

Prince William Area

(Prince William County, Cities of Manassas & Manassas Park)



Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) Federal Fiscal Year 2024 (FY2025)

Prince William County Office of Housing and Community Development
Dr. A. J. Ferlazzo Building
15941 Donald Curtis Drive, Suite 112,
Woodbridge, Virginia 22191
Joan S. Duckett, Director

Consolidated Plan, FFY 2020-2024 (FY2021-2025)
FFY24 (FY25) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report

INTRODUCTION

The **FFY0224 (FY25) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report** is a summary of the accomplishments resulting from funded activities administered by the Prince William County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD) during Federal Fiscal Year 2024 (FY25).

This report is submitted in accordance with regulations governing Consolidated Submissions for Community Planning and Development Programs (24 CFR 91.520) and Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reporting requirements as directed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The purpose is to report on OHCD's use of federal entitlement funding allocated from HUD. The federal entitlement funding sources are the **Community Development Block Grant** (CDBG) and the **HOME Investment Partnerships** (HOME), and **Emergency Solutions Grant** (ESG).

In Federal Fiscal Year 2024 (FY25), these funding sources were used to address Suitable Living Environment, Decent Housing and Economic Development for the Prince William Area. The Prince William Area includes Prince William County, cities of Manassas and Manassas Park.

Although the federal entitlement funding is awarded automatically according to a need-based formula, the County still must formally apply to HUD for the money. The application consists of a plan that describes the strategy of addressing the needs of the community. OHCD submits one five-year strategic plan for the three-federal entitlement-funding programs; consequently, the document is referred to as the "Consolidated Plan". Each year the **Consolidated Plan** is updated through an Annual Action Plan, which describes how that year's federal entitlement funding will be used to implement the five-year strategic plan. The **FFY2024 (FY25) Annual Action Plan** was the fifth annual component of the Consolidated Plan, FFY2020 – 2024 (FY2021 - 2025).

The **FFY24 (FY25) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report** consists of narrative statements, which explain the progress made in carrying out the activities and achieving the objectives, and outcomes set out in the **FFY24 (FY25) Annual Action Plan**. It also describes the methods used to comply with federal regulations. Appendices with tables and reports supply additional details about the use of federal entitlement funding for the Prince William Area. All this information serves to document the significant amount of work contributed by County staff and community partners in an effort to carry out the Prince William Area mission of preserving and enhancing communities and improving the quality of life for individuals and families.

Prince William County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD) contracted with Community and Policy Advisors, LLC; to provide and submit the Annual Action Plan the FFY24 (FY25) CAPER to HUD within the eCon Planning Suite.

Table of Contents

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes	1
CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted	6
CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a).....	7
CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)	15
CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs	18
CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)	20
CR-45 CDBG 91.520(c)	27
CR-50 HOME 91.520 (d)	28
CR-58 – Section 3	30
CR-60 – ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)	31
Attachments.....	34

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan.

91.520(a)

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

Prince William County receives funding from three federal grant programs, the Community Development Block Grant Program, the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and the Emergency Solutions Grant. These three grant programs combined provided **\$3,816,664** into the county to support affordable housing, homeless, and community development programs and projects in FFY2024 (FY25).

During FFY 2024, Prince William County accomplished a variety of activities using CDBG, HOME and ESG funds and CARES ACT Funding through CDBG-CV. CDBG funds were able to provide case management services for extended hours for homeless shelter for homeless population assisting **395** extremely low-income persons, CDBG funds were used to provide transportation services to the Homeless population in the Prince William Area serving **527** extremely low-income persons; and provided CDBG funding for comprehensive housing financial counseling for approximately **473** persons. CDBG funds were provided to Prince William County Human Rights Commission to perform fair housing testing to local apartment complexes. During FFY 2024. CDBG funds were used to provide homeowner rehab for thirteen (13) low-moderate income owner-occupied households, with four (4) rehab projects started in FY24 and completed in FY25, nine (9) started in FY25 and completed in FY25, and one (1) started in FY25 to be completed in FY26. assisting 33 persons; within eleven (11) households, utilizing prior year CDBG CDBG prior year funds-were allocated to a local homeless shelter and a local non-profit that provides services to persons with developmental disabilities, for ADA accessibility renovations to their existing playgrounds in FFY23 and the projects continued into FFY24 with total expenditures in the amount of \$430,535.16 and both of the activities are now completed.

FFY2024 HOME funds were used to provide down-payment and closing costs assistance to assist Seven (7) eligible first-time low-moderate income homebuyers to acquire properties located in the Prince William Area utilizing FY21 and FY22 HOME funds and prior year HOME program income assisting twenty (20) low-moderate income persons. ESG funds were used in a variety of shelter operations and rapid re-housing projects which aided 673 extremely low-income persons.

OHCD using \$2,197,062.32 in prior year CDBG funds through the Emergency Housing Assistance Program, II (Subsistence Payments) provided to all eligible low – moderate income households who have experienced financial hardships related to COVID-19 resulting in arrearages in mortgage, rent, Homeowner Association and/or utilities which could potentially result in eviction, foreclosure and loss of utilities causing homelessness which could spread the Coronavirus. Subsistence Payments are defined as a one-time or short-term, (no more than six (6) consecutive months payments) of assistance, with the

arrearage amount as one payment and then five additional consecutive monthly payments.

The public comment period ran from August 21, 2025, through September 19, 2025. No comments received.

Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee's program year goals.

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
CHDO Set Aside	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$	Other	Other	5	5	100.0%	1	1	100.00%
Enhance Access to Public Facilities & ADA Access	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	100	3185	318.5%	0	0	0.00%
Enhance Access to Public Facilities & ADA Access	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	25		0	25	
Enhance Access to Public Facilities & ADA Access	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household housing units	0	4		0	4	
Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	650	1893	291.23%	140	430	307.14%
Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	0	5		0	5	
Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	0	6		10	0	0.0%
Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	0	17		10	10	100.0%
Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	90	18	11.11%	0	18	
Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	50	0	0.00%	8	0	0.00%

Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	0	0		22	0	0.00%
Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Housing for Homeless added	Household Housing Unit	0	0		0	0	
Expand Affordable Housing Options	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added	Household Housing Unit	0	0		0	0	
Program Administration	Administration	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Other	Other	5	5	100.0%	1	1	100.00%
Promote Fair Housing in the Area	Administration	CDBG: \$	Other	Other	5	5	100.0%	1	1	100.00%
Provide Support for Public Service Programs	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	300	1317	439.0%	618	922	149.19%
Provide Support for Public Service Programs	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	0	0		0	0	
Provide Support for Public Service Programs	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Other	Other	5	0	0.00%			
Support Efforts to Combat Homelessness		CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	11		0	0	
Support Efforts to Combat Homelessness		CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	1500	65	4.33%	498	0	4.42%
Support Efforts to Combat Homelessness		CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added	Beds	35	0	0.00%	27	0	0.00%
Support Efforts to Combat Homelessness		CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	3900	0	0.00%	27	0	0.00%

Support Efforts to Combat Homelessness		CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Other	Other	5	4	80.00%	1	1	100.00%
--	--	-----------------------	-------	-------	---	---	--------	---	---	---------

Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date

Assess how the jurisdiction's use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.

ESG – ESG funds were utilized to provide funds for emergency shelters, transitional housing, HMIS support and rapid re-housing. In undertaking these projects, ESG funds were able to meet the homelessness priority need identified in the FFY 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan.

HOME – Home funds were used to provide direct financial assistance to nine (9) first time home buyers and program administration. This was able to meet the Priority need of Low to Moderate Income Housing, as identified as a high priority in the Plan.

CDBG – CDBG funds were used to meet many of the priority needs outlined in the Consolidated Plan, including homelessness, low to moderate income housing, financial assistance to owner-occupied residents of Prince William County Area to correct health and safety issues as well as to increase energy efficiency within their properties, provided affordable rental housing for persons with developmental disabilities, homeless persons with disabilities, special needs populations, Fair Housing, and Public Facilities and ADA Accessibility activities.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted).
91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME
White	491	0
Black or African American	680	9
Asian	68	17
American Indian or American Native	0	1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	0
Total	1,242	27
Hispanic	302	1
Not Hispanic	940	26

Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds

Describe the clients assisted (including the racial and/or ethnicity of clients assisted with ESG)

	HESG
American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	3
Asian or Asian American	12
Black, African American, or African	397
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	30
Middle Eastern or North African	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1
White	121
Multiracial	109
Client doesn't know	0
Client prefers not to answer	0
Data not collected	0
Total	673

Narrative

The County served over 1,242 persons during FFY 2024 with CDBG and HOME funds. Of the households captured in the table above, some 491 (or 39% percent) were white, 689 (or 55% percent) were black/African American, 85 were Asian, and three were Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. In terms of ethnicity, some 303 were Hispanic. An additional 673 persons were served with ESG funds. 397 were black or African American, 121 were white, 30 were Hispanic or Latino, and 109 were multiracial.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	public - federal	7,478,242	3,342,692.99
HOME	public - federal	9,998,292.64	919,302.00
ESG	public - federal	228,267	191,966.08

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

In addition, the County had the following resources available:

State Rental Assistance Program (SRAP) committed \$933,352 as total budget funds for both administration and rental assistance payments to Project Based Rental Assistance Tenants (PBRA) for the eleven (11) affordable rental units and thirty-five (35) Tenant Based Rental Assistance Vouchers (TBRA) in FY25. These SRAP vouchers were used in Prince William County and City of Manassas for persons with disabilities through referrals through the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services (DBHDS) and Prince William County Community Services (CS). OHCD for FY25 was awarded a budget of \$954,564 for both administration and rental assistance for seventy-two (72) Permanent Supportive Tenant Based Rental Assistance Vouchers to provide housing assistance to households with serious mental illnesses.

CDBG -During FFY 2024, Prince William County expended \$3,342,692.99 (per HUD report) in CDBG funds., which included thirteen (13) low-moderate income owner-occupied households provided rehabilitation, four (4) rehab projects started in FY24 and completed in FY25, nine (9) started in FY25 and completed in FY25, and one (1) started in FY25 to be completed in FY26. assisting 33 persons; within eleven (11) households, utilizing prior year CDBG funds CDBG funds were allotted for public service activity administered by a local nonprofit for street outreach, homeless outreach and Case Management to the homeless population assisting 395 extremely low-income persons and funded a public service activity administered by the County's Department of Social Services for Transportation Services for homeless population which assisted 527 extremely low-income persons. CDBG funding was provided for comprehensive housing financial counseling for approximately 473 persons, and Fair Housing funding was provided to the

Prince William County Human Rights Commission to initiate complete testing for Fair Housing discrimination for local apartment complexes. ,

HOME -During FFY2024, Prince William County expended \$919,302.00 in HOME funds. This included \$79,485 in Administration funding, \$839,817 in the completion of seven (7) eligible low-moderate income First-Time Homebuyer Program projects which received down payment & closing costs assistance using FY21 and FY22 HOME entitlement funds assisting twenty (20) low-moderate income persons, \$639,632.33 of prior year HOME Program Income was spent in FFY24.

ESG - \$191,966.08 funds were expended in ESG funds for the FFY2024, grant funding, which included \$130,870.27 Operations, \$42,901 in HMIS Support and \$18,194.81 in Rapid Re-Housing. There was \$1,031.19 of FFY23 (FY24) Rapid Re-Housing funds drawn down in FFY24 (FY25), \$6,430 of Rapid Re-Housing funds were not drawn down in IDIS until FFY25 (FY26) and the FFY24 (FY25) ESG Administrative Funds were also drawn down in FFY25 (FY26).

CDBG Prior Year Funds in the amount of \$219,798.94 were used for emergency housing assistance costs in FFY24 (FY25).

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
Countywide	100	100	Non-targeted for Low-Mod Individual Benefit and Administration

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

During FFY 2024, much of the funding from CDBG and HOME were available for eligible funding opportunities countywide. While funds were not targeted geographically, some funds were used within CDBG Eligible areas. These are estimated to be 10 percent of funds within these areas.

Leveraging

Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state, and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied,

as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.

HOME – Matching requirements for the HOME Program are met through deferred taxes on nonprofit owned properties where HOME and CHDO funds were provided for acquisition and rehabilitation of affordable rental properties, below market rate first trust financing through Virginia Housing (VH) Sponsoring Partnerships and Revitalizing Communities (SPARC).

In addition, funds provided to HOME eligible projects, reduced professional service fees, and below market rate opportunities for first-trust funding. For FFY24, OHCD was awarded \$19M through Virginia Housing Development Authority (VHDA) now referred to as Virginia Housing (VH) through their Sponsoring Partnerships and Revitalizing Communities (SPARC), of which \$18,634,469 was expended in FY25. SPARC Funds are a special allocation of VH financing provided to housing industry local governments and nonprofits to support special housing needs. The SPARC funding from VH allows for 1% reduction in market interest rate for first trust mortgage financing for first-time homebuyers and additionally used in conjunction with the HOME down-payment and closing costs funding which is a second lien on the eligible properties. There was \$1,540,600 in Virginia Housing SPARC first trust financing for FTHB activities and the remaining \$17,093,869 SPARC funds were used to assist first-time

ESG - Recipients of ESG funds are required to provide a dollar-for-dollar match. The match must be for the specific project for which ESG funding is requested and must be received and expended within the grant year. Eligible sources of match are:

- 1) Donated Supplies: Donated goods such as clothing, furniture, equipment, etc. Include the source and an estimated value for all donated goods.
- 2) Cash Donations or Grants: Private donations or grants from foundations, nonprofits, or local, state, and federal sources. A single grant may serve as the required match.
- 3) Value of Donated Building: The fair market value of a donated building in the year that it is donated. The building must be proposed for ESG-related activities and must not currently be in use for these activities. The verification should state when the building was donated and for what purpose, the current use of the building, and how long the building has been used for its current purpose. A licensed real estate salesperson, broker or licensed appraiser may be used to determine the fair market value of the property.
- 4) Rent or Lease: Rent paid for space currently used to provide services to the homeless must include the source of funds used to pay rent. The fair market rent, or lease value of a building owned or space that is donated (rent free) to the organization is also an acceptable match resource. To document fair market value a letter from a licensed real estate salesperson, broker or licensed appraiser that specifies the location of

building, square footage, value per square foot, and total lease or rent value based on 12-month occupancy.

- 5) Salaries: Any staff salary paid with general operating funds or grant funds (CDBG, United Way, etc.). The position(s) used as match must be involved in ESG related activities and the hours utilized for match must be for hours worked for ESG related activities. For each position include the title, annual salary, percentage of time dedicated to ESG activities, source of funds and the dollar amount proposed as match.
- 6) Volunteers: Time and services contributed by volunteers, with a value not to exceed \$34.79 per hour. [Note: Volunteers providing professional services such as medical or legal services]

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	7,169,855.37
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	186,426.96
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	7,356,282.33
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	204,830.00
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	7,151,452.33

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
25-HI32-421200-01	8/23/2024						23,852.22	23,852.22
25-HI32-421200-02	08/30/2024						24,954.20	24,954.20
25-HI32-421200-03	09/03/2024						18,149.99	18,149.99
25-HI32-421200-04	11/08/2024						23,087.51	23,087.51
25-HI32-421200-05	11/27/2024						27,789.93	27,789.93
25-HI32-421200-06	12/20/2024						19,964.25	19,964.25
25-HI32-421200-07	04/16/2025						19,423.04	19,423.04
GSHF 1917 Old Post	06/30/2025		3,127.51					3,127.51
GSHF Mayflower	06/30/2025		3,546.08					3,546.08
GSHF Grundy	06/30/2025		4,283.57					4,283.57
GSHF W Longview	06/30/2025		4,526.38					4,526.38
GSHF Grist Mill	06/30/2025		3,467.26					3,467.26
GSHF Blue Jay	06/30/2025		3,421.06					3,421.06
GSHF Gemstone	06/30/2025		3,720.04					3,720.04
GSHF Lodge Terr	06/30/2025		3,113.92					3,113.92

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

Table 7 – Program Income HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period	Amount received during reporting period	Total amount expended during reporting period	Amount expended for TBRA	Balance on hand at end of reporting period
\$2,008,548.33	0	639,632.33	0	\$1,368,916.11

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White NonHispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black NonHispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male
Contracts			
Dollar Amount	0	0	0
Number	0	0	0
Sub-Contracts			
Number	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0

Table 8 - Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted						
	Total	Minority Property Owners				White non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0

Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

CAPER

12

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 09/30/2022)

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition

		Parcels Acquired	0	0		
		Businesses Displaced	0	0		
		Nonprofit Organizations Displaced	0	0		
		Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced	0	0		
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White NonHispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	27	0
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	18	24
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	0	0
Total	45	24

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	88	0
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	0	0
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	18	8
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	8	16
Total	106	24

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.

During FFY2024, Prince William County expended \$919,302.00 in HOME funds. This included \$79,485 in Administration funding, \$839,817 in the completion of seven (7) eligible low-moderate income First-Time Homebuyer Program projects which received down payment & closing costs assistance using FY21 and FY22 HOME entitlement funds assisting twenty (20) low-moderate income persons, no \$639,632.33 of prior year HOME Program Income was spent in FFY24.

The housing market in the Northern Virginia Area continues to be a competitive seller's market, where sales prices are still very high, including bidding wars, exclusion of home

inspections and appraisals are common. The annual increase in sales price limits and the deficient of housing units create barriers to low-moderate income first-time homebuyers from obtaining the first homes in the Prince William Area.

In FFY 2024 CDBG funds were used to complete rehabilitation on eight (8) low-moderate income owner-occupied units, located within the Prince William Area during FFY2024. OHCD's application process for submission of new applications for the Neighborhood Housing Rehabilitation Program (NHRP), is through an on-line application process, using the Community Planning and Development Neighborly Software program. OHCD processed 27 rehabilitation applications of which six (6) were denied, eleven (11) were completed and the remaining are under review for eligibility.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

Prior Year unspent HOME funds have been and will be reallocated along with Program Income to assist low-moderate income first-time homebuyers and to provide Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) Vouchers, to eligible households in the Prince William Area.

Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.

Number of Households Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	4	0
Low-income	4	1
Moderate-income	6	9
Total	14	10

Table 13 – Number of Households Served

Narrative Information

The County funded ten (10) low-moderate income eligible first-time homebuyers during FFY 2024 with HOME funds. This included one (1) low-income and nine (9) moderate income households.

CDBG funded eight (8) single-family housing unit rehabs during FFY 2024. This included one (1) extremely low, and seven (7) low-income households. Public service activity administered by a local non-profit for street outreach, case management to the homeless assisted 395 extremely low-income persons, Homeless Outreach and Case Management for homeless population, additionally CDBG funding was provided to the County's Department of Social Services to provide transportation for the homeless and served 527 extremely low-income and comprehensive housing financial counseling for approximately 441 persons. Fair Housing funding in the amount of \$30,000 was provided to the Prince William County Human Rights Commission to initiate and complete testing for Fair Housing discrimination, additionally Prince William County participated in an Intergovernmental regional fair housing alliance along with the Council of Government (COG) to collaborate on a new, rigorous approach to furthering fair housing, which was completed in FY24. CDBG Prior Year Funds were also used to allow three non-profits to acquire six (6) affordable rental properties. These affordable rental units will provide housing for persons with developmental disabilities, and homeless persons with permanent supportive housing, for six (6) extremely low-income households. CDBG prior year funds in the amount of \$900,000 were allocated to a local homeless shelter and a local non-profit that provides services to persons with developmental disabilities, for ADA accessibility renovations to their existing playgrounds. For FFY23 \$263,254.06 was expended and the activities are on schedule to be completed early FFY24.

CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c)

Evaluate the jurisdiction's progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

The County provided funds to Streetlight Outreach Ministries, who provided outreach to 395 extremely low-income homeless persons, particularly assisting high barrier clients providing a Case Manager who conducted street/campsite outreach designed to provide essential services necessary to reach out to unsheltered homeless persons for the purpose of connecting unsheltered homeless people with emergency shelter, housing, or critical services; and to provide urgent, non-facility-based care to unsheltered homeless people who are unwilling or unable to access emergency shelter, housing, or an appropriate health facility. The County also provided funds to the County's Department of Social Services (DSS) who provided homeless persons transportation services for 527 extremely low-income homeless individuals from the streets to a local shelter with available space from an established pick-up site or by appointment from the individual's current location. Also provide transportation between shelters or to and from medical clinics, detoxification facilities, public assistance offices, other local service providers and any other transportation needs for the individuals as needed for those identified as homeless. The County also works closely with the Continuum of Care and homeless service providers in their outreach activities throughout the year.

The Dawson Beach Transitional Housing Program continues to provide its program of assisting those families who are referred from local shelters who are in good standing, meeting the program's income requirements as well as other eligibility criteria. OHCD has implemented along with other financial and educational program opportunities for the families a seventeen-week required "Choices" a life skill program designed to assist with creating a sustainable home and work toward self-sufficiency. Each Participant who successfully completed the training program is provided a "Certificate of Completion" along with a graduation ceremony

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The County funded two programs for FFY2024 involving the expansion of the number of beds for emergency shelter and supportive housing. The County used CDBG funds to fund the Dawson Beach Transitional Housing Program to provide transitional housing beds for 25 persons, in its' seven-unit facility. The funds also provided emergency shelter access for 335 persons in the Prince William County Ferlazzo Homeless Shelter/Homeless Navigation Center East Shelter, The Hilda Barg Homeless Shelter, and the Supportive Shelter. These three shelters are administered by Prince William County Department of Social Services. In addition, operation funding helped support two additional homeless facilities, administered by Prince William County nonprofit(s) (ACTS (246 and NVFS 254). The Office of Housing and Community Development was able to provide funding to assist

673 extremely low-income homeless persons with emergency and transitional housing needs during FFY24 (FY25).

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs.

For FFY 2024 (FY25), the County funded two Prince William County homeless facilities ACTS, Inc. and NVFS with Rapid Re-Housing funding to avoid entering, or shortening the length of, homelessness. ACTS and NVFS expended \$24,624.81 of Rapid Re-Housing funding, with a total of \$31,286 funded.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

In addition to funding rapid re-housing, the County utilized CDBG and ESG to fund services to prevent the return to homelessness, where funds were also provided for case management through ESG FFY24 (FY25) Shelter Operation funding provided to local shelters in the amount of \$139,690 to help meet the needs of homeless households through homeless transition housing through both Case and Property Management activities.

CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

Prince William County does not have any public housing.

Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

Prince William County does not have any public housing.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

Prince William County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD) did not use any CDBG, HOME or ESG to assist OHCD's Public Housing Agency.

CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)

Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)

Prince William County Office of Housing along with the Prince William County Board of County Supervisors has worked together to address and reduce the effects of public policy on affordable housing developments over the past few years. Statistics have supported a lack of affordable housing units, especially for the household income range of 30-50% of AMI. On December 13, 2022, the Prince William County Board of County Supervisors approved a major update to the County's Comprehensive Plan, which guides the future growth, redevelopment, and preservation of the County as well as investments in future public infrastructure through the year 2040, which included for the first time a "Housing" Chapter.

OHCD along with the Prince William County Planning and Development Service Agencies has collaboratively worked together for the creation of an Affordable Dwelling Unit Ordinance which also allows for the creation of an Affordable Housing Trust Fund. The DRAFT Affordable Dwelling Unit Ordinance was presented to the County Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2025 and was approved. The County Board of Supervisors has allocated funding of \$10.5M for FY24 & FY25, with budgetary funding of over \$30M by FY29.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The County has continued to look for new funding sources for programs that address underserved needs. Funding has been one of obstacles in providing the services needed to focus on the vast variety of issues that prevent families from breaking out of poverty and from living in the best, most affordable housing possible.

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

OHCD continues to follow all policies and procedures to reduce lead-based paint hazards in any renovation or redevelopment projects.

Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The County has continued its efforts in conjunction with the Continuum of Care (CoC) to reduce the number of poverty-level families through the development of services needed to assist those families with educational opportunities, job growth, and life skills training through the various social service agencies operating in the county. During FFY 2024, the County funded several activities to prevent homelessness and offer supportive services to poverty-level families. These efforts include case management, outreach, HMIS Support, shelter operations and short-term housing support.

Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

During this Program year the County has:

- OHCD collaborates with non-profit organizations to address community needs, barriers to affordable housing and provides support to federal and non-federal funding initiatives.
- OHCD administers both Tenant-Based Rental Vouches and Project-based rental vouchers through Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services (DBHDS). OHCD will be administering seventy-two (72) Permanent Supportive Vouchers to provide housing assistance to those with severe mental illness funded through the State Rental Assistance Program (SRAP)
- Worked with private industry and other government agencies in assessing and addressing important issues that hamper housing and community development efforts.

Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The County has continued to coordinate planning activities with private housing and social service agencies, including participation in the Prince William County Continuum of Care (CoC) meetings, on-going development of the Continuum of Care, development and implementation of a coordinated entry system and enumeration of point-in-time and homeless surveys. The County's Homeless Service Division has collaboratively with other CoC members implemented the "Pad Mission" which is a housing search resource for homeless service providers and landlords to register and utilize the tool to help quickly move literally homeless individuals and families into housing. County OHCD staff also participate as a member of the Program Analysis and Ranking (PAR) Committee of the CoC and continues its participation in other coalitions and study groups as the opportunity arises. OHCD staff also attend and participate in monthly CoC Serving Homeless monthly meetings, as well as other trainings and round table discussions.

Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdiction's analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)

In 2014, Prince William County created a Fair Housing Plan based on the 2014 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing. This report identified five broad impediments to fair housing. OHCD completed a review in FFY23 of the Fair Housing Plan and it was determined that there was no change to these identified impediments and OHCD would continue to address these needs:

1. Housing affordability
2. Overlapping areas of racially and ethnically concentrated poverty, segregation, and limited access to community assets
3. Lower-income Latino and Asian households demonstrate greater housing needs
4. Discrimination in the provision of housing

5. Lending practices limit the access of African American and Latino households

Fair Housing

Some of the Outreach Activities include:

- OHCD provided funding to the Prince William County Human Rights Agency to conduct Fair Housing Testing in local Apartment complexes within Prince William County
- OHCD Participates in the County Supervisors Open House and Community engagements to provide information on OHCD's Housing Programs and benefits and services available within the Community through its partners.
- OHCD also participates as an Affiliate Member of Prince William Association of Realtors (PWAR)
- Participating in affordable housing workshops, lunch and learns and Affiliate meetings providing information on all CPD programs and services provided, reaching both Realtors, Lenders, and Settlement Agencies
- Participated in the PWAR Annual Fall Conference as an exhibitor providing an opportunity to meet, discuss and provide brochures and information on all CPD programs
- Participated in Affordable Housing Workshops and Affiliate meetings providing information on all CPD programs and services provided, reaching Lenders and Settlement Agencies in the Northern Virginia Area
- As an active participant in the Annual Northern Virginia Housing Expo as a Vendor and a Trainer providing information to the participants concerning the housing programs available along with other resources for housing assistance and educational opportunities. The virtual provision of the Housing Expo continues to be available to participants which allows for virtual visits to Exhibit Hall, Workshops provided, Home Buyer and Rental resources, Coaching and Financial Information. OHCD will continue to be a participant in the Northern Virginia Housing Expo.
- OHCD participated in the Community Resource Roundtable providing information on Housing Opportunities hosted by the Prince William County Community Safety Agency.
- OHCD participated in the annual Prince William County Community Fair sponsored by the Prince William County Police Department – providing program information on all Housing programs to the community
- OHCD participated in the All County Public Safety Expo, where information on our housing programs was provided to the Participants.

- OHCD attended two Prince William County sponsored Job Fairs; where both housing job information was provided as well as housing assistance program information to the community
- OHCD participated in Fair Housing Community Webinars, providing Housing program information on all Housing programs to the attendees
- OHCD participated in Prince William County Community Outreach Pop-Ups; this outreach is initiated County Pop-ups within the County providing information from County Departments concerning the services and programs administered.
- OHCD participated in the Manassas Park City Community Services Event hosted by the Department of Housing in Manassas Park, Virginia; OHCD provided program information for all Housing programs, there were over 300 attendees for this event.
- OHCD participated in the Fairfax County Housing Symposium in learning about collaboration and regional approaches to methods of increasing affordable housing
- Provided on-going program information to real estate industry concerning affordable housing programs (First-Time Homebuyer Program and Neighborhood Housing Rehabilitation Program)
- The Director of Housing participated as a speaker representing the Office of Housing & Community Development in an "Affordable Housing Town Hall" where community residents and guests attended to receive information around the Affordable Dwelling Unit and Housing Programs that Prince William County administers.
- OHCD has on staff three Spanish speaking employees to allow for better communication and housing opportunities for the Latino population
- The County website can translate program descriptions in different languages as applicable, allowing for broader availability of the programs and services within the County
- OHCD Participated in the first County Quadrant Resource Fair where 1,391 attendees participated to gain information on County agencies, services, benefits and housing opportunities
- Funding provided through CDBG funds to the Prince William County Virginia Cooperative Extension to provide Housing Counseling, Financial Management, and Budgeting; with classes held in both English and Spanish. All class participation is a requirement for assistance under the First-Time Homebuyer Program. Educational classes are available in hybrid form.

Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

County Executive/Board of County Supervisors (BOCS)

Per the 1992 Board of County Supervisors formal resolution concerning "affordable housing", the Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD) prepares detailed reports of all housing and community development activities for the County Executive and the Board of County Supervisors. One of the main sections of the report is ongoing Consolidated Plan development and implementation. Other sections include new proposals for funding and implementation of new housing initiatives, as well as measurable goals and objectives called "performance measures." OHCD works with the Prince William County Finance and Budgeting offices to ensure that identified performance measures are being met and where other measures are needed.

Citizen Boards

Each month at the Prince William County Housing Board meetings, Consolidated Plan related issues and progress updates are discussed as part of the regular agenda, there is citizen time allocated for any housing related guests to express any affordable housing issue. Board training is provided throughout the year; on updates to federal program guidelines; and other affordable housing related topics. Community Planning and Development (CPD) management staff is present at Housing Board meetings and discusses questions concerning progress, obstacles, upcoming Consolidated Plans, events, and housing related activities.

Performance Measurement System

To establish specific targets on the road to achieving the Area goals and objectives and monitor them each year, a Performance Measurement System was developed that will be used each year with the submission of the Annual Performance Report. The Performance Measurement System includes objectives, outcomes as well as measurable outcome statements to identify how the Area is progressing towards the established objectives.

Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)

Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.

The Office of Housing and Community Development will convene and conduct at least one citizen input meeting which will be hybrid, at key times in the year. This meeting will allow for access and discussion of the progress made on the current year's performance of the Consolidated Plan and the second to solicit input for developing the ensuing year's Action Plan. Special citizen input meetings will be held as needed for substantial

amendments and/or special funding opportunities. Prior to obtaining formal approval by the Board of County Supervisors, the Office of Housing and Community Development will facilitate the convening and conduction of public hearings by the Prince William Housing Board. The meetings will be hybrid at convenient times and at accessible facilities. Citizen public comment in-put meeting notifications will be provided through the County's local newspaper, on the Housing website and OHCD will work with the County's Communication Department to reach all social media acceptable methods.

CR-45 CDBG 91.520(c)

Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.

Prince William County did not have any significant changes to the Goals listed in the Consolidated Plan and FFY2024 Action Plan. The County has met or exceeded most of the goals outlined in the Consolidated Plan. This year's activities have continued to be in line with the objectives of the County's Consolidated Plan, and as a result, the County does not plan on making any significant changes.

Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants? No

[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.

CR-50 HOME 91.520 (d)

Include the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

OHCD performed Housing Quality Standards Inspections (HQS) on thirty-five (35) residential properties in FFY24 (FY25), which consisted of seven (7) for the FTHB Program, fourteen (14) for both owner-occupied rehabilitation and affordable rental rehabilitation and twelve (12) residential properties were conducted on properties that were acquired/rehabilitated by County non-profits with prior year HOME and CDBG Funds. These inspections are completed to enforce the deed restrictions; affordability period and to monitoring of beneficiaries. These inspections included a visual assessment/ paint stabilization of all lead hazard remediation actions for the property that was built prior to 1978, inspections for required carbon monoxide detectors, radon potential and mold like substances.

Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. 92.351(b)

CHDO projects and property owners applying for HOME funds for assisted housing containing five or more housing units are advised of Affirmative Marketing requirements. As a condition of funding, a description of the project's affirmative marketing procedures must be submitted to and approved by the OHCD. During FFY24 (FY25) OHCD requested that FFY17-FFY20 the originally allocated CHDO funds be lowered and be reallocated to HOME entitlement funds, which was processed by the U.S. Department of HUD in July 2025. During FFY2024 (FY25) there were no CHDO activities. OHCD typically provides two years of CHDO Funds before providing competitive application process for affordable housing projects. However, due to the limited number of eligible CHDO's, OHCD currently has HOME CHDO unspent funds for FFY22 through FFY24. Application for HOME CHDO Certifications and funding is ongoing however there have been no Applicants applying for these funds. There are only two CHDO eligible non-profit housing providers in Prince William County and they have been contacted on many occasions to apply for CHDO funding, to no avail, as there is no interest.

Refer to IDIS reports to describe the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics

Of the seven (7) First Time Homebuyer (FTHB) disbursements in FFY2024; funding was used through the HOME FY21 and FY22 HOME Funds and prior year HOME Program Income. These funds expended benefited a total of seven (7) households or 20 persons, of which all seven (7) households were low income (50% to 60% of AMI).

Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 91.320(j)

No other actions taken.

CR-58 – Section 3

Identify the number of individuals assisted and the types of assistance provided

Total Labor Hours	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA	HTF
Total Number of Activities	0	0	0	0	0
Total Labor Hours					
Total Section 3 Worker Hours					
Total Targeted Section 3 Worker Hours					

Table 1 – Total Labor Hours

Qualitative Efforts - Number of Activities by Program	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA	HTF
Outreach efforts to generate job applicants who are Public Housing Targeted Workers					
Outreach efforts to generate job applicants who are Other Funding Targeted Workers.					
Direct, on-the job training (including apprenticeships).					
Indirect training such as arranging for, contracting for, or paying tuition for, off-site training.					
Technical assistance to help Section 3 workers compete for jobs (e.g., resume assistance, coaching).					
Outreach efforts to identify and secure bids from Section 3 business concerns.					
Technical assistance to help Section 3 business concerns understand and bid on contracts.					
Division of contracts into smaller jobs to facilitate participation by Section 3 business concerns.					
Provided or connected residents with assistance in seeking employment including: drafting resumes, preparing for interviews, finding job opportunities, connecting residents to job placement services.					
Held one or more job fairs.					
Provided or connected residents with supportive services that can provide direct services or referrals.					
Provided or connected residents with supportive services that provide one or more of the following: work readiness health screenings, interview clothing, uniforms, test fees, transportation.					
Assisted residents with finding child care.					
Assisted residents to apply for, or attend community college or a four year educational institution.					
Assisted residents to apply for, or attend vocational/technical training.					
Assisted residents to obtain financial literacy training and/or coaching.					
Bonding assistance, guaranties, or other efforts to support viable bids from Section 3 business concerns.					
Provided or connected residents with training on computer use or online technologies.					
Promoting the use of a business registry designed to create opportunities for disadvantaged and small businesses.					
Outreach, engagement, or referrals with the state one-stop system, as designed in Section 121(e)(2) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.					
Other.					

Table 2 – Qualitative Efforts - Number of Activities by Program

Prince William County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD) has been proactive in providing guidance and informational training to the Contractors that participate within the applicable assistance programs through OHCD.

CR-60 – ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in e-snaps
For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY
Organizational DUNS Number	003096740
EIN/TIN Number	546001531
Identify the Field Office	WASHINGTON DC
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Prince William County CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Ms
First Name	Joan
Middle Name	S
Last Name	Duckett
Suffix	0
Title	Director of Housing

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	15941 Donald Curtis Drive, Suite 112
Street Address 2	0
City	Woodbridge
State	VA
ZIP Code	22191
Phone Number	703-792-7539
Extension	0
Fax Number	703-792-4978
Email Address	jduckett@pwccgov.org

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	
First Name	
Last Name	
Suffix	
Title	
Phone Number	
Extension	

Email Address

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete Program

Year Start Date 07/01/2024

Program Year End Date 06/30/2025

3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Prince William County Department of Social Services

City: Woodbridge

State: VA

Zip Code: 22191, 4256

DUNS Number: 003096740

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$49,283

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Action in Community Through Service, Inc. (ACTS)

City: Dumfries

State: VA

Zip Code: 22026, 0074

DUNS Number: 052280195

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$36,273

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Northern Virginia Family Service

City: Oakton

State: VA

Zip Code: 22124, 2764

DUNS Number: 162818561

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$67,218

**** CR-65 through CR-75 data has been replaced by the submission of a separate Sage report**

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COLLABORATION AGREEMENT

AMONG

District of Columbia
District of Columbia Housing Authority
City of Alexandria, VA
Alexandria Housing and Redevelopment Authority, VA
Arlington County, VA
Fairfax County, VA
Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority
Loudoun County, VA
Montgomery County, MD
Housing Opportunities Commission, MD
Prince William County, VA,
Rockville Housing Enterprises, MD and
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments

FOR

THE 2021-2025 METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF

IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON REGIONAL FAIR HOUSING PLAN

Prince William County

Prepared by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, the Urban Institute, and Ochoa Urban Collaborative in partnership with COG member governments

November 2023



Metropolitan Washington
Council of Governments

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON REGIONAL FAIR HOUSING PLAN

November 2023

This subsection is part of the regional plan, which is available on COG's website.

ABOUT COG

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) is an independent, nonprofit association that brings area leaders together to address major regional issues in the District of Columbia, suburban Maryland, and Northern Virginia. COG's membership is comprised of 300 elected officials from 24 local governments, the Maryland and Virginia state legislatures, and U.S. Congress.

PARTICIPATING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

This fair housing plan was prepared in collaboration with eight COG member governments: City of Alexandria, VA; Arlington County, VA; District of Columbia; Fairfax County, VA; City of Gaithersburg, MD; Montgomery County, MD; Loudoun County, VA; and Prince William County, VA.

Key government staff for this collaboration included: City of Alexandria: Kim Cadena and Melodie Seau; Arlington County: Joel Franklin, Jennifer Daniels, and Rolda Nedd; District of Columbia: Lesley Edmond; Fairfax County: Linda Hoffman, Vin Rogers, Amanda Schlener, Kenneth Saunders, and Margot Squires; Loudoun County: Brian Reagan, Eileen Barnhard, Rebekah King, and Christine Hillock; City of Gaithersburg: David Cristeal; Montgomery County: Katherine Canales, Cathy Mahmud, and Frank Demarais; Prince William County: Joan Duckett.

CREDITS

Author: Diane Glauber, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

Contributing Authors: Peter Tatian, Urban Institute, and Manuel Ochoa, Ochoa Urban Collaborative

Additional Contributors: Kim SESCOE from Public Engagement Associates supported the community engagement activities. Yipeng Su, Ananya Hariharan, Patrick Spauster, and Elizabeth Burton from the Urban Institute assisted in preparing data, tables, and maps for the plan. Monique King-Viehland contributed to the overall report framing and strategy.

Design: Stephen Fortune and Lindsey Martin

Project Manager: Hilary Chapman

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity provided technical assistance to the participating governments to support effective regional collaboration. Ronaldlyn Latham from HUD and Jarrod Elwell from Enterprise Community Partners were key partners in this effort. Support from Citi Community Development made regional workshops and graphic materials possible. The local governments wish to acknowledge support from the District of Columbia and Lesley Edmond for providing a Plain Language editorial review and translation of the executive summary and related materials.

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Regionally-focused organizations which work with residents directly impacted by fair housing choice provided guidance to the local governments. The organizations included: Action in the Community Through Service (ACTS); CASA; Catholic Charities Archdiocese of Washington and Catholic Charities of Arlington; ENDependence Center of Northern Virginia; Equal Rights Center; Friendship Place; Greater Washington Urban League; House of Ruth; Legal Services of Northern Virginia; NAACP Chapters of Arlington County, Fairfax County, Montgomery County, and Prince William County; Offender Aid Restoration; Pathways Homes; and Washington Legal Clinic for the Homeless.

ACCOMMODATIONS POLICY

Alternative formats of this document are available upon request. Visit www.mwcog.org/accommodations or call (202) 962-3300 or (202) 962-3213 (TDD).

TITLE VI NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin and fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations prohibiting discrimination in all programs and activities. For more information, to file a Title VI related complaint, or to obtain information in another language, visit www.mwcog.org/nondiscrimination or call (202) 962-3300.

El Consejo de Gobiernos del Área Metropolitana de Washington (COG) opera sus programas sin tener en cuenta la raza, el color, y el origen nacional y cumple con el Título VI de la Ley de Derechos Civiles de 1964 y los estatutos y reglamentos relacionados que prohíben la discriminación en todos los programas y actividades. Para más información, presentar una queja relacionada con el Título VI, u obtener información en otro idioma, visite www.mwcog.org/nondiscrimination o llame al (202) 962-3300.

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	2
II. Community Participation	2
III. Assessment of Past Goals	10
IV. Fair Housing Analysis	15
A. Demographic Summary.....	15
B. General Issues.....	22
i. Segregation versus Integration	22
ii. Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty.....	34
iii. Disparities in Access to Opportunity.....	41
a. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Education	41
b. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Employment	49
c. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Transportation.....	64
d. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Access to Low-Poverty Neighborhoods.....	78
e. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Access to Environmentally Healthy Neighborhoods	90
f. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Patterns in Disparities in Access to Opportunity	97
iv. Disproportionate Housing Needs	98
C. Publicly Supported Housing Analysis	111
D. Disability and Access Analysis.....	121
V. Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources	137
VI. Fair Housing Goals and Priorities	139
VII. Contributing Factors	146
VIII. Public Comments	193
IX. Endnotes	236
X. Glossary.....	251
XI. Appendix.....	258

I. Executive Summary

The executive summary is published as a separate document and can be found on the same web page as this document at www.mwcog.org/fairhousingplan. Hard copies are available upon request.

II. Community Participation

Meaningful community engagement is important to the development of the regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (Regional Fair Housing Plan) for the metropolitan Washington region and the eight jurisdictions participating in the plan: the District of Columbia; Montgomery County and the City of Gaithersburg in Maryland; and the City of Alexandria, Arlington County, Fairfax County, Loudoun County, and Prince William County in Virginia.

Although there is no current US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) rule or guidance on community engagement, the project team took cues from the 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule, which defines community engagement as: “a solicitation of views and recommendations from members of the community and other interested parties, a consideration of the views and recommendations received, and a process for incorporating such views and recommendations into decisions and outcomes” (24 CFR § 5.152). The team took seriously its role in ensuring that community voices inform the plan. These voices helped confirm data findings, identify gaps in information, and reshape biases or viewpoints.

The Regional Fair Housing Plan is an important step that should inform each grantee’s Consolidated Plan, which defines how communities will use HUD grant funds, specifically Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnerships, and Emergency Solutions Grant. In principle, the Fair Housing Act of 1968, which calls for all federal programs to “affirmatively further fair housing,” should prioritize limited HUD funding and resources for protected classes—the individuals, groups, and communities most impacted by past discriminatory practices that have affected resources and land patterns to this day. Enshrined in the Fair Housing Act, these protected classes are race, color, sex, national origin, religion, familial status, and disability.

The project team leaned on its experience in community engagement. The team has conducted over 20 analyses of impediments from across the country in a variety of geographies, including large cities, urban counties, and suburban jurisdictions—such as Kansas City, Los Angeles County, Prince George’s County, and Orange County (California). The team was advised by Jarrod Elwell of Enterprise Community Partners, assigned by HUD to provide best practices and guidance to the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) and the regional effort.

An important anchor for the work was the regional coordination of community engagement led by Hilary Chapman, housing program manager at the Metropolitan Washington COG. She coordinated meetings with the Regional AI Project Team and the Regional Fair Housing Community Advisory Committee as well as internally with COG communications staff. The project team also coordinated with the Regional AI Project Team, which included senior staff and housing directors from every jurisdiction. Additionally, the Regional Fair Housing Community Advisory Committee was composed of a wide variety of community organizations representing HUD defined protected classes, such as civil rights groups, disability advocates, housing for seniors, immigrant groups, and service organizations from throughout the region.

The project team met monthly, and the Community Advisory Committee met every other month. This is in addition to countless meetings the team and committee members had with staff from each jurisdiction or leaders from various organizations.

Although the COVID-19 pandemic limited the number of public meetings, they were held in government facilities that were accessible and met the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The project team also tried to ensure that websites and virtual meetings met Section 508 requirements and to use descriptive language when making presentations. In addition, Spanish interpreters were provided for those with limited English proficiency. Every meeting offered services for the visually and hearing impaired, as well as interpretation in various languages through the multilingual services contracted by various jurisdictions.

As mentioned, one of the challenges to community engagement was the COVID-19 pandemic. A handful of in-person meetings and presentations were conducted in fall 2021 during a lull in the pandemic. For the most part, however, the meetings were held virtually using the Zoom platform. The project team experimented with different days of the week and times of day to encourage as much participation as possible. The team also grappled with “Zoom fatigue,” a real phenomenon and challenge because participants were spending so much time on work calls as well as connecting with family, friends, and social groups, especially during the height of the pandemic. The team worked closely with expert facilitators who were able to adapt community engagement techniques for a virtual audience by adjusting presentations and using short videos, recorded testimonials, and breakout groups to allow as much audience participation as possible.

To guide the work, the project team developed a Regional Community Engagement Plan in May 2021 for review and comment by COG and participating jurisdictions. This plan outlined how the team would seek information from community stakeholders to inform the Regional Fair Housing Plan. The Community Engagement Plan included the following elements: outreach events and marketing, a social media communication strategy, a regionwide survey, interviews, local jurisdiction focus groups and meetings, protected class focus groups, and a public comment period. The following sections provide more detailed information on the various elements of the plan as well as findings from the survey, focus groups, and community meetings.

Outreach Events

The first step in community engagement was to inform as many stakeholders as possible that the Regional Fair Housing Plan process has begun. This involved outreach to local organizations, fair housing agencies, civil rights organizations, and service organizations that work with protected classes. In addition, the project team worked with each jurisdiction to conduct an awareness campaign inside their local government to ensure that all related agencies were aware of the Regional Fair Housing Plan. This included social service agencies, homeless services, planning and zoning, human relations, human rights as well as area advisory boards or other officially constituted advisory boards from each jurisdiction, such as regional services centers in Montgomery County or magisterial districts in Prince William County.

The team worked with each jurisdiction to prepare an outreach list and a Google calendar. Jurisdictional project leads worked closely with the team to obtain invitations to scheduled advisory board and other regularly scheduled meetings held by the county or city. The team began to informally call these meetings “familiarization tours,” because most individuals or groups were not familiar with fair housing or a fair housing plan. Overall, the team found that it was helpful to present information on the Fair Housing Act, why the act was created, and how the planning would proceed. This way, individuals were prepared to participate in future meetings or interviews and were more willing to share information about future meetings with other community members.

These familiarization tours were conducted primarily from April to June 2021, and the project team developed a list of more than 1,235 agencies, organizations, and individuals interested in engaging more deeply in the Regional Fair Housing Plan process. A list of all outreach meetings and events can be found in the appendix, “Outreach Events and Presentations.”

Media Strategy

The project team coordinated with Housing Program Manager Hilary Chapman and COG communication staff as well as with each jurisdiction’s COG project leads. Each jurisdiction, in turn, helped to coordinate and communicate with their public information office.

The team sent event announcements and flyers to interested individuals and organizations via Mailchimp, and a much larger outreach was done in coordination with COG communications staff and each jurisdiction’s public information office or internal departmental mailing lists. Each jurisdiction had mailing lists that could reach thousands of citizens. Coordination was key to ensuring that messages were sent promptly, given that the team depended on the cooperation of each jurisdiction to reach as wide an audience as possible.

Each jurisdiction was responsible for following its internal requirements for posting public notices in newspapers of general circulation, on departmental websites, or to social media. This included posting messages or announcements in multiple languages, including Spanish, Amharic, Arabic, and other spoken languages in each jurisdiction. The team provided materials in Spanish and English for all flyers and major announcements.

The team worked with COG to create a social media toolkit that included sample tweets and Facebook posts encouraging participation in the Regional Fair Housing Plan and the regional survey. Members of COG’s board and elected leaders from throughout the region also recorded a short “call to action” video encouraging participation in the process.¹ A copy of COG’s social media toolkit can be found in the appendix, “Housing Equity and Race: Fair Housing in the DMV.”

The project team also worked with COG’s communications team to create an easy-to-find, centralized Regional Fair Housing Plan website at www.mwcog.org/fairhousing, which includes information about the draft Regional Fair Housing Plan, upcoming events, videos, and an infographic.

Regional Focus Groups

As part of the Regional Fair Housing Plan community engagement strategy, regionalism is an important theme. Because housing affordability, the need for units accessible for persons with disabilities, and discrimination in housing, among other issues, do not stop at jurisdictional lines, the community engagement plan included regional focus groups.

To that end, the project team engaged with residents from across the region to share barriers to affordable housing and talk about equity and discrimination in housing. The team partnered with Challenging Racism, a nonprofit organization headquartered in Arlington, Virginia, with a mission to “educate people about the prevalence and inequities of institutional and systemic racism, giving them the knowledge and tools to disrupt racism where they encounter it—in their family, work and community.”²

Challenging Racism helped the project team design an interactive Zoom session that combined education and dialogues at the intersection of housing, transportation, education, environment, and race. To attract as diverse an audience as possible, the sessions were conducted on Thursday, July

14; Friday, July 22; and Sunday, July 31, 2021. Each session was two-and-a-half hours long and included educational sessions on redlining in the Washington region and some background on the federal government's role in housing inequality based on Richard Rothstein's book *The Color of Law*.³ The format included presentations by storytellers from a variety of backgrounds and small group discussions. These sessions attracted more than 388 registrants.

Survey

From July 2021 to February 2022, the project team conducted a survey of residents from throughout the Washington region, targeting the eight jurisdictions that are part of the Regional Fair Housing Plan. The team used Alchemer, an online survey tool, to reach residents, advocates, and organizations. The survey was simplified by plain language experts provided by the government of the District of Columbia to achieve a more readable format for the general public, and thereby increasing the response rate. The survey was also translated into Spanish.

A soft launch of the survey was first included as part of the post-meeting materials of the Challenging Racism regional workshops. The team then worked with Metropolitan Washington COG and the eight jurisdictions to post the survey on COG's fair housing website and each jurisdiction's departmental website. The team also sent the survey with follow-up emails after each focus group meeting. Initial responses were low, given that participants were asked to complete a survey after a one-and-a-half hour meeting. A more concerted campaign was made in fall 2021 and spring 2022 using social media. The team developed a social media toolkit that included information and messages about the survey for each jurisdiction. The joint effort greatly improved the response rate, rapidly increasing the number of participants. All told, 2,825 surveys were collected from the eight jurisdictions.

The top findings from the survey include the following:

- Safe, affordable housing in an acceptable condition is difficult to find, according to 83.6 percent of respondents. The top three reasons were that the residents did not earn enough money (58.9 percent), the housing available was in bad condition or was unsafe (30.5 percent), and the respondent was not able to save for a security deposit or a down payment (29.9 percent). Other reasons were that the respondent had too much debt, mortgage interest or fees were too expensive, and the homebuying process was too confusing or complicated.
- About 13 percent of respondents reported that they personally had experienced discrimination. An additional 3.6 percent reported that not only had they experienced discrimination but also know someone else who had. An additional 9.2 percent reported that they personally had not experienced discrimination but know someone who had.
- The top three reasons for discrimination were income level, race and ethnicity, and source of income.
- Of the respondents who reported discrimination, 41.3 percent said the landlord or property manager was the perpetrator.
- Almost 75 percent of survey respondents did not report their discrimination complaints. The primary reasons were that they did not believe it would make a difference (39 percent) and that it was too much of a hassle (11 percent); but about 17 percent did not know how to report a case.

Survey participants shared the following characteristics:

- The jurisdictions with the most respondents were the District of Columbia (57.2 percent), Loudoun County (16.2 percent), and the City of Alexandria (8.2 percent).

- The participants primarily worked in the District of Columbia (59.3 percent), Loudoun County (12.4 percent), and Fairfax County (11.7 percent).
- About half of respondents (47.4 percent) lived in multifamily buildings, evenly split between small buildings (with fewer than 20 units) and larger buildings (with 20 or more units).
- Those who lived in single-family dwellings were 18.1 percent of respondents.
- Unhoused or unsheltered people were 4.2 percent of respondents.
- Of respondents, 18.7 percent paid a mortgage and 60.1 percent paid rent, with 33.4 percent paying rent to a private landlord.
- Of respondents, 58.7 percent identified as Black or African American, 26.1 percent as White, 6.4 percent as multiracial, and 8.8 as Hispanic or Latino.⁴

The survey was a useful tool for comparing housing barriers and potential goals and actions collected from focus groups and public meetings. But it also served as another form of outreach by collecting data from interested members of the public who did not have time to participate in public meetings. A complete summary of the survey results is available in the appendix, “Report for 2021–2022 Regional Fair Housing Survey.”

Jurisdictional Focus Group and Public Meetings

In the fourth quarter of 2021, the project team conducted a focus group and a public meeting for each jurisdiction, reaching over 700 participants. The participating jurisdictions were the District of Columbia; Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties and the City of Alexandria in Virginia; and (in a joint meeting) Montgomery County and the City of Gaithersburg in Maryland. Meetings were scheduled from October to early December to accommodate each jurisdiction’s existing schedule of events and previously scheduled public meetings.

Extensive consultation and outreach were conducted with each jurisdiction to develop a list of stakeholders for smaller focus groups of approximately 30 participants and for larger meetings that were open to the public. The project team sent individual invitations via Mailchimp with follow-up emails and phone calls. The team worked closely with jurisdictional liaisons to do outreach, develop the agenda, and create the presentations.

Each meeting included an overview of the fair housing process, preliminary data findings for each jurisdiction from the Urban Institute, short presentations on related housing studies by each jurisdiction, and a breakout for small group discussions. For the smaller focus groups, the team used Jamboard, a virtual whiteboard on Google that allows participants to share “sticky notes,” to discuss barriers and solutions to housing. The small group discussions provided rich and valuable information that helped the team to better understand the barriers that renters, homeowners, and the unhoused face across the region.

The notes and Jamboards were analyzed by Lorraine Hopkins, Tayanna Teel, and Aaron Turner—a team of graduate students in the Masters of Public Administration and Policy program in the School of Public Affairs at American University. The students used NVivo, a word analysis software that helps social scientists look for patterns and commonalities. Their analysis helped to summarize all 14 meetings across the region.

The NVivo study found that the top ten barriers to fair housing in the region were as follows (in rank order):

1. lack of affordability
2. government failure (i.e., government’s inability to address the issue)

3. racial discrimination
4. lack of housing stock
5. lack of ADA accessibility, including not enough housing for people with disabilities or seniors, discrimination against people with disabilities, and noncompliance with existing laws and regulations
6. difficulty navigating the system (e.g., program requirements, waiting lists, etc.)
7. subtle practices that support segregated housing and neighborhoods
8. bad landlords or property managers
9. lack of awareness of fair housing rights
10. planning and zoning regulations

The top ten solutions to the barriers identified include the following:

1. more programs and staff with cultural and language competency
2. creation of accessible housing for people with disabilities
3. creation of accessible housing grants
4. improved building code, zoning, and planning regulations
5. more navigation support (e.g., housing counseling)
6. better-trained real estate professionals
7. more rental assistance programs that are easier to navigate
8. materials in multiple languages, including plain language
9. programs for returning citizens (those formerly incarcerated)
10. stronger tenant rights

Interviews

After considering the findings from the jurisdictional focus groups and public meetings, the project team consulted with each jurisdiction's project lead to develop a list of 8 to 10 key people to interview in their jurisdiction. The team conducted 36 interviews in January, February, and early March 2022. In several cases, the interviews included a small group of elected or senior officials. Overall, the team interviewed approximately 50 individuals. The interviews provided the team with the opportunity to discuss recent housing needs studies and fair housing plans. For example, both the District of Columbia and Arlington County already have their own draft Analyses of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice.

The interviews included the following influential stakeholders and decisionmakers:

- fair housing and civil rights organizations, including each jurisdiction's civil rights, fair housing, or human relations agency, such as the NAACP
- private housing industry, such as developers, lenders, members of the National Association of Realtors, mortgage companies, real estate brokers, insurance companies, home inspectors, appraisers, management companies, and trade groups like the Northern Virginia Board of Realtors
- senior officials from offices and agencies of housing and community development, public housing authorities, and social services agencies
- planning directors and staff with oversight of land use and zoning
- elected government officials, such as city councilmembers or county commissioners
- nonprofit leaders, such as community-based organizations, community development corporations, housing counseling groups, legal services agencies, immigrant rights advocacy groups, and so on

In addition to these interviews, the team had dozens of informal conversations with area leaders in the civil rights, housing, and community development fields. For a full list of interviews, see the appendix, “Events and Interviews Master Tracker.”

Protected Classes Focus Groups

Although the project team was pleased with the diversity of participants in the jurisdictional focus groups and public meetings, there were noted gaps in representatives of the protected classes. Despite outreach attempts, representatives of certain groups were not able to attend the meetings at the scheduled times because of conflicts or other demands. To remediate these gaps, the team analyzed for missing groups and consulted the jurisdictional liaisons and the Community Advisory Committee.

The team found that more information was needed from representatives of Spanish-speaking and immigrant communities, the LGBTQ+ community, seniors, and people with disabilities. Beginning in January 2022, targeted outreach was made to representative organizations to schedule a focus group at convenient days and times in March. More than 100 people attended five meetings, which included short presentations. The meetings were kept small to encourage conversation and exchange rather than adhere to a tightly scripted agenda.

Following are some top barriers and solutions to housing identified by each focus group:

Spanish-Speaking Community

- need for more Spanish-speaking housing counselors as well as local government staff
- multiple issues with housing conditions and code enforcement
- fear of reprisal is a major issue in reporting housing discrimination or substandard housing conditions
- need for more outreach and education on fair housing rights

Immigrant Communities

- not enough program information available in other languages, such as Arabic, Amharic, and Chinese
- lack of familiarity with local government housing programs
- many cases of source-of-income discrimination
- lack of affordability is the biggest obstacle for homeownership
- subtle forms of discrimination because of religion, national origin, and language that are hard to prove
- need for more fair housing testing

Seniors

- few options and programs for seniors to remain in place
- limited number of affordable rental housing choices for seniors
- need for more options for multigenerational dwellings
- need for more housing for seniors who also have disability
- need for more housing counseling for seniors, especially regarding foreclosure prevention and reverse mortgage fraud

People with Disabilities Community

- need for more landlords abiding by reasonable accommodation regulations
- low-income people with disabilities face limited choices because of credit, deposit, and other requirements
- not enough fair housing testing for people with disabilities
- need for access to affordable professionals who can make necessary modifications
- need for more universal design standards in all buildings

LGBTQ+ Community

- LGBTQ and trans youth face additional challenges because of limited programs and services, leading to higher incidences of homelessness
- need for more LGBTQ+ fair housing testing
- need for better coordination across jurisdictions for LGBTQ+ youth services; many jurisdictions are sending youth to Washington, D.C.
- greater need to address housing challenges for senior LGBTQ+ individuals

Public Comment

In January 2023, the draft plan was published on COG's and each jurisdiction's websites for a 60-day public comment period. Each jurisdiction was responsible for posting a message notifying the public about the draft plan. The project team prepared a flyer for each jurisdiction to circulate and sent a message to the team's internal mailing list. Public comments were collected through COG's fair housing project website (via email at fairhousing@mwkog.org) as well as each jurisdiction's general project mailbox, depending on the agency responsible for their jurisdiction's fair housing plan.

Conclusion

Community engagement requires more than one format or type of outreach and input; it needs multiple modes to reach different groups. People are challenged not just by work and family pressures but also by multiple public meetings and surveys, compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic. The project team understood that a survey may be the only input provided by some interested member of the public. Outreach requires careful planning, multiple channels, and reminders. But most important of all is the invitation from a colleague or a friend, which makes a great difference in whether someone attends a public meeting.

As the team has had time to reflect on outreach efforts, following are some takeaways from the Regional Fair Housing community engagement plan:

1. Include public engagement officers at the planning stages and throughout the effort. Their mailing lists and social media reach is much larger than what the project team could ever muster.
2. Find community engagement champions among stakeholder groups. This is key to getting more citizen voices involved. Community leaders have more credibility than the project team could ever have on the neighborhood or local level.
3. A multilingual effort is necessary, which requires more consistent investment and time from local government agencies throughout the process.

4. Funding outreach efforts by community-based organizations—such as Latino, immigrants, the disability community, seniors, and LGBTQ+ individuals—could result in better turnout for community-engagement efforts.
5. Getting eight local governments to agree on a multipronged approach takes a lot of compromise and effort; but the results are worthwhile.

The development of the Regional Fair Housing Plan was successful primarily because of the coordinated efforts of the Washington Council of Governments, jurisdictional liaisons, housing directors, the project team, and the many advisors, colleagues, and friends in housing and community development who kept moving forward.

Now that all the information is gathered and the draft plan has been reviewed and adopted by each jurisdiction, the next step is for senior and elected officials to implement the goals and recommendations, so that the plan is followed through with action rather than just words. Some progress will be rapid, building on the many existing efforts across the region, while others may be incremental and take more time. Ultimately, it will take a dedicated public to stay engaged and continued advocacy efforts by stakeholders to keep track of progress—not just for a year but for the next several years to come.

III. Assessment of Past Goals

1. Prioritize policies that support the expansion of the affordable and accessible housing supply, especially in the least affordable neighborhoods.
2. Continue to expand the supply of housing at both the upper and lower ends of affordability. Data suggest that the supply of affordable housing is constrained by low inventory of both upper-income and lower-income housing.
3. Continue to work with local developers and nonprofit organizations to increase the supply of housing affordable to the lowest-income households.
4. Encourage and incentivize developers engaged in significant neighborhood development to target both ends of the affordability spectrum.
5. Explore permitting accessory dwelling units (ADUs) by right in a broader range of neighborhoods, particularly those with large lot-size requirements. Allowing ADUs can be a simple and cost-effective way to increase the supply of affordable housing units in areas with fewer existing options.
6. Ensure that existing financial incentives appropriately address the affordable housing needs of the county and that administrative tasks are not excessively burdensome to the development of housing.
7. Review the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) qualified allocation plan (QAP) to ensure that credits are appropriately allocated to meet the affordable housing needs of the county.
8. Explore alternative sources of funding for the development of accessible housing affordable to families and individuals earning 50–80 percent of the area median income (AMI) or less.
9. Engage area business leaders to develop a clear picture of the workforce and housing needs of employers. Explore opportunities for and interest in corporate housing investment.

10. Explore the feasibility of partnering with local employers to create employer-assisted housing benefit plans for employees that reside and/or work in the Prince William County area.
11. Ensure that all participants in county-administered housing programs and services are made aware of the full spectrum of housing opportunities throughout the area.
12. Make certain that services contracted by the county from the Virginia Cooperative Extension, such as free educational events and HUD-approved housing counseling services, are available to Spanish speakers and affirmatively marketed to residents living in R/ECAPs and segregated neighborhoods.
13. Continue to support homeownership and wealth-building opportunities for county residents.
14. Affirmatively market homeownership programs to residents in R/ECAPs and segregated neighborhoods.
15. Target R/ECAPs and segregated neighborhoods for workforce training and economic development investments.
16. Ensure that land use regulations allow for the development of affordable housing in a variety of neighborhoods throughout the county, fostering mixed-income communities.
17. Investigate practices and models of community planning that provide significant participation opportunities for the area's diverse population and drive development needs.
18. Review patterns of community opposition to identify concerns that might be addressed through outreach, education, or participation.
19. Explore the feasibility of creating a rental registry program in the county. Rental registry programs have been used in many other areas to curb the negligence of absentee landlords, enhance the efficiency of code enforcement efforts, increase the availability of safe and affordable rental units, and protect the value of neighboring properties. Such a program could be administered at no cost to the county. Application fees could cover associated administrative costs. A comprehensive review of other rental registry programs should begin as soon as staff time permits.
20. Continue to provide funding for home rehabilitation programs such as the Neighborhood Housing Rehabilitation Program (NHRP) in Prince William County and Manassas Park and the Manassas City home repair program.
21. Target rehabilitation program marketing efforts toward communities demonstrating the greatest disparities.
22. Secure dedicated funding to conduct annual rental audit testing focused on race, color, disability, and national origin.
23. Target the area's Latino community for fair housing, landlord-tenant, consumer protection, and financial literacy education, and support efforts to engage the Latino community in homeownership programs.

24. Consider holding the county's biennial housing fair on an annual basis. Include fair housing education, training, and outreach components for housing seekers and providers.
25. Continue to make fair housing educational materials available on the county website in both English and Spanish and work with sub-grantee jurisdictions to do the same.
26. Ensure that county-administered housing program participants receive fair housing education.
27. Explore providing a fair housing information program that covers zoning and community and economic development for officials and employees who have a direct impact on fair housing.
28. Provide annual fair housing training to the Prince William County Housing Board.
29. Encourage hiring or training a bilingual (Spanish and English) staff person to work in the Prince William County Human Rights Commission office.
30. Increase minority access to sustainable mortgage products.
31. Continue to support the provision of financial literacy, homeownership, and credit repair counseling in coordination with down payment assistance programs.
32. Set a goal of providing counseling services to an increasing number of individuals or households per year as applicable.
33. Support and publicize an annual lending report that evaluates the lending practices of the area's largest lending institutions. Encourage area lenders to examine and alter their practices when lending disparities exist. Explore policy and practice solutions that encourage mainstream lending to underserved communities.
34. Continue to work with financial partners to provide Prince William County employees access to financial education, credit tools, and related benefits.
35. Take an active role in providing public comments on the lending behaviors of lending institutions during their Community Reinvestment Act exams.
36. Affirmatively market financial education, foreclosure prevention, reverse mortgage counseling, pre- and post-purchase counseling, and other housing counseling services to minorities, specifically African Americans and Latinos.

Efforts made to address these goals, combat impediments, and promote fair housing during FY2018 through FY2022 are described below. Partners and outreach activities included the following:

- Realtor Association of Prince William (affiliate member)
 - Participated in affordable housing workshops and affiliate meetings, providing information to realtors, lenders, and settlement agencies on all available US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Community Planning and Development (CPD) programs and services.
 - Participated in the annual fall conference as an exhibitor, providing brochures and information on all available CPD programs to promote homeownership and aging in place, preserve and improve owner-occupied properties, and bring properties up to applicable building codes and standards. (Namely, assistance is available to

correct exterior and interior deficiencies, make accessibility modifications, correct health and safety violations, improve weatherization and energy conservation, and correct lead-based paint violations. Assistance is also available for general improvements, including alterations; kitchen, bathroom, and accessibility modifications; carpeting; fencing; and landscaping.)

- Northern Virginia Mortgage Bankers Association (affiliate member)
 - Participated in affordable housing workshops and affiliate meetings, providing information on CPD programs and services to lenders and settlement agencies in the northern Virginia area.
- Northern Virginia Housing Expo
 - Participated in the annual Northern Virginia Housing Expo, providing information on all available CPD programs and services to private citizens and local communities; lenders, realtors, settlement agencies, and others in the real estate industry; and nonprofits and government entities.
- Latino Festival
 - Participated in the annual Latino Festival; Spanish-speaking staff of CPD attended and provided brochures and information on all available CPD programs to private citizens, local communities, and others in the real estate industry.
- Workshops for local lenders, realtors, and settlement agencies
 - The Prince William County Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD) provided informational workshops to local lenders, the Realtor Association of Prince William, private real estate agencies, and private settlement agencies.
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Housing Summit
 - Participated in the first annual NAACP Housing Summit, providing brochures and information on all available CPD programs to private citizens, local communities, and others in the real estate industry.
- Veterans Housing Summit
 - Participated in first annual local Veterans Housing Summit, providing brochures and information on all available CPD programs to private citizens, local communities, and others in the real estate industry.

