

2020

**Analysis of Impediments to
Fair Housing Choice**

State of Louisiana

II. Table of Contents:

I.	Cover Sheet	
II.	Table of Contents	i.
III.	Executive Summary	1
IV.	Community Participation Process	7
V.	Assessment of Past Goals and Actions	34
VI.	Fair Housing Analysis	36
	A. Demographic Summary	36
	B. General Issues	61
	i. Segregation/Integration	61
	ii. Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)	76
	iii. Disparities in Access to Opportunity	83
	iv. Disproportionate Housing Needs	249
	C. Publicly Supported Housing Analysis	271
	D. Disability and Access Analysis	313
	E. Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach Capacity, and Resources Analysis	353
VI.	Fair Housing Goals and Priorities	368

II. Executive Summary

The State of Louisiana's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice ("the Analysis" or "this Analysis") seeks to provide a comprehensive view of conditions relating to fair housing and access to opportunity for individuals who are protected from discrimination by the Fair Housing Act in Louisiana.

An Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) is an examination of the impediments or barriers to fair housing that affect protected classes within a geographic region. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") defines impediments to fair housing choice in terms of their applicability to state and federal law. This could include:

Any actions, omissions or decisions taken on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, disability or handicap, familial status, national origin, or religion (protected classes) which restrict housing choices or the availability of housing choice.

Any actions, omissions or decisions which have the effect of restricting housing choices or the availability of housing choice on the basis of the protected classes listed previously.

Impediments to fair housing therefore represent barriers that prevent protected classes of persons from exercising their choice of housing. Based on this definition, a concentration of persons living in poverty is not necessarily an impediment to fair housing choice, although it may be a symptom of other socio-economic barriers. On the other hand, a decision by a public policy maker that groups low income housing in a specific location may be seen as an impediment to fair housing choice because the public policy decision restricts housing choice or the availability of housing choices. To reiterate, an impediment to fair housing choice represents an action, a decision, omission or practice, as opposed to the consequence of such practices. The observed consequence only tells us that fair housing choice difficulties have been or are being encountered.

Compilation of data for the purpose of this Analysis was conducted and generated by Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law "LCCR") and its subcontractor, The Louisiana Fair Housing Action Center ("LAFHAC"), formerly known as Greater New Orleans Fair Housing Action Center under contract with the Louisiana Housing Corporation ("LHC"), with funding provided through the Office of Community Development ("OCD"). LHC issued a request for proposals to assist in the preparation of the Analysis. LCCR was the sole respondent to the request. This Analysis includes data gathered or produced by LCCR and LAFHAC, including information obtained from community input across the State. The statistical information reflected in the Analysis and upon which narrative is based was primarily provided by HUD. The data, information, opinions, conclusions in the Analysis have not been independently gathered, tested, or verified by the State. Any information, data, opinions, and/or conclusions of LCCR and/or LAFHAC contained in this Analysis may hereafter be supplemented or withdrawn in the event the State determines it may be inaccurate, incorrect or incomplete. The Analysis is for use solely for the planning activities referenced herein, and its contents are not adopted by the State or intended or authorized for use for any other purpose.

This Analysis was conducted at a time when the methods of analyzing impediments to fair housing were in flux. The State partially utilized the framework for states to complete their Assessments of Fair Housing (AFH) and information provided by HUD; however, HUD has suspended the implementation the AFH framework, which continues to evolve as reflected by the pending proposed Rule, issued on January 14, 2020, Docket No. FR 6123-P-02. While this Analysis discusses conditions in entitlement jurisdictions that receive funds directly from HUD, because entitlement jurisdictions are required to complete their own fair housing analyses, this Analysis focuses more on non-entitlement jurisdictions.

This Executive Summary provides short overviews of each section.

I. Assessment of Past Goals and Strategies

In its 2010 Analysis of Impediments (“2010 AI”), the State of Louisiana proposed several action steps to: (1) improve fair housing system capacity, access to the system and ability to respond to needs; (2) improve communications and coordination among agencies and those interested in affirmatively furthering fair housing; and (3) enhance understanding of fair housing by both consumers and providers. The 2010 AI called for a working group to be established; however, following the issuance of the 2010 AI, the State created the LHC and included within that agency the Housing and Transportation Planning and Coordinating Commission (“the Commission”), with functions that subsumed the scope of the working group.

II. Summary of Community Participation

To inform and engage the citizenry of the State regarding this Analysis, LAFHAC led a community participation process that was designed to ensure that a broad range of stakeholders had meaningful input into the development of the Analysis. This effort included direct outreach to key stakeholder organizations, the circulation of a comprehensive survey addressing fair housing issues in Louisiana, and community forums in all eight regions of the State.

III. Demographic Summary

The demographic summary provides the context that readers can rely on when reviewing the substantive analysis of subsequent sections of the Analysis. Information included provides an overview of the race and ethnicity, sex, age, Limited English Proficiency status, national origin, and familial status of residents of the State and of the State’s eight regions. The section also highlights trends with respect to all of these data points over time. At a high level, the picture that emerges is one of a state with a high African American population relative to other states that is gradually becoming more racially and ethnically diverse as its Latino and Asian and Pacific Islander populations grow, particularly in more urbanized areas. Southeastern Louisiana features the largest Latino and Asian and Pacific Islander populations in the state. African American residents are most prevalent in southeastern and northern Louisiana but comprise smaller percentages of the population in central, south-central, and southwestern Louisiana.

The state, and in particular Greater New Orleans, suffered significant population losses in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina but has been slowly rebounding since then. In general, the population is aging in most regions and families with children represent a declining portion of all households.

Somewhat counter intuitively, increases in the foreign-born population have not always been accompanied by increases in the Limited English Proficient population. This is especially true in rural areas and small cities in south Louisiana where there are significant Cajun populations. The aging of monolingual native-born French speakers has offset the influx of Limited English Proficient immigrants in those areas.

IV. Segregation and Integration

Patterns of segregation and integration are consistent across the State of Louisiana. In general, African Americans face the highest degree of segregation in relation to white residents of any group though, in some regions, there are inconsistencies that may be explained by small sample sizes in the American Community Survey. The segregation of African American residents is most pronounced in regions anchored by larger cities like Baton Rouge, New Orleans, and Shreveport, and is less severe in the Houma-Thibodaux region where the African American population is much smaller.

Although patterns of segregation are most pronounced in large cities and between large cities and their more heavily white suburbs, segregation is visible in the small towns and cities that often serve as parish¹ seats, as well. Many small municipalities in Louisiana have distinct white and African American sides of town. Levels of segregation faced by African Americans have decreased slightly over time, but the rate at which segregation is decreasing has slowed. Long-term trends in segregation of other racial and ethnic groups are less consistent, but many regions have had increases in levels of segregation, albeit starting from much lower levels of segregation than for African Americans. Historically a wide variety of potential factors can contribute to segregation, including zoning and land use policies, community opposition, the location of publicly supported housing, displacement of residents due to economic pressures, lack of community revitalization strategies, lack of both public and private investment in certain areas, lending discrimination, and private discrimination.

V. Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs) are census tracts that have a poverty rate of over 40% of the population and, if located within metropolitan areas, are majority-minority or, if located outside of metropolitan areas, are more than 20% minority. Growing up as a child in a R/ECAP is associated with decreased access to opportunity as an adult across a broad range of life quality factors. In Louisiana, R/ECAPs generally fall into three categories: predominantly African American central city neighborhoods in core cities, predominantly African American portions of small cities and towns that often serve as parish seats in rural areas, and a few rural census tracts in the Mississippi Delta. The exceptions to these trends are primarily located in more diverse metropolitan areas.

In Baton Rouge, there is one R/ECAP that has a large Asian or Pacific Islander population near the campus of Louisiana State University. In Greater New Orleans, there is a heavily Asian or Pacific Islander R/ECAP in predominantly Vietnamese-American New Orleans East. There are also R/ECAPs on the West Bank in Jefferson Parish that have significant Latino populations in addition to African American population concentrations. Racially or ethnically concentrated poverty declined sharply in Louisiana between 1990 and 2000 but has stabilized since with the emergence of new R/ECAPs largely offsetting decreases in racially or ethnically concentrated poverty elsewhere.

¹ In Louisiana, a parish is a unit of local government equivalent to a county in other states.

R/ECAPs can emerge when options are limited for protected class members. All of the contributing factors to segregation except for lending discrimination are potential contributing factors for R/ECAPs. In addition, deteriorated and abandoned properties and lack of intergovernmental coordination can contribute to R/ECAPs.

VI. Publicly Supported Housing

Trends in publicly supported housing in Louisiana, similar to trends in segregation and integration, show significant similarities across regions. In general, African American households are more likely than other racial or ethnic groups to reside in public housing and utilize Housing Choice Vouchers. The Demographics of Project-Based Section 8 housing are more mixed. In most regions, Latino and Asian or Pacific Islander households are underrepresented in most types of publicly supported housing in comparison to their share of the population and of the income-eligible population.

African American households and families with children are more likely to reside in publicly supported housing located in R/ECAPs than are other groups. White households, elderly households, and persons with disabilities are less likely to reside in R/ECAPs. Many of the same factors that have contributed to segregation and R/ECAPs effect publicly supported housing. Additionally, admissions and occupancy policies relating to criminal background screening, impediments to mobility, the quality of affordable housing information programs, site selection policies, and source of income discrimination can play significant roles.

VII. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

This Analysis reviews data reflecting disparities in access to opportunity in each region of Louisiana. Specific dimensions of access to opportunity include access to proficient schools, job proximity, labor market engagement, low-cost transportation, transit trips, low poverty exposure, and environmental health. The data suggests that consistent patterns emerge across the State's regions; in general, African Americans face the lowest levels of access to proficient schools, labor market engagement, low poverty exposure, and environmental health. African Americans tend to have higher access to job proximity, low-cost transportation, and transit trips. For white residents, the pattern is the inverse while for other racial and ethnic groups the index values for access to various types of opportunity vary more widely between regions and often fall in between the poles of African American and white access to opportunity.

VIII. Disproportionate Housing Needs

Disproportionate housing needs on the basis of protected class status may include housing cost burden, overcrowding, and lack of adequate plumbing and kitchen facilities. Census data that HUD provides in relation to the State's regions reflects all of these types of housing problems. Disproportionate housing needs can encompass other issues such as mold, lead paint, or damage from natural disasters. In general, African American households face the most disproportionate housing needs in Louisiana, although Latino households face similarly high levels of housing problems in the regions of New Orleans and Baton Rouge where the Latino population is largest. Although HUD-provided data does not break out housing problems other than cost burden by type, Latino households may face higher levels of overcrowding than other racial and ethnic groups because African

Americans consistently face higher levels of housing cost burden in regions where overall levels of housing problems are similar between the two groups. The HUD-provided data also shows disparities for families with children.

Overall, families with children do not experience higher levels of housing need across the State's regions, but large families including five or more people do, specifically, housing need stemming from overcrowding. Non-family households are more vulnerable to cost burden, in large part because they tend to be either younger or much older and thus have lower incomes or fixed incomes. The primary contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs that is not captured in connection with other fair housing issues is the lack of availability of affordable units in a range of sizes. This appears to exacerbate overcrowding for large families statewide and for Latino families in the New Orleans and Baton Rouge regions.

IX. Disability and Access

The Disability and Access section of this Analysis looks at both the broad spectrum of fair housing issues discussed above, specifically as they relate to persons with disabilities, and at a range of issues that pertain primarily or exclusively to persons with disabilities. Statewide and in various regions, persons with disabilities do not experience segregation in the same ways that racial and ethnic minorities do. In general, persons with disabilities are not concentrated in specific neighborhoods within cities or in specific cities within regions. They also are not concentrated in R/ECAPs, and, when they reside in publicly supported housing, persons with disabilities are disproportionately likely to reside in such housing outside of R/ECAPs. However, many persons with disabilities reside in institutions or other segregated settings because of the lack of supportive services and affordable, accessible housing to enable them to live in the community.

X. Fair Housing Enforcement, Outreach, and Infrastructure

This section of the Analysis contains a review of fair housing laws in Louisiana, organizations that provide resources to victims of housing discrimination, and evidence of housing discrimination by private and public actors. The State of Louisiana's Equal Housing Opportunity Act is substantially equivalent to the federal Fair Housing. Fair housing ordinances in municipalities in the State are less consistent and, in some cases, missing. Services of fair housing organizations in Louisiana are more readily available in the Greater New Orleans area than in other parts of the State. LAFHAC provides services statewide but only maintains an office in New Orleans. The services of legal aid service organizations are more widely distributed. The Louisiana Department of Justice is charged with enforcing the Equal Housing Opportunity Act; those enforcement activities are funded and monitored by HUD.

XI. Conclusion

The Analysis closes by proposing goals and strategies for addressing the fair housing issues and potential contributing factors revealed by the Analysis. These goals and strategies are designed to be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound, and correspond to the Analysis's prioritization of the top contributing factors for fair housing issues in the State.

On February 14, 2020, Louisiana Governor Jon Bel Edwards through executive order JBE 2020-3, initiated an overarching initiative for rural revitalization, addressing all aspect of qualify

of life. That initiative will serve for non-entitlement areas focused upon this Analysis to more thoroughly address methods to provide more opportunities to quality housing, and improvement of quality of life, for the citizens in those communities, especially those most vulnerable.

III. Community Participation Process

The community participation process included: extensive outreach to organizations throughout Louisiana, twenty-four (24) community meetings in nine (9) regions, as well as, statewide distribution of the Fair Housing survey. For outreach purposes, the state was divided into the following nine (9) regions:

- **Alexandria:** Vernon, Rapides, Avoyelles, Concordia, Catahoula, LaSalle, Grant, and Winn Parishes
- **Baton Rouge:** West Feliciana, East Feliciana, Pointe Coupee, West Baton Rouge, East Baton Rouge, Iberville and Ascension Parishes.
- **Hammond:** St. Tammany, Tangipahoa, Washington, Livingston, and St. Helena Parishes.
- **Houma:** Lafourche, Terrebonne, St. Mary, Assumption, St. James, St. John, and St. Charles Parishes.
- **Lafayette:** Evangeline, St. Landry, Acadia, Lafayette, St. Martin, Vermillion, and Iberia Parishes.
- **Lake Charles:** Beauregard, Allen, Calcasieu, Jefferson Davis, and Cameron Parishes.
- **Monroe:** Union, Lincoln, Jackson, Morehouse, Ouachita, Caldwell, West Carroll, East Carroll, Richland, Franklin, Madison, and Tensas Parishes.
- **New Orleans:** Orleans, Jefferson, St. Bernard, and Plaquemines Parishes.
- **Shreveport:** Caddo, Bossier, Webster, Claiborne, DeSoto, Red River, Bienville, Sabine, and Natchitoches Parishes.

In each region, potential stakeholders were identified from the following categories: public officials, housing authorities, human services agencies, legal services, community organizations working in related fields (including healthcare, housing, transportation, education, environment, immigration, senior services, and disability services), housing developers and other housing providers, faith communities, and neighborhood organizations. Special care was taken to identify organizations that serve underrepresented constituencies, including persons residing in racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPS), immigrant populations and persons with disabilities. More than five hundred such organizations and agencies were contacted (see below for complete list). The fair housing survey, which was available in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese, was distributed by email and in hard copies to participating organization, as well as shared on social media and at several community events.

Stakeholder organizations/agencies and the general public were invited to community meetings that were held across the state from June-December, 2016. Meetings were held in locations that were accessible for people with disabilities and convenient to public transit. At least two meetings were scheduled in each of the nine regions, during the day and in the evening.

The meetings were publicized through direct contact (by emails and phone) to each organization. Social media posts were also shared and targeted to users in each region. Print media in each market was also notified, including the following:

- CityBusiness
- Clarion Herald
- New Orleans Gambit
- Plaquemines Gazette
- St. Bernard Voice
- Times-Picayune
- New Orleans Jambalaya News
- The Louisiana Weekly
- Plaquemine Post South
- The Advocate
- Bogalusa Daily News
- St Charles Herald Guide
- Franklin Banner-Tribune
- Hammond Star
- Houma Today
- Houma Carrier
- Thibodaux Daily Comet
- Tri-Parish Times
- The Jena Times
- Leesville Daily Leader
- Winn Parish Enterprise
- Bossier City Press-Tribune
- Shreveport Times
- Natchitoches Times
- and Business News
- LaFourch Gazette
- News Examiner--Enterprise/Vacherie News
- Bayou Journal
- The Franklin Sun
- Vermillion Today
- Evangeline Today
- Crowley Post- Signal
- Eunice Today
- Abbeville Meriodial
- Kaplan Herald
- The Gueyden Journal
- Lafayette Advertiser
- Opelousas World
- Iberian
- Baptist Message
- Lafayette Independent
- Acadiana Gazette
- The Best of Times Shreveport
- The Forum News
- The Inquisitor
- Bastrop Daily Enterprise
- Farmerville Gazette
- Monroe News-Star
- Richland Today
- Ruston Daily Leader
- Amite-Tangi Digest
- Livingston Parish News
- St. Helena News
- The Ponchatoula Times
- Acadiana LifeStyle
- Teche Today
- Evangeline Today/Ville Platte Gazette/ Ville Platte Today
- Ouachita Citizen
- The Advocate Acadiana Office
- Cameron Pilot
- De Quincy News
- Beauregard Daily News
- Lake Charles American Press
- Southwest Daily News
- Jennings Daily News
- Alexandria Daily Town Talk
- The Avoyelles Journal
- The Bunkie Record
- The Marksville Weekly News
- Concordia Sentinel
- Cenla Focus

State AI Survey Results Summary

295 total survey participants

Race of participants:

- 56% White
- 29% Black/African American
- 13% Latino/Hispanic
- 7% Other
- 1% Asian

Gender of participants:

- 78% Women
- 22% Men
- 2% Transgender

Participants with disabilities:

- 16% with disabilities

Access to housing and discrimination:

- 54% report they have had trouble finding safe, quality housing that they could afford in a neighborhood that they wanted to live
- 14% of those who reported having trouble finding housing said the reason was discrimination
- Another 20% said the reason was that they were not shown options in all neighborhoods by a realtor or landlord
- 42% of all participants indicated having ever experienced housing discrimination, but only 15% said they had reported the discrimination
- 65% said that their city, parish, or state does not make investments (for example, on streets, schools, parks, drainage, business development, or other projects) fairly in all neighborhoods.
- Only 4% said that their city, parish, or states makes investments fairly in all neighborhoods.

The community meeting schedule was as follows:

Alexandria

June 20, 2016
5:30pm – 7:30pm
American Red Cross
425 Bolton Ave.
Alexandria, LA 71301

November 16, 2016
10am – 12pm
Bolton Community
Center
315 Bolton Ave.
Alexandria, LA 701301

Baton Rouge

July 11, 2016
5:30pm – 7:30pm
Carver Branch Library
720 Terrace Ave.
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

December 12, 2016
10am – 12pm
EBRPL Main Library
7711 Goodwood Blvd.
Baton Rouge, LA

December 12, 2016
6pm – 8pm
Shiloh Missionary
Baptist Church
185 Eddie Robinson Sr.
Dr.
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

Hammond

July 14, 2016
9:30am – 12pm
First Presbyterian
Church
411 W. Charles St.
Hammond, LA 70401

July 14, 2016
6pm – 8pm
First Presbyterian
Church
411 W. Charles St.
Hammond, LA 70401

November 15, 2016
10am – 12pm
First Presbyterian
Church
411 W. Charles St.
Hammond, LA 70401

Houma

July 12, 2016
6pm- 8pm
Bayou Towers
7491 Park Ave.
Houma, LA 70364

July 19, 2016
9:30am – 12pm
Terrebonne Parish
Government Tower
8026 Main St.
Houma, LA 70360

Lafayette

June 15, 2016
1pm – 4pm
Main Library
301 W. Congress St.
Lafayette, LA 70501

June 15, 2016
6pm – 8pm
South Regional Library
6101 Johnston St.
Lafayette, LA 70503

Lake Charles

June 16, 2016
1pm – 4pm
Allen P. August Sr.
Annex
2000 Moeling St.
Lake Charles, LA 70601

June 16, 2016
5:30 – 7:30pm
Allen P. August Sr.
Annex
2000 Moeling St.
Lake Charles, LA 70601

Monroe

June 21, 2016
 9:30am-12pm
 Monroe Housing
 Authority
 210 Harrison St.
 Monroe, LA 71201

June 21, 2016
 6pm – 8pm
 Emily P. Robinson
 Community Center
 3504 Jackson St.
 Monroe, LA 71202

New Orleans *

July 19, 2016
 5:30pm – 7:30pm
 Sojourner Truth
 Community Center
 2200 Lafitte St.
 New Orleans, LA 70119

August 25, 2016
 6pm – 7:30pm
 New Orleans East
 Library
 5641 Read Blvd.
 New Orleans, LA 70127

September 6, 2016
 2:30 – 4:30pm
 Urban League of GNO
 4640 S. Carrollton Ave.
 New Orleans, LA 70119

September 7, 2016
 9:30-11:30am
 Urban League of GNO
 4640 S. Carrollton Ave.
 New Orleans, LA 70119

September 10,
 2016 Treme
 Community
 Center
 900 N. Villere St.
 New Orleans, LA 70116

Shreveport

June 22, 2016
 9:30am – 12pm
 Fairgrounds Clubhouse
 3301 Pershing Blvd.
 Shreveport, LA 71109

June 22, 2016
 6pm – 8pm
 Church for the Highlands
 520 S. Olive St.
 Shreveport, LA 71104

July 25, 2016
 6pm – 8pm
 Church for the Highlands
 520 S. Olive St.
 Shreveport, LA 71104

** Conducted as part of the New Orleans Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) community engagement process.*

During each community meeting, participants were given an overview of the Fair Housing Act and the obligation that jurisdictions have to affirmatively further fair housing. Participants were also given an explanation of the *Analysis of Impediments* process and timeline, and a demonstration of the AFFH Data and Mapping Tool provided by HUD. The majority of time during each meeting was reserved for community input and questions. After each meeting, participants were sent a follow-up email with slides from the meeting and a link to complete the Fair Housing survey. They were also asked to assist with distribution of the survey.

1. Provide a list of organizations consulted during the community participation process.

The following organizations were contacted with information about the Analysis of Impediments process, invited to community participation meetings, and asked to share the fair housing survey with their constituents:

- 4U, Lockport
- A Community Voice
- AARP Louisiana
- Acadian Stroke Support Group
- Acadiana Legal Service Corporation
- Acadiana Regional Coalition on Homelessness
- ACLU of LA
- Acquired Brain Injury Survivors
- Advocacy Center
- Alexandra Housing Authority
- Alexandria Branch NAACP
- All Souls UU Church
- Allen Action Agency
- Allen P. Council on Aging
- AMAZE Support Group
- American Planning Association, Louisiana Chapter
- American Red Cross
- Anacoco Senior Center (Vernon COA)
- Antioch FG Baptist Church
- Ascension Career Solutions Center
- Ascension Parish Section 8 program
- Aseana Foundation
- Associated Builders & Contractors
- Assumption Parish Police Jury
- Avoyelles Council on Aging
- Avoyelles P. School Board
- Avoyelles Parish Police Jury
- Baton Rouge NAACP
- Baton Rouge Head Injury Association Support Group
- Baton Rouge Primary Care Collaborative
- Baton Rouge Spinal Cord Support Group
- Bayou Interfaith Shared Community
- Bayou Land Families Helping Families, Inc.
- Bayou Response
- Beard Family Foundation
- BeauCARE
- Beauregard Community Action Association, Inc.
- Beauregard Council on Aging
- Belle Reve New Orleans
- Bernstein Development, Inc
- Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church HIV/AIDS Outreach Housing Program
- Bienville Parish Police Jury
- Bogalusa Housing Authority
- Bopp Law
- Bossier City Housing Authority
- Bossier Parish Housing Authority
- Boys/Girls Clubs of CENLA
- Bradley E Black LLC
- Baton Rouge Area Foundation

- BreakOUT!
- Broadmoor Neighborhood Association
- Caddo Parish Commission
- Calcasieu Parish Adult Education - Sulphur
- Calcasieu Parish Housing Authority
- Calcasieu Parish Human Services Department
- Calcasieu Parish Police Jury
- Campus Federal Credit Union
- Capital Area Alliance for the Homeless
- Capital City Family Health Center
- Capital One
- CARC Opportunities for People with Disabilities
- Catahoula COA (Jonesville)
- Catahoula COA (Sicily Island)
- Catahoula Parish Police Jury
- Catholic Charities Archdiocese of New Orleans
- Catholic Charities Diocese of Lake Charles
- Catholic Charities of Baton Rouge
- Catholic Charities of Baton Rouge - Immigration Legal Services
- Catholic Charities of New Orleans - Immigrant Survivors Services
- Catholic Housing Services
- Catholic Services of Acadiana
- CENLA Area Agencies on Aging
- CENLA Community Action Committee
- CENLA Homeless Coalition
- Centenary College of Louisiana
- Center for Planning Excellence
- Center for Racial Justice
- Central LA Homelessness Coalition
- Central LA Interfaith Immigration Center
- Central LA ProBono Project
- Chasewood East Neighborhood Association
- Chateau Du Lac
- Children's Cabinet
- Christian World
- Christopher Youth Center
- CHRISTUS Hospital
- Church for the Highlands
- Church Point Housing Authority
- City of Alexandria
- City of Baton Rouge
- City of Donaldsonville
- City of Iberia
- City of Kentwood
- City of Monroe Planning and Urban Development Department
- City of Plaquemine Section 8 Office
- City of Port Allen
- City of Thibodaux Office of Housing and Community Development
- City of Ville Platte
- Claiborne Parish Section 8
- Commercial Properties Realty Trust
- Community Directions, Inc. Opelousas
- Community Foundation of North Louisiana
- Community Land Trust
- Community

- Outreach Center
- Community Renewal International, Inc.
- Community Services of St. Charles Parish
- Community Support Programs, Inc.
- Comprehensive Mental Health Support Services
- Concordia Council on Aging
- Concordia Parish Police Jury
- Cottonport Senior Center (Avoyelles COA)
- Covington Housing Authority
- Crescent Care
- Crisis Housing
- Crowley Housing Authority
- Deaf Action Center
- DELF USA Behavioral Health Services
- Delhi Housing Authority
- Denham Springs Housing Authority
- Department of Children & Family Services
- Department of Veterans Affairs
- DeRidder Housing Authority
- DeSoto Habilitation Services, Inc.
- DeSoto Parish Police Jury
- DHH Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities
- Diamond Realty and Associates, LLC
- Diocese of Lafayette - Migration and Refugee Services
- Domestic Violence & Family Justice Center of Ouachita/ The Wellspring Alliance
- Dry Prong Senior Center (Grant P. COA)
- East Baton Rouge Parish Public Housing Authority
- East Carroll Parish Housing Authority
- East Carroll Parish Police Jury
- East St. Tammany NAACP.
- ECO at LSU
- Elisha Ministries
- Episcopal Clergy
- Eunice Housing Authority
- Evangeline Parish Police Jury
- Evergreen
- Presbyterian Ministries
- Fairfield Historic District Association
- Faith and Friends Food Pantry
- Faith House
- Faith Life Ministries
- Faithshare Outreach
- Families Helping Families at the Crossroads of LA, Inc
- Families Helping Families of Acadiana, Inc.
- Families Helping Families of Greater Baton Rouge, Inc.
- Families Helping Families of Northeast Louisiana
- Families Helping Families of Southeast Louisiana, Inc.
- Families Helping Families Region 7
- Family Justice Center of Acadiana
- Family Resource Center
- Ferriday Senior Center (Concordia COA)
- Foreman-Reynaud Community Center
- Fowler Law

- Franklin Parish Police Jury
- Fuller Center
- Galilee City Limited Partnership, LLC
- Glad Tidings Food Pantry
- Glenmora Senior Center (Rapides P. COA)
- Global Green USA - New Orleans Office
- GO Group SWLA
- God's Food Box (A Ministry of Beauregard Ministerial Alliance)
- Goodwork Network
- Grace Project, Inc
- Grant Parish Council on Aging
- Grant Parish Housing Authority
- Greater Alexandria Economic Development Authority
- Greater Covington NAACP
- Greater Light Ministries
- Greater New Orleans Housing Alliance
- Greater St. Mary Missionary Baptist Church/ F.H. Dunn Resurrection Center
- Gulf Coast Center for Law & Policy
- Gulf Coast Housing Partnership
- Gulf Coast Social Services
- Guste Homes Resident Management Corporation
- H.O.P.E. Center - Helping Our People to Excel
- HAART (HIV/AIDS Alliance for Region 2)
- Habitat for Humanity
- Hagar's House
- Hammond Housing Authority
- Harmony Neighborhood Development
- Healing Minds NOLA
- Hessmer Senior Center
- Highland Area Partnership
- Highland Restoration Association
- Hispanic Apostolate Community Services
- Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Louisiana
- Historic South Highlands N.A.
- Holy Cross Episcopal Church
- HOME Coalition
- HOPE Connections
- Hope House of Central LA
- Hornbeck Senior Center (Vernon P. COA)
- Houma Nation
- Houma Terrebonne Housing Authority
- Housing Authority of Arcadia
- Housing Authority of Basile
- Housing Authority of Breaux Bridge
- Housing Authority of Bunkie
- Housing Authority of Caldwell Parish
- Housing Authority of Colfax
- Housing Authority of Cotton Valley
- Housing Authority of Cottonport
- Housing Authority of Delcambre
- Housing Authority of DeQuincy
- Housing Authority of Duson
- Housing Authority of East Hodge
- Housing Authority

- of Elton
- Housing Authority of Erath
- Housing Authority of Farmerville
- Housing Authority of Ferriday
- Housing Authority of Gibsland
- Housing Authority of Grambling
- Housing Authority of Grant Parish
- Housing Authority of Gueydan
- Housing Authority of Haynesville
- Housing Authority of Homer
- Housing Authority of Iowa
- Housing Authority of Kaplan
- Housing Authority of Lake Charles
- Housing Authority of Logansport
- Housing Authority of Merryville
- Housing Authority of Minden
- Housing Authority of New Iberia
- Housing Authority of New Roads
- Housing Authority of Newellton
- Housing Authority of Oakdale
- Housing Authority of Oberlin
- Housing Authority of Oil City
- Housing Authority of Opelousas
- Housing Authority of Patterson
- Housing Authority of Pearl River
- Housing Authority of Rapides Parish
- Housing Authority of Rayne
- Housing Authority of Rayville
- Housing Authority of Sabine
- Housing Authority of Simmesport
- Housing Authority of South Landry
- Housing Authority of St. James Parish
- Housing Authority of St. Martinville
- Housing Authority of the City of Abbeville
- Housing Authority of the City of Donaldsonville
- Housing Authority of the City of Eunice
- Housing Authority of the City of Jennings
- Housing Authority of the City of Leesville
- Housing Authority of the town of
- Berwick
- Housing Authority of the town of Jena
- Housing Authority of the town of Jonesboro
- Housing Authority of the town of Lake Arthur
- Housing Authority of the town of Lake Providence
- Housing Authority of the Town of Mansfield
- Housing Authority of the town of Olla
- Housing Authority of the town of Welsh
- Housing Authority of the town of White Castle
- Housing Authority of the town of Winnsboro
- Housing Authority of the Village of Parks
- Housing Authority of Vernon Parish
- Housing Authority of Vinton
- Housing Authority of Vivian
- Housing Authority of Winnfield
- Housing Authority of Youngsville
- Human Relations Commission

- Iberia Parish Government
- IberiaBank
- Iberville Parish Government
- Image Changers, Inc.
- Inner-City Revitalization Corporation
- Interfaith Louisiana
- Iris
- Jackson Parish Police Jury
- Jeanerette Public Housing Agency
- Jeff Davis C.D.A.
- Jeff Davis Council on Aging
- Jena Band of Choctaw Indians
- Journey's Rest
- June N. Jenkins Women's Shelter/Beauregard Community Concerns
- Keller Williams Realty, Red Stick Partners
- Kids ReThink New Orleans Schools
- Kinder Housing Authority
- Lafayette Consolidated Government Neighborhood Counseling Services
- Lafayette Housing Authority
- Lafayette League of Women Voters
- Lafayette NAACP
- Lafayette Parish Public Education Stakeholders' Council (LaPESC)
- Lafayette Parish School System
- Lafayette Community Development
- Lafourche Parish Housing Authority
- Lafourche Parish NAACP
- Lafourche Parish School Board
- Lake Bethlehem Community Development Corporation
- Lake Charles Housing Authority
- Lakeside Acres Subdivision Neighborhood Association, Inc.
- Land Trust for Southeast Louisiana
- LaSalle P. Council on Aging
- Leadership for Educational Equity
- League of Women Voters
- League of Women Voters of Louisiana
- Lecompte Senior Center
- Legal Services of Central Louisiana
- Legal Services of North Louisiana
- Lincoln Parish Police Jury
- Literacy Council
- Louisiana Association of Affordable Housing Providers (LAAHP)
- Louisiana Budget Project
- Louisiana Civil Justice Center
- Louisiana Coalition Against Domestic Violence
- Louisiana Dept. of Justice
- Louisiana Dept. of Children & Family Services
- Louisiana Family Resource Center
- Louisiana Housing Alliance
- Louisiana Initiative for Nonprofit and Community Collaboration
- Louisiana Latino Health Coalition
- Louisiana Progress
- Louisiana Public Health Institute
- Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program

- Lower Mississippi Riverkeeper
- LSU Health Sciences Foundation
- Lutheran Conference of Women Religious Lake Providence Collaborative Ministries
- Magnolia Community Development Cooperation
- Make It Right
- Mamou Housing Authority
- Manna Ministries – St. Luke Simpson United Methodist Church
- Marksville Housing Authority
- Martin Luther King Community Development Corporation
- McNeese State University
- Merryville Housing Authority
- Midcity Redevelopment Alliance
- Miiboso Consultants LLC
- Monroe Housing Authority
- Morehouse Parish Police Jury
- Morgan City Housing Authority
- Mt. Pleasant Community Development Corporation
- Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church
- Multi-Cultural Development Center Housing Counseling Agency
- Natchitoches Housing Authority
- Natchitoches City Housing Authority
- Natchitoches Parish Housing Authority
- National Alliance on Mentally Illness (NAMI) Louisiana
- National Alliance on Mentally Illness (NAMI) New Orleans
- Neighborhood Assistance Corporation of America
- Neighborhood Counseling Services
- Neighborhood Housing Services of New Orleans
- Neighborhood Housing Services St. Tammany
- New Horizons
- New Orleans Area Habitat for Humanity
- New Orleans Regional AIDS Planning Council
- New Orleans Women's Shelter
- New Roads City
- New Sunlight Baptist Church
- Newellton Housing Authority
- North West Louisiana Baptist Association
- Northern & Central LA Interfaith
- Northern Louisiana Legal Services
- Northlake Homeless Coalition
- Northshore Community Foundation
- Northshore Families Helping Families, Inc.
- Northwest Louisiana Brain Injury Support Group
- Northwest Louisiana Community Development Corporation
- Nuestra Voz NOLA
- NZBC Urban Corporation
- O'Brien House
- Oak Park Food Pantry at 1st Christian Church

- Oasis a Safe Haven for Survivors of Domestic and Sexual Violence
- Odyssey House
- Office of Community Development, Lake Charles
- Olive Branch Ministries, Inc.
- Options for Independence
- OPTIONS Inc
- Orleans Public Education Network
- Ouachita Council on Aging
- Ouachita Parish Police Jury
- PACE
- Pennington Biomedical Research Center (LSU)
- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Philadelphia Center
- Phoenix Point Family Resource Center
- Pilgrim's Rest Community Development Agency
- Pineville Housing Authority
- Pineville Senior Center
- Pitkin Senior Center
- Pointe Coupe Community Resource Center
- Ponchatoula Housing Authority
- PRIDE of St. Tammany
- Pro Bono Project
- Progressive Baptist Church-- Community Outreach
- Project Build a Future
- Project Celebration
- Puentes New Orleans
- Quad Area, CAA
- Rapides P. Council on Aging
- Rapides Parish School Board
- Rapides Parish Vet Center
- Rapides Senior Citizen Center
- Rapides Station Community Ministries
- Rayne City
- Rebuilding Together
- Red River Bank
- Red River Coalition of Community Gardeners
- Red River Parish Police Jury
- Refugee Resettlement Center
- Renaissance Neighborhood Development Corporation
- Resourceworks
- RIDE New Orleans
- Rosepine Senior Center
- Ruston City Housing Authority
- Safe Harbor
- Salvation Army Center of Hope
- Second Harvest Food Bank of Greater New Orleans & Acadiana
- Senior Resource Center
- Serenity Help Center – For Women
- Seventh Day Adventist Church
- Shelter Resources, Inc.
- Shepherd's Inn Outreach of United Christian Fellowship Church
- Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church
- Shreveport Bar Foundation
- Shreveport Housing Authority
- Shreveport Human

- Relations Commission
- Shreveport NAACP
- Shreveport Office of Com Development
- Simmesport Senior Center
- Slagle Senior Center
- Slidell Housing Authority
- SMILE Community Action Agency
- Southeast Louisiana Legal Services
- Southern Hills Business Association
- Southern Hills Homeowners Association
- Southern Mutual Help Association, Inc.
- Southern United Neighborhoods
- Southwest Acadia Consolidated Housing Authority
- Spinal Cord Injury Support Group
- Spring Creek Senior Center
- St. Charles Parish Housing Authority
- St. Frances Cabrini Immigration Law Center
- St. John the Baptist Parish Housing Authority
- St. Landry Parish Housing Authority
- St. Martin Parish Police Jury
- St. Mary Parish Council
- St. Tammany Federation of Teachers and School Employees
- St. Tammany Parish Dept. of Health & Human Services
- St. Tammany Parish's Department of Public Works
- Standard Enterprises
- START Corporation
- Stonewall Multi-Cultural Community Development Corporation
- Strive NOLA Job Readiness Training Program
- Sulphur Housing Authority
- SunQuest
- Tangipahoa Parish Council
- Tangipahoa Parish NAACP
- TARC
- Terrebonne Parish Branch NAACP
- Terrebonne Parish Consolidated Government Housing and Human Services Division
- Terrebonne Parish School Board
- The Fuller Center for Housing of NW LA
- The Pierre Avenue Neighborhood Association
- The Salvation Army New Orleans Command
- The Shepherds Farm Child Development and Learning Center
- The Southwest Louisiana Law Center
- Thibodaux Housing Authority
- Thibodaux Section 8 Housing
- Together Baton Rouge
- Together Louisiana
- Total Home Health
- Touro Rehabilitation Center
- Town of Independence Housing Authority
- Town of White Castle

- Townfolk, LLC
- Tulane Regional Urban Design Center
- Tulane/Canal Neighborhood Development Corporation
- Union Hill Senior Center
- Union Parish Police Jury
- Union Parish Section 8 Housing
- United Way
- University of Louisiana at Lafayette
- Urban League
- Urban Restoration Enhancement Corporation
- Urban Support Programs
- USDA OFFICE-Rural Development Housing Programs
- VA Medical Center
- VA Medical Clinic Lafayette
- VAYLA (Vietnamese American Young Leaders Association)
- Vernon Community Action Council
- Vernon Council on Aging
- Vernon P. Housing Authority
- Vernon P. School Board
- Veteran Affairs E. St. Tammany
- Veteran Affairs W. St. Tammany
- Veterans Advocacy Council
- Vidalia Senior Center (Concordia P. COA)
- Village of Fenton Housing Authority
- Ville Platte Housing Authority
- Volunteers for Youth Justice
- Volunteers of America
- VOTE
- Washington Parish Housing Authority
- Webster Parish Police Jury
- Welcome House
- Welsh Housing Authority
- West Carroll Parish Police Jury
- Housing Assistance
- West Jefferson Medical Center Rehab
- West Monroe Section 8
- West Ouachita Senior Center
- West Peak Neighborhood Association
- Western Hills Estates Neighborhood Assoc.
- Winn Council on Aging
- Winn Parish Police Jury
- Women of Infinite Possibilities
- Women With a Vision
- Woodworth Senior Center
- Workforce Development
- Works in Progress LA

2. How successful were the efforts at eliciting meaningful community participation?
If there was low participation, provide the reasons.

The community participation process engaged more than two hundred stakeholders in face-to-face meetings and nearly three hundred community members through the fair housing survey. The stakeholders engaged represented a diverse cross section of Louisiana communities, including representatives from various fields and residents of urban, suburban, and rural areas. Participants were also racially and ethnically diverse. Survey respondents were 56% White, 29% Black/African American, 13% Latino/Hispanic, 1.4% Asian/Asian American, and 0.3% American Indian or Alaska Native, which is similar to 2010 census estimates of Louisiana's racial demographics (60% White, 32% Black/African American, 4% Latino/Hispanic, 1.5% Asian/Asian American and 0.7% American Indian or Alaska Native). Latinos were somewhat over-represented due to targeted outreach to that population, which included a Spanish-language survey.

3. Summarize all comments obtained in the community participation process. Include a summary of any comments or views not accepted and the reasons why.

The following is a summary of the comments obtained; it does not represent an investigation or conclusion as to any individual comment received.

