

April 2010

## Sustainable and Inclusive Growth: Housing Opportunities for Latino Communities

By Ulises A. Gonzalez, 2009–2010 CHCI National Association of Realtors Graduate Housing Fellow

*[A major trend in the United States] is the disappearance of housing policy as a public issue over the past two decades... Housing is all but invisible as a social policy issue, and this is particularly problematic in light of the nation's growing diversity and sharp economic inequality.*

— Xavier De Souza Briggs, *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America*

### Introduction

A viable Latino community depends on developing an environment envisioned through principles of urban sustainability and housing affordability. As the current housing crisis unfolds, unsustainable housing finance policies bring economic distress across the country, especially among minority communities. Many Latinos face foreclosure, homelessness, and loss of wealth, which greatly impacts the overall United States economy (Bowler, Quercia, and Smith 2010). The federal government has begun discussing sustainable communities and ensuring that housing policies are being implemented in a more inclusive manner free of discrimination. Various experts have noted that housing policy has traditionally emphasized homeownership and disregarded a large segment of the population who rent their homes (Briggs 2005: p. 3-4). As the fastest growing community in the United States, Latinos must be beneficiaries of community development trends, such as “sustainability” through affordable housing. This paper explores the benefits of sustainability, highlights urban problems faced in the United States, summarizes the role of the federal government in developing sustainable and inclusive cities, and presents information on the Latino community. In light of recent housing trends, this brief provides recommendations that can give Latinos access to sustainable communities and affordable housing.

### Background

#### *Design Concepts of Sustainable Cities and the Benefits to Communities*

A sustainable community encompasses a wide variety of principles. Sustainability theory aims to encourage regions to strategically plan their communities to promote a green and healthier environment and improve the quality of life. In a recent publication, Levi, et al (2010) highlight the key concepts of sustainability:

1. *Compactness* — urban areas should be limited in how much they can expand by preventing their boundaries from growing.
2. *Sustainable Transport* — cities should support walking, cycling and efficient public transport.
3. *Density* — people should live in higher densities; there should be more people and dwelling units in a given area.
4. *Mixed Land Uses* — compatible land uses, such as housing, commercial areas, and offices, should be located close to each other.
5. *Housing Diversity*: different types, styles, and densities within urban areas.
6. *Social Diversity*: a variety of income-level groups and cultures within urban areas.
7. *Passive Solar Design* — the design, setting, orientation, layout and landscaping of buildings should be optimized for solar gain.
8. *Greening* — more nature should be integrated into cities through parks, street trees, etc.

A sustainable community also incorporates public transporta-

tion and urban design to produce an environment that is livable with associated social, psychological, and health benefits to its residents (Levi, et al, 2010; Chiesura, 2004; Van den Berg, Hartig and Staats, 2007).

### ***The Benefits of Public Transportation***

Public transportation can alleviate car dependency and encourage people to use alternative forms of transportation (walking, biking, and riding the bus or other mass transit). Euclidean zoning (a system that segregates land use by type) has dominated the United States and produced a sprawled environment that depends heavily on the automobile (Hall 2007). People living in residential areas separated from commercial and urban cores depend on the car to shop and get to work, producing long commute times. Mass transportation connects urban districts, reduces auto dependency, and encourages a healthier environment (with less carbon emissions and traffic nuisances). Therefore, coordinating land use and transportation are essential for a feasible urban transportation system.

### ***The Benefits of Compact Communities and Urban Design***

Sustainability encompasses the following ideas: compact cities, higher buildings, open spaces, walkable streets, and mix-use development (Levi, et. Al., 2010) that have various environmental and economic benefits. Integration of these sustainable concepts can have the following benefits:

- A compact and dense city uses land efficiently, thereby giving opportunity for more parks, urban forests, and saving agricultural land. Environmental psychologists state that access to nature, such as parks, provides people with an avenue to exercise, relieve stress, and live healthier lifestyles (Van den Berg, Hartig and Staats, 2007).
- Architects and urban planners can design cities to encourage walkability. A walkable environment brings people to the streets to shop and encourages an active lifestyle. Therefore, a streetscape plan (that integrates sidewalks, building facades, street signs, and safety) is beneficial because it connects pedestrians to public transportation options and other economic amenities, like grocery stores.
- Mix-use development brings compatible land uses together to provide better access to urban amenities. Mixing residential and commercial areas not only reduces car use but also encourages people to walk and shop along the streets. Mix-use development brings street life and opportunity for commercial activity.