Funding was provided through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to the Prince William County Department of Social Services to provide transportation services for the homeless population. Transportation services were funded for up to 350 homeless individuals annually (for the five-year period) from the streets to a local shelter with available space, either from an established pick-up site or by appointment from the individual's location. Transportation was also covered between shelters or to and from medical clinics, detoxification facilities, public assistance offices, other local service providers, and any other locations as needed for individuals identified as homeless.

Funding was provided through CDBG funds to the Prince William County Virginia Cooperative Extension to provide homeownership counseling (with a Veterans Housing-approved curriculum) and financial management and budgeting classes, held in both English and Spanish. All classes are required for assistance under the First Time Homebuyers Program (FTHP).

In support of the 50th anniversary of the Fair Housing Act of 1968, outreach and marketing about fair housing activities and history were provided and the following outcomes and accomplishments were achieved:

- The final report from fair housing noted the following accomplishments:
 - creation of a fair housing logo designed by the Student Leadership Council and office of communications
 - co-sponsorship of the annual Fair Housing Luncheon with the Fairfax County Human Rights Commission that provided training to over 500 housing professionals
 - training of 19 student council members on fair housing and presentation of fair housing information to 9 of the 14 high schools, the homeschool community, and 2 private schools
 - distribution of fair housing posters to 65 apartment communities to be displayed in areas residents frequent
 - addition of a fair housing video produced by the Student Leadership Council and Hylton High School media program to the county Human Rights website (that will also be placed on public school, homeschool and private school websites)
- The OHCD provided funding to the Prince William County Human Rights Commission for annual fair housing testing.
- The county continued participating in an intergovernmental regional fair housing alliance along with the Council of Governments (COG) to collaborate on a new rigorous approach to furthering fair housing.
- Ongoing training was provided to the real estate industry concerning affordable housing programs (FTHP and NHRP).
- The OHCD tasked three Spanish-speaking employees to better communicate with the Latino population and participate in the Latino Festival.
- The county website added functionality to translate any county web page into many different languages to offer better communication and provide the community information on all programs and services.

Prince William County may have not been as successful as planned in creating more affordable housing; however, under the creation of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the county has been proactive by including an achievable housing chapter. The stated vision is to ensure a diversity of housing styles and price points to promote equitable, sustainable communities for residents during all phases of their lives and across all income bands. Attainable housing is housing meant to be affordable to households earning the AMI. The county has also recognized the need for an affordable housing ordinance, which is in a draft stage and being considered by the county Board of Supervisors.

IV. Fair Housing Analysis

A. Demographic Summary

This demographic summary provides an overview of data concerning race and ethnicity, sex, familial status, disability status, limited English proficiency (LEP), national origin, and age. The data included reflects the composition of the region.

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

Table 1: Demographics, Race and Ethnicity

	Non-Hispanic Black/ African American		Non-Hispanic White		Hispanic/Latino		Non-Hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander		Non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaska Native		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Prince William County	93,876	20.3	198,161	42.9	108,408	23.5	38,560	8.4	1,324	0.3	461,423
Regional	1,535,282	24.8	2,819,732	45.5	976,666	15.8	622,938	10.1	12,753	0.2	6,196,585

Note: All percentages represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.

Data sources: Decennial Census, American Community Survey.

Prince William County

Prince William County comes closer to mirroring regional demographics than any other jurisdiction. The county is slightly less heavily White, Black, and Asian or Pacific Islander than the broader region and somewhat more heavily Hispanic.

Region

The region is 45.5 percent White, 24.8 percent Black, 15.8 percent Latino, about 10 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, and about 10 percent Native American. Comparatively, the US as a whole is about 60 percent White; 12 percent Black; 18 percent Latino; 6 percent Asian, Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander; and less than 1 percent Native American.

Table 2: Demographics, Disability Status and Type

	With a Disability		With a Hearing Difficulty		With a Vision Difficulty		With a Cognitive Difficulty		With an Ambulatory Difficulty		With a Self-Care Difficulty		With an Independent Living Difficulty		Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Prince William County	35,221	7.8	8,987	2	6,882	1.5	13,794	3.3	16,574	4	7,274	1.7	11,717	3.6	453,557
Region	530,902	8.7	137,130	2.2	96,668	1.6	191,985	3.4	259,195	4.5	10,136	1.8	185,326	3.9	6,121,354

Note: All disability characteristics are based on the civilian noninstitutionalized population. All percentages represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.

Data source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Prince William County

In general, a lower percentage of Prince William County’s population has a disability than the region’s population.

Region

About 9 percent of the region’s population has a disability. The most common types of disability in the region are ambulatory, independent living, and cognitive disabilities.

Table 3: Demographics, Country of Origin for Non-Native-Born Residents

	#1 Country of Origin	#2 Country of Origin	#3 Country of Origin	#4 Country of Origin	#5 Country of Origin	#6 Country of Origin	#7 Country of Origin	#8 Country of Origin	#9 Country of Origin	#10 Country of Origin	Total Population
Prince William County	El Salvador	Ghana	Mexico	Honduras	Peru	Guatemala	Pakistan	Philippines	Afghanistan	Korea	
	23,273	6,440	6,277	5,295	4,964	4,855	4,565	3,922	3,919	3,709	112,955
Region	El Salvador	India	China	Korea	Ethiopia	Guatemala	Vietnam	Philippines	Mexico	Honduras	
	194,468	103,755	75,287	59,430	53,699	51,108	48,953	48,806	47,427	41,226	1,412,074

Note: The 10 most often reported places of birth at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as at the region level, and are therefore labeled separately. China does not include Hong Kong and Taiwan.
Data source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey.

Prince William County

Of non-US-born residents of Prince William County, El Salvador is by far the most common country of origin.

Region

Of non-US-born residents across the region, El Salvador is the most common country of origin, followed by India, China, Korea, and Ethiopia. About 200,000 residents of the region were born in El Salvador, about 100,000 were born in India, and about 75,000 were born in China. Between about 40,000 and 60,000 residents are from the other most common countries of origin.

Table 4: Demographics, Language Spoken at Home for Those Who Speak English “Less Than Very Well”

	#1 LEP Language	#2 LEP Language	#3 LEP Language	#4 LEP Language	#5 LEP Language	#6 LEP Language	#7 LEP Language	#8 LEP Language	#9 LEP Language	#10 LEP Language	Total Population
Prince William County	Spanish	Other Indo-European languages	Other and unspecified languages	Korean	Vietnamese	Other Asian or Pacific Islander languages	Arabic	Chinese (incl. Mandarin, Cantonese)	Tagalog (incl. Filipino)	French, Haitian, or Cajun	Total population
	38,626	6,951	3,342	2,071	1,927	1,463	1,471	1,348	758	611	427,305
Region	Spanish	Other Indo-European languages	Chinese (incl. Mandarin, Cantonese)	Other and unspecified languages	Korean	Vietnamese	Other Asian or Pacific Islander languages	French, Haitian, or Cajun	Arabic	Tagalog (incl. Filipino)	Total population
	343,586	58,581	40,202	39,678	32,625	27,986	27,381	18,821	14,682	9,701	5,793,981

Note: The 10 most often reported languages at the jurisdiction level may not be the same as at the region level, and are therefore labeled separately.

Data source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, Spanish is the most prevalently spoken language for people with LEP. From 2010 to 2019, Prince William County's population with LEP grew by 40 percent.

Region

Across the whole region, Spanish is the most prevalently spoken language for people with LEP. The remainder of the top 10 LEP languages (or language groups) in the region are as follows, in order: other Indo-European languages; Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese); other and unspecified languages; Korean; Vietnamese; other Asian or Pacific Islander languages; French, Haitian, or Cajun; Arabic; and Tagalog (including Filipino).

Table 5: Demographics, Growth in LEP Population, Washington Region, 2010–2019

Jurisdiction	Percentage
Prince William County	40%

Data source: 2006–2010 and 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Table 6: Demographics, Sex

	Total Population	Male Population		Female Population	
		#	%	#	%
Prince William County	461,423	230,487	50.0	230,936	50.0
Region	6,196,585	3,028,975	48.9	3,167,610	51.1

Note: All percentages represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.

Data source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Each of the jurisdictions and the region have about equal proportions of males and females.

Table 7: Demographics, Age

	Total Population	Population under 18 Years of Age		Population 18–64 Years of Age		Population 65 and Over	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Prince William County	461,423	125,851	27.3	291,563	63.2	44,009	9.5
Region	6,196,585	1,427,108	23.0	3,983,449	64.3	786,028	12.7

Prince William County

Prince William County has a higher percentage of youth under 18 years of age than the region as a whole.

Region

The region as a whole has a slightly lower percentage of people 65 and older (12.7 percent) than the country (15.6 percent).⁵

Table 8: Demographics, Families with Children

	#	%
Prince William County	62,155	43.8
Region	740,724	33.4

Note: All percentages represent a share of the total family households in the jurisdiction or region.

Data source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Prince William County

Prince William County has a much higher percentage of families with children than the region as a whole.

Region

About 46.1 percent of the region’s family households are families with children. Family households are those with two or more people living together, at least one of whom is related to the head of household by marriage, birth, or adoption.

Table 9: Demographic Trends, Prince William County, Virginia

	1990		2000		2010		Current	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Race/Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	202,340	80.8	211,928	65.0	219,720	48.4	198,161	42.9
Black, Non-Hispanic	27,957	11.2	60,871	18.7	92,880	20.5	93,876	20.3
Hispanic	11,535	4.6	34,158	10.5	97,981	21.6	108,408	23.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,355	2.9	15,242	4.7	39,353	8.7	38,560	8.4
Native American, Non-Hispanic	709	0.3	2,018	0.6	2,519	0.6	1,324	0.3
National Origin								
Foreign-Born	15,946	6.4	38,703	11.9	93,631	20.6	112,955	24.5
LEP								

Limited English Proficiency	7,439	3.0	21,195	6.5	55,411	12.2	59,205	13.9
Sex								
Male	128,068	51.2	163,062	50.0	225,886	49.7	200,718	49.7
Female	122,305	48.9	163,160	50.0	228,210	50.3	203,293	50.3
Age								
Under 18	75,773	30.3	101,301	31.1	130,981	28.8	125,851	27.3
18-64	166,624	66.6	209,658	64.3	292,482	64.4	291,563	63.2
≥65	7,976	3.2	15,263	4.7	30,633	6.8	44,009	9.5
Family Type								
Families with Children	39,527	59.8	26,580	57.0	61,051	54.2	62,155	43.8

Note: All percentages represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction, except family type, which is out of total family households.

Data sources: Decennial Census, American Community Survey.

The racial and ethnic demographics of Prince William County have shifted since 1990. Most notably, the Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Black populations have grown significantly and the percentage of the population that is White has decreased. The proportion of the population that is Hispanic has almost quadrupled. The percentage of foreign-born residents has also almost doubled since 1990.

Table 10: Demographic Trends, Region

Race/Ethnicity	1990		2000		2010		Current	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
White, Non-Hispanic	2,671,370	64.1	2,696,495	55.6	2,762,787	48.9	2,278,106	41.8
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,053,952	25.3	1,306,715	26.9	1,486,865	26.3	1,290,907	23.7
Hispanic	227,064	5.5	430,297	8.9	775,416	13.7	778,484	14.3
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	198,835	4.8	364,525	7.5	580,476	10.3	558,174	10.2

Native American, Non-Hispanic	9,894	0.2	21,648	0.5	25,389	0.5	11,970	0.2
National Origin								
Foreign-born	489,041	11.7	830,998	17.1	1,140,681	20.2	1,412,074	22.8
LEP								
Limited English Proficiency	228,633	5.5	409,098	8.4	519,697	9.2	624,410	10.8
Sex								
Male	2,030,838	48.7	2,357,615	48.6	2,750,340	48.7	3,028,975	48.9
Female	2,138,525	51.3	2,492,433	51.4	2,899,200	51.3	3,167,610	51.1
Age								
Under 18	985,397	23.6	1,254,069	25.9	1,348,790	23.9	1,427,108	23.0
18-64	2,823,736	67.7	3,160,017	65.2	3,733,524	66.1	3,983,449	64.3
≥65	360,230	8.6	435,962	9.0	567,226	10.0	786,028	12.7
Family Type								
Families with children	510,562	48.8	388,450	49.7	657,872	48.1	740,724	33.0

Note: All percentages represent a share of the total population within the region, except family type, which is out of total family households.

Data sources: Decennial Census, American Community Survey.

The racial and ethnic demographics of the region have shifted since 1990. Most notably, the Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander populations have grown significantly, and the percentage of the population that is White has decreased. Specifically, the proportion of the population that is Hispanic has more than doubled. The percentage of foreign-born residents has also about doubled since 1990. The percentage of families with children grew from 1990 to 2000 but dipped slightly from 2000 to 2010. From 2010 until the 2019 five-year American Community Survey (ACS), the percentage of families with children dipped below the 1990 percentage.

B. General Issues

i. Segregation versus Integration

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

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

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

The Dissimilarity Index measures the percentage of a certain group’s population that would have to move to a different census tract in order to be evenly distributed within a city or metropolitan area in relation to another group. The higher the Dissimilarity Index value, the higher the extent of the segregation.

Table 11: Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity

Prince William County	1990	2000	2010	Current
Non-White/White	23.98	27.23	31.32	34.54
Black/White	27.77	30.51	34.74	38.41
Hispanic/White	23.94	30.09	38.55	41.35
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	19.07	22.85	22.48	27.41
Region	1990	2000	2010	Current
Non-White/White	52.16	49.33	46.78	50.34
Black/White	64.99	62.69	60.80	64.06
Hispanic/White	41.91	47.62	48.36	50.75
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	34.97	37.79	37.46	42.08

Data source: HUD tables based on 2011–2015 American Community Survey data.

Prince William County

Overall, Prince William County experiences low levels of segregation between Black and White and Asian or Pacific Islander and White populations. Prince William County also experiences moderate levels of segregation between Hispanic and White populations. The Dissimilarity Index values for Black/White, Hispanic/White, and Asian or Pacific Islander/White populations are all lower in Prince

William County than in the region as a whole. The Dissimilarity Index values across all racial and ethnic categories have increased since 1990.

Region


Overall, the region experiences high levels of segregation between Black and White populations. The region also experiences moderate levels of segregation between Hispanic and White and between Asian or Pacific Islander and White populations. The Dissimilarity Index values across all racial and ethnic categories have increased since 2010.

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

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

Map 1: Race/Ethnicity, Prince William County


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In Prince William County, a majority of the residents are White; the second-most-populous group is Hispanic. Although the White population is more evenly dispersed throughout the county, the western portion of the county is predominately White.

Map 2: Race/Ethnicity, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity

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


Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Regionally, a majority of the residents are White; the second-most-populous group is Black. The eastern portion of the region has the most diversity among racial and ethnic groups. The western portion of the region is predominantly White. The racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs) are also predominantly seen in the eastern portion of the region.

Map 3: National Origin, Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 3 - National Origin

Description: Current national origin (5 most populous) dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)


Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

In Prince William County, the most common nationality of non-native-born residents is Salvadoran. The second-most-common nationality is Ghanaian, followed by Mexican. Non-native-born residents tend to live in the eastern portion of the county and near Manassas. Non-native-born residents are least likely to live in the southern portion of the county.

Map 4: National Origin, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 3 - National Origin

Description: Current national origin (5 most populous) dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Regionally, the most common nationality of non-native-born residents is Salvadoran. The second-most-common nationality is Indian, followed by Chinese. Non-native-born residents are most prevalent in the eastern portion of the region. Comparatively, few non-native-born residents live in the western portion of the region.


Map 5: Limited English Proficiency, Prince William County
HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In Prince William County, 14 percent of the population speaks with LEP. The top foreign languages spoken by those with LEP are Spanish, other Indo-European languages, other unspecified languages, and Korean. There are also large populations of Spanish residents with LEP near Manassas and Dale City.

Map 6: Limited English Proficiency, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 4 - LEP

Description: LEP persons (5 most commonly used languages) for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Regionally, 10.8 percent of the population has limited proficiency in English. The top languages spoken by those with LEP are Spanish, other Indo-European languages, and Chinese. The majority of LEP residents reside in the eastern portion of the region, with few in the western portion of the region.

Map 7: Percentage of Renter-Occupied Households, Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 16 - Housing Tenure

Description: Housing Tenure by Renters with R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

In Prince William County, the locations of renters largely correlate with aforementioned patterns of racial and ethnic segregation. The large pockets of renters are near the more urban areas of the county. For example, the areas near and in the cities of Manassas and Dale City have a higher percentage of renters compared with the rest of the county.

Map 8: Percentage of Renter-Occupied Households, Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 16 - Housing Tenure
Description: Housing Tenure by Renters with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)
Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Regionally, the location of renters largely correlates with aforementioned patterns of racial and ethnic segregation. The percentage of renter-occupied households increases near the more urban areas of the region, a spatial pattern that also often correlates with the areas with a larger percentage of minority residents.

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

Map 9: Racial Demographics in 1990, Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends


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

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 10: Racial Demographics in 2000, Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends


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

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 11: Racial Demographics in 2010, Prince William County
HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

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

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV


HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Prince William County

Segregation in Prince William County has increased since 1990. Since 1990, the Dissimilarity Index values across all racial and ethnic minorities have increased (Table 11). In 1990, the Dissimilarity Index values all corresponded with low levels of segregation. Although higher, the current Dissimilarity Index values all still correspond with low levels of segregation, with the exception of the value for Hispanic/White, which is in the moderate range.

Map 12: Racial Demographics in 1990, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

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


Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 13: Racial Demographics in 2000, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

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


Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 14: Racial Demographics in 2010, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

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

Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Region

Regionally, segregation is on the rise. Dissimilarity Index values for Non-White/White and Black/White are nearly identical to the 1990 values. These values dipped slightly in 2010 and then rose again between 2010 and the present. Since 1990, the Dissimilarity Index values have increased for Hispanic/White and Asian or Pacific Islander/White. The Dissimilarity Index values for Non-White/White, Hispanic/White, and Asian or Pacific Islander/White all correspond to moderate levels of segregation. The Dissimilarity Index value for Black/White corresponds to a high level of segregation.

Exposure Index values, measuring a single group's exposure to all other groups, have decreased since 1990 for all other ethnic groups in relation to White residents. Exposure Index values of minority groups in relation to other minority groups have increased since 1990. These values, taken together with the Dissimilarity Index values, indicate that while minority populations are becoming more segregated from White populations, minorities are becoming less isolated with respect to other minorities.

ii. Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

R/ECAPs are geographic areas with significant concentrations of poverty and populations of people of color. HUD defines R/ECAPs based on census tracts. In terms of racial or ethnic concentration, R/ECAPs are areas with a non-White population of 50 percent or more. With regard to poverty, R/ECAPs are census tracts in which either 40 percent or more of individuals live at or below the poverty line or the poverty rate is three times the average for the metropolitan area, whichever threshold is

lower. In the Washington, D.C., region, which has a significantly lower rate of poverty than the nation as a whole, the latter of these two thresholds is used.

Where one lives has a substantial effect on mental and physical health, education, exposure to crime, and economic opportunity. Urban areas that are more residentially segregated by race and income tend to have less upward economic mobility than other areas. Research has found that racial inequality is thus amplified by residential segregation. Concentrated poverty is associated with higher crime rates and worse health outcomes. However, these areas may offer some opportunities as well. Individuals may actively choose to settle in a neighborhood containing a R/ECAP because it is close to a job center. Ethnic enclaves may help immigrants build a sense of community and adapt to life in the United States. The businesses, social networks, and institutions in ethnic enclaves may help immigrants preserve their cultural identities while providing services that allow them to establish themselves in their new homes. Identifying R/ECAPs facilitates an understanding of entrenched patterns of segregation and poverty.


Some tables and maps in this section are sourced from the HUD tool, which used 2011–2015 five-year ACS data. These tables and maps are accessible to all, and anyone can use them to numerically and spatially analyze jurisdictions or communities of interest. Other tables and maps the Urban Institute created are based on 2015–2019 five-year ACS data. Some of the maps, therefore, identify different census tracts as R/ECAPs and reflect slightly different demographic data.

1.a. Identify any R/ECAPs or groupings of R/ECAP tracts within the jurisdiction and region.

There are no R/ECAPs within Prince William County, so the county is excluded from this analysis.

Map 15: R/ECAPs in Jurisdiction with Race/Ethnicity, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity
Description: Current race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)
Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Within the region, most R/ECAPs are within the District and in primarily Black areas. Historically, federal housing policies bolstered White flight from cities like the District, creating segregated suburbs.⁶ Even with the lower poverty rate threshold for R/ECAP status in effect, the relative economic prosperity of the region results in some racially and ethnically diverse areas with low-income populations—in eastern Montgomery County, southeastern Fairfax County, and eastern Prince William County—not being classified as R/ECAPs.

Map 16: R/ECAPs in Jurisdiction with National Origin, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 3 - National Origin

Description: Current national origin (5 most populous) dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV



HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Across the region, Salvadorans and other Central Americans are foreign-born residents most likely to live in R/ECAPs. Within R/ECAPs, Salvadorans make up just under 3.0 percent and other Central Americans make up 2.5 percent of residents.⁷

Map 17: R/ECAPs in Jurisdiction with Poverty Rates, Prince William County

Poverty Rates by Census Tract in Prince William County, Virginia

R/ECAPs Highlighted in Yellow



Source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

There are no R/ECAPs in Prince William County.

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

Prince William County is excluded from this table because HUD's latest data show there are no R/ECAPS in the county.

Table 12: R/ECAP Demographics, Region

R/ECAP Race/Ethnicity	#	%
Total Population in R/ECAPs	150,440	100.00%
White, Non-Hispanic	8,904	5.92%
Black, Non-Hispanic	119,872	79.68%
Hispanic	16,312	10.84%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2,646	1.76%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	325	0.22%
Other, Non-Hispanic	225	0.15%
R/ECAP Family Type		
Total Families in R/ECAPs	32,565	100.00%
Families with children	17,062	52.39%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Table 13: R/ECAP Demographics, Country of Origin for Non-Native-Born Residents, Region

	Country of origin	#	%
#1	El Salvador	4,484	2.98%
#2	Other Central America	3,757	2.50%
#3	Other South America	1,314	0.87%
#4	Mexico	1,219	0.81%
#5	Eastern Africa	1,020	0.68%
#6	Western Africa	899	0.60%
#7	Other Caribbean	809	0.54%
#8	Other South-Central Asia	722	0.48%
#9	China (excl. Taiwan)	496	0.33%
#10	India	484	0.32%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Region


In the region, 80 percent of residents of R/ECAPs are Black and 11 percent are Hispanic. Over half of families living in R/ECAPs in the region are families with children. Over 5 percent of R/ECAP residents in the region are originally from El Salvador and other Central American countries. Black individuals

are most disproportionately residents of R/ECAPs as they make up one-quarter of the population of the whole region but 80 percent of the population of R/ECAPs in the region. The demographics of R/ECAPs in the region are heavily driven by the demographics of R/ECAPs in the District, which is home to a large majority of the region's R/ECAPs. Suburban R/ECAPs tend to be more heavily Hispanic than those in the District.

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

Map 18: R/ECAPs and Racial Demographics in 1990, Region


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends
Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)
Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

In 1990, the R/ECAPs were located primarily in the District and were predominantly located in majority Black neighborhoods.

Map 19: R/ECAPs and Racial Demographics in 2000, Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends

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


Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

In 2000, most of the R/ECAPs in the region were in predominantly Black neighborhoods in the southeast and northeast areas of D.C.

Map 20: R/ECAPs and Racial Demographics in 2010, Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 2 - Race/Ethnicity Trends
Description: Past race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)
Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

In 2010, most of the R/ECAPs in the region were in the southeast and northeast areas of D.C.

iii. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

a. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Education

i. Describe any disparities in access to proficient schools in the jurisdiction and region.


Table 14: School Proficiency Index for Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV Metropolitan Statistical Area

	Prince William County	Region
Total Population		
White, Non-Hispanic	54.30	60.67
Black, Non-Hispanic	44.61	38.14
Hispanic	41.11	43.36
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	50.06	58.09

Native American, Non-Hispanic	48.15	48.69
Population below Federal Poverty Line		
White, Non-Hispanic	48.48	54.12
Black, Non-Hispanic	43.01	34.15
Hispanic	38.92	39.28
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	46.95	53.01
Native American, Non-Hispanic	64.13	40.50

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 21: Race/Ethnicity and School Proficiency, Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Legend**
- Jurisdiction**
 Jurisdiction
 - Region**
 Region
 - Demographics 2010**
 1 Dot = 75
 - White, Non-Hispanic
 - Black, Non-Hispanic
 - Native American, Non-Hispanic
 - Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic
 - Hispanic
 - Other, Non-Hispanic
 - Multi-racial, Non-Hispanic
 - TRACT**
 TRACT
 - R/ECAP**
 R/ECAP
 - School Proficiency Index**
 - 0 - 10
 - 10.1 - 20
 - 20.1 - 30
 - 30.1 - 40
 - 40.1 - 50
 - 50.1 - 60
 - 60.1 - 70
 - 70.1 - 80
 - 80.1 - 90
 - 90.1 - 100
 - School Proficiency Index: Data not Available**
 School Proficiency Index: Data not Available

Name: Map 7 - Demographics and School Proficiency

Description: School Proficiency Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status, and R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV


HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 22: National Origin and School Proficiency, Prince William County

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Map 23: Familial Status and School Proficiency, Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Prince William County

Access to schools in Prince William County varies significantly by race and ethnicity. White residents consistently have the most access to proficient schools, though this access decreases for White residents living below the poverty line. Asian and Native American residents have slightly less access, especially Asian residents living below the poverty line. Native American residents below the poverty line actually have the most access to proficient schools, even when compared with the total population of White residents. Black residents have relatively little access to proficient schools, though access is relatively the same for the total population of Black residents as it is for Black residents living below the poverty line. Hispanic residents have the least access to proficient schools, especially those living below the poverty line.

Map 24: Race/Ethnicity and School Proficiency, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Legend

Jurisdiction



Region



Demographics 2010

1 Dot = 75

White, Non-Hispanic

Black, Non-Hispanic

Native American, Non-Hispanic

Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic

Hispanic

Other, Non-Hispanic

Multi-racial, Non-Hispanic

TRACT



R/ECAP



School Proficiency Index

0 - 10

10.1 - 20

20.1 - 30

30.1 - 40

40.1 - 50

50.1 - 60

60.1 - 70

70.1 - 80

80.1 - 90

90.1 - 100

School Proficiency Index: Data not Available



Name: Map 7 - Demographics and School Proficiency

Description: School Proficiency Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status, and R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 25: National Origin and School Proficiency, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Legend

Jurisdiction



Region



National Origin [Region] (Top 5 most populous)

1 Dot = 75 People

-  El Salvador
-  Other South America
-  Other Central America
-  India
-  Western Africa











TRACT



R/ECAP



School Proficiency Index

-  0 - 10
-  10.1 - 20
-  20.1 - 30
-  30.1 - 40
-  40.1 - 50
-  50.1 - 60
-  60.1 - 70
-  70.1 - 80
-  80.1 - 90
-  90.1 - 100

School Proficiency Index: Data not Available



Name: Map 7 - Demographics and School Proficiency

Description: School Proficiency Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status, and R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 26: Familial Status and School Proficiency, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In general, White residents across the region have the most access to proficient schools, followed by Asian residents. This is true to a slightly lesser extent for exclusively the population below the poverty line. Native American residents across the region have a moderate level of access to proficient schools, though it decreases for Native Americans living under the poverty line. Black and Hispanic residents throughout the region have the least access to proficient schools, especially those living below the poverty line.

ii. Describe how the disparities in access to proficient schools relate to residential living patterns in the jurisdiction and region.

Prince William County

Access to proficient schools in the county correlates with residential living patterns. Access to proficient schools is lowest in and around Dale City, which is home to a significant portion of the

county's Black and Hispanic residents. This is also true of areas just northwest of Manassas, like Sudley and Bull Run. Both of these areas are home to much of the county's Central American immigrant population and have a disproportionate number of residents without children. In comparison, the areas with the most access to proficient schools are more sparsely populated and disproportionately White, like Bull Run Mountain Estates, Woolsey, and, in the southeast, Shenandoah and Independent Hill.

Region

Disparities in access to proficient education correlate with residential living patterns in the region. Suburban areas have much more access to proficient schools, particularly in Loudoun, Fairfax, and Montgomery Counties. These areas are disproportionately White, and to a lesser extent, Asian or Pacific Islander. In contrast, urban areas with low levels of access to proficient schools are consistently home to larger numbers of Black and Hispanic residents. This includes the District of Columbia and the urban portions of Alexandria and Arlington. But even within these urban areas, where people of color are a majority of the population, access to proficient schools is heavily correlated with race and ethnicity.

iii. Informed by community participation, any consultation with other relevant government agencies, and the participant's own local data and local knowledge, discuss programs, policies, or funding mechanisms that affect disparities in access to proficient schools.

Prince William County

Prince William County Public Schools has published an equity statement and established an Advisory Council on Equity, which publishes equity scorecards measuring various metrics related to race and inclusion. However, it is not clear whether these statements and this council have resulted in any tangible policy changes.

Despite these efforts, systemic barriers remain in place. Namely, localities still rely on property taxes to fund public schools, such that historical and persistent racial inequalities in housing lead to disparate funding, and, as a result, disparate performances. One study by Education Trust⁸ showed that Virginia school divisions serving the highest share of students of color in 2015 had 8 percent less total state and local funding per pupil than divisions serving the lowest share of students of color.

b. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Employment

Access to employment at a livable wage is an integral component of broader access to opportunity. Where one lives can affect one's access to employment opportunities and their quality. Access can be affected by proximity of residential areas to places with high concentrations (or low concentrations) of jobs as well as barriers to residents of particular neighborhoods, even when they are close by. The analysis in this section is based on a review of two data indicators for each jurisdiction: the Labor Market Engagement Index and the Jobs Proximity Index. The Labor Market Engagement Index measures, by census tract in a jurisdiction, the level of engagement residents within that tract have in the labor force. Values range from 0 to 100. The higher the score, the higher the rates of employment in that particular area. The Jobs Proximity Index measures, by census tract, the accessibility of employment opportunities to that tract's residents. Values range from 0 to 100. The higher the score, the more access residents from that area have to employment opportunities.

i. Describe any disparities in access to jobs and labor markets by protected class groups in the jurisdiction and region.


Table 15: Labor Market Engagement and Jobs Proximity Indexes

Labor Market Engagement Index	Prince William County	Region
Total Population		
White, Non-Hispanic	76.98	82.91
Black, Non-Hispanic	71.07	62.67
Hispanic	66.54	74.49
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	76.42	86.47
Native American, Non-Hispanic	72.93	72.84
Population below Federal Poverty Line		
White, Non-Hispanic	69.67	76.55
Black, Non-Hispanic	65.79	51.91
Hispanic	60.42	69.89
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	77.67	83.78
Native American, Non-Hispanic	68.39	75.77
Jobs Proximity Index	Prince William County	Region
Total Population		
White, Non-Hispanic	20.09	48.26
Black, Non-Hispanic	16.95	42.42
Hispanic	23.99	46.50
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	20.52	53.37
Native American, Non-Hispanic	20.87	44.20
Population below Federal Poverty Line		
White, Non-Hispanic	23.89	50.51
Black, Non-Hispanic	18.11	50.96
Hispanic	25.37	46.40


Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	18.12	58.27
Native American, Non-Hispanic	34.82	55.30

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.


Map 27: Demographics and Jobs Proximity (Race/Ethnicity), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Map 28: Demographics and Jobs Proximity (National Origin), Prince William County
HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Map 29: Demographics and Jobs Proximity (Familial Status), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Map 30: Demographics and Labor Market (Race/Ethnicity), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Legend**
- Jurisdiction**
 Jurisdiction
 - Region**
 Region
 - Demographics 2010**
 1 Dot = 75
 - White, Non-Hispanic
 - Black, Non-Hispanic
 - Native American, Non-Hispanic
 - Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic
 - Hispanic
 - Other, Non-Hispanic
 - Multi-racial, Non-Hispanic
 - TRACT**
 TRACT
 - R/ECAP**
 R/ECAP
 - Labor Market Index**
 - 0 - 10
 - 10.1 - 20
 - 20.1 - 30
 - 30.1 - 40
 - 40.1 - 50
 - 50.1 - 60
 - 60.1 - 70
 - 70.1 - 80
 - 80.1 - 90
 - 90.1 - 100
 - Labor Market Index: Data not Available**
 Labor Market Index: Data not Available

Name: Map 9 - Demographics and Labor Market


Description: Labor Engagement Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)


Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 31: Demographics and Labor Market (National Origin), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Map 32: Demographics and Labor Market (Familial Status), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Prince William County

Prince William County has a moderately high Labor Market Engagement Index value. The disparity is markedly more significant between White and Hispanic residents than for other groups; the index value for Asian residents is roughly equivalent to the value for White residents. White residents, as in other jurisdictions, and Asian residents have a 10-point index value lead in comparison with Hispanic residents. For residents below the poverty line, racial disparities are also present. The index value is highest for Asian residents (78), while, similar to other jurisdictions, it is lowest for Hispanic and Black residents. So, while the index value continues to be high for Asian residents regardless of economic status, the value for White residents below the poverty line is more comparable to other non-Asian racial groups. But the disparity between Hispanic and White residents is still present here as well.

Prince William County has the lowest jobs proximity values of all area jurisdictions, ranging from as low as 17 to 24. In respect to race alone, for the most part, there are minimal disparities between the groups. The only disparity of note relates to Hispanic, Asian, and Native American residents, for whom index values are slightly higher than for Black residents, a difference of less than 8 points. When economic status is considered, the primary disparity is for Native American residents, for whom jobs proximity values are higher compared with other groups and nearly double the index value for groups on the lower end of the spectrum.


Map 33: Demographics and Jobs Proximity (Race/Ethnicity), Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Map 34: Demographics and Jobs Proximity (National Origin), Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Map 35: Demographics and Jobs Proximity (Familial Status), Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Map 36: Demographics and Labor Market (Race/Ethnicity), Region



Map 37: Demographics and Labor Market (National Origin), Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Map 38: Demographics and Labor Market (Familial Status), Region



Region

The region as a whole has fairly high job engagement values across all racial groups, however, clear racial disparities in job engagement are present. This pattern is consistent with the jurisdictional trends in the area. Regionally, the Labor Market Engagement Index values are much higher for Asian and White residents than for Black, Hispanic, and Native American residents. When economic status is considered, there is some slight variation in these disparities. Labor engagement values continue to be comparatively lower for Black and Hispanic residents, while they are higher for White, Asian, and Native American residents. When the Labor Market Engagement Index value for Asian residents is compared with the value for Black residents, the disparity is stark—a difference of more than 20 points. This regional value difference is much more pronounced than the differences in index values within the smaller jurisdictions.

Jobs proximity values for the region are moderate but veer toward the lower end of the index range. The index values tend to be higher for residents who live in the District or in counties adjacent than for those farther away. In part, this can be attributed to the geographic distance of jurisdictions from the hub of labor activity. Additionally, there are more transportation options toward the center of D.C. than in the outer regions of the area. Jobs proximity values for residents with incomes below the poverty line change little and, in some instances, the values increase for certain racial and ethnic groups.

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

Prince William County

There is a clear geographic division based on the degree of labor engagement. Higher-value areas are concentrated primarily in the northeast, but one small cluster exists in the southeast edge of the jurisdiction. White residents are the predominant group living in the northeastern area (with higher job engagement), but Hispanic residents live there as well, with little distinction between their residential patterns. In the south, where job engagement values are considerably lower, residents of color, particularly Black and Hispanic residents, make up a much larger share of the overall population. Immigrant populations, mostly of Hispanic origin, are clustered near areas with high job engagement but tend to border them as opposed to live within them. This is particularly true in the southeast area, where a large swathe of Hispanic and Black residents live in tracts with low labor engagement that surround a smaller tract with a higher labor engagement value. Job proximity values closely correspond with the pattern for labor engagement. Similarly, the racial and immigrant population trends for jobs proximity align with those for job engagement.

Region

Job engagement is higher in the jurisdictions that border the District as well as the more outlying jurisdictions. In contrast, the District has lower Labor Market Engagement Index values. The trend for jobs proximity data is the inverse. As previously noted, because D.C. has the most extensive transportation system, jobs proximity values are higher simply because commuter times are shorter for those living closer to D.C. There is also a small pocket in Prince William County on the southern border, near a major military installation, with higher proximity values than the rest of the region. The residential patterns do not show a correlation between jobs proximity values and race. In the D.C. area and its borders, White residents live primarily in the north and on the western side, and a larger proportion of Black residents reside in Southeast D.C. and adjoining Prince George's County, but the jobs proximity values are roughly the same.

- iii. Informed by community participation, any consultation with other relevant government agencies, and the participant's own local data and local knowledge, discuss programs, policies, or funding mechanisms that affect disparities in access to employment.*

Prince William County has a strong local employment climate compared with the rest of the state. As of February 2022, according to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, the county’s unemployment rate was 2.8 percent,⁹ compared with 3.2 percent in the state of Virginia,¹⁰ 2.3 percent in neighboring Loudoun County,¹¹ and 2.5 percent in neighboring Fairfax County.¹² As of 2015–2019 (capturing employment conditions worse than at present and subject to significant margins of error), the ACS reported unemployment rates of 4.1 percent for White workers, 4.7 percent for Black workers, 4.5 percent for Asian workers, and 5.3 percent for Hispanic workers.¹³ These unemployment rates (with the exception of the Asian population) are lower than the ACS national unemployment data, which reported unemployment rates of 4.5 percent for White workers, 9.5 percent for Black workers, 4.2 percent for Asian workers, and 6.2 percent for Hispanic workers.¹⁴

A variety of programs operating in Prince William County seek to connect low-income workers from racial and ethnic minority groups with opportunities for employment and professional advancement. The Prince William County Department of Economic Development provides no-cost employment resources and training to Prince William County residents.¹⁵ The Department of Economic Development operates the ELEVATE initiative, which provides job training, GED training, paid work experiences, career coaching, and financial coaching.¹⁶

c. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Transportation

i. Describe any disparities in access to transportation in the jurisdiction and region.

The Low Transportation Cost Index and Transit Trips Index are used to measure access to transportation within a location. The Low Transportation Cost Index measures access to low-cost transportation services, and the Transit Trips Index measures how often residents take transit trips. Scores range from 0 to 100. A higher score correlates to better transportation access.


Table 16: Transit Trips and Low Transportation Cost Indexes

Transit Trips Index	Prince William County	Region
Total Population		
White, Non-Hispanic	61.05	64.69
Black, Non-Hispanic	63.33	72.81
Hispanic	64.10	74.25
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	62.23	73.66
Native American, Non-Hispanic	62.46	65.28
Population below Federal Poverty Line		
White, Non-Hispanic	63.17	64.97
Black, Non-Hispanic	63.34	80.43
Hispanic	66.56	77.28

Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	62.06	77.63
Native American, Non-Hispanic	51.37	75.29
Low Transportation Cost Index	Prince William County	Region
Total Population		
White, Non-Hispanic	84.54	87.43
Black, Non-Hispanic	87.41	91.18
Hispanic	88.49	91.47
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	85.88	89.94
Native American, Non-Hispanic	86.19	88.87
Population below Federal Poverty Line		
White, Non-Hispanic	86.91	88.80
Black, Non-Hispanic	87.90	94.08
Hispanic	90.09	92.91
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	86.72	89.94
Native American, Non-Hispanic	84.07	88.87


Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 39: Demographics and Transit Trips (Race/Ethnicity), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Map 40: Demographics and Transit Trips (National Origin), Prince William County

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 10 - Demographics and Transit Trips

Description: Transit Trips Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV


HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 41: Demographics and Transit Trips (Familial Status), Prince William County

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Map 42: Demographics and Low Transportation Cost (Race/Ethnicity), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Legend**
- Jurisdiction**
 Jurisdiction
 - Region**
 Region
 - Demographics 2010**
 1 Dot = 75
 - White, Non-Hispanic
 - Black, Non-Hispanic
 - Native American, Non-Hispanic
 - Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic
 - Hispanic
 - Other, Non-Hispanic
 - Multi-racial, Non-Hispanic
 - TRACT**
 TRACT
 - R/ECAP**
 R/ECAP
 - Low Transportation Cost Index**
 - 0 - 10
 - 10.1 - 20
 - 20.1 - 30
 - 30.1 - 40
 - 40.1 - 50
 - 50.1 - 60
 - 60.1 - 70
 - 70.1 - 80
 - 80.1 - 90
 - 90.1 - 100
 - Low Transportation Cost Index:**
Data not Available
 Data not Available

Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 43: Demographics and Low Transportation Cost (National Origin), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost

Description: Low Transportation Cost with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 44: Demographics and Low Transportation Cost (Familial Status), Prince William County

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Prince William County

Prince William County residents have less access to low-cost transportation than all other areas in the region, with some negligible differences based on race and ethnicity. Within the total population, the lowest values for both the Transit Trips Index and the Low Transportation Cost Index were for White residents. However, within the population below the poverty line, Native Americans fare the worst, particularly in terms of the Transit Trips Index, as the index value lags by over 10 points. This is a notable disparity, especially when compared with the minimal discrepancies in all other regions.

Region


The District has the highest values of the Transit Trips and Low Transportation Cost Indexes, followed by the closer in suburbs of Alexandria and Arlington. Index values continue to decline farther from the center of the region, with Gaithersburg, Fairfax County, and Montgomery County having the next highest values, and Loudoun County and Prince William County the lowest.

Map 45: Demographics and Transit Trips (Race/Ethnicity), Region




Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 46: Demographics and Transit Trips (National Origin), Region



Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 47: Demographics and Transit Trips (Familial Status), Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Legend

Jurisdiction

Region

% of Households that are Families with Children

- 0% - 20%
- 20.1% - 40%
- 40.1% - 60%
- 60.1% - 80%
- 80.1% - 100%

TRACT

R/ECAP

Transit Trips Index

- 0 - 10
- 10.1 - 20
- 20.1 - 30
- 30.1 - 40
- 40.1 - 50
- 50.1 - 60
- 60.1 - 70
- 70.1 - 80
- 80.1 - 90
- 90.1 - 100

Transit Trips Index: Data not Available

Name: Map 10 - Demographics and Transit Trips


Description: Transit Trips Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV


HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 48: Demographics and Low Transportation Cost (Race/Ethnicity), Region




Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 49: Demographics and Low Transportation Cost (National Origin), Region



Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 50: Demographics and Low Transportation Cost (Familial Status), Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Region

Throughout the region, access to low-cost transportation is relatively high compared with the rest of the country. To the extent that there are disparities based on race and ethnicity, the lowest Transit Trips Index values are for White residents, at a regional level of 64.69 for the total population, compared with Black residents at 72.81, Hispanic residents at 74.25, Asian or Pacific Islander residents at 73.66, and Native American residents at 65.28. This distribution is even more pronounced for individuals living below the poverty line, with the value for White residents at 64.97, Black residents at 80.43, Hispanic residents at 77.28, Asian or Pacific Islander residents at 77.63, and Native American residents at 75.29.

The Low Transportation Cost Index follows a similar, though less pronounced, distribution with values ranging from 87.43 to 91.47 for each group in the population. Once again, values are lowest for White residents and highest for Hispanic residents, followed closely by Black residents at 91.18, Asian or

Pacific Islander residents at 89.94, and Native American residents at 88.87. For those living below the poverty line, Low Transportation Cost Index values range from 88.80 to 94.08, with the worst transportation values for White residents living below the poverty line, and the highest for Black residents. The second-highest value is for Hispanic residents, at 92.91, followed closely by Asian or Pacific Islander residents at 92.60 and Native American residents at 92.25.

These statistics, however, are slightly misleading in that they do not control for the population density and are skewed by the lack of public transit in suburban areas that are disproportionately White. It remains true that a higher percentage of Black and Hispanic residents rely on public transit, such that these numbers do not fully reflect existing inequities in transportation.

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

Prince William County

Access to low-cost transportation in Prince William County is highest near Manassas and Dale City, an area that has a much higher percentage of Black and Hispanic residents than the county as whole. This area is also home to a large number of the county's Central American immigrant residents. Areas in between these cities, like Aden and Nokesville, are more sparsely populated and suburban and have lower values for low transportation cost. These areas are home to a disproportionate number of White residents. This pattern holds true for the Transit Trips Index as well.

Region

To the extent that there are disparities in access to transportation, they do correlate with residential living patterns. White residents are more likely to live in more suburban areas farther from D.C. that have less access to transportation. Indeed, the lack of public transit in these areas may explain why they are disproportionately White, as Black and Hispanic residents are more likely to rely on public transit. In contrast, areas of the region that are home to more Black and Hispanic residents, like D.C. proper, have greater access to transportation.

iii. Informed by community participation, any consultation with other relevant government agencies, and the participant's own local data and local knowledge, discuss programs, policies, or funding mechanisms that affect disparities in access to transportation.

Prince William County

Prince William County, in its Equity and Inclusion Policy draft, has explicitly called for increased equity in transit systems. Moreover, the county's strategic plan for 2021–2024 describes a number of strategies to enhance transit options to “prioritize providing equitable access to multimodal transportation options.”¹⁷ Though this report includes general recommendations, such as providing subsidies to low-income residents and studying mobility trends, it does not provide specifics, let alone implement any policies. While this recognition is an important first step, it remains to be seen if the county will be successful in putting these commitments into practice.

d. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Access to Low-Poverty Neighborhoods

i. Describe any disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods in the jurisdiction and region.

Disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods is measured by the Low Poverty Index. The Low Poverty Index is a HUD calculation using both family poverty rates and public assistance receipt in the

form of cash welfare (such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families). This is calculated at the census tract level. The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in the neighborhood.


Some tables and maps in this section are sourced from the HUD tool, which used 2011–2015 five-year ACS data. These tables and maps are accessible to all, and anyone can use them to numerically and spatially analyze jurisdictions or communities of interest. Other tables and maps the Urban Institute created are based on 2015–2019 five-Year ACS estimated data. Some of the maps, therefore, identify different census tracts as R/ECAPs and reflect slightly different demographic data.

Table 17: Low Poverty Index


	Prince William County	Region
Total Population		
White, Non-Hispanic	79.81	79.93
Black, Non-Hispanic	72.23	61.71
Hispanic	65.83	65.57
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	77.93	78.68
Native American, Non-Hispanic	74.87	70.77
Population below Federal Poverty Line		
White, Non-Hispanic	71.71	71.36
Black, Non-Hispanic	68.55	45.68
Hispanic	57.86	56.92
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	81.29	68.99
Native American, Non-Hispanic	78.98	64.66

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 51: Demographics and Low-Poverty Neighborhoods (Race/Ethnicity), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




**Map 52: Demographics and Low-Poverty Neighborhoods (National Origin), Prince William County
HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool**



Map 53: Demographics and Low-Poverty Neighborhoods (Familial Status), Prince William County

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 12 - Demographics and Poverty

Description: Low Poverty Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)


Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 54: Jurisdictional Poverty Rates by Census Tract with COG Opportunity Equity Emphasis Areas, Prince William County

Poverty Rates by Census Tract in Prince William County, Virginia

COG Equity Emphasis Area Highlighted in Magenta




Source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Prince William County


There are notable race- and ethnicity-based disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods in Prince William County. In general, White and Asian or Pacific Islander residents have the most access to low-poverty neighborhoods, followed closely by Native American and Black residents. Hispanic residents have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods in Prince William County. For the population living below the poverty line, rates of access to low-poverty neighborhoods are actually higher for Asian and Native American residents. Apart from these outliers, access to low-poverty neighborhoods for those below the poverty line follows a distribution similar to the total population, with White residents having a high level of access, followed by Black residents, and, finally, Hispanic residents.

Map 55: Demographics and Low Poverty Neighborhoods (Race/Ethnicity), Region




Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 56: Demographics and Low Poverty Neighborhoods (National Origin), Region



Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 57: Demographics and Low Poverty Neighborhoods (Familial Status), Region



Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Region

The regional trend for racial disparities follows a pattern similar to the jurisdictional trends. As is the case for all jurisdictions, White residents are more likely than other groups to reside in areas with low-poverty neighborhoods. While the index value for White residents is 80, the values for Hispanic and Black residents are much lower: 65 and 61. The regional trend most closely aligns with the District of Columbia and Fairfax County because in these jurisdictions, Black residents face higher incidences of restricted access to low-poverty neighborhoods than any other group. In the majority of jurisdictions, Hispanic residents have the least access to low-poverty neighborhoods. As displayed throughout the individual jurisdictions, poverty levels also have a significant negative impact on index values for all groups, but the comparative index value losses by racial group do show a racial and ethnic disparity in reduced access as well.

ii. For the protected class groups for which HUD has provided data, describe how disparities in access to low poverty neighborhoods relate to residential living patterns in the jurisdiction and region.

Prince William County

Access to low-poverty neighborhoods in Prince William County correlates with residential living patterns. The level of access to low-poverty neighborhoods is lowest in and around Dale City, which is home to a significant portion of the county’s Black and Hispanic residents. This is also true of areas just northwest of Manassas, like Sudley, Bull Run, and Yorkshire. These areas are home to much of the county’s Central American immigrant population and have a disproportionate number of residents without children. In comparison, the areas with the most access to low-poverty neighborhoods are

more sparsely populated and disproportionately White, like Bull Run Mountain Estates, Woolsey, and, in the southeast, Shenandoah and Independent Hill.

Region


In general, disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods correlate with residential living patterns in the region. Access to low-poverty neighborhoods is much higher in suburban areas, particularly in Loudoun, Fairfax, and Montgomery Counties. These areas are disproportionately White, and to a lesser extent, Asian or Pacific Islander. In contrast, urban areas with low levels of access to low-poverty neighborhoods are consistently home to larger numbers of Black and Hispanic residents. This includes the District of Columbia and the urban portions of Alexandria and Arlington. But even within these urban areas, where people of color are a majority of the population, access to low-poverty neighborhoods is heavily correlated with race and ethnicity.

iii. Informed by community participation, any consultation with other relevant government agencies, and the participant's own local data and local knowledge, discuss programs, policies, or funding mechanisms that affect disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods

Map 58: Median Rental Rates, Region

Median Gross Rent by Census Tract in Washington Region

COG Equity Emphasis Area Highlighted in Magenta




Source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Map 59: Poverty Rates, Region

Poverty Rates by Census Tract in Washington Region

COG Equity Emphasis Area Highlighted in Magenta




Source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Map 60: Median Housing Costs, Region

Median Monthly Housing Cost by Census Tract in Washington Region

COG Equity Emphasis Area Highlighted in Magenta



Source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Region

Policies that affect access to low-poverty neighborhoods are mostly addressed in the Contributing Factors section, particularly the section Impediments to Mobility (see Table 38). Other contributing factors also explain disparities in access to low-poverty neighborhoods, such as (1) lack of investment in specific neighborhoods, (2) lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations, (3) lack of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes, (4) practices and decisions for publicly supported housing, (5) occupancy codes and restrictions, (6) land use and zoning laws, (7) location

and type of affordable housing, and (8) lack of community revitalization strategies. Ultimately, all of the contributing factors either directly or indirectly impact access to low-poverty housing.

One policy with a large impact on access to low-poverty neighborhoods is inclusionary zoning, which jurisdictions in the region have implemented, though with varying levels of stringency. In 2020, Virginia passed legislation that encouraged localities to more aggressively implement inclusive zoning. The District of Columbia has focused on upzoning the Rock Creek West area. Another policy that has notable impacts on access to low-poverty neighborhoods throughout the region is the improvement of the payment standards used to determine housing assistance payments, which Montgomery County, D.C., and Prince William County have all implemented.

e. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Access to Environmentally Healthy Neighborhoods

i. Describe any disparities in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods in the jurisdiction and region.

The HUD Environmental Health Index measures exposure to harmful airborne toxins. The index is based on standardized Environmental Protection Agency estimates of carcinogenic, respiratory, and neurological hazards. The index does not consider other environmental issues, such as water quality or soil contamination, meaning it is a limited measure of overall environmental health. However, it can still provide useful insight into environmental conditions in jurisdictions. Index values range from 0 to 100, with higher values indicating better conditions and less exposure to environmental hazards that can harm human health. Generally, urban areas tend to have lower air quality, as these areas have more emissions sources and therefore more exposure to hazards.


Table 18: Environmental Health Index

	Prince William County	Region
Total Population		
White, Non-Hispanic	51.77	44.24
Black, Non-Hispanic	47.98	35.39
Hispanic	47.92	36.59
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	50.21	38.50
Native American, Non-Hispanic	49.53	42.19
Population below Federal Poverty Line		
White, Non-Hispanic	50.55	42.92
Black, Non-Hispanic	47.76	29.66
Hispanic	48.10	34.45
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	47.70	34.19

Native American, Non-Hispanic	59.71	35.99
--------------------------------------	-------	-------


Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 61: Demographics and Environmental Health (Race/Ethnicity), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Map 62: Demographics and Environmental Health (National Origin), Prince William County

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Map 63: Demographics and Environmental Health (Familial Status), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Prince William County


Prince William County scores relatively well on access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods, with the value for the total population ranging from 47.92 to 51.77, just slightly below the range in Loudoun County. Within the total population, White residents have the most access and Hispanic residents have the least. The values for Black, Asian, and Native American residents fall within these, with values of 47.98, 50.21, and 49.53, respectively. For those living below the poverty line, access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods falls slightly for most racial groups. The Environmental Health Index value for White residents living below the poverty line is 50.55, while for Asian or Pacific Islander residents living below the poverty line, it is 47.70. The index values for Black and Hispanic residents are 47.76 and 48.10, respectively. As in Loudoun County, the environmental health value for Native Americans living below the poverty line (59.71) is higher than for any other racial, ethnic, or economic subgroup.

Map 64: Demographics and Environmental Health (Race/Ethnicity), Region




Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 65: Demographics and Environmental Health (National Origin), Region



Source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Map 66: Demographics and Environmental Health (Familial Status), Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Region

Racial differences in the Environmental Health Index are more pronounced at the regional level, with values of 44.24 for White residents versus 35.39 for Black residents, 36.59 for Hispanic residents, 38.50 for Asian or Pacific Islander residents, and 42.19 for Native American residents. Regionally, residents living below the poverty line experience similar environmental health conditions, with index values of 42.92 for White residents, 29.66 for Black residents, 34.45 for Hispanic residents, 34.19 for Asian or Pacific Islander residents, and 35.99 for Native American residents.

For all populations, the index values have improved dramatically since 2019. This may be because the COVID-19 pandemic reduced the number of commuters.

ii. For the protected class groups for which HUD has provided data, describe how disparities in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods relate to residential living patterns in the jurisdiction and region.

As explained above, disparities in Environmental Health Index values are most pronounced at the regional level. The more suburban and rural areas of Loudoun and Prince William Counties—also disproportionately White—have the most access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods. Washington, D.C., followed closely by Arlington and Alexandria, have much larger populations of non-White residents and have the least access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods. Regional values, incorporating suburban and rural areas, are about three times as high as those in urban areas.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, Black, Asian, and Hispanic residents are concentrated in Manassas and the area north of Prince William Forest Park. This is also where the majority of the county's non-US-born residents live. These areas have the lowest Environmental Health Index values of the county, with most census tract values ranging from 20 to 40. The area between these two regions, roughly Westchester, has an average value of 40 to 50. The population is disproportionately White. The areas of Prince William County with the highest values, ranging from 70 to 80, are Waterfall, Bull Run Mountain Estates, and Broad Run. These areas are over 80 percent White.

Region

Overall, Environmental Health Index values are significantly higher in suburban and rural areas, like Loudoun, Prince William, Fairfax, and Montgomery Counties, which are disproportionately White and, to a lesser extent, Asian or Pacific Islander. More urban areas, specifically D.C. proper, have much higher percentages of Black and Hispanic residents and less access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods. Within these urban areas, however, it does not appear that index values are correlated with race.

iii. Informed by community participation, any consultation with other relevant government agencies, and the participant's own local data and local knowledge, discuss programs, policies, or funding mechanisms that affect disparities in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods.

Prince William County

Prince William County has acknowledged that environmental harms disproportionately impact communities of color. In May 2021, the county's Racial and Social Justice Commission made a motion to discuss land use, housing development, and community design policies that create environmental justice challenges disproportionately impacting communities of color. In doing so, the commission established the need to "think about environmental justice in our decision-making process."¹⁸ It is not yet clear if this will be reflected in future zoning changes and plan reviews.

Region

Although the Environmental Health Index does not reflect significant disparities in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods within the District of Columbia, several significant environmental problems within the city affect vulnerable populations. The region has consistently ranked in the 10 worst cities in terms of air pollution. According to the 2022 American Lung Association State of the Air report, the District of Columbia received an "F" grade for high ozone (smog) days.¹⁹

The Anacostia and Potomac Rivers are also severely polluted. A goal of achieving a swimmable and fishable Anacostia River has been set for the year 2025.²⁰ However, some residents of Ward 8 (Anacostia) have expressed concerns that as the river is targeted for cleanup, housing prices will rise and gentrification pressures will push out low-income communities of color.²¹

f. Disparities in Access to Opportunity—Patterns in Disparities in Access to Opportunity

i. Describe any disparities in access to opportunity in the jurisdiction and the region, including any overarching patterns of access or exposure to adverse community factors. Include how these patterns compare with patterns of segregation, integration, and R/ECAPs.

Throughout the metropolitan Washington region, there are marked disparities in access to opportunity based on race and ethnicity. For almost all indexes, regional values are lower for Black and Hispanic residents than for White residents and to a lesser extent, Asian residents. Native American residents often fall somewhere between these groups, with some exceptions. And these disparities are only exacerbated for the population living below the poverty line.

Black residents throughout the region have the lowest levels of access to education, jobs, low-poverty neighborhoods, and environmentally healthy neighborhoods. With few exceptions, this is only worse for Black residents living below the poverty line. The notable exception is transit, for which Black residents have the highest levels of access. But this, of course, is a function of needing transit to reach school and work, as Black residents are less likely to live in low-poverty or environmentally healthy neighborhoods that are farther from the District and tend to be inhabited by those with cars. This general pattern, though to a slightly lesser extent, applies to Hispanic residents throughout the region as well.

White residents, and to a lesser extent, Asian residents, consistently scored the highest on all metrics. White residents had the most access to proficient schools, low-poverty neighborhoods, and environmentally healthy neighborhoods. In job-related indexes, White residents closely followed Asian residents in levels of access to jobs and the labor market. For schools and low-poverty neighborhoods, Asian residents had second-best access and third-best access to environmentally friendly neighborhoods. Asian residents had the highest job index-related values but in other metrics were consistently second to White residents.

The level of access for each racial group, from most to least, to each opportunity indicator is as follows:

- Schools: White, Asian, Native American, Hispanic, Black (same below poverty line)
- Labor market: Asian, White, Native American, Hispanic, Black (same below poverty line)
- Job proximity: Asian, White, Hispanic, Native American, Black (below poverty line, Hispanic and White drop to lowest)
- Transit trips: Hispanic, Asian, Black, Native American, White (same below poverty line, except Black moves to highest)
- Transit costs: roughly the same for all
- Low-poverty neighborhoods: White, Asian, Native American, Hispanic, Black (same below poverty line)
- Environmentally friendly neighborhoods: White, Native American, Asian, Hispanic, Black

ii. Based on these opportunity indicators, identify areas that experience (1) high levels of access and (2) low levels of access across multiple indicators.

To answer this question, it is helpful to separate opportunity indicators into two groups, the first containing indexes correlating positively with urban areas, and the second those correlating with suburban areas. The first group includes both transportation indexes and the Jobs Proximity Index. It also includes labor markets, though to a slightly lesser extent. Even within these urban jurisdictions, however, job-related metrics are still lower for Black and Hispanic residents. As explained, the high

level of access to transportation is a function of necessity, not convenience. On these measures, the District of Columbia typically scores the highest and Loudoun County the lowest.

The second group includes indexes on which suburban counties fare well, like access to proficient schools, environmentally healthy neighborhoods, and low-poverty neighborhoods. Here, suburban counties like Loudoun, and to a lesser extent, Montgomery and Fairfax, have high index values. Loudoun County has lower values for the indexes that correlate to more urban environments. Conversely, District residents, particularly Black residents, consistently have the least access to proficient schools, environmentally healthy neighborhoods, and low-poverty neighborhoods.

iv. Disproportionate Housing Needs

1.a. Which groups (by race/ethnicity and familial status) experience higher rates of housing cost burden, overcrowding, or substandard housing compared with other groups? Which groups also experience higher rates of severe housing burdens compared with other groups?

Across the metropolitan Washington region, many residents face high rates of housing problems, severe housing problems, and severe housing cost burden. The four HUD-designated housing problems include (1) lack of complete kitchen facilities, (2) lack of complete plumbing facilities, (3) overcrowding, and (4) housing cost burden.²² Households are considered to have a housing problem if they experience at least one of the above. This analysis also considers what HUD designates as severe housing problems, which include lacking a kitchen or plumbing, housing more than one person per room, or experiencing severe cost burden, defined as housing cost of greater than 50 percent of household income.

Table 19: Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs, Prince William County, Virginia

Households Experiencing Any of the Four Housing Problems	Households with Problems #	Total Households #	Households with Problems %
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	20,341	81,799	24.87%
Black, Non-Hispanic	12,235	31,619	38.70%
Hispanic	13,464	26,400	51.00%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	4,001	10,396	38.49%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	76	369	20.60%
Other, Non-Hispanic	1,739	4,571	38.04%
Total	51,918	155,245	33.44%
Household Type and Size			
Family, <5 people	26,027	92,980	27.99%

Family, ≥5 people	11,255	26,466	42.53%
Nonfamily	14,644	35,788	40.92%
Households Experiencing Any of the Severe Housing Problems	Households with Severe Problems #	Total Households #	Households with Severe Problems %
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	7,690	81,799	9.40%
Black, Non-Hispanic	5,807	31,619	18.37%
Hispanic	7,676	26,400	29.08%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	2,295	10,396	22.08%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	76	369	20.60%
Other, Non-Hispanic	1,003	4,571	21.94%
Total	24,653	155,245	15.88%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Over 50 percent of Hispanic households in Prince William County experience housing problems. Approximately 38 percent of Black and Asian households experience housing problems, compared with one-quarter of White households. Over 40 percent of family households with five or more members and nonfamily households experience housing problems, compared with 28 percent of households with fewer than five members. Approximately 30 percent of Hispanic households experience severe housing problems, as do approximately 20 percent of Black, Asian, and Native American households. In comparison, fewer than 10 percent of White households experience severe housing problems.

Table 20: Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden, Prince William County

Race/Ethnicity	Households with Severe Cost Burden #	Total Households #	Households with Severe Cost Burden %
White, Non-Hispanic	7,007	81,799	8.57%
Black, Non-Hispanic	4,578	31,619	14.48%
Hispanic	5,299	26,400	20.07%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	1,771	10,396	17.04%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	68	369	18.43%

Other, Non-Hispanic	844	4,571	18.46%
Total	19,567	155,245	12.60%
Household Type and Size			
Family, <5 people	10,373	92,980	11.16%
Family, ≥5 people	3,332	26,466	12.59%
Nonfamily	5,856	35,788	16.36%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

As in the rest of the jurisdictions in this region, Hispanic households in Prince William County have the highest rate of severe housing cost burden, with 20 percent of households harmed. Native American households are burdened at a rate of 18 percent, Asian households at a rate of 17 percent, and Black households at a rate of 14 percent. White households are the least burdened at 9 percent. Nonfamily households are most affected by severe housing cost burden at 16 percent, while family households have rates closer to 12 percent.

Table 21: Demographics of Households with Disproportionate Housing Needs, Region

Households Experiencing Any of the Four Housing Problems	Households with Problems #	Total Households #	Households with Problems %
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	290,379	1,146,249	25.33%
Black, Non-Hispanic	228,930	547,575	41.81%
Hispanic	116,643	229,029	50.93%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	63,849	184,508	34.61%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	1,912	4,987	38.34%
Other, Non-Hispanic	18,138	48,608	37.31%
Total	719,855	2,160,990	33.31%
Household Type and Size			
Family, <5 people	331,440	1,195,683	27.72%
Family, ≥5 people	95,644	230,517	41.49%
Nonfamily	292,760	734,793	39.84%
Households Experiencing Any of the	Households with	Total	Households with

Severe Housing Problems	Severe Problems #	Households #	Severe Problems %
Race/Ethnicity			
White, Non-Hispanic	125,471	1,146,249	10.95%
Black, Non-Hispanic	116,013	547,575	21.19%
Hispanic	68,070	229,029	29.72%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	33,791	184,508	18.31%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	1,040	4,987	20.85%
Other, Non-Hispanic	8,829	48,608	18.16%
Total	353,250	2,160,990	16.35%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Table 22: Demographics of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden, Region

Race/Ethnicity	Households with Severe Cost Burden #	Total Households #	Households with Severe Cost Burden %
White, Non-Hispanic	112,920	1,146,249	9.85%
Black, Non-Hispanic	100,254	547,575	18.31%
Hispanic	45,579	229,029	19.90%
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	25,257	184,508	13.69%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	809	4,987	16.22%
Other, Non-Hispanic	7,588	48,608	15.61%
Total	292,407	2,160,990	13.53%
Household Type and Size			
Family, <5 people	130,274	1,195,683	10.90%
Family, ≥5 people	25,636	230,517	11.12%
Nonfamily	136,547	734,793	18.58%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

The metropolitan Washington region includes slightly more than 2 million households. One-third of these households have housing problems. When evaluated by race and familial status, housing needs are disproportionately borne by households of color, particularly Hispanic and Black households, as well as nonfamily households and families with five or more members. As is the case in every regional jurisdiction except for Fairfax County, Hispanic households have the most disproportionate rate of housing problems compared with White households. Black households also face similar disparities throughout the region. The highest rate of Hispanic households with housing problems is in Gaithersburg, where more than 60 percent have housing problems. Another group vulnerable to housing problems are families with five or more members. This disparity is most pronounced in Alexandria, where over 63 percent of these households have housing problems.

Regionally, while one-quarter of White households have housing problems, at least one out of every three households of color have them. Among some racial and ethnic groups, the proportion of households experiencing housing problems is even more pronounced: for example, 51 percent of Hispanic households and 42 percent of Black households have housing problems. Asian, Native American, and other groups also have higher rates of housing problems than White households. Approximately 40 percent of nonfamily households and households with five or more members also face housing problems.

This trend is the same for households facing severe housing problems. Hispanic households are almost three times more likely to have severe housing problems than White households, and Black households and Native American households are more than twice as likely to have severe housing problems.

There is also a pattern of racially imbalanced housing cost burdens on the regional level that parallels the jurisdictional trends. In most jurisdictions, Hispanic households have the highest rates of cost burden, although in the District of Columbia and Loudoun County, Native Americans shoulder the highest cost burden while making up a small share of the population. White households have the lowest cost burden, with fewer than 10 percent burdened. The jurisdiction with highest rate of severe cost burdens for residents is the District of Columbia. Fairfax and Montgomery Counties also have high rates of households burdened with severe housing costs. Nonfamily households are also disproportionately impacted by housing cost burden, while small-family households have lower rates of housing cost burden.

Overcrowding

Table 23: Percentage of Overcrowded Households by Race and Ethnicity

	Non-Hispanic White Households		Black Households		Native American Households		Asian or Pacific Islander Households		Hispanic Households	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Prince William County	444	0.61	585	2.17	6	1.04	278	3.20	1,862	9.98
Region	7,385	0.66	13,321	2.49	273	3.60	7,094	4.26	22,597	11.37

Data source: 2008–2012 American Community Survey.

Prince William County

As in other jurisdictions, there are racial and ethnic disparities in overcrowding. Hispanic households have a disproportionate rate of households in overcrowded conditions (9.98 percent), while White households have a much lower rate (0.61 percent).

Region

Regionally, regardless of race and ethnicity, households have fairly low rates of overcrowding. Still, a disparity exists in the proportion of White households that are overcrowded compared with other groups. This is particularly true for Hispanic households, which have disproportionate rates of overcrowding in every jurisdiction. At least 11 percent of Hispanic households live in overcrowded housing, more than 10 percentage points higher than White households. The issue of overcrowding is most pronounced in D.C., where at least 15 percent of Hispanic households live in overcrowded housing.