Alexandria

- There is a systemic issue with immigrants being able to access ID.
- Moms with children living in 2-bedroom house with four families cannot get housing assistance for many months. It takes so long to get housing assistance. Lots of homelessness.
- Disability income is too low to qualify for most housing – people apply for assistance but few get it, people live with family or under the bridge.
- Assistance list has been closed for 2 years. Overwhelming shortage of affordable housing
- People with a criminal background are at great risk of homelessness, and denied jobs.
- People say “oh I don't want to live on that street.” Fear of contact with different people. Need more education.
- Transportation is a barrier, buses are filthy, takes a lot of time, \$0.75 cents each ride – could cost \$6/day with transfers, also expensive to own a vehicle. It takes a long time to get to work. Rural areas have additional transportation challenges.
- No good paying jobs – especially since the oil industry went down. Job opportunities based on whom you know.
- Kids in certain areas get stuck in failing schools. Schools are segregated because neighborhoods are segregated. Lots of kids live with grandparents so that they can be in another school district – breaks up a lot of families. When one or a few minority students get vouchers to attend private schools, they feel out of place and unwelcome.
- Wealthy side of town does not know that there is homelessness in the Alexandria area – not exposed to poverty.
- Rural food deserts common – expensive, low quality food.
- Police pull you over a lot – for revenue purposes.

- Not enough one bedrooms, efficiencies, energy efficient units (some people with low rent have \$600-700 utility bills). There are no 1-bedroom apartments: “When we have a vacancy, we get 50-60 calls. We could fill 50 more apartments if we had them.”
- It is very hard for community to get in touch with the community development office. City government is not accessible.

Baton Rouge

- South Baton Rouge has all of the resources (and Zachary). Difficult to get there from North Baton Rouge (traffic, buses are slow and stop running at 9pm, and it is difficult to transfer).
- North and South Baton Rouge are both racially and economically segregated.
- Southeast BR is segregated (all white) and that has not changed over time.
- All hospitals are now concentrated in the South (this is new in past three years); hospitals in N BR were closed under Jindal admin.
- North Baton Rouge has no large grocery store; Pennington Health Center did a study that showed everything North of Florida Blvd. is a food desert.
- Segregation has not changed. Remained consistent for past 50 years.
- MidCity is now changing (beginning to gentrify). Suburban Baton Rouge is also changing (due to white flight; property values dropping; more affordable housing there).
- Homelessness: there is a consolidated effort to eradicate homelessness, but it does not seem to be making a big difference (in Mid City especially); the issue is related to the availability of medical services and the strong need for permanent supportive housing.
- Homeless people live under the overpass, the city periodically clears out the homeless’ stuff, and they leave and then return.
- Lots of neighborhood opposition to group homes.
- Green Light Program (infrastructure improvement project); everyone in the city pays a penny sales tax, but all of the improvements made in South Baton Rouge: paving, sidewalks, etc.
- Title clearing issues are preventing people from taking care of family homes; causing homes to fall into disarray
- Segregation and increased concentration of low income housing in low-income areas.
- Low income housing is built exclusively in North Baton Rouge; when you apply for subsidies to build affordable housing, you get extra points for building in areas of high poverty; tax credits are not available for building in high opportunity neighborhoods; no new buildings, schools, and businesses are developed in North Baton Rouge; and developers are saying that the income levels are not high enough to justify putting in new businesses.
- Biggest housing issues: lack of decent and affordable, safe; conditions; general deterioration; and elderly people especially cannot maintain their homes.

Hammond

- Lots of people have not been able to repair properties after March flooding.
- Lots of very low income people have trouble finding affordable housing, especially people with disabilities.

- Segregation depends on where you live. In Hammond, it is not as bad as it used to be. In 1981, someone burned a cross on the lawn of a Black family who moved into a white community.
- Lots of discrimination against Mexican immigrants, fear that they are taking jobs and lowering wages.
- Low wages in the area, majority of jobs are minimum wage. Lots of people do not have stable income due to type of jobs. Most jobs concentrated in Hammond and lots of people commute from rural areas.
- Transportation is the biggest challenge - if you are in the city limits of Hammond, the Council on Aging runs a bus system (no other public transportation). Seniors outside of the city limits can schedule a ride ahead of time for free, non-seniors have to pay \$9 each way. St. Tammany has a transit system in Covington and in Slidell.
- Tangipahoa is split – north (very rural) and south (Hammond area), Hammond became recognized as an MSA when population increased a lot after Katrina.
- Most jobs concentrated in Hammond, people have to commute from rural areas.
- Residents of Livingston and St. Helena Parishes have to come to Hammond for mental health services (outpatient) or St. Tammany (hospital).
- St. Helena has no internet providers; in Washington it is very limited.
- Hammond now has a charter school, lots of Catholic schools and a private school opened in response to desegregation order – white and middle class Black families moving their kids out of public schools. Schools that were for K-1 are now going to higher grades and facilities are not adequate.
- Biggest housing issues – affordability and poor quality.
- Seniors have a lot of issues finding affordable housing.
- Not enough vouchers for people – seven year wait (people camped out in Hammond in order to get on the waiting list).
- People with vouchers have a hard time finding units, but not due to landlord discrimination, just the lack of affordable housing that can meet inspections.
- Extreme lack of housing in St. Helena.
- Most families getting vouchers have kids, but it is hard to find large enough units for big families.
- Lots of inaccessible housing. Lots of people with disabilities do not know that they can ask for modifications or accommodations. Landlords do not know their responsibilities.

Houma

- Houma, surrounding areas are rural. Always had an issue with transportation. Have a bus system now but it is dangerous because bus stops are on the side of the busy roads with no sidewalk, no lights, and no benches. Very dangerous, especially for people with disabilities.
- Public services like doctors, hospital difficult to access, especially in southern Lafourche.
- Very few public housing units. Almost nonexistent. Most public housing is centralized.
- A lot of gun violence all across Terrebonne/Lafourche.
- Cost of housing is the biggest issue. And credit.
- It is hard to find bigger rentals for families.

- What is affordable is not livable. Dangerous, unhealthy, leaks, mold, rodents, nails coming out of the floorboards.
- Long waiting list for section 8. They have openings ‘over here’ (Bayou Towers Senior Center) for seniors and people with disabilities and they opened up The Circle (an apartment complex, open to young mothers and grandmothers raising children) but it is filling up fast.
- Housing authority manages trailers that are in the areas of lower opportunities, lower income areas. They have zoning laws that say you cannot build trailers in certain areas.
- There are resources for immigrants, but not really. They are technically available, but not easily accessible. “You call a number and it says ‘If you don’t speak English, press two.’” Immigrants are very, very low income. “They stay to themselves.” People from here are not very nice to people who are not from here. “If I don’t know your grandma, then...”
- A lot of environmental hazards because of the oil, oil production industry. High cancer rates. Risk from spills.
- Jobs are mostly shipbuilding, oil stuff, etc. When oil prices drop, people are out of jobs, go on unemployment. Not many other jobs outside of industry options. “You can’t buy a job around here.”
- All of the public housing is in lower-income areas. Some of the neighborhoods have changed (increased poverty, decreased resources) over the years since the buildings/public housing were placed (current building an example).
- No homes for middle and low income, young people to purchase, become homeowners. Young, college educated people are not coming back after they get degrees.
- Terrebonne: District 2 is predominately black and segregated. The public housing is basically the black neighborhood. Only little corner stores with liquor, cigarettes, etc.
- Lafourche: In every city there is segregation. It is still from the 1950s. Families have not moved and migrated to other neighborhoods. That is where their support system is. Childcare. Transportation isn’t easy.
- Private landlords hike up rents for oil field workers. Fluctuation of housing costs is difficult for HCV holders.
- Public housing built some of these problems intentionally. Concentrating public housing was too dense, concentrating the poor. Public housing is built in the bushes where you cannot see them from the road. No place for poor people to go. All the housing that poor people can afford is concentrated into one or two areas. It is after the fact and there is no plan.
- Poorer communities are the only areas where landlords are offering units available. If you do not concentrate funding in the places we have, you get penalized. Cannot afford land in the higher-income areas so cannot build there. It is like you are set up to fail.
- In Saint Charles, we will not acknowledge we have a homeless problem because it does not look good. We send them to other Parishes. Elected officials have to embrace and agree that we have a need here (for more affordable housing). Primarily an issue of funding.
- We struggle to find housing that will pass inspection. We will make landlords fix things, but the HCV people are still getting the bottom of the barrel.
- A lot of the black people don’t want to live in the predominantly white area because they feel uncomfortable.
- Section 8 is closed, but public housing, every day people are coming in. Do not have time

to field all the requests. People would come by bus loads looking for section 8 because everyone else is closed. Got 400 in 4 days. All staff could do was take applications. Mostly from Kenner, etc, in the Greater New Orleans area.

- We had people from all over 2/3 were from outside of the parish. 50% of the people find a place but 20% really aren't living there, because they live in other parishes, but they want a voucher because they know that if they live there for a year, they know they can move it. People are desperate.
- Large families have difficulty. Landlords will lease a 4-bedroom, but do not want someone with a lot of kids. Landlords want to know how old are the kids, how big the kids are.
- One bedrooms are harder to find. People with one bedrooms do not vacate as often. Only three people vacated from one bedrooms in the last year.
- Zero tolerance is still in a lot of leases. It is a big fight to keep the community safe and peaceful. Not sure how we can balance that and not be discriminatory.

Lafayette

- Overarching disparities
 - Public Transit
 - Only city of Lafayette has public transit; unincorporated areas do not.
 - Transit rides are lengthy between cities, and the service is spotty.
 - Few sidewalks, no seating or cover from the rain at bus stops.
 - Transit lines may not connect where jobs are.
 - Transit is locally described as a “maid service.”
 - Dearth of opportunity in central Lafayette (African-American neighborhood).
 - Lack of jobs in central Lafayette.
 - Majority of poverty is on the north side of town, and majority of new construction is on south side of town – including majority of new jobs are on the south side of town.
 - Low-lying areas/floodways are often used to build low-income housing. Disparities in housing site selection – low-lying areas are often used because it is cheap land.
 - Environmental racism: Evangeline Thruway (future I-49 connector) runs through Black neighborhood. 18-wheeler trucks run through (noise, air pollution).
 - Maintenance of roads on north side of town is not at the same level as the south side of town.
 - Blighted housing in north side of town.
- Schools
 - High performing schools are on the south side of town.
 - Majority-minority busing is still in effect.
 - School board is having difficulty keeping up with translation needs.
- Both urban and rural populations that have problems. The conditions people are living in are horrible. The landlords would not live in them. So then they are faced with ‘do we stay or do we go’ but there is not a lot of affordable housing.
- One lady sleeping with a bat to kill rats. Her doors do not lock. Do not want to call code enforcement because they do not want to get evicted.
- Code enforcement will go out and write a report, send the landlord a letter, but things

mostly just stay in a file. I will call and they say “we got a file on them” but nothing is changed.

- One lady fell through the bedroom floor and she called landlord to say the floor is rotten, and the landlord says no you are just too fat.
- Brownfield areas near the airport.
- There is a large un-banked population.

Lake Charles

- Seniors suffering the most from cost burden.
- Mostly elderly in substandard housing. Situation more from neglect. Or lack of funding. Mostly homeowners. Or it was passed down from grandma, but maybe not legally. Homes falling into disrepair because people do not have money.
- Lack of major transit. Transit does not run Saturday and Sunday.
- We try to keep up with the requirement to have 75% in low-poverty areas. Worked until Rita, after rents are so high, units are now above fair market rent.
- People with poor credit scores. Credit scores can mean no job or no housing.
- Criminal background checks impede ability to gain employment.
- Businesses in north Lake Charles (majority-black neighborhood) do not pay more than minimum wage.
- Students must attend neighborhood-based schools, unless they apply for charters. Charters do not provide busing.
- Tobacco outlets highly concentrated in north Lake Charles, as well as liquor stores.
- Additional housing is needed for growing workforce: people are coming from other jurisdictions for jobs, but there is no housing.
- Section 8 and public housing residents do have access to high opportunity neighborhoods, but it is “not enough.” Developers face Not in My Backyard (NIMBYism) from neighbors living in south Lake Charles.
- Some of north Lake Charles’ public housing stock is in poor condition (north of Broad Street).

Monroe

- The best jobs are in West Monroe – lots of racial discrimination in hiring.
- School buses pass by neighborhoods but will not stop there. Lots of kids get bused – pass four high schools before they get to school.
- Paper mill in West Monroe, the fumes cross the river when the wind shifts.
- Buses take a long time and in the south there are no shelters. They only come every 45-60 min and stop running at 9pm. The farthest they come is the hospital. Some stop at 5:30pm. There is only one trolley. Paratransit available for people with disabilities but not young people or people with children. No transportation into West Monroe where there are better jobs.
- Lots of people have to walk across the bridge to West Monroe in order to get a bus over there – 3 or 4 miles, people leave their house at 5am.
- Housing is sometimes cheaper in West Monroe but Black people are not welcome – taxes are cheaper there too.

- There is no post office in the south – there is only one downtown but there is not enough parking because the court is using it.
- Rural areas do not have enough access to groceries. Grocery stores in the south are expensive.
- CenturyTel is building a gated subdivision just for their employees. People who do not live in the subdivision cannot shop in their grocery store.
- Majority of clinics are in West Monroe.
- Housing cost is rising. Waiting list is very long. Very hard to get a voucher or any assistance.
- Poor quality of housing stock, including public housing.
- Limited one-bedroom housing.
- Rent is too high, including in public housing.
- Public housing does not have Wi-Fi in rural areas.
- Big demand for people who need assistance, do not qualify (income eligibility, seniors, people under 55 looking for assistance).
- Gun violence in the south side.
- Only one bank/ATM on the south side.

New Orleans*

Housing Affordability

- Where the hospitals are built, the prices are going way up. A lot of people have been put out by the landlords near the hospitals because the landlords are raising rents.
- The only option for people is Habitat for Humanity.
- “If it wasn’t for Section 8, I would be out on the street.”
- Rent is too much. Paying 1,200 a month with four kids to be comfortable.
- Coming out of a housing development is like “Oh my god, what am I going to do?”
- Choosing between being comfortable and pulling child out of college.
- Not enough low-income and affordable housing.
- High rent versus low wages.
- Difficulty with upfront costs (deposits and first month rent) even with assistance.
- Higher rent forces people out of their community.
- Converting duplexes to single-family creates less rental housing.

Access to Housing

- One-bedroom market rates in tax-credits are over a year on waiting list.
- Where are people going? A lot of people living with families or in the shelters. Increase in homeless – living under the overpass, hanging out on the neutral ground, Carrollton, Napoleon.
- People building and constantly coming in from other states and pushing people out from better areas into the slum areas.
- Demand for housing near schools, jobs, etc.

- Gentrification causing residents to be pushed to areas with a lot of poverty to areas with less amenities and transportation.
- Short term rentals are causing evictions and will raise rent prices.
- Public Housing taking too long to complete, like Guste.
- Need more affordable housing.
- Live close to schools.
- Difficulty finding a house. Slum landlords. No jobs, no healthcare. PCP licenses? Access to food pantries. Downtown and Carrollton areas. Grocery stores. Only Walmart, Family Dollar, Dollar General. Community stores with no good food.
- HCV is for very, very low income people.
- Most people on the list don't get off the list until they pass away. A lot of people might qualify for the 60% units. Even on social security people are over income.

Renter Rights & Tenant Relations

- In mixed-income communities, third-party managers are a problem (not community focused).
- No knowledge of renter rights and the power to enforce violation, as well as, risk of eviction.
- Education for the public on renters' rights.
- The developers come and bring these management teams in. People were told, "if we fix the gates, we are going to raise your rent."
- We need to take the community back as a community. It is not about community anymore. Marrero Commons.
- Do the individual public housing sites have a responsibility to inform tenants of what is happening in housing programs?
- Renters not having knowledge of what their rights are. Not having power to hold landlords accountable. The schools do not seem integrated. People seem forced into accepting substandard housing. A lot of blighted housing.

Quality of Housing

- People living in deplorable conditions. Mold, termites, lead paint, general disrepair. Leaks and nonfunctioning air conditioners. Landlords are unresponsive.
- Since Katrina, it has not gotten back to the point where it was. Conditions of homes. Some homes are deplorable and some people are living in luxury.
- Bad streets and not enough lighting.
- Low quality of housing (not up to code).
- Privatized community police and neighborhood watch that goes around. The construction is well-maintained Uptown. In lower-income areas, construction is not as orderly. Majority of the houses in neighborhoods uptown are Airbnb.
- Blight map is concentrated in certain areas of the city. Blighted houses a big issue.
- Unsafe occupied houses.
- Housing needs and concerns should be on substandard properties. Lots of blighted property.
- Substandard Housing.

- Not enough safe, low-income housing. “It is the housing society thinks we should have because we are low-income.”
- Abandoned houses with mold, termites, etc. Landlords expect tenants to make repairs.

Housing Discrimination

- Discrimination because a person would like more cash instead of a voucher.
- Some landlords prefer voucher holders over cash.

Jobs

- Transportation
- Jobs are concentrated in certain areas.
- Access to jobs is a problem. People working temporary jobs, jobs are not sustainable.
- Criminal background checks are keeping people from getting jobs.
- Like the airport, there are a lot of jobs, but it is really far, the JP (Jefferson Parish) bus is different from Orleans Parish.
- The streetcar is being built in the Bywater where they already have transportation.
- People who need transit in poor Black neighborhoods have to walk a far way to get anywhere, transportation is going to the richer areas still.
- The transportation is made for the tourists.
- Driving, transportation close to work can be expensive.
- Jobs that are close to home do not pay that much.

Public/Private Investment Concerns

- Tapping into community services is important. There are community services but people are not aware of them.
- “God, what am I going to do?” In Pigeontown, only five houses are lived-in and the others are blighted.
- Budget priority: build fewer jails and put more funds into affordable housing and schools and youth improvement.
- Grocery stores. No affordable grocery stores in vast places of the city.
- Building a grocery store at Columbia Parc, which is good, but it is the only one.
- Big infrastructure to reduce flooding uptown, but there are a lot of areas that have a lot of flooding.
- Not doing any work on roads in poorer Black neighborhoods.
- Want to see more equity in construction, levees, streets, potholes, and lighting.
- Food deserts /a lot of blight in the industrial canal area.
- Uneven investment/infrastructure/development/allocation of resources in certain neighborhoods; seems like a way to push people out so developers can buy cheap and redevelop.

Schools

- Students have to take the bus at 7 in the morning.
- Schools are fair, not good.
- A bus is the only way to get to school, can create a very long day.
- Not enough good schools.

- Problems with resources at schools.
- Lack of parent involvement.
- Not enough libraries.
- Libraries not open late enough.
- Schools not offering enough vocational education.
- Neighborhood schools – better integrated with community.
- Need better neighborhood schools, loss of a sense of community, no school pride.

Access to Healthy Food

- There is Whole Foods, but it is unaffordable.
- Access to healthy food, but not affordable healthy food.
- Not enough grocery stores.
- Corner store food (not healthy).
- Not enough grocery stores.
- Food stamps not enough to afford healthy food.

Transit Access

- Buses running less frequently.
- School buses are only on major roads, not into communities. Have to walk a long way for kids to catch a bus.
- City buses also do not go into the community, only outskirts on major roads.
- Transit not good in Jefferson, New Orleans East. No regional connectivity.
- Transportation not accessible. Not taking care of people who use services.

Recreation Facilities

- Recreation facilities are available (but not programming).

Quality Health Care

- Not enough neighborhood-based clinics (were more before Hurricane Katrina).
- Not enough residents have health insurance.
- Insurance is very costly; some deductibles are way too high.
- Health coverage from the state is limited.

Public Health & Environmental Concerns

- Violent crime.
- Exposure to environmental health hazards.
- Poverty.
- Racial segregation.
- Groups working with minority poverty populations should go through Undoing Racism Training.
- Community also has to take responsibility for some issues.
- Agriculture Street landfill. Built on top of a landfill. Environmental injustice. Found out in 1993. Has cancer at 34. No school in the area. No store in the area. No bus in the area. Homeowners from HANO who are paying taxes but are not able to access their properties. Want relocation for the 53 people who are left back there.

- Budget priority: build fewer jails, and put more funds into affordable housing and schools and youth improvement.
- Agriculture street landfill. Built on top of a landfill. Environmental issues.

Shreveport

- Poor people move a lot. A couple of times a year. Can be difficult to build wealth/community stability. Consequences for children's education.
- No good schools for kids in poorer neighborhoods to attend. Have to take a lot of buses to get to schools in neighborhoods with more money, resources.
- Transportation is an issue. Difficult to get to work/schools. People catching a few buses to get to jobs.
- All the factories, paper mills are near Black neighborhoods. Black neighborhood built on top of an old landfill. People having higher rates of cancer in that area.
- High prominence of diet-related illness (diabetes, etc.) related to no grocery stores/fresh food, especially in the Black community.
- LGBT community are afraid to disclose their orientation to landlords for fear of being evicted
- Lots of housing providers are wary of people with disabilities.
- It is misleading to ask if there are disparities – it focuses on the negative instead of building on what is right. It is good to focus on education, not hate and negatives. Gun violence and poverty are caused by breakdown in the family.
- City Council passed an ordinance saying that group homes have to be 1,000 feet from each other.
- ALL neighborhoods appear to be segregated.
- No way to get to work unless you have a car. Lack of reliable transportation can also negatively impact the choices that shoppers make. Even when people may try to buy healthful food, they may be discouraged from some of those purchases because they do not have a way to get it home.
- Debate currently happening about I-49 extension because the plan will take the highway through a historically Black neighborhood that is currently being revitalized. The project would split the neighborhood in half. What will happen to the space under the bridge? Also houses are in danger because they will need to be removed to build on and off ramps. Highway will also affect South Shreveport – a road will close that will result in rerouting the way that traffic flows.
- Lack of choice for voucher holders. “The impression is there” that voucher holders have choice, but once they try to find a place, voucher holders run into barriers. Voucher holders often cannot look into high-opportunity neighborhoods.
- Affordability is a big problem. Habitable units seem to start at about \$600 a month. “Terrible shortage of quality affordable housing.” Lack of enforced housing codes. Tenants are afraid to complain because they might be evicted. Lack of code or enforcement is a big problem.
- City passed a code enforcement ordinance “but it has no teeth.”
- NIMBYism is a problem when affordable housing is proposed in high-opportunity, white neighborhoods. Opposition has blocked affordable housing in high opportunity neighborhoods.
- Blighted homes in minority neighborhoods are a problem.

- Lead paint exposure in SW Shreveport especially, is a large health problem. Highland also had many old homes. Black mold also leads to negative health impacts. Access to health care is different based on race. Families without cars may have to use ambulances for non-ER trips.
- 3 major ER centers in the Shreveport area all are in the white areas.
- Lack of housing/jobs for justice-involved individuals.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF PAST GOALS, ACTIONS AND STRATEGIES

The 2010 Analysis of Impediments (“2010 AI”) in Louisiana set out three main goals:

- Improve fair housing system capacity, access to the system, and ability to respond to needs;
- Improve communication and coordination among agencies and those interested in affirmatively furthering fair housing; and
- Enhance understanding of fair housing by both consumers and providers.

In order to improve fair housing system capacity, the 2010 AI recommended establishing a fair housing working group. Following that publication, the State of Louisiana has consolidated the state’s housing agencies and funding sources into the Louisiana Housing Corporation (LHC). The LHC, created by Act 409 of the 2011 Louisiana Legislative Session, administers federal and state housing funds through programs designed to advance the development of affordable housing. In the LHC’s enabling legislation, the legislature declared that resources for housing in Louisiana would be more efficiently utilized if a single agency coordinated housing policy in the state. Consolidation helps to streamline how the state addresses its housing needs and avoids duplicative efforts.

To further the studies and assessment of housing issues and coordination and communication, the state also established the Commission in 2011. The goal of the Commission is to advise the LHC in coordinating the integration of planning and spending by local governments, parish and municipal governing authorities, redevelopment authorities, and the Department of Transportation and Development on housing and transportation needs. In addition, the state created the Louisiana Interagency Action Council for the Homeless in 2011. The State Interagency Council on Homelessness is tasked with creating and implementing the State of Louisiana Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness; serving as a clearinghouse for information on homeless services, housing, and transportation options for the homeless; and other activities and services as necessary. The council brings together the resources, programs, and experiences of state and federal agencies to coordinate services for those most in need. The council reports to the governor annually.

Several steps have been taken to enhance understanding of fair housing. Louisiana’s 2015 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) stated that the Louisiana government partners with the Louisiana Office of the Attorney General to provide fair housing and accessibility workshops statewide to inform developers, architects, engineers, property managers, and the general public and address the most common misconceptions regarding compliance under the Fair Housing Act with an emphasis on accessibility, design, and construction requirements. The LHC also continues to provide annual fair housing training to its staff in order to address impediments and/or barriers to providing or accessing affordable housing to protected class members. The purpose of the training is to educate and equip staff with the tools necessary to recognize discriminatory activities or practices. As a matter of policy, the LHC has included certain pro-integration language in its Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP), discussed further in the Segregation and Integration section below. The QAP governs the allocation of tax credits for the development of affordable housing development across the state. In other programs, the State requires landlords to undergo training in their fair housing obligations as a

condition of receiving funds. For homebuyers, LHC offers a Homeownership Education Counseling Program. Through the program, LHC approved housing counseling agencies present a series of workshops to help potential homeowners prepare for finding, buying, and maintaining their first home.

The Board of Directors of the Louisiana Housing Corporation has adopted a fair housing discrimination policy that involves the filing of a complaint with the appropriate enforcement agency. Invoking this provision on the part of the developer provides for a reallocation of Low Income Housing Tax Credits.

LHC conducts research and collects data on housing needs. The LHC has encouraged partnerships between for-profit developers, nonprofit organizations, local governmental units, commercial lending institutions, and state and federal agencies in an effort to reduce barriers and garner community support for affordable housing.

- a. Discuss how you have been successful in achieving past goals, and/or how you have fallen short of achieving those goals (including potentially harmful unintended consequences). Include a description of any oversight, coordination, or assistance of other public entities' goals, actions, and strategies, including those within State or region.

The creation of the LHC has improved coordination of the state's strategy to address housing needs. The LHC oversees the state's rental assistance, home ownership promotion programs, homelessness prevention, housing-related child care, and hurricane recovery dollars for rebuilding rental housing. The State continues to look for opportunities in various programs to increase public outreach, education and technical assistance which increase the awareness and implementation of measures which mitigate against fair housing impediments.

Discuss any additional policies, actions, or steps that you could take to achieve past goals, or mitigate the problems you have experienced.

The activities of the Commission could provide more focused opportunities with interest stakeholders with a goal of building additional fair housing system capacity and further facilitate the increased communication and coordination between nongovernmental fair housing agencies and governmental agencies tasked with affirmatively furthering fair housing.

The Commission could provide more specific reports on progress towards individual fair housing goals in order to provide a clearer picture of what has been accomplished and what still needs to be done.

- b. Discuss how the experience of program participant(s) with past goals has influenced the selection of current goals.

While some progress has been made to improve efficiency in access to services, the comments of various interested stakeholders suggests there is still work to be done. These experiences speak to the larger issues present in the affordable housing arena, which tend to indicate that segregation and housing inequity is still present in the state as a whole.

V. Fair Housing Analysis

A. Demographic Summary

1. If the State is choosing to perform its analysis using sub-State areas, identify and describe these areas and explain why the use of these sub-State areas will facilitate a meaningful Analysis from a fair housing perspective.

For the purpose of this Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, the state is divided into eight regional sub-areas. The areas are characterized by common economic, cultural, and historical ties. Although they are, in some cases, larger than regional housing markets, these sub-areas provide a lens into the contexts in which households make choices about where they will live, work, learn, and recreate in a meaningful way. Louisiana has used these regions as a platform for conducting housing and community development planning and analysis in the past such as the Louisiana Housing Corporation's 2014 Housing Needs Assessment and reports from Louisiana Economic Development. Therefore, the regional sub-areas are being used here to facilitate continuity and efficiency in an effort to affirmatively further fair housing statewide.

Those regional sub-areas include:

- **New Orleans Sub-Area:** Including Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. James, St. John the Baptist, and St. Tammany Parishes. The New Orleans sub-area is coextensive with the New Orleans-Kenner-Metairie, LA Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) though it is important to note that the federal Office of Management & Budget, which is responsible for MSA delineations, removed St. James Parish from the MSA in 2003 before adding it back for the 2013 American Community Survey.
- **Baton Rouge Sub-Area:** Including Ascension, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberville, Livingston, Pointe Coupee, St. Helena, Tangipahoa, Washington, West Baton Rouge, and West Feliciana Parishes. Tangipahoa and Washington Parishes are outside of the Baton Rouge, LA MSA, but the remaining nine parishes comprise that MSA.
- **Houma-Thibodaux Sub-Area:** Including Assumption, Lafourche, and Terrebonne Parishes. Lafourche and Terrebonne Parishes comprise the Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA MSA, but Assumption Parish is outside of the MSA.
- **Lafayette Sub-Area:** Including Acadia, Evangeline, Iberia, Lafayette, St. Landry, St. Martin, St. Mary, and Vermilion Parishes. Evangeline, St. Landry, and St. Mary Parishes are not included in the Lafayette, LA MSA, but the remaining five parishes in the sub- area are.
- **Lake Charles Sub-Area:** Including Allen, Beauregard, Calcasieu, Cameron, and Jefferson Davis Parishes. Calcasieu and Cameron Parishes comprise the Lake Charles, LA MSA, but the remaining three parishes in the sub-area are outside of the MSA.

- **Alexandria Sub-Area:** Including Avoyelles, Catahoula, Concordia, Grant, LaSalle, Rapides, Vernon, and Winn Parishes. Grant and Rapides Parishes comprise the Alexandria, LA MSA, but all other parishes in the sub-area are outside of the MSA.
 - **Shreveport-Bossier Sub-Area:** Including Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, Claiborne, De Soto, Lincoln, Natchitoches, Red River, Sabine, and Webster Parishes. Bossier, Caddo, and DeSoto Parishes comprise the Shreveport-Bossier City, LA MSA, but all other parishes in the sub-area are outside of the MSA.
 - **Monroe Sub-Area:** Including Caldwell, East Carroll, Franklin, Jackson, Madison, Morehouse, Ouachita, Richland, Tensas, Union, and West Carroll Parishes. Ouachita and Union Parishes comprise the Monroe, LA MSA, but all other parishes in the sub-area are outside of the MSA.
2. Describe demographic patterns in the State, and describe trends over time (since 1990).

Except where otherwise specified, the data provided from 2000 and 2010 is from Summary File 1 of the Decennial Censuses for those years and data for 2014 is from the 2014 American Community Survey (“ACS”), 1-Year Estimates. The data discussed below provides the background against which the Analysis considers fair housing issues in subsequent sections.

State of Louisiana:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2014 – Total	2014 – Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	2,794,391	62.5%	2,734,884	60.3%	2,753,573	59.2%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	1,443,390	32.3%	1,442,420	31.8%	1,493,046	32.1%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	54,256	1.2%	69,327	1.5%	78,138	1.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	24,129	0.5%	28,092	0.6%	23,474	0.5%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	39,260	0.9%	57,766	1.3%	66,888	1.4%
Hispanic or Latino	107,738	2.4%	192,560	4.2%	223,889	4.8%

Overall, population growth in Louisiana has been very modest between 2000 and 2014. Between 2000 and 2010, the state’s population grew by 1.4%. Between 2010 and 2014, the state’s population grew more rapidly by 2.6%. In light of these broader dynamics, White population decreased by a smaller amount than it did as a percentage share of the population, and the African American population actually increased slightly despite appearing flat as a percentage of the total population. Non-Hispanic White and African American population growth was most limited between 2000 and 2010, the timeframe that included Hurricane Katrina, but has rebounded since 2010. Although Louisiana remains less heavily Latino and Asian-American than the nation as a whole, the increased representation of those groups in Louisiana is a significant development with regard to race and ethnicity at the statewide level in Louisiana since 2000. Some implications of Latino population growth are discussed in the Segregation/Integration portion and Disproportionate Housing Needs sections of this analysis.

National Origin	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2014 – Total	2014 – Percentage
Foreign-Born	115,885	2.6%	172,866	3.8%	194,277	4.2%

Data for the year 2000, in the table above, is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census, and data for 2010 is from the 2010 ACS 1-Year Estimates. Both the absolute number and the percentage of foreign-born residents of Louisiana increased between 2000 and 2010 and continued to increase at a more modest pace between 2010 and 2014.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2014 – Total	2014 – Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	116,907	2.8%	119,852	2.8%	131,247	3.0%

Despite the increase in Louisiana’s foreign-born population between 2000 and 2014, the percentage of the state’s population that consists of individuals five years of age or older who are Limited English Proficient (LEP) was relatively stable. There was more pronounced growth in the LEP population in absolute numbers between 2010 and 2014 than there was between 2000 and 2010.

Sex	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2014 – Total	2014 – Percentage
Female	2,306,073	51.6%	2,314,080	51.0%	2,377,560	51.1%
Male	2,162,903	48.4%	2,219,292	49.0%	2,272,560	48.9%

As with race and ethnicity, demographic trends in relation to sex were not consistent over the period of 2000 to 2014. Between 2000 and 2010, male population increased by 2.6% while female population only increased by 0.3%. This disparity appears consistent with strong growth in Latino population in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, which might have been, in part, spurred by an increase in the availability of construction jobs and the relatively slow return of African American and non-Hispanic White residents displaced by Hurricane Katrina. By contrast, between 2010 and 2014, male and female population increased in a roughly proportional manner.

Age	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2014 – Total	2014 – Percentage
Under 18	1,219,799	27.3%	1,118,015	24.7%	1,114,784	24.0%
18-64	2,732,248	61.1%	2,857,500	63.0%	2,903,722	62.4%
65+	516,929	11.6%	557,857	12.3%	631,170	13.6%

Since 2000, both the non-elderly adult and elderly populations of the state have increased, with the non-elderly adult population increasing more rapidly between 2000 and 2010 and the elderly population increasing more rapidly between 2010 and 2014. The population of children in the state decreased substantially between 2000 and 2010 before decreasing more modestly between 2010 and 2014. These trends represent a high-level picture of the State from data concerning overall population growth, race and ethnicity, and sex. The significant increase in the Latino population, following Hurricane Katrina, is disproportionately male, and it also disproportionately consists of working age adults. The increase in the elderly population is consistent with nationwide trends and the aging of the Baby Boomer generation.

Family Type	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2014 – Total	2014 – Percentage
Families with Children	575,053	34.5%	510,286	29.5%	468,682	27.3%

Since 2000, there have been persistent declines in both the number of families with children and in the percentage of family households that include children. This is consistent with the influx of adults to work in construction jobs, the general aging of the population, and a slow recovery from the devastation of Hurricane Katrina. As is discussed later in this analysis, arresting this trend may require a renewed focus on the development of housing with an array of bedroom sizes that accommodates the needs of families with children.

New Orleans Sub-Area:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2014 – Total	2014 – Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	731,514	54.7%	639,356	53.8%	655,532	52.4%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	498,569	37.3%	403,731	33.9%	428,347	34.2%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	28,345	2.1%	31,519	2.6%	36,202	2.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	4,544	0.3%	4,347	0.4%	4,018	0.3%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	13,801	1.0%	15,494	1.3%	16,992	1.4%
Hispanic or Latino	58,545	4.4%	92,178	7.7%	106,163	8.5%

Between 2000 and 2010, non-Hispanic White and African American population in the New Orleans sub-area decreased dramatically, primarily because of the devastating effects of Hurricane Katrina. During that same period, Latino population increased substantially, while Asian-American and multi-racial population increased modestly, and the Native American population changed little. Between 2010 and 2014, non-Hispanic White and African American population rebounded though that process was underway as early as 2006. Native American population growth continued to stagnate, and Latino, Asian-American, and multi-racial population growth continued. Latino population growth was somewhat slower than its swift 2000-2010 pace, but Asian-American population growth accelerated slightly. Overall, the region has become less heavily non-Hispanic White and less heavily African American with Latino, Asian-American, and multi-racial individuals increasing their representation.

National Origin	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2014 – Total	2014 – Percentage
Foreign-Born	64,169	4.8%	81,125	7.0%	96,475	7.7%

The data for 2010 is from the 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates and does not include St. James Parish foreign born as ACS data is unavailable. The denominator used to calculate the percentage included for that year does not reflect the total population of St. James Parish. If the number of foreign born residents of St. James Parish is assumed to be zero, the percentage of foreign born residents of the sub-area would decline modestly to 6.8%. As the foreign born population of St. James Parish as of the 2000 Census was just 22 individuals, it is likely that ACS data was unavailable because the number of foreign-born individuals was an extremely low but non-zero figure. Data from 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census.

Overall, the number of foreign born residents of the New Orleans sub-area actually increased at a faster rate between 2010 and 2014 than it did between 2000 and 2010. However, because of the sharp declines in the native born population between 2000 and 2010, increases in the foreign born population during that period translated into a larger uptick in the percentage of the overall population that was foreign born.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 Total	– 2000 Percentage	2010 Total	– 2010 Percentage	2014 Total	– 2014 Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	42,212	3.4%	49,795	4.5%	58,325	5.0%

Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census. Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The rate of increase in both the number and percentage of LEP individuals was relatively steady between 2000 and 2014. The increase in the LEP population is consistent with increases in the foreign born population and increases in the representation of race and ethnic groups that have disproportionately more LEP members.

Sex	2000 Total	– 2000 Percentage	2010 Total	– 2010 Percentage	2014 Total	– 2014 Percentage
Female	697,792	52.2%	610,679	51.3%	645,513	51.6%
Male	639,934	47.8%	579,187	48.7%	606,336	48.4%

Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Demographic trends regarding sex from the New Orleans Sub-Area provide an important lens for interpreting the same table at the statewide level. Female population declined significantly more than male population did in the area between 2000 and 2010. Between 2010 and 2014, population growth by sex was much more proportional although the increase among females was slightly greater. This may be an anomaly associated with the impact of the post hurricane construction boom following Hurricane Katrina

Age	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2014 Total	2014 Percentage
Under 18	358,092	26.8%	278,519	23.4%	280,612	22.4%
18-64	827,605	61.9%	766,415	64.4%	799,699	63.9%
65+	152,029	11.3%	144,932	12.2%	171,538	13.7%

Although all age brackets experienced population decreases between 2000 and 2010 and all groups grew in population between 2010 and 2014, the magnitude of those decreases and increases has been highly uneven. The number of children in the region dropped dramatically between 2000 and 2010 and has barely rebounded since. Both non-elderly and elderly adults experienced much more modest population declines between 2000 and 2010 that increased their respective shares of the total population. Between 2010 and 2014, both groups continued to experience robust population growth in absolute terms, but the number of elderly adults increased by a greater proportion, leading the percentage of the total population that is comprised of non-elderly adults to fall slightly as the percentage of elderly adults increased. Continued growth patterns may indicate whether this is another anomaly in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina or whether other factors may be contributing.

Family Type	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2014 Total	2014 Percentage
Families with Children	166,536	32.9%	128,986	27.9%	117,995	24.9%

The number and proportion of households that are comprised of families with children steadily and steeply declined between 2000 and 2014. This data is consistent with but the table above reflecting the population of the region by age. It also raises similar questions about whether this a temporary anomaly or whether other factors may be contributing.

Baton Rouge Sub-Area:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	536,828	63.1%	574,134	59.1%	578,755	58.7%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	282,089	33.2%	335,607	34.6%	339,845	34.5%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	9,663	1.1%	15,044	1.5%	16,685	1.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	1,827	0.2%	2,398	0.2%	2,167	0.2%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	5,795	0.7%	9,766	1.0%	12,180	1.2%
Hispanic or Latino	13,452	1.6%	32,504	3.3%	34,581	3.5%

Data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, the population grew across all racial and ethnic groups, but the rate of increase among African American, Asian American, multi-racial, and Latino people was greater than that among non-Hispanic White and American Indian people. Growth was especially pronounced among multi-racial and Latino people. In general, trends were consistent over the entire 2000 to 2012 timeframe with two exceptions. First, there was a slight decline in American Indian population between 2010 and 2012 that did not entirely offset the increase between 2000 and 2010. Second, although African American population continued to grow, the rate of African American population growth decreased.

National Origin	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Foreign-Born	19,463	2.3%	30,960	3.2%	33,120	3.4%

The data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and the data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census.

The number and percentage of foreign born residents increased substantially and relatively consistently between 2000 and 2012, likely as a result of Latino individuals and households moving to the area.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	15,815	2.0%	18,926	2.1%	18,960	2.1%

Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census. Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The number of LEP persons in the sub-area increased at a slightly higher rate than the population as a whole between 2000 and 2010 but changed very little between 2010 and 2012.

Sex	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Female	434,843	51.1%	494,333	50.9%	502,986	51.0%
Male	415,644	48.9%	476,416	49.1%	482,667	49.0%

Both male and female population grew largely in proportion to the overall population between 2000 and 2012. Male population grew slightly faster between 2000 and 2010, and female population grew slightly faster between 2010 and 2012. That variation may reflect a similar dynamic present in the New Orleans Sub-Area manifesting to a lesser extent.

Age	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Under 18	230,469	27.1%	240,610	24.8%	239,911	24.3%
18-64	534,894	62.9%	623,348	64.2%	629,600	63.9%
65+	85,124	10.0%	106,791	11.0%	116,142	11.8%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, the population of children in the sub-area increased at a slow rate and the population of both non-elderly and elderly adults increased. The increase in the population of non-elderly adults was

most significant between 2000 and 2010 and leveled off somewhat between 2010 and 2012. The increase in the population of elderly adults was consistent across the entire time period. There was a minute decrease in the population of children between 2010 and 2012.