### ***Livability***

A livable environment can enhance the quality of life by producing an environment that generates opportunities for people to access amenities and foster human contact (Del Rio, Levi, & Duarte, 2010). Scholars define a livable environment as:

*“...places that people like, satisfy their needs, promote human*

*health, and contribute to a sustainable ecosystem. The livability of an urban environment relates to features that promote residential and neighborhood satisfaction, a sense of community, and environmental sustainability.” (Levi, et. al., 2010)*

People who live in places that have access to parks, walkable neighborhoods, public transportation, and is integrated with nature (with trees and urban forest) are healthier (Oakes, Forsyth, and Schmitz 2007) and feel a stronger sense of belonging to a community that fosters human and social relationships.

### ***“Geography of Opportunity”***

A sustainable environment has a wide range of benefits, but few people have access to sustainable neighborhoods. Many cities in the United States have started implementing “...sustainability programs.... Although many of these programs are well intentioned... most fall short of addressing social justice and equity...” (Agyeman and Tomevans, 2003: p. 38). A challenge of urban development is the ability to regulate economic forces and integrate housing affordability in communities that have access to urban amenities. As a result from high land prices, segregation, housing mobility, access to jobs, and local land use policies (zoning) has shaped the geography of the United States with regions of concentrated poverty and inequities (Briggs, 2005).

### ***Cost of Land***

Sustainable development (often referred to as “smart growth”) tends to increase land prices and thus limits those with lower-income levels to access quality housing options. According to one source, the economic effects of smart growth “...places upward pressure on prices of both new and existing units, making housing less affordable than it would otherwise be” (Down 2005: p. 270). Therefore, “Smart growth cannot be really socially just and responsible unless it includes a significant element of affordable housing. That would make it truly smart” (Downs 2005: 274).

### ***Racial Segregation and Access to Opportunity***

The United States faces high levels of racial segregation (Wilkes and Iceland, 2004). Due to high land prices, lower-income individuals will move to more affordable neighborhoods. Scholars have cited the impact of segregation and determined that housing is a key determinate for health, education, job access, and safety (Briggs, 2005; Valenzuela, 2000). Racially segregated neighborhoods face the following: “...high poverty and high crime rates,... high rates of school failure and other signs of distress, [which] have contributed to persistent poverty and racial inequality in a wide variety of outcomes” (de Souza, Briggs, and Keys, 2009, p. 430). Therefore, sustainable communities should emphasize and ensure affordable housing for diverse income groups. Affordable housing in sustainable communities would give more Latinos (the future of the U.S. workforce and economy) access to socio-economic benefits associated with living in a sustainable environment.

### ***Housing Mobility and Access to Jobs***

The lack of housing mobility is another significant reason people stay in impoverished neighborhoods. Housing mobility is the ability to move out to a new neighborhood. Urban scholars indicate, "...housing mobility continued to be the most important mode of exit from poor tracts..." (de Souza, Briggs, and Keys, 2009: p. 429). The ability to move out from a poor neighborhood can provide access to better opportunities, such as better schools and closer job opportunities. Several academics have noted that "Central city residents (most who are...Latino....) are not connected (mismatched) to jobs nearest their place of residence" (Kasandra, 1983; Wilson, 1987; Valenzuela, 2000).

### **Zoning**

Sentiments against higher-density zoning have produced racial segregation in U.S. urban areas. "Throughout the twentieth century, affluent Whites have taken political actions to separate themselves spatially from perceived out-groups—first Southern and Eastern European immigrants, then African — Americans, and most recently Hispanics...." (Rothwell and Douglas, 2009: p. 780). NIMBY (not in my back yard) sentiments have influenced local land policies and thus reduced the amount of affordable housing in many communities. Urban planning trends show that affluent communities do not want to live near affordable housing communities for various reasons. Reflecting upon city planning hearings, affordable housing projects are associated with immigrants, lower income residents, higher density buildings, and additional traffic that all affect the community's environment. These negative sentiments often drive the development of affordable housing away from affluent communities because of the "nuisances" associated with affordable housing. Rothwell and Douglas (2009) determined that "...anti-density zoning increases Black residential segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas by reducing the quantity of affordable housing in White jurisdictions" (Rothwell and Douglas, 2009: p. 779). Therefore, increasing density can help reduce segregation because it can facilitate the financing of affordable housing. Housing developers cannot feasibly provide a significant amount of affordable housing, without incentives, because it would not be profitable. Density bonuses<sup>1</sup> can be used as incentives for a developer to build more units and ensure a percentage of their total housing remains affordable (this planning tool is referred to as "inclusionary housing"). Higher density would provide the opportunity to accommodate households living in proximity to opportunities rather than living on the margins of a neighborhood.