Table 24: Substandard Conditions by Housing Tenure

Jurisdiction	Owner-Occupied One Condition	Owner-Occupied Two Conditions	Owner-Occupied Three Conditions	Owner-Occupied Four Conditions	Owner-Occupied No Conditions	Total
Prince William County	24,032	848	45	0	79,136	104,061
Regional	254,458	5,207	333	7	865,348	1,125,353
Jurisdiction	Renter-Occupied One Condition	Renter-Occupied Two Conditions	Renter-Occupied Three Conditions	Renter-Occupied Four Conditions	Renter-Occupied No Conditions	Total
Prince William County	17,747	1,540	42	6	18,604	37,939
Regional	312,493	26,163	746	70	378,231	717,703
Jurisdiction	One Condition	Two Conditions	Three Conditions	Four Conditions	No Conditions	Total
Prince William County	41,779	2,388	87	6	97,740	142,000
Regional	566,951	31,370	1,079	77	1,243,579	1,843,056

Data source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

In the region, renters are more likely to experience substandard conditions than owners. Of the more than 1 million owner-occupied households, over three-quarters experience no substandard conditions and fewer than 1 percent have two, three, or four substandard conditions. Slightly more than half of all renter households have no substandard conditions, and almost 4 percent have two, three, or four


substandard conditions. Renter-occupied households in Alexandria and Arlington and Loudoun Counties are least likely to experience substandard housing conditions.

All jurisdictions have a similarly low rate of substandard housing conditions for owner-occupied households, ranging from the lowest in Arlington and Loudoun Counties at under one-fifth to the highest in Gaithersburg and Prince William County, where approximately one-quarter of owner-occupied households have one or more substandard conditions.

Among renter-occupied households, almost half have one or more substandard housing conditions in Gaithersburg, Montgomery County, and Prince William County. Renter-occupied households in Alexandria, Arlington and Loudoun Counties are least likely to experience substandard housing conditions.

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

Map 67: Households with Any of the Four Housing Problems (Race/Ethnicity), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 6 - Housing Problems


Description: Households experiencing one or more housing burdens in Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs and race/ethnicity dot density

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 68: Households with Any of the Four Housing Problems (National Origin), Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 6 - Housing Problems

Description: Households experiencing one or more housing burdens in Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs and national origin dot density


Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006


Housing burdens are not evenly distributed throughout Prince William County. There are two distinct clusters of households with high rates of housing burdens: one on the western side near Manassas and one on the eastern side. The center of the county has notably lower rates of households with burdens. In comparison with other counties, there appears to be some degree of racial integration among households residing in areas with high levels of housing problems. One exception to this trend is in the southern tip of the county, where Black residents make up the majority of the cluster of census tracts with housing problems. As a whole, the rate of housing problems for people of color is more pronounced than it is for White households because of their overrepresentation in the data. Mexican and Salvadoran households also tend to be overrepresented in groups with housing problems. Although Mexican households are more evenly distributed throughout the county, Salvadoran households tend to be clustered in the north and southeast sections of the county. These sections of the county have the highest levels of housing problems.

Map 69: Households with Any of the Four Housing Problems (Race/Ethnicity), Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 6 - Housing Problems
Description: Households experiencing one or more housing burdens in Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs and race/ethnicity dot density
Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)
Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 70: Households with Any of the Four Housing Problems (National Origin), Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



There is a regional split in the racial distribution of housing problems that reflects the region’s overall demographics. Households with housing problems tend to be concentrated in the east and southeast portions of the region, which are overwhelmingly Black. Toward the center of the region, the number of households with problems becomes increasingly concentrated. This uneven distribution may in part be explained by these more centralized jurisdictions’ higher populations and older housing stock. This regional pattern closely resembles the jurisdictional patterns because, for the most part, the distribution of households with housing problems is concentrated in certain parts of the area rather than forming an evenly distributed pattern. While White households in all jurisdictions except the District of Columbia form the plurality racial or ethnic group and constitute 53 percent of the total regional population, households of color are disproportionately represented when their relative population size is accounted for. National origin groups, most commonly Indians and Salvadorans, tend to be distributed toward the eastern half of the region. The high proportion of Salvadoran households closely follows the patterns for each jurisdiction, but Indian households appears to be most prevalent in Loudoun County.

1.c. Compare the needs of families with children for housing units with two and three or more bedrooms with the available existing housing stock in each category of publicly supported housing for the jurisdiction and region.

Table 25: Publicly Supported Housing by Program Category: Units by Number of Bedrooms and Number of Children

Prince William County	Households in 0–1 Bedroom Units		Households in 2 Bedroom Units		Households in ≥3 Bedroom Units		Households with Children	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	NA	NA
Project-Based Section 8	244	62.6%	89	22.8%	57	14.6%	108	27.7%
Other Multifamily	106	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	NA	NA
HCV Program	417	20.1%	601	28.9%	1,059	51%	1,032	50%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Prince William County

There are no public housing units in Prince William County. As in the majority of jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area, the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program provides the largest available housing stock for families. The project-based Section 8 developments have 108 units for families with children, while other multifamily developments have no units available for families with children.

Region

There are not enough publicly supported housing units in the region, resulting in a lack of sufficient affordable housing, particularly for families. In most jurisdictions, HCVs offer the most adequate publicly supported housing for families in need. In contrast, project-based Section 8 units do not offer much—or sometimes any—housing opportunity for families, and it is likely that many developments are restricted to seniors. There is a clear need for more affordable housing units for families, instead of HCVs alone.

1.d. Describe the differences in rates of renter and owner-occupied housing by race/ethnicity in the jurisdiction and region.

Table 26: Housing Tenure by Race

			Prince William County	Region
White, Non-Hispanic	Owner- Occupied	#	58,636	820,608
		%	80.8	73.3

	Renter-Occupied	#	13,956	299,248
		%	19.2	26.7
Hispanic	Owner- Occupied	#	11,240	99,296
		%	60.2	50.0
	Renter-Occupied	#	7,423	99,442
		%	39.8	50.0
Black	Owner- Occupied	#	15,812	277,586
		%	58.6	51.8
	Renter-Occupied	#	11,172	257,980
		%	41.4	48.2
Native American	Owner- Occupied	#	421	4,269
		%	72.7	56.3
	Renter-Occupied	#	158	3,311
		%	27.3	43.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	Owner- Occupied	#	7,198	112,704
		%	82.4	67.7
	Renter-Occupied	#	1,541	53,821
		%	17.6	32.3

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Table 27: Population Growth by Housing Type, 2010–2019

Jurisdiction	Owner-Occupied Percentage	Renter-Occupied Percentage
Prince William County	11%	20%

Data source: 2006–2010 and 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, over 50 percent of households in all racial groups live in owner-occupied units. The rate of homeownership for Asian households is the highest at 82 percent, followed closely by White households at 81 percent. The racial groups with the lowest rate of owner-occupied units are Black households at 59 percent and Hispanic households at 60 percent.

Region

Throughout the region, at least 50 percent of all households, irrespective of race, live in owner-occupied housing. White residents have the highest rate of owner-occupied households at 73 percent, and Asian or Pacific Islander residents have the second highest at 68 percent. Although in several counties Hispanic households have higher rates of home ownership than Black households, in the region as a whole, they have the lowest rate of homeownership. As is the general trend on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis, White households have much higher rates of homeownership than households of color, particularly Hispanic and Black households.

Additional Information


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

Spatial Distribution and Availability of Affordable Housing

Affordable rental housing is defined as a unit renting at or less than 30 percent of household income for a household with income at 50 percent of AMI.

Map 71: Location of Affordable Rental Housing, Prince William County


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In Prince William County, there is a fairly even distribution of affordable housing throughout the jurisdiction, with concentrated clusters of affordable housing in the northwest, central, and eastern parts of the jurisdiction.

Map 72: Location of Affordable Rental Housing, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 17 - Location of Affordable Rental Housing (% Rental Units Affordable to 50% AMI)

Description: Map of percent of rental units affordable, defined as units renting at or less than 30% of household income for a household with income at 50% of AMI.

Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

The region’s rental housing stock that is affordable to low-income households—regardless of subsidy status—is concentrated on the edges of the metropolitan area. Some affordable rental units exist in the center of some jurisdictions, although the centers of the District of Columbia and Fairfax and Montgomery Counties have a greater concentration of households with housing cost burdens. Affordable housing in this central area tends to be concentrated in R/ECAP areas. Otherwise, the largest supply of affordable housing is on the periphery.

B. Publicly Supported Housing Analysis

Some tables and maps in this section are sourced from the HUD tool, which used 2011–2015 five-year ACS data. These tables and maps are accessible to all, and anyone can use them to numerically and spatially analyze jurisdictions or communities of interest. Other tables and maps the Urban Institute created are based on 2015–2019 five-year ACS estimated data. Some of the maps, therefore, identify different census tracts as R/ECAPs and reflect slightly different demographic data.

1. Publicly supported housing demographics

Table 28: Publicly Supported Housing Units by Program Category

Prince William County	#	%
Total Housing Units	155,142	100.00%
Public Housing	NA	NA
Project-Based Section 8	392	0.25%
Other Multifamily	112	0.07%
HCV Program	2,364	1.52%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, residents relying on publicly supported housing include those living in project-based Section 8 units and other multifamily housing units and HCV users. Overall, 1.84 percent of households reside in units assisted with federal tenant-based or project-based subsidies. HCVs are the most prominent source of publicly supported housing assistance in Prince William County, followed by project-based Section 8 housing. There are no public housing units in Prince William County.

Region

Across the jurisdictions, approximately 4 percent of households reside in units assisted with federal tenant-based or project-based subsidies. In every jurisdiction, HCVs are the most prominent source of publicly supported housing, followed by project-based Section 8 housing. A majority of the jurisdictions have no public housing units at all. It is clear from these data that while progress is being made, more publicly supported housing is still needed in the region.

1.a. Are certain racial/ethnic groups more likely to be residing in one program category of publicly supported housing than other program categories (public housing, project-based Section 8, other multifamily assisted developments, and HCV) in the jurisdiction?

Table 29: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics

Prince William County	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Project-Based Section 8	131	33.59%	105	26.92%	81	20.77%	71	18.21%
Other Multifamily	80	75.47%	16	15.09%	4	3.77%	6	5.66%

HCV Program	398	19.16%	1,474	70.97%	152	7.32%	48	2.31%
Total Households	81,799	52.69%	31,619	20.37%	26,400	17.01%	10,396	6.70%
0–30% of AMI	5,546	34.46%	4,015	24.95%	4,555	28.30%	1,209	7.51%
0–50% of AMI	12,616	36.45%	7,534	21.77%	10,385	30.01%	2,742	7.92%
0–80% of AMI	17,656	37.71%	10,223	21.84%	13,509	28.85%	3,705	7.91%
Region	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian or Pacific Islander	
Housing Type	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Public Housing	503	6.71%	6,532	87.15%	315	4.20%	128	1.71%
Project-Based Section 8	3,501	17.17%	13,201	64.76%	1,182	5.80%	2,408	11.81%
Other Multifamily	449	26.35%	969	56.87%	100	5.87%	181	10.62%
HCV Program	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total Households	1,146,249	53.04%	547,575	25.34%	229,029	10.60%	184,508	8.54%
0–30% of AMI	90,665	33.26%	112,341	41.21%	40,008	14.68%	21,717	7.97%
0–50% of AMI	175,960	34.84%	190,389	37.70%	85,426	16.92%	39,408	7.80%
0–80% of AMI	244,055	36.68%	240,579	36.15%	111,238	16.72%	51,826	7.79%

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

Data sources: Decennial Census; APSH; CHAS.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, Black households are the largest group living in publicly supported housing and the highest percentage of households that use HCVs. Black households using publicly supported housing are also most likely to use HCVs over any other type of publicly supported housing by a significant margin. The second-most-common option for Black households is project-based Section 8 housing. White households represent the highest percentage of households in Prince William that

reside in publicly supported other multifamily housing. White households using publicly supported housing are most likely to use HCVs. The second-most-common option for White households is project-based Section 8 housing. Hispanic households represent the third-highest percentage of households that reside in publicly supported housing. Hispanic households using publicly supported housing are most likely to use HCVs. The second-most-common option for Hispanic households is project-based Section 8 housing. Asian or Pacific Islander households represent the lowest percentage of households using publicly supported housing. Asian or Pacific Islander households using publicly supported housing are most likely to reside in project-based Section 8 housing. Overall, in Prince William County, White households are most likely to occupy publicly supported housing, while Asian or Pacific Islander households are least likely to occupy publicly supported housing.

Region

Regionally, the vast majority of households living in publicly supported housing are Black households, despite accounting for only one-quarter of the region's total population. Black households represent the highest percentage of households living in public housing, project-based Section 8 housing, and other multifamily housing. Despite accounting for more than half of the region's total population, White households represent the second-highest percentage of households living in public housing, project-based Section 8 housing, and other multifamily housing. The third-highest number of households living in publicly supported housing are Hispanic households, and Asian or Pacific Islander households are least likely to occupy publicly supported housing. Regionally, HCVs are the most used type of publicly supported housing assistance, often by a large margin.

1.b. Compare the racial/ethnic demographics of each program category of publicly supported housing for the jurisdiction with the demographics of the same program category in the region.

Regional data are not available concerning the demographics of HCV users but are available for other types of publicly supported housing.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, there is a higher percentage of White, Hispanic, and Asian or Pacific Islander households living in project-based Section 8 housing developments than across the region. There is a lower percentage of Black households living in project-based Section 8 housing developments than there is regionwide. There is a higher percentage of White households living in other multifamily housing developments than across the region. There is a lower percentage of Black, Hispanic, and Asian or Pacific Islander households living in other multifamily housing developments than across the region.

1.c. Compare the demographics, in terms of protected class, of residents of each program category of publicly supported housing (public housing, project-based Section 8, other multifamily assisted developments, and HCVs) with the population in general and with those who meet the income eligibility requirements for the relevant program category of publicly supported housing in the jurisdiction and the region. Include in the comparison a description of whether there is a higher or lower proportion of groups based on protected class.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, Black households represent a higher proportion of HCV users and occupants of project-based Section 8 housing compared with the total number of Black households. There is a higher proportion of White households residing in other multifamily housing. There is also a higher proportion of Hispanic households and Asian or Pacific Islander households residing in project-based Section 8 housing. Correspondingly, there is a lower proportion of Black, Hispanic, and Asian or Pacific Islander households residing in other multifamily housing compared with the total number of


households in those groups. There is also a lower proportion of White households using HCVs and residing in project-based Section 8 housing. Finally, Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households represent a lower proportion of HCV users.

Controlling for income eligibility, the overrepresentation of Black households using HCVs and residing in project-based Section 8 housing decreases. The overrepresentation of Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households residing in project-based Section 8 housing also decreases when controlling for income eligibility. The overrepresentation of White households in other multifamily housing increases, and the underrepresentation of Black, Hispanic, and Asian or Pacific Islander households residing in other multifamily housing increases when controlling for income eligibility. The underrepresentation of White households using HCVs and residing in project-based Section 8 housing decreases. Finally, the underrepresentation of Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households in HCV usage increases when controlling for income eligibility.

2. Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy

2.a. Describe patterns in the geographic location of publicly supported housing by program category (public housing, project-based Section 8, other multifamily assisted developments, HCVs, and LIHTC) in relation to previously discussed segregated areas and R/ECAPs in the jurisdiction and the region.


Map 73: Publicly Supported Housing and Race/Ethnicity, Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 5 - Publicly Supported Housing and Race/Ethnicity
Description: Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, Other Multifamily, and LIHTC locations mapped with race/ethnicity dot density map with R/ECAPs, distinguishing categories of publicly supported housing by color
Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Within Prince William County, the majority of the publicly supported housing is clustered near Manassas and Dale City. There is a large population of Hispanic residents near Manassas and a large population of Black residents near Dale City. In Prince William County, the majority of HCV users live in areas with a higher percentage of Black residents than in the county overall.

Map 74: Publicly Supported Housing and Race/Ethnicity, Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Regionally, much of the publicly supported housing is concentrated near areas with high proportions of Black residents. Publicly supported housing is least likely to be located in areas with high proportions of White residents. The areas with the highest percentage of HCV holders also tend to be in areas with higher percentages of Black residents. There is much more publicly supported housing in the eastern portion of the region that is closest to D.C. There is a lack of publicly supported housing in the western and southern portions of the region.

2.b. Describe patterns in the geographic location of publicly supported housing that primarily serves families with children, elderly persons, or persons with disabilities in relation to previously discussed segregated areas or R/ECAPs in the jurisdiction and the region.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, other multifamily housing serves the highest percentage of elderly residents and persons with a disability compared with other types of publicly supported housing. Other multifamily housing is also most likely to be located in areas with a large population of White residents. The HCV program serves the highest percentage of families with children. HCV users are most likely to live in or near the areas that have the highest proportion of Black residents.

2.c. How does the demographic composition of occupants of publicly supported housing in R/ECAPS compare with the demographic composition of occupants of publicly supported housing outside R/ECAPs in the jurisdiction and region?

Prince William County

There are no R/ECAPs in Prince William County.

Table 30: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics by R/ECAP and Non-R/ECAP Tracts

Prince William County	Total Units (Occupied) #	White %	Black %	Hispanic %	Asian or Pacific Islander %	Families with Children %	Elderly %	With a Disability %
Public Housing								
R/ECAP tracts	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Non-R/ECAP tracts	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Non-R/ECAP tracts	387	33.59%	26.92%	20.77%	18.21%	27.69%	62.31%	12.60%
Other Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Non-R/ECAP tracts	108	75.47%	15.09%	3.77%	5.66%	NA	72.64%	33.02%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Non-R/ECAP tracts	1,987	19.16%	70.97%	7.32%	2.31%	49.69%	21.33%	24.41%
-------------------	-------	--------	--------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------

Note: Disability information is often reported for heads of household or spouse/co-head only. Here, the data reflect information on all members of the household.

Data source: APSH.

2.d. Do any developments of public housing, properties converted under the RAD, and LIHTC developments have a significantly different demographic composition, in terms of protected class, than other developments of the same category for the jurisdiction? Describe how these developments differ.

Table 31: Project-Based Section 8 Publicly Supported Housing Demographics

Prince William County									
Type	Development Name	PHA Code	PHA Name	Units #	White %	Black %	Hispanic %	Asian %	Households with Children %
Project-Based Section 8	Marywood	NA	NA	127	33.59	13.28	10.16	42.97	NA
Project-Based Section 8	Coverstone IV Apartments	NA	NA	166	15.66	43.37	37.35	3.01	65.06
Project-Based Section 8	Lake Ridge Fellowship	NA	NA	99	64.58	16.67	6.25	11.46	NA
Other Multifamily Assisted Housing	Community	NA	NA	20	84.21	10.53	0.0	5.26	NA
Other Multifamily Assisted Housing	Willow Oaks Court	NA	NA	77	76.39	13.89	4.17	5.56	NA
Other Multifamily Assisted Housing	Willow Oaks Place	NA	NA	15	60.0	26.67	6.67	6.67	NA

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, among project-based Section 8 developments, Lake Ridge Fellowship has a significantly higher percentage of White residents.

2.e. Provide additional relevant information, if any, about occupancy, by protected class, in other types of publicly supported housing for the jurisdiction and the region.

2.f. Compare the demographics of occupants of developments in the jurisdiction, for each category of publicly supported housing (public housing, Project-Based Section 8, other multifamily assisted developments, properties converted under the Rental Assistance Demonstration, and LIHTC) with the demographic composition of the areas in which they are located. For the jurisdiction, describe whether developments primarily occupied by one race or ethnicity are located in areas occupied largely by the same race or ethnicity. Describe any differences for housing that primarily serves families with children, elderly persons, or persons with disabilities.

Table 32: Publicly Supported Housing Demographics and Surrounding Census Tract Demographics, Prince William County, Virginia

Type	Development Name	PHA Code	PHA Name	Units #		White %		Black %		Hispanic %		Asian %		Households with Children %		Population below Poverty Line %
				Development	Tract	Development	Tract	Development	Tract	Development	Tract	Development	Tract	Development	Tract	Tract
S8	Marywood	NA	NA	127	2,677	33.6	26.2	13.3	14.1	10.2	41.1	43.0	14.5	NA	34.1	14.6
S8	Coverstone IV Apartments	NA	NA	166	2,761	15.7	23.7	43.4	16.9	37.4	42.4	3.0	10.9	65.1	53	11.8
S8	Lake Ridge Fellowship	NA	NA	99	1,995	64.6	38.8	16.7	17.8	6.3	26.3	11.5	11.1	NA	44.5	5.6
OM	Community	NA	NA	20	2,088	84.2	14.4	10.5	31	0.0	46.4	5.3	4	NA	54	23.3

OM	Willow Oaks Court	NA	NA	77	1,961	76.4	68.6	13.9	8	4.2	8.1	5.6	9.1	NA	39.6	2.5
OM	Willow Oaks Place	NA	NA	15	1,961	60.0	68.6	26.7	8	6.7	8.1	6.7	9.1	NA	40	2.5

Note: Housing types are S8 = project-based Section 8, and OM = other multifamily assisted housing.

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, the residents of a publicly supported housing development that serves a large percentage of families with children is more heavily Black than the population of the census tract in which it is located. This development also has smaller White, Hispanic, and Asian populations than the census tracts. Developments that serve a large percentage of persons with disabilities and elderly persons also tend to have smaller Hispanic populations than the census tracts in which they are located.

3. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

3.a. Describe any disparities in access to opportunity for residents of publicly supported housing in the jurisdiction and the region, including within different program categories (public housing, project-based Section 8, other multifamily assisted developments, HCVs, and LIHTC) and between types (housing primarily serving families with children, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities) of publicly supported housing.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, HCV users have less access to proficient schools. HCV users also have less market engagement than residents of other publicly supported housing. There are no meaningful differences in access to transportation costs or jobs proximity across different types of publicly supported housing. HCV users also have less access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods. This is likely because a significant portion of HCV users live in or near the cities of Manassas and Dale City.

Region

Regionally, public housing residents and HCV users tend to live in areas with low access to proficient schools, low labor market engagement, and low access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods. Proximity to transit centers is less consistent across areas with higher proportions of public housing residents and HCV users.

C. Disability and Access Analysis

In 1988, Congress extended Fair Housing Act protections against housing discrimination to persons with disabilities. In addition to protection against intentional discrimination and unjustified policies that have disproportionate effects, the Fair Housing Act includes three provisions unique to persons with disabilities.

First, the act prohibits the denial of reasonable accommodation requests for persons with disabilities if the accommodations are necessary to afford an individual equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. Reasonable accommodations are departures from facially neutral policies. These accommodations are generally granted, so long as they would not place an undue burden on the party providing the accommodation or result in a direct threat to the health or safety of others. Permitting


an individual with an anxiety disorder to have a dog in their rental unit as an emotional support animal despite a broad “no pets” policy is an example of a reasonable accommodation.

Second, the act prohibits the denial of reasonable modification requests. Modifications involve physical alterations to a unit, such as the construction of a ramp or the widening of a door frame and must be paid by the person requesting the accommodation unless the unit receives federal financial assistance and is subject to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

Third, the act includes a design and construction provision that requires most multifamily housing constructed since 1991 to have certain accessibility features. This section of the Fair Housing Analysis looks at the housing barriers faced by persons with disabilities, including those that result in the segregation of persons with disabilities in institutions and other congregate settings.

1. Population Profile

Map 75: Disability by Type (Hearing, Vision, Cognitive), Prince William County
HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 14 - Disability by Type


Description: Dot density map of the population of persons with disabilities by persons with vision, hearing, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living difficulties with R/ECAPs for Jurisdiction and Region

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 76: Disability by Type (Hearing, Vision, Cognitive), Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 14 - Disability by Type


Description: Dot density map of the population of persons with disabilities by persons with vision, hearing, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living difficulties with R/ECAPs for Jurisdiction and Region

Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

**Map 77: Disability by Type (Ambulatory, Self-Care, Independent Living), Prince William County
HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool**



Name: Map 14 - Disability by Type

Description: Dot density map of the population of persons with disabilities by persons with vision, hearing, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living difficulties with R/ECAPs for Jurisdiction and Region

Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 78: Disability by Type (Ambulatory, Self-Care, Independent Living), Region
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 14 - Disability by Type


Description: Dot density map of the population of persons with disabilities by persons with vision, hearing, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living difficulties with R/ECAPs for Jurisdiction and Region

Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 79: Disability by Age, Prince William County
 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 15 - Disability by Age Group

Description: All persons with disabilities by age range (5-17)(18-64)(65+) with R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: Prince William County (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Map 80: Disability by Age, Region

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 15 - Disability by Age Group

Description: All persons with disabilities by age range (5-17)(18-64)(65+) with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: District Of Columbia (CDBG)

Region: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

HUD-Provided Data Version: AFFHT0006

Table 33: Disability by Type

Jurisdiction	Disability Status	Hearing Difficulty	Vision Difficulty	Cognitive Difficulty	Ambulatory Difficulty	Self-Care Difficulty	Independent Living Difficulty
Prince William County	8.0%	2.0%	2.0%	3.0%	3.6%	2.0%	3.6%
Region	8.7%	2.2%	1.6%	3.4%	4.5%	1.8%	3.9%

Note: All disability characteristics are based on the civilian noninstitutionalized population.

Data source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

1.a. How are people with disabilities geographically dispersed or concentrated in the jurisdiction and region, including R/ECAPs and other segregated areas identified in previous sections?

Prince William County

In Prince William County, the one area with an extreme concentration of persons with disabilities is a census tract in Gainesville that includes the large Heritage Hunt senior living community. That area has a relatively larger White population than the county as a whole. Other parts of the county have slightly higher concentrations of persons with disabilities, though not nearly to the same extent as Heritage Hunt. Most of these areas are in the northeastern part of the county, near I-95, and most are

areas with larger Black and Hispanic populations than the county as a whole. At the same time, none of these areas are R/ECAPs as the county does not have R/ECAPs.

1.b. Describe whether these geographic patterns vary for people with each type of disability or for people with disabilities in different age ranges for the jurisdiction and region.

Prince William County

The distribution of individuals with disabilities by type of disability generally mirrors the overall geographic residential patterns of persons with disabilities, with two exceptions. First, persons with hearing disabilities, though subject to the same overarching pattern of distribution, are less concentrated in particular parts of the county than are individuals with other types of disabilities. Second, Heritage Hunt in Gainesville is not an area with a high percentage of persons with cognitive disabilities. With respect to the geographic patterns of persons with disabilities by age, older adults with disabilities tend to reside in the same areas of the county as persons with disabilities overall, while younger adults with disabilities tend to reside in the northeastern part of the county, as well as in the parts of the county immediately to the northwest of Manassas and Manassas Park. Children with disabilities are not uniquely clustered in any particular part of the county.

1. Housing Accessibility

2.a. Describe whether the jurisdiction and the region have sufficient affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes.

As the data show, between 2.5 percent and 6.1 percent of individuals have ambulatory disabilities, depending on the jurisdiction. Similarly, 2–3 percent of individuals and 2–4 percent of individuals, respectively, have hearing or vision disabilities. Given the large size of the region, this implies a likely estimated total need for between 100,000 and 300,000 accessible housing units. Given the low income levels of persons with disabilities, it is critical that a significant share of these units be affordable.

Accessibility Requirement for Federally Funded Housing

HUD's implementation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (24 CFR Part 8) requires that publicly supported federal housing developments make (1) 5 percent of total units accessible to individuals with mobility disabilities and (2) an additional 2 percent of total units accessible to individuals with sensory disabilities. It requires that each property, including site and common areas, meet the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards or HUD's alternative accessibility standard.

Public housing and project-based Section 8 units are both considered to be publicly supported housing. The Publicly Supported Housing Analysis section describes, jurisdiction by jurisdiction, the number of units that exist through the public housing and project-based Section 8 programs, as well as programs like Section 202 and Section 811 that fall under the umbrella of other multifamily housing. Collectively, these units account for a significant share of units subject to Section 504, though that law's accessibility requirements apply to HUD programs like HOME and CDBG as well.

Unfortunately, housing through the programs discussed in the Publicly Supported Housing Analysis section account for tens rather than hundreds of thousands of units, and, as described above, the accessibility requirements that apply to those units only require that 5 percent of units be accessible to persons with mobility disabilities and 2 percent to individuals with sensory disabilities. As publicly supported housing is generally concentrated in the District and is least present in outer suburban communities like Loudoun and Prince William Counties, the distribution of accessible units may follow

that pattern to an extent. However, as discussed below, a portion of older public housing units in the District may require retrofits in order to be fully accessible, slightly undermining that conclusion.

Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Units

There is legal ambiguity regarding whether LIHTC units are subject to Section 504, but the program contributes an important supply of affordable, accessible housing regardless. That is primarily because the Fair Housing Act's design and construction requirements, which took effect in 1991, have been in place for the vast majority of the life of the LIHTC program. There are tens of thousands of LIHTC units across the jurisdictions, including 23,631 low-income LIHTC units in the District. It is likely that more LIHTC units meet an accessibility standard than other types of publicly supported housing units, but the accessibility standard that those LIHTC units meet is a lesser one.

Fair Housing Act Units

In the region, 156,637 units in structures with five or more units have been built from 2000 to the present and a further 176,137 units in structures with five or more units were built from 1980 through 1999. It is not possible to determine what portion of the latter was constructed between the date in 1991 when the Fair Housing Act's design and construction standards took effect and the close of 1999. This may appear to be a significant number of potentially accessible units, but it is important to keep a few factors in mind. First, the data above include publicly supported housing units, particularly LIHTC units, built in the relevant timeframe. Thus, totals from this subsection cannot be added to figures from the preceding subsections. Second, many households that do not include individuals with disabilities who have accessibility needs also reside in this housing. Indeed, from the standpoint of community integration, it would not be a desirable outcome for people who do not have disabilities to vacate this housing en masse for it to be made available to persons with disabilities. Third, compliance with the Fair Housing Act's accessibility requirements can be uneven at times. These ACS data do not provide a basis for concluding that the developers of this housing followed the law.

Summary

Overall, there appear to be significant unmet needs for affordable, accessible housing in the region. It is likely that these are most acutely felt in outer suburban communities like Loudoun and Prince William Counties that lack both multifamily housing, in general, and publicly supported housing, in particular, in comparison with the jurisdictions at the core of the region. It is also likely that funding for accessibility retrofits will be essential to ensure that older sources of publicly supported housing, such as D.C.'s large public housing stock, are accessible to persons with disabilities. Lastly, inclusionary zoning, as practiced in the District, Fairfax County, and Montgomery County, has begun to balance the location of affordable, accessible housing regionally.

2.b. Describe the areas where affordable, accessible housing units are located in the jurisdiction and the region. Do they align with R/ECAPs or other areas that are segregated?

The Publicly Supported Housing Analysis section contains a granular discussion of the location of affordable housing in each jurisdiction and in the region. There is no basis for concluding that there are significant differences between where affordable housing is located and where affordable, accessible housing is located. There may, however, be some minor nuances. For instance, the affordable housing that is least likely to be accessible consists of older developments, principally public housing, developed before the passage of accessibility laws. By a wide margin, the District is home to the largest share of such housing. Thus, while the District still likely has more affordable,

accessible housing than any jurisdiction, it is also likely that a meaningful amount of D.C.'s public housing is not accessible.

At the same time, because public housing is subject to Section 504, public housing residents may be entitled to have the D.C. Housing Authority pay for accessibility retrofits as reasonable modifications. The other important nuance is in regard to affordable but not publicly supported housing produced through inclusionary zoning programs. The District, Fairfax County, and Montgomery County all have robust inclusionary zoning programs that result in the development of affordable units, most frequently in large new multifamily developments. The locations of such developments are often different from the distribution of affordable, accessible housing that exists through publicly supported housing programs. In Fairfax County, the most significant areas of growth through inclusionary requirements are in the Silver line corridor in western Fairfax County. In D.C., areas of growth include the Wharf, Navy Yard, NoMa, Shaw, Columbia Heights, and Petworth. In Montgomery County, Bethesda and Rockville are areas of significant inclusionary development.

2.c. To what extent are people with different disabilities able to access and live in the different categories of publicly supported housing in the jurisdiction and region?

Table 34: Persons with a Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category

Prince William County	#	%
Public Housing	NA	NA
Project-Based Section 8	49	12.60%
Other Multifamily	35	33.02%
HCV Program	507	24.41%

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, persons with disabilities are underrepresented in project-based Section 8 housing relative to their share of the income-eligible population but appear to have relatively equal opportunity to reside in other multifamily housing or to obtain HCVs.

2. Integration of People with Disabilities Living in Institutions and Other Segregated Settings

3.a. To what extent do people with disabilities in or from the jurisdiction or region reside in segregated or integrated settings?

Until a wave of policy reforms and court decisions in the 1960s and 1970s, governments at all levels, including in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, primarily housed persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities and individuals with psychiatric disabilities in large state-run institutions. Within these institutions, persons with disabilities had few opportunities for meaningful interaction with individuals without disabilities, limited access to education and employment, and a lack of individual autonomy. The transition from housing persons with disabilities in institutional settings toward providing housing and services in home and community-based settings accelerated with the passage of the ADA in 1991 and the US Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Olmstead v. L. C.* in 1999. In *Olmstead*, the Supreme Court held that, under the regulations of the US Department of Justice implementing Title II of the ADA, if a state or local government provides supportive services

to persons with disabilities, it must do so in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of each person with a disability and consistent with their informed choice. This obligation is not absolute and is subject to the ADA defense that providing services in a more integrated setting would constitute a fundamental alteration of the state or local government programs.

The transition from widespread institutionalization to community integration has not always been linear, and concepts about what constitutes a home and community-based setting have evolved over time. Although it is clear that developmental centers and state hospitals are segregated settings, and an individual's own house or apartment in a development where most residents are individuals without disabilities is an integrated setting, significant ambiguities remain. Nursing homes and intermediate care facilities are clearly segregated, though not to the same degree as state institutions. Group homes fall somewhere between truly integrated supported housing and segregated settings, and the degree of integration in a group home often corresponds to its size.

The following section includes detailed information about the degree to which persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities and individuals with psychiatric disabilities reside in integrated or segregated settings. The selection of these two areas of focus does not mean that persons with other types of disabilities are never subject to segregation. The discussion below includes some jurisdiction-level analysis but is primarily organized by state. State governments are primarily responsible for implementation of the *Olmstead* mandate, and, as a result, there are often significant commonalities across jurisdictions within the same states.

Virginia

In 2012, Virginia entered into a sweeping consent decree in *United States v. Commonwealth of Virginia*, a lawsuit brought by the US Department of Justice to challenge the alleged segregation of Virginians with intellectual and developmental disabilities in large institutions called training centers. The former Northern Virginia Training Center, which was in Fairfax, closed in 2016. As of 2022, Virginia has closed all of its training centers, but the process of implementing the consent decree is not complete.²³ Policy changes in Virginia, at times supplemented at the local government level, have increased community integration for persons with developmental and intellectual disabilities by creating new integrated housing options, increasing the supply of home- and community-based services waivers, and changing waiver rules to facilitate independent living.

Nonetheless, undersupply of permanent supportive housing (PSH) and tenant-based rental assistance have pushed many individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities to live in congregate settings like group homes and nursing homes. Although the US Census Bureau does not disaggregate these data by type of disability, the 2015–2019 ACS shows that the 242,548 residents of group quarters in the District were over twice as likely to have disabilities—24.0 percent compared with 11.4 percent—as individuals not living in group quarters. Residents of institutionalized group quarters—45.3 percent—were especially likely to have disabilities. That Virginia's group quarters population is disproportionately larger than Maryland's and consists of a lower proportion of persons with disabilities (including among those in institutionalized group quarters) reflects Virginia's significantly higher incarceration rate.

Despite its apparent yet incomplete progress made toward advancing community integration for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities, Virginia continues to rely heavily on large-scale state-run psychiatric hospitals to house persons with psychiatric disabilities. The Northern Virginia Mental Health Institute in Falls Church is one such institution. In addition to the overreliance on psychiatric hospitals, Virginia's high rate of incarceration is a barrier to community integration for persons with psychiatric disabilities who have been subjected to prolonged solitary confinement in state prisons.

3.b. Describe the range of options for people with disabilities to access affordable housing and supportive services in the jurisdiction and the region.

Supportive Services

Across jurisdictions, supportive services are provided through similar Medicaid-funded programs, including variations on waivers for home- and community-based services. These programs, at their best, enable individuals with disabilities, including those with the most intensive needs for services and supports, to live in integrated, community-based settings. The exact names of available waivers, the processes for applying, the length of wait (if any) to start receiving waiver services, and the services covered under the waiver (and their billing rates) vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

In Virginia, the two primary waivers are the Developmental Disabilities and Intellectual Disabilities waivers, and mental health services are provided through the community services boards for Alexandria, Arlington County, Fairfax–Falls Church, Loudoun County, and Prince William County. Available mental health services include the Program of Assertive Community Treatment, an intensive level of community-based mental health services that can enable individuals with the most severe and persistent psychiatric disabilities to live in integrated, community-based settings. There is a waiting list for waiver services in Virginia, and, as a result, some individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities are not able to access the level of community-based supportive services that they need.

Permanent Supportive Housing

The provision of PSH across jurisdictions in the region is far more disparate. Through its Department of Human Services, the District of Columbia provides locally funded tenant-based rental assistance on a large scale as its primary means of creating integrated housing opportunities. The assistance can be accessed through the Coordinated Assessment and Housing Placement system. One limitation of this program is that payment standards for rental assistance are lower than those of the District of Columbia Housing Authority. As a result, persons with disabilities may have limited choice of neighborhoods and sometimes resort to housing entirely outside D.C. Montgomery County, Maryland, serves more than 1,500 individuals annually through its PSH, with at least 90 percent retaining permanent housing on an annual basis. In Virginia, multiple local governments support nonprofits like New Hope Housing, PathForward, and the Good Shepherd Housing Foundation that provide supportive housing through a number of different approaches, including site-based PSH development and master leasing of units in existing apartment complexes. Tenant-based rental assistance for persons with disabilities is much less available in Virginia than it is in the District, and PSH programs are much more established and operate at a larger scale in Alexandria, Arlington County, and Fairfax County than they do in Loudoun and Prince William Counties. These outer suburban counties need more capacity for PSH to keep pace with their more rapid population growth.

3. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

4.a. To what extent are people with disabilities able to access—and what major barriers do they face in accessing—the following services, accommodations, and opportunities in the jurisdiction and the region?

i. Government Services and Facilities

Although a variety of public facilities and services have reasonable accommodation policies for persons with disabilities, many facilities and services require additional outreach or efforts by the person with a disability to request accommodations themselves, usually with several days' notice,

rather than having these services consistently embedded into their administration. As a result, individuals with disabilities must be proactive to obtain necessary accommodations.

In the region, some counties provide a range of accessibility services. Montgomery County has an ADA compliance team and provides training and technical assistance for county staff on ADA compliance and other disability needs. Similarly, Fairfax County provides ADA services through its government offices, including enforcing building codes that require ADA compliance and handling ADA complaints. In the District of Columbia, any facility or part of a facility constructed by a state or local government entity after January 26, 1992, must be built in strict compliance with the ADA. The District is not necessarily required to make every pre-ADA facility fully compliant with current accessibility codes, however, all District services, programs, or activities must be accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities when viewed in their entirety. This is called “overall program access.”²⁴ Nonetheless, this loophole means accessibility problems may remain, with persons who have disabilities facing greater barriers in accessing government facilities or services. The same principles apply to other governments in the region.

Web accessibility reveals similar dualities, as governments have attempted to comply with Section 508 website accessibility standards. However, this compliance is only implemented “whenever possible,” and certain elements remain poorly accessible.

ii. Public Infrastructure

Although accommodations are available for a range of public and private infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, and pedestrian signals), lack of compliance or maintenance results in inequitable treatment for persons with disabilities. Inadequate maintenance of sidewalks can impede accessibility for persons with mobility-related disabilities, including persons who require wheelchairs for transportation. Recent public efforts, such as the crowdsourced Project Sidewalk, endeavor to map sidewalk accessibility by noting curb ramp conditions, lack of sidewalks, and other common issues impeding mobility in the District. Many sidewalks in the District metropolitan area are not up to ADA standards; in many cases, this is because construction projects have left large cracks that serve as impediments to persons in wheelchairs.

The governments of the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland have all put out ADA Transition Plans for Public Rights-of-Way, which provide a detailed review of sidewalks, crosswalks, bus stops, curb ramps, and accessible pedestrian signals. However, the Transition Plans for D.C., published in 2016, and Maryland, published in 2009, have not been updated recently, and inaccessible infrastructure problems persist. Additionally, because COVID-19 has caused restaurants to use more public space for outdoor dining, the pandemic has created new accessibility challenges. Moreover, parking of electric scooters and bicycles has also resulted in impassable sidewalks, particularly in downtown D.C.

iii. Transportation

In Virginia, the elderly population is predicted to increase to 20 percent of residents by 2030,²⁵ the largest population increase of any demographic. The state recognizes that as the elderly population increases, the demand for public transportation will increase as well, but as it admits in its 2018 *Assessment of Disability Services in Virginia* study, there is insufficient transportation of this type to accommodate rising demand.²⁶ The outpaced demand for transportation also disproportionately impacts individuals with disabilities, who also tend to rely on public transportation to travel. Similarly, although Maryland has more extensive public transportation modes for individuals with disabilities, less extensive infrastructure in suburban areas reduces access for individuals with disabilities.

Bus and Rail

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) serves the entire region and explicitly outlines on its website the measures taken to enhance access to its rail and bus systems for persons with disabilities. Fare vending machines have accessibility features, including instructions in Braille with raised alphabets and a button for audio instructions. All stations have at least one extra-wide fare gate for wheelchair access, and all stations except Arlington Cemetery use bumpy tiles to alert customers with low vision that they are nearing the edge of a platform. Railcars also provide priority seating for persons with disabilities and gap reducers have been installed on all railcars to make it easier for an individual with a mobility support to enter and exit the car safely. For Metrobus, all buses are wheelchair accessible and have both audio and visual stop announcements. If the automated announcement system fails to work, bus operators announce major intersections, landmarks, and transfer points. Various other measures are in place as well.²⁷

One notable concern with the WMATA Metrorail system is the operating quality of elevators. They are deteriorating, resulting in patrons being trapped in the elevator.²⁸ Also, at stations with multiple entrances, signage directing people to elevators can often be scarce, making them difficult to locate.²⁹ Because elevators are a primary access point to the Metro station for individuals with disabilities, these dysfunctional elevator features are likely to disproportionately limit transportation access for transit riders with disabilities. This trend may change as an influx of federal dollars is allocated to elevator repairs.

Virginia Railway Express,³⁰ the Maryland Transit Administration,³¹ the D.C. Circulator,³² ART buses,³³ and Montgomery County Ride On buses use similar measures to Metrorail and Metrobus.³⁴ Prince William County's OmniRide,³⁵ Loudoun County Local Bus Service,³⁶ and the Fairfax Connector³⁷ and CUE buses are wheelchair accessible; however, their websites do not specify whether bus operators are instructed to announce major intersections, landmarks, and transfer points.³⁸ The Alexandria DASH bus system is wheelchair accessible, provides bus service within the city, and connects with Metrobus, Metrorail, Virginia Railway Express, and other local bus systems. However, the DASH website does not elaborate on what, if any, other measures are taken to make the system accessible to persons with disabilities.³⁹ DASH has been fare-free since September 2021.⁴⁰

Paratransit

WMATA also runs MetroAccess, a door-to-door paratransit program, throughout the entire region. Some MetroAccess customers are entitled to free rides on Metrorail and Metrobus. However, MetroAccess does not provide same-day trip service. Fares can also be expensive and cost up to \$6.50 per trip.⁴¹

WMATA also offers an even more costly service called Abilities-Ride. Although this service has been suspended because of COVID-19, Abilities Ride allows individuals eligible for MetroAccess to receive same-day transportation services through a local taxi company, provided the trip begins or ends in Maryland. The individual pays for the first \$5 of the trip, WMATA pays for the next \$15, and then the rider is responsible for paying any amount over \$20.⁴² The City of Rockville offers a similar program that provides low-income residents over the age of 60 a subsidy of \$34 a month for taxicab services.⁴³

The Alexandria DOT offers a paratransit program similar to MetroAccess seven days a week for Alexandria residents unable to use public transportation. As with MetroAccess, trips must be scheduled a minimum of one day in advance. Trips inside the city and within five miles of the city cost \$4 each way, and trips to areas more than five miles outside the city cost \$6 each way. Availability of the paratransit program may also be limited to high-priority trips, depending on the status of the COVID-

19 pandemic.⁴⁴ Arlington County,⁴⁵ Loudoun County,⁴⁶ and MDOT⁴⁷ also offer similar paratransit programs that do not take same-day reservations.

iv. Proficient schools and educational programs

Prince William County

Prince William County’s 2018 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act report shows a graduation rate for students with individualized education programs (IEPs) of 64 percent, higher than the state target rate of 56 percent.⁴⁸ The county has a dropout rate of 1.5 percent, slightly higher than the state target rate. The report also identified a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs. The rate at which students with IEPs were included in regular classroom instruction for 80 percent or more of the day was 65 percent, below the state target rate of 70 percent.⁴⁹ Among children ages 3 to 5 with IEPs, 30 percent were in separate educational facilities, significantly higher than the state target of 17 percent.⁵⁰

v. Jobs

As the table below shows, persons with disabilities are employed at extremely low rates across all jurisdictions participating in this analysis. The problem is most extreme in the District and least pervasive in Fairfax County, Gaithersburg, and Loudoun County, also suburban areas with low unemployment and high labor force participation generally. As jurisdictions undertake efforts to increase access to employment for persons with disabilities, it is critical that the opportunities created be truly integrated and pay a decent wage. Under Maryland Code Health-Gen. § 7-207, sheltered workshops that pay below the minimum wage may not receive state funding in Maryland. By contrast, sheltered workshops that fail to pay minimum wage are still present in Virginia.

Table 35: Population with a Disability That Is Employed, Ages 18–64

Jurisdiction	%
Alexandria	50.2%
Arlington County	50.2%
District of Columbia	32.5%
Fairfax County	58.6%
Gaithersburg	61.3%
Loudoun County	58.4%
Montgomery County	51.6%
Prince William County	54.2%

Source: 2019 American Community Survey one-year estimates.

4.b. Describe existing processes in the jurisdiction and the region for people with disabilities to request and obtain reasonable accommodations and accessibility modifications to address the barriers discussed above.

i. Government Services and Facilities

Jurisdictions in the region vary in the extent to which they clearly and publicly share information about reasonable accommodation processes and accessibility on local government websites. Three jurisdictions—Fairfax County, Loudoun County, and Montgomery County—have robust, well-organized accessibility pages on their sites that are directly accessed from the main page. The District of Columbia also links to its accessibility page from its main page, but the information presented there is not as comprehensive. Alexandria and Arlington County do not link to their accessibility pages from

their main pages but do have accessibility pages that present useful information. Gaithersburg and Prince William County have extremely sparse information about accessibility on their websites.

ii. Public Infrastructure

Arlington County, the District of Columbia, Fairfax County, and Montgomery have dedicated web portals for residents to make sidewalk-related requests, including accessibility requests, rather than routing individuals through more general accessibility request processes.

iii. Transportation

Major transportation providers in the region, including WMATA and Virginia Railway Express, include information about how to request reasonable accommodations on their websites.

iv. Proficient Schools and Educational Programs

School districts in the region generally have information about requesting accommodations posted on their websites.

v. Jobs

This analysis did not reveal specific information regarding reasonable accommodations policies for private employers. The description of website accessibility information for government services and facilities above has significant implications for access to public-sector employment.

4.c. Describe any difficulties in achieving homeownership experienced by people with disabilities and by people with different types of disabilities in the jurisdiction and the region.

Persons with disabilities face at least two significant barriers to homeownership in the region. First, as discussed above, persons with disabilities tend to have lower incomes than individuals who do not have disabilities. Given the higher cost of homeownership in comparison with renting in an area with expensive housing costs, homeownership is often out of reach. Second, single-family homes, which are not covered by the Fair Housing Act's design and construction standards, are the most significant source of owner-occupied units in the region. Multifamily units, by contrast, are comparatively more likely to be rental units. Single-family units may not be accessible to persons with mobility disabilities, in particular.

4. Disproportionate Housing Needs

5.a. Describe any disproportionate housing needs experienced by people with disabilities and by people with certain types of disabilities in the jurisdiction and the region.

As with homeownership, the comparatively low income levels of persons with disabilities fuel disproportionate levels of cost burden.

Factors Contributing to Disability and Access Issues

Please see the Contributing Factors section for the following contributing factors to disability and access issues:

- access for persons with disabilities to proficient schools
- access to publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities

- access to transportation for persons with disabilities
- inaccessible government facilities or services
- inaccessible public or private infrastructure
- lack of access to opportunity attributable to high housing costs
- lack of affordable in-home or community-based supportive services
- lack of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes
- lack of affordable, integrated housing for individuals who need supportive services
- lack of assistance for housing accessibility modifications
- lack of assistance for transitioning from institutional settings to integrated housing
- lack of local or regional cooperation
- land use and zoning laws
- lending discrimination
- location of accessible housing
- loss of affordable housing
- occupancy codes and restrictions
- regulatory barriers to providing housing and supportive services for persons with disabilities
- source-of-income discrimination
- state or local laws, policies, or practices that discourage individuals with disabilities from living in apartments, family homes, supportive housing, and other integrated settings

V. Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources

1. List and summarize any of the following that have not been resolved:

- *a charge or letter of finding from HUD concerning a violation of a civil rights–related law*
- *a cause determination from a substantially equivalent state or local fair housing agency concerning a violation of a state or local fair housing law*
- *any voluntary compliance agreements, conciliation agreements, or settlement agreements entered into with HUD or the Department of Justice*
- *a letter of findings issued by or lawsuit filed or joined by the Department of Justice alleging a pattern or practice or systemic violation of a fair housing or civil rights law*
- *a claim under the False Claims Act related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, or civil rights generally, including an alleged failure to affirmatively further fair housing*
- *pending administrative complaints or lawsuits against the locality alleging fair housing violations or discrimination*

There were no unresolved findings; compliance, conciliation, or settlement agreements; claims; complaints; or lawsuits regarding fair housing and civil rights laws in the D.C. metropolitan region.

2. Describe any state or local fair housing laws. What characteristics are protected under each law?

Virginia Laws

The Virginia Department of Professional and Occupational Regulation’s Fair Housing Board enforces Virginia laws that provide protection and monetary relief to victims of unlawful housing practices. Virginia’s Fair Housing Law (Virginia Code § 36-96.1, et seq.) prohibits discriminatory housing practices and harassment in the following:

- advertising
- application and selection process
- representation by a real estate broker or agent
- terms and conditions of tenancy
- privileges of occupancy

- mortgage loans and insurance
- public and private land use practices
- unlawful restrictive covenants

The following categories are protected by the Virginia Fair Housing Law:

- race
- color
- religion
- national origin
- sex
- elderliness
- familial status
- disability
- source of funds
- sexual orientation
- gender identity
- military status
- disability

Additionally, the Virginia Fair Housing Law contains reasonable accommodations, reasonable modifications, and accessibility provisions similar to the federal Fair Housing Amendments Act. The Virginia Human Rights Act (Virginia Code § 2.2-3900-03) prohibits discrimination in seeking public accommodations on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions including lactation, age, military status, disability, or national origin.

3. Identify any local and regional agencies and organizations that provide fair housing information, outreach, and enforcement, including their capacity and the resources available to them.

Virginia Department of Professional and Occupational Regulation’s Fair Housing Board

The Virginia Department of Professional and Occupational Regulation’s Fair Housing Board investigates fair housing complaints and enforces the Virginia Fair Housing Law. The Fair Housing Board conducts educational campaigns and trainings on fair housing law in Virginia. Additionally, the Fair Housing Board issues guidance documents on housing discrimination, reasonable accommodations, and other fair housing issues. The Virginia Department of Professional and Occupational Regulation’s Fair Housing Office is also a HUD Fair Housing Assistance Program agency and receives funding from HUD to enforce fair housing laws.

Housing Opportunities Made Equal of Virginia

Housing Opportunities Made Equal (HOME) is a 501(c)3 nonprofit corporation and also a HUD-approved housing counseling agency. Additionally, HOME is a grantee under HUD’s Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP). HOME works to provide equal access to housing and protect the housing rights of Virginia residents. HOME investigates instances of housing discrimination and uses both the courts and administrative processes to enforce fair housing laws. HOME also works closely with politicians and policy advocates to support stronger housing policies in Virginia. Finally, HOME provides educational outreach and housing counseling for Virginia residents.

Equal Rights Center

The Equal Rights Center (ERC) is a private civil rights organization in Washington, D.C., that identifies and seeks to eliminate unlawful and unfair discrimination in housing in the greater Washington area and nationwide. The ERC’s core strategy for identifying housing discrimination is civil rights testing.

The ERC conducts tests and trains civil rights testers. The ERC also conducts fair housing trainings to educate the public, engages in policy advocacy, and enforces fair housing laws. In addition, the ERC conducts research and releases publications on fair housing.

Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs

Based in Washington, D.C., the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs uses litigation, public education, and policy advocacy to fight housing discrimination. The Housing Justice Project at the organization handles a wide variety of issues, including predatory lending, discriminatory real estate advertising, insurance discrimination, exclusionary zoning, discrimination against families with children, and discrimination against low-income families who use housing subsidies.

Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Contributing Factors

Please see the Contributing Factors section for the following contributing factors to fair housing enforcement, outreach capacity, and resources:

- Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement
- Lack of local public fair housing enforcement
- Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations
- Lack of state or local fair housing laws
- Unresolved violations of fair housing or civil rights law

VI. Fair Housing Goals and Priorities

The participating jurisdictions thoroughly considered input from many sources as they developed the fair housing goals and strategies below. Beyond local and federal data, these sources included public forums, stakeholder engagements, individual interviews, surveys, and guidance from the Community Advisory Committee.

The participating jurisdictions have chosen these shared goals and strategies as those most impactful in reducing housing discrimination, reversing patterns of racial segregation, and improving access to opportunity for all current and future residents of the metropolitan Washington region.

A. Regional Goals

1. Increase the supply of housing affordable to low- and moderate-income families in the region, particularly in areas that have historically lacked such housing.

The metropolitan Washington region has high and ever-increasing housing costs, along with an unequal distribution of committed affordable housing and housing restricted to those with low to moderate incomes. For example, home values jumped over 11 percent last year in Prince William County, and the median home value in Arlington rose to almost \$800,000. As a result, there are significant fair housing challenges for members of protected classes in the region. Data presented in this fair housing plan indicate that among the most impacted groups in the region, Hispanic residents, Black residents, and persons with disabilities experience housing affordability and housing instability problems most acutely.

Many households are rent burdened, and racial and ethnic minorities face severe housing burdens at higher rates. For example, 25 percent of renters in the District of Columbia pay over 50 percent

of their income on rent. In the region, 57 percent of severely burdened households were non-White, and 47 percent were immigrant households.

- a. *Use best practices from other jurisdictions and explore policies and programs that increase the supply of housing affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, such as housing bonds, real estate transfer taxes, mandatory inclusionary housing where permitted, as-of-right ADUs, public land set aside for affordable housing, community land trusts, expedited permitting and review, and relaxation of parking requirements for affordable housing developments.*

The above policies and practices have resulted in an increase in affordable housing in jurisdictions throughout the country. In the region, there has been an increase in the supply of subsidized affordable housing in jurisdictions that have adopted these best practices.

- b. *Lower the income targeting of new rental housing affordable to people with incomes of 80 percent of AMI to 60 percent and below, with specific targeting of units affordable at 50 percent of AMI or below in order to address the chronic housing shortage for low-income individuals and families.*

A number of jurisdictions require developers that use inclusionary zoning incentives to set aside affordable housing units for households with incomes of up to 80 percent of AMI. Jurisdictions should target newly constructed affordable units for households with incomes at or below 60 percent of AMI through a combination of increasing incentives and lowering the number of set-aside units to make deeper affordability financially feasible.

- c. *Provide low-interest loans to develop ADUs with affordability restrictions on the property.*

ADUs (also known as accessory living units, or ALUs, in Fairfax County) are now allowed in all participating jurisdictions, with varying restrictions. Local governments should consider providing financial assistance or tax benefits to incentivize homeowners to make their ADUs affordable to HCV users. Because it can be difficult for homeowners to access bank financing to build ADUs, there may be a need to offer incentives. As a condition of receiving assistance, jurisdictions should also require homeowners to attend fair housing training and to maintain records that facilitate audits of their compliance with nondiscrimination laws. Education for individual homeowners who do not have experience as landlords and knowledge of the law may prevent unintentional and intentional violations of fair housing laws.

2. Reform zoning and land use policies to expand access to fair housing choice by increasing the development, geographic distribution, and supply of affordable housing.

The prevalence of single-family residential zoning in the region makes it challenging to develop committed affordable housing that could offer housing opportunities to members of protected classes. Many cities across the country are allowing greater zoning density to meet the demand for housing, resulting in lower development costs per unit and new condo and cooperative homeownership models.

- a. *Revise zoning regulations to allow as-of-right ADUs.*

Currently, the District of Columbia, Arlington County, Fairfax County, Loudoun County, and Montgomery County allow ADUs in most of their residential zones. ADUs have the potential to

expand affordable housing options without expanding land development. This is particularly relevant in the region, where the preponderance of land is zoned for single-family housing.

- b. *Increase inclusionary zoning incentives for creating on-site affordable housing and increase fees in lieu of providing on-site affordable housing.*

Inclusionary housing programs often lack enough financial incentives for providing on-site affordable housing. Increasing these incentives along with increasing fees for developers who choose alternative compliance options will increase the likelihood of creating additional committed affordable housing units in high opportunity areas.

- c. *Adopt zoning changes that facilitate the development of affordable housing as of right.*

Multifamily housing remains the most effective way of producing deeply affordable housing that is critically necessary to meet the needs of Black and Hispanic households and persons with disabilities in the region. Zoning that allows affordable multifamily housing developments as of right in designated areas such as COG Activity Centers⁵¹—denser, mixed-use housing and job centers—can reduce the cost of affordable housing development, thereby increasing the number of units that can be developed from year to year. Overlay districts are a way of achieving this goal while avoiding the opportunity cost of predominantly market-rate multifamily development and, particularly, development that yields few family-sized units and monopolizes desirable sites.

- d. *Incorporate a fair housing equity analysis into the review of significant rezoning proposals and specific plans.*

Several large new developments in the region have not sufficiently addressed the needs of members of protected classes who have been displaced or priced out of the area. Incorporating a fair housing analysis in the review process for these plans, similar to what the City of Boston recently implemented, could reduce displacement and other negative impacts for members of protected classes.⁵²

3. Implement policies designed to preserve affordable housing and prevent displacement with a goal of no net loss of existing affordable rental units.

The region lost a significant number of affordable housing units during the past decade from the compounding impacts of reduced housing production, decreased federal investment in deeply affordable housing, and a lack of local resources to acquire and preserve housing affordable to lower-income households. In the region, there was a loss of more than 85,000 rental units with monthly rents under \$1,500 and an increase of more than 40,000 rental units with monthly rents \$2,500 and above. The region must prioritize the preservation of its existing affordable stock as a necessary complement to increasing its supply of affordable housing.

- a. *Preserve affordable subsidized and market-rate housing, including manufactured housing, by tracking and supporting existing affordable housing and establishing an acquisition loan fund for tenants, nonprofit organizations, and local governments to purchase for-sale apartments and manufactured home parks.*

A significant number of committed affordable housing developments are coming to the end of their affordability requirements. Their owners have little incentive to renew subsidy contracts in higher-opportunity areas or in areas experiencing rapid gentrification, which is the majority

of the region. It is generally more cost-effective to preserve existing affordable housing than to build new affordable housing, particularly in areas with high land costs. Accordingly, jurisdictions should track affordable housing developments, particularly those in higher-opportunity or rapidly gentrifying areas, and work with nonprofit housing developers to provide financial support for property acquisition and rehabilitation. Additionally, all for-profit developers of proposed affordable housing projects, including those funded through LIHTC, should be required to provide a right of first refusal to tenants, nonprofit organizations, and local governments seeking to maintain affordability after rent restrictions are lifted. For manufactured home parks—one of the most important sources of unsubsidized affordable housing in the region, particularly in its more rural areas—homeowners should be provided an opportunity to purchase their communities with technical assistance from nonprofit organizations like ROC USA.

4. Increase the number of homeowners in the region and reduce inequities and discriminatory practices that limit homeownership opportunities for members of protected classes.

The greater metropolitan Washington region is facing an affordability crisis in homeownership as well as in rental housing. In the past year alone, housing prices rose almost 11 percent, making homeownership out of reach for the majority of residents, particularly members of protected classes.

a. Increase homeownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income members of protected classes through the following strategies:

- Support innovative approaches designed to increase homeownership opportunities, such as cooperative homeownership models and community land trusts.
- Support policies and practices that will increase the supply of affordable homeownership housing units, such as allowing and encouraging smaller, higher-density units/ADUs and duplexes.
- Ensure that affordable housing set-asides in new housing developments include subsidized home ownership opportunities in addition to subsidized rental opportunities.
- Increase housing affordability through mortgage write-downs, down payment and closing cost assistance, special purpose credit programs, and other affordable homeownership subsidies.
- Support first-time homebuyers by expanding financial literacy programs, homeownership counseling, and homebuyer education.

b. Support current homeowners with protected characteristics, including racial and ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, and seniors, through the following strategies:

- Increase funding for repair, rehabilitation, and renovation programs and products.
- Expand programs that provide energy efficient improvements to lower utility costs.
- Provide comprehensive foreclosure prevention counseling and legal referrals.

c. Reduce inequities and discriminatory practices that exacerbate the wealth gap between White households and households of color by addressing issues of appraisal bias and by increasing fair housing testing and monitoring for lenders and real estate entities. Use local and regional Community Development Financial Institutions to target members of protected classes to reduce inequities in mortgage lending.

5. Protect the housing rights of individuals with protected characteristics.

Evictions and significant rent increases contribute to the displacement of protected class members, particularly Black and Hispanic residents and persons with disabilities. The pandemic has highlighted the vulnerability of renters, as well as racial and ethnic disparities.

- a. *Expand locally funded housing voucher programs, increase the scale and scope of housing mobility programs, and improve the portability of vouchers across jurisdictions in the region.*

Housing mobility is an important tool to address high segregation levels in the HCV program. In many places in the region, voucher families have been limited in where they can live. Additional local resources, along with increased mobility strategies and better coordination throughout the region, will give families a broader range of housing options.

- b. *Reduce barriers to accessing rental housing by encouraging landlords to reduce, eliminate, or offset application fees for voucher users and follow HUD's guidance on the use of criminal backgrounds in screening tenants.*

Stakeholders reported that high application fees for rental housing are a significant barrier for HCV users. Additionally, some landlords continue to refuse rental housing to prospective tenants based on criminal background checks that reveal decades-old criminal histories or minor misdemeanors.

- c. *Pilot a Right to Counsel program to ensure legal representation for tenants in landlord-tenant proceedings.*

Thousands of residents in the region are displaced annually after evictions. According to local legal services and fair housing organizations, many evictions occur because tenants do not understand their rights and obligations. It is estimated that only a small percentage of tenants facing eviction have legal representation, and those without representation almost always are evicted, regardless of a viable defense. In 2021, Maryland passed a Right to Counsel bill that would provide access to counsel for low-income tenants facing eviction, but it is inadequately funded. Several legal providers in the region are well positioned to serve low-income tenants, including undocumented tenants. Although funding for legal representation would be an up-front investment, it is less costly than serving families experiencing homelessness.

- d. *Expand and increase support for fair housing outreach, education and training, testing, and enforcement.*

Jurisdictions could increase support for organizations that provide fair housing outreach, education, and enforcement and expand the number of protected classes tested annually. Although Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia require landlords to accept HCVs, tenants report that some landlords continue to refuse vouchers. Landlords have also refused to participate in the Emergency Rental Assistance Program, preferring to file for eviction instead. Tenants facing eviction reported difficulties accessing these emergency rental assistance funds, and victims of housing discrimination did not know where to get help. Some jurisdictions reported that there was limited fair housing testing and no testing for discrimination against persons with disabilities.

The metropolitan Washington region recognizes 12 protected classes in common; 7 are federal, with the balance designated by the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. Beyond the federal classes, fair housing protections in the two states and the District of Columbia include marital status, age, elderliness (age 55 or older), sexual orientation, gender

identity or expression, and source of income. Expanding testing beyond race and ethnicity on an annual basis could identify and address discriminatory practices and reduce harm to residents.

Fair housing organizations and legal services providers play a critical role in fair housing enforcement, education, and outreach but struggle to meet the full needs of victims of discrimination because financial and staff capacity are limited. By supporting these organizations, jurisdictions can help ensure that these organizations can address existing and critical emerging issues, like source-of-income discrimination and emergency rental assistance.

6. Increase community integration and reduce housing barriers for persons with disabilities.

- a. *Increase the supply of PSH units by utilizing innovative funding streams, like affordable housing bonds, affordable housing trust funds, commercial linkage fees, and real estate transfer taxes.*

Federal funding sources such as CDBG and HOME and inclusionary zoning are not sufficient to meet the total need for PSH for persons with disabilities. Additionally, some program rules for federal housing programs may disproportionately exclude persons with disabilities generally or persons with specific types of disabilities on the basis of criminal history and directly exclude undocumented persons with disabilities based on immigration status. Deeply affordable housing utilizing the above funding mechanisms could help increase the supply of such housing. In designing incentives, jurisdictions could utilize existing priorities for PSH in qualified allocation plans to encourage PSH set-asides in new developments. Additionally, jurisdictions should prioritize using that funding to support developments eligible for the Section 811 Project Rental Assistance Program.

- b. *Advocate for the adoption of design standards that require at least 10 percent of total units in new multifamily developments receiving public funds to be accessible to persons with mobility disabilities and at least 4 percent for persons with hearing and vision disabilities.*

Persons with disabilities, including seniors, have expressed difficulty finding accessible housing. Some jurisdictions in the region have adopted this higher standard to increase housing options for persons with disabilities, and the higher standard should become uniform throughout the region.

- c. *Increase support for rental assistance programs for persons with disabilities and advocate for additional resources.*

Programs like Virginia's State Rental Assistance Program provide much-needed rental assistance to persons with disabilities. Increasing this assistance will provide options for persons with disabilities who are leaving institutions or are at risk of institutionalization and who are at high risk of becoming homeless.

- d. *Support fair housing testing that investigates barriers identified by case managers who assist persons with disabilities in finding integrated housing.*

Fair housing testing is most effective as a civil rights tool when it targets structural barriers that perpetuate segregation. Case managers who assist persons with disabilities with securing housing, particularly those persons exiting institutions, homelessness, or incarceration, are

uniquely positioned to identify patterns across large landlords that make it harder for persons with disabilities to find homes and maintain stable tenancy.

- e. *Support education regarding the application of the Fair Housing Act's reasonable accommodation duty in the context of criminal history screening.*

Persons with disabilities are disproportionately likely to have contact with the criminal justice system and to be the victims of crime. Some contact with the criminal justice system has a causal connection to individuals' disabilities and law enforcement's inadequate training and capacity to deescalate difficult situations. Persons with disabilities may be entitled to reasonable accommodations that qualify them for units for which landlords' criminal history screening policies might otherwise make them ineligible. Focused education for landlords on this point would help ensure that accommodation requests in this context are responded to appropriately.

- f. *Improve the tracking and mapping of the locations of affordable, accessible restricted units and the accessibility of surrounding streets and sidewalks.*

Tenants expressed frustration with the absence of a database with ADA-accessible housing units. Regional jurisdictions could identify ways to develop and maintain this list, make it available on the jurisdiction's website, and distribute it to organizations serving persons with disabilities. Additionally, it is important to ensure that the surrounding streets and sidewalks are accessible.

