.49%	6,733	17.37%	10,666	27.51%	12,058	31.10%
Other Multifamily	1,706	32.43%	450	8.55%	1,173	22.30%	1,909	36.29%
HCV Program	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total Households	1,741,265	40.51%	332,330	7.73%	1,458,220	33.92%	666,628	15.51%
0-30% of AMI	242,025	29.00%	96,395	11.55%	355,100	42.55%	122,168	14.64%
0-50% of AMI	425,645	28.94%	149,340	10.16%	661,570	44.99%	203,018	13.81%
0-80% of AMI	682,980	30.49%	208,645	9.31%	990,690	44.22%	310,058	13.84%

Orange County, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	1,362	33.06%	73	1.77%	626	15.19%	1,941	47.11%
Other Multifamily	71	68.27%	8	7.69%	10	9.62%	6	5.77%
HCV Program	5,776	25.32%	1,610	7.06%	4,819	21.12%	9,390	41.16%
Total Households	537,517	51.84%	16,903	1.63%	241,657	23.30%	186,863	18.02%
0-30% of AMI	63,893	40.68%	2,935	1.87%	52,308	33.30%	34,051	21.68%
0-50% of AMI	119,885	41.29%	5,251	1.81%	102,916	35.45%	55,867	19.24%
0-80% of AMI	206,268	43.82%	8,396	1.78%	160,512	34.10%	85,187	18.10%

Orange County Urban County	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	154	36.75%	11	2.63%	96	22.91%	154	36.75%
Other Multifamily	21	87.50%	0	0.00%	3	12.50%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	729	31.81%	164	7.16%	420	18.35%	969	42.30%
Total Households	123,567	64.87%	3,074	1.61%	30,302	15.91%	29,493	15.48%
0-30% of AMI	14,141	57.02%	339	1.37%	5,608	22.61%	4,234	17.07%
0-50% of AMI	27,749	57.61%	644	1.34%	10,983	22.80%	7,883	16.36%
0-80% of AMI	46,897	59.09%	1,298	1.64%	17,045	21.48%	12,551	15.82%

Aliso Viejo, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	109	66.09%	17	10.60%	23	13.90%	14	8.60%
Total Households	12,570	67.58%	380	2.04%	2,120	11.40%	2,830	15.22%
0-30% of AMI	960	67.37%	85	5.96%	100	7.02%	205	14.39%
0-50% of AMI	1,675	66.07%	180	7.10%	195	7.69%	385	15.19%
0-80% of AMI	3,540	65.98%	250	4.66%	555	10.34%	770	14.35%

Anaheim, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	58	21.48%	14	5.19%	51	18.89%	146	54.07%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	1,273	26.52%	430	8.96%	1,788	37.25%	1,290	26.89%
Total Households	36,390	36.39%	2,688	2.69%	41,509	41.51%	17,464	17.46%
0-30% of AMI	5,410	26.79%	670	3.32%	10,364	51.32%	3,345	16.56%
0-50% of AMI	10,610	27.99%	1,214	3.20%	19,969	52.68%	5,429	14.32%
0-80% of AMI	17,010	28.83%	1,723	2.92%	30,514	51.72%	8,554	14.50%

Buena Park, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	13	11.40%	1	0.88%	5	4.39%	95	83.33%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	174	24.25%	127	17.65%	232	32.25%	184	25.54%
Total Households	7,540	32.34%	835	3.58%	7,705	33.05%	6,830	29.29%
0-30% of AMI	885	21.74%	250	6.14%	1,545	37.96%	1,300	31.94%
0-50% of AMI	1,820	22.28%	315	3.86%	3,590	43.94%	2,270	27.78%
0-80% of AMI	3,180	25.68%	515	4.16%	5,020	40.53%	3,440	27.78%

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census, APSH, and CHAS; accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 6, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Numbers presented are numbers of households not individuals.
Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 5 – Publicly Supported Households by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

Costa Mesa, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	69	65.09%	0	0.00%	19	17.92%	18	16.98%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	376	57.17%	23	3.50%	107	16.24%	149	22.64%
Total Households	25,230	61.75%	695	1.70%	10,105	24.73%	3,870	9.47%
0-30% of AMI	3,720	54.35%	105	1.53%	2,380	34.77%	480	7.01%
0-50% of AMI	6,395	51.45%	175	1.41%	4,680	37.65%	955	7.68%
0-80% of AMI	10,960	53.71%	285	1.40%	6,955	34.08%	1,800	8.82%
Fountain Valley, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	10	14.29%	0	0.00%	1	1.43%	59	84.29%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	99	19.23%	6	1.21%	44	8.55%	363	70.42%
Total Households	10,409	55.16%	175	0.93%	2,166	11.48%	5,794	30.70%
0-30% of AMI	1,305	49.25%	0	0.00%	227	8.57%	1,015	38.30%
0-50% of AMI	2,299	51.26%	25	0.56%	472	10.52%	1,539	34.31%
0-80% of AMI	4,214	52.51%	70	0.87%	1,036	12.91%	2,529	31.51%
Fullerton, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	5	5.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.00%	94	94.00%
Other Multifamily	38	79.17%	3	6.25%	5	10.42%	2	4.17%
HCV Program	264	38.23%	96	13.99%	232	33.64%	95	13.71%
Total Households	20,005	44.40%	1,448	3.21%	11,890	26.39%	10,615	23.56%
0-30% of AMI	3,305	37.49%	344	3.90%	2,835	32.16%	2,100	23.82%
0-50% of AMI	5,515	37.14%	434	2.92%	5,350	36.03%	3,205	21.58%
0-80% of AMI	9,305	38.61%	789	3.27%	8,375	34.75%	4,965	20.60%
Garden Grove, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	34	13.28%	3	1.17%	4	1.56%	215	83.98%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	133	4.98%	35	1.30%	219	8.24%	2,270	85.23%
Total Households	14,254	29.92%	592	1.24%	13,550	28.44%	18,417	38.66%
0-30% of AMI	2,160	20.26%	165	1.55%	3,100	29.08%	5,054	47.42%
0-50% of AMI	3,865	20.48%	204	1.08%	6,200	32.86%	8,244	43.69%
0-80% of AMI	7,080	23.55%	303	1.01%	10,125	33.68%	12,043	40.06%
Huntington Beach, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	133	35.00%	4	1.05%	41	10.79%	200	52.63%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	461	42.58%	50	4.61%	166	15.36%	399	36.88%
Total Households	53,650	71.15%	753	1.00%	10,855	14.40%	8,114	10.76%
0-30% of AMI	5,730	60.89%	115	1.22%	2,140	22.74%	1,220	12.96%
0-50% of AMI	11,035	62.66%	183	1.04%	3,905	22.17%	2,105	11.95%
0-80% of AMI	20,055	65.89%	323	1.06%	6,110	20.08%	3,205	10.53%
Irvine, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	428	59.03%	24	3.31%	42	5.79%	231	31.86%
Other Multifamily	12	52.17%	5	21.74%	2	8.70%	4	17.39%
HCV Program	682	46.76%	282	19.34%	246	16.84%	243	16.67%
Total Households	45,515	50.61%	1,800	2.00%	6,788	7.55%	33,230	36.95%
0-30% of AMI	6,055	45.27%	230	1.72%	1,145	8.56%	5,260	39.33%
0-50% of AMI	9,580	46.56%	510	2.48%	1,939	9.42%	7,670	37.28%
0-80% of AMI	16,010	49.11%	625	1.92%	2,959	9.08%	11,750	36.04%

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census, APSH, and CHAS; accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 6, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Numbers presented are numbers of households not individuals.
Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 5 – Publicly Supported Households by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

La Habra, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	44	30.34%	1	0.69%	51	35.17%	49	33.79%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	46	24.39%	19	10.22%	110	58.51%	13	6.89%
Total Households	7,363	38.84%	304	1.60%	8,870	46.80%	2,260	11.92%
0-30% of AMI	1,213	35.16%	85	2.46%	1,760	51.01%	355	10.29%
0-50% of AMI	2,253	35.62%	120	1.90%	3,240	51.23%	625	9.88%
0-80% of AMI	3,803	36.31%	159	1.52%	5,555	53.03%	855	8.16%
Laguna Niguel, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	127	82.47%	4	2.60%	12	7.79%	11	7.14%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	77	74.80%	6	5.82%	12	11.63%	7	6.78%
Total Households	18,280	73.56%	395	1.59%	3,210	12.92%	2,350	9.46%
0-30% of AMI	1,785	72.12%	30	1.21%	310	12.53%	215	8.69%
0-50% of AMI	3,210	68.96%	65	1.40%	775	16.65%	400	8.59%
0-80% of AMI	6,165	69.62%	145	1.64%	1,605	18.13%	665	7.51%
Lake Forest, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	191	60.78%	46	14.61%	46	14.51%	31	9.89%
Total Households	18,234	66.17%	540	1.96%	4,370	15.86%	3,865	14.03%
0-30% of AMI	1,629	57.18%	65	2.28%	690	24.22%	365	12.81%
0-50% of AMI	3,364	59.18%	180	3.17%	1,460	25.69%	535	9.41%
0-80% of AMI	6,014	58.59%	225	2.19%	2,605	25.38%	1,185	11.55%
Mission Viejo, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	175	69.74%	22	8.69%	34	13.57%	19	7.47%
Total Households	25,265	74.89%	389	1.15%	4,099	12.15%	3,050	9.04%
0-30% of AMI	1,990	69.58%	19	0.66%	554	19.37%	185	6.47%
0-50% of AMI	4,320	70.94%	129	2.12%	1,014	16.65%	480	7.88%
0-80% of AMI	7,490	71.03%	189	1.79%	1,814	17.20%	800	7.59%
Newport Beach, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	88	88.00%	0	0.00%	4	4.00%	8	8.00%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	92	61.86%	25	16.75%	22	14.73%	10	6.66%
Total Households	31,580	83.86%	184	0.49%	2,340	6.21%	2,718	7.22%
0-30% of AMI	3,185	79.92%	15	0.38%	335	8.41%	360	9.03%
0-50% of AMI	6,030	81.05%	15	0.20%	600	8.06%	564	7.58%
0-80% of AMI	9,390	80.36%	69	0.59%	990	8.47%	874	7.48%
Orange, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	80	43.96%	2	1.10%	77	42.31%	22	12.09%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	203	32.15%	60	9.48%	209	33.17%	154	24.42%
Total Households	24,095	56.85%	530	1.25%	12,030	28.38%	4,979	11.75%
0-30% of AMI	2,860	48.93%	65	1.11%	1,945	33.28%	775	13.26%
0-50% of AMI	5,465	48.17%	225	1.98%	4,220	37.20%	1,165	10.27%
0-80% of AMI	9,780	49.51%	325	1.65%	7,340	37.16%	1,910	9.67%

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census, APSH, and CHAS; accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 6, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.

Note 2: Numbers presented are numbers of households not individuals.

Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 5 – Publicly Supported Households by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	87	62.31%	21	14.87%	24	17.06%	6	4.50%
Total Households	11,890	69.59%	285	1.67%	2,674	15.65%	1,855	10.86%
0-30% of AMI	1,095	66.57%	0	0.00%	440	26.75%	60	3.65%
0-50% of AMI	1,855	61.22%	50	1.65%	805	26.57%	215	7.10%
0-80% of AMI	3,525	65.58%	65	1.21%	1,295	24.09%	355	6.60%
San Clemente, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	52	73.24%	0	0.00%	9	12.68%	9	12.68%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	100	72.35%	5	3.82%	26	18.61%	6	4.62%
Total Households	19,495	79.56%	130	0.53%	3,264	13.32%	965	3.94%
0-30% of AMI	1,820	67.16%	20	0.74%	605	22.32%	35	1.29%
0-50% of AMI	3,980	70.76%	20	0.36%	1,264	22.47%	65	1.16%
0-80% of AMI	6,420	72.62%	55	0.62%	1,809	20.46%	225	2.55%
Santa Ana, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	44	5.47%	9	1.12%	202	25.12%	462	57.46%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	191	10.86%	69	3.89%	537	30.49%	958	54.41%
Total Households	12,430	16.55%	899	1.20%	50,935	67.83%	9,959	13.26%
0-30% of AMI	1,570	8.63%	159	0.87%	13,565	74.59%	2,745	15.09%
0-50% of AMI	3,405	9.76%	299	0.86%	26,460	75.88%	4,400	12.62%
0-80% of AMI	6,150	11.63%	529	1.00%	39,210	74.16%	6,440	12.18%
Tustin, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	20	19.42%	0	0.00%	10	9.71%	73	70.87%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	192	33.12%	86	14.95%	219	37.88%	79	13.70%
Total Households	10,485	40.69%	604	2.34%	7,710	29.92%	6,084	23.61%
0-30% of AMI	1,480	39.31%	160	4.25%	1,465	38.91%	589	15.64%
0-50% of AMI	2,660	34.08%	240	3.07%	3,535	45.29%	1,134	14.53%
0-80% of AMI	4,595	34.93%	375	2.85%	5,965	45.34%	1,874	14.25%
Westminster, CA	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	3	3.03%	0	0.00%	1	1.01%	95	95.96%
Other Multifamily	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HCV Program	122	5.13%	21	0.87%	103	4.33%	2,131	89.46%
Total Households	9,270	34.01%	203	0.74%	5,165	18.95%	12,121	44.47%
0-30% of AMI	1,595	22.62%	14	0.20%	1,195	16.95%	4,154	58.92%
0-50% of AMI	2,800	23.64%	24	0.20%	2,260	19.08%	6,599	55.71%
0-80% of AMI	4,685	27.38%	79	0.46%	3,630	21.22%	8,397	49.08%

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census, APSH, and CHAS; accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 6, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.

Note 2: Numbers presented are numbers of households not individuals.

Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

B.   Segregation/Concentration and Integration

The following analysis describes segregation/concentration levels, identifies the racial/ethnic groups that experience the highest levels of segregation/concentration, and explains how these levels and patterns have changed over time.

Table 6 – Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends, displays how segregated/concentrated or integrated various racial/ethnic groups are in the region, the Orange County Urban County, and the HUD Entitlement Cities using a Dissimilarity Index, which is calculated using data from the 2010 Decennial Census. The Dissimilarity Index measures the degree to which two groups are evenly distributed across a geographic area and is commonly used for assessing residential segregation/integration between two groups. Dissimilarity index values indicate the following:

- Values between 0 and 39 generally indicate high integration (low segregation/concentration)
- Values between 40 and 54 generally indicate moderate segregation/concentration
- Values between 55 and 100 generally indicate a high level of segregation/concentration

Please note two key shortcomings of these data:

1. The data only measure segregation between Black and White, Hispanic, and White, and AAPI and White residents. As a result, no conclusions can be drawn regarding segregation among Black, Hispanic, and AAPI residents.
2. The data measure segregation only within each jurisdiction and do provide insights into racial/ethnic segregation across jurisdictional boundaries.

Table 6 shows that, in the region, there are high levels of segregation between Black and White residents and between Hispanic and White residents, and there is moderate segregation between AAPI and White residents. Since 1990, segregation between Black and White residents has declined, while segregation between Hispanic/White and AAPI/White has increased.

In Orange County the following jurisdictions are highly integrated, indicating low levels of segregation/concentration among the groups analyzed:

- The Urban County jurisdictions – While segregation levels are higher compared to 1990, they have trended downward since 2000 for Black/White and Hispanic/White residents.
- Aliso Viejo – Since 1990, concentrations of Hispanic and AAPI residents have been increasing but remain low.

- Anaheim – Segregation levels between Black/White and AAPI/White have been increasing since 1990. Segregation level between Hispanic/White were high in 2000 but have since declined.
- Buena Park – Segregation levels have increased since 1990 but remain low.
- Fountain Valley – Since 1990, segregation levels between Hispanic/White and between AAPI/White have been increasing but remain low.
- Fullerton – Segregation level between AAPI/White is increasing but remains low.
- Garden Grove – Segregation levels have increased since 1990 but remain low.
- Huntington Beach – Segregation level between Black/White increased between 2000-2010 but remains low.
- Irvine – Segregation levels between the groups analyzed decreased between 2000-2010.
- La Habra – Since 1990, segregation between Black/White residents has increased, though remains low, and segregation between Hispanic/White and between AAPI/White has decreased.
- Laguna Niguel – Between 1990-2010, concentrations of Black and Hispanic residents increased, though remain low.
- Lake Forest – Between 1990-2010, segregation between Hispanic/White and between AAPI/White increased, though remains low.
- Mission Viejo – Between 1990-2010, concentration of Hispanic residents increased, though remains low.
- Newport Beach – Between 1990-2010, segregation between Hispanic/White and between AAPI/White increased, though remains low.
- Orange – Between 1990-2010, segregation between AAPI/White increased, though remains low.
- Rancho Santa Margarita – Concentration by race/ethnic group has increased since 1990 but remains low.
- Westminster – Segregation levels have increased since 1990 but remain low.

In Orange County the following jurisdictions have moderate levels of segregation between at least two of the racial groups analyzed (no jurisdictions in the County have high levels of segregation):

- Costa Mesa –There is moderate segregation between Hispanic and White residents. Segregation levels declined slightly between 2000-2010 but remain moderate.
- Santa Ana –There is moderate segregation between Hispanic and White residents, and between AAPI and White. Segregation levels between Hispanic/White residents declined slightly between 2000-2010 but remain moderate. Since 1990, segregation between AAPI/White residents has increased.
- Tustin – There is moderate segregation between Hispanic and White residents. Segregation levels declined between 2000-2010 but remain moderate.

Table 6 - Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA			Orange County Urban County			Aliso Viejo, CA		
	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend
Non-White/White	55.32	55.50	54.64	30.48	36.54	35.55	1.79	6.49	8.90
Black/White	72.75	68.12	65.22	32.90	35.33	34.07	15.82	12.66	11.59
Hispanic/White	60.12	62.44	62.15	36.26	42.43	39.52	0.19	14.88	15.67
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	43.46	46.02	45.77	32.65	36.76	37.16	0.31	4.86	7.94

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Anaheim, CA			Buena Park, CA			Costa Mesa, CA		
	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend
Non-White/White	29.33	31.57	31.56	18.17	22.07	21.40	29.84	36.88	34.33
Black/White	22.16	25.87	27.69	21.76	23.51	25.25	30.17	27.07	27.67
Hispanic/White	38.77	40.24	38.70	26.64	33.21	30.85	34.52	45.33	41.88
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	13.23	17.28	21.53	11.56	13.87	16.44	30.36	31.94	30.59

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Fountain Valley, CA			Fullerton, CA			Garden Grove, CA		
	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend
Non-White/White	14.25	22.27	23.54	25.53	31.16	30.52	25.05	31.79	32.16
Black/White	27.24	27.57	26.28	30.60	31.84	26.53	22.19	23.11	23.45
Hispanic/White	21.64	28.33	29.59	33.72	39.98	38.28	27.67	32.64	33.20
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	13.85	22.12	23.58	30.41	33.48	35.24	27.45	34.97	33.98

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Huntington Beach, CA			Irvine, CA			La Habra, CA		
	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend
Non-White/White	21.11	23.44	21.58	16.49	21.55	18.01	28.18	26.72	24.14
Black/White	21.45	19.99	24.20	42.99	27.84	19.37	12.56	13.25	19.36
Hispanic/White	28.10	33.37	30.09	21.98	22.79	17.88	33.93	30.96	28.59
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	22.86	20.11	18.25	18.18	22.57	18.73	40.48	38.69	36.53

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Laguna Niguel, CA			Lake Forest, CA			Mission Viejo, CA		
	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend
Non-White/White	9.17	12.98	16.34	9.39	15.38	17.28	13.67	15.17	15.75
Black/White	13.82	22.75	16.24	12.43	12.16	9.52	18.03	20.63	16.83
Hispanic/White	13.34	20.76	22.79	15.72	26.10	27.63	12.26	18.75	20.96
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	13.37	12.68	13.82	8.84	11.06	13.46	20.00	16.83	13.98

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Newport Beach, CA			Orange, CA			Rancho Santa Margarita, CA		
	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend
Non-White/White	13.20	15.04	17.04	23.75	24.25	22.59	5.43	12.26	14.07
Black/White	21.92	19.85	15.96	24.17	24.63	24.89	7.18	12.64	13.35
Hispanic/White	14.33	18.29	18.21	30.31	29.99	26.95	5.73	19.52	23.13
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	22.99	23.74	25.92	19.44	22.28	22.53	6.70	8.56	9.55

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	San Clemente, CA			Santa Ana, CA			Tustin, CA		
	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend
Non-White/White	21.89	25.93	16.76	47.77	49.28	46.49	26.33	36.73	32.93
Black/White	13.86	19.08	14.93	36.53	27.91	25.15	42.49	35.11	29.02
Hispanic/White	27.16	32.90	23.71	53.09	53.61	50.00	31.13	48.20	42.54
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	14.66	14.76	16.56	43.10	46.77	46.87	19.20	17.74	19.76

Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index	Westminster, CA		
	1990 Trend	2000 Trend	2010 Trend
Non-White/White	24.58	28.05	31.59
Black/White	11.56	14.18	17.62
Hispanic/White	30.31	29.74	31.83
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	23.15	29.73	34.65

Note 1: Data Source: Decennial Census, accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 3, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

The following analysis identifies areas with relatively high segregation/concentration and integration and indicates the predominant groups living in each area.

Race/Ethnicity

Map 2 – Racial/Ethnic Concentration, is a series of maps showing racial/ethnic concentrations in the region, and in northern, central, and southern Orange County. These maps are published by California HCD using methodology from the Othering & Belonging Institute, which combines various measures of segregation and integration (including a dissimilarity index), and uses data from 2020. On these maps, dark red indicates areas where people of color (POC) experience high levels of segregation/concentration; green indicates areas where White residents experience high levels of segregation/concentration; yellow indicates areas that are racially/ethnically integrated.

Map 3 – Predominant Population by Race/Ethnicity, is a series of maps showing the predominant racial/ethnic group by Census Tract in the region, and in northern, central, and southern Orange County. The colors indicate different racial/ethnic groups, and the relative strength of the shading indicates the extent to which one group is dominant over the next most populous group (with darker shading indicating a higher concentration of that racial/ethnic group). These maps were created by California HCD using 2017-2021 ACS data, to facilitate fair housing planning.[7]

Collectively, the maps illustrate that in Orange County overall, there are areas of high POC segregation/concentration in the central and northern parts of the County (including the cities of Santa Ana, Westminster, Garden Grove, Anaheim, and Fullerton), and there are areas of high White segregation/concentration along the entire coast (including Seal Beach, Huntington Beach, Newport Beach, Laguna Beach, Dana Paint, Capistrano Beach, and San Clemente) and in the southern part of the County (including Mission Viejo, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Niguel, and Rancho Santa Margarita).

Within each participating jurisdiction, there are areas of high segregation/integration in the following locations:

- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions,
    - There are areas of high White segregation in Dana Point, Laguna Beach, Laguna Hills, Laguna Woods, the unincorporated areas east of Rancho Santa Margarita, North Tustin, Seal Beach, Yorba Linda, northern Placentia, Villa Park, and Orange Park Acres.
    - There are areas of high POC segregation in Stanton (which are predominantly Hispanic or AAPI), Cypress (which are predominantly AAPI), northern Yorba

---

[7] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing

Linda (which are predominantly AAPI), La Palma (which are predominantly AAPI), and San Juan Capistrano (which is predominantly Hispanic).

- o There are areas of integration including the Atwood neighborhood in Placentia, which is predominantly Hispanic; Brea just northwest of the SR-90/SR-57 interchange, which is a predominantly Hispanic area; and in Los Alamitos, in the neighborhood north of Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos and west of Lexington Drive, which is predominantly Hispanic.

- In Aliso Viejo, most of the city is considered an area of high White concentration, with the exception of a few neighborhoods with low-medium concentration (which are predominantly White) in the northern and eastern parts of the city.

- In Anaheim, the map shows integrated areas in Southeast Anaheim (where Hispanic residents are the predominant group), in western Anaheim west of Brookhurst Street (where Hispanic residents are the predominant group in many neighborhoods, and AAPI residents are the predominant group in a few others), and in the neighborhoods between Modjeska Park and Palm Lane Park in the Hermosa Village community (where Hispanic residents are the predominant group). The map shows another integrated area in Northeast Anaheim, to the north of SR-91. However, this is primarily an industrial/commercial area. The city also has neighborhoods of high POC segregation, including the neighborhoods north of downtown and along SR-91, and neighborhoods south of downtown and adjacent to Disneyland. These areas are predominantly Hispanic. The Anaheim Hills area demonstrates a high White segregation.

- In Buena Park, most of the city is considered an area of low-medium segregation with the exception of the following areas: the northeast corner of the city is considered an area of high POC segregation and is predominantly AAPI; the neighborhood between I-5, Artesia Boulevard, Beach Boulevard, and the Los Angeles County border is also considered an area of high POC segregation, and is predominantly Hispanic; and the neighborhoods south of Boisseranc Park between Dale Street and the nurseries, is considered a racially integrated area.

- In Costa Mesa, the neighborhoods between downtown and the Costa Mesa Country Club are areas of high POC segregation, with a predominantly Hispanic population. The neighborhoods in East Side Costa Mesa (east of SR-55 and south of Mesa Drive) are all areas of high White segregation, as are the neighborhoods north of the Country Club and the neighborhoods between Estancia High School and Canyon Park.

- In Fountain Valley, the majority of Census Tracts are considered areas of high POC segregation, and many have a predominantly AAPI population (particularly north of Warner Avenue). The neighborhoods surrounding the intersection of Magnolia Street and Ellis Avenue in the city's southwest, and between Brookhurst Street and Ward Street south of I-405, are considered areas of high White segregation.

- In Fullerton, there are various neighborhoods that are considered racially integrated, including in the area around CSU Fullerton and extending west to Fullerton College, and in the southwest area of the city. There are also areas considered to have high POC segregation, including most of the neighborhoods west of Harbor Boulevard and north of Malvern Avenue, which are predominantly AAPI areas.
- In Garden Grove, the majority of the city is considered an area of high POC segregation except for West Garden Grove. In West Garden Grove, the residential neighborhoods west of Knott Street are considered areas of high White segregation. East of Knott Street is primarily industrial and commercial land uses. In the high POC segregation areas, AAPI residents are the predominant group west of 9th Street and Hispanic residents are the predominant group east of there.
- In Huntington Beach, most of the city's neighborhoods are predominantly White, with the exception of one Census Tract in the center of the city that is predominantly Hispanic.
- In Irvine, there are a number of Census Tracts considered to be areas of high POC segregation, some of which are predominantly AAPI and others are predominantly White. These areas include the neighborhoods between I-405 and UC Irvine, the Westpark community north of I-405, the neighborhoods between Como Channel and I-5, and the Northwood community north of I-5. There are also areas of high White segregation in Irvine, including the neighborhood bounded by Turtle Rock Drive the area surrounding the Strawberry Farms Golf Club, the Woodbridge community north of I-405, and the neighborhood west of the Oak Creek Golf Club. Please note that data was unavailable for many parts of the city, as indicated by the grey shading.
- In La Habra, there are various neighborhoods considered to have high POC segregation, including neighborhoods in the center of the city north of Guadalupe Park and between Idaho Street to the west and Sonora High School to the east. These neighborhoods are predominantly Hispanic. The city also has two racially integrated areas, one that extends across its border to the west (between SR-90 and the railroad tracks) and another that extends across its border to the south (south of SR-90 and east of Euclid St).
- In Laguna Niguel, most of the city is considered an area of high White concentration, with the exception of a few neighborhoods with low-medium concentration (which are predominantly White) in the northeastern and eastern parts of the city.
- In Lake Forest, most of the city's neighborhoods have a predominantly White population. There are predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods in the southeast corner of the city, along El Toro Road, and the northwest corner of the city is predominantly AAPI.
- In Mission Viejo, most of the city is considered an area of high White concentration, with the exception of a few neighborhoods with low-medium concentration in the southern, northern, and western parts of the city.

- In Newport Beach, the entire city is classified as an area of high White segregation.
- In Orange, most of the city to the north and east of Villa Park is considered an area of high White segregation, and most of the city to the south and west of Villa Park is considered an area of low-medium POC segregation. In the low-medium segregation areas, the neighborhoods are predominantly Hispanic west of Glassel Street with a high concentration of Hispanic residents in the neighborhoods north of Walnut Avenue. The neighborhoods between Glassel Street and SR-55 are predominantly White, and the neighborhoods east of SR-55 and south of Villa Park are predominantly Hispanic. There is one area in the city that is considered integrated. This area lies to the south of Villa Park and runs south along Santiago Creek and east along the northside of Chapman Avenue toward El Modena.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, most of the city is considered an area of high White concentration, with the exception of a few neighborhoods with low-medium concentration (which are predominantly White) in the neighborhoods east of SR-241 between Antonio Parkway and Santa Margarita Parkway.
- In San Clemente, the majority of the city is considered an area of high White concentration, with the exception of one Census Tract encompassing neighborhoods north and east of Max Berg Plaza Park, which is classified as low-medium concentration with a predominantly White population.
- In Santa Ana, the majority of the city is considered an area of high POC segregation and has a predominantly Hispanic population except for the Riverview West community which is predominantly AAPI. There are some areas of low-medium POC segregation in the city, including the neighborhoods north of I-5, Floral Park, West Floral Park, Fisher Park, Morrison/Eldridge Park, Riverglen, Casa de Santiago, and neighborhoods south of Warner Avenue. There is one integrated area in the southern part of the city between Segerstrom High School and the Bristol Place Shopping Mall, where White residents are the predominant group.
- In Tustin, there are racially integrated neighborhoods just to the north of I-5. These are surrounded by neighborhoods of low-medium segregation that are a mix of predominantly White, Hispanic, and AAPI.
- In Westminster, the majority of the city is considered an area of high POC segregation and has a predominantly AAPI population with a few exceptions. The northwestern corner of the city, between I-405 and Bolsa Chica Road is an area of high White segregation. Across I-405 from those neighborhoods is an integrated area with a predominantly Hispanic population (west of Edwards Avenue). This area includes mobile home parks near the intersections of SR-22 and I-405.

Map 2 – Racial/Ethnic Concentration – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 2 – Racial/Ethnic Concentration – North Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 2 – Racial/Ethnic Concentration – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 2 – Racial/Ethnic Concentration – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 3 – Predominant Population by Race/Ethnicity – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 3 – Predominant Population by Race/Ethnicity – North Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 3 – Predominant Population by Race/Ethnicity – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 3 – Predominant Population by Race/Ethnicity – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

The following analysis compares the locations of publicly supported housing with the areas of concentration.

Map 4 - Publicly Supported Housing, is a series of maps showing the location of federal- and state-subsidized housing in the region, and in northern, central, and southern Orange County. These maps were created by California HCD to facilitate fair housing planning, using data from California Housing Partnership[8]. On the maps, the size of each dot correlates to the number of publicly-supported housing units in an area—larger dots indicate higher numbers of units. The shading of the Census Tracts indicates the percentage of renter occupied housing units in that Tract that are supported by a HCV, including both tenant-based and project-based vouchers. The darker shading indicates higher percentages of vouchers.

The locations of publicly supported housing on these maps align with the areas of segregation and integration on Map 2 (Racial/Ethnic Segregation/Integration), in the following places:

---

[8] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing

- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions,
  - There is overlap between the location of publicly supported housing, including a high rate of voucher use, and areas of high POC segregation in the following places:
    - Cypress – in the neighborhood around King Elementary School, in the north of the city.
    - Placentia – in the southwest corner of the city
    - Stanton – throughout the city
    - San Juan Capistrano – in the Census Tract that encompasses the interchange between I-5 and the Ortega Highway (SR-74)
  - There is overlap between areas without any publicly supported housing and either low HCV use or no data on HCV use, and areas of high White segregation, the following places:
    - Rossmoor, Seal Beach, North Tustin, Villa Park, Orange Park Acres, North Laguna Hills, Laguna Woods, and Dana Point
- In Aliso Viejo, there are publicly supported units and higher percentages of units with vouchers in the south of city, which is an area of high White concentration.
- In Anaheim, there are multiple publicly supported housing developments downtown and north of downtown, which are high POC segregation areas. The map also shows a concentration of vouchers in the high POC segregation area between Santa Ana River and Orangethorpe Avenue, east of Anaheim Canyon Metrolink station and west of Imperial Highway (SR-90). However, this is largely a commercial/industrial area with few housing units. In the western part of the city, around Western High School, there is also a cluster of publicly supported housing developments in a racially integrated area.
- In Buena Park, most publicly supported housing units are located in between I-5 and the Artesia Freeway (SR-91), which is a low-medium segregation area like most of the city.
- In Costa Mesa, the largest number of publicly supported housing units and the highest concentration of vouchers is in high POC segregation area located downtown and west of downtown.
- In Fountain Valley, the location of publicly supported housing units and highest concentrations of vouchers mirrors the high POC segregation areas.
- In Fullerton, publicly supported housing units are mostly clustered in the center of the city, which is a low-medium segregation area.
- In Garden Grove, there are lots of publicly supported housing units in the center of city along Garden Grove Boulevard, which is a high POC segregation area. There are no publicly supported housing units in West Garden Grove, which is an area of high White segregation.

- In Huntington Beach, the map shows publicly supported housing units located in the center of the city. Local data identify affordable housing projects distributed broadly across the city.
- In Irvine, the high POC segregation areas north of I-405 overlap with the location of publicly supported housing units. In other parts of the city where there is high voucher use and multiple publicly supported housing developments, there is no segregation data available.
- In La Habra, publicly supported housing units are located in the city's center and north neighborhoods, which are all low-medium or high POC segregation areas.
- In Laguna Niguel, the map shows one public supported housing development (near the intersection of Pacific Park Drive and La Paz Road) and a small concentration of voucher use in northwest part of city, which is a low-medium concentration area. City staff report that another development in the western part of the City also receives vouchers.
- In Lake Forest, there are publicly supported housing units in the northwest, near the intersection of SR-241 and Alton Parkway. There are a smaller number of units in the south of the city, along El Toro Road.
- In Mission Viejo, the map shows two publicly supported housing developments in the southern part of the city. One of these developments, in the southeast, aligns with a low-medium concentration area. City staff report that there are additional publicly supported housing developments that are not reflected in the HUD-provided data.
- In Newport Beach, there are two publicly supported housing developments (one east and one west of Newport Center), both of which are in high White segregation areas.
- In Orange, all publicly supported housing units and households with vouchers are located to the west and south of Villa Park (which are low-medium segregation areas). There are no units or vouchers in use to the east of Villa Park, where it is a high White segregation area. The largest publicly supported housing development (biggest blue dot) is in the integrated area to the south of Villa Park, running south along Santiago Creek and east along the northside of Chapman Avenue towards El Modena.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, there are no publicly supported housing units. There are some vouchers in use in the northeast part of the city that is a low-medium concentration area
- In San Clemente, there is a cluster of publicly supported housing units in the low-medium concentration area north and east of Max Berg Plaza Park.
- In Santa Ana, a significant number of publicly supported housing units are located downtown and southeast of downtown, both of which are high POC segregation areas. There is a higher concentration of vouchers, as well as some publicly

supported housing units, west of the Santa Ana River, which is also a high POC segregation area.

- In Tustin, there is a large concentration of publicly supported housing units in the south. Segregation data for this area are unavailable; however, according to Map 3 (Predominant Population by Race/Ethnicity) the population is predominantly AAPI.
- In Westminster, the location of publicly supported housing units and areas with highest concentration of vouchers aligns with the high POC segregation areas in the central part of the city. There are no publicly supported housing units, and fewer vouchers in use, in the western parts of the city that are high White segregation, racially integrated, and low-medium segregation areas.

Map 4 - Publicly Supported Housing – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 4 - Publicly Supported Housing – Region (HCV Only)

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 4 - Publicly Supported Housing – North Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 4 - Publicly Supported Housing – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 4 - Publicly Supported Housing – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

The following analysis describes the public or private policies or practices, demographic shifts, economic trends, or other factors that may have caused or contributed to the patterns described above (including siting decisions of private or publicly supported housing or the location of residents using Housing Choice Vouchers).

Broadly speaking, the patterns of residential segregation/concentration by race – both between and within jurisdictions in Orange County and across the United States – are due, in part, to:

- Historic practices of redlining and legal racial segregation, which created many of the residential patterns that still exist today.
- Local land use and zoning laws that have perpetuated patterns of racial segregation, some of which remain in place, while others which have been removed but continue to have lasting effects.
- Market factors, including the high cost of land and existing housing throughout Orange County, constrain the development of new affordable housing and limit access for families to existing housing.

- Discrimination in the private housing market, including source-of-income discrimination, driven in part by a lack of knowledge of state and federal fair housing laws and regulations, which in turn limits housing mobility.
- There are numerous ethnic enclaves of Hispanic, Vietnamese, Chinese, and other groups throughout Orange County. These enclaves provide a sense of community and a social network that may help newcomers preserve their cultural identities. However, these active choices should not obscure the significant impact of structural barriers to fair housing choice and discrimination.

Through the stakeholder consultations and community meetings, it was also reported that segregation/concentration patterns in the County are due to:

- In addition to landlord resistance to renting to HCV Program participants, the gap between HCV subsidy amounts and housing costs further inhibits HCV Program participants from accessing housing in higher cost (and higher opportunity) areas.
- Lack of housing mobility for some minority groups based on a lack of credit history coupled with high demand for affordable housing across the County, which permits landlords and property management companies to prioritize applicants based on credit history.

Detailed lists of the public or private policies or practices, demographic shifts, economic trends, and other factors that have caused or contributed to segregation/concentration in each of the jurisdictions are included in Section IV.

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

The following analysis identifies R/ECAPs and/or groupings of R/ECAP tracts.

HUD defines racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs) as Census Tracts that meet both of the following criteria:

- a non-White population of 50 percent or more, and
- a poverty rate that exceeds 40% or a poverty rate that is three or more times the average Tract poverty rate for the metropolitan area, whichever threshold is lower.

The analysis in this report uses a measure of segregation and concentrated poverty created by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) and California HCD. The TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map's poverty concentration and racial segregation filter aligns with HUD's R/ECAP methodology but is designed to more effectively reflect the level of racial and ethnic diversity in many parts of California. This measure uses the following criteria to define Census Tracts as "High Segregation and Poverty" areas:

- Tracts and rural block groups where at least 30 percent of the population is living below the poverty level (note that college and graduate students are removed from

the poverty calculation in the filter in Census Tracts where they comprise at least 25% of the population); and

- Tracts that have a Location Quotient (LQ) higher than 1.25 for Black, Hispanic, Asian, or all people of color. The LQ measures relative segregation by calculating how much more segregated a Census Tract is relative to a larger area (in this case, the County). Compared to the measure used by HUD (which is an absolute threshold of non-White population in a Census Tract), this measure better captures inequality operating on individuals at the neighborhood level.

Map 5 – High Segregation and Poverty Areas, indicates racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty in Orange County (note that the only R/ECAP areas are located in the central part of the County). This map was created by California HCD to facilitate fair housing planning, using the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map data. This map shows R/ECAPs in the following areas:

- Placentia – in the southwestern corner of the city, south of Orangethorpe Avenue
- Anaheim – northeast of Disneyland, along Ball Road and I-5
- Garden Grove – in the northern part of the city to between Brookhurst Street and Gilbert Street, north of Chapman Avenue
- Santa Ana – covering multiple Census Tracts in the downtown
- Costa Mesa – on the west side of downtown and the area southwest of downtown (between Newport Avenue (SR-55) and Placentia Avenue, south of 19th Street).

Map 5 – High Segregation and Poverty Areas – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

The following analysis describes and identifies the predominant protected classes residing in R/ECAPs, and how these demographics compare with the overall demographics of the area.

To identify the predominant protected classes residing in R/ECAPs and compare them to the overall demographics of the surrounding areas, we look at the areas designated as "High Segregation and Poverty" on Map 5 (High Segregation and Poverty Areas) in relation to the demographic information on Map 3 (Predominant Population by Race/Ethnicity). The analysis finds that R/ECAPs in Orange County are predominantly Hispanic. Specifically,

- In Placentia, the R/ECAP Tract is predominantly Hispanic, as are the neighborhoods to the west and south in Fullerton and Anaheim. The neighborhoods to the east are predominantly White.
- In Anaheim, the R/ECAP Tract is predominantly Hispanic, as are all the surrounding neighborhoods.
- In Costa Mesa, the R/ECAP area is predominantly Hispanic, as are the adjacent neighborhoods to the north and west. The Census Tracts to the east, across Newport Avenue, are all predominantly White.
- In Garden Grove, the R/ECAP Tract is predominantly Hispanic and is surrounded by Census Tracts that are predominantly AAPI.

- In Santa Ana, the R/ECAP Tracts are predominantly Hispanic, as are all the surrounding neighborhoods.

The following analysis describes how R/ECAPs align with the location of publicly supported housing.

Map 6 - Publicly Supported Housing and R/ECAPs, shows the location of public-supported housing in Orange County in comparison to the location of the R/ECAPs (outlined in red). This map shows no overarching patterns between the location of publicly supported housing and R/ECAPs.

- In Placentia, the R/ECAP area is home to one public housing development of 50-100 units, and between 5-15% of renter-occupied units in the Tract utilize a voucher— which is similar to other Tracts in the city.
- In Anaheim, there are no publicly supported housing units in the R/ECAP Tract, and fewer than 5% of renter-occupied units in the R/ECAP Tract utilize a voucher.
- In Costa Mesa, the largest publicly supported housing development in the city is located on the northern boundary of the R/ECAP area. There is no data on voucher usage in the Tract.
- In Garden Grove, 15-30% of renter-occupied units in the R/ECAP tract utilize a voucher, which is similar to a number of other non-R/ECAP Tracts in the city. There are no publicly supported housing developments in the R/ECAP Tract.
- In Santa Ana, fewer than 5% of renter-occupied housing units in the R/ECAP areas utilize a voucher; however, there are various publicly supported housing developments within the boundaries of the R/ECAP area.

Map 6 - Publicly Supported Housing and R/ECAPs

2/3/2025, 12:54:53 PM

Subsidized Housing (CHPC, 2023) Housing Choice Vouchers (HUD, 2021) - Tract

- • Up to 50 Units
- • 50 - 100 Units
- ● 100 - 250 Units
- ● 250 - 500 Units
- ● More 500 Units

No Data
≤5%
5% - 15%
15% - 30%
30% - 60%
Greater than 60%

COG Geography TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map - High Segregation and Poverty (HCD, 2023) - Tract

1:102,618

0   0.75   1.5   3 mi
0   1.25   2.5   5 km

County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, GeoTechnologies, Inc., USGS, EPA
Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: Created by authors using map from California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

The following analysis describes the public or private policies or practices, demographic shifts, economic trends, or other factors that may have caused or contributed to the patterns described above.

In the most recent Housing Elements prepared and adopted by each jurisdiction, the following factors were identified that contribute to the existence of R/ECAPs in these jurisdictions.

In Placentia:

- Lack of affordable housing, which limits housing mobility.
- Limited participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program.
- Land use and development practices that constrain affordable housing development.
- Private discrimination in housing, due in part to a lack of fair housing knowledge and enforcement.

In Anaheim:

- Historic practices of redlining and legal racial segregation have created many of the residential patterns that still exist today. Additionally, the high cost of land and existing housing in Anaheim (and throughout Orange County) are significant constraints to the development of new affordable housing and access for families to existing housing.

In Costa Mesa:

- Housing discrimination, which limits mobility for families.
- Lack of affordable housing due to both governmental and market constraints.

In Garden Grove:

- Lack of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes, due to high land and development costs in the region, public opposition to new development, and land use and zoning laws.
- Housing discrimination, which limits mobility for families.
- Limited access to financial services.
- Lack of meaningful language access for individuals with limited English proficiency.
- Lack of private investment in specific neighborhoods.

In Santa Ana:

- Lack of fair housing education and outreach.
- Lack of affordable housing.

D.   Disparities in Access to Opportunity

The following paragraphs analyze disparities in access to opportunity for education, employment, transportation, poverty, environmentally healthy neighborhoods, disability and access, and patterns in any disparities to access to opportunity.

1.   Education

Table 6 – Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity (below), includes a *School Proficiency Index*, which measures the proximity various racial/ethnic groups have, based on where they live, to neighborhoods with high-performing schools. School proficiency is measured using school-level data on the performance of 4th grade students on state exams. The index is based on a range of 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating better proximity to high-performing schools.