Family Type	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Families with Children	109,246	35.3%	109,206	30.1%	105,174	29.1%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of families with children in the sub-area was relatively flat at a time of strong population growth. Between 2010 and 2012, the number of families with children decreased while overall population growth was more modest, resulting in a smaller decrease in the percentage of households comprised of families with children.

Houma-Thibodaux Sub-Area:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	166,050	76.2%	167,311	72.2%	167,004	71.8%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	37,107	17.0%	40,836	17.6%	41,037	17.6%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	1,485	0.7%	1,890	0.8%	1,922	0.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	7,547	3.5%	8,981	3.9%	8,415	3.6%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	2,284	1.0%	3,779	1.6%	4,453	1.9%
Hispanic or Latino	3,199	1.5%	8,566	3.7%	9,467	4.1%

Data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, non-Hispanic White population in the Houma-Thibodaux Sub-Area was largely static and thus

came to represent a smaller percentage of the total population while all other categories increased. The population of Latinos and multi-racial individuals increased most significantly while gains in African American and Asian American populations were more modest. Native American population surged between 2000 and 2010 before falling off slightly between 2010 and 2012. It is worth noting that individuals with Native American heritage make up a substantial portion of the multi-racial population. If there have been changes in the degree to which Native American people identify as American Indian Alone or American Indian in combination with another race, these differing numbers could be the result of reporting rather than actual change in demographics. This sub-area is a center of Native American population and culture within Louisiana.

National Origin	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Foreign-Born	3,056	1.4%	6,087	2.6%	6,962	3.0%

The data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and the data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census.

The number and percentage of foreign born residents increased substantially and relatively consistently between 2000 and 2012, likely as a result of Latino individuals and households moving to the area.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	9,250	4.6%	6,379	3.0%	7,100	3.3%

Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census. Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The proportion of LEP individuals fell sharply between 2000 and 2010 before rebounding slightly between 2010 and 2012. There is potential that the decline between 2000 and 2010 was largely attributable to a decrease in the number of speakers of elderly native-born Indo-European languages. Many members of this group were likely French speaking Cajuns. Successive generations of Cajuns are more likely to have full English proficiency.

Sex	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Female	111,317	51.1%	117,251	50.6%	117,861	50.7%
Male	106,548	48.9%	114,348	49.4%	114,711	49.3%

Both male and female population grew between 2000 and 2010 though male population grew at a noticeably faster rate. Both male and female population growth stagnated between 2010 and 2012.

Age	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total 232572	2012 Percentage
Under 18	61,725	28.3%	58,545	25.3%	57,648	24.8%
18-64	133,266	61.2%	145,312	62.7%	145,595	62.6%
65+	22,874	10.5%	27,742	12.0%	29,329	12.6%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, the population of children in the sub-area decreased and the population of both, non-elderly and elderly adults increased. The increase in the population of non-elderly adults was most significant between 2000 and 2010 and leveled off somewhat between 2010 and 2012. The increase in the population of elderly adults was consistent across the entire time period.

Family Type	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Families with Children	29,375	38.5%	27,027	32.1%	26,059	31.1%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The number and percentage of families with children as a proportion of all households declined sharply between 2000 and 2012. The decrease was most acute between 2000 and 2010 but continued between 2010 and 2012. Continued growth patterns may indicate whether this is another anomaly in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina or whether other factors may be contributing.

Lafayette Sub-Area:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	414,814	68.9%	422,528	66.1%	425,739	65.8%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	165,044	27.4%	176,756	27.7%	177,086	27.4%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	6,022	1.0%	8,077	1.3%	8,233	1.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	2,030	0.3%	2,793	0.4%	2,084	0.3%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	4,569	0.8%	8,067	1.3%	11,068	1.7%
Hispanic or Latino	8,420	1.4%	19,425	3.0%	21,550	3.3%

Data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, non-Hispanic White population in the Lafayette Sub-Area increased at a slower rate than the population as a whole and thus came to represent as smaller percentage of the total population. The African American and Asian American populations increased at a faster rate than the total population between 2000 and 2010 before leveling off between 2010 and 2012. The multi-racial and Latino populations increased at a high, sustained rate with each more than doubling between 2000 and 2012. The Native American population increased substantially between 2000 and 2010, but nearly all of those gains were lost between 2010 and 2012.

National Origin	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Foreign-Born	9,794	1.6%	18,233	2.9%	19,876	3.1%

The data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and the data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census.

The number and percentage of foreign born residents increased substantially between 2000 and 2012, likely as a result of Latino individuals and households moving to the area. The rate of increase was greater between 2000 and 2010 than between 2010 and 2012.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	28,376	5.1%	22,338	3.8%	22,104	3.7%

Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census. Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The proportion of LEP individuals fell sharply between 2000 and 2010 and was flat between 2010 and 2012. Many members of this group were also likely French speaking Cajuns. Successive generations of Cajuns are more likely to have full English proficiency.

Sex	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Female	309,904	51.5%	326,801	51.2%	330,809	51.2%
Male	291,750	48.5%	311,967	48.8%	315,728	48.8%

Both male and female population grew between 2000 and 2010 though male population grew at a slightly faster rate. Both male and female population grew at similar and slower rates between 2010 and 2012.

Age	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Under 18	173,295	28.8%	165,967	26.0%	165,353	25.6%
18-64	360,287	59.9%	396,626	62.1%	401,188	62.1%
65+	68,072	11.3%	76,175	11.9%	79,996	12.4%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, the population of children in the sub-area decreased and the population of non-elderly and elderly adults increased. The increase in the population of non-elderly adults was most significant between 2000 and 2010 and leveled off somewhat between 2010 and 2012. The increase in the population of elderly adults was consistent across the entire time period.

Family Type	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Families with Children	82,091	37.3%	75,977	31.3%	73,581	30.6%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The number and percentage of families with children as a proportion of all households declined sharply between 2000 and 2010 before declining at a slower rate between 2010 and 2012.

Lake Charles Sub-Area:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	212,940	75.1%	212,009	72.5%	212,394	72.0%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	60,132	21.2%	63,613	21.7%	63,591	21.6%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	1,599	0.6%	2,513	0.9%	2,961	1.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	1,327	0.5%	1,944	0.7%	1,647	0.6%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	2,517	0.9%	4,843	1.7%	5,171	1.8%
Hispanic or Latino	4,604	1.6%	6,982	2.4%	8,745	3.0%

Data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, non-Hispanic White population in the Lake Charles Sub-Area was largely static and thus came to represent a smaller percentage of the total population while all other categories increased. The population of Asian American, Latino, and multi-racial individuals increased most significantly while gains in African American and Native American population were more modest overall and offset by slight declines between 2010 and 2012.

National Origin	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Foreign-Born	3,370	1.2%	6,468	2.2%	7,216	2.4%

The data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and the data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census.

The number and percentage of foreign born residents increased substantially and relatively consistently between 2000 and 2012, likely as a result of Latino and Asian American individuals and households moving to the area.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	6,059	2.3%	4,956	1.8%	5,152	1.9%

Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census. Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The proportion of LEP individuals fell sharply between 2000 and 2010 before rebounding slightly between 2010 and 2012. The decline between 2000 and 2010 was largely attributable to a decrease in the number of elderly speakers of other Indo-European languages. Many members of this group were likely French speaking Cajuns. Successive generations of Cajuns are more likely to have full English proficiency.

Sex	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Female	143,230	50.5%	147,059	50.3%	147,810	50.1%
Male	140,199	49.5%	145,560	49.7%	147,138	49.9%

Both male and female population grew between 2000 and 2010 though male population grew at a slightly faster rate. Both male and female population growth stagnated between 2010 and 2012. Overall, the sub-area is more heavily male than other sub-areas in the state, which may be the result of to do employment patterns in the oil and gas industry and the presence of correctional institutions and other facilities.

Age	2000 Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 Total	2012 – Percentage
Under 18	77,645	27.4%	74,255	25.4%	73,740	25.0%
18-64	171,863	60.6%	180,622	61.7%	181,706	61.6%
65+	33,921	12.0%	37,742	12.9%	39,502	13.4%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, the population of children in the sub-area decreased and the population of non-elderly and elderly adults increased. The increase in the population of non-elderly adults was most significant between 2000 and 2010 and leveled off somewhat between 2010 and 2012. The increase in the population of elderly adults was consistent across the entire time period.

Family Type	2000 Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Families with Children	37,467	36.1%	33,746	30.7%	34,328	31.2%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The number and percentage of families with children as a proportion of all households declined sharply between 2000 and 2010 before rebounding slightly between 2010 and 2012.

Alexandria Sub-Area:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	207,830	69.0%	206,058	66.5%	204,540	66.0%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	79,108	26.2%	83,176	26.9%	83,508	27.0%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	2,065	0.7%	2,736	0.9%	3,128	1.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	2,396	0.8%	2,665	0.9%	2,202	0.7%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	3,423	1.1%	4,979	1.6%	5,060	1.6%
Hispanic or Latino	6,132	2.0%	9,600	3.1%	10,760	3.5%

Data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, non-Hispanic White population in the Alexandria Sub-Area declined slightly. The African American population increased at a moderate pace while the Asian American, multi-racial, and Latino populations increased more rapidly. The Native American population increased substantially between 2000 and 2010, but all of those gains were lost between 2010 and 2012.

National Origin	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Foreign-Born	4,912	1.6%	6,151	2.0%	7,428	2.4%

The data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and the data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census.

The number and percentage of foreign born residents increased substantially between 2000 and 2012, likely as a result of Latino and Asian American individuals and households moving to the area. The rate of increase was relatively consistent across the entire timeframe.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	5,714	2.0%	4,728	1.7%	5,618	2.0%

Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census. Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The proportion of LEP individuals fell sharply between 2000 and 2010 and before increasing between 2010 and 2012. The decline between 2000 and 2010 was largely attributable to a decrease in the number of speakers of elderly native-born speakers of other Indo-European languages. The increase in the population of Spanish speaking individuals who speak English less than very well between 2010 and 2012 offset the reduction in monolingual French speakers.

Sex	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Female	152,633	50.6%	154,233	49.8%	153,623	49.6%
Male	148,757	49.4%	155,528	50.2%	156,143	50.4%

Male population in the sub-area grew over the period of 2000 through 2012 while female population grew at a slower rate between 2000 and 2010 before declining slightly between 2010 and 2012. Although the sub-area is home to two state prisons, it is unknown if employment at those facilities was a factor during the applicable period. The causes of the shift in the sex distribution of the population are currently undetermined.

Age	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Under 18	82,466	27.4%	78,509	25.3%	77,112	24.9%
18-64	181,194	60.1%	190,613	61.5%	190,472	61.5%
65+	37,730	12.5%	40,639	13.1%	42,182	13.6%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, the population of children in the sub-area decreased, and the population of non-elderly and elderly adults increased. The increase in the population of non-elderly adults was most significant

between 2000 and 2010 before a slight decline between 2010 and 2012. The increase in the population of elderly adults was consistent across the entire time period.

Family Type	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Families with Children	39,465	35.9%	35,807	31.2%	33,589	30.3%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates.

Shreveport-Bossier Sub-Area:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	330,665	58.5%	328,556	55.6%	328,422	55.1%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	211,065	37.4%	225,606	38.2%	228,392	38.3%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	3,832	0.7%	5,737	1.0%	6,094	1.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	3,801	0.7%	4,293	0.7%	4,363	0.7%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	5,283	0.9%	8,123	1.4%	8,315	1.4%
Hispanic or Latino	9,661	1.7%	17,709	3.0%	19,200	3.2%

Data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, non-Hispanic White population in the Shreveport-Bossier Sub-Area declined slightly. The African American population increased at a moderate and consistent pace while the Asian American, multi-racial, and Latino populations increased more rapidly. The Native American population was stable.

National Origin	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Foreign-Born	8,609	1.5%	14,313	2.4%	15,084	2.5%

The data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and the data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census.

The number and percentage of foreign born residents increased substantially between 2000 and 2012, likely as a result of Latino and Asian American individuals and households moving to the area. The rate of increase was more pronounced between 2000 and 2010 than between 2010 and 2012.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	6,786	1.3%	8,052	1.5%	8,070	1.5%

Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census. Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The proportion of LEP individuals increased at a moderate rate between 2000 and 2010 and was relatively unchanged between 2010 and 2012. The increase was likely associated with growth in the Latino and Asian American populations of the sub-area. The absence of any decline between 2000 and 2010 is reflective of the smaller presence of French speaking Cajuns in northwestern Louisiana than in southern Louisiana.

Sex	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Female	294,346	52.1%	304,807	51.6%	307,307	51.6%
Male	270,723	47.9%	286,177	48.4%	288,762	48.4%

Male population grew at a greater rate than female population between 2000 and 2010. Between 2010 and 2012, male and female population grew at similar rates. Although the proportion of the population that is male grew over time, the sub-area remains more heavily female than the state as a whole.

Age	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Under 18	150,196	26.6%	143,209	24.2%	143,359	24.1%
18-64	339,286	60.0%	366,779	62.1%	368,374	61.8%
65+	75,587	13.4%	80,996	13.7%	84,337	14.1%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, the population of children in the sub-area decreased, and the population of non-elderly and elderly adults increased. The rate of increase in the population of non-elderly adults was most significant between 2000 and 2010 before a slight decline between 2010 and 2012. The increase in the population of elderly adults was consistent across the entire time period.

Family Type	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Families with Children	69,176	32.1%	65,186	28.0%	60,876	26.9%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The number and percentage of families with children as a proportion of all households declined sharply between 2000 and 2010 before declining at a slower rate between 2010 and 2012.

Monroe Sub-Area:

Race or Ethnicity	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	193,750	62.2%	184,932	59.8%	183,257	59.3%
African American Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	110,276	35.4%	113,095	36.6%	114,393	37.0%
Asian Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	1,245	0.4%	1,811	0.6%	1,608	0.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	637	0.2%	671	0.2%	780	0.3%
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic or Latino	1,588	0.5%	2,715	0.9%	2,372	0.8%
Hispanic or Latino	3,725	1.2%	5,596	1.8%	6,210	2.0%

Data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, non-Hispanic White population in the Monroe Sub-Area declined moderately. The African American and American Indian populations increased slightly, and the Latino population increased significantly. The Asian American and multi-racial populations increased significantly between 2000 and 2010 before decreasing between 2010 and 2012.

National Origin	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Foreign-Born	2,512	0.8%	3,659	1.2%	3,696	1.2%

The data for the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and the data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census.

The number and percentage of foreign born residents increased substantially between 2000 and 2010 but leveled off between 2010 and 2012.

Limited English Proficiency	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Speaks English Less Than Very Well, 5 Years of Age and Older	2,655	0.9%	2,426	0.8%	2,049	0.7%

Data from the year 2000 is from Summary File 4 of the 2000 Census. Data from the year 2010 is from the 2008-2012 ACS 5-Year Estimates, and data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The proportion of LEP individuals decreased at a moderate rate between 2000 and 2012. Northeastern Louisiana appears to have had a slightly larger population of French speaking Cajun residents, particularly in Ouachita Parish, than northwestern Louisiana, and the increase in Latino and Asian American population in the region has been more modest than in other parts of the state.

Sex	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Female	162,008	52.0%	158,917	51.4%	158,342	51.2%
Male	149,348	48.0%	150,109	48.6%	150,722	48.8%

Male population was roughly stable between 2000 and 2012 while female population declined slightly.

Age	2000 Total	2000 Percentage	2010 Total	2010 Percentage	2012 Total	2012 Percentage
Under 18	85,911	27.6%	78,401	25.4%	77,609	25.1%
18-64	183,853	59.0%	187,785	60.8%	187,055	60.5%
65+	41,592	13.4%	42,840	13.9%	44,400	14.4%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. Between 2000 and 2012, the population of children in the sub-area decreased, and the population of non-elderly and elderly adults increased. The increase in the population of non-elderly adults was most significant between 2000 and 2010 before a slight decline between 2010 and 2012. The increase in the population of elderly adults was consistent across the entire time period.

Family Type	2000 – Total	2000 – Percentage	2010 – Total	2010 – Percentage	2012 – Total	2012 – Percentage
Families with Children	38,697	33.6%	34,351	29.2%	32,508	28.3%

Data from the year 2012 is from the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The number and percentage of families with children as a proportion of all households declined sharply between 2000 and 2010 before declining at a slower rate between 2010 and 2012.

B. General Issues


i. Segregation/Integration

The demographic summary reveals that Louisiana is a culturally and ethnically diverse state. Approximately one-third of the state’s population is African American, a proportion which has remained stable since 1990 while Louisiana’s Latino and Asian American populations are small but growing. Despite the state’s increasing diversity, segregation along racial and ethnic lines persists at the regional, local, and neighborhood levels. The following analysis provides a detailed look at patterns of segregation and integration as well as trends in different areas of the state.

1. Analysis

- a. Describe and compare segregation levels in different areas within the State, and identify the predominant racial/ethnic, national origin, or LEP group(s) living in each area with relatively high segregation. Based on the dissimilarity index, identify the racial/ethnic groups that experience the highest levels of segregation.

State of Louisiana: Percent White, Not Latino by Parish, 2014




Most parishes within Louisiana have concentrations of non-Hispanic White individuals between 40% and 80%. The six parishes that are especially disproportionately White are Beauregard and Cameron Parishes in southwest Louisiana, St. Tammany and Livingston Parishes in southeast

Louisiana, LaSalle Parish in central Louisiana, and West Carroll Parish in northeast Louisiana. It is important to note that these predominantly White parishes are not equal in size. Combined, approximately 387,876 people reside in St. Tammany and Livingston Parishes, and approximately 69,546 people reside in the other four parishes combined. Non-Hispanic White population concentration is an issue at the parish-level in multiple regions of the state, but its effect on individuals and households is most pronounced in southeast Louisiana due to the more suburbanized nature of the populations of St. Tammany and Livingston Parishes. St. Tammany and Livingston Parishes are in different sub-areas for the purposes of the demographic summary in this Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice.

There are four parishes in Louisiana with non-Hispanic White populations of less than 40%. They include two rural parishes in the Mississippi Delta, an outer suburban parish between New Orleans and Baton Rouge, and Orleans Parish itself. This data triggers a few observations. First, the adjoining Baton Rouge and New Orleans sub-areas are home to areas with both high and low White population concentrations, suggesting conditions of pronounced segregation. Second, a more fine-grained geographical analysis would show that, despite New Orleans being an area of relatively low White population concentration at the parish-level, there are areas within the city that have high levels of White population concentration. This juxtaposition is inherent in the dissimilarity index data discussed below. Third, West Carroll Parish, which is predominantly White, and East Carroll Parish, one of the least White parishes, are immediately adjacent to each other in a relatively non-White region of the state.


State of Louisiana: Percent Non-Latino African American by Parish, 2014



Most parishes within Louisiana have African American population concentrations of between 15% and 45%. Eight parishes are less than 15% African American. Four are in southwest Louisiana, including two parishes that are among those that are over 80% non-Hispanic white. Three are in southeast Louisiana, including two that are over 80% non-Hispanic White. One, which is over 80% non-Hispanic white, is in central Louisiana. There are just two parishes, both located in the

Mississippi Delta in the northeast corner of the state, that are over 60% African American. There are 11 parishes that are between 45% and 60% African American. Those parishes are all located in the New Orleans and Baton Rouge sub-areas in southeast Louisiana or in northern Louisiana. There are no parishes that are heavily African American in the Alexandria, Houma-Thibodaux, Lafayette, and Lake Charles sub-areas. In southwest Louisiana, there is a concentration of African American population within the City of Lake Charles and relative underrepresentation in the remainder of Calcasieu Parish and the surrounding parishes.

State of Louisiana: Percent Non-Latino Asian by Parish, 2014



No parishes in Louisiana have concentrations of Asian American population at the parish level although there are relatively larger Asian American populations in the southeastern portion of the New Orleans sub-area, in East Baton Rouge Parish, in the southern portion of the Lafayette sub-area, and in Vernon Parish. Although areas of concentration do not exist at the parish-wide level, some areas of concentration do exist within parishes, such as Gretna and Terrytown in Jefferson Parish as well as at

the neighborhood level, such as in New Orleans East where there is a significant Vietnamese-American population.

State of Louisiana: Percent Latino by Parish, 2014



Similar to the Asian American population, Louisiana lacks parishes that have high concentrations of Latino individuals at the parish-wide level. Jefferson and St. Bernard Parishes in the New Orleans sub-area, Bossier Parish in the Shreveport-Bossier sub-area, and Vernon Parish in the Alexandria sub-area have the highest Latino populations among parishes in the state. The relatively higher representation of Latino and Asian American individuals in Vernon Parish may be attributable to the presence of Fort Polk, which is a major Army base.

The following describes levels of segregation in the State by Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The Dissimilarity Index measures the relative unevenness of racial and ethnic groups within a region or city. The higher the index value, the higher the proportion of a racial or ethnic group would have to move to a different census tract in order to be evenly distributed with respect to another group. Dissimilarity Index values of less than 40 are generally considered low, values of between 40 and 55 are moderate, and values of 55 or above are high.

Alexandria MSA Dissimilarity

Year	White-Black	White-Latino	White-Asian
2010	59.5	36.0	38.1
2000	62.0	24.8	42.8
1990	58.8	18.8	42.9
1980	64.2	25.7	39.8

In the Alexandria, LA MSA, segregation between non-Hispanic White and African American residents remains high and has not declined since 1990. It has declined only slightly since 1980. Segregation between White residents, Latino, and Asian American residents, respectively, is near the upper limit of the low range. Segregation of Latinos has increased over time while segregation of Asian Americans has been relatively flat. The value of dissimilarity index data is limited in cases where the population of a particular minority group is relatively small like the populations of Latinos and Asian Americans in the Alexandria MSA and in most other regions of the state.

Baton Rouge MSA Dissimilarity

Year	White-Black	White-Latino	White-Asian
2010	57.2	32.7	47.8
2000	60.1	30.3	52.1
1990	59.6	25.9	52.7
1980	68.2	23.9	41.4

In the Baton Rouge, LA MSA, segregation between non-Hispanic White and African American residents is high. Such segregation has only declined modestly since 1990 but dropped significantly between 1980 and 1990. Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Latino residents is low but has gradually increased over time. Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Asian American residents is moderate and has been relatively stable over time.

Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux MSA Dissimilarity

Year	White-Black	White-Latino	White-Asian
2010	42.6	26.4	26.6
2000	45.6	19.4	35.3
1990	45.9	13.7	49.4
1980	54.0	11.2	34.7

In the Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA MSA, segregation between non-Hispanic White and African American residents is moderate and has only declined modestly since 1990 though it declined significantly between 1980 and 1990. Segregation of Latino residents is low but has gradually increased while segregation of Asian American residents is low. Segregation of Asian American residents has declined overall but has shown some volatility that may reflect the limited utility of the Dissimilarity Index when the overall population of a minority group is quite small.

Lafayette MSA Dissimilarity

Year	White-Black	White-Latino	White-Asian
2010	44.3	24.2	27.9
2000	48.8	18.1	32.0
1990	49.6	16.8	44.8
1980	55.7	12.6	31.8

In the Lafayette, LA MSA, segregation between non-Hispanic White and African American residents is moderate and has declined consistently but not steeply over time. Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Latino residents is low but has increased gradually over time. Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Asian American residents is low. While it has decreased sharply since 1990, segregation between non-Hispanic White and Asian American increased significantly between 1980 and 1990.

Lake Charles MSA Dissimilarity

Year	White-Black	White-Latino	White-Asian
2010	60.8	20.8	37.1
2000	61.7	19.7	34.1
1990	63.4	16.2	37.8
1980	67.8	20.7	38.3

In the Lake Charles, LA MSA, segregation between non-Hispanic White and African American residents is high and has only declined modestly over time. Both segregation of Latino residents and segregation of Asian American residents are low and have been stable over time; however, segregation of Asian American residents is near the upper bound of the low range while segregation of Latinos is quite low.

Monroe MSA Dissimilarity

Year	White-Black	White-Latino	White-Asian
2010	63.4	31.7	35.1
2000	65.8	28.9	45.9
1990	66.6	23.5	55.3
1980	69.0	32.8	49.2

In the Monroe, LA MSA, segregation between non-Hispanic White and African American residents is high and has only declined modestly over time. Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Latino a resident is low and has increased since 1990, following a decrease between 1980 and 1990. Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Asian American residents is low and has decreased significantly over time.

New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner MSA Dissimilarity

Year	White-Black	White-Latino	White-Asian
2010	63.3	38.3	45.2
2000	69.0	35.6	47.4
1990	68.3	31.1	49.6
1980	70.0	26.6	51.6

In the New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA MSA, segregation between non-Hispanic White and African American residents is high. The index decreased notably between 2000 and 2010 but had been largely unchanged between 1980 and 2000. In light of the significant impact of Hurricane Katrina on residential patterns between 2000 and 2010, it is possible that the storm explains some of that decrease. In particular, some neighborhoods with high concentrations of African American residents, like the Lower Ninth Ward, have been among the slowest in regaining population over the course of the long-term recovery from the hurricane. Some historically White areas, like St. Bernard Parish, have become more diverse since the storm. Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Latino residents is at the upper bound of the low range and has increased moderately since 1980. Segregation between non-Hispanic White residents and Asian American residents is moderate and has decreased slightly since 1980. Segregation data for Latino and Asian American populations is more meaningful in the context of the New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA MSA than it is in other areas because of the larger overall populations of those groups.

Shreveport-Bossier City MSA Dissimilarity

Year	White-Black	White-Latino	White-Asian
2010	56.4	31.8	31.7
2000	56.0	26.6	29.4
1990	57.6	23.6	33.1
1980	65.3	28.7	29.2

In the Shreveport-Bossier City, LA MSA, segregation between non-Hispanic White and African American residents is high and has been relatively unchanged since 1990, following a significant decline between 1980 and 1990. Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Latino residents is low but has increased modestly since 1990, following a decline between 1980 and 1990.

Segregation between non-Hispanic White and Asian American residents is low and has been relatively unchanged over time.

- b. Identify areas with relatively high segregation and integration in the region, and identify the predominant racial/ethnic, national origin, or LEP group(s) living in each area with relatively high segregation. Based on the dissimilarity index, identify the racial/ethnic groups that experience the highest levels of segregation.

In general, African Americans face the highest levels of segregation of any race or ethnicity, and, with the exception of the Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA MSA, the data reveals that segregation of African American residents is high in every area of the state. Although the segregation of African American residents has declined some over time in all areas of the state, those declines have been slow and modest in degree.

Segregation of Latino and Asian American residents is generally low, although moderate for Asian Americans in two metropolitan areas. For Latinos, levels of segregation have tended to increase over time while, for Asian Americans, the trend has been less clear. Differences between parishes demonstrate the starkness of the problem of segregation in the New Orleans and Baton Rouge sub-areas. Although there are no areas where there are high levels of segregation of Latino or Asian American residents when measured at a high level, segregation is most pronounced in the New Orleans and Baton Rouge sub-areas, which have relatively larger Latino and Asian American populations than do other sub-areas.

- c. Explain how different areas with relatively high segregation and integration in the State and region have changed over time (since 1990).

Changes in levels of segregation within Louisiana do not have a strong regional dimension. All regions have seen relatively consistent but quite modest declines in segregation between African American and non-Hispanic White residents. Some more nuanced patterns are discernible. In particular, some parishes that have had consistently disproportionately White populations have experienced more rapid population growth than the state or their regions as a whole.

This phenomenon can limit the degree to which segregation is reduced over time. St. Tammany and Livingston Parishes are examples of this pattern. On the other hand, St. Bernard Parish is an outlier in that it is a parish that has undergone significant demographic change over time. As of the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, that parish is now 20.1% African American and 9.4% Latino whereas it was 7.6% African American and 5.1% Latino as of the 2000 Census.

- d. Discuss whether there are any demographic trends, laws, policies, or practices that could lead to higher segregation in the State in the future.

Demographic Trends

There are a few demographic trends that could exacerbate segregation in Louisiana in the future. Parishes in the state that are experiencing the highest population growth are disproportionately among those that are the most heavily non-Hispanic White and are located on the edges of the state's

two largest metropolitan areas of New Orleans and Baton Rouge, respectively. This pattern raises concerns that non-Hispanic White households are leaving historically White but diversifying places like St. Bernard Parish, parts of Jefferson Parish, and parts of northern East Baton Rouge Parish as people of color move to those locations.

Although overall levels of segregation for Latino households are still relatively low, increases in Latino population have been consistently accompanied by increases in the segregation of Latinos since 1980. As there is no reason to believe that Latino population growth is likely to subside, it is likely that segregation of Latinos will increase in the absence of any strategic intervention to foster integration.

Within the City of New Orleans, some historically African American neighborhoods, including but not limited to Mid-City and the Bywater, have experienced an influx of new residents who are more likely to be White than longstanding neighborhood residents and who are likely to have higher incomes than longstanding residents. Eventual displacement of low income African American households could be a concern in connection with this change.

Laws and Policies

Availability of Affordable Housing in the State

As reported by LCCR reports that restrictive local land use laws, especially in incorporated cities, exacerbate segregation in some geographic areas by limiting both the overall supply of housing and the supply of types of housing, such as multi-family housing and manufactured housing, which are comparatively likely to be affordable to low-income households that disproportionately include people of color. Such policies may restrict the overall amount of land available for residential development of any kind. They may restrict the amount of land available for specific types of development. Additionally, even where regulations permit a broad range of housing types, they may impose requirements, such as large minimum lot size requirements, low density limits, and large unit size requirements that may either make the development of those housing types infeasible or result in non-affordable multi-family development.

It is important to note that some density limiting land use regulations can be justifiable in light of the limits on the capacity of utilities to provide services to new development on the fringes of built-out areas. What constitutes a reasonable density restriction is likely to depend on the specific local context, both in terms of infrastructure capacity and the economics of developing affordable housing. In some more rural parts of the state, it may be feasible to develop affordable housing by building detached single-family homes of 1/4 acre lots. In larger metropolitan areas with higher land costs, that may be impossible as a general rule, and building at high-density may be a practical necessity for affordable housing development.

Private Sector Practices

In the private sector, housing discrimination in predominantly white areas can perpetuate residential segregation. This can take the form of steering, refusals to rent or sell, discriminatory terms and conditions, the use of neutral criteria like criminal background and credit history as pretexts for discrimination, the use of overly broad criminal background credit history screening criteria, and Not in My Backyard (NIMBY) opposition to affordable housing development, among other types of

discrimination. These practices threaten the ability of moderate income and above African American households to access market-rate housing outside of areas of minority population concentration and the potential of affordable housing development strategies in high opportunity areas to accomplish their goal of promoting integration.

2. Contributing Factors of Segregation

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

- Community Opposition

Community opposition to affordable housing development for families can be a significant contributing factor to segregation across all sub-areas of the state. Community opposition can stymie integration by making members of protected classes feel unwelcome in certain communities, by deterring developers from proposing affordable housing projects in certain areas, and/or by resulting in exclusionary zoning and land use decisions.

- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures

Displacement of residents due to economic pressures is a significant contributing factor to segregation in a handful of neighborhoods within New Orleans. On a case by case basis, it may also be a contributing factor in circumstances where significant new economic development activities are occurring. In light of dramatic fluctuations in oil and gas prices and the rental cost increases that are often associated with drilling booms, a surge in drilling following a rebound in oil and gas prices could result in the displacement of low-income people of color from a particular area and increase segregation as a result.

- Lack of private investments in specific areas within the State

Lack of private investments in specific areas within the state is a significant contributing factor to segregation in Louisiana. The ways in which a lack of private investment functions are similar to the role of the lack of community revitalization strategies. When private investments disappear from racially and socioeconomically diverse neighborhoods and cities, job opportunities dissipate and physical blight increases because of the presence of vacant commercial and industrial properties. Households that are economically mobile and that do not face discriminatory housing barriers respond to this dynamic by relocating to the areas where population growth has been fueled by White flight.

- Lack of public investments in specific areas within the State, including services or amenities

Lack of public investments in specific areas within the state, including services or amenities, can indirectly be a contributing factor to segregation in operation with private influences. Inadequate public services can result in the departure of residents who can afford to relocate, who will often be disproportionately white. Two examples are instructive

- Lack of State, regional, or other inter-governmental cooperation

Lack of inter-governmental cooperation is not a significant contributing factor to segregation in Louisiana. Segregation is primarily an inter-jurisdictional phenomenon in Louisiana. However, the state is not at a point at which there are ongoing robust but uncoordinated efforts by different governments that undermine each other's effectiveness.

- Land use and zoning laws

Land use and zoning laws can be a significant contributing factor to segregation. Sites that are appropriately zoned for multi-family housing are scarce in many high-growth, predominantly White areas in which the development of family-occupancy affordable housing could promote integration.

- Lending Discrimination

Lending discrimination can be a factor contributing factor to segregation. Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data consistently reflects higher loan denial rates for applicants of color and heightened exposure to high-cost subprime loans for borrowers of color. These patterns do not conclusively establish that intentional discrimination is occurring in specific instances but reflect a marketplace in which there are structural barriers to affordable mortgage loans, some of which may not have substantial business justifications.

There are two principal ways in which these disparities can contribute to segregation. First, in metropolitan areas in which central cities tend to be more heavily African American and in which suburbs tend to be more heavily non-Hispanic White, the housing stock in suburban areas tends to feature a greater proportion of owner-occupied homes whereas urban areas tend to have more rental properties. Thus, when the current geographic balance of renter-occupied and owner-occupied homes is taken as a given, disparities in mortgage lending that limit the ability of African American households to purchase homes will reinforce existing segregated residential patterns. Second, areas of non-Hispanic White population concentration in Louisiana tend to have higher home values than similarly situated areas within the state that are more diverse. If borrowers of color are paying a subprime premium in order to purchase homes, that increased cost could result in the need to purchase a less expensive home.

- Location and type of affordable housing

The location and type of affordable housing can be a contributing factors to segregation across the state. Affordable housing is concentrated in principal cities of metropolitan statistical areas; those some affordable housing is present in suburban areas.

The ways in which the type of affordable housing functions to increase segregation are subtler and intersect with the location of affordable housing in key ways. First, senior housing is more likely than family-occupancy housing to be located in predominantly White suburban areas, and the population of low-income seniors is more heavily non-Hispanic White than the population of low-income people generally. Building family-occupancy housing in predominantly White areas does more to foster integration than building senior housing in those areas. Second, affordable housing

that is owner-occupied is more likely to be occupied by non- Hispanic White households than affordable housing that is renter occupied, and investments in affordable housing in suburban areas are more likely to focus on owner-occupants than those in urban areas. This also serves to lock-in existing patterns of segregation. Lastly, disparities in the depth of subsidy in affordable housing by location can perpetuate segregation. The population of extremely low-income and very low-income households is much more heavily minority than the population of low-income households. Accordingly, public housing and Project-Based Section 8 are likely to serve a more heavily minority set of households than is the LIHTC program. To the extent that affordable housing developments in suburban areas are less likely than those in urban areas to include deep subsidies, they are also likely to have disproportionately White tenants in comparison to deep subsidy properties in urban areas.

- Occupancy codes and restrictions

This analysis did not reveal evidence that occupancy codes and restriction are currently a significant contributing factor to segregation in Louisiana. The most common scenario in which occupancy codes can contribute to segregation is that of limits on the number of people who can live in a dwelling. These restrictions impact groups that tend to have larger household sizes, including Latinos. However, as the discussion of the data above reflects, Latino residents of Louisiana generally face relatively low levels of segregation. To the extent, that Latinos do face segregation, there is little evidence that occupancy codes and restrictions play a material role.

- Private discrimination

Private discrimination is a contributing factor to segregation in Louisiana. Reports of fair housing testing and complaint data reflect continued housing discrimination in Louisiana on the basis of multiple protected class statuses, with race and disability being the two most common bases of discrimination.

Conclusion

Despite some small declines, Louisiana continues to experience high rates of segregation. African- Americans have the highest rates of segregation of any race, and the segregation of African-Americans is high throughout the state. Levels of Latino segregation are low but have been increasing over time as the Latino population increases as a whole. For Asian Americans, segregation is also generally low in most of the state and it is unclear how segregation levels for this group will change over time. Although segregation has consistently declined in recent decades, a variety of demographic trends could hinder further integration.

ii. R/ECAPs

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) are often the mirror image of patterns of segregation, as discussed in the previous section. When low-income minority households are unable to access housing in predominantly non-Hispanic white communities, their choices are often limited to housing within R/ECAPs or places that are on the verge of becoming R/ECAPs. Extensive empirical data illustrates the negative long-term effects of growing up within R/ECAPs on the economic and educational outcomes of children, thus making the prevalence of R/ECAPs a serious fair housing issue.

1. Analysis

- a. Identify any R/ECAPs or groupings of R/ECAPs within the State and region.

For the purposes of this analysis, Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) were identified using the version of the AFFH Data & Mapping Tool for local governments. It is not clear whether that version of the tool, which was designed with jurisdictions that are located within core-based statistical areas in mind, uses the definition of R/ECAPs for core-based statistical areas outside of core-based statistical areas or solely within core-based statistical areas. If the tool uses the same definition in all places, the listing of R/ECAPs below may be incomplete; however, it still likely captures the vast majority of R/ECAPs. The difference between the two definitions of R/ECAPs pertains solely to racial or ethnic concentration and not to poverty rate. Thus, within core-based statistical areas in Louisiana, R/ECAPs are census tracts in which more than 50% of the population is comprised of people of color and in which the poverty rate is over 40%. Outside of core-based statistical areas, R/ECAPs must meet the same poverty rate threshold but need only have over 20% of their population comprised of people of color. Within Louisiana, rural or small town census tracts that have poverty rates of over 40% are almost invariably majority-minority.

This Analysis only specifically identifies R/ECAPs that are outside of entitlement jurisdictions. The vast majority of R/ECAPs outside of entitlement jurisdictions in Louisiana fall into one general category: small cities or substantial portions of small cities that are at the core of rural or outer suburban parishes. In some cases, these cities are mostly African American, and, in others, they are deeply segregated with an identifiable African American side of town. The following cities (in one case an unincorporated census-designated place) appear to be wholly or largely within one or more R/ECAP census tracts:

- Homer, Claiborne Parish
- Grambling, Lincoln Parish
- Ferriday, Concordia Parish
- Winnsboro, Franklin Parish
- Farmerville, Union Parish
- Ville Platte, Evangeline Parish
- Reserve, St. John the Baptist Parish

The following cities, which tend to be somewhat larger, include an identifiable portion of town that is comprised of one more R/ECAP census tracts:

- Ruston, Lincoln Parish – South Side
- Mansfield, De Soto Parish – South Side and adjoining rural areas
- Natchitoches, Natchitoches Parish – West Side
- Bastrop, Morehouse Parish – West Side
- Opelousas, St. Landry Parish – West Side
- New Iberia, Iberia Parish – West Side
- Franklin, St. Mary Parish – Southwest Side
- Bogalusa, Washington Parish – East Side

Additionally, there are two groupings of R/ECAPs in rural portions of the Mississippi Delta in the northeastern portion of the state. A grouping of R/ECAPs comprises the western three-quarters of Madison Parish, and a grouping of R/ECAPs comprises the northern one-third of East Carroll Parish. There are also three R/ECAPs that extend into unincorporated areas on the edges of entitlement jurisdictions, two of which appear to be lightly populated. First, a grouping of R/ECAPs on the north side of Shreveport extends slightly into an unincorporated section of Caddo Parish. The unincorporated portion of the R/ECAP grouping appears to have relative few structures within it. Second, a grouping of R/ECAPs on the north side of Lake Charles extends slightly into an unincorporated section of Calcasieu Parish. Most of this area appears to consist of water. Third, a R/ECAP grouping on the south side of Monroe extends into an unincorporated portion of Ouachita Parish. This area, by contrast, is well populated.

Louisiana's entitlement jurisdictions that are cities tend to have substantial African American populations and, as discussed above, tend to be highly segregated by race. Throughout the state, there is also a persistent correlation between race and socioeconomic status. R/ECAPs tend to be predictably found within the parts of core cities that are heavily African American. These areas include the central and eastern portions of New Orleans, the central portion of Baton Rouge, the northeastern portion of Lafayette, the northern portion of Lake Charles, the northern portion of Alexandria, the southern portion of Monroe, and the western and northern portions of Shreveport. R/ECAPs tend to take up a larger portion of the cities of New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Monroe, and Shreveport and smaller portions of Lafayette, Lake Charles, and Alexandria. The only R/ECAPs in entitlement jurisdictions outside of these core cities are in Jefferson Parish.

One of the R/ECAPs includes a significant unpopulated portion of the Jean Lafitte National Historic Park and Preserve along with a heavily African American sliver of the census-designated place of Marrero. The second contains parts of the southern portions of both Harvey and Gretna. A

final R/ECAP is on the border with New Orleans and contains a portion of Terrytown. The latter two R/ECAPs are unique within Louisiana in that they contain concentrations of Latino residents in addition to concentrations of African American residents.

- b. Which protected classes disproportionately reside in R/ECAPs in the State, including any sub-State area(s) used for analysis?

Within Louisiana, African Americans disproportionately reside in R/ECAPs. There are no substantial variations in the population of R/ECAPs by region of the state with the caveat that the two R/ECAPs in Jefferson Parish contain substantial Latino populations.

- c. Describe how R/ECAPs and groupings of R/ECAPs in the State and region have changed over time (since 1990).