7. Expand access and affordability of public transportation for members of protected classes.

High housing costs in the region have forced many low- and moderate-income residents, including members of protected classes, to move farther from their jobs and reliable public transportation. This, in turn, can exacerbate disparities in employment and can also burden employers who cannot find local residents to hire.

- a. *Identify resources to expand free or reduced-fare bus and paratransit transportation to low-income households.*

Transportation barriers for members of protected classes increase with rising displacement. Data shows that low-income households are much more likely to use bus services.⁵³ Providing free bus transportation to lower-income households would help facilitate access to jobs and services.

- b. *Study and make recommendations to improve, expand, and coordinate bus routes across jurisdictions to ensure that members of protected classes can access jobs in employment centers.*

As members of protected classes are forced to live farther from their jobs as a result of displacement caused by soaring housing costs, public transportation options become less viable. Bus routes should be expanded or rerouted to ensure that they connect the places low- and moderate-income members of protected classes—who are more likely to use public transportation—live and work.⁵⁴ Additional funding may be required to accomplish this.

B. Prince William County Goals

1. **Increase the supply of housing affordable to low- and moderate-income families** by establishing a housing trust fund to subsidize the development of affordable housing.
2. **Reform zoning and land use policies to expand access to fair housing choice by increasing the development, geographic distribution, and supply of affordable housing.**
 - a. *Implement a voluntary inclusionary zoning policy that would incentivize the development of affordable housing in exchange for greater density.*
 - b. *Upzone the Rural Crescent area (currently zoned for 10 acres per unit) to allow for increased residential, commercial, and industrial development.*
 - c. *Permit as-of-right duplexes and ADUs throughout the county.*
 - d. *As recommended in the county's Pathway to 2040 draft, increase density in transit-oriented developments such as town centers and activity centers located near mass transit stations like the Virginia Rail Express.*

VII. Contributing Factors

Access to Proficient Schools for Students with Disabilities

Alexandria

In the most recent Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) report from 2019, the City of Alexandria performed near state targets on most indicators, but obstacles remain in others. For example, 65 percent of Alexandria students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) are included in regular classroom instruction for at least 80 percent of the day, compared with the state target of 70 percent. However, 36 percent of children ages 3–5 continue to attend separate educational facilities when the state target is 17 percent.⁵⁵ Development of adequate IEPs in Alexandria is prompt, and representation among children with disabilities is commensurate with the demographics of the district as a whole.

Arlington County

Of Arlington County's 27,000 students, 14.3 percent receive special education services. Arlington County schools consistently rank among the highest performing in Virginia and the nation, but barriers remain in access to opportunities for individuals with disabilities. The demographic disparities between students referred for IEPs and the overall population of APS are small. However, significant racial, class, and language disparities persist among students referred for supplementary aids and services provided under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act: White students are overrepresented (66 percent of Section 504 referrals vs. 45 percent of the APS population), and economically disadvantaged students (8 percent vs. 32 percent) and English learners (6 percent vs. 30 percent) are underrepresented.⁵⁶

APS has routinely fallen short of the state target for the percentage of early childhood students with disabilities who spend the majority of their time in regular early childhood programs; in 2016–2017, this was 27 percent for APS, while the state target was 33 percent.⁵⁷ However, APS exceeded state targets in preparing students with disabilities for the postsecondary transition, with 60 percent of such students enrolling in higher education within one year of leaving high school, compared with the state target of 35 percent.⁵⁸

District of Columbia

Students with disabilities are nearly 20 percent of all students in the District. The Office of the State Superintendent of Education has implemented initiatives to increase access to proficient schools for

these students, but significant barriers remain. Nearly 25 percent of the 3,253 students with disabilities who are transported by the District to school spend two hours or more on the bus to school each day.⁵⁹

Accessibility in schools is evaluated using IDEA, which requires all states and the District of Columbia to assess accessibility standards in public schools every year. In the District's latest report, from 2019, the percentage of children with IEPs who spent 80 percent or more of the school day inside regular classrooms (57 percent) fell well short of the target (64 percent).⁶⁰ This discrepancy begins in preschool education and continues through high school. Moreover, of the 1,770 students with disabilities, over 66 percent exited special education by dropping out of the school system.⁶¹

Although no particular racial or ethnic groups or particular disabilities appear to be overrepresented among the District's population of students with disabilities, the identification of these students and the implementation of IEPs continues to be inadequate. Only 86 percent of children whose parents had consented to an IEP evaluation received one within 60 days.⁶² And though IEP development for early childhood is close to the target, the same is not true for the secondary education level. Only 76 percent of students ages 16 and older have an adequate IEP that accounts for postsecondary goals.⁶³ As a result of these discrepancies, the achievement gap between students with and without disabilities is growing in the District.

Fairfax County

The most recent IDEA report from 2019 found that although Fairfax students with disabilities participate and perform well in academic assessments compared with state targets, access to educational infrastructure remains inadequate. Only 54 percent of Fairfax students with IEPs are included in regular classroom instruction for at least 80 percent of the day, compared with the state target of 70 percent, and 46 percent of children ages 3–5 continue to attend separate educational facilities when the state target is 17 percent.⁶⁴ Nonetheless, development of adequate IEPs in Fairfax is prompt, and representation among children with disabilities is commensurate with the demographics of the district as a whole.

Gaithersburg

See Montgomery County.

Loudoun County

In Loudoun County, fewer impediments to educational access for students with disabilities exist in comparison with other jurisdictions. Fewer than 0.5 percent of students with disabilities drop out, and 79 percent graduate from high school with a regular diploma. However, only 68 percent of students with disabilities are included in regular classroom instruction for at least 80 percent of the day, below the state target.⁶⁵ Additionally, 27 percent of children ages 3–5 attend separate educational facilities, above the state target of 17 percent.⁶⁶

Montgomery County

Montgomery County does not appear to have released aggregated data on educational outcomes for students with disabilities. As of October 2018, 19,848 students with disabilities were enrolled in special education, 12 percent of the total enrollment.⁶⁷ Hispanic and Black students with disabilities are overrepresented at 35 percent and 26 percent, respectively.⁶⁸

Prince William County

Prince William County's 2018 IDEA report shows a graduation rate for students with IEPs of 64 percent, higher than the state target rate of 56 percent.⁶⁹ The county has a dropout rate of 1.5 percent, slightly higher than the state target rate. The report also identified a significant discrepancy in the rate of

suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs. The rate of students included in regular classrooms 80 percent or more of the day is 65 percent, below the state target rate of 70 percent.⁷⁰ Among children ages 3–5 with IEPs, the rate of children in separate educational facilities is 30 percent, significantly higher than the state target of 17 percent.⁷¹

Access to Financial Services

Region

Access to financial services is a contributing factor to fair housing issues in the District of Columbia but is not a significant factor for fair housing issues in surrounding municipalities. Residents of the District of Columbia are unbanked at a far higher percentage than surrounding municipalities. According to the 2022 Prosperity Now Scorecard, a higher percentage of people of color were unbanked than White/Non-Hispanic people in all municipalities with data.⁷² The District of Columbia had the greatest unbanked discrepancy, with 1.1 percent of White/Non-Hispanic households unbanked compared with 12.7 percent of people of color.⁷³

Table 36: Access to Financial Services

Municipality	Population Estimate July 1, 2019	Minority Population %	Unbanked %	FDIC-Regulated Institutions	FDIC-Regulated Full-Service Brick-and-Mortar Branches	FDIC-Regulated Non-Brick-and-Mortar Branches
City of Alexandria	159,428	33.3%	4.0%	15	32	2
Arlington County	8,535,519	25.0%	2.5%	24	58	3
District of Columbia	705,749	54.0%	8.0%	32	197	15
Fairfax County	1,147,532	35.3%	2.4%	39	273	19
Loudoun County	413,538	33.0%	1.6%	23	85	7
Montgomery County	1,050,688	40.0%	2.8%	28	252	19
Prince William County	470,335	37.6%	3.2%	16	65	4

Data source: US Census Bureau, *Quick Facts*, 2020, <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045219>; Prosperity Now Scorecard, *Local Outcome Report*, September 2021, <https://scorecard.prosperitynow.org/reports#report-local-outcome>; and “Details and Financials—Institution Directory,” FDIC, accessed September 30, 2022, <https://www7.fdic.gov/idasp/advSearchLanding.asp>.

Many financial institutions and physical banking locations are available to residents in the metropolitan D.C. area. However, mere physical access to financial institutions does not preclude the possibility of predatory lending practices, nor does it assure access to banking institutions (see the Lender Discrimination section).

Access to Publicly Supported Housing for Persons with Disabilities

In the region, HCVs are the primary form of publicly supported housing support for persons with disabilities. Project-based Section 8 provides a disproportionately lower rate of housing for individuals with disabilities than other programs.

In Maryland, residents with disabilities tend to have low incomes; therefore, there is a significant need for affordable housing, including publicly supported housing. Based on a study performed by the Maryland Department of Health, at least half of all residents with a disability had a household income of less than \$15,000.⁷⁴ Additionally, the population of elderly residents is expected to increase to over 20 percent of the total population. Currently, almost 195,000 elderly residents are cost burdened.⁷⁵

Similarly, Virginia has a high rate of individuals with disabilities who live in poverty: an estimated 20 percent.⁷⁶ As in Maryland, the population of elderly residents is predicted to substantially increase in the next 10 years. Consequently, there is significant demand among individuals with disabilities for access to publicly supported housing, and this need is likely to increase in the coming years.

Data from HUD show that, across jurisdictions, persons with disabilities are underrepresented in project-based Section 8 developments in relation to their proportion of the income-eligible population. Because local governments in the area do not directly administer project-based Section 8 developments, support for fair housing organizations to engage in testing may be the most effective way to address this underrepresentation. Although the data do not show similar disparities for other types of publicly supported housing, low-income persons with disabilities may also have limited access to LIHTC units because of the way rents are set in those developments. In LIHTC developments, affordability is generally targeted at households making 50 percent or 60 percent of AMI. Because over half of Maryland residents with disabilities have household incomes under 30 percent of AMI, many do not meet AMI requirements for LIHTC development.

In the region, most residents with a disability rely on HCVs, although the proportion of multifamily dwellings and project-based housing in some jurisdictions provides additional housing options. Despite the prevalence of HCVs, those with ambulatory disabilities do not have sufficient accessible housing because there is a lack of accessibility features.

Regionally, HCVs are the primary form of publicly supported housing. Included in other multifamily developments are Section 811 developments, which target persons with disabilities, and Section 202, which target elderly individuals (who are disproportionately persons with disabilities). Additionally, although the proportion of residents with disabilities in other multifamily housing is high compared with other programs in several jurisdictions, the total amount of available multifamily housing is significantly lower than the amount available through the HCV program. Although HUD does not provide regional data reflecting the percentage of HCV users with disabilities, it provides these data by jurisdiction for other CDBG recipients.

Table 37: Housing Choice Voucher Users with Disabilities, by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	#	%
Alexandria	214	15.82
Arlington County	318	21.98
District of Columbia	2,994	24.75
Fairfax County	705	17.75
Gaithersburg	101	17.32
Loudoun County	140	24.14
Montgomery County	1,141	16.78
Prince William County	442	19.95

Data source: HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool, data version AFFHT0006.

In the District, where almost 12 percent of the population reports having a disability, persons with disabilities appear able to access public housing and HCVs at rates at least commensurate with the portion of the income-eligible population that has disabilities. The same is not true with respect to project-based Section 8 units, in which the percentage of residents with disabilities is lower than the percentage of all District residents with disabilities and is presumably much lower than the percentage of the income-eligible population that has disabilities. The reason for this disparity is not clear. Because the other multifamily housing category includes several programs with different purposes and because the District has relatively few other multifamily developments, it is not clear whether persons with disabilities face structural barriers to accessing that housing.

The District also administers tenant-based rental assistance programs and other supportive housing assistance that specifically targets persons with particular types of disabilities. Within these programs, persons with disabilities are not underrepresented. The Department of Behavioral Health's *Supportive Housing Strategic Plan, 2012–2017*,⁷⁷ reported that 675 Home First tenant-based vouchers were available for persons with psychiatric disabilities, in addition to those provided through the HCV program, and that the District had funded project-based rental assistance for 121 units of PSH for the same population. The Department on Disability Services also provides rental assistance to persons with developmental disabilities, though data are not available on the number of individuals served. Family members of individuals with developmental disabilities have reported difficulties using this assistance to find housing within the District for their loved ones because payment standards are not as generous as for the HCV program. As a result, some individuals with developmental disabilities from the District reside outside the regional parameters in Montgomery County, Maryland, while receiving District-funded services.

Of the other jurisdictions in the region, only Loudoun County has a greater proportional representation of persons with disabilities among its voucher holders than the District. Additionally, this jurisdiction has among the fewest vouchers in use. This suggests that suburban public housing authorities may not prioritize serving persons with disabilities as well as the District of Columbia Housing Authority. At the same time, the overall share of persons with disabilities, at approximately 9 percent, is significantly lower regionwide than in the District.

Montgomery County has the second-largest population of persons with disabilities in the region. As in other jurisdictions, a much lower proportion of individuals with disabilities use project-based Section 8 housing. Other programs like HCVs and other multifamily housing offer a significantly larger proportion of available affordable units. While multifamily dwellings in Montgomery County do have a higher proportion of residents with disabilities than HCV units do, the latter provides the largest number of publicly supported housing units throughout the county. But, as noted above, HCVs may offer limited accessibility for individuals with ambulatory impairments.

Access to Transportation for Persons with Disabilities

Access to transportation for persons with disabilities is a significant contributing factor. In Virginia, the elderly population is predicted to increase to 20 percent of residents by 2030,⁷⁸ the largest population increase of any demographic. The state recognizes that as the elderly population increases, the demand for public transportation will increase, but as it admits in its 2018 Assessment of Virginia's Disability Services System, public transportation is insufficient to accommodate rising demand.⁷⁹ The outpaced demand for transportation also disproportionately impacts individuals with disabilities, who also tend to rely on public transportation to travel. Similarly, although Maryland has more extensive public transportation modes for individuals with disabilities, less extensive infrastructure in suburban areas reduces access for individuals with disabilities.

Bus and Rail

WMATA serves the entire region and explicitly outlines on its website the measures taken to enhance access to its rail and bus systems for persons with disabilities. Fare vending machines have accessibility features, including instructions in Braille with raised alphabets and a button for audio instructions. All stations have at least one extra-wide fare gate for wheelchair access, and all stations except Arlington cemetery use bumpy tiles to alert customers with low vision that they are nearing the edge of a platform. Rail cars also provide priority seating for persons with disabilities and gap reducers have been installed on all rail cars to make it easier for an individual with a mobility support to enter and exit the car safely. For Metrobus, all buses are wheelchair accessible and have both audio and visual stop announcements. If the automated announcement system fails to work, bus operators announce major intersections, landmarks, and transfer points. Various other measures are in place as well.⁸⁰

One notable concern with the WMATA Metrorail system is the operating quality of elevators. They are deteriorating, resulting in patrons being trapped in the elevator.⁸¹ Also, at stations with multiple entrances, signage directing people to elevators can often be scarce, making them difficult to locate.⁸² Because elevators are a primary access point to the Metro station for individuals with disabilities, these dysfunctional elevator features are likely to disproportionately limit transportation access for transit riders with disabilities. This trend may change as an influx of federal dollars is allocated to elevator repairs.

Virginia Railway Express,⁸³ the Maryland Transit Administration,⁸⁴ the DC Circulator,⁸⁵ ART buses,⁸⁶ and Montgomery County Ride On buses use similar measures to Metrorail and Metrobus.⁸⁷ Prince William County's OmniRide,⁸⁸ Loudoun County Local Bus Service,⁸⁹ and the Fairfax Connector⁹⁰ and CUE buses are wheelchair accessible, however their websites do not specify whether bus operators are instructed to announce major intersections, landmarks, and transfer points.⁹¹ The Alexandria DASH bus system is wheelchair accessible, provides bus service within the city, and connects with Metrobus, Metrorail, Virginia Railway Express, and other local bus systems. However, the DASH website does not elaborate on what, if any, other measures are taken to make the system accessible to persons with disabilities.⁹² DASH has been fare-free since September 2021.⁹³

Paratransit

WMATA also runs MetroAccess, a door-to-door paratransit program, throughout the entire region. Some MetroAccess customers are entitled to free rides on Metrorail and Metrobus. However, MetroAccess does not provide same day trip service. Fares can also be expensive and cost up to \$6.50 per trip.⁹⁴

WMATA also offers an even more costly service called Abilities-Ride. Although this service has been suspended because of COVID-19, Abilities Ride allows individuals eligible for MetroAccess to receive same-day transportation services through a local taxi company, provided the trip begins or ends in Maryland. The individual pays for the first \$5 of the trip, WMATA pays for the next \$15, and then the rider is responsible for paying any amount over \$20.⁹⁵ The City of Rockville offers a similar program that provides low-income residents over the age of 60 a subsidy of \$34 a month for taxicab services.⁹⁶

The Alexandria DOT offers a paratransit program similar to MetroAccess seven days a week for Alexandria residents unable to use public transportation. As with MetroAccess, trips must be scheduled a minimum of one day in advance. Trips inside the city and within five miles of the city cost \$4 each way, and trips to areas more than five miles outside the city cost \$6 each way. Availability of the paratransit program may also be limited to high-priority trips depending on the status of the COVID-

19 pandemic.⁹⁷ Arlington,⁹⁸ Loudoun County,⁹⁹ and MDOT¹⁰⁰ also offer similar paratransit programs that do not take same-day reservations.

Admissions and Occupancy Policies and Procedures, Including Preferences in Publicly Supported Housing

District of Columbia

The D.C. Housing Authority exercises preferences on its public housing waiting list. Elderly families and families that include a household member with a disability receive preference, as do working families and unhoused people.¹⁰¹ The D.C. Housing Authority may deny access to public housing to individuals who have been convicted of a violent crime or who have been documented as participants in one (regardless of their conviction), though enforcing this preference is not required.¹⁰²

Overall, however, the shortage of public housing in the District is not attributable to preferences in allocation of such housing; the waiting list has been closed since 2013. Additionally, within the past two years, the District has allocated only 56 percent of its housing vouchers reserved for individuals and an even more meager 37 percent of those reserved for families.¹⁰³ This has exacerbated the District's housing problem and prevented many individuals from gaining admission to affordable housing.

Virginia

Most governments in the region do not provide explicit information about their preferences for publicly supported housing or other housing-related services. Alexandria is unique in its maintenance of separate lists for different housing programs, including a priority list for unhoused individuals and individuals in supported housing, as well as a list for elderly people and persons with disabilities.¹⁰⁴ Other jurisdictions in the region, such as Fairfax County, have large numbers of individuals and families on third-party waiting lists, many of which may also be subject to preferences.¹⁰⁵ Overall, however, preferences and other admissions policies appear to be a less significant barrier than other impediments examined in this analysis.

Maryland

Montgomery County Housing Opportunities Commission's HCV waiting list operates on a system of preferences for those displaced by government action; those who live, work, or have been hired to work in Montgomery County; persons with disabilities; veterans; and those with a history of homelessness.¹⁰⁶ Though preferences for the county's other housing programs, including public housing, are not explicitly stated, they are likely similar.

Availability of Affordable Units in a Range of Sizes

As discussed in the Location and Type of Affordable Housing section, affordable housing in the region is available in a range of unit sizes. However, this availability may not meet the demand for specific unit sizes, and not every local government lists unit size in its housing directory. Affordable units in appropriate sizes may not always be accessible to those who need them. The shortage of available housing units for larger families is particularly acute, and most large families rely on HCVs for suitable units rather than on public housing and other types of publicly supported multifamily housing.

Availability, Type, Frequency, and Reliability of Public Transportation

Availability, type, frequency, and reliability of public transportation contribute significantly to impediments to fair housing. Metropolitan Washington is served chiefly by Metrorail and Metrobus services operated by WMATA, which has a reputation for delays, unreliability, and inaccessibility.

WMATA's latest performance report, from the second quarter of 2021, shows that Metrobus and Metrorail are both performing near or above targets in almost all safety and quality indicators.¹⁰⁷ However, because ridership remains significantly depressed after the COVID-19 pandemic, it is more instructive to look at the last pre-pandemic performance report, from FY 2019. This report shows significant improvement from previous years, which have been marked by numerous delays, breakdowns, and even death caused by fire, but also shows room for further improvement. The bus fleet, which is more accessible and widespread than rail, remains somewhat unreliable. Buses, on average, traveled just over 6,300 miles between service interruptions and experienced approximately 67 bus collisions per 1 million miles driven.¹⁰⁸ No on-time bus performance was reported because of data quality errors.¹⁰⁹ MetroAccess, the door-to-door paratransit service, showed an on-time performance rate of 90 percent.¹¹⁰

WMATA operates 6 lines serving 91 rail stations in the District, Maryland, and Virginia.¹¹¹ However, stations are frequently far from each other, so riders may need to take buses to transfer from one station to another or to reach their destination from a rail station. In addition to bus, rail, and MetroAccess, WMATA operates parking spaces at 44 Metrorail stations, costing approximately \$5 per day.¹¹²

Metropolitan Washington is also served by Capital Bikeshare, which is owned by Lyft and offers 4,500 bikes across over 500 stations in the District, Maryland, and Virginia. A single trip costs \$1.00 to unlock plus \$0.15 per minute, while annual membership costs approximately \$8.00 per month.¹¹³ Bikes are concentrated in downtown D.C., although stations are spread throughout the region, including in lower-income areas in Southeast D.C., Virginia, and Maryland.¹¹⁴ Bike shares are widely used, with more than 254,000 trips taking place in May 2021 alone.¹¹⁵

Nonetheless, the District's truly public transport options, bus and rail, remain subject to significant quality defects. Though public transport is available, its frequency and reliability are subject to variation, and the variety of options available is also limited, especially for persons with disabilities and those who live outside downtown D.C.

Community Opposition

District of Columbia

Although the District is known as a Democratic stronghold with progressive leanings in the realm of social justice, this image has often failed to hold true regarding support for affordable housing. Of particular importance has been the geographically inscribed gap between the District's White population and its residents of color, which mirrors the divide between its wealthiest and its lowest-income communities. Efforts by the government of Mayor Muriel Bowser to build affordable housing, including in wealthier neighborhoods, have faced opposition owing to fears of congestion and undesirable changes in the character of communities.¹¹⁶ Although most District residents believe the current housing situation is unfair, many have also been slow to support efforts to expand affordable housing outside its geographically concentrated locations.¹¹⁷ However, within the past year, District residents have become increasingly aware of segregative housing issues, and many have begun to speak up against exclusionary zoning and similar problems.¹¹⁸

Virginia

Earlier this year, Virginia became the third state in the nation to implement legislation barring the denial of building permits to housing developments on the grounds that those developments will contain affordable housing units.¹¹⁹ This law, which attempts to combat the NIMBY (not in my backyard) perspective and the desire of wealthy communities to maintain their self-segregation, paves the way for more equitable housing in northern Virginia and reflects a trend away from community

opposition to fair housing. It contrasts to the opposition to affordable housing that influenced many planning decisions in the early 2010s. Nonetheless, community opposition remains a problem, especially in rural areas.¹²⁰ Earlier this year, for example, Loudoun County scrapped plans for a mixed-income housing development after neighborhood protests.¹²¹ Local governments in northern Virginia, like their counterparts in the District, are beginning to critically examine exclusionary zoning policies.¹²² However, mere policy changes may not be enough to dismantle opposition to the creation of more affordable housing in the region.

Maryland

Montgomery County has often been a site of controversy regarding affordable housing, even as it has sought to increase housing inclusion and affordability in recent years. The 2022 county executive campaign has brought the issue of affordable housing to the forefront, with a discourse centering on the need for affordable housing versus economic development.¹²³ There has also been community opposition to the proposed Thrive Montgomery plan, which would allow duplexes and triplexes in some single-family neighborhoods.¹²⁴ Thus, it appears that community opposition to affordable housing not only exists in Montgomery County, but also manifests within the county's government and political discourse.

Deteriorated and Abandoned Properties

Though the District of Columbia has gentrified significantly in recent years, rapid development of new housing has not kept properties from falling into disrepair. The D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development's Property Acquisition and Disposition Division maintains a portfolio of vacant and abandoned properties, nearly two-thirds of which are in Wards 7 and 8, the lowest-income wards in the city.¹²⁵ The division attempts to repair these properties into livable homes, but its work addresses only a small fraction of the deteriorated and abandoned properties in the District. As of 2016, the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs' Vacant and Blighted Enforcement Unit maintained a list of around 1,200 vacant properties, but loopholes and inadequate reporting mean that this number is also likely to be a significant underestimate.¹²⁶ A 2017 auditor's report revealed that the number is likely closer to 2,000 properties.¹²⁷

The problem appears to be less significant in surrounding areas of metropolitan Washington, D.C., especially as house prices have increased rapidly throughout 2020 and 2021. Deteriorated and abandoned properties tend to be concentrated in the District and do not appear to have been extensively catalogued elsewhere.

Displacement of and Lack of Housing Support for Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking

District of Columbia

One in three women experiencing homelessness in the District cites domestic violence as the cause of her housing instability.¹²⁸ The District is home to several domestic violence shelters and emergency shelters (not specific to domestic violence), as well as the District Alliance for Safe Housing, which provides housing services and an emergency fund for victims of domestic violence. The Domestic Violence Housing Continuum was founded in 2016 to encourage dialogue and collaboration in the realm of housing for victims of domestic violence. Despite the existence of these services, DASH identified a one-to-five ratio of survivors placed in housing versus those turned away because no housing options were available.¹²⁹

Virginia

Several northern Virginia counties offer support services for those displaced by domestic violence, including shelters and support for housing and utilities. Nonetheless, domestic violence affects approximately 25 percent of households in northern Virginia.¹³⁰ Low-income, immigrant, and refugee families are particularly vulnerable.¹³¹ Shelters specifically dedicated to domestic violence remain few within any given locality; for example, Doorways' Domestic Violence Safehouse, which serves 60–80 people per year, is the only domestic violence shelter in Arlington County, and those who stay at the safehouse remain only for short periods.¹³²

Maryland

The Betty Ann Krahnke Center (BAK) of Family Services, Inc., the only emergency domestic violence shelter for women and their children in Montgomery County, is a 60-bed short-term crisis shelter.¹³³ Various other shelters exist for men, women, and families, and Montgomery County also runs the Abused Persons Program, but admission to the latter is by application.¹³⁴

Displacement of Residents Caused by Economic Factors

Region

High housing costs and a lack of affordable housing options place significant pressure on longtime District residents. As a result, many residents, particularly low-income residents of color, relocate to the edges of the metropolitan region or out of the region altogether.¹³⁵ The City of Alexandria, Arlington County, the District of Columbia, Fairfax County, the City of Gaithersburg, Loudoun County, Montgomery County, and Prince William County all have households vulnerable to displacement.

Households earning less than 200 percent of the federal poverty line in Arlington, Loudoun, Fairfax, and Prince William Counties in northern Virginia have the nation's highest rate of spending more than 50 percent of their income on housing.¹³⁶ The high cost of housing is especially burdensome to low- and moderate-income households closer to the District of Columbia.¹³⁷

Increasing financial pressure after the COVID-19 pandemic has affected many households' ability to pay their rent or mortgages. Eviction moratoriums have delayed many evictions, but high housing costs in the region will likely force households to move farther from the region's center.

Alexandria

Business investment in the area around the City of Alexandria, particularly the selection of Arlington as Amazon's second headquarters, has increased housing costs and will make it more difficult for low-income residents to remain. There is particular concern that Amazon will displace residents of the Arlandria-Chirilagua neighborhood, one of the last sections in Alexandria that has some market-rate affordable housing.¹³⁸

Arlington County

As in the City of Alexandria, Arlington County housing costs are increasing from economic development and growing income inequality.¹³⁹ Increasing business development, including the construction and opening of Amazon's HQ2, will likely accelerate the displacement of longtime residents.¹⁴⁰ Residents in southern Arlington County, where more than half of residents rent, face higher risk of displacement than residents of northern Arlington County.¹⁴¹ Increasing economic inequality, intensified after the COVID-19 pandemic, make Black and Hispanic renters particularly vulnerable.

District of Columbia

Increasing economic requirements for housing in the District of Columbia have led to high levels of displacement for low-income residents,¹⁴² who are disproportionately likely to be Black.¹⁴³ A study by the Institute on Metropolitan Opportunity concluded that the District of Columbia had the most

widespread displacement of low-income residents of any major city between 2000 and 2016.¹⁴⁴ In the wake of low-income resident exodus, wealthier households are moving in. This creates a feedback cycle whereby less affordable housing is created, making it harder for low-income households to remain in the District. The high cost of housing has collateral effects on other industries. With new, increasingly wealthier residents moving in, the prices for services like child care also increase and place financial pressure on households.¹⁴⁵

Fairfax County

Fairfax County faces a significant threat of resident displacement in the metropolitan D.C. region.¹⁴⁶ Housing prices are increasing rapidly. Fairfax County has a large number of established low- and moderate-income households likely to face significant increases in housing costs in the future.¹⁴⁷

Loudoun County

In 2020, 62 percent of Loudoun County households spent more than one-third of their income on housing.¹⁴⁸ A 2021 draft of Loudoun County’s Unmet Housing Needs Strategic Plan highlighted that people who work in Loudoun County are unable to afford to live there and are forced to live outside the county.¹⁴⁹ Furthermore, Loudoun County lacks housing options with practical access to transit, forcing households to use roads overburdened by workers commuting from adjacent counties.¹⁵⁰

Montgomery County

Montgomery County lacks housing across all income levels. Although the region faces competition for low- and moderate-income housing, Montgomery County’s spiraling housing costs force even middle-income households to move farther from the metropolitan center. Housing prices in the county are 57 percent above the statewide average and 74 percent above neighboring Prince George’s County average.¹⁵¹

Prince William County

Prince William County faces problems similar to other municipalities in the region. High housing costs and lack of housing stock, particularly low- and moderate-income housing, make it difficult for many to live in the county.

Table 38: Impediments to Mobility

Municipality	HCV Waiting List Status	HCV Payment Standard for 2 Bedrooms	HCV Lease-Up Time	Source-of-Income Protection Law
Alexandria	Closed to new applicants	\$1,941	Not locally specified; HUD minimum voucher term is 60 days	Statewide: yes Locally: no
Arlington County	Closed to new applicants; average voucher wait is approximately 5 years	\$1,941	120 days	Statewide: yes Locally: no
District of Columbia	Closed to new applicants; estimated 1–10 years to get to the top of the waiting list	Based on zip code, ranges from \$1,160 to \$2,650	180 days	Yes

Fairfax County	Closed to new applicants	\$1,934	60 days with automatic 60-day extension upon request	Statewide: yes Locally: no
Loudoun County	Closed to new applicants	\$1,941	60 days; 30-day extensions are available	Statewide: yes Locally: no
Montgomery County	Open to new applicants	Based on zip code, ranges from \$1,160 to \$2,650	90 days; extensions up to 60 days are available	Statewide: yes Locally: yes
Prince William County	Closed to new applicants	\$1,941	60 days; generous extensions available	Statewide: yes Locally: no

Sources: “Housing Choice Voucher Programs (HCVP),” Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority, accessed August 12, 2022, <https://www.arha.us/housing-choice-voucher-programs-hcvp>; “Rental Services,” Arlington, Virginia, accessed August 12, 2022, <https://housing.arlingtonva.us/get-help/rental-services/achcv-program/hcv-wait-list-faqs/>; “How to Comply with ADA Guidelines,” District of Columbia Housing Authority, accessed September 27, 2022, https://webserver1.dchousing.org/?page_id=284#waitlist; “Apply for Public Housing,” DASH, accessed September 27, 2022, <https://www.dashdc.org/housing-resource-center/find-safe-housing/permanent-housing/apply-public-housing/>; “Housing Choice Voucher Program (Formerly Section 8),” Fairfax County Department of Housing and Community Development, accessed October 18, 2023, <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/rentalhousing/housingchoicevoucher>; Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County, “Chapter 8—Voucher Issuance & Briefings,” in *Administrative Plan: Housing Choice Voucher Program*, May 8, 2019, <https://www.hocmc.org/images/files/HCVAdministrativePlan/s8AdminPlan-10-Ch08.pdf>; and “Housing & Community Development,” Prince William County Office of Housing and Community Development, accessed September 27, 2022, <https://www.pwcva.gov/department/housing-community-development>.

The biggest impediment to mobility in the D.C. metropolitan region is the lack of affordable housing beyond the existing housing system. A range of impediments reduce access to housing. First, the majority of HCV programs have suspended applications for the program through waiting list closures. As a result, individuals in need of affordable housing who are not on the existing waiting list cannot even apply for the program, which limits the expansion of affordable housing stock. Montgomery County is the only municipality with an open waiting list for HCVs. In markets where the waiting list is closed, housing is either unavailable or available only after several years.

State and local laws in the District and Montgomery County prohibit source-of-income discrimination. Although the District has protected source of income in housing for years, a study in 2018 by the Urban Institute found that 15 percent of District landlords did not accept vouchers.¹⁵² In response, the D.C. Council strengthened source-of-income protections,¹⁵³ notably requiring landlords to affirm in all advertisements they will not refuse to rent to a person paying through a voucher for rental housing assistance.¹⁵⁴ Maryland enacted source-of-discrimination protection statewide in 2020.¹⁵⁵ However, Montgomery County has had source-of-income protections far longer. Like Maryland, statewide source-of-income protections in Virginia are recent, taking effect on July 1, 2020.¹⁵⁶ Similar to Maryland’s statute, but unlike the Montgomery County ordinance, Virginia’s law exempts “small landlords, landlords that own four or fewer units, or when the entity providing the payment for rent takes more than 15 days to approve the lease” from source-of-income protections.¹⁵⁷

All jurisdictions in the region except for Fairfax County use HUD’s small area fair market rent calculation for HUD vouchers. By using a zip code–based calculation, these jurisdictions increase mobility because the voucher amount, rather than using a one-size-fits-all model, is tailored to costs in a more discrete area, thereby expanding the potential housing stock an individual can access. In contrast, Fairfax County has one payment standard for the entire county, effectively limiting HCV users to the areas of town where rent is below the standard rate.¹⁵⁸

The voucher lease-up time in some jurisdictions also impedes mobility. Once a voucher lease time expires, an individual loses the voucher. Given that the waiting lists are effectively closed, an expired lease time limit can disqualify otherwise eligible voucher participants from securing affordable housing for many years. In the majority of Virginia's jurisdictions in the region, the public housing agency imposes a lease-up time of 60 days. Although extensions are available, the standard wait time is insufficient to allow residents to find eligible housing because of the extensive housing search necessary (in addition to standard employment and family care obligations) and, often, a lack of familiarity with qualifying housing. Landlords' prejudice about accepting vouchers despite the legal protection, as well as the onerous housing application process, are also barriers that may cause a lease time to expire before an individual can secure housing.

Inaccessible Government Facilities or Services

Inaccessible government facilities or services contribute to disparities in access to opportunity for persons with disabilities. Although a variety of public facilities and services have reasonable accommodation policies for persons with disabilities, many facilities and services require additional outreach or efforts by the person with a disability to request accommodations themselves, usually with several days' notice, rather than having these services consistently embedded into their administration. As a result, individuals with disabilities must be proactive to obtain necessary accommodations.

In the region, some counties provide a range of accessibility services. Montgomery County has an ADA Compliance Team and provides training and technical assistance for county staff on ADA compliance and other disability needs. Similarly, Fairfax County provides ADA services through its government offices, including enforcing building codes that require ADA compliance and handling ADA complaints. In the District of Columbia, any facility or part of a facility constructed by a state or local government entity after January 26, 1992, must be built in strict compliance with the ADA. The District is not necessarily required to make every pre-ADA facility fully compliant with current accessibility codes, however, all District services, programs, or activities must be accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities when viewed in their entirety. This is called "overall program access."¹⁵⁹ Nonetheless, this loophole means accessibility problems may remain and persons with disabilities may face greater barriers in accessing government facilities or services. The same principles apply to other governments in the region.

Web accessibility reveals similar dualities as governments have attempted to comply with Section 508 website accessibility standards. However, this compliance is only implemented "whenever possible," and certain elements remain poorly accessible.

Inaccessible Public or Private Infrastructure

Inaccessible public or private infrastructure contributes to disparate access for persons with disabilities in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Although accommodations are available in public and private infrastructure, lack of compliance or maintenance results in inequitable treatment for persons with disabilities. Inadequate maintenance of sidewalks can impede accessibility for persons with mobility-related disabilities, including persons who require wheelchairs for transportation. Recent public efforts, such as the crowdsourced Project Sidewalk, endeavor to map sidewalk accessibility by noting curb ramp conditions, lack of sidewalks, and other common issues impeding mobility in the District.¹⁶⁰ Many sidewalks in the D.C. metropolitan area are not up to ADA standards; in many cases, this is because construction projects have left large cracks that serve as impediments to persons in wheelchairs.¹⁶¹

The governments of the District of Columbia,¹⁶² Virginia,¹⁶³ and Maryland¹⁶⁴ have all released ADA Transition Plans for public rights-of-way, which provide a detailed review of sidewalks, crosswalks, bus stops, curb ramps, and accessible pedestrian signals. However, the transition plans for the District, published in 2016, and Maryland, published in 2009, have not been updated recently, and inaccessible infrastructure problems persist. Additionally, because COVID-19 has caused restaurants to use more public space for outdoor dining, the pandemic has created new accessibility challenges.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, parking of electric scooters and bicycles has also resulted in impassable sidewalks, particularly in downtown D.C.

Lack of Access to Opportunity Related to High Housing Costs

The extent to which high housing costs impede access to opportunity is a serious concern throughout the region. Median home values vary depending on location. The median home value in Prince William County is approximately \$450,000,¹⁶⁶ whereas the median home value in Arlington is almost \$800,000.¹⁶⁷ Home values dramatically increased this past year across the board. Home values have increased the least in the District, by over 3 percent,¹⁶⁸ and the most in Prince William County, by almost 12 percent.¹⁶⁹

Home values vary depending on location, but low-income households throughout the region are burdened by the cost of housing. According to a study from the Community Foundation for Northern Virginia, when compared with the 50 largest metro areas, northern Virginia has the highest percentage of low-income households severely burdened by the cost of housing. Northern Virginia also has the sixth-highest rate of housing burden among moderate-income households. Racial and ethnic minorities face severe housing burdens at higher rates: 57 percent of severely burdened households were non-White, and 47 percent were immigrants.¹⁷⁰ In addition, nonfamily households have the highest cost burden throughout the region compared with family households. Consequently, individuals with disabilities who live alone, and who are likely to live on a fixed income like Supplemental Security Income, are likely to face more barriers to opportunity caused by high housing costs.

In the District, nearly 60 percent of households rented housing in 2018. Of those households, one in four spent over 50 percent of their income on rent, and another one-fifth spent between 31 and 50 percent of their income. People of color are also more likely to face housing cost burdens in the District; 30 percent of Black renters spend over half their income on rent.¹⁷¹ Similarly, in Montgomery County, 50 percent of renters spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing, and one-quarter of renters spend over 50 percent of their income.¹⁷² Because affordable housing is in such short supply throughout the region, low-income workers may need to live farther from employers and transportation. For workers with a disability, transit distances are likely to impede job access as well.

Lack of Affordable In-Home or Community-Based Supportive Services

District of Columbia

D.C.'s Department of Behavioral Health has certified more than 30 in-home and community-based providers of supportive services, many of which also provide services to children and youth.¹⁷³ Though these services vary in their affordability and accessibility, they are located throughout the city (there is only one in Southwest D.C., but the rest are not concentrated in any of the other three quadrants). The D.C. Department on Disability Services also funds some supportive services.¹⁷⁴ Though supply still fails to meet demand, the framework for adequate, affordable supportive services nonetheless exists.

Virginia

Virginia Housing and Supportive Services, a community engagement initiative of the Virginia government that serves northern Virginia, maintains a database of programs and resources for individuals with developmental disabilities and others who may benefit from such services.¹⁷⁵ These include programs that assist with accessibility modifications, emergency rent, financial counseling, food, and other potential needs. More than 700 people in the region who have developmental disabilities and live independently currently use these services.

Maryland

The Montgomery County government provides personal assistance, medical assistance, and other supportive services to individuals who meet the county's medical level of care.¹⁷⁶ Such individuals must also qualify for Medicaid. The county does not provide access to or information about more general services. Nonprofit groups serving the rest of the region fill some of these gaps, but Montgomery County remains an area in need of supportive services.

Lack of Affordable, Integrated Housing for People Who Need Supportive Services

Region

The lack of affordable, integrated housing for people who need supportive services is a significant contributing factor to segregation, homelessness, and inadequate housing for persons with disabilities in the D.C. metropolitan area. Although the municipalities have prioritized integrated housing for people who need supportive services, the high housing costs and the lack of affordable housing in general limit the effectiveness of targeted programs.

Table 39: Population, Supportive Housing, and Rental Housing Characteristics

Municipality	2019 Census Population Estimate	Permanent Supportive Housing Year-Round Beds	Total Rental Units	Rental Units with 30% or More of Household Income as Gross Rent	Rental Vacancy Rates	Median Gross Rent
Alexandria	159,428	47	38,804	15,084 (38.9%)	4.2%	\$1,781
Arlington County	236,842	278	61,245	23,144 (37.8%)	3.3%	\$1,993
District of Columbia	705,749	9,958	162,199	69,304 (42.7%)	7.0%	\$1,603
Fairfax County	1,147,532	627	126,768	57,431 (45.3%)	2.6%	\$1,900
Loudoun County	413,538	24	28,713	11,617 (40.4%)	7.1%	\$1,876
Montgomery County	1,050,688	2,155	125,266	63,923 (51.0%)	4.9%	\$1,788

Data source: American Community Survey, ACS Data Table DP04, Selected Housing Characteristics, 2019 ACS 1-Year Estimates Data Profiles, US Census Bureau.

Alexandria

The City of Alexandria acknowledges that there is a lack of supportive housing and aims to increase affordable housing and supportive housing through its efforts to end homelessness.¹⁷⁷

Arlington County

Arlington County has increased its capacity to support individuals needing PSH, but many applicants remain on the waiting list for services for more than one year.¹⁷⁸

District of Columbia

The District of Columbia prioritizes funding PSH to address homelessness.¹⁷⁹ HUD's Continuum of Care Housing Inventory Count Report indicated that the District of Columbia provides the highest number of supportive housing beds per capita in the region. Although the District is a leader in the region, there is still an overall lack of supportive housing.

Fairfax County

Fairfax County acknowledges the need to create more affordable and supportive housing, and there is a waiting list.¹⁸⁰ However, short-term plans to increase supportive housing stock are seemingly modest.¹⁸¹

Loudoun County

Loudoun County has the fewest number of PSH beds per capita in the region, according to HUD's Continuum of Care Housing Inventory Count Report.¹⁸² The county acknowledges that it needs increased capacity to provide PSH, homelessness prevention, and intensive case management.¹⁸³

Montgomery County

Montgomery County's Interagency Commission on Homelessness prioritizes creating housing and services for homeless persons, including emergency and transitional shelter, rapid rehousing, and PSH.¹⁸⁴ Since 2015, the commission has worked with the county to revise its structure for delivering supportive housing.¹⁸⁵ The commission's 2020 annual report acknowledged that their overall effort was hurt by the lack of affordable housing for families at or below 30 percent of AMI and the lack of supportive housing services.¹⁸⁶

Lack of Affordable, Accessible Housing in a Range of Unit Sizes

HUD's implementation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (24 CFR Part 8) requires that publicly supported federal housing developments make 5 percent of total units accessible to individuals with mobility disabilities and an additional 2 percent accessible to individuals with sensory disabilities. Public housing and project-based Section 8 units are both considered publicly supported housing subject to this mandate. Based on these requirements, every jurisdiction except for Gaithersburg, Maryland, meets the above legal criteria.

As discussed in the Location and Type of Affordable Housing section, affordable housing in the region is available in a range of unit sizes. These include accessible housing options such as assisted living facilities, independent living units, and congregate care facilities. However, the supply of affordable, accessible housing continues to fall well short of demand in the D.C. area, as a report by the D.C. Affordable Housing Alliance makes clear.¹⁸⁷ Virginia and Maryland also acknowledge the mismatch between the supply of affordable, accessible housing and the growing need for such housing.¹⁸⁸

Despite a range of sizes being available, disparities in unit size allocations produce disparities in access to affordable, accessible housing. As discussed in depth in the Disproportionate Housing Needs section, there is a disproportionately lower percentage of publicly supported housing for larger families, meaning individuals with disabilities who live with their families are less likely to have access to affordable housing. Additionally, there appears to be an outsized proportion of housing stock reserved for one-bedroom units, which also limits access to affordable and accessible housing because in some circumstances occupancy limits prevent a resident from retaining a necessary live-in attendant.

Additionally, many individuals with disabilities live on a fixed income. Those who rely on Supplemental Security Income as their primary income and live alone are unable to afford most units. Further development of affordable, accessible housing units is needed to ensure availability to a larger proportion of those who need it.

Lack of Assistance for Housing Accessibility Modifications

In the District of Columbia, the Single-Family Residential Rehabilitation Program administers grants for modification to eliminate barriers to accessibility for persons with disabilities.¹⁸⁹ The District's public housing program also prioritizes persons with disabilities and allows reasonable accommodations for those with disabilities.¹⁹⁰ Rebuilding Together Arlington/Fairfax/Falls Church provides home repair services to make homes accessible at no cost to persons with disabilities. The Housing Modifications for the Disabled and Elderly program assists low-income individuals and families with housing modifications to allow for greater mobility.¹⁹¹ The City of Alexandria's Rental Accessibility Modification Program provides grant funds to modify rental housing to make the units more accessible for low- and moderate-income tenants with physical disabilities.¹⁹² In Maryland, much of this work is done by a group of nonprofits known as the Centers for Independent Living, but these organizations do not provide explicit support for housing accessibility modifications, nor does the government of Montgomery County appear to do so.

Housing accessibility and accessibility modifications remain a major concern, particularly with regard to discriminatory renting. A 2019 report revealed that housing in the D.C. region is frequently inaccessible and that affordable housing programs frequently steer persons with disabilities toward already modified housing, a violation of the Fair Housing Act.¹⁹³

Lack of Assistance for Transitioning from Institutional Settings to Integrated Housing

Lack of assistance for transitioning from institutional settings to integrated housing is a slight contributing factor to the segregation of persons with disabilities in D.C. and the broader region. In the past decade, Maryland and Virginia have significantly reduced the proportion of individuals with disabilities who live in institutional settings, but this alone does not prove that assistance provided for transitioning to integrated housing has been successful. Stakeholders indicated that transition services for persons with psychiatric disabilities lag behind those available for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities, with less stable housing tenure in integrated settings being the result. Additionally, a large population of individuals with psychiatric disabilities live in group homes, including some large group homes, that may not meet the regulatory definition for an institution but in practice are virtually the same.

There is a need for more proactive case management that informs individuals living in group homes of more integrated housing opportunities. In the broader region, although the Commonwealth of Virginia has increased the transition services offered to persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities, such services for persons with psychiatric disabilities are not as adequate.

Nevertheless, several agencies in the region work with clients to assist with this transition. In the District, the main organization that assists with transitions from institutional settings to integrated housing is Pathways to Housing D.C., which has helped nearly 1,000 people move into its permanent housing program since 2004.¹⁹⁴ Pathways to Housing D.C. works exclusively with those overcoming mental illness, substance abuse, or severe health challenges. Given that Pathways to Housing D.C. is the District's only organization primarily dedicated to providing assistance with the transition to integrated housing, there is room for expansion in this field.

Virginia Supportive Housing has also worked to increase access to information about transitioning to integrated housing. However, it does not run its own programs but rather contracts with community partners to facilitate transitions.¹⁹⁵ No Wrong Door is its primary program to expand access to integrated settings, but it predominantly does so by connecting individuals with private entities.¹⁹⁶

In Maryland, the Maryland Developmental Disabilities Administration assists with similar services and has an online portal, Maryland Access Point, where people can identify available resources in their area.¹⁹⁷ Virginia and Maryland provide Medicaid waivers to assist individuals with disabilities in the transition to integrated housing. However, in Maryland, wait times for these services are considerably long, taking more than a year in most cases.¹⁹⁸ Nonetheless, in this past year, Maryland increased its waiver rates, which indicates that service providers may be able to expand and improve the overall services and reduce wait times.¹⁹⁹

Lack of Community Revitalization Strategies

All jurisdictions within the Washington, D.C. metropolitan region dedicate significant time and funds to community revitalization. All use the Opportunity Zone program to incentivize developers to build within economically disadvantaged neighborhoods. Opportunity Zones are designated zones in a federal program that provides tax incentives for investments in new businesses and commercial projects in low-income communities. In addition to this federal initiative, local jurisdictions have also instituted a variety of other programs.

Virginia has a variety of community revitalization and jurisdiction-based strategies. Prince William County offers households financial assistance to improve owner-occupied housing and increase energy efficiency, with priority given to households making below 50 percent of AMI.²⁰⁰ Loudoun County offers a similar program.²⁰¹ Arlington County offers community development grants for community groups that aim to improve the quality of life for low-income residents.²⁰² Eligible Areas Small Grants Program also provides grants for community activities.²⁰³ In 2020, Loudoun County designated an area of land outside Leesburg as a Virginia Housing Development Authority revitalization area.²⁰⁴ Fairfax County created the Economic Incentive Program to encourage redevelopment in certain areas.²⁰⁵

Maryland has also developed a host of programs to advance community revitalization. Under its Sustainable Community Act, the state provides funding to designated localities to invest in community development activities, including local economic development, historic landmark preservation, affordable and sustainable housing development, and growth and development practices that target the improvement of the natural and built environment.²⁰⁶ One important initiative is the Community Legacy Program, which provides funding to local governments, community groups, and groups of local governments to support the following:

- mixed-use development consisting of residential, commercial, or open space, or any combination thereof
- business retention, expansion, and attraction initiatives
- streetscape improvements
- increased homeownership and home rehabilitation among residents
- residential and commercial facade improvement programs
- real estate acquisition, including land banking, and strategic demolition²⁰⁷

Montgomery County is eligible for these funds and has developed several initiatives to implement the Community Legacy Program. Montgomery County offers the Focused Neighborhood Assistance

program for public land improvement, home improvement, commercial property improvement, neighborhood cleanup, murals, and community events.²⁰⁸

Lack of Local Private Fair Housing Outreach and Enforcement

Lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement is not a contributing factor to the segregation and various fair housing issues in the District of Columbia's metropolitan region. More than 30 private organizations across the metropolitan region offer legal advice and representation to low-income individuals experiencing housing issues, with several organizations restricting their clientele to low-income seniors and other special populations. The ERC, Maryland Legal Aid, Legal Services of Northern Virginia, Housing Opportunities Made Equal of Virginia, Greater Washington Urban League, and Northern Virginia Urban League are among the private organizations offering housing outreach and enforcement services to residents in the larger metropolitan region.

In the District, an even more robust network of private organizations offers fair housing legal aid services. Organizations such as Bread for the City, Legal Counsel for the Elderly, Legal Aid, Neighborhood Legal Services Program, and D.C. Bar Pro Bono Center offer legal services to low-income residents experiencing fair housing issues, with several organizations forming partnerships to coordinate and bolster the fair housing services they offer individuals. These partnerships include the D.C. Right to Housing Initiative, the Housing Right to Counsel Project, and the Landlord-Tenant Court-Based Legal Services Project.²⁰⁹

Nevertheless, private fair housing outreach and enforcement services still need to be expanded in the area, particularly for metropolitan residents who have disabilities. The Disability Rights D.C. program at University Legal Services offers legal services to District residents with disabilities, and many of the organizations listed above routinely offer legal services to low-income residents who have disability-related fair housing needs.²¹⁰ Yet, individuals with disabilities who are not income eligible may find it difficult to acquire legal representation or advice regarding their reasonable accommodation.

Lack of Local Public Fair Housing Outreach and Enforcement

Lack of transparency into local public fair housing outreach and policy enforcement is a significant impediment to fair housing in the region. For the most part, Virginia provides educational materials regarding fair housing rights targeting both housing seekers and partners like real estate agencies. This includes information on changes to the state fair housing laws regarding the expanded protected classes and new source-of-income discrimination protections. Virginia does not provide public information on the amount or type of fair housing complaints online, so it is difficult to assess the quality of enforcement mechanisms. When it comes to fair housing testing, residents rely on nonprofits to investigate fair housing violations because public fair housing agencies do not typically provide testing services.

Local enforcement activities, as well as resources, are also limited. Three local municipalities—the District of Columbia, Fairfax County, and Montgomery County—have locally certified substantially equivalent agencies eligible to investigate fair housing complaints under their jurisdiction.²¹¹ Other municipalities have complaints made directly to HUD or the state's subagency in charge of enforcing the Fair Housing Act. As a result, it is difficult to determine the total number of public fair housing complaints and resolutions in the region because of the fragmented enforcement mechanisms available and the lack of transparency related to fair housing complaint information. Additionally, Virginia has recently reduced the number of attorneys in the state's Office of Civil Rights charged with investigating fair housing complaints.

Lack of Meaningful Language Access for Individuals with Limited English Proficiency

A lack of meaningful language access for individuals with LEP is a contributing factor to unequal access to opportunity in the District of Columbia's metropolitan region.

District of Columbia

While the D.C. Language Access Act of 2004 requires all District government agencies, public-facing contractors, and grantees to ensure that individuals with LEP have access to the full range of government services, studies show that the city's housing organizations provide insufficient translation and interpretation services to individuals. In fact, the District's inadequate access to translation and interpretation services is widely known among proponents of equal language access. Advocacy groups including the D.C. Language Access Coalition²¹² and the Council for Court Excellence²¹³ have frequently pointed out the insufficiency of meaningful language access for individuals in the District, especially with regard to the city's housing agencies and rental assistance programs.

The D.C. Office of Human Rights Language Access Program monitors and evaluates all 38 covered entities annually. The District's housing-related agencies are designated as covered entities with major public contact under this act.

The Office of Human Rights' latest report revealed the D.C. Housing Authority to have one of the lowest interpretation rates among D.C. agencies, with interpretation services provided to only 31 percent of the test calls and visits.²¹⁴ The Housing Authority scored a 31 percent on the Office of Human Rights evaluation of the organization's compliance with the Language Access Program, one of the lowest scores.²¹⁵ In 2019, the D.C. Housing Authority faced two inquiries alleging that it had violated the Language Access Act.

The most frequently encountered languages for District agencies were Spanish, Amharic, Vietnamese, Mandarin, Arabic, French, and Korean.²¹⁶

Virginia

Arlington County requires all county departments to provide interpretation and translation services to residents with LEP. In fact, the Arlington County HCV program is specifically required to offer LEP residents oral interpretation and written translation services free of charge.²¹⁷ Housing information available on the county's website is almost always written on the web page itself, therefore allowing the materials to be translated by the page-translating service at the top of the web page.

In Fairfax County, more than one-third of residents speak a language other than English at home. However, while the county uses interpreters from LanguageLine Solutions to provide language services to those calling 911, the county does not seem to require their departments to offer translation and interpretation services to non-English speakers seeking help with housing issues.²¹⁸ The county's website provides several housing resources that are only available in English. The Fairfax County Affordable Housing Guide and Family Self-Sufficiency Interest Form,²¹⁹ for instance, are both only available as a PDF, making them difficult to translate with an automatic web service. The county does, however, allow web pages to be translated by Google Translate and filmed videos regarding the COVID-19 Emergency Rental Assistance Program in both English and Spanish.²²⁰

Slightly more than one-third of all Alexandria residents speak a language other than English at home.²²¹ However, despite hosting the April 2022 Virginia Language Access Conference, Alexandria does not appear to abide by any long-term language access programs itself. When language access is provided to residents, translation and interpretation services are limited to Spanish-speaking LEP individuals. For instance, the City of Alexandria's Office of Housing provides special assistance to

Spanish speakers seeking housing-related mediation.²²² The Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority offers interpretation and translation services to Spanish-speaking LEP individuals as well, recommending that applicants bring an interpreter to the office to complete Section 8 applications with staff aid.²²³ This is an issue, as an estimated 19.1 percent of all Alexandria residents speak neither English nor Spanish at home.²²⁴ Nevertheless, the websites of both the City of Alexandria and the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority can be translated into any other language via Google Translate, and both websites often ensure that PDFs published on their websites are available in a variety of languages. Alexandria’s 2021 Housing Resource Guide, for instance, is available in English, Spanish, Arabic, Urdu, and Amharic.²²⁵

In Loudoun County, 31.5 percent of the county’s residents speak a language other than English at home, and 9.8 percent speak English “less than very well.” Contrary to other county governments in the D.C. metropolitan region, however, Loudoun County does have a long-term language access policy that requires its departments and personnel to take “reasonable steps to provide LEP persons with timely and meaningful access to services and benefits.”²²⁶ Specifically, Loudoun County provides translation and interpretation services to residents who speak Spanish, Arabic, Farsi, Urdu, Mandarin, Cantonese, Korean, Vietnamese, French, Hindi, Turkish, and Somali via foreign language phone interpretation, face-to-face interpretation, and written translation contract vendors. In 2020 alone, the county provided interpretation services for more than 10,000 phone calls, of which 80 percent were from Spanish-speaking residents.²²⁷ Loudoun County’s website can also be translated by a Google Translate button in the bottom right corner of each page. The vast majority of resources on housing are located on the web page itself and can thus be translated by the Google Translate tool, though several resources are only available as a PDF in English. These resources—the ADU Self-Screening Questionnaire and the document Financial Education and Credit Counseling Resources,²²⁸ for example—cannot be translated by the Google Translate tool, making it difficult for LEP residents to access them.²²⁹

Maryland

Like Loudoun County, Montgomery County offers LEP residents written translation and oral interpretation services to help them communicate with county staff members. When residents visit staff offices, they can select their primary language on a language ID board to receive interpretation services. These services may be provided by someone listed in a database of bilingual county employees or the Language Bank, a searchable online database made up of community volunteers.²³⁰ Montgomery County’s website archives translated resources in a single place, making it easy for LEP individuals to find the information they both need and understand. Notably, however, housing resources were available primarily in English and Spanish.²³¹

Lack of Private Investment in Specific Neighborhoods

Alexandria

Alexandria provides a list of affordable housing projects that are proposed or recently completed, as well as a list of market-rate projects that will contain affordable housing units. Current nonprofit affordable housing projects include the Lineage, which will redevelop 15 public housing units into a four-story building that will include 15 replacement units for households that earn up to 30 percent of AMI and 37 units for those that earn up to 50 percent and 60 percent of AMI. Two other projects will serve residents earning between 40 and 60 percent of AMI. None of the market-rate projects provide more than a handful of affordable units. One project will provide for 4 affordable units in a 370-unit mixed-use development. Rather than provide more units, the developer appears to have elected to contribute \$1 million to the city’s housing trust fund.²³²

There has been ample development in the Opportunity Zones within Alexandria.²³³ The Alexandria Housing Development Corporation has sought a loan for a project that will result in hundreds of affordable units in Arlandria. As many as 530 units could be constructed.²³⁴ In Arlandria, the poverty rate is over 15 percent and more than 10 percent of households experience overcrowding.²³⁵

There are also several new developments in Alexandria West, including a townhouse development with units starting at \$800,000. Several office buildings in the area are being converted into multifamily residential units. In another development, 24 units of garden-style apartments will be torn down and replaced with a 383-unit building.²³⁶ The project was approved over the objections of two council members, who were concerned about the relatively low number of affordable units within the building.²³⁷

Arlington County

This past year, Arlington County approved a 77-unit affordable housing project in the Columbia Pike Corridor. Construction also started on a 160-unit, 6,750 square foot building on Washington Boulevard. Another affordable housing complex on South Glebe Road was completed.²³⁸

The Columbia Pike Corridor is the location of one designated Opportunity Zone within Arlington County.²³⁹ Certain tracts within the corridor are also listed as disadvantaged by the Northern Virginia Health Foundation.²⁴⁰ Arlington County has committed \$150 million in loans to preserve Barcroft Apartments near Columbia Pike, aiming to keep more than 1,300 units affordable for middle- and low-income residents.²⁴¹

District of Columbia

There are 25 census tracts considered Opportunity Zones within the District, most of which are in Wards 7 and 8. Opportunity Zone investments offer a federal tax incentive, and District taxpayers can realize District-level tax benefits for certain qualifying investments approved by the mayor.²⁴² There are currently 15 such investments. Several mixed-use housing developments are listed as qualifying investments, as are urban farms, a brewery, and a commercial development in downtown Anacostia that will provide over 34,000 square feet of retail space, among others.²⁴³

Fairfax County

The Opportunity Zones in Fairfax County are in Herndon and Reston, as well as the area around Groveton and Mount Vernon Woods.²⁴⁴ However, according to a study from the Northern Virginia Health Foundation, there are some isolated, economically distressed census tracts in several other locations in Fairfax County. These tracts can be found in Centreville and Chantilly, Fair Oaks and Oakton, Springfield and Annandale, and Seven Corners and Bailey's Crossroads.²⁴⁵

There appear to be a few new mixed-use developments in Herndon. However, none appear to be within the Opportunity Zone.²⁴⁶ There are several proposed mixed-use developments in Reston, including the redevelopment of the Lake Anne Fellowship House, which provides affordable housing for seniors. However, the new development will merely replace existing housing, not add to the number of units.

There is also discussion about converting Fair Oaks Mall into a mixed-use development with more than 2,000 units. However, though a new transit center is being constructed near the mall, the existing roadways are not conducive to biking and walking.²⁴⁷ This seems to be a trend in the county, as the Springfield Mall is being converted into a mixed-use development, but the need for a pedestrian-friendly experience to reach the mall from the Metro station has also interfered with plans.²⁴⁸

Fairfax County has also launched an economic incentive program to spur development in several commercial revitalization districts. These districts include parts of Springfield, Annandale, Bailey's

Crossroads and Seven Corners, and Richmond Highway, which includes Groveton. The county will offer a 10-year real estate tax abatement for new commercial, industrial, or multifamily residential developments within these areas.²⁴⁹

Gaithersburg

Several new commercial and residential developments are planned in Gaithersburg, including the proposed Stevenson-Metgrove mixed residential community and the Novavax Campus containing over 600,000 square feet of offices, light manufacturing, and open space. The recently closed Lake Forest Mall will also provide mixed uses, including a range of housing opportunities. Several developments already in the pipeline will include affordable homes through the city's Moderately Priced Dwelling Units and Work Force Housing Units programs (both rental and ownership options). All told, the city will add more than 1,500 residential units if the already submitted plans become fully realized.

Loudoun County

The Loudoun County Department of Economic Development has extensive information for developers on its website, encouraging them to develop a project in an Opportunity Zone.²⁵⁰ The two Opportunity Zones in Loudoun County are in Oak Grove and Sterling.²⁵¹ Loudoun County has recently constructed several mixed-use developments, four of which are near Oak Grove and along Phase 2 of the Silver line Metro extension. There are several other mixed-use developments in and around Sterling, most notably Dulles Town Center.²⁵²

However, one area, Leesburg, is not classified as an Opportunity Zone. In that area, there are census tracts where more than 10 percent of households experience overcrowding. In one tract in Leesburg, only 56 percent of adults graduated high school. By comparison, 92 percent of adults ages 25 and older in northern Virginia graduated high school.²⁵³ Over 2 million square feet of office, retail, and commercial space is under development in the town.²⁵⁴ While some of the proposed uses include mixed-use developments, others are fast-food restaurants and storage units.²⁵⁵

Montgomery County

There are 13 Opportunity Zones in Montgomery County.²⁵⁶ In the Opportunity Zones around Germantown and Gaithersburg, one recently proposed development is a 137-unit residential building.²⁵⁷ It appears to be designed for students, given its proximity to the Germantown campus of Montgomery College and its application name of College View Campus.²⁵⁸ There were also proposals for a development with 450 townhomes, 32 single-family detached homes, and 6 duplex units²⁵⁹ and for a development with 49 townhomes, a four-story apartment building with 72 units, and retail space.²⁶⁰

Prince William County

There are six Opportunity Zones within Prince William County, most of which are near the border of Fairfax County along I-95.²⁶¹ The Northern Virginia Health Foundation identifies as disadvantaged not only those areas, but also three census tracts in Dumfries.²⁶² Riverside Station, a large mixed-use development containing 930 multifamily residential units and 145,000 square feet of retail, is planned for North Woodbridge across from the Woodbridge Virginia Railway Express station.²⁶³

Lack of Public Investment in Specific Neighborhoods

District of Columbia

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 implemented Opportunity Zones in the District.²⁶⁴ Currently, 25 census tracts in the District are designated as Opportunity Zones, with the majority in Wards 7 and 8. The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development also maintains a map and list of its own projects, affordable housing projects, industrial revenue bond projects, vacant properties,

and Great Streets awardees and corridors.²⁶⁵ The majority of these public investment projects are in Wards 4–8, with Ward 8 containing the highest number, followed by Ward 6. Currently, 112 projects are listed in the database, including projects in development, under construction, and completed since 2011.

Virginia

In recent years, northern Virginia has seen a rise in private investment, including well-known projects such as the second Amazon headquarters in Arlington. Nonetheless, the region has seen an uptick in public investment in transportation infrastructure. For example, in 2020, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority pledged over \$500 million in funding for 21 projects throughout the region.²⁶⁶ City and county governments have each undertaken public projects within their jurisdictions. However, these projects do not match the scale of projects in D.C., nor do they take a similarly pointed approach to neighborhoods with a particular need for such investments.

Maryland

The Montgomery County government maintains a list and map of economic development projects that receive public funding.²⁶⁷ The map currently contains nine projects, which include transportation, residential development, a science research complex, and a hotel project. These are concentrated in the southeastern part of the county, especially around Bethesda and Silver Spring. All are in Districts 1, 3, 4, and 5. District 2 and the western portion of District 1, which encompass the western and northwestern portions of the county, receive minimal public investment.

Lack of Regional and Local Cooperation

Lack of regional and local cooperation is not a contributing factor to fair housing issues in the District of Columbia’s metropolitan region. The metropolitan region’s primary cooperative body is COG, which is composed of more than 300 elected officials from 24 local governments, the Maryland and Virginia legislatures, and the US Congress. Since COG established the need for accessible and affordable housing in its 2010 regional plan,²⁶⁸ members have recognized the centrality of fair and affordable housing issues in securing a vibrant and equitable future for the metropolitan area. In September 2019, the COG Board of Directors adopted the Regional Housing Initiative. The initiative establishes three regional housing targets intended to “address the region’s housing needs from an economic competitiveness and transportation infrastructure standpoint.” Specifically, as part of this Regional Housing Initiative, COG aspires to work alongside nonprofit, private, and philanthropic partners to create an additional 320,000 housing units, with three-quarters of all new housing affordable to low- and middle-income families and in activity centers or near high-capacity transit.²⁶⁹ COG also established a committee dedicated to helping local jurisdictions meet fair housing requirements. This Regional Fair Housing project team meets monthly and is composed of a core group of jurisdictions and their public housing authority partners.²⁷⁰

Lack of Resources for Fair Housing Agencies and Organizations

Lack of resources for fair housing agencies and organizations is a moderate contributing factor to the housing issues in the region. Multiple fair housing agencies and organizations in the metropolitan region receive or have received FHIP funds from HUD, including the ERC, the National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development, the National Community Reinvestment Coalition, and the National Fair Housing Alliance.²⁷¹ CDBG also grants funds to fair housing organizations across the metropolitan region. However, each organization that has recently received FHIP funds is based in the District and primarily works within the city—not the larger metropolitan region—to help residents resolve housing issues. In fact, the ERC was the only private fair housing organization of those that received FHIP funds in 2020 that was dedicated to serving the housing needs of the greater

Washington, D.C., region.²⁷² Resources for fair housing organizations are thus concentrated within the District itself, with fewer resources allocated to the larger metropolitan region.