Table 6 shows the following disparities in access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools in each of the participating jurisdictions:

- In the region, there are significant disparities in access to neighborhoods with high performing schools. Access is lowest for Black and Hispanic residents, and highest for White and AAPI residents. Access is especially low for Black residents living below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, Hispanic residents have the least access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools, and this disparity is even more pronounced for Hispanic residents living below the FPL. Compared to the region, access is better across all groups and there are smaller disparities between groups.
- In Aliso Viejo, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is high for all groups and there is little disparity between race/ethnic groups.
- In Anaheim, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is relatively low for all groups in the city and there are significant racial/ethnic disparities. Hispanic residents have the least access, followed by Native American and Black residents. Access also tends to be worse for residents living below the FPL, with Hispanic residents living below the FPL having the least access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools.
- In Buena Park, Hispanic and Black residents have less access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools than other groups, and this disparity is even greater for Hispanic residents living below the FPL. Residents in the city have better access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools than their counterparts regionwide, and there are fewer disparities in access by race/ethnicity when compared to the region.
- In Costa Mesa, Hispanic residents have less access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools than other groups, and this disparity is even greater for Hispanic

residents living below the FPL. Generally, residents in the city have better access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools than their counterparts regionwide, and there are fewer disparities in access by race/ethnicity when compared to the region.

- In Fountain Valley, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is high for all groups, with little disparity between race/ethnic groups, except for Native Americans living below the FPL, who have relatively poor access.
- In Fullerton, access to neighborhoods with high performing schools is comparable to the region, with relatively low access and evidence of racial/ethnic disparities. Hispanic residents have the least access, followed by Native American and Black residents.
- In Garden Grove, Hispanic residents have less access than other groups to neighborhoods with high-performing schools, though these disparities are less pronounced than in the region as a whole.
- In Huntington Beach, Hispanic and Black residents have less access than other groups to neighborhoods with high-performing schools, and these disparities are more pronounced for residents living below the FPL.
- In Irvine, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is high for all groups.
- In La Habra, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is relatively low for all groups and there is little disparity between race/ethnic groups.
- In Laguna Niguel, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is high for all groups.
- In Lake Forest, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is moderately high for all groups, though residents living below the federal FPL have less access to these types of neighborhoods. Hispanic residents living below the federal FPL, in particular, have the least access compared to other groups.
- In Mission Viejo, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is moderately high for all groups and there is little disparity between groups.
- In Newport Beach, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is high for all groups.
- In Orange, there are some disparities in access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools, with Black and Hispanic residents having less access than other groups. These disparities are less pronounced than in the region overall—this is because, Hispanic, Black, and Native American residents of Orange have better access to these kinds of neighborhoods than their counterparts in the region overall, while White and AAPI residents of Orange have less access.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is high for all groups.

- In San Clemente, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is moderately high for all groups with few disparities between groups.
- In Santa Ana, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is relatively low for all groups and there are significant disparities between race/ethnic groups. Hispanic and Native American residents have the least access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools.
- In Tustin, Hispanic and Native American residents living below the FPL have significantly less access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools than other groups.
- In Westminster, access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools is moderately high for all groups and there is little disparity between groups.

Table 6 – Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity

Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	65.19	68.03	67.43	77.63	73.13	54.59	21.35
Black, Non-Hispanic	36.07	33.82	35.34	87.25	79.02	40.72	11.92
Hispanic	35.53	39.72	35.73	86.48	77.78	43.70	12.36
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	55.03	61.94	57.64	85.13	75.98	51.11	13.13
Native American, Non-Hispanic	48.40	50.70	48.58	81.04	75.36	45.88	17.68
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	53.66	60.62	59.62	83.19	78.51	56.98	18.46
Black, Non-Hispanic	24.12	28.03	26.41	88.34	81.07	36.90	11.74
Hispanic	25.05	33.70	29.50	89.09	80.94	44.63	10.63
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	45.45	57.59	51.41	88.58	80.61	52.88	11.05
Native American, Non-Hispanic	33.63	39.10	36.05	84.43	78.22	47.65	16.22

Orange County Urban County, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	76.48	81.89	74.59	60.92	67.05	46.96	24.39
Black, Non-Hispanic	69.50	75.53	68.16	74.64	71.50	44.07	15.23
Hispanic	58.20	67.52	59.65	75.35	73.08	45.50	15.65
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	69.64	76.68	67.46	77.05	70.10	43.85	13.93
Native American, Non-Hispanic	68.87	73.43	68.92	69.65	69.78	46.01	19.49
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	68.31	77.99	69.03	62.05	71.85	49.98	24.26
Black, Non-Hispanic	57.08	70.54	60.65	74.14	71.46	42.77	13.74
Hispanic	40.26	56.48	46.97	79.38	77.74	45.63	12.87
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	59.82	72.84	58.95	82.14	75.35	40.98	10.57
Native American, Non-Hispanic	59.71	78.50	58.72	80.71	75.06	48.72	12.85

Aliso Viejo, CA CDBG	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	86.40	83.80	89.60	25.37	76.58	67.81	44.39
Black, Non-Hispanic	85.66	83.41	89.02	26.10	79.11	67.21	44.13
Hispanic	84.11	84.55	88.33	26.59	79.32	68.55	43.87
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	87.35	84.31	89.76	24.91	75.76	67.91	44.68
Native American, Non-Hispanic	86.17	83.12	88.93	26.36	79.02	67.87	44.33
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	82.37	81.49	87.38	28.15	80.65	67.31	43.92
Black, Non-Hispanic	96.00	90.96	92.00	20.00	71.00	68.85	44.00
Hispanic	87.11	86.95	88.83	25.18	80.76	67.92	44.61
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	79.67	82.36	87.60	28.86	79.35	68.30	43.19
Native American, Non-Hispanic	89.00	73.76	91.00	20.00	71.00	64.40	46.00

Anaheim, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	57.74	51.16	55.99	86.30	72.67	43.78	11.42
Black, Non-Hispanic	42.85	39.66	45.37	89.16	78.00	36.96	8.52
Hispanic	36.00	27.30	39.83	90.59	79.51	50.51	7.89
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	49.75	44.50	50.68	87.98	75.45	37.02	9.49
Native American, Non-Hispanic	44.95	36.79	46.32	89.37	77.46	48.18	8.95
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	45.90	40.49	46.79	89.04	77.96	42.96	9.09
Black, Non-Hispanic	31.74	34.14	37.42	89.65	79.84	31.61	7.85
Hispanic	29.41	22.31	35.78	91.71	81.27	52.65	7.32
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	45.63	44.33	47.94	88.35	76.64	30.85	9.12
Native American, Non-Hispanic	28.04	34.19	30.87	92.22	79.80	57.77	8.38

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census; ACS; Great Schools; Common Core of Data; SABINS; LAI; LEHD; and NATA; all accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 12, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 6 – Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

Buena Park, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	60.45	68.12	55.62	88.37	74.04	32.63	5.85
Black, Non-Hispanic	46.36	56.49	50.18	88.38	76.06	36.64	5.75
Hispanic	45.66	56.38	48.40	87.86	75.87	38.65	5.61
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	55.66	65.85	56.16	88.51	74.65	34.48	5.98
Native American, Non-Hispanic	54.49	66.44	52.73	88.12	74.89	31.49	5.74
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	53.80	63.19	53.10	88.01	75.46	34.13	5.82
Black, Non-Hispanic	34.70	61.54	49.56	89.06	79.09	51.37	6.30
Hispanic	36.05	49.35	44.29	87.95	77.28	40.67	5.51
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	52.60	62.69	52.02	88.88	76.16	33.32	5.99
Native American, Non-Hispanic	66.17	70.34	82.13	88.84	71.20	32.56	6.92

Costa Mesa, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	60.10	72.71	73.56	89.69	81.33	83.04	28.03
Black, Non-Hispanic	55.04	70.24	69.80	90.47	83.27	83.47	25.72
Hispanic	40.06	60.53	56.72	90.42	83.05	78.57	30.24
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	61.51	71.28	73.20	90.57	82.88	87.44	22.65
Native American, Non-Hispanic	53.54	70.81	68.03	90.49	82.74	81.69	28.26
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	53.85	69.80	68.91	90.07	82.43	80.51	28.58
Black, Non-Hispanic	61.70	78.78	82.00	91.46	84.89	87.37	19.50
Hispanic	33.36	56.69	51.57	90.56	83.60	78.70	31.40
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	55.36	71.81	73.29	90.38	83.08	84.52	24.46
Native American, Non-Hispanic	50.53	67.96	56.06	91.85	77.66	85.70	19.03

Fountain Valley, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	72.99	77.95	66.97	88.74	72.84	63.54	10.36
Black, Non-Hispanic	63.35	74.50	64.34	89.00	77.04	67.34	9.23
Hispanic	61.51	73.48	61.11	89.32	76.51	64.27	9.44
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	68.19	74.62	62.14	88.86	73.78	61.25	9.43
Native American, Non-Hispanic	71.09	77.77	66.67	88.24	73.04	61.75	9.83
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	73.72	79.47	71.04	88.66	70.86	60.63	12.98
Black, Non-Hispanic	59.12	85.62	60.95	89.98	80.00	64.77	7.03
Hispanic	62.05	75.52	64.05	88.78	73.78	52.61	10.82
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	64.02	71.44	61.18	88.82	76.72	64.70	8.84
Native American, Non-Hispanic	25.00	58.70	39.00	91.00	79.00	33.65	9.00

Fullerton, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	62.61	56.65	61.50	87.07	76.65	55.54	8.66
Black, Non-Hispanic	49.62	47.75	52.52	88.60	79.69	50.90	7.95
Hispanic	42.72	39.02	45.92	88.92	79.56	48.09	7.72
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	59.92	66.82	67.55	86.58	74.57	45.70	8.74
Native American, Non-Hispanic	52.94	46.15	50.35	88.41	78.82	50.79	7.98
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	55.56	50.27	55.74	89.34	80.78	56.42	8.27
Black, Non-Hispanic	36.98	38.56	45.43	90.92	83.87	43.50	7.52
Hispanic	37.93	36.39	41.66	89.84	80.77	46.43	7.60
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	59.46	64.03	66.38	88.24	78.20	51.50	8.57
Native American, Non-Hispanic	66.11	42.19	54.89	87.14	77.59	36.66	7.59

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census; ACS; Great Schools; Common Core of Data; SABINS; LAI; LEHD; and NATA; all accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 12, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 6 – Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

Garden Grove, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	51.61	62.62	46.45	89.02	75.00	36.85	5.30
Black, Non-Hispanic	41.29	55.63	41.33	89.90	78.05	34.48	5.93
Hispanic	38.31	49.57	38.53	90.25	78.44	36.49	6.55
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	36.53	57.58	38.40	89.26	78.09	26.41	6.31
Native American, Non-Hispanic	42.49	57.15	40.82	89.84	77.88	33.27	6.01
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	43.98	59.78	40.82	89.70	77.12	33.92	5.82
Black, Non-Hispanic	31.36	52.83	42.46	88.39	77.73	22.40	6.08
Hispanic	33.96	47.89	37.29	90.91	80.88	38.03	6.46
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	34.39	57.31	37.26	89.10	78.63	24.49	6.43
Native American, Non-Hispanic	25.46	59.54	38.35	90.71	82.88	20.33	5.55

Huntington Beach, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	73.22	76.09	73.40	86.19	75.11	39.88	27.16
Black, Non-Hispanic	66.28	64.48	68.38	86.93	77.62	44.20	22.24
Hispanic	56.39	62.72	61.50	86.96	78.62	46.28	19.14
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	70.78	72.77	69.79	85.78	74.36	43.09	23.36
Native American, Non-Hispanic	69.29	73.74	70.28	86.49	76.42	41.44	25.86
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	70.07	73.38	72.99	86.92	77.44	38.84	27.86
Black, Non-Hispanic	46.90	56.51	58.56	88.62	80.11	43.69	17.85
Hispanic	42.73	56.09	51.58	87.45	81.23	47.75	14.39
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	61.40	65.76	67.00	86.92	78.76	42.40	23.92
Native American, Non-Hispanic	72.02	78.94	63.69	86.00	64.39	36.61	26.65

Irvine, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	75.51	91.83	85.86	86.03	75.70	82.98	24.62
Black, Non-Hispanic	71.46	90.47	85.50	87.62	77.90	85.02	24.34
Hispanic	71.82	91.30	84.30	87.17	77.18	84.06	24.32
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	74.27	91.74	86.27	86.36	76.01	81.99	24.03
Native American, Non-Hispanic	73.19	91.00	86.39	86.51	77.19	85.15	24.45
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	74.06	91.44	81.96	88.76	79.32	87.44	26.01
Black, Non-Hispanic	70.68	91.56	89.17	86.53	76.94	79.65	24.23
Hispanic	72.33	89.99	77.69	89.76	80.78	89.91	26.12
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	75.04	93.12	76.85	88.34	80.05	88.66	27.79
Native American, Non-Hispanic	75.05	92.63	64.82	92.82	83.98	89.60	26.21

La Habra, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	54.95	45.37	49.14	85.13	74.94	24.60	9.57
Black, Non-Hispanic	51.87	41.91	49.43	85.67	76.39	21.77	9.50
Hispanic	49.15	38.57	41.33	85.10	76.65	25.54	9.56
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	63.20	44.08	62.32	84.33	71.22	22.13	9.44
Native American, Non-Hispanic	51.76	43.96	45.26	84.53	75.07	26.27	9.56
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	56.10	47.10	49.00	84.46	74.26	24.56	9.48
Black, Non-Hispanic	52.83	41.39	42.26	87.37	77.76	28.47	9.43
Hispanic	46.12	36.01	37.54	85.25	76.92	28.33	9.70
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	52.15	40.10	53.86	86.17	73.95	25.19	9.48
Native American, Non-Hispanic	53.40	39.69	33.09	88.64	77.34	23.54	9.00

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census; ACS; Great Schools; Common Core of Data; SABINS; LAI; LEHD; and NATA; all accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 12, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 6 – Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

Laguna Niguel, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	76.15	78.68	81.92	20.01	65.30	24.83	44.29
Black, Non-Hispanic	75.53	78.56	81.05	20.78	66.76	27.40	43.54
Hispanic	74.16	77.79	80.90	21.60	68.64	26.05	42.93
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	76.21	79.74	81.58	21.17	67.10	30.29	43.17
Native American, Non-Hispanic	73.38	78.54	81.49	20.46	66.97	23.45	45.40
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	76.39	77.56	79.65	20.30	66.57	26.91	43.73
Black, Non-Hispanic	71.95	74.35	89.13	22.25	72.54	11.92	43.47
Hispanic	75.89	78.28	79.36	21.25	67.62	30.40	44.20
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	75.56	80.73	75.10	23.52	71.49	42.28	41.54
Native American, Non-Hispanic	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

Lake Forest, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	76.36	72.36	81.64	32.24	69.42	71.33	42.33
Black, Non-Hispanic	73.27	69.65	81.67	32.34	70.96	72.67	42.25
Hispanic	67.04	66.07	76.36	31.35	73.18	70.57	39.94
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	73.63	72.58	82.39	32.16	69.56	73.34	42.56
Native American, Non-Hispanic	75.43	68.97	79.14	32.03	71.55	69.17	41.59
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	70.42	68.73	79.06	32.70	72.03	71.31	41.04
Black, Non-Hispanic	80.40	60.52	86.90	25.18	69.16	38.16	45.46
Hispanic	63.26	57.73	67.26	26.85	71.64	76.10	35.45
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	61.70	65.12	73.73	35.90	75.46	69.11	39.66
Native American, Non-Hispanic	27.00	62.47	60.00	31.00	85.00	71.40	34.00

Mission Viejo, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	81.64	76.96	76.49	20.23	60.25	21.34	46.11
Black, Non-Hispanic	79.61	72.77	76.94	20.85	64.05	27.65	45.55
Hispanic	77.56	73.46	73.81	20.70	64.44	27.95	44.61
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	80.69	77.17	77.29	20.55	60.53	22.69	45.63
Native American, Non-Hispanic	79.23	74.24	74.50	21.07	62.03	22.20	46.25
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	80.70	78.05	76.43	20.42	61.66	22.41	46.10
Black, Non-Hispanic	70.69	76.42	81.54	21.23	69.77	27.61	43.31
Hispanic	73.93	74.29	66.28	20.00	66.08	35.01	41.77
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	74.62	76.39	81.02	20.31	65.65	30.45	42.20
Native American, Non-Hispanic	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

Newport Beach, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	81.31	90.17	82.88	86.59	75.16	90.40	41.36
Black, Non-Hispanic	78.86	89.72	81.85	86.92	76.61	90.54	40.65
Hispanic	79.04	88.93	81.76	86.93	76.81	89.82	40.55
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	84.48	91.60	85.94	83.05	68.64	89.19	38.80
Native American, Non-Hispanic	79.22	88.29	81.86	88.35	78.06	91.17	40.73
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	78.99	89.20	83.30	87.76	78.81	90.38	43.27
Black, Non-Hispanic	78.71	86.38	78.21	89.58	85.43	87.99	48.46
Hispanic	82.46	87.75	81.41	88.28	77.88	89.87	41.76
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	84.34	88.97	82.79	88.43	76.05	92.09	39.15
Native American, Non-Hispanic	77.00	89.17	88.00	93.00	85.00	95.55	40.00

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census; ACS; Great Schools; Common Core of Data; SABINS; LAI; LEHD; and NATA; all accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 12, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 6 – Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

Orange, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	59.85	60.76	61.19	87.39	72.03	69.31	10.04
Black, Non-Hispanic	52.12	48.57	51.47	89.40	77.99	78.41	8.77
Hispanic	48.30	50.65	52.77	88.89	76.83	76.42	9.01
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	59.06	58.78	59.94	87.51	72.50	67.82	9.94
Native American, Non-Hispanic	54.37	55.48	56.10	88.33	74.75	73.95	9.39
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	57.04	52.92	58.45	89.18	76.75	78.49	9.16
Black, Non-Hispanic	32.85	42.16	41.19	83.58	78.05	89.55	9.52
Hispanic	45.47	53.35	53.02	89.09	76.93	73.57	9.08
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	52.82	43.86	48.07	89.57	79.90	81.30	8.42
Native American, Non-Hispanic	64.21	51.31	53.78	90.52	79.37	86.78	8.55

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	87.82	84.08	87.29	19.01	61.49	12.75	54.08
Black, Non-Hispanic	85.22	82.80	86.30	20.39	66.64	13.57	53.73
Hispanic	84.08	80.19	85.16	21.29	69.41	11.83	54.01
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	86.50	84.59	87.52	19.55	63.25	12.85	53.44
Native American, Non-Hispanic	86.05	82.04	86.50	20.09	66.32	11.54	53.88
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	83.99	77.97	85.14	20.86	67.77	9.82	54.55
Black, Non-Hispanic	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
Hispanic	79.71	72.25	79.75	22.39	74.90	7.51	54.71
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	92.08	91.03	89.00	16.53	50.91	17.71	53.51
Native American, Non-Hispanic	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

San Clemente, CA CDBG	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	76.02	73.91	77.79	15.18	58.61	30.53	54.50
Black, Non-Hispanic	75.72	74.47	77.50	15.14	58.28	33.23	53.99
Hispanic	64.41	66.23	74.88	16.13	64.05	28.18	54.33
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	77.00	75.99	77.85	14.57	56.60	36.23	53.93
Native American, Non-Hispanic	70.21	72.47	77.11	16.20	60.72	31.36	54.49
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	72.53	69.89	77.05	15.87	60.90	29.70	54.94
Black, Non-Hispanic	33.81	63.97	69.04	14.71	67.68	30.34	53.00
Hispanic	64.44	65.67	75.42	15.59	64.76	30.60	54.22
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	75.99	79.46	77.89	13.66	59.13	42.42	53.36
Native American, Non-Hispanic	69.92	82.92	81.47	13.38	53.61	35.91	53.08

Santa Ana, CA	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	43.58	40.95	48.31	92.62	80.95	74.89	10.29
Black, Non-Hispanic	37.22	34.86	40.19	92.78	81.04	67.18	10.60
Hispanic	27.34	28.45	33.05	92.92	80.41	62.17	11.06
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	37.32	41.90	37.03	92.43	79.82	52.24	10.44
Native American, Non-Hispanic	30.92	33.84	37.35	92.65	79.81	61.51	10.65
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	36.59	35.69	45.31	92.55	81.75	72.63	10.59
Black, Non-Hispanic	30.40	34.66	39.64	91.94	82.25	76.57	10.44
Hispanic	22.21	27.00	30.56	93.36	82.18	60.87	10.98
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	36.22	40.88	35.66	92.11	80.53	46.13	10.05
Native American, Non-Hispanic	22.28	21.56	35.82	93.35	79.06	60.67	11.72

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census; ACS; Great Schools; Common Core of Data; SABINS; LAI; LEHD; and NATA; all accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 12, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

Table 6 – Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

Tustin, CA CDBG	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	63.67	71.61	73.97	89.66	78.12	75.92	12.00
Black, Non-Hispanic	49.37	60.11	64.18	92.75	83.81	83.31	10.82
Hispanic	44.93	51.70	59.55	93.52	85.08	86.73	9.74
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	54.59	67.08	73.12	90.92	80.48	78.28	12.30
Native American, Non-Hispanic	58.55	62.31	69.02	91.12	81.54	81.61	10.47
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	50.82	67.17	68.54	92.03	82.78	82.13	11.15
Black, Non-Hispanic	53.03	52.08	60.97	93.61	85.87	88.59	9.55
Hispanic	33.68	38.03	51.91	95.23	88.33	88.99	8.87
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	51.22	62.44	67.76	91.95	82.30	84.23	11.07
Native American, Non-Hispanic	21.99	34.26	62.35	95.29	87.57	92.46	8.78

Westminster, CA CDBG	Low Poverty Index	School Proficiency Index	Labor Market Index	Transit Index	Low Transportation Cost Index	Jobs Proximity Index	Environmental Health Index
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	49.67	72.09	47.64	86.39	76.49	42.87	6.57
Black, Non-Hispanic	40.88	69.65	44.06	86.96	78.34	40.93	6.86
Hispanic	35.08	63.82	39.25	87.10	78.73	37.10	6.50
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	35.42	65.32	39.47	87.81	79.49	29.74	7.51
Native American, Non-Hispanic	43.72	69.82	44.55	87.26	77.82	41.17	6.24
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	42.88	69.22	42.57	86.90	77.90	37.35	6.79
Black, Non-Hispanic	32.08	67.37	41.25	85.75	77.20	41.57	7.92
Hispanic	32.07	60.97	36.24	86.89	78.84	40.17	5.44
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	31.20	62.98	38.17	87.91	80.04	31.20	7.13
Native American, Non-Hispanic	37.94	63.01	34.15	89.90	81.79	23.92	8.00

Note 1: Data Sources: Decennial Census; ACS; Great Schools; Common Core of Data; SABINS; LAI; LEHD; and NATA; all accessed through the HUD AFFH Tool, Table 12, Version AFFHT0006, Released July 10, 2020.
Note 2: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info/resource/4848/affh-data-documentation).

By comparing the School Proficiency Index in Table 6 to the demographic data in Table 1 (Demographics), a pattern emerges showing that cities where all residents have access to neighborhoods with high-performing schools, have a lower percentage of Hispanic residents than the County overall. In other words, Hispanic residents are concentrated in cities with fewer high-performing schools. Specifically, in the following cities, the School Proficiency Index is 70 or higher for every racial/ethnic group, and the percentage of the population that is Hispanic is lower than the countywide percentage of 33.93%:

- Aliso Viejo, where the School Proficiency Index is over 83 for all groups, and 20.02% of the population is Hispanic.
- Fountain Valley, where the School Proficiency Index is over 73 for all groups, and 17.08% of the population is Hispanic.
- Irvine, where the School Proficiency Index is over 90 for all groups, and 11.24% of the population is Hispanic.
- Laguna Niguel, where the School Proficiency Index is over 77 for all groups, and 16.10% of the population is Hispanic.
- Mission Viejo, where the School Proficiency Index is over 72 for all groups, and 19.67% of the population is Hispanic.

- Newport Beach, where the School Proficiency Index is over 88 for all groups, and 10.47% of the population is Hispanic.
- Rancho Santa Margarita, where the School Proficiency Index is over 80 for all groups, and 20.41% of the population is Hispanic.

Map 7 – Education Score, is a series of maps showing the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map's Education Composite Score for north, central, and south Orange County, and the region. These maps were created by California HCD to facilitate fair housing planning, using the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map data[9]. The Education Composite Score for a particular Census Tract is based on four indicators, all of which are based on enrollment-weighted averages of the three schools closest to the tract's center point[10]:

- <u>Math and Reading Proficiency</u>, where "Proficiency" is the percentage of students performing at grade-level in the 4th grade.
- <u>High School Graduation Rate</u>, which is calculated using California Department of Education data on the percent of students who graduate in four years.
- <u>Student Poverty</u>, which is measured as the percentage of students that do not receive free and reduced-price lunch.

A tract's composite score is determined by whether it falls above or below the median (50th percentile) tract or block group value within each region. Each indicator that falls above the regional median adds one point to the final score. On the maps, the categories equal the following scores:

- Highest: >3-4
- High: >2-3
- Moderate: >1-2
- Low: 0-1

These maps, along with Map 3 showing the predominant race/ethnicity in each area, show the following relationship between residency patterns and proximity to proficient schools by race/ethnicity:

- In the County overall,
  - Cities in the central County have the lowest education scores, indicating that residents in these areas are less likely to live near high quality schools. Areas in the southern County, along the coast, and in the unincorporated areas in the north and east parts of the County, have the highest education scores.

---

[9] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing
[10] Detailed descriptions of the methodology used to measure each indicator can be found on the CTAC website, https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp

Low education score areas generally correspond to areas where the population is predominantly Hispanic.

- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions,
  - Brea and Los Alamitos have high education scores and are predominantly White in most but not all areas.
  - Cypress has high education scores and a predominantly AAPI and White population.
  - La Palma has high education scores and a predominantly AAPI population
  - Yorba Linda, Villa Park, Orange Park Acres, North Tustin, unincorporated areas of the County, Laguna Woods, Laguna Beach, and Laguna Hills, all have the highest education scores and are predominantly White.
  - Dana Point has a mix of education scores, all areas are predominantly White.
  - Placentia has low education scores in the southeast, which align with the predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods.
  - San Juan Capistrano has low education score areas that are a mix of predominantly Hispanic and predominantly White neighborhoods.
- In Aliso Viejo, all neighborhoods in the city have the highest education score and are predominantly White.
- In Anaheim, most of the city's neighborhoods have low education scores and are predominantly Hispanic. The exception is Anaheim Hills, which is both predominantly White, and has the highest education scores.
- In Buena Park, there are neighborhoods with low education scores in the city's center and southeast, which are also areas of predominant Hispanic population.
- In Costa Mesa, the southwest quarter of the city has low education scores. This area is a mix of predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods in and around downtown, and predominantly White neighborhoods to the west.
- In Fountain Valley, almost all of the city's neighborhoods have high education scores. These neighborhoods are a mix of predominantly White and AAPI.
- In Fullerton, neighborhoods in the south of the city have low education scores and are also the areas with the highest concentrations of Hispanic residents.
- In Garden Grove, the neighborhoods with low education score areas in the east are predominantly Hispanic, and the neighborhoods with low education scores in the northwest are predominantly Hispanic and AAPI.
- In Huntington Beach, the neighborhoods with the highest education scores correlate to areas that are predominantly White, which is most of the city. One area of the city with low education scores has a predominantly Hispanic population.
- In Irvine, neighborhoods across the city have the highest education score. These neighborhoods are a mix of predominantly White and AAPI.

- In La Habra, neighborhoods with low education scores are located in the center and eastern part of the city, which are also the areas with the highest concentrations of Hispanic residents.
- In Laguna Niguel, all neighborhoods have high education scores and are predominantly White.
- In Lake Forest, all neighborhoods have high education scores and most are predominantly White, except in the southeastern corner of the city, along El Toro Road, which is predominantly Hispanic.
- In Mission Viejo, all neighborhoods have high education scores, and most are predominantly White except in the southern part of the city.
- In Newport Beach, all neighborhoods have high education scores and are predominantly White.
- In Orange, neighborhoods in the western half of the city have low education scores and are predominantly Hispanic. The neighborhoods with the highest education scores are in the eastern half of the city. The high education score areas north and west of Villa Park are predominantly White, and the high education score areas south and west of Villa Park are predominantly Hispanic.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, all neighborhoods have high education scores and are predominantly White.
- In San Clemente, all neighborhoods have high education scores and are predominantly White.
- In Santa Ana, neighborhoods with low education score areas comprise most of the city, and are areas where population is predominantly Hispanic.
- In Tustin, the neighborhoods with low education scores are predominantly Hispanic and White, and the neighborhoods with the highest education scores are predominantly AAPI.
- In Westminster, there is a mix of moderate, high, and highest education score areas. There is one part of the city with low education scores, in the north. This area is predominantly Hispanic.

Map 7 – Education Score – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 7 – Education Score – North Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 7 – Education Score – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 7 – Education Score – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

2.   Employment

Table 6 includes a Jobs Proximity Index, which measures the physical distance between where residents of different races/ethnicities live and the location of jobs. A higher index value indicates better access to employment opportunities. Table 6 also includes a Labor Market Index, which measures the unemployment rate, labor-force participation rate, and percentage of the population aged 25 and above with at least a bachelor's degree, by neighborhood. A higher index value indicates that residents live in a neighborhood with higher labor force participation and human capital.

Table 6 shows the following regarding disparities in access to neighborhoods close to jobs and with high labor force participation and human capital in each of the participating jurisdictions:

- In the region, there are significant disparities in both the Jobs Proximity and the Labor Market Index. The Jobs Proximity Index is the lowest for Black residents, especially those living below FPL. It is also low for Hispanic residents. White residents are most likely to live in neighborhoods close to jobs. The Labor Market Index is lowest for Black and Hispanic residents, especially those living below FPL, and highest for White residents. Generally, the Labor Market Index is lower for individuals living below FPL.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, there is relatively low access to neighborhoods close to jobs for all races/ethnicities, with no large disparities between groups. Compared to the region, residents of all races/ethnicities have better access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. However, there are disparities between racial/ethnic groups, with Hispanic residents having significantly less access than other groups, and White residents having more access.
- In Aliso Viejo, access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is high for all races/ethnicities, with no large disparities between groups. This is also true for access to neighborhoods close to jobs. On both indices, the city performs significantly better than the region overall.
- In Anaheim, there are significant disparities in access to neighborhoods close to jobs, and with high labor force participation and human capital. Hispanic residents have the least access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Black and AAPI residents have the least access to neighborhoods close to jobs. On both indices, the city is comparable to the region overall, with low-to-moderate scores and significant disparities between groups.
- In Buena Park, there is relatively low access to neighborhoods close to jobs for all races/ethnicities, with no large disparities between groups. Compared to the region, residents of all races/ethnicities have less access to neighborhoods close to jobs. There is moderate access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and

human capital, with slight disparities between races/ethnicities—Hispanic residents have the least access to these neighborhoods. Compared to the region, access is higher for Hispanic and Black residents in the city.

- In Costa Mesa, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is high for all races/ethnicities, with only slight disparities—Hispanic residents have the least access. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is also high for all races/ethnicities, but with significant disparities between races/ethnicities—again Hispanic residents have the least access. On both indices, the city performs better than the region overall for all racial/ethnic groups.
- In Fountain Valley, access to neighborhoods close to jobs, and with high labor force participation and human capital, is relatively high for all groups except for Native American residents living below the FPL, who have very low index values for each measure.
- In Fullerton, all race/ethnicities have moderate access to neighborhoods close to jobs, with slight disparities between groups—AAPI residents have the least access of any group. Regarding access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital, there are some disparities between groups (with Hispanic residents having the least access), and index values for Hispanic, Black, and AAPI residents are higher than their counterparts regionwide.
- In Garden Grove, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is low for all groups, with some disparities between groups—AAPI residents have the least access. Compared to the region, all groups in Garden Grove have less access. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is also relatively low for all groups in the city, with slight disparities between races/ethnicities. Access is lowest for Hispanic and AAPI residents. Compared to the region, the Labor Market Index in the city is higher for Black and Hispanic residents, and lower for all others.
- In Huntington Beach, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is relatively low for all groups, with few disparities between races/ethnicities. Overall, groups in the city have better access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital; however, there are large disparities between groups. Hispanic residents, and especially those living below the FPL, have the least access to these neighborhoods.
- In Irvine, access to neighborhoods close to jobs and with high labor force participation and human capital is high for all groups (and higher than the region). The only significant disparities are for Black residents living below FPL, who have less access to neighborhoods close to jobs, and Native American residents living below FPL, who have less access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital.
- In La Habra, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is very low for all groups, with no disparities between groups. There are disparities, however, in access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Hispanic

residents and Native American residents living below FPL have the least access of all groups. Compared to region, Hispanic, Black and AAPI residents in the city have more access, while White residents have less access.

- In Laguna Niguel, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is lower than the region for all groups, with little disparity between groups. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is high for all groups, with little disparity between groups.
- In Lake Forest, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is relatively high, and higher than region, for all groups. There is very little disparity between groups, except for Black residents below FPL, who have very low access to neighborhoods close to jobs. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is higher than in the region for all groups, with little disparity except for Hispanic, AAPI, and Native American residents living below FPL, all of whom have significantly less access.
- In Mission Viejo, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is low for all groups, with no disparities between groups. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is high for all groups, with little disparity except for Hispanics living below FPL, for whom access is relatively low compared to other city residents but is still higher than in the region.
- In Newport Beach, access to neighborhoods close to jobs, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital, is high for all groups, with very little disparity between groups.
- In Orange, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is higher than the region, but there are some disparities—access is lowest for AAPI and White residents. There are also disparities in access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Black and Hispanic residents overall, and Black and AAPI residents living below FPL have the least access. However, access is higher for all groups (except White residents), in comparison to the region.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is very low for all groups, with no disparities between groups. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is high for all groups, with some disparities—Hispanic residents living below FPL have the least access.
- In San Clemente, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is low for all groups, with very little disparity between groups. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is high for all groups (and higher than in the region), with some disparity—namely, Hispanic residents living below FPL have less access.
- In Santa Ana, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is higher for all groups than in region, with some disparities—access is lowest for AAPI residents, especially those living below FPL. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is lower than in the region for all groups except Black residents, and

there are significant disparities in access—Hispanic residents have the least access, and access is also lower for individuals living below FPL in each racial/ethnic group.

- In Tustin, access to neighborhoods close to jobs is higher for all groups than in region, with some disparities between races/ethnicities—White residents have the least access. Access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital is higher than in the region, with some disparities—Hispanic residents have the least access, and access is also lower for individuals living below FPL in each racial/ethnic group.

- In Westminster, there are disparities in access to neighborhoods close to jobs by race/ethnicity. Native American residents living below FPL, and AAPI residents, have the least access. There are some disparities in access to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital by race/ethnicity—Native American residents living below FPL and Hispanic and AAPI residents overall, have less access. Compared to the region, access in the city is slightly better for Black and Hispanic residents, worse for all other groups.

The following analysis describes how a person's place of residence affects their ability to obtain a job.

Map 8 – Economic Score, is a series of maps showing the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map's Economic Composite Score for north, central, and south Orange County, and the region. These maps were created by California HCD to facilitate fair housing planning, using the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map data[11]. The Economic Composite Score for a particular Census Tract is based on four indicators[12]:

- Poverty Rate – Measured as the percentage of the Tract residents who live above 200 percent of the FPL (the 200 percent threshold is used to account for the higher cost of living in California compared to other regions of the United States).

- Adult Education Rate – Measured as the percentage of adults aged 25 years and older in each Tract, who have earned at least a bachelor's degree.

- Employment Rate - Measured as the percentage of individuals in each Tract ages 20 to 64 who are employed in either the civilian labor force or the armed forces.

- Home Value – Measured as the median home value (dollars) of owner-occupied housing units in each tract.

---

[11] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing
[12] Detailed descriptions of the methodology used to measure each indicator can be found on the CTAC website, https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp

The composite score for each Tract is determined by whether it falls above or below the median (50th percentile) tract or block group value within each region. On the map, a higher numerical score indicates more positive economic outcomes.

These maps show the following relationship between residency patterns and economic outcomes, including employment:

- Countywide, there is a similar pattern to the education scores, with cities in the central County tending to have lower economic scores than cities and unincorporated areas along the coast and in the southern, northern, and eastern parts of the County. Low score areas generally correspond to areas where the population is predominantly Hispanic of AAPI, whereas the high score areas correspond to predominantly White areas.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions,
    - There are generally good economic outcomes in Cypress, Yorba Linda, North Tustin, La Palma, Los Alamitos, unincorporated areas east of Yorba Linda, Brea, North Tustin, Orange Park Acres, Villa Park, Seal Beach (except for the Tract where Leisure World, a retirement community, is located), Rossmoor, Laguna Beach, Dana Point, Ladera Ranch, and Capistrano Beach.
    - There is a mix of economic outcomes in the following places:
        - Placentia, where there are lower economic scores in the southwest corner of the city, which is predominantly Hispanic.
        - Laguna Woods and North Laguna Hills, which are predominantly White and have lower economic scores.
        - San Juan Capistrano, where there are lower economic scores in the Census Tract that encompasses the interchange between I-5 and the Ortega Highway (SR-74), which is also a high POC segregation area and predominantly Hispanic.
- In Aliso Viejo, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores, are predominantly White, and are mostly areas of high White concentration.
- In Anaheim, neighborhoods with lower economic scores include neighborhoods considered to be areas of high POC segregation, including those north of downtown and along SR-91, and south of downtown and adjacent to Disneyland. These areas are predominantly Hispanic. Conversely, Anaheim Hills has high economic scores and is predominantly White.
- In Buena Park, the neighborhoods between I-5 and SR-91 have the lowest economic scores in the city. These areas are predominantly Hispanic. The northeastern corner of the city, which is predominantly AAPI, has the highest economic scores in the city.
- In Costa Mesa, the neighborhoods in and surrounding downtown, on the west side of Newport Boulevard have the lowest economic scores. These are also areas that are predominantly Hispanic.

- In Fountain Valley, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores.
- In Fullerton, there is a general north/south divide between areas with higher and lower economic scores. The southeastern neighborhoods, which are predominantly Hispanic, have the lowest economic scores, while the northern half of the city, predominantly White and AAPI neighborhoods, have the highest economic scores.
- In Garden Grove, economic scores are moderate north of Garden Grove Freeway (SR-22) and are higher in West Garden Grove. Economic scores are generally lower south of SR-22.
- In Huntington Beach, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores.
- In Irvine, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores except in the area surrounding UC Irvine, and in the neighborhoods east of the intersections of SR-133 and I-5—these are predominantly AAPI.
- In La Habra, the areas with the lowest economic scores are the same areas with high POC segregation, including the neighborhoods in the center of the city north of Guadalupe Park and between Idaho Street to the west and Sonora High School to the east. These neighborhoods are predominantly Hispanic.
- In Laguna Niguel, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores, are predominantly White, and are mostly areas of high White concentration.
- In Lake Forest, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores except for in the southeastern corner, which is a predominantly Hispanic area.
- In Mission Viejo, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores, are predominantly White, and are primarily areas of high White concentration.
- In Newport Beach, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores, are predominantly White, and are all areas of high White segregation.
- In Orange, neighborhoods across the city have good economic scores. The best economic scores are in the neighborhoods north and east of Villa Park, where the population is predominantly White and classified as an area of high White segregation. The neighborhoods with lower economic scores are located west of Glassel Street and north of Walnut Avenue, which is a predominantly Hispanic area.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores, are predominantly White, and are generally areas of high White concentration.
- In San Clemente, neighborhoods across the city have high economic scores, are predominantly White, and are primarily areas of high White concentration.
- In Santa Ana, there are neighborhoods with low economic scores in much of the central and western parts of the city, which correspond to the areas of high POC segregation and are predominantly Hispanic, except for the Riverview West community, which is predominantly AAPI. Neighborhoods with higher economic scores are in the northern and southern parts of the city, which are areas of low-medium segregation.

- In Tustin, all neighborhoods have good economic scores except for one neighborhood south of I-5 and west of SR-55, adjacent to Santa Ana. This is also a predominantly Hispanic area and is classified as an area of high POC segregation.
- In Westminster, economic scores are lowest in the central part of the city, in the neighborhoods south of Westminster Boulevard, east of Hoover Street, and north of Bolsa Avenue. These are all areas of predominantly AAPI population.

Map 8 – Economic Score – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 8 – Economic Score – North Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 8 – Economic Score – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 8 – Economic Score – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

The following analysis describes the groups that are least successful in accessing employment.

Table 7 - Labor Force Participation and Unemployment, shows 2018-2022 ACS data on labor force participation rates and unemployment rates in the region and Orange County, for the overall population and by race/ethnicity, disability status, and sex. The table shows that:

- Orange County has lower unemployment rates than the region for every group measured in the table, except for Pacific Islanders.
- Labor force participation rates are generally higher in Orange County than the region, except for White individuals (lower in the County than the region) and Asian individuals (same rate in County and region).
- Similar to the region overall, Black individuals have the highest unemployment rate in Orange County. In the County, Pacific Islanders have the second highest unemployment rate.