Between 2000 and 2010, there was significant change in the location of specific R/ECAPs but relatively less change in the overall patterns reflecting where R/ECAPs are found. The two main differences between 2000 and 2010 are as follows. First, relatively fewer small towns were entirely within R/ECAP census tracts in 2000 than in 2010. Although the total number of R/ECAPs did not significantly change, more R/ECAPs outside of entitlement cities included just part of a city or town in 2000 than in 2010. Second, in some of the larger entitlement cities there were relatively fewer R/ECAPs in 2000 than in 2010. This appears to have broadly been the case in southern Louisiana cities but not in Monroe and Shreveport.

The following specific areas outside of entitlement cities were R/ECAPs in 2010 but were not R/ECAPs in 2000:

- Homer, Claiborne Parish
- Grambling, Lincoln Parish
- Winnsboro, Franklin Parish
- Farmerville, Union Parish
- Reserve, St. John the Baptist Parish
- Mansfield, De Soto Parish – South Side and adjoining rural areas
- Bogalusa, Washington Parish – East Side
- Madison Parish – Western three-quarters

The following areas were R/ECAPs in 2000 but not in 2010:

- Rayville, Richland Parish – Entire City
- Coushatta and Edgefield, Red River Parish – Entire Cities and adjoining rural areas
- Abbeville, Vermilion Parish – East Side, 1990
- Eunice, St. Landry Parish – East Side
- Hammond, Tangipahoa Parish – Part of City Center

- Tallulah, Madison Parish – North Side
- Minden, Webster Parish – Part of City Center
- Tensas Parish – Rural southeastern portion

Between 1990 and 2000, there were more significant changes in the number and distribution of the state's R/ECAPs than between 2000 and 2010. First, there were far more R/ECAPs in Louisiana overall in 1990 than there were in 2000. This is consistent with a nationwide reduction in poverty in general and in concentrated poverty specifically during that decade. Second, the additional R/ECAPs in 1990 were almost exclusively in rural areas and small towns and cities in rural parishes. It does not appear that there was markedly more racially or ethnically concentrated poverty in large cities in Louisiana in 1990 than there was in 2000. Third, although many of the additional R/ECAPs were either in areas that were R/ECAPs in 2010 but not in 2000 or were in areas near R/ECAPs from 2000 and/or 2010, some R/ECAPs were in areas of the state that have had few R/ECAPs more recently in large part because they are currently parts of the state with relatively high proportions of non-Hispanic white residents, such as the Florida Parishes and Houma. In addition to reflecting favorable economic conditions in the 1990s, the decline in R/ECAPs, when combined with stagnant or declining population in some places, may suggest patterns of migration of low-income, disproportionately African American residents from rural areas in Louisiana to urban centers, both in Louisiana and elsewhere.

The following areas were R/ECAPs in 2010 but not in 1990 (all areas that were R/ECAPs in 2000 were R/ECAPs in 1990):

- Grambling, Lincoln Parish
- Farmerville, Union Parish
- Reserve, St. John the Baptist Parish

The following areas were R/ECAPs in 1990 but were not R/ECAPs in 2000 or 2010:

- Houma, Terrebonne Parish – East Side
- Thibodaux, Lafourche Parish – Part of City Center
- Rayne, Acadia Parish – West Side and Adjoining Rural Area
- Sunset and Grand Coteau, St. Landry Parish
- Marksville, Avoyelles Parish
- Jonesville, Catahoula Parish
- Many, Sabine Parish – Including Adjoining Rural Area to the Southeast
- Bunkie, Avoyelles Parish – Including Adjoining Rural Area
- Oakdale, Allen Parish – West Side
- Jennings, Jefferson Davis Parish – West Side
- Amite Parish – Rural southern portion
- Tangipahoa Parish – Rural northwestern portion
- Washington Parish – Rural north-central portion

- Ascension Parish – Rural northwestern portion
- St. Mary Parish – Rural western portion
- Pointe Coupee Parish – Two rural northern swaths
- Franklin Parish – Rural southeastern portion

There are four areas for which it is worth noting that the R/ECAP areas were larger in 1990 than in other years. In Hammond, a larger portion of the city center was a R/ECAP. In Tensas Parish, the entire eastern portion of the parish was a R/ECAP rather than just the southeastern portion. All of East Carroll Parish was a R/ECAP instead of just the northern portion. Lastly, a greater portion of the outlying rural area to the south and southeast of Monroe in Ouachita Parish was a R/ECAP.

In general, African Americans were the primary group concentrated in R/ECAPs across all years although the presence of R/ECAPs in Houma and Thibodaux in 1990 meant that more Native Americans lived in R/ECAPs at that point than more recently. Even in those R/ECAPs in the more heavily populated Native American part of the state, African Americans outnumbered Native Americans.

- d. Describe any larger demographic trends, laws, policies, practices, or other factors that may impact R/ECAPS in the State or region, in the future.

In general, the prevalence of R/ECAPs increased between 2000 and 2010. It is unclear whether this increase represents a long-term trend rooted in structural economic forces in rural areas influenced by policies and practices that impede economic mobility. Nonetheless, there are a few trends that have persisted over the entire timeframe. It appears likely that R/ECAPs will be concentrated in small and large cities and that the prevalence of geographically large R/ECAPs in outlying rural areas is unlikely to increase given their racial and economic demographics. Areas of the state with high potential for growth, such as the Florida Parishes and suburban areas of the Lake Charles Sub-Area, will likely continue to have relatively few R/ECAPs.

2. Contributing Factors of R/ECAPs

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

- Community Opposition

Community opposition is a contributing factor to R/ECAPs as it functions to perpetuate segregation in high growth areas outside of R/ECAPs. Racial, ethnic, and poverty concentration are, in part, a consequence of economically mobile, disproportionately White households who may choose to relocate from integrated areas that are then at risk of becoming R/ECAPs.

- Deteriorated and Abandoned Properties

Deteriorated and abandoned properties are a significant contributing factor for R/ECAPs throughout the state of Louisiana. Deteriorated and abandoned properties are present everywhere from disinvested urban neighborhoods to rural agricultural areas. Deteriorated and abandoned properties

contribute to R/ECAPs can influence economically mobile households to move away from R/ECAPs or areas at risk of becoming R/ECAPs and can influencing businesses to not invest business capital in a given area, which in turn results in fewer economic opportunities for the local residents.

- Displacement of Residents Due to Economic Pressures

Displacement of residents due to economic pressures is another significant contributing factor for R/ECAPs, particularly in New Orleans where some neighborhoods, including Marigny, the Bywater, and Mid-City, have been subject to patterns of gentrification, rent increases, and displacement in recent years. When low-income African American renters are displaced from such neighborhoods, they face limited choices about where to relocate within the same city. The result can be the creation of new R/ECAPs or the reinforcing of existing R/ECAPs, and the transition away from R/ECAP status of gentrifying neighborhoods. Outside of New Orleans, displacement of residents due to economic pressures is present but appears to be less prevalent.

- Lack of Community Revitalization Strategies

Lack of a long-standing broad community revitalization strategy for non-entitlement areas is a contributing factor for R/ECAPs in non-entitlement areas.

- Lack of Private Investments in Specific Areas Within the State

Lack of private investments in specific areas within Louisiana can be a contributing factor to R/ECAPs, particularly in rural areas. As reflected in the section of this analysis examining Disparities in Access to Opportunity, both job proximity and labor market engagement are low in heavily African American rural areas and small towns and cities that serve as the parish seats of government for many rural parishes. In many majority African American rural areas within the state, household incomes are sufficiently low and a high percentage of the population lives in poverty thereby creating and reinforcing R/ECAPs.

Although there are urban R/ECAPs in Louisiana that suffer from a lack of private investment, the lack of private investment does not impact those areas more significantly than some of the other factors. Lack of private investment can and does result in a deterioration of community amenities, such as grocery stores, that make it difficult for urban and diverse suburban areas to remain integrated and to avoid becoming R/ECAPs. Unlike in rural areas, job access is not a primary mechanism through which a lack of private investment fuels concentrated poverty and thereby R/ECAPs. In general, urban and suburban R/ECAPs in Louisiana have higher job proximity indices than do rural low poverty areas.

- Lack of Public Investments in specific areas within the State, including Services or Amenities

Limited public investments can be a contributing factor to R/ECAPs. As with private investments, public investments, through economic development grants and financing programs, can promote increased job access in predominantly African American rural areas. The impact of such programs are dependent on private market influences. Public investments in services and amenities like parks, sidewalks, and streetlights can impact the overall quality of life for residents living in

areas at risk of becoming R/ECAPs.

In metropolitan cities like New Orleans, revitalization programs that focus public investments in specific neighborhoods, which often overlap with R/ECAPs, are often in place. However, there are limits on resources for public investments in services and amenities to effectively address all needs.

- Lack of State, Regional, or Other Inter-governmental Cooperation

Lack of inter-governmental cooperation can be a contributing factor to R/ECAPs in Louisiana. The community participation process described above reflected a lack of collaboration between local governments within metropolitan regions regarding the provision of affordable housing, public transportation, and schools.

- Land Use and Zoning laws

Land use and zoning laws are not a significant contributing factor to R/ECAPs except to the extent that land use and zoning laws can operate as a contributing factor to segregation. In most instances, segregation is a necessary precondition for the existence of R/ECAPs.

- Location and Type of Affordable Housing

As with zoning and land use laws, the location and type of affordable housing are only contributing factors to the extent that they contribute to segregation. The reality in Louisiana, and as in most other states, is that there is such a significant net shortage of affordable housing. Every neighborhood could have the volume of affordable housing that the neighborhoods with the highest concentrations have and not be burdened in a manner that caused a neighborhood to become poorer and more segregated. In order for that type of dynamic to unfold, a neighborhood would have to have a housing stock consisting predominantly of traditional public housing for extremely low-income families. Influenced by policies of the state designed to deconcentrate poverty in the redevelopment of multi-family affordable housing in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina, very few neighborhoods in Louisiana approach that level of concentration.

- Occupancy Codes and Restrictions

This analysis did not reveal evidence that occupancy codes and restrictions are currently a significant contributing factor to R/ECAPs.

- Private Discrimination

With respect to private discrimination, testing and complaint data reveals that it is all too pervasive in Louisiana. As a significant contributing factor to R/ECAPs, private discrimination against racial and ethnic minority households in predominantly non-Hispanic White neighborhoods and municipalities has the effect of reinforcing patterns of racial and ethnic concentrations that are integral to the persistence of R/ECAPs.

iii. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

1. Analysis

This portion of the analysis details disparities in access relative to education, employment, transportation, low poverty areas, and environmental health in Louisiana. Patterns of segregation discussed earlier in this analysis as well as urban density are linked to Disparities in Access to Opportunity.

a. Education

- i. Describe any disparities in access to proficient schools in the State based on race/ethnicity, national origin (including LEP persons), and family status.

The School Proficiency Index list values ranging from zero to one hundred with the highest values representing higher school performance and the lower values representing lower school performance for the given metropolitan statistical area, as follows:

School Proficiency Index, Total Population

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Latino	Black, Non-Latino	Latino	Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Latino	Native American, Non-Latino
Alexandria	53.01	33.76	53.19	45.54	43.64
Baton Rouge	54.42	34.05	45.53	40.09	52.94
Houma	54.58	47.31	53.59	49.97	48.27
Lafayette	51.86	34.29	49.68	50.23	49.28
Lake Charles	67.28	44.29	60.65	67.39	61.59
Monroe	69.43	50.80	57.55	77.80	63.83
New Orleans	64.99	61.97	57.61	59.65	59.71
Shreveport	47.45	26.18	40.90	47.24	41.32


School Proficiency Index, Population Below Federal Poverty Line

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Latino	Black, Non-Latino	Latino	Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Latino	Native American, Non-Latino
Alexandria	52.65	31.12	48.45	47.62	56.99
Baton Rouge	47.29	28.65	43.07	28.00	57.15
Houma	54.98	45.25	54.21	31.01	46.36
Lafayette	47.98	32.61	50.60	57.98	47.01
Lake Charles	64.00	41.11	55.28	59.93	56.09
Monroe	65.18	47.93	46.57	67.58	52.74
New Orleans	62.47	60.58	56.98	60.36	58.48
Shreveport	40.46	24.11	33.95	49.97	34.67


Racial disparities with regard to the School Proficiency Index persist across each metropolitan statistical area in Louisiana and are not explained by poverty status. The disparity between non-Hispanic White individuals and non-Hispanic African American individuals is the most consistent disparity. All other groups also tend to have lower School Proficiency Indices than non-Latino Whites but those disparities are inconsistent and, in most cases, relatively modest. With regard to African Americans, disparities are less severe in Houma and New Orleans than in the remainder of the state's metropolitan areas. Additionally, there is also regional variation in the absolute values of the indices for groups. Thus, while the levels of disparity between non-Hispanic White and African American individuals are relatively similar in the Baton Rouge and Monroe metropolitan areas, the quality of education for both non-Hispanic White and African American residents is substantially higher in Monroe than in Baton Rouge. Although disparity is the hallmark of access to quality education as a fair housing issue, absolute measures can be instructive in relation to broader fair housing issues as the seemingly poor quality of education in Baton Rouge may lead to more White flight than in Monroe.

ii. Describe the relationship between the residency patterns of racial/ethnic, national origin (including LEP persons), family status groups, and their proximity to proficient schools in the State.


- Shreveport Area:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Areas of African American population concentration on the north and west sides of the City of Shreveport have the lowest School Proficiency Indices in the broader area. Areas of non-Hispanic White population concentration in suburban Bossier Parish tend to have the highest indices. In rural areas in the region, there does not appear to be a significant relationship between place, race, and school proficiency. Individuals of Mexican national origin are concentrated in non-R/ECAP portions of the City of Shreveport, which have relatively low School Proficiency Indices, as well in parts of Bossier City that have relatively high School Proficiency Indices. Persons of Filipino national origin are concentrated in the southwestern portion of the City of Shreveport where School Proficiency Indices are relatively low. Families with children are concentrated in suburban areas, primarily within Bossier Parish, that have relatively high School Proficiency Indices.


- Monroe Area:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Areas of African American population concentration on the southeast side of the City of Monroe have lower School Proficiency Indices than more heavily White areas within the city, particularly those in the northern portion of the city. Suburban areas surrounding the city in all directions except to the southeast have relatively high School Proficiency Indices. These areas are predominantly White, except for the integrated areas to the east of the city, which have high performing schools and a significant African American population. The suburban areas to the southeast of the city are relatively integrated but have even lower School Proficiency Indices than the southeast side of the City of Monroe. Rural areas to the far north of Monroe have low School Proficiency Indices and are predominantly White, with the exception of a R/ECAP centered around Farmersville. There are no significant populations of national origin groups in the Monroe area. Families with children in the area are most likely to reside in suburban areas with relatively high performing schools and not in urban or rural areas with lower School Proficiency Indices; however, families with children within the City of Monroe are more likely to reside in areas with lower School Proficiency Indices on the southeast side of the city than they are in other parts of the city.

- Alexandria Area:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Areas of African American population concentration within the City of Alexandria vary widely in their School Proficiency Indices. Most have relatively low indices, but some areas have moderately high indices and one census tract has a very high index. Areas of White population concentration in the city tend to have moderate School Proficiency Indices. Rural and suburban areas to the west and south of Alexandria tend to have low School Proficiency Indices. Areas to the west of the city are predominantly White while some areas to the south are mostly African American and some are relatively integrated. Rural and suburban areas to the north and east of Alexandria tend to have relatively high School Proficiency Indices. These areas are predominantly White but also have the most significant concentrations of Latino residents in the region. Residents of Mexican, mainland Chinese, and Vietnamese national origin primarily reside in areas to the north of Alexandria that have relatively high School Proficiency Indices. Residents of Burmese national origin primarily reside in central city areas with relatively low School Proficiency Indices. Within the City of Alexandria, families with children are somewhat concentrated in areas with Low School Proficiency Indices, but, in the broader region, areas with high concentrations of families with children tend to have higher School Proficiency Indices. By contrast, the rural western portion of the area has low concentrations of families with children and low School Proficiency Indices.

- Lake Charles Area:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




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: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lake Charles, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In discussing the Lake Charles area, it is important to note that the suburban and rural areas surrounding Lake Charles have virtually no areas of large African American population concentration, unlike the other regions of the state. Within the City of Lake Charles, African American residents are concentrated on the north and east sides and also reside in a corridor that stretches from east to west across the city between 12th Street and I-210. School Proficiency Indices are moderate in areas of African American population concentration in the northern portion of the city. In areas of African American population concentration on the east side of the city, School Proficiency Indices are low. Areas of White population concentration on the west side of the city but east of the Bayou Contraband tend to have relatively low School Proficiency Indices while mostly White areas to the west of Bayou Contraband have relatively high School Proficiency Indices. Rural and suburban areas of the region are all predominantly White. Those areas that are to the immediate north and west of Lake Charles tend to have relatively high School Proficiency Indices while areas to the south and east, as well as areas such as Vinton, tend to have low to moderate School Proficiency Indices. Individuals of Mexican national origin are concentrated in Sulphur and in the southwestern portion of Lake Charles in areas with relatively high School Proficiency Indices. Individuals of other national origins, including Honduran, Indian, Filipino, and Vietnamese individuals, are concentrated in Sulphur and Lake Charles but not within specific neighborhoods in Lake Charles. Families with children tend to be concentrated in suburban areas and in the far southwest of Lake Charles in areas with relatively high School Proficiency Indices.

- Lafayette Area:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Lafayette area, where there are many scattered areas of African American population concentration, African Americans tend to reside in areas with low School Proficiency Indices relative to white residents regardless of whether they live in urban, suburban, or rural communities. In general, the areas in and around Lafayette have low School Proficiency Indices as do the vicinities of Church Point, Crowley, Rayne, St. Martinville, and Abbeville. Areas to the southwest of Lafayette and to the west of Church Point, all of which are predominantly white, have the highest School Proficiency Indices. Individuals of Mexican national origin are concentrated in the western portions of Lafayette in areas with low to moderate School Proficiency Indices but also live in and around New Iberia, in areas with both high and low School Proficiency Indices. Vietnamese and Laotian residents are concentrated in an area stretching between Abbeville, where access to proficient schools is low, and New Iberia, where access to proficient schools is moderate. In the communities between those two cities, School Proficiency Indices are relatively high. Individuals of Honduran and Indian national origin do not appear to be concentrated in specific parts of the region. Families with children disproportionately live in areas with relatively high School Proficiency Indices throughout the region.

- Houma Area:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Based on HUD’s dot density maps, there does not appear to be a significant relationship between race, residential patterns, and access to proficiency schools in the Houma area. There are areas with high, moderate, and low School Proficiency Indices throughout the area, and those areas generally appear to be comparatively integrated in contrast to the rest of the state. Around the edges, some disparities are evident with slightly higher concentrations of African Americans in Houma and Thibodaux where access to proficient schools is generally lower than in suburban and rural areas. There do not appear significant concentrations of national origin groups in parts of the region that correlate to differential access to proficient schools. Families with children disproportionately reside in areas with relatively high access to proficient schools.

- Baton Rouge Area:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 9 - Demographics and School Proficiency

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

Jurisdiction: Baton Rouge (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Baton Rouge, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




There is a stark contrast between the levels of access to proficient schools for African Americans inside or outside of the City of Baton Rouge within the region. Within the city, African Americans have very low access to proficient schools whereas White residents reside in areas with moderate School Proficiency Indices. Outside of the city, African Americans are concentrated in northern East Baton Rouge Parish, West Feliciana Parish, and Pointe Coupee Parish, all of which have relatively high School Proficiency Indices. African Americans are also concentrated in East Feliciana and St. Helena Parishes, which have relatively low School Proficiency Indices. White population is concentrated in areas with generally moderate School Proficiency Indices with the exception of Ascension Parish, which has high access to proficient schools. With the exception of people of Mexican national origin, national origin minorities are concentrated in areas with low access to proficient schools in large part because they are concentrated within the City of Baton Rouge. There are significant concentrations of Mexican-American residents in Ascension and Livingston in areas where there are relatively high School Proficiency Indices. Families with children are generally concentrated in suburban areas with high School Proficiency Indices rather than in urban or rural areas with lower indices.

- New Orleans Area:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



African American residents in the region are concentrated in the City of New Orleans as well as in comparatively rural communities in St. John the Baptist, St. Charles, and St. James Parishes. In most of New Orleans, with the exception of the Westbank, School Proficiency Indices are relatively high, while in other areas of African American population concentration, indices are relatively low. White population in the region is concentrated in certain neighborhoods within New Orleans, in Metairie in Jefferson Parish, in Plaquemines Parish, in St. Bernard Parish, and on the Northshore of Lake Pontchartrain. In predominantly White New Orleans neighborhoods, in Plaquemines Parish, and on the Northshore, School Proficiency Indices are relatively high while they are moderate in other areas of White population concentration. People of Honduran and Nicaraguan national origin are concentrated in areas of Jefferson Parish and on the Westbank in Orleans Parish that have relatively low access to proficient schools. People of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in New Orleans East, in an area with relatively high access to proficient schools and in Chalmette in St. Bernard Parish, where the School Proficiency Index is moderate.

In general, families with children are most concentrated in suburban areas rather than in urban or rural areas. The primary exception in this region is that some heavily African American neighborhoods in the City of New Orleans have concentrations of families with children. As noted above, access to proficient schools is generally lowest in rural areas in this region while it is high in suburbs and in parts of New Orleans but low to moderate in other suburban and urban areas. It is noteworthy that HUD’s School Proficiency Index does not show significant disparities between census tracts on the east bank of the Mississippi River in the City of New Orleans. Other evidence suggests that residents of heavily African American neighborhoods, which also have concentrations of families with children, have less access to proficient schools than do predominantly White

neighborhoods.

- iii. Describe education programs, policies, and funding in the State and how they impact a student’s ability to attend a proficient school. Include in the description which protected class groups are least successful in accessing proficient schools.

Under Section 13 of Article VIII of the Louisiana Constitution, the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education is required to develop and utilize a formula to establish a minimum foundation program for education throughout the State. The program targets public elementary and secondary schools to equitably allocate funds to parish and city school districts. School boards levy property taxes to provide additional funding, though there are constitutional limits on how high those taxes may be. Such taxes are higher in New Orleans than elsewhere in the State, in the absence of specific voter approval. Federal grant funds further contribute to school finance in Louisiana.

A notable state intervention in elementary and secondary education in Louisiana was the creation of the Recovery School District (“RSD”), which has been most active in New Orleans. The creation of the RSD resulted in Orleans Parish School Board losing control over most of its traditional public schools, which eventually closed and were re-opened as charter schools. These charter schools are open for enrollment on a citywide basis and are not limited to neighborhood residents. Decoupling school attendance from neighborhood residence has the potential to reduce school segregation by enabling students from predominantly African American neighborhoods to attend schools in mostly White areas and vice versa; however, the impact of that effort is impacted by the extent to which White students in New Orleans opt out of public schools and go to private schools. Transportation to the chosen charter school can also present an issue.

- iv. Describe how education-related laws, policies, and practices, such as admissions policies, tuition assistance, financial aid, and funding, affect the ability of residents of different areas of the State to attend postsecondary and vocational education. Which protected class groups are least successful in accessing postsecondary and vocational educational opportunities?

Enrollment by Race or Ethnicity by Four-Year Institution, Fall 2015

School	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian	% American Indian
Grambling	4,553	1.58%	91.24%	1.10%	0.15%	0.26%
La Tech	12,335	67.94%	13.18%	2.97%	1.17%	0.32%
McNeese	8,170	68.56%	17.33%	2.63%	1.48%	0.49%
Nicholls	6,215	68.38%	19.16%	3.23%	1.13%	1.82%
ULM	9,024	64.80%	22.26%	2.19%	2.23%	0.39%
NSU	9,324	59.32%	26.25%	4.70%	0.78%	1.54%
SLU	14,602	62.54%	15.91%	6.71%	0.90%	0.19%
ULL	17,837	67.11%	20.21%	3.60%	2.16%	0.44%
LSU A	3,081	67.61%	17.43%	3.77%	1.43%	5.84%
LSU A&M	31,911	69.62%	11.84%	5.35%	3.27%	0.30%

LSU S	4,428	52.37%	22.58%	4.16%	2.06%	0.54%
UNO	8,423	54.98%	15.04%	10.28%	7.04%	0.33%
SU A&M	6,510	3.01%	90.31%	0.66%	2.37%	0.14%
SUNO	2,709	4.13%	84.42%	0.85%	1.11%	0.33%
<i>Total</i>	<i>139,122</i>	<i>59.19%</i>	<i>24.09%</i>	<i>4.33%</i>	<i>2.22%</i>	<i>0.60%</i>

The table above shows the total undergraduate enrollment by race or ethnicity for each of Louisiana’s four-year public colleges and universities, as well as for all those institutions combined. In reviewing the data, it is helpful to keep in mind the demographics of 18-24 year-olds in the state – 52.9% are non-Hispanic White, 37.8% are Black, 5.3% are Hispanic, 1.8% are Asian American, and 0.6% are American Indian.

African American students, but not members of other racial and ethnic minority groups, attend the state’s three undergraduate public Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in significant numbers. Additionally, the state’s public two-year and technical institutions serve a greater percentage of African American residents: 39.93% of students at two-year colleges are African American as are 41.53% of students at technical colleges.

b. Employment

- i. Describe any disparities in access to employment and labor markets by protected class in the State and region.

Jobs Proximity Index, Total Population

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Latino	Black, Non-Latino	Latino	Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Latino	Native American, Non-Latino
Alexandria	44.86	54.76	47.71	58.64	39.92
Baton Rouge	47.54	50.05	54.47	58.39	46.61
Houma	47.76	51.54	54.59	54.10	46.94
Lafayette	49.71	48.62	53.37	58.87	49.91
Lake Charles	44.36	49.78	47.98	50.92	45.27
Monroe	45.97	50.59	53.68	58.60	50.01
New Orleans	54.31	45.49	54.58	50.41	53.23
Shreveport	47.27	49.25	51.12	53.03	47.35

Jobs Proximity Index, Population Below the Poverty Line

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Latino	Black, Non-Latino	Latino	Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Latino	Native American, Non-Latino
Alexandria	44.35	55.59	53.07	58.23	40.12
Baton Rouge	47.20	49.04	52.76	58.70	56.89
Houma	48.11	50.61	50.63	45.26	52.97
Lafayette	50.27	50.05	52.59	70.04	48.14

Lake Charles	45.87	44.90	53.60	40.85	41.23
Monroe	50.30	50.07	47.42	56.47	45.88
New Orleans	55.34	45.95	57.07	49.28	53.49
Shreveport	50.15	49.19	55.16	47.20	55.19

Labor Market Index, Total Population

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Latino	Black, Non-Latino	Latino	Asian Pacific Islander, Non-Latino	or Native American, Non-Latino
Alexandria	38.19	22.86	27.32	45.91	29.16
Baton Rouge	60.32	40.98	58.51	74.11	54.58
Houma	39.88	34.47	34.40	39.78	26.00
Lafayette	48.93	33.81	49.54	50.80	45.73
Lake Charles	46.61	27.74	43.16	53.81	40.68
Monroe	53.47	26.09	39.59	61.87	42.36
New Orleans	58.40	33.04	49.63	51.42	44.89
Shreveport	54.01	30.84	48.25	63.60	46.17

Labor Market Index, Population Below the Poverty Line

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Latino	Black, Non-Latino	Latino	Asian Pacific Islander, Non-Latino	or Native American, Non-Latino
Alexandria	33.31	19.61	19.98	33.63	14.38
Baton Rouge	58.49	32.91	59.09	59.13	59.85
Houma	32.17	31.41	30.47	14.39	26.19
Lafayette	42.37	30.45	45.97	60.62	55.32
Lake Charles	38.64	26.01	30.63	34.00	20.89
Monroe	47.60	21.10	34.63	57.45	31.54
New Orleans	51.66	28.67	44.90	40.37	37.07
Shreveport	45.00	23.11	35.74	63.00	37.69

Across all regions of Louisiana, there are disparities in access to jobs for African Americans in relation to other groups. In some regions, Latinos experience similar disparities while, in other areas, they do not. Sample sizes for Asian or Pacific Islander and Native American individuals are generally too small to support broad conclusions except for in the New Orleans area for Asians or Pacific Islanders and in the Houma area for Native Americans.

It is also noteworthy that there appear to be significant disparities in job access between regions of the state with the regions that are anchored by Louisiana's largest cities faring better than less populated regions. Specifically, New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and Shreveport have the highest levels of job access; Lafayette, Monroe, and Lake Charles lie in the middle; and Alexandria and Houma fare the worst. The areas where there is the greatest Jobs Proximity tends to be the most heavily African American, Latino, and Asian areas of the state while the areas with less Jobs Proximity tends to be more heavily White and, in the case of Houma, more heavily Native American. Thus, while African American residents of Louisiana are less able to access employment than others in the regions in which they reside, they are more likely to reside in regions where jobs are comparatively plentiful.


At a high level, relative geographic proximity to job centers appears less likely to cause the apparent disparities in access to employment. In all but one region of the state, African Americans are either as likely, or more likely, than white residents to live in close proximity to jobs. The greater New Orleans region is the only exception to this trend. This overall pattern generally reflects that African American households are more likely to reside in central cities and less likely to reside in rural areas than are Whites throughout the state. Some job centers that are outside of central cities, such as industrial facilities along the Mississippi River.

The contrasts in New Orleans may be attributable to two different factors. First, the New Orleans area has major suburban job centers, particularly in Jefferson Parish and St. Tammany Parish that are more accessible to White residents than they are to African Americans. Second, New Orleans is a significantly larger city than Louisiana's other major cities. Although there are predominantly African American neighborhoods like Treme and Mid-City that are near downtown job centers, African American neighborhoods like New Orleans East and the Lower Ninth Ward are further from downtown than are similar neighborhoods in other cities.

- ii. How does a person's place of residence in the State affect their ability to obtain employment?

Shreveport Area:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 10 - Demographics and Job Proximity

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

Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the Shreveport area, job proximity is greatest in the adjacent cities of Shreveport and Bossier City, in Minden, and along a rural stretch of I-49 to the east of Mansfield. These are areas that have relatively high concentrations of African American residents in comparison to the region as a whole. At the same time, some of the areas of greatest African American population concentration in the City of Shreveport have relatively low Job Proximity Indices. Rural areas in the region, which are predominantly White though some are quite integrated, tend to have low to moderate Job Proximity Indices. Individuals of Mexican national origin comprise the only national origin group that is subject to patterns of residential concentration. Mexican-Americans primarily reside in Bossier Parish in areas with moderate to high Job Proximity Indices. Families with children are most heavily concentrated in Bossier Parish in areas with moderate to high Job Proximity Indices.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Labor Market

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


Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Labor market engagement is lowest in predominantly African American neighborhoods in the central and northern portions of the City of Shreveport and is highest in predominantly White Bossier City and in mostly White neighborhoods in the southeastern portion of Shreveport. There are predominantly African American neighborhoods in the western portion of the city and spilling over into adjacent suburbs that have relatively high labor market engagement. Rural areas in the region tend to have moderate Labor Market Indices. There are not significant variations in index values on the basis of the racial composition of census tracts. Within the region, people of Mexican national origin are most heavily concentrated in portions of Bossier City and in rural areas outside of Ruston that have moderate Labor Market Indices. Other national origin groups are not highly concentrated in specific areas. Families with children are generally concentrated in suburban areas with high Labor Market Indices though there are a couple of R/ECAP census tracts on the north side of the City of Shreveport that have concentrations of families with children and low Labor Market Indices.


Monroe Area:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 10 - Demographics and Job Proximity
 Description: Jobs Proximity Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
 Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)
 Region: Monroe, LA

Within the Monroe area, job proximity is highest in and around the City of Monroe and in the small towns and cities that dot the region. Job proximity is lowest in rural areas though it tends to be moderate in the eastern portion of the region, nearer to the Mississippi River, and low in the western portion of the region. In general, African American residents are concentrated in towns and cities, and African Americans are more likely to reside in rural areas to the east of the region than in those to the west. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in rural areas to the west of Farmersville where Job Proximity Indices are low. Families with children are most likely to reside in cities, towns, and surrounding suburban areas. They are more likely to reside in rural areas in the eastern portion of the region than they are in rural areas to the west.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Labor Market

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

Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)


Region: Monroe, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Labor market engagement in the Monroe area is lowest in predominantly African American neighborhoods on the south side of the City of Monroe, in the small, predominantly African American City of Bastrop, and in the rural, majority African American parishes of the Mississippi Delta. Labor Market Indices are highest in predominantly white areas on the north side of the City of Monroe and in adjacent suburbs to the city's north. Racially integrated and predominantly white rural areas tend to have moderate Labor Market Indices. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in rural areas to the west of Farmersville where Labor Market Indices are low. Families with children are concentrated on the fringes of the City of Monroe in areas with both high Labor Market Indices to the north, east, and west of the city and in areas with low indices to the south of the city. There are relatively low concentrations of families with children in rural areas, which tend to have low to moderate Labor Market Indices.

Alexandria Area:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




African Americans are concentrated in the City of Alexandria and in areas to the immediate south and southeast of the city. These areas generally have high Job Proximity Indices though there are a few exceptions, most notably one R/ECAP on the east side of the city. White residents experience varying levels of job proximity. Predominantly White areas like the west side of the City of Alexandria and the suburbs to the north of the city have relatively high Job Proximity Indices while rural areas in the region, which are disproportionately White, have low Job Proximity Indices. Individuals of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in suburban areas immediately to the north of the city where job proximity is relatively high. Individuals of Burmese national origin are concentrated in the city in census tracts that have moderate job proximity but which are adjacent to areas of high job proximity.

Individuals of Mexican and Chinese national origin primarily reside further out in the northern suburbs and rural areas outside of Alexandria. These areas have low to moderate Job Proximity Indices. Mexican-American residents are also concentrated in the far southern portion of the region near Forest Hill. This area has low to moderate job proximity. There does not appear to be a significant relationship between job proximity and familial status in the Alexandria area. Suburban areas and the southern portions of the region have high job proximity and relatively large proportions of families with children, but some rural areas with low job proximity also have such concentrations. The representation of families with children is lowest in the City of Alexandria where job proximity is generally relatively high.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Alexandria area, labor market engagement is high in predominantly White areas to the west of the City of Alexandria and are lowest in predominantly African American parts of the central and southern portions of the City of Alexandria as well as in rural areas, regardless of their racial composition. Very few members of national origin groups reside in the aforementioned communities on the west side of the City of Alexandria. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in an area to the north of Alexandria that has low Labor Market Indices and near Forest Hill where Labor Market Indices are low. People of Burmese national origin are concentrated near the center of the city where labor market engagement is low. People of Chinese and Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in northern suburbs where engagement is moderate. The areas with the highest concentrations of families with children tend to overlap with areas of moderate to high labor market engagement.

Lake Charles Area:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 10 - Demographics and Job Proximity

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

Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lake Charles, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Within the City of Lake Charles, African American residents are concentrated on the east side, which generally has lower job proximity than the predominantly White west side of the city (though the far southwestern extreme is an exception). However, within the context of the broader region the east side of the City of Lake Charles still has higher Job Proximity Indices than do outlying rural areas, particularly to the north of the city. Outside of the city and its immediate suburbs to the east, west, and south, job proximity in the region is low generally. African American residents are more highly concentrated in central city neighborhoods less concentrated in outlying areas in the Lake Charles region than in any other region in the state. Individuals of Mexican national origin in the region are concentrated in south central portion of the city, in Sulphur, and to the southeast of the city.

With the exception of the southeastern outskirts of Lake Charles, where job proximity is low, these areas tend to have moderate Job Proficiency Indices. People of Honduran national origin are concentrated on the east side of the City of Lake Charles in areas with moderate Job Proficiency Indices. People of Indian national origin are concentrated in the southwestern portion of the city in areas with moderate Job Proximity Indices. There are no areas with significant concentrations of individuals of Filipino or Vietnamese national origin. Unlike in other regions of Louisiana, some rural portions of the Lake Charles area have concentrations of families with children. Those areas contain the parts of the region with the least access to jobs whereas the City of Lake Charles has relatively high access to jobs and a lower proportion of families with children.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Jurisdiction**

- Demographics 2010**
 1 Dot = 75 People
 -  White, Non-Hispanic
 -  Black, Non-Hispanic
 -  Native American, Non-Hispanic
 -  Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic
 -  Hispanic
 -  Other, Non-Hispanic
 -  Multi-racial, Non-Hispanic
- 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

POWERED BY  Esri, HERE, Garmin, NGA, USGS, NPS | Esri, HERE


Date created: 1/25/2017

Name: Map 9 - Demographics and Labor Market
Description: Labor Engagement Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lake Charles, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Labor market engagement in the area is generally lowest on the north and east sides of the City of Lake Charles, which are predominantly African American. Labor market engagement is highest in predominantly white areas including the southwestern portion of the City of Lake Charles and the nearby City of Sulphur. The one significant caveat is that a racially diverse swath of the center of the City of Lake Charles has high Labor Market Indices. Overwhelmingly White rural areas tend to have moderate Labor Market Indices. People of Mexican, Honduran, Indian, and Vietnamese national origin are generally concentrated in the southern suburbs of the City of Lake Charles and in the City of Sulphur, which are areas of moderate labor market engagement. Within the Lake Charles region, labor market engagement is generally highest in areas with large concentrations of families with children.


Lafayette Area:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 8 - Demographics and Job Proximity
Description: Jobs Proximity Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lafayette, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Lafayette area, job proximity is highest in the City of Lafayette and along the U.S. 90 corridor, both of which are areas of African American population concentration relative to the region as a whole. White population is more broadly distributed throughout the region in areas with widely varying Job Proximity Indices, including the rural western portions of the region, which tend to have relatively low access to jobs. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated on the west side of the City of Lafayette in areas with relatively low Job Proximity Indices and in the U.S. 90 corridor where indices are higher. People of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in rural areas to the southwest of Lafayette and in Abbeville. These areas tend to have moderate Job Proximity Indices. People of Honduran and Indian national origin are concentrated in parts of the City of Lafayette where job proximity is relatively high. People of Laotian national origin are concentrated in the U.S. 90 corridor where job proximity is high. There are few clear patterns with regard to familial status and job proximity within the region, excepting that the most rural parts of the region have few families with children and low job proximity. In more populated areas, places with concentrations of families with children appear to be similarly likely to have low, moderate, or high Job Proximity Indices.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Labor Market
Description: Labor Engagement Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lafayette, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Labor Market
Description: Labor Engagement Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lafayette, LA

Labor market engagement in the region is highest in predominantly White portions of the south side of the City of Lafayette and in adjacent suburbs to the south and west of the city, as well as in racially integrated areas to the north of Lafayette. Predominantly African American communities on the north side of Lafayette have the lowest Labor Market Indices. Rural areas, regardless of racial composition, tend to have moderate levels of labor market engagement. The areas where people of Mexican, Honduran, and Vietnamese national origin are concentrated tend to have moderate Labor Market Indices. The areas where people of Indian national origin are concentrated have high index values. The areas where people of Laotian national origin are concentrated have low labor market engagement. As with job proximity, there do not appear to be any discernible patterns with respect to familial status and labor market engagement.


Houma Area:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Within the Houma area, job proximity is highest in Houma and in Lafourche Parish near Galliano. The former area is relatively diverse for the region, and has significant African American and American Indian populations. The latter area is predominantly non-Hispanic White. Among more highly populated areas, Thibodaux, which has a significant African American population, has much lower job proximity than does Houma. Overall, however, rural areas that are overwhelmingly white tend to have the lowest Job Proximity Indices in the region. People of Mexican and Filipino national origin in the region tend to be concentrated in Houma where job proximity is high. People of Honduran national origin tend to reside between Lockport and Larose in Lafourche Parish where job proximity is low to moderate. Families with children tend to reside in urban and suburban areas with relatively high job proximity rather than in rural areas with low job proximity.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Labor Market
Description: Labor Engagement Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Houma-Terrebonne (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Labor market engagement in the area is highest in Houma, with the exception of a few relatively heavily African American census tracts in the center of the city, and along Louisiana Route 1 in Lafourche Parish. It is worth noting that some of the areas with high Labor Market Indices in Houma are heavily African American. Labor market engagement is low in extremely rural areas, which tend to be mostly White. The Route 1 corridor along with the area between Routes 57 and 315 in Terrebonne Parish have moderate to high Labor Market Indices and are also home to significant Native American populations. The area in and around Thibodaux, which is more heavily African American than Houma, has low to moderate indices.