### ***The Role of the Federal Government in Sustainable Housing and Communities***

Leadership is key to implementing programs that address affordable housing and sustainability (Downs, 2005: 272). Creating "cities of opportunity" through such programs is at the forefront of federal policy. As a result, the Obama administration has made urban policy an administrative priority through the establishment of the new Office of Urban Policy. The purpose of this new office is to coordinate and review the programs of federal agencies with programs or efforts that pertain to urban development.

Similarly, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has created a new office of Sustainable Housing and Communities tasked to research and address how HUD can help create green, sustainable, and livable communities in the United States. Innovation, collaboration, and communication amongst the federal agencies and offices provide a critical foundation to address issues of sustainability.

Accumulation of wealth begins by having a safe, stable, and affordable home that is near to good schools, jobs, transportation, hospitals, public facilities, and amenities (Katz, Turner, Brown, Cunningham, and Sawyer, 2003, 89). The Obama Administration has recognized that "...45 percent of all renters and two-thirds of poor renters live in central cities. Low-income families, many of them minorities, live in neighborhoods that limit access to quality jobs, good schools and opportunities to create wealth" (US Department of Housing and Urban Development, FY 2010 Budget: pg 23). Consequently, HUD and other agencies have allocated funding and collaborated to address sustainability and affordable housing. For example, the following excerpts highlight two HUD programs that address sustainable communities.

**"Sustainable Communities Initiative:** HUD requests \$150 million for a new Sustainable Communities Initiative to integrate transportation and housing planning and decisions in a way that maximizes choices for residents and businesses, lowers transportation costs and drives more sustainable development patterns. Funding for this initiative would be set aside from the proposed increase in the CDBG program" (US Department of Housing and Urban Development, FY 2010 Budget: pg 25).

**Choice Neighborhoods:** Transforming public housing will remain a central objective of the program, but at \$113 million in its first year, it does not measure up to the levels of HOPE VI funding in the late 1990s, which approached \$700 million a year or the equivalent of about 15-20 annual project grants of around \$35 million each. The U.S. Department of Education has recently announced a companion grant program called "Promise Neighborhoods", which is modeled on the Harlem Children's Zone, which seeks to coordinate a broad range of social and educational activities all within one individual neighborhood. (Urban Land Institute 2009)

Further, in 2009, The Urban Land Institute cited a collaboration between HUD, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) as follows:

HUD, US-DOT, EPA and US-DOE work in a more collaborative manner around the six "**livability principles**" laid out by agency directors at the beginning of June in testimony before the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. Donovan concluded by stating his belief that housing in the United States remains the "essential source

of stability” for all citizens and that “the hopes and dreams of all Americans should not be limited by where one lives.” (Urban Land Institute 2009)

### Summarizing the Demographics, Socio-Economic, Housing Characteristics, and Transportation Patterns of the Latino Community

This section outlines the current state of the Latino community across the United States by presenting U.S. Census data of communities with a high concentration of the Latino population. Overall, data show that Latinos are concentrated in major metropolitan areas, have lower incomes than the average household, overpay for housing, are more likely to rent rather than own their homes, and have unique transportation characteristics.

#### Demographic Profile

The top five most populated cities in the U.S. have large Latino populations. One out of every four children under the age of five in the United States is Latino (Murguia, 2010). Table 1 shows cities with the highest numbers of the Latino population: New York City, Los Angeles, Houston, San Antonio, and Chicago.

**Table 1. Large Places in Total Population and Hispanic Population**

Place and State	Total Population	Hispanic Population	% Hispanic of total Population
New York, NY	8,308,163	2,287,905	0.28
Los Angeles, CA	3,749,058	1,815,005	0.48
Houston, TX	2,024,379	849,226	0.42
San Antonio, TX	1,277,322	782,220	0.61
Chicago, IL	2,725,206	758,877	0.28

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

Investing in developing these metropolitan areas can have a significant impact on the Latino community. However, one should not overlook smaller urban municipalities. Data shows there are smaller cities with high concentration of Latinos that should also receive specific attention due to racial inequities, such as lower income, lower educational attainment, and health outcomes. Table 2 highlights various cities in the United States that have a high concentration of Latinos. For example, El Paso (TX), Santa Ana (CA), Miami (FL), Laredo (TX), Hialeah (FL), Oxnard (CA), East Los Angeles (CA), McAllen (TX), and El Monte (CA) are smaller cities with a high percentage of Latinos proportionate to the total population. These smaller cities have the highest concentration of Latinos and providing access to sustainable transportation and housing can ensure that smaller and growing cities with the high rates of poverty have an opportunity for economic growth.