Table 7 – Labor Force Participation and Unemployment

	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA		Orange County, CA		Aliso Viejo, CA	
	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate
Population 16 years and over	65.00%	6.60%	65.60%	5.40%	75.30%	3.80%
Race/Ethnicity						
White, Non-Hispanic	63.40%	6.30%	62.80%	5.10%	75.50%	3.50%
Black	60.70%	10.40%	70.60%	7.70%	84.90%	8.90%
Hispanic	67.60%	6.60%	70.70%	5.50%	78.00%	3.00%
Asian	62.70%	5.30%	62.70%	5.10%	71.00%	3.00%
Pacific Islander	66.40%	7.00%	68.70%	7.30%	100.00%	0.00%
Native American	66.20%	7.90%	70.60%	5.20%	100.00%	0.00%
Sex (population 20 to 64 years)						
Male	84.10%	6.10%	85.90%	4.70%	91.10%	2.90%
Female	72.80%	6.50%	73.50%	5.40%	79.00%	4.10%
Disability Status						
With any disability	46.80%	13.30%	51.00%	10.80%	68.50%	2.90%

	Anaheim, CA		Buena Park, CA		Costa Mesa, CA	
	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate
Population 16 years and over	67.40%	5.40%	69.00%	5.40%	73.20%	5.00%
Race/Ethnicity						
White, Non-Hispanic	62.70%	5.00%	61.40%	6.40%	71.20%	5.00%
Black	72.30%	9.30%	77.70%	3.30%	91.60%	5.90%
Hispanic	70.80%	5.40%	72.40%	5.00%	76.50%	5.80%
Asian	64.20%	4.70%	70.90%	5.00%	64.10%	2.60%
Pacific Islander	66.80%	2.50%	63.30%	33.50%	92.80%	2.80%
Native American	73.70%	4.10%	67.80%	18.30%	72.90%	3.70%
Sex (population 20 to 64 years)						
Male	86.20%	4.70%	87.00%	5.60%	89.50%	4.00%
Female	73.90%	5.50%	77.00%	4.90%	78.50%	5.00%
Disability Status						
With any disability	47.50%	13.40%	50.10%	13.70%	57.80%	11.50%

	Fountain Valley, CA		Fullerton, CA		Garden Grove, CA	
	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate
Population 16 years and over	61.80%	6.00%	65.40%	6.90%	64.30%	5.80%
Race/Ethnicity						
White, Non-Hispanic	57.40%	6.90%	60.40%	6.60%	59.70%	6.70%
Black	70.50%	27.80%	63.10%	17.80%	57.80%	0.00%
Hispanic	72.90%	3.90%	71.10%	6.60%	72.90%	4.90%
Asian	62.10%	5.10%	63.60%	6.90%	59.60%	6.40%
Pacific Islander	65.20%	20.40%	83.50%	0.00%	65.60%	13.00%
Native American	66.00%	0.00%	73.20%	8.30%	78.70%	5.90%
Sex (population 20 to 64 years)						
Male	83.30%	7.40%	85.00%	5.50%	83.30%	5.00%
Female	75.30%	4.80%	71.80%	7.50%	74.00%	5.80%
Disability Status						
With any disability	37.40%	12.10%	52.00%	10.50%	46.40%	10.70%

	Huntington Beach, CA		Irvine, CA		Laguna Niguel, CA	
	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate
Population 16 years and over	66.30%	5.40%	65.60%	5.50%	66.20%	5.50%
Race/Ethnicity						
White, Non-Hispanic	63.80%	5.10%	66.90%	6.30%	63.50%	4.70%
Black	80.90%	13.10%	73.10%	5.20%	63.40%	9.80%
Hispanic	75.70%	5.70%	68.10%	5.50%	74.10%	3.00%
Asian	63.40%	5.40%	63.40%	4.50%	69.40%	9.60%
Pacific Islander	77.70%	6.40%	79.30%	0.60%	93.10%	0.00%
Native American	56.00%	4.00%	65.20%	4.00%	89.70%	0.00%
Sex (population 20 to 64 years)						
Male	85.70%	5.50%	83.10%	4.10%	86.70%	4.30%
Female	77.40%	4.60%	70.10%	6.40%	75.00%	6.80%
Disability Status						
With any disability	53.80%	13.00%	54.10%	11.20%	37.80%	10.50%

Note 1: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Table 7 – Labor Force Participation and Unemployment (continued)

	La Habra, CA		Lake Forest, CA		Mission Viejo, CA	
	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate
Population 16 years and over	68.30%	7.20%	69.20%	5.00%	63.60%	4.40%
Race/Ethnicity						
White, Non-Hispanic	63.60%	7.60%	67.20%	5.20%	60.30%	4.70%
Black	76.00%	3.60%	54.70%	3.50%	71.10%	2.80%
Hispanic	71.20%	7.70%	75.20%	5.50%	71.50%	3.20%
Asian	65.30%	4.30%	67.50%	3.30%	66.20%	5.00%
Pacific Islander	100.00%	0.00%	60.70%	0.00%	89.50%	0.00%
Native American	57.70%	0.00%	94.90%	0.00%	72.80%	0.00%
Sex (population 20 to 64 years)						
Male	88.90%	6.20%	88.90%	4.30%	88.60%	3.50%
Female	76.60%	7.50%	73.80%	5.00%	75.10%	4.60%
Disability Status						
With any disability	49.80%	15.90%	57.30%	7.50%	53.90%	3.70%

	Newport Beach, CA		Orange, CA		Rancho Santa Margarita, CA	
	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate
Population 16 years and over	62.40%	4.10%	66.10%	4.70%	74.30%	3.30%
Race/Ethnicity						
White, Non-Hispanic	60.50%	4.70%	64.00%	4.00%	73.60%	3.00%
Black	54.80%	0.00%	60.90%	5.60%	82.10%	1.60%
Hispanic	76.80%	2.70%	69.20%	5.40%	80.20%	3.80%
Asian	57.50%	0.80%	64.90%	3.10%	72.70%	3.40%
Pacific Islander	100.00%	0.00%	59.60%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Native American	65.40%	0.00%	76.50%	0.00%	95.00%	21.60%
Sex (population 20 to 64 years)						
Male	88.70%	3.80%	82.30%	4.20%	92.90%	3.50%
Female	68.60%	3.90%	75.60%	4.20%	77.10%	2.20%
Disability Status						
With any disability	60.30%	10.40%	52.40%	5.10%	62.10%	5.20%

	San Clemente, CA		Santa Ana, CA		Tustin, CA	
	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate
Population 16 years and over	63.10%	5.30%	66.70%	5.50%	69.00%	5.90%
Race/Ethnicity						
White, Non-Hispanic	61.90%	5.80%	59.90%	3.90%	65.90%	7.30%
Black	71.50%	0.00%	70.50%	6.60%	74.00%	8.00%
Hispanic	70.70%	4.70%	68.50%	5.30%	72.50%	6.50%
Asian	52.20%	3.90%	61.70%	7.40%	67.80%	4.00%
Pacific Islander	30.90%	0.00%	42.10%	24.90%	63.50%	14.80%
Native American	100.00%	0.00%	70.00%	6.40%	68.20%	0.00%
Sex (population 20 to 64 years)						
Male	85.40%	4.80%	85.00%	4.90%	89.70%	4.40%
Female	71.60%	5.30%	71.60%	5.20%	75.80%	6.50%
Disability Status						
With any disability	52.60%	4.40%	51.70%	9.60%	51.40%	11.20%

	Westminster, CA	
	Labor Force Participation Rate	Unemployment rate
Population 16 years and over	59.90%	7.50%
Race/Ethnicity		
White, Non-Hispanic	58.00%	5.80%
Black	71.40%	3.80%
Hispanic	66.60%	9.00%
Asian	57.40%	7.20%
Pacific Islander	36.30%	25.60%
Native American	47.60%	15.40%
Sex (population 20 to 64 years)		
Male	82.10%	7.20%
Female	71.20%	7.60%
Disability Status		
With any disability	42.10%	12.90%

Note 1: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

3. **Transportation**

This analysis describes any disparities in access to transportation related to costs and access to public transit by protected class groups.

Table 6 includes a *Transit Index*, which measures the likelihood that residents will utilize public transportation. Higher index values indicate better access to public transit in a neighborhood. Table 6 also includes a *Low Transportation Cost Index*, which measures the cost of transportation in a neighborhood. Higher index values indicate lower transportation costs. Transportation costs may be low in a neighborhood due to better access to public transportation, or to the density of housing, services, and employment, or contributing factors.

Table 6 shows the following regarding disparities in access to transit and to neighborhoods with low transportation costs in each of the participating jurisdictions:

- In the region, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are relatively high for all groups, though there are significant disparities between racial/ethnic groups. Both indices are lowest for White residents and highest for Black residents and are higher across all groups for individuals living below the FPL.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, access to transit is slightly lower for all groups compared to the region but is still relatively high. There are also significant disparities, with AAPI residents having the best access, and White residents having the least access. Access is slightly higher across groups for people living below the FPL. Access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is lower for all groups compared to the region overall but is still relatively high. There are some disparities between groups, with Hispanic residents having the best access, and White residents having the least access. Access is slightly higher across groups for people living below the FPL, except for Hispanic residents living below the FPL who have similar access to the overall Hispanic population.
- In Aliso Viejo, access to transit is low for all groups, and lowest for Black and Native American residents living below the FPL. Access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is relatively high for all groups, with small disparities between groups—access is lowest for Black and Native American residents living below the FPL.
- In Anaheim, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.
- In Buena Park, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.
- In Costa Mesa, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.

- In Fountain Valley, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups. Black residents living below the FPL have the highest access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs.
- In Fullerton, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.
- In Garden Grove, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.
- In Huntington Beach, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups. Native American residents living below the FPL have relatively low access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs, compared to other groups in city and the region.
- In Irvine, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.
- In La Habra, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.
- In Laguna Niguel, access to transit is low for all groups. Access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is slightly lower for residents of the city in comparison to the region.
- In Lake Forest, access to transit is low for all groups, and lowest for Black and Hispanic residents living below the FPL. Access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is slightly lower for residents of the city in comparison to the region.
- In Mission Viejo, access to transit is low for all groups. Access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is slightly lower for residents of the city in comparison to the region.
- In Newport Beach, access to transit is high for all groups. Access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is comparable to the region for most groups, except for AAPI residents in the city, who have less access than other groups and compared to the region.
- In Orange, access to transit is high for all groups and slightly better than access in the region. Access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is relatively high for all groups and is comparable to the region as a whole.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, access to transit is low for all groups. Access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is also lower in the city compared to the region, and there are significant racial/ethnic disparities. AAPI residents living below the FPL have significantly lower access than other groups.
- In San Clemente, access to transit is low for all groups, and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs is also lower in the city compared to the region. There are some racial/ethnic disparities in access to neighborhoods with low

transportation costs—Native American residents living below the FPL line, and AAPI residents of all income levels, have less access compared to other groups.

- In Santa Ana, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.
- In Tustin, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.
- In Westminster, access to transit and access to neighborhoods with low transportation costs are high for all groups.

The following analysis describes how a person's place of residence affects their access to transportation.

Map 9 – High Quality Transit Areas, is a series of maps showing the areas of north, central, and south Orange County, and the region, that have access to "high quality" public transit, defined as having scheduled frequencies of 15 minutes or less. These maps were created by California HCD to facilitate fair housing planning, using data from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).[13]. On the maps, the outlined areas are those within half a mile of a transit stop that is served by public transit with scheduled frequencies of 15 minutes or less.

These maps show the following relationship between a person's place of residence and access to transportation:

- Countywide, high quality transit areas (HQTAs) are concentrated in central County cities, and there are no HQTAs in the southern or northeast parts of the County.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, there are HQTAs in the following places
    - In Brea, there is a HQTA in the center of city, overlapping with the racially integrated Census Tract that has a predominantly Hispanic population.
    - In Cypress, there is a HQTA on the southern edge of the city.
    - In Stanton, HQTAs cover the entire city.
    - In Seal Beach, there are HQTAs along Seal Beach Boulevard north of US-1.
    - In Rossmoor, the southeastern corner of the city is a HQTA, along Seal Beach Boulevard.
    - In Los Alamitos, the northern edge of the city is part of an HQTA.
    - In Laguna Woods, the eastern half of the city is a HQTA, along El Toro Rd.
    - In Laguna Hills, the part of the city adjacent to the HQTAs in Laguna Woods and Lake Forest is a HQTA.

---

[13] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing

- o The following areas have no HQTAs: Placentia, Yorba Linda, unincorporated areas east of Yorba Linda, La Palma, Villa Park, Orange Park Acres, El Modena, North Tustin, Laguna Beach, Dana Point, Capistrano Beach, San Juan Capistrano, Ladera Ranch, and North Laguna Hills
- In Aliso Viejo, there are no HQTAs
- In Anaheim, there are HQTAs in the western part of city along Beach Boulevard; in the central and southern part of city along Harbor Boulevard and Katella Avenue, including the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center near Angel Stadium; and in the eastern part of the city near the Anaheim Canyon Metrolink station. These areas overlap with both high POC segregation areas and racially integrated areas.
- In Buena Park, there are HQTAs in the eastern half of city, along Beach Boulevard and La Palma Avenue.
- In Costa Mesa, HQTAs cover most of the city's area except for the high White segregation areas in the northwest (the neighborhoods north and west of the Country Club) and in East Side Costa Mesa (east of SR-55 and south of Mesa Drive), which do not have HQTAs.
- In Fountain Valley, there are no HQTAs
- In Fullerton, there are HQTAs in downtown Fullerton and up to Fullerton College, including the area around the Metrolink station.
- In Garden Grove, there are HQTAs south of SR-22, in West Garden Grove, and in the eastern part of the city. There are no HQTAs in the city's north-central area.
- In Huntington Beach, most of the city is not a HQTA. There is one HQTA around the intersection of Main Street and Pacific Coast Highway (US-1).
- In Irvine, there are HQTAs located near UC Irvine and John Wayne Airport, and the Irvine Medical and Science Complex. The majority of the city does not have HQTAs.
- In La Habra, the western half of the city is a HQTA. In the eastern half of the city, which is a high POC segregation area and has a concentration of predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods, there are no HQTAs
- In Laguna Niguel, there are no HQTAs except in a small area in the northeast corner along Crown Valley Parkway, adjacent to Mission Viejo.
- In Lake Forest, most of the city is not a HQTA. There are two HQTAs in the city: one in Foothill Ranch, north of SR-241(around Towne Center); and the other in the city's southeastern corner along El Toro Rd (which is a predominantly Hispanic area).
- In Mission Viejo, most of the city does not have HQTAs. There are two HQTAs in the city: one in the southern part, along Crown Valley Parkway (which is a low-medium concentration area with a predominantly Hispanic population); and the other in the northern part of the city, around the intersections of Santa Margarita Parkway with Los Alisos Boulevard and Marguerite Parkway (which are low-medium concentration areas with predominantly White populations)

- In Newport Beach, there are HQTAs just south of Costa Mesa and around the Civic Center. Much of the city does not have HQTAs.
- In Orange, there are HQTAs downtown, in the neighborhoods west and northwest of downtown, and along the westside of Costa Mesa Freeway (SR-55) north of Katella Avenue. There are no HQTAs east of the Costa Mesa Freeway.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, there are no HQTAs
- In San Clemente, there are no HQTAs
- In Santa Ana, most of the city is covered by HQTAs, except for northeast and southeast corners.
- In Tustin, most of the city does not have HQTAs. There are two HQTAs in the following areas: one HQTA is in the racially integrated neighborhoods just to the north of I-5, in and around downtown; the other HQTA is in South Tustin, around the Metrolink train station.
- In Westminster, most of the city is considered a HQTA, with the exception of the western and southeastern areas.

Map 9 – High Quality Transit Areas – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 9 – High Quality Transit Areas – North Orange County

12/2/2024, 11:28:49 AM

1/2 Mile from High Quality Transit Area

1:179,206

Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community, City of Anaheim, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 9 – High Quality Transit Areas – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 9 – High Quality Transit Areas – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

4. Access to Low Poverty Neighborhoods

The following analysis describes any disparities in exposure to poverty by protected class groups.

Table 6 includes a *Low Poverty Index*, which measures the level of poverty in a neighborhood. Higher index values indicate less exposure to poverty in a neighborhood.

Table 6 shows the following regarding disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods in each of the participating jurisdictions:

- In the region, there are significant disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods. Hispanic and Black residents have the least access, and White residents have the most access. Individuals living below the FPL also have less access to low-poverty neighborhoods, compared to the overall population.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region, including for individuals living below the FPL. However, there are significant disparities in access. Hispanic residents have the least access. White residents have the most access. Individuals living below the FPL also have less access to low-poverty neighborhoods, compared to the overall population.

- In Aliso Viejo, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region, including for individuals living below the FPL, and there are no major disparities by race/ethnicity.
- In Anaheim, there are significant disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods. Hispanic residents have the least access. White residents have the most access. Individuals living below the FPL also have less access to low-poverty neighborhoods, compared to the overall population. Compared to the region, White, AAPI, and Native American residents of the city have less access to low-poverty neighborhoods; and Black residents of the city have better access.
- In Buena Park, there are similar disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods as in the region, though at a smaller scale because Hispanic, Black, and Native American residents in the city have better access than their counterparts in the region. Access in the city is lowest for Hispanic and Black residents, and highest for White residents. Individuals living below the FPL have less access across all groups, except for Native American residents.
- In Costa Mesa, there are similar disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods as in the region, though at a smaller scale due to the fact that all groups, except for White residents, in the city have better access than their counterparts in the region as a whole. Access in the city is lowest for Hispanic residents and highest for AAPI residents. Individuals living below the FPL have less access across all groups, except for Black residents
- In Fountain Valley, all residents have relatively good access to low-poverty neighborhoods compared to the region. There are some disparities by race/ethnicity, with Hispanic residents, and Native American residents living below the FPL, having the least access.
- In Fullerton, all residents have relatively good access to low-poverty neighborhoods compared to the region. There are some disparities by race/ethnicity, with Hispanic residents, including those living below the FPL, and Black residents living below the FPL, having the least access.
- In Garden Grove, there are significant disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods. AAPI and Hispanic residents have the least access. White residents have the best access. The population living below the FPL has less access across all groups. Compared to the region, disparities in the city are less pronounced due to lower index values for White and AAPI residents in the city, and higher index values for all other groups in the city, as compared to values in the region.
- In Huntington Beach, all residents have relatively good access to low-poverty neighborhoods compared to the region. There are some disparities by race/ethnicity, with Hispanic residents having the least access and White residents having the most access. Individuals living below the FPL have less access across all groups, except for Native American residents.

- In Irvine, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region, including for individuals living below the FPL, and there are no major disparities by race/ethnicity.
- In La Habra, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region, except for White residents. There are significant disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods by race/ethnicity. Hispanic residents have the least access. AAPI residents overall have the most access, however, the AAPI population living below the FPL has significantly less access compared to the overall AAPI population in the city.
- In Laguna Niguel, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region, including for individuals living below the FPL, and there are no major disparities by race/ethnicity.
- In Lake Forest, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region. However, some racial/ethnic disparities exist, with Hispanic residents having the least access. For the population living below the FPL, access is much lower for Native American residents compared to any other group, access is lower for AAPI residents compared to the overall AAPI population, and access is higher for Black residents compared to the overall Black population.
- In Mission Viejo, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region. However, some disparities exist for individuals living below the FPL, with Black residents living below the FPL having less access than other groups in the city (though still with better access compared to the region).
- In Newport Beach, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region, including for individuals living below the FPL, and there are no major disparities by race/ethnicity.
- In Orange, there are similar disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods as in the region, though at a smaller scale because all groups, except for White residents, in the city have better access than their counterparts in the region as a whole. Hispanic residents in the city have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods. Additionally, Black residents living below the FPL have significantly lower access.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region, and there is little racial/ethnic disparity. For the population living below the FPL, racial/ethnic disparities are larger, mainly because the AAPI population below the FPL has the most access to low-poverty neighborhoods of any group in the city.
- In San Clemente, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is higher for all groups compared to the region. However, some racial/ethnic disparities exist, with Hispanic residents experiencing the least access. Disparities are larger for the population

living below the FPL, with Black residents living below the FPL having the least access in the city.

- In Santa Ana, there are significant disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods. Hispanic residents have the least access overall, and White residents have the most access overall. For the population living below the FPL, access is lower across all groups. Compared to the region, all groups in the city have less access to low-poverty neighborhoods, except for Black residents, who have access comparable to the region overall.
- In Tustin, there are similar disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods as in the region, though at a smaller scale due to the fact that Hispanic, Black, and Native American residents in the city have higher access relative to the region, and White and AAPI residents have lower access relative to region. In the city, Hispanic residents have the lowest access. For the population living below the FPL, there are also significant disparities. Access to low-poverty neighborhoods is lowest for Native American and Hispanic residents living below the FPL, and access for White residents living below the FPL is significantly lower than access for the overall White population.
- In Westminster, access to low poverty neighborhoods is lower than in the region for all groups, except for Black residents, and there are significant racial/ethnic disparities. Hispanic and AAPI residents have the least access, overall. For the population living below the FPL, access is lower across all groups and is lowest for AAPI residents.

Map 10 – Poverty Status, is a series of maps showing the percent of households, by Census Tract, living below the FPL in north, central, and south Orange County, and in the region. These maps were created by California HCD to facilitate fair housing planning, using data from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2017-2021 5-Year Estimates.[14]

These maps show the following relationship between an individual's place of residence and their exposure to poverty:

- Countywide, higher poverty areas are in the central County cities, whereas the areas along the coast, in the south, and in the northeast are low poverty areas.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, there are high poverty areas (i.e., with poverty rates above 20%) in the following places:
  - In Placentia, in the southwest corner of the city, which is a high POC segregation area that is predominantly Hispanic.
  - In Stanton, in the neighborhoods on the south side of Katella Avenue and on the eastside of Beach Boulevard north of Katella Avenue.

---

[14] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing

- o In San Juan Capistrano, there is one tract between Camino Del Avion, Del Obispo Street, and Alipaz Street, which has a poverty rate over 20% and is predominantly Hispanic.
- In Aliso Viejo, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Anaheim, the highest poverty area is located downtown north of Lincoln Avenue (in a predominantly Hispanic area). There are other areas of concentrated poverty south and west of downtown, which are also predominantly Hispanic. The areas of lowest poverty are downtown south of Lincoln Avenue, east of downtown (including the racially integrated areas), in Northeast Anaheim, and in Anaheim Hills.
- In Buena Park, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Costa Mesa, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Fountain Valley, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Fullerton, there are high poverty areas in the southeast (predominantly Hispanic, low-medium segregation areas) and surrounding CSU Fullerton (likely due to the presence of college students).
- In Garden Grove, there are high poverty areas in the industrial area in West Garden Grove, in the Census Tract between Brookhurst Street and Gilbert Street north of Chapman Avenue (a low-medium segregation area that is predominantly Hispanic), and in the Census Tract in between SR-22 and Garden Grove Boulevard west of Gilbert Street (a high POC segregation area that is predominantly AAPI).
- In Huntington Beach, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Irvine, the highest poverty area is surrounding UC Irvine (likely due to the presence of college students). There is also a high poverty area west of San Diego Creek north of I-405. This is primarily an industrial/commercial area encompassing the Irvine Business Complex.
- In La Habra, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Laguna Niguel, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Lake Forest, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Mission Viejo, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Newport Beach, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Orange, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%, and all neighborhoods east of Villa Park have poverty rates below 10%.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In San Clemente, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Santa Ana, high poverty areas are concentrated in downtown and southeast of downtown where land use is primarily industrial and commercial, and in western Santa Ana, specifically the Census Tract northwest of the intersection of McFadden Avenue and Harbor Boulevard, where Kona Kai Mobile Home Park is located. All of these areas are high POC segregation areas with predominantly Hispanic populations.

- In Tustin, all Census Tracts have a poverty rate below 20%.
- In Westminster, there are high poverty areas between Edwards Street and Beach Boulevard along Westminster Boulevard, and south of Bolsa Avenue west of Bushard Street. These areas are high POC segregation areas with predominantly AAPI populations.

Map 10 – Poverty Status – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 10 – Poverty Status – North Orange County

12/2/2024, 11:33:56 AM

Poverty Status (ACS, 2017-2021) - Tract

- [ ] < 10%
- [ ] 10% - 20%
- [ ] 20% - 30%
- [ ] 30% - 40%
- [ ] > 40%

1:179,206

0   1.75   3.5   7 mi
0   3   6   12 km

Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community, City of Anaheim, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 10 – Poverty Status – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 10 – Poverty Status – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Table 8 - Poverty by Race/Ethnicity and National Origin, shows data from the 2018-2022 ACS on poverty rates by race/ethnicity and national origin, for the region, Orange County, the Urban County jurisdictions, and the HUD Entitlement Cities. The table shows the following:

- Countywide, the poverty rate is lower than region for all groups except AAPI residents (who have a poverty rate comparable to the region). There are significant racial/ethnic disparities. The Black poverty rate is highest and is nearly double the White poverty rate, and the foreign-born population is more likely to live below poverty than the native-born population.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, the poverty rate is lower than the County overall. Similar to the County overall, the Black poverty rate is highest and is nearly double the White poverty rate, and the foreign-born population is more likely to live below poverty than the native-born population.
- In Aliso Viejo, the overall poverty rate is lower than the County. Similar to the County, the foreign-born population is more likely to live below poverty than the native-born population. (Note that the Black and Native American populations may be too small for the sample data to be accurate.)
- In Anaheim, the overall poverty rate is higher than the County and is comparable to the region poverty rate. Black and Hispanic residents have the highest poverty rates.

Similar to the County overall, the foreign-born population is more likely to live below poverty than the native-born population.

- In Buena Park, the overall poverty rate is lower than in the County. Similar to the County overall, Black residents have the highest poverty rate.
- In Costa Mesa, the overall poverty rate is similar to the County and there are much larger racial/ethnic disparities. The Black poverty rate in the city is over 20%, which is nearly three times as high as the White poverty rate and double the AAPI poverty rate. Similar to the County overall, the foreign-born population is more likely to live below poverty than the native-born population.
- In Fountain Valley, the overall poverty rate is lower than the County. Similar to the County, the foreign-born population is more likely to live below poverty than the native-born population. (Note that the Black and Native American populations may be too small for the sample data to be accurate.)
- In Fullerton, the overall poverty rate is higher than the County and is comparable to the region poverty rate, and there are much larger racial/ethnic disparities than in the County overall. The Black poverty rate is over 22%, which is almost three times higher than the White and AAPI poverty rates. The Hispanic poverty rate is above 17%, which is more than double the White and AAPI rates. Similar to the County overall, the foreign-born population is more likely to live below poverty than the native-born population. (Note that the Native American population may be too small for the sample data to be accurate.)
- In Garden Grove, the overall poverty rate is higher than the County and is comparable to the region poverty rate. There are relatively small disparities by race/ethnicity, with Black residents experiencing the highest poverty rates, and foreign-born residents more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents.
- In Huntington Beach, the overall poverty rate is lower than the County and the foreign-born population is much more likely to live below poverty than the native-born population. (Note that the Native American population may be too small for the sample data to be accurate.)
- In Irvine, the overall poverty rate is higher than the County and is comparable to the region poverty rate. Black, Hispanic, and AAPI residents experience similar poverty rates, which are all higher than the poverty rate for White residents. Foreign-born residents are more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents.
- In La Habra, the overall poverty rate is similar to the County. Foreign-born residents more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents, and Hispanic residents have a higher poverty rate than other groups. (Note that the Black and Native American populations may be too small for the sample data to be accurate.)
- In Laguna Niguel, the overall poverty rate is lower than the County. However, there are disparities between groups. Hispanic residents have the highest poverty rate in

the city, and foreign-born residents are more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents.

- In Lake Forest, the overall poverty rate is lower than in the County. However, there are disparities between groups. Hispanic residents have the highest poverty rate in the city, and foreign-born residents are more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents.
- In Mission Viejo, the overall poverty rate is lower than the County. The data show the Black poverty rate to be much higher than other racial/ethnic groups, however the population size may be too small for the data to be accurate.
- In Newport Beach, the overall poverty rate is lower than the County. Unlike the County overall, foreign-born residents in the city are less likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents. Poverty rates for Black, AAPI, and Native American residents are the highest. However, note that the Black and Native American populations may be too small for the sample data to be accurate.
- In Orange, the overall poverty rate is similar to the County. In the city, Native American and Hispanic residents have the highest poverty rates, and foreign-born residents are more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, the overall poverty rate is lower than the County. The data show the Native American poverty rate to be much higher than other racial/ethnic groups, however the population size may be too small for the data to be accurate.
- In San Clemente, the overall poverty rate is lower than the County and foreign-born residents are more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents. The data show the Black poverty rate to be much higher than other racial/ethnic groups, however the population size may be too small for the data to be accurate.
- In Santa Ana, the overall poverty rate is higher than the County but lower than the region poverty rate. Black residents have the highest poverty rate (nearly 20%).
- In Tustin, the overall poverty rate is higher than the County but lower than the region poverty rate. Hispanic residents have the highest poverty rate (nearly double the White poverty rate), and foreign-born residents are more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents.
- In Westminster, the overall poverty rate is higher than the County and the region. The Black poverty rate is over 20% and more than double the White poverty rate. The AAPI poverty rate is over 18% and is also more than double the White poverty rate. Foreign-born residents are more likely to live below the FPL than native-born residents. (Note that the Native American population may be too small for the sample data to be accurate.)

Table 8 – Poverty by Race/Ethnicity and National Origin

	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA			Orange County, CA			Urban County Jurisdictions		
	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)
Total Population	12,920,085	1,647,788	12.8%	3,137,483	303,810	9.7%	582,174	43,112	7.4%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic	3,668,661	323,497	8.8%	1,210,102	85,075	7.0%	292,262	15,698	5.4%
Black	811,104	159,065	19.6%	51,984	6,751	13.0%	9,465	1,027	10.9%
Hispanic	5,846,585	884,177	15.1%	1,063,284	125,597	11.8%	141,632	13,808	9.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,162,068	239,538	11.1%	689,672	76,196	11.0%	112,985	11,023	9.8%
Native American	128,664	19,497	15.2%	19,436	1,999	10.3%	2,701	138	5.1%
National Origin									
Foreign Born	4,215,010	604,310	14.3%	930,789	112,838	12.1%	135,078	14,304	10.6%
Native	8,705,075	1,043,478	12.0%	2,206,694	190,972	8.7%	447,096	28,808	6.4%

	Aliso Viejo, CA			Anaheim, CA			Buena Park, CA		
	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)
Total Population	51,292	2,536	4.9%	343,102	43,311	12.6%	83,085	7,313	8.8%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic	28,566	1,463	5.1%	80,534	8,896	11.0%	18,453	1,509	8.2%
Black	1,378	11	0.8%	8,888	1,316	14.8%	1,957	272	13.9%
Hispanic	10,262	546	5.3%	183,520	26,222	14.3%	33,314	3,184	9.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,204	378	4.6%	61,686	6,252	10.1%	27,521	2,193	8.0%
Native American	54	0	0.0%	2,917	269	9.2%	721	44	6.1%
National Origin									
Foreign Born	12,434	1,072	8.6%	119,493	15,929	13.3%	28,957	2,617	9.0%
Native	38,858	1,464	3.8%	223,609	27,382	12.2%	54,128	4,696	8.7%

	Costa Mesa, CA			Fountain Valley, CA			Fullerton, CA		
	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)
Total Population	110,499	10,459	9.5%	56,467	3,940	7.0%	139,420	17,089	12.3%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic	53,986	4,029	7.5%	21,679	1,399	6.5%	43,928	3,528	8.0%
Black	1,569	316	20.1%	408	12	2.9%	2,995	672	22.4%
Hispanic	40,007	4,890	12.2%	9,620	851	8.8%	53,149	9,389	17.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,182	974	9.6%	21,740	1,525	7.0%	35,218	2,974	8.4%
Native American	1,199	136	11.3%	253	30	11.9%	766	144	18.8%
National Origin									
Foreign Born	25,700	3,009	11.7%	18,014	1,442	8.0%	40,515	5,355	13.2%
Native	84,799	7,450	8.8%	38,453	2,498	6.5%	98,905	11,734	11.9%

	Garden Grove, CA			Huntington Beach, CA			Irvine, CA		
	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)
Total Population	170,314	21,492	12.6%	196,462	14,268	7.3%	294,174	36,705	12.5%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic	29,306	3,125	10.7%	117,697	7,779	6.6%	106,519	10,083	9.5%
Black	1,878	258	13.7%	2,371	190	8.0%	5,450	812	14.9%
Hispanic	63,619	7,808	12.3%	38,440	3,341	8.7%	31,876	4,652	14.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	71,977	9,834	13.7%	25,548	2,254	8.8%	131,790	18,819	14.3%
Native American	1,340	10	0.7%	879	157	17.9%	616	26	4.2%
National Origin									
Foreign Born	75,026	10,677	14.2%	32,025	3,644	11.4%	118,575	18,364	15.5%
Native	95,288	10,815	11.3%	164,437	10,624	6.5%	175,599	18,341	10.4%

Note 1: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Table 8 – Poverty by Race/Ethnicity and National Origin (continued)

	Laguna Niguel, CA			La Habra, CA			Lake Forest, CA		
	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)
Total Population	64,011	4,749	7.4%	62,463	6,123	9.8%	85,280	6,234	7.3%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic	41,043	2,292	5.6%	15,442	927	6.0%	41,699	2,687	6.4%
Black	1,299	45	3.5%	1,218	69	5.7%	1,858	154	8.3%
Hispanic	10,330	1,668	16.1%	37,307	4,373	11.7%	19,916	2,200	11.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,326	275	3.8%	7,635	627	8.2%	17,133	860	5.0%
Native American	98	8	8.2%	628	237	37.7%	697	40	5.7%
National Origin									
Foreign Born	14,975	997	6.7%	15,451	1,976	12.8%	22,911	2,397	10.5%
Native	49,036	3,752	7.7%	47,012	4,147	8.8%	62,369	3,837	6.2%

	Mission Viejo, CA			Newport Beach, CA			Orange, CA		
	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)
Total Population	92,779	4,550	4.9%	84,875	6,741	7.9%	132,780	12,263	9.2%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic	56,531	2,764	4.9%	64,620	5,070	7.8%	55,043	4,266	7.8%
Black	1,095	190	17.4%	663	154	23.2%	1,708	122	7.1%
Hispanic	18,286	774	4.2%	8,861	568	6.4%	51,508	6,009	11.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,114	666	5.1%	6,901	745	10.8%	18,190	1,193	6.6%
Native American	415	19	4.6%	284	33	11.6%	1,116	164	14.7%
National Origin									
Foreign Born	20,553	1,066	5.2%	12,667	919	7.3%	29,177	3,073	10.5%
Native	72,226	3,484	4.8%	72,208	5,822	8.1%	103,603	9,190	8.9%

	Rancho Santa Margarita, CA			San Clemente, CA			Santa Ana, CA		
	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)
Total Population	47,659	1,864	3.9%	63,979	3,554	5.6%	307,413	35,391	11.5%
Race/Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic	28,312	1,047	3.7%	46,057	2,356	5.1%	27,332	2,868	10.5%
Black	819	22	2.7%	1,057	159	15.0%	3,181	630	19.8%
Hispanic	9,720	492	5.1%	10,804	619	5.7%	237,341	26,855	11.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,983	156	2.6%	3,144	238	7.6%	36,979	4,716	12.8%
Native American	210	36	17.1%	205	10	4.9%	3,394	265	7.8%
National Origin									
Foreign Born	9,905	425	4.3%	7,227	560	7.7%	126,835	14,705	11.6%
Native	37,754	1,439	3.8%	56,752	2,994	5.3%	180,578	20,686	11.5%

	Tustin, CA			Westminster, CA		
	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)	Total Population	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (#)	Population Living Below Poverty Rate (%)
Total Population	79,119	7,952	10.1%	90,136	14,164	15.7%
Race/Ethnicity						
White, Non-Hispanic	22,406	1,500	6.7%	18,687	1,789	9.6%
Black	1,826	134	7.3%	901	186	20.6%
Hispanic	31,997	4,241	13.3%	21,775	3,107	14.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	20,308	1,893	9.3%	46,108	8,601	18.7%
Native American	561	56	10.0%	382	177	46.3%
National Origin						
Foreign Born	24,951	2,987	12.0%	40,320	7,320	18.2%
Native	54,168	4,965	9.2%	49,816	6,844	13.7%

Note 1: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

5. Access to Environmentally Healthy Neighborhoods

The following analysis describes any disparities in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods by protected class groups.

Table 6 includes an *Environmental Health Index*, which captures the potential exposure to harmful toxins in a neighborhood. Higher index values indicate less exposure to harmful toxins, and therefore better environmental quality, in a neighborhood.

Table 6 shows the following regarding disparities in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods in each of the participating jurisdictions:

- In the region, there is relatively low access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods for all groups, and racial/ethnic disparities exist. Access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods is highest access for White residents, and lowest for Black residents followed by Hispanic and AAPI residents. Access is lower for all groups living below the FPL, with the least access experienced by Hispanic residents living below the FPL.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, there is relatively low access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods for all groups, and racial/ethnic disparities exist. Access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods is highest access for White residents, and lowest for AAPI residents followed by Black and Hispanic residents. Access is lower for all groups living below the FPL, except for White residents who have comparable access to the overall population.
- In Aliso Viejo, there is relatively high access to environmentally health neighborhoods for all groups compared to the region, and no racial/ethnic disparities.
- In Anaheim, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In Buena Park, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In Costa Mesa, residents have better access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than residents of the region, but access is still low. There are some racial/ethnic disparities in access. Overall, AAPI residents have the least access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods, and Hispanic residents have the best access. For the population living below the FPL, Black and Native American residents have the least access.
- In Fountain Valley, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents compared to the region. There are small disparities in access for the population living below the FPL. Specifically, Black residents living below the FPL have the least access.

- In Fullerton, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In Garden Grove, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In Huntington Beach, residents have better access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than residents of the region overall, but access is still fairly low and there are some racial/ethnic disparities. Access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods is lowest for Hispanic residents, and even more so for Hispanic residents living below the FPL.
- In Irvine, residents have better access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than those of the region, but access is still low for all groups regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In La Habra, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In Laguna Niguel, residents have better access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than residents of the region overall, but access is still limited for all groups regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In Lake Forest, residents have better access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than residents of the region overall, but access is still limited and there are some disparities among the population living below the FPL—specifically, Native American residents living below the FPL have the least access.
- In Mission Viejo, residents have better access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than residents of the region overall, but access is still limited for all groups regardless of race/ethnicity
- In Newport Beach, residents have better access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than residents of the region overall, but access is still limited for all groups regardless of race/ethnicity
- In Orange, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, there is relatively high access to environmentally health neighborhoods for all groups compared to the region and other jurisdictions in Orange County, and no racial/ethnic disparities.
- In San Clemente, there is relatively high access to environmentally health neighborhoods for all groups compared to the region and other jurisdictions in Orange County, and no racial/ethnic disparities.
- In Santa Ana, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.
- In Tustin, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.

- In Westminster, there is very poor access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods for all residents, regardless of race/ethnicity.

Map 11 – Environmental Health, is a series of maps showing data from the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen 4.0). These maps were created by California HCD to facilitate fair housing planning, using CalEnviroScreen data from OEHHA[15].

The CalEnviroScreen tool is designed to identify communities most affected by pollution, and those where residents may be especially vulnerable to its effects. To do this, it uses a composite score based on 13 different indicators of pollution burden – such as exposure indicators (e.g., diesel particulate matter levels and lead risk from housing and environmental effect indicators (e.g., location of solid waste facilities) - as well as eight indicators of population characteristics including sensitive population indicators (e.g., asthma rates) and socioeconomic factor factors (e.g., poverty and linguistic isolation). More detailed information on the mapping methodology is available on the OEHHA website[16]. On these maps, green areas represent regions with more positive environmental factors, while red areas indicate regions with more negative environmental factors.

These maps show the following relationship between an individual's place of residence and their access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods:

- Countywide, the areas with more positive environmental factors are along the coast, in the south, and northeast. The areas with more negative environmental factors are in the central parts of the County north of I-405 and west of the Costa Mesa Freeway (SR-55).
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, most neighborhoods have primarily positive environmental factors. The areas with more negative environmental factors are located in the following places:
  - Stanton.
  - Southwest Placentia, next to Fullerton, which is an area of high POC segregation and is predominantly Hispanic.
  - San Juan Capistrano, in the Census Tract that encompasses the interchange between I-5 and the Ortega Highway (SR-74), which is a high POC segregation area and is predominantly Hispanic.
- In Aliso Viejo, all neighborhoods in the city have positive environmental factors.

---

[15] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing

[16] https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen

- In Anaheim, Anaheim Hills (a high White segregation area), has positive environmental factors. Much of the rest of the city is affected by negative environmental factors, with the severe environmental factors located in and around downtown, along I-5 cutting across the city, and along Riverside Freeway (SR-91) on the northern edge of the city.
- In Buena Park, there is one Census Tract with a score lower than 40 (indicating more positive environmental factors). This area is between La Palma Avenue and Crescent Avenue, on either side of Knott Avenue. Areas of the city with more negative environmental factors include the neighborhoods north of the Artesia Freeway (SR-91) and adjacent to I-5, and the western part of the city, which includes numerous warehouses and distribution facilities.
- In Costa Mesa, areas with more positive environmental factors include neighborhoods east of Newport Boulevard (SR-55), which are high White segregation areas, as well as neighborhoods along the western edge of the city and north of I-405, which are also predominantly White. The areas with more negative environmental factors include neighborhoods downtown, which are predominantly Hispanic.
- In Fountain Valley, areas with more positive environmental factors include the neighborhoods in the southwest corner of city, which have a high concentration of White residents, and those surrounding Mile Square Regional Park, a high POC segregation area that is predominantly AAPI. The rest of the city experiences moderate environmental factors.
- In Fullerton, areas with more positive environmental factors include the neighborhoods near the Panorama Nature Preserve in the city's northeast. Areas with more negative environmental factors include the neighborhoods in the southeast part of the city, which are predominantly Hispanic—this area includes the commercial/industrial area along the Riverside Freeway (SR-91); and neighborhoods in the southwest part of the city, around Fullerton Municipal Airport and to the south, which are also predominantly Hispanic.
- In Garden Grove, residential neighborhoods in West Garden Grove, west of Knott Street have more positive environmental factors and are areas of high White segregation. The rest of the city experiences less positive environmental factors, with the most negative factors located in West Garden Grove, east of Knott Street an industrial and commercial area, and along Garden Grove Freeway (SR-22), in the city's southeast.
- In Huntington Beach, most of the city – particularly along the coast and in the southeastern region – has more positive environmental factors. However, an area with less positive environmental factors is in the industrial/commercial area between Beach Boulevard (SR-39) and Gothard Street, spanning from Talbert

Avenue to Edinger Avenue. This area overlaps with the one predominantly Hispanic Census Tract.

- In Irvine, most of the neighborhoods in the city have positive environmental factors. The few places with more negative environmental factors include the area west of San Diego Creek north of I-405 (which is primarily comprised of industrial and commercial land uses, including the Irvine Business Complex), the area between UC Irvine and I-405 (which is a high POC segregation area and is predominantly AAPI), and the eastern part of city along I-5 near Lake Forest, where Irvine Industrial Complex East and Irvine Technology Center are located.
- In La Habra, most of the city is affected by negative environmental factors, with the most negative factors concentrated in the central and southeast areas of the city/ This is likely due to the proximity to warehouses, distribution centers, and Imperial Highway (SR-90). These areas overlap with the high POC segregation areas, which are predominantly Hispanic.
- In Laguna Niguel, all neighborhoods in the city have positive environmental factors.
- In Lake Forest, most neighborhoods in the city have positive environmental factors, except for those south of Serrano Creek, which experience more negative environmental factors.
- In Mission Viejo, all neighborhoods in the city have positive environmental factors.
- In Newport Beach, all neighborhoods in the city have positive environmental factors.
- In Orange, the neighborhoods east of Villa Park, which haver high White segregation, experience more positive environmental factors. Neighborhoods west of Glassel Street, which are predominantly Hispanic, are affected by more negative environmental factors.
- In Rancho Santa Margarita, all neighborhoods in the city have positive environmental factors.
- In San Clemente, most neighborhoods in the city have positive environmental factors, except for one area with moderate environmental factors. This area encompasses the neighborhoods north and east of Max Berg Plaza Park, and is classified as a low-medium concentration area with a predominantly White population.
- In Santa Ana, most of the city has negative environmental factors, with the most negative factors located in the east and southeast side of the city along the Costa Mesa Freeway (SR-55), where many of the commercial/industrial land uses are located. Other highly impacted areas include downtown and neighborhoods west of downtown. These are all areas of high POC segregation, and most are predominantly Hispanic, except for one of the Tracts to the far west of downtown, which is predominantly AAPI. There is one Census Tract with positive environmental factors located in the southern part of the city, within a racially integrated area between

Segerstrom High School and the Bristol Place Shopping Mall, where White residents are the predominant group.

- In Tustin, neighborhoods north of I-5 have more positive environmental factors, and neighborhoods south of I-5 have more negative environmental factors.
- In Westminster, most of the city has negative environmental factors, with the most negative factors located in the central neighborhoods, from I-405 north, between Beach Boulevard and Edwards Street.

Map 11 – Environmental Health – Region

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 11 – Environmental Health – North Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 11 – Environmental Health – Central Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 11 – Environmental Health – South Orange County

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

6.   Disability and Access

The following analysis describes the barriers that deny individuals with disabilities access to opportunity and community assets.

Table 7 – Disability by Type, presents the percentage of residents with various disabilities living in the region, Orange County, the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, and in HUD Entitlement City. In the region and Orange County overall, the most prevalent form of disability is ambulatory difficulty, followed by independent living difficulty. Ambulatory difficulty is also the most prevalent form of disability in the Urban County jurisdictions and all HUD Entitlement Cities except for Aliso Viejo and Rancho Santa Margarita, where cognitive difficulty is most prevalent, and Irvine, where independent living difficulty is most prevalent.