Baton Rouge Area:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Within the Baton Rouge area, African American residents are concentrated in areas that have relatively high Job Proximity Indices. Two dynamics contribute to this pattern. First, African Americans disproportionately reside in the City of Baton Rouge and, in particular, in neighborhoods close to the center of the city. Major employers including the State of Louisiana, Louisiana State University, and ExxonMobil's Baton Rouge refinery (the fourth largest in the United States) are present in this area. Second, in comparatively rural areas in the region, African Americans disproportionately reside in communities near the Mississippi River. Major industrial uses are clustered up and down the river. People of Vietnamese, Indian, Chinese, and Honduran national origin generally live in areas with relatively high Job Proximity Indices within the region as members of those groups disproportionately reside within the City of Baton Rouge. Individuals of Mexican national origin do not experience consistent patterns of job proximity as they reside throughout the region in a much less concentrated manner than other national origin groups. Families with children in the Baton Rouge region tend to experience low to moderate job proximity as they are most concentrated in suburban areas that are not along the Mississippi River. At the same time, the areas with the very lowest Job Proximity Indices are rural areas that are not adjacent to the river and which have relatively few families with children.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 9 - Demographics and Labor Market

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

Jurisdiction: Baton Rouge (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Baton Rouge, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Labor market engagement in the Baton Rouge area is highest in the southern portion of the City of Baton Rouge and in suburban areas immediately to the south of the city that are still within East Baton Rouge Parish. Engagement is moderate in the northern, western, and eastern suburbs and is lowest on the north side of the City of Baton Rouge and in rural areas to the northeast of the region. In general, areas of African American population concentration, particularly in northern Baton Rouge, have the lowest Labor Market Indices though some northern and western suburbs have significant African American populations and moderate to high labor market engagement. Areas of very high labor market engagement in southern Baton Rouge and adjacent suburbs are overwhelmingly White.


People of Vietnamese, Indian, Chinese, and Honduran national origin in the region are concentrated in the southern portion of the City of Baton Rouge and in adjacent southern suburbs where labor market engagement is high. Individuals of Mexican national origin in the area are less concentrated and reside throughout areas of East Baton Rouge Parish that have low, medium, and high Labor Market Indices. There are relatively few members of the above national origin groups in the region outside of East Baton Rouge Parish. Families with children in the region tend to be concentrated in suburban areas with moderate to high Labor Market Indices. There are relatively few families with children in the City of Baton Rouge, including in areas of both high and low labor market engagement. There are also few families with children in outlying rural areas with low to moderate labor engagement.


New Orleans Area:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool






In the New Orleans area, African American residents disproportionately reside in areas with relatively high job proximity such as New Orleans itself. Within the City of New Orleans, African American and White residents are similarly likely to reside in close proximity to jobs. Some predominantly African American neighborhoods, like Gentilly and the Lower Ninth Ward have relatively low job proximity, while others, like Treme and Mid City, have very high job proximity. Likewise, disproportionately White residents of the Garden District have much higher job proximity than the overwhelmingly White residents of Lakeview.


Within the region more broadly and as in the Baton Rouge area, there are concentrations of African American residents in communities along the Mississippi River that have high Job Proximity Indices. Asian residents are concentrated in New Orleans East where job proximity is relatively low, while Latino residents are concentrated in parts of Jefferson Parish where job proximity is moderate to high.

Individuals of Mexican and Honduran national origin are concentrated in portions of Jefferson Parish near Kenner with relatively high job proximity and in parts of the Jefferson Parish portion of the Westbank with moderate job proximity. Vietnamese-Americans are concentrated in New Orleans East where Job Proximity Indices are low and in parts of the Westbank of Jefferson Parish that have moderate Job Proximity Indices. Individuals of Indian national origin reside in suburban areas and small cities throughout the region, which have a range of Job Proximity Indices. Families with children in the region tend to reside in suburban areas that have moderate Job Proximity Indices.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Labor Market

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

Jurisdiction: New Orleans (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: New Orleans-Metairie, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Labor market engagement in the area is highest in the western portions of the City of New Orleans, on the Eastbank in Jefferson Parish, and in Slidell. These are areas of White population concentration and, in the case of the Eastbank of Jefferson Parish, Latino population concentration. Labor market engagement is lowest in predominantly African American and Asian American portions of the eastern half of the City of New Orleans. Rural areas in the region tend to have moderate labor market engagement. Those to the west are relatively racially diverse while those to the north and south are predominantly White. People of Honduran, Mexican, and Guatemalan national origin are concentrated on the Eastbank of Jefferson Parish in areas of moderate to high labor market engagement.

People of Vietnamese and Honduran national origin are concentrated on the Westbank of Jefferson Parish where labor market engagement is low to moderate. People of Vietnamese national origin are also concentrated in New Orleans East where labor market engagement is low to moderate. Families with children in the region are concentrated on the Westbank where labor market engagement is low to moderate and on the Northshore where labor market engagement is moderate to high. There are relatively few families with children in the City of New Orleans, whether in areas of high or low labor market engagement.

- iii. Describe State programs designed to create jobs and job training programs, and identify areas in the State that such programs serve. Which protected class groups are least successful in accessing such programs?

The Louisiana Workforce Commission (LWC) is the agency that is primarily responsible for facilitating the provision of job training to workers and matching unemployed individuals with employers. The LWC’s reports do not reflect the protected characteristics of individuals who participate in the agency’s programs. Louisiana Rehabilitation Services, which is housed within the LWC, exclusively serves persons with disabilities and provides vocational rehabilitation services and connects workers with employers.

The Louisiana Department of Administration’s Office of Community Development (OCD) uses 20% of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds that it administers for economic development activities that often have the effect of creating or retaining jobs. HUD’s Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) does not enable grantees like OCD to record the race and ethnicity of indirect beneficiaries of CDBG-funded activities, such as individuals who are employed by direct grantees.

Louisiana Economic Development (LED) is another key player in efforts to create jobs for Louisianans. LED administers a wide range of incentive programs with the purpose of drawing businesses to Louisiana, maintains a database of sites for development activities, and operates a workforce training and placement program called FastStart, which is free for eligible businesses. The federal Enterprise Zone program, which primarily serves low-income communities of color, is among the incentive programs run by LED.

c. Transportation

- i. Describe any disparities in access to transportation by protected class related to place of residence, transportation type, cost, or other transportation-related factors in the State.

Transit Trips Index by Race by Metropolitan Statistical Area, All Individuals

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	Native American, Non-Hispanic
New Orleans	42.01	51.19	50.91	49.83	41.98
Baton Rouge	28.05	34.31	32.87	38.72	28.87
Houma	43.98	58.82	52.80	47.31	51.24
Lafayette	42.28	54.24	52.81	53.17	46.30
Lake Charles	48.97	61.29	54.83	63.64	51.24
Alexandria	25.64	35.96	23.32	38.15	20.83
Monroe	32.27	39.68	32.22	43.48	34.83

Shreveport	30.36	40.96	33.07	35.99	37.09
------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Transit Trips Index by Race by Metropolitan Statistical Area, Individuals with Incomes below the Federal Poverty Line

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic or	Native American, Non-Hispanic
New Orleans	44.10	54.22	56.50	55.64	50.37
Baton Rouge	32.52	36.41	37.38	42.50	33.53
Houma	46.05	61.50	52.96	63.73	55.76
Lafayette	43.34	55.28	50.77	57.79	60.62
Lake Charles	49.75	63.23	62.15	64.96	34.54
Alexandria	28.16	40.40	31.35	10.72	24.23
Monroe	35.15	42.82	14.07	20.89	33.11
Shreveport	31.10	40.96	33.07	35.99	37.09

Low Transportation Cost Index by Race by Metropolitan Statistical Area, All Individuals

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic or	Native American, Non-Hispanic
New Orleans	41.66	50.51	52.48	47.44	40.38
Baton Rouge	42.85	50.23	50.68	57.86	43.68
Houma	25.76	32.35	28.11	28.17	24.03
Lafayette	32.19	37.78	39.04	38.12	33.71
Lake Charles	26.07	35.92	30.59	35.25	28.03
Alexandria	11.81	20.32	11.60	21.23	9.71
Monroe	13.67	20.80	15.70	21.50	15.80
Shreveport	27.24	35.14	35.08	37.52	28.78

Low Transportation Cost Index by Race by Metropolitan Statistical Area, Individuals with Incomes below the Federal Poverty Line

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	Native American, Non-Hispanic
New Orleans	44.51	54.78	59.17	51.09	48.35
Baton Rouge	47.74	52.52	55.25	61.79	53.85
Houma	24.93	32.35	26.92	23.74	25.95
Lafayette	31.39	37.29	36.55	43.37	43.26
Lake Charles	26.88	36.86	33.11	36.00	19.78
Alexandria	12.36	22.67	14.28	8.28	8.44
Monroe	17.06	21.40	10.43	24.25	11.71
Shreveport	27.88	35.80	31.68	32.40	35.20

Across all of the state’s regions, African American residents consistently have the highest levels of access to transit in relation to White residents, as measured by both the Transit Trips Index and the Low Transportation Cost Index. The data is not surprising as it largely reflects that African Americans in Louisiana are more likely to live in urban areas that have developed fixed-route transportation systems and are less likely to live in moderately served suburban areas or totally underserved rural areas. Data for other racial or ethnic groups is much more mixed, in part because the total populations of other groups, particularly Asian or Pacific Islander or Native American people, are very small in some regions. In most regions, Latino and Asian or Pacific Islander individuals have greater access to transportation than do White residents. For Native Americans, the data is much more scattered.

In the Houma region, which has, by far, the highest percentage of Native Americans of any region, Native Americans have a higher Transit Trips Index but a roughly similar Low Transportation Cost Index to White residents. For Latinos, there appears to be a trend of similar levels of access to transportation to African American residents in the southern half of the state and much lower access in the northern half of the state. The economy of the northern half of the state is more agricultural in nature than that of the southern half of the state.


- ii. Which racial/ethnic, national origin (including LEP persons), or family status groups are most affected by the lack of a reliable, affordable, transportation connection between their place of residence and opportunities in the State and region?

The Transit Trips and Low Transportation Cost Indices are not exclusive indicators of which protected class groups are most affected by the lack of a reliable, affordable, transportation connection between their place of residence and opportunities in regions across Louisiana. African American residents have disproportionately high access to low cost, public transportation. Latino, Asian or Pacific Islander residents, and various national origin groups have relatively high


access to public transit because they are concentrated in the principal cities and inner suburbs of metropolitan areas. However, the indices do not reflect the relationship between access to public transportation and need for public transportation. Additionally, the indices do not measure the degree of connectivity between places of residence and opportunities like high performing schools and a healthy living environment.

Shreveport:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 12 - Demographics and Transit Trips

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

Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 12 - Demographics and Transit Trips


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

Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA

In the Shreveport region, the Transit Trips Index ranges from low levels in rural and suburban areas to moderate levels in Shreveport and in some satellite towns. There are no places with high Transit Trips Indices. In general, the Transit Trips Index is highest in areas with concentrations of African American residents. Individuals of Mexican national origins are concentrated in Bossier Parish in areas with low but not extremely low Transit Trips Indices. People of Filipino national origin are concentrated on the southern outskirts of the City of Shreveport and on the west side of the City of Ruston in areas with moderate Transit Trips Indices. Families with children in the region are concentrated in Bossier Parish and the southern portions of Shreveport in areas with low but not extremely low Transit Trips Indices.


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Demographics 2010**
1 Dot = 75 People
- White, Non-Hispanic
 - Black, Non-Hispanic
 - Native American, Non-Hispanic
 - Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic
 - Hispanic
 - Other, Non-Hispanic
- 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

Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Legend**
- National Origin (Top 5 in Descending Order)**
1 Dot = 25 People
- Mexico
 - Philippines
 - Vietnam
 - Honduras
 - Germany
- 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

Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA

In the Shreveport area, the Low Transportation Cost Index largely tracks the Transit Trips Index. The only caveat is that the overall distribution of index values is narrower for transportation costs. Nonetheless, the same patterns with respect to protected class status exist.

Monroe:




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 12 - Demographics and Transit Trips
Description: Transit Trips Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Monroe, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Monroe area, Transit Trips Indices are moderate in the City of Monroe, including in both predominantly African American and predominantly White areas. In all rural areas of the region regardless of racial composition, Transit Trips Indices are extremely low. People of Honduran, Indian, and German national origin are concentrated in the City of Monroe where Transit Trips Indices are moderate. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in rural areas west of Farmersville where there are few transit trips. Families with children are concentrated on the periphery of the City of Monroe where Transit Trips Indices are low to moderate.


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




As in the Shreveport area, the Low Transportation Cost Index mirrors the Transit Trips Index, and the same patterns with respect to protected class status exist for both measures.

Alexandria:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the Alexandria area, Transit Trips Indices are low except in the City of Alexandria, some of its suburbs, and the City of Leesville. In the former areas, there are a moderate number of transit trips. In Leesville, there are generally a moderate number though one census tract is more extensively served by transit. Leesville is predominantly White while Alexandria is racially diverse in comparison to the region as a whole. There are not significant disparities in transit trips between predominantly White northern and southwestern Alexandria and more heavily African American western and southeastern Alexandria. People of Vietnamese and Burmese national origin are concentrated in parts of the City of Alexandria with moderate Transit Trips indices. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in the northern suburbs of Alexandria and in Forest Hill, two areas where there are few transit trips. Families with children are concentrated in suburban areas near Alexandria and Leesville that have moderate Transit Trips Indices.


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Demographics 2010**
1 Dot = 75 People
- White, Non-Hispanic
 - Black, Non-Hispanic
 - Native American, Non-Hispanic
 - Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic
 - Hispanic
 - Other, Non-Hispanic
- 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

Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Alexandria, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Legend**
- National Origin (Top 5 in Descending Order)**
1 Dot = 25 People
- Mexico
 - China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan
 - Vietnam
 - Burma
 - England
- 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


Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Alexandria, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



As in other regions, the Low Transportation Cost Index mirrors the Transit Trips Index. The one caveat is that the census tract containing Fort Polk has a very high Low Transportation Cost Index. The census tract itself does not have a significant number of residents but is surrounded by predominantly White census tracts.


Lake Charles:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the Lake Charles region, Transit Trips Indices are highest in the City of Lake Charles and in the City of Sulphur. Within these areas, there are not significant differences between index values in predominantly African American neighborhoods and in mostly White neighborhoods; however, African American residents within the region are highly concentrated in Lake Charles, so, overall, African Americans reside in places with relatively high Transit Trips Indices. It is worth noting that, while index values are lower in rural areas in the region than they are in urban and suburban areas, they are higher than in comparable rural areas in northern or central Louisiana. Areas of concentration of national origin groups are all located within Lake Charles and Sulphur where indices are relatively high. Families with children in the region are concentrated on the periphery of the two significant cities in areas where the number of transit trips is moderate.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 11 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost

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

Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lake Charles, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Legend

National Origin (Top 5 in Descending Order)

1 Dot = 25 People

- Mexico
- Honduras
- India
- Philippines
- Vietnam

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


Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost

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

Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lake Charles, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



% of Households that are Families with Children

Families with Children

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

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

Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost


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

Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)


Region: Lake Charles, LA

As in other regions, the Low Transportation Cost Index closely tracks the Transit Trips Index with the caveat that the range of distribution of values is narrower. In and around Lake Charles, the Low Transportation Cost Index supports the same conclusions with respect to the connection between transportation access and protected class status as does the Transit Trips Index.


Lafayette:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 12 - Demographics and Transit Trips
Description: Transit Trips Index for Jurisdiction and Region with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lafayette, LA

In the Lafayette region, Transit Trips Indices are moderate to high in the City of Lafayette and along the U.S. 90 corridor. These areas comprise the most heavily African American portions of the region. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated on the west side of the City of Lafayette in areas and in the U.S. 90 corridor, both of which have relatively high Transit Trips Indices. People of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in rural areas to the southwest of Lafayette and in Abbeville. These areas tend to have low to moderate Transit Trips Indices. People of Honduran and Indian national origin are concentrated in parts of the City of Lafayette where there are many transit trips. People of Laotian national origin are concentrated in the U.S. 90 corridor where there are many transit trips. There are no clear patterns with regard to the relationship between transit trips and familial status in the Lafayette area.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Demographics 2010**
1 Dot = 75 People
- White, Non-Hispanic
 - Black, Non-Hispanic
 - Native American, Non-Hispanic
 - Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic
 - Hispanic
 - Other, Non-Hispanic

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

Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lafayette, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Legend

- National Origin (Top 5 in Descending Order)**
1 Dot = 25 People
- Mexico
 - Vietnam
 - Laos
 - Honduras
 - India

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


Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lafayette, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Unlike in most other regions, the relationship between the Low Transportation Cost Index and the Transit Trips Index in the Lafayette area is complicated. Within the City of Lafayette, the two indices appear to be closely related, but, in the U.S. 90 corridor, Low Transportation Cost Index values are low. Thus, while African American, Honduran, and Indian individuals have access to low cost transportation, people of Mexican and Laotian national origin in the U.S. 90 corridor do not.

Houma-Thibodaux:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 12 - Demographics and Transit Trips

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

Jurisdiction: Houma-Terrebonne (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the Houma-Thibodaux area, the Transit Trips Index relatively high in Houma, Thibodaux, Matthews, and LaRose. These areas, and in particular the former three, are home to the vast majority of African American residents of the region, which is the least heavily African American in the state. Native American residents also appear to largely reside within census tracts that have high Transit Trips Indices, but it is worth noting that census tracts in the region that are located outside of cities tend to be long and narrow, following major roads. Many Native American individuals and families live in these census tracts, such as one encompassing the area around Route 57.

People of Mexican national origin are most heavily concentrated in the City of Houma where there are many transit trips. People of Honduran national origin are concentrated between Matthews and LaRose in areas where indices are low. People of Vietnamese national origin primarily reside in the southern portion of the City of Houma, including in census tracts with relatively high and moderate indices. People of Chinese and Indian national origin are not concentrated in particular geographic areas. Families with children are most likely to reside on the periphery of the region's cities rather than in downtown locations or in rural areas. These areas tend to have moderate to high Transit Trips Indices, with indices being lowest outside of Matthews.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool





Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost

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

Jurisdiction: Houma-Terrebonne (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost

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

Jurisdiction: Houma-Terrebonne (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




As in the Lafayette area, the connection between the Transit Trips Index and the Low Transportation Cost Index is more tenuous in the Houma-Thibodaux area than it is in other regions of the state. In general, Low Transportation Cost Indices are low outside of the centers of both Houma and Thibodaux where they are moderate. Accordingly, African American individuals and people of Mexican national origin have relatively high access to low-cost transportation, which other race or ethnicity, national origin, and familial status groups lack.

Baton Rouge:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Within the Baton Rouge Area, Transit Trips Indices are moderate in the City of Baton Rouge, including in both the predominantly African American north side of the city and the predominantly White south side. In surrounding suburban and rural areas, there are few transit trips though indices are slightly higher in the eastern and southern suburbs, which are mostly White, than they are in the northern suburbs, which are mostly African American. People of Vietnamese, Indian, Chinese, and Honduran national origin are concentrated in the City of Baton Rouge while individuals of Mexican national origin are less concentrated in the region and reside in more places with low Transit Trips Indices. Families with children in the region are concentrated in suburban areas to the east and south of the City of Baton Rouge and are least represented in the city and in other suburban and rural areas. These areas of relative concentration have Transit Trips Indices that are low in comparison to the city but higher than those of other outlying areas.

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Demographics 2010**
1 Dot = 75 People
- White, Non-Hispanic
 - Black, Non-Hispanic
 - Native American, Non-Hispanic
 - Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic
 - Hispanic
 - Other, Non-Hispanic

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

Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Baton Rouge (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Baton Rouge, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Legend

- National Origin (Top 5 in Descending Order)**
1 Dot = 25 People
- Mexico
 - Vietnam
 - India
 - China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan
 - Honduras

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

Name: Map 13 - Demographics and Low Transportation Cost
Description: Low Transportation Cost with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Baton Rouge (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Baton Rouge, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




As in most areas within the State of Louisiana, the Low Transportation Cost Index mirrors the Transit Trips Index with regard to geographic patterns, including in relation to local demographics. Unlike in other regions, the Low Transportation Cost Index is generally higher across the board than the Transit Trips Index. Accordingly, residents of the region, including protected class members, have access to public transit that is relatively affordable but not especially frequent.

New Orleans:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Within Greater New Orleans, Transit Trips Indices are generally moderate to high in New Orleans and in Jefferson Parish. Outside of those more highly populated areas, indices tend to be moderate in small cities like Slidell and Covington and low in more rural areas. African American population in the region is heavily concentrated in New Orleans where there are more transit trips, and the allocation of transit trips in New Orleans and in Jefferson Parish does not appear to correlate with areas of racial or ethnic concentration. The exception is that the portion of New Orleans East with a significant Asian or Pacific Islander population has a moderate Transit Trips Index that is lower than most of the remainder of the city.

Members of identified national origin groups tend to be highly concentrated in New Orleans and in Jefferson Parish where there are many transit trips. People of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in New Orleans East where there are relatively few transit trips in comparison to remainder of the city. It is important to note that other areas of Vietnamese-American population concentration in the region, primarily in Jefferson Parish, do not have disproportionately few transit trips. Families with children in the region are primarily concentrated in the northern and eastern portions of the City of New Orleans and in suburban areas on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain. Although these areas fare well in terms of the number of transit trips in comparison to the region, within New Orleans, there tend to be more transit trips in closer proximity to the Central Business District.


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



As in most regions of the state, the Low Transportation Cost Index mirrors the Transit Trips Index. The one noteworthy contrast is that the isolation of New Orleans East is more pronounced when viewed through the lens of the Low Transportation Cost Index than it is through the Transit Trips Index.

- iii. Describe how the State's and region's transportation programs and policies, such as public transportation infrastructure, routes or transportation systems, including those transportation routes designed for use of personal vehicles, and transportation funding affect the ability of protected class groups in the State to access transportation. Describe any relevant interstate compacts or other arrangements that may affect access to transportation opportunities for protected class groups.

The Louisiana Department of Transportation & Development (DOTD) completed a statewide transportation plan in 2015. DOTD identified \$55.89 billion in transportation funding needs over the next 30 years. Of that \$55.89, 64.4% was for roads and bridges while 12.9% was for transit. DOTD outlined Priority "A" thru "D," four alternative approaches to addressing some portion of those needs under various funding levels.

With Priority A, projects can be funded if there is an increase in state funding even in the absence of an increase in federal appropriations. Priority B projects can only be funded if both state and federal funding increases. DOTD does not envision funding Priority C or D projects under any funding scenario. Priority C includes two passenger rail project proposals, one connecting New Orleans's Central Business District to the airport and one running from Shreveport to the Texas state line in northwest Louisiana. Although DOTD would increase funding for many transportation needs under the third scenario, it would only maintain funding levels for public transit in urban communities, the area where the impact of investments most directly promotes connections for African American and Latino residents. Additionally, of DOTD's megaprojects, there are no transit projects listed under Priority A and only one, the Baton Rouge to New Orleans Intercity Passenger Rail, under Priority B.

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) by Area

The state's metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) also play a significant role in transportation planning and expenditures. The Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments is the MPO for the Shreveport area. Currently, a unified transit system provides fixed-route bus service in Shreveport and Bossier City. All routes filter through downtown Shreveport where transfers are available. There are no existing plans for service expansions, and there is no fixed route service in the region outside of the two principal cities.

In the Monroe area, the North Delta Regional Planning & Development District is the MPO for that area. The only fixed-route bus service that exists within the area is in the City of Monroe.

In the Alexandria area, the Rapides Area Planning Commission is the MPO. Fixed route bus service currently exists within and between Alexandria and Pineville but does not serve other parts of the region

The Imperial Calcasieu Regional Planning and Development Commission (IMCAL) is the MPO for the Lake Charles area. Currently, the only fixed-route bus service in the region operates entirely within the City of Lake Charles. Routes transport riders from all corners of the city to downtown where transfers are available to different routes. The system only operates on weekdays, and service ceases at 5:45 PM, limiting the utility of the system for service workers and others who work irregular hours. Calcasieu Parish operates a demand response system that is more expensive for riders but attempts to fill in some of the gaps.

In the Houma-Thibodaux area, existing bus service is limited to between and within Houma and Thibodaux.

In the Baton Rouge area, the Capital Regional Planning Commission (CRPC) envisions \$423,260,000 in funding for streets and highways from 2013 through 2017, \$728,146,836 for streets and highways from 2018 through 2027, and \$900,241,111 for streets and highways from 2028 through 2037. By contract, CRPC estimates \$59,737,297 from 2013 through 2017 for public transit, \$129,470,020 from 2018 through 2027, and \$163,679,390 from 2028 through 2037.

The New Orleans Regional Planning Commission (NORPC) is the MPO in the Greater New Orleans area. Its top tier transit projects primarily concern existing operations and maintenance needs. Its second tier transit projects include more projects that have the potential to transform the ways in which residents of the region access opportunity. In particular, they include bus rapid transit in Jefferson Parish, which could increase access to job opportunities in the City of New Orleans for Latinos residing in Jefferson Parish and access to job opportunities in Jefferson Parish for African Americans residing in New Orleans, and a number of planned street car expansions in New Orleans. These streetcar expansions include streetcar service along Rampart Street, starting from Canal Street and going first to Elysian Fields Avenue, then to Poland Avenue, and then to a refinery in St. Bernard Parish. There is also streetcar service along Elysian Fields Avenue between the Mississippi River and the University of New Orleans. The line along Rampart Street would connect historically African American neighborhoods to jobs in the French Quarter and the Central Business District.

d. Access to Low Poverty Neighborhoods

- i. Describe any disparities in exposure to poverty by protected class in the State. Which racial/ethnic, national origin (including LEP persons), or family status groups are most affected by these poverty indicators in the State?

Low Poverty Index by Race or Ethnicity by Metropolitan Statistical Area, All Individuals

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific-Islander, Non-Hispanic	Native American, Non-Hispanic
New Orleans	56.49	26.51	42.46	45.93	43.21
Baton Rouge	57.14	33.27	47.50	60.51	50.36
Houma	46.80	36.37	41.80	44.20	37.02
Lafayette	46.68	28.62	41.77	43.58	42.34
Lake Charles	49.93	25.24	43.58	54.52	42.84
Alexandria	42.07	21.62	37.50	44.16	37.14
Monroe	43.08	15.43	29.63	41.94	32.66
Shreveport	52.38	25.83	41.89	54.16	45.49


Low Poverty Index by Race or Ethnicity by Metropolitan Statistical Area Population below the Federal Poverty Line

Metropolitan Statistical Area	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific-Islander, Non-Hispanic	Native American, Non-Hispanic
New Orleans	46.45	20.16	31.33	33.58	30.92
Baton Rouge	53.09	22.86	44.16	41.13	66.38
Houma	42.54	29.45	25.42	24.61	36.14
Lafayette	39.59	24.54	38.24	52.78	39.64
Lake Charles	39.92	20.32	31.58	36.27	28.68
Alexandria	36.91	15.80	27.62	42.33	33.27
Monroe	34.84	10.90	25.67	39.62	26.61
Shreveport	42.86	18.36	30.37	61.40	34.12


Across all metropolitan areas in Louisiana, African American residents have the lowest Low Poverty Indices and therefore the highest exposure to high-poverty neighborhoods. The disparity in exposure between African Americans and Whites is the most extreme of any access to opportunity index. In general, Latinos are the next most likely racial or ethnic group to be exposed to high-poverty neighborhoods though the gap between the experiences of Latinos and African Americans is large. Asian or Pacific Islander residents have relatively low exposure to poverty and, in fact, when not controlling for individual poverty status, are less likely to be exposed to poverty than are Whites. Focusing on Asian or Pacific Islanders who are living poverty results in a more ambiguous, region-by-region comparison to the experiences of Whites. Data for Native Americans is somewhat erratic because of the small Native American populations in most regions, but, in the Houma region where the Native American population is significant, Native American exposure to high-poverty neighborhoods is higher than for Whites, but the difference is not extreme.

- ii. What role does a person’s place of residence play in their exposure to poverty in the State and region? Describe any patterns based on protected class.


Shreveport:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Shreveport area, the Low Poverty Index is highest in parts of the southeastern portion of the City of Shreveport, in Bossier Parish northeast of the City of Shreveport, and in suburbs to the southwest of Shreveport. The former two areas are predominantly White. The index is highest on the north side of the City of Shreveport. In rural areas, the index tends to be low to moderate. There does not appear to be a significant relationship between race, ethnicity, and exposure to poverty in rural census tracts, except that small satellite town and city centers tend to have especially low indices and are heavily African American. People of Mexican national origin tend to be concentrated in parts of Bossier City and southern Shreveport with moderate Low Poverty Indices. People of Vietnamese and Filipino national origin tend to be concentrated in portions of southern Shreveport with moderate Low Poverty Indices. There are also concentrations of persons of Filipino national origin in a high poverty portion of the City of Ruston and concentrations of German-Americans in a low-poverty portion of the City of Ruston. Families with children in the region are most heavily concentrated in suburban areas within in Bossier City and in Caddo Parish outside of Shreveport that have moderate to high Low Poverty Indices.

Monroe:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 14 - Demographics and Poverty

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

Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Monroe, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the Monroe area, Low Poverty Indices are highest in northern and western suburbs of the City of Monroe as well as in rural areas to the south of the city and its immediate suburbs. Exposure to high poverty neighborhoods is most pronounced on the south side of the City of Monroe and in the suburbs immediately to its south, in western Union Parish, in small town and city centers, and in the far eastern portion of the region along the Mississippi River. All areas with high Low Poverty Indices are predominantly White, and all areas that have greater exposure to poverty are predominantly African American. Western Union Parish is the least heavily African American of the high poverty areas, and it has the largest concentration of Latino residents in the region. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in western Union Parish and in the southern portions of the City of Monroe, which are areas with low Low Poverty Indices. People of Honduran national origin are concentrated in the central and southern portions of the City of Monroe in areas with moderate and low Low Poverty Indices. People of Pakistani national origin are concentrated in the eastern suburbs of Monroe in areas with moderate Low Poverty Indices. People of German national origin are concentrated in the western suburbs of Monroe in areas with high Low Poverty Indices. There are no concentrations of national origin groups in the eastern portions of the region. In the region, families with children are generally concentrated in the suburbs of Monroe in areas with moderate to high Low Poverty Indices. Rural areas and the south side of the City of Monroe tend to have few families with children.

Alexandria:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 14 - Demographics and Poverty

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


Jurisdiction: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Alexandria, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Alexandria area, the Low Poverty Index is highest in the southern and western suburbs of the City of Alexandria and in the vicinity of Fort Polk. These are predominantly White areas. The index is lowest in central and southeastern Alexandria and in the eastern rural portions of the region. The portions of the City of Alexandria with high exposure to poverty are predominantly African American. In the rural eastern portion of the region, areas that are further north and south tend to be heavily African American while those that are due east are predominantly White. People of Mexican national origin in the region are concentrated in the northern suburbs of Alexandria, to the west of Fort Polk, and in Forest Hill. These are generally areas with moderate Low Poverty Indices. People of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in Leesville in areas with low to moderate Low Poverty Indices. People of Chinese national origin are concentrated in the southwestern portion of the City of Alexandria, and in the northern suburbs of Alexandria in areas with moderate Low Poverty Indices. People of Burmese national origin are concentrated in the center of the City of Alexandria where exposure to poverty is high. Families with children are most prevalent in suburban areas outside of Alexandria and outside of Fort Polk that have moderate to high Low Poverty Indices.


Lake Charles:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the Lake Charles region, Low Poverty Indices are highest in the southwestern portion of the City of Lake Charles and in rural areas to the north and south of the city. These areas are predominantly White. Exposure to poverty is highest in the eastern portions of the City of Lake Charles and in suburban areas immediately to the east of the city. These are predominantly African American communities. Exposure to poverty is moderate in rural areas to the east and west of the city, which are predominantly White. It is notable that, likely because of employment in the oil and gas sector, rural areas have higher Low Poverty Indices in the Lake Charles area than they do elsewhere in the state. People of Mexican, Indian, and Vietnamese national origin in the region are concentrated in portions of southwestern Lake Charles that have high Low Poverty Indices. People of Honduran and Filipino national origin are concentrated in central Lake Charles where indices are low to moderate. There are also concentrations of Mexican-American and Honduran-American individuals in Sulphur where indices are low to moderate. Families with children in the region are concentrated in rural and suburban areas that have moderate to high Low Poverty Indices.


Lafayette:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Lafayette region, Low Poverty Indices are highest in the southwestern portions of the City of Lafayette and in adjacent suburbs and in the rural area between Kaplan and Abbeville. These areas are predominantly White. Exposure to poverty is highest in the northeastern portions of the City of Lafayette and in small city centers along U.S. 90 such as in New Iberia, Jeanette, Baldwin, and Franklin. These areas are predominantly African American. Other rural areas generally tend to have moderate Low Poverty Indices with the exception of Bayou Teche, which has high exposure to poverty. Bayou Teche is predominantly White. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated to the west of the City of Lafayette in areas where Low Poverty Indices are moderate and to the west of the City of New Iberia where indices are low.

Persons of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in the southwestern suburbs of Lafayette where indices are high, in rural areas to the southwest of Lafayette where indices are moderate, and along the U.S. 90 corridor between New Iberia and Franklin where indices are low to moderate. People of Laotian national origin are concentrated to the west of New Iberia where indices are low and in rural areas to the east of where the City of Lafayette where indices are moderate. People of Honduran national origin are concentrated in the western portion of the City of Lafayette where indices are moderate to high. People of Indian national origin are concentrated in the southwestern portion of the City of Lafayette where indices are high. Families with children are concentrated in rural and suburban areas where indices run the full gamut from low to high.


Houma:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Houma area, Low Poverty Indices are highest in the western portion of the City of Houma, the eastern portion of the City of Thibodaux, to the west of Lockport, and between Lockport and Larose. These areas are predominantly White and have some Native American population. Exposure to poverty is highest on the east side of the City of Houma and the west side of the City of Thibodaux. These areas are more heavily African American than the region as a whole and, in Houma, more heavily Native American. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated on the east side of the City of Houma where exposure to poverty is high and in Lockport where exposure to poverty is low. People of Honduran national origin are concentrated in Lockport where Low Poverty Indices are high. People of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated to the east of the City of Houma where indices are moderate. People of Chinese national origin are concentrated on the west side of the City of Houma where indices are high. People of Indian national origin are concentrated on the west side of the City of Thibodaux where indices are low to moderate. There does not appear to be a relationship between the location of families with children and exposure to neighborhood-level poverty in the Houma area.


Baton Rouge:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Baton Rouge area, the areas with the highest Low Poverty Indices are in the southern portions of the City of Baton Rouge and adjacent portions of both East Baton Rouge Parish and West Baton Rouge Parish. These areas are predominantly but not exclusively White, with the low poverty area within West Baton Rouge Parish being slightly more heavily African American than those areas in East Baton Rouge Parish. Areas with high levels of exposure to poverty are concentrated on the north side of the City of Baton Rouge and in rural areas to the north and northeast of Baton Rouge. The north side of the City of Baton Rouge is very heavily African American, and outlying rural areas more heavily African American than the region as a whole but not as concentrated as the north side of the City of Baton Rouge.


There are concentrations of Asian and Pacific Islander residents in one R/ECAP census tract in southern Baton Rouge that has high levels of exposure to poverty. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in the eastern portions of the City of Baton Rouge and East Baton Rouge Parish, as well as in Gonzalez and in Tangipahoa Parish to the west of Hammond. These areas primarily have low to moderate Low Poverty Indices. People of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in southeastern Baton Rouge in areas with high Low Poverty Indices. People of Indian national origin are concentrated in southern East Baton Rouge Parish in areas of moderate to high Low Poverty Indices as well as in the R/ECAP mentioned above where there are concentrations of Asian and Pacific Islanders. People of Chinese national origin are concentrated in that R/ECAP. People of Honduran national origin are concentrated in southern Baton Rouge and adjacent portions of East Baton Rouge Parish. Families with children are disproportionately likely to reside in suburban areas to the east and south of the City of Baton Rouge that have relatively high Low Poverty Indices.

New Orleans:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In Greater New Orleans, Low Poverty Indices are highest on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain and in neighborhoods in the western half of New Orleans, they are moderate in much of Jefferson Parish, and are low in the eastern half of the City of New Orleans. Areas with high Low Poverty Indices in the region tend to be predominantly White. Areas with moderate indices are mostly White but with substantial Latino populations and areas with low indices are predominantly African American. People of Honduran, Mexican, Nicaraguan, and Guatemalan national origins are concentrated on the east bank in Jefferson Parish where indices are moderate. There are also concentrations of people of Honduran and Vietnamese national origin on the Westbank in Jefferson Parish where indices are low to moderate. People of Vietnamese national origin are also concentrated in New Orleans East where indices are low to moderate. Families with children in the region are concentrated in Jefferson Parish, on the north shore, and in certain neighborhoods in eastern New Orleans, particularly those that are further north. These areas run the gamut of levels of exposure to poverty. There tend to be few families with children in areas of both low and high poverty closer to New Orleans’ downtown core.

- iii. Describe how the State’s programs and policies affect the ability of protected class groups to access low poverty areas.

In its QAP, the LHC provides 10 points for LIHTC properties that are located in census tracts in which the median income exceeds 120% of the area median income for the metropolitan statistical area and 12 points for projects where the median income exceeds 150% of the area median income. More total points are available for deconcentration projects than for any other type of development. At the same time, the geographic distribution of LIHTC’s in Louisiana remains stacked towards areas of African American and low-income population concentration.

e. Access to Environmentally Healthy Neighborhoods

- i. Describe any disparities in access to environmentally healthy areas within the State by protected class group.

Environmental Health Index by Region by Race, All Individuals

Region	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	Native American, Non-Hispanic
New Orleans	52.58	41.80	48.17	51.26	56.71
Baton Rouge	59.78	48.88	53.98	48.23	58.31
Houma	80.49	77.37	80.62	80.90	84.77
Lafayette	72.46	69.05	69.31	67.73	70.68
Lake Charles	63.96	63.26	61.82	59.95	65.39
Alexandria	65.46	58.74	65.42	58.12	66.44
Monroe	69.14	68.05	68.74	64.98	68.66
Shreveport	54.02	42.69	48.00	46.02	52.58

Environmental Health Index by Region by Race, Individuals below the Federal Poverty Line

Region	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	Native American, Non-Hispanic
New Orleans	50.58	39.87	45.55	47.45	49.78
Baton Rouge	56.99	44.85	52.56	45.37	49.77
Houma	81.23	78.11	79.52	87.03	83.92
Lafayette	71.38	69.64	68.63	63.46	67.89
Lake Charles	63.28	62.96	59.00	68.21	75.47
Alexandria	65.45	55.76	65.30	71.67	68.55
Monroe	68.15	68.43	72.90	66.54	73.64
Shreveport	53.17	40.94	50.51	51.78	41.92


In general, African Americans have less access to environmentally healthy areas across regions of the state. In some regions, these disparities are pronounced while, in others, they are relatively less pronounced. In general, disparities are higher in more heavily urbanized regions, which are also the regions where most of the state’s African American population resides. Latinos also face relatively consistent disparities across regions, but these disparities tend to be smaller in magnitude than for African Americans. There are no clear patterns with respect to access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods among Asian or Pacific Islanders or Native Americans.

In some regions, they have greater access than do Whites, in some they have similar access, and in some they have less access. In the Houma area, which is the most heavily Native American region of the state, Native Americans have greater access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than do other groups. This reflects the concentration of Native Americans in relatively rural census tracts with little industrial development, in contrast to portions of the state mentioned above where disparities in access to environmentally healthy areas are more pronounced. Residents of the New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and Shreveport regions, who are disproportionately African American, have less access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than do residents of more rural regions. It is worth reiterating the point that the primary valence of disparity in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods within Louisiana may be the region within the state where a person lives rather than where within that region a person lives.

- ii. Which racial/ethnic, national origin (including LEP persons), or family status groups have the least access to environmentally healthy areas within the State?


Shreveport:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health
Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Shreveport area, Environmental Health Indices are highest in rural areas to the east and south of Shreveport and are lowest in the City of Shreveport. In Bossier City, they are low to moderate, and, in the western and southern suburbs of Shreveport, they are moderate. African Americans are highly concentrated in the City of Shreveport but also comprise a majority of some rural census tracts with high indices. Whites and Latinos are concentrated in Bossier Parish. The suburban areas with moderate indices are relatively diverse to the west of Shreveport and predominantly White to the south. Overall, reduced access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods by African Americans appears to flow from the concentration of African Americans in the City of Shreveport rather than from disparities between predominantly White and predominantly African American rural areas. People of Mexican and Honduran national origin in the region are concentrated in Bossier City where Environmental Health Indices are moderate. People of Filipino and Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in the urbanized areas of the region but not in specific pockets within those areas. They tend to be concentrated in areas with moderate indices. Families with children are concentrated in Bossier City and in the southern suburbs of Shreveport, which are areas with moderate indices.

Monroe:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health

Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Monroe, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health


Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)


Region: Monroe, LA

Within the Monroe area, Environmental Health Indices are highest in rural areas to the far east of the region, in the Mississippi Delta. These areas tend to be more heavily African American than rural areas that are further west within the region. In the immediate vicinity of Monroe, indices tend to be moderate. In general, indices are lower in the more heavily African American, southern portions of Monroe, but that does not hold true in the predominantly African American southern suburb of Richwood, which has a high index value. There are very few members of identified national origin groups in the eastern Delta parishes where index values are highest. There are concentrations of people of Honduran and German national origin in Ruston where indices are high but not extremely high. There are also concentrations of persons of Honduran national origin in the northern portions of the City of Monroe where indices are moderate. Families with children are concentrated in the suburbs of Monroe. These are areas with moderate Environmental Health Indices.