**Table 2. Large Places in Total Population and Hispanic Population**

Place and State	Total Population	Hispanic Population	% Hispanic of total Population
Los Angeles, CA	3,749,058	1,815,005	0.48
El Paso, TX	593,496	475,014	0.80
San Diego, CA	503,941	341,800	0.68
Santa Ana, CA	327,681	258,773	0.79
Miami, FL	349,856	242,864	0.69
Laredo, TX	216,339	203,995	0.94
Hialeah, FL	206,931	195,336	0.94
Brownsville, TX	176,073	162,817	0.92
Oxnard, CA	175,906	123,379	0.70
East Los Angeles, CA	120,985	118,318	0.98
McAllen, TX	123,732	100,549	0.81
El Monte, CA	111,889	76,746	0.69

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

#### Socio-Economic Characteristics

A renowned urban scholar stated, “...the 2000 census indicates that some 28 million Americans families pay exorbitant costs for housing, according to federal standards of affordability” (Briggs, 2005: p. 5). Latino families are over paying for housing, which has a direct impact in their disposable income and quality of life. For example, in the City of Los Angeles, “...Home prices grew by 12%, up to \$227,000 in 2001, but incomes only grew by 3%. The average Latino family spends almost half of its income on housing” (Guerra, et al: 2010). These statistics are representative of many Latino communities throughout the United States. In turn, many municipalities have a limited amount of affordable housing stock, which leaves a large portion of the population with overpriced housing. As gas prices and the cost of living increase, many Latinos face economic hardships because their incomes have not increased.

#### Per capita and Median Household Income

Cities that have a higher concentration of Latinos tend to have lower per capita and median household incomes (Table 3). This supports the assertion that poorer neighborhoods like Brownville, TX and East Los Angeles, CA depend on less income per capita, which, in turn, limits their provision of quality local social services, such as education and housing. Cities with a high concentration of poverty have a higher need of affordable housing.

**Table 3. Economic Data for Places with Latino Population**

Place and State	Per capita income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)	Median Household Income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)	Percent Hispanic of Total Population
Brownsville, TX	11,623.00	28,523.00	0.92
East Los Angeles, CA	12,592.00	36,376.00	0.98
Laredo, TX	13,883.00	36,454.00	0.94
El Monte, CA	14,612.00	42,363.00	0.69
Hialeah, FL	15,116.00	31,901.00	0.94
Detroit, MI	15,255.00	29,423.00	0.06
Santa Ana, CA	16,891.00	55,927.00	0.79
El Paso, TX	17,607.00	36,649.00	0.80
McAllen, TX	18,959.00	38,253.00	0.81
Miami, FL	20,639.00	29,151.00	0.69
Philadelphia, PA	20,876.00	36,222.00	0.11
Oxnard, CA	21,143.00	59,552.00	0.70
San Antonio, TX	21,447.00	42,731.00	0.61
Phoenix, AZ	24,377.00	49,933.00	0.42
Houston, TX	26,158.00	42,624.00	0.42
Chicago, IL	26,814.00	46,767.00	0.28
Dallas, TX	27,047.00	41,731.00	0.43
Los Angeles, CA	27,523.00	48,610.00	0.48
New York, NY	30,415.00	50,403.00	0.28
San Diego, CA	32,716.00	63,181.00	0.68
San Jose, CA	33,859.00	79,796.00	0.32

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

**Housing Occupancy**

Many cities with high concentrations of Latinos have a high percentage of renter-occupied units (Table 4). Cities with higher land prices also tend to have larger rental markets. For example, states like California have higher real estate costs; therefore, many cities like El Monte, East Los Angeles, Oxnard, and Los Angeles have a concentrated rental housing market because many people do not have access to the resources required for homeownership.