Many organizations that provide fair housing services to the District's residents are not devoted solely to remedying fair housing issues in the region. Organizations such as the ERC, Maryland Legal Aid, Legal Services of Northern Virginia, and the D.C. Bar Pro Bono Center have broad missions, with specific projects devoted to alleviating specific housing issues in their region. Therefore, these organization's resources are often divided among a variety of projects. For instance, the D.C. Office of Human Rights, the body tasked with investigating claims of housing discrimination in the District, has also been reported to lack sufficient resources to properly handle claims and investigate cases.²⁷³

Lack of State or Local Fair Housing Laws

Lack of state or local fair housing laws is not a significant contributing factor. The D.C. Human Rights Act protects against housing discrimination based on a variety of traits, including race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, personal appearance, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, familial responsibilities, political affiliation, disability, matriculation, familial status, source of income, place of residence or business, and status as a victim of an intrafamily offense.²⁷⁴ While not as broad as the District's, Virginia's and Maryland's fair housing laws also prohibit discrimination based on several traits. In Virginia, it is illegal to discriminate in housing on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, elderliness, familial status, disability, source of funds, sexual orientation, gender identity, and veteran status.²⁷⁵ Maryland similarly prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, or source of income.²⁷⁶

Montgomery County expands on Maryland's law by prohibiting discrimination on the basis of ancestry, presence of children, family responsibilities, and age.²⁷⁷ Arlington County differs slightly from Virginia law in that it protects both marital status and familial status, and specifies that both physical and mental disabilities are protected.²⁷⁸ Alexandria likewise considers marital and familial status, as well as age and transgender status, to be protected traits.²⁷⁹ Prince William County also prohibits discrimination based on both marital and familial status, as well as age in addition to elderliness.²⁸⁰

The Loudoun County website has been updated to reflect the changes to Virginia's Fair Housing Law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.²⁸¹

Land Use and Zoning Laws

Land use and zoning laws play a role in a variety of fair housing issues. Specifically, overly restrictive zoning that suppresses the production of affordable housing in particular and housing more generally leads to disproportionately high rates of housing cost burden and overcrowding for some racial and ethnic groups as well as for persons with disabilities. Additionally, more restrictive zoning in communities that are predominantly White and have disproportionately higher incomes than other parts of their cities or regions can exacerbate patterns of residential racial segregation. Conversely, inadequate zoning and land use controls to buffer low-income communities of color from heavily polluting industrial land uses can contribute to racial disparities in health outcomes. An analysis of the fair housing ramifications of land use and zoning laws in each participating jurisdiction follows.

Region

The majority of the land in the District of Columbia is developed.²⁸² Arlington County, the City of Alexandria, and Fairfax County have similar land development profiles as the District of Columbia.²⁸³ Montgomery County contains the highest percentage of undeveloped land in the region.²⁸⁴

Alexandria


The City of Alexandria has a large amount of single-family housing.²⁸⁵ The many historic areas in the city make it difficult to build multifamily housing.²⁸⁶ As a result, affordable housing is only viable on the edges of the municipality.²⁸⁷ The Alexandria City Council approved ADUs in 2021.²⁸⁸

Arlington County

Arlington County is currently undertaking a study to address the “missing middle”:²⁸⁹ the lack of multiunit housing that fits between single-family housing and large residential developments.²⁹⁰ Arlington County’s zoning laws heavily favor single-family housing and have impeded the creation of multiunit affordable housing.

Map 81: Impacts of the Housing Gap

Impacts of the Housing Gap



Source: Angela Woolsey, “Arlington Missing Middle Housing Study Sets October Kick-Off,” *ARLnow*, September 29, 2020, <https://www.arlnow.com/2020/09/29/arlington-missing-middle-housing-study-sets-october-kick-off/>.

Between 2010 and 2018, Arlington County added significant housing stock that contained 20 or more units and had modest increases in single-detached and single-attached housing and housing with 2–4 units.²⁹¹ However, Arlington County lost housing stock that contained 5–19 units.²⁹²

District of Columbia

Affordable housing is unevenly distributed in the District. Ward 8 has significantly more affordable housing than other wards. In contrast, Wards 2 and 3 have significantly less affordable housing than other wards. Single-family homes account for 80 percent of residential buildings in the District.²⁹³

Table 40: D.C. Affordable Housing by Ward

Ward	2019 Median Household Income	2018–2019 Households below the Poverty Line %	Total Affordable Housing Units	Affordable Housing Units at 0%–30% of AMI	Affordable Housing Units at 31%–50% of AMI	Affordable Housing Units at 51%–60% of AMI	Affordable Housing Units at 61%–80% of AMI	Affordable Housing Units above 81% of AMI
Ward 1	\$94,810	9.5%	1,530	486	347	445	252	0
Ward 2	\$128,670	7.6%	774	94	81	438	158	3
Ward 3	\$71,782	15.7%	135	0	11	80	44	0
Ward 4	\$102,822	12.2%	2,463	393	846	866	355	3
Ward 5	\$111,064	14.0%	2,972	780	432	1,043	717	0
Ward 6	\$45,318	26.3%	4,843	981	1,301	1,295	975	291
Ward 7	\$114,363	12.0%	3,634	704	872	1,743	266	49
Ward 8	\$35,245	32.9%	6,375	1,300	2,299	2,413	340	23

Data sources: Open Data D.C. (interactive map), “Economic Characteristics of D.C. Wards,” accessed October 11, 2023, <https://opendata.dc.gov/apps/economic-characteristics-of-dc-wards-2017-2021-5-year-acs/explore>; and Open Data D.C. (interactive map), “Affordable Housing,” accessed October 11, 2023, <https://opendata.dc.gov/datasets/affordable-housing/explore>.

Additionally, the District has a large amount of land that cannot be used for housing because of its historical designation or governmental use. The District requires most new residential developments to include affordable housing through the Inclusionary Zoning program.²⁹⁴ From 2011 to 2019, inclusionary zoning created 989 affordable housing units.²⁹⁵ The District allows ADUs but requires them to be owner-occupied, limiting their usefulness for adding additional housing stock.²⁹⁶


Fairfax County

Fairfax County is almost entirely zoned for single-family housing.²⁹⁷ Fairfax County began allowing ADUs in 2021 to enable homeowners to add smaller rental units onto their homes.²⁹⁸

Loudoun County

Loudoun County is the most rural jurisdiction in this analysis. The eastern part of the county, closest to the District of Columbia, contains more development. Moving westward, the county is less developed and less dense.²⁹⁹ Historically, Loudoun County’s land use policies and zoning laws have actively discouraged the type of development most conducive to affordable housing. Instead, Loudoun County has promoted low-density land uses.³⁰⁰

Map 82: Zoning Patterns, Virginia Jurisdictions



Source: Angela Woolsey, “Arlington Missing Middle Housing Study Sets October Kick-Off,” *ARLnow*, September 29, 2020, <https://www.arlnow.com/2020/09/29/arlington-missing-middle-housing-study-sets-october-kick-off/>.


Loudoun County’s 2019 General Plan acknowledged the need for increased density land uses and created two “urban policy areas” near future train stations on the D.C. Metro’s Silver line.³⁰¹ The urban policy areas aim to offer “a diversity of housing” and “offer flexible land use policies to allow for innovation and changing market demands.”³⁰² In addition, the 2019 General Plan promotes policies to increase density, such as the addition of residential units on existing single-family housing properties, more dwelling units per acre than are currently allowed, and mixed-use development.³⁰³ These policies are often prerequisites for developing low- and moderate-income housing.

Loudoun County is currently rewriting its zoning ordinance to implement the 2019 General Plan.³⁰⁴ The zoning ordinance was last comprehensively rewritten in 1993, so most of the use categories and policies are not conducive to affordable housing development. The current zoning ordinance has only two use types amenable to multifamily development: R-16 and R-24.³⁰⁵ These use types make up a relatively small proportion of county land. Areas zoned for multifamily development are concentrated on the county’s east side, closest to the District of Columbia.

Montgomery County

Montgomery County’s zoning laws are a significant impediment to fair housing. Zoning laws allow apartments on less than 2 percent of county land, and more than one-third of the county is restricted to single-family homes.³⁰⁶

Map 83: Zoning Patterns, Montgomery County



Source: Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission, *Thrive Montgomery 2050: Let's Plan Our Future. Together*, Planning Board Draft, April 2021, https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/THRIVE-Planning-Board-Draft-2021-Pages_web.pdf.

Montgomery County attempted to relax zoning restrictions in 2010 to allow low- and moderate-income housing by introducing a new zoning designation: commercial/residential.³⁰⁷ Areas designated as commercial/residential can have increased density and building height. However, areas zoned as commercial/residential are a relatively tiny percentage of the county. In 1980, Montgomery County set aside 93,000 acres along the northwest edge of the county, almost one-third of the county, as an agricultural reserve. The accompanying zoning ordinances severely limited housing development by requiring at least 25 acres per dwelling.³⁰⁸

Montgomery County published a new general plan in 2020, the first update since 1993.³⁰⁹ Montgomery County's original general plan used "wedges and corridors" to promote development along major thoroughfares and promote open spaces in other parts of the county.³¹⁰ The general plan published in 2020 acknowledges that the "wedges and corridors" unintentionally promoted unequal development and restricted housing construction.³¹¹ The updated general plan encourages zoning reform to integrate "varied uses, building types, and lot sizes."³¹² Montgomery County launched a "missing middle" housing program to increase the supply of affordable housing.³¹³


Gaithersburg

The city has launched Retool Gaithersburg, a comprehensive initiative to update the zoning code. The update aims to modernize the zoning ordinance to better reflect the needs of the community and ensure that zoning regulations support the city's vision and goals (including its residential areas and future needs). Gaithersburg anticipates this effort to be completed in 2024.³¹⁴

Prince William County

Over 75 percent of housing in Prince William County is single-family housing.³¹⁵ Prince William County has issued a draft of the land use chapter of its comprehensive plan update, along with a long-range land use map.³¹⁶ The plan contemplates changes to allow for a variety of housing types rather than single-family zoning and the relaxation of the rural area's zoning from one house per 10 acres to one house per 5 acres.³¹⁷ The county has no ADU ordinance, voluntary inclusionary zoning, or affordable housing trust fund, making zoning a barrier to creating affordable housing.

Map 84: Long-Range Land Use Map, Prince William County



Source: Prince William County Planning Office, "Long-Range Land Use Map," Draft, December 5, 2022, https://www.pwcva.gov/assets/2022-02/DRAFT_LRLU_3000_36x66%2020220201.pdf.

Lender Discrimination

Data on home purchase mortgage applications that were denied by the lender demonstrate that non-Hispanic White applicants in all municipalities were significantly more likely to receive a mortgage than other races or ethnicities. Non-Hispanic Black applicants in the District, Fairfax County, Loudoun County, and Montgomery County were the most likely to be denied in their respective jurisdictions. Non-Hispanic Native American or Alaska Native in Alexandria, Hispanic/Latino applicants in Arlington County, and non-Hispanic Asian or Pacific Islander applicants in Prince William County were most likely to be denied in those jurisdictions.

Table 41: Home Purchase Mortgage Denial Rates

Municipality	Non-Hispanic White Applicants	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Applicants	Hispanic/Latino Applicants	Non-Hispanic Asian or Pacific Islander Applicants	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Applicants
Alexandria	4.2%	9.5%	7.3%	5.5%	14.3%
Arlington County	3.4%	5.8%	9.7%	6.1%	0.0%
District of Columbia	4.1%	15.5%	7.7%	6.6%	9.4%
Fairfax County	4.2%	8.7%	8.3%	8.4%	3.4%
Loudoun County	4.5%	10.0%	8.5%	8.6%	9.4%
Montgomery County	5.1%	11.3%	9.7%	9.1%	3.6%
Prince William County	5.3%	9.2%	9.5%	10.2%	4.2%

Note: Data exclude 12,661 applications (19 percent of total) where race and ethnicity were not reported.

Data source: Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data on home purchase loan applications for one- to four-unit dwellings in 2019.

Location and Type of Affordable Housing

District of Columbia

D.C. Open Data, a project of the District government, maintains data on affordable housing sites in the District, as well as a map of such units.³¹⁸ The dataset contains 577 affordable housing sites, but only 513 of these currently contain one or more affordable housing units. These units are located across Wards 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, which have substantially larger low-income populations than Wards 2 and 3. Sites with more units (tens or hundreds, with the largest containing 668 units) appear more often in Wards 6, 7, and 8. Units also vary in affordability with respect to AMI.

Virginia

Alexandria, Arlington County, Fairfax County, and Loudoun County all maintain lists of affordable housing units within their jurisdictions.³¹⁹ Prince William County no longer maintains such a list. Among the four jurisdictions that do, affordable housing appears to be available in a range of locations and types. Publicly and privately owned housing options exist, including market-rate housing with affordable units. Housing is also distributed across a variety of neighborhoods, with complexes containing anywhere from fewer than 10 units to more than 200 units.


Maryland

Montgomery County's Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit program offers access to affordable units in apartment complexes throughout the county. The list includes 71 sites, most with at least 20 units in a range of sizes, from efficiencies to three-bedroom units.³²⁰ The sites, which include both high-rise and garden-style apartments, encompass all major municipalities within the county and have rents starting from \$1,133.

Location of Accessible Housing


The location of accessible housing is not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Although it is not possible to precisely map the location of accessible housing in the area, it tends to exist where new multifamily housing and publicly supported housing are concentrated. These two dimensions cut in somewhat contradictory directions. The ACS does not facilitate the disaggregation of housing units by the number of units in a structure and the year a structure was built, but it does allow a look at those two data points separately. As the following maps reflect, there is some overlap. For example, both newer and denser housing are clustered in parts of Arlington and Fairfax Counties. There are concentrations of new predominantly single-family homes in the northern part of Montgomery County, the western part of Fairfax County, and the center of the District of Columbia. There are concentrations of older multifamily housing in and surrounding the District of Columbia. The parts of the county with more new multifamily housing offer high access to opportunity in an areawide perspective.

Map 85: Median Year Structure Built, D.C. Metropolitan Area



Source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates, Table [B25035](#).


Map 86: Units in Structure (≥ 20), D.C. Metropolitan Area



Source: 2015–2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates, [Table DP04](#).

By contrast, publicly supported housing, as reflected in Map 87, is much more concentrated on the edges of and immediately surrounding the District of Columbia, places that do not have concentrations of new multifamily development. It is likely that the two categories of housing more likely to be accessible are widely dispersed across the metropolitan area. Across the area, places with accessible housing include high-opportunity areas. When affordability is not factored into consideration, the location of accessible housing does not appear to contribute significantly to fair housing issues.

Map 87: Publicly Supported Housing, Region



Source: HUD, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Tool, D.C. Metropolitan Area.

Location of Employers

Region

The location of employers is a contributing factor to disparities in access to opportunity in the District of Columbia's metropolitan region. The highest-paying jobs are located primarily in downtown D.C., where employers occupy office buildings in the most expensive part of the region. These employers provide jobs to hundreds of thousands of people who reside outside the District, indicating that expensive housing costs have forced at least some individuals who would otherwise live in the District of Columbia to reside farther from the city center in the greater metropolitan region.

The long commute times of District employees are evidence that high housing costs have pushed people to reside farther from their employers in the larger metropolitan region. District employees face some of the longest commute times in the nation: census estimates indicate that the average person travels 43 minutes to work each day. This is over 1.5 times the length of the commute of the average American, who spends approximately 27 minutes traveling to work each day. The metropolitan D.C. region has consistently been ranked as one of the most expensive housing markets in the nation, and these census findings echo a study conducted by the Brookings Institution that found commutes tend to be longer in metropolitan areas where housing is the priciest.³²¹

A spatial mismatch in jobs and affordable housing often places a significant burden on workers. Long commutes cut into time that could otherwise be spent with family members or friends or pursuing interests unrelated to work. Traveling to and from work—enduring traffic jams, unforeseen

circumstances, and bad weather—are additional stressors. Numerous studies have shown that individuals with long commutes suffer from psychosomatic disorders at a much higher rate than those with short trips to work.³²² The psychological, physical, and financial burdens that coincide with long commutes all hinder access to equal opportunity for residents of the metropolitan D.C. region.

Alexandria

Despite being home to many large employers—the US Department of Defense, the US Trademark and Patent Office, the Salvation Army, and the Society for Human Resource Management among them—people who both live and work in Alexandria are by far the city’s minority. Approximately 16 percent of Alexandria residents live and work in Alexandria, while 84 percent of the city’s residents commute out of Alexandria each day. Alexandria residents spend slightly more time than the average American commuting to work each day (30 minutes) and travel primarily to employers in the District and Fairfax County.³²³ These individuals have access to public transportation via bus and Metro.

Arlington County


While it is estimated that nearly 20 percent of Arlington County residents work within the county, residents’ commute times mirror those of the average American; the average Arlington County resident spends 27 minutes traveling to and from work each day.³²⁴ Those commuting out of the county are traveling primarily to the District, with approximately 70 percent traveling by car or train. The county’s biggest employers are Accenture, Deloitte, the Virginia Hospital Center, Booz Allen Hamilton, and Garter, and approximately 50,000 residents of the larger metropolitan region commute to Arlington County each day to work for these companies, among others.

District of Columbia

District residents spend slightly more time than the average American commuting to work each day, with the average District resident traveling just under 29 minutes to get to work. Approximately 9 percent of all District residents, however, endure “super commutes” and spend more than an hour getting to work each day.³²⁵

A 2017 study conducted by the D.C. Policy Center suggests that the time it takes a District resident to commute to work is strongly linked to their income. People who live in the Georgetown and Capitol Hill neighborhoods, where residents’ average median income is highest, have the shortest average commutes; it often takes residents of these neighborhoods less than 25 minutes to get to work each day. Meanwhile, those who live in neighborhoods like Brightwood, Petworth, and Anacostia have longer commute times than the overall city average. The Southeast quadrant of the District endures the longest commute times of them all, with Marshall Heights residents traveling almost 40 minutes on average to work each day. The percentage of commuters traveling by bus is also highest in Southeast D.C., where incomes are lowest and there are no Metro stops.³²⁶ These results indicate that low-income people residing within the District must both travel farther to access employment and use less reliable means of transportation to do so.

Map 88: Commute Times, Household Income, and Commuters Traveling by Bus, District of Columbia



Source: Randy Smith, "Commute Times for District Residents Are Linked to Income and Method of Transportation," D.C. Policy Center, March 23, 2017, <https://www.dcpolicycenter.org/publications/commute-times-for-district-residents-are-linked-to-income-and-method-of-transportation/>.

Fairfax County

Unlike individuals residing in other parts of the District's metropolitan region, most Fairfax County residents live and work within the county. Approximately 60 percent of Fairfax County residents commute to work within the county, while only 15 percent commute to the District and 12 percent to Arlington County or Alexandria.³²⁷ Yet, the average commute for Fairfax County residents is 30 minutes, slightly above the national average.³²⁸ Those who live and work within Fairfax County, however, earn lower incomes on average than those traveling out of the county for work. The largest employers in the county are Booz Allen Hamilton, Inova Health System, Freddie Mac, and Lockheed Martin.³²⁹ Commuters have access to public transportation via the Metro, Metrobuses, and local buses.

Unlike for other parts of the region, there are significant data detailing the demographics, incomes, and jobs of Fairfax County residents commuting to the District to work. An estimated 40 percent are employed by the government, and these in-commuters make more money, on average, than those who live and work in the county.³³⁰ These findings strike contrary to the trend for District residents, with low-income residents—not high-income earners—enduring the longest commute times on average.

Loudoun County

Of the 177,432 working residents of Loudoun County, an estimated 70 percent commute out of the county for work each day, traveling primarily to Fairfax County and the District. Only 30 percent of Loudoun County residents both live and work within the county.³³¹ At least some of these individuals are likely working for the county's largest employers: the Loudoun County Public School System, local government, Verizon, Northrop Grumman, and United Airlines.³³² The average commute time for Loudoun County residents is 32 minutes—5 minutes longer than the national average.³³³

Montgomery County

Despite being home to the National Institute of Health, the US Food and Drug Administration, Naval Support Activity Bethesda, Marriott International, Lockheed Martin, and other large employers,³³⁴ more than half of Montgomery County residents commute out of the county for work each day. The average Montgomery County resident travels 33 minutes to work, and more than 3 percent of all employed residents have “super commutes” in excess of 90 minutes. Montgomery County residents spend more time, on average, commuting to work than any other residents of the metropolitan region.

Prince William County

In Prince William County, a larger proportion of residents commute outside the county for work than anywhere else in the District metropolitan region. Only one-quarter of all Prince William County residents work within county lines. Meanwhile, approximately three-quarters of all county residents are commuting out of the county for work, traveling primarily to Fairfax County and the District. Almost half of out-commuters leave for work before 7:00 a.m.³³⁵

Location of Environmental Health Hazards

District of Columbia

In an Environmental Protection Agency assessment of the severity of environmental pollution in the United States, the District of Columbia ranks 576 out of 2,357 metropolitan areas.³³⁶ A study by the D.C. Policy Center found that Wards 4, 5, and 6 are disproportionately exposed to chemicals in the soil, air, and water from sources other than daily activity. Sources of such exposure include soil contamination from leaking underground storage tanks (Ward 4 has the largest number of active tanks, with 36; it is followed by Wards 4 and 6, with 17 each), brownfields, and superfund sites. Air pollution is also a major concern; Ward 1 has the highest concentration of ozone, largely driven by vehicle exhaust, and Ward 7 has the highest levels of particulate matter. Water pollution is a further concern; Ward 6 and the southeastern portion of the District are particularly exposed to sewer overflows. In general, the Northeast and Southeast quadrants are most susceptible to environmental health hazards. These are also the areas where affordable housing is most needed and most prevalent.

Virginia

A March 2021 report by the Environmental Working Group found per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances levels in water samples taken from northern Virginia to be some of the highest in the country. The most severely polluted samples were taken from areas closest to D.C., though Prince William County water also has high levels of the toxins.³³⁷ Northern Virginia is also known for its polluted air—the Environment Virginia Research and Policy Center reported 84 dirty air days in 2016.³³⁸

Maryland

Montgomery County is home to 30 superfund sites. Of these, 10 are active non-NPL (sites not on the national priority list in terms of threatened releases of hazardous substances) and 20 are archived; none are active NPL sites.³³⁹ Gaithersburg ranks in the 90th and 80th percentile, respectively, for residents in close proximity to these sites. Air pollution in Montgomery County occasionally exceeded

the regulatory standard in the 2000s, but this has become rarer in recent years.³⁴⁰ Gaithersburg has several air quality risks that pose hazards to human health. The environmental justice indexes show that Gaithersburg ranks in the highest percentile nationally for concentrations of diesel particulate matter, air toxics linked with cancer, and air toxics linked with respiratory hazards.³⁴¹ The western part of the area also ranks in the 90th percentile for traffic proximity, meaning that nearby residents have more exposure to mobile sources of air pollutants.³⁴²

Location of Proficient Schools and School Assignment Policies

District of Columbia

D.C.'s School Transparency and Reporting Framework has consistently confirmed the existence of deep inequities in school quality in the District.³⁴³ A map in the 2018–2019 school year report shows that Wards 7 and 8, and, to a lesser extent, Ward 6, are more likely to have schools with lower ratings, which denote lower student achievement, student growth, college and career readiness, and graduation rates, as well as poorer school environments characterized by poorer attendance, inconsistent enrollment, and poorer safety and discipline standards.³⁴⁴ These inequalities stem from the historic failure to desegregate D.C. schools and the tendency for wealthier families, especially in Wards 2 and 3, to send their children to private schools.³⁴⁵

Virginia

Northern Virginia is known to have some of the state's highest-performing school districts, and academic achievement in public schools in Arlington County is particularly high.³⁴⁶ However, inequalities continue to pose a challenge in the region. For example, while most high schools in Loudoun County have dropout rates below 1 percent, some schools in Fairfax County have dropout rates well above 15 percent. Similar disparities exist for measures like chronic absenteeism and accreditation rates, as well as for numeric measures of student achievement.

Maryland

Montgomery County Public Schools are among the most well-resourced and highest-achieving schools in Maryland. However, MCPS continues to fall short of some targets. In particular, academic achievement of Black students, Hispanic students, students with disabilities, and English learners continues to be inadequate. Though the school district continues to improve in its provisions, these improvements have not extended to all demographics of students; in particular, Hispanic and English-learner students have not seen improvements in academic achievement or graduation rates in the past several years.³⁴⁷

Loss of Affordable Housing

Region

The loss of affordable housing in the region contributes to segregation and the creation of R/ECAPS throughout the metropolitan area.

Broadly, constrained housing supply and the explosive growth of the region have contributed significantly to the loss of affordable housing in the area. These affordable housing losses are primarily concentrated in the District, Alexandria, and Arlington County, which, at one time, were home to a sizable population of affordable housing units. Alexandria, in particular, has eliminated almost 90 percent of the city's affordable housing stock in just two decades. Almost every local government in the District of Columbia metropolitan region has coordinated efforts to expand affordable housing in their area, though many will not create the number of housing units needed to make up for the market's substantial losses.

Alexandria

Wage stagnation, gentrification, and the growing popularity of the city itself have driven up Alexandria's housing prices and created a crisis for those who rely upon affordable housing. The latest ACS approximates that 14,500 renter households earning less than \$75,000 are burdened by Alexandria's housing costs and unable to properly invest in other necessities. The situation is even more dire for the city's 6,600 renter households earning less than \$50,000, who spend 50 percent or more of their monthly earnings on housing-related costs.³⁴⁸

These burdens are at least partly attributable to the loss of affordable housing in Alexandria. Between 2000 and 2017, the City of Alexandria lost 90 percent of its affordable housing. Alexandria, which once offered more than 18,000 units of affordable housing, now has only 1,749. These affordable units are unsubsidized, privately owned units that cater to low-income renter households. Few of these units, however, can accommodate larger families who earn 60 percent of AMI or less. Two-thirds of the affordable units in the city are studio or single-bedroom units, 27 percent are two-bedroom units, and just 7 percent are three-bedroom units,³⁴⁹ meaning that some Alexandria residents must crowd their families into the first affordable housing unit that becomes available.

In May 2021, the City of Alexandria announced a plan to build 480 affordable units in the next three years on the site of the old Safeway on West Glebe Road.³⁵⁰ One-quarter of these units are to be deemed "deeply affordable" and set aside for families making 40 percent of AMI.³⁵¹ While these housing units will likely ease the housing burden of at least some low-income Alexandria residents, they will be unable to make up for the significant loss of affordable housing units over the past two decades.

Arlington County

In Arlington, the loss of affordable housing has been spurred by the increasing popularity of the city, which has driven up the cost of living and, consequently, the cost of housing as well. Only 9,500 apartments for rent are affordable to the approximately 17,000 renter households with incomes below 60 percent of AMI. Older apartments and homes that were at one time affordable to those with incomes below 60 percent of AMI have been renovated or replaced, with these improved units boasting higher rents than the original ones.³⁵² From 2000 to 2013, Arlington County lost 13,500 affordable housing units, many of which were naturally occurring market-affordable housing units.³⁵³

Because of the continual loss of naturally occurring market-affordable housing units, Arlington's affordable housing program has announced that it is focusing on both preserving and increasing the number of committed affordable rental units. By 2040, Arlington County aims for 17.7 percent of the county's housing stock to be affordable to residents with incomes at or below 60 percent of AMI. They have not given up on naturally occurring affordable housing, however, and have committed to preserving 60–80 percent of the current naturally occurring affordable housing stock as well.³⁵⁴

District of Columbia

In the District, declining housing construction, rising demand, and market pressures have all spurred the loss of the city's affordable housing units. In fact, the District now has half as many affordable units as it reported in 2002. Adjusted for inflation, the number of District apartments with rents under \$800 fell from almost 60,000 in 2002 to 33,000 in 2013.³⁵⁵ Meanwhile, the number of properties for rent between \$1,300 and \$2,500 has skyrocketed, making subsidized housing effectively the only source of affordable housing in the city.³⁵⁶ Among residents earning 30–50 percent of AMI, 31 percent are considered severely burdened by housing costs.³⁵⁷

In May 2019, D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser signed the Housing Framework for Equity and Growth, which called upon local agencies to create and preserve affordable housing units in the city. District agencies

are tasked with creating an additional 36,000 housing units, with at least 12,000 units designated as affordable housing for low-income residents. The District hopes to preserve at least 6,000 existing affordable housing units by funding the maintenance, inspection, and repair of old units, allowing vulnerable populations to “age in place.”³⁵⁸

Fairfax County

While it is unclear whether Fairfax County has lost affordable housing units in recent years, there is—at the least—a need for *more* affordable housing in the area. In Fairfax County, one in five renters spends more than half of their monthly earnings on housing costs.³⁵⁹

In an attempt to subsidize affordable housing units in Fairfax County, in 2019, county lawmakers announced their commitment to produce and preserve affordable housing. The county has adopted the goal of constructing a minimum of 5,000 new rental homes over the next 15 years for residents earning 60 percent of AMI or less. To preserve existing affordable housing units, the county has partnered with private and public entities to create “committed affordable homes” required to keep rent affordable for a specific period of time. Today, most of the county’s committed affordable homes for residents earning 60 percent of AMI or less are within the Parkwood, Murraysgate, Landing I, and Landing II housing projects. There are 628 units, with 640 more “in the pipeline” to be created at the Little River Glen, Lake Anne House, One University, and Stonegate Village housing projects.³⁶⁰

Loudoun County

Unfortunately, there are not sufficient data documenting either the loss or the growth of Loudoun County affordable housing units over time. Nevertheless, the need for more affordable housing units in the area is evident. In 2017, approximately 81 percent of Loudoun County households earning 30–50 percent of AMI reported being cost burdened and approximately 39 percent reported being severely cost burdened.³⁶¹ The county additionally reports that, of the 168 LIHTC units affordable to households earning 60 percent of AMI, none are expected to be income restricted after 2028.³⁶²

In June 2021, the Loudoun County Board of Directors announced that they had adopted the Unmet Housing Needs Strategic Plan, intended to help the county and its partners improve housing access, quality, and affordability for all families in the area. By 2040, the county aims to construct 16,000 new housing units, of which 20 percent—or 8,200 units—are to be designated affordable housing for those who make at or below 100 percent of AMI.³⁶³

Montgomery County

In Montgomery County, there is a large gap between the demand for and the availability of housing units for those making below 100 percent of AMI. While an estimated 25,081 units are available to Montgomery County households that earn less than 50 percent of AMI, 49,675 are needed, resulting in an affordability gap of 24,594 units.³⁶⁴ This affordability gap shows no signs of shrinking, as the rise of Montgomery County’s median gross rent continues to outpace the growth of the area’s median income.³⁶⁵ The 2020 Montgomery County Housing Needs Assessment pointed to “significant pricing pressure” as a leading cause for the loss of affordable housing in several of its jurisdictions, including Gaithersburg, which experienced a net loss of 246 units of affordable housing from 2010 to 2018.³⁶⁶

Since county officials set out to preserve deed-restricted housing units in 2000, Montgomery County has created deed-restricted housing units at a faster rate than it has lost them. Unfortunately, however, the same cannot be said for the county’s naturally occurring affordable housing units, which account for 80 percent of all affordable housing units in the area. In two decades, Montgomery County has lost more than 19,000 naturally occurring affordable housing units. Current projections estimate that the county is slated to lose an additional 7,000–11,000 more units by 2030. If these estimates are

accurate, then the county will have fewer than 20,000 naturally occurring affordable housing units in less than 10 years.³⁶⁷

Like Fairfax County, Montgomery County has committed to ensuring that there is no net loss of affordable housing units in the coming years. In 2019, county lawmakers announced that they intended to add 41,000 new housing units by 2030, with most affordable to low- and medium-income residents.³⁶⁸ Montgomery County has also begun to incentivize housing developers to build naturally occurring independent housing units. The county will exempt developers from paying development impact taxes, for instance, if they construct a new housing complex and designate at least one-fourth of these new units as affordable housing.³⁶⁹ To prevent net loss of affordable housing units, local lawmakers have also passed initiatives aimed at preserving existing affordable housing units. Among these initiatives are the requirement that all rental units undergo annual inspections and the adoption of stricter penalties for housing code violations. The county also allows tenants and municipalities to purchase properties before landlords offer them to outside buyers. Currently, Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, and the District are the only jurisdictions in the country that allow such a practice, and it has shown significant success in preventing the loss of additional affordable housing units in these areas.³⁷⁰

Prince William County

There are insufficient data regarding the amount of affordable housing in Prince William County over time. Nevertheless, the severe lack of affordable housing in the area is evident. An estimated 51,938 households in the county, about one-third of the total, have one or more housing problems, which include affordability, lack of complete kitchen or plumbing facilities, and overcrowding. About 1 in 5 households (19 percent) has a cost burden and 13 percent has a severe cost burden. These shares were higher for renter households, with 27 percent being cost burdened and 23 percent severely cost burdened. In fact, Prince William County's affordable housing market is so overwhelmed that the county's HCV program is currently closed because of the sheer number of residents on the waiting list.³⁷¹

There is no local funding source to incentivize the construction of affordable housing units in Prince William County, and the county currently has no plan to do so. The Prince William County Planning Commission proposed a series of affordable housing policies in July 2021, though county officials have yet to decide the best path forward. In May 2021, however, the Prince William County Board voted five to three to approve an affordable housing development in the county's Rural Crescent.³⁷²

Occupancy Codes and Restrictions

All municipalities in the D.C. metropolitan region use International Code Council standards as the foundation for their construction codes and International Building Codes as the foundation for their building codes. How the region's municipalities and counties define *family* varies, but none of the definitions are so restrictive that they negatively affect access to housing.

Loudoun County, Prince William County, Arlington County, and Alexandria all have similar definitions of family as including any number of people "related by blood or marriage together with any number of natural, foster, step, or adopted children." However, the jurisdictions sometimes differ from one another with regard to how many unrelated individuals can live together to constitute a family. Arlington County, Alexandria, and Loudoun County all cap the number of unrelated individuals living together to four, or two unrelated adults plus their children.³⁷³ Prince William County's zoning ordinance caps a family at three unrelated individuals, or two unrelated adults plus their children.³⁷⁴ Though each of these counties and municipalities should increase the cap of unrelated individuals

that can live together in a household, this is especially true for Prince William County, which has the lowest number of allowed unrelated persons in a household of the entire metropolitan region.

Both the District and Montgomery County use the term *household* instead of *family* in their zoning ordinances. The District's definition of household is the broadest in the metropolitan region. Not only is a household defined as "any number of people related by blood, marriage, adoption, or guardianship," but it considers six unrelated people and "two unrelated people and any children, parents, siblings, or other persons related to either of them by blood, adoption, or guardianship" to be a household as well.³⁷⁵ Montgomery County's definition of a household is identical to the District's, though the ordinance caps the number of unrelated people living in a particular place at five individuals instead of six.³⁷⁶

Private Discrimination

District of Columbia

The D.C. Office of Human Rights has not released a detailed annual report since 2018. That report described continued increases in cases filed regarding fair housing and public accommodations (53 and 57 cases, respectively, as opposed to 42 and 47 the previous year).³⁷⁷ Of the fair housing cases, 22 cited source-of-income discrimination, 16 cited discrimination based on disability status, and 4 cited race discrimination. The public accommodation cases included 14 cases of sex discrimination, 13 cases of discrimination based on disability status, and 9 cases of race discrimination. The report does not specify how many cases within these categories were mediated or settled.

Virginia

Fairfax County Human Rights Commission's annual report from FY 2019–2020 states that in 2018, 20 fair housing cases were filed involving the county.³⁷⁸ In 2019, this number was 22; in 2020, it increased to 35, or one-third of the total cases filed (105). Of the 2020 cases, 24 involved disability-related discrimination (the most significant factor), followed by race (11 cases), national origin (5 cases), and sex (4 cases). Twenty cases were resolved in 2020, though it is unclear if these cases were also filed in 2020. Fairfax County and Prince William County have also seen several private discrimination lawsuits in recent years, including one alleging discrimination based on family structure and another alleging discrimination based on disability.

Maryland

After D.C., Montgomery County has seen the largest number of private discrimination lawsuits of any jurisdiction in the county between 2020 and 2022. These suits include allegations of discrimination based on age, source of income, and disability and involve several property management companies that operate in Montgomery County and elsewhere in the region. It appears that private discrimination by management companies, private landlords, and community members, such as neighbors, continues to contribute significantly to impediments to fair housing in the region.

Quality of Affordable Housing Information Program

District of Columbia

The Department of Housing and Community Development helps support community-based nonprofit organizations that provide housing counseling services and training to potential homeowners, current homeowners, and tenants, focusing on low- to moderate-income residents and neighborhoods.³⁷⁹ Services are provided to assist tenants in understanding their rights and responsibilities, including issues such as potential displacement, rental/eviction counseling, and apartment locating. Though all of these organizations are based in the District, some serve the greater Washington, D.C., region as a whole. However, only a few of these organizations are specifically dedicated to housing issues and the

provision of mobility counseling. Others are more general economic empowerment and economic development organizations. HUD maintains a separate but overlapping list of HUD-approved housing counseling agencies in the District that have similar characteristics.³⁸⁰ More specifically designated general-eligibility mobility counseling in the District is needed.

Virginia

HUD maintains a list of HUD-approved housing counseling agencies in Virginia.³⁸¹ Only a handful are based in northern Virginia, and most of those agencies serve prospective homebuyers rather than tenants, suggesting a serious lack of support for low-income communities and residents. Virginia Housing, for example, offers a free class for those purchasing a house for the first time.³⁸² Three counseling agencies are located in the District metropolitan region and provide rental counseling: Money Management International in Alexandria and Northern Virginia Family Service and Cornerstones in Fairfax County.³⁸³ Considering the significant number of residents who need renter-oriented affordable housing information programs, simply not enough programs are available to keep up with the demand rising throughout northern Virginia.

Maryland

HUD's list of HUD-approved housing counseling agencies in Maryland includes four organizations based in Montgomery County, most of which provide rental housing counseling.³⁸⁴ However, there is a clear gap between supply and demand for such counseling services, given the large population of Montgomery County and the small number of existing agencies. The county government does not appear to run or support mobility counseling programs, further exacerbating this gap. Housing counseling agencies that offer assistance to both renters and potential homeowners include the Housing Initiative Partnership; HomeFree-USA of the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area; Greater Washington Urban League; and Centro de Apoyo Familiar.³⁸⁵


Regulatory Barriers to Providing Housing and Supportive Services for Persons with Disabilities

Regulatory barriers are not a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues for persons with disabilities in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan region. There are no specific examples of regulations that make the provision of supportive services difficult. Some policies have been implemented to support housing for persons with disabilities. For example, Fairfax³⁸⁶ and Arlington³⁸⁷ Counties require property owners who desire to convert a building from multifamily rental housing to a condominium or cooperative to allow tenants with disabilities a three-year extension on their leases. Moreover, both Maryland and Virginia expanded the scope of protected classes beyond those recognized in federal law to include the prohibition of source-of-income discrimination, and issued directives to prevent blanket bans on individuals based on their criminal records.

Siting Selection Policies, Practices, and Decisions for Publicly Supported Housing

Siting selection policies, practices, and decisions for publicly supported housing, including discretionary aspects of QAPs and other programs, are significant contributing factors to the segregation of public housing units. Throughout the greater Washington, D.C., metropolitan region, affordable housing units are located primarily in low- and middle-income areas. For instance, while 15 percent of the total affordable housing units in the District are in 6E (Shaw) and 8E (Congress Heights, etc.), there are no income-restricted housing units in the upper-income, predominantly White 2D (Kalorama), 2E (Georgetown/Burleith), 3C (Woodley Park/Cleveland Park), and 3D (Spring Valley/AU Park) neighborhoods.³⁸⁸ The low-income, minority-majority neighborhoods in which affordable housing is predominantly located are often far from transit, contributing to disproportionately long commutes and high transportation costs for the neighborhood's residents.³⁸⁹


Map 89: Income-Restricted Affordable Housing by Advisory Neighborhood Commission, 2018



Source: D.C. Office of Planning—State Data Center, “District of Columbia, Income-Restricted Affordable Housing by ANC, 2018,” updated November 23, 2022, <https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/travis.pate/viz/DistrictofColumbiaIncome-RestrictedAffordableHousingbyANC/AffordableHousingANC>.

Nevertheless, the area’s site-selection policies have shown improvement, especially by ensuring that more affordable housing units are located near transit. Arlington County has been particularly successful in this regard. Since 2000, 75 percent of all new residential units built in Arlington County were within the Rosslyn-Ballston and Jefferson Davis Metro corridors and only 6 percent were single-family detached homes or townhouses.³⁹⁰ Additionally, the COG has emphasized the need to build affordable housing units near public transit in the region as a whole. The Regional Housing Initiative, which COG passed in 2019, calls for at least 75 percent of the proposed 320,000 affordable housing units to be located in activity centers or near high-capacity transit. (High-capacity transit areas anticipated in the region by 2030 are shown in Map 90.)³⁹¹ These efforts, combined with D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser’s initiative to create 12,000 affordable units dispersed throughout all eight wards,³⁹² represent positive steps to making the region’s site-selection policies more equitable. However, until every part of the metropolitan area prioritizes the location of affordable housing in neighborhoods with ample access to transit and opportunity, these efforts will likely fall short of achieving their intended effect.

Map 90: High Capacity Transit Station Areas, Region



Source: Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, “High Capacity Transit Station Areas (HCTs),” updated October 13, 2021, <https://www.mwcog.org/maps/map-listing/high-capacity-transit-station-areas-hcts/>.

As for other programs, however, only the District offers housing construction incentives by way of a QAP. Presently, the District’s Department of Housing and Community Development offers new construction and rehabilitation projects a 9 percent fixed tax credit if they were placed in service after July 30, 2008, and a 4 percent fixed tax credit if they are financed with tax-exempt bonds under Internal Revenue Code Section 103 or involve the acquisition of existing buildings. Developers can earn a boost of up to 30 percent if their project is located in an area with residents earning 60 percent of AMI or that has a poverty rate of at least 25 percent.³⁹³ As noted previously, however, neither Virginia nor Maryland incentivizes developers with financial credits laid out in QAPs.

Source-of-Income Discrimination

The District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia all have statutes prohibiting source-of-income discrimination.³⁹⁴ Montgomery County also has local laws prohibiting source-of-income discrimination, while Virginia provides statewide incentives (in the form of tax credits) to promote acceptance of HCVs.

Nonetheless, source-of-income discrimination remains a significant problem in the metropolitan Washington region, as demonstrated by several recent lawsuits. For example, *Lundregan v. Housing Opportunities Commission*, a 2020 case brought before the US District Court of Maryland, alleged that the Montgomery County Housing Opportunities Commission, a government-supported affordable housing agency, housing finance agency, and housing developer, discriminated against the plaintiff because she uses housing vouchers. Similarly, in 2021, the ERC and a local renter filed a suit in the US District Court for the District of Columbia against Vaughan Place Apartments for the latter’s refusal to accept housing vouchers as a source of income to pay rent.³⁹⁵ Many other cases have alleged discriminatory acts by landlords, property management companies, and government agencies against tenants who use housing vouchers, even if such discrimination may not be solely or primarily attributable to the housing vouchers. Such cases reveal the continued prevalence of source-of-income discrimination in the metropolitan Washington region despite its de facto illegality.

State or Local Laws, Policies, or Practices That Discourage Individuals with Disabilities from Living in Apartments, Family Homes, Supportive Housing, and Other Integrated Settings

State or local laws, policies, or practices that discourage individuals with disabilities from living in apartments, family homes, supportive housing, shared housing, and other integrated settings are a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues for persons with disabilities.

The D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977 explicitly protects individuals with disabilities from experiencing housing discrimination,³⁹⁶ yet individuals with disabilities continue to face housing obstacles in the District in myriad ways.

The ERC conducted a civil rights investigation in 2019 to capture “the potential barriers that persons with disabilities face when seeking housing both in person and online.” Of the 23 District properties examined, 16 were found to violate the standards set in the Fair Housing Act Design Manual, and 51 violations were reported in total. Violations included inaccessible public and common use areas (25), unusable kitchens and bathrooms (19), inaccessible entrances on accessible routes (4), unusable doors (1), inaccessible routes into and through covered units (1), and unreinforced walls in bathrooms for later installation of grab bars (1).

An ERC analysis of property websites and online applications also revealed several barriers individuals with disabilities face when attempting to find affordable, accessible housing online. Of the 25 websites examined on a desktop computer, 21 posed accessibility issues to individuals with disabilities. In these instances, mandatory fields involving interactive calendars, combo boxes, and drop-down menus could not be accessed by screen readers, thus making it impossible for visually impaired users to determine how many units were available, filter results, and find other information. Screen readers also could not access 13 of the 16 online renter applications, with the biggest accessibility issues arising from inclusion of CAPTCHA requirements or mandatory fields that screen readers could not understand. As more and more rental properties come to rely on online applications, virtual walkthroughs, and their websites as a whole to find potential renters, it is crucial that these websites are accessible to all individuals with disabilities.³⁹⁷

Though the ERC’s investigation only examined rental properties in the District, similar barriers can no doubt be found at properties across the region. To date, the District, Virginia, and Maryland have not passed policies requiring property websites to be accessible to individuals with disabilities. To eliminate the barriers these individuals may face, the region must better ensure that properties follow both ADA and Federal Housing Administration guidelines and build accessible websites for those who need them.

In Maryland, a 21,000-person waiting list for Medicaid waivers that help individuals afford at-home care also discourages individuals with disabilities from living in apartments, family homes, supportive housing, and other integrated settings. This waiting list, among the longest in the country, means that many persons with disabilities will never have the opportunity to receive care that would allow them to continue to reside at home or with family members. If one does get off this waiting list, it often takes years. A family from Towson, Maryland, for instance, received news that their son had gotten off the waiting list nine years after they signed up for the waiver program. The length of the waiting list poses a significant burden to individuals with disabilities, as well as their family members, who often forgo wages to care for their loved ones. Individuals who cannot afford at-home care are thus moved out of their apartments and family homes into retirement homes, often without much choice.³⁹⁸

Unresolved Violations of Fair Housing or Civil Rights Law

Unresolved violations of fair housing law are not a significant contributing factor in the region. In September 2022, the District filed three lawsuits alleging housing discrimination against seven real estate companies and individuals operating in the District.³⁹⁹ In February 2023, D.C. Attorney General Karl Racine announced that a lawsuit was filed against a Virginia-based moving company for rejecting reservations for rental moving boxes from applicants living in Wards 7 and 8. He also announced a settlement with a Maryland home improvement company that refused to operate east of the Anacostia.⁴⁰⁰

Outside the District, the Virginia Office of the Attorney General recently resolved an investigation into Loudoun County Public Schools. The NAACP filed a complaint with the office in 2019, alleging that the school system failed to admit Black students to the school district's advanced STEM program on the basis of race. After concluding the school district's policies and practices do discriminate against Black and Latino students, Loudoun County Public Schools agreed to revise its outreach and recruitment plans and its admissions criteria for the advanced programs. The school system also agreed to revise its nondiscrimination policies, annually review its protocol for handling hate speech, and hire a consultant approved by the Office of Civil Rights.⁴⁰¹

VIII. Public Comments



March 31, 2023

The Honorable Kate Stewart
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 N Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Chair Stewart:

Adherence to fair housing law is a cornerstone of ensuring equitable access for all in the community, and the apartment industry is committed to working with localities and other constituencies across the region to deliver equitable housing access and to reduce and eliminate fair housing violations. The Apartment and Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington (AOBA) supports the regional and local goals in the draft Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan to increase housing attainment and to reverse historical patterns of segregation in our region. We further offer our expertise, drawn from our members' daily work providing housing across the region, to help shape strategies to ensure that they produce the desired outcome of a fairer and more equitable housing market throughout Metropolitan Washington.

As you know, AOBA is the premier non-profit organization representing owners and managers of more than 435,000 apartment units and approximately 169 million square feet of office space in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. Our members play a critical role in building and operating the commercial and residential buildings that will accommodate the economy and workforce of the future. As such, our member companies consider themselves part of the Metropolitan Washington community and maintain a vested stake in the long-term sustainability and well-being of the region and each of the eight jurisdictions in the Regional Fair Housing Plan. Our member companies take pride in providing safe and sanitary, professionally managed homes for their residents, and we look forward to working with the region's governing bodies to achieve our shared goals.

Goals # 1 and 2: Increase the supply of affordable housing for families earning at or below 60% of the Area Median Income and change zoning and land use policies to expand access to fair housing

The region's ability to lower housing costs will be directly tied to its ability to increase the overall supply of housing units. By contrast, policies which restrict housing construction preclude some households from living affordably in the community. AOBA supports applying best practices to increase the supply of housing attainable for lower and moderate-income households and to provide diverse housing options. However, we caution not to overlook potential negative impacts of targeting specific populations and income brackets – e.g., potentially discouraging investment in housing for households with incomes at or below 80% of the area median income (AMI) in an effort to target incomes below 60% AMI. Moreover, we should remain cognizant that even the creation of housing at higher price points benefits lower-income households because the market is interconnected across types, sizes, and costs; constructing any housing reduces competition for otherwise limited supply, lowering prices as a result.

Goal # 3: Implement policies to preserve affordable housing and to prevent displacement of residents

We share the goal of developing and maintaining market rate and committed affordable housing units, but it comes at a cost, which is often borne by the balance of the rental market if restrictions are not accompanied by funding. Financial incentives and flexibility for additional residential densities are ways to deliver affordable units without creating excessive upward pressure on overall market rents. By contrast, indefinite extensions of affordability commitments, requirements to replace market-rate affordable units, or a right of first refusal for tenant purchases could inhibit the delivery of this much-needed affordable housing by increasing the cost and uncertainty of providing these units.



1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 1005 Washington, DC 20036
p: 202.296.3390 f: 202.296.3399
www.aoba-metro.org



Goal # 5: Protect the housing rights of individuals who are part of protected groups

Rental assistance programs with local or state funding and modeled after the federal housing choice voucher program with expanded eligibility, flexibility, and increased efficiencies could assist residents who are chronically rent-burdened, without passing costs onto housing providers or other tenants. A means-test and housing sustainability measurement could assess the needs of the applicant and what housing can be made available with the programs awarding a supplementary payment to bridge the gap between 30% of an applicant's pre-tax income and their periodic rent. Such programs could be scaled to assist the desired number of potential voucher recipients across the region.

Tenant screening reports provide housing providers solely with a recommendation regarding the tenant based on the criteria provided (*i.e.*, tenant qualified to rent, tenant does not qualify to rent). These reports specifically exclude personal information to remove subjectivity from such determinations and eliminate the prospect for fair housing violations or discriminatory actions. Restricting housing providers from charging fees to applicants precludes providers from being reimbursed for staff time and expenses, such as fees charged by screening agencies, related to processing the application. Such restrictions could raise barriers to housing and drive up rents by passing these costs onto other tenants.

Conceptually, AOBA does not oppose right to counsel programs to ensure legal representation for tenants in landlord-tenant proceedings. However, it is important that the cost for tenants' counsel not be passed to the housing provider, as property managers have only one source of income: the rental payments from their tenants. As such, a "landlord-paid" counsel would become a cost for other tenants, raising the cost of housing, and diluting the impact to assist tenants. By contrast, providing funding from the state or local general fund would provide the service without raising the cost of housing for residents who can least afford the extra burden. Additionally, care should be taken that such programs do not result in an extension of the court process, as delays can have the effect of digging a deeper financial hole for the very tenants they are intended to assist.

Each jurisdiction and the region as a whole have made progress toward achieving a more equitable housing market, as noted in the draft Regional Fair Housing Plan. We celebrate these successes and look to build on them in pursuing the regional and local goals and priorities. We look forward to collaborating to expand housing access and to reduce and ultimately to eliminate fair housing violations across our region. We hope that the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and each of its participating localities will look to us as partners as you move forward to finalize and then to implement the Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan.


Sincerely,



Katalin Peter, Esq.
Vice President of Government Affairs,
District of Columbia-Residential
Apartment and Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington (AOBA)



Brian Anleu
Vice President of Government Affairs,
Maryland




Scott E. Pedowitz
Director of Government Affairs,
Virginia

cc: Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments Board of Directors; Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments Executive Director Clark Mercer; Alexandria City Council; Arlington County Board; District of Columbia Council; Fairfax County Board of Supervisors; Gaithersburg City Council; Loudoun County Board of Supervisors; Montgomery County Council; Prince William Board of County Supervisors



1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 1005 Washington, DC 20036
p: 202.296.3390 f: 202.296.3399
www.aoba-metro.org





Alliance for Regional Cooperation

"Keeping it Regional"

Metro Washington COG,
Fair Housing Plan participating governments and
Community Advisory Committee;
fairhousing@mwcog.org
31 March 2023

Distinguished Metropolitan Leaders & Housing Advocates,

Jim Schulman, Exec. Director
631 E St. NE, WDC 20002
jschulman@ARCdmv.org
www.ARCdmv.org

Board of Directors
(affiliations listed for identification purposes only)
Bicky Corman, President
Bicky Corman Law
Devin Deaton, Vice-Pres.
Aspen Institute
Karen Onthank, Sec'y/Treas.
Integrative Strategies Forum
B.A. Cockburn
Community Purchasing Alliance
Susanna Lowen
Climate Action Coffee
Rodney North
Independent Co-op Consultants
Janine Finnell
Leaders in Energy
Jim Drexler, Chair
Leaders in DMV

Advisory Board
(affiliations listed for identification purposes only)
Raj Aggarwal, ProvoC
Jeffrey Barber, ISF
Mencer@Dan@Edwards, J&S Assoc.
Jim Epstein, Blue Ridge Produce
Alan Feinberg, FeinDesign
David Feldman, Virtue Matters
Miriam Gennari, MetroMakover LLC
Jessica Graham, JG Global Advisory
Samuel Jordan, BTEC
Larry Martin, Grid 2.0, LLC
Vernon Oakes, Everything Co.op
Gaby Seltzer, DC Central Kitchen
Stella Tarnay, Capital Nature
Steven Shaff, Com. Vision Partners
Michael Shuman, Neigh. Assoc. Corp.
Eddie Tuvin, FSC First
Peter Whitehead, SMC Concrete

My name is Jim Schulman & The Alliance for Regional Cooperation (ARC), which I lead is a non-profit organization focused on sustainable regional economic development. I am also an Architect.

ARC promotes self-reliant approaches to metropolitan planning and development, addressing the region's ability to meet residents' basic needs for food, shelter, clothing, education, health care, water, and energy. These are human needs that can best be met through governmental policies that stress equity and regional self-reliance so that residents can become more self-sufficient & competitive in the global economy. Housing is widely acknowledged to be a regional policy issue that heavily impacts other sectors.

ARC is not opposed to the greater provision of a variety of housing types, mixed-use or mixed-income neighborhoods, the adoption of alternatives to auto-dominated land-uses nor housing equity policies that will actually serve those with great financial need. **We strongly agree with comments Suzanne Smith Sundburg from Arlington has submitted critiquing the draft report.**

Washington Metro area jurisdictions appear to be missing opportunities to improve the affordability of housing by:

- **fostering partial equity housing cooperatives as are common in DC, NYC, and Madison, WI**
- **establishing Community Housing Land Trusts**
- **reforming property appraisal methodology so that it does not continue to favor and encourage the unnecessary inflation of land values - which currently discriminates against people of color**

Many area governments also appear to be missing opportunities to:

- **incentivize the conversion of vacant luxury housing and vacant commercial property into affordable housing**
- **establish a program of reparations via housing policy, featuring down-payment assistance to former priced-out residents as Rochester, NY and Evanston, IL are piloting**

We thank you for this opportunity to share our concerns.

Sincerely,

ARC, Executive Director

ENDependence Center of Northern Virginia (ECNV)

Comments on

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) Regional Fair Housing Plan

The ENDependence Center of Northern Virginia (ECNV) thanks the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Regional Fair Housing Plan prior to its submission to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). ECVN applauds the MWCOC for its leadership in facilitating the first collaborative regional effort on fair housing in more than 25 years. Based on our review of the Plan, and comments we heard during recent listening sessions held in the Northern Virginia community, we offer our comments for your consideration.

About ECVN

ECNV is a community resource center run by and for people with disabilities who live and work in the Virginia Suburbs of Washington, D.C. Our service area includes Arlington, Fairfax and Loudoun Counties and the Independent Cities of Alexandria, Fairfax and Falls Church. For more than 40 years, ECVN has provided peer-based, self-help services to people of all ages who have all types of disabilities. Our core services include peer counseling and support, independent living skills training, information about programs and services that promote community living and prevent institutionalization, and individual and systems advocacy aimed at ensuring that the community is accessible and citizens with disabilities can fully participate in all aspects of society.

One primary focus of our advocacy and public education efforts has been housing. As individuals with disabilities ourselves, we know firsthand how important finding accessible, affordable and integrated housing is to being able to live, work, and fully participate in community life without fear of being forced into nursing homes or other institutions, isolated and segregated with every aspect of one's daily existence regulated by others, including when you get out of bed, when and what you eat, what you do with your time, who can visit you, and when you retire to bed for the night.

We are part of a network of more than 500 centers for independent living (CILs) in the United States, and among 17 such centers in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Among our colleagues in the Metropolitan Washington Region are the District of Columbia Center for Independent Living (DCCIL) and Independence NOW which serves Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland. Together with our colleagues nationwide we worked for the enactment of disability rights protections, including the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Fair Housing Act Amendments of 1988.

In June 1999, we heralded the U.S. Supreme Court Olmstead Decision. In that Decision, the Court, in applying the Most Integrated Setting provision of the ADA, said that people with disabilities have the right to choose to live and receive services in the most integrated setting and not be forced into nursing homes and other institutional placement. One of the key ingredients to be able to exercise one's ADA and Olmstead rights is 1) protection from discrimination on the basis of disability and 2) the availability of affordable, accessible and integrated housing in the community.

Consequently, we work diligently to help people with disabilities to secure housing that meets their needs, and we educate them about their rights to live in integrated settings in the community without facing prejudice or discrimination due to having a disability.

COMMENTS ON DRAFT PLAN

The Draft MWCOG Regional Fair Housing Plan was/is an ambitious and comprehensive analysis of challenges and efforts to address impediments to advancing fair housing undertaken by eight (8) local jurisdictions that receive federal funds to assist them with increasing the stock of affordable housing options in the Metropolitan Washington Region and addressing barriers to fair housing that include systemic racism and discrimination based on race, national origin, ethnicity, disability, marital and familial status, and other factors.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The Plan's Executive Summary describes the collaborative efforts undertaken by the 8 localities with overall coordination by MWCOG staff and consultants to provide for a regional analysis of the impediments to fair housing. The regional assessment presents demographic information that documents the increase in population from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, many of whom are not native English speakers and have limited English proficiency. It also includes information on the prevalence of individuals with disabilities residing in the region.

According to the Draft Plan, 9% of area residents are persons with disabilities. This data appears to come from the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS has been the traditional source of information about the prevalence of disabilities used by most jurisdictions when preparing their Five Year Consolidated Plans. According to the Draft Fair Housing Plan, 9% of the region's population are persons with disabilities.

Our concern is that the ACS is a random sampling of a limited number of people with disabilities from which the Census Bureau derives an estimate of the percentage of the population that has disabilities. Data about other population groups is taken directly from the decennial Census and is clearly a more accurate count. Unfortunately, there is no question on the Census about whether there are persons with disabilities in a household and what types of disabilities they have.

Thus, given our familiarity with the disability community in the Metropolitan Washington Region, we believe that the prevalence of individuals who have disabilities is far higher than that cited in the Draft Plan. Many federal government and national disability advocacy groups estimate the prevalence of disability in the U.S. population at 20% to 25% of the total population. According to the American Association of People with Disabilities the number of individuals with disabilities in the United States is 56 million.

It should be noted that ACS and CHAS data used to prepare Consolidated Plans segregates data on the number of persons with disabilities from data about the number of seniors in the population despite the fact that many seniors have physical, sensory and cognitive disabilities.

It should also be noted that the definitions used to document the types of various disabilities in the community are inconsistent and appear to be based on subjective assessments of whether the people being surveyed have functional limitations in performing certain tasks, such as seeing, hearing,

independent living or transportation, which can result in inaccurate or duplicative or overlapping counts. Consequently, given the lack of a definitive source of data on the prevalence of disability, we would recommend an analysis of data on disability from a variety of sources.

Additionally, many people with disabilities migrate to the Washington Metropolitan Area from other parts of the country seeking educational and job opportunities here. They also come because, as a major metropolitan area our region has more community amenities which are accessible than most communities. Consequently, we are convinced that the prevalence of disability in this metropolitan area is likely to be higher than documented in the Draft Plan. We fear that the amount of resources allocated to address the housing needs of people with disabilities may be unfairly limited due to an undercount. We are also concerned that it is possible that the needs of persons with disabilities from other marginalized populations, especially immigrants, are not well documented.

HOUSING PROBLEMS AND LACK OF ACCESSIBLE UNITS

The Draft Plan looks at the lack of accessible housing in the Region. It cites the requirement of the Fair Housing Act as well as Section 504 requirement that apply to federal assisted housing. However, it does not clearly explain the limits of these requirement to produce a significant number of fully accessible housing units.

For example, FHAA requirements apply to all newly constructed, multi-family residential units built since 1991. However, the accessibility standards for residential units as opposed to common areas are fairly minimal, dealing with elements in the built environment such as door and hallway widths and height of environmental controls. Bathroom must include loadbearing walls to accommodate the installation of grab bars and bathroom and kitchen cabinets must be able to be modified so that a person with a disability using a wheelchair can roll under them and use them.

However, the analysis does not address some of the limitations of the Fair Housing Act requirements. For example, although all units in elevators buildings must comply with the Accessibility Standards of the FHAA, only ground floor units must comply in garden style developments. The impact is that the potential number of new developments with units that are covered by the FHAA is significantly reduced. Furthermore, a individual with a significant physical disability who needs accessibility features beyond to FHAA requirements will face the potential of having to pay to make accessibility modifications. This can present an extra financial burden on a renter with a disability that goes beyond the burden that other low- and extremely low income renters face due to rising rent costs.

The Section 504 accessibility standards, i.e., the federal Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) apply to federally assisted housing units, such as those constructed with CDBG or HOME funds. These units meet the standards for fully accessible units that provide for maximum independence for individuals with disabilities. However, the number of these units is extremely limited and once they are occupied their occupants tend to remain in them for years. We feel that it is important to document the limitations and restrictions that negatively impact the availability of accessible and usable units to meet the housing needs of persons with disabilities.

The Draft Plan also mentions that localities are using Low Income Housing Tax Credits to finance new affordable housing. However, the plan says that these units only have to meet minimum accessibility requirements. This may be true when using non-competitive 4% tax credits, but in Virginia, developers

seeking 9% tax credits are required to make at least 10% of the units fully accessible (Type A) units. This presents an opportunity to increase the number of fully accessible units, and it has been used by Northern Virginia jurisdictions, in part, as an incentive to building more accessible units. We believe that the analysis in the Draft Plan is deficient since it is not sharing information about this type of solution to the lack of accessible housing in our communities.

We also note that the analysis does not mention that most state building codes have some requirement with respect to the percentage of newly constructed units that are Type A fully accessible in any new residential project. This percentage is 2% of the total number of units in Virginia. The problem is that the percentage is so low that it is not adequate to address the demand. However, in our opinion, not pointing this out does not adequately educate the elected officials reading the Plan about a potential long term solution to the problem of the lack of accessible housing. A policy change advocating an increase in the state building code to require 10% of all newly constructed residential units to be accessible Type A units could over time bring the number of accessible units closer to meeting the need.

Furthermore, it would begin to increase the number of units that a person with a disability could occupy using a housing choice, Mainstream or other housing voucher. Similarly, it will help to increase the stock of housing available to seniors who want to age in place in the community.

ADDRESSING SEGREGATION OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

We are concerned that the regional analysis specifically calls out the Olmstead Decision, but it appears to imply that that Decision only applies to people with intellectual, developmental or mental health disabilities. Many people with physical and sensory disabilities, including seniors are trapped in nursing homes due to the lack of fully accessible housing as well as personal assistance services and other long term supports and services. The Olmstead Decision obligates ADA Title II entities, including local governments to ensure the rights of all people with disabilities to live in the community.

Regional Goals and Objectives

Finally, we would like you to consider changing the wording of the objective under the Goal of addressing the needs of persons with disabilities to ask localities to increase the percentage of multi-family units in new construction to 10% of the total number of units to remove the reference to public funded units only. If that wording is used it will severely limit the number of units that could be added to the stock of accessible housing.

In summary, we great appreciate the collaborative efforts, time and energy that went into this Regional Plan and look forward to its successful implementation. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Respectfully Submitted,

Doris M. Ray



The Equal Rights Center (ERC) is a civil rights organization that identifies and seeks to eliminate unlawful and unfair discrimination in housing, employment, and public accommodations in its home community of Greater Washington, D.C. and nationwide. For many years, the ERC has conducted intakes with individuals in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan region who believe they may have experienced housing discrimination, investigated individual claims and systemic forms of housing discrimination, pursued enforcement of the Fair Housing Act and state and local fair housing laws as needed, and conducted education and outreach about fair housing protections and requirements. We were also honored to serve on the community advisory committee as part of the regional analysis of impediments effort. We have reviewed the draft Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan and appreciate the opportunity to offer the following comments to be taken into consideration in the crafting of the final regional fair housing plan.

Overall, we appreciate the novel regional approach taken for this fair housing plan, which MWCOG and participating jurisdictions were not required to undertake, and which we understand likely demanded additional resources compared to if individual jurisdictions in the region had proceed independently. We hope the regional approach serves as a national model for other metropolitan regions. Previous fair housing plans in the region have been individually prepared by local jurisdictions, for example by the District of Columbia or Fairfax County, which can make it challenging to identify the broader regional trends and solutions necessary to address a regional housing market. The ERC commends the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) and the participating local jurisdictions for this more collaborative approach.¹

We also appreciate the coalition’s effort to engage the community in crafting the plan. It is crucial that the area’s residents – especially members of groups that have historically been devalued and left out of planning and decision-making processes – have a say in shaping the region’s fair housing priorities.

Of course, no effort that is simultaneously so expansive but also detailed in nature can be perfect, but we remain invested in ensuring that the final plan is as good as it possibly can be. In that spirit, we offer the following comments, concerns, and suggestions, targeted at ensuring there are actionable strategies and accompanying commitments to ensure the region achieves the plan’s goals:

To Stem the Tide of Increasing Neighborhood Segregation, the Plan Must Include Broader Commitments to Building & Preserving Deeply Affordable Housing

The ERC appreciates the plan’s focus on increasing affordable housing to combat the tide of increasing segregation in the region. Throughout the United States, historical racism and its ongoing legacy have not only impacted people’s access to housing, but also their access to employment and their ability to

¹ The participating jurisdictions include the City of Alexandria, VA; Arlington County, VA; District of Columbia; Fairfax County, VA; City of Gaithersburg, MD; Montgomery County, MD; Loudoun County, VA; and Prince William County, VA.

accumulate wealth. As a result, class and race are deeply intertwined. The most recent DC² and Fairfax County³ Als found that a lack of affordable housing played a significant role in worsening neighborhood segregation. This trend holds true across the region.

However, the affordable housing crisis is not new. For the past several years, the ERC has been ringing the alarm about the affordable housing crisis in our region, particularly in the District. The *District of Columbia Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice 2006–2011* identified that most housing in DC was unaffordable to most DC residents.⁴ Efforts over the last decade have proven inadequate to stop the worsening problem of housing unaffordability. The scope of the affordable housing crisis facing the region is now massive, and will require local jurisdictions to mount equally massive, thoughtful, and immediate investments in response.

For this reason, we were relieved to see the plan’s stated goals to not only build affordable housing, but also preserve it. Given the pace of growth in our region, affordable housing established under temporary contracts only temporarily delays the displacement of the region’s low-income residents. Affordable housing must be made permanent to have a real impact.

We were also heartened to read the plan’s stated goal to create new rental housing for people earning at or below 60 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) instead of 80 percent, as had been proposed previously. This change will help ensure that lower-income residents will be able to find and maintain housing.

However, this goal alone is insufficient, as many developers have historically and likely will continue to build housing for people at the higher end of that range. As such, the region’s lowest-income residents will remain most vulnerable to displacement. The region should prioritize the construction and preservation of deeply affordable units for residents earning at or below 30 percent AMI in order to avoid escalating this crisis. The ERC recommends including in the plan a goal that sets a minimum percentage of affordable housing for residents at or below 30 percent AMI.