Alexandria:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Legend

National Origin (Top 5 in Descending Order)

1 Dot = 25 People

- Mexico
- China excl. Hong Kong & Taiwan
- Vietnam
- Burma
- England

R/ECAP



Environmental Health 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


Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health

Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Alexandria, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



% of Households that are Families with Children

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

R/ECAP



Environmental Health 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

Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health


Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)


Region: Alexandria, LA

In the Alexandria area, Environmental Health Indices are highest in rural parishes along or near the Mississippi River. Indices are lowest, but still in the moderate range, in the City of Alexandria and at Fort Polk. They are moderately high elsewhere in rural areas to the north, south, and west of the City of Alexandria. African American residents of the region are generally concentrated in the City of Alexandria where indices are comparatively low and in rural eastern parishes where indices are especially high. White population is highest in the western portions of the region, which tend to have moderately high indices. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in areas within Pineville, Forest Hill, and Leesville that have moderate indices that are low by regional standards. People of Chinese national origin are concentrated in portions of Pineville that have relatively high indices. People of Vietnamese national origin are concentrated in parts of Pineville with low to moderate indices, and people of Burmese national origin are concentrated in parts of the City of Alexandria with low to moderate indices. There are very few members of these national origin groups in the rural eastern parishes where indices are notably high. There are relatively few families with children in portions of the City of Alexandria and adjacent to Pineville that have the lowest indices by regional standards. Outside of those urban areas, there are no discernible patterns between concentrations of families with children and Environmental Health Indices.

Lake Charles:




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



- Legend**
- National Origin (Top 5 in Descending Order)**
1 Dot = 25 People
- Mexico
 - Honduras
 - India
 - Philippines
 - Vietnam
- R/ECAP**
-
- Environmental Health 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

Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health
Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lake Charles, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




- % of Households that are Families with Children**
- 0% - 20%
 - 20.1% - 40%
 - 40.1% - 60%
 - 60.1% - 80%
 - 80.1% - 100%
- R/ECAP**
-
- Environmental Health 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


Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health
Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lake Charles, LA

In the Lake Charles area, Environmental Health Indices are highest in communities on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico and in rural areas on the eastern fringe of the region. Indices are lowest in industrial areas to the west and southwest of Lake Charles. These areas of high and low indices are all predominantly White. Indices on the heavily African American east side of Lake Charles are moderate. People of Mexican, Vietnamese, Indian, and Filipino national origin are concentrated in southern Lake Charles where indices are moderate. There is also a concentration of people of Mexican and Honduran national origin in Sulphur where indices are low. There are relatively few families with children in Sulphur where indices are low. Except on the western fringe of the region, rural areas, which tend to have higher indices, have relatively large numbers of families with children.

Lafayette:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Legend

National Origin (Top 5 in Descending Order)
 1 Dot = 25 People

- Mexico
- Vietnam
- Laos
- Honduras
- India


R/ECAP

Environmental Health 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

Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health
Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lafayette, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



% of Households that are Families with Children

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

R/ECAP


Environmental Health 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


Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health
Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Lafayette, LA

Environmental Health Indices in the Lafayette area are highest in the rural areas at the eastern and western edges of the region and moderate in the center of the region, including in the City of Lafayette. African American population in the region is generally concentrated in the City of Lafayette, where indices are moderate, and in rural eastern communities where indices are high. White population is highest in southern Lafayette and adjacent suburbs, as well as in rural western communities. People of various national origin groups, including Mexican- Americans, Vietnamese-Americans, Laotian-Americans, Honduran-Americans, and Indian Americans are concentrated in a variety of communities in the center of the region where indices are moderate. There are relatively few people of these national origin groups at the eastern or western extremes of the region where indices are high. Families with children are generally concentrated in rural areas with relatively high indices with the exception of the U.S. 90 corridor in the southeastern portion of the region, which has relatively few families with children. The City of Lafayette, which has the lowest indices in the region, has the lowest concentrations of families with children.

Houma:




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health
Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Houma-Terrebonne (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 15 - Demographics and Environmental Health
Description: Environmental Health Index with race/ethnicity, national origin, family status and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Houma-Terrebonne (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA

In the Houma area, Environmental Health Indices are relatively consistently high across communities though they are slightly higher in rural areas than they are in the Cities of Houma and Thibodaux. The latter areas are centers of African American population in the region. Rural areas with very high indices tend to be disproportionately White and Native American. People of Mexican national origin appear to be slightly more likely to reside in areas with moderate indices as opposed to high indices than other national origin groups in the region, primarily within the City of Houma. People of Honduran and Indian national origin primarily reside in areas with high indices. In the region, families with children are slightly more likely to live in rural areas with higher indices than they are to live in the city centers of Houma and Thibodaux where indices are lower.


Baton Rouge:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Baton Rouge area, Environmental Health Indices are lowest in the City of Baton Rouge and highest in rural areas to the north of Baton Rouge. Indices are moderate to the east, west, and south of the city. African American population is concentrated in the City of Baton Rouge, but rural areas that are more heavily African American largely have higher indices than predominantly White rural areas. People of Vietnamese, Chinese, and Honduran national origin are primarily concentrated in parts of the City of Baton Rouge with relatively low to moderate indices. People of Mexican and Indian national origin are concentrated in many of the same areas but are also concentrated in suburban areas to the east and southeast of the city that have slightly higher indices. Families with children are concentrated in suburban areas in the City of Baton Rouge and in rural areas to the east of the city. There are relatively few families with children in rural areas to the north and west of the city and in the city itself. In general, areas with concentrations of families with children have moderate to high Environmental Health Indices.


New Orleans:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the New Orleans area, Environmental Health Indices are highest on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain, in rural portions of St Bernard Parish, in Plaquemines Parish, and in St. James Parish. With the exception of St. James Parish, all of these areas are predominantly White. Indices are lowest in the City of New Orleans and in Jefferson Parish, including both predominantly White, predominantly African American, predominantly Asian American, and more integrated. In general, the portions of these parishes that are on the Westbank and those that are on the lakefront have slightly higher indices than those of the bulk of Jefferson Parish and New Orleans. The Westbank is somewhat more heavily Latino than the region as a whole. People of Honduran, Vietnamese, and Nicaraguan national origin are concentrated in parts of the region, within Jefferson Parish and New Orleans that have lower indices than the region as a whole. There are concentrations of people of Mexican and Guatemalan national origin in north shore communities with higher indices. Families with children in the region are concentrated on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain in areas with relatively high indices.

- iii. Describe any environmental laws, programs, policies, and practices (e.g., emissions standards, clean drinking water standard, lead-based paint standards) siting of industrial and energy facilities) in the State and region that affect access to environmentally healthy places of residence for members of protected class groups in the State. Include any relevant interstate compacts or other arrangements.

Louisiana has a number of state environmental quality laws that largely mirror the protections that exist under federal law. The Louisiana Environmental Quality Act includes the Air Control Law, the Water Control Law, the Nuclear Energy and Radiation Control Law, the Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery Law, the Hazardous Waste Control Law, and the Inactive and Abandoned Hazardous Waste Sites Law. Additionally, outside of the umbrella of the Louisiana Environmental Quality Act, Louisiana has several additional statutes, including the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Act, the Louisiana Natural Resources and Energy Act, and the Louisiana Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act. The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality is responsible for the administration and enforcement of these statutes. Under the leadership of current Secretary Chuck Carr Brown, the department has stressed the importance of the department's role in determining whether a company is in compliance.

With regard to the location of enforcement efforts in relation to neighborhood demographics, it is noteworthy that two of the Department of Environmental Quality's criminal prosecutions for illegal waste dumping in 2016 were focused on alleged activity in communities of color in New Orleans. In one case, an employee of a construction company allegedly dumped drums of chemicals on the ground near a storm drain in the Lower Ninth Ward. In another, a business owner allegedly abandoned over 500 tires near a building he rented in New Orleans East.

f. Patterns in Disparities in Access to Opportunity

Identify and discuss any overarching patterns of access to opportunity and exposure to adverse community factors by protected class in the State or region. Identify areas that experience an aggregate of poor access to opportunity and high exposure to adverse community factors in the State and region. Include how these patterns compare to patterns of segregation and R/ECAPs in the State and region.

Overall and across regions, African American and, to a lesser extent, Latino residents of Louisiana experience lower levels of access to the types of opportunity that are concentrated in suburban and rural areas. These opportunities might include access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods, access to low poverty neighborhoods, access to proficient schools, and labor market engagement. Disparities with respect to the type of opportunity that is associated with urban density include transit access and job proximity. When comparing city-dwelling African Americans to city-dwelling non-Hispanic Whites, rather than comparing individuals of different races within regions, disparities in access to opportunity at the disadvantage of African Americans and Latinos remain. Patterns of low access to opportunity, particularly the former types of opportunities that are more easily found outside of central cities, are strongly related to areas of segregation and R/ECAPs across the state.

2. Additional Information

- a. Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about disparities in access to opportunity in the State and region affecting groups with other protected characteristics.

There is limited data available concerning disparities in access to opportunity for groups with other protected characteristics; however, some useful information is available. For example, across the state, women have less access to employment than do men. According to the 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, while men experienced a slightly higher unemployment rate than women (7.7% as compared to 7.5%), 70.5% of men, ages 20 to 64, were employed as opposed to just 63.4% of women in that age range. Across regions, it is apparent that national origin minorities are clustered in urban and suburban areas but have limited access to rural areas. By extension, it is likely that religious minorities have less access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods than do other groups and more access to transit and job proximity. The relationship between religious affiliation and access to proficient schools and other amenities primarily found in metropolitan areas are not spread evenly across metropolitan areas.

- b. The program participant should also describe other information relevant to its assessment of disparities in access to opportunity, including any activities aimed at improving access to opportunities for areas that may lack such access or at promoting access to opportunity (e.g., proficient schools, employment opportunities, and transportation). There may also be other categories in which the State has identified disparities, (e.g., opportunities or lack thereof related to emergency preparedness, public safety, public health, housing finance and other

financial services, prisoner re-entry) related to protected class and place of residence, which the State should also describe.

There are severe disparities in access to neighborhoods where residents are safe from violent crime in Louisiana. The state, with 10.3 killings per 100,000 residents in 2015, has the highest homicide rate of any country. Those homicides are concentrated in central cities within the state that tend to be more heavily African American than their surrounding metropolitan areas. The Cities of New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Shreveport, Lafayette, Monroe, Alexandria, and Houma all had higher homicide rates in 2015 than did the state as a whole. Of the core cities of the state's regions, only Lake Charles had a homicide rate that was lower than the state as a whole. In New Orleans (41.7), Monroe (36.2), Baton Rouge (26.2), and Houma (20.4), homicide rates were especially high. New Orleans had the fourth highest homicide rate of any large city in the country in 2015. Homicides are concentrated in specific neighborhoods within cities that tend to be more heavily African American than the encompassing cities. The City of New Orleans has launched NOLA FOR LIFE, a comprehensive strategy for reducing murders.

Louisiana has experienced several catastrophic disasters in recent years, from Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Gustav and the B.P. Oil Spill to major flooding in August of 2016. Few, if any, other states have experienced as much strain on their capacity to respond to and recover from manmade and natural disasters.

3. Contributing Factors

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the State and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of disparities in access to opportunity.

- Access to financial services

This Analysis did not reveal evidence of a strong relationship between limited access to financial services and disparities in access to opportunity.

- The availability, type, frequency, and reliability of public transportation

The availability and frequency of public transportation are contributing factors to disparities in access to opportunity across all regions of the state. Public transportation outside of the core cities of Louisiana's sub-areas is limited and, in sub-areas anchored by smaller cities like Alexandria and Monroe, public transportation is non-existent. This can limit access to proficient schools, environmentally healthy neighborhoods, and areas of low poverty for racial and ethnic minorities. A family choosing to move near a proficient school in such an area may in turn decrease job proximity. Frequency of public transit service is an issue that can effect availability; a transit system without service outside peak work hours can impact transportation to for from work.

- Lack of private investments in specific areas within the State

Lack of private investment in rural parishes in the Mississippi Delta in the Monroe and Alexandria sub-areas is a contributing factor to disparities in access to employment for African American residents in those areas. Although African American population across the state is generally concentrated in cities, the Delta is the exception to that trend. The area, which spans two of the state's sub-areas, is heavily African American and has a primarily agricultural economy.

- Lack of public investments in specific areas within the State, including services or amenities

Limited public investments in specific areas within Louisiana is a contributing factor to disparities in access to transportation and, by extension, other disparities in access to opportunity that flow from limited transit access. Public transit is generally financed through public monies, and, in Louisiana, transit infrastructure is limited in rural areas.

- Lack of State, regional, or other inter-governmental cooperation

Lack of state and regional cooperation contributes to disparities in access to opportunity on a number of levels. With regard to access to proficient schools, this analysis did not reveal any programs that exist to facilitate inter-district transfers of students. With respect to transportation, across regions of the state, communities that do not have significant transit-dependent populations do not have public transportation available in their jurisdictions.

- Land use and zoning laws

Land use and zoning laws can contribute to a broad range of disparities in access to opportunity. In urban areas affordable multi-family housing is generally though not exclusively concentrated in central city neighborhoods, which placement can be impacted in part by land use and zoning laws in addition to other factors. Such laws can also impact environmentally healthy neighborhoods in connection with neighborhood placement in proximity to environmental impacting industrial uses.

- Lending Discrimination

Lending discrimination contributes to disparities in access to opportunity across all regions of Louisiana. Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data reveals persistent disparate outcomes in the mortgage lending context for applicants of color.

- Location of employers

In most parts of the state, the location of employers does not contribute to disparities in access to employment. In fact, protected groups that suffer from lower labor market engagement often have higher job proximity. The location of employers may, however, adversely affect access to proficient schools and environmentally healthy neighborhoods which may not be located in proximity to work. In the Delta the location of employers contributes to job access disparities.

- Location of environmental health hazards

The location of environmental health hazards is a contributing factor to disparities in access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods. Environmental health hazards in all regions of Louisiana are disproportionately concentrated in core cities that are more heavily African American and Latino than their surrounding regions and are often concentrated in specific neighborhoods or specific sections of those cities that are more heavily minority than the surrounding cities.

- Location of proficient schools and school assignment policies

The location of proficient schools and school assignment policies are contributing factors to disparities in access to proficient schools. Proficient schools are heavily concentrated in suburban areas that have smaller African American populations than do core cities.

- Location and type of affordable housing

The location of affordable housing is a contributing factor to disparities in access to opportunity across all regions of the state. Affordable housing is concentrated in central city locations that are heavily African American and that provide lower access to proficient schools, environmentally healthy neighborhoods, labor market engagement, and areas of low poverty. The Publicly Supported Housing analysis section of this analysis provides greater detail regarding the concentration of affordable housing in low opportunity areas.

- Occupancy codes and restrictions

This analysis did not reveal evidence that specific occupancy codes and restrictions in Louisiana have limited the ability of protected class members to access areas of opportunity.

- Private discrimination

Private discrimination is a contributing factor to disparities in access to opportunity. More data is available on this factor in the New Orleans sub-area. Reported fair housing testing evidence reflects incidents of housing providers in high opportunity areas treating African American home-seekers differently than non-Hispanic White home-seekers, which can take the form of outright refusals to rent or sell, differences in quoted prices or terms, and the differential treatment in the application process.

iv. Disproportionate Housing Needs

Housing needs in Louisiana vary significantly by group. Generally, African Americans experience greater housing problems and cost burdens. Asian and Pacific Islander households as well as Hispanic households also face greater housing problems than non-Hispanic White households. As previously discussed, African Americans disproportionately reside in R/ECAPs and there is a persistent correlation between race and economic status. Consequently, patterns of segregation are linked to housing cost burdens. Additionally, housing needs have been shaped by natural disasters, new economic investments in neighborhoods, and demographic changes. Lacks of private and public investment as well as discrimination are additional factors contributing to disproportionate housing needs. The analysis below provides more information about housing needs by group and by sub- region.

1. Analysis

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

Percentage of Households with Housing Problems by Region by Race or Ethnicity

Region	White, Not Hispanic	Black, Not Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic	Native American, Not Hispanic	Other, Not Hispanic
New Orleans	28.39%	50.22%	46.55%	34.61%	34.61%	45.49%
Baton Rouge	22.66%	41.72%	43.61%	31.43%	15.02%	33.16%
Houma	19.62%	42.28%	28.90%	29.55%	38.66%	42.96%
Lafayette	21.00%	42.34%	37.99%	31.34%	35.14%	27.40%
Lake Charles	20.87%	41.52%	40.77%	40.46%	37.94%	24.12%
Alexandria	22.29%	47.02%	25.45%	33.46%	23.75%	38.02%
Monroe	22.67%	46.25%	25.50%	41.74%	28.97%	32.77%

Shreveport	21.95%	42.97%	34.43%	38.84%	37.85%	38.93%
------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Percentage of Households with Housing Problems by Household Type and Region

Region	Family Households, <5 People	Family Households, 5+ People	Non-Family Households
New Orleans	30.45%	46.07%	44.76%
Baton Rouge	22.22%	41.80%	39.29%
Houma	19.50%	38.44%	28.73%
Lafayette	20.39%	38.36%	34.00%
Lake Charles	21.07%	35.57%	33.64%
Alexandria	22.91%	45.15%	36.07%
Monroe	24.91%	44.95%	36.59%
Shreveport	23.58%	42.10%	38.29%

Percentage of Households with Severe Housing Problems by Region by Race or Ethnicity

Region	White, Not Hispanic	Black, Not Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic	Native American, Not Hispanic	Other, Not Hispanic
New Orleans	13.83%	30.94%	26.70%	22.26%	21.31%	23.83%
Baton Rouge	11.64%	23.96%	26.74%	18.63%	5.31%	19.67%
Houma	10.57%	28.10%	18.28%	29.55%	22.27%	23.67%
Lafayette	10.60%	24.59%	22.80%	19.09%	19.08%	9.22%
Lake Charles	10.22%	22.25%	24.19%	20.56%	16.26%	9.36%
Alexandria	9.97%	26.07%	10.78%	25.94%	11.61%	15.24%
Monroe	10.40%	26.47%	7.35%	21.85%	5.56%	19.42%
Shreveport	10.29%	23.62%	19.93%	26.38%	27.08%	12.38%

Percentage of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden by Region by Race or Ethnicity

Region	White, Not Hispanic	Black, Not Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic	Native American, Not Hispanic	Other, Not Hispanic
New Orleans	12.38%	27.44%	19.39%	16.95%	19.45%	20.60%
Baton Rouge	9.48%	19.95%	16.60%	13.58%	2.98%	16.05%
Houma	7.05%	19.96%	4.53%	23.05%	13.97%	16.38%
Lafayette	8.17%	20.61%	13.19%	9.63%	13.05%	7.10%
Lake Charles	8.03%	19.12%	13.14%	19.90%	16.26%	6.58%
Alexandria	7.61%	22.51%	7.49%	20.68%	7.92%	14.07%
Monroe	8.43%	21.73%	5.54%	23.81%	5.56%	13.35%
Shreveport	8.42%	19.65%	14.97%	22.03%	22.68%	10.74%

Percentage of Households with Severe Housing Cost Burden by Household Type and Region

Region	Family Households, <5 People	Family Households, 5+ People	Non-Family Households
New Orleans	14.26%	14.71%	24.21%
Baton Rouge	9.15%	10.31%	20.92%
Houma	8.32%	7.98%	12.23%
Lafayette	8.81%	7.28%	16.27%
Lake Charles	8.40%	9.26%	15.92%
Alexandria	9.37%	13.66%	15.36%
Monroe	10.65%	13.99%	15.91%
Shreveport	10.02%	10.47%	17.88%

Across all regions of the state, African Americans in Louisiana consistently face disproportionately high levels of housing problems including housing cost burden and severe housing cost burden. Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households face a higher incidence of housing problems than non-Hispanic White households across all regions of the state, but generally encounter lower rates of housing problems than do African Americans. The same is generally true with respect to severe housing problems with more exceptions. Hispanics in the Monroe region have a lower rate of severe housing problems than do non-Hispanic Whites, and there are more regions in which either Hispanic or Asian or Pacific Islander households experience a higher rate of severe housing problems than there are with regard to housing problems generally. On a region by region basis, there are no clear patterns in the data for Native Americans; however, in the Houma region where the Native American population is largest, Native American households face high rates of all types of housing problems.

Across all regions, large families with five or more people are more likely to experience housing problems. Non-family households (single adult households or unrelated people sharing

housing) experience housing problems at higher rates than do smaller families of four or fewer people, which experience the lowest rates of housing problems. By contrast, non-family households experience severe housing cost burden at the highest rates of any household type. This likely supports an inference that the disproportionate incidence of housing problems among large families is driven by overcrowding rather than cost burden.


- b. In which areas in the State do residents 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?

Overall, residents in the New Orleans region experience the greatest housing burden. All other regions are relatively comparable, with small variations present on the basis of race or ethnicity. For example, severe housing cost burden for non-Hispanic White households in the Baton Rouge area is notably higher than it is for such households in any other region except for the New Orleans region, but severe housing cost burden for African American households is not notably high in that region. The Alexandria region has a severe housing cost burden for non-Hispanic Whites that is particularly high. It is notable that the New Orleans region, which has the highest incidence of severe housing cost burden, is the most highly segregated region in the state.

Below, this analysis evaluates the connection between areas of housing cost burden and segregated areas, integrated areas, and R/ECAPs in each of the state's sub-areas.

Shreveport:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 7 - Housing Burden and Race/Ethnicity

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

Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 8 - Housing Burden and National Origin

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


Jurisdiction: Shreveport (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Shreveport-Bossier City, LA

In the Shreveport area, areas with high rates of housing cost burden are clustered in the City of Shreveport and in Bossier City. African American residents are highly concentrated in portions of the City of Shreveport with high rates of housing cost burden, including in areas that are R/ECAPs. Areas with high rates of housing cost burden are not as widespread in Bossier City, but the portion of the city that does have high housing cost burden appears to be relatively integrated with a higher representation of Hispanic residents than is found in most parts of the region. In rural areas in the region, housing cost burden generally tends to be lower though there appears to be some connection between rural census tracts with moderately high rates of housing cost burden and areas of African American population concentration. There is some overlap with R/ECAPs in these areas, such as in Mansfield in DeSoto Parish. In the region, members of the most prevalent national origin groups are concentrated in Shreveport and Bossier City but appear to be most likely to reside in portions of these cities where housing cost burden is moderate rather than high.

Monroe:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 7 - Housing Burden and Race/Ethnicity

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

Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Monroe, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 8 - Housing Burden and National Origin

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


Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Monroe, LA

In the Monroe area, housing cost burden is highest on the south side of the city of Monroe and in small towns and cities that anchor rural areas like Ruston, Farmerville, and Bastrop. These areas overlap heavily with segregated areas of African American population concentration and R/ECAPs. Heavily African American rural areas in the Delta to the east of the region, by contrast, do not have high elevated rates of housing cost burden. In the City of Monroe, members of the most prevalent national origin groups generally live outside of areas with the highest incidence of housing cost burden. In Ruston, Honduran-Americans are concentrated in a R/ECAP with high rates of housing cost burden. Mexican-Americans are concentrated in a rural census tract to the northwest of Farmerville that has a high rate of housing cost burden.

Alexandria:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 7 - Housing Burden and Race/Ethnicity

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

Jurisdiction: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Alexandria, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 8 - Housing Burden and National Origin

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


Jurisdiction: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Alexandria, LA

In the Alexandria area, housing cost burden is highest in Alexandria, in suburban areas to the west of Alexandria, in Natchitoches, in Winnfield, and in Jonesville in Catahoula Parish. With the exception of the suburban areas to the west of Alexandria, these areas are all heavily African American and include R/ECAPs. In general, there is not a strong relationship between the location of national origin groups in the region and areas with high rates of housing cost burden although Burmese-American residents are concentrated in portions of the City of Alexandria that have high housing cost burden.

Lake Charles:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 7 - Housing Burden and Race/Ethnicity

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

Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lake Charles, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 8 - Housing Burden and National Origin


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

Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)


Region: Lake Charles, LA

In the Lake Charles area, there are relatively few areas with high rates of housing cost burden; however, the predominantly African American east side of the City of Lake Charles is the main exception to that trend. That area includes a R/ECAP. There are concentrations of Vietnamese-American and Mexican-American residents on the east side of Lake Charles in areas with moderate to high rates of housing cost burden.

Lafayette:



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 8 - Housing Burden and National Origin

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


Jurisdiction: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lafayette, LA

In the Lafayette region, areas with high rates of housing cost burden include the predominantly African American east side of Lafayette, in Crowley, to the north of New Iberia, and between New Iberia and Jeanerette. The latter three areas are moderately heavily African American but are not areas of extreme concentration or R/ECAPs. There are concentrations of Honduran-Americans in Crowley, but other areas with high rates of housing cost burden lack significant concentrations of members of identified national origin groups.

Houma:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 7 - Housing Burden and Race/Ethnicity

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

Jurisdiction: Houma-Ierrebonne (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 8 - Housing Burden and National Origin

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


Jurisdiction: Houma- Terrebonne (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA

In the Houma area, rates of housing cost burden are highest on the east side of Houma, on the west side of Thibodaux, and in Raceland. The portions of Houma and Raceland with high rates of housing cost burden are more heavily African American than the region as a whole while the west side of Thibodaux is not. As the Thibodaux region does not have any R/ECAPs, there is no overlap between R/ECAPs and areas with high rates of housing cost burden. People of Mexican national origin are concentrated in portions of the City of Houma that have high rates of housing cost burden.

Baton Rouge:

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 7 - Housing Burden and Race/Ethnicity

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

Jurisdiction: Baton Rouge (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Baton Rouge, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 8 - Housing Burden and National Origin

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


Jurisdiction: Baton Rouge (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: Baton Rouge, LA

In the Baton Rouge region, areas with high rates of housing cost burden include the heavily African American north side of Baton Rouge, Amite City, and Hammond. Portions of the north side of Baton Rouge are R/ECAPs. People of Honduran national origin are concentrated in an area on the south side of Baton Rouge that has high rates of housing cost burden. People of Chinese national origin are concentrated in a R/ECAP census tract in Baton Rouge.

New Orleans:

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: New Orleans (CDBG, HOME, ESG)

Region: New Orleans-Metairie, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the New Orleans region, areas with high rates of housing cost burden are concentrated in the heavily African American eastern half of the City of New Orleans. These areas do not contain large concentrations of members of identified national origin groups, and, notably, the rate of housing cost burden in the most heavily Vietnamese-American portion of New Orleans East is lower than in surrounding, predominantly African American portions of that section of the city.

- c. Describe any demographic trends, conditions, or other factors that impact disproportionate housing needs in the State and region.

The City of New Orleans has been undergoing significant population growth, particularly in some central neighborhoods, including Mid-City, Treme, and the Bywater, that are historically African American. Changing demographics in these areas has fueled rent increases that can contribute to housing cost burden among the pre-existing residents. Increases in Louisiana's Hispanic population are also associated with emerging trends in disproportionate housing needs, specifically with regard to overcrowding. Across the state, 7.4% of Hispanic households reside in overcrowded conditions as opposed to just 1.6% of non-Hispanic White households. This is a function of larger family sizes as well as relative differences in income levels.

2. Additional Information

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

Based on anecdotal reports, substandard housing conditions not captured by HUD-provided data is an issue across the state in rental housing, predominantly in African American areas.

3. Contributing Factors of Disproportionate Housing Needs

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the State and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of disproportionate housing needs.

- The availability of affordable units in a range of sizes

The availability of affordable units in a range of sizes is a contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs among large families and Hispanic households across all regions of the state. For Hispanic households, the problem is most acute in regions such as New Orleans and Baton Rouge where there are relatively larger Hispanic populations.

- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures

The displacement of residents due to economic pressures is a contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs in the New Orleans area where new economic investment is ongoing in historically African American neighborhoods. Rents are rising in these neighborhoods, resulting in increased housing cost burden.

- Lack of private investments in specific areas within the State

Lack of private investments in specific areas within Louisiana has an indirect effect on disproportionate housing needs. Specifically, lack of private investment is related to relatively low incomes in parts of the state that, in turn, is associated with housing cost burden. This analysis did not reveal evidence suggesting that lack of developer interest in expanding housing supply, particularly affordable housing stock, has been a significant factor in increasing housing costs in areas, including all of the state's metropolitan areas, where housing cost burden disparities persist.

- Lack of public investments in specific areas within the State, including services or amenities

Limited resources for public investments in specific areas can be a contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs.

- Land use and zoning laws

Land use and zoning laws can be a contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs in connection with placement of affordable housing.

- Lending Discrimination

Lending discrimination can be a significant contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs. Across sub-areas of the state, owner-occupied units are likely to have more bedrooms than are

rental units. Thus, when racial and ethnic minorities have less access to owner-occupied housing than similarly situated non-Hispanic White households, they are more likely to reside in housing that does not have a sufficient number of bedrooms for their household size and experience the housing problem of overcrowding.

Conclusion

Overall, African Americans and other minority groups in Louisiana experience a disproportionate number of housing problems and bear disproportionate cost burdens. Non-family households experience greater cost-burdens and housing problems than do families. Large families experience more housing problems than smaller families. In terms of region, housing burdens are most severe in the New Orleans area. Across Louisiana, persistent patterns of segregation and R/ECAPs are correlated with housing cost burdens.

C. Publicly Supported Housing Analysis

1. Analysis

a. Publicly Supported Housing Demographics

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

Shreveport:

Housing Type	Total Units	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Public Housing	1,040	7.68%	91.35%	0.67%	0.19%
Project-Based Section 8	2,289	12.22%	86.86%	0.74%	0.09%
Other Multifamily	203	50.00%	49.02%	0.49%	0.00%
HCV Program	3,153	8.62%	90.90%	0.41%	0.03%

In the Shreveport region, Black households are much more likely to reside in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units than are all other groups. White households are more likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing than are other groups. Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households are unlikely to reside in any of the categories of publicly supported housing.

Monroe:

Housing Type	Total Units	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Public Housing	1,377	13.58%	86.35%	0.07%	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	739	18.08%	81.51%	0.13%	0.00%
Other Multifamily	243	20.16%	76.95%	2.88%	0.00%
HCV Program	2,304	13.41%	86.37%	0.17%	0.04%

In the Monroe region, Black households are more likely to reside in all categories of publicly supported housing than all other racial or ethnic groups. Other Multifamily housing has a slightly higher representation of White and Hispanic households than do the other categories.

Alexandria:

Housing Type	Total Units	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Public Housing	277	5.71%	92.14%	1.07%	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	167	39.52%	60.48%	0.00%	0.00%
Other Multifamily	16	56.25%	43.75%	0.00%	0.00%
HCV Program	1,332	15.14%	83.88%	0.75%	0.07%

In the Alexandria region, Black households are more likely to reside in Public Housing and HCV-assisted units than in other types of publicly supported housing. White households are comparatively more likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing.

Lake Charles:

Housing Type	Total Units	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Public Housing	725	6.61%	92.15%	1.10%	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	625	38.88%	59.68%	1.28%	0.16%
Other Multifamily	119	52.94%	46.22%	0.84%	0.00%
HCV Program	1,910	13.20%	85.86%	0.47%	0.16%

In the Lake Charles region, Black households that are most likely to reside in Public Housing or in HCV-assisted units, are somewhat less likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8, and are least likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing. White households are most likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing, somewhat less likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8, and least likely to reside in Public Housing or in HCV-assisted units. Hispanic households are somewhat more likely to reside in Public Housing and Project-Based Section 8 than they are in Other Multifamily housing and HCV-assisted units. Very few Asian or Pacific Islander households live in any category of publicly supported housing.

Lafayette:

Housing Type	Total Units	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Public Housing	526	7.79%	89.92%	2.28%	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	982	36.62%	60.02%	2.75%	0.51%
Other Multifamily	123	65.04%	34.96%	0.00%	0.00%
HCV Program	2,816	14.95%	83.98%	0.96%	0.11%

In the Lafayette region, Black households that are most likely to reside in Public Housing and HCV-assisted units, are somewhat less likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8, and are least likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing. White households that are most likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing are somewhat less likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8, and least likely to reside in Public Housing and in HCV-assisted units. Hispanic households are more likely to reside in Public Housing and Project-Based Section 8 than they are in other types of publicly supported housing.

Houma:

Housing Type	Total Units	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Public Housing	250	25.72%	71.41%	0.91%	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	-	-	-	-	-
Other Multifamily	79	88.61%	8.86%	2.53%	0.00%
HCV Program	787	22.07%	75.31%	0.62%	0.12%

In the Houma region, Black households are more likely to reside in Public Housing and in HCV-assisted units and are less likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing. The inverse is true for White households. Hispanic households are also more likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing than in other types of publicly supported housing. Asian or Pacific Islander householders are roughly equally unlikely to reside in all categories of publicly supported housing.

Baton Rouge:

Housing Type	Total Units	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Public Housing	880	1.14%	82.16%	16.70%	0.00%
Project-Based Section 8	1,399	13.01%	86.20%	0.71%	0.07%
Other Multifamily	334	30.84%	66.47%	1.20%	1.50%
HCV Program	4,257	3.37%	92.02%	4.06%	0.16%

In the Baton Rouge region, Black households are most likely to reside in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units and are somewhat less likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing. White households are most likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing, somewhat less likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8, and least likely to reside in Public Housing and HCV-assisted units. Hispanic households are most likely to reside in Public Housing, somewhat less likely to reside in HCV-assisted units, and least likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing. Asian or Pacific Islander households are most likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing and least likely to reside in all other categories of publicly supported housing.

New Orleans:

Housing Type	Total Units	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Public Housing	3,275	4.76%	93.50%	1.53%	0.15%
Project-Based Section 8	4,949	29.91%	64.76%	4.46%	0.69%
Other Multifamily	478	58.79%	31.38%	9.21%	0.63%
HCV Program	26,232	3.71%	93.58%	2.49%	0.13%

In the New Orleans region, Black households are most likely to reside in Public Housing and in HCV-assisted units, are somewhat less likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8, and are least likely to reside in Other Multifamily housing. The inverse is true for White households as well as Hispanic households. Asian or Pacific Islander households are most likely to reside in Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing and are least likely to reside in Public Housing and in HCV-assisted units.

- ii. Compare the demographics, in terms of protected class, of residents of each category of publicly supported housing (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other HUD Multifamily Assisted developments, and HCV) to the population in general, and persons who meet the income eligibility requirements for the relevant category of publicly supported housing. Include in the comparison, a description of

whether there is a higher or lower proportion of particular groups based on protected class.

Shreveport:

Households	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Total Households	168,418	59.22%	36.26%	2.27%	0.99%
0-30% of AMI	23,169	34.33%	62.11%	1.63%	0.48%
0-50% of AMI	42,537	33.32%	58.30%	2.02%	0.47%
0-80% of AMI	71,014	40.49%	51.95%	2.36%	0.97%

In the Shreveport region, Black households comprise a higher percentage of households residing in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units than they do of all households and of all income-eligible households. White households make up a greater share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing than they do of the income-eligible households but not than they do of all households. Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households are underrepresented in all categories of publicly supported housing, both in comparison to their share of all households and in comparison to their share of income-eligible households.

Monroe:

Households	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Total Households	65,463	64.89%	31.92%	1.67%	0.58%
0-30% of AMI	9,035	40.73%	56.05%	1.25%	0.49%
0-50% of AMI	16,170	39.07%	52.83%	1.54%	0.44%
0-80% of AMI	25,380	45.55%	48.30%	1.49%	0.33%

In the Monroe region, Black households comprise a greater share of households residing in all categories of publicly supported housing than they do of income-eligible households or of all households. White and Asian or Pacific Islander households are underrepresented in all categories of publicly supported housing in relation to their shares of income-eligible households and all households. Hispanic households comprise a greater share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing than they do of income-eligible households or all households but a smaller share of all other categories of publicly supported housing.

Alexandria:

Households	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Total Households	54,096	69.79%	25.80%	1.83%	1.02%
0-30% of AMI	5,847	54.17%	42.99%	0.75%	1.53%
0-50% of AMI	11,166	46.64%	41.52%	0.96%	1.29%
0-80% of AMI	19,684	52.92%	38.13%	1.49%	1.01%

In the Alexandria region, Black households comprise a greater share of households residing in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units than they do of both income-eligible households and all households. Black households comprise a greater share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing than they do of all households, but the percentage of Other Multifamily occupants that are Black households is roughly in line with the income-eligible population. White households comprise a similar share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing to their share of income-eligible households but a lower share than their proportion of all households. For all other categories of publicly supported housing, White households are underrepresented. Hispanic households are underrepresented in Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing in relation to their share of both income-eligible households and all households. They comprise a similar share of households in Public Housing and HCV-assisted units to their proportion of income-eligible households but a lower share than their proportion of all households. Asian or Pacific Islander households are underrepresented in all categories of publicly supported housing.

Lake Charles:

Households	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Total Households	75,016	73.12%	22.52%	1.93%	0.80%
0-30% of AMI	9,350	53.11%	43.02%	1.25%	0.37%
0-50% of AMI	16,369	49.22%	38.09%	1.53%	0.68%
0-80% of AMI	29,289	56.43%	34.03%	2.00%	0.78%

In the Lake Charles region, Black households comprise a greater share of households residing in all categories of publicly supported housing than they do of both income-eligible households and total households. White households comprise a smaller share of households residing in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units than they do of both income-eligible households and total households. White households comprise a similar share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing to their proportion of income-eligible households but a lower proportion than their share of total households. Both Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households comprise a smaller share of households residing in all categories of publicly supported housing than they do of income-eligible households and total households.

Lafayette:

Households	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Total Households	173,517	72.61%	22.45%	2.29%	1.21%
0-30% of AMI	24,234	51.96%	41.83%	2.63%	1.31%
0-50% of AMI	43,072	50.30%	37.57%	2.57%	0.92%
0-80% of AMI	69,429	56.60%	34.22%	2.30%	1.10%

In the Lafayette region, Black households comprise a greater share of households residing in all categories of publicly supported housing than they do of all households. They also comprise a greater share of households residing in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units, but not Other Multifamily housing, than they do of income-eligible households. White households comprise a smaller share of households residing in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units than they do of both income-eligible households and of all households. They comprise a larger share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing than they do of income-eligible households, but not of all households. Hispanic households comprise a similar share of households residing in Public Housing and Project-Based Section 8 to their proportion of both income-eligible households and all households. They comprise a disproportionately small share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing and HCV-assisted units. Asian or Pacific Islander households are underrepresented in all categories of publicly supported housing.

Houma:

Households	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Total Households	71,068	77.10%	14.60%	3.01%	0.87%
0-30% of AMI	7,269	57.27%	32.84%	2.44%	1.42%
0-50% of AMI	13,254	54.78%	25.97%	2.14%	0.76%
0-80% of AMI	24,029	60.79%	23.97%	2.59%	1.05%

In the Houma region, Black households comprise a larger share of households residing in Public Housing and in HCV-assisted units than they do of both income-eligible households and of all households. They comprise a smaller share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing than they do of both income-eligible households and all households. White households comprise a smaller share of households residing in Public Housing and in HCV-assisted units than they do of both income-eligible households and of all households. They comprise a larger share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing than they do of both income-eligible households and of all households. Hispanic households comprise a similar share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing to their portion of both income eligible households and of all households but are underrepresented in both Public Housing and the HCV program. Asian or Pacific Islander households are underrepresented in all categories of publicly supported housing.

Baton Rouge:

Households	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Total Households	292,352	61.87%	32.74%	2.59%	1.60%
0-30% of AMI	41,923	43.11%	51.57%	2.41%	1.38%
0-50% of AMI	72,002	38.41%	50.72%	3.01%	1.34%
0-80% of AMI	116,732	44.73%	46.40%	2.73%	1.58%

In the Baton Rouge region, Black households comprise a greater share of households residing in all categories of publicly supported housing than they do of both income-eligible households and of all households. White households comprise a smaller share of households residing in all categories of publicly supported housing than they do of both income-eligible households and of all households. Hispanic households comprise a greater share of households residing in Public Housing and in HCV-assisted units than they do of both income-eligible households and of all households while being underrepresented in Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing. Asian or Pacific Islander households comprise a similar share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing to their proportion of both income-eligible households and of all households. They are underrepresented in all other categories of publicly supported housing.

New Orleans:

Households	Total	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander
Total Households	459,789	57.14%	32.42%	6.55%	2.29%
0-30% of AMI	66,303	33.75%	56.07%	5.81%	2.23%
0-50% of AMI	113,609	32.32%	51.42%	6.64%	2.08%
0-80% of AMI	186,588	38.77%	46.50%	7.20%	2.12%


In the New Orleans region, Black households comprise a greater share of households residing in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units than they do of both income-eligible households and of all households. They comprise a similar share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing to their share of all households but a lower one than their proportion of income-eligible households. The Assessment of Fair Housing for the City of New Orleans and the Housing Authority of New Orleans revealed that some of the developments counted as Other Multifamily housing by HUD are market-rate, which may partially explain this phenomenon. White households comprise a smaller share of households residing in both Public Housing and HCV-assisted units than they do of both income-eligible housing and all households. They comprise a similar share of households residing in Project-Based Section 8 to their share of income-eligible households, which is lower than their share of all households. They comprise a larger share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing than their share of income-eligible households and a similar one to their proportion of all households. Hispanic households comprise a smaller share of households residing in Public Housing, Project-Based Section 8, and HCV-assisted units

than their proportion of both income-eligible households and all households. They comprise a larger share of households residing in Other Multifamily Housing than they do of both income-eligible households and all households. Asian or Pacific Islander households are underrepresented in all categories of publicly supported housing.


b. Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy

- i. Describe patterns in the geographic location of publicly supported housing by program category (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other HUD Multifamily Assisted developments, HCV, and LIHTC) in relation to previously discussed segregated areas and R/ECAPs.