**Table 4. Housing Occupancy in Selected U.S. Cities**

Place and State	Total Housing Units	Renter-Occupied Units		Owner-Occupied Units	
			%		%
Cities with > than 40 % Renter- Occupied Units					
New York, NY	3,327,835	2,001,051	0.60	1,031,910	0.31
East Los Angeles, CA	31,741	19,010	0.60	10,417	0.33
Los Angeles, CA	1,361,786	773,499	0.57	502,035	0.37
El Monte, CA	28,291	15,725	0.56	11,404	0.40
Miami, FL	163,123	85,124	0.52	51,381	0.31
Santa Ana, CA	77,476	37,410	0.48	37,145	0.48
Houston, TX	870,308	396,772	0.46	350,751	0.40
San Diego, CA	503,941	232,360	0.46	232,204	0.46
Dallas, TX	512,931	236,005	0.46	210,110	0.41
Hialeah, FL	75,477	34,221	0.45	36,547	0.48
Chicago, IL	1,182,326	519,003	0.44	498,885	0.42
Oxnard, CA	50,694	20,705	0.41	26,628	0.53
Cities with < than 40 % Renter- Occupied Units					
San Jose, CA	301,826	111,510	0.37	177,240	0.59
Philadelphia, PA	660,562	241,588	0.37	322,249	0.49
San Antonio, TX	492,381	178,998	0.36	264,842	0.54
Phoenix, AZ	554,468	187,755	0.34	297,041	0.54
Detroit, MI	367,789	124,209	0.34	150,644	0.41
El Paso, TX	215,665	74,253	0.34	123,682	0.57
Laredo, TX	64,490	21,137	0.33	37,636	0.58
Brownsville, TX	57,051	18,824	0.33	31,673	0.56
McAllen, TX	47,492	15,286	0.32	25,332	0.53

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

### Household Size

The cities with the highest concentration of Latinos also have a concentration of bigger families (Table 5). A University of Southern California's planning professor indicated that Latinos live in conditions conducive to compact living:

*"The Latino population, which comprises the bulk of the growth ahead, has propensity for lifestyles that are compatible with compact cities. This is evident from three key indicators: mean persons per households, multifamily housing (most often rental housing), and compact commuting" (Dowell Mayers, 2001; 389).*

Mayers' study demonstrated that Latinos have bigger families, live closer together, and frequently use public transportation. Therefore, planning and designing housing options for Latinos in these communities should implement higher density and multi-family housing located near public transportation.

**Table 5. Household Size in Cities with High Percentage of Latino Population**

Place and State	Average household size	Average family size	Household population
Santa Ana, CA	4.32	4.59	322,207
East Los Angeles, CA	4.08	4.49	119,973
El Monte, CA	4.07	4.4	110,489
Oxnard, CA	3.69	4.07	174,638
Laredo, TX	3.66	4.07	215,145
Brownsville, TX	3.46	3.95	174,772

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

### Transportation Patterns

Few studies about transportation patterns in the Latino community have been produced. An earlier study, prepared by the US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, and entitled, Travel Patterns of People of Color (Battelle, 2000) highlighted the following findings:

- *"Transportation costs are the second highest household expenditure after total housing costs. Housing, including utilities, operations, and furnishing in 2004 was on average 32.1 percent of household expenditures, with utilities consuming 6.7 percent of this total. Transportation, for the households surveyed in the annual Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Survey, was another 18 percent of expenditures. (Bernstein, et. al., 2007: 4)*
- *"...Hispanics spent 18.8 percent...of their annual household income on transportation in 1995" (Polzin, et. al., 2000: 41)*
- *"...[People] of color are several times and likely as White to use public for non-work travel and about twice as likely as Whites to walk for non-work travel" (Valenzuela, 2000: 6)*

In short, the study highlights transportation as a significant expenditure for many people of color (including many Latino families) and points out that people of color are more likely to use public transportation than Whites. These two facts support the premise that Latino communities can benefit from a mass public transportation system and will also pay for transportation costs since they represent a significant percentage of riders.

### Recommendations

Most of the Latino community lives in America's great urban centers. Therefore, in order to have a burgeoning U.S. economy, policymakers and other leaders need to invest in the Latino community. Investing in affordable housing for Latino communities is investing in America's future workforce. Community development strategies, such as sustainability, should be implemented across the United States and ensure that Latino communities are also included in urban trends. As discussed in this paper, investing in affordable housing near transportation, parks, and other amenities can provide an opportunity for many Latino families. Latinos are the future of the American workforce and should have access to jobs, a great education, and other opportunities. Building capacity, collaboration, and allocating resources can ensure equitable sustainable development.

#### Building Capacity

- Social advocates should discuss transportation equity and affordable housing issues as interconnected and interdependent and encourage higher density.
- Educate the Latino community about the benefits of sustainable communities, including density and transportation.
- There should be a stronger presence of Latino leadership in the sustainable movement. For example, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC)<sup>2</sup> should take more of a leadership role in sustainability.