Jurisdictions Need to Commit to Robust, Systemic Investigation and Enforcement of Fair Housing Violations

In order to adequately address the extent of the fair housing concerns detailed in the plan, jurisdictions must proactively and systemically enforce federal, state, and local fair housing laws. It would be ideal if

² “Draft for Public Comment: Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice Washington, D.C.” (2019). DC Department of Housing and Community Development, the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, and the Poverty and Race Research Action Council (PRRAC).

<https://dhcd.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dhcd/publication/attachments/D.C.%20Draft%20Analysis%20of%20Impediments%20to%20Fair%20Housing%20Choice%209.27.2019%20%281%29.pdf>

³ “Fairfax County, Virginia Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice 2016-2020” (2017). Fairfax County, Department of Housing and Community Development and Fairfax County Office of Human Rights and Equity Programs, Human Rights Division.

<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/humanrights/sites/humanrights/files/migration/docs/ai-2016-2020.pdf>

⁴ “District of Columbia Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice 2006–2011” (2012). District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development.

<https://ohr.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ohr/publication/attachments/DC%20AI%202012%20-%20FINAL.pdf>

participating jurisdictions would make public commitments to doing so as part of their plan adoption efforts.

While victims of discrimination can individually defend their fair housing rights through litigation or the administrative complaint process, they must not be made to bear the burden of ensuring the region is free from housing discrimination. For many, litigation is not an accessible option. The administrative complaint process, meanwhile, can be a years-long, sometimes re-traumatizing endeavor. As their complaints progress through the process, individual complainants are required to repeatedly relive the discrimination they experienced. Some former ERC clients have found the administrative complaint process to be even more traumatic than the initial discrimination they experienced. Jurisdictions should conduct testing and other systemic investigations and aggressively pursue enforcement of fair housing violations in order to lift this undue burden off of individual victims. The region's residents deserve to be treated with fairness and respect at the leasing office, mortgage lender, and beyond.

The ERC also recommends that the plan set specific goals for civil rights testing, which is arguably the most effective tool for uncovering and pinpointing systemic barriers to fair housing. At Community Advisory Committee meetings, the ERC was excited to hear that the local governments had committed to conducting testing across the metropolitan area. These commitments should be included in the final plan. Testing serves as a critical tool for identifying more subtle forms of discrimination, such as in the sales and lending market. The report places a significant emphasis on increasing homeownership, but these goals will fail to reduce the racial homeownership gap unless they include a robust campaign to confront sales and lending discrimination against people of color, especially Black homebuyers. The plan should stipulate that participating jurisdictions fund fair housing testing and commit to following through on test results.

The Plan Needs an Implementation Roadmap

One of the greatest disappointments with previous AIs has been the lack of full implementation. Local jurisdictions have devoted significant time and resources into creating this report and identifying goals and strategies for reducing housing discrimination. This commitment cannot end once the report is published, but instead participating entities must double down on effective implementation. To facilitate that, the plan should at least include a roadmap for the further work jurisdictions will need to engage in.

Conclusion

The Regional Fair Housing Plan's purpose – to eliminate housing discrimination and promote affordable, integrated communities throughout the region – is an essential one. This draft is a valuable first step. The ERC commends the report's collaborative, regional approach and emphasis on affordable housing; however, we also urge that the final plan include:

- Goals related to building and preserving deeply affordable housing for the region's lowest income residents, at or below 30 percent AMI.
- Commitments from the jurisdictions involved to conduct fair housing testing and other systemic investigations as part of enforcement efforts to proactively root out barriers to fair housing and ensure that the burden of combatting discrimination across the region does not fall on individual complainants.

- An implementation roadmap to ensure that the time and resources spent and the collaborative framework established in the plan's creation do not fall apart after it is published. The plan is only meaningful if each jurisdiction involved implements it effectively.

With these changes made, the plan will offer the jurisdictions involved a real opportunity to replace patterns of discrimination and segregation with fair, affordable, and integrated housing throughout the region.

March 13, 2023

Executive Director Clark Mercer
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Re: Regional Fair Housing Plan

Dear Executive Director Mercer,

The Greater Washington Partnership (“the Partnership”) commends you and your team for the draft of the Regional Fair Housing Plan, an important planning document to increase access to safe and affordable housing and create more inclusive communities throughout the Washington area.

The Partnership is a first-of-its-kind nonprofit alliance of the region’s most influential and leading employers in Maryland, Virginia and Washington, DC. Together, we leverage our collective experiences, resources, and assets to identify shared challenges and offer real solutions to the region’s most critical issues including skills and talent, regional mobility, infrastructure, and inclusive growth. Affordable housing, in thriving communities that are well-connected to the region’s job, educational, and recreational centers, are key components of our [Blueprint for Regional Mobility](#) and [Regional Blueprint for Inclusive Growth](#).

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft plan and offer the following comments and recommendations for how the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) could advance our shared goals to enhance our region’s economic competitiveness and collaboration, ensure inclusive growth, and expand access to moderate and affordable housing.

The Partnership commends the draft’s focus on:

- The supply of affordable housing for families earning at or below 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI), a segment of the regional workforce that is currently underserved and overburdened by housing costs according to the Partnership’s [Inclusive Growth Dashboard](#).
- Pro-growth zoning and land use policies to expand the supply of housing, a key solution supported by the Partnership’s [Housing Pillar](#) of our Regional Blueprint for Inclusive Growth.

To strengthen the final draft plan, the Partnership recommends:

- A bolder goal for affordable rental units in the region. The draft only calls for preserving the same number of existing affordable rental units. The region needs even more affordable rental units in the future to address the pressing affordability challenges and prevent displacement.
- A stronger focus on more housing, especially affordable housing, near high-quality transit. While the draft calls for making public transit easier to access and more affordable, the final plan could include a stronger focus on transit-oriented zoning and land use policies to increase the supply of affordable housing near affordable transportation options.

I thank you for your review and consideration of the Partnership’s comments intended to support our shared goal of making this region the best place to live, work, and build a business.

Sincerely,



Kathy Hollinger
CEO

CC: Francesca Ioffreda, Vice President of Inclusive Growth & Talent Initiatives, Greater Washington Partnership
John Hillegass, Director, Regional Mobility & Infrastructure, Greater Washington Partnership



Housing Opportunities Made Equal of Virginia

Ensuring equal access to housing for all people.

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Attn: Fair Housing Plan
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002
fairhousing@mwkog.org

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Regional Fair Housing Plan. We at Housing Opportunities Made Equal (HOME) of Virginia commend the jurisdictions in Northern Virginia for their efforts to expand access to quality affordable housing and address the impact of housing inequities. We applaud MWCOC for bringing together the many localities in the region for the first time in 25 years to collaborate on these critical goals. Housing inequities transcend the borders of jurisdiction. As such, the most effective remedies require participation from residents, advocates, and government officials in all neighboring localities. We recognize that so much more is possible through this regional coalition, and thus, we have high hopes for the implementation of this plan.

Specifically, we appreciate the plan's emphasis on housing for those with incomes below 60% AMI and for those from disadvantaged protected classes, with particular focus on accessibility. HOME is very supportive of the inclusion of fair housing analyses in significant rezoning efforts. We believe strongly that any changes to zoning ordinances must consider the potential for displacement and tenant instability. We also want to highlight the goal to establish a right of first refusal for manufactured home park residents. Thank you for including this vital provision in the plan to protect these residents and the affordability of manufactured homes. Furthermore, HOME commends the jurisdictions in Northern Virginia for their commitment to more fair tenant screening practices regarding criminal history. While we are supportive of the many goals outlined in the plan, we are aware that much work is still required to make these goals a reality. HOME believes that clear accountability and transparency measures will be necessary to ensure that this plan is implemented in a timely and comprehensive manner.

Thank you for your important work in Northern Virginia. If you have questions about our comments or would like to learn more about HOME's fair housing work across the state, please reach out to our Executive Director, Thomas Okuda Fitzpatrick, at TFitzpatrick@homeofva.org.

About HOME: Housing Opportunities Made Equal of Virginia (HOME) is a civil rights fair housing organization with a mission to ensure equal access to housing for all people. Founded in 1971, we exist to address housing-related systemic inequities that perpetuate segregation, concentrations of poverty, and wealth inequality. HOME enacts its mission through fair housing enforcement and advocacy, housing research and policy, and HUD-approved housing counseling and education direct services. At a time when unequal access to housing and credit contributes most to the United States' growing wealth gap, HOME's multifaceted approach is a powerful catalyst toward furthering fair housing. You can learn more about HOME and all its services at www.HOMEofVA.org.



**Metropolitan Washington
Regional Fair Housing Plan**

Draft of January, 2023

Comments & Recommendations

March 31, 2023

INTRODUCTION:

The draft Regional Fair Housing Plan (Draft Plan), published in January 2023 by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOCG) provides important information and laudable goals. Unfortunately, the policies and programs offered are not sufficient to address the magnitude of the problem.

The number one problem identified in the Draft Plan is the lack of affordable housing. In particular, many households are paying more than 30% of their income for housing costs. The Draft Plan does not explain why there is a lack of affordable housing. Many of the recommended policies and programs fall short because they do not address the root causes of this problem.

In some cases, there might be sufficient housing supply, but some people might lack "effective demand." In other words, they lack the income to pay housing costs. For example, in Rust Belt cities in the United States, housing prices are often very low. Large homes can be purchased more cheaply than one-bedroom condos in New York City. But, if you're unemployed in a Rust Belt city (as many are), even a cheap home can be unaffordable.

In other cases, there might not be sufficient supply. For example, in Silicon Valley in California, many households are affluent (making six-figure incomes). Yet, many of these households have difficulty finding decent affordable housing.

Policies that might be effective in increasing effective demand (housing vouchers or other subsidies to households) might be ineffective if the problem is constrained supply. In such a case, housing subsidies would simply exacerbate inflation in housing prices. On the other hand, increasing housing supply in a place that has ample supply (including many vacant homes) might be ineffective if the problem is unemployment and a lack of income.

GOVERNMENT BARRIER TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING: THE UPSIDE-DOWN TAX

Landowners who construct or improve housing are punished with higher property taxes. A 1% or 2% property tax might not seem like much. However, unlike a sales tax that is only paid once (at the time of sale), a property tax is paid each and every year that an improvement adds value to a property. For long-lived assets (like buildings and building components) this stream of tax payments can be substantial. **Thus, a 1% or 2% property tax can have the economic impact of a 10% to 20% sales tax on construction labor and materials.**

Meanwhile, **owners who allow buildings to deteriorate are rewarded with lower taxes.** And the owners of vacant lots typically pay much less tax than their neighbors with buildings, even though it costs the local government about the same to maintain streets, sidewalks and sewers in front of similar-sized properties regardless of whether they are vacant or developed.

A REMEDY

Fortunately, some communities have turned these upside-down incentives right-side up. They have transformed their property tax into an infrastructure access fee. This is accomplished by **reducing** the tax rate applied to privately-created building values while **increasing** the tax rate applied to publicly-created land values. The lower rate on buildings makes them cheaper to

construct, improve and maintain. This lowers space costs for residents and businesses alike. Surprisingly, the higher rate applied to land values helps keep land prices more affordable by reducing profits from land speculation. As a bonus, the higher rate on land encourages development of high-value sites -- typically infill sites near existing urban infrastructure amenities. Increasing infill development reduces development pressure at the urban fringe, reducing sprawl.

This policy, combining lower rates of tax on building values with higher rates of tax on land values, increases housing supply. And, by reducing space costs and encouraging construction, improvement and maintenance activities, it stimulates employment, increasing incomes as well. Thus, **without new spending or any loss of revenue, this “tax shift” can make both buildings and land more affordable, increase employment and reduce urban sprawl.** In other words, this policy addresses both supply side and demand side problems.

LOWER-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

If this tax reform reduced the market price of housing by 10% or more, some might complain that it would not help very low income households. Certainly, vouchers will be necessary for some households. But because vouchers typically fill the gap between 30% of income and the market price, the ability of the tax shift to reduce market prices will reduce the gap and allow a given amount of voucher subsidies to assist more households.

DENSITY

Why is housing so much cheaper in Rust Belt cities than in the Metropolitan Washington Region? It's not because the price of labor or materials is that much less there than here. Instead, it's primarily because land prices are so much higher here. A high demand for commercial and residential space in our Region causes high land prices.

It would seem obvious that if we could get more households to share the same parcel of land, the cost of land per household could be reduced and housing could be made more affordable. This is the rationale behind recommendations for zoning reforms that would increase allowable densities.

Unfortunately, if the allowable density for a parcel is increased, the potential income from the parcel increases and so does its price. Thus, increasing allowable density leads to even higher land prices – and this reduces or eliminates the ability of density increases to reduce the cost of land per household.

However, if the tax shift were implemented, publicly-created land values (as a result of higher density zoning) would be returned to the community instead of becoming windfall profits for landowners. This would minimize land price increases due to zoning reform, thereby making zoning reform a more effective policy than it is under the traditional property tax system.

TRANSIT ACCESS

Today, transit access is a double-edged sword. It can be very helpful for low-income individuals by providing them with better access to education, jobs, shopping and recreation. But, because

transit service is so valuable, proximity to high-quality transit typically increases land prices and rents, thereby displacing the households that need it most.

However, if the tax shift were implemented, transit-created land values would be returned to the community instead of becoming windfall profits for landowners. In this way, transit could become financially self-sustaining to a greater degree because transit created land value could be returned to the transit agencies instead of being given away to landowners. (Hong Kong's transit system is profitable because it owns land around and air rights above its transit stations. Thus, transit-created land values are returned to the transit agency in the form of rent.)

CONCLUSION:

Transforming the traditional property tax into a public infrastructure access fee has been implemented successfully in both urban and rural communities. This tax shift is not the only policy or program required to improve housing affordability. However, if it is not implemented, many of the other important policies and programs are less effective or even counter-productive.

For more information, see <https://www.shareable.net/land-value-return-and-building-a-more-equitable-economy/>.

See also, “**Invisible Role of Taxes in US Housing Shortage**” (Wall Street Journal) 2023-03-06 <https://www.wsj.com/video/series/wsj-explains/the-invisible-role-taxes-play-in-americas-housing-shortage/3B6959A8-71A5-4943-94C6-DE52E3AB8DD0>

Thank you for considering my comments. Please let me know if I can provide any assistance regarding the design or implementation of this tax reform.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rick Rybeck". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Rick Rybeck
Director



March 28, 2023

RE: MWCOG Attn: Fair Housing Plan

To Whom it May Concern:

The National Community Reinvestment Coalition (NCRC) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan. The region is to be commended for developing the first regional plan in 25 years. The plan provides an important opportunity for local jurisdictions to collaborate in promoting integration and access to affordable housing, job opportunities and improved quality of life for people of color.

NCRC is an association of over 600 community-based organizations around the country and in the District-Maryland-Virginia (DMV) area whose mission is to increase access to credit and capital for revitalizing communities of color and modest income neighborhoods. We are thus excited about this regional plan and hope opportunities present themselves to help you achieve the objectives described in the plan. This comment will focus on the regional housing plan and those of Montgomery County and the District of Columbia.

The regional plan and those of the participating jurisdictions have several commendable aspects, programs and approaches for achieving fair housing objectives. The programs and approaches of the various jurisdictions are innovative and long standing. At the same time, NCRC encourages you to describe more specific actions, commit to reporting outcomes of the actions and to use the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) as a means to promoting affordable housing and fair lending.

In addition, the region should consider some region-wide approaches to achieving fair housing and improved quality of life for people of color. One such approach could be working with banks to establish regional Special Purpose Credit Programs (SPCP) and enlisting banks to partner with regionwide first time homeownership programs and rental housing development and preservation. Although we are commenting on fair housing plans, we also encourage the jurisdictions to work with banks to create small business lending programs targeted to women- and minority-owned small businesses that provide employment opportunities and basic necessities (including quality food, child care and health care) for people of color residing in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods.

In a region that is less than 50% White, segregation has been increasing. Your plan documented that the more segregated a region is, the fewer opportunities people of color have to advance economically. Segregation also increases racial inequality.¹ In the DMV, African Americans were one quarter of the population but 80% of the residents of racially or ethnically impoverished neighborhoods.² Over 50% of African Americans and almost 42% of Hispanics

¹ Metropolitan Washington Fair Housing Plan, Executive Summary, Draft, January 2023, p. 7, https://www.mwcog.org/assets/1/6/Executive_Summary_Fair_Hsg_English_with_cover4.pdf

² Metro Fair Housing Plan, p. 8.



confronted housing problems (physically inadequate housing or cost burden) compared to 25% of whites.³

In response to barriers experienced by people of color, the regional plan outlined sensible policy approaches. If they are implemented in an aggressive fashion, they could lessen the disparities the plan identified. Among the policies and approaches the plan listed were these⁴:

- Create new rental units to focus on lower income tenants at 60% of area median income (AMI) instead of 80% of AMI.
- Provide low-interest loans to homeowners that want to build accessory dwelling units (ADUs) that can offer opportunities for modest income renters to reside in less segregated neighborhoods.
- Increase inclusionary zoning initiatives. Local suburban jurisdictions should follow Arlington County's lead in creating multi-unit zoning.
- Establish a loan fund to help tenants, nonprofit organizations and local government agencies to buy apartments and manufactured home parks for sale in an attempt to preserve affordable housing.
- Expand resources for low fare or free bus service (following the District of Columbia's anticipated program of free bus service) in order to improve access to jobs in the DMV.
- Expand local resources for housing vouchers.
- Reduce appraisal bias and increase resources for housing testing.
- Engage in housing equity analyses when considering changes in zoning.
- Increase allowable density and provide affordable housing units in new developments.

NCRC supports each of these proposals and urges the region to document progress. We hope that HUD's forthcoming Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule will require annual reporting (as currently proposed) and in that case recommend that the region and its component jurisdictions publicly report annually on progress toward concrete metrics. The 2022-2026 plan should record how many new units for tenants at or below 60% of AMI are created. The next plan should then commit to a realistic yet aggressive increase in that number. Further, the region should set metrics for unit location and should document where the units are located and whether they are in less segregated neighborhoods. In addition, any publicly subsidized loan program to support ADUs should provide similar documentation.

Federal agencies including the Department of Housing and Urban Development have clarified that the Fair Housing Act allows for SPCP programs as ways to narrow racial inequities in lending. If a bank documents with data analysis that a group of borrowers or neighborhoods are underserved, the bank can design a SPCP that targets people of color including a home purchase

³ Metro Fair Housing Plan, p. 11.

⁴ Metro Fair Housing Plan, pp. 20-21.



program or a program to lend to small businesses.⁵ The jurisdictions should work with banks to develop SPCP programs and then document their progress.

The jurisdictions should employ the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) to offer loans to people of color and traditionally underserved communities.⁶ Montgomery County mentions CRA in its fair housing plan but in a cursory manner. While we commend this mention of CRA, the plan for the DMV region as a whole and for individual jurisdictions should elaborate on using CRA to increase access to credit. CRA requires federal bank agencies to measure and rate bank lending, investing and service to low- and moderate-income (LMI) borrowers and communities. Within the LMI community, there is a significant segment of people of color that CRA can directly benefit.

A regional program featuring downpayment assistance and home purchase loans to modest income first time homebuyers is likely to also serve considerable numbers of people of color. The DMV region should establish this type of program either jointly or the individual jurisdictions ought to establish similar programs. Documentation of program outcomes should include income levels of borrowers and their race/ethnicity and gender. Documentation should also include neighborhoods in which the borrowers reside and whether the program is promoting choice and increasing integration at a neighborhood level.

Recommendations for Montgomery County's Plan

A major component of the county's plan is employing its Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit Program (MPDU) program. Under the MPDU program, developers of 20 or more units of housing must include affordable housing. As one of the first of its kind in the country, Montgomery County has operated the MPDU program for decades. This program has a statutory objective of assisting minority households, young families, older adults and female-headed households. A report in 2004 documented that over 30 years, the county provided 11,000 MPDU rental and homeownership units.⁷

Because segregation is increasing in Montgomery County, the county should build on its MPDU experience to develop or expand methods for marketing the program in an affirmative manner to people of color and to increase neighborhood-level integration.⁸ The county should commit to

⁵ Memorandum from Demetria L. McCain, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing & Equal Opportunity, *FHEO's Statement by HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity on Special Purpose Credit Programs as a Remedy for Disparities in Access to Homeownership*, December 7, 2021, https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/FHEO/documents/FHEO_Statement_on_Fair_Housing_and_Special_Purpose_Programs_FINAL.pdf

⁶ For more on CRA, see <https://ncrc.org/> or <https://www.ffiec.gov/cra/default.htm>

⁷ Aron Trombka and Michael Faden, February 2004, *Strengthening the Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit Program: A 30 Year Review, A Report to the Montgomery County Council*, https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DHCA/Resources/Files/housing/singlefamily/mpdu/report_mpdu30yearreview.pdf, pp. 1-2.

⁸ Draft Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan, Montgomery County, January 2023, p. 28, https://www.mwcog.org/assets/1/6/Montgomery_County_Clean_web.pdf



reporting data on the demographics of MPDU occupants, including race and ethnicity, and should report on the demographics of neighborhoods in which MPDU occupants reside. A report issued in 2004 on the 30-year history of MPDU reported unit production by town such as Bethesda-Chevy Chase, suggesting that a county-maintained database could accommodate census tract reporting or at least reporting by town and indicating the demographics of the town. Furthermore, a county website indicates that annual MPDU data collection includes “demographic information which will assist staff to assess the program’s racial equity going forward.”⁹

The draft plan reported that concentrations of renters correlate with racially segregated areas. The county should work on providing more rental MPDU opportunities in less segregated areas and affirmatively marketing these units to people of color.¹⁰

If results are not up to expectations, the county should increase its affirmative marketing and other actions to promote fair housing. The county should list the community organizations that help market the MPDU program, including how many and which organizations are controlled by people of color. The county should also document other means of affirmative marketing such as the use of minority-owned media.

Other policies and programs that Montgomery has committed to include in its plan include:

- Eviction prevention – The County’s plan mentioned partnerships with nonprofit organizations to provide counseling and eviction prevention services. The state recently passed a law to fund the right to counsel for tenants facing eviction. The state, county, and nonprofit organizations should partner to collect data on tenants receiving counseling and those represented by a lawyer in court. The demographics of clients and outcomes such as eviction prevention or moving to alternative affordable housing should be recorded and presented in annual updates to the fair housing plan.¹¹
- Identifying landlords with inclusive screening procedures – The draft plan stated that the county would identify landlords that waive customary screening procedures regarding criminal and credit history. The county should maintain a publicly available list of these landlords.¹²
- Lowering income targeting to 60% of AMI in new affordable rental developments and expand locally funded housing voucher programs¹³ – About 20% of African American and Hispanic residents face severe cost burden as opposed to 10% of white residents in

⁹ Memo from Aseem K. Nigam Director, Department of Housing and Community Affairs to Gabe Albornoz, Council President, *Annual Report on the Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) and Workforce Housing Programs Covering Calendar Year 2021*, p. 6, https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DHCA/Resources/Files/housing/affordable/publications/mpdu/annual_report_mpdu_2021.pdf

¹⁰ Draft Montgomery County Plan, p. 32.

¹¹ Draft Montgomery County Plan, pp. 14 and 155.

¹² Draft Montgomery County Plan, p. 14

¹³ Draft Montgomery County Plan, pp. 152 and 159.

the County.¹⁴ Overall more than 50% of Hispanic households and 45% of African American households experience housing problems (physical inadequacy or cost burden) compared to 25% of white households in the County.¹⁵ Affirmative marketing should include aggressive outreach to African Americans and Hispanics regarding new affordable rental developments and any additional vouchers funded by local governments. Montgomery County should commit to reporting on the demographic characteristics of households served by new rental units and vouchers to determine whether racial disparities are being narrowed.

- Expand access to low fare or free bus service¹⁶ – The draft plan described a desire for additional funding for discounted fares. It also mentioned that Hispanics overall tend to have lower access to jobs in the county. In addition, Asians and African Americans below the poverty line fare poorly in terms of job access.¹⁷ The county should explore free or reduced fares for bus routes serving neighborhoods with concentrations of these populations and then conduct follow-up surveys to see if access to jobs has improved.

Lastly, Montgomery County’s draft plan presented lending disparities by race but then did not indicate what policies or programs could reduce these disparities. The draft plan documented that the average interest rates for Whites and African American borrowers were 4.21% and 5.29%, respectively.¹⁸ Over the life of the loan, these price disparities can cost borrowers several thousands of dollars. African American borrowers start out with much lower wealth, on average than whites. The price disparities only exacerbate the wealth disparities by making it harder for African American borrowers to accumulate as much equity as Whites.

In addition, African American applicants experienced considerably lower origination rates than whites. About 68% of White applicants received loans in contrast to 55.6% of African American applicants according to Montgomery County’s plan.¹⁹

Together, the higher interest rates and lower origination rates for African Americans suggest that Montgomery County should work with lending institutions to create SPCP programs for African Americans that would help lower their interest rates and increase their origination rates. Further analysis can also document neighborhoods where these disparities are particularly high. As part of SPCP programs, marketing and homeownership counseling can be targeted to the neighborhoods with high disparities.

Finally, the county should work with banks to create CRA home purchase lending programs focusing on LMI people of color that increase their homeownership rates. These programs can also increase the affordability and physical adequacy of their housing via home improvement

¹⁴ Draft Montgomery County Plan, p. 104

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 102.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 162.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 59.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 191.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 192.



loans that can finance repair and energy efficiency upgrades. It is rare that CRA exams document this type of collaboration between public jurisdictions and banks. If Montgomery County pursues these recommendations, it would be lessening income and racial disparities and also helping banks score better on their CRA exams.

Recommendations for the District of Columbia’s Plan

The District of Columbia (the District) described commendable programs for remediating racial disparities and providing affordable housing in its draft plan. In order to determine if the programs and approaches are commensurate with the housing shortage in the city, the District of Columbia should commit to robust data collection and dissemination regarding the demographics of program recipients.

Between 2000 and 2010, an astounding one third of the District’s rental stock was lost. Such a dramatic loss of housing stock contributed to 25% of the District’s residents paying more than 50% of their monthly income on rent, a proportion that is not sustainable because it leaves too little for other basic necessities.²⁰ In response, the Mayor announced a program that would add 36,000 housing units, 12,000 of which would be affordable for LMI populations, by 2025. The District also announced that it allocated about \$100 million annually to a housing production trust fund and that this initiative produced 1,000 units in FY 2021.

A major District homeownership program is the Home Purchase Assistance Program (HPAP) which features a second lien loan of up to \$200,000. Loan repayments are modest for moderate-income households and are deferred for low-income households.²¹ In FY 2021 according to the District, the HPAP program assisted 328 households become homeowners, all of which were first-time homeowners.²²

Data collection and dissemination are essential if the District is to achieve its equity goals for these programs. Data on the race, ethnicity, gender and income levels of the households assisted make it possible for the District and stakeholders to determine if these programs are reducing inequalities. Moreover, data regarding the neighborhoods in which these households reside will help determine if the programs are achieving goals of integration and moving to opportunities.

In the District, about 23% of African Americans and Hispanics experienced severe cost housing cost burdens (paying more than 50% of monthly income for housing) compared to about 11% for Whites.²³ In addition, the homeownership rate for African American households in the City was

²⁰ Draft Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan, District of Columbia, January 2023, p. 13, https://www.mwcog.org/assets/1/6/District_of_Columbia_Clean_web.pdf

²¹ District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development, Home Purchase Assistance Program (HPAP) – Eligibility, How to Apply and Program Details, <https://dhcd.dc.gov/page/hpap-eligibility-how-apply-and-program-details>

²² District of Columbia Plan, p. 11.

²³ Ibid., p. 114.



34% compared to 49% for White households.²⁴ The only way to know if the fair housing programs have a realistic chance of reducing these disparities is if the District collects and reports demographic data on the program's clients.

The City should use the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) as an encouragement for banks to participate in the housing programs. The fair housing plan refers to City financing of these programs but does not describe bank or other private sector financing of them. The final plan should include data on bank financing and indications of whether banks will increase their financing in future years. Moreover, it is our understanding that banks are not regular partners in the HPAP programs. HPAP data should include information on which institutions are making first lien loans under the program. Banks should be encouraged to report HPAP data to their CRA examiners in order to boost their ratings on CRA exams.

In addition to creating affordable housing (in particular in highly resourced areas), the City should invest in creating opportunities for residents of currently disinvested areas and communities. For example, the City should target job training and workforce development to the Southeast section of the City. While African Americans were about 50% of the City's population, 95% of the residents residing in racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs) were African Americans.²⁵ While 6.8% of District residents were impoverished, the R/ECAPs in the District experienced poverty rates above 10%, many of which were confronted with poverty rates above 30%, especially in Wards 6, 7, and 8.²⁶

The District should target and market workforce development to African Americans and other people of color in R/ECAPs. The District should conduct an inventory of nonprofit organizations and other entities that provide workforce development and determine if there is a sufficient quantity of these organizations in the wards 6 through 8 or whether capacity needs to be expanded. The City should also determine if housing developers and commercial developers have apprenticeship programs that would employ and mentor residents of Southeast Washington. The District and the region's other jurisdictions should also explore implementing and/or expanding on small business lending programs with banks that provide financing to women- and minority-owned small businesses with an additional objective of providing jobs and workforce development for residents of R/ECAPs. Finally, the District has embarked on an innovative transit initiative to provide free or reduced fares on buses operated by the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA); it is also important that the District ensure adequate and equitable quality of transit service, in particular for communities that are reliant on public transportation.

The District's report also discussed racial disparities in access to banking and credit in a section called "Contributing Factors" that highlighted barriers exacerbating inequalities and segregation.

²⁴ District of Columbia, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, Homeownership, <https://dmped.dc.gov/page/homeownership>

²⁵ District of Columbia Fair Housing Plan, p. 44.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 48.



However, the plan did not include programs or initiatives that addressed several of these contributing factors such as unequal access to banking. For example, the plan noted that the District had higher racial disparities in access to banking than other local jurisdictions. It found that just 1.1% of White residents were unbanked compared to 12.7% of people of color.²⁷ Perhaps the City could set aside some municipal deposits for a bank that would be willing to establish a branch in a community of color that experiences a lack of branches (NCRC has helped jurisdictions and community-based organizations identify banking deserts that have a population density which can support a branch).

The District's plan highlighted racial disparities in the cost of loans and approval rates. For instance, Whites had a median interest rate of 3.98% while African Americans had a median rate of 4.34% during 2019.²⁸ This difference of a third of a percentage point can equate to several thousands of dollars of additional payments over the term of a mortgage, draining equity from African American households and communities. Moreover, lenders approved White applicants 70% of the time whereas African Americans were approved just 50% of the time.²⁹ In response, the plan should have committed to increased financial and housing counseling to African Americans and African American communities and should have indicated a plan to collect demographic data about the clients of counseling. SPCP programs can also address these disparities.

Conclusion

Our comment has focused on the need to commit to comprehensive and publicly available data on the fair housing programs and initiatives committed to by the jurisdictions in our region. We hope the programs and initiatives can reduce segregation. Powerful market forces and the legacy of discrimination are formidable barriers. In order to correct for this systemic discrimination, the jurisdictions must undertake aggressive and coordinated initiatives that are long lasting and are improved upon over the decades.

The private and public sectors created, enforced and exacerbated redlining and segregation spanning centuries. Long term and concerted initiatives on several fronts are necessary to counteract segregation including zoning reforms, more affordable housing production, fair lending and targeted workforce development and economic development. Central to these efforts is data collection and dissemination so that the jurisdictions and stakeholders can ensure that the programs and initiatives are benefiting people of color and modest income residents in an equitable manner.

The draft plans did not identify a core of programs and initiatives that would be offered on a regional basis. The advantages of regional programs are that the chances of using them to bolster integration increase due to a wider choice of neighborhoods that can be served by the programs.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 183.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 213.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 214.



Possibilities include first time homeownership programs, affordable housing production or improved coordination of Section 8 programs.

Lastly and critically important is our recommendation to better coordinate fair housing planning with the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) and SPCPs. In our experience, fair housing planning rarely incorporates consideration of CRA. We have reviewed numerous fair housing plans and only rarely see CRA mentioned or partnerships with banks identified, let alone any data reported from bank special affordable lending programs (home or small business loans). This is a major missed opportunity and means that a significant set of strategies to promote equity are being overlooked. We appreciate the mention of CRA in the draft Montgomery County plan but the brief mention in that plan should be elaborated upon in the manner suggested in this comment letter.

The federal bank agencies have recently proposed reforms to the CRA regulations that seek to increase coordination among banks and local jurisdictions. This could make for a powerful combination that could exponentially increase the effectiveness of public and private financing for affordable and integrative housing. Moreover, the federal agencies are seeking to elevate the attention CRA exams place on SPCP programs. The time is right for our regional jurisdictions to reach out to banks of all sizes and see which ones would be willing to engage on efforts to increase the sustainability, affordability and integration of single- and multifamily housing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these draft plans and their important mission. We are happy to answer any questions you may have. You can email me on jvantol@ncrc.org. Or you can consult with Megan Haberle, Senior Director of Policy, on mhaberle@ncrc.org or Josh Silver, Senior Fellow, on jsilver97@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jesse Van Tol".

Jesse Van Tol
President and CEO



March 29, 2022

To Whom It May Concern:

Tenants and Workers United (TWU) is a registered 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that has worked with low-income communities of color in Northern Virginia for over 35 years. We serve people with intersectional identities: people of color, women, Hispanics/Latinos, LGBTQIA+, immigrants with varying immigration statuses, elderly, and people with disabilities. Most of the people we serve have low-wage jobs, limited education, limited literacy skills, lack of access to quality and affordable health care, and face marginalization and systemic oppression and discrimination. We appreciate we have been given an opportunity to provide feedback on the Regional Fair Housing Plan

Overall the regional fair housing plan acknowledged that Black and Brown communities have the hardest time accessing affordable housing and have the most housing issues compared to their counterparts. While the plan outlined many different strategies to provide additional affordable housing and rights to residents, most notable of which include 1) Building rental units for people making less than 50% of the AMI, 2) establishing a loan fund to help tenants and nonprofits buy apartments and manufactured home parks for sale, 3) Expanding local funding for housing vouchers, and 4) Establishing a pilot Right to Counsel Program so that tenants can get free legal representation in cases against landlords.

Some areas where this plan could improve is recognizing that the groups that the plan acknowledged are having the hardest time accessing affordable, fair housing (Black and Hispanic communities) are more likely to be making 0-40% of AMI. So you should be focusing a large portion of its resources on creating more affordable housing options for these extremely low-income and working class folks. For example, in your goal #1, you could make a larger effort to build more affordable housing for people making less than 40% of the AMI (instead of below 60% AMI), as these are the families in most need of affordable units, and these are the families that are more likely to be cost burdened and at risk of eviction. Additionally, when expanding local housing vouchers, it is important to make sure these housing vouchers are accessible to undocumented and immigrant communities; this was not noted in the plan and is very important, especially since you acknowledged the growing immigrant community in the region.

The plan recognized that rent is increasing drastically, especially for Black and Brown communities during the pandemic, however you did not acknowledge rent stabilization as a way to curb the increase in rents in the region. We recognize the state has not allowed the localities this power yet, but we think it is still important for the region to acknowledge this method of mitigating rent increases for communities and become united to push for this policy.

Individual Localities

Alexandria City

We understand that the City has the following goals, based on this plan:

1. City is in the process of hiring a language access coordinator to improve its communication with households having limited English proficiency
2. Increase the Supply of housing that is affordable to low-and moderate income families
 - a. Prioritize public land for affordable housing
 - b. Provide tax abatements for homeowners who rent accessory dwelling units to low-and moderate-income tenants
3. Reform zoning and land use policies to expand access to fair housing choice by increasing the development, geographic distribution, and supply of affordable housing
 - a. Adopt mandatory inclusionary zoning citywide
 - b. Permit duplexes in R-20 zone

There is a mention of [voluntary rent guidelines](#) that the city has, where they recommend that landlords increase rent by no more than 5% year-over-year, but they acknowledge that they have no real power to enforce this. **The city could go a step further and recognize that merely a recommendation does not do anything to curb severe rent increases for tenants. The city could explicitly state the importance of and their support of mandatory rent stabilization.**

Although the City has their mandatory inclusionary zoning goal that would mandate that in most new apartments built, a specific percentage of the new units have to be made affordable. This is a good policy, but **the City needs to ensure the units should be at 40% or less AMI.** Other strategies the city can use in order to fulfill their goals are:

1. The city should establish a **local fund voucher program that will allow units to be at the 40% of AMI for the diverse residents that live across the city, regardless of immigration status.** The city needs to be more proactive in having innovative tools to ensure the preservation of the existing working class families living in the City.
2. Another tool the City of Alexandria should also use in order to create affordability and sustainability are **supporting in creating Community land trusts and housing co-ops** which are alternative forms of homeownership
3. We emphasize that none of the goals will be achieved, unless **the City secures funding and should be a priority.**

Prince William County

We understand that the County has the following goals, based on this plan:

1. Increase the Supply of housing that is affordable to low-and moderate income families by establishing a housing trust fund to subsidize the development of affordable housing
2. Reform zoning and land use policies to expand access to fair housing choice by increasing the development, geographic distribution, and supply of affordable housing
 - a. Implement voluntary inclusionary zoning that would incentivize the development of affordable housing in exchange for greater density
 - b. Upzone the Rural Crescent area
 - c. Permit as-of-right duplexes and ADUs throughout county

We believe the County should also:

1. Make a goal for inclusionary zoning to be mandatory, similar to Alexandria City's goal. And use density as an equitable tool for the increase in housing low income working class families of color.
2. Create a housing trust fund and continuously invest in it, in order to prioritize housing for families earning 40% of the AMI and below
3. They should also ensure that they are prioritizing subsidizing housing development affordable for the lowest incomes, 40% of the AMI and below and allow those residents, regardless of immigration status, to have the access into these affordable housing units.
4. Lastly, Prince William County should create a property maintenance report system that will allow tenants from the County to report out any concerns. This will give the County the opportunity to investigate landlords who may be violating state codes, such as the Virginia Landlord Tenant Act

Fairfax

We understand that Fairfax County has the following goals, based on this plan:

1. Increase the Supply of housing that is affordable to low-and moderate income families
 - a. Revise the county's for-sale workforce development housing (WDU) policy by lowering the current AMI categories and/or percentages applicable to the program to facilitate more homeownership opportunities, and consider creating a separate policy for WDUs in high-rise condominiums outside of Tysons.
2. Protect the housing rights of individuals with protected characteristics.
 - a. Adopt tiered payment standards that are aligned to market rents to increase access to higher opportunity areas for voucher users.

Although Fairfax County's goal #2 is a provision for the housing voucher program so that voucher holders are able to find voucher-eligible housing in higher opportunity areas. But again, the county should be equitable and make sure people are able to receive a local voucher regardless of immigration status.

We also want to emphasize that Fairfax County should continue increasing funds for deeply affordable housing in order to preserve the existing housing and create new affordable housing.

As a community organization, and on behalf of our community members, we appreciate being given the opportunity to provide feedback on this plan. We acknowledge the plan is enormous, yet very complex. Which is why we emphasize to you on sharing your internal process and plan for creating and publishing clear, measurable, and specific objectives. What are the results you aim to achieve? How will you measure progress toward those results? How will you analyze progress and evolve your plan as needed, and how will you carry out modifications to the plan? How will you hold yourselves accountable? What is your timeline? How will your plan impact those at the lowest income levels of 40% area median income (AMI) and below? We hope you take our feedback and our questions into consideration as you continue working on the outcomes of this plan to ensure the needs of our working class families of color when it comes to accessibility and affordability of housing.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Tenants and Workers United

Tenants and Workers United ♦ Inquilinos y Trabajadores Unidos

3801 Mount Vernon Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22305 phone 703.684.5697 fax 703.684.5714 www.twsc.org



Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan Comment by the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs

I. Introduction:

The Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs (the "Committee")¹ submit this Comment is to ensure the goals and priorities outlined draft Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan (the Plan) promote housing choice in the most robust ways possible. In order to have a truly equitable city and region, Black and other DC residents of color must have the same choices about where to live as white residents. That means they must have the ability to choose to live in areas where people of color have not typically lived, to remain in gentrifying areas or to remain in areas where the majority of residents are not white without making compromises about their health or safety. They should also have the opportunity to own and control the homes that they live in to the same extent as white people.

The statutory duty to affirmatively further fair housing is explicitly set forth in the Fair Housing Act (FHA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 3608(d) and 3608(e)(5), and arises from the recognition that housing segregation across the country has been fostered and maintained through decades of exclusionary policies at the federal, state, and local levels. It further recognizes that remediation of the consequences of this pervasively harmful legacy requires active and equally intentional efforts to secure meaningful housing choice.

¹ The Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs was founded in 1968 to address civil rights violations, racial injustice and to fight poverty in our community through litigation and advocacy, including mobilizing the pro bono resources of the private bar. One of the areas on which the Committee focuses is fair and equal housing opportunity.

Local and federal government policy before and after the passage of the Fair Housing Act (“FHA”) has denied Black and other DC residents of color the same menu of housing options white DC residents enjoy.² This has limited not only where they can live, but also household wealth and economic mobility for Black and other DC residents of color.³

As the District and other nearby jurisdictions attempt to address housing segregation, they should be careful to do so in a way that increases housing choice for Black and other DC residents of color. Too often governments attempt to address the problem of segregated neighborhoods by developing housing and amenities in those areas that will attract new, wealthier and racially diverse residents.⁴ For a time, these neighborhoods may appear to be integrating, but eventually, they lose most of their low-income residents of color and thereafter become off limits to people of color because of rising rents.⁵ Thus, these efforts actually restrict rather than expand housing choice and can create new segregated areas.

The comments below examine five of the seven Fair Housing Goals and Priorities and suggest ways they could be amended or expanded to ensure that they: 1) create housing opportunities for Black and other DC residents of color to move out of

² Zickur, Kathryn, Discriminatory Housing Practices in the District; A brief history, D.C. Policy Center, October 23, 2018; Schoenfeld, Sarah, Mapping Segregation in D.C., D.C. Policy Center, April 23, 2019.

³ Mapping Segregation in D.C.; Discriminatory Housing Practices in the District.

⁴ Discriminatory Housing Practices in the District; Gentrification and Neighborhood Revitalization; What is the Difference, National Low Income Housing Coalition, April 2019.

⁵ Lauber, Daniel, District of Columbia Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice 2006-2012, District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development, April 2012, at pg. 2; Richardson, Jason et. al., Shifting Neighborhoods; Gentrification and cultural displacement in American cities, National Community Reinvestment Coalition, Executive Summary, 2019, <https://ncrc.org/gentrification/>; Gentrification and Neighborhood Revitalization; What is the Difference, <https://nlihc.org/resource/gentrification-and-neighborhood-revitalization-whats-difference>.

economically and racially segregated areas, 2) create housing opportunities for low and moderate income people to build wealth, and/or 3) encourage development focused on improving disparities in access to opportunities⁶ for existing residents of racially and economically segregated areas.

II. DC's History of Housing Discrimination and its Legacy

Before Congress passed the FHA, restrictive covenants, lending discrimination, and government-sponsored urban renewal efforts restricted where Black residents lived and denied them access to government-subsidized home ownership opportunities.⁷ Those homeownership opportunities were a critical foundation for what has become generational wealth for most middle-income white households.⁸ Because of this long-standing and pervasive housing discrimination, most Black DC residents are renters.⁹ Those that do own homes, own them in parts of the city that have not appreciated as quickly as white neighborhoods.¹⁰ This has contributed to an enormous racial wealth gap. In DC, white households have 81 times the wealth of Black households and 22 times the wealth of Latinx households.¹¹ That means white homebuyers are able to choose from

⁶ Draft Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, at page 6, January 2023.

⁷ Mapping Segregation in D.C.

⁸ Mapping Segregation; Discriminatory Housing Practices in the District; Mineo, Liz, Racial Wealth Gap may be the Key to other Inequities, Harvard Gazette, June 3, 2021.

⁹ Black Homeownership Strike Force, Homeownership, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, <https://dmped.dc.gov/page/homeownership>.

¹⁰ Lederer, Anneliese, Tracy McCracken, The Many Effects of Housing Discrimination on African Americans, National Community Reinvestment Coalition, April 28, 2021.

¹¹ Williams, Erica, DC's Extreme Wealth Concentration Exacerbates Racial Inequality, Limits Economic Opportunity, D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute, October 20, 2022.

67% of homes for sale while Black homebuyers are limited to 9.3% and Latinx buyers to 29%.¹²

Discrimination's legacy is not the only factor limiting housing choice for Black DC residents today. After the FHA went into effect, most of the housing that the government subsidized a generation earlier was no longer affordable, which meant that Black households were not necessarily able to move from segregated areas to integrated ones.¹³ Further, the District's zoning and land use policies kept areas like majority white Ward 3 comprised of single-family homes while concentrating apartment buildings in low-income areas like Ward 8.¹⁴ These policies worked well to preserve segregation. Today, very low-income renters can afford 67% of the units east of the Anacostia River and only 7% of those that are west of Rock Creek Park.¹⁵ In this way, income and wealth inequality along racial lines and the rising cost of housing have solidified as intractable barriers to both Black housing choice and economic mobility. Economic development driven by an influx of high earning, mostly white, professionals in recent years has further limited housing choice for Black residents as developers have replaced low cost apartments with high cost units, displacing residents from the District entirely or to neighborhoods that are more economically and racially segregated.¹⁶

¹² Hendey, Leah, Somala Diby, [A Vision for an Equitable D.C.](#), Urban Institute, December 12, 2016.

¹³ [Discriminatory Housing Practices in the District](#).

¹⁴ [Discriminatory Housing Practices](#); Ward 3, zoned almost exclusively for single-family use, is over 80% white with a median household income of over \$150,000, Summary Data for Ward 3, DC Health Matters, <https://www.dchealthmatters.org/>; Ward 8 where the city's largest concentration of multifamily housing is concentrated, is over 90% Black with a median household income is less than 42K, Summary Data for Ward 8, DC Health Matter, <https://www.dchealthmatters.org/demographicdata?id=131495>.

¹⁵ [A Vision for an Equitable D.C.](#)

¹⁶ Rivers, Wes, [Going, Going, Gone: D.C.'s Vanishing Affordable Housing](#), D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute, March 12, 2015; Lang, Marissa J., [Gentrification in D.C. means widespread displacement, study finds](#), Washington Post, April 26, 2019.

The goals and priorities outlined in the Plan are meant to undo the legacy of discrimination and segregation. In order for those goals and priorities to be successful policymakers must take special care to ensure the remedies they pursue expand rather than further restrict housing options for Black other DC residents of color and attempt to close the racial wealth gap that plays a significant role in perpetuating segregation. The following comments suggest amendments or modifications to the Plan's goals that are in line with these principals.

III. Increase the supply of affordable housing for families earning at or below 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the region – especially where there has not been any.

Increasing the supply of affordable housing for families earning at or below 60% of AMI where there has not been any is critical to disrupting existing patterns of segregation, but does little to address the disparities in income and wealth along racial lines. That wealth gap persistently undermines efforts to foster racial integration because the wealth gap fuels income inequality that greatly restricts where Black residents can live.¹⁷ For the most part the priorities for achieving this goal relate to creating rental housing. DC and other jurisdictions should consider creating down payment assistance programs specifically for families earning less than 60% of AMI that currently live in racially and economically segregated areas that would allow them to buy a home outside of those areas.¹⁸ In addition to addressing the problem of racial segregation, such policies would also begin to alleviate the racial wealth gap by allowing the recipients of that down

¹⁷ DC's Extreme Wealth Concentration Exacerbates Racial Inequality, Limits Economic Opportunity; District of Columbia Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice 2006-2012.

¹⁸ Stegman, Michael, Mike Loftin, An Essential Role for Down Payment Assistance in Closing America's Racial and Homeownership Wealth Gaps, Urban Institute, April 2021.

payment assistance to begin building home equity. That wealth gap is not only a legacy of discrimination and segregation, but also a driver of racial disparities in other areas like health, income and education.¹⁹ As the Plan outlines in the Disparities in Access to Opportunities section, many Black DC residents live in racially and economically isolated parts of the city where they do not have the same level of access to education and employment as people living in less isolated parts of the city.²⁰ That lack of access to education and employment opportunities creates income disparities leading to a cycle of disparate access to opportunity.²¹

IV. Change zoning and land use policies to expand access to fair housing. Increase the development, geographic distribution, and supply of affordable housing.

This goal argues that zoning for single-family housing makes it hard to develop affordable housing in many areas and calls on local leaders to make changes that will make it easier to develop affordable housing. The priorities that the Plan suggests should be strengthened and priorities that create affordable housing outside racially and economically segregated areas and allow for the creation of wealth by residents should also be considered.

First, one of the priorities proposed is to increase fees for developers to build affordable housing required by inclusionary zoning in different locations. The Plan should recommend that jurisdictions eliminate those incentives and require developers to

¹⁹ DC's Extreme Wealth Concentration Exacerbates Racial Inequality, Limits Economic Opportunity; Racial Wealth Gap may be the Key to other Inequities.

²⁰ Draft Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan, Disparities in Access to Opportunity.

²¹ Racial Wealth Gap may be the Key to other Inequities.

build the affordable housing first or simultaneously with market rate housing at the same location.

Second, the Plan calls for jurisdictions to adopt zoning regulations that make it easier to develop affordable housing generally. The Plan should propose that jurisdictions adopt zoning regulations that make it easier to develop affordable housing outside of racially and economically segregated areas specifically. That will ensure that more affordable housing is built outside of racially and economically segregated areas. If zoning regulations are only changed to make it easier to build affordable housing generally the result could be more affordable housing being built in racially and economically segregated areas and little or none being built outside those areas.

Finally, the District and other jurisdictions should consider acquiring single-family homes in areas zoned only for single-family homes and reselling those homes as affordable owner-occupied housing to households that earn below 60% of AMI and are moving out of racially and economically segregated areas. This would allow jurisdictions to create some opportunities for residents of racially and economically segregated areas to move out of those areas without changing zoning regulations and allows for the recipients of this housing to build wealth.

V. Implement policies to preserve affordable housing and prevent displacement of residents. Keep the same number of existing affordable rental units in our region.

Preventing displacement and preserving existing affordable housing is critical to ensuring housing choice for people with protected traits. The Plan calls on jurisdictions to track existing affordable housing and establish funds to aid tenants seeking to purchase

properties.²² The District should also revise zoning regulations to require developers seeking zoning approval for projects to build replacement affordable housing first where new development will demolish existing affordable housing. The development process can take years, and when residents are relocated for the duration of construction, they rarely find their way back to the new property for a variety of reasons.²³ Requiring developers to build replacement housing first would reduce this risk of displacement.

VI. Increase the number of homeowners in the region and reduce the unequal treatment and discriminatory practices that keep members of protected classes from buying a home.

Efforts to increase the number of homeowners in the region and reduce unequal treatment and discriminatory practices that keep members of protected classes from buying a home are likely to have a moderate impact on the racial wealth gap, but little impact on segregation because of income inequality. The average Black homebuyer is only able to afford about 9% of homes in the DC market and those homes are in the areas with the lowest housing costs, which are also in racially and economically segregated areas.²⁴ The District and other local governments could increase homeownership and disrupt patterns of segregation by increasing down payment assistance to households earning below 80% of AMI such that those households would be able to choose from a percentage of homes on the market closer to the level of choice enjoyed by the average

²² Where a public housing authority seeks to demolish and redevelop and or sell a public housing property they are required to consider allowing the tenants or a nonprofit to purchase the property. 24 CFR 970.11. DC law also requires any property owner seeking to sell a rental property to all the tenants the opportunity to purchase. Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act (TOPA), § 42-3404. This strategy suggests that jurisdictions create funds to assist tenants seeking to purchase the housing they live in.

²³ Zipple, Claire, *DC's Public Housing; An important resource at risk*, DC Fiscal Policy Institute, fn. 15, January 27, 2016, https://www.dcfpi.org/all/dcs-public-housing-an-important-resource-at-risk/#_ednref15

²⁴ [A Vision for an Equitable DC.](#)

white household.²⁵ That would allow those households to choose to live outside of racially and economically segregated areas.²⁶

VII. Protect the housing rights of individuals who are part of protected groups. For example, people of color, those with disabilities and seniors.

Protecting the housing rights of individuals who are part of protected groups is critical to expanding housing choice for those groups and generally because if those rights are not protected housing choice will be further restricted.²⁷ The priorities suggested here are well suited to accomplish this purpose, but they fall short of actually preventing evictions, which the goal recognizes as a mechanism that disproportionately displaces Black and other residents of color from their homes. Increasing funding for emergency rental assistance can prevent evictions and avoid displacement by helping tenants catch up on delinquent rental payments.²⁸

VIII. Conclusion

Congress created the duty to affirmatively further fair housing in recognition that in order to create true housing choice and foster integrated communities, policy makers must take deliberate steps aimed at disrupting patterns of segregation and the attendant inequitable distribution of wealth. In order to do that, policy makers must pursue

²⁵ An Essential Role for Down Payment Assistance in Closing America's Racial and Homeownership Wealth Gaps;

²⁶ A Vision for an Equitable DC.

²⁷ Draft Metropolitan Washington Regional Fair Housing Plan, Lack of Local Fair Housing Outreach and Enforcement (describing the need to expand fair housing outreach and enforcement services); District of Columbia Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice 2006-2012, Fair Housing Complaints and Studies.

²⁸ Abraham, Noah et al., A Collaborative Framework for Eviction Prevention in DC, Urban Institute, Access to Emergency Financial Resources, February 2023; Airgood-Obrycki, Whitney, Short Term Benefits of Emergency Rental Assistance Extend Beyond Housing, June 14, 2022, <https://www.ichs.harvard.edu/blog/short-term-benefits-emergency-rental-assistance-extend-beyond-housing>.

priorities that subsidize homeownership outside of racially and economically segregated areas as vigorously as policies seeking to create rental housing. Similarly, where investments are made in racially and economically segregated areas, they should focus on improving the material circumstances of and increasing access to opportunities for the people already living there instead of focusing on attracting racially and economically diverse newcomers. By keeping these principles in mind, the District and surrounding jurisdictions can undo much of the legacy of discrimination and segregation.



26 March 2023

Crises demand bold action. The solutions recommended in this Draft should go further to relieve the housing burden face by residents of the region. All jurisdictions should:

1. Increase the supply of homes at all levels of affordability to dampen housing cost growth for everyone;
2. Encourage construction of deeply affordable homes through financial and regulatory incentives for homebuilders; and
3. Rewrite or strike zoning regulations that make housing of all kinds illegal or cost prohibitive. Legalize multifamily buildings on all residential land, reduce or eliminate parking and lot size mandates that increase housing costs, examine the impact of FAR limits on home costs, etc.

Alexandria should go far beyond its own local recommendations to also strengthen eviction protections and tenant rights, eliminate all minimum lot sizes above 2,500 square feet, legalize multifamily homes citywide, and support conversion of existing single-family homes into co-living or multifamily homes.

YIMBYS of Northern Virginia

IX. Endnotes

- ¹ “Five Things to Know about the Regional Housing Equity Plan,” Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, news release, June 9, 2021, <https://www.mwcog.org/newsroom/2021/06/09/five-things-to-know-about-the-regional-housing-equity-plan/>.
- ² “What We Do,” Challenging Racism, accessed October 10, 2023, <https://www.challengingracism.org/what-we-do.html>.
- ³ Richard Rothstein, *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America* (New York: Liveright, 2017).
- ⁴ The use of the terms Hispanic or Latino in the report is related to the data sources. In this case, these were the choices that respondents were presented in the survey: “Are you Hispanic or Latino? Yes/No.”
- ⁵ American Community Survey, ACS Data Table S0101, *Age and Sex: 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables (United States)*, US Census Bureau, <https://data.census.gov/table?q=United+States&d=ACS+5-Year+Estimates+Subject+Tables&tid=ACSST5Y2019.S0101>.
- ⁶ Kathryn Zickuhr, “Discriminatory Housing Practices in the District: A Brief History,” D.C. Policy Center, October 2018, <https://www.dcpolicycenter.org/publications/discriminatory-housing-practices-in-the-district-a-brief-history/>.
- ⁷ Data from HUD online tool table downloads, based on 2011–2015 American Community Survey data.
- ⁸ Ivy Morgan and Ary Amerikaner, *Funding Gaps: An Analysis of School Funding Equity Across the U.S. and Within Each State*, Education Trust, 2018, <https://edtrust.org/resource/funding-gaps-2018/>.
- ⁹ “Unemployment Rate: Loudoun County, VA (U),” US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Data Viewer, <https://beta.bls.gov/dataViewer/view/timeseries/LAUCN511070000000003>.
- ¹⁰ “Unemployment Rate: Virginia (S),” BLS Data Viewer, <https://beta.bls.gov/dataViewer/view/timeseries/LASST510000000000003>.
- ¹¹ “Unemployment Rate: Prince William County, VA (U),” BLS Data Viewer, <https://beta.bls.gov/dataViewer/view/timeseries/LAUCN511530000000003>.
- ¹² “Unemployment Rate: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV Metropolitan Division, VA part (U),” BLS Data Viewer, <https://beta.bls.gov/dataViewer/view/timeseries/LAUID514789400000003>.
- ¹³ American Community Survey (ACS), ACS Data Table S2301, *Employment Status: 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables*, US Census Bureau, <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?t=Employment%20and%20Labor%20Force%20Status&g=0500000US1153&tid=ACSST5Y2019.S2301> (retrieved April 26, 2022).
- ¹⁴ ACS, ACS Data Table S2301, *Employment Status: 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables*, US Census Bureau <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?t=Employment%20and%20Labor%20Force%20Status&g=0100000US&tid=ACSST5Y2019.S2301>.
- ¹⁵ “Workforce and Talent,” Department of Economic Development, Prince William County (website), <https://www.pwcdded.org/workforce>.
- ¹⁶ “Jobseekers,” ELEVATE Prince William: Building Businesses and Careers, Virginia Career Works, Northern Region (website), <https://vcwnorthern.com/elevate-jobseekers/>.
- ¹⁷ *Prince William County 2021–2024 Strategic Plan: A Community of Choice*, Prince William County Office of Management and Budget, 34, https://www.pwcva.gov/assets/2021-09/2021-2024_Strategic_Plan-FINAL.pdf.
- ¹⁸ Prince William County Planning Office, “Racial & Social Justice Commission Government and Workforce Committee Presentation,” July 12, 2021, <https://eservice.pwcgov.org/planning/documents/cpu/housing/RSJ%20Commission%20PPT%2020210712.pdf>.
- ¹⁹ American Lung Association, “Report Card: District of Columbia,” *State of the Air 2022*, <https://www.lung.org/initiatives/healthy-air/sota/city-rankings/states/district-of-columbia/>, accessed December 21, 2022.
- ²⁰ Anacostia Watershed Society, *A Waterway to 2025, A Vision for the Anacostia River*, <https://www.anacostiaws.org/our-watershed/waterway-to-2025.html>.
- ²¹ Jacob Fenston, “The Consequences Of Cleaning Up The Anacostia River,” *Weekend Edition*, National Public Radio, May 5, 2018, <https://www.npr.org/2018/05/05/608723599/the-consequences-of-cleaning-up-the-anacostia-river>.
- ²² HUD, “CHAS: Background,” HUD User (website), https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp/CHAS/bg_chas.html.
- ²³ Donald J. Fletcher, *Report of The Independent Reviewer on Compliance with the Settlement Agreement United States v. Commonwealth of Virginia*, December 13, 2021, <https://dbhds.virginia.gov/assets/doc/settlement/indreview/211213-final-19th-report-to-the-court.pdf>.
- ²⁴ Office of Disability Rights, “Facility Access Requirements,” D.C. Government, <https://odr.dc.gov/book/ADATITLEII/facility-access>.
- ²⁵ Shonel Sen, “1 in 5 Virginians Will Be Over 65 Years by 2030,” *StatChat* (web series), July 5, 2017, University of Virginia Demographics Research Group, <https://statchatva.org/2017/07/05/1-in-5-virginians-will-be-over-65-years-by-2030/#:~:text=Virginia's%20elderly%20population%20is%20anticipated,and%20reaching%2019%25%20by%202030>.
- ²⁶ Virginia Board for People with Disabilities, *Assessment of Virginia’s Disability Services System: Transportation*, Commonwealth of Virginia, 2018, <https://sharepoint.wvrc.net/VBPDdocs/Shared%20Documents/Polymaking/2018%20Assessments/VBPD%202018%20Transportation%20Assessment.pdf>.
- ²⁷ “Metrorail Accessibility Features,” Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (website), <https://wmata.com/service/accessibility/metrorail.cfm>.
- ²⁸ “Washington, D.C. Public Transportation,” Wheelchair Travel (website), <https://wheelchairtravel.org/washington-dc/public-transportation/>.

-
- 29 *Ibid.*
- 30 “Accessibility,” Virginia Railway Express (website), <https://www.vre.org/service/accessibility/>.
- 31 “Accessibility,” Maryland Transit Authority (website), <https://www.mta.maryland.gov/accessibility>.
- 32 “Accessibility,” D.C. Circulator (website), <https://www.dccirculator.com/bus-basics/accessibility/>.
- 33 “About,” Arlington Transit (website), <https://www.arlingtontransit.com/about/>.
- 34 “Ride On Bus Accessibility,” Montgomery County Department of Transportation Transit Services (website), https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DOT-Transit/routesandschedules/brochures/accessible_ride_on.html.
- 35 “Accessibility,” OmniRide (website), <https://omniride.com/about/accessibility/>.
- 36 “Local Bus,” Loudoun County Transit and Commuter Services (website), <https://www.loudoun.gov/3302/Local-Bus>.
- 37 “Rider Guide,” Fairfax County Connector (website), <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/connector/new-rider>.
- 38 “Transportation for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities,” Fairfax County CUE Bus System (website), <https://www.fairfaxva.gov/government/public-works/transportation-division/cue-bus-system/transportation-for-seniors-and-persons-with-disabilities>.
- 39 Alexandria Transit Company DASH (website), <https://www.dashbus.com/>.
- 40 “Fare-Free Transit at DASH,” DASH (website), <https://www.dashbus.com/free/>.
- 41 Department of Access Services, *Customer Guide to MetroAccess*, WMATA, <https://wmata.com/service/accessibility/metro-access/upload/MetroAccess-Customer-Guide-2021.pdf>.
- 42 “Abilities-Ride,” WMATA (website), <https://www.wmata.com/service/accessibility/metro-access/Abilities-Ride.cfm>.
- 43 “Rockville Call N Ride,” Info Montgomery (website), <https://infomontgomery.org/program/59463344>.
- 44 “DOT Paratransit Program,” City of Alexandria (website), <https://www.alexandriava.gov/tes/info/default.aspx?id=6538>.
- 45 “STAR—Specialized Transit for Arlington Residents,” Arlington Transit (website), <https://www.arlingtontransit.com/star/>.
- 46 “Accessible Bus Service,” Loudoun County Transit and Commuter Service (website), <https://www.loudoun.gov/3303/Paratransit-Bus-Service>.
- 47 “Accessibility,” Maryland Transit Administration (website) <https://www.mta.maryland.gov/accessibility>.
- 48 Prince William County Public Schools, *FFY 2018 Special Education Performance Report*, Virginia Department of Education, https://www.doe.virginia.gov/special_ed/reports_plans_stats/special_ed_performance/division/2018-2019/spp-app/princewilliam.pdf.
- 49 Prince William County Public Schools, *FFY 2018 Special Education Performance Report*.
- 50 Prince William County Public Schools, *FFY 2018 Special Education Performance Report*.
- 51 “Activity Centers Maps,” Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, January 13, 2013, <https://www.mwcog.org/documents/2013/01/13/activity-centers-maps/>. Activity Centers are priority places for growth in metropolitan Washington.
- 52 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, Article 80, Boston Planning and Development Agency (website), <http://www.bostonplans.org/housing/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing-article-80>.
- 53 Hugh M. Clark, *Who Rides Public Transportation*, January 2017, American Public Transportation Association, <https://www.apta.com/research-technical-resources/research-reports/who-rides-public-transportation/>.
- 54 COG’s Equity Emphasis Areas analysis and maps can help inform this work. “Equity Emphasis Areas for TPB’s Enhanced Environmental Justice Analysis,” Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (website), <https://www.mwcog.org/transportation/planning-areas/fairness-and-accessibility/environmental-justice/equity-emphasis-areas/>.
- 55 Virginia Department of Education, *Alexandria City Public Schools FFY 2018 Special Education Performance Report*, https://www.doe.virginia.gov/special_ed/reports_plans_stats/special_ed_performance/division/2018-2019/spp-app/alexandria.pdf.
- 56 Arlington Public Schools, *Evaluation of Services for Students with Disabilities and Those Requiring Intervention*, November 2019, <https://www.apsva.us/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Evaluation-of-Services-for-Students-with-Disabilities-and-Those-Requiring-Intervention-FINAL-1.pdf>.
- 57 *Ibid.*, 57.
- 58 *Ibid.*, 125.
- 59 Office of the State Superintendent of Education, *Students with Disabilities in the District of Columbia: Landscape Analysis*, October 2019, https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/page_content/attachments/SWD%20Landscape%20Analysis%2010.19.pdf.
- 60 US Department of Education, *D.C. State Performance Plan—2019 Annual Performance Report: Part B*, February 1, 2021, <https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/FFY%202019%20Annual%20Performance%20Report%20-%20Part%20B.pdf>.
- 61 *Ibid.*, 11.
- 62 *Ibid.*, 43.
- 63 *Ibid.*, 49.
- 64 Virginia Department of Education, *Fairfax County Public Schools FFY 2018 Special Education Performance Report*, https://www.doe.virginia.gov/special_ed/reports_plans_stats/special_ed_performance/division/2018-2019/spp-app/fairfax.pdf.
- 65 Virginia Department of Education, *Loudoun County Public Schools FFY 2018 Special Education Performance Report*, https://www.doe.virginia.gov/special_ed/reports_plans_stats/special_ed_performance/division/2018-2019/spp-app/loudoun.pdf.
- 66 *Ibid.*
- 67 Maryland State Department of Education, *Montgomery County Public Schools Special Education*, October 2018,

<https://montgomerycountymd.gov/HHS-Program/Resources/Files/A%26D%20Docs/CPWD/MCPSDataOct2018.pdf>.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ Virginia Department of Education, *Prince William County Public Schools FFY 2018 Special Education Performance Report*, https://www.doe.virginia.gov/special_ed/reports_plans_stats/special_ed_performance/division/2018-2019/spp-app/princewilliam.pdf.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ Prosperity Now, *Local Outcome Report*, September 2021, <https://scorecard.prosperitynow.org/reports#report-local-outcome>.

⁷⁴ National Center for Smart Growth and Enterprise Community Partners, *Maryland Housing Needs Assessment and 10-Year Strategic Plan*, Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, December 2020, <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Documents/Other%20Publications/Report.pdf>.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Virginia Board for People with Disabilities, *Assessment of Virginia's Disability Services System: Housing*, 2018, <https://sharepoint.wvrc.net/VBPDdocs/Shared%20Documents/Policymaking/2018%20Assessments/VBPD%202018%20Housing%20Assessment.pdf>.

⁷⁷ District of Columbia Department of Behavioral Health, *Supportive Housing Strategic Plan, 2012–2017*, September 2012, <https://dbh.dc.gov/publication/2012-2017-supportive-housing-strategic-plan>.

⁷⁸ Shonell Sen, "1 in 5 Virginians Will Be Over 65 Years by 2030," *StatChat* (web series), July 5, 2017, University of Virginia Demographics Research Group, <https://statchatva.org/2017/07/05/1-in-5-virginians-will-be-over-65-years-by-2030/#:~:text=Virginia's%20elderly%20population%20is%20anticipated.and%20reaching%2019%25%20by%202030>.