Shreveport:




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the Shreveport areas, publicly supported housing is highly concentrated in the City of Shreveport and, in particular, in highly segregated R/ECAP areas of the city. Public housing and Project-Based Section 8 are more highly concentrated than are Low Income Housing Tax Credit and Other Multifamily developments. There are also areas of concentration in Mansfield, which corresponds to a R/ECAP, and in Minden, which is more heavily African American but is not a R/ECAP. Housing Choice Voucher holders are highly concentrated in Shreveport, Mansfield, and Minden, as well.

Monroe:

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: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Monroe, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 6 - Housing Choice Vouchers and Race/Ethnicity
Description: Housing Choice Voucher map with race/ethnicity dot density map and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Monroe (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Monroe, LA

In the Monroe area, there are significant concentrations of publicly supported housing in Monroe, Ruston, Bastrop, Rayville, and Farmerville. This is true across categories of publicly supported housing developments. Each of these cities has R/ECAPs in which publicly supported housing units are concentrated. Notably the rural R/ECAPs in the eastern portion of the region do not have any concentration of publicly supported housing units. Housing Choice Voucher holders are much more intensely concentrated in Monroe. While the other cities have more voucher holders than surrounding areas, the spatial disparity is not as intense. It is noteworthy that voucher holders are concentrated in a R/ECAP area of East Carroll Parish, which is extremely rural.

Alexandria:

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: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Alexandria, LA

R/ECAP



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 6 - Housing Choice Vouchers and Race/Ethnicity
Description: Housing Choice Voucher map with race/ethnicity dot density map and R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Alexandria (CDBG, HOME)
Region: Alexandria, LA

In the Alexandria area, publicly supported housing is concentrated in Alexandria, Pineville, Marksville, Leesville, and DeRidder. The only R/ECAPs among these cities are in Alexandria, but Marksville is an area of relative African American population concentration in comparison to the surrounding region. There do not appear to be significant differences in the location of publicly supported housing depending on the category of publicly supported housing. Voucher utilization patterns in the region differ somewhat with significant concentrations of voucher holders in Natchitoches, which is the site of a R/ECAP in addition to Alexandria.

Lake Charles:

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: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lake Charles, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 6 - Housing Choice Vouchers and Race/Ethnicity

Description: Housing Choice Voucher map with race/ethnicity dot density map and R/ECAPs


Jurisdiction: Lake Charles (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lake Charles, LA

In the Lake Charles area, publicly supported housing is concentrated in Lake Charles, Sulphur, and Jennings, though much more intensively in Lake Charles than in the other two cities. In Lake Charles, but not elsewhere in the region, the location of publicly supported housing closely mirrors R/ECAPs with high concentrations of African American residents. The predominantly African American east side of Lake Charles is the only area of Housing Choice Voucher concentration in the region.

Lafayette:

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: Lafayette (CDBG, HOME)

Region: Lafayette, LA


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



In the Lafayette area, publicly supported housing appears to be somewhat more widely dispersed than in other regions. There are small clusters of publicly supported housing in Lafayette, Breaux Bridge, New Iberia, Jeanerette, Abbeville, and Crowley. Within the City of Lafayette, developments are most likely to be on the predominantly African American east side of the city. Project-Based Section 8 developments are concentrated in Lafayette, and there is a concentration of Other Multifamily housing in New Iberia. Lafayette and New Iberia are the sites of R/ECAPs, but the other cities are not. Non-R/ECAPs that have concentrations of publicly supported housing tend to have higher African American population concentrations than the region as a whole but not by a significant margin. Housing Choice Voucher holders in the region are generally concentrated in the same areas.

Houma:

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: Houma-Terrebonne (CDBG, HOME)


Region: Houma-Thibodaux, LA

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




In the Houma area, publicly supported housing appears to be spread widely across the populated portions of the region with few apparent patterns of concentration. Public housing is more likely to be located in Houma and Thibodaux, including in parts of those cities that are more heavily African American than the region as a whole, than in other sections of the region. There are no R/ECAPs in the region. The area with the greatest concentration of voucher holders is in Lockport, which is predominantly non-Hispanic White.

Baton Rouge:




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 6 - Housing Choice Vouchers and Race/Ethnicity
 Description: Housing Choice Voucher map with race/ethnicity dot density map and R/ECAPs
 Jurisdiction: Baton Rouge (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
 Region: Baton Rouge, LA

In the Baton Rouge area, all categories of hard units of publicly supported housing are highly concentrated in the City of Baton Rouge and, in particular, on the predominantly African American north side of the city, which contains multiple R/ECAPs. Housing Choice Voucher holders are generally concentrated in the same areas though there is also an area of voucher concentration in a predominantly African American portion of Port Allen that is not a R/ECAP.

New Orleans:



In the New Orleans region, publicly supported housing is highly concentrated in the City of New Orleans, the portion of Jefferson Parish that is on the Westbank, Slidell, and Covington. Within New Orleans, publicly supported housing is highly concentrated in the heavily African American central and eastern portions of the city, which include many R/ECAPs. There is comparatively less publicly supported housing in mostly non-Hispanic White portions of Uptown, and there are no hard units of publicly supported housing at all in almost all-White Lakeview. The portions of Jefferson Parish that have concentrations of publicly supported housing are more heavily Hispanic than the region as a whole and include one R/ECAP. Within Slidell, publicly supported housing is more likely to be located in areas with a higher African American population concentration than that of the city as a whole. Public housing in the region is highly concentrated in New Orleans.

Almost all publicly supported housing in Covington consists of LIHTC developments. Use of Housing Choice Vouchers in the region is highly concentrated in heavily African American R/ECAP areas in the eastern half of New Orleans and on the Westbank in New Orleans. In general, it appears that voucher holders have been pushed more to the geographic edges of the city in comparison to residents of hard units of publicly supported housing.

- ii. Describe patterns in the geographic location of publicly supported housing in the State that primarily serves families with children, elderly persons, or persons with disabilities in relation to previously discussed segregated areas or R/ECAPs?

Overall, elderly households and households including persons with disabilities tend to be more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs across all regions, and families with children tend to be more likely to reside within R/ECAPs. This is generally true across categories of publicly supported housing, but differences tend to be more pronounced in Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing, both of which contain many senior developments and developments designated for occupancy by persons with disabilities, than in the public housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs. These trends are subject to regional variations, most notably in New Orleans. The data from which the table below was derived was limited to jurisdictions that are HUD program participants and does not reflect the broader regions within jurisdictions.

Shreveport:

	Total Occupied Units	% Elderly	% with a Disability	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with Children
Public Housing								
R/ECAP tracts	207	20.35%	15.12%	0.00%	99.42%	0.58%	0.00%	61.63%
Non R/ECAP tracts	376	14.93%	11.20%	0.27%	99.27%	0.00%	0.00%	63.47%
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	914	17.40%	13.13%	3.56%	95.47%	0.54%	0.00%	58.80%
Non R/ECAP tracts	1,613	45.29%	27.77%	13.98%	84.61%	1.09%	0.19%	27.89%
Other HUD Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	13	7.14%	100.00%	38.46%	61.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Non R/ECAP tracts	259	81.63%	13.78%	47.40%	35.42%	16.15%	0.52%	2.55%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	750	10.86%	21.43%	4.60%	95.11%	0.14%	0.00%	56.71%
Non R/ECAP tracts	1,445	9.96%	21.24%	6.79%	92.61%	0.60%	0.00%	55.83%

In the City of Shreveport, housing that primarily serves elderly households, including a large share of Project-Based Section 8 units and Other Multifamily units, is dispersed outside of R/ECAPs. In the Housing Choice Voucher and public housing programs, there are not significant disparities in the locations of housing that primarily serves persons with disabilities and housing that does not. Superficially, it appears that Other Multifamily housing in R/ECAPs is more likely to house persons with disabilities than such housing outside of R/ECAPs, but there are only 13 units of Other Multifamily housing within R/ECAPs. In Project-Based Section 8 housing, however, developments outside of R/ECAPs have more than double the concentration of persons with disabilities as developments within R/ECAPs. Overall, publicly supported housing that primarily serves persons with disabilities is disproportionately likely to be located outside of R/ECAPs but not to the same extent as publicly supported housing that primarily serves elderly households. In all categories of publicly supported housing except for Project-Based Section 8, the percentages of households that are families with children within and outside of R/ECAPs in those categories are similar. In Project-Based Section 8 housing, families with children disproportionately reside in R/ECAPs.

Monroe:

	Total Occupied Units	% Elderly	% with a Disability	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with Children
Public Housing								
R/ECAP tracts	913	25.35%	17.03%	16.71%	83.16%	0.13%	0.00%	54.55%
Non R/ECAP tracts	278	42.45%	12.95%	27.74%	71.90%	0.36%	0.00%	42.81%
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	959	15.30%	15.96%	6.41%	90.10%	0.90%	2.59%	53.66%
Non R/ECAP tracts	258	15.81%	37.55%	15.79%	83.81%	0.40%	0.00%	28.46%
Other HUD Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	147	95.27%	4.73%	2.08%	95.83%	2.08%	0.00%	0.00%
Non R/ECAP tracts	114	68.75%	25.89%	48.62%	50.46%	0.92%	0.00%	0.00%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	694	7.53%	18.23%	0.17%	99.83%	0.00%	0.00%	67.73%
Non R/ECAP tracts	604	12.31%	27.31%	7.10%	92.90%	0.00%	0.00%	50.77%

In the City of Monroe, there is no clear pattern regarding whether elderly households in particular categories are likely to reside within or outside of R/ECAPs. In public housing and to a much lesser extent in the Housing Choice Voucher program, they are more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs than are non-elderly households. In Other Multifamily housing, they are more likely to reside within R/ECAPs. In Project-Based Section 8, they comprise similar percentages of tenants inside and outside of R/ECAPs. Households including persons with disabilities are disproportionately likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs in all categories of publicly supported housing except for public housing where the degree to which they are more likely to reside within R/ECAPs is slight. Families with children are disproportionately likely to reside within R/ECAPs across categories of publicly supported housing in which families with children reside in the city. In Monroe, no families with children live in Other Multifamily housing.

Alexandria:

	Total Occupied Units	% Elderly	% with a Disability	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with Children
Public Housing								
R/ECA P tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	416	9.12%	12.71%	2.84%	96.31%	0.57%	0.28%	70.99%
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	74	20.51%	3.85%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	67.95%
Non R/ECAP tracts	101	89.32%	25.24%	76.47%	21.57%	0.00%	0.098%	0.00%
Other HUD Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	18	12.50%	100%	53.33%	46.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	193	14.55%	18.18%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	66.06%
Non R/ECAP tracts	640	15.06%	22.87%	7.65%	91.42%	0.56%	0.19%	51.72%

In the City of Alexandria, there are only two categories of publicly supported housing that include units both within and outside of R/ECAPs. In the Project-Based Section 8 Program, elderly households and persons with disabilities are much more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs than within R/ECAPs, and families with children are disproportionately likely to reside within R/ECAPs. The same trends hold with respect to the Housing Choice Voucher program, but the extent of the difference between voucher holders within and outside of R/ECAPs is much smaller than in Project-Based Section 8 housing. It is notable that public housing, not located in R/ECAPs, has the highest concentration of families with children of any publicly supported housing program in the city. Although no units are located in R/ECAPs, buildings are concentrated in predominantly African American neighborhoods within the city.

Lake Charles:

	Total Occupied Units	% Elderly	% with a Disability	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with Children
Public Housing								
R/ECAP tracts	217	15.67%	9.68%	0.93%	98.15%	0.93%	0.00%	60.83%
Non R/ECAP tracts	536	26.69%	13.35%	9.33%	88.95%	1.71%	0.00%	50.94%
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	120	8.00%	4.80%	2.42%	97.58%	0.00%	0.00%	73.60%
Non R/ECAP tracts	675	45.42%	49.20%	49.59%	48.57%	1.43%	0.20%	19.32%
Other HUD Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	100	43.43%	85.86%	47.42%	49.48%	2.06%	1.03%	3.03%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	109	20.79%	17.82%	1.01%	97.98%	1.01%	0.00%	40.59%
Non R/ECAP tracts	1,503	9.52%	17.36%	8.75%	90.58%	0.52%	0.07%	61.61%

In the City of Lake Charles, elderly households are disproportionately likely to reside in public housing and in Project-Based Section 8 outside of R/ECAPs but comprise a larger share of R/ECAP tenants in the Housing Choice Voucher program. There are no Other Multifamily developments located within R/ECAPs in the city. Persons with disabilities are disproportionately likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs in all categories except for Housing Choice Vouchers where they comprise similar percentages of R/ECAP and non-R/ECAP tenants. Families with children are more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs if they are voucher holders and within R/ECAPs if they live in public housing or Project-Based Section 8.

Lafayette:

	Total Occupied Units	% Elderly	% with a Disability	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with Children
Public Housing								
R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	528	25.24%	45.47%	7.65%	90.20%	1.76%	0.00%	34.68%
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	236	18.60%	34.71%	39.58%	60.00%	0.42%	0.00%	39.67%
Non R/ECAP Tracts	950	16.67%	23.75%	46.95%	48.84%	3.21%	1.00%	42.05%
Other HUD Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	91	23.86%	100.00%	54.22%	44.58%	1.20%	0.00%	0.00%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	409	11.76%	18.49%	4.00%	94.00%	2.00%	0.00%	61.90%
Non R/ECAP tracts	965	13.75%	22.49%	13.75%	84.79%	1.34%	0.00%	50.00%

In the City of Lafayette, only Project-Based Section 8 and the Housing Choice Voucher programs have tenants both within and outside of R/ECAPs. In Project Based Section 8, tenants within R/ECAPs were slightly more likely to be elderly, slightly less likely to be families with children, and significantly more likely to include persons with disabilities. In the Housing Choice Voucher program, tenants within R/ECAPs are slightly less likely to be elderly or to include persons with disabilities and are significantly more likely to be families with children. Public housing and Other Multifamily housing, which are exclusively located outside of R/ECAPs, have tenants who are more likely to be elderly or to have disabilities and are less likely to be families with children than in other categories of publicly supported housing.

Houma:

	Total Occupied Units	% Elderly	% with a Disability	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with Children
Public Housing								
R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	458	42.27%	51.20%	40.84%	54.08%	1.32%	0.00%	24.84%
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other HUD Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	85	61.90%	40.48%	91.25%	8.75%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non R/ECAP tracts	424	13.64%	22.25%	15.67%	80.10%	0.50%	0.50%	60.53%

As there are no R/ECAPs in Houma/Terrebonne Parish, there are no disparities with regard to publicly supported housing to mention here.

Baton Rouge:

	Total Occupied Units	% Elderly	% with a Disability	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with Children
Public Housing								
R/ECAP tracts	355	12.46%	22.84%	3.82%	95.49%	0.69%	0.00%	53.29%
Non R/ECAP tracts	580	13.97%	35.34%	0.69%	98.96%	0.35%	0.00%	47.41%
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	578	27.55%	16.76%	10.39%	89.61%	0.00%	0.00%	51.83%
Non R/ECAP tracts	1,549	47.55%	19.58%	22.59%	73.23%	3.40%	0.64%	29.44%
Other HUD Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	63	100%	1.54%	34.92%	55.56%	7.94%	1.59%	0.00%
Non R/ECAP tracts	207	94.84%	5.16%	29.47%	70.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	436	8.45%	19.25%	2.13%	97.64%	0.24%	0.00%	53.76%
Non R/ECAP tracts	3,148	11.34%	16.55%	2.13%	97.38%	0.50%	0.10%	60.08%

In the City of Baton Rouge, elderly households disproportionately reside outside of R/ECAPs across all categories of publicly supported housing except for Other Multifamily. The disparity is most significant with respect to Project-Based Section 8. Persons with disabilities are disproportionately likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs in all categories of publicly supported housing except for the Housing Choice Voucher program. The difference is most significant with respect to public housing. Families with children are more likely to reside in R/ECAPs in public housing and Project- Based Section 8 housing but more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs in the Housing Choice Voucher program. Consistent with the heavy representation of elderly households in Project- Based Section 8 outside of R/ECAPs, the difference for families with children is largest in Project-Based Section 8.

New Orleans:

	Total Occupied Units	% Elderly	% with a Disability	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian or Pacific Islander	% Families with Children
Public Housing								
R/ECAP tracts	1,427	36.45%	40.87%	1.33%	97.01%	1.49%	0.08%	36.69%
Non R/ECAP tracts	257	6.18%	13.51%	0.00%	93.39%	6.61%	0.00%	69.11%
Project-Based Section 8								
R/ECAP tracts	1,816	75.48%	28.07%	30.75%	57.72%	4.17%	6.64%	0.00%
Non R/ECAP tracts	2,321	64.61%	17.30%	26.81%	54.92%	15.37%	2.82%	16.86%
Other HUD Multifamily								
R/ECAP tracts	181	92.22%	12.22%	20.59%	22.94%	25.29%	31.18%	0.00%
Non R/ECAP tracts	315	93.31%	13.06%	44.26%	27.87%	9.84%	12.79%	0.00%
HCV Program								
R/ECAP tracts	6,192	14.53%	23.01%	1.25%	95.70%	2.87%	0.0%	47.82%
Non R/ECAP tracts	12,399	11.58%	19.95%	1.37%	94.99%	3.28%	0.22%	53.64%

In the City of New Orleans, elderly households are disproportionately likely to reside within R/ECAPs across all categories of publicly supported housing except for Other Multifamily, which is almost exclusively resided by elderly households. The gap between R/ECAP and non-R/ECAP developments for elderly households is widest in public housing. Persons with disabilities are also more likely to reside within R/ECAPs across all categories aside from Other Multifamily housing. Families with children are more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs in all categories aside from Other Multifamily housing, which includes no families with children. The apparent trends in New Orleans differ significantly from what is seen in most regions of the state where elderly households and persons with disabilities are generally more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs and families with children are more likely to live within R/ECAPs.

- iii. Describe how the patterns of demographic composition of occupants of publicly supported housing in the State vary depending on whether they are located in R/ECAPS or outside of R/ECAPS?

Shreveport:

In Shreveport, the percentage of households in each category of publicly supported housing that is African American is higher within R/ECAPs than outside of R/ECAPs while the opposite is true for non-Hispanic White households. The differences are largest for Other Multifamily housing and Project-Based Section 8. The differences are smaller for public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher Program because almost all participants in both programs are African American.

Monroe:

In Monroe, the percentage of households in each category of publicly supported housing that is African American is higher within R/ECAPs than outside of R/ECAPs while the opposite is true for non-Hispanic White households. The difference is largest for Other Multifamily housing.

Alexandria:

In Alexandria, there are no public housing or Other Multifamily Housing developments in R/ECAPs. For both Project-Based Section 8 and the Housing Choice Voucher program, African American households comprise a higher share of tenants in R/ECAPs than they do of tenants outside of R/ECAPs while the opposite is true for non-Hispanic White households. For Project-Based Section 8, the difference is particularly extreme though the total number of units in the city is relatively small.

Lake Charles:

In Lake Charles, there are no Other Multifamily developments in R/ECAPs. Across all other categories of publicly supported housing, African American households are more likely to reside in housing within R/ECAPs than in housing outside of R/ECAPs while the opposite is true of non-Hispanic White households. The disparity is much more extreme for Project-Based Section 8 than it is for public housing or the Housing Choice Voucher program. It appears that Project-Based Section 8 housing for elderly households is concentrated outside of R/ECAPs and is relatively inaccessible to African American households while family housing is concentrated in R/ECAPs and is more accessible to African American households.

Lafayette:

In Lafayette, there are no public housing or Other Multifamily developments in R/ECAPs. For both Project-Based Section 8 and the Housing Choice Voucher Programs, households within R/ECAPs are more likely to be African American and less likely to be non-Hispanic White than households outside of R/ECAPs.

Houma:

In Houma, there are no differences in the racial or ethnic composition of households residing in publicly supported housing in light of the lack of R/ECAPs.

Baton Rouge:

In Baton Rouge, public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher program share similar percentages of racial and ethnic groups residing within and outside of R/ECAPs. This is largely attributable to the fact that African American households make up an extremely high share of households in both types of publicly supported housing. For Project-Based Section 8, the percentage of African American households in R/ECAPs is higher than the percentage of African American households outside of R/ECAPs while the inverse is true for non-Hispanic White households. In Other Multifamily housing, African American households make up a higher share of tenants outside of R/ECAPs than they do of tenants within R/ECAPs while non-Hispanic White and Hispanic households represent a higher share within R/ECAPs.

New Orleans:

In New Orleans, on a category by category basis, racial or ethnic groups are generally similarly likely to reside within or outside of R/ECAPs. The major exception to this are for Hispanics in Project-Based Section 8, where they are much more likely to reside within R/ECAPs, and in Other Multifamily housing, where they are much more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs, and for Asian or Pacific Islanders in Other Multifamily housing, who are also more likely to reside outside of R/ECAPs. The New Orleans Assessment of Fair Housing revealed that some developments labeled Other Multifamily housing in HUD's AFFH Data & Mapping Tool are market rate developments that secured HUD loans and are not a source of affordable housing. Since there is much more Project-Based Section 8 housing than Other Multifamily housing in New Orleans, Hispanics in publicly supported housing in the city tend to be concentrated in R/ECAPs. African Americans comprise the vast majority of occupants of both public housing and of Housing Choice Voucher holders. Because those two categories are distributed very differently in relation to R/ECAPs, with public housing concentrated in R/ECAPs and Housing Choice Vouchers mostly utilized outside of R/ECAPs, African Americans are not particularly concentrated or dispersed in comparison to other publicly supported housing residents. To a much greater extent, since they comprise the vast majority of all publicly supported housing residents, they are subject to the overall concentration of publicly supported housing in R/ECAPs, rather than to intra- program racial and ethnic disparities. It is worth noting that many public housing developments in New Orleans are extremely large and dominate the census tracts in which they are located. This contributes to their concentration in R/ECAPs because, even if neighboring residents are of a different racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic background than public housing residents, the encompassing census tract is still likely to be a R/ECAP.

- iv. Explain how the occupancy demographic patterns by protected class of each category of publicly supported housing in the State relate to the demographic patterns of the areas in the State in which the housing is located.

As described above, public housing residents and Housing Choice Voucher holders in every core city of the state's regions are more heavily African American than the city or region in which they reside. For residents of Project-Based Section 8 and Other Multifamily housing, the picture is less clear and largely hinges on the proportion of such housing that is for elderly households. Publicly supported housing for elderly households typically has a higher percentage of non-Hispanic White residents than does family-occupancy housing. In the Cities of Shreveport, Alexandria, Lake Charles, Houma, and New Orleans, non-Hispanic White households comprise a greater share of households residing in Other Multifamily housing than they do of all households. Only in Alexandria do non-Hispanic White households make up a larger share of households residing in Project-Based Section 8 housing than they do of all households. Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households are generally underrepresented in public housing and among Housing Choice Voucher holders, but, in some core cities make up a similar or larger share of households in Other Multifamily or Project-Based Section 8 housing than they do of all households. Hispanic households make up a larger share of Other Multi-Family occupants than they do of all households in Shreveport, Monroe, and New Orleans, and they comprise a larger share of occupants of Project-Based Section 8 housing in New Orleans. Asian or Pacific Islander households comprise a larger share of occupants in both programs only in New Orleans.

- v. Describe any laws, policies, and practices that affect the ability of protected class groups to access each category of publicly supported housing in the State.

At least three categories of publicly supported housing – public housing, Project-Based Section 8, and Housing Choice Vouchers – are unavailable to undocumented immigrants who are disproportionately Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander in Louisiana. The ability of undocumented immigrants to reside in Other Multifamily housing varies on a program-by-program basis, but it may not be a coincidence that Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households are most heavily represented in Other Multifamily housing as opposed to other publicly supported housing programs.

Additionally, most public housing authorities primarily utilize first-come, first-served waiting lists for their programs. As Hispanic and Asian and Pacific Islander households who do have documented status are more likely to be new arrivals to Louisiana and to the cities and regions in which they reside than are non-Hispanic White and African American households, it is likely to take them longer to reach the top of waiting lists for assistance. Additionally, in some communities, the waiting lists for assistance are seldom opened to new applicants. Thus, a subset of disproportionately Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander households may not even have had an opportunity to apply for assistance.

c. Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)

- i. Identify provisions of the State's Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) or other state or local laws or policies that may influence the location of LIHTC units and which protected class groups have access to them in relation to areas with relatively high levels of segregation, R/ECAPS, and areas with access to opportunity, including the influence of the provisions listed below. Consider how such provisions may affect families with children, individuals with disabilities or the elderly differently:

1. How “concerted community revitalization plans” are defined for purposes of 26 U.S.C. § 42(m)(1)(B)(ii)(III), and what standards or review processes are in place to assess the plans.

LHC’s 2016 Final QAP provided a priority for Redevelopment Projects, which was defined as projects located within a Qualified Census Tract (QCT) that fell into one of three categories. The three categories include Distressed Properties, Redevelopment Properties, and Owner-Occupied Properties covered by a Development Plan of Action. The Redevelopment Properties category is intended to mirror Section 42’s reference to projects that contribute to concerted community revitalization plans. Redevelopment properties are defined as projects located within QCTs that a local government has designated as requiring revitalization as evidenced through documentation from the municipality.

2. Incentives for locating projects in particular areas or areas with particular characteristics.

The 2016 QAP had a variety of incentives for locating projects in certain areas. First, under the umbrella of Targeted Project Types, projects must apply as one of seven types of developments, two of which have locational characteristics. De-concentration projects are eligible for up to 22 points, while no other category can qualify for more than ten points. There are two components of de-concentration projects: the median income of the census tract in which they are located and the extent to which they are mixed income. Projects located in census tracts with median household incomes that are above 120% of the area median income for the metropolitan statistical area are entitled to ten points, and projects located in census tracts with median household incomes that are above 150% of the area median income are entitled to 12 points. For the remaining ten points in the category, ten are available for projects where 40% of total units are low-income units, eight points are available for projects where 50% of total units are low-income units, and four points are available for projects where 60% of total units are low-income units. Areas with median household incomes that are significantly higher than that of the area median income are likely to be disproportionately non-Hispanic White, and developments in those areas are likely to contribute to integration and to break down barriers to access to opportunity. In contrast to the 22 points available to mixed-income projects in high opportunity areas, just six points are available for Redevelopment Projects, the only other category within Targeted Project Types where eligibility is based on location. Redevelopment Projects are likely to be located in segregated, predominantly African American neighborhoods that have limited access to opportunity. This balance of incentives appropriately prioritizes development in high opportunity areas.

Second, there were locational incentives in the category of Priority Development Areas and Other Preferences. For this category, applicants can select all preferences that apply and do not have to choose one type of project. Two points are available for projects located within Qualified Census Tracts. Three points are available for projects located within HUB Zones designated by the Small Business Administration, which are also likely to be low-income, predominantly African American areas. Ten points are available for Rural Area Projects, which may be more likely than most projects to be located in predominantly non-Hispanic White areas. Lastly, four points are available for projects in the Delta parishes, which are heavily African American and have high poverty rates.

Lastly, in the category of Location Characteristics, the 2016 QAP awards up to ten points for

proximity to certain community assets and deducts an uncapped number of points for proximity to undesirable land uses. In general, proximity to beneficial land uses could likely be concentrated in predominantly non-Hispanic White neighborhoods that afford access to opportunity while proximity to undesirable land uses is likely greatest in heavily African American communities. Because the award of points is based on geographic proximity, projects that are located within cities or medium-density suburbs are likely to score higher than those located in low-density suburbs or rural areas.

3. Requirements or preferences for project applicants to have approval or support from the local jurisdiction in which a proposed project would be located.

The 2016 QAP did not require local support or approval but did award points if government support resulted in a 7% or more reduction of total project development costs. Three points are available if the cost reduction is greater than or equal to 4% and less than 7%. Two points are available if the cost reduction is greater than or equal to 2% and less than 4%. The preference is not limited to local government support with funds.

4. Affirmative marketing requirements related to protected class.

The 2016 QAP required all applicants to submit an affirmative marketing plan and refers applicants to HUD's standard Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan form.

5. Preferences, points or threshold criteria for projects serving particular protected class groups (e.g., points for projects serving elderly, particular affordability requirements).

The QAP awards points to projects that serve special populations. First, for homeless households, households including persons with disabilities and families with children, five points are available if 20% of units are set aside for such populations, and three points are available if 10% of units are reserved. Second, seven points are available if 50% or more of units are set aside for households including veterans. Lastly, six points are awarded to projects where 100% of units are designated for elderly households. These points for serving special populations are cumulative and are not mutually exclusive. They are, however, capped at a total of 13.

The 2016 QAP also offered up to six points for projects that set aside units at deeper levels of affordability than are served at normal LIHTC rents. Reaching deeper levels of affordability is often integral to serving persons with disabilities. Four points are available for projects, other than permanent supportive housing, where at least 5% but less than 10% of units serve households with incomes at or below 30% of the area median income. Five points are available for projects, other than permanent supportive housing, where at least 10% but less than 15% of units serve households with incomes at or below 30% of the area median income. Six points are available for projects where at least 5% and less than 10% of units serve permanent supportive housing households with incomes at or below 20% of area median income.

Lastly, the QAP's treatment of the Rehabilitation Act section 504 requirements, implicates the LIHTC program's ability to effectively serve persons with disabilities in Louisiana. First, the QAP states that Section 504 applies to all projects. This ensures a higher baseline of more meaningful

accessibility than may be the case in some other states. Second, the QAP awards up to three points to projects that include additional accessible units in excess of Section 504 requirement that 5% of units be accessible to persons with mobility impairments and 2% of units be accessible to persons with hearing or vision impairments. The QAP awards one point to projects where more than 8% but less than or equal to 10% of units are accessible, two points to projects where more than 10% but less than or equal to 15% of units are accessible, and three points to projects where more than 15% of units are accessible.

- ii. How does the administration of funds used for gap financing or otherwise leveraging LIHTC developments (e.g., HOME, Tax Increment Financing, tax-exempt bonds, other tax credits) affect the location of LIHTC units in relation to patterns of segregation, R/ECAPS, and areas with access to opportunity.

As discussed above in relation to local support incentives, leveraging other resources is a factor in determining the allocation of tax credits. Local governments that receive direct allocations of HOME funds from HUD are best positioned to take advantage of these incentives to make LIHTC applications in their jurisdictions more competitive. These local governments include the core cities of the state's eight sub-areas plus Jefferson Parish. With the exception of Jefferson Parish and Houma-Terrebonne (because the entire parish is the entitlement jurisdiction), these program participants tend to be more heavily comprised of racial or ethnic minorities and African Americans, in particular, than the metropolitan areas in which they are located.

LIHTC developments in the state have been supported with tax increment financing from local governments. The redevelopment of public housing in New Orleans provides the most notable examples of this. It is not clear whether the use of tax increment financing to achieve QAP points for leveraging drives LIHTC development in any predictable direction.

- iii. Describe whether the State is aware of information indicating discrimination against voucher holders by LIHTC properties or against members of particular protected classes. Describe the State's oversight and enforcement of use agreements prohibiting discrimination against voucher-holders.

This analysis did not reveal specific evidence of source of income discrimination by LIHTC owners in violation of Section 42.

d. Other State Administered Programs Related to Housing and Urban Development

- i. Describe how the administration of CDBG, HOME, and the National Housing Trust Fund programs may affect patterns of segregation, R/ECAPs, disparities in access to opportunity and disproportionate housing needs.

The State's use of regular CDBG funds improves opportunities by funding applications from local jurisdictions within the non-entitlement areas. Generally, 80% of those funds are allocated for projects benefitting housing opportunities in low to moderate income areas by improving the infrastructure resources serving those neighborhoods; 20% of the annual allocation is set aside for economic development projects creating or retaining job opportunities for low to moderate income

workers. Additionally, the state utilizes significant CDBG-DR funds directly on housing repair or reconstruction for low to moderate income homeowners as well as providing major investments in affordable housing rental programs (often as gap financing coupled with LIHTC allocations) and economic development projects benefitting low to moderate income households.

LHC administers the HOME program and primarily devotes the state's allocation to support for the development of affordable rental housing while providing some funding for tenant-based rental assistance. In allocating funds, LHC attempts to prioritize rural areas where local governments do not receive HOME funds directly from HUD and to pair the allocation of HOME funds with LIHTC assistance. The latter strategy for using HOME funds is generally positive from a fair housing perspective as the leverage of HOME funds facilitates efforts to make LIHTC units affordable to extremely low-income households who are often more likely to be African American and are always more likely to include persons with disabilities across the state's regions than are households that can afford LIHTC rents that are designed to be affordable to households at 50% or 60% of the area median income. Thus, LIHTC units that are also assisted with HOME funds are more likely to foster residential racial integration if they are located in predominantly non-Hispanic White areas than are LIHTC units that are not HOME-assisted.

- ii. Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional information about other related State housing programs relating to fair housing issues, including any State housing trust funds.

Louisiana created a state housing trust fund in 2003 that had an initial allocation of \$25 million but did not have a permanent source of funding. Although the statute authorizing the creation of the trust fund is still on the books, the fund ran out of money several years ago and is not currently a resource.

The Louisiana Housing Authority, which is integrated into LHC, administers the Housing Choice Voucher program. The state uses project-based vouchers and Shelter Plus Care funds in order to make Permanent Supportive Housing units affordable to extremely low-income persons with disabilities. This innovative use of vouchers, generally in combination with LIHTC, fosters community integration for persons with disabilities. To further this commitment, the Louisiana Housing Corporation applied for and received an award of over \$8 million under the Section 811 Project Rental Assistance program in 2013. These funds also serve to make LIHTC units affordable to extremely low-income persons with disabilities who can be at risk of institutionalization.

e. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

Describe any disparities in access to opportunity for residents of publicly supported housing in the State, including within different program categories (public housing, project-based Section 8, Other HUD Multifamily Assisted Developments, HCV, and LIHTC) and between types of publicly supported housing (housing primarily serving families with children, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities).

Across sub-areas of the state, publicly supported housing is concentrated in areas that have relatively low access to proficient schools, low poverty, labor market engagement, and environmental health. Additionally, publicly supported housing is generally located in areas that

have elevated rates of violent crime. These same areas tend to provide more transit access and closer job proximity than do other areas. Public housing is the most highly concentrated in such neighborhoods of the categories of publicly supported housing while Other Multifamily housing is the least concentrated in areas with limited access to opportunity. In general, housing for families with children is more concentrated in areas with limited access to opportunity than are housing for elderly households and housing for persons with disabilities.

2. Additional Information

- a Beyond the HUD-provided data, provide additional relevant information, if any, about publicly supported housing in the State, particularly information about groups with other protected characteristics and about housing not captured in the HUD-provided data.

Criminal background screening and the eviction of current tenants due to law enforcement contact can be barriers to domestic violence survivors' efforts to secure housing, including publicly supported housing. Public housing authorities that administer the public housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs, as well as owners of Project- Based Section 8 properties, are required by federal law to engage in limited criminal background screening, but HUD guidance recently made it clear that unduly restrictive criminal background policies may violate the Fair Housing Act through the disparate impact criminal background screening has on African American and Hispanic households.

3. Contributing Factors of Publicly Supported Housing Location and Occupancy

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the State and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of fair housing issues related to publicly supported housing, including Segregation, R/ECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs. For each contributing factor that is significant, note which fair housing issue(s) the selected contributing factor relates to.

- Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing

Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures are a contributing factor to disproportionate housing needs for African American and Hispanic households. Although Louisiana is home to housing authorities with inclusive criminal background screening policies, some housing authorities continue to have restrictive policies. This analysis did not reveal the existence of potentially discriminatory residency preferences.

- Land use and zoning laws

Land use and zoning laws can be a contributing factor for segregation, R/ECAPs, and disparities in access to opportunity in connection with publicly supported housing across Louisiana. High opportunity areas may have requirements that limit the opportunity for development of multi-family housing and thereby most publicly supported housing.

- Community opposition

Community opposition can be a contributing factor for segregation, R/ECAPs, and disparities in access to opportunity in connection with publicly supported housing through influencing decisions on necessary variances from existing applicable zoning ordinances.

- Impediments to mobility

Impediments to mobility can contribute to segregation, R/ECAPs, and disparities in access to opportunity in Louisiana. Specifically, no public housing authorities in the state offers the kind of robust mobility counseling that has been proven to be effective in reducing levels of segregation in the Housing Choice Voucher program. Payment standards are less of an issue as the Housing Authority of New Orleans has elected to set its payment standard at 110% of the fair market rent.

- Lack of private investment in specific areas within the State

As discussed in greater detail in the Disparities in Access to Opportunity section of this analysis, a lack of private investment in specific areas within Louisiana has contributed to disparities in access to opportunity. Those disparities in access to opportunity have a significant impact on residents of publicly supported housing since that housing is highly concentrated in areas with limited access to proficient schools, low poverty, labor market engagement, and environmental health. In predominantly African American rural areas, there is a lack of employment opportunities because of limited private sector activities. Urban centers may have weak property tax bases because of limited investment and have few amenities because of insufficient revenue.

- Lack of public investment in specific areas within the State, including services and amenities

Limited resources for public investment in specific areas can contribute to disparities in access to opportunity for residents of publicly supported housing.

- Lack of State, regional, or other inter-governmental cooperation

Regional cooperation on affordable housing on a larger scale could serve to increase opportunities to mitigate segregation, R/ECAPs, and disparities in access to opportunity in connection with publicly supported housing.

- Occupancy codes and restrictions

This analysis did not reveal evidence that occupancy codes and restrictions are contributing to fair housing issues with respect to publicly supported housing in Louisiana.

- Quality of affordable housing information programs

The quality of affordable housing information programs can be a contributing factor to segregation, R/ECAPs, and disparities in access to opportunity. As discussed below, source of income discrimination is a widespread problem in Louisiana.

- Site selection policies, practices and decisions for publicly supported housing, including discretionary aspects of Qualified Allocation Plans and other programs

Incentives exist for locating LIHTC developments in high opportunity areas.

- Source of income discrimination

Source of income discrimination is a contributing factor to segregation, R/ECAPs, and disparities in access to opportunity in connection with publicly supported housing. Reported testing reflects incidents of landlord refusals to accept housing vouchers, thus limiting housing opportunities to the voucher holder.

D. Disability and Access Analysis



In 1988, Congress amended the Fair Housing Act to add disability status as a protected characteristic. The Fair Housing Act's protections against discrimination on the basis of disability status prohibit intentional discrimination against persons with disabilities and policies and practices that have unjustified discriminatory effects on persons with disabilities. Additionally, and unlike the other protected characteristics, the Fair Housing Act requires housing providers to grant reasonable accommodations from neutral policies and practices and to allow reasonable modifications that are necessary to afford persons with disabilities equal opportunity to use and enjoy housing. Lastly, developers of multifamily housing must comply with design and construction standards that ensure the physical accessibility of housing. These legal provisions, along with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act, which Congress passed three years later, strive to ensure the meaningful integration of persons with disabilities into communities across the country. When public and private policies and practices do not afford opportunity and access to persons with disabilities, the unjustified segregation of persons with disabilities in segregated settings is often the result.

1. Population Profile


- a How are persons with disabilities geographically dispersed or concentrated in the State, including R/ECAPs and other segregated areas identified in previous sections?

Persons with disabilities live throughout the state of Louisiana and are concentrated in urban areas with higher population densities. Individuals with disabilities do not appear to be concentrated in R/ECAPs in any region. The maps below illustrate where persons with disabilities are located in each region of the state.

Alexandria Area:




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Baton Rouge Area:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool





HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Houma Area:







Lafayette Area:





HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Lake Charles Area:




HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Monroe Area:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 16 - Disability by Type

Description: Dot density map of the population of persons with disabilities by persons with vision, hearing, cognitive,


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 16 - Disability by Type

Description: Dot density map of the population of persons with disabilities by persons with vision, hearing, cognitive,

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 17 - Disability by Age Group

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

New Orleans Area:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 16 - Disability by Type


Description: Dot density map of the population of persons with disabilities by persons with vision, hearing, cognitive

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Name: Map 16 - Disability by Type

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool




Shreveport Area:


HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool



Name: Map 17 - Disability by Age Group

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

- b. Describe whether these geographic patterns vary for persons with each type of disability or for persons with disabilities in different age ranges.

Persons with each type of disability are spread out throughout the state with higher concentrations for each type of disability in Louisiana's urban areas. The geographic patterns do not appear to vary significantly by type of disability. The most common type of disability in all regions is ambulatory difficulty. The Alexandria region has the highest proportion of individuals with each type of disability while the New Orleans region has the highest number of persons with each type of disability. The Baton Rouge, Monroe, and New Orleans regions have lower proportions of individuals with each type of disability than the state does as a whole.

Persons with disabilities in different age ranges also live throughout the state with greater concentrations in urban areas. In each region, persons aged 18-64 make up the largest age cohort of persons with disabilities though individuals aged 65 or older make up a larger share of persons with disabilities than they do of the total population. The Alexandria region has the highest percentage of individuals with a disability for each age range. Monroe has the lowest percentage of individuals with a disability for the 5-17 and 18-64 age ranges while Lafayette has the lowest for the 65+ age range.