#### Collaboration

- Federal, state, and local funding should strategically align their investments in municipalities and areas that encourage the following planning strategies: updating zoning codes that facilitates mix-use development; inclusionary zoning ordinances; long term housing planning that accommodates the growth of the city; and streetscape planning.
- Local governments should form community agreements with developers to ensure that local residents have access to jobs.

#### Allocation of Resources

- More resources should be allocated to develop low-income housing tax credits and transportation financing.
- The federal government should not only invest in large cities but also in medium-size municipalities with high concentrations of poverty.

## Appendix 1.

### Large Places in Total Population and Hispanic Population

Place and State	Total Population	Hispanic Population	% Hispanic of total Population
New York, NY	8,308,163	2,287,905	0.28
Los Angeles, CA	3,749,058	1,815,005	0.48
Houston, TX	2,024,379	849,226	0.42
San Antonio, TX	1,277,322	782,220	0.61
Chicago, IL	2,725,206	758,877	0.28
Phoenix, AZ	1,468,633	617,968	0.42
Dallas, TX	1,214,287	523,047	0.43
El Paso, TX	593,496	475,014	0.80
San Diego, CA	503,941	341,800	0.68
San Jose, CA	905,180	285,269	0.32
Santa Ana, CA	327,681	258,773	0.79
Miami, FL	349,856	242,864	0.69
Laredo, TX	216,339	203,995	0.94
Hialeah, FL	206,931	195,336	0.94
Brownsville, TX	176,073	162,817	0.92
Philadelphia, PA	1,448,911	158,780	0.11
Oxnard, CA	175,906	123,379	0.70
East Los Angeles, CA	120,985	118,318	0.98
McAllen, TX	123,732	100,549	0.81
El Monte, CA	111,889	76,746	0.69
Detroit, MI	808,398	52,057	0.06

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey  
2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

## Appendix 2.

### Economic Data for Places with Latino Population

Place and State	Median Household Income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)	Median Family income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)	Per capita income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)
San Jose, CA	79,796	89,180	33,859
San Diego, CA	63,181	76,111	32,716
Oxnard, CA	59,552	60,976	21,143
Santa Ana, CA	55,927	54,719	16,891
New York, NY	50,403	55,492	30,415
Phoenix, AZ	49,933	57,409	24,377
Los Angeles, CA	48,610	53,008	27,523
Chicago, IL	46,767	53,381	26,814
San Antonio, TX	42,731	51,715	21,447
Houston, TX	42,624	47,185	26,158
El Monte, CA	42,363	44,615	14,612
Dallas, TX	41,731	44,948	27,047
McAllen, TX	38,253	41,910	18,959
El Paso, TX	36,649	41,411	17,607
Laredo, TX	36,454	38,978	13,883
East Los Angeles, CA	36,376	37,267	12,592
Philadelphia, PA	36,222	46,365	20,876
Hialeah, FL	31,901	37,303	15,116
Detroit, MI	29,423	34,560	15,255
Miami, FL	29,151	33,326	20,639
Brownsville, TX	28,523	30,114	11,623

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey  
2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

**Appendix 3.**  
**Housing Characteristics**

Place and State	Total Housing Units	Renter-Occupied Units		Owner-Occupied Units		Occupied housing Units		Vacant Housing Units	
			%		%		%		%
New York, NY	3,327,835	2,001,051	0.60	1,031,910	0.31	3,032,961	0.91	294,874	0.09
Los Angeles, CA	1,361,786	773,499	0.57	502,035	0.37	1,275,534	0.94	86,252	0.06
Chicago, IL	1,182,326	519,003	0.44	498,885	0.42	1,017,888	0.86	164,438	0.14
Houston, TX	870,308	396,772	0.46	350,751	0.40	747,523	0.86	122,785	0.14
Philadelphia, PA	660,562	241,588	0.37	322,249	0.49	563,837	0.85	96,725	0.15
Phoenix, AZ	554,468	187,755	0.34	297,041	0.54	484,796	0.87	69,672	0.13
San Diego, CA	503,941	232,360	0.46	232,204	0.46	464,564	0.92	39,377	0.08
Dallas, TX	512,931	236,005	0.46	210,110	0.41	446,115	0.87	66,816	0.13
San Antonio, TX	492,381	178,998	0.36	264,842	0.54	443,840	0.90	48,541	0.10
Detroit, MI	367,789	124,209	0.34	150,644	0.41	274,853	0.75	92,936	0.25
El Paso, TX	215,665	74,253	0.34	123,682	0.57	197,935	0.92	17,730	0.08
San Jose, CA	301,826	111,510	0.37	177,240	0.59	288,750	0.96	13,076	0.04
East Los Angeles, CA	31,741	19,010	0.60	10,417	0.33	29,427	0.93	2,314	0.07
Laredo, TX	64,490	21,137	0.33	37,636	0.58	58,773	0.91	5,717	0.09
Brownsville, TX	57,051	18,824	0.33	31,673	0.56	50,497	0.89	6,554	0.11
Hialeah, FL	75,477	34,221	0.45	36,547	0.48	70,768	0.94	4,709	0.06
McAllen, TX	47,492	15,286	0.32	25,332	0.53	40,618	0.86	6,874	0.14
Santa Ana, CA	77,476	37,410	0.48	37,145	0.48	74,555	0.96	2,921	0.04
El Monte, CA	28,291	15,725	0.56	11,404	0.40	27,129	0.96	1,162	0.04
Oxnard, CA	50,694	20,705	0.41	26,628	0.53	47,333	0.93	3,361	0.07
Miami, FL	163,123	85,124	0.52	51,381	0.31	136,505	0.84	26,618	0.16