⁷⁹ Virginia Board for People with Disabilities, *Assessment of Virginia's Disability Services System: Transportation*, Commonwealth of Virginia, 2018, <https://sharepoint.wvrc.net/VBPDdocs/Shared%20Documents/Policymaking/2018%20Assessments/VBPD%202018%20Transportation%20Assessment.pdf>.

⁸⁰ Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority, *Metrorail Accessibility Features*, <https://wmata.com/service/accessibility/metrorail.cfm>.

⁸¹ Wheelchair Travel, *D.C. Public Transportation*, <https://wheelchairtravel.org/washington-D.C./public-transportation/>.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Virginia Railway Express, *Accessibility*, <https://www.vre.org/service/accessibility/>.

⁸⁴ Maryland Transportation Authority, *Accessibility*, <https://www.mta.maryland.gov/accessibility>.

⁸⁵ D.C. Circulator, *Accessibility*, <https://www.dccirculator.com/bus-basics/accessibility/>.

⁸⁶ Arlington Transit, *About*, <https://www.arlingtontransit.com/about/>.

⁸⁷ Montgomery County Department of Transportation, *Ride On Bus Accessibility*, https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DOT-Transit/routesandschedules/brochures/accessibile_ride_on.html.

⁸⁸ OmniRide, *Accessibility*, <https://omniride.com/about/accessibility/>.

⁸⁹ Loudoun County, *Local Fixed Route Bus Service*, <https://www.loudoun.gov/3302/Local-Bus>.

⁹⁰ Fairfax County, *Fairfax Connector Rider Guide*, <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/connector/new-rider>.

⁹¹ Fairfax County Cue Bus System, *Transportation for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities*, <https://www.fairfaxva.gov/government/public-works/transportation-division/cue-bus-system/transportation-for-seniors-and-persons-with-disabilities>.

⁹² Alexandria Transit Company Dash Bus, *Accessibility*, <https://www.dashbus.com/node/52>.

⁹³ "Fare-Free Transit at DASH," DASH (website), <https://www.dashbus.com/free/>.

⁹⁴ WMATA, *Metro Access Customer Guide*, <https://wmata.com/service/accessibility/metro-access/upload/MetroAccess-Customer-Guide-2021.pdf>.

⁹⁵ "Abilities-Ride," WMATA (website), <https://www.wmata.com/service/accessibility/metro-access/Abilities-Ride.cfm>.

⁹⁶ "Rockville Call N Ride," Info Montgomery (website), <https://infomontgomery.org/program/59463344>.

⁹⁷ City of Alexandria, DOT Paratransit Program, <https://www.alexandriava.gov/tes/info/default.aspx?id=6538>.

⁹⁸ Arlington Transit, *STAR—Specialized Transit for Arlington Residents*, <https://www.arlingtontransit.com/star/>.

⁹⁹ Loudoun County, *Paratransit Bus Service*, <https://www.loudoun.gov/3303/Paratransit-Bus-Service>.

¹⁰⁰ Maryland Transit Authority, *Accessibility*, <https://www.mta.maryland.gov/accessibility>.

¹⁰¹ "Rule 14-6105—Preferences For Public Housing," D.C. Municipal Regulations, Register Vol. 69, No. 40, October 7, 2022, <https://casetext.com/regulation/district-of-columbia-administrative-code/title-14-housing/chapter-14-61-public-housing-admission-and-recertification/rule-14-6105-preferences-for-public-housing>.

¹⁰² "Apply for Public Housing," District Alliance for Safe Housing (website), <https://www.dashdc.org/housing-resource-center/find-safe-housing/permanent-housing/apply-public-housing/>.

¹⁰³ Morgan Baskin, "D.C. Wasted Hundreds Of Permanent Housing Voucher Subsidies Last Year," *DCist*, April 21, 2021, <https://dcist.com/story/21/04/12/dc-wasted-hundreds-of-permanent-housing-voucher-subsidies-last-year/>.

¹⁰⁴ Affordable Housing Online Waiting List Statuses (website), <https://affordablehousingonline.com/housing-authority/Virginia/Alexandria-Redevelopment-and-Housing-Authority/VA004>.

¹⁰⁵ "Fairfax County Housing Waitlists," Fairfax County Housing and Community Development (website), <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/waitlist>.

¹⁰⁶ "Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County Waiting List Statuses," Affordable Housing Online, <https://affordablehousingonline.com/housing-authority/Maryland/Housing-Opportunities-Commission-of-Montgomery-County/MD004>.

-
- ¹⁰⁷ WMATA, *Performance Report: Q2/FY2021, July–December 2020*, February 5, 2021, <https://www.wmata.com/about/records/upload/Q2FY21MetroPerformanceReport.pdf>.
- ¹⁰⁸ WMATA, *FY19 Metro Performance Report*, <https://www.wmata.com/about/records/scorecard/upload/O4FY19-Metro-Performance-Report.pdf>.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹¹ “Metrorail,” WMATA (website), <https://www.wmata.com/service/rail/>.
- ¹¹² “Metro Parking,” WMATA (website), <https://www.wmata.com/service/parking/>.
- ¹¹³ Capital Bikeshare (website), <https://www.capitalbikeshare.com/>.
- ¹¹⁴ “Map,” Capital Bikeshare (website), <https://account.capitalbikeshare.com/map>.
- ¹¹⁵ “Index of Bucket Capitalbikeshare-data,” <https://s3.amazonaws.com/capitalbikeshare-data/index.html>.
- ¹¹⁶ Paul Schwartzman, “How George Floyd’s Death Is Fueling a Push for Affordable Housing in Mostly White Parts of D.C.,” *Washington Post*, March 1, 2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dc-politics/dc-racism-affordable-housing/2021/03/01/a37506b4-6d86-11eb-9ead-673168d5b874_story.html.
- ¹¹⁷ Liz Farmer, “Capital Ideas: Washington, D.C.’s Ambitious Plan to Distribute Affordable Housing More Equitably,” *Lincoln Institute of Land Policy*, January 15, 2020, <https://www.lincolninst.edu/publications/articles/2020-01-capital-ideas-washington-dc-ambitious-plan-distribute-affordable-housing-more-equitably>.
- ¹¹⁸ Meagan Flynn, “D.C.’s Housing Fund Falls Short of Requirement to Aid Lowest-Income Renters,” *Washington Post*, April 3, 2023, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2023/04/03/dc-affordable-housing-report-bowser/>.
- ¹¹⁹ Wyatt Gordon, “An ‘Anti-NIMBY’ Bill Will Soon Be Law in Virginia. Will It Have an Impact on Affordable Housing?” *Greater Greater Washington*, May 27, 2021, <https://gwwash.org/view/81471/an-anti-nimby-bill-will-soon-be-law-in-virginia-will-it-have-an-impact-on-affordable-housing>.
- ¹²⁰ Nolan Stout, “Northern Virginia Leaders Highlight Affordable Housing, Transportation,” *Inside NoVa*, August 26, 2021, https://www.insidenova.com/headlines/northern-virginia-leaders-highlight-affordable-housing-transportation/article_78faaf20-062d-11ec-bafc-5f8139602051.html.
- ¹²¹ Drew Wilder, “Loudoun County Board Votes Against Development on Goose Creek After Neighbors Protest,” *NBC Washington*, March 16, 2021, <https://www.nbcwashington.com/news/local/northern-virginia/loudoun-county-board-to-reconsider-development-on-goose-creek-after-neighbors-protest/2609335/>.
- ¹²² Antonio Olivo, “Fairfax Poised to Approve Zoning Changes That Would Make It Easier to Rent Converted Apartments,” *Washington Post*, March 22, 2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/virginia-politics/fairfax-accessory-units-zoning-change/2021/03/22/0f5b4756-88dc-11eb-8a8b-5cf82c3dffe4_story.html.
- ¹²³ Ally Schweitzer, “A Battle Over Housing Is Brewing in the 2022 Montgomery County Executive Race,” *DCist*, June 11, 2021, <https://dcist.com/story/21/06/11/housing-fight-heats-up-montgomery-county-executive-race/>.
- ¹²⁴ Ally Schweitzer, “Montgomery County’s New General Plan Ignites Debate over Race and Affordability,” *National Public Radio*, November 2, 2021, <https://www.npr.org/local/305/2021/11/02/1051622681/montgomery-county-s-new-general-plan-ignites-debate-over-race-and-affordability>.
- ¹²⁵ District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development, *PADD Property Sites Report*, <https://octo.quickbase.com/db/bmnu25bzt>.
- ¹²⁶ David Sheon and David Gottfried, “D.C. Has Way More Vacant Properties Than It Thinks,” *Greater Greater Washington*, May 18, 2016, <https://gwwash.org/view/41741/dc-has-way-more-vacant-properties-than-it-thinks>.
- ¹²⁷ Peter Jamison, “D.C. Failing to Crack Down on Abandoned Buildings, Report Finds,” *Washington Post*, September 21, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dc-politics/dc-failing-to-crack-down-on-decrepit-buildings-report-finds/2017/09/21/181c7a6a-9e14-11e7-9083-fbdfd6804c2_story.html.
- ¹²⁸ “District Alliance for Safe Housing (DASH),” *Greater Washington Catalogue of Philanthropy* (website), <https://www.cfp-dc.org/nonprofits/1478/District-Alliance-for-Safe-Housing-DASH/>.
- ¹²⁹ “Domestic Violence Housing Continuum,” *D.C. Coalition Against Domestic Violence* (website), <https://dccadv.org/housing-continuum/>.
- ¹³⁰ “NVFS’ Impact on Advocating, Educating, and Reducing Domestic Violence in Northern Virginia,” *Northern Virginia Family Service*, October 2, 2017, <https://www.nvfs.org/reducing-domestic-violence-northern-virginia/>.
- ¹³¹ “Domestic Violence,” *Northern Virginia Family Service* (website), <https://www.nvfs.org/our-services/mental-health/domestic-violence/>.
- ¹³² “Shelter and Housing,” *Doorways* (website), <https://www.doorwaysva.org/our-work/emergency-shelter-and-long-term-housing/>.
- ¹³³ “Housing/Shelter,” *Info Montgomery* (website), <https://www.infomontgomery.org/search-results/?taxonomyCode=BH>.
- ¹³⁴ “Abused Persons Program,” *Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services* (website), <https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/HHS-Program/Program.aspx?id=BHCS/BHCSAbusedPerson-p207.html>.
- ¹³⁵ Margery Austin Turner et al., *Meeting the Washington Region’s Future Housing Needs*, *Urban Institute*, September 4, 2019, https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/100946/meeting_the_washington_regions_future_housing_needs_4.pdf.
- ¹³⁶ Elizabeth Hughes, *Unequal Burden, Low-Income Northern Virginians Face the Country’s Most Severe Housing Cost Burden*, *Community Foundation for Northern Virginia, Insight Region Inclusive Prosperity Series #1*, January 2021, https://www.cfnova.org/images/communityreports/InsightRegion_UnequalBurden_Copyright2021.pdf.
- ¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

- 138 Vernon Miles, "Alexandria Races to Put Arlandria Affordable Housing Plan in Place before Amazon's Arrival," ALXnow, March 23, 2021, <https://www.alxnow.com/2021/03/23/alexandria-races-to-put-arlandria-affordable-housing-plan-in-place-before-amazons-arrival/>.
- 139 Jo DeVoe, "County Board Mulls Changes to Affordable Housing Grants Ahead of Budget Vote," ARLnow, April 19, 2021, <https://www.arlnow.com/2021/04/19/county-board-mulls-changes-to-affordable-housing-grants-ahead-of-budget-vote/>.
- 140 Ally Schweitzer, "Amazon Will Cause 'Mass Displacement' of Working Class Latino Residents, Report Says," WAMU, February 20, 2019, <https://wamu.org/story/19/02/20/amazon-will-cause-mass-displacement-of-working-class-latino-residents-report-says/>.
- 141 Tracy Jan and Kathy Orton, "Northern Virginia Property Owners Are Delighted Amazon HQ2 Is Moving In. Renters, First-Time Buyers and Low-Income Residents Aren't," *Washington Post*, November 13, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/northern-virginia-property-owners-are-delighted-amazon-hq2-will-be-moving-in-renters-first-time-buyers-and-low-income-residents-arent/2018/11/13/47307aba-e457-11e8-b759-3d88a5ce9e19_story.html.
- 142 Hallie Mellendorf, "'It's Primarily Racial': Study Finds D.C. Has the Most Intense Gentrification in the Country," WTOP News, April 18, 2019, <https://wtop.com/dc/2019/04/its-primarily-racial-dc-has-the-most-intense-gentrification-in-the-country-study-found/>.
- 143 Jason Richardson, Bruce Mitchell, and Juan Franco, *Shifting Neighborhoods: Gentrification and Cultural Displacement in American Cities* (Washington, DC: National Community Reinvestment Coalition, 2019), <https://ncrc.org/gentrification/>.
- 144 Institute on Metropolitan Opportunity, *American Neighborhood Change in the 21st Century*, University of Minnesota Law School, April 2109, https://www.law.umn.edu/sites/law.umn.edu/files/metro-files/american_neighborhood_change_in_the_21st_century_-_full_report_-_4-1-2019.pdf.
- 145 Eliza Berkon, "For Some D.C. Parents, It's Too Expensive to Work," National Public Radio, January 9, 2020, <https://www.npr.org/local/305/2020/01/09/794851835/for-some-d-c-parents-it-s-too-expensive-to-work>.
- 146 Margery Austin Turner et al., *Meeting the Washington Region's Future Housing Needs*, Urban Institute, September 4, 2019, <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/meeting-washington-regions-future-housing-needs>.
- 147 *Ibid.*
- 148 Renss Greene, "Loudoun Leaders Target Lower Housing Costs as Top Priority," *LoudounNow*, February 20, 2020, <https://loudounnow.com/2020/02/20/loudoun-leaders-target-lower-housing-costs-as-top-priority/>.
- 149 Loudoun County, *Draft: Unmet Housing Needs Strategic Plan*, April 1, 2021, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/164847/April-1-2021-Draft-Unmet-Housing-Needs-Strategic-Plan>.
- 150 *Ibid.*
- 151 Sage Policy Group, Inc., *Restoring Economic Momentum in Montgomery County, MD*, submitted to Empower Montgomery, December 2018, <https://www.empowermontgomery.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/SAGE-Policy-Report-January-2019.pdf>, 32.
- 152 Mary Cunningham et al., "Do Landlords Accept Housing Choice Vouchers? Findings from Washington, D.C.," Urban Institute, October 3, 2018, https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2018/10/03/do_landlords_accept_housing_choice_vouchers_washington_dc.pdf.
- 153 Michelle D. Thomas, "Testimony on Rental Housing Source of Income Amendment Act of 2019," Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia, February 20, 2020, <https://oag.dc.gov/release/testimony-rental-housing-source-income-amendment>.
- 154 "Act 23-574—Rental Housing Source of Income Amendment Act of 2020 (B23-528)," D.C. Municipal Regulations Register Vol. 68, No. 4, January 22, 2021, <https://www.dcregs.dc.gov/Common/NoticeDetail.aspx?NoticeId=N102999>.
- 155 Maryland House Bill 231, *Housing Opportunities Made Equal Act*, May 8, 2020, <https://legiscan.com/MD/text/HB231/2020>.
- 156 Arlington County Housing Choice Voucher Program, "SOI Discrimination and Protections: What Arlington Tenants Need to Know," <https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2021/04/An-Overview-of-Source-of-Income-Protections-for-AHCVP-Clients-1.pdf>.
- 157 *Ibid.*
- 158 "Housing Choice Voucher Portability," Fairfax County Housing and Community Development (website), <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/rentalhousing/housingchoicevoucher/portability>.
- 159 Office of Disability Rights, "Facility Access Requirements," D.C. Government, <https://odr.dc.gov/book/ADATITLEII/facility-access>.
- 160 Project Sidewalk (website), <https://sidewalk-sea.cs.washington.edu/>.
- 161 Sianna Boschetti, "District Sidewalks Still Not Up to ADA Standards," *The Wash*, January 21, 2020, <https://thewash.org/2020/01/21/district-sidewalks-still-not-up-to-ada-standards/>.
- 162 District Department of Transportation, *2016 ADA Transition Plan for the Public Right-of-Way*, August 8, 2016, https://ddot.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ddot/page_content/attachments/2016-08-08_ADA_Transition%20Plan_DDOT_CB.pdf.
- 163 Hannah E. MacKnight, Peter B. Ohlms, T. Donna Chen, and Shanjiang Zhu, *Guidelines for Prioritizing Curb Ramp Retrofits under the Americans with Disabilities Act*, Virginia Transportation Research Council, Report 21-R18, March 2021, https://www.virginiadot.org/vtrc/main/online_reports/pdf/21-R18.pdf.
- 164 Maryland State Highway Administration, *Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plan for Public Rights-of-Way*, December 2009, https://roads.maryland.gov/OHD2/ADA_Transition_Plan_Final_122209.pdf.

¹⁶⁵ Brittany Renee Mayes and Maria Aguilar, “Outdoor Dining Reopened Restaurants for All—but Added to Barriers for Disabled,” *Washington Post*, July 13, 2021, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2021/07/13/outdoor-dining-sidewalk-access-disability/>.

¹⁶⁶ “Prince William County Home Values,” Zillow, September 30, 2022, <https://www.zillow.com/prince-william-county-va/home-values/>.

¹⁶⁷ “Arlington County Home Values,” Zillow, September 30, 2022, <https://www.zillow.com/arlinton-va/home-values/>.

¹⁶⁸ “Washington, D.C., Home Values,” Zillow, September 30, 2022, <https://www.zillow.com/washington-dc/home-values/>.

¹⁶⁹ “Prince William County Home Values,” Zillow.

¹⁷⁰ “Northern Virginia Has a Worse Housing Burden for Low-Income Families than Any Other US Metro Area,” *Annandale Today*, January 21, 2021, <https://annandaleva.blogspot.com/2021/01/northern-virginia-has-worst-housing.html>.

¹⁷¹ Michael Bailey, Eric LaRose, and Jenny Schuetz, “What Will It Cost to Save Washington, D.C.’s Renters from COVID-19 Eviction?” Brookings Institution, July 23, 2020, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/what-will-it-cost-to-save-washington-d-c-s-renters-from-covid-19-eviction/>.

¹⁷² Pete Tomao, “Montgomery County Doesn’t Have Enough Homes. Will It Use Public Land to Help Solve the Problem?” *Greater Greater Washington*, May 23, 2018, <https://ggwash.org/view/67742/montgomery-county-doesnt-have-enough-homes-will-it-use-public-land-to-help>.

¹⁷³ “List of Community-Based Service Providers,” District of Columbia Department of Behavioral Health (website), <https://dbh.dc.gov/page/list-community-based-service-providers>.

¹⁷⁴ “Home and Community-Based Services Waiver Program,” District of Columbia Department on Disability Services (website), <https://dds.dc.gov/page/home-and-community-based-services-waiver-program>.

¹⁷⁵ Housing Resources Search Menu, Virginia Housing and Supportive Services (website), <https://www.novahss.org/housing-resources/searching-for-housing>.

¹⁷⁶ “Home and Community-Based Services and Supports,” Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services (website), <https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/HHS-Program/ADS/HomeCommBasedSvs.html>.

¹⁷⁷ The Partnership to Prevent and End Homelessness in the City of Alexandria, *Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness in the City of Alexandria, Virginia, FY2014–2020*, July 12, 2014, <https://www.alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/dchs/economicssupport/PPEH%20Strategic%20Plan%20FY2014-15%20final%20071214.pdf>.

¹⁷⁸ Arlington Department of Human Services, *Action Plan for Ending Homelessness in Arlington, Virginia: 2019 Annual Report*, <https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/33/2020/10/2019-Annual-Report-10-2020.pdf>.

¹⁷⁹ District of Columbia Interagency Council on Homelessness, *Homeward D.C.: Strategic Plan 2015–2020*, https://ich.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ich/page_content/attachments/ICH-StratPlan2.11%20web.pdf.

¹⁸⁰ “Housing Blueprint,” Fairfax County Housing and Community Development (website), <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/data/housing-blueprint>.

¹⁸¹ “Housing Blueprint: At a Glance—FY2021,” Fairfax County Housing and Community Development, <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/sites/housing/files/assets/documents/housing%20blueprint/fy%202021%20final.pdf>.

¹⁸² HUD, *HUD 2020 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs Housing Inventory Count Report: Virginia*, January 13, 2021, https://files.hudexchange.info/reports/published/CoC_HIC_State_VA_2020.pdf.

¹⁸³ Loudoun County CDBG Program, *Annual Action Plan 2019-2020*, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/146363/Annual-Action-Plan-2019-2020->

¹⁸⁴ Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services, *Interagency Commission on Homelessness Annual Report 2020*, December 2020, <https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/Homelessness/Resources/Files/Documents/Annual%20Reports/2020-ICHAnnual%20Report.pdf>.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁷ “Accessible Housing for People with Disabilities,” D.C. Affordable Housing Alliance, https://www.smartergrowth.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/ACCESSIBLE-HOUSING-FOR-PEOPLE-WITH-DISABILITIES_election-2014-brief.pdf.

¹⁸⁸ Virginia Board of People with Disabilities, *Assessment of Virginia’s Disability Services System: Housing*, Commonwealth of Virginia, 2018, <https://sharepoint.wvrc.net/VBPDdocs/Shared%20Documents/Policy-making/2018%20Assessments/VBPD%202018%20Housing%20Assessment.pdf>; National Center for Smart Growth and Enterprise Community Partners, *Maryland Housing Needs Assessment*.

¹⁸⁹ “Single-Family Residential Rehabilitation Program (SFRPP),” District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development (website), <https://dhcd.dc.gov/SFRPP>.

¹⁹⁰ “People with Disabilities,” District of Columbia Housing Authority (website), https://webserver1.dchousing.org/?page_id=346.

¹⁹¹ “Services,” Rebuilding Together (website), <https://rebuildingtogether-aff.org/what-we-do/services/>.

¹⁹² “Resources for Accessible Rental Housing,” City of Alexandria Office of Housing, November 4, 2015, <https://www.alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/housing/info/RAMP%20Brochure%20-%20FINAL.pdf>.

¹⁹³ Justin Wm. Moyer, “Disabled Residents in the D.C. Region Face Obstacles When Searching for Housing, Report Says,” *Washington Post*, March 20, 2019, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/disabled-residents-in-the-dc-region-face-obstacles-when-searching-for-housing-report-says/2019/03/20/7564a056-4a6d-11e9-b7e1-f816f3e72d77_story.html.

¹⁹⁴ Pathways to Housing, D.C. (website), <https://pathwaystohousingdc.org/>.

- 195 “Preparing Individuals for Independent Housing,” Virginia Housing and Supportive Services (website), <https://www.novahss.org/housing-tool-kit/preparing-individuals-to-transition>.
- 196 No Wrong Door (website), <https://www.nowrongdoor.virginia.gov/default.htm>.
- 197 Maryland Access Point (website), <https://marylandaccesspoint.211md.org/>.
- 198 “Maryland Medicaid Waiver: Disability Services and Waivers” (website), <http://medicaidwaiver.org/state/maryland.html>.
- 199 “Maryland Department of Health Announces New Medicaid Rate Increases,” Maryland Department of Health, November 2, 2021, <https://health.maryland.gov/newsroom/Pages/Maryland-Department-of-Health-announces-new-Medicaid-rate-increases.aspx>.
- 200 “Neighborhood Housing Rehabilitation Program,” Prince William County Housing and Community Development (website), <https://www.pwcva.gov/department/housing-community-development/neighborhood-rehabilitation-program>.
- 201 “Home Improvement Programs,” Loudoun County Housing and Community Development (website), <https://www.loudoun.gov/1789/Home-Improvement-Programs>.
- 202 “Community Development,” Arlington Community Development (website), <https://housing.arlingtonva.us/community-development/>.
- 203 “Small Grants Program: FY2021 Proposal Instructions and Application Form,” Arlington County Housing Division, <https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2020/07/SMALL-GRANTS-PROPOSAL-INSTRUCTIONS-AND-APPLICATION-FORM-fillable.pdf>.
- 204 Renss Greene, “Loudoun Board Designates New Area for State Affordable Housing Financing,” *Loudoun Now*, February 6, 2020, <https://loudounnow.com/2020/02/06/loudoun-board-designates-new-area-for-state-affordable-housing-financing/>.
- 205 “Economic Incentive Program,” Fairfax County Planning and Development (website), <https://www.fcrevite.org/economic-incentive-program>.
- 206 “Sustainable Communities: Enhancing Maryland Communities by Prioritizing Investment,” Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (website), <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/dn/default.aspx>.
- 207 “Community Legacy Program,” Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (website), <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/programs/CL.aspx>.
- 208 “Focused Neighborhood Assistance Program,” Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs (website), <https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DHCA/community/neighborhood/fnaprojects.html>.
- 209 “Housing Right to Counsel Project,” D.C. Bar Pro Bono Center (website), <https://www.dcbbar.org/pro-bono/what-we-do/housing-right-to-counsel-project>.
- 210 “Disability Rights D.C.,” University Legal Services—Disability Rights D.C. (website), <https://www.uls-dc.org/protection-and-advocacy-program/disability-rights-dc/>.
- 211 “Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP) Agencies,” HUD Fair Housing Partners (website), https://www.hud.gov/program/offices/fair_housing_equal_opp/partners/FHAP/agencies.
- 212 Immigrant Justice Clinic, *Access Denied: the Unfulfilled Promise of the D.C. Language Access Act*, American University Washington College of Law, https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/language_portal/Access%20Denied-%20The%20Unfulfilled%20Promise%20of%20the%20D.C.%20Language%20Access%20Act.pdf.
- 213 Sosseh Prom, Council for Court Excellence (CCE), Letter to D.C. Department of Human Services, July 29, 2021, https://www.washlaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/CCE_Request_for_Language_Access_Changes_to_STAY_DC_Website.pdf.
- 214 District of Columbia Office Of Human Rights, *Language Access Program Annual Compliance Report*, 2019, https://ohr.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ohr/publication/attachments/OHRLAR19_FINAL_121820.pdf.
- 215 *Ibid.*
- 216 *Ibid.*
- 217 Arlington County Department of Human Services, *Arlington County Housing Choice Voucher Program Administration Plan*, July 1, 2019 <https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2020/06/Administrative-Plan-05-21-2020.pdf>.
- 218 “Language Line,” Fairfax County Department of Public Safety Communications (website), <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/911/language-line>.
- 219 Fairfax County Department of Housing and Community Development, *Fairfax County Affordable Housing Guide* <https://www.novahousingexpo.org/images/virtual/FairfaxDHCDAffordableHousingGuide2020.pdf>; “Family Self-Sufficiency Program Interest Form,” https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/sites/housing/files/assets/documents/fss/updated_fss_program_flyer.pdf.
- 220 “Fairfax County Emergency Rental and Utility Assistance,” Fairfax County Department of Health and Human Services (website), <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/health-humanservices/eviction-prevention/emergency-rent-assistance-program-eligibility>.
- 221 American Community Survey, *ACS Data Table DP02, Selected Social Characteristics in the United States, Alexandria City: 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Table*, US Census Department, <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=DP02&g=0500000US51510&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP02>.
- 222 “Renter Resources,” City of Alexandria (website), <https://www.alexandriava.gov/housing/info/default.aspx?id=74591>.
- 223 “HCV Program FAQ,” Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority (website), <https://www.arha.us/hcv-program-faq>.
- 224 American Community Survey, *ACS Data Table DP02: Selected Social Characteristics in the United States, Alexandria: 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables*, US Census Department, <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=DP02&g=0500000US51510&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP02>.
- 225 “Office of Housing,” City of Alexandria, accessed October 11, 2023, <https://www.alexandriava.gov/Housing>.

- ²²⁶ “Language Interpretation and Translation,” Loudoun County, accessed October 11, 2023, <https://www.loudoun.gov/5099/Language-Interpretation-and-Translation>.
- ²²⁷ Sahar Behboudifar, *2022 Overview of Loudoun County Government’s Limited English Proficiency Plan*, Loudoun County 2020, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/122720/LEP-PLAN-CULTURAL-DEMOGRAPHICS---Updated-May-2021?bidId=#:~:text=Loudoun%20County%20Government's%20Language%20Access%20Policy&text=A%20person%20wh%20cannot%20speak,County%20employees%20while%20receiving%20services>.
- ²²⁸ “ADU Purchase Program Information,” Loudoun County Department of Housing and Community Development (website), <https://www.loudoun.gov/1824/ADU-Purchase-Program>; “Financial Education and Credit Counseling Resources,” Loudoun County Housing Department, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/122182/Credit-Counseling-Financial-Education-Resources>.
- ²²⁹ Loudoun County Government (website), www.loudoun.gov.
- ²³⁰ “Limited English Proficiency (LEP): Internal Language Resources,” Montgomery County Government (website), https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/lep/res_internal.html.
- ²³¹ *Ibid.*
- ²³² “Affordable Housing Projects and Partners,” City of Alexandria Office of Housing (website), <https://www.alexandriava.gov/housing/info/default.aspx?id=74589>.
- ²³³ “Designated Qualified Opportunity Zone,” (interactive map), ArcGIS, <https://vedp.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=bf7c530d8e0240c6a911a4b40fb0a357>.
- ²³⁴ “Arlandria Affordable Housing Project May Grow Larger,” *Alexandria Living*, January 3, 2021, <https://alexandrialivingmagazine.com/home-and-garden/arlandria-affordable-housing-project-may-grow-larger/>.
- ²³⁵ Steven H. Woolf, Derek A. Chapman, Layota Hill, and Lauren K. Snellings, *Getting Ahead: The Uneven Opportunity Landscape in Northern Virginia*, Northern Virginia Health Foundation, November 2017, <https://novahealthfdn.org/resources/getting-ahead-the-uneven-opportunity-landscape-in-northern-virginia>.
- ²³⁶ “Alexandria Development Map,” *Alexandria Living* (website), <https://alexandrialivingmagazine.com/development>.
- ²³⁷ Beth Lawton, “City Council Approves 383-Unit Newport Village Development,” *Alexandria Living*, February 24, 2021, <https://alexandrialivingmagazine.com/home-and-garden/city-council-approves-newport-village-development-west-end-alexandria/>.
- ²³⁸ Housing Arlington, *Affordable Housing Master Plan (AHMP): Five-Year Report*, December 2020, https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/housing/documents/AHMP_5YR-Report.pdf.
- ²³⁹ “Designated Qualified Opportunity Zone,” (interactive map), ArcGIS, <https://vedp.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=bf7c530d8e0240c6a911a4b40fb0a357>.
- ²⁴⁰ Woolf et al., *Getting Ahead*, <https://novahealthfdn.org/resources/getting-ahead-the-uneven-opportunity-landscape-in-northern-virginia>.
- ²⁴¹ “Barcroft Apartments,” Arlington County (website), <https://www.arlingtonva.us/Government/Programs/Housing/Development/Barcroft-Apartments#:~:text=In%20December%202021%2C%20the%20County,Barcroft%20apartments%20as%20affordable%20units>.
- ²⁴² D.C. Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, *Opportunity Zones in Washington, D.C.*, <https://dmped.dc.gov/page/opportunity-zones-washington-dc>.
- ²⁴³ D.C. OZ Investment Project Marketplace, *Affordable Housing Listing Details*, <https://dcgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/743a320023924f1e9e62cbd2aa75a988>.
- ²⁴⁴ “Designated Qualified Opportunity Zone,” (interactive map), ArcGIS, <https://vedp.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=bf7c530d8e0240c6a911a4b40fb0a357>.
- ²⁴⁵ Woolf et al., *Getting Ahead*, <https://novahealthfdn.org/resources/getting-ahead-the-uneven-opportunity-landscape-in-northern-virginia>.
- ²⁴⁶ “Active Land Use and Development Cases,” Town of Herndon (website), <https://www.herndonva.gov/departments/community-development/development-services/current-development-projects>.
- ²⁴⁷ Douglas Stewart, “The Fair Oaks Mall Could Be Converted into a Walkable Mixed-Use Community, if Fairfax County Can Reimagine Its Streets,” *Greater Greater Washington*, February 9, 2021, <https://gwwash.org/view/80344/the-fair-oaks-mall-could-be-copnverted-into-affordable-housing>.
- ²⁴⁸ Jeffrey Levine, “Springfield Mall Slowly Morphs into a Town Center,” Annandale Chamber of Commerce, January 2014, <http://www.annandalechamber.com/springfieldmall.rhtml>.
- ²⁴⁹ “Fairfax County Launches Incentive Program for Development in Revitalization Areas,” *E-Bird Newsletter*, Fairfax County Economic Development Authority, October 1, 2020, <https://www.fairfaxcountyeda.org/media-center/fairfax-county-launches-incentive-program-for-development-in-revitalization-areas/>.
- ²⁵⁰ “Invest in Loudoun’s Opportunity Zones,” Loudoun, Virginia, Economic Development (website), <https://biz.loudoun.gov/opportunity-zones/>.
- ²⁵¹ “Designated Qualified Opportunity Zone,” (interactive map), ArcGIS, <https://vedp.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=bf7c530d8e0240c6a911a4b40fb0a357>.
- ²⁵² “Major Mixed-Use Developments,” Loudoun, Virginia, Economic Development (website), <https://biz.loudoun.gov/site-selection/major-developments/>.
- ²⁵³ Woolf et al., *Getting Ahead*, <https://novahealthfdn.org/resources/getting-ahead-the-uneven-opportunity-landscape-in-northern-virginia>.
- ²⁵⁴ “Development News,” Town of Leesburg Economic Development (website), <https://www.leesburgva.gov/government/development-news>.
- ²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

256 HUD, Map of Opportunity Zones, <https://opportunityzones.hud.gov/resources/map>.

257 “Significant Development Activity,” (interactive map), Montgomery County Planning Department MCATLAS Map Viewer, <https://mcatlas.org/developmentactivity/>.

258 “Plan Number: 120200170,” Development Activity Information Center, Montgomery County Planning MCATLAS (website), https://mcatlas.org/Development_Info/default.aspx?apno=120200170.

259 *Ibid.*

260 *Ibid.*

261 “Federal Opportunity Zones,” Prince William County Planning Office (website), <https://www.pwcva.gov/department/planning-office/federal-opportunity-zones>.

262 Woolf et al., *Getting Ahead*, Northern Virginia Health Foundation, <https://novahealthfdn.org/resources/getting-ahead-the-uneven-opportunity-landscape-in-northern-virginia>.

263 “Riverside Station,” IDI Group (website), <https://www.idigroup.com/project/riverside-station/>.

264 “Opportunity Zones in Washington, D.C.,” D.C. Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development (website), <https://dmped.dc.gov/page/opportunity-zones-washington-dc>.

265 D.C. Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development (website), *Project Pipeline Database (PPD)*, <https://octo.quickbase.com/db/bgk8b4c4n>.

266 “\$110 Million in New Regional Transportation Project Investments Coming to Prince William County,” *Prince William Living*, July 10, 2020, <https://princewilliamliving.com/110-million-in-new-regional-transportation-project-investments-coming-to-prince-william-county/>.

267 Montgomery County Economic Development, “Projects,” Montgomery County Maryland App, <https://apps.montgomerycountymd.gov/BASISCAPITAL/Common/ProjectList.aspx?ID=93&TYPE=SUBC>.

268 Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *Region Forward: A Comprehensive Guide for Regional Planning and Measuring Progress in the 21st Century*, January 13, 2010, <https://www.mwcog.org/documents/2010/01/28/region-forward-vision/>.

269 Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *The Future of Housing in Greater Washington: A Regional Initiative to Create Housing Opportunities, Improve Transportation, and Support Economic Growth*, September 2019, <https://www.mwcog.org/documents/2019/09/10/the-future-of-housing-in-greater-washington/>.

270 “Regional Housing Targets,” Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (website), n.d., <https://www.mwcog.org/community/planning-areas/housing-and-homelessness/regional-housing-initiative/>.

271 “HUD Awards Over \$40 Million to Fight Housing Discrimination: Grants Support and Promote Fair Housing Nationwide,” US Department of Housing and Urban Development (website), June 30, 2020, <https://archives.hud.gov/news/2020/pr20-097.cfm>.

272 *Ibid.*

273 D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development, the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, and the Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC), “Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, Washington, D.C.,” draft for public comment, September 2019, <https://dhcd.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dhcd/publication/attachments/D.C.%20Draft%20Analysis%20of%20Impediments%20to%20Fair%20Housing%20Choice%209.27.2019%20%281%29.pdf>.

274 “Protected Traits in D.C.,” D.C. Office of Human Rights (website), <https://ohr.dc.gov/protectedtraits>.

275 “Virginia Fair Housing Office: Protected Classes,” Virginia Fair Housing Office (website), <https://www.dpor.virginia.gov/FairHousing>.

276 “Housing Discrimination,” State of Maryland Commission on Human Rights (website), <https://mccr.maryland.gov/Pages/Housing-Discrimination.aspx>.

277 Montgomery County Code 27-12. Discriminatory Housing Practices, https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/montgomerycounty/latest/montgomeryco_md/0-0-0-13807#JD_27-12.

278 Arlington County Code, Chapter 31: Human Rights, https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/07/Ch31_HumanRights.pdf.

279 Alexandria City Code, Chapter 4—Human Rights, https://library.municode.com/va/alexandria/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCOGEOR_TIT12EDSOSEWE_CH4H_URI.

280 Northern Virginia Association of Realtors®, Inc., *Fair Housing Laws* (brochure), January 2012, <https://ppmnva.com/wp-content/uploads/Fair-Housing-Laws.pdf>.

281 Loudoun County Fair Housing (website), <https://www.loudoun.gov/5703/Fair-Housing>.

282 Leah Brooks, Genevieve Denoeux, and Jenny Schuetz, “The Washington, D.C., Region Needs More Housing, and Satellite Data Can Tell Us Where to Build,” Brookings Institution (blog), June 4, 2020, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2020/06/03/the-washington-dc-region-needs-more-housing-and-satellite-data-can-tell-us-where-to-build/>.

283 *Ibid.*

284 *Ibid.*

285 “Accessory Dwelling Units in Alexandria,” City of Alexandria (website), <https://www.alexandriava.gov/planning/info/default.aspx?id=113872>.

286 *Ibid.*

287 *Ibid.*

288 *Ibid.*

289 *Ibid.*

290 “County to Study Allowing ‘Missing Middle’ Housing,” ARLnow (website), December 19, 2021, <https://www.arlnow.com/2019/12/19/county-to-study-allowing-missing-middle-housing/>.

291 “Accessory Dwelling Units in Alexandria.”

292 *Ibid.*

293 Yesim Sayin Taylor, *Taking Stock of the District’s Housing Stock*, D.C. Policy Center, 2018, https://www.dcpolicycenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/DC-Policy-Center-Housing-Report.final_March25.pdf.

294 “Inclusionary Zoning Affordable Housing Program,” D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development (website), <https://dhcd.dc.gov/service/inclusionary-zoning-iz-affordable-housing-program>.

295 D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development, *FY 2020 Annual Action Plan*, https://dhcd.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dhcd/page_content/attachments/Final%20HUD%20FY2019%20DHCD%20FY2020%20Annual%20Action%20Plan%20formatted_0.pdf.

296 “Accessory Apartments,” *Zoning Handbook*, D.C. Department of Zoning, <https://handbook.dcoz.dc.gov/use-categories/other-uses/accessory-apartments/>.

297 Tracy Hadden Loh, “Where the Washington Region Is Zoned for Single-Family Homes: An Update,” Greater Greater Washington (website), December 18, 2018, <https://ggwash.org/view/70232/washington-region-single-family-zoning-an-update>.

298 Antonio Olivo, “Fairfax Adopts Zoning Changes That Make It Easier to Rent Converted Basements,” *Washington Post*, March 23, 2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/virginia-politics/fairfax-county-zoning-changes/2021/03/23/fed70cb4-8be0-11eb-9423-04079921c915_story.html.

299 *Loudoun County 2019 General Plan*, Loudoun County, Virginia, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/152285/General-Plan—Combined-with-small-maps-bookmarked>.

300 *Ibid.*, 29 (designating the vast majority of land as “open space” and “enduring rural landscape”).

301 *Ibid.*

302 *Ibid.*

303 *Ibid.*, 2–53.

304 “Zoning Ordinances,” Loudoun County (website), <https://www.loudoun.gov/1755/Zoning-Ordinances>.

305 *Ibid.*

306 The Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission, *Thrive Montgomery 2050*, April 2021, https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/THRIVE-Planning-Board-Draft-2021-Pages_web.pdf.

307 “Commercial Residential Zones,” Montgomery Planning (website), <https://montgomeryplanning.org/development/zoning/commercial-residential-zones/>.

308 “Agricultural Reserve,” Montgomery Planning (website), <https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/agricultural-reserve/>.

309 The Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission, *Thrive Montgomery 2050*.

310 “General Plan on Wedges and Corridors,” Montgomery Planning (website), May 24, 2019, <https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/master-plan-list/general-plans/>.

311 The Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission, *Thrive Montgomery 2050*.

312 *Ibid.*

313 “Missing Middle Housing in Montgomery County,” Montgomery Planning (website), <https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/housing/attainable-housing-strategies-initiative/missing-middle-housing/>.

314 “Retool Gaithersburg,” City of Gaithersburg (website), <https://www.retoolgaithersburg.com/>.

315 Jaclene Begley, Leah Brooks, Brian J. McCabe, and Jenny Schuetz, *2019 State of the Capital Region*, Center for Washington Studies, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/blogs.gwu.edu/dist/7/677/files/2019/05/20190507_socr_2019_pages.pdf.

316 Prince William County, *General Plan—Land Use*, January 31, 2022, https://www.pwcva.gov/assets/2022-02/Land%20Use%20Chapter%20Update%20Draft%202022_0128%20%281%29.pdf.

317 *Ibid.*

318 “Affordable Housing, Affordable and Accessible Apartment Lists,” Open Data D.C. (website), <https://opendata.dc.gov/datasets/DCGIS::affordable-housing/explore?location=38.893729%2C-77.019147%2C11.33>.

319 “Affordable and Accessible Apartment Lists,” Northern Virginia Regional Commission (website), <https://www.novaregion.org/168/Affordable-Housing-Lists>.

320 “Apartment Complexes with MPDUs,” Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs (website), <https://apps.montgomerycountymd.gov/dhca-mpdu/Rental/List>.

321 Jenny Schuetz, “Cost, Crowding, or Commuting? Housing Stress on the Middle Class,” Brookings Institution (website), May 7, 2019, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/cost-crowding-or-commuting-housing-stress-on-the-middle-class/>.

322 Annette Schaefer, “Commuting Takes Its Toll,” *Scientific American*, October 1, 2005, <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/commuting-takes-its-toll/>.

323 *Virginia Labor Market Information: Alexandria*, Virginia Employment Commission, Richmond, August 22, 2018, https://web.archive.org/web/20180823042031/http://virginialmi.com/report_center/community_profiles/5104000510.pdf.

324 “Arlington County,” DataUSA (website), accessed August 12, 2022, <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/arlington-county-va#economy>.

325 Randy Smith, “Commute Times for District Residents Are Linked to Income and Method of Transportation,” D.C. Policy Center (website), March 23, 2017, <https://www.dcpolicycenter.org/publications/commute-times-for-district-residents-are-linked-to-income-and-method-of-transportation/>.

326 *Ibid.*

327 “Commuting Patterns,” Fairfax County (website), <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/demographics/commuting-patterns>.

- ³²⁸ Charlynn Burd, Michael Burrows, and Brian McKenzie, *Travel Time to Work in the United States: 2019*, US Census Bureau, Washington, D.C., 2021, <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2021/acs/acs-47.pdf>.
- ³²⁹ “Major Employers in Northern Virginia,” Fairfax County Economic Development Authority (website), <https://www.fairfaxcountveda.org/doing-business/largest-employers-fairfax-county/>.
- ³³⁰ Lynda Laughlin, Peter Mateyka, and Charlynn Burd, “Characteristics of Daytime Urban Commuters for 20 US Cities: Gender, Work, and Family,” US Census Bureau, Washington, D.C., 2015, <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2015/demo/2015-Laughlin-01-Abstract.pdf>.
- ³³¹ Smith, “Commute Times for District Residents.”
- ³³² “Major Employers,” Loudoun Economic Development (website), <https://biz.loudoun.gov/information-center/major-employers/>.
- ³³³ Burd, Burrows, and McKenzie, *Travel Time to Work in the United States: 2019*.
- ³³⁴ “Major Employers in Montgomery County, Maryland,” Maryland Department of Commerce, 2015, <https://commerce.maryland.gov/Documents/ResearchDocument/MajorEmployersInMontgomeryCounty.pdf>.
- ³³⁵ Simone Roy, “Who Has the Longest Commute in the D.C. Area?,” D.C. Policy Center (website), September 27, 2017, <https://www.dcpolicycenter.org/publications/who-has-the-longest-commute-in-the-d-c-area/>.
- ³³⁶ Emilia Calma, “The Geography of Environmental Toxins in the District of Columbia,” D.C. Policy Center (website), October 15, 2020, <https://www.dcpolicycenter.org/publications/environmental-toxins/>.
- ³³⁷ Bruce Leshan and Megan Rivers, “Report: Northern Virginia Is a ‘Hot Spot’ for Forever Chemicals,” WUSA9, March 11, 2021, <https://www.wusa9.com/article/news/local/virginia/forever-chemicals-pfas-found-in-northern-virginia-tap-water/65-7d778d3c-7e94-4574-a3a0-c4726130b60d>.
- ³³⁸ Environment Virginia Research & Policy Center, “Trouble in the Air: Northern Virginia Residents’ Health at Risk with 84 Dirty Air Days in 2016,” Environment Virginia (website), June 28, 2018, <https://environmentvirginia.org/news/vac/trouble-air-northern-virginia-residents%E2%80%99-health-risk-84-dirty-air-days-2016>.
- ³³⁹ “Montgomery County, MD Environmental Hazards Report—Superfund Sites,” Homefacts, accessed August 12, 2022, <https://www.homefacts.com/environmentalhazards/superfunds/Maryland/Montgomery-County.html>.
- ³⁴⁰ “Environment and Infrastructure in Montgomery County, Maryland,” Well Being in the Nation (WIN) Network (website), <https://www.winmeasures.org/statistics/winmeasures/maryland/montgomery-county-environment-and-infrastructure>.
- ³⁴¹ US Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool, accessed August 12, 2022, <https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen>.
- ³⁴² *Ibid.*
- ³⁴³ “SY2018-19 STAR Ratings: Bringing Accountability, Demonstrating Improvement in D.C. Public Schools” (slide presentation), District of Columbia Public Schools, November 2019, https://dcps.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dcps/page_content/attachments/DCPS%20STAR%20Ratings%20for%20School%20Year%202018-2019.pdf.
- ³⁴⁴ D.C. Office of the State Superintendent of Education, “D.C. School Report Card,” accessed August 12, 2022, <https://dcschoolreportcard.org/state/99999-0000/profile>.
- ³⁴⁵ Eileen Cunha, “62 Years Later: It’s Time to Desegregate D.C. Schools,” *D.C. Post*, July 8, 2020, <https://thedcpost.com/washington-dc-schools-desegregation/>.
- ³⁴⁶ “Virginia School Quality Profiles,” Virginia Department of Education (website), accessed August 12, 2022, <https://schoolquality.virginia.gov/>.
- ³⁴⁷ “2020 Montgomery County Schools at a Glance,” Maryland Department of Education (website), 2022, <https://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/Graphs/#/AtaGlance/Index/3/17/6/15/XXXX/2020>.
- ³⁴⁸ ACS five-year estimates, 2015–2019, City of Alexandria, US Census Bureau (website), accessed August 12, 2022, <https://censusreporter.org/profiles/16000US5101000-alexandria-va/>.
- ³⁴⁹ “Market Affordable 2017 Update,” City of Alexandria (website), June 6, 2017, <https://media.alexandriava.gov/docs-archives/housing/info/2017marketaffordablereport=updatedjune2017.pdf>.
- ³⁵⁰ “Development Fact Sheet: AHDC Glebe/Mt. Vernon,” City of Alexandria (website), August 3, 2021, <https://media.alexandriava.gov/docs-archives/planning/info/factsheet-ahdc=glebe=mtvernon=final.pdf>.
- ³⁵¹ “Housing Master Plan & Regional Housing Initiative,” City of Alexandria (website), September 21, 2022, <https://www.alexandriava.gov/HousingPlan>.
- ³⁵² Lisa A. Sturtevant and Jeannette Chapman, *Housing a Diverse and Inclusive Community in Arlington County*, Arlington County, VA, September 2013, <https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/Housing/Documents/Affordable-Housing-Study-Needs-Analysis.pdf> (see page 16).
- ³⁵³ *Affordable Housing Master Plan*, Arlington County, VA, September 2015, <https://arlingtonva.s3.dualstack.us-east-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2015/12/AHMP-Published.pdf>.
- ³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*
- ³⁵⁵ Wes Rivers, “Going, Going, Gone: D.C.’s Vanishing Affordable Housing,” D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute (website), March 12, 2015, <https://www.dcfpi.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Going-Going-Gone-Rent-Burden-Final-3-6-15format-v2-3-10-15.pdf>.
- ³⁵⁶ Margery Austin Turner, Leah Hendey, Maya Brennan, Peter Tatian, and Kathryn Reynolds, *Meeting the Washington Region’s Future Housing Needs*, Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., September 2019, https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/100946/meeting_the_washington_regions_future_housing_needs.pdf.
- ³⁵⁷ Rivers, “Going, Going, Gone.”

³⁵⁸ Mayor's Order 2019-036, Government of the District of Columbia, May 10, 2019, https://planning.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/op/page_content/attachments/Mayor%27s%20Order%20on%20Housing.pdf.

³⁵⁹ *Communitywide Housing Strategic Plan*, Fairfax County, VA, June 2018, <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/sites/housing/files/assets/documents/communitywide%20housing%20strategic%20plan/communitywide%20housing%20strategic%20plan%20final.pdf>.

³⁶⁰ Fairfax County Affordable Housing Dashboard, Fairfax County Housing and Community Development, accessed August 12, 2022, <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/affordablehousingdashboard>.

³⁶¹ *Primer on Housing in Loudoun County*, Loudoun County, VA, October 16, 2017, https://loudoun.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=69&clip_id=5147&meta_id=130106.

³⁶² *Loudoun County, Virginia Unmet Housing Needs Strategic Plan*, Loudoun County, VA, September 8, 2021, <https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/167024/Unmet-Housing-Needs-Strategic-Plan-Approved-9821-with-Appendices>.

³⁶³ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁴ HR&A Advisors Inc. and LSA, *Montgomery County Housing Needs Assessment*, Montgomery County, MD, July 2020, <https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/MoCo-HNA-July-2020.pdf>.

³⁶⁵ National Center for Smart Growth and Enterprise Community Partners, *Maryland Housing Needs Assessment*; see also Ally Schweitzer, "Maryland Must Build Thousands More Homes to Keep Prices Affordable, Report Says," National Public Radio, February 18, 2021, <https://www.npr.org/local/305/2021/02/18/968790273/maryland-must-build-thousands-more-homes-to-keep-prices-affordable-report-says>.

³⁶⁶ HR&A Advisors Inc. and LSA, *Montgomery County Housing Needs Assessment*, slide 26.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁸ National Center for Smart Growth and Enterprise Community Partners, *Maryland Housing Needs Assessment*; see also Schweitzer, "Maryland Must Build Thousands More Homes."

³⁶⁹ Meghan Thompson, "Shortage of Affordable Rental Housing Hits Md. Poor Hardest," Maryland Matters (website), May 16, 2019, <https://www.marylandmatters.org/2019/05/16/shortage-of-affordable-rental-housing-hits-md-poor-hardest/>.

³⁷⁰ Willow Lung-Amam, "An Equitable Future for the Washington, D.C., Region?: A 'Regionalism Light' Approach to Building Inclusive Neighborhoods," paper presented at "A Shared Future: Fostering Communities of Inclusion in an Era of Inequality," national symposium hosted by Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies, April 2017, https://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/a_shared_future_equitable_future_washington_dc.pdf.

³⁷¹ *Prince William Area 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan*, Prince William County, VA, https://www.pwcva.gov/assets/2021-04/pwc_cp_fnl_42220_1.pdf.

³⁷² Jared Foretek, "Prince William Board Approves Housing Development in 'Rural Crescent,'" Inside NOVA (website), January 20, 2021, https://www.insidenova.com/headlines/prince-william-board-approves-housing-development-in-rural-crescent/article_747e5584-5b18-11eb-9211-4fd40e1cb356.html.

³⁷³ City of Alexandria Municipal Code, 2-143—Family, https://library.municode.com/va/alexandria/codes/zoning?nodeId=ARTIIDE_2-143FA; Arlington County Zoning Ordinance 2022, https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/building/documents/codes-and-ordinances/aczo_effective_01.12.2022.pdf; Loudoun County Code, Article 10—Definitions, <https://www.Loudoun.Gov/Documentcenter/View/9957/Article-10-Definitions>.

³⁷⁴ Prince William County Code, Part 100.—Definitions, https://library.municode.com/va/prince_william_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CH32ZO_ARTITEDE.

³⁷⁵ D.C. Municipal Code, Title 11, Zoning, <https://dcoz.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dcoz/publication/attachments/SubtitleB.pdf>.

³⁷⁶ Linda McMillan, "Single-Family Rental Licensing and Code Enforcement" (memorandum), Montgomery County Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee, November 27, 2019, https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/cm/2019/20191202/20191202_PHED3PM.pdf.

³⁷⁷ D.C. Office of Human Rights, *2018 Annual Report*, https://ohr.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ohr/publication/attachments/OHR_AR18_062619_FINAL.pdf.

³⁷⁸ Fairfax County Office of Human Rights & Equity Programs, *Fiscal Year 2020 Annual Report*, <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/humanrights/sites/humanrights/files/assets/documents/pdf/ohrep%20fy2020%20annual%20report.pdf>.

³⁷⁹ "Housing Counseling Services CBOs," D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development, <https://dhcd.dc.gov/node/702332>.

³⁸⁰ "Housing Counseling Services," US Department of Housing and Urban Development, <https://apps.hud.gov/offices/hsg/sfh/hcc/hcs.cfm?webListAction=search&searchstate=DC>.

³⁸¹ *Ibid.*

³⁸² "Homebuyer Education," Virginia Housing, <https://www.vhda.com/Homebuyers/HomeownershipEdu/Pages/HomeownershipEdu.aspx#.WSM8Sevys-N>.

³⁸³ "Housing Counseling Services," HUD.

³⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁸⁶ Fairfax County Code, Article 4.—Condominium and Cooperative Conversions, Section 12-4-3.—Lease extensions, https://library.municode.com/va/fairfax_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=FACOCO_CH12TEANRE_ART4COCOC0_S12-4-3LEEX.

-
- ³⁸⁷ Arlington County Code, Chapter 45 Inoperative Statutes and Condominium Conversion, September 2011, https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/county-board/documents/code/ch45_inoperativestatutesandcondominiumconversion.pdf.
- ³⁸⁸ D.C. Office of Planning—State Data Center, “District of Columbia, Income-Restricted Affordable Housing by ANC, 2018,” May 23, 2019 (updated August 21, 2020), <https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/travis.pate/viz/DistrictofColumbiaIncome-RestrictedAffordableHousingbyANC/AffordableHousingANC>.
- ³⁸⁹ D.C.’s Economic Strategy, *Prepared Residents: Average Commute Times for Residents, by Ward*, 2017.
- ³⁹⁰ *Affordable Housing Master Plan*, Arlington County, VA, August 2015, <https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/Housing/Documents/Clean-AHMP-8.0.pdf>.
- ³⁹¹ Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, “High-Capacity Transit Station Areas (HCTs),” ArcGIS Online, <https://hct-eea-mwcog.hub.arcgis.com/pages/hct-main>.
- ³⁹² “Bowser Administration Breaks Ground on 24 New Affordable Homes at 8th and O Streets NW,” District of Columbia Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (website), April 13, 2021, <https://mayor.dc.gov/release/bowser-administration-breaks-ground-24-new-affordable-homes-8th-and-o-streets-nw>.
- ³⁹³ D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development, *2021 Low-Income Housing Tax Credit: Qualified Allocation Plan*, 2021, <https://dhcd.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dhcd/publication/attachments/DHCD%20Qualified%20Allocation%20Plan%20signed.pdf>.
- ³⁹⁴ Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC), “Appendix B: State, Local, and Federal Laws Barring Source-of-Income Discrimination,” *Expanding Choice: Practical Strategies for Building a Successful Housing Mobility Program*, 2022, <https://www.prrac.org/pdf/AppendixB.pdf>.
- ³⁹⁵ “ERC and Local Renter File Federal Lawsuit Alleging Source of Income and Race Discrimination at Northwest D.C. Apartment Building” (press release), The DC Line (website), June 17, 2021, <https://thedcline.org/2021/06/17/press-release-erc-and-local-renter-file-federal-lawsuit-alleging-source-of-income-and-race-discrimination-at-northwest-dc-apartment-building/>.
- ³⁹⁶ “Protected Traits in D.C.,” District of Columbia Office of Human Rights, <https://ohr.dc.gov/protectedtraits>.
- ³⁹⁷ *From Click to Visit: A Civil Rights Testing Investigation*, Equal Rights Center, Washington, D.C., <https://equalrightscenter.org/wp-content/uploads/click-to-visit-report-final.pdf>.
- ³⁹⁸ Rebecca Tan, “She’s Desperate to Get Home Care for Her Mom. In Maryland, 21,000 Are on the Wait List,” *Washington Post*, October 9, 2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/maryland-covid-medicaid-waitlist/2021/10/07/37dfc41e-2214-11ec-b3d6-8cdebe60d3e2_story.html.
- ³⁹⁹ “Seven D.C. RE Firms and Professionals Accused of Housing Discrimination,” Fair Housing Coach, September 21, 2020, <https://www.fairhousingcoach.com/article/seven-dc-re-firms-and-professionals-accused-housing-discrimination>.
- ⁴⁰⁰ “AG Racine Announces Two Actions to Stop Discrimination Against District Residents Living East of the River,” Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia, February 22, 2021, <https://oag.dc.gov/release/ag-racine-announces-two-actions-stop>; Consent order, D.C. v. Design Build Inc., February 1, 2021, https://oag.dc.gov/sites/default/files/2021-02/Design-Builders-consent-order_2.1.21.pdf.
- ⁴⁰¹ Resolution Agreement in re: Loudoun Public Schools, Virginia OCR Case No. 19-2652, Loudoun County Public Schools and Virginia Office of Civil Rights, <https://www.oag.state.va.us/files/2021/RESOLUTION-AGREEMENT-In-Re-LCPS-2021-02-18-Fully-Endorsed.pdf>.

X. Glossary

accessibility: A physical structure, object, or technology able to be used by persons with disabilities such as mobility issues, hearing impairment, or vision impairment; accessibility features include wheelchair ramps, audible crosswalk signals, and TTY numbers (see *also* TTY/TDD).

accessory dwelling unit (ADU): A smaller, independent residential unit located on the same lot as a stand-alone single-family home. In Fairfax County, these are also known as accessory living units (ALUs).

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH): An obligation under the Fair Housing Act requiring that local governments take steps to further fair housing, especially in places that have been historically segregated (see *also* segregation).

alternative accessibility standard: An alternative to the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) for HUD grantees to meet Section 504 accessibility requirements; a modified version of the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design (see *also* Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards).

American Community Survey (ACS): A survey conducted by the US Census Bureau that regularly gathers information about demographics, education, income, language proficiency, disability, employment, and housing. Unlike the census, ACS surveys are conducted both yearly and across multiple years studying samples of the population, rather than counting every person.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA): A federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination against persons with disabilities.

Annual Action Plan: An annual plan used by local jurisdictions that receive money from HUD to plan how they will spend the funds to address fair housing and community development; the Annual Action Plan carries out the larger Consolidated Plan (see *also* Consolidated Plan).

area median income (AMI): Annual median income calculated by HUD-designated area, based on American Community Survey data and Consumer Price Index trends. HUD sets extremely low (30 percent of the AMI), very low (50 percent of the AMI), and low (80 percent of the AMI) income limits by household size to determine eligibility for assisted housing programs.

census tract: A small subdivision of cities, towns, and rural areas that the US Census Bureau uses to group residents together and accurately evaluate the demographics of a community. Several census tracts, put together, make up a town, city, or rural area.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG): A grant that local governments receive from HUD to spend on housing and community improvement.

Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs): Private-sector financial institutions that specialize in personal lending and business development with the goal of expanding economic opportunity in impoverished and underresourced communities.

consent decree: A settlement agreement that resolves a dispute between two parties without admitting guilt or liability. The court maintains supervision over the implementation of the consent decree, including any payments or actions taken as required by the consent decree.

Consolidated Plan: A plan that helps local governments evaluate their affordable housing and community development needs and market conditions. Local governments must use their Consolidated Plan to identify how they will spend money from HUD to address fair housing and community development. Any local government that receives money from HUD in the form of CDBGs, HOME, ESG, or Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS grants must have a Consolidated Plan. Consolidated Plans are carried out through annual Action Plans (see *also* Action Plan, Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnership Program, Emergency Solutions Grants).

Continuum of Care (CoC): A HUD program designed to promote commitment to the goal of ending homelessness. The program provides funding to nonprofits and state and local governments to quickly rehouse homeless individuals and families, promote access to and effect utilization of mainstream programs by homeless individuals, and optimize self-sufficiency among individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool (AFFH-T): An online HUD resource that combines census data and American Community Survey data to generate maps and tables evaluating the demographics of an area for a variety of categories, including race, national origin, disability, limited English proficiency, housing problems, environmental health, school proficiency, and others.

de facto segregation: Segregation that is not created by the law, but is the result of various outside factors, including former laws (see *also* segregation).

de jure segregation: Segregation that is created and enforced by the law. Segregation is currently illegal (see *also* segregation).

density bonus: An incentive for developers that allows developers to increase the maximum number of units allowed at a building site in exchange for either affordable housing funds or making a certain percentage of the units affordable.

disparate impact: The type of practices in housing that negatively affect one group of people with a protected characteristic (such as race, sex, or disability, etc.) more than other people without that characteristic, even though the rules applied by landlords do not single out that group.

displacement: The involuntarily relocation of residents from a housing unit or neighborhood due to external pressures. Displacement often occurs because of economic factors such as rising housing costs and/or gentrification (see *also* gentrification).

Dissimilarity Index: An index measuring the percentage of a certain group's population that would have to move to a different census tract in order to be evenly distributed within a city or metropolitan area in relation to another group. The higher the Dissimilarity Index value, the higher the level of segregation. For example, if a city's Black/White Dissimilarity Index value was 65, then 65 percent of Black residents would need to move to another neighborhood in order for Black and White residents to be evenly distributed across all neighborhoods in the city.

Emergency Rental Assistance Program: A program that helps qualified residents who are dealing with housing emergencies, often by providing money for overdue rent or covering court costs if the household is facing eviction. Additionally, the program can provide support for security deposits and initial rent for residents moving into new apartments. Qualified households are those that earn less than 40 percent of the area median income (see *also* area median income).

entitlement jurisdiction: A local government that receives funds from HUD to be spent on housing and community development (see *also* HUD grantee).

Environmental Health Index: A HUD index calculating potential exposure to harmful toxins at a neighborhood level. This includes air quality and carcinogenic, respiratory, and neurological hazards. The higher the number, the less exposure to toxins that are harmful to human health.

environmental justice: The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, especially minorities, in the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Historically, environmental hazards have been concentrated near segregated neighborhoods, making minorities more likely to experience negative health effects. Recognizing this history and working to make changes in future environmental planning are important pieces of environmental justice.

Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG): Grants provided by HUD to (1) engage homeless individuals and families living on the street, (2) improve the number and quality of emergency shelters for homeless individuals and families, (3) help operate these shelters, (4) provide essential services to shelter residents, (5) rapidly rehouse homeless individuals and families, and (6) prevent families/individuals from becoming homeless.

ethnic enclave: An area with a high spatial concentration of a particular ethnic group, with cultural and economic activity partially segregated from the majority culture and greater urban area.

exclusionary zoning: The use of zoning ordinances to prevent certain land uses, especially the building of large and affordable apartment buildings for low-income people. A city with exclusionary zoning

might only allow single-family homes to be built in the city, excluding people who cannot afford to buy a house.

Exposure Index: An index measuring how much the typical person of a specific race is exposed to people of other races. A higher number means that the average person of that race lives in a census tract with a higher percentage of people from another group.

Fair Housing Act: A federal civil rights law that prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of race, class, sex, religion, national origin, or familial status (see *also* housing discrimination).

familial status: The presence of children under 18 in a household, as defined by the Fair Housing Act (see *also* Fair Housing Act).

gentrification: The process of renovating or improving a house or neighborhood to make it more attractive to middle-class residents. Gentrification often causes the cost of living in the neighborhood to rise, pushing out lower-income residents. Often, the rising housing costs cause a corresponding change in the racial demographics of an area.

high-opportunity areas: Communities with low poverty, high levels of access to jobs, and low concentrations of existing affordable housing. Often, local governments try to build new affordable housing options in high opportunity areas to provide residents with access to better resources and in an effort to desegregate a community, as minorities are often concentrated in low-opportunity areas and in existing affordable housing sites.

home- and community-based services (HCBS): Medicaid programs that provide beneficiaries with medical care and supportive services at their own home or community rather than at an institutional setting. HCBS programs are most often provided through state waivers.

housing choice voucher (HCV)/Section 8 voucher: A HUD voucher issued to a low-income household that promises to pay a certain amount of the household's rent. Prices are set based on the rent in the metropolitan area, and voucher households must pay any difference between the rent and the voucher amount. Voucher users are often the subjects of discrimination based on source of income (see *also* source-of-income discrimination).

housing cost burden: Housing cost that is more than 30 percent of a household's income (as defined by HUD) . Severe cost burden is defined as housing cost that is more than 50 percent of income.

housing discrimination: Discrimination against a potential tenant, buyer, or lendeer based on race, class, sex, religion, national origin, or familial status, including refusal to rent to or inform a potential tenant about the availability of housing. Housing discrimination also applies to buying a home or getting a loan to buy a home. Housing discrimination is illegal under the Fair Housing Act.

Housing First model: A policy approach to chronic homelessness that prioritizes providing unhoused people with immediate access to permanent supportive housing without any housing readiness requirements.

Housing Opportunities Made Equal (HOME) Investment Partnership Program: A program that provides grants to states and localities that communities (often in partnership with nonprofits) use to fund activities such as building, buying, and/or rehabilitating affordable housing for rent or ownership or to provide direct rental assistance to low-income people.

housing problem: The four HUD-designated housing problems are lack of complete kitchen facilities, lack of complete plumbing facilities, overcrowding, and housing cost burden (see *also* overcrowding, housing cost burden).

HUD grantee: A jurisdiction (city, country, consortium, state, etc.) that receives money from HUD (see also entitlement jurisdiction).

inclusionary zoning: A zoning ordinance that requires that a certain percentage of any newly built housing must be affordable to people with low and moderate incomes.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA): A federal civil rights law that ensures students with a disability are provided with a free appropriate public education that is tailored to their individual needs.

integration: The process of reversing trends of racial or other segregation. Often, segregation patterns in housing continue even though enforced segregation is now illegal, and integration may require affirmative steps to encourage people to move out of their historic neighborhoods and mix with other groups in the community.

Isolation Index: An index measuring how much the typical person of a specific race is only exposed to people of the same race. For example, an 80 percent Isolation Index value for White people would mean the typical White person is exposed to a population that is 80 percent White.

Jobs Proximity Index: A HUD index measuring distances to all job locations, distance from any single job location, size of employment at that location, and labor supply to that location. The higher the index value, the better the access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.

Labor Market Engagement Index: A HUD index measuring level of employment, labor force participation, and educational attainment in a census tract. The higher the number, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in the neighborhood.

limited English proficiency (LEP): Language proficiency of those for whom English is not the first language or who self-identify as speaking English less than “very well.”

local data: Any data used in this analysis that are not provided by HUD through the Data and Mapping Tool (AFFH-T) or through the census or American Community Survey.

Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC): A tax incentive to encourage individual and corporate investors to invest in the development, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable rental housing.