Table 7 – Disability by Type

Disability Type	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA #	%	Orange County, CA		Orange County Urban County		Aliso Viejo, CA		Anaheim, CA	
Hearing difficulty	327,938	2.50%	79,275	2.51%	19,027	3.25%	689	1.33%	8,319	2.40%
Vision difficulty	254,941	1.94%	49,469	1.57%	9,354	1.60%	1,002	1.93%	5,994	1.73%
Cognitive difficulty	523,200	3.99%	109,210	3.46%	20,087	3.43%	1,502	2.89%	13,316	3.84%
Ambulatory difficulty	686,925	5.24%	138,750	4.39%	30,281	5.17%	1,436	2.77%	16,547	4.77%
Self-care difficulty	351,827	2.68%	70,216	2.22%	14,167	2.42%	1,075	2.07%	8,339	2.40%
Independent living difficulty	566,545	4.32%	115,032	3.64%	22,514	3.85%	1,469	2.83%	14,042	4.05%

Disability Type	Buena Park, CA		Costa Mesa, CA		Fountain Valley, CA		Fullerton, CA		Garden Grove, CA	
Hearing difficulty	2,166	2.59%	2,252	2.02%	1,575	2.78%	2,902	2.04%	4,012	2.34%
Vision difficulty	1,662	1.99%	1,555	1.39%	787	1.39%	2,155	1.51%	3,500	2.04%
Cognitive difficulty	3,577	4.28%	3,673	3.29%	2,151	3.79%	5,084	3.57%	7,551	4.40%
Ambulatory difficulty	4,325	5.18%	4,740	4.25%	2,680	4.72%	5,894	4.14%	8,995	5.24%
Self-care difficulty	2,221	2.66%	2,259	2.03%	1,422	2.51%	2,794	1.96%	4,754	2.77%
Independent living difficulty	3,502	4.19%	4,029	3.61%	2,388	4.21%	5,064	3.56%	8,377	4.88%

Disability Type	Huntington Beach, CA		Irvine, CA		La Habra, CA		Laguna Niguel, CA		Lake Forest, CA	
Hearing difficulty	5,577	2.82%	4,587	1.51%	1,569	2.49%	1,702	2.65%	1,886	2.20%
Vision difficulty	3,076	1.56%	3,081	1.01%	1,368	2.17%	811	1.26%	1,045	1.22%
Cognitive difficulty	7,071	3.58%	7,130	2.34%	2,550	4.05%	1,853	2.88%	2,771	3.24%
Ambulatory difficulty	8,728	4.42%	7,092	2.33%	3,328	5.29%	2,683	4.18%	3,195	3.73%
Self-care difficulty	3,684	1.87%	4,489	1.47%	1,927	3.06%	1,385	2.16%	1,547	1.81%
Independent living difficulty	6,990	3.54%	7,198	2.36%	2,696	4.29%	2,055	3.20%	2,664	3.11%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.
Note 2: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Disability Type	Mission Viejo, CA		Newport Beach, CA		Orange, CA		Rancho Santa Margarita, CA		San Clemente, CA	
Hearing difficulty	3,005	3.22%	2,689	3.16%	2,803	2.02%	1,059	2.22%	2,302	3.58%
Vision difficulty	1,438	1.54%	838	0.98%	1,785	1.29%	634	1.33%	752	1.17%
Cognitive difficulty	4,203	4.51%	1,811	2.13%	3,750	2.70%	1,522	3.19%	2,043	3.18%
Ambulatory difficulty	4,989	5.35%	3,282	3.85%	4,865	3.51%	1,519	3.18%	2,450	3.81%
Self-care difficulty	2,920	3.13%	1,625	1.91%	2,455	1.77%	926	1.94%	1,114	1.73%
Independent living difficulty	4,320	4.63%	2,770	3.25%	4,350	3.14%	1,393	2.92%	2,138	3.33%

Disability Type	Santa Ana, CA		Tustin, CA		Westminster, CA	
Hearing difficulty	6,809	2.19%	1,192	1.50%	3,153	3.48%
Vision difficulty	5,829	1.87%	1,050	1.32%	1,753	1.93%
Cognitive difficulty	11,316	3.63%	2,527	3.18%	3,722	4.11%
Ambulatory difficulty	13,423	4.31%	2,680	3.37%	5,618	6.20%
Self-care difficulty	7,204	2.31%	1,393	1.75%	2,516	2.78%
Independent living difficulty	10,456	3.36%	2,304	2.90%	4,313	4.76%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.
Note 2: Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

According to data from HUD, in Orange County, a total of 398 housing discrimination cases were opened between January 2019 and November 2024 (when this report was prepared). As shown in Table 8, below, the majority (65.33%) of cases alleged discrimination based on disability. (Please note, the total number of cases in the table below equal more than 398, and the percentages equal more than 100% because one case can involve allegations of discrimination based on multiple protected classes). Table 9 shows the number of cases by jurisdiction, and the number and percentage of cases that included allegations of discrimination based on disability status. As the table shows, in nearly all jurisdictions, discrimination based (in whole or in part) on disability status comprises most cases.

Table 8 – Discrimination Complaints, Orange County, 2019-2024

Basis for Case (Summary by Protected Status)	Number of Cases	Percent of Cases
Color	23	5.78%
Disability	260	65.33%
Familial Status	39	9.80%
National Origin	52	13.07%
Race	62	15.58%
Religion	10	2.51%
Sex	44	11.06%
Source: HUD FHEO		

**Table 9 – Discrimination Complaints by Jurisdiction,
Orange County, 2019-2024**

Jurisdiction	Number of Cases	Number of Cases with Disability as Basis	Percent of Cases based on Disability
Aliso Viejo	12	10	83.33%
Anaheim	46	34	73.91%
Brea	5	2	40.00%
Buena Park	7	2	28.57%
Capistrano Beach	1	1	100.00%
Corona Del Mar	4	2	50.00%
Costa Mesa	30	23	76.67%
Cypress	5	3	60.00%
Dana Point	8	7	87.50%
Foothill Ranch	2	2	100.00%
Fountain Valley	4	2	50.00%
Fullerton	18	10	55.56%
Garden Grove	7	4	57.14%
Huntington Beach	40	31	77.50%
Irvine	50	33	66.00%
La Habra	4	3	75.00%
Laguna Beach	3	2	66.67%
Laguna Hills	2	1	50.00%
Laguna Niguel	10	7	70.00%
Laguna Woods	3	2	66.67%
Lake Forest	6	2	33.33%
Los Alamitos	2	0	0.00%
Midway city	1	1	100.00%
Mission Viejo	14	11	78.57%
Newport Beach	14	8	57.14%
Orange	8	8	100.00%
Placentia	7	4	57.14%
Rancho Santa Margarita	3	1	33.33%
San Clemente	6	3	50.00%
San Juan Capistrano	8	7	87.50%
Santa Ana	25	17	68.00%
Seal Beach	4	3	75.00%
Silverado	1	0	0.00%
Stanton	6	3	50.00%
Tustin	17	6	35.29%
Westminster	12	4	33.33%
Yorba Linda	3	1	33.33%
Grand Total	398	260	65.33%

Source: HUD FHEO

The fair housing challenges facing individuals with a disability were described during the stakeholder consultations and community meetings. Participants in these meetings reported the following barriers that deny individuals with disabilities access to opportunity and community assets:

- Individuals with disabilities often seek affordable housing in older buildings that may not meet accessibility standards, creating additional barriers.
- Affordable housing options are concentrated in areas of Santa Ana and Anaheim, with fewer options in higher opportunity areas of the County.
- Individuals with disabilities often face barriers in accessing necessary modifications in housing. Tenants must provide a doctor's letter to request modifications, yet landlords are often resistant to approving accommodation requests. In many cases, tenants are responsible for covering modification costs, unless the property is government-owned. Additionally, low-income individuals with disabilities struggle to afford the necessary modifications.

7.   Patterns in Disparities in Access to Opportunity

The following analysis identifies and discusses any overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors, including how these patterns compare to patterns of segregation, integration, and R/ECAPs. The analysis also identifies areas that experience: (a) high access; and (b) low access across multiple indicators.

In Orange County, there is a general pattern of disparities in access to opportunity between the cities in the central part of the County, and the cities and unincorporated areas along the coast and in the southern and northeastern parts of the County. Cities in central Orange County tend to have higher poverty areas, lower educational scores, lower economic scores, and worse environmental health factors. These cities are also comprised of many areas of high POC segregation, with predominantly Hispanic populations. Except for Garden Grove and Westminster, which have neighborhoods with predominantly AAPI populations. Conversely, the cities and unincorporated areas along the coast and in the south and northeast experience lower poverty rates, higher educational scores, higher economic scores, and better environmental health factors. These areas correspond to areas of high White segregation and predominantly White populations.

In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions,

- The following racial/ethnic groups experience disparities in access across multiple indicators:
  - Hispanic residents, and particularly those living below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL), have the least access to low poverty neighborhoods, neighborhoods in close proximity to high performing schools, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital.

- The following areas experience low access across multiple indicators:
  - Southwest Placentia neighborhoods have low access to environmental health, high poverty, low economic scores, and are not located in a high-quality transit area. This part of the city is a high POC segregation area that is predominantly Hispanic.
  - Stanton residents experience low access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods and high exposure to poverty on the south side of Katella Avenue and on the east side of Beach Boulevard north of Katella Avenue.
  - In San Juan Capistrano, the neighborhoods surrounding the I-5 and the Ortega Highway (SR-74) interchange experience poor environmental health and have low economic scores. This is a high POC segregation area and is predominantly Hispanic.
- Apart from the areas above, the rest of the Urban County jurisdictions experience high environmental quality and have relatively low poverty. In addition, the following areas have access to educational and economic opportunities, as reflected in high education and economic scores on the maps analyzed above:
  - Brea, Cypress, La Palma, Laguna Beach, Los Alamitos, North Tustin, Orange Park Acres, Villa Park, Yorba Linda, and the unincorporated areas east of Yorba Linda

In Aliso Viejo, residents have high access across multiple opportunities, including high education scores, high economic scores, high environmental quality, and low exposure to poverty. However, residents generally do not have good access to transit and neighborhoods with low transportation costs.

In Anaheim, Hispanic residents have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods, neighborhoods close to high performing schools, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, neighborhoods near the downtown have low environmental health, low education scores, low economic scores; but good access to HQTAs. Conversely, Anaheim Hills, which is a predominantly White area, has the best access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods with low poverty rates, high education scores, and high economic scores.

In Buena Park, Hispanic and Black residents have less access than other groups to neighborhoods with low poverty rates and high performing schools. Geographically, the neighborhoods in the center of the city, between I-5 and the Artesia Freeway (SR-91), have poor environmental health, lower educational scores, and lower economic scores.

In Costa Mesa, Hispanic residents have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods, neighborhoods close to high performing schools, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, neighborhoods downtown and west of downtown are less environmentally healthy and have lower education and economic

scores. These are also predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods. Conversely, neighborhoods east of Newport Boulevard (SR-55), which are predominantly White, have higher education and economic scores, are more environmentally healthy, and have lower poverty rates.

In Fountain Valley, neighborhoods across the city have relatively high economic and educational scores, and relatively low poverty rates. White or AAPI residents comprise the predominant population in all neighborhoods.

In Fullerton, Hispanic residents have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods, neighborhoods close to high performing schools, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, neighborhoods in southeast Fullerton (which are predominantly Hispanic), have relatively low economic and education scores, poor environmental quality, and relatively high poverty rates. Conversely, neighborhoods in the northern part of the city, which are predominantly White or AAPI, have higher education and economic scores, better environmental health, and lower poverty.

In Garden Grove, Hispanic and AAPI residents have the least access to low poverty neighborhoods and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Additionally, Hispanic residents also have the least access to neighborhoods with high performing schools. Geographically, the neighborhoods with access to the most opportunities are in West Garden Grove, where education and economic scores are high, environmental quality is high, and poverty is low. West Garden Grove is a predominantly White area.

In Huntington Beach, Hispanic residents have relatively low access to neighborhoods with good environmental health, low poverty, high education scores, and high economic scores. Overall, access to opportunities in the city is high compared to the region.

In Irvine, residents across the city have relatively high access to opportunities. Geographically, the neighborhoods surrounding UC Irvine have relatively low economic scores and relatively high poverty rates, but this is most likely due to the concentration of college students in this area.

In La Habra, neighborhoods in the city's center and southeast of the center have poor environmental quality, low education scores, and low economic scores. These neighborhoods are also predominantly Hispanic.

In Laguna Niguel, residents have high access across multiple opportunities, including high education scores, high economic scores, high environmental quality, and low exposure to poverty. However, residents generally do not have good access to transit and neighborhoods with low transportation costs.

In Lake Forest, residents overall have relatively good access to opportunities, compared to the region. However, residents living below the FPL in the city generally have less access to opportunities than the rest of the population.

In Mission Viejo, residents across the city have relatively high access to opportunities (apart from transit and low-cost transportation). Most of the city's neighborhoods are predominantly White, except in the south.

In Newport Beach, residents across the city have relatively high access to opportunities. All of the city's neighborhoods are predominantly White.

In Orange, Hispanic, and Black residents (especially Black residents living below the FPL) have relatively low access to neighborhoods close to high performing schools, and to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, neighborhoods west of Glassel Street (which are predominantly Hispanic), have lower education and economic scores, and worse environmental quality. Conversely, neighborhoods to the north and east of Villa Park (predominantly White), have high education and economic scores, and good environmental quality.

In Rancho Santa Margarita, residents across the city have relatively high access to opportunities. All of the city's neighborhoods are predominantly White.

In San Clemente, residents have relatively high access to opportunities compared to the region. Geographically, compared to the rest of the city, neighborhoods north and east of Max Berg Plaza Park have lower environmental quality, lower economic scores, and slightly higher poverty rates.

In Santa Ana, Hispanic residents are more likely than other groups to be exposed to poverty in their neighborhoods and are less likely than other groups to live in close proximity to high performing schools, or in neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, neighborhoods downtown, west of downtown, and southeast of downtown have low economic scores, low education scores, high poverty rates, and poor environmental quality. Neighborhoods in the north and south of the city have better economic and education scores.

In Tustin, Hispanic residents (especially those below FPL) are less likely than other groups to live in close proximity to high performing schools, or in neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital; and are more likely to be exposed to poverty in their neighborhoods.

In Westminster, AAPI residents are more likely than other groups to be exposed to poverty in their neighborhoods and are less likely than other groups to live in close proximity to high performing schools or jobs. Native American residents living below the FPL are also less likely to live in close proximity to high performing schools or jobs.

This section describes the public or private policies or practices, demographic shifts, economic trends, or other factors that may have caused or contributed to the patterns described above.

Broadly speaking, disparities in access to opportunities between and within jurisdictions in Orange County are due, in part, to:

- Lack of affordable (market or publicly subsidized) housing in high opportunity areas, due to market factors, governmental constraints, and community opposition to high density zoning.
- Lack of public and private investment in low-opportunity neighborhoods.
- Displacement of residents is due to rising housing costs.

Through the stakeholder consultations and community meetings, it was also reported that disparities in access to opportunities in the County are due to:

- In addition to landlord resistance to renting to HCV Program participants, the gap between HCV subsidy amounts and housing costs further inhibits HCV Program participants from accessing housing in higher cost (and higher opportunity areas).
- Many seniors are on fixed incomes and cannot keep up with the rising cost of housing.
- The high cost of land, which makes it hard to build new affordable housing in high opportunity areas.
- The California Coastal Act, which limits development in high opportunity areas along the coast.
- Lack of accessible housing for individuals with disabilities.

Detailed lists of the public or private policies or practices, demographic shifts, economic trends, and other factors that have caused or contributed to disparities in access to opportunities in each of the jurisdictions are included in Section IV.

E.   Disproportionate Housing Needs

The following analysis describes which groups experience higher rates of housing cost burden, severe housing cost burden, overcrowding, or substandard housing when compared to other groups.

Housing Problems

Table 10 – Disproportionate Housing Problems, shows 2017-2021 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data on the percentage of households experiencing at least one of the following four housing problems, organized by race/ethnicity:

- Lacks complete kitchen facilities: Household lacks a sink with piped water, a range or stove, or a refrigerator.
- Lacks complete plumbing facilities: Household lacks hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet, and a bathtub or shower.
- Overcrowding: A household is considered overcrowded if there are more than 1.01 individuals per room.
- Cost burden: A household is considered cost burdened if the household spends more than 30% of its total gross income for housing costs. For renters, housing costs include rent paid by the tenant, plus utilities. For owners, housing costs include mortgage payment, taxes, insurance, and utilities.

A disproportionately greater need exists when members of a racial or ethnic group in a certain income range experience housing problems at a rate that is least 10 percentage points higher than the rate experienced by all households within that income level. Table 10 reports the following:

- American Indian or Alaska Native households, and Pacific Islander households have disproportionate housing needs within the 80%-100% AMI range.
- It is also worth noting that Hispanic households in the 30% AMI and below range experience housing needs at a much higher rate than the overall population in that income range, though the rate is slightly less than 10 percentage points.

Table 10 - Disproportionate Housing Problems, Orange County

Race/Ethnicity	Percent of households experiencing at least one housing burden, by income range			
	Less than 30% AMI	30%-50% AMI	50%-80% AMI	80%-100% AMI
Orange County as a whole	79.8%	78.9%	63.3%	42.6%
White	77.4%	72.4%	61.6%	43.8%
Black/African American	81.5%	85.9%	70.9%	37.5%
Asian	72.5%	78.5%	61.7%	44.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	59.7%	60.7%	56.5%	54.2%
Pacific Islander	78.1%	76.5%	71.7%	55.1%
Hispanic	89.5%	86.0%	65.4%	39.3%

Source: CHAS 2017-2021

Severe Housing Problems

Table 11 – Disproportionate Severe Housing Problems, shows 2017-2021 CHAS data on the percentage of households experiencing at least one of the following four severe housing problems, organized by race/ethnicity:

- Lacks complete kitchen facilities: Household does not have a stove/oven and refrigerator.
- Lacks complete plumbing facilities: Household does not have running water or modern toilets.
- Severe overcrowding: A household is considered severely overcrowded if there are more than 1.5 individuals per room.
- Severe cost burden: A household is considered severely cost burdened if the household spends more than 50% of its total income for housing costs. For renters, housing costs include rent paid by the tenant, plus utilities. For owners, housing costs include mortgage payment, taxes, insurance, and utilities.

According to Table 11, the following groups experience disproportionate need as defined above:

- Hispanic households have disproportionate severe housing needs within the 0%-30% AMI range.
- American Indian or Alaska Native households, and Pacific Islander households have disproportionate severe housing needs within the 50%-80% AMI range.
- American Indian or Alaska Native households have disproportionate severe housing needs within the 80%-100% AMI range.

Table 11 - Disproportionate Severe Housing Problems, Orange County

| Race/Ethnicity | Percent of households experiencing at least one severe housing burden, by income range | | | |
	Less than 30% AMI	30%-50% AMI	50%-80% AMI	80%-100% AMI
Orange County as a whole	71.2%	55.5%	28.0%	14.8%
White	68.7%	52.5%	22.9%	10.5%
Black/African American	72.9%	55.5%	25.2%	4.3%
Asian	62.4%	52.5%	27.7%	15.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	59.7%	17.0%	44.4%	30.6%
Pacific Islander	58.1%	59.3%	40.7%	19.2%
Hispanic	82.2%	60.3%	34.6%	23.0%

Source: CHAS 2017-2021

The following analysis identifies which areas experience the greatest housing burdens and describes which of these areas align with segregated areas, integrated areas, or R/ECAPs, and the predominant race/ethnicity or national origin groups in such areas.

Map 12 – Housing Problems, is a series of maps illustrating concentrations of households experiencing housing burdens in Orange County. These maps were created by California HCD to facilitate fair housing planning, using data from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2018-2022 5-Year Estimates.[17] On these maps, areas with darker shading have a higher percentage of households experiencing a particular housing problem (i.e., cost burden, overcrowding, incomplete plumbing, and incomplete kitchen facilities.

The maps show that the areas experiencing the greatest housing burdens are the following:

- Overcrowding is an issue that is generally only experienced by the residents of cities in the central and northern parts of the County. Overcrowding is not a significant concern in the coastal areas, the areas south and east of Irvine, or the northeastern region, including Yorba Linda and the unincorporated areas to the east Conversely, more than 20% of all units are overcrowded in the following areas:
    - In Santa Ana, in most of the city, which are also areas of high POC segregation and are predominantly Hispanic.
    - In Garden Grove, in the eastern and southeastern neighborhoods, which are areas of high POC segregation and are predominantly Hispanic in the east.

---

[17] The maps were downloaded from the AFFH Data Viewer, which can be accessed at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing

- o In Anaheim, in the neighborhoods north and south of downtown, and around Disneyland. These are also areas of high POC segregation and are predominantly Hispanic.
  - o In Fullerton, in the neighborhoods south of downtown, which are predominantly Hispanic.
- Overpayment by renters is an issue everywhere in the County. In most neighborhoods in the County, over 40% of renter households are struggling with overpayment.
- Overpayment by owners is less of an issue than overpayment by renters but is also widespread throughout the County. In many neighborhoods, 20-40% of homeowner households struggle with overpayment. There are only a few areas where more than 60% or fewer than 20% of homeowner households struggle with overpayment.
- Incomplete plumbing is not a significant concern in the County, as fewer than 2% of homes experience this issue. However, one exception is Fountain Valley, where 5-10% of housing units are affected. This area includes the neighborhood surrounding Fountain Valley High School and north to Warner Avenue, which is an area of high POC segregation.
- Incomplete kitchen facilities are also not a significant concern in the County. In most of the County less than 10% of homes experience this issue. The areas where more than 10% of homes experience this issue are:
  - o In Anaheim, in the western neighborhoods, which are racially integrated and predominantly Hispanic, except for one Census Tract that is predominantly AAPI.
  - o In Orange, in the predominantly Hispanic area west of Glassel Street and north of Walnut Avenue.
  - o In La Habra, in one Census Tract in the north central part of the city.
  - o In Irvine, near UC Irvine (which may reflect a concentration of student housing).

Map 12 – Housing Problems – Overcrowding

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 12 – Housing Problems – Overpayment by Renters

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 12 – Housing Problems – Overpayment by Owners

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 12 – Housing Problems – Lacking Complete Plumbing

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

Map 12 – Housing Problems – Lacking Complete Kitchen

Source: California HCD, AFFH Data Viewer

The following analysis describes the differences in rates of renter and owner-occupied housing by race/ethnicity.

Table 12 – Housing Tenure by Race/Ethnicity, shows the percentages of households that are renters and homeowners by race/ethnicity, based on data from the 2018-2022 American Community Survey. The table shows that,

- Countywide, the homeownership rate is 56.5%, which is higher than the homeownership rate in the region. There are large disparities in homeownership by race/ethnicity. Black households have the lowest homeownership rate (32.4%). Less than 40% of Hispanic households own their home, and approximately 42% of Native households own their home. White and AAPI households have the highest homeownership rates.
- In the Orange County Urban County jurisdictions, homeownership rates are higher overall and for each group compared to the County. The same disparities in homeownership by race/ethnicity exist as in the County.
- In Aliso Viejo, homeownership rates for AAPI, Black, and Hispanic households are higher than in the County overall, and homeownership rates for White households are lower.
- In Anaheim, homeownership rates are lower for all groups compared to the County, and similar racial/ethnic disparities exist.

- In Buena Park, homeownership rates and racial/ethnic disparities are similar to the County overall; however, the disparities are even larger due to a higher homeownership rate for White households compared to the County, and a lower rate for Black households compared to the County.
- In Costa Mesa, homeownership rates are lower for all groups compared to the County, and similar racial/ethnic disparities exist.
- In Fountain Valley, homeownership rates are higher compared to the County for all groups, except Black households. However, it is important to note that the small sample size for Black households may affect the accuracy of the data is not accurate.
- In Fullerton, homeownership rates are lower for all groups than the County overall, except for AAPI households. Racial/ethnic disparities exist, with Native American households the least likely to own their home, and AAPI households most likely.
- In Garden Grove, the Black and Hispanic homeownership rate is half the White homeownership rate. The AAPI homeownership rate in the city is lower than the AAPI homeownership countywide.
- In Huntington Beach, homeownership rates are lower for White, Black, and Hispanic households compared to the County overall, and higher for AAPI and Native American households. Similar racial/ethnic disparities exist in the city as in the County.
- In Irvine, homeownership rates are lower for all groups compared to the County overall, and racial/ethnic disparities are similar to the County, with Black and Hispanic households experiencing the lowest homeownership rates (15.7% and 18% respectively)
- In La Habra, homeownership rates are higher for all groups compared to the County, and similar racial/ethnic disparities exist as in the County.
- In Laguna Niguel, homeownership rates are higher for all groups compared to the County, and racial/ethnic disparities exist—the Hispanic homeownership rate is the lowest, followed by the Black homeownership rate. The AAPI homeownership rate is the highest, followed by the White homeownership rate.
- In Lake Forest, homeownership rates are higher for all groups compared to the County, except Native American households. Racial/Ethnic disparities exist, with AAPI and White homeownership higher than Black and Hispanic homeownership rates.
- In Mission Viejo, homeownership rates across all groups are much higher than in the County overall, though racial/ethnic disparities still exist. The Black homeownership rate is the lowest in the city, though it is above 60%.
- In Newport Beach, homeownership rates are lower for all groups compared to the County overall, except for AAPI households, who have slightly higher homeownership rate in the city. The Black and Native American homeownership

rates are very low in the city. However, due to the small sample sizes for these groups, the data may not be entirely accurate.

- In Orange, homeownership rates are comparable to the County overall, and similar disparities exist. However, the disparities are slightly larger in the city than in the County, as White, AAPI, and Hispanic homeownership rates are higher than in the County overall, while the Black homeownership rate is lower.

- In Rancho Santa Margarita, homeownership rates are higher for all groups when compared to the County. However, there are still racial/ethnic disparities. Hispanic households have the lowest homeownership rate, and it is 20 percentage points lower than the AAPI homeownership rate, which is the highest rate in the city.

- In San Clemente, homeownership rates are higher for White, AAPI, and Hispanic households compared to the County overall, while rates are lower for Black and Native American households. Due to the small sample size for Black and Native American households, the data may not be accurate. This causes the racial/ethnic disparities in homeownership rates to be larger than at the County level.

- In Santa Ana, racial/ethnic disparities in homeownership rates are similar to the County overall, but less pronounced. This is because homeownership rates in the city are lower for White and AAPI households, and higher for Black, Hispanic, and Native American households compared to the County overall.

- In Tustin, homeownership rates are very low for Black and Hispanic households, equaling less than half of the homeownership rate for AAPI and White households. The AAPI homeownership rate is higher in the city than in the County overall, and the White homeownership rate is lower in the city than in the County overall.

- In Westminster, there are large racial/ethnic disparities in homeownership. Black, Hispanic, and Native American households have the lowest rates (30%), and these rates are less than half the homeownership rate for White households, which is the highest in the city. The AAPI homeownership rate in the city is lower than in the County overall and is nearly 20 percentage points lower than the White homeownership rate in the city.

Table 12 - Homeownership and Rental Rates by Race/Ethnicity

	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA					Orange County, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	4,429,379	2,155,123	48.7%	2,274,256	51.3%	1,066,286	602,959	56.5%	463,327	43.5%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	1,656,053	944,998	57.1%	711,055	42.9%	520,993	334,107	64.1%	186,886	35.9%
Black	330,603	107,271	32.4%	223,332	67.6%	19,013	6,156	32.4%	12,857	67.6%
Hispanic (any race)	1,556,438	613,265	39.4%	943,173	60.6%	264,817	102,954	38.9%	161,863	61.1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	752,806	429,742	57.1%	323,064	42.9%	228,293	142,507	62.4%	85,786	37.6%
Native American	39,496	16,871	42.7%	22,625	57.3%	5,856	2,442	41.7%	3,414	58.3%
	Urban County Jurisdictions					Aliso Viejo, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	210,864	147,382	69.9%	63,482	30.1%	19,300	10,851	56.2%	8,449	43.8%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	126,765	95,582	75.4%	31,183	24.6%	12,417	7,024	56.6%	5,393	43.4%
Black	3,390	1,552	45.8%	1,838	54.2%	429	193	45.0%	236	55.0%
Hispanic (any race)	36,948	18,619	50.4%	18,329	49.6%	3,071	1,351	44.0%	1,720	56.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	37,128	27,038	72.8%	10,090	27.2%	2,754	1,986	72.1%	768	27.9%
Native American	882	437	49.5%	445	50.5%	43	2	4.7%	41	95.3%
	Anaheim, CA					Buena Park, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	104,671	48,806	46.6%	55,865	53.4%	24,283	13,721	56.5%	10,562	43.5%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	34,058	20,183	59.3%	13,875	40.7%	6,521	4,616	70.8%	1,905	29.2%
Black	3,424	943	27.5%	2,481	72.5%	675	111	16.4%	564	83.6%
Hispanic (any race)	44,777	14,692	32.8%	30,085	67.2%	7,890	3,318	42.1%	4,572	57.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	20,082	11,781	58.7%	8,301	41.3%	8,807	5,454	61.9%	3,353	38.1%
Native American	698	207	29.7%	491	70.3%	200	87	43.5%	113	56.5%
	Costa Mesa, CA					Fountain Valley, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	41,407	16,427	39.7%	24,980	60.3%	18,906	12,455	65.9%	6,451	34.1%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	24,557	11,359	46.3%	13,198	53.7%	8,961	6,005	67.0%	2,956	33.0%
Black	617	92	14.9%	525	85.1%	129	33	25.6%	96	74.4%
Hispanic (any race)	9,988	2,345	23.5%	7,643	76.5%	2,235	1,057	47.3%	1,178	52.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,183	1,825	43.6%	2,358	56.4%	6,808	4,913	72.2%	1,895	27.8%
Native American	297	54	18.2%	243	81.8%	144	130	90.3%	14	9.7%

Note 1: Data presented are numbers of households, not individuals.
Note 2: Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Table 12 - Homeownership and Rental Rates by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

	Fullerton, CA					Garden Grove, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	47,014	24,259	51.6%	22,755	48.4%	48,183	26,039	54.0%	22,144	46.0%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	19,000	11,504	60.5%	7,496	39.5%	12,035	8,558	71.1%	3,477	28.9%
Black	1,100	309	28.1%	791	71.9%	453	159	35.1%	294	64.9%
Hispanic (any race)	13,835	4,442	32.1%	9,393	67.9%	14,262	5,288	37.1%	8,974	62.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,817	7,505	63.5%	4,312	36.5%	20,542	11,467	55.8%	9,075	44.2%
Native American	312	39	12.5%	273	87.5%	348	185	53.2%	163	46.8%
	Huntington Beach, CA					**Irvine, CA**				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	77,641	43,236	55.7%	34,405	44.3%	110,465	48,451	43.9%	62,014	56.1%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	52,207	30,911	59.2%	21,296	40.8%	46,565	18,960	40.7%	27,605	59.3%
Black	1,174	301	25.6%	873	74.4%	2,049	321	15.7%	1,728	84.3%
Hispanic (any race)	10,930	4,086	37.4%	6,844	62.6%	10,380	1,867	18.0%	8,513	82.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,561	6,213	65.0%	3,348	35.0%	46,466	26,065	56.1%	20,401	43.9%
Native American	389	191	49.1%	198	50.9%	281	145	51.6%	136	48.4%
	Laguna Niguel, CA					**La Habra, CA**				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	25,239	16,669	66.0%	8,570	34.0%	20,188	11,500	57.0%	8,688	43.0%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	18,002	12,359	68.7%	5,643	31.3%	6,827	4,737	69.4%	2,090	30.6%
Black	507	272	53.6%	235	46.4%	502	230	45.8%	272	54.2%
Hispanic (any race)	3,202	1,390	43.4%	1,812	56.6%	9,717	4,554	46.9%	5,163	53.1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,675	2,036	76.1%	639	23.9%	2,875	1,812	63.0%	1,063	37.0%
Native American	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	214	92	43.0%	122	57.0%
	Lake Forest, CA					**Mission Viejo, CA**				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	30,298	21,300	70.3%	8,998	29.7%	32,650	25,312	77.5%	7,338	22.5%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	17,370	12,681	73.0%	4,689	27.0%	22,405	17,745	79.2%	4,660	20.8%
Black	641	245	38.2%	396	61.8%	438	265	60.5%	173	39.5%
Hispanic (any race)	5,512	3,011	54.6%	2,501	45.4%	4,606	2,995	65.0%	1,611	35.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,809	4,603	79.2%	1,206	20.8%	4,398	3,681	83.7%	717	16.3%
Native American	219	41	18.7%	178	81.3%	104	65	62.5%	39	37.5%

Note 1: Data presented are numbers of households, not individuals.
Note 2: Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Table 12 - Homeownership and Rental Rates by Race/Ethnicity (continued)

	Newport Beach, CA					Orange, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	38,636	20,277	52.5%	18,359	47.5%	44,336	26,103	58.9%	18,233	41.1%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	31,448	16,950	53.9%	14,498	46.1%	22,472	15,221	67.7%	7,251	32.3%
Black	224	22	9.8%	202	90.2%	612	172	28.1%	440	71.9%
Hispanic (any race)	2,933	964	32.9%	1,969	67.1%	12,747	5,329	41.8%	7,418	58.2%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,827	1,858	65.7%	969	34.3%	6,481	4,294	66.3%	2,187	33.7%
Native American	119	18	15.1%	101	84.9%	326	134	41.1%	192	58.9%

	Rancho Santa Margarita, CA					San Clemente, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	16,798	12,240	72.9%	4,558	27.1%	23,646	15,338	64.9%	8,308	35.1%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	11,588	8,859	76.4%	2,729	23.6%	18,705	13,047	69.8%	5,658	30.2%
Black	258	178	69.0%	80	31.0%	317	22	6.9%	295	93.1%
Hispanic (any race)	2,564	1,389	54.2%	1,175	45.8%	2,866	1,157	40.4%	1,709	59.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,822	1,440	79.0%	382	21.0%	832	632	76.0%	200	24.0%
Native American	95	74	77.9%	21	22.1%	60	0	0.0%	60	100.0%

	Santa Ana, CA					Tustin, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	77,553	34,749	44.8%	42,804	55.2%	26,508	13,318	50.2%	13,190	49.8%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder										
White, Non-Hispanic	12,014	6,630	55.2%	5,384	44.8%	9,494	5,855	61.7%	3,639	38.3%
Black	1,083	465	42.9%	618	57.1%	582	145	24.9%	437	75.1%
Hispanic (any race)	51,956	20,966	40.4%	30,990	59.6%	8,826	2,421	27.4%	6,405	72.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,004	6,408	53.4%	5,596	46.6%	6,959	4,494	64.6%	2,465	35.4%
Native American	823	426	51.8%	397	48.2%	115	52	45.2%	63	54.8%

	Westminster, CA				
	All Occupied Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	#	#	%	#	%
All Occupied Housing Units	27,700	14,526	52.4%	13,174	47.6%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder					
White, Non-Hispanic	7,582	5,321	70.2%	2,261	29.8%
Black	409	126	30.8%	283	69.2%
Hispanic (any race)	5,572	1,713	30.7%	3,859	69.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,463	7,002	52.0%	6,461	48.0%
Native American	187	63	33.7%	124	66.3%

Note 1: Data presented are numbers of households, not individuals.
Note 2: Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Charts 1 and 2, below, show denial rates for home purchase loans by race/ethnicity in Orange County and California between 2010-2021. In both Orange County and California, denial rates are highest for Black loan applicants, followed by Hispanic then Asian applicants. White applicants have the lowest denial rates. Denial rates are lower in Orange County for all groups compared to the state, except for Hispanic applicants who have the same denial rate in both geographies. Since the Great Recession, denial rates have fallen for all groups.

Chart 1: Home Purchase Loan Denial Rates by Race/Ethnicity, Orange County

Source: Analysis of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data by the Federal Reserve Banks of Philadelphia and Cleveland.

Chart 2: Home Purchase Loan Denial Rates by Race/Ethnicity, California

Source: Analysis of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data by the Federal Reserve Banks of Philadelphia and Cleveland.

This section describes the public or private policies or practices, demographic shifts, economic trends, or other factors that may have caused or contributed to the patterns described above.

Broadly speaking, disproportionate housing needs across and within jurisdictions in Orange County are influenced by several factors, including:

- The age of housing stock in some neighborhoods, and the high cost of home repairs/rehabilitation relative to incomes.
- Insufficient number of Housing Choice Vouchers or other types of publicly subsidized housing
- Land use and zoning laws that have led to the dominance of single-family housing, which is typically more expensive than multifamily housing.

Through stakeholder consultations and community meetings, it was also reported that disproportionate housing needs in the County are due to:

- Eviction notices have a particularly adverse impact on tenants, especially on families who are fleeing or those with a history of domestic violence. While the judicial system is making efforts to address these issues, barriers such as language and understanding legal terminology continue to pose challenges.

- Lack of adequate shelter for individuals experiencing homelessness, particularly for the most vulnerable groups such as trans women.
- Insufficient homebuyer education for minority homebuyers.
- Lack of resources for organizations providing education and services to protected class groups.
- Language and digital literacy barriers that make it hard for LEP populations to locate and access housing resources.

Detailed lists of the public or private policies or practices, demographic shifts, economic trends, and other factors that have caused or contributed to disproportionate housing needs in each of the jurisdictions are included in Section IV.

F.   Local and State Policies and Practices Impacting Fair Housing

The following analysis describes how local laws, policies, ordinances, and other practices impede or promote fair housing (including how they impede or promote the siting or location of affordable housing in well-resourced neighborhoods, and equitable access to homeownership and other asset building and economic opportunities).

In general, land use and zoning laws across Orange County have led to the dominance of single-family housing, which is typically more expensive than multifamily housing and has contributed in various ways to reinforcing longstanding patterns of segregation, concentration of poverty, and disparities in access to opportunities. Through the Housing Element process mandated by the State of California, each jurisdiction has identified various public and/or private policies and practices that have contributed to the fair housing issues identified in this AFH, as well as efforts they are making to promote fair housing. These items are detailed in Section IV.

This section describes any state or local fair housing laws and the characteristics protected under each law.

In the State of California, the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) and the Unruh Civil Rights Act prohibit discrimination in housing based on the following characteristics:

- Race
- Color
- National origin (including language use restrictions)
- Religion
- Sex
- Familial status (including children under the age of 18 living with parents or legal custodians; pregnant women and people securing custody of children under 18)
- Handicap (disability)
- Age
- Ancestry

- Citizenship
- Gender Identity and Gender Expression
- Genetic Information
- Immigration Status
- Marital Status
- Primary Language
- Sexual Orientation
- Source of Income
- Military or veteran status

This section describes efforts to increase fair housing compliance and enforcement capacity, and to ensure compliance with existing fair housing and civil rights laws and regulations.

Orange County jurisdictions rely on the state and local nonprofit fair housing providers to ensure fair housing compliance and enforcement, including the following organizations:

California Civil Rights Department

The California Civil Rights Department (CRD), formerly known as the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH), is responsible for enforcing state fair housing laws that make it illegal to discriminate against or harass someone because of a protected characteristic, that require reasonable accommodations for disabilities, and that prohibit retaliation against someone for exercising their rights. The CRD receives and investigates complaints and provides mediation and conflict resolution services throughout the state.

Fair Housing Council of Orange County

The Fair Housing Council of Orange County (FHCOC) is a nonprofit with a mission of ensuring access to housing and preserving human rights. FHCOC provides a variety of services in multiple languages, including community outreach and education, homebuyer education, mortgage default counseling, landlord-tenant mediation, and limited low-cost advocacy. In addition to these client services, FHCOC investigates claims of housing discrimination and assists with referrals to the state. FHCOC currently works in Anaheim, Santa Ana, Fountain Valley, Lake Forest, Laguna Niguel, Rancho Santa Margarita, the City of Orange, and Orange County.

Fair Housing Foundation

The Fair Housing Foundation (FHF) serves parts of Los Angeles County and several cities in Orange County, including Aliso Viejo, Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Irvine, La Habra, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, Orange, San Clemente, Tustin, and Westminster. FHF provides landlord-tenant counseling and mediation, rental housing counseling, and community outreach and education. In addition, the FHF screens

fair housing complaints, investigates through testing, and either engages in conciliation or mediation efforts or refers the complaints to the appropriate administrative agencies.

This section describes the status of any unresolved findings, lawsuits, enforcement actions, settlements, or judgments in which the program participant has been a party related to fair housing or other civil rights laws in the jurisdiction.

There are no unresolved findings, lawsuits, enforcement actions, settlements, or judgments in which the program participants have been a party related to fair housing or other civil rights laws in the jurisdictions.

IV.   Fair Housing Issues and Action Plan

For each participating jurisdiction, this section outlines (1) the issues identified in the preceding analysis; (2) the factors that create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of each fair housing issue; and (3) the actions each jurisdiction has taken or will take to address those contributing factors in order to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing. The actions listed below are included in the most recently approved and adopted Housing Element for each jurisdiction, and include actions taken to affirmatively further fair housing since the adoption of the Orange County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice in 2020.

A.   Orange County Urban County

Across the Urban County jurisdictions, the preceding analysis identified the following fair housing issues:

- Disparities in Access to Opportunities: Hispanic residents, and particularly those living below the FPL, have the least access to low poverty neighborhoods, neighborhoods in close proximity to high performing schools, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital.
- Disproportionate Housing Needs: Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in the Urban County jurisdictions. Additionally, there are racial/ethnic disparities in homeownership. Specifically, Black, Latino, and Native American households have low homeownership rates compared to White and AAPI households. The Black homeownership rate, the lowest among all groups, is approximately half the White homeownership rate, which is the highest.

Within the jurisdictions that make up the Urban County, the following additional fair housing issues were identified:

- Unincorporated Orange County
  - Segregation: There are areas of high White segregation in the unincorporated areas east of Rancho Santa Margarita, in North Tustin, in Orange Park Acres, and in Rossmoor.
- Brea
  - Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.
- Cypress
  - Segregation: There are areas of high POC segregation (which are predominantly AAPI neighborhoods), and there is overlap between the location of publicly supported housing, including a high rate of voucher use,

and areas of high POC segregation in the neighborhood near King Elementary School, in the north of the city.

- o Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

- Dana Point
    - o Segregation: There are areas of high White segregation in the city.
    - o Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

- La Palma
    - o Segregation: There are areas of high POC segregation in the city, which are predominantly AAPI neighborhoods.

- Laguna Beach
    - o Segregation: There are areas of high White segregation in the city.
    - o Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

- Laguna Hills
    - o Segregation: There are areas of high White segregation in the city.
    - o Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

- Laguna Woods
    - o Segregation: There are areas of high White segregation in the city.
    - o Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

- Placentia
    - o Segregation and R/ECAPs: There are areas of high White segregation in the north of the city, and high POC segregation areas in the southwest corner of the city. The high POC segregation area also has several publicly supported housing units, including a high rate of voucher use. Additionally, in this part of the city, the neighborhoods south of Orangethorpe Avenue are a R/ECAP. The R/ECAP Tract is predominantly Hispanic, as are the neighborhoods to the west and south in Fullerton and Anaheim.
    - o Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing. Geographically, southwestern Placentia neighborhoods have low access to environmental health, high poverty, low

economic scores, and are not located in a high-quality transit area. As noted above, this part of the city is a high POC segregation area that is predominantly Hispanic.