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006–2008 American Community Survey  
2006–2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates



**Appendix 4.**  
**Social Characteristics**

Place and State	Average household size	Average family size	Household population
Santa Ana, CA	4.32	4.59	322,207
East Los Angeles, CA	4.08	4.49	119,973
El Monte, CA	4.07	4.4	110,489
Oxnard, CA	3.69	4.07	174,638
Laredo, TX	3.66	4.07	215,145
Brownsville, TX	3.46	3.95	174,772
San Jose, CA	3.1	3.63	896,472
McAllen, TX	3.02	3.5	122,638
Phoenix, AZ	2.99	3.76	1,449,632
El Paso, TX	2.97	3.51	588,763
Detroit, MI	2.89	3.84	794,019
Los Angeles, CA	2.87	3.67	3,658,397
Hialeah, FL	2.85	3.21	201,468
San Antonio, TX	2.81	3.54	1,247,493
New York, NY	2.68	3.51	8,127,274
Dallas, TX	2.67	3.56	1,191,913
Houston, TX	2.66	3.45	1,991,179
Chicago, IL	2.61	3.53	2,661,688
San Diego, CA	2.58	3.31	1,199,797
Miami, FL	2.49	3.25	339,721
Philadelphia, PA	2.47	3.43	1,392,299

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006–2008 American Community Survey  
2006–2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

**End Notes:**

1 “A density bonus is an incentive-based tool that permits developers to increase the maximum allowable development on a property in exchange for helping the community achieve public policy goals. Increasing development density may allow for increases in developed square footage or increases in the number of developed units. This tool works best in areas where growth pressures are strong and land availability limited or when incentives for attaining the goals outweigh alternative development options” (Center for Land Use Education, 2005).

2 “The Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC) was founded in December 1976 as a legislative service organization of the United States House of Representatives. Today, the CHC is organized as a Bicameral Congressional Member organization, governed under the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, with a total of 24 Members, 1 in the U.S. Senate, and 23 Members in the House of Representatives.

The CHC aims to address national and international issues and the impact these policies have on the Hispanic community. The function of the Caucus is to serve as a forum for the Hispanic Members of Congress to coalesce around a collective legislative agenda. The Caucus is dedicated to voicing and advancing, through the legislative process, issues affecting Hispanics in the United States and Puerto Rico”.