Low Poverty Index: A HUD index measuring family poverty rates and public assistance receipt in the form of cash welfare (such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families). This is calculated at the census tract level. The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in the neighborhood.

Low Transportation Cost Index: A HUD index measuring estimated transportation costs for a single-parent family of 3 with an income of 50 percent of the median income for renters in the region. The higher the number, the lower the cost of transportation in the neighborhood.

market-rate housing: Housing that is not restricted by affordable housing laws. A market rate unit can be rented for any price that the market can support.

NIMBY (not in my backyard): A social and political movement that opposes housing or commercial development in local communities. NIMBY complaints often involve affordable housing, with reasons ranging from traffic concerns to small town quality to, in some cases, thinly veiled racism.

overcrowding: A housing unit being occupied by more than one person per room, excluding bathrooms and kitchens. HUD defines severe overcrowding as more than one and a half persons per room.

other multifamily developments: Includes the HUD-sponsored Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly and Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities, which provides nonprofit organizations with funding to provide supportive housing to elderly and/or disabled very-low-income persons.

payment standard: The maximum monthly assistance payment paid to a household with a housing choice voucher (HCV). A lower payment standard means that the household will pay a greater share of the rent (see *also* housing choice voucher/Section 8 voucher).

poverty line: The minimum level of yearly income needed to allow a household to afford the necessities of life such as housing, clothing, and food. The poverty line is defined on a national basis. As of 2021, the US poverty line for a family of four with two children under 18 is \$27,479.

project-based Section 8: A government-funded program that provides rental housing to low-income households in privately owned and managed rental units. The funding is specific to the building so if you move out of the building, you will no longer receive the funding.

protected class: A group of people with a common characteristic (or “protected characteristic”) who are legally protected from discrimination on the basis of that characteristic. The Fair Housing Act includes seven protected classes: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability, and familial status (see *also* housing discrimination).

publicly supported housing: Housing assisted with funding through federal, state, or local agencies or programs, as well as housing that is financed or administered by or through any such agencies or programs.

Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP): A document that states the eligibility criteria and priorities for the awarding of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs). State governments must update their QAPs each time they receive a federal LIHTC allocation (see *also* Low-Income Housing Tax Credit).

quintile: A segment of 20 percent of a population; one-fifth of a population that is divided into five equal groups.

reasonable accommodation: A change to rules, policies, practices, or services that would allow a handicapped person an equal opportunity to use and enjoy their housing, including in public and common use areas. It is a violation of the Fair Housing Act to refuse to make a reasonable accommodation when such accommodation is necessary for the handicapped person to have equal use and enjoyment of the housing.

R/ECAPs (racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty): A census tract that has more than 50 percent non-White residents, and where 40 percent or more of the population is in poverty OR where the poverty rate is greater than three times the average poverty rate in the area, as defined by HUD. In the HUD Data and Mapping Tool (AFFH-T), R/ECAPS are outlined in pink (see *also* census tract).

region: In this analysis, the region (also referred to as the metropolitan Washington region or the metropolitan D.C. region) includes the jurisdictions of Montgomery County, the City of Alexandria, Arlington County, Fairfax County, Loudoun County, Prince William County, the District of Columbia Housing Authority, the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority, the Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County, the Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority, and the Rockville Housing Enterprises.

Rehabilitation Act (Section 504): A federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in programs conducted by federal agencies, programs receiving federal financial assistance, federal employment, and employment practices of federal contractors.

Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD): A HUD affordable housing initiative that allows public housing authorities to convert original public housing properties to a project-based Section 8 platform. Converted properties gain access to additional sources of funding for unit maintenance and repair (see also project-based Section 8).

restrictive covenant: A clause in a deed or lease that restricts how people can use their land. The Fair Housing Act bans the use of racial restrictive covenants, which have commonly been used to discriminate against non-White and Jewish people.

right of first refusal: A contractual right for a party to enter into a transaction with a person or company before any other party can.

School Proficiency Index: A HUD index using the performance of fourth-grade students on state exams to determine which neighborhoods have high-performing elementary schools nearby and which are near lower-performing elementary schools. The higher the number, the higher the school system quality is in a neighborhood.

segregation: The illegal separation of racial or other groups. Housing segregation can occur within a city or town or across multiple cities. Even though segregation is now illegal, housing often continues to be segregated because of factors that make certain neighborhoods more attractive and expensive than others and therefore more accessible to affluent White residents (see also integration, de facto segregation, and de jure segregation).

Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities: A HUD program that funds rental housing with supportive services for income-eligible persons with disabilities via subsidies to developers and project rental assistance to state housing agencies.

source-of-income discrimination: Housing discrimination based on whether a potential tenant plans to use a housing choice voucher/Section 8 voucher to pay part of their rent. Source of income discrimination is illegal under Virginia, Maryland, and District of Columbia law (see also housing choice voucher/Section 8 voucher).

superfund site: Any land in the United States that has been contaminated by hazardous waste and identified by the Environmental Protection Agency as a candidate for cleanup because it poses a risk to human health and/or the environment. Superfund sites evaluated as particularly hazardous and/or warranting remedial actions are additionally placed onto the National Priorities List.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): Benefits paid to disabled adults and children who have limited income and resources or to people 65 and older without disabilities who meet the financial limits.

testers: People who apply for housing to determine whether a landlord is illegally discriminating. For example, Black and White testers will both apply for housing with the same landlord, and if they are treated differently or given different information about available housing, their experiences are compared to show evidence of discrimination.

Transit Trips Index: A HUD index measuring the estimated number of transit trips taken by a single-parent family of three with an income of 50 percent of the median income for renters in the region. The higher the number, the more likely residents in that neighborhood utilize public transit.

TTY/TDD (Text Telephone/Telecommunication Device for the Deaf): TTY is the more widely used term. People who are deaf or hard of hearing can use a text telephone to communicate with other people who have a TTY number and device. TTY services are an important resource for government offices to have so that deaf or hard of hearing people can easily communicate with them.

Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS): A guide to uniform standards for design, construction, and alternation of buildings so that physically handicapped people will be able to access and use such buildings.

Violence Against Women Act (VAWA): A federal law protecting women who have experienced domestic and/or sexual violence. The law establishes several programs and services including a federal rape shield law, community violence prevention programs, protections for victims who are evicted because of events related to domestic violence or stalking, funding for victim assistance services such as rape crisis centers and hotlines, programs to meet the needs of immigrant women and women of different races or ethnicities, programs and services for victims with disabilities, and legal aid for survivors of domestic violence.

XI. Appendix

The appendices are published as separate documents and can be found on the same web page as this document at www.mwcog.org/fairhousingplan. Hard copies are available upon request.



Metropolitan Washington
Council of Governments

777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

mwcog.org

2024

**FAIR HOUSING
TESTING REPORT**

PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY 2024 FAIR HOUSING TESTING SUMMARY

County Wide Testing Effort

65 Rental Tests Were Conducted at apartment complexes located in various zip codes in Prince William County.

32 Tests Were Based on Race: Black/White testers

33 Tests Were Based on National Origin: Hispanic/White testers

Over 100 Units at all apartment complexes tested.

Aggregate of 14,927 Units for all apartment complexes tested.

Overall Results of Testing

A review of the rental tests in the most recent battery of testing showed:

A difference in treatment in one test based on national origin.

A re-test was conducted at the apartment complex where the issue was found to determine if there were any subsequent problems.

No differences in treatment were found in the national origin re-test.

A review of the rental tests paints a picture of:

A rental housing market that is not as tight as previous testing cycles have shown. Testing showed no systemic issues.

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
The County’s Role in Challenging Housing Bias.....	2
Fair Housing Testing	2
Federal, State and County Fair Housing Laws	3
Legal Precedents Establishing Housing Bias	3
Development of a County-Wide Testing Effort.....	4
Analysis of Test Results.....	6
Notes	8
Appendix A: List of Tested Apartment Complexes	9

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Curtis Porter, Chair
Ramunda Young, Parliamentarian
Evelyn Brumar, Vice Chair
Benjamin Baldwin
Victor L. Ginoba, Jr.
William A. Johnston, III
Dr. Erika Laos
Aaron Muz
Padreus Pratter

HUMAN RIGHTS OFFICE STAFF

Raul Torres, Esq., Executive Director
Shelia Venning, Assistant Director
Oliver Demery, Investigator
Dennis Sumlin, Investigator
Tiffany Jones, Administrative Specialist

INTRODUCTION

Fair Housing Management Consultants (“FHMC”) entered into a contract with the Northern Virginia Regional Commission on June 30, 2023 to provide testing services to Prince William County. The testing services are set forth in the Project Work Plan of the contract.

Sixty-five (65) rental tests were conducted in accordance with that contract at apartment complexes located in various zip codes in Prince William County. Oversight of the testing project was maintained by the staff of the Human Right Commission (“Staff”). Appendix A sets forth the testing sites. However, the test sites set forth in Appendix A are not listed in the actual order in which they were tested.

THE COUNTY’S ROLE IN CHALLENGING HOUSING BIAS

The legal authority for a local government’s role in challenging discriminatory housing practices was established by the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Gladstone Realtors v. Village of Bellwood*, 441 U.S. 91 (1979). This decision affirmed that a local government has standing to challenge racially discriminatory housing practices under Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, the Fair Housing Act.

FAIR HOUSING TESTING

Tester corroboration has become an accepted investigative tool used by administrative agencies at all levels to enforce fair housing laws. In 1982, the United States Supreme Court stated that, under certain circumstances, testers have the right to sue under the federal Fair Housing Act. *Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman*, 455 U.S. 363 (1982).

Testing is a method to determine whether or not a home seeker is treated differently in his or her search for housing. A person’s race, for example, would be an impermissible factor in denying an opportunity to rent an apartment. Testers in housing discrimination cases have been defined as “individuals who, without an intent to rent or purchase a home or apartment, pose as renters or purchasers for the purpose of collecting evidence of unlawful discriminatory housing practices.” *Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman*, 455 U.S. 363, 373 (1982).

The experiences of testers are used to compare the treatment of one home seeker (protected class) to another (non-protected class). In this context, testing measures the difference in treatment afforded a home seeker as determined by the information and services provided by property management firms, rental agents, and others. The experiences of testers are used to compare the treatment of one home seeker (protected class) to another (non-protected class). In this context, testing measures the difference in treatment afforded a home seeker as determined by the information and services provided by property management firms, rental agents and others.

FEDERAL, STATE AND COUNTY FAIR HOUSING LAWS

The Federal Fair Housing Act outlaws discrimination in renting or purchasing a home or financing a home mortgage based on race, color, religion, national origin and sex. The federal law was amended in 1988 to include familial status and handicap as protected classes.

The Virginia Fair Housing Law mirrors the federal law and contains the additional protected class of elderliness, sexual orientation, gender identity, source of funds and status as a veteran. The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) is authorized to review local and state fair housing laws to make a determination of whether these laws contain rights and remedies for alleged discriminatory housing practices that are substantially equivalent to those provided in the federal law. Once a local or state enforcement agency has been certified, HUD will refer complaints of housing discrimination to the certified agency for investigation and resolution. HUD has made a determination that the Virginia Fair Housing Law is substantially equivalent to the federal law.

The Prince William County Fair Housing Ordinance contains the additional protected classes of age and marital status. The County ordinance does not provide the same remedial relief as provided under both the federal and state Fair Housing Laws.

LEGAL PRECEDENTS ESTABLISHING HOUSING BIAS

The courts have established two ways of proving housing discrimination. Discriminatory housing practices are defined below.

Disparate (Unequal) Treatment - Evidence of disparate treatment occurs when a housing provider treats home seekers differently, for example, on the basis of their race. Fair housing testing is designed to uncover disparate treatment. This is the most common evidence uncovered by fair housing testing.

Adverse Impact - Evidence of adverse impact occurs when housing providers have policies, practices or procedures that, for example, disproportionately limit the ability of protected class members to obtain housing. If the effect of such a policy, practice or procedure adversely impacts members of a protected class, it would violate the fair housing laws.



DEVELOPMENT OF A COUNTY-WIDE TESTING EFFORT

65 Rental Tests Were Conducted at apartment complexes located in various zip codes in Prince William County.

32 Tests Were Based on Race: Black/White testers

33 Tests Were Based on National Origin: Hispanic/White testers
One of these tests was a re-test based on National Origin.

Over 100 Units at all apartment complexes tested.

Aggregate of 14,927 Units for all apartment complexes tested.

A master testing schedule was developed, a tester pool was established and training was undertaken on March 20, 2024. Testing began on March 25 and concluded on April 9, 2024. The testing results are discussed in Analysis section of this report.

Testing Site and Characteristics Assignments

The purpose of testing in Prince William County was to determine how Black and Hispanic testers were treated at apartment complexes located in the county.

This is done by pairing two testers who are matched as equally as possible to each other except for the material factors of race and national origin. The characteristics that relate to the rental qualification processes were matched as closely as practical for each tester. This included matching, for example, the income, employment background and prior housing history of the testers.

It is important to minimize, as much as possible, variables that are extraneous to what is being tested (differences in treatment based on race and national origin). Generally, it is necessary for testers to assume characteristics other than their own. Testers are, in fact, playing a role during the test.

The Site Visitation Assignment Form

Site Visitation Assignment Forms were developed for each of the 65 tests.

This form indicates the type of housing that the tester is looking for (one-bedroom apartment and the move-in date for example). The form also indicates the tester characteristics that are required for the completion of the test, for example, income and prior housing history.

Slightly superior qualifications were assigned to the protected class testers (Black and Hispanic testers) to assist in determining whether differences were the result of the tester's status as a member of a protected class. Personal characteristics, for example, the sex and marital status of the testers were also matched.

Also, all testers were instructed to inquire about rent specials when visiting the rental office. A rent special, for example, could range from a waiver of the security deposit to one month's free rent.

The testers were sent to the same apartment complex on the same day, usually one to two hours apart. Generally, the testers were instructed to have the protected class tester visit the rental office first followed thereafter by their teammate. The tester teams were assigned to express interest in renting the same type of apartment and move-in date. In the race and national origin tests, both members of the tester teams posed as being married with no children and stated that they were looking for a one-bedroom apartment for April 15, 2024.

Tester Training

All testers were required to attend a training session. FHMC conducted a training session on March 20, 2024.

Pretest training serves to enhance the credibility of the testing process and diminish the likelihood of deviation from controlled factors.

Testers are oriented as to what is expected of them when conducting a test.

Tester training included instruction in the following areas:

- Brief discussion of federal, state and local fair housing laws;
- What testing is;
- Playing the role of a tester;
- Conducting the test; and
- The debriefing process.

These, of course, were not the only components of the training, but were critical to the process of preparing the testers.

The training also provided an opportunity to thoroughly familiarize the testers with all of the testing forms. The training also emphasized the importance of timeliness in the completion of the forms in order to insure the validity of the testing process.

Debriefing Process

The testers were generally debriefed each day after completing their assigned tests by the contractor, FHMC.

The debriefing interview is a mechanism to ensure that the testing experience is being reported accurately and objectively.

During the debriefing interview FHMC carefully reviewed the Tester Report Form with each tester. Particular attention was given to the narrative portion of the form. Any corrections and additions to the report form are made by the testers during the debriefing session. Each member of the tester team was debriefed separately.

Debriefing each tester separately maintains the confidentiality and objectivity of the testing results.

ANALYSIS OF TEST RESULTS

Each test was analyzed individually to ascertain if there were any differences in treatment accorded, for example, to the Hispanic and White members of the tester team. The tester teams were assembled based on the protected class sought to be tested along with a visibly matched team apparent to the housing provider upon meeting each team member. Because the nature of housing discrimination is often subtle, care was given to ensure that the matching tester teams looked to the provider as the same in every material way except for the protected-class status being tested, race and national origin.

Rather than categorizing one aspect of the test as showing a difference in treatment, the tests were analyzed as a whole to put the totality of treatment afforded to each tester in context. By doing so, the variables looked for would be clear and, if no variation in treatment existed, such conclusions would be equally clear.

It is important to note that, because the rental tests did not include having the testers complete a rental application or participate in the subsequent qualification process at any of the apartment complexes tested, the tests could only measure the initial contact the testers experienced in the leasing office. The tests were designed to measure differences in treatment based on the availability of a one-bedroom apartment unit requested by the testers and the corresponding treatment concerning the issue of availability received by the testers.

Thus, while this aspect of testing is critical in understanding how persons are treated at the initial stage of home seeking, it cannot tell the complete story of how individuals are processed and what their ultimate treatment will be. Notwithstanding, experience dictates that the initial contact with and treatment by a housing provider are often where most problems arise when it comes to housing bias. Thus, initial experiences in ascertaining availability remain important factors in determining if housing bias is practiced.

Review of the Test Results

A review of the rental tests in the most recent battery of testing showed:

A difference in treatment in one test based on national origin.

A re-test was conducted at the apartment complex where the issue was found to determine if there were any subsequent problems. **No differences in treatment were found in the national origin re-test.** The testing results are reviewed below.

Test #42 (National Origin Test)

This test was conducted on March 29, 2024. Both the Hispanic and White testers requested a one-bedroom apartment for April 15, 2024. The testers spoke to different leasing agents. Both testers were instructed to inquire about rent specials.

The Hispanic tester indicated that she was looking for a one-bedroom apartment for April 15, 2024. The agent told the tester that a one-bedroom apartment was available. The tester asked about rent specials and the agent told her that no rent specials were available. The agent told the tester about the security deposit and other fees. The agent invited the tester to call back.

The White tester spoke to a different leasing agent. She was told that a one-bedroom apartment was available. The tester asked about rent specials and the agent told the tester about a rent special. The rent special was that two weeks would be taken off the second month's rent if the apartment was rented that day (date of the test). The agent told the tester about the security deposit and other fees. The agent invited the tester to call back.

This site was re-tested because the Hispanic tester was told there were no rent specials available and the White tester was told about a rent special.

Re-Test #42 (Test #61)

The re-test was conducted on April 8, 2024. Both testers spoke to the same agent that the Hispanic tester spoke to in the original test. Both testers inquired about rent specials. Both testers were told that a one-bedroom apartment was available. The agent told both testers that there were no rent specials available at the time of the test. Both testers were told about the security deposit and other fees. Both testers were asked to call back. **The re-test showed no differences in treatment.**

A review of the rental tests paints a picture of:

A rental housing market that is not as tight as previous testing cycles have shown.

Summary Review

The tests were structured to have each tester team request a one-bedroom apartment with a move-in date of April 15, 2024 when visiting the rental office.

48 out of 65 Tests

Both tester teams were told a one-bedroom apartment would be available on the requested April 15 move-in date.

8 out of 65 Tests

Tester teams were told a one-bedroom apartment would be available between April 16 and May 8, 2024.

9 out of 65 Tests

Tester teams were told a one-bedroom apartment would be available on June 1, 2024 or later (July and August).

As previously noted, the testers were instructed to inquire about rent specials when visiting the rental office. The testing results still show that rent specials continued not to be offered to prospective tenants as often as in earlier testing cycles.

46 out of 65 Tests

Tester teams were told there were no rent specials.

0 out of 65 Tests

Revealed a rent special that offered one or two months free or reduced rent.

In past testing cycles, these more generous types of rent specials were more common. The low number and type of rent specials offered to the tester teams in this testing cycle also appears to be consistent with a still tight housing market.

African Americans and Hispanics comprise approximately 45 percent of the Prince William County population. No other minority group approaches their demographics in the county.

Therefore, testing these two major minority groups allows the County to extrapolate how 45 percent of its population would be treated under fair housing laws. We would undoubtedly test other protected classes if we had indications or had concerns brought to our attention about issues with other protected classes.

For the same reasons, testing housing complexes of more than 100 units gives two advantages:

- Vacancies are more likely to be available, particularly in tight housing markets.
- In a complex of 100 units or more, it could easily be extrapolated that members of these two protected classes residing in these apartment complexes would be treated similarly to the testers.

In this case, the aggregate number of units in all complexes was 14,927.

Fair housing testing has two significant objectives:

- The enforcement of fair housing laws.
- Preventing discrimination.

Knowing that Prince William County tests regularly keeps landlords focused on compliance and the importance of training their employees about fair housing laws to avoid non-compliance issues.

Fair housing testing has its limitations. It only tests how a tester is treated by rental agents when seeking a particular size apartment for a specific date. Testers can not sign rental contracts or applications. The test is limited to the interactions between rental agents and testers.

The testing sites were randomly selected by zip code among the apartment complexes with more than 100 units. The consultant used a list submitted by the County's demographer. The list was updated and supplemented by an internet search of apartment complexes with over 100 units in Prince William County.

Apartment Complexes Tested in Prince William County

(Sites are not listed in the order that they were tested.)

Apartment Complexes	Zip Code	Apartment Complexes	Zip Code
Orchard Mills Apartments	22193	Barrington Apartments	20109
Potomac Ridge Apartments	22191	Woodlee Terrace Apartments	22192
Rolling Brook Village Apartments	22192	Dale Forest Apartments	22193
Windsor Park Apartments	22192	Broadstone @River Oaks Apartments	22026
Long View Apartments	22191	Rivergate North Apartments	22191
Riverside Station Apartments	22191	Bayvue Apartments	22191
Landing @Markham Grant	22191	Woodbridge Station Apartments	22191
The Flats @Neabsco	22191	Kensington Place	22191
Linden Park Apartments	22172	Summerland Heights Apartments	22191
The Sutton Apartments	22191	Springwoods Lake Ridge Apartments	22192
Signal Hill Apartments	22191	Stone Pointe Apartments	22191
River Oaks Apartments	22191	Woodbridge Forest Apartments	22192
Assembly Manassas	20109	Elevation One	22191
East Gate Apartments	22172	Bell Stonebridge Apartments	22191
Shorehaven Apartments	22026	Enclave at Potomac Club Apartments	22191
River Woods Apartments	22191	Potomac Vista Apartments	22191
Misty Ridge Apartments	22191	Glen Ridge Commons Apartment	22193
Meridian Bay Apartments	22191	Townsquare @Dumfries	22172
Oasis at Montclair Apartments	22025	The Crossing at Summerland Apartments	22191
Shenandoah Station in the Park	22172	Viridium Apartments	22191
Virginia Commons Apartments	22026	Landing at Mason's Bridge Apartments	22191
The Preserve at Catons Crossing	22192	Bella Vista Apartments	22191
Reids Prospect Apartments	22192		
Dominion Middle Ridge Apartments	22192		

This project was made possible by a generous grant from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development through the Prince William County Office of Housing and Community Development.



**PRINCE
WILLIAM**
— COUNTY

PRINCE WILLIAM

Human Rights

15941 Donald Curtis Drive, Suite 125
Woodbridge, VA 22191
703-792-4680 (TTY:711)
pwhrc@pwcgov.org

pwcva.gov/humanrights



Prince William Area Consolidated Plan Performance Report for FFY2024 (FY25) & Citizen Input Annual Action Plan FY2027 **Public Information Meeting**



Public Information Meetings will be held to receive comments on Prince William Area FFY2024 (FY25) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) and solicit input from citizens on the development of the Annual Action Plan FY2027.

Join the meeting on September 2, 2025, at 1:00 PM

In-Person Dr. A.J. Ferlazzo Bldg. 15941 Donald Curtis Drive #112, Woodbridge, VA 22191

Teams Meeting <https://pwc-doit.webex.com/pwc-doit/j.php?MTID=mc4b7f1f859eba2fdb057488f7ec8e2be>

Copies of the DRAFT FY25 CAPER will be made available for review on or about **August 21, 2025**, at the Manassas City, Community Development; Manassas Park, Department of Community Services; Sudley North Government Center (Dept. of Social Services), McCoart Complex (Information Desk) and Dr. A. J. Ferlazzo Building (Office of Housing and Community Development). In addition, the document can also be accessed through the internet at <https://www.pwcva.gov/department/housing-community-development/reports/>

Non-English-speaking residents and citizens with speech, sight, or hearing impairments who wish to review the documents or comment at the public meetings should contact the Prince William County Office of Housing & Community Development five days in advance at 703-792-7531, Julie Roane, Administrative Coordinator. Virginia Relay enables people who are deaf, hard of hearing, deaf/blind, or have difficulty speaking to communicate by TTY (text telephone) or another assistive telephone device with anyone who uses a standard phone. Anyone can make a Virginia Relay call by dialing 7-1-1. Each request will be considered individually according to the type of assistance required, the availability of resources, and the financial ability of the County to provide accommodation.

Written comments on the FFY24 (FY25) CAPER or input into Annual Action Plan FY2027 may be submitted for the record **until 5:00 p.m. September 19, 2025**. Written comments should be addressed to the attention of: Julie Roane, Administrative Coordinator, Office of Housing and Community Development, Dr. A. J. Ferlazzo Building, 15941 Donald Curtis Drive, Suite 112, Woodbridge, VA 22191- 4291 or you can e-mail your comments to jroane@pwcgov.org.



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Office of Community Planning and Development
 Integrated Disbursement and Information System
 Home Matching Liability Report

2014	25.0%	\$975,787.63	\$919,023.33	\$229,755.83
2015	25.0%	\$309,877.14	\$258,944.71	\$64,736.17
2016	25.0%	\$589,745.65	\$533,193.65	\$133,298.41
2017	25.0%	\$504,347.21	\$441,431.21	\$110,357.80
2018	25.0%	\$458,500.30	\$392,361.90	\$98,090.47
2019	25.0%	\$460,666.04	\$368,671.44	\$92,167.86
2020	25.0%	\$224,645.87	\$135,703.87	\$33,925.96
2021	25.0%	\$340,779.00	\$246,840.00	\$61,710.00
2022	25.0%	\$486,944.00	\$394,497.00	\$98,624.25
2023	25.0%	\$883,089.70	\$781,559.00	\$195,389.75
2024	25.0%	\$918,093.80	\$819,320.00	\$204,830.00



Office of Community Planning and Development
 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Integrated Disbursement and Information System
 PR26 - CDBG Financial Summary Report
 Program Year 2024
 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY , VA

DATE: 08-28-25
 TIME: 14:21
 PAGE: 1

PART I: SUMMARY OF CDBG RESOURCES

01 UNEXPENDED CDBG FUNDS AT END OF PREVIOUS PROGRAM YEAR	0.00
02 ENTITLEMENT GRANT	2,559,056.00
03 SURPLUS URBAN RENEWAL	0.00
04 SECTION 108 GUARANTEED LOAN FUNDS	0.00
05 CURRENT YEAR PROGRAM INCOME	257,627.27
05a CURRENT YEAR SECTION 108 PROGRAM INCOME (FOR SI TYPE)	0.00
06 FUNDS RETURNED TO THE LINE-OF-CREDIT	0.00
06a FUNDS RETURNED TO THE LOCAL CDBG ACCOUNT	0.00
07 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL AVAILABLE	0.00
08 TOTAL AVAILABLE (SUM, LINES 01-07)	2,816,683.27

PART II: SUMMARY OF CDBG EXPENDITURES

09 DISBURSEMENTS OTHER THAN SECTION 108 REPAYMENTS AND PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION	3,293,911.05
10 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL AMOUNT SUBJECT TO LOW/MOD BENEFIT	0.00
11 AMOUNT SUBJECT TO LOW/MOD BENEFIT (LINE 09 + LINE 10)	3,293,911.05
12 DISBURSED IN IDIS FOR PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION	48,781.94
13 DISBURSED IN IDIS FOR SECTION 108 REPAYMENTS	0.00
14 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL EXPENDITURES	0.00
15 TOTAL EXPENDITURES (SUM, LINES 11-14)	3,342,692.99
16 UNEXPENDED BALANCE (LINE 08 - LINE 15)	(526,009.72)

PART III: LOWMOD BENEFIT THIS REPORTING PERIOD

17 EXPENDED FOR LOW/MOD HOUSING IN SPECIAL AREAS	0.00
18 EXPENDED FOR LOW/MOD MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	0.00
19 DISBURSED FOR OTHER LOW/MOD ACTIVITIES	3,293,911.05
20 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL LOW/MOD CREDIT	0.00
21 TOTAL LOW/MOD CREDIT (SUM, LINES 17-20)	3,293,911.05
22 PERCENT LOW/MOD CREDIT (LINE 21/LINE 11)	100.00%

LOW/MOD BENEFIT FOR MULTI-YEAR CERTIFICATIONS

23 PROGRAM YEARS(PY) COVERED IN CERTIFICATION	PY: PY: PY:
24 CUMULATIVE NET EXPENDITURES SUBJECT TO LOW/MOD BENEFIT CALCULATION	0.00
25 CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURES BENEFITING LOW/MOD PERSONS	0.00
26 PERCENT BENEFIT TO LOW/MOD PERSONS (LINE 25/LINE 24)	0.00%

PART IV: PUBLIC SERVICE (PS) CAP CALCULATIONS

27 DISBURSED IN IDIS FOR PUBLIC SERVICES	576,627.84
28 PS UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS AT END OF CURRENT PROGRAM YEAR	0.00
29 PS UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS AT END OF PREVIOUS PROGRAM YEAR	0.00
30 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL PS OBLIGATIONS	0.00
31 TOTAL PS OBLIGATIONS (LINE 27 + LINE 28 - LINE 29 + LINE 30)	576,627.84
32 ENTITLEMENT GRANT	2,559,056.00
33 PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM INCOME	621,855.75
34 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL SUBJECT TO PS CAP	0.00
35 TOTAL SUBJECT TO PS CAP (SUM, LINES 32-34)	3,180,911.75
36 PERCENT FUNDS OBLIGATED FOR PS ACTIVITIES (LINE 31/LINE 35)	18.13%

PART V: PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION (PA) CAP

37 DISBURSED IN IDIS FOR PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION	48,781.94
38 PA UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS AT END OF CURRENT PROGRAM YEAR	0.00
39 PA UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS AT END OF PREVIOUS PROGRAM YEAR	0.00
40 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL PA OBLIGATIONS	0.00
41 TOTAL PA OBLIGATIONS (LINE 37 + LINE 38 - LINE 39 +LINE 40)	48,781.94
42 ENTITLEMENT GRANT	2,559,056.00
43 CURRENT YEAR PROGRAM INCOME	257,627.27
44 ADJUSTMENT TO COMPUTE TOTAL SUBJECT TO PA CAP	0.00
45 TOTAL SUBJECT TO PA CAP (SUM, LINES 42-44)	2,816,683.27
46 PERCENT FUNDS OBLIGATED FOR PA ACTIVITIES (LINE 41/LINE 45)	1.73%



Office of Community Planning and Development
 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Integrated Disbursement and Information System
 PR26 - CDBG Financial Summary Report
 Program Year 2024
 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY , VA

DATE: 08-28-25
 TIME: 14:21
 PAGE: 2

LINE 17 DETAIL: ACTIVITIES TO CONSIDER IN DETERMINING THE AMOUNT TO ENTER ON LINE 17

No data returned for this view. This might be because the applied filter excludes all data.

LINE 18 DETAIL: ACTIVITIES TO CONSIDER IN DETERMINING THE AMOUNT TO ENTER ON LINE 18

No data returned for this view. This might be because the applied filter excludes all data.

LINE 19 DETAIL: ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN THE COMPUTATION OF LINE 19

Plan Year	IDIS Project	IDIS Activity	Voucher Number	Activity Name	Matrix Code	National Objective	Drawn Amount
2022	14	1292	6922504	The Arc of Greater Prince William/INSIGHT-Rehabilitation Two Chimneys/Running Pine	03B	LMC	\$123,165.50
2023	14	1328	7020236	ARC/INSIGHT Rehabilitation Affordable Rental	03B	LMC	\$141,063.00
2023	14	1328	7037770	ARC/INSIGHT Rehabilitation Affordable Rental	03B	LMC	\$8,937.00
2024	13	1360	7037774	ARC/INSIGHT Rehabilitation Affordable Rental	03B	LMC	\$36,759.60
2024	13	1360	7039209	ARC/INSIGHT Rehabilitation Affordable Rental	03B	LMC	\$103,464.00
					03B	Matrix Code	\$413,389.10
2022	2	1295	6922507	Dawson Beach Renovations	03C	LMC	\$10,842.00
2022	2	1295	6928041	Dawson Beach Renovations	03C	LMC	\$94,414.50
2022	2	1295	6935525	Dawson Beach Renovations	03C	LMC	\$60,045.50
2023	21	1331	6922510	Accessible Playground Equipment for the Hilda Barg Homeless Prevention Center	03C	LMC	\$70,985.79
2023	21	1331	7037806	Accessible Playground Equipment for the Hilda Barg Homeless Prevention Center	03C	LMC	\$135,152.56
					03C	Matrix Code	\$371,440.35
2023	2	1320	6928036	Dawson Beach Transitional Housing Case Management	03T	LMC	\$35,000.00
2023	17	1322	6928038	Dawson Beach Transitional Housing Property Management	03T	LMC	\$142,521.12
					03T	Matrix Code	\$177,521.12
2023	12	1318	6922513	Homeless Transportation Through PWC DSS	05E	LMC	\$18,480.45
2023	12	1318	6978863	Homeless Transportation Through PWC DSS	05E	LMC	\$4,469.85
2024	12	1355	6978863	Homeless Transportation Through PWC Department of Social Services	05E	LMC	\$2,561.66
2024	12	1355	7005156	Homeless Transportation Through PWC Department of Social Services	05E	LMC	\$14,616.95
2024	12	1355	7036750	Homeless Transportation Through PWC Department of Social Services	05E	LMC	\$22,821.39
					05E	Matrix Code	\$62,950.30
2020	14	1257	6978863	Emergency Housing Assistance Program	05Q	LMC	\$219,798.94
					05Q	Matrix Code	\$219,798.94
2023	11	1317	6922512	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	05Z	LMC	\$6,222.48
2024	10	1351	6978863	Comprehensive Housing Counseling PWCounrty and City of Manassas	05Z	LMC	\$6,058.62
2024	10	1351	7006417	Comprehensive Housing Counseling PWCounrty and City of Manassas	05Z	LMC	\$64,076.38
2024	11	1354	6978863	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	05Z	LMC	\$13,175.41
2024	11	1354	7005156	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	05Z	LMC	\$7,659.57
2024	11	1354	7036753	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	05Z	LMC	\$19,165.02
					05Z	Matrix Code	\$116,357.48
2023	6	1327	6928031	County Administered Neighborhood Housing Rehabilitation Program	14A	LMH	\$349,375.45
2023	6	1327	6978863	County Administered Neighborhood Housing Rehabilitation Program	14A	LMH	\$163,533.40
2024	6	1361	7005157	P. D. Rice - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$171,315.00
2024	6	1361	7015586	P. D. Rice - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$19,384.45
2024	6	1362	7005158	J. L. McFarland - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$48,600.60
2024	6	1362	7015586	J. L. McFarland - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$5,333.40
2024	6	1363	7005159	V. Ramirez Caldron - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$142,687.50
2024	6	1363	7015586	V. Ramirez Caldron - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$44,100.00
2024	6	1363	7037456	V. Ramirez Caldron - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$13,500.00
2024	6	1367	7005161	T. Williams - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$40,320.00
2024	6	1367	7015586	T. Williams - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$11,700.00
2024	6	1367	7030497	T. Williams - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$5,780.00
2024	6	1368	7005162	Shani Ford - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$152,980.00
2024	6	1368	7024830	Shani Ford - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$16,820.00
2024	6	1369	7007461	F. Noorzai NHRP	14A	LMH	\$45,540.00
2024	6	1369	7020230	F. Noorzai NHRP	14A	LMH	\$29,250.00
2024	6	1376	7005430	S. Castaneda - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$5,392.50
2024	6	1376	7006434	S. Castaneda - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$36,277.50
2024	6	1376	7024835	S. Castaneda - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$4,630.00



Office of Community Planning and Development
 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Integrated Disbursement and Information System
 PR26 - CDBG Financial Summary Report
 Program Year 2024
 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY , VA

DATE: 08-28-25
 TIME: 14:21
 PAGE: 3

Plan Year	IDIS Project	IDIS Activity	Voucher Number	Activity Name	Matrix Code	National Objective	Drawn Amount
2024	6	1377	7019703	A Yaqoob - NHRP	14A	LMH	\$73,170.00
2024	6	1378	7027726	R. Spooner-Williams NHRP	14A	LMH	\$36,990.00
2024	6	1378	7037457	R. Spooner-Williams NHRP	14A	LMH	\$79,650.00
					14A	Matrix Code	\$1,496,329.80
2024	21	1359	7005155	INSIGHT/ARC Acquisition of Housing Persons with Disabilities	14G	LMH	\$350,000.00
					14G	Matrix Code	\$350,000.00
2023	7	1315	6928033	NHRP Program Administration	14H	LMH	\$86,123.96
					14H	Matrix Code	\$86,123.96
Total							\$3,293,911.05

LINE 27 DETAIL: ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN THE COMPUTATION OF LINE 27

Plan Year	IDIS Project	IDIS Activity	Voucher Number	Activity to prevent, prepare for, and respond to Coronavirus	Activity Name	Grant Number	Fund Type	Matrix Code	National Objective	Drawn Amount
2023	2	1320	6928036	No	Dawson Beach Transitional Housing Case Management	B23UC510005	EN	03T	LMC	\$35,000.00
2023	17	1322	6928038	No	Dawson Beach Transitional Housing Property Management	B23UC510005	EN	03T	LMC	\$142,521.12
								03T	Matrix Code	\$177,521.12
2023	12	1318	6922513	No	Homeless Transportation Through PWC DSS	B23UC510005	EN	05E	LMC	\$18,480.45
2023	12	1318	6978863	No	Homeless Transportation Through PWC DSS	B23UC510005	EN	05E	LMC	\$4,469.85
2024	12	1355	6978863	No	Homeless Transportation Through PWC Department of Social Services	B23UC510005	EN	05E	LMC	\$2,561.66
2024	12	1355	7005156	No	Homeless Transportation Through PWC Department of Social Services	B23UC510005	EN	05E	LMC	\$14,616.95
2024	12	1355	7036750	No	Homeless Transportation Through PWC Department of Social Services	B24UC510005	PI	05E	LMC	\$22,821.39
								05E	Matrix Code	\$62,950.30
2020	14	1257	6978863	Yes	Emergency Housing Assistance Program	B23UC510005	EN	05Q	LMC	\$180,201.06
2020	14	1257	6978863	Yes	Emergency Housing Assistance Program	B24UC510005	EN	05Q	LMC	\$39,597.88
								05Q	Matrix Code	\$219,798.94
2023	11	1317	6922512	No	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	B23UC510005	EN	05Z	LMC	\$6,222.48
2024	10	1351	6978863	No	Comprehensive Housing Counseling PWCounrty and City of Manassas	B23UC510005	EN	05Z	LMC	\$6,058.62
2024	10	1351	7006417	No	Comprehensive Housing Counseling PWCounrty and City of Manassas	B22UC510005	EN	05Z	LMC	\$10,178.00
2024	10	1351	7006417	No	Comprehensive Housing Counseling PWCounrty and City of Manassas	B23UC510005	EN	05Z	LMC	\$53,898.38
2024	11	1354	6978863	No	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	B23UC510005	EN	05Z	LMC	\$13,175.41
2024	11	1354	7005156	No	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	B23UC510005	EN	05Z	LMC	\$7,659.57
2024	11	1354	7036753	No	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	B23UC510005	EN	05Z	LMC	\$11,049.61
2024	11	1354	7036753	No	Streetlight Community Outreach Ministries - Case Management Homeless	B24UC510005	PI	05Z	LMC	\$8,115.41
								05Z	Matrix Code	\$116,357.48
				No	Activity to prevent, prepare for, and respond to Coronavirus					\$356,828.90
				Yes	Activity to prevent, prepare for, and respond to Coronavirus					\$219,798.94
Total										\$576,627.84

LINE 37 DETAIL: ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN THE COMPUTATION OF LINE 37

Plan Year	IDIS Project	IDIS Activity	Voucher Number	Activity Name	Matrix Code	National Objective	Drawn Amount
2023	3	1316	6928034	CDBG Program Administration	21A		\$18,781.94
					21A	Matrix Code	\$18,781.94
2024	5	1350	6978863	Fair Housing Activities	21D		\$30,000.00
					21D	Matrix Code	\$30,000.00
Total							\$48,781.94

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Office of Community Planning and Development
 Integrated Disbursement and Information System
 Program Income Details by Fiscal Year and Program
 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY,VA

Report for Program:

*Data Only Provided for Time Period Queried:07-01-2024 to 08-28-2025

Program Year	Program	Associated Grant Number	Fund Type	Estimated Income for Year	Transaction	Voucher #	Voucher Created	Voucher Type	IDIS Proj. ID	IDIS Actv. ID	Matrix Code	Receipted/Drawn Amount
2020	HOME	M20UC510502	PI	0.00								
			PI		DRAWS							
						6955363 -001	10/23/2024	PY	9	1347		120,450.00
						6955364 -001	10/23/2024	PY	9	1348		107,250.00
						6955748 -002	10/24/2024	PY	9	1346		98,354.34
						6964154 -001	11/20/2024	PY	9	1349		145,200.00
						6969717 -001	12/09/2024	PY	9	1357		140,250.00
						6994044 -001	02/13/2025	PY	9	1366		28,127.99
											Receipts	
											PI Draws	639,632.33
											PA Draws	0.00
											Balance	(639,632.33)
2020	HOME	M20UC510502									Total Local Account Receipts	
											Total Local Account Draws	639,632.33
											Total Local Account Balance	(639,632.33)
2024	CDBG	B24UC510005	PI	0.00								
					RECEIPTS							
						5432721 -001	07/16/2024		17	1322	03T	12,380.00
						5450308 -001	03/31/2025		7	1352	14H	198,132.00
						5450309 -001	03/31/2025		16	1358	03T	16,178.47

Program Year	Program	Associated Grant Number	Fund Type	Estimated Income for Year	Transaction	Voucher #	Voucher Created	Voucher Type	IDIS Proj. ID	IDIS Actv. ID	Matrix Code	Receipted/Drawn Amount
					DRAWS	5455792 -001	06/16/2025		7	1352	14H	30,936.80
						6928031 -001	08/02/2024	PY	6	1327	14A	12,380.00
						7019703 -001	04/25/2025	PY	6	1377	14A	73,170.00
						7027726 -001	05/20/2025	PY	6	1378	14A	36,990.00
						7036750 -001	06/17/2025	PY	12	1355	05E	22,821.39
						7036753 -002	06/17/2025	PY	11	1354	05Z	8,115.41
						7037457 -001	06/19/2025	PY	6	1378	14A	79,650.00
						7054625 -001	08/08/2025	PY	6	1377	14A	8,130.00
						7054728 -001	08/08/2025	PY	6	1378	14A	16,370.47
											PI Receipts	257,627.27
											PI Draws	257,627.27
											PI Balance	0.00
2024	CDBG										Total CDBG Receipts*:	257,627.27
											Total CDBG Draws against Receipts*:	257,627.27
											Total CDBG Receipt Fund Balance*:	0.00
2025	CDBG	B25UC510005	PI	0.00	RECEIPTS							
					DRAWS	5457658 -001	07/15/2025		16	1358	03T	8,882.00
						7054624 -002	08/08/2025	PY	6	1369	14A	7,582.00
						7054728 -002	08/08/2025	PY	6	1378	14A	1,300.00
											PI Receipts	8,882.00
											PI Draws	8,882.00
											PI Balance	0.00
2025	CDBG										Total CDBG Receipts*:	8,882.00
											Total CDBG Draws against Receipts*:	8,882.00
											Total CDBG Receipt Fund Balance*:	0.00

Program	Associated	Fund	Estimated		Voucher	Voucher	IDIS	IDIS	Matrix	Received/Drawn		
Year	Program	Grant Number	Type	Income for Year	Transaction	Voucher #	Created	Type	Proj. ID	Actv. ID	Code	Amount

CAPER Aggregator 2.0

Aggregates data from CAPERs submitted to HUD by selected criteria (project type and/or specific question)

Filters for this report

Aggregate or detailed mode	Aggregate
Year	2024
CAPER Project Type TIP: Hold down the CTRL key on the (all)	
Programs	ESG: Prince William County - VA
Report executed on	8/25/2025 4:18:12 PM

Grant List

Jurisdiction	Type	Start Date
ESG: Prince William County - VA	CAPER	7/1/2024

Q04a: Project Identifiers in HMIS

Please select details mode in the filters above to see Q4 information.

Or [click here](#) to view details in a new tab.

CSV uploads containing multiple project rows in Q4 will display as separate rows here using the same value in Project Info Row ID.

Q05a: Report Validations Table

Category	Count of Clients for DQ	Count of Clients
Total Number of Persons Served	673	673
Number of Adults (Age 18 or Over)	433	433
Number of Children (Under Age 18)	240	240
Number of Persons with Unknown Age	0	0
Number of Leavers	481	481
Number of Adult Leavers	310	310
Number of Adult and Head of Household Leavers	310	310
Number of Stayers	192	192
Number of Adult Stayers	123	123
Number of Veterans	19	19
Number of Chronically Homeless Persons	49	49
Number of Youth Under Age 25	16	16
Number of Parenting Youth Under Age 25 with Children	1	1

Number of Adult Heads of Household	386	386
Number of Child and Unknown-Age Heads of Household	0	0
Heads of Households and Adult Stayers in the Project	364	4

Effective 1/1/2023, this question includes separate columns for totals relevant to the DQ questions and totals relevant to the entire APR. Data

Q06a: Data Quality: Personally Identifying Information

	Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	Information Missing
Name	0	0
Social Security Number	58	0
Date of Birth	0	0
Race/Ethnicity	0	0
Overall Score	0	0

New as of 10/1/2023.

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Archived as of 10/1/2023: This table only contains data uploaded prior to 10/1/2023.

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q06b: Data Quality: Universal Data Elements

Data Element	Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	Information Missing
Veteran Status	0	0
Project Start Date	0	0
Relationship to Head of Household	0	0
Enrollment CoC	0	0
Disabling Condition	0	0

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q06c: Data Quality: Income and Housing Data Quality

Data Element	Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	Information Missing
Destination	15	0
Income and Sources at Start	0	0
Income and Sources at Annual Assessment	0	0
Income and Sources at Exit	0	0

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q06d: Data Quality: Chronic Homelessness

Entering into project type	Count of Total Records	Missing Time in Institution
ES-EE, ES-NbN, SH, Street Outreach	405	0
TH	10	0
PH (All)	18	0
CE	0	0
SSO, Day Shelter, HP	0	0
Total	433	0

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q06e: Data Quality: Timeliness

Time for Record Entry	Number of Project Start Records	Number of Project Exit Records
	0	0
0 days	102	122
1-3 Days	346	210
4-6 Days	44	44
7-10 Days	10	24
11+ Days	12	81

Q06f: Data Quality: Inactive Records: Street Outreach & Emergency Shelter

Data Element	# of Records	# of Inactive Records
Contact (Adults and Heads of Household in Street Outreach)	0	0
Bed Night (All Clients in ES - NbN)	0	0

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q07a: Number of Persons Served

	Total	Without Children
Adults	433	274

Children	240	0
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	0	0
Total	673	274
For PSH & RRH – the total persons served who moved in 18		10

Q07b: Point-in-Time Count of Persons on the Last Wednesday

	Total	Without Children
January	182	71
April	182	72
July	171	63
October	155	67

Q08a: Households Served

	Total	Without Children
Total Households	386	272
For PSH & RRH – the total households served who move 12		10

Q08b: Point-in-Time Count of Households on the Last Wednesday

	Total	Without Children
January	102	70
April	101	71
July	91	63
October	92	67

Q09a: Number of Persons Contacted

Number of Persons Contacted	All Persons Contacted	First contact – NOT staying on the Streets, ES-EE, ES-NbN, or SH
Once	0	0
2-5 Times	0	0

6-9 Times	0	0
10+ Times	0	0
Total Persons Contacted	0	0

Q09b: Number of Persons Newly Engaged

Number of Persons Engaged	All Persons Contacted	First contact – NOT staying on the Streets, ES-EE, ES-NbN, or SH
Once	0	0
2-5 Contacts	0	0
6-9 Contacts	0	0
10+ Contacts	0	0
Total Persons Engaged	0	0
Rate of Engagement	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q11: Age

	Total	Without Children
Under 5	71	0
5-12	117	0
13-17	52	0
18-24	35	16
25-34	109	51
35-44	102	52
45-54	79	58
55-64	69	59
65+	39	38
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	0	0
Total	673	274

New as of 10/1/2023.

Archived as of 10/1/2023: This table only contains data uploaded prior to 10/1/2023.

Q12: Race and Ethnicity

	Total	Without Children
American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	3	3
Asian or Asian American	12	3
Black, African American, or African	397	163
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	30	9
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	0
White	121	72
Asian or Asian American & American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	0	0
Black, African American, or African & American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	4	3
Hispanic/Latina/e/o & American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	0	0
Middle Eastern or North African & American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander & American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	0	0
White & American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	0	0
Black, African American, or African & Asian or Asian American	1	0
Hispanic/Latina/e/o & Asian or Asian American	2	0
Middle Eastern or North African & Asian or Asian American	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander & Asian or Asian American	1	1
White & Asian or Asian American	1	0
Hispanic/Latina/e/o & Black, African American, or African	10	5
Middle Eastern or North African & Black, African American, or African	1	1
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander & Black, African American, or African	0	0
White & Black, African American, or African	30	0
Middle Eastern or North African & Hispanic/Latina/e/o	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander & Hispanic/Latina/e/o	0	0
White & Hispanic/Latina/e/o	49	8
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander & Middle Eastern or North African	0	0
White & Middle Eastern or North African	3	3

White & Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1
Multiracial – more than 2 races/ethnicity, with one being Hispanic/Latina/e/o	5	1
Multiracial – more than 2 races, where no option is Hispanic/Latina/e/o	1	1
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	0	0
Total	673	274

New as of 10/1/2023.

Archived as of 10/1/2023: This table only contains data uploaded prior to 10/1/2023.

Archived as of 10/1/2023: This table only contains data uploaded prior to 10/1/2023.

Q13a1: Physical and Mental Health Conditions at Start

	Total Persons	Without Children
Mental Health Disorder	144	100
Alcohol Use Disorder	14	13
Drug Use Disorder	13	12
Both Alcohol Use and Drug Use Disorders	17	16
Chronic Health Condition	115	95
HIV/AIDS	3	3
Developmental Disability	30	21
Physical Disability	105	90

The "With Children and Adults" column is retired as of 10/1/2019 and replaced with the columns "Adults in HH with Children & Adults" and

Q13b1: Physical and Mental Health Conditions at Exit

	Total Persons	Without Children
Mental Health Disorder	102	76
Alcohol Use Disorder	11	10
Drug Use Disorder	10	9
Both Alcohol Use and Drug Use Disorders	12	12
Chronic Health Condition	76	66
HIV/AIDS	2	2
Developmental Disability	18	12

Physical Disability

69

60

The "With Children and Adults" column is retired as of 10/1/2019 and replaced with the columns "Adults in HH with Children & Adults" and

Q13c1: Physical and Mental Health Conditions for Stayers

	Total Persons	Without Children
Mental Health Disorder	41	24
Alcohol Use Disorder	3	3
Drug Use Disorder	2	2
Both Alcohol Use and Drug Use Disorders	5	4
Chronic Health Condition	40	30
HIV/AIDS	1	1
Developmental Disability	11	8
Physical Disability	35	29

The "With Children and Adults" column is retired as of 10/1/2019 and replaced with the columns "Adults in HH with Children & Adults" and

Q14a: History of Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault, Dating Violence, Stalking, or Human Trafficking

	Total	Without Children
Yes	80	41
No	353	233
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	0	0
Total	433	274

Q14b: Most recent experience of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking, or human trafficking

	Total	Without Children
Within the past three months	20	12
Three to six months ago	7	3
Six months to one year	9	5
One year ago, or more	43	20
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	1	1
Total	80	41

New as of 10/1/2023.

Archived as of 10/1/2023: This table only contains data uploaded prior to 10/1/2023.

Q15: Living Situation

	Total	Without Children
Homeless Situations		
Place not meant for habitation	204	181
Emergency shelter, including hotel or motel paid for with emergency shelter voucher, Host Home shelter	182	67
Safe Haven	0	0
Subtotal - Homeless Situations	386	248
Institutional Situations		
Foster care home or foster care group home	0	0
Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility	12	10
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention facility	4	4
Long-term care facility or nursing home	0	0
Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility	0	0
Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center	2	1
Subtotal - Institutional Situations	18	15
Temporary Situations		
Transitional housing for homeless persons (including host home)	0	0
Residential project or halfway house with no homeless clients	0	0
Hotel or motel paid for without emergency shelter voucher	18	5
Host Home (non-crisis)	0	0
Staying or living in a friend's room, apartment, or house	6	5
Staying or living in a family member's room, apartment, or house	1	0
Subtotal - Temporary Situations	25	10
Permanent Situations		
Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy	3	1
Rental by client, with ongoing housing subsidy	1	0
Owned by client, with ongoing housing subsidy	0	0
Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy	0	0
Subtotal - Permanent Situations	4	1

Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	0	0
Subtotal - Other Situations	0	0
TOTAL	433	274

Updated 10/1/2023: Rows reordered and grouped differently. New "Rental by client, with ongoing housing subsidy" row includes data previous. Interim housing is retired as of 10/1/2019.

Q16: Cash Income - Ranges

	Income at Start	Income at Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers
No income	225	3
\$1 - \$150	2	0
\$151 - \$250	2	0
\$251 - \$500	13	0
\$501 - \$1000	57	1
\$1,001 - \$1,500	36	0
\$1,501 - \$2,000	37	0
\$2,001+	61	0
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	0	0
Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an A	0	119
Number of Adult Stayers Without Required Annual Assessment	0	0
Total Adults	433	123

Q17: Cash Income - Sources

	Income at Start	Income at Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers
Earned Income	110	0
Unemployment Insurance	2	0
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	45	1
Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI)	43	0
VA Service-Connected Disability Compensation	3	0
VA Non-Service Connected Disability Pension	3	0

Private Disability Insurance	0	0
Worker's Compensation	0	0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	18	0
General Assistance (GA)	1	0
Retirement Income from Social Security	6	0
Pension or retirement income from a former job	2	0
Child Support	10	0
Alimony and other spousal support	2	0
Other Source	0	0
Adults with Income Information at Start and Annual Ass	0	4

Q19b: Disabling Conditions and Income for Adults at Exit

	AO: Adult with Disabling Condition	AO: Adult without Disabling Condition
Earned Income	23	31
Unemployment Insurance	0	2
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	22	4
Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI)	26	7
VA Service-Connected Disability Compensation	2	1
VA Non-Service-Connected Disability Pension	1	0
Private Disability Insurance	0	0
Worker's Compensation	0	0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	1	0
General Assistance (GA)	0	0
Retirement Income from Social Security	3	0
Pension or retirement income from a former job	0	2
Child Support	1	0
Alimony and other spousal support	1	0
Other source	0	1
No Sources	52	32
Unduplicated Total Adults	120	75

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q20a: Type of Non-Cash Benefit Sources

	Benefit at Start	Benefit at Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) (Previously known as Food Stamps)	208	3
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	2	0
TANF Child Care Services	4	0
TANF Transportation Services	0	0
Other TANF-Funded Services	2	0
Other Source	0	0

Q21: Health Insurance

	At Start	At Annual Assessment for Stayers
MEDICAID	508	3
MEDICARE	53	0
State Children's Health Insurance Program	7	0
Veteran's Health Administration (VHA)	13	0
Employer-Provided Health Insurance	11	0
Health Insurance obtained through COBRA	3	0
Private Pay Health Insurance	9	0
State Health Insurance for Adults	5	0
Indian Health Services Program	3	0
Other	3	0
No Health Insurance	117	1
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	3	0
Number of Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual	0	188
1 Source of Health Insurance	513	3
More than 1 Source of Health Insurance	40	0

Q22a2: Length of Participation – ESG Projects

Total	Leavers
--------------	----------------

0 to 7 days	37	36
8 to 14 days	44	28
15 to 21 days	26	15
22 to 30 days	32	28
31 to 60 days	116	84
61 to 90 days	92	65
91 to 180 days	194	143
181 to 365 days	119	73
366 to 730 days (1-2 Yrs)	9	6
731 to 1,095 days (2-3 Yrs)	3	3
1,096 to 1,460 days (3-4 Yrs)	1	0
1,461 to 1,825 days (4-5 Yrs)	0	0
More than 1,825 days (> 5 Yrs)	0	0
Total	673	481

Q22c: Length of Time between Project Start Date and Housing Move-in Date

	Total	Without Children
7 days or less	3	3
8 to 14 days	1	1
15 to 21 days	1	1
22 to 30 days	1	1
31 to 60 days	0	0
61 to 90 days	0	0
91 to 180 days	2	2
181 to 365 days	0	0
366 to 730 days (1-2 Yrs)	0	0
Total (persons moved into housing)	8	8
Average length of time to housing	<i>33.25</i>	<i>33.25</i>
Persons who were exited without move-in	8	4
Total persons	16	12

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q22d: Length of Participation by Household Type

	Total	Without Children
7 days or less	37	16
8 to 14 days	44	19
15 to 21 days	26	10
22 to 30 days	32	16
31 to 60 days	116	48
61 to 90 days	92	41
91 to 180 days	194	74
181 to 365 days	119	44
366 to 730 days (1-2 Yrs)	9	5
731 days or more	4	1
Total	673	274

Updated 10/1/2023: Data previously in categories of 1,096 days at higher has been collapsed into 731 days or more.

Q22e: Length of Time Prior to Housing - based on 3.917 Date Homelessness Started

	Total	Without Children
7 days or less	111	34
8 to 14 days	67	13
15 to 21 days	82	13
22 to 30 days	52	14
31 to 60 days	117	41
61 to 90 days	34	30
91 to 180 days	89	61
181 to 365 days	64	29
366 to 730 days (1-2 Yrs)	30	23
731 days or more	13	11
Total	659	269
Not yet moved into housing	9	5
Data not collected	5	0
Total persons	673	274

Q22f: Length of Time between Project Start Date and Housing Move-in Date by Race and Ethnicity

	American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	Asian or Asian American
Persons Moved Into Housing	0	0
Persons Exited Without Move-In	1	0
Average time to Move-In	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Median time to Move-In	<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>

New as of 10/1/2023.

Q22g: Length of Time Prior to Housing by Race and Ethnicity - based on 3.917 Date Homelessness Started

	American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	Asian or Asian American
Persons Moved Into Housing	2	12
Persons Not Yet Moved Into Housing	1	0
Average time to Move-In	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Median time to Move-In	<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>

New as of 10/1/2023.

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q23c: Exit Destination

	Total	Without Children
Homeless Situations		
Place not meant for habitation (e.g., a vehicle, an abandoned building, bus/train/subway station/airport or anywhere outside)	57	27
Emergency shelter, including hotel or motel paid for with emergency shelter voucher, Host Home shelter	10	6
Safe Haven	0	0
Subtotal - Homeless Situations	67	33
Institutional Situations		
Foster care home or foster care group home	0	0

Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical fac	10	10
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention facility	10	9
Long-term care facility or nursing home	3	3
Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility	1	1
Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center	2	2
Subtotal - Institutional Situations	26	25
Temporary Situations		
Transitional housing for homeless persons (including ho	11	0
Residential project or halfway house with no homeless c	1	1
Hotel or motel paid for without emergency shelter vouc	26	8
Host Home (non-crisis)	0	0
Staying or living with family, temporary tenure (e.g., room, apartment, or house)	25	4
Staying or living with friends, temporary tenure (e.g., room, apartment, or house)	8	4
Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA TH	0	0
Subtotal - Temporary Situations	71	17
Permanent Situations		
Staying or living with family, permanent tenure	48	20
Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure	18	11
Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA PH	0	0
Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy	86	31
Rental by client, with ongoing housing subsidy	144	49
Owned by client, with ongoing housing subsidy	4	0
Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy	1	1
Subtotal - Permanent Situations	301	112
Other Situations		
No Exit Interview Completed	0	0
Other	1	1
Deceased	0	0
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	15	8
Data Not Collected	0	0
Subtotal - Other Situations	16	9
Total	481	196
Total persons exiting to positive housing destinations	301	112

Total persons whose destinations excluded them from t 13		13
Percentage	<i>64.32%</i>	<i>61.20%</i>

Updated 10/1/2023: Rows reordered and grouped differently. Destinations with subsidies are now detailed in Q23d. Existing data has been updated. Numbers in green italics have been recalculated or weighted based on available totals.

Q23d: Exit Destination – Subsidy Type of Persons Exiting to Rental by Client With An Ongoing Subsidy

	Total	Without Children
GPD TIP housing subsidy	0	0
VASH housing subsidy	7	5
RRH or equivalent subsidy	105	38
HCV voucher (tenant or project based) (not dedicated)	19	0
Public housing unit	0	0
Rental by client, with other ongoing housing subsidy	1	1
Housing Stability Voucher	0	0
Family Unification Program Voucher (FUP)	8	1
Foster Youth to Independence Initiative (FYI)	0	0
Permanent Supportive Housing	2	2
Other permanent housing dedicated for formerly homeless	2	2
TOTAL	144	49

New as of 10/1/2023: Existing data from Q23c prior to 10/1/2023 has been relocated to Q23d as appropriate.

Q23e: Exit Destination Type by Race and Ethnicity

	Total	American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous
Homeless Situations	67	0
Institutional Situations	26	0
Temporary Housing Situations	71	0
Permanent Housing Situations	301	0
Other	16	1
Total	481	1

New as of 10/1/2023.

Q24a: Homelessness Prevention Housing Assessment at Exit

	Total	Without Children
Able to maintain the housing they had at project start-- Without a subsidy	0	0
Able to maintain the housing they had at project start-- With the subsidy they had at project start	0	0
Able to maintain the housing they had at project start-- With an on-going subsidy acquired since project start	0	0
Able to maintain the housing they had at project start-- Only with financial assistance other than a subsidy	0	0
Moved to new housing unit--With on-going subsidy	0	0
Moved to new housing unit--Without an on-going subsidy	0	0
Moved in with family/friends on a temporary basis	0	0
Moved in with family/friends on a permanent basis	0	0
Moved to a transitional or temporary housing facility or Client became homeless – moving to a shelter or other place unfit for human habitation	0	0
Jail/prison	0	0
Deceased	0	0
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data not collected (no exit interview completed)	0	0
Total	0	0

Q24d: Language of Persons Requiring Translation Assistance

Language Response (Top 20 Languages Selected)	Total Persons Requiring Translation Assistance	Language Name¹
367	12	<i>Spanish</i>
180	1	<i>French</i>
Different Preferred Language	0	
Total	13	

New as of 10/1/2023.

¹This lookup is provided by Sage. The CSV upload contains only the response code.

Q25a: Number of Veterans

	Total	Without Children
Chronically Homeless Veteran	2	2
Non-Chronically Homeless Veteran	17	16
Not a Veteran	414	256
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	0	0
Total	433	274

Q26b: Number of Chronically Homeless Persons by Household

	Total	Without Children
Chronically Homeless	49	39
Not Chronically Homeless	624	235
Client Doesn't Know/Prefers Not to Answer	0	0
Data Not Collected	0	0
Total	673	274

End Date
6/30/2025

Current Status
Submitted

ata uploaded prior to 1/1/2023 has been bulk updated to use the same totals for both columns in order to

Data Issues	Total	% of Issue Rate
0	0	0%
0	58	8.62%
0	0	0%
0	0	0%
0	58	8.62%

Data Issues	Total	% of Issue Rate
0	0	0%
0	0	0%
0	0	0%
0	0	0%
0	0	0%

Data Issues	Total	% of Error Rate
0	15	3.12%
1	1	0.23%
0	0	0%
0	0	0%

Missing Time in Housing	Approximate Date Started DK/R/missing	Number of Times DK/R/missing	Number of Months DK/R/missing	% of Records Unable to Calculate
0	1	0	0	0.21%
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0.19%

% of Inactive Records
0
0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
159	0	0

240	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
399	0	0
8	0	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
111	0	0
110	0	0
108	0	0
88	0	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
114	0	0
2	0	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
32	0	0
30	0	0
28	0	0
25	0	0

First contact – WAS staying on Streets, ES-EE, ES-NbN, or SH	First contact – Worker unable to determine
0	0
0	0

0	0
0	0
0	0

First contact – WAS staying on Streets, ES-EE, ES-NbN, or SH	First contact – Worker unable to determine
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
71	0	0
117	0	0
52	0	0
19	0	0
58	0	0
50	0	0
21	0	0
10	0	0
1	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
399	0	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
0	0	0
9	0	0
234	0	0
21	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	0
49	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	0
2	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	0
5	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
30	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
41	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

0	0	0
4	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
399	0	0

Adults in HH with Children & Adults	Children in HH with Children & Adults	With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household Type
37	7	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
20	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
3	6	0	0	0
14	1	0	0	0

"Children in HH with Children & Adults".

Adults in HH with Children & Adults	Children in HH with Children & Adults	With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household Type
23	3	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
2	4	0	0	0

8	1	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---

"Children in HH with Children & Adults".

Adults in HH with Children & Adults	Children in HH with Children & Adults	With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household Type
14	3	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
1	2	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0

"Children in HH with Children & Adults".

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
39	0	0
120	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
159	0	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
8	0	0
4	0	0
4	0	0
23	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
39	0	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
23	0	0
115	0	0
0	0	0
138	0	0
0	0	0
2	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	0
3	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
13	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	0
1	0	0
15	0	0
2	0	0
1	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
3	0	0

0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
159	0	0

ously reported under separate subsidy types.

**Income at Exit for
Leavers**

127
0
1
7
47
27
26
75
0
0
0
0
310

**Income at Exit for
Leavers**

110
3
32
34
3
2

0
0
12
0
5
2
7
2
1
310

AO: Total Adults	AO: % with Disabling Condition by Source	AC: Adult with Disabling Condition	AC: Adult without Disabling Condition	AC: Total Adults
54	42.59%	9	47	56
2	0%	0	1	1
26	84.62%	4	1	5
33	78.79%	0	1	1
3	66.67%	0	0	0
1	100.00%	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
1	100.00%	5	6	11
0	0	0	0	0
3	100.00%	1	1	2
2	0%	0	0	0
1	100.00%	4	2	6
1	100.00%	1	0	1
1	0%	0	0	0
84	61.90%	8	35	43
195		27	87	114

**Benefit at Exit for
Leavers**

171

4

2

0

1

0

At Exit for Leavers

371

35

5

7

8

1

5

2

1

4

77

0

1

0

374

29

Stayers

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
21	0	0
25	0	0
16	0	0
16	0	0
68	0	0
51	0	0
120	0	0
75	0	0
4	0	0
3	0	0
399	0	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
77	0	0
54	0	0
69	0	0
38	0	0
76	0	0
4	0	0
28	0	0
35	0	0
7	0	0
2	0	0
390	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
399	0	0

Black, African American, or African	Hispanic/ Latina/e/o	Middle Eastern or North African	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White
16	0	0	0	1
8	0	0	0	0
<i>38.13</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>

Black, African American, or African	Hispanic/ Latina/e/o	Middle Eastern or North African	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White
385	30	0	1	121
8	0	0	0	0
<i>215.31</i>	<i>34.53</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>200.66</i>
<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>	<i>Cannot calculate</i>

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
30	0	0
4	0	0
0	0	0
34	0	0
0	0	0

0	0	0
1	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	0
11	0	0
0	0	0
18	0	0
0	0	0
21	0	0
4	0	0
0	0	0
54	0	0
28	0	0
7	0	0
0	0	0
55	0	0
95	0	0
4	0	0
0	0	0
189	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
7	0	0
0	0	0
7	0	0
285	0	0
189	0	0

0	0	0
66.32%	0	0

Updated to match new row order and relocated to Q23d as appropriate.

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
0	0	0
2	0	0
67	0	0
19	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
7	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
95	0	0

Asian or Asian American	Black, African American, or African	Hispanic/Latina/e/o	Middle Eastern or North African	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
0	32	1	0	0
0	17	2	0	0
0	47	1	0	0
1	188	21	0	1
0	14	0	0	0
1	298	25	0	1

With Children and Adults	Unknown Household Type
0	0
1	0
158	0
0	0
0	0
159	0

With Children and Adults	With Only Children	Unknown Household
10	0	0
389	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
399	0	0