Disability by Type

Disability Status of Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population by Type of Disability Louisiana, Total 2015 1-Year Estimates

Disability Type	Louisiana #	Louisiana %
Hearing Difficulty	171,865	3.8%
Vision difficulty	138,025	3.0%
Cognitive difficulty	268,770	6.3%
Ambulatory Difficulty	364,217	8.5%
Self-care difficulty	139,969	3.3%
Independent living difficulty	237,618	6.9%

Table 13 - Disability by Type				
	(Alexandria, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Alexandria, LA CBSA) Region	
Disability Type	#	%	#	%
Hearing difficulty	2,296	5.29%	7,956	5.78%
Vision difficulty	3,519	8.11%	8,861	6.43%
Cognitive difficulty	4,169	9.61%	11,597	8.42%
Ambulatory difficulty	5,574	12.85%	16,694	12.12%
Self-care difficulty	2,261	5.21%	6,604	4.79%
Independent living difficulty	3,739	8.62%	10,942	7.94%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.

Note 2: Data Sources: ACS

[Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details \(www.hudexchange.info\).](http://www.hudexchange.info)

Table 13 - Disability by Type				
	(Baton Rouge, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction		(Baton Rouge, LA CBSA) Region	
Disability Type	#	%	#	%
Hearing difficulty	11,437	3.20%	28,022	3.80%
Vision difficulty	9,595	2.69%	21,405	2.90%
Cognitive difficulty	18,310	5.13%	41,626	5.64%
Ambulatory difficulty	25,332	7.09%	56,630	7.67%
Self-care difficulty	9,902	2.77%	21,563	2.92%
Independent living difficulty	17,372	4.86%	36,445	4.94%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.

Note 2: Data Sources: ACS

[Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details \(www.hudexchange.info\).](http://www.hudexchange.info)

	(Houma-Terrebonne, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Houma-Thibodaux, LA CBSA) Region	
Disability Type	#	%	#	%
Hearing difficulty	4,310	4.21%	8,661	4.52%
Vision difficulty	3,410	3.33%	5,878	3.07%
Cognitive difficulty	7,192	7.02%	12,978	6.77%
Ambulatory difficulty	8,488	8.29%	16,971	8.86%
Self-care difficulty	2,874	2.81%	5,446	2.84%
Independent living difficulty	5,749	5.61%	10,482	5.47%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.

Note 2: Data Sources: ACS

Note 3: [Refer to the Data Documentation for details \(www.hudexchange.info\)](http://www.hudexchange.info).

Table 13 - Disability by Type

	(Lafayette, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Lafayette, LA CBSA) Region	
Disability Type	#	%	#	%
Hearing difficulty	4,827	2.76%	16,578	3.85%
Vision difficulty	3,457	1.98%	10,992	2.55%
Cognitive difficulty	8,674	4.96%	25,352	5.88%
Ambulatory difficulty	11,158	6.38%	34,256	7.95%
Self-care difficulty	4,439	2.54%	13,459	3.12%
Independent living difficulty	7,994	4.57%	23,560	5.47%

Table 13 - Disability by Type

	(Lake Charles, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Lake Charles, LA CBSA) Region	
Disability Type	#	%	#	%
Hearing difficulty	2,581	3.92%	9,036	4.92%
Vision difficulty	2,097	3.18%	6,928	3.77%
Cognitive difficulty	4,668	7.08%	13,663	7.43%
Ambulatory difficulty	5,984	9.08%	16,393	8.92%
Self-care difficulty	2,539	3.85%	6,143	3.34%
Independent living difficulty	4,108	6.23%	10,123	5.51%

Table 13 - Disability by Type				
	(Monroe, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Monroe, LA CBSA) Region	
Disability Type	#	%	#	%
Hearing difficulty	1,236	2.80%	5,773	3.62%
Vision difficulty	1,224	2.77%	4,066	2.55%
Cognitive difficulty	2,044	4.63%	8,162	5.12%
Ambulatory difficulty	3,042	6.88%	12,218	7.67%
Self-care difficulty	1,356	3.07%	4,937	3.10%
Independent living difficulty	2,076	4.70%	8,264	5.19%

Table 13 - Disability by Type				
	(New Orleans, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction		(New Orleans-Metairie, LA CBSA) Region	
Disability Type	#	%	#	%
Hearing difficulty	9,626	2.92%	41,612	3.72%
Vision difficulty	11,234	3.41%	31,920	2.86%
Cognitive difficulty	20,488	6.22%	66,092	5.92%
Ambulatory difficulty	26,013	7.90%	86,930	7.78%
Self-care difficulty	9,930	3.02%	31,902	2.86%
Independent living difficulty	17,305	5.26%	55,662	4.98%

Table 13 - Disability by Type				
	(Shreveport, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction		(Shreveport-Bossier City, LA CBSA) Region	
Disability Type	#	%	#	%
Hearing difficulty	6,795	3.72%	16,693	4.16%
Vision difficulty	6,291	3.45%	13,113	3.27%
Cognitive difficulty	10,991	6.02%	23,803	5.94%
Ambulatory difficulty	15,925	8.73%	36,440	9.09%
Self-care difficulty	5,992	3.28%	13,708	3.42%
Independent living difficulty	10,615	5.82%	23,268	5.80%

Disability by Age Group

Disability Status of Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population by Age Louisiana, Total, 2015 1-Year Estimates

Age of People with Disabilities	Louisiana #	Louisiana % of total state population
age 5-17 with Disabilities	55,013	1.2%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	372,108	8.1%
age 65+ with Disabilities	251,557	5.5%

Table 14 - Disability by Age Group

	(Alexandria, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Alexandria, LA CBSA) Region	
Age of People with Disabilities	#	%	#	%
age 5-17 with Disabilities	1,200	2.77%	2,981	2.16%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	5,662	13.05%	17,059	12.38%
age 65+ with Disabilities	3,338	7.70%	9,839	7.14%

Table 14 - Disability by Age Group

	(Baton Rouge, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction		(Baton Rouge, LA CBSA) Region	
Age of People with Disabilities	#	%	#	%
age 5-17 with Disabilities	4,019	1.13%	10,240	1.39%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	26,238	7.35%	59,144	8.01%
age 65+ with Disabilities	16,136	4.52%	36,192	4.90%

Table 14 - Disability by Age Group

	(Houma-Terrebonne, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Houma-Thibodaux, LA CBSA) Region	
Age of People with Disabilities	#	%	#	%
age 5-17 with Disabilities	1,872	1.83%	3,244	1.69%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	9,595	9.37%	18,237	9.52%
age 65+ with Disabilities	5,585	5.45%	11,121	5.80%

Note 1: All % represent a share of the total population within the jurisdiction or region.

Note 2: Data Sources: ACS

Note 3: Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info).

Table 14 - Disability by Age Group

	(Lafayette, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Lafayette, LA CBSA) Region	
Age of People with Disabilities	#	%	#	%
age 5-17 with Disabilities	1,909	1.09%	5,479	1.27%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	12,375	7.08%	35,683	8.28%
age 65+ with Disabilities	7,264	4.15%	21,874	5.07%

Table 14 - Disability by Age Group

	(Lake Charles, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Lake Charles, LA CBSA) Region	
Age of People with Disabilities	#	%	#	%
age 5-17 with Disabilities	688	1.04%	3,242	1.76%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	5,995	9.10%	17,436	9.49%
age 65+ with Disabilities	3,893	5.91%	10,993	5.98%

Table 14 - Disability by Age Group

	(Monroe, LA CDBG, HOME) Jurisdiction		(Monroe, LA CBSA) Region	
Age of People with Disabilities	#	%	#	%
age 5-17 with Disabilities	482	1.09%	1,687	1.06%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	2,741	6.20%	11,252	7.06%
age 65+ with Disabilities	2,251	5.09%	8,764	5.50%

Table 14 - Disability by Age Group

	(New Orleans, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction		(New Orleans-Metairie, LA CBSA) Region	
Age of People with Disabilities	#	%	#	%
age 5-17 with Disabilities	3,380	1.03%	13,704	1.23%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	28,869	8.77%	89,218	7.99%
age 65+ with Disabilities	15,592	4.74%	59,008	5.28%

Table 14 - Disability by Age Group

	(Shreveport, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction		(Shreveport-Bossier City, LA CBSA) Region	
Age of People with Disabilities	#	%	#	%
age 5-17 with Disabilities	2,528	1.39%	5,121	1.28%
age 18-64 with Disabilities	14,895	8.16%	34,000	8.48%
age 65+ with Disabilities	11,010	6.03%	24,082	6.01%

2. Housing Accessibility

- a. Describe the areas in the State where affordable accessible housing units are located. Do they align with R/ECAPs or other areas that are segregated within the State?

Affordable accessible housing units are located primarily in the principal cities of Louisiana’s metropolitan statistical areas. Much of the housing within principal cities is located within R/ECAPs. The amount of affordable housing in R/ECAPs varies significantly by city. There are no publicly supported housing units in R/ECAPs in Houma while in Monroe, the majority of the city’s publicly supported housing units are in R/ECAPs. The tables below show the total number of units of publicly supported housing in R/ECAP tracts and non-R/ECAP tracts as well as the percentage of residents that have a disability. The proportion of individuals that have a disability in publicly supported housing units located within R/ECAP tracts is notably higher in New Orleans than in other cities.

Table 7 - R/ECAP and Non-R/ECAP Publicly Supported Housing Program Category

(Alexandria, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction	Total #units (occupied)	% with a disability
Public Housing		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts	416	12.71%
Project-based Section 8		
R/ECAP tracts	74	3.85%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	101	25.24%
Other HUD multifamily		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts	18	100.00%
HCV Program		
R/ECAP tracts	193	18.18%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	640	22.87%

(Baton Rouge, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction	Total #units (occupied)	% with a disability
Public Housing		
R/ECAP tracts	355	22.84%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	580	35.34%
Project-based Section 8		
R/ECAP tracts	578	16.76%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	1,549	19.58%
Other HUD multifamily		
R/ECAP tracts	63	1.54%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	207	5.16%
HCV Program		
R/ECAP tracts	436	19.25%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	3,148	16.55%

(Houma-Terrebonne, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction	Total #units (occupied)	% with a disability
Public Housing		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts	458	51.20%
Project-based Section 8		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts		
Other HUD multifamily		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts	85	61.90%
HCV Program		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts	424	22.25%

(Lafayette, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction	Total #units (occupied)	% with a disability
Public Housing		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts	528	45.47%
Project-based Section 8		
R/ECAP tracts	236	34.71%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	950	23.75%
Other HUD multifamily		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts	91	100.00%
HCV Program		
R/ECAP tracts	409	18.49%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	965	22.49%

(Lake Charles, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction	Total #units (occupied)	% with a disability
Public Housing		
R/ECAP tracts	217	9.68%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	536	13.35%
Project-based Section 8		
R/ECAP tracts	120	4.80%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	675	49.20%
Other HUD multifamily		
R/ECAP tracts		
Non-R/ECAP tracts	100	85.86%
HCV Program		
R/ECAP tracts	109	17.82%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	1,503	17.36%

(Monroe, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction	Total #units (occupied)	% with a disability
Public Housing		
R/ECAP tracts	913	17.03%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	278	12.95%
Project-based Section 8		
R/ECAP tracts	959	15.96%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	258	37.55%
Other HUD multifamily		
R/ECAP tracts	147	4.73%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	114	25.89%
HCV Program		
R/ECAP tracts	694	18.23%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	604	27.31%

(New Orleans, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction	Total #units (occupied)	% with a disability
Public Housing		
R/ECAP tracts	1,427	40.87%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	257	13.51%
Project-based Section 8		
R/ECAP tracts	1,816	28.07%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	2,321	17.30%
Other HUD multifamily		
R/ECAP tracts	181	12.22%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	315	13.06%
HCV Program		
R/ECAP tracts	6,192	23.01%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	12,399	19.55%

(Shreveport, LA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction	Total #units (occupied)	% with a disability
Public Housing		
R/ECAP tracts	207	15.12%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	376	11.20%
Project-based Section 8		
R/ECAP tracts	914	13.13%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	1,613	27.77%
Other HUD multifamily		
R/ECAP tracts	13	100.00%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	259	13.78%
HCV Program		
R/ECAP tracts	750	21.43%
Non-R/ECAP tracts	1,445	21.24%

- b. Describe the extent to which the supply of accessible housing aligns with the demand for such housing in particular areas within the State. Include the extent to which individuals with disabilities who require accessible housing move out of or into the State to obtain accessible housing.

Accessible housing is located primarily in urban areas of the state where persons with disabilities are concentrated and thus the supply aligns with where much of the demand is located. However, the demand for accessible housing exceeds available supply, and some persons with disabilities who need accessible units might prefer to be able to exercise the choice to reside outside of principal cities.

- c. To what extent are persons with different disabilities able to access and live in the different categories of publicly supported housing in the State?

Persons with disabilities make up a disproportionate percentage of residents of publicly supported housing in most areas of the state. In particular, people with disabilities make up an especially high proportion of those living in other multifamily housing and of individuals living in poverty in most regions. However, the number of people with disabilities living in publicly supported housing is a small portion of the total state population of people living with disabilities. This indicates that a significant number of persons with different disabilities are unable to access publicly supported housing. The tables below show overall numbers of persons with disabilities by publicly supported housing category.

Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category (Alexandria, LA CBSA) Region

	People with a disability (#)	People with a disability %
Public Housing	78	11.93%
Project-Based Section 8	51	17.65%
Other Multifamily	46	25.41%
HCV Program	282	22.35%

Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category (Baton Rouge, LA CBSA) Region

	People with a disability (#)	People with a disability %
Public Housing	336	26.77%
Project-Based Section 8	380	17.46%
Other Multifamily	57	16.01%
HCV Program	774	17.26%

Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category (Houma-Thibodaux, LA CBSA) Region

	People with a disability (#)	People with a disability %
Public Housing	323	32.33%
Project-Based Section 8		
Other Multifamily	34	40.48%
HCV Program	190	24.84%

Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category (Lafayette, LA CBSA) Region

	People with a disability (#)	People with a disability %
Public Housing	435	25.25%
Project-Based Section 8	492	20.59%
Other Multifamily	264	46.89%
HCV Program	294	18.56%

Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category (Lake Charles, LA CBSA) Region

	People with a disability (#)	People with a disability %
Public Housing	151	13.41%
Project-Based Section 8	253	40.35%
Other Multifamily	112	72.73%
HCV Program	387	17.92%

Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category (Monroe, LA CBSA) Region

	People with a disability (#)	People with a disability %
Public Housing	208	15.04%
Project-Based Section 8	306	21.03%
Other Multifamily	36	13.85%
HCV Program	542	23.17%

Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category (Shreveport-Bossier City, LA CBSA) Region

	People with a disability (#)	People with a disability %
Public Housing	246	17.56%
Project-Based Section 8	705	21.24%
Other Multifamily	74	29.96%
HCV Program	652	21.98%

Disability by Publicly Supported Housing Program Category (New Orleans-Metairie, LA CBSA) Region

	People with a disability (#)	People with a disability %
Public Housing	735	27.46%
Project-Based Section 8	1,030	16.21%
Other Multifamily	100	11.48%
HCV Program	5,424	20.88%

- d. Describe any disability-specific housing programs or preferences in the State, including Non-Elderly Disabled (NED) vouchers, LIHTC or other set-asides, PHA preferences, and targeted remedial preferences.

Louisiana has created the Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) program. PSH offers rental assistance for a variety of integrated housing units so that individuals with disabilities are able to remain in or reenter the community. PSH participants pay 30% of their monthly income for rent. The Louisiana PSH model combines rental housing assistance with voluntary, flexible, and individualized community-based services to assist people with severe and complex disabilities. Louisiana has tried to create a comprehensive PSH system that includes a goal of reducing the unnecessary confinement of people with serious disabilities in nursing homes and other high- cost, restrictive settings. PSH funding includes 3,000 vouchers for people with serious disabilities, including people in institutions, at risk of institutionalization, the homeless, and people at risk of homelessness.

Permanent Supportive Housing supports approximately 2,700 households. Program housing is concentrated in areas most affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Consequently, there is limited availability of Permanent Supported Housing in other areas of the state and a long waitlist. The need for Permanent Supportive Housing is especially high in northern areas of Louisiana. Eighty-five percent of current Permanent Supported Housing homes have at least one member with a mental illness.

3. Integration of Persons with Disabilities Living in Institutions and Other Segregated Settings

- a. To what extent do persons with disabilities in the State or region reside in segregated or integrated settings? Include the extent to which the State uses institutional settings outside of the State to provide health care services to State residents who are individuals with disabilities.

Institutional Settings:

A 2014 report from the Louisiana Legislative Auditor showed that the state offered individuals with developmental disabilities (ICFs/DD) services at 524 facilities, all of which participate in the state’s Medicaid program. Of these facilities, 518 are privately run.

According to the Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council, Louisiana has closed all but one large publicly operated ICF/DD. However, there has not been similar progress in the downsizing and closure of private, residential facilities (large and small ICFs/DD). Louisiana has the most number

of people per capita in ICFs/DD in the nation.

The U.S. Department of Justice through a letter issued December 21, 2016, concluded that Louisiana relies too heavily on institutionalization and that many individuals with serious mental illness in Louisiana nursing facilities could be served through community-based alternatives. Subsequently, the State and the U.S. DOJ entered an agreement in connection with which the Louisiana Department of Health is utilizing the Permanent Supportive Housing program coupled with multifamily housing financing opportunities to increase independent housing opportunities for those individuals.

Integrated Settings:

In 1989, Act 378 directed the Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council to develop a plan for a system of community and family supports to be available for families of children and adults with disabilities in their own homes based on their individual needs in order to avoid out-of-home placement. The Community and Family Support system helps keep people with disabilities in their own homes and communities through the provision of individualized and flexible supports. state.

- b. Describe the range of options for persons with disabilities to access affordable housing and supportive services in the State, including access to affordable housing and supportive services.

Louisiana offers several community-based services for individuals with serious mental illness. These services include Assertive Community Treatment, Community Psychiatric Support and Treatment and Psychosocial Rehabilitation, and peer supports.

- Assertive community treatment
 - A community-based service that provides intensive mental health services to individuals with the highest mental health needs and enables service recipients to transition from institutions and live in the community. Assertive Community Treatment teams in Louisiana are designed to address every aspect of an individual's needs, including medication management, therapy, crisis intervention, social support, employment, substance use disorder treatment, and housing. The service is provided by a multidisciplinary team of professionals, including, but not limited to, a licensed mental health professional, housing specialist, employment specialist, substance abuse service provider, nurse, peer support specialist, and psychiatrist. The team is available at all hours, and its members are the primary providers of recovery-oriented services for the individual in the community. As of July 2015, there were 14 teams, serving 1,150 people.
- Community Psychiatric Support and Treatment and Psychosocial Rehabilitation
 - Two Louisiana Medicaid services that provide individualized mental health supports of varying intensity. Community Psychiatric Support and Treatment is a face-to-face intervention that can take place in community settings and

includes supportive counseling, behavioral management and analysis, assistance with identifying crisis triggers, development of crisis management plans, and assistance in restoring the individual's fullest possible integration in the community. Psychosocial Rehabilitation helps people regain independent living and interpersonal skills. While less intensive than Assertive Community Treatment, if implemented in an individualized manner consistent with the person's needs, the combination of Community Psychiatric Support and Treatment and Psychosocial Rehabilitation can be used to provide support similar to the intensive case management services available in other states. In July 2015, 4,845 Louisianans were receiving Community Psychiatric Support and Treatment, and 3,419 people were receiving Psychosocial Rehabilitation.

- Mobile Crisis Service
 - Louisiana offers limited crisis prevention and intervention services, which include Mobile Crisis and toll-free crisis lines. Mobile Crisis is an evidence-based intervention designed to provide support to individuals in crisis at their homes and in other community locations. Where available, Mobile Crisis teams in Louisiana provide on-site support to help people remain in their homes and avoid inappropriate institutionalization. Currently, only 21 out of 64 parishes in Louisiana offer Mobile Crisis for adults. A 24-hour crisis telephone line is available statewide. A non-crisis line, staffed by peers in recovery, is also available from 5 a.m. until 10 p.m., seven days per week. Some of the local governing entities provide crisis hotlines or contract with third party providers to offer crisis services after hours, on weekends, and on holidays; and some use staff members to substitute when third party providers are temporarily unavailable.

The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council oversees the implementation of the Community and Family Support System Plan. The Developmental Disabilities Council provides an overview of current Community and Family Support Services offered through the Department of Health and Hospitals:

- Office for Citizens with Development Disabilities:
 - **Individual and family support** services provide assistance not available from any other resource that will allow people with developmental disabilities to live in their own homes or with their families in their own community. These services include respite care, personal assistance services, specialized clothing, dental and medical services, equipment and supplies, communication services, crisis intervention, specialized utility costs, specialized nutrition, and family education. Services are provided through contractual agreements by private provider agencies or through individualized agreements with individuals and families who obtain their own service providers.
 - **Flexible Family Fund:** A cash subsidy of \$258 per month is provided to eligible families with children with severe disabilities. A total of 1,756 families receive the monthly Flexible Family Fund while 3,624 children

remain on a waiting list.

- **Medicaid Home and Community Based Waiver Services.** The Medicaid New Opportunities Waiver (NOW), Residential Options Waiver (ROW), and the Children's Choice Waiver provide an array of services to individuals in their own homes. As of June 2016, there are 14,100 people on the waiting list for waiver services.
- Office of Behavioral Health/Office of Aging and Adult Services/Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council:
 - **Consumer Care Resources** provides an array of family support services to children with emotional/behavioral health needs to assist in keeping the child in the home with their family.
 - **Supported Living** services are available for a very small number of adults whose disability occurred after the age of 22 but before the age of 55. Limited funding is available to assist individuals moving out of nursing homes into the community or to those at risk of institutionalization. Support coordination, rental assistance, furniture, transportation, etc. are the types of assistance available.
 - **Supported Living** for adults with behavioral health needs is available in five regions of the state (New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Houma/Thibodaux, Alexandria and Shreveport). Limited funding is available to assist individuals who are making/have made the transition from institutional settings to the community. Support coordination, rental assistance, furniture, transportation, etc. are the types of assistance available.
 - **Families Helping Families** are family-directed regional resource centers that provide information and referral, peer support and education and training to individuals with disabilities and families.
- c. Describe the State's *Olmstead* planning efforts, including any *Olmstead* plans, any existing or efforts to implement remedial preferences to provide housing in integrated, community-based settings for persons with disabilities in the State.

Louisiana's Medicaid program spent \$2.2 billion on long-term services and supports in fiscal year 2014. Approximately 39% or \$865 million of that spending was allocated to home and community-based settings. This reflects a nationwide shift in expenditures away from institutional settings and efforts to comply with *Olmstead* obligations.

- d. To what extent are the following categories of persons with disabilities able to access housing in integrated, community based settings in the State: children (including foster care placements and access to medical services), persons at risk of institutionalization, individuals with mental health disabilities, individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities; individuals who are blind, individuals who are deaf, individuals with mobility disabilities, and any other identified

categories of persons with disabilities.

Individuals with mental health disabilities

See discussion of Permanent Supportive Housing Program, above.

Family Support Services

These programs are operated by the human services districts and authorities to ensure that families have the necessary support, information and skills to cope, maintain family integrity, and enhance the likelihood that children who have serious emotional disturbances can successfully remain at home. Program elements include respite care, education, telephone support, parent support groups, parent case manager training, home aide services, transportation, and advocacy services. The Office of Behavioral Health also offers supported living services, either through specialized residential programs or through case management and other services that support people with mental illnesses living in their own homes.

Children

My Place Louisiana is a program focusing on Medicaid funding and following participants in transitioning from qualified institutions to home and community-based living settings. In order to be eligible for My Place Louisiana, individuals must currently reside in a qualified institution and have resided in the institution for at least 90 consecutive days; be transitioning to the community; be Medicaid eligible; and be receiving an OCDD waiver.

Children with developmental disabilities who are currently residing in a nursing facility, hospital or rehabilitation hospital who have a developmental disability and who meet My Place Louisiana program eligibility requirements can receive My Place Louisiana assistance to transition from a qualified institution to a home and community-based living setting of the individual's or family's choice.

Individuals with developmental disabilities

Individuals with developmental disabilities who are currently residing in an Intermediate Care Facility for the Developmentally Disabled (ICF/DD) or nursing facility (NF) who meet My Place Louisiana program eligibility requirements can receive My Place Louisiana assistance to transition from a qualified institution to a home and community-based living setting of the individual's choice.

- e. Describe the State's efforts or plans to transition individuals with disabilities to integrated settings, including timeframes and goals adopted by the State. Include the State's efforts to transfer individuals with disabilities to integrated, community based settings from the following types of facilities: nursing facilities, board and care and adult care facilities, mental health facilities, institutions for individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, day activity centers or supported employment services, and schools, among others.

Louisiana has created a Money Follows the Person Demonstration designed to deliver Medicaid services in a new way. The Louisiana Demonstration is called My Place Louisiana. This program helps people move from qualified institutions into home and community-based living settings and then follows those individuals for the first year of waiver services to help ensure a successful transition. The program has been relatively successful. Over a five-year period, 910 nursing facility residents with physical disabilities were transitioned into the community. Additionally, see discussion of Permanent Supportive Housing Program, above.

4. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

- a. To what extent are persons with disabilities in the State able to access the following in the State? Identify major barriers faced concerning:
 - i. Government services and facilities

The United States and the Louisiana Supreme Court entered into a settlement agreement in August 2014 to resolve a suit regarding the Court's policies, procedures, and practices for screening and evaluating applicants to the Louisiana bar with mental health disabilities.

- ii. Public infrastructure

The New Orleans Inspector General released a report in October 2016 that described the city's efforts to upgrade pedestrian crossing signals. The report noted that increased foot traffic in the city suggests an increased need for retrofits to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Currently, many sidewalks lack ramps and many intersections lack crossing signals. The report also found that although New Orleans has an initiative to add or upgrade pedestrian crossing signals, the initiative ignored requirements in the city's own 2013 ADA transition plan and failed to account for new ADA requirements expected to take effect in early 2017, leaving the city with outdated equipment. The report concluded that the city's failure to follow its own plans raised questions about the City's commitment to ADA accessibility. The report recommended that the Department of Public Works coordinate with the City's ADA Administrator, the Mayor's Advisory Council for Citizens with Disabilities, the City Council's Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Advisory Committee, and other city departments to ensure that ADA issues are incorporated into public works projects.

- iii. Transportation

Public transportation services that utilize accessible vehicles are available in the urban sections of the state's regions. Public transportation agencies in these areas also offer paratransit services to persons with disabilities. Transit services are much more limited in rural areas.

Alexandria area:

The City of Alexandria operates a bus system called ATRANS that serves Alexandria and Pineville. Five of the 11 buses providing fixed route service are ADA accessible. The system provides on-demand paratransit service for qualifying persons with disabilities who are unable to access fixed

route buses. The service requires users to fill out an application and a 24-hour notice to schedule service.

Baton Rouge area:

The Capital Area Transit System (CATS) serves the cities of Baton Rouge and Baker as well as unincorporated areas of East Baton Rouge Parish. CATS maintain a fleet of 61 ADA accessible buses for fixed route service. CATS provide paratransit service through its CATS On Demand Service to persons unable to use the fixed route system. Persons must apply for CATS on Demand Service and if qualified request service 24 hours in advance.

Lafayette area:

The Lafayette Transit System provides service to Lafayette Parish. Every bus in the system's fleet is equipped with lifts or ramps. Paratransit service is provided via a vendor service contract with Acadiana Transit System, which provides five ADA accessible buses to be in services at times of fixed-route service. Paratransit service users must fill out an application to qualify and service must be requested 24 hours in advance.

Lake Charles area:

The Lake Charles Transit System provides bus transportation for residents within the City of Lake Charles. All buses in the system are ADA accessible. Individuals must fill out an application in order to qualify for paratransit service. Calcasieu Parish Public Transit provides curb to curb transportation in areas of the parish outside of Lake Charles. All vehicles in the system are ADA accessible.

Shreveport area:

SporTran provides transit service to Shreveport and Bossier City. Forty-five of the buses provided services are ADA accessible. LiftLine is SporTran's paratransit service and persons with disabilities must apply to qualify for the service. Service must be scheduled at least 24 hours in advance.

Houma area:

Good Earth Transit provides transportation in Terrebonne Parish and the City of Thibodeaux. All Good Earth buses are ADA accessible and Good Earth provides paratransit service to individuals with disabilities.

Monroe area:

The Monroe Transit System (MTS) operates 14 fixed routes and paratransit service. All MTS buses are ADA accessible. MTS Paratransit service provides service within $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile beyond fixed routes but does not provide service to any areas west of the Ouachita River. Individuals with disabilities must apply to use paratransit and request service at least 24 hours in advance.

New Orleans area:

In New Orleans, the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) provides bus and streetcar service. RTA buses are ADA accessible. However, a 2014 RTA survey found that only 5.7% of bus stops are ADA compliant. The streetcars that operate on the Canal, Riverfront, and the Rampart-St. Claude Streetcar lines are ADA accessible. The historic St. Charles Streetcar line was exempted by the ADA and is not accessible. RTA also operates a paratransit service that uses buses and min-vans to provide curbside service. An individual is eligible to use paratransit services if: they cannot use the RTA buses or streetcars on their own, he can generally use RTA buses and streetcars on his own, but they need someone else's assistance to use the system in certain ways, and if their disability prevents them from using particular buses or streetcar stops. Individuals must apply to use RTA paratransit services.

Jefferson Transit provides fixed route and paratransit service within urbanized Jefferson Parish and also provides service to New Orleans. All facilities and fixed route buses are ADA accessible. The Mobility Impaired Transit System (MITS) provides transit in urbanized Jefferson Parish and a limited area of Orleans Parish for persons unable to use the fixed route system. MITS provides curb to curb service for individuals who are qualified to ride.

St. Tammany Area Transit (STAR Transit) began operating in 2015 as a result of a partnership between the Council on Aging St. Tammany and the St. Tammany Parish government. The system operates as an on-demand curb to curb service and riders are advised to schedule service at least 14 days in advance. STAR Transit services are available to any person within the boundaries of St. Tammany parish. All vehicles are ADA compliant.

- iv. Proficient schools and educational programs, including post-secondary and vocational educational opportunities

Louisiana's graduation rate for students with disabilities is 37% while its overall graduation rate is 74%. The graduation rate for special education students in the state is among the lowest in the country. Additionally, 25% of Louisiana's students with disabilities were suspended from school in 2011-2012, a rate higher than the national average and twice the suspension rate for students without disabilities. In 2011, 41% of students with disabilities continued their education after high school.

- v. Jobs

American Community Survey 1-year estimates for 2015 reveal that persons with disabilities in Louisiana are less likely to be employed than the overall population and earn less money than persons with no disability. Approximately 23% of Louisiana's population with disabilities aged 16 and over are employed compared to approximately 64% of the population without disabilities. The median income of persons with disabilities is \$21,406 compared to \$30,767 for persons without a disability.

- b. Describe the processes that exist in the State for persons with disabilities to request and obtain reasonable accommodations and accessibility modifications to address the barriers discussed above.

Baton Rouge area:

East Baton Rouge Public Housing Authority Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy:

The PHA will ask all applicants and resident families if they require any type of accommodations, in writing, on the intake application, reexamination documents, and notices of adverse action by the PHA, by including the following language: "If you or anyone in your family is a person with disabilities, and you require a specific accommodation in order to fully utilize our programs and services, please contact your assigned Housing Manager." A specified person and phone number will be indicated as the contact for requests for accommodation for persons with disabilities.

Monroe area:

Fourth Judicial District Court:

The court serves Ouachita Parish as well as Morehouse Parish. A written ADA accommodation request form is available. The procedure for a reasonable accommodations request is as follows:

Persons in Ouachita Parish, requiring accommodations should submit a written request or complete the accommodation request form and send it to the Ouachita Parish ADA Ombudsman.

Persons in Morehouse Parish, requiring accommodations should submit a written request or complete the accommodation request form and send it to the Morehouse Parish ADA Ombudsman, The ADA Ombudsmen may also be contacted through the Louisiana Relay Center TDD/TTY 1-800-846-5277, voice 1-800-947-5277.

Requests for accommodations must be made as far in advance as possible but no less than ten (10) working days from the date upon which it is needed.

All accommodation requests shall include a description of the accommodation sought, along with a statement about the impairment that requires such accommodation. The Court or its designee may request additional information about the qualifying impairment if it is deemed necessary.

When an accommodation request is received, the Ombudsman will confer with the individual requesting the accommodation and the manager of the area where the accommodation is needed to discuss and evaluate the effectiveness of the accommodation.

The Ombudsman will help coordinate provision of the requested accommodation or, with the approval of the Chief Judge, a suitable and effective alternative may be offered in the event that the original accommodation requested is not feasible.

The Ombudsman shall contact the requestor to offer the accommodation. A record of the requestor's response is made. If the requestor rejects the accommodation offered, he/she is notified of the right to file a complaint in the manner outlined below.

COMPLAINTS

Individuals with disabilities who believe they have been discriminated against with regard to access to services, programs, or activities at the Fourth Judicial District Court may file a complaint with the Judicial Administrator at: 300 St. John Street, Suite 400. The telephone number is (318) 361-2250. This number may also be reached through the Louisiana Relay Center TDD/TTY 1-800-846-5277, voice 1-800-947-5277. Upon receipt of a complaint, the Judicial Administrator shall review the complaint, notify the Chief Judge and propose a resolution. The approved resolution shall then be communicated with the complainant.

New Orleans area:

HANO HCVP Administrative Plan details reasonable accommodation process:

HANO strives to ensure that persons with disabilities have full access to HANO's programs and services. HANO may need to verify that a person requesting an accommodation is a qualified individual with a disability. HANO must also determine whether an accommodation is necessary in order to provide the individual with an equal opportunity to participate in the HCV program. A person who does not have a disability is not entitled to a reasonable accommodation.

HANO's reasonable accommodation request process works most effectively when requests are made in writing. However, if an applicant or participant indicates that an exception, change, or adjustment to a rule, policy, practice, or service is needed because of a disability, HANO will treat the information as a request for a reasonable accommodation, even if no formal, written request is made. HANO requires individuals to certify that they are a person with a disability, under the ADA or under the Fair Housing Act. Additional details and policies regarding reasonable accommodations are found in the HCVP Administrative Plan on pages 25 to 28.

HANO Admissions and Continued Occupancy –Public Housing Reasonable Accommodation

HANO policies and practices will be designed to provide assurances that all persons with disabilities will be provided reasonable accommodation so they may fully access and utilize the public housing program and related services.

Requests for reasonable accommodation from persons with disabilities will be granted upon verification that accommodations address the need presented by the disability and they do not create an "undue financial and administrative burden" for HANO. An undue burden requires "significant difficulty or expense."

An applicant or resident may verbally request a reasonable accommodation. HANO and its Agents must consider the request without a provider designated form, but HANO or its agent will provide the applicant or the resident with the designated form to formalize the verification process.

A reliable, knowledgeable professional will verify all requests for accommodation or modification of a unit. Requests for reasonable accommodation from persons with disabilities will be granted upon verification that they meet the need presented by the disability.

HANO or its agents will require verification from a knowledgeable professional when a request for a home visit recertification is submitted. HANO and its agents must comply with HUD/DOJ statement that provides instructions on verification of reasonable accommodations. Additional details can be found throughout HANO's Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy.

It is the policy of the City of New Orleans, pursuant to the federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 and applicable state laws, to provide individuals with disabilities reasonable accommodation in the City's zoning and land use regulations, rules, policies and practices to ensure equal access to housing and to facilitate the development of housing for individuals with disabilities. Reasonable accommodations in the zoning and land use context means providing individuals with disabilities, or developers of housing for people with disabilities, flexibility in the application of land use, zoning and building regulations, policies, practices and procedures, or even waiving certain requirements, when it is necessary to eliminate barriers to housing opportunities.

[Requests for reasonable accommodation](#) should be filed with the Executive Director of the City Planning Commission, in accordance with Article 27 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. Appeals of the CPC Director's decision on an accommodation may be taken to the Board of Zoning Adjustments, which meets the first Monday of every month.

Jefferson Parish Government:

The parish government has an ADA Accessibility Notice on its website. The notice states If an individual with a disability requires auxiliary aids or devices, or other reasonable accommodation under the ADA Amendments Act, a request should be submitted to the ADA Coordinator at the Office of Citizens with Disabilities at least 48 hours in advance or as soon as practical. A 72-hour advanced notice is required to request Certified ASL interpreters.

Twenty-Fourth Judicial District Court: This court has original jurisdiction of all civil and criminal matters in Jefferson Parish, with the exception of certain juvenile matters. The court will make reasonable efforts to meet the needs of litigants, attorneys, job applicants, employees and others with disabilities who request physical accommodations, who wish written materials converted to alternative formats, or who request auxiliary aids or services such as interpreters, assistive listening devices or other services when: a member of the public needs an accommodation in order to visit, conduct business, or participate in any activity or program at the Court; or an applicant with a disability needs an accommodation to be considered for a job; or an applicant with a disability needs an accommodation to enable the employee to perform the essential functions of the job or to gain access to the workplace; or an employee with a disability needs an accommodation to enjoy equal benefits and privileges of employment. Accommodation requests must be in writing and submitted as far in advance as possible. Such requests may be made for the person with the disability by a family member, health professional or other representative. The court provides an ADA Accommodations Request Form for employees, visitors, attorneys, and job applicants. The exact process for different types of reasonable accommodation is as follows:

REQUESTS FOR ACCOMMODATION IN COURT PROCEEDINGS

Applications requesting accommodations pursuant to this rule may be presented ex parte (i.e., done on behalf of one party only and without notice to an opposing party) in writing, on the ADA

Accommodation Request Form. This form can be obtained via this website ([Accommodation Request Form](#)).

All applications for accommodations shall include a description of the accommodation sought, along with a statement of the impairment that necessitates such accommodation. The court, in its discretion, may require the applicant to provide additional information about the qualifying impairment.

Applications should be made as far in advance of the requested implementation date as possible, and in any event should be made no less than five court days prior to the requested implementation date. The court may, in its discretion, waive this requirement.

Upon request, the court shall place under seal the identity of the applicant as designated on the application form and all other identifying information provided to the court pursuant to the application.

An applicant may make ex parte communications with the court. Such communications shall deal only with the accommodation(s) the applicant's disability requires and shall not deal in any manner with the subject matter or merits of the proceedings before the court.

The applicant will be informed in writing of findings of fact and orders, as may be appropriate, that the request for accommodations is granted or denied, in whole or in part, and the nature of the accommodation(s) to be provided, if any.

REQUEST FOR ACCOMMODATION FROM COURT EMPLOYEES

Written requests/applications for accommodation pursuant to this section may be submitted to the Judicial Administrator's Office.

Requests shall include a description of the accommodation sought, along with a statement of the impairment that necessitates such accommodation. The Court may require the applicant to provide additional information about the qualifying impairment.

The ADA Ombudsman and the employee's manager will: provide the applicant with a copy of the ADA booklet, "Your Employment Rights as an Individual with a Disability" complete an essential functions job analysis and may request a clinician review to help determine whether/how applicant may perform essential functions with or without accommodation; assess whether the applicant is a qualified individual with a disability; recommend reasonable accommodation(s), if applicable, or alternate work if accommodation appears to be unduly burdensome, and summarize findings and forward recommendation to the Judicial Administrator.

Court representatives may consult with the applicant and his/her representative and/or rehabilitation counselor, if applicable.

REQUEST FOR ACCOMMODATION FROM CANDIDATES FOR COURT EMPLOYEES

Requests for accommodation in the testing or application process should be submitted to the Judicial Administrator's Office as far in advance of the requested accommodations implementation date as possible, and in any event, should be made no less than five business days prior to the requested

implementation date. Requests for accommodation with regard to the essential functions of a position applied for should be submitted following a conditional offer of employment. The ADA Ombudsman will make a recommendation on the requested accommodation to the Judicial Administrator.

In determining whether to grant an accommodation and what accommodation to grant, the Judicial Administrator shall consider, but is not limited by, the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and related state and federal laws.

The applicant will be informed in writing of Judicial Administrator's findings.

The Judicial Administrator's decision to deny a request for accommodation is final.

Jefferson Parish Housing Authority:

It is the policy of the Jefferson Parish Housing Authority (JPHA) to be service-directed in the administration of our housing programs, and to exercise and demonstrate a high level of professionalism while providing housing services to families.

A participant with a disability must first ask for a specific change to a policy or practice as an accommodation of his or her disability before JPHA will treat a person differently than anyone else. JPHA's policies and practices will be designed to provide assurances that persons with disabilities will be given reasonable accommodations, upon request, so that they may fully access and utilize the housing program and related services.

If JPHA finds that the requested accommodation creates an undue administrative or financial burden, JPHA will deny the request and/or present an alternate accommodation that will still meet the need of the person.

JPHA will provide a written decision to the person requesting the accommodation within ten business days, after receipt of all requested information. If a person is denied the accommodation or feels that the alternative suggestions are inadequate, they may request an informal hearing to review JPHA's decision.

JPHA may verify disabilities under definitions in the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, and Americans with Disabilities Act.

Shreveport area:

The City of Shreveport Human Resources Department does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to, or treatment or employment in its programs or activities. Reasonable accommodations will be provided to allow access to the department's programs and activities for individuals with disabilities unless such accommodations would result in undue hardship.

Auxiliary aids such as readers, telecommunications devices for deaf persons (TDDs), taped text, and large print material, or other aids are provided for individuals requesting such accommodations under