- San Juan Capistrano
  - Segregation: There is a high POC segregation area that is predominantly Hispanic. There is overlap between the location of publicly supported housing, including a high rate of voucher use, and the areas of high POC segregation in the Census Tract that encompasses the interchange between I-5 and the Ortega Highway (SR-74).
  - Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing. Geographically, the neighborhoods around the I-5 and the Ortega Highway (SR-74) interchange experience poor environmental health and have low economic scores. This is a high POC segregation area and is predominantly Hispanic.
- Seal Beach
  - Segregation: There are areas of high White segregation in the city.
  - Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.
- Stanton
  - Segregation: There are areas of high POC segregation in the city, which are predominantly Hispanic or AAPI neighborhoods. There are overlaps between the location of publicly supported housing, including a high rate of voucher use, and areas of high POC segregation throughout the city.
  - Disparities in Access to Opportunity: Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing. Additionally, all Stanton residents experience low access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods, and residents in the neighborhoods on the south side of Katella Avenue and on the eastside of Beach Boulevard north of Katella Avenue also experience high exposure to poverty.
- Villa Park
  - Segregation: There are areas of high White segregation in the city.
- Yorba Linda
  - Segregation: There are areas of high POC segregation in the northern area of the city, which is predominantly AAPI, and areas of high White segregation elsewhere

The contributing factors to each of the fair housing issues listed above, along with each jurisdictions' fair housing goals and actions, are outlined as follows:

1. Unincorporated Orange County

Issue: Segregation and R/ECAPs	

Contributing Factors:

1. Lack of investment in certain neighborhoods, including lack of community revitalization strategies, lack of private investment, and lack of public investment, including in services and amenities.
2. Limited quantity of affordable housing due to community opposition, land use and zoning laws, and occupancy codes and restrictions.
3. Private discrimination, including source of income discrimination.
4. Limited knowledge of fair housing laws due to: limited resources to pay for outreach; increasingly fewer people rely on newspapers to receive information, and public notices or printed flyers are costly and ineffective means to reach the community at large; unknown language barriers and resource barriers to accessing information.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Facilitate Affordable Housing Development through the following actions:	
1. Create a Housing Opportunities Overlay Map and webpage providing information about the Housing Opportunities Overlay and identify areas where higher density projects would be permitted with expedited processing, and which may be eligible for density bonuses.	Within 18-months of adoption/certification of the Housing Element.
2. Develop informational materials on the County's website regarding the County's lot consolidation incentives and density bonus program.	Within 18-months of adoption/certification of the Housing Element.
3. Update the "*Orange County Housing Opportunities Manual*" and will also create and distribute promotional materials explaining the County's expedited permit processing and incentives for affordable housing to be provided to developers in the region.	Within one year of adoption and certification of the Housing Element.
4. Publish and review the Affordable Housing Rental List.	Annually
5. Review the County Housing Authority's participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Section 8 Rental Assistance Program and pursue additional vouchers/funding when available.	Annually
6. Work with applicants who propose for-rent residential projects to encourage four-bedroom units for large families as part of the proposed developments.	As proposals are received (ongoing)
7. Meet with Developers and DPRC to identify potential constraints to the development of affordable housing and housing for those with special needs in the County's zoning regulations.	Within one year of adoption. Address within six months.
Coordination with Affordable Housing Stakeholders through the following actions:	
8. Provide letters of support to affordable housing developers' applications to local, State, and federal agencies for funding,	Initiate by January 2025

provided the proposed projects are consistent with the goals and policies of the *General Plan*.	
9. Work with cities and LAFCO to ensure that new planned communities in sphere of influence areas provide adequate sites at appropriate densities for affordable housing.	Annually
10. Conduct meetings with stakeholders, including the development community and property owners to facilitate housing development.	Annually
11. Attend and promote development incentives at the monthly Housing Opportunities Committee meeting and the bi-monthly OC Housing Finance Trust meetings.	Twice annually
12. Meet with owners of the religious properties identified in the inventory of sites and provide information on regulatory changes, development standards and affordability requirements and incentives and/or assistance available through the County for development of housing on religious institution properties.	By January 2025
13. Meet with nonprofit developers and housing organizations to evaluate projects for acquisition and rehabilitation/new construction of new shelters, and long-term affordable housing, including senior housing.	Annually
Increase knowledge and enforcement of fair housing laws through the following actions:	
14. Implement Restrictive Covenant Modification Plan (RCM) including Phase III, examination of remaining handwritten documents for unlawful languages and process.	By July 2027
15. Continue to work under contract with the FHCOC and/or other qualified fair housing service providers to provide fair housing services for all segments of the community. Evaluate and adjust the scope of services to ensure the County addresses any emerging trends in fair housing.	Annually
16. Provide federal/state/local information regarding discrimination to residents, including applicable Fair Housing Information and Discrimination Complaint Forms.	Annually
17. Maintain bilingual staff to assist non-English speaking families and ensure handicap accessible offices.	Annually
18. Work with the fair housing agencies to provide information regarding housing discrimination and intervention to resolve complaints.	Annually
19. Use non-traditional media (e.g., social media, County website) in outreach and education efforts in addition to print media and notices.	Annually

20. Update the Affordable Housing Rental List (translated in multiple languages) on the County website.	Annually
21. Inform community members of the existence of the Orange County Fair Housing Council (FHCOC) and its oversight of fair housing practices by posting on the County's website and at the Planning counter.	By December 2025
22. The County shall work with local resource agencies to implement an outreach program informing families within the County of housing and services available for individuals with developmental disabilities.	Annually
Amend the zoning code and other local ordinances to facilitate new housing opportunities and increase housing mobility, including:	
23. Allow emergency shelters without a Use Permit or other discretionary permit in the commercial and industrial portions of the Housing Opportunities Overlay Zone.	By October 2024
24. Remove the Site Development Permit requirement for multifamily developments of one to four units and any developments with 20% affordable units and allow by-right. Amend the Site Development Permit requirements for objective findings for developments of units or more.	By October 2024
25. Adopt Objective Design Standards (ODS).	By October 2024

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities	
Contributing Factors: 1. Unaffordable rents and sales prices in a range of sizes. 2. Displacement of residents due to economic pressures. 3. Lack of private and public investment in specific neighborhoods.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
Increase accessible and affordable housing opportunities for persons with disabilities through the following actions:	
1. Review Definition of Single Housekeeping Unit. To promote flexibility to accommodate residents with different living conditions, the County will review and adopt revisions as appropriate to its zoning code to provide greater flexibility in consideration of accommodating a variety of household situations for related and unrelated individuals living together.	By December 2026.
2. The County will review and revise its group home and zoning ordinances as needed to ensure ongoing compliance with state and federal fair housing laws. For example, the ordinance will be reviewed to ensure that a group home that operates as a single	By December 31, 2025.

housekeeping unit is permitted in any zoning district in the same manner as other residential uses in that zone (e.g., multifamily, single family). The definition of single housekeeping unit as to group homes will be revised to eliminate (1) the reference to residential activities that do not occur on a nonprofit basis and, (2) the requirement that the residents share lease agreements or ownership. In addition, the standards for group homes shall be objective and not unnecessarily constrain approval of group homes in that zoning district.	
3. Seek State and Federal monies, as funding becomes available, for permanent supportive housing construction and rehabilitation targeted for persons with disabilities, including persons with developmental disabilities.	Annually.
4. Develop a program /ordinance to provide regulatory incentives, such as expedited permit processing and fee waiver, to projects targeted for persons with disabilities, including persons with developmental disabilities.	Within 2 years of adoption of the Housing Element.
5. On an ongoing basis, enforce building code provisions requiring accessible design.	Annually.
6. On an ongoing basis, implement reasonable accommodation ordinance.	Ongoing.
7. On an ongoing basis, ensure the permitting requirements for group homes and care facilities for seven or more persons are consistent with State law and fair housing requirements.	Ongoing.
Increase affordable housing opportunities in high opportunity areas through the following actions:	
8. Sites Rezoning – Amend the HOO to accommodate a higher density of development, establish a minimum density for R2, R3, R4, RP, and MX zones, rezone C1, C2, CC, CH, CN, RP to MX, and expand the HOO.	Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 25, 2024.
9. No Net Loss – Identify and make available additional adequate sites to accommodate the share of housing need by income level.	By end of 2024, if required.
10. Review incentives for density bonuses, expedited permit processing procedures, development standards, tax-exempt conduit financing, infrastructure financing assistance, and direct financial assistance.	Every two years.

11. Review with DPRC members the existing and proposed codes, procedures, and fees to ensure that they do not unreasonably hinder housing production.	Within 1 FY of approval.
12. Review funding opportunities and aggressively pursue, as the County has been, all state and federal housing grant funds for which the County is eligible	Bimonthly.
13. Approve affordable housing projects in Rancho Mission Viejo administratively.	Ongoing.
14. Coordinate with the City of Newport Beach for development and shared RHNA credit of the identified parcels on the County-owned Coyote Canyon site.	By November 2024.
15. Implement an informational program to disseminate information about developing ADUs.	By end of 2025; annually thereafter.
16. Prepare pre-approved ADU plans.	July 2024.
17. Implement the Affordable ADU Loan Program Policy Manual.	Within 2 years of adoption.
18. Initiate consideration of an Inclusionary Housing Program/Policy.	By December 2026.
19. Leverage available funding sources, such as Homekey funds, to purchase or rehabilitate housing, including hotels, motels, vacant apartment buildings, and other buildings and convert them into interim or permanent, long-term housing.	Annually.

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs	
Contributing Factors: 1. Unaffordable rents and sales prices in a range of sizes. 2. Shortage of subsidized housing units. 3. Cost of repairs and rehabilitation. 4. Dominance of single-family housing, which is typically more expensive than multifamily.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
Rehabilitate and Preserve Existing Residential Units through the following actions:	
1. Use available housing funding to finance housing rehabilitation, focusing in Central and North County.	Annually.
2. Implement and review the County's code enforcement and graffiti removal programs.	Ongoing.
3. Provide infrastructure maintenance in existing residential neighborhoods, including through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), focusing in Central and North County.	Annually.
4. Participate in the CDBG, HOME and related programs as a means of providing passthrough funding to affordable housing projects and efforts to rehabilitate existing affordable units or projects, focusing in Central and North County.	Annually.

5. Site Replacement – Comply with site replacement requirement pursuant to Government Code Section 65583.2(g)(3). Replace sites identified in the inventory that currently have residential uses, or within the past five years have had residential uses that have been vacated or demolished, and:
   a. Were subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of low or very low-income; or
   b. Subject to any other form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power; or
   c. Occupied by low or very low-income households for the purpose of this program "previous five years" is based on the date the application for development was submitted.
	As necessary (ongoing).

6. Monitor projects with expiring affordability covenants and take appropriate action to preserve these affordable units whenever possible. Promote funding and other opportunities to owners considering conversion of units through existing outreach programs and the County's website.	Annually.
7. Enforce the provisions of the County's condominium and mobile home park conversion ordinance.	Annually.
Make neighborhood improvements in low opportunity areas in Central and North County, including the following:	

8. Implement the County CIP plan including ADA, roadway, and infrastructure improvements in the Unincorporated County. Improvements may include:
    a. Curb ramp, sidewalk, and driveway upgrades and improvements to satisfy current ADA standards and requirements.
    b. Parkway, sidewalk, and intersection improvements.
	Annually.

9. Facilitate the development or improvement of parks and open space under the County's CIP plan or other implementation plan benefiting residents of Unincorporated communities, particularly communities with reduced access to environmental opportunities. Projects may include:
    a. Development of Mile Square Regional Park in Fountain Valley
    b. Santa Ana River Trail
    c. Ted Craig Regional Park improvements
    d. Yorba Regional Park improvements
	By 2029.

Increase housing opportunities, with a focus in Central County, for persons experiencing homelessness through the following actions:	
10. Facilitate the development of one interim or permanent, long-term housing project using available funding sources, such as Homekey funds (provided it is made available through the State), during the planning period which is anticipated to assist 50 persons experiencing homelessness annually.	Annually.

2.   Brea

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunity and Disproportionate Housing Needs	
Contributing Factors: 1. Lack of community revitalization strategies. 2. Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services and amenities. 3. High cost of housing rehabilitation and repairs. 4. High levels of overpayment create displacement risk. 5. Limited availability of affordable housing in all areas of the city, including those where rents and sales prices have become exclusive. 6. Community concern about housing densities. 7. Lack of knowledge of fair housing laws.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
Increase knowledge of fair housing laws through the following actions:	
1. By the end of 2022, post additional fair housing information at the Family Resource and Senior Centers and on their digital platforms. Starting in 2022, conduct an informational workshop at these locations once every two years.	By the end of 2022
2. In 2023, conduct a fair housing information session for the City Council. Invite local nonprofits (including the Orange County Human Relations Commission, the Kennedy Commission, and People for Housing O.C.) to attend.	By the end of 2023
3. Publish Fair Housing information, including any community meetings in Brea Line (city newsletter), as well as non- traditional media, such as Instagram and Facebook, and conduct targeted outreach to tenants, mobile home park residents, and other lower-income populations.	Annually
4. Increase the distribution of fair housing materials by at least 25 percent to increase awareness of fair housing options among residents, including special needs groups and low-income residents. Seek to increase the number of Brea residents counseled through the Fair Housing Council of Orange County from an average of 70 to 75 annually.	Annually, between 2021-2029
Increase quality of affordable housing and access to opportunities in low opportunity areas through the following actions:	
5. Include information about rehabilitation resources in City newsletters and on the City website, including the availability of funds for accessibility improvements. Include translated information when feasible. Seek to assist 12-15 households annually. Starting in 2023, conduct targeted outreach in identified Low and Moderate Resource	Annually

Census Tracts, utilizing the Housing Conditions Survey and Code Enforcement information to further target assistance.	
6. Identify apartments in need of rehabilitation and cooperate with nonprofit providers to acquire and rehabilitate units and provide as long-term affordable housing. Seek to complete at least two projects, including the 47-unit Walnut Village in partnership with Jamboree Housing.	Between 2021-2029
7. Continue to improve access to individuals with disabilities through ADA improvements to streets, sidewalks, and public facilities. Dedicate or seek funding, including annual CDBG allocations, to prioritize infrastructure and accessibility improvements in Low and Moderate Resource opportunity areas.	Ongoing
8. Increased public and private investment in Low and Moderate Resource Census Tracts, including $2,000,000 allocated for a variety of ADA, park facilities, transportation, water, and sewer line improvements in these Census Tracts during 2021-2029.	2021-2029
Increase housing opportunities in high opportunity areas through the following actions:	
9. Starting in 2023, work with the FHCOC to contact landlords of affordable multifamily complexes every two years and provide fair housing information and assistance. This outreach will focus on promoting the Section 8 voucher program to landlords who have not previously participated in the program and should include multi-lingual materials. Through landlord outreach in coordination with the FHCOC and housing mobility programs through the Orange County Housing Authority, the City's goal will be to increase Housing Choice Vouchers by 10%, from 114 to 125 vouchers, including a 10% increase in high resource neighborhoods.	Every two years; 2021-2029
10. Rezone sufficient parcels to provide geographically dispersed sites for over 1,100 lower-income units, fostering a more inclusive community.	2022
11. Provide significant new housing opportunities in Highest Resource eastern Brea through development of a diverse mix of 1,100 new units in the Brea 265 project, including an estimated 76 deed restricted affordable units as required through the City's inclusionary ordinance. Pursue the introduction of workforce housing on Amazon's 31-acre warehouse site in eastern Brea.	2021-2029
12. Update Brea's Affordable Housing Ordinance in 2022 to integrate low- and moderate-income units in market rate projects throughout the community	2022

13. Coordinate with the Orange County Housing Authority (OCHA) in 2023 to utilize the mobility counseling program. This OCHA program informs Housing Choice Voucher holders about their residential options in higher opportunity areas and provides holistic support to voucher holders seeking to move to higher opportunity areas.	2023-2029
14. Initiate a marketing program for homeowners on the benefits of ADUs and the availability of funds to support development through the City's Newsletter and posting of the ADU application checklist on the City website, thereby expanding housing opportunities in areas traditionally limited to single-family ownership. Promote and support the development of ADUs and seek to issue permits for 16 units annually throughout Brea.	Annually, starting in 2022
15. Adopt an Ordinance by 2022 to expand the housing supply in High Resource single-family zones by allowing for lot splits and duplexes under the parameters of SB 9. In coordination with research being conducted at the State level, pursue opportunities to incentivize and provide funding assistance for homeowners to provide affordable units under SB 9.	2022-2025
16. Require affordable developers receiving public funds to prepare an affirmative marketing plan and encourage private developers with affordable units in their projects to prepare an affirmative marketing plan. The affirmative marketing plan shall ensure marketing materials for new developments are designed to attract renters and buyers of diverse demographics, including individuals of any race, ethnicity, sex, handicap, and familial status.	Ongoing
Prevent displacement through the following actions:	
17. Continue anti-displacement programs including limits on rent increases and prohibiting evictions without just cause for tenants that have resided in their units for more than 12 months; relocation assistance where public funds are utilized; and replacement requirements when affordable units are removed.	Ongoing
18. Assist mobile home park resident organizations interested in purchasing their parks to access funds through the state HCD Mobile Home Park Resident Ownership Program (MPROP). Provide available local funds for leverage and assist with the subdivision map waiver process consistent with the Subdivision Map Act.	Ongoing

3. Cypress

Issue: Segregation and Disparities in Access to Opportunity	
Contributing Factors: 1. Lack of City-specific data on fair housing inquiries/complaints. 2. Lack of effective outreach strategies. 3. Concentration of lower- and moderate-income households. 4. Limited understanding of regulations surrounding acceptance of HCV tenants.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Advocate to receive reports from the Orange County Fair Housing Council that include data specific to the City of Cypress to allow the City to better assess fair housing issues within the community.	Ongoing
2. Create an updated webpage on the City's website with information on fair housing rights and resources by 2023.	2023
3. Publish information about fair housing resources in the City's quarterly newsletter.	Ongoing
4. Implement requirements for developers to submit an Affirmative Action Marketing Plan for density bonus projects by 2023.	2023, ongoing thereafter
5. Expand outreach and education of Source of Income Protection laws (SB 329 and SB 222), which include HCVs and other public assistance as legitimate sources of income for housing.	Ongoing
6. Provide information on Source of Income Protection laws in ADU informational packets.	Ongoing
7. Increase affordable housing stock in high opportunities through the following actions:	
a. Promote key lower income housing opportunity sites for affordable housing development as a means to bring new housing opportunities to high resource areas.	Ongoing
b. Conduct a feasibility study on the implementation of an inclusionary housing ordinance by 2024.	2024
c. Support funding applications by nonprofit developers for affordable housing in high resource areas.	Ongoing

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs	
Contributing Factors: 1. Presence of a higher proportion of older multi-family rental units. 2. Limited income available for home repairs/maintenance. 3. Older single family housing stock.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Implementation of a Neighborhood Preservation Pilot Program to identify and address code violations and needed right of way improvements.	Ongoing
2. Expand outreach and education efforts to neighborhood residents on resources available to address code violations and property maintenance issues.	Ongoing

4.   Dana Point

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Contributing Factors:

1. Low rates of HCV use. Despite high rates of overpayment for rental households, the use of housing vouchers is low. This may be due to stigma associated with the use of Housing Vouchers, both by property owners and tenants.
2. School performance. Disadvantaged students at schools serving Dana Point residents may be falling behind other students in the school and compared to those across the state. Both elementary schools in Dana Point are ranked much lower compared to other elementary schools that serve Dana Point residents.
3. Income and Diversity. The City lacks a substantial number of suitable housing sites in moderate / high / highest opportunity areas; many of these areas are largely built out with single-family homes. The majority of available housing sites are in Census Tracts that already have a higher concentration of low-income residents.
4. Lack of regional coordination and lack of public/private investment. Dana Point and surrounding cities generally address the need and solutions for affordable housing and homeless shelters in an independent manner, which causes them to compete against one another for funds and eliminates opportunities to pool resources.
5. Potential community opposition. While there is little community opposition to a proposed affordable project (e.g., there was community support for Silver Lantern), additional regional collaboration can help to mitigate community opposition that may arise in the future (whether an affordable housing project or homeless shelter).

Actions:	Timeframe:
Increase knowledge and enforcement of fair housing laws through the following actions:	
1. Educate the community about fair-housing and equal housing opportunities, providing housing counseling services and family resource information and referral. Topics include, but are not limited to tenant rights, legal resources, rehabilitation grants and loans, first-time homebuyer programs, and Section 8 programs. Distribute materials in English and Spanish through City Hall, City libraries, City websites, and the Fair Housing Council website.	Ongoing
2. Track fair housing issues and identify patterns in the City, including meeting annually to check on the status of active cases.	Annually
3. Promote fair housing opportunities through various financial assistance initiatives and affordable housing/neighborhood revitalization programs.	Ongoing

4. Actively recruit residents from neighborhoods in low resource areas to serve or participate on boards, committees, and other local government bodies.	Ongoing
5. As part of the City's Housing Element Annual Report, continue to annually monitor zoning regulations to ensure compliance with fair housing laws.	Ongoing
Increase use of Housing Choice Vouchers through the following actions:	
6. Coordinate with OCHA to generate a detailed understanding of where overpayment rates and displacement risks are highest in the city (as of latest available Census data), where vouchers are and are not used, and how many tenants could potentially qualify at each multifamily property in target areas.	2022
7. Coordinate with Orange County United Way on the WelcomeHomeOC program to identify opportunities to assist Dana Point residents.	2022
8. Apply affirmative advertising policy to income-restricted units to be built in the Victoria Apartments development in the Doheny Village area. Apply the policy to all future income-restricted projects, as permitted by state and/or federal funding programs.	2022
9. Coordinate with OCHA to develop an outreach plan and materials to communicate the benefits of vouchers and tenant rights regarding just cause evictions, limitations on rent increases, and replacement housing requirements if any existing residential units would be removed, based on state law.	2023
10. Complete study of options to augment/adjust current in-lieu fee program for possible application of funds for those overpaying and/or at risk of displacement; evaluate how the City can prioritize or facilitate mixed- income housing through potential use of in-lieu fees or other resources (e.g., determine which federal and state grant or loan programs are structured to score mixed-income projects as more competitive compared to 100 percent lower income developments).	2024
11. Distribute outreach materials through means that reach target populations (e.g., those receiving subsidized school lunches). Conduct direct outreach to 10 properties (tenants and owners) in Census Tracts illustrating high rates of rental overpayment and conduct mailer outreach to all renter occupied units and rental	2024

property owners in the Town Center and Doheny Village Census Tracts.	
12. Bring forth appropriate in-lieu fee provisions for adoption.	2024
13. Establish strategies to use City resources (technical support and/or in-lieu fees as appropriate) to encourage mixed-income housing developments.	2024
Improve educational outcomes for lower income and underserved students at schools in or serving Dana Point, through the following actions:	
14. Continue annual assessment of effectiveness of Sparkpoint OC with Orange County United Way.	Annually
15. Negotiate with the Victoria Apartments property owner to dedicate substantial funds toward schools in Dana Point, specifically Dana Hills High School (which serves residents in the low resource areas).	2024
16. Coordinate with United Way to continue and or expand Sparkpoint effort on annual basis, with modifications to provide better or more effective assistance and/or to reach more families.	Annually
17. Coordinate with United Way to expand Sparkpoint effort to Palisades Elementary School.	2025
Increase affordable housing opportunities through the city, and especially in moderate, high, and highest resource areas, through the following actions:	
18. Adopt a pre-approval review process for ADUs.	2023
19. Initiate a general plan update with an explicit objective to identify additional housing opportunities in moderate, high, and highest resource areas, with additional emphasis on Census Tracts that can help improve patterns of greater diversity, promote a broader distribution of households with a range of incomes, and lowers displacement risk.	2023
20. Coordinate with the OCHA to inform Housing Choice Voucher holders about their residential options in moderate, high, and highest resource areas.	Annually
21. In coordination with research being conducted at the state level, pursue opportunities to incentivize and provide funding assistance	Ongoing

for homeowners to provide affordable units under SB 9 provisions (adopted by ordinance in February 2022).	
22. Coordinate through the Orange County Housing Finance Trust (OCHFT) on the use of funding sources (e.g., REAP) and potential to apply for additional funding.	Ongoing
23. Coordinate through OCHFT on year two notice of funding availability (NOFA), and subsequent NOFAs for years three, four, and five; advocate for the use of funds in Dana Point as appropriate and in surrounding jurisdictions when such location would yield better benefits (more units, deeper level of subsidy, more target populations, etc.).	Ongoing
24. Assist in the update of the OCHFT five-year strategic plan.	2024

5.   La Palma

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Contributing Factors:

1. Some residents who are in need of fair housing resources, including low-income households, individuals with disabilities, racial/ethnic minorities and other protected classes, may be unaware of the fair housing resources that are available. Although information about fair housing services is posted on the City website and in public offices, more could be done to make this information available.

2. Lack of access to opportunity due to high housing costs is a significant contributing factor to fair housing throughout the region. All areas of La Palma are classified as high opportunity. Increasing housing availability in areas with good opportunity make it easier for lower-income households to access the types of services and amenities that further economic and social mobility.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Expand fair housing outreach through the following actions:	
a. Continue directing fair housing inquiries to the Fair Housing Council of Orange County.	Ongoing
b. Post and update information annually regarding fair housing and request FHCOC to conduct a presentation every two years about services available.	Every two years
c. Contact all apartment complexes annually to provide education and materials about the Section 8/Housing Choice Voucher program including multi-lingual materials. Coordinate to develop an outreach plan and materials to communicate the benefits of vouchers and tenant rights regarding just cause evictions, limitations on rent increases, and replacement housing requirements. Conduct direct outreach to 30 properties (tenants and owners) in Census Tracts with LMI concentrations by December 2026.	Annually
d. Publish and update links to fair housing information on the City website and via social media annually.	Annually
2. Improve Access to Opportunity and Mobility through the following actions:	
a. Conduct fee study annually and adopt City planning fee reductions for new deed-restricted low-income housing projects and fee waivers for lot consolidation by June 2025	Annually, fee reductions adopted by June 2025
b. Update Municipal Code for large residential care facilities and remove any unreasonable conditions of approval or other	By December 2024

	requirements by establishing objective development standards to eliminate subjective components of the discretionary CUP process and ensure barrier free housing choices for individuals with disabilities by December 2024.	
c.	Continue to support the provision of housing for individuals with disabilities through updates to zoning regulations in compliance with fair housing law by December 2023.	December 2023
d.	Encourage and facilitate housing development commensurate with the City's identified housing need in the RHNA allocation on a continuous basis.	Ongoing
e.	Apply for CDBG funding through the County of Orange Urban County program and seek third-party grant writing assistance for City's Meals on Wheels senior program and ADA improvements for streets and sidewalks by October 2025.	October 2025

f.	Establish Economic Development/Land Use Committee by February 2024 to implement the following programs:
	  i. Review City-owned properties annually and identify any surplus land that could be made available for affordable housing development by June 2024.
	  ii. Explore options to allow and incentivize missing middle and special needs residential uses in the R-3 as part of the development standards amendments for increased story count, parking, and lot coverage by December 2024.
	  iii. Pursue strategies to facilitate housing development of at least 10 housing units on religious, institutional, and quasi-institutional lands, and adaptive reuse of underutilized properties for affordable housing by December 2024. Include potential residential development and conduct targeted outreach to interested parties for City-owned parcel on 5062 La Palma Avenue and conduct outreach to the three large churches within La Palma. Evaluate opportunities for adaptive reuse as part of outreach to Centerpointe property owners by December 2024.
	  iv. Report back to City Council on findings, recommendations and provide update on program implementation by December 2024. By 2027, implement short term and midterm programs identified in the Strategic Plan.
		Report to Council by December 2024. Implement short and midterm programs in Plan by 2027.

g. Work cooperatively with the County of Orange and cities to create a regional housing bond program to help fund affordable housing and permanent supportive housing.	Ongoing
h. Work with Orange County Housing & Community Development to conserve existing affordable housing units at-risk of converting to market rate. Contact owners of the City's low-income apartment complexes (Camden Place, Seasons at La Palma, and Casa La Palma) and offer funding from the City's affordable housing asset fund toward rental rehabilitation of at least 20 units during the planning period.	2021-2029
i. Work with the Fair Housing Council to expand knowledge of first-time homebuyer programs, and promote available programs on the City's website, newsletters and through social media.	Ongoing
j. Affirmative Marketing and Regional Registries: Require, provide incentives, and utilize other strategies to promote affirmative marketing plans in all new housing developments. The affirmative marketing plans will consider regional housing registries and ensure marketing materials for new developments are designed to attract renters and buyers of diverse demographics, including individuals of any race, ethnicity, income, disability, and familial status.	Ongoing

k. In collaboration with OCHA, expand the use of housing choice vouchers in high resource areas through the following actions:
   i. Develop an outreach plan and materials with targeted outreach to Census Blocks of LMI concentrations to communicate the benefits of vouchers and tenant rights regarding just cause evictions, limitations on rent increases, and replacement housing requirements if any existing residential units would be removed, based on state law.
   ii. Gain a better understanding of where overpayment and overcrowding rates are highest in the city, where vouchers are and are not used, and how many tenants could potentially qualify at each multifamily property in target areas in order to develop strategies to expand use of vouchers with the goal of increasing voucher use (63 vouchers in 2023) by at least two per year in La Palma.
   iii. Inform voucher holders about their residential options in high-resource areas by developing a Housing
	Ongoing

Resources Directory available on the City's website and updated annually.	
l. Expand production of accessory dwelling units in high-resource single family neighborhoods and address potential overcrowding by promoting the City's ADU ordinance, application, look-up tool, preapproved plans, and educational resources through the Housing SoCal page by June 2024. Target direct outreach to areas of LMI concentration and Census Tracts south of La Palma Avenue with promotional materials annually. Increase ADU production by two units per year for a total of at least 30 units during the planning period.	2021-2029
m. Enhance City's existing proactive code enforcement program by targeting areas of concentrated owner rehabilitation needs, resulting in repairs to minimize displacement and relocation impacts. Re-initiate volunteer home painting/repair program with local churches and home improvement stores, which was successful in the last planning period. Provide owner rehabilitation assistance to at least a total of 16 residential units rehabilitated within areas of LMI concentration during the planning period.	2021-2029
n. Distribute direct mailers and applications to apartment complexes for La Palma Citizens' Academy to recruit residents from areas of concentrated lower income and renters to serve on boards, committees, and other local government decision-making bodies annually.	Annually
o. Initiate joint use agreement between City and Centralia Elementary School District to create a public playground at Miller Elementary School and Edison Right-of-Way to benefit the LMI concentration in the eastern portion of the City. Seek grant funding opportunities by December 2026.	December 2026
p. Continue place-based strategies toward community revitalization including: 　i. Invest and prioritize City beautification projects, including 3.85 miles of street medians, trees, and drought-tolerant landscaping, along corridors of areas with LMI concentrations (La Palma Avenue, Moody Street, and Walker Avenue) by June 2025. 　ii. Complete water infrastructure projects related to four (4) water main interconnections to provide emergency and contingency water supply to 4,270 units; and	2024-2025

replacement of large water meters for 36 residential units by June 2024. iii. Seek grant funding for the La Palma Avenue Slurry Seal Project, which includes sidewalk ADA improvements from west to east City limits, centralized in area of higher percentage (10-20%) of population with a disability by December 2024.	
q. In cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority, provide community education regarding transport services for individuals with disabilities. Partner with OCTA, OC Health Care Agency, and local school districts to implement OC Safe Routes to Schools Program in its Countywide initiatives through participation in Next STEP (ATP and REAP 2.0 funding) by December 2027.	December 2027

6. Laguna Beach

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Contributing Factors:

1. Lack of knowledge and enforcement of fair housing laws due to the following:
   a. Insufficient fair housing monitoring and limited outreach capacity.
   b. Lack of a variety of media inputs.
   c. Lack of marketing community meetings.
   d. Lack of regional coordination.
2. Lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas due to the following:
   a. Historical land use development patterns and zoning, and lack of vacant land limit opportunities for larger and higher density project types.
   b. Past national, state, and regional racial/ethnic discriminatory practices.
   c. Current high cost of housing limits access to lower income households of all races/ethnicities.
   d. Lack of affordable housing and need for greater access to opportunities.
   e. Regional coordination affects transit services, funding sources, and allocation of housing resources including vouchers.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Increase fair housing knowledge and enforcement through the following actions:	
a. Ensure that all laws, programs, and activities affirmatively further fair housing in accordance with state law. As the General Plan and Zoning Code are updated or amended, review and revise policies and code provisions to promote an inclusive community.	Ongoing
b. When considering specific plan or rezoning proposals, evaluate whether the change in zoning will help achieve fair housing goals.	Ongoing
c. Include fair housing information on the City's website, including up-to-date fair housing laws, FHCOC services, and information on filing discrimination complaints. Proactive announcement of fair housing resources on Community Newsletter (weekly text messaging system).	Provide link to services on City website by 2023 and make service announcements at least annually.
d. Continue to publish a Housing Assistance Guide informing community members of the Orange County Fair Housing Council (FHCOC) and its oversight of fair housing practices, for availability on the City's website and at the Planning counter.	Update annually

e. Develop interest list for update on fair housing and affordable housing projects.	By the end of 2022 and updated annually.
f. Update the City website with affordable housing projects.	Update website semi- annually.
g. Utilize non-traditional media (i.e., social media, City website, Community Newsletter) in outreach and education efforts in addition to print media and notices.	Beginning in 2023; ongoing thereafter
h. As a participating City in the County of Orange Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, continue to support the annual contribution of CDBG funds to the Orange County Fair Housing Council (FHCOC).	Annually
i. Participate in regional efforts to address fair housing issues and monitor emerging trends/issues in the housing market. Attend quarterly OCHA Housing Advisory Committee meetings.	Quarterly
j. Petition to Orange County, administrator of the City's CDBG program, for the fair housing provider (FHCOC) to expand landlord education on source of income discrimination and voucher programs.	Beginning in 2023.
k. Expand outreach and education on recent state laws (SB 329 and SB 222) supporting source of income protection for publicly assisted low-income households (HCVs).	Begin in 2023
2. Increase affordable housing in high opportunity areas through the following actions:	
a. Establish a new Housing Program Coordinator planner position to oversee and expedite Housing Element program implementation.	Beginning in 2023.
b. Create a comprehensive ADU Handbook with tools to facilitate ADU production.	12/1/2022.
c. Require that 25% of the total number of units or lots, whichever is greater, in new subdivisions of two or more residential units or lots and 25% of new development of three or more units on existing building sites be affordable to extremely-low-, very-low-, low- or moderate-income households or individuals.	Initiate inclusionary housing policy update in 2023 with a market feasible study.
d. Update inclusionary housing policy to enhance feasibility and production of affordable housing.	

e.	Amend the Zoning Code to provide more flexible development standards and the built form for affordable housing and facilitate development of densities at or above 30 units per acre.	Complete amendments by 2024.
f.	Conduct outreach to religious institutions to provide information and technical assistance on state law regarding developing housing units on religious-use parking spaces.	In 2023.
g.	Monitor financial assistance programs administered by the California Department of Housing and Community Development and apply for funding that the City is eligible for and can competitively vie for.	Annually explore funding options available.
h.	Amend the Zoning Code to create a new zone where emergency shelters all allowed by right, then apply the zone to the Friendship Shelter site.	Zoning Code revision adopted by the City Council on December 13, 2022.
i.	Amend Zoning Code to address Low Barrier Navigation Center, transitional housing, and supportive housing, SRO, and reasonable accommodation.	By June 2023.
j.	Review Zoning Code to accommodate large group homes (7+ individuals) as a residential use to be conditionally permitted in residential zones and to establish conditions for approval that are objective and provide for certainty in outcomes.	By June 2023.
k.	Establish an Affirmative Marketing Plan, to include advertising and community outreach designed to reach underrepresented households to be implemented when affordable units become available.	Establish plan by the end of 2023.
l.	Initiate an update to the Laguna Canyon Specific Plan to evaluate suitability for expansion of sites, through code amendments or rezoning, to where live-work, residential, or mixed-use development is permitted.	Complete plan by 2023.
m.	Continue to evaluate potential for mixed-use and work/live spaces along the Coast Highway Corridor and on vacant or underutilized commercial properties.	Establish strategy by 2024.
n.	With adoption of Phase 2 of the DSP, include incentives such as: increased densities, increased height limits, higher lot coverage, lower parking requirements, allowances for off-site parking, allowances for lot assemblage and, and removal of upper story	Adoption of Phase 2 in 2025.

residential use limitations to assist in the development of housing	
3. Make neighborhood improvements to increase access to opportunity, and preserve housing affordability, through the following actions:	
a. Pursue the development of an amnesty program for unpermitted residential units.	By 2023
b. Laguna Canyon Road (SR-133) Improvements: place overhead utilities underground; active transportation improvements; reconstruct drainage channel; add dam to control storm flows.	By end of 2025
c. Coast Highway ADA South Improvements (Moss Street to Fifth Avenue): add new sidewalks; widen existing sidewalk; reconstruct existing curb ramps and driveways to meet current ADA standards; add audible pedestrian crossing systems; repair, resurface, and restripe roadway.	By end of 2025
d. Laguna Canyon Road Median Landscaping: Replant the landscaped median along Laguna Canyon Road between Forest Avenue and east of Canyon Acres Drive.	2023-2024
e. Continue to provide Senior Housing Repair program.	Ongoing
f. Monitor implementation of the Short-Term Lodging Ordinance. Restrictions to short-term lodging are intended to help preserve rental housing stock by limiting their use for vacation rental purposes.	Annually
g. Continue to support aging in place through amortization and abatement agreements which allow residents to remain on the property under specified conditions to improve the property.	Ongoing
h. Where safety concerns can be addressed, allow residents to remain in unpermitted spaces while they are adapted to meet work/live code If funding is available, develop incentives and funding programs to assist building owners and tenants to make the building modifications necessary to conform with work/live ordinances.	By 2023

7.   Laguna Hills

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Contributing Factors:
1. Concentration of more affordable housing (e.g., multifamily, mobile home park) in north Laguna Hills and the Via Lomas neighborhood.
2. Neighborhoods in south Laguna Hills are more desirable, therefore more costly, than neighborhoods in central and north Laguna Hills.
3. Availability of affordable units in a range of sizes.
4. Cost of rehabilitation or repair.
5. Availability of rentals that accept Housing Choice Vouchers.
6. Linguistic isolation of non-English speaking households.
7. Availability of high-ranked elementary schools to serve north Laguna Hills and the Via Lomas neighborhood.
8. Housing shortages regionally in Orange County.
9. Unaffordable rents and home prices.
10. Lack of partnerships with affordable housing developers
11. Concentrated areas of poverty in low-resource areas.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Coordinate local housing efforts with federal, state, regional, and local government and/or agencies and cooperate in implementation of intergovernmental housing programs; including the following actions:	Ongoing
a. Submit CDBG applications to assist in preserving existing affordable housing stock;	Annually
b. Continue to publicize programs, such as energy-efficiency programs and state and federal funding programs;	Ongoing
c. Encourage local housing advocates to make presentations to local builders and developers, Chamber of Commerce, civic groups, and the local community re: affordable and multifamily/higher density development.	Biannually
2. Encourage the development of ADUs throughout the City to expand housing opportunities for all income levels within existing neighborhoods, particularly for lower-income seniors, single individuals, individuals with disabilities, and small households; through the following actions:	Ongoing
a. Update the City's current ADU Ordinance	2023
b. Promote development of ADUs through City website c. and informational material	2023

d.	Identify and implement potential incentives to encourage production of affordable ADUs.	Ongoing
e.	Monitor the production and affordability of ADUs annually to ensure the City will meet the assumption of 18 ADUs during the planning period.	Annually
f.	Explore funding options to create an ADU forgivable Loan Program.	2024
3. Increase affordable housing in high opportunity areas through the following actions:		
a.	Establish objective design standards for residential development and analyze opportunities to permit multifamily residential in an existing commercial center.	By August 2024
b.	Analyze opportunities to permit multifamily residential in an existing commercial center in north Laguna Hills.	2024
c.	Mitigate regulatory constraints on the production of housing through the following actions.	
i.	Consider adaptive reuse ordinance by June 2024 and implement, if appropriate, by June 2025.	2024-2025
ii.	Consider inclusionary housing ordinance and present findings to City Council by June 2024 and implement, if appropriate, by June 2025.	2024-2025
iii.	Consider congregational overlay by June 2024 and implement, if appropriate, by June 2025.	2024-2025
iv.	Conduct initial review of development standards and permitting requirements by June 2025 and update Zoning Ordinance as needed.	2025
v.	Amend the General Plan and Zoning Code, as needed, to provide adequate sites for 413 lower-income units.	2024
d.	Provide incentives (e.g., expedited processing, fee waivers, and density bonuses) to facilitate set-asides for planned low-income units, and for mixed-use development.	Ongoing
e.	Promote lower-income housing development incentives on the City website.	Ongoing
f.	Enact new measures that will raise local funding for construction of affordable and other needed housing types.	June 2025

g. Develop and implement strategies to encourage and facilitate lot consolidation and phasing of residential and mixed-use developments on large sites.	Ongoing
h. Explore the potential to partner with a nonprofit organization to offer a program based on the Community Land Trust model.	2025
i. Work with stakeholders to identify nongovernmental constraints that may impede the construction of housing.	Ongoing
j. Increase participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program through the following actions:	
i. Provide referral services and information to City residents on HCV program.	Ongoing
ii. Study the feasibility of a landlord incentive program for landlords that choose to accept voucher holding tenants.	2024
4. Increase housing opportunities for special needs populations through the following actions:	
a. Pursue homeless assistance grants through the Continuum of Care.	Annually
b. Assist public and private nonprofit housing developers in preparation of funding applications for special-needs populations.	Annually
c. Conduct outreach to service providers to discuss ways the City can assist in the development of housing for lower income households.	Annually
d. Work with local organizations that provide assistance to individuals with disabilities to implement an outreach program that informs individuals with disabilities and their families about housing and available services.	Ongoing
e. Prepare and distribute informational material on the reasonable accommodation ordinance, that will direct people to service information on the City website.	2024
f. Encourage developers to provide universal design features in housing developments.	Ongoing

	g. Provide fair housing education and information to apartment managers and homeowners associations on why denial of reasonable modifications/ accommodations is unlawful.	Ongoing
5. Promote development opportunities in the Urban Village Specific Plan (UVSP) area, encouraging affordable housing development, through the following actions:		
	a. Add promotional material re: UVSP housing opportunities on the City's website.	2023
	b. Meet with prospective developers to encourage incorporating housing for multiple income levels.	Annual
	c. Consider amending UVSP to incorporate inclusionary housing requirements.	2024
	d. Provide regulatory incentives on a case-by-case basis consistent with Chapter 9-72 of the Zoning Ordinance.	Ongoing
6. Preserve existing affordable housing through the following actions:		
	a. Cooperate with owners of existing affordable units to secure appropriate federal funding necessary to maintain existing affordability.	Annually
	b. Enforce the Municipal Code and address matters related to property maintenance that pose threat to public health, safety, or welfare.	Ongoing
	c. Develop informational materials to help educate property owners on available funding programs to assist with rehabilitation.	2023
	d. Notify the State Franchise Tax Board if substandard rental housing is identified.	Ongoing
	e. Work with Orange County Housing and Community Services Department to receive rehabilitation loans and grants for low and moderate-income homeowners and rental property owners; Use CDBG funds as funding becomes available and pursue other funding sources;	Ongoing
	f. Prepare and distribute informational material advertising the rehabilitation program	2024
	g. Continue to pursue the extension of affordability controls for 51 units that are set to expire in 2032; prepare a "Risk	Annually

	Assessment" report provided by the California Housing Partnership Corporation	
h.	Provide technical assistance to preserve at-risk units;	Ongoing
i.	Apply for state or federal funding on behalf of interested non-profit entities, if necessary, to protect the affordability of rental units	Ongoing
j.	Provide foreclosure information on City website	2023, update annually
k.	Refer residents to external agencies to assist in reducing incidents of foreclosures	Ongoing
l.	Require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of SB 330 on sites identified in the sites inventory when any new development occurs on a site that has been occupied by or restricted for the use of lower-income households at any time during the previous five years;	Ongoing
m.	Prevent tenant displacement by considering the feasibility of a local Just Cause Eviction ordinance, a Local Rent Stabilization ordinance, and a multi-lingual Right to Counsel program;	2024
7.	Increase services to special needs populations through the following actions:	
a.	Allocate CDBG funds to nonprofits providing shelter for the homeless	Annually
b.	Contract with Mercy House or other housing services providers to help residents experiencing homelessness obtain services.	Annually

8. Laguna Woods

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs	
Contributing Factors:	
1. Lack of affordable housing. The availability and price of land represents a significant market constraint to housing production in Laguna Woods, where there is very little residentially designated vacant land. 2. Displacement risk for existing lower-income residents due to economic pressures/motivators on property owners/managers 3. Limited access to opportunities for individuals with disabilities and other special needs due to underimproved housing stock potentially resultant of financial or physical challenges.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Conduct a market study and then amend the existing inclusionary housing ordinance to modify the minimum percentages of new housing units that must be deed-restricted for extremely low, very low, and low-income households, as feasible and advantageous to promote the development of affordable housing.	
2. Investigate potential incentives for property owners to extend and/or expand existing affordability covenants beyond the planned expiration date and/or current number of housing units, with an emphasis on incentivizing (i) affordability covenants for extremely low and very low-income housing units, and (ii) affordability covenants that apply to housing units in a range of sizes. If feasible and economical, adopt such incentives.	
3. Adopt an ordinance waiving or reducing City building permit fees for improvements to the home of a person at least 60 years of age with a qualifying disability that are made to accommodate that disability, as provided for by California Health and Safety Code Section 17951.7. Consider including provisions allowing for similar building permit fee waivers or reductions for improvements to the home of a person with a qualifying disability that are made to accommodate that disability, regardless of age. Prepare and maintain a flyer with related information. Conduct annual outreach to nonprofit organizations known to provide medical or social services to residents with disabilities. Conduct biennial outreach to residents residing in Census Tracts 626.22 and 626.48 due to their comparatively lower economic domain scores from the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map.	
4. Provide opportunities for reimbursements, grants, or other forms of financial assistance to support home improvements that increase accessibility or functionality for individuals with special needs. Conduct annual outreach to nonprofit organizations known to provide medical or social services to residents with special needs. Conduct biennial outreach to residents residing	

in Census Tracts 626.22 and 626.48 due to their comparatively lower economic domain scores from the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map.	
5. Formalize a proactive code enforcement program that focuses on housing-related rehabilitation needs, results in repairs, and seeks to mitigate potential cost, displacement, and relocation impacts on residents.	

6. Improve pedestrian accessibility on sidewalks, curb ramps, crosswalks, and other public property connecting housing with transit stops, public buildings, businesses, and educational institutions. Prioritize improvements based on factors including:
   a. The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool ("CalEnviroScreen") scores for individual Census Tracts, with an emphasis on undertaking improvements in and around Census Tract 626.47 due to its comparatively higher CalEnviroScreen score, as feasible and economical; and
   b. Education domain scores from the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee ("TCAC")/HCD Opportunity Map, with an emphasis on undertaking improvements in and around Census Tract 626.22 due to its comparatively lower scores, as feasible and economical.	