## References:

- 2009. Choice Neighborhoods Program Announced by HUD Secretary. Urban Land Institute [http://thegroundfloor.typepad.com/the\\_ground\\_floor/2009/07/choice-neighborhoods-program-announced-by-hud-secretary.html](http://thegroundfloor.typepad.com/the_ground_floor/2009/07/choice-neighborhoods-program-announced-by-hud-secretary.html) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Agyman, J. and Evans, T. (2003). Toward Just Sustainability in Urban Communities: Building Equity Rights with Sustainable Solutions. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 590 (35).
- American Community Survey. 2006-2008. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce. [www.factfinder.census.gov](http://www.factfinder.census.gov) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Bernstein, S., Haas, P., Hefferman, K., Markarewicz, C., Scheu R., and Star, A. (2007). Growing More Affordably: Connecting the Dots on Housing, Energy and Transportation Cost. Funders' Network For Smart Growth and Livable Communities. [www.fundersnetwork.org](http://www.fundersnetwork.org) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Bernstein, S., Haas, P., Heffernan, K., Markarewicz, C., Scheu, R. and Star A. 2007. Growing More Affordably: Connecting the Dots on Housing, Energy and Transportation Cost. Funders' Network For Smart Growth and Livable Communities. [www.fundersnetwork.com](http://www.fundersnetwork.com) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Blackweel, A. G. and Fox, R. K. 2004. Regional Equity and Smart Growth: Opportunities for Advancing Social and Economic Justice in America. Funders' Network For Smart Growth and Livable Communities. [www.fundersnetwork.com](http://www.fundersnetwork.com) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Center for Land Use Education. 2005. Planning Implementation Tools Density Bonus. University of Wisconsin, Steven Points. [www.uwsp.edu/cnr/landcenter/](http://www.uwsp.edu/cnr/landcenter/) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Chiesura, A. (2004). The Role of Urban Parks for the Sustainable City. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 68 (1), 129-138.
- De Souza Briggs, X. and Keys, B.J.. 2009. Has Exposure to Poor Neighborhoods Changed in America? Race, Risk and Housing Location in Two Decades. *Urban Studies*, 46: 429-458.
- De Souza Briggs, X., eds. 2005. *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Guerra, F. J., Marks, M. A., and Barreto, M. 2010. *The Leavey Center for the Study of Los Angeles Chasing the Dream: Latinos and Housing in Los Angeles County*
- Hall, E. 2007. Divide and Sprawl, Decline and Fall: A Comparative Critique of Euclidean Zoning by Eliza Hall. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, 68 (4). [http://lawreview.law.pitt.edu/?page\\_id=137](http://lawreview.law.pitt.edu/?page_id=137) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Kasandra, J. 1983. "Caught in the web of change." *Society* 211: 41-47
- Levi, D., Casswell, R., Gonzalez, U., and Lopez, A. 2010. Attitudes Toward Sustainable Cities: Are Sustainable Cities Livable Cities?. *Journal of the City and Regional Planning Department, San Luis Obispo*. Focus, 6(1). In Print.
- Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles. [http://www.lmu.edu/Cen-ter\\_for\\_the\\_Study\\_of\\_Los\\_Angeles/Publications\\_and\\_Working\\_Papers/Chasing\\_the\\_Dream\\_Latinos\\_and\\_Housing\\_in\\_Los\\_Angeles\\_County.htm](http://www.lmu.edu/Cen-ter_for_the_Study_of_Los_Angeles/Publications_and_Working_Papers/Chasing_the_Dream_Latinos_and_Housing_in_Los_Angeles_County.htm) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Maldonado, A. Jr. 2000. "Race, Inequality, and Travel Patterns Among People of Color". In *Travel Patterns of People of Color*. US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration. By Battelle. 2000. Columbus, Ohio. 1-21
- Murguia, J. 2010. NCLR. Speech.
- Myers, D. 2001. Demographic Futures as a Guide to Planning: California's Latinos and the Compact City. *American Planning Association Journal*, 67 (4): 383-97.
- Oakes, J.M., Forsyth, A., and Schmitz, K.H.. 2007. The effects of neighborhood density and street connectivity on walking behavior: the Twin Cities walking study. *Epidemiologic Perspectives & Innovations*, 4 (16).
- Polzin, S. E., Chu, X., and Rey, J. R. 2000. "Demographics of People of Color: Findings from the Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey". In *Travel Patterns of People of Color*. US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration. By Battelle. 2000. Columbus, Ohio. 27-43
- Rothwell, J., and Massey, D. S.. 2009. The Effect of Density Zoning on Racial Segregation in US Urban Areas. *Urban Affairs Review* 44: 779-806.
- The Congressional Hispanic Caucus. 111th Congress. Washington DC. <http://velazquez.house.gov/chc/> (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2010. Fiscal Year 2010 Budget: Road Map for Transformation. Washington, D.C: [www.hud.gov/budgetsummary2010](http://www.hud.gov/budgetsummary2010) (accessed January 25, 2010).
- US Census Bureau. 2001. Census 2000 Brief: The Hispanic Populations. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce.
- US Census Bureau. Census 2000. American Survey 2000 Summary File 3. American Fact Finder. [www.factfinder.census.gov](http://www.factfinder.census.gov) (Retrieved January 25, 2010).
- Ven den Berg, A. E., Hartig, T., and Staats, H.. (2007). Preference for Nature in Urbanized Societies: Stress, Restoration, and the Pursuit of Sustainability. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63 (1), 79-96.
- Wilkes, R. and Iceland, J.. 2004. Hypersegregation in the twenty-first century: An update and analysis. *Demography* 41: 23-36.
- Wilson, W. J. 1987. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner-City, the Underclass and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.