7. Pursue partnerships and seek funding to provide Laguna Woods-based housing mobility counseling services. If feasible and economical, implement such services.	
8. Adopt an ordinance waiving or reducing City building permit fees, or providing other incentives, for housing projects that prepare and implement an affirmative marketing plan designed to attract renters or buyers of diverse demographics, including individuals of any race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin. Prioritize incentives based on factors including racial concentrations from U.S. Census Bureau data products, with an emphasis on avoiding the creation of geographically discernable patterns of segregation or racially concentrated areas of poverty.	
9. Prepare and maintain a webpage with information on housing mediation, foreclosure assistance, tenant legal counseling services, and vocational counseling services. Train City staff to make referrals using the webpage.	
10. Pursue partnerships and seek funding to provide Laguna Woods-based housing mediation, foreclosure assistance, and multilingual tenant legal counseling services. If feasible and economical, implement such services.	
11. Investigate potential hazard mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate the long-term risk of residential displacement as a result of future disasters. If feasible and economical, implement such hazard mitigation measures. Prioritize improvements based on factors including economic	

domain scores from the TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map for individual Census Tracts, with an emphasis on undertaking improvements in and around Census Tracts 626.22 and 626.48 due to their comparatively lower scores, as feasible and economical.	
12. Investigate potential incentives for property owners of apartment and cooperative housing units for which tenants pay usage-based energy costs to make energy efficiency improvements that exceed the minimum requirements set forth in the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards. If feasible and economical, implement such incentives. Prioritize incentives for residents residing in Census Tracts 626.46 and 626.47 due to those areas being identified in this Housing Element as susceptible to displacement and having the highest renter vulnerability indices, as feasible and economical.	
13. Investigate opportunities to provide rental relief for residents at risk of homelessness. If feasible and economical, implement such opportunities. Prioritize rental relief for residents residing in Census Tracts 626.46 and 626.47 due to those areas being identified as susceptible to displacement and having the highest renter vulnerability indices, as feasible and economical.	

9. Los Alamitos

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunity and Disproportionate Housing Needs	
Contributing Factors: 1. Lack of housing for special needs population. 2. Lack of knowledge of fair housing laws. 3. Local land use and zoning laws.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**

1. Encourage development of housing for special needs populations through the following actions:
    a. The City shall encourage and facilitate development of housing for families and large households, the elderly, farmworkers, individuals experiencing homelessness and individuals with disabilities, including physical and developmental disabilities.
    b. The City will assist developers in identifying outside funding sources and support efforts to pursue those opportunities—either as group homes or in single family homes, when appropriate and feasible.
    c. The City will develop a menu to offer incentives such as density bonuses, regulatory concessions, and expedited processing.
    d. The City will develop and disseminate informational materials annually to developers regarding the incentive program and identified funding sources to potentially assist 5 special needs residents annually through the planning period.
	Establish incentive program and publish on City website by June 30, 2023.

2. Increase fair housing knowledge and enforcement through the following actions:
    a. The City shall continue to provide referrals to the Fair Housing Council of Orange County for fair housing services including counseling services for tenant-landlord disputes and cases of alleged discrimination.
    b. The City shall continue to publicize fair housing and complaint referral information at local community centers and in the Recreation & Community Services Schedule of Classes. The City will also provide information at City Hall and on the City's website.
    c. The City shall work with government agencies (e.g., Fair Housing Council of Orange County) and nonprofit groups (e.g., Habitat for Humanity) on anti-discrimination during housing processes for residents in protected classes, such as those with disabilities and families with children. Advertise workshops and events held by these organizations on anti-discrimination on the City's email newsletter and Housing Element webpage.
	Ongoing

3. Collaborate and coordinate with government agencies and nonprofit groups such as the Fair Housing Council of Orange County to support outreach and expansion of lending programs for homeownership among minority populations.	Annually
4. The City currently requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application for a residential care facility for seven or more individuals in the R-3 zone. To remove any potential constraint to housing for individuals with disabilities, the City shall remove the CUP requirement for the R-3 Zone or allow residential care facility for seven or more individuals by right in another zone as appropriate.	By December 2022
5. The City will annually review its policies and zoning laws relating to fair housing and reach out to the community through surveys and workshops as appropriate. The outreach efforts will be advertised via multiple channels, such as City email newsletter, posting at City website, print material at City Hall, local community centers, and social media.	Annually

10.   Placentia

Issue: Segregation and R/ECAPs	
Contributing Factors: 1. Lack of affordable housing limits housing mobility 2. Limited participation in Housing Choice Voucher Program 3. Land use and development practices 4. Lack of fair housing knowledge and enforcement	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Disseminate information on the City's website and conduct community outreach meeting with local stakeholders and affordable housing developers to promote affordable housing development throughout the city and discuss other City-incentives to create affordable housing.	Annually beginning in August 2024.
2. Conduct marketing to increase participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program.	Ongoing
3. Collaborate with developers to develop a mechanism to develop affordable housing in highest-opportunity areas.	Annually
4. Annually review existing policies and programs for potential restrictive practices that would limit diversity within racially concentrated areas of affluence (RCAAs). If restrictive practices are identified, address prior to adoption of the new policies and programs or within six months for existing policies and programs.	Annually
5. Establish incentives for affordable developments (including ADUs and JADUs) in RCAA and high opportunity areas.	By March 31, 2025
6. Establish specific incentives for the development of affordable units the RCAAs and high opportunity areas.	By June 2025
7. Conduct Affirmative marketing to increase diversity within RCAAs. This may include, but is not limited to, noticing of affordable units/projects through direct mail targeted outreach to lower income Census Tracts, publishing advertising materials in multiple language, informing service agencies, outreach to community organizations or places of worship.	Every 2 years, beginning in August 2024.
8. Facilitate the development and/or legalization of over 84 ADUs during the planning period by a variety of methods, including but not limited to:	2021-2029

a. Annually pursuing funding to adopt permit-ready ADU plans to minimize design costs, expedite permit processing, and provide development certainty. b. Developing an ADU Manual guiding applicants through the construction of an ADU by December 2024. c. Developing an ADU webpage informing the community on ADU related codes, processes, and incentives December 2024. d. Developing and implementing a public awareness campaign for construction of ADUs and the City's incentives utilizing all forms of media and outreach distribution December 2024. e. Establishing incentives for ADUs, with an emphasis on affordable ADUs by December 2024.		
9. Research and establish home sharing program(s) and/or policies.	2025	
10. Coordinate with local organizations to assist with matching tenants with existing homeowners. The City will assist with outreach, facilitate annual presentations, and conduct outreach to eligible and potential homeowners.	Annually	
11. Facilitate the development of at least 30 units on publicly-owned properties, with an emphasis on areas with relatively higher opportunity, higher median income and RCAAs.	2021-2029	
12. Increase fair housing knowledge and enforcement through the following actions:		
a. In partnership the city's fair housing provider, conduct multi-faceted fair housing outreach to tenants, landlords, property owners, realtors, and property management companies. Methods of outreach should include workshops, informational booths, presentations to civic leaders and community groups, staff training, and distribution of multi- lingual fair housing literature.	Ongoing	
b. Provide general counseling and referrals to address tenant-landlord issues and provide periodic tenant-landlord walk-in clinics at City Halls and other community locations.	Ongoing	
c. Include testing/audits within the scope of work for each city's fair housing provider.	Annually	

d.	Support enforcement activity and publicize outcomes of fair housing litigation.	Ongoing
e.	Provide and maintain multi-lingual informational materials on tenant legal counseling and resources.	Develop by August 2024; disseminate annually; update as needed.
f.	Work collaboratively with local housing authorities to ensure affirmative fair marketing plans and de-concentration policies are implemented.	Ongoing

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunity and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Contributing Factors:
1. High cost of housing in high opportunity areas
2. Limited accessible housing opportunities for individuals with disabilities
3. High cost of housing repairs/rehabilitation
4. Displacement of residents due to economic factors
5. Lack of public investment in lower opportunity areas

Actions:		Timeframe:
1. The City will seek to improve access to opportunity for lower-income households and other protected classes through the following actions:		
	a. Providing adequate sites for affordable housing development	Update candidate sites list annually
	b. Reduce governmental constraints to encourage the production of ADUs	Review ADU procedures annually and revise as needed to reduce cost and time and comply with state law.
	c. Facilitating the production of housing for individuals with special needs by providing technical assistance to developers proposing affordable housing.	Ongoing
	d. Work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an ADU and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental.	Annually
2. Increase community integration for individuals with disabilities.		Ongoing

3. Continue to help develop housing projects for special needs households by providing technical assistance with tax credit applications, tax-exempt bond financing and other public funds, including ESG, CDBG, and HOME.	Ongoing
4. Review reasonable accommodation standards and procedures annually and update within 6 months of annual review if not compliant with state or federal law. If not compliant, the City will process reasonable accommodations in compliance with state or federal law in the interim.	Annually
5. Enhance the proactive code enforcement program that targets areas of concentrated rehabilitation needs, resulting in repairs and mitigating potential costs, displacement and relocation impacts on residents.	Review and revise annually
6. The City shall develop a program to collaborate with non-profit housing providers and develop a preservation strategy. The preservation strategy will allow the City to act quickly if, and when, it receives notice of conversion. As part of the strategy, the City shall ensure compliance with noticing requirements; conduct tenant education and pursue funding to preserve the units.	Develop strategy by 2024, apply for funding annually thereafter.
7. Explore anti-gentrification policies and regulations to combat displacement, which especially affects low-income residents and communities of color. These may include, but are not limited to foreclosure assistance, community land trusts, and housing trust funds.	Report to Council by October 2025.
8. Provide housing mobility counseling either directly or through referrals. This counseling may include, but is not limited to, information on opportunity areas, housing search skills and tools, workshops, search assistance, referrals, structured support for a time after a move to the City, landlord-tenant mediation, and retention counseling.	Ongoing
9. Engage community health workers to conduct ground level site visits and meetings within areas of lower income to better understand resident and business barriers, resources, and needs.	Ongoing
10. Seek funding and will review Capital Improvement Program in order to prioritize projects in areas of lower income, to improve living environments and reduce the risk of displacement. Examples of projects include street	Annually

improvements, multi- modal investments, safe routes to school, parks, community facilities and amenities, infrastructure, and other investment toward community revitalization.	
11. The City will continue to encourage and emphasize public art in areas of lower income and diversity.	Ongoing

11.   San Juan Capistrano

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Contributing Factors:

1. Limited local private fair housing outreach and enforcement
2. Overcrowding in Capistrano Villas
3. Limited affordable and accessible low-income housing
4. Inability to afford and take advantage of local educational, recreational activities
5. Private discrimination against protected classes (in violation of federal Housing Law) directly limits housing choice and mobility.
6. Zoning standards that limit the ability to achieve the maximum permitted density.
7. Lower and moderate households may face displacement pressures as rents rise due to high overall housing costs.

Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Contract directly with a fair housing services provider to provide specific services for San Juan Capistrano residents	Annually
2. Continue increased bilingual translation and interpretation services as well as alternative events and workshops times, locations, and formats to enable and facilitate meaningful participation from the Community of Focus	Ongoing
3. Provide tenant/landlord training about fair housing laws, requirements, services, and resources.	Annually
4. Pursue development of a program to increase maintenance and necessary repairs and safety of overcrowded rental units through voluntary owner certifications and randomized inspections in a manner that does not rely on tenant complaints or lead to increased threat of retribution or displacement.	Ongoing
5. Update Density Bonus Ordinance	Ongoing
6. Continue to coordinate and support community-based organizations that support after school programs, self-help training, food-assistance and counseling and access to other resources.	Annually
7. As part of the Capital Improvement Plan, coordinate with Public Works to prioritize Environmental Justice / Community of Focus areas for actions and capital improvements.	Annually
8. Rezoning to permit high density residential development in higher resource areas,	Ongoing
9. Increase housing choices through removal of regulatory and procedural barriers to higher density housing; increased incentives and requirements for construction of affordable housing,	Ongoing

10. Amend the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to increase the minimum percentage of lower-income affordable housing units (or in-lieu fees) to the extent feasible based on current economic analysis.	2023 and ongoing
11. Review Architectural Control process to ensure objective design standards.	2024
12. Continue Housing Rehabilitation Grant Program.	Ongoing
13. Continue to implement the mobile home park rent increase limits ordinance and the senior mobile home park overlay,	Ongoing
14. Consider new forms of rent stabilization and price control for older multifamily units to ensure existing residents are not priced out of their homes.	2024
15. Ensure compliance with and education regarding the Tenant Protection Act of 2019 (AB 1482), including maximum annual rent increases, just cause evictions, and financial compensation requirements to stabilize residents living in areas at risk of displacement.	Ongoing

12.   Seal Beach

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs	
Contributing Factors: 1. Lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas due to local land use and zoning laws.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. The City will process zoning and General Plan amendments for sufficient sites with appropriate densities as identified in the City's Housing Element, to fully accommodate the City's remaining housing need.	2025
2. Create a mixed-use zone that meets state requirements for RHNA site designation, specifically to facilitate housing for lower income households. The zoning code update process will accommodate all relevant state requirements regarding density and affordability and will engage with all relevant stakeholders to ensure the development standards can result in the development of the maximum number of units allowed and facilitate the inclusion of affordable units.	2025
3. Make information on available incentives and concessions available and evaluate their efficacy regularly.	Ongoing
4. Provide a streamlined and understandable process for the development of ADUs and JADUs, supported by incentives and resources as they may be available. Adopt pre-approved plans. Permit 10 ADUs during the planning period.	Revise ordinance by September 2024 and adopt pre-approved plans by June 2025.
5. Reduce barriers to housing development by streamlining permit processing consistent with SB 35.	By January 2024
6. Implement SB 9 requirements - Reduce barriers to housing development through simplified processing and creating incentives to make units created affordable.	Process 2 SB 9 projects between 2021-2029.
7. Amend the Zoning Code to allow employee housing consistent with Health and Safety Code §17021.5 and 17021.6.	August 2025
8. Allow housing at select locations in the Main Street Specific Plan. Permit two residential units in the Main Street Specific Plan during the planning period.	By October 2025

9. Reduce minimum unit size constraints to housing development, especially to promote affordable housing.	By August 2025
10. Allow SROs as uses allowed by-right in the RHD Zone.	By December 2026
11. Reduce Parking Requirements for Studios and 1-Bedroom Units.	By December 2026

13. Stanton

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs	
Contributing Factors: 1. Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations. 2. Displacement of residents due to economic pressures. 3. Location and type of affordable housing, including availability of affordable units in a range of sizes. 4. Lack of access to opportunity due to high housing costs. 5. Quality of affordable housing information programs. 6. Access to transportation for individuals with disabilities.	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Support fair housing services provider and efforts to minimize discriminatory housing practices.	Ongoing
2. Maintain and monitor the residential sites inventory to ensure sufficient sites remain to accommodate the RHNA allocation throughout the planning period. Receive and process development applications for residential projects.	2021-2029
3. Maintain adequate capacity to accommodate the City's RHNA obligations at all income levels throughout the planning period. Report as required through the HCD annual report process.	2021-2029
4. Collaborate with the development community annually, including affordable housing developers, to evaluate the viability of developing city-owned land as affordable housing.	Annually
5. For all project applications, identify the need for replacement of affordable housing units and ensure replacement, if required, occurs.	Ongoing
6. Monitor the City's existing affordable housing stock and support affordable housing developers in their efforts to develop new affordable units in Stanton. Monitor the City's options for special needs housing and likewise support special needs housing developers.	2021-2029
7. Understand the potential for market-force economic displacement and consider programs to address the issue, if necessary.	2021-2029
8. Ensure that the City's parking standards for residential uses are adequate while not unduly constraining housing development.	2021-2029

14. Villa Park

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Contributing Factors:

1. 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, nonprofit 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.

2. Lack of local public fair housing outreach and enforcement may also 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.

3. Lack of access to opportunity due to high housing costs may be a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in Orange County. Increasing housing affordability would make it easier for low-income households to access the types of services and amenities that further social mobility.

4. General lack of a range of affordable housing opportunities, including limited affordable housing options for families

5. Limited opportunity for residential development in sites accommodating multiple family development.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. The City will continue to disseminate information regarding fair housing in a variety of locations including City Hall, the City website and the library, and conduct ongoing, proactive outreach to engage members of all socio-economic groups and recruit members of underrepresented groups to participate in City meetings. The City will continue to seek funding to support the Fair Housing Council of Orange County (FHCOC), which provides community education, individual counseling, mediation, and low-cost advocacy with the expressed goal of eliminating housing discrimination and guaranteeing the rights of all people to freely choose the housing for which they qualify in the area they desire. The City will invite FHCOC to conduct annual fair housing outreach targeted to Villa Park residents and landlords.	Ongoing
2. The City will seek to improve access to opportunity for lower-income households and other protected classes by providing adequate sites for affordable housing development, encouraging the production of ADUs,	

and facilitating the production of housing for individuals with special needs.	
3. Recruit at least five landlords to become a participating voucher property during three-year period. 4. Coordinate with the County to assist with improving voucher mobility at local level by:	2021-2024
a. Identifying local staff to commit to 25% administrative function to support voucher mobility programs.	June 2024
b. Establishing a customer service framework including dedicated phone number, email and contact information.	June 2024
c. Establishing an annual monitoring program to evaluate the success of voucher mobility program. Provide for annual program amendments, as necessary.	By June 2024, annually thereafter
5. Annually review the Sites Inventory and the location of new, affordable housing development to ensure equal and fair housing development practices throughout the whole City.	Annually
6. Annual meetings with developers to explore affordable housing and non-traditional single-family housing opportunities.	Annually

15. Yorba Linda

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of effective fair housing outreach to seniors due to digital divide
2. Private discrimination
3. Lack of knowledge of existing resources among the public
4. Low number of HCVs in the City compared to the County overall
5. Lack of affordable housing opportunities throughout the city, including in areas where rent and sale prices have become exclusive, and for special needs groups such as persons with disabilities and female-headed households
6. Need for more public investment in infrastructure and accessibility improvements in moderate resource opportunity areas
7. Challenges for housing/property upkeep due to financial/physical constraints and age of housing stock.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Increase the distribution of fair housing materials and increase awareness of fair housing options among residents, including special needs groups and low-income residents, through the following actions:	
a. By the end of 2022 have additional fair housing information posted at the Yorba Linda Senior Center site and on their digital platforms. Hold an informational workshop in 2023 and 2025	2022-2025
b. By December 2022, conduct a fair housing information session for the City Council. Invite local nonprofits (including the Orange County Human Relations Commission, the Kennedy Commission, Making Housing Happen and People for Housing O.C.) to attend	2022
c. Publish Fair Housing information, including any community meetings, on non-traditional media such as Facebook or Instagram, and conduct targeted outreach to tenants, mobile home park residents and other lower income populations.	Annually
2. Increase public and private investment in areas of Yorba Linda that have been identified as moderate resource areas and portions of the City with higher percentages of special needs groups, through the following actions:	
a. Starting in 2022, work with the FHCOC to contact landlords of affordable multifamily complexes every two years and provide fair housing information and assistance. This outreach will focus on promoting the Section 8 voucher program to landlords who have not previously participated in the program and should include multi-lingual materials.	Every 2 years

b.	Adopt an ordinance to expand the housing supply in High Resource single-family zones by allowing for lot splits and duplexes under the parameters of SB 9. In coordination with research being conducted at the State level, evaluate opportunities to incentivize and provide funding assistance for homeowners to provide affordable units under SB 9.	Completed in 2023
c.	Continue to improve access to persons with disabilities through ADA improvement to streets, sidewalks and public facilities. Dedicate or seek funding, including annual CDBG allocations, to prioritize infrastructure and accessibility improvements in the moderate resource opportunity areas	Annually
d.	Coordinate with the Orange County Housing Authority in 2023 about utilizing the mobility counseling program in Yorba Linda. This OCHA program informs Housing Choice Voucher holders about their residential options in higher opportunity areas and provides holistic support to voucher holders seeking to move to higher opportunity areas.	2023
3. Increase affordable housing options throughout the city through the following actions:		
a.	Adopt the Affordable Housing Overlay, Commercial Mixed-Use Overlay and Congregational Land Overlay, providing geographically dispersed sites for over 600 lower income units which foster a more inclusive community. Initiate rezoning and the Measure B election in 2024 and pay for all costs associated with the ballot measure.	Completed in 2024
b.	Increase the allocation of units in Savi Ranch from 200 to 790 high density units, creating a better geographic distribution of development between the eastern and western areas of the community.	Completed in 2024
c.	Promote and support the development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), including pursuing funding for rent-restricted ADUs, and seek to issue permits for over 50 units annually throughout Yorba Linda	Ongoing
d.	Expand information available on affordable housing in Yorba Linda, including any community meetings on non-traditional media such as Facebook and Instagram.	Ongoing
e.	Require affordable developers receiving public funds to prepare an affirmative marketing plan and encourage private developers with affordable units in their projects to prepare an affirmative marketing plan. The affirmative marketing plan shall ensure marketing materials	Ongoing

	for new developments are designed to attract renters and buyers of diverse demographics, including persons of any race, ethnicity, sex, handicap, and familial status.	
f.	During the public hearing processes for the Affordable Housing Overlay, Mixed-Use Housing Overlay, and Congregational Land Overlay, as well as the outreach process for the Measure B election (in November 2024), utilize tools such as the "Myths and Facts About Affordable & High-Density Housing" currently on the City's website to show what affordable housing means and who it benefits. Contact Kennedy Commission, Making Housing Happen and People for Housing O.C. for potential input. Conduct at least five educational events for the public in locations throughout the community.	Completed in 2024
g.	By the end of 2022, research the development of a program that would provide 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 restrictions on their property. This research should also explore outside funds. If funding is available, establish a pilot program by December 2023 with a goal of achieving at least two deed-restricted ADUs annually; evaluate the program by the end of 2025.	2022-2025
4. Preserve the existing housing stock through the following actions:		
a.	Include information about rehab and maintenance resources (including the Residential Rehabilitation Program and Community Preservation Program) in City newsletters and on the website. Include translated information when feasible. Seek to assist 10 households annually. Starting in 2022, conduct targeted outreach through annual mailings to Census Tracts 218.20 and 218.26. about available rehabilitation assistance.	Annually

B. **Aliso Viejo**

Issue: Concentration
Most of the city is considered an area of high White concentration, except for a few neighborhoods with low-medium concentration (which are predominantly White) in the northern and eastern parts of the city. Since 1990, levels of concentration have been increasing but remain low.

Contributing Factors:
1. Location and type of affordable housing.
2. Limited access to opportunity due to high housing costs.
3. Insufficient fair housing outreach and enforcement.
4. Availability of affordable housing.
5. Availability of affordable units in a range of sizes.
6. Insufficient Housing Choice Vouchers.
7. Displacement of residents due to economic pressures.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Expand access to opportunity for all protected classes through the following actions:	Annually and ongoing.
1. Identify sites in high opportunity areas for new housing development.	
2. Review policies and programs that increase the supply.	
3. Conduct a landlord/tenant education campaign on fair housing laws.	
4. Encourage development of a range of affordable housing types.	
5. Encourage the development of ADUs.	
6. Promote Housing Choice Vouchers.	
7. Educate renters about their rights.	

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities
Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities may disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of outreach and education regarding supportive services for individuals with disabilities.
2. Lack of education regarding resources available in the City and County, such as schools, transportation, and other in-home or community resources, for individuals with disabilities and single female-headed households.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Bring existing resources to protected classes through the following actions:	

1. Review and amend (if necessary) Reasonable Accommodation regulations and procedures.	Review and amend regulations and procedures by the end of FY 25/26.
2. Provide information on supportive services for individuals with disabilities, single female-headed households, and homeless individuals via the OC Social Services Agency.	Conduct annually by Dec. 31st of each year.
3. Partner with OCTA and publish public transit program info (OC Flex, OC ACCESS Service, and youth rider free pass).	Conduct bi-annually by Dec. 31st of each year.

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs

The City's *2021-2029 Housing Element* identified substandard housing conditions for low-income households as an issue facing low-income residents in the city. Additionally, housing cost burden is an issue for renters throughout Orange County.

Contributing Factors:
Substandard housing conditions due to:

1. Insufficient affordable and healthy homes for very-low incomes.
2. Lack of insufficient outreach and education on code enforcement.
3. Insufficient funding for repairs or rehabilitation.
4. Via Iglesia neighborhood has homes in need of repairs

Actions: Reduce existence of substandard housing conditions through the following actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Add information about the City's Code Enforcement service on the City's website for renters and owners.	Information added on City's website to be completed by the end of FY 25/26. Annually, conduct one informational campaign on Code Enforcement services with the goal of reaching at least 10 renters and 10 owners.
2. Create educational materials about healthy homes, and post information on the City's website.	Educational materials to be completed by the end of FY 25/26 and posted to the City's website annually.

C.   Anaheim

Issue: Segregation, including R/ECAPs; and Disproportionate Housing Needs.

While segregation levels overall in Anaheim are low, the city has neighborhoods considered to be areas of high POC segregation north of downtown and along SR-91, and south of downtown and adjacent to Disneyland. These areas are predominantly Hispanic. The neighborhoods north and south of downtown also have a higher percentage of overcrowded units than other neighborhoods in the city, and the areas north of downtown are home to multiple publicly supported housing developments. Additionally, housing cost burden is an issue for renters throughout Orange County. Anaheim also has one R/ECAP to the northeast of Disneyland, along Ball Rd and I-5. This Census Tract is predominantly Hispanic, as are all the surrounding neighborhoods. Additionally, Anaheim Hills is considered an area of high White segregation.

Contributing Factors:
Historic practices of redlining and legal racial segregation have created many of the residential patterns that still exist today. Additionally, the high cost of land and existing housing in Anaheim (and throughout Orange County) are significant constraints to the development of new affordable housing and access for families to existing housing.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Increase the supply of affordable housing in high Opportunity areas through the following actions:	
1. Disseminate on the City's website, information material to promote and facilitate implementation of state and City regulations and incentives to create affordable housing. 2. Develop and maintain a database of affordable housing developers working in California; and hold an annual workshop to engage and collaborate with affordable housing developers on these topics.	Develop webpage, including housing element candidate site list, and developer database and hold first annual workshop by October 2024. Update housing element candidate site list annually in conjunction with Housing Element Annual Progress Report. Review by October 2025, and revisions, if necessary, by October 2026.
3. Disseminate on the City's website, information material to promote and facilitate AMC 18.38.215 Residential Uses of Motels, Commercial, and Office Structures. 4. Develop and maintain a database of existing motels, commercial, and office structures for which conversion could be feasible.	Develop information and database and participate in annual affordable housing workshop by October 2025.
5. Encourage the production of ADUs. 6. Continue to seek opportunities to defray costs associated with construction to homeowners.	Continue to refine existing review process for ADUs not using pre-approved plans.

7. Develop, subject to funding availability, a program to facilitate the construction of deed-restricted ADUs.	Continue to refine existing review process for ADUs using pre-approved plans and expand pre-approved plan catalog. Continue to support and promote programs such as the Orange County Housing Finance Trust's Affordable ADU Loan Program, when offered. Continue to seek potential local, state, and/or federal funds to establish an Anaheim Housing Authority affordable ADU grant/loan program. In conjunction with Annual Progress Report, identify and track ADU construction in high and highest resource areas/Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs). Conduct review by October 2025, and if ADU construction is disproportional to the number of units, develop targeted outreach with a goal of improving the ADU/overall dwelling unit metric for the areas relative to other residential areas in the City.
8. Continue to regularly monitor deed-restricted, affordable housing units that exist citywide. 9. Collaborate with nonprofit housing providers and develop a preservation strategy to meet the City's Quantified Objective for preserving 60 At-Risk Units (30 Very Low- and 30 Low-Income).	Continue monitoring all deed-restricted affordable housing units annually and add new properties as applicable. Develop preservation strategy for 60 units converting in 2027 – 2031.

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities

Hispanic residents have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods, neighborhoods close to high performing schools, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, neighborhoods near the downtown have low environmental health, low education scores, low economic scores; but good access to HQTAs. Conversely, Anaheim Hills, which is a predominantly White area, has the best access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods with low poverty rates, high education scores, and high economic scores. Additionally, based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

Contributing Factors:
A lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas (due to the factors discussed above) contributes to the disparities in access to opportunities. Additionally, specific groups in the city face the unique housing challenges that impact access to opportunity, including:

- Seniors:
    - Having limited and fixed incomes.
    - Disproportionately higher healthcare costs, adding monthly living costs.
    - Require customized housing features due to mobility and self-care limitations.
    - Transit dependency.
    - Limited in-home support, due to living alone.
- Individuals with physical and developmental disabilities:
    - Need for specialized housing to accommodate disabilities.
    - Higher incidence of dependent living needs.
    - High incidence of unemployment and having fixed income.
    - Need for supportive services.
- Large person households:
    - Lack of affordable housing with sufficient bedroom counts.
    - Options for larger bedroom counts in rental units.
    - Higher monthly cost burden.
    - Affordable options for large family households.
    - Childcare needs for working families.
- Single parent households
    - Affordable housing options.
    - Rental and for sale housing options.
    - Higher monthly cost burdens with single-income families.
    - Childcare needs for working families.
- Farmworker households
    - Affordable housing options.
    - Higher incidents of cost burden for housing.
    - Rental and for sale housing options.
- Extremely Low-Income households:
    - Need for increased affordable housing options.
    - Markedly higher incidents of cost burden for housing.
    - Need for smaller housing unit options such as SRO's.
    - Rental assistance.
    - Higher incidents of homelessness.
    - Higher likelihood for transitional and supportive housing.
- Residents experiencing homelessness:
    - Need for increased affordable housing options.
    - Need for smaller housing unit options such as SRO's.
    - Rental assistance.
    - Higher likelihood for transitional and supportive housing.
    - Need for emergency shelters.
    - Need for stable health care.

Actions:	Timeframe:
The city will ensure equal access to housing, expand access to opportunity for all protected class groups, and increase community integration for individuals with disabilities through the following actions:	
1. Continue to provide an estimated 6,500 Section 8 Rental Assistance Vouchers annually, subject to federal funding availability, to qualified tenants. 2. Develop and maintain a database of existing housing in high and highest resource areas/Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs) which has the potential to provide voucher-based unit(s), including ADUs. 3. Develop a targeted outreach program to recruit potential additional landlords in these areas.	Continue to award all funded Section 8 Rental Assistance Vouchers annually. Develop database and conduct first annual outreach program by October 2025. Target and increase the portion of Section 8 Rental Assistance Vouchers leased in high and highest resource areas/Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs) in planning period.
4. In partnership with the Fair Housing Council of OC, disseminate and display for public viewing information regarding fair housing law applicable to landlords, tenants, sellers, buyers, real estate professionals and others in the housing industry at City Community Centers / Family Resource Centers/Youth Centers.	Include in Scope of Services for Fair Housing Council of OC no later than October 2026.
5. Continue to implement the Homelessness Action Plan, including the four overarching principles: - Housing First: The City of Anaheim commits to following nationally recognized best practices in addressing homelessness including Housing First practices and the belief that housing and housing support services are the solutions to homelessness. - Person-Centered: All programs funded by the City strive to be person- centered, including prioritizing trauma-informed care and acknowledging that people experiencing homelessness understand best what services and supports are needed to help them gain and keep housing that will resolve their homelessness. - Equity: The City commits to incorporating equity into service delivery systems and using data to evaluate gaps in service and identify areas of improvement so that every household in City- funded programs receives	Ongoing with update to the Homeless Action Plan for July 2024 – June 2028. The Homeless Action Plan has the following metrics: Decrease unsheltered homelessness by 70% and overall homelessness by 50%.

relevant and affirming support from the City's network of providers. • Data-Driven Solutions: The City commits to the utilization of data to drive funding decisions and solutions to homelessness. This includes evaluating the efficacy of programs and continual monitoring of the City's portfolio of interventions to ensure collective efforts are meeting the needs of the community while making gains against agreed upon community goals. The Plan identifies Unsheltered Households, Chronically Homeless Individual Households, Families, Veterans, Transition-Aged Youth, and Seniors as unique populations experiencing homelessness within the City.	
6. Increase community integration for individuals with disabilities by continuing to assist in the development of housing projects for special needs households by providing technical assistance with tax credit applications, tax-exempt bond financing and other public funds, including, ESG, CDBG, and HOME.	On-going, with annual review and adjustments, if adjustments are required and applicable.
7. The City shall continue to monitor to ensure the effectiveness of reasonable accommodation standards and procedures and maintain compliance with federal and state housing laws.	On-going, with annual review and adjustments, if adjustments are required and applicable.
8. In partnership with the Fair Housing Council of OC, provide and maintain multi-lingual informational materials on tenant legal counseling and resources with the goal of eliminating housing discrimination and guaranteeing the rights of all people irrespective of race religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, age, family size or disability to freely choose the housing for which they qualify in the area they desire. 9. Continue to participate in City of Anaheim Neighborhood Services Mobile Family Resource Centers as well as agencies and associations who specialize in supporting disabled tenants including those with hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self- care, and independent living difficulties consistent with data from Anaheim residents reporting a disability.	Continue to provide estimated annual allocation of $100,000, based on program funding availability. Annually evaluate program effectiveness and adjust Scope of Services as appropriate and based on available funding. Target an increase in the number of households served per funding dollar.

D. Buena Park

Issue: Segregation
Segregation levels in the city have increased since 1990 but remain low overall. However, the following areas in the city are considered to have high POC segregation: the northeast corner of the city, which is predominantly AAPI; and the neighborhood between I-5, Artesia Blvd, Beach Blvd, and the LA County line, which is predominantly Hispanic.

Contributing Factors:
1. Concentration of Hispanics/Latinos of any race and non-Hispanic Asian groups experiencing limitation to housing opportunities.
2. Barriers to mobility.
3. Lack of opportunities for residents to obtain housing in higher opportunity areas.
4. Housing Choice Vouchers.

Actions: The city will increase affordable housing opportunities in high opportunity areas through the following actions:	Timeframe
1. Amend the city's Zoning Ordinance to establish provisions for Low Barrier Navigation Centers (LBNC) consistent with state law.	By the end of 2023
2. Continue to annually monitor and facilitate the preservation of at-risk affordable housing units throughout the community. Facilitate new housing developments accessible to the elderly and disabled individuals throughout the community. Through these steps, the city's goal will be to preserve 130 units considered to be "at-risk" of market-rate conversion. 3. Facilitate new housing developments accessible to the elderly and disabled individuals throughout the community, with efforts targeting Census Tracts 086801, 086803, 110201, 110202, 110302, and 110500. Through this step, the city's goal will be to increase the supply of accessible units by at least 25 percent. 4. Continue to administer city-operated programs to assist households with disabilities with architectural modifications to their homes and continue to implement the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). 5. Provide information in public places regarding the city's reasonable accommodation ordinance and make information available on this program more widely available. 6. Continue to facilitate/process Reasonable Accommodation requests to ensure equal housing opportunities. Through this step, the city's goal is to ensure approval of 100 percent of the reasonable accommodation applications submitted. 7. Support Infill, Site Recycling and ADU construction throughout the community. Through this step, the city's goal will be to reach its RHNA obligation to meet the community's needs.	Ongoing

8. Continue to provide outreach and education to housing providers and potentially qualified residents regarding Housing Choice Voucher program, with efforts targeting Census Tracts 086801, 110110, 110116, 110201, 110202, 110303, 110401, 110402, 110500, 110603, and 110606. Through these steps, the City's goal will be increasing participation in the voucher program by 20 percent.	

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities, including Homeownership.

Hispanic and Black residents have less access than other groups to neighborhoods with low poverty rates and high performing schools. Geographically, the neighborhoods in the center of the city, between I-5 and the Artesia Freeway (SR-91), have poor environmental health, lower educational scores, and lower economic scores.

Large disparities in homeownership rates exist between White households, who have the highest rate, and Black households, who are least likely to own their own home. Additionally, housing cost burden is an issue for renters throughout Orange County.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of affordable housing in a range of sizes.
2. Land use and zoning laws.

Actions: The city will increase affordable housing opportunities in high opportunity areas through the following actions:	Timeframe:
1. Amend the zoning code to enable and promote residential development through use of the mixed-use overlay zones, religious congregation and fraternal site overlay zones, and housing opportunity overlay zones, among other planning tools. These initiatives provide new opportunities for a variety of residential development types and prices and includes areas where residential development was previously not allowed.	By end of 2024
2. Prepare educational material, develop pre- approved site/floor plans, and establish a monitoring program to ensure city is on track to meeting ADU construction goals. Through these steps, they will be to facilitate construction of at least 16 ADUs throughout the community.	By early 2025
3. Provide technical and financial (subject to availability) assistance for single-family residential additions to eliminate overcrowding conditions, with efforts targeting Census Tracts 110402, 110603, and 110606. Through these steps, it will be the city's goal to provide residential rehabilitation assistance to approximately 160 units. 4. Continue to promote use of the state Density Bonus Law through website materials and counter assistance. 5. Promote, increase, maintain homeownership for LMI households, as well as residential rehabilitation assistance for senior and down payment assistance	Ongoing

programs for young families with assistance throughout the community, with efforts targeting Census Tracts 086803, 110201, 110202, 110302, 110401, 110402, 110500, 110603, 110607). Through these steps, the city's goal will be to increase assistance to eligible residents by 25 percent.

6. Continue to enforce city codes to eliminate and prevent unsightly or hazardous conditions in residential areas throughout the community, with efforts targeting Census Tracts 110603, 110500, 110301, 110302, and 110401 located adjacent to limited access freeways. Through these steps, the city's goal will be to reduce blighted conditions by 20 percent.

7. Continue to participate in Orange County assessments and programs as a participating city in the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing.

8. Continue to promote fair housing among all income categories throughout the community.

E. Costa Mesa

Issue: Segregation and R/ECAPs
There is moderate segregation between Hispanic and White residents in the city, though these levels declined slightly between 2000-2010. Geographically, the neighborhoods between downtown and the Costa Mesa Country Club are areas of high POC segregation, with a predominantly Hispanic population. The largest number of publicly supported housing units and the highest concentration of vouchers in the city is in this area. The city's one R/ECAP is also located here, in the neighborhood between Newport Avenue and Placentia Avenue, south of 19th Street. The neighborhoods in East Side Costa Mesa (east of SR-55 and south of Mesa Drive) are all areas of high White segregation, as are the neighborhoods north of the Country Club and the neighborhoods between Estancia High School and Canyon Park.

Contributing Factors:
1. Housing discrimination.
2. Lack of affordable housing due to governmental and market constraints.

Actions:	Timeframe:
The City will take the following meaningful actions, in addition to resisting discrimination, to overcome patterns of segregation based on protected characteristic, as defined by California law:	
1. Continue to contract with the Fair Housing Foundation or other fair housing service provider and provide information regarding the Public Law Center to address Housing Discrimination and unfair lending, including promoting mediation services, foreclosure assistance and/or multilingual tenant legal counseling services. Promote available services on the City's webpage.	Ongoing
2. Continue to enforce the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, which was approved on August 6, 2024, and became effective on September 6, 2024.	Ongoing
3. Support the development of affordable housing through the following efforts: • Continue to evaluate programs and incentives to encourage the development of affordable housing. • Make materials available to applicants regarding the City's affordable housing ordinance. • Develop additional incentives and materials as state legislation provides additional incentives. • Continue to pursue funding and partnerships with affordable housing builders.	Ongoing

4. Amend the City's Zoning Code to meet requirement set forth in the California Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6, which requires the City to permit farmworker housing by-right, without a conditional use permit, in single-family zones for six or fewer individuals and in agricultural zones with no more than 12 units or 36 beds. Until the zoning code is updated, the City will process any proposed farmworker housing by-right in single-family zones pursuant to State Law.	Revise Zoning Code in 2025
5. Review and update the Zoning Code to comply with the State Density Bonus Law as part of the City's rezone program. In the meantime, continue to process State Density Bonus Law requests and project in compliance with state law.	Revise Zoning Code in 2025
6. Review planning application fees to avoid creating a constraint to the development of affordable housing, as part of the City's rezone program.	Revise Zoning Code in 2025
7. Reduce barriers to construction of housing for extremely low and lower-income households through the following actions: • Subsidize up to 100 percent of the City's application processing fees for qualifying developments where all units are affordable to 80 percent AMI or lower, as funding is available. • Annually promote the benefits of this program to the development community by posting information on its webpage and creating a handout to be distributed with land development applications regarding development opportunities and incentives. • Proactively reach out to developers at least once annually to identify and promote development opportunities. • Adopt priority processing and streamlined review for developments with units affordable to lower income households. • Support funding development applications throughout the planning period for projects proposing units affordable to lower income households.	Ongoing
8. Review and revise the Zoning Code's requirements for residential off-street parking for multi-family projects to facilitate the development of multi-family housing, and specifically affordable housing.	Revise Zoning Code in 2025
9. Promote the development of ADUs through the following actions:	Complete the update to ADU regulations in municipal code by April

• Review and revise the City's ADU ordinance as necessary to comply with state law. • Maintain a dedicated web page that promotes ADU development.	2025. Maintain web page on ongoing basis.

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities

Hispanic residents have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods, neighborhoods close to high performing schools, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, the neighborhoods downtown and west of downtown are less environmentally healthy and have lower education and economic scores. These are also predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods. Conversely, neighborhoods east of Newport Boulevard (SR-55), which are predominantly White, have higher education and economic scores, are more environmentally healthy, and have lower poverty rates. Additionally, Black, Hispanic, and Native American residents are less likely to own their home than White and AAPI residents.

Additionally, based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

Contributing Factors:
1. Unfair lending practices
2. Approximately 86 percent of housing units were built prior to 1989 before the Fair Housing Act and state laws regarding accessibility requirements for individuals with disabilities were adopted.

Actions: The City will take the following meaningful actions, in addition to resisting discrimination, to foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristic, as defined by California law:	Timeframe:
1. Continue to contract with the Fair Housing Foundation or other fair housing service provider and provide information regarding the Public Law Center to address Housing Discrimination and unfair lending, including promoting mediation services, foreclosure assistance and/or multilingual tenant legal counseling services. Promote available services on the City's webpage.	Ongoing
2. Continue operating the Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation Program, which may be used to assist qualified property owners in improving single-family residential properties, including health and safety repairs such as mechanical plumbing, electrical, roofing, security, medical emergency requirements,	On an annual basis, provide informational materials on the Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation program; encourage the participation of seniors, veterans, and disabled residents in

and/or aid the mobility of the physically disabled and/or elderly.	this program; and evaluate the effectiveness of this program and, if necessary, modify program characteristics.
3. Increase the availability of accessible housing for individuals with disabilities through the following actions: • Review and revise the Reasonable Accommodation procedure to promote access to housing for individuals with disabilities, address potential constraints and establish potential objective standards, and provide guidance and amend as necessary to promote greater certainty on how approval findings will be implemented. • Meet with local organizations and developers to promote access to housing for individuals with disabilities and address potential constraints.	The City is currently in the process of reviewing its Reasonable Accommodation procedures and anticipates bringing any recommendations to Planning Commission and City Council in 2025. Other efforts are ongoing.
4. Increase the availability of transitional and supportive housing through the following actions: • Amend the Zoning Code to include transitional and permanent supportive housing within the City's land use matrix in compliance with Senate Bill 2 and Government Code Section 65651. • Monitor the inventory of sites appropriate to accommodate transitional and supportive housing. • Proactively engage relevant organizations to meet the needs of individuals experiencing homelessness and extremely low-income residents, including the Costa Mesa Network for Homeless Solutions, which aims to provide a comprehensive system programs and services for residents experiencing homelessness and those at risk of homelessness.	Revise Zoning Code in 2025. Other efforts are ongoing.
5. Review and revise the City's Zoning Code and application procedures applicable to group homes to promote objectivity and greater approval certainty similar to other residential uses.	The City is currently in the process of reviewing its Group Homes procedures and anticipates bringing any recommendations to Planning Commission and City Council in 2025.

F.   Fountain Valley

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs
Housing cost burden is an issue for renters throughout Orange County, including Fountain Valley.

Contributing Factors:
1. Stigma associated with Housing Vouchers: A large percentage of rental households in Fountain Valley spend more than 30 and 50 percent of household income on monthly rent and utilities. While this may be due in part to residents being willing to pay more for access to high performing school districts, there may also be a stigma associated with the use of Housing Vouchers, both by property owners and tenants.
2. Lack of additional housing options. The City's housing supply has not increased at a rate commensurate with regional demand, driving costs higher and limit housing choices for existing residents looking to remain in Fountain Valley (adult children eager to move out of their parent's house and older adults looking to downsize) and potential new residents looking for more affordable options in Fountain Valley.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Expand voucher use by 50 tenants by 2028, and extend affordability term of 70 units in the Guadalupe Manor an additional 20-30 years by 2029, through the following actions:	
1. Coordinate with OCHA to generate a detailed understanding of where overpayment rates are highest in the city (as of latest available Census data), where vouchers are and are not used, and how many tenants could potentially qualify at each multifamily property in target areas.	By 2028
2. Update Development Code consistent with state law and produce residential project flow-chart and/or informational sheets, consistent with SB 35 and SB 330.	By 2026
3. Coordinate with OCHA and FHCOC to develop an outreach plan and materials to communicate the benefits of vouchers.	By 2026
4. Complete study of options to augment/adjust affordable housing preservation program for possible application of funds for those overpaying.	By 2026
5. Distribute outreach materials through means that reach target populations (e.g., those receiving subsidized school lunches). Conduct direct outreach to five properties (tenants and owners) in Census Tracts illustrating high rates of rental overpayment.	By 2026
6. Secure extended affordability for Guadalupe Manor through at least 2058.	By 2029

Increase supply of affordable housing through the following efforts:	
1. Evaluate options to apply affirmative advertising requirements to income-restricted units in the Slater Avenue project.	By 2026
2. Adopt Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.	By 2024
3. Establish procedures and requirements that will ensure affirmative advertising requirements are applied to and conducted for all future income-restricted housing developments.	By 2026
4. Adopt 2045 General Plan.	By 2024
5. Adopt appropriate pre-vetted ADU site plans, with the goal of permitting 100 ADUs affordable to lower income households in high and highest resources areas by 2026 (as measured from June 30, 2021).	By 2026

G. Fullerton

Issue: Segregation
Areas of the city considered to have high POC segregation include most of the neighborhoods west of Harbor Blvd and north of Malvern Ave, which have predominantly AAPI populations.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of resources for fair housing agencies to conduct more rigorous testing and audits, outreach, training, public education campaigns.
2. Lack of language access.

Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Provide informational seminars to area residential real estate agents and brokers on fair housing laws and regulations.	Provide training to at least 15 real estate agents and brokers annually.
2. Work with tenants, tenant advocates to identify violations of fair housing federal and state fair housing laws and support prospective and existing tenants who are experiencing discrimination.	Annually
3. Provide trainings for property owners/managers on the requirements of federal and state fair housing laws to prevent discrimination.	Provide training to at least 15 property owners and managers annually.
4. With the Fair Housing Foundation, support an annual Fair Housing Audit Report that assesses typical or timely market-based suspected areas of discrimination.	Review methodology for a Fair Housing Audit by January 2025
5. Affordable Rental Housing Counseling Services: Provide funding for information and referral services that direct families and individuals with financial resources for housing rental or purchase, locating suitable housing, and obtaining housing with special needs facilities such as disabled-accessible units.	Hold at least four informational events between 2025-2029; assist at least 50 residents and landlords annually.
6. Create a Language Access Plan based on HUD guidelines and publish on the City's website: The goal of the Language Access Plan is to survey, maintain and publish a list of multi-lingual staff capacity at City Hall so that staff may respond to the needs of Limited English Proficiency households.	Create a Language Access Plan by January 2025. Maintain multilingual staff capacity at City Hall on an ongoing basis.
7. Ensure that local housing programs respond to the needs of a culturally diverse community that includes multi-generational families, a variety of living arrangements, and Limited English Proficiency households. Collaborate with community groups, including faith-based and nonprofit organizations, to provide	Review the existing fair housing marketing plan every two years to ensure compliance with current City policy to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing and

outreach on housing resources to all types of households and those households with Limited English Proficiency.	make necessary changes within six months.
8. Add information on fair housing laws and resources on the City's website regarding housing programs in several languages.	By January 2025
9. Seek opportunities to expand outreach and public education strategies on available tenant protection, fair housing services, and homeownership education to reach vulnerable households by offering information in multiple languages, targeted social media efforts, combining information with other assistance programs, distributing resources through local schools and colleges, and partnering with community-based organizations.	2021-2029

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities

Hispanic residents have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods, neighborhoods close to high performing schools, and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, neighborhoods in southeast Fullerton (which are predominantly Hispanic), have relatively low economic and education scores, poor environmental quality, and relatively high poverty rates. Conversely, neighborhoods in the northern part of the city, which are predominantly White or AAPI, have higher education and economic scores, better environmental health, and lower poverty. Additionally, based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

Contributing Factors:
1. Location, type, and supply of affordable housing.
2. Land use and zoning laws.
3. The availability, type, frequency, and reliability of public transportation.
4. Location of environmental health hazards
5. Lack of investment in community-based infrastructure and services
6. Lack of access to housing mobility

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Implement changes to the in-lieu fee structure and the desire and ability of developers to contribute to an affordable housing trust fund. Adopt incentives such as increased densities, increased height limits, reduced parking standards, and ministerial review for projects that incorporate increased affordable units or deeper levels of affordability.	Complete a feasibility study on in-lieu payments to a Housing Trust Fund by January 2026. If feasible, amend the municipal code to allow for an in-lieu fee structure by December 2027 and implement an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance by December 2029.

2. Facilitate the development of housing for individuals with disabilities (including developmental disabilities) through incentives for affordable housing development with services, resources, and assistance.	Develop 25 housing units for special needs households between 2021-2029.
3. Provide financial support to organizations that provide supportive housing for emancipated foster youth (ages 18-21) who are homeless or at immediate risk of becoming homeless.	Assist at least 10 foster youth with supportive housing between 2021-2029.
4. In compliance with recent updates to the Surplus Land Act (AB 1255, 2019-Rivas; AB 1486, 2019-Ting), identify City-owned land for the development of affordable housing. If surplus properties are identified, pursue development via a competitive Request for Proposals or other processes.	Annually, assess the list of surplus sites and solicit development via a competitive RFP process or other forms of partnership such as land lease agreements.
5. Acquire funds from local, state, and federal grant opportunities, including the HCD Infill Infrastructure Grant Program, to support the development of affordable housing, housing for special needs, and support service projects. When a critical mass of state (various HCD programs) and/or federal (CDBG, HOME) funding is available, the City will issue a competitive Notice of Funding Availability with objective criteria to transparently identify the best non-profit affordable housing developer to partner with on new affordable housing developments in the city.	Partner with at least one nonprofit housing developer biennially throughout the planning period and support the entitlement of at least 400 subsidized housing units affordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households in the city during the planning period.
6. Partner with Orange County Housing Finance Trust to secure funding for affordable housing in Fullerton.	Conduct feasibility study for an affordable housing trust fund by January 2027.
7. Develop a web-based Housing Development Toolkit that outlines a step-by-step process for residential development, including identifying steps in the entitlement and building permit process, detailed information on development incentives, and funding	Publish Housing Development Toolkit on City's website by December 2026.

programs and resources for affordable housing development.	
8. Review the General Plan, applicable Specific Plans, and Zoning Code and Zoning Map to evaluate opportunities for removing barriers to housing production such as adding housing capacity and accommodating a greater mix of dwelling types and sizes in High and Highest Resource areas identified by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC), focusing efforts in northeastern and northwestern Fullerton. Recommend amendments, as necessary, to accommodate added housing capacity in these areas. Additionally, review the Zoning Code to identify opportunities to increase and encourage a greater mix of dwelling types and sizes, specifically housing types that may accommodate moderate-income households (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, courtyard buildings), in lower-density residential areas and mixed-use zones citywide and amend the Zoning Code as needed (i.e., implementation of LTD).	Review the General Plan, applicable Specific Plan, and Zoning Code and Zoning Map by June 2025 and implement any changes by January 2026. Following adoption of zoning code changes, monitor at least 1,801 moderate-income units and 2,238 lower-income units to be constructed annually in High and Highest Resource areas as designated by TCAC. Permit the development of at least 150 moderate-income dwelling types in the neighborhoods of E Las Palmas Dr/N Sunnywood Dr, Craig Park, Sunny Hills, Bastanchury Rd/Fairway Isles Dr, Acacia Park, and Byerrum Park (Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence) by the end of 2029.
9. Identify and advertise housing opportunity sites within one-quarter mile of public transit stops in northern Fullerton. Educate developers on the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program, and/or pursue funding to increase transit infrastructure in northern Fullerton.	On an ongoing basis, consult with interested developers on the TOD Housing Program. Conduct a study with OCTA to identify capital projects to increase transit infrastructure by 2026. Apply for TOD Housing Program funds as NOFA becomes available.
10. Monitor lot splits and two-unit developments under SB 9, provide technical assistance to homeowners, and develop or adjust development standards as needed. Provide easily accessible information and resources about SB 9 on the City website. Conduct outreach to homeowners' associations in the neighborhoods of E Las Palmas Dr/N Sunnywood Dr, Craig Park, Sunny Hills, Bastanchury Rd/Fairway Isles Dr, Acacia Park, and Byerrum Park, and the neighborhoods in	Beginning in 2025, meet with at least one homeowners' association annually in the areas of northwest Fullerton and the neighborhoods of E Las Palmas Dr/N Sunnywood Dr, Craig Park, Sunny Hills, Bastanchury Rd/Fairway Isles Dr, Acacia Park, and Byerrum Park to provide education on SB 9 implementation. Amend the Zoning Code to comply with SB 9 by December 2025.

northwest Fullerton, and provide information on SB 9.	
11. Conduct outreach to religious institutions and provide technical assistance for interested parties to develop affordable housing on sites zoned religious institution.	Starting in 2025, annually mail or email resources on developing affordable housing to all religious institutions in the city with underutilized land. Conduct follow up calls with institutions with sites that hold the most potential based on location and size, prioritizing potential sites in the neighborhoods of E Las Palmas Dr/N Sunnywood Dr, Craig Park, Sunny Hills, Bastanchury Rd/Fairway Isles Dr, Acacia Park, and Byerrum Park since they are Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence. By December 2026, present information during at least one meeting with the board and/or members of OC United. By the end of 2027, provide technical assistance for the potential development of at least one affordable housing development on a religious institution site.
12. Conduct outreach to people experiencing homelessness with the Illumination Foundation and the OC Health Care Agency, focusing efforts in areas where there is a high concentration of homeless individuals in the neighborhoods of Independence Park, Santa Fe District/SoCo, and Gilbert Park, and along arterial boulevards and commercial centers. Provide resources to connect individuals with shelter space in Fullerton and as needed, to services in surrounding cities.	Annually allocate funding and City resources to support outreach efforts in coordination with the Illumination Foundation and the OC Health Care Agency to provide information and resources to those experiencing homelessness. Annually fund the Fullerton Police Department's Homeless Liaison Officer Unit, and as funding is available and based on need, increase the number of officers to provide services for residents experiencing homelessness.
13. Adopt an ordinance for new development standards to allow additional ADUs that meet basic setbacks and square footage requirements on properties exceeding one acre in the R-1 and R-2 zoning districts. The ordinance shall allow at least two ADUs on qualifying properties if such properties can safely accommodate two ADUs (e.g., that the properties have adequate sewer/septic and water capacity, can construct the ADUs in	Adopt the ordinance by July 2025.

compliance with all building code and fire prevention requirements, and can meet parking requirements).	
14. Reduce minimum unit sizes and update the Zoning Code, as necessary, to accommodate alternative housing types such as housing co-operatives, Single-Room Occupancy (SROs), dormitories, tiny homes, and collective home ownership models in more areas of the city, including religious sites and publicly owned land. Stakeholder outreach shall include discussions with for-profit and non-profit housing developers.	Amend the Zoning Code by July 2025. Conduct stakeholder outreach with developers and community groups and service providers on alternative housing at least once by January 2026, with the goal of achieving 30 units of alternative housing types by the end of 2029, with at least half of those units in the neighborhoods of E Las Palmas Dr/N Sunnywood Dr, Craig park, Sunny Hills, Bastanchury Rd/Fairway Isles Dr, Acacia Park, and Byerrum Park since they are Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence.
15. Encourage the development of both smaller rental and owner units (studio and one-bedroom) and larger rental units (3 to 4-bedroom units) in residential and mixed-use development. In consultation with developers, identify and provide incentives and reduction of constraints to encourage the construction of these housing types and develop a work plan to implement any proposed changes to development standards, City programs, and so forth.	Develop incentives and mitigations to constraints by July 2025. Starting in 2025, hold an annual workshop with developers and provide education about technical assistance and incentives for larger and smaller rental units, with a goal of supporting the development of 50 large (3-4-bedroom) units and 100 studio/1-bedroom units by December 2029. At least 50 percent of large and small rental units should be in neighborhoods of greater degrees of overcrowding, including Woodcrest Park, Artesia Blvd/N Gilbert St, Valencia Park, W Oak Ave/Lambert Dr, E Wilshire Ave/N Raymond Ave, Rancho La Paz.
16. Prioritize public health, education, economic, and safety programs in lower resource areas as defined by TCAC in coordination with area public health entities, school districts, workforce development groups, and the police department. Identify addresses and compile mailing list and email addresses to focus outreach to neighborhoods with higher concentrations of low-income and minority residents to prioritize services in these areas.	Increase participation in the City's first-time homebuyer seminars and owner-occupied housing rehabilitation grant program 5 percent annually from lower income and minority concentration areas between 2021-2029 (data collection via surveys conducted at the seminars).

17. Assess potential preference policy for affordable housing opportunities, land use, transportation, urban design, public facilities and services, and economic development strategies. The City will seek involvement from community organizations and advocates, business councils, and residents to further refine the program scope.	Establish a community working group that meets annually to prioritize funding for community investments.
18. Apply for funding and coordinate with the OCTA Safe Routes to School program to establish at least one partnership in the city for active transportation projects and/or safety education campaign, prioritizing school routes within and from the neighborhood of E Imperial Highway and N Harbor Boulevard.	Establish partnership for Safe Routes to School and apply for grant funding by the end of 2025. Initiate at least one project or campaign by the end of the planning period.

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs
Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in Fullerton. More than 20% of all units are overcrowded in the neighborhoods south of downtown, which are predominantly Hispanic.
Contributing Factors: 1. Displacement of residents due to economic pressures. 2. Location, type, and supply of affordable housing 3. Land use and zoning laws

Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Develop an outreach strategy in multiple languages for property owners who own fewer than 10 residential units (either in single-family or multi-family rental housing) to assess needs and connect them with resources, such as housing unit rehabilitation and financing programs. The intent of this program is to preserve Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (i.e., not currently regulated with affordability restrictions), particularly in the neighborhoods of Woodcrest Park and Rancho La Paz. The program will seek to prioritize communities vulnerable to displacement, generally in the	Develop an outreach strategy for "mom and pop" property owners by January 2026. After the strategy is adopted, conduct outreach to at least 15 property owners with less than 10 units and assist at least 5 property owners with a combined total of 20 units or more by December 2029.

southern areas of the city, a focus on neighborhoods with lower median income.	
2. Review the City's Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program with input from tenants and property owners/managers, ensuring representation across the economic spectrum, and update as appropriate. Outreach to be conducted to all vulnerable communities during the update process and after final adoption in 2027. Fill any gaps between Section 8 assistance and rent, or to aid those who may not qualify for Section 8 but need one-time emergency assistance, to provide relief to tenants to avoid the displacement in vulnerable communities.	Update the City's Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program by January 2027. Prepare and present a report on recommendations for programs that would provide relief to tenants and landlords to avoid the displacement in vulnerable communities by December 2026. If a rental assistance program is approved and implemented as a result, the program will assist at least 10 lower income renter households annually.
3. In consultation with fair housing service providers and community-based organizations, evaluate existing state and federal "just cause for eviction" (AB 1482; 2019-Chiu) and other similar legislation with provisions to determine if additional protections through a local ordinance is warranted.	Assess if additional protections are needed by January 2026. If warranted, recommend adoption of a local tenant protection ordinance to City Council by December 2026.
4. Partner with Cal state Fullerton to develop a plan to address the need for off-campus affordable housing for students.	Develop a city-wide student housing plan by December 2029.
5. Prioritize public health, education, economic, and safety programs in lower resource areas as defined by TCAC in coordination with area public health entities, school districts, workforce development groups, and the police department. Identify addresses and compile mailing list and email addresses to focus outreach to neighborhoods with higher concentrations of low-income and minority residents to prioritize services in these areas.	Increase participation in the City's first-time homebuyer seminars and owner-occupied housing rehabilitation grant program percent annually from lower income and minority concentration areas between 2021-2029 (data collection via surveys conducted at the seminars).

Issue: Disparities in Access to Homeownership

Homeownership rates are lower for all groups than the County overall, except for AAPI households. Racial/ethnic disparities exist, with Native American households the least likely to own their home, and AAPI households most likely.

Contributing Factors:
1. Racial discrepancies in loan origination.
2. Lack of funding for consumer rights and responsibility education on Fair Lending practices and identification of predatory lending practices.

Actions:	Timeframe:

1. Work to promote fair lending practices throughout the city, including:
    a. Ensure that low-income and minority residents have fair access to capital resources needed to acquire and maintain housing.
    b. Prevent predatory lending through information and referrals to the Fair Housing Foundation.
	Annually conduct and publish third party review of City or regional HMDA data to identify areas of need regarding fair access to lending.

2. Add information on fair housing laws and resources on the City's website regarding housing programs in several languages.	By January 2025
3. Seek opportunities to expand outreach and public education strategies on available tenant protection, fair housing services, and homeownership education to reach vulnerable households by offering information in multiple languages, targeted social media efforts, combining information with other assistance programs, distributing resources through local schools and colleges, and partnering with community-based organizations.	2021-2029
4. Partner with the County and/or community-based organizations to increase participation in homeownership education and assistance programs for historically underrepresented residents in the homeownership market. Organizations may include teachers' associations, school districts, and community-based service providers to increase awareness of, and access to, housing resources and financial planning services.	Facilitate homeownership workshops, counseling, and/or education campaigns by January 2025. By October 31, 2029, connect at least 30 residents to education on homeownership-related topics.
5. Prioritize public health, education, economic, and safety programs in lower resource areas as defined by TCAC in coordination with area public health entities, school districts, workforce development groups, and the police department. Identify addresses and compile mailing list	Increase participation in the City's first-time homebuyer seminars and owner-occupied housing rehabilitation grant program 5 percent annually from

and email addresses to focus outreach to neighborhoods with higher concentrations of low-income and minority residents to prioritize services in these areas.	lower income and minority concentration areas between 2021-2029 (data collection via surveys conducted at the seminars).

H.   Garden Grove

Issue: Segregation and R/ECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunities, and Disparities in Access to Homeownership

The majority of the city is considered an area of high POC segregation except for West Garden Grove. In West Garden Grove, the residential neighborhoods west of Knott St are considered areas of high White segregation. In the high POC segregation areas, AAPI residents are the predominant group west of 9th St and Hispanic residents are the predominant group east of there. Additionally, there are lots of publicly supported housing units in the center of city along Garden Grove Boulevard, which is a high POC segregation area. There are no publicly supported housing units in West Garden Grove, which is an area of high White segregation.

There is a R/ECAP in the northern part of the city to between Brookhurst St and Gilbert St, north of Chapman Ave. The R/ECAP tract is predominantly Hispanic and is surrounded by Census Tracts that are predominantly AAPI.

Hispanic and AAPI residents have the least access to low poverty neighborhoods and neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Additionally, Hispanic residents also have the least access to neighborhoods with high performing schools. Geographically, the neighborhoods with access to the most opportunities are in West Garden Grove, where education and economic scores are high, environmental quality is high, and poverty is low. West Garden Grove is a predominantly White area.

The Black and Hispanic homeownership rate in the city is half the White homeownership rate.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes.
2. Inadequate supply/production of affordable housing.
3. Displacement of residents due to regional economic pressures.
4. Housing discrimination.
5. High land and development costs in the region.
6. Public opposition to new development and land use and zoning laws.
7. Access to financial services.
8. Lack of meaningful language access for individuals with limited English proficiency.
9. Lack of private investment in specific neighborhoods.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Continue to contract with the Fair Housing Foundation to promote public awareness of federal, state, and local regulations regarding fair housing. Provide information to the public about local, state, and federal housing programs and fair housing law. Maintain referral information on the City's website, social media, newspaper ads, and at a variety of other locations such as community and senior centers, local social service offices, in City utility bills, and at other public locations including City Hall and the library. Add or	Ongoing

translate resources and information in Vietnamese, Korean, and Spanish and make available to the public through communications materials and online.	
2. Direct homebuyers and property owners with property deeds, covenants, and other real estate property documents that contain restrictions intended to limit where certain people could live or buy property, based on race, religion, or other characteristics, to the Orange County Clerk-Recorder's Office to have such discriminatory language removed at no charge.	Ongoing
3. Continue to target dissemination of Fair Housing Outreach information and notices of available services and workshops in neighborhoods identified with disproportionate housing needs and displacement risks. Fair Housing Foundation holds regular workshops and 1-on-1 counseling sessions at the City's Senior Center and Family Resource Centers.	Ongoing
4. Ensure that all development applications are considered, reviewed, and approved without prejudice to the proposed residents, contingent on the development application's compliance with all entitlement requirements.	Ongoing
5. Pursue funding and target neighborhoods of concentrated poverty for investment in rehabilitation, parks, transit, active transportation, and other needs identified in the City's Environmental Justice Element. To the extent possible, ensure funding plans reflect the needs of lower-opportunity neighborhoods.	Annually
6. Continue to implement the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and HUD Consolidated Plan.	Annually
7. Annually monitor building and home sales activities in historically under-market neighborhoods to identify any adverse trends.	Annually
8. Investigate ways to incentivize housing developers to increase the number three-bedroom units in their developments.	Ongoing
9. In concert with Code Enforcement, develop a proactive cooperative code compliance program that targets areas of concentrated rehabilitation needs, results in repairs, and mitigates potential cost, displacement, and relocation impacts on residents.	Ongoing
10. Implement programs to increase housing choices and affordability (e.g., duplex, triplex, multifamily, accessory dwelling units, SB 9 housing developments, transitional and supportive housing, and group homes), with a particular focus in High Opportunity Areas. Establish a protocol to annually monitor development progress towards housing creation that increases housing choices and affordability in High Opportunity Areas. Should monitoring reveal a shortfall in development progress towards housing creation of increased housing choices and affordability, the City will commit to developing additional actions, as necessary, including, but not limited to	Ongoing

| incentives, waivers, concessions, expedited processing, and other regulatory approaches, including examination of development standards) to ensure the City satisfies its identified housing need (RHNA). | |

I. Huntington Beach

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities and Disproportionate Housing Needs
In Huntington Beach, Hispanic residents have relatively low access to neighborhoods with good environmental health, low poverty, high education scores, and high economic scores. Overall, access to opportunities in the city is high compared to the region.
Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in Huntington Beach.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of knowledge of fair housing and associated laws.
2. High cost of housing limits access to lower income households of all races/ethnicities.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Promote fair housing practices through the following actions: 1. Continue to contract with the Fair Housing Foundation to provide fair housing services, including fair housing and discrimination investigations, tenant and landlord counseling, education and outreach activities, and affirmatively further fair housing activities.	Ongoing
Preserve quality and affordability of existing housing through the following actions: 1. Provide financial assistance to low-income households for home repairs through the Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program. 2. Provide rental assistance to extremely low (ELI) and very low income (VLI) households through the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance Program.	Ongoing

J.   Irvine

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunities, and Disproportionate Housing Needs

There are several Census Tracts considered to be areas of high POC segregation, including the neighborhoods between I-405 and UC Irvine, the Westpark community north of I-405, the neighborhoods between Como Channel and I-5, and the Northwood community north of I-5. There are also areas of high White segregation in Irvine, including the neighborhood bounded by Turtle Rock Dr, the area surrounding the Strawberry Farms Golf Club, the Woodbridge community north of I-405, and the neighborhood west of the Oak Creek Golf Club.

Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in Irvine. Homeownership rates are lower for all racial/ethnic groups compared to the County overall, and racial/ethnic disparities are similar to the County, with Black and Hispanic households having the lowest homeownership rates (15.7% and 18% respectively).

Contributing Factors:
1. Shortage of affordable rental and homeownership options due to market and governmental constraints
2. Underutilized properties (i.e., retail centers and hotels) could provide new affordable housing opportunities for Irvine residents, but current land use and zoning laws inhibit this development
3. Lack of supportive housing in community-based settings
4. Lack of renter protections and economic uncertainty from pandemic increased risk of displacement for lower income households

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. The City will continue to pursue alternative options for meeting the RHNA through preservation, legislative changes, and regional cooperation. The City will apply for all available funding to pursue acquisition/rehabilitation of affordable housing projects and preservation of at-risk housing.	Annually
2. The City will incorporate changes in State law (particularly affordable housing, employee housing, emergency shelters, and transitional/supportive housing, ADUs) into the Land Use Element and Zoning Ordinance. This will involve allowing for increased densities or FAR in both residential and non- residential areas to adhere to RHNA requirements. Other General Plan elements will be updated to ensure consistency with the updated Housing and Land Use Elements, as well as the Zoning Ordinance	Completed
3. The City will establish zoning overlays to allow for multifamily residential in nonresidential areas (which may include properties	By October 2024

designated for religious institutions and schools) to provide flexibility in land use and development standards, including mixed-use developments. These flexible standards shall be directed toward meeting the physical, social, and economic needs of the community. The City will adhere to the requirements of California Government Code, Section 65583.2, subdivisions (h) and (i), as part of the rezoning program, including applicable by-right provisions, and the residential overlay zones in nonresidential areas will allow for densities of 30 units/acre, allow for 100 percent residential use, and will require residential use to occupy 50 percent of floor area on mixed use projects.		
4. The City will encourage the subdivision of sites that are 10 acres or more to provide more opportunities for development of affordable housing, which the HCD has determined is more feasible on sites between 0.5 and 10 acres in size.	City will conduct a review every 2 years
5. The City will work with UCI to draft an agreement regarding approving, permitting, certifying occupancy, and/or reporting new units to the California State Department of Finance (DOF). The agreement will involve documentation from UCI on planned housing that has been approved to be built as well as information on the timing of the project construction and unit affordability by household income category.	By January 2022, and ongoing
6. The City will seek to amend the fee collection process for land divisions and lot line adjustments resulting in parcel sizes that facilitate multifamily developments affordable to households with lower incomes (including extremely low income and farmworkers) in light of State, Federal, and local financing programs (i.e., 2–10 acres).	Within 12 months of Housing Element certification
7. The City will also identify potential property owners and nonprofit developers by the end of FY 2022-23 and work with them on an annual basis to target and market the availability of sites with the best potential for development. In addition, the City will offer incentives for the development of affordable housing.	Within 12 months of Housing Element certification
8. The City will expedite development of housing projects for seniors, people with disabilities, and lower-income people and/or households	As projects are proposed
9. The City will review the current Development Standards and update as appropriate to encourage residential, mixed-use, and transit-oriented developments	By October 2022

10. To expedite the process of finding resources and incentives, the City will gather information on the available incentives/concessions for developers within a year of the City's Housing Element Update certification. The City will then develop and post an overview of the available incentives/concessions for developers on the City's website and updates will be performed on an annual basis. The goal of this program is either expedite the time it takes to obtain development approvals and/or incentives that provide cost savings on housing projects, thereby improving and increasing the financial feasibility of affordable housing projects	Within one (1) year of Housing Element certification
11. To decrease the entitlement and construction process, following the adoption of the Housing Element the City will designate a dedicated planner, plan checker, and building inspector(s) to provide expedited processing for affordable housing projects, with an emphasis on projects that include extremely low-income units. The goal of this program is to expedite the affordable housing development process to accelerate the availability of affordable housing units in the community, which also has the effect of reducing development costs	By October 2022
12. Hold one (1) outreach meeting or survey with affordable housing developers and providers each year after the state budget funding for the next fiscal year are made public (by October of each year) to discuss available funding sources (City, state and federal), sites identified in the Housing Element sites inventory that are available, developer needs and opportunities for affordable housing projects. Provide technical assistance to developers regarding City's lower income sites, funding opportunities, as well as mixed use zoning and density bonus incentives	October of each program year
13. The City will establish streamlined, ministerial review procedures and processes for qualifying multi-family residential projects consistent with SB 35	By May 2023
14. The City will update the current Zoning Ordinance to establish higher density in areas with underdeveloped/underutilized property, such as Planning Areas 32 (adjacent to the Irvine Station served by Amtrak/Metrolink passenger rail services and Orange County Transportation Authority bus services), 33, and 36 (a.k.a., Irvine Business Complex or "IBC" near John Wayne Airport). This update will maximize land utilization for residential development to accommodate RHNA requirements, including allowing residential overlays in commercial areas to allow for residential to be added to commercial areas or to allow existing underutilized commercial uses to be converted to residential (i.e., hotels)	By October 2024

15. Multiple State laws have been passed since 2019 establishing statewide standards for local regulations governing ADU development. State law requires that ADUs be allowed in residential and mixed-use areas despite local ordinances or homeowner's association rules and requirements. Additionally, State law requires jurisdictions to develop a plan to encourage and incentivize ADUs in an effort to address the current California housing crisis.	By January 2023
16. Assembly Bill (AB) 671 requires local agencies' Housing Elements to include a plan that incentivizes and promotes the creation of ADUs that can offer affordable rents for households with very-low-, low-, or moderate-income households. As part of the ADU ordinance update (including public outreach), the City will research feasible options to facilitate affordable housing options for ADUs	By October 2024
17. Housing Elements to include a plan that incentivizes and promotes the creation of ADUs that can offer affordable rents for households with very-low-, low-, or moderate-income households. As part of the ADU ordinance update (including public outreach), the City will research feasible options to facilitate affordable housing options for ADUs	By the end of 2022 and begin providing incentives by January 2023
18. The City will provide financial and other available assistance to affordable housing property owners to preserve units. The committed assistance may consist of both financial and non-financial, in-kind services to incentivize the preservation of affordable units. The total number of units to be preserved are seven extremely low, 517 very low and 299 low-income units	By June 30, 2025
19. The City will continue to monitor and preserve the affordability of all publicly assisted housing units, and support applications by nonprofits	Ongoing
20. The Sites Inventory includes four non- vacant sites with existing residential uses. The sites are currently combined and house an 880-unit apartment building. In considering a demolition and new construction of residential development at the site (that increases the total number of units), the City is proposing the incorporation of 465 deed- restricted units affordable to very low- and low-income households on this site, generating replacement units for any units that may be inhabited by very low- and low-income families.	As development projects are proposed (timing dependent on development community)
21. In addition to providing funding opportunities related to HUD programs on the City's website, funding opportunities will be disseminated via targeted email notifications and may also be posted	Ongoing

on all City social media accounts and include information on vacant land currently owned by the City.	
22. The City will access information from HCD and other State agencies to identify grant application opportunities for affordable housing. When grant opportunities are known, the City will reach out to affordable developer stakeholders to identify projects and/or opportunities to include on grant applications. The City will apply or support a minimum of three (3) grant application each year. The goal of this program would be to increase the amount of funding available for affordable housing projects, which require public subsidies to be built.	Timing dependent on State HCD and other departments
23. The City will retain a consultant to conduct a feasibility study on increasing the inclusionary housing requirement from 15 percent (5 percent very low, 5 percent low, and 5 percent moderate) to 20 percent (9 percent very low, 6 percent low, and 5 percent moderate). The policy changes proposed to Planning Commission and City Council, if deemed feasible in the study, will include increasing the inclusionary requirement to 20 percent with corresponding updated in-lieu fee	By October 2024
24. The City will identify and analyze local funding options for affordable housing and monitor new funding and financing resources each year. This program will also include using State and Federal funding received by the City to partner with nonprofit organizations (such as the ICLT), as the commitment of City funding can enhance the scoring of 100 percent affordable projects to secure important funding sources, such as low- income housing tax credits (LIHTCs) that have become highly competitive.	Annually
25. The City will identify and utilize State programs and/or potential public/private partnerships with major employers to acquire existing market rate housing units or develop new housing units to create moderate or workforce housing (available to households with incomes at 80 percent to 120 percent of AMI)	Ongoing
26. The City will follow all requirements of the Surplus Land Act, Article 8 (commencing with Section 54220) of Chapter 5 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5, including holding a public hearing designating the properties as "surplus properties" under California Law. The City will also conduct an analysis to determine, based on market conditions, if selling or leasing the properties would maximize the development of affordable units. The City will then send a Notice of Availability to all required parties regarding the availability of County-owned land available for purchase or lease. It is the City's intent to facilitate the	Surplus Land Act activities to be completed by October 2024 and Notice of Availability by December 2025

development of 100 percent affordable housing projects on vacant or underutilized City- owned sites. The City will also coordinate with the public entities that own a site (or sites) to ensure that the legally mandated surplus property process is followed	
27. The City seeks to continue to strengthen its relationship with the ICLT to collaborate and partner on efficiently and effectively maximizing affordable housing opportunities.	As opportunities arise for acquisition, development, and legislative initiatives the City will work with ICLT. Additionally, City will meet at least quarterly with ICLT starting in November 2021 to coordinate efforts. City will document progress on these items in its Annual Progress Report.
28. The City will coordinate with public agencies to facilitate the development of affordable housing projects on vacant and underutilized sites, including sites owned by the County of Orange, the State, and the Irvine Ranch Water District. Activities could include collaboration with public agencies on master-planning and disposition efforts for large vacant and underutilized sites.	Coordination with County of Orange, the State, and the Irvine Ranch Water District and any other relevant public agencies in connection with the Land Use Element Update and Zoning Ordinance amendment from 2022 through October 2024
29. The City's Land Use Element allows for the entitlement of affordable housing units beyond the maximum unit counts established in the Zoning Ordinance, thus considered additive to the General Plan intensity thresholds, which allows additional units to be developed under the City's established land use designations.	As development projects are proposed (timing dependent on development community).
30. The City will amend the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance	By October 2024
31. Encourage and incentivize ADUs through various programs	By January 2023

32. Encourage innovative design prototypes and/or construction, such as smaller units with increased energy efficiency (i.e., sustainable designs and operations), modular units or other innovative building types	On an ongoing basis
33. Streamline permitting to encourage a diverse housing stock	On an ongoing basis
34. The City will make appropriate zoning changes as part of the General Plan - Land Use Element Update and Zoning Ordinance Amendment to bring the City's Zoning Ordinance in compliance with State law changes related to parking, by right uses, and other requirements.	By October 2024.
35. The City will work with UCI to draft agreement regarding approving, permitting, certifying occupancy, and/or reporting new units to the California State Department of Finance (DOF).	By January 2022 and ongoing tracking.
36. The Federal Housing Choice Voucher Program extends rental subsidies to extremely low and very low-income households, including families, seniors, farmworkers, and the disabled.	Ongoing
37. The City will study the benefits associated with creating an Irvine Housing Authority with the ability to allocate Federal Housing Choice Vouchers	By January 2023
38. The City will analyze incentives to encourage affordable housing developers to consider extending the terms of affordability in perpetuity	By January 2023
39. The City will monitor legislative changes to ensure that City policies and regulations comply with State and Federal laws	Annually
40. The goal of this program is to ensure that fees (both the dollar amount and timing), incentives, development standards/review processes do not constrain the development of housing units or render housing development infeasible	Annually
41. The City will develop and establish specific written procedures for requesting and granting a reasonable accommodation for housing for persons with disabilities.	6/30/2023
42. The City will update the Zoning Ordinance and related policies pertaining to emergency shelters, Low- Barrier Navigation Centers (LBNCs), transitional and supportive housing, and group care facilities to conform to State requirements, as established by AB 139, AB 2162, and Senate Bill 48. Generally, this update would allow these land uses in all of the City's residential zones and with fewer conditions.	Completed by October 2024

43. Any funding sources have specific eligibility criteria or other requirements that may not always align with potential projects in Irvine. The City will pursue relevant State and Federal funding sources to provide additional options for developers of lower-income housing that serve veterans, individual, and families at-risk of and currently experiencing homelessness in the City. The City will ensure that such housing options will include reasonable accommodations and transitional and supportive services for people with disabilities.	Ongoing as funding is released and available.
44. The City will explore the feasibility of joining the Orange County Housing Finance Trust (OCHFT), a joint power authority composed of many Orange County cities.	Explore by October 2023
45. The City will ensure that housing options will include reasonable accommodations and supportive services for people with disabilities.	Explore by October 2023
46. The City will continue to make information about services for people experiencing homelessness available on the City's website and at City facilities.	Ongoing
47. The City will continue to provide resources for non-profits that provide transitional housing, motel vouchers, food pantry, emergency rent and utility payment assistance, life-skills counseling and clothing.	Ongoing
48. The City will continue to provide CDBG grant funding to non-profits such as Families Forward, South County Outreach, Human Options, and Stand Up for Kids that provide these services. Information on these resources is included in the City's Affordable Housing Guide and the City's website.	Ongoing
49. The City will explore establishing a crisis response protocol for local service providers to render rapid crisis support, including after-hour services for people experiencing or at risk of homelessness.	By October 2022
50. The City will reach out to other California cities currently implementing shared housing programs that help match individuals experiencing or at risk of homelessness and seniors for a mutually beneficial living situation. Individuals in need of housing can provide needed physical assistance around the home for seniors.	Explore by October 2024
51. Compile a list of local organizations and reach out to inquire about possible collaborations. This will help the City cooperate with community-based organizations that provide services or information about services to any special needs or linguistically isolated groups.	Ongoing

52. The City's primary (and very effective) effort in displacement prevention is facilitating the development of affordable housing in the community, as referenced in the AFFH section of this HEU. Displacement prevention activities will also include connecting residents to resources to minimize the displacement of households with lower incomes and special needs whenever possible and where necessary to ensure that displacement is carried out in an equitable manner.	Ongoing
53. The City will participate in the Orange County United Way's Eviction Task Force and associated study. This work includes identifying and coordinating community resources to support households facing eviction.	Ongoing
54. The City will provide a link on its website to landlord/tenant meditation services and landlord/tenant rights and responsibilities, which may include information from service providers such as the Fair Housing Foundation. The City will also add information on the City's website and provide resources on non-profits such as Community Legal Aid SoCal and the Legal Aid Society of OC.	Annual
55. The City will encourage homeownership through education, sharing information, and links to existing nonprofit, County, State, and Federal resources on the City's website	Ongoing basis and updated annually for accuracy
56. This existing program provides financial assistance to lower-income Irvine homeowners for critical home improvement projects.	Ongoing basis and updated annually for accuracy
57. The City will update its Land Use Element and amend the Zoning Ordinance	Ordinance by October 2024
58. The City will continue implementation of its One Irvine program to revitalize individual neighborhoods through a work program uniquely developed with community input for each neighborhood.	By January 2023.
59. The City will reach out to community organizations and collaborate with them on outreach to different communities	By January 2023.
60. The City will provide links to Fair Housing Foundation (a nonprofit the City currently contracts with) to provide Irvine residents with information regarding fair housing law, tenant and landlord rights (including information on mediation services)	Within six months of Housing Element certification.
61. Compile a list of local organizations and set up an annual meeting or meetings to discuss community housing needs and potential solutions. Cooperate with community-based organizations that	Within six months of Housing Element certification.

provide services or information about services to any special needs and linguistically isolated groups.	Meet annually with identified organizations starting in fiscal year 2022- 23 (meetings will be conducted by June 30 of each year).
62. The City will connect developers of projects with affordable density bonus units and local non-profits/community organizations to coordinate efforts and determine if the units could be set aside, where feasible, for special groups including but not limited to veterans and special need adults.	Within three months of a density bonus project application.
63. The City will provide translations or interpretation in all applicable languages to ensure access to programs, services, and materials	Ongoing
64. The City will conduct an internal audit at a minimum of every other year to evaluate that we are addressing all language needs for the City.	Annually or as needed
65. The City is in the process and has taken several steps to identify climate impacts, reduce pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), and prepare for a climate resilient future	Completed by December 31, 2022
66. Continuing to require added greenery throughout the City to reduce exposure to environmental pollution such as vehicle emissions through the City's Zoning Ordinance (Section 3-15-4)	Annually
67. Irvine Cool City Challenge will reduce climate emissions and utility bills while building resiliency and local emergency preparedness against climate disasters such as extreme heat, floods, wildfires, and extreme storm events.	The Cool Block Challenge was initiated in January 2022 and will be 2 years in length. There will be a new team established roughly every 4.5-5 months. In year 3 of the Cool City Challenge, the City will present a game plan to the Empowerment Institute. After that, the City will work to implement the carbon

	neutrality plan.
68. Provide adequate parks and open space to all parts of the community, the City will prepare a comprehensive design strategy to include passive urban park setting for every project and include other placemaking strategies. This program, as implemented, will reduce unsustainable energy use, reduce pollutants, improve air quality, reduce extreme heat events and improve the health outcomes of residents, employees and others in the community.	By December 2024.
69. The City will contact the Irvine Unified School District to inquire about expanding access to enrollment in the district's schools for residents that may not be within the district's boundaries	Within six months of Housing Element certification.
70. The City will conduct a bi-annual survey of homeowners to obtain input on existing programs and to identify additional ways to support the City's homeowners and their unique needs	At least one survey every two years
71. The City shall strengthen its relationship with the local fair housing provider and explore ways to expand services and mutually pursue additional funding resources for that expansion.	Ongoing with check in meeting one time per year

Issue: Segregation

There are various neighborhoods considered to have high POC segregation, including neighborhoods in the center of the city north of Guadalupe Park and between Idaho St to the west and Sonora High School to the east. These neighborhoods are predominantly Hispanic. Publicly supported housing units are in the city's center and north neighborhoods, which are all low-medium or high POC segregation areas.

Contributing Factors:
1. Zoning Code regulations and land use controls that constrain/ restrict housing opportunities.
2. Historic limited available land for new development of multiple- family housing.
3. General lack of affordable housing for low-and moderate-income residents.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Increase production of affordable housing through the following actions: 1. Adopt streamlined ministerial approval process to expedite the development of housing. 2. Revise density bonus ordinance and remove CUP requirement to facilitate higher density housing. 3. Remove 1-acre minimum for mixed use projects and 20% standard for multiple-family on a block. 4. Adopt objective design standards to facilitate multi-family and mixed-use production. 5. Remove the CUP neighborhood compatibility finding in the design review process. 6. Adjust story height and parking requirement to facilitate multiple-family housing production. 7. Allow transitional, supportive housing, and low barrier navigation centers in accordance with state law. 8. Allow residential care facilities req. by state law and remove filing fee for reasonable acc. request.	Adopt 8 ordinances by 2024. By 2025, approval of at least 2 multiple-family residential projects and permitting of at least 2 care facilities.

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities

Neighborhoods in the city's center and southeast of the center have poor environmental quality, low education scores, and low economic scores. These neighborhoods are also predominantly Hispanic.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lower ranking schools compared to wealthier districts in the County.
2. Lower graduation rate among Hispanics and other groups compared to County results.
3. Lower incomes due to either under- employment and or unemployment.
4. Need to continue investments in the children and youth of La Habra.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Improve access to opportunities in low resource areas through the following actions:	
1. Operate the Child Development Division programs and assist up to 600 La Habra children from lower-income families	Ongoing
2. Administer City workforce training and employment programs for 600 participants in the County; increase staff fourfold	Ongoing
3. Continue to support La Habra Boys and Girls Club, serving 3,000 La Habra residents each year	Ongoing
4. Continue to work with housing, employment, and community service partners, as needed, evaluate, and expand partnerships and resources	Quarterly or as needed
5. Retrofit two parks or recreation facilities (e.g., El-Centro-Lions, Vista) in low-mod resource areas in central La Habra	By end of 2025
6. Remediate landfill hazards with vapor devices underneath the Vista Grande Park	Ongoing
7. Continue to support the children's museum, accommodating nearly 95,000 visits each year	Ongoing
8. Update safety element to address climate change, EJ, and resiliency; implement programs to address hazards	By June 2023
9. Operate the Hillcrest Health and Wellness Center to serve residents in need, including Central La Habra	Ongoing
10. Ensure 25% Love La Habra projects in Central La Habra Complete NTMP projects in K, M, F Neighborhoods	Annually
11. Expend $2.5 million to install East Bishop storm drain	By end of 2024
12. Apply for SR2S grants citywide for all schools; if received, develop plan, make improvements during planning period	By 2029
13. Market services to eligible lower income residents through affirmative marketing at Hillcrest Center	By end of 2023

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs

Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in La Habra. More than 10% of homes have incomplete kitchen facilities in one Census Tract in the north central part of the city.

Contributing Factors:
1. High levels of overcrowding and overpayment; mismatch with housing needs.
2. Rising prices and rents for housing far exceed recent increases in incomes.
3. Several affordable housing projects remain at risk of conversion.
4. Age of housing stock; most homes were built more than 50 years ago.
5. Housing rehabilitation and repairs are expensive, especially for retirees.
6. Limited staff for building/ code compliance make it difficult to address needs.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Reduce housing instability through the following actions:	
1. Encourage ADUs, including 20% in higher resource areas through annual publication citywide.	Permit 30 ADUs; 20% in high resource areas by the end of 2022
2. Support and advertise HCV program to increase participants.	Ongoing
3. Assist up to 200 lower-income households over the planning period with ARPA-funded bill assistance.	Assist 200 households by the end of 2023.
4. Retain affordability and condition of mobile home parks and deed-restricted apartments affordable to lower income households.	Preserve affordability of 50% of units in the two city-owned mobile home parks between 2021-2029.
5. Require replacement units per Gov't Code 65915 for lower income units demolished.	Ongoing, as projects are proposed
6. Implement inclusionary housing ordinance and prioritize funding (fees) for affordable housing.	Develop all 100 inclusionary units, 25% of which are in highest income tracts, between 2021-2029.
7. Target affirmative marketing in low resource areas at the Hillcrest Center, Boys & Girls Club, and others.	Prepare and distribute fliers on City programs by 2023.
Improve quality of existing housing through the following actions:	
8. Hold regular Love La Habra events to assist income- qualified residents with home repairs	Annually in September

9. Hire additional code enforcement staff to address backlog and provide capacity for proactive work	By end of 2023
10. Purchase Land Management System (LMS) to track code compliance, building and planning permits	By end of 2023
11. Issue housing rehabilitation grants/loans for 25 households over the planning period	Make 3 grants per year
12. Evaluate feasibility of rental housing inspection program and, if feasible, develop program	By end of 2023
13. Seek collaborative partnership which can assist in addressing local housing rehabilitation needs	Annually
14. Target affirmative marketing in low resource areas at the Hillcrest Center, Boys & Girls Club, and others	By end of 2023

L.   Laguna Niguel

Issue: Concentration
Most of the city is considered an area of high White concentration, except for a few neighborhoods with low-medium concentration (which are predominantly White) in the northeastern and eastern parts of the city.

Contributing Factors:
1. Historical land use development patterns and zoning, environmental constraints, and lack of vacant land limit opportunities for larger and higher density project types.
2. Current high cost of housing limits access to lower income households of all races/ethnicities.
3. Lack of affordable housing and need for greater access to opportunities.
4. Regional coordination affects transit services, funding sources, and allocation of housing resources including vouchers.
5. Community resistance to development.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Increase fair housing knowledge through the following actions:	
1. Promote Fair Housing Council programs and expand knowledge of first-time homebuyer programs on the City's website, newsletters, and through social media.	By December 2025, review annually thereafter
2. Promote affirmative marketing plans in all new housing developments that are designed to attract renters and buyers of diverse demographic backgrounds, including race, ethnicity, income, disability, and familial status.	Ongoing
3. Develop an outreach plan and materials to communicate the benefits of vouchers and tenant rights regarding just cause evictions, limitations on rent increases, and replacement housing requirements if any existing residential units would be removed, based on state law.	By December 2025
Increase housing opportunities in high opportunity areas through the following actions:	
4. Incentivize multi-family and mixed- use development in the Gateway Specific Plan area (northeast portion of city) through the following actions:	
a. Amend the Gateway Specific Plan to mandate that any public benefit provided to achieve a density of higher than 50 du/ac shall include a provision of affordable housing, and to encourage the production of workforce housing and missing middle housing.	By July 2025

b. Allocate CDBG or other available funding assistance to projects in the Gateway Specific Plan area that include multi-family units targeted for extremely-low-income households, as feasible.	Annually
c. Provide administrative assistance to affordable housing developers in preparing grant applications.	Ongoing
d. Post and maintain a current inventory of vacant sites in the Gateway Specific Plan area suitable for multi-family residential or mixed-use development on the City website.	Ongoing
e. Contact local developers and publicize development opportunities within the Gateway Specific Plan area at least once each year.	Annually
f. Assist in facilitating subdivision of large parcels where necessary to create building sites through concurrent processing and project coordination.	Ongoing
5. Contact the property owners of vacant properties to assist development of the site for residential purposes.	Annually
6. Continue to implement state Density Bonus Law as amended from time to time.	Ongoing
7. Engage and assist developers seeking funding and/or tax credits for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing.	Annually
8. Incentivize affordable housing development through modified development standards, expedited processing, or other financial incentives for affordable housing projects.	Ongoing
9. Provide administrative assistance to developers of low- or moderate-income projects.	Ongoing
10. Promote options for assistance to developers on the City website.	Ongoing
11. Prioritize funding assistance for Extremely Low-Income units.	Ongoing
12. Review City-owned properties annually to identify any surplus land that could be made available for affordable housing development and distribute list of suitable sites to regional affordable housing developers.	Annually
13. Work cooperatively with the County of Orange and other local cities to create a regional housing bond program to help fund affordable housing and permanent supportive housing.	Ongoing, consultation with County at least annually

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities

Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

Contributing Factors:
1. Insufficient fair housing monitoring and limited outreach capacity
2. Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations
3. Limited understanding of fair housing laws

Actions:	Timeframe:
Improve fair housing education and outreach through the following actions:	
1. Direct fair housing inquiries to the Fair Housing Council of Orange County (FHCOC).	Ongoing
2. Post and update information annually regarding fair housing and request that FHCOC conduct a presentation every two years about the services available.	Annually
3. In cooperation with the FHCOC, contact all low-income apartment complexes annually to provide education and materials about the Section 8 program, including multi- lingual materials.	By July 2025 and annually thereafter
4. Publish and update fair housing information on the City website and via social media annually.	Annually

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs

Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in Laguna Niguel.

Contributing Factors:
1. Historical land use development patterns and zoning, environmental constraints, and lack of vacant land limit opportunities for larger and higher density project types.
2. Current high cost of housing limits access to lower income households of all races/ethnicities.
3. Lack of affordable housing and need for greater access to opportunities.
4. Community resistance to development.
5. Regional coordination affects transit services, funding sources, and allocation of housing resources including vouchers.
6. Age of housing stock.
7. Cost of repairs/rehabilitation.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Encourage the development of ADUs and SB 9 units through the following actions:	

1. Monitor the production and affordability of ADUs every three years to ensure the City is meeting ADU production targets and act if projections are not consistent.	Perform review in December 2026
2. Conduct increased outreach and education on ADU and SB 9 unit/lot split opportunities.	Ongoing
3. Continue to promote ADUs on the City's website, social media, and at City offices.	Ongoing
4. Promote SB 9 units and lot splits on the City's website, social media, and at City offices.	Ongoing
5. Expedite ADU permit processing.	Ongoing
Provide support to individuals experiencing homelessness through the following actions:	
6. Participate in meetings of the Orange County Homeless Issues Task Force as they occur	Ongoing
7. Allocate an appropriate level of CDBG funding in relation to the local need.	Annually
8. Explore and consider Project Homekey and opportunities to work with the County.	Ongoing
9. Assist applicants proposing permanent or interim supportive housing by helping to apply for funding.	Ongoing
Expand the use of Housing Choice Vouchers through the following actions:	
10. Contact all low-income apartment complexes annually to provide education and materials about the Section 8 program including multilingual materials.	By July 2025 and annually thereafter
11. Encourage the development of missing middle housing types and evaluate specific methods to encourage their production in RCAAs, areas of higher density, and in the central areas of the City.	Between 2021-2029, facilitate 80 "missing middle" units, with at least 20% located in targeted areas, including RCAAs, higher density areas, central areas of the City.
Preserve existing affordable housing units and prevent displacement through the following actions:	
12. Monitor assisted units to assess the risk of conversion to market rate.	Annually

13. Offer financial incentives to encourage owners of at-risk properties to maintain their rental units as affordable housing.	Three-year, twelve-month, and six-month coordination with at-risk property owners and OCHCS.
14. Allocate a portion of CDBG funds to assist in extending affordability covenants for at-risk units.	Annually
15. Provide educational materials to tenants of properties with expiring covenants regarding options for securing other affordable housing.	Ongoing
16. Continue the City's active property maintenance program run by the Code Enforcement Division of the Community Development Department.	Conduct windshield surveys covering all properties in the City every six months.
17. Seek CDBG funding for housing rehabilitation.	Facilitate rehabilitation of 15 housing units between 2021-2029.
18. Survey older areas of the City and connect property owners to rehabilitation programs.	Six property owner contacts per year.

M. Lake Forest

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities

While residents overall have relatively good access to opportunities, compared to the region, residents living below the FPL in the city generally have less access to opportunities than the rest of the population.

Contributing Factors:

1. Lack of opportunity due to high housing costs.
2. Lack of access to public transportation.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Increase housing supply in high opportunity areas through the following actions: 1. Implement Program 1: Land Use Policy, Entitlements, and Development Capacity (Shortfall Program), to rezone sites to accommodate new residential and mixed-use development at densities consistent with the City's General Plan (adopted in 2020) to meet the City's RHNA at all income levels. 2. Implement Program 2: Monitor Residential Capacity (No Net Loss), to ensure that replacement sites identified to continue to accommodate the City's remaining RHNA throughout the planning period are consistent with the City's duty to affirmatively further fair housing. 3. On an ongoing basis, actively recruit residents from neighborhoods of concentrated poverty to serve or participate on boards, committees, and other local government bodies as positions are made available due to the regular appointment process or vacancies.	Between 2021-2029, the City's goal is to promote the development of 1,648 new units (including 303 lower income units and 167 moderate income units, consistent with the City's Quantified Objectives for 2021-2029) with 75% of the new units located in areas of moderate or high opportunity; rezone 158 acres to allow for the development of up to 2,965 multifamily units, with 75% of the units located in areas of moderate or high opportunity; and increase the number of applications from residents living in low or moderate resource areas for open Board and Commission positions by 20%.
Preserve existing affordable housing opportunities and prevent displacement through the following actions: 4. Implement Program 4: Replacement of Affordable Units, to ensure that affordable units that are removed from the City's housing stock are replaced in accordance with state law. 5. Implement Program 5: Facilitate Affordable and Special Needs Housing Construction, to encourage the development of housing units to serve the needs of larger	Between 2021-2029, the City's goal will be to maintain at least 202 affordable housing units in the City; increase the proportion of new multifamily units that are 3 or more bedrooms by 10%; promote the develop of 70 new extremely low income housing units (consistent with the City's Quantified Objectives for 2021-

households, including large extremely low-income households. 6. Implement Program 23: Economic Displacement Risk Analysis, to proactively identify potential issues related to economic displacement as a result of new development.	2029); and commit $70,500 to implement programs and improvements serving the Southwest Lake Forest neighborhood with a focus on programs and improvements that protect existing residents from displacement.
Increase access to opportunities for individuals with disabilities through the following actions: 7. Implement Program 1: Land Use Policy, Entitlements, and Development Capacity (Shortfall Program), to rezone sites adjacent to transit corridors and activity centers to allow for higher density residential development, suitable for affordable and special needs housing, including new opportunities for individuals with disabilities. 8. Implement Program 5: Facilitate Affordable and Special Needs Housing Construction, whereby the City will proactively reach out to developers of housing for special needs populations to share details about special needs groups in Lake Forest and promote the development of housing for special needs groups in areas of moderate and high levels of opportunity. 9. Implement Program 6: Monitor and Implement Changes in federal and state Housing, Planning, and Zoning Laws to proactively identify changes in federal and/or state regulations required to be implemented at the local level to improve access to opportunity for individuals with disabilities.	Between 2021-2029, the City's goal will be to rezone 158 acres to accommodate the development of up to 2,965 new units with a focus to promote the development of units affordable to lower income households in areas of moderate or high opportunity; increase the number of local individuals with disabilities taking transit by 10% by encouraging the development of new housing for individuals with disabilities to be located close to transit routes; increase the proportion of new multifamily units that are 3 or more bedrooms by 10%; and resolve 100% of reasonable accommodation requests consistent with the requirements of state law.

N.   Mission Viejo

Issue: Concentration and Disproportionate Housing Needs

Most of the city has a high concentration of White residents, although there are neighborhoods in the southern, northern, and western parts of the city where there's more diversity. Overall, residents have good access to opportunities, though getting around on public transit or finding affordable transportation can be a challenge. Additionally, data on fair housing complaints shows that people with disabilities often face challenges when it comes to housing. Renters across Orange County, including in Mission Viejo, are also struggling with housing costs.

Contributing Factors:
1. Limited affordable housing overall due to land use designations and zoning regulations.
2. Limited availability of affordable units in a range of sizes and types.
3. Displacement of residents due to economic pressures.
4. Lack of affordable, integrated housing for individuals who need supportive needs.
5. Regulatory barriers to providing housing and supportive services for individuals with disabilities.
6. Lack of private investments in specific neighborhoods.
7. Housing discrimination in the private market.

Actions:	Timeframe:
Increase housing opportunities through the following actions:	
1. Proactively outreach to developers about development opportunities.	Annually
2. Actively market Site 3 and reach conclusion regarding the importation of dirt to be able to deliver a Pad-ready site to potential developers.	By July 2026
3. For Site 3 development, establish a priority processing procedure, with fee waivers and grant other incentives and concessions as appropriate, including the need and applicability for CDBG Funding.	By July 2026
4. Conduct an outreach and education program regarding SB 4 opportunities for religious facilities and nonprofit colleges.	By December 2025
5. Promote funding available from Orange County Housing Finance Trust's Affordable ADU Loan Program.	Annually
6. Apply for funding available at the state to assist lower and moderate-income homeowners to develop ADUs.	Annually
7. Prioritize funding for projects that set aside units for special needs populations and those with extremely low incomes.	Annually

8. Assist OCHA, FHF, and United Way in promoting the HCV program	Hold promotional workshops annually.
9. Study and pursue a home sharing program	Establish program in 2025 and begin implementation in 2026.
Improve conditions in neighborhoods through the following actions:	
10. Assess and expand MV Shuttle services and Safe Routes to School program to serve new developments and underserved neighborhoods.	Assess transit services at least every three years. Assess and expand Safe Routes to School program to align with new developments.
11. Target outreach to two neighborhoods where there are issues of housing conditions.	Annually
12. Study and develop appropriate strategies for adaptive reuse of underutilized commercial properties.	By the end of 2026.
Preserve existing affordable housing units through the following actions:	
13. Monitor status of all affordable units.	Annually
Increase fair housing education and enforcement through the following actions:	
14. Provide fair housing and tenant/landlord dispute resolution services	Annually
15. Expand promotion of housing resources, including fair housing services, via a multi-media approach, such as eNewsletter with circulation of 20,000, message boards, senior newsletter, and other social media outlets.	Annually

O.   Newport Beach

Issue: Segregation and Disparities in Access to Opportunity
Residents across the city have relatively high access to opportunities, however, all of the city's neighborhoods are predominantly White and are classified as areas of high White segregation. Homeownership rates are lower for all groups compared to the County overall, except for AAPI households, who have slightly higher homeownership rate in the city. Housing cost burden is also an issue for renters in the city. Additionally, based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

Contributing Factors:
1. High cost of housing and limited supply of affordable housing.

Actions:	Timeframe:

1. Adopt and codify accessory dwelling unit (ADU) regulations that facilitate and incentivize ADU development beyond state law minimum requirements, create new housing development incentives and fee waivers, and that provide for access into areas of high opportunity that contribute to the following community development actions:
    a. Increase residential development opportunities;
    b. Maximize infill development in "built out" neighborhoods; and
    c. Increase affordable housing options.
2. Conduct two community workshops that will accomplish the following:
    a. Identify local issues that are influencing access to opportunity;
    b. Identify potential solutions to address those local issues;
    c. Identify opportunities to increase the housing supply for all income levels; and
    d. Establish economic development priorities to help stimulate the creation of jobs and access to services.
	By June 2023, the City will adopt revised ADU regulations. By December 2023, the City will conduct two community workshops. The City will seek to produce 20 to 30 ADUs per calendar year within higher resource areas.

3. Adopt an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to ensure lower income units are developed in conjunction with new market-rate development equitably throughout the City and higher resource Census Tracts.	By December 2026, the City will aspire to have approved between 750 and 1,000 affordable housing units or to have collected a commensurate in-lieu affordable housing fee for

	use to subsidize future affordable housing projects.
4. Maintain and promote the City's Business Ambassador Program to residents to support local businesses and entrepreneurship. 5. Target outreach to two low-access Census Tracts via mailers or by other means including social media to provide website information about local entrepreneurship and educational opportunities.	The City will improve upon its existing Business Ambassador Program and will seek to assist at least 35-45 individuals annually with establishing their own business opportunities. The Business Ambassador Program will be advertised within the lower-opportunity Census Tracts with a goal of reaching at least 50% of the households.
6. Continually update the City's housing-related webpages to ensure current available data.	Starting 2023, the City will annually review and update its housing-related webpages.

7. Improve access to mortgage loans through the following actions:
    a. Disseminate online information to the community about home loans and the loan application and approval process.
    b. Conduct biannual affordable housing workshops with invited guests from the local lending industry and local affordable housing advocates.
    c. Conduct annual report of loan dispositions in the City and identify any trends or issues. Provide findings to local lenders and financial institutions.
	By June 2023, the City will provide information to the community about home loans and the loan process. By December 2023, the City will conduct its first biannual affordable housing workshop with affordable housing lenders and local affordable housing advocates. The City will seek to reach between 10,000 and 15,000 households with loan information and will further seek to reduce any occurrence of loan disposition discrimination, if found to be prevalent.

**P.	Orange**

Issue: Segregation and Disparities in Access to Opportunities
Most of the city to the north and east of Villa Park is considered an area of high White segregation, and there are concentrations of predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods west of Glassel Street. Additionally, all publicly supported housing units and households with vouchers are located to the west and south of Villa Park. There are no publicly supported housing units or vouchers in use to the east of Villa Park, where it is a high White segregation area.

Geographically, the neighborhoods west of Glassel Street, have lower education and economic scores, and worse environmental quality. Conversely, neighborhoods to the north and east of Villa Park, have high education and economic scores, and good environmental quality. Related to this geographic distribution of opportunities, Hispanic and Black residents (especially Black residents living below the FPL) have relatively low access to neighborhoods close to high performing schools, and to neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Additionally, based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing. |

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of public investment in certain neighborhoods
2. Lack of sufficient affordable housing due, in part, to community opposition to affordable housing and land use and zoning regulations
3. Lack of fair housing knowledge

Actions:	Timeframe:
Improve access to opportunity through the following actions:	
1. The City will continue to utilize the Public Works and Community Services Departments for the as-needed removal of graffiti and other deferred maintenance issues on public property, including sidewalks, parks, bus shelters signs and other structures adjacent to the public right-of-way, to enhance the quality of Orange's residential neighborhoods.	Ongoing
2. Provide public information related to housing development and how the provision of affordable housing benefits the community.	Ongoing
3. The City will continue gathering community input on affordable housing, housing for special needs populations, and ADUs. The continued outreach will be City-wide with a focus on traditionally under-represented communities.	Ongoing
4. Continue to follow current state Density Bonus law.	Ongoing
5. Update the Transitional Housing Ordinance that establishes guidelines and regulations for the development and operation of transitional housing in the city.	2025

6. Prepare and adopt a Single Room Occupancy Ordinance that sets regulations for buildings designed for single room occupancy.	2025
7. Prepare and adopt a Residential Care Facility Ordinance that establishes regulations and standards for non-medical care facilities providing care to individual requiring assistance.	2025
8. Prepare and adopt a Farmworker and Employee Housing Ordinance that sets standards and regulations for housing provided to farmworkers by their employers.	2025
9. Adopt a program to subsidize application processing fees for qualifying developments where all units are affordable to 80% AMI or lower when funding is available.	Ongoing
10. Continue providing CDBG funds to the Fair Housing Foundation to provide fair housing activities to the community.	

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs
Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in the City of Orange.

Contributing Factors: 1. Lack of sufficient affordable housing	
Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. The City will assist in preserving at-risk units by, but not limited to, supporting non-profit applications for funding to purchase at-risk units, work with property owners to maintain affordability and develop preservation strategies, and assist with funding when available.	Ongoing
2. The City will continue to seek qualified non-profit organizations for acquisition, construction, and rehabilitation of affordable housing. Funds will be available annually, contingent on funding availability.	Annually
3. The City will continue to encourage through outreach to private and non-profit housing developers, the development of rental and for-sale housing for larger (5 or more individuals) families. The City will support developers/builders that incorporate larger bedroom counts (3 or more bedrooms) to accommodate the needs of larger families and reduce incidents of overcrowding in the existing housing stock. The City will evaluate providing regulatory incentives such as density bonuses that encourage and support the development of housing for large families on a project-by-project basis.	Ongoing
4. The City will develop a program to subsidize application processing fees, when funding is available, for qualifying developments where all units affordable to 80% AMI or lower. The City will also promote the benefits of this program to the	Ongoing

development community by posting information on its webpage and creating a handout to be distributed with land development applications.	

Q. Rancho Santa Margarita

Issue: Concentration
Most of the City's population is predominantly White, with greater diversity in the neighborhoods east of SR-241. There are no publicly supported housing units. Some vouchers are in use in the northeast part of the city, which is a low-medium concentration area.

Contributing Factors:
1. Location and type of affordable housing available
2. Land use and zoning laws that limit affordable housing development
3. Limited resources for fair housing agencies and organizations.
4. Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Continue to serve as a liaison between the public and appropriate agencies in matters concerning housing discrimination within the City.	Ongoing
2. Provide annual fair housing literature to schools, libraries, and post offices. Make information available via the City's fair housing service provider. Review annually to ensure that the posters and literature being provided are up to date.	Annually
3. In coordination with OCHA and fair housing services provider, conduct biennial landlord education campaign to educate property owners about state law prohibiting discrimination based on household income. Provide public information and brochures regarding fair housing/equal housing opportunity requirements, including how to file a complaint and access the investigation and enforcement activities of the state Fair Employment and Housing Commission. Make said information available on the City's website and at City Hall. Review information annually to ensure that any materials, links, and information provided are current.	Biennial campaigns; annual review of information on website
4. In collaboration with the Orange County Housing Authority (OCHA): 　a. Attend quarterly OCHA Housing Advisory Committee to enhance the exchange of information regarding the availability, procedures, and policies related to the Housing Assistance Voucher program and regional housing issues. 　b. Support OCHA's affirmative fair marketing plan and de-concentration policies by providing five-year and annual PHA plan certifications.	Ongoing
5. Monitor FBI data annually to determine if any hate crimes are housing-related and if the City's fair housing service provider can take action to address potential discrimination linked to the bias motivations of hate crimes.	Annually

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities	
Residents across the city have relatively high access to opportunities, except for access to transit. Homeownership rates in the city are higher for all groups when compared to the County. However, Hispanic households have the lowest homeownership rate, and it is 20 percentage points lower than the AAPI homeownership rate, which is the highest rate in the city.	

Contributing Factors:	
1. Location of employers 2. Availability, type, frequency, and reliability of public transportation 3. Location and type of affordable housing available	

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Request the Orange County Transportation Authority explore bus route options to ensure neighborhoods with concentration of low-income or protected class populations have access to transportation services.	Ongoing
2. Update the City's Circulation element to better facilitate multimodal transportation to/from the lower opportunity Census Tracts to goods and services.	By mid-March 2025.
3. In cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority, provide community education regarding transport services for individuals with disabilities.	Ongoing

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs

Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in Rancho Santa Margarita.

Contributing Factors:
1. Economic displacement
2. Environmental hazards such as wildland fires and the interface with urban areas

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Support local eviction prevention strategies to reduce the number of homeless individuals and families (homelessness prevention services).	Annually
2. Update the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan by December 2024 to ensure community resiliency from hazards.	By mid-2025
3. Conduct outreach to landlords and support OCHA's mobility counseling program to increase Housing Choice Vouchers in the city.	Increase Housing Choice Vouchers through the Orange County Housing Authority by 5% between 2021-2029.

R.   San Clemente

Issue: Concentration, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs
The majority of the city is considered an area of high White concentration, except for one Census Tract encompassing neighborhoods north and east of Max Berg Plaza Park, which is classified as low-medium concentration. There is a cluster of publicly supported housing units in this low-medium concentration area. Based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities may disproportionately experience discrimination in housing. Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in San Clemente.

Contributing Factors:
1. Unaffordable rents and sales prices in a range of sizes, the location and type of affordable housing, and an overall shortage of subsidized housing units 2. Displacement of residents due to economic pressures 3. Cost of repairs or rehabilitation 4. Dominance of single-family housing, which is typically more expensive than multi-family housing 5. Lack of fair housing education and outreach

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Annually promote equal access to fair housing information for all residents. Expand outreach methods beyond traditional media (newspaper or City website) to include other social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. Focus fair housing outreach efforts in the area along the western side of Interstate 5 where racial/ethnic minorities and LMI households are concentrated.	Annually, with the goal to increase distribution of information by 20% between 2021-2029
2. Continue to work under contract with the Fair Housing Foundation (FHF) and/or other qualified fair housing service providers to provide fair housing services for all segments of the community.	Serve at least 50 households each year. Annually evaluate and adjust the scope of services to ensure the City address any emerging trends in fair housing issues.
3. In coordination with OCHA and fair housing services provider, provide outreach and education to landlords and tenants regarding the state's new source of income protection (SB 329 and SB 229) that recognizes public assistance such as Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) and Veterans Assistance Supportive Housing (VASH) as legitimate source of income for rent	Conduct outreach and education annually; increase vouchers from Orange County Housing Authority by 10% between 2021-2029.

payments. Specifically, provide fair housing responsibility to new ADU applicants.	
4. Help non-profits acquire and convert market-rate housing to affordable housing	Ongoing
5. Work to preserve the City's affordable housing inventory	Ongoing
6. Offer a variety of housing opportunities to enhance mobility among residents of all races and ethnicities by facilitating affordable housing throughout the community through the following actions:	Goal of creating 446 affordable units for lower income households between 2021 and 2029
a. Promote by-right approvals to facilitate at least one new multi-family housing project with at least 20% of units for lower income households	2021-2029
b. Promote Lot Consolidation program and incentives to at least three developers.	2021-2029
c. Implement the City's Affordable Housing Overlay to facilitate at least one new multi-family housing project	2021-2029
d. Promote the City's Inclusionary Housing Program to facilitate at least one multi-family housing project with units affordable for lower income households	2021-2029
7. Provide rehabilitation financing assistance through the Neighborhood Revitalization Program and advertise this program to the western and southern areas of the City with older housing units and overpaying households.	Assist at least two homeowners per year
8. Increase public outreach to at least once a year and encourage residents to learn about available housing programs.	Annually
9. Through the City's fair housing service provider (FHF) increase materials distribution by 25% through the following actions:	
a. Provide fair housing education and information to apartment managers and homeowner associations on why denial of reasonable modifications/ accommodations is unlawful through fair housing service contract at least once a year.	Annually
b. Conduct multi-faceted fair housing outreach at least once a year to tenants, landlords, property owners, realtors, and property management companies. Methods of outreach may include workshops, informational booths, presentations to community	Annually

	groups, and distribution of multilingual fair housing literature.	
c.	Provide general fair housing counseling and referral services to address tenant landlord issues and investigate allegations of fair housing discrimination and take appropriate actions to reconcile cases or refer to appropriate authorities.	Ongoing
d.	Periodically monitor local newspapers and online media outlets to identify potentially discriminatory housing advertisements.	Annually
e.	Include testing/audits within the scope of work with fair housing provider.	Ongoing

S.   Santa Ana

Issue: Segregation and R/ECAPs
There is moderate segregation between Hispanic and White residents, and between AAPI and White. The majority of the city is considered an area of high POC segregation and has a predominantly Hispanic population except for the Riverview West community which is predominantly AAPI. There are lots of publicly supported housing units downtown and southeast of downtown, which are high POC segregation areas. There is a higher concentration of vouchers, as well as some publicly supported housing units, west of the Santa Ana River, which is also a high POC segregation area. There is a R/ECAP covering multiple Census Tracts in the downtown area. These tracts are predominantly Hispanic, as are all the surrounding neighborhoods.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of fair housing education and outreach 2. Lack of affordable housing

Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Ensure all City programs and activities relating to housing and community development are administered in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing.	Ongoing
2. Hold annual small apartment managers' workshop to train and educate property owners, HOAs, property managers, and tenants about best practices in property management, neighborhood safety, and landlord/tenant responsibilities.	Annually
3. Periodically prepare the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice to identify, remove, and/or mitigate potential impediments to fair housing in Santa Ana.	Every 5 years
4. Partner with legal assistance organizations to provide legal clinics for tenants on tenants' rights and recourse for intimidation and unjust evictions.	Annually

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities

Hispanic residents are more likely than other groups to be exposed to poverty in their neighborhoods and are less likely than other groups to live in close proximity to high performing schools, or in neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital. Geographically, neighborhoods downtown, west of downtown, and southeast of downtown have low economic scores, low education scores, high poverty rates, and poor environmental quality. Neighborhoods in the north and south of the city have better economic and education scores.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of affordable housing
2. Lack of public investment in low opportunity areas

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Publish preapproved ADU plans and publicize ADU program through dedicated web page in various languages to facilitate ADU construction.	Facilitate construction of 723 ADUs between 2021-2029
2. Enforce the City's inclusionary housing ordinance, known as the Affordable Housing Opportunity & Creation Ordinance (AHOCO), to require eligible housing development projects of five or more units, including condominium conversions, to include at least 15 percent of the units as affordable to low-income households; or 10 percent of the units affordable to very low-income households; or 5 percent to extremely low-income households; or a minimum of 10 percent available affordable households with five (5)5 percent to low- income, 3 percent to very low-income, and 2 percent to extremely low-income households, for rental housing. Require 5 percent of the units as affordable to moderate-income households for for-sale housing.	Ongoing
3. Establish guidelines as part of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update for new housing development projects to include a variety of unit sizes, including units for large families, that are affordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income families.	By December 2025
4. Annually monitor the status of at-risk housing projects, specifically the Warwick Square, Highland Manor, and other projects that may come due. Contact owners of properties at risk of conversion within one year of expiration to discuss City's desire to preserve projects as affordable housing.	Annually
5. Assist low-income households with down payment assistance loans of up to $120,000 and moderate-income households with loans of up to $80,000.	Annually

6. Create, assist, and support neighborhood associations, especially in R/ECAP and TCAC Census Tracts, to collaborate on projects and sponsor and hold annual events.	Annually
7. Complete infrastructure improvements in residential neighborhoods consistent with the City's Capital Improvement Plan.	Ongoing
8. Through the City's RFP process for Affordable Housing Development (see program 2), facilitate and encourage the development in the Transit Zoning Code plan area of varied housing types at a mix of affordability levels, including for lower income households using appropriate incentives, such as awarding bonus points to developers whose projects provide at least 75% or more for the units for extremely low-income families at 30% Area Median Income.	Annually

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs
Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in Santa Ana. Additionally, more than 20% of housing units are overcrowded in most of the city's neighborhoods.

Contributing Factors:
1. High cost of housing in the private market
2. High cost of housing repairs/rehabilitation

Actions:	**Timeframe:**
1. Implement the City's Rent Stabilization and Just Cause Eviction Ordinance for tenants facing housing instability, including ongoing outreach and education, a program monitor system, and a schedule of penalties that may be imposed for noncompliance. Provide tenant protections beyond state mandates.	Annually
2. Provide housing assistance payments to eligible households participating in the Housing Choice Voucher Program and adhere to policies and procedures in the federal regulations and the Housing Choice Voucher Program Administrative Plan. Administer 100 percent of the funding provided to the Housing Authority annually for eligible households. This includes Special Purpose Vouchers including the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program; Mainstream Voucher Program; Foster Youth to Independence Program; and Emergency Housing Voucher Program. The objectives are to: 1) Utilize 100 percent of the Annual Budget Authority provided by HUD for each CY; 2) Apply for new funding opportunities for additional vouchers; 3) Retain High Performer SEMAP status; 4) Communicate on a regular basis with active landlords by providing information on key program updates.	Ongoing

3.	Contract with a local nonprofit organization (currently Habitat for Humanity) to implement the City's Residential Rehabilitation Grant Program. Provide grants for the repair and rehabilitation of single-family and mobile homes, prioritizing applicants in R/ECAP and TCAC Census Tracts and low-income households.	Annually
4.	Enhance local preferences program for residents working and living in Santa Ana who are seeking affordable housing. Explore a right-of-first-refusal ordinance for mobile home parks and publicly supported multifamily residential properties to minimize tenant displacement and preserve affordable housing stock. Evaluate and pursue collective ownership models for mobile home parks as a tool to prevent displacement.	Ongoing

T.   Tustin

Issue: Segregation
There is moderate segregation between Hispanic and White residents. There is a concentration of publicly supported housing units in the south, in neighborhoods that are predominantly AAPI.

Contributing Factors:
1.   Lack of affordable housing opportunities.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Engage linguistically isolated communities by translating official City announcements (i.e., community meeting, hearings, etc.) to Spanish and disseminating printed copies of information to renters, property owners, and via social media, to expand knowledge of affordable housing options in High Opportunity Areas.	Ongoing
2. Conduct at least one community informational meeting in areas that lack affordable housing opportunities and that exhibit high segregation, on an annual basis.	Annually
3. Improve housing conditions in segregated areas establishing a multi-family quality rental housing inspection program that focuses on high segregation areas. The City will receive at least one monthly referral from the City's Neighborhood Improvement Task Force (NITF) (NITF includes Code Enforcement, Police, Social Service/County, School District representatives, City staff form various Departments) to identify households in need of this tenant protection and anti-displacement focused program; focused on improving the quality of single family and multi-family residential dwellings by providing technical assistance and funds to repairs substandard housing conditions. The City will conduct at least five multi-family quality rental housing inspections in the program's first year and will increase the number of annual inspections by 2, each year thereafter, until 2029.	2025 through 2029

Issue: Disparities in Access to Opportunities

Hispanic residents (especially those living below the FPL) are less likely than other groups to live in close proximity to high performing schools, or in neighborhoods with high labor force participation and human capital; and are more likely to be exposed to poverty in their neighborhoods. Additionally, based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

Homeownership rates are very low for Black and Hispanic households, equaling less than half of the homeownership rate for AAPI and White households.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of affordable housing in high opportunity areas.
2. Lack of public and private investment in low-resource neighborhoods.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Create an ADU/SB 9 accelerator program and focus in High Opportunity Areas within the northeast portion of the City where there are predominately single-family residences to expand housing choices. This program could include a permit fee waiver for affordable housing units, permit fast tracking, and technical assistance.	By 2025, the City will adopt a program and mail out information pertaining to the new accelerator program for ADUs and SB 9 developments, specifically to high opportunity areas.
2. Provide technical assistance and permit fast-tracking for new ADU/SB9 development proposals and at least six projects that include housing affordable to lower income households annually through 2029.	Fast track a minimum of 10 ADU and/or SB 9 developments in high opportunity areas on an annual basis; reduce review times by 25% compared to year 2022.
3. Translate the City's Tustin Housing Authority website and factsheets promoting affordable housing opportunities and ancillary support services, such as transit and childcare, into Spanish, and distribute to low resource areas.	Annually, 2023 through 2029
4. Tustin Legacy (Tract 744.15) is a Master Planned Community being developed. Although the tract has been identified as low resource, it has been substantially enhanced with new resources within recent years. The area comprises 1,500 acres, of which 800 acres remain for future development of a diverse housing stock, community amenities, and resources. By 2029, the City will continue to implement projects that increase assets in the Specific Plan area as proposed by developers and identified in the Tustin Legacy Backbone Infrastructure	By 2029, the City anticipates the Tustin Legacy (Tract 744.15) to be identified as a "high resource" area according to TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map criteria.

Program. Improvements will provide increased access to safe and decent housing, transportation, recreation, and a healthy environment.	
5. Create a "Financial Assistance for Child Care" webpage with information and links to Children's Home Society of California (CHS) and the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE). These programs provide funding to low-income families for childcare services. The City will work with Tustin Preschool, Kiddie Academy of Tustin, or other local preschool programs within Census Tract 755.14 to advertise and promote financial assistance through pamphlets, e-blasts, and other applicable online community forums (such as Facebook and NextDoor).	By December 2022; update annually thereafter

Issue: Disproportionate Housing Needs
Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in Tustin.
Contributing Factors: 1. Lack of affordable housing.   2. Substandard housing in low-resource areas.   3. High cost of housing repairs/rehabilitation.

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. The City will partner with a non-profit to develop and launch a CDBG funded Housing Rehabilitation Program to facilitate the repair of dilapidated housing to address lack of plumbing, kitchen facilities and repairs to provide relief of overcrowding. Program participants will be provided grants and/or loans to conduct necessary housing updates.	Starting in July 2024, the program will facilitate four (4) rehabilitation projects to assist with reducing overcrowding per year and another four (4) projects will assist with general habitability repairs, with a total of eight (8) dwellings assisted annually.
2. The City will amend the zoning code to require all new multi-family projects to provide at least five (5) percent large family units (3+ bedrooms) which will prevent overcrowding and further cost burden, by addressing demand for such units and increasing the large units into the local housing inventory.	Zoning code amended by January 2024. Four (4) large family units will be generated annually, and 32 total by 2029.
3. Improve housing conditions in segregated areas establishing a multi-family quality rental housing inspection program that focuses on high segregation areas. The City will receive at least one monthly referral	2025 through 2029

from the City's Neighborhood Improvement Task Force (NITF) (NITF includes Code Enforcement, Police, Social Service/County, School District representatives, City staff form various Departments) to identify households in need of this tenant protection and anti-displacement focused program; focused on improving the quality of single family and multi-family residential dwellings by providing technical assistance and funds to repairs substandard housing conditions. The City will conduct at least five multi-family quality rental housing inspections in the program's first year and will increase the number of annual inspections by 2, each year thereafter, until 2029.	

U.   Westminster

Issue: Segregation, Disparities in Access to Opportunities, and Disproportionate Housing Needs

The majority of the city is considered an area of high POC segregation and has a predominantly AAPI population with a few exceptions. The northwestern corner of the city, between I-405 and Bolsa Chica Rd is an area of high White segregation. The location of publicly supported housing units and areas with highest concentration of vouchers aligns with the high POC segregation areas in the central part of the city. There are no publicly supported housing units, and fewer vouchers in use, in the western parts of the city that are high White segregation, racially integrated, and low-medium segregation areas.

AAPI residents are more likely than other groups to be exposed to poverty in their neighborhoods and are less likely than other groups to live in close proximity to high performing schools or jobs. Native American residents living below the FPL are also less likely to live in close proximity to high performing schools or jobs. Additionally, based on analysis of fair housing complaint data, individuals with disabilities disproportionately experience discrimination in housing.

There are large racial/ethnic disparities in homeownership. Black, Hispanic, and Native American households have the lowest rates (around 30%), and these rates are less than half the homeownership rate for White households, which is the highest in the city. The AAPI homeownership rate in the city is lower than in the County overall and is nearly 20 percentage points lower than the White homeownership rate in the city.

Housing cost burden is an issue for renters across Orange County, including in Westminster.

Contributing Factors:
1. Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations
2. Land use and zoning laws.
3. Displacement of residents due to economic pressures.
4. Location and type of affordable housing.
5. Lack of private investment in specific neighborhoods.
6. Lack of community revitalization strategies

Actions:	Timeframe:
1. Maintain an inventory of the available sites for residential development and post it online (with annual updates) and provide it to prospective residential developers upon request. Monitor development trends to ensure continued ability to meet the RHNA.	Ongoing
2. Continue to perform project-by-project evaluation to determine if adequate capacity remains for the remaining RHNA.	Ongoing
3. Adopt new mixed-use zoning districts and rezone all sites identified in the City's most recent Housing Element to accommodate shortfall housing need, consistent with the densities, acreages, and capacity	Completed

levels identified in the Housing Element. Complete all rezoning pursuant to Government Code Section 65583.2, subdivisions (h) and (i).	
4. Encourage and facilitate construction of ADUs through the following actions:	
a. Update the City's ADU Ordinance to reflect state law.	2025
b. Prepare pre-approved ADU design templates, tailored to meet specific zoning and building standards. Use of these design templates by a potential developer would ensure that the proposed ADU meets most, if not all, required standards at the outset of the development process, minimizing and streamlining the review process. This is expected to significantly incentivize production of ADUs by removing costs, reducing approval timeframes, and providing high application certainty.	Completed
c. Promote development of ADUs by continuing to provide written information at the City's planning counter and on the City's website and update it annually.	Ongoing
d. Monitor ADU permit applications and approvals annually through the Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) process; identify and implement additional incentives or other strategies including rezoning, as appropriate, to ensure adequate sites during the planning period. Should ADU production fall short of projections for three consecutive APR reporting periods then new incentives, strategies, and/or rezoning shall be implemented within six months of the third submitted APR.	Annually
e. Promote the City's ADU Process Guide (available on the City's website).	Ongoing
f. Host an annual workshop on accessory dwelling units, including guidance for development and common questions and answers.	Annually
g. Continue requesting information on rental rates to determine their affordability and review this information annually against the projects identified in the Housing Element.	Annually
5. For all project applications, identify need for replacement of affordable housing units and ensure replacement, if required, occurs.	Ongoing
6. Use HOME Funds and Housing Successor Funds to increase affordable housing production through the following actions:	
a. Provide HOME Funds and Housing Successor Funds to assist development such as for the purpose of acquisition and/or	2021-2029

subsidizing the cost of land acquisition and off-site improvements for construction of 100 new affordable housing units.	
b. Use HOME Funds and Housing Successor Funds to acquire 16 multifamily or single-family units to be rehabilitated by a nonprofit and restricted to low-income rental housing.	2021-2029
c. Contact local service providers and developers annually and inform them of the potential partnerships with the Housing Division through paperless methods such as phone calls, email, and online postings.	Annually
7. Encourage development of affordable and special needs housing opportunities	
a. Contact affordable housing providers (including non-profit providers) annually to encourage them to develop affordable housing for low-/very-low-income households and the disabled in Westminster.	Annually
b. Maintain on the City's website an inventory of sites suitable for the development of affordable housing for low-income households and households with special needs and update it annually.	Ongoing
c. Support and prepare applications for funding annually.	Annually
d. Provide incentives and concessions to developers to assist in the development of housing for lower income households or households with special needs, such as flexible development standards, expedited processing, and support from state funding including SB 2 Planning Grants and Permanent Local Housing Allocation. The preparation of flexible development standards and expedited processing for projects including affordable units will be addressed through the City's Zoning Code Update.	2022-2025
e. Explore additional funding sources and strategies such as boomerang funds and financing districts to assist the development of housing for lower income households on a biennial basis.	Ongoing
8. Continue to make available the City's application submittal packet to provide interested builders or service providers with Density Bonus information through paperless methods such as online postings. Provide printed copies at the front counter. Meet with developers to explain the process and requirements.	Ongoing
9. Maintain a Zoning Code that is consistent with state law regarding low barrier navigation centers, supportive housing, employee housing, and	Ongoing

farmworker housing; and update the Zoning Code as needed to comply with future changes.	
10. If an application to convert a residential development to a condominium/stock cooperative is submitted to the City, the provisions of the City's condominium conversion ordinance shall be implemented and enforced.	Ongoing
11. Implement the mobile home park conversion ordinance by requiring applicants to (a) identify the quantity and conditions of each lower-income household/unit, and (b), upon approval of a permit to convert a mobile home park, implement mitigation measures that fully mitigate the net loss of low-income households.	Ongoing
12. Conduct a Displacement Risk Analysis Study to identify the local conditions that lead to displacement and develop and implement an action program based on the results. Identify potential partners to participate in the study that specialize in eviction-related topics related to displacement, such as the Fair Housing Foundation. Annually monitor program effectiveness.	2021-2029
13. Implement incentives that will facilitate lot consolidation and increase the overall feasibility of affordable housing projects; as part of the City's Zoning Code Update, incorporate specific development standards that support lot consolidation, such as a reduction in parking standards, shared parking arrangements in mixed-use projects, a reduction of minimum unit size, and modification of setback requirements. Apply annually for grant funding to prepare conceptual development plans on consolidated lots.	2022-2025 for code update and annually for grant funding
14. Address substandard housing through the following actions:	
a. Using the land use data generated from the General Plan Update, adopted in 2020, combined with the data generated from the 2007 Housing Conditions Survey, identify multifamily projects with the most significant level of deterioration for the purpose of providing loans for rehabilitation of multifamily units, subject to the applicable funding source requirements.	2021-2029
b. Provide funding through the Neighborhood Pride Multi-Family Rental Rehabilitation Program to bring at least 14 substandard units up to code.	2021-2029
c. Continue to conduct annual community workshops explaining code compliance issues. Prepare and distribute a Good Neighbor Guide describing how residents can maintain a healthy, safe, and appealing property.	2021-2029

d. Continue to utilize the Community Preservation Unit to assist with community education and neighborhood maintenance.	2021-2029
15. Increase fair housing knowledge and enforcement through the following actions:	
a. Continue to make available a program directory or list of housing resources (including resources and regulatory opportunities such as the Secondary Unit Ordinance) to the public through the City's website and in City Hall.	Ongoing
b. Continue to advertise the City's reasonable accommodations provisions using the City's website, brochures, and other forms of appropriate media. Ensure continued use of the City's reasonable accommodation provisions, by processing in a timely manner any application requesting a reasonable accommodation.	Ongoing
c. Continue the City's commitment to working with the Fair Housing Foundation and disseminating fair housing information at City Hall, public libraries, the Chamber of Commerce, and on the City's website. Include within the annual budget adequate funding to continue the contract with the Fair Housing service provider.	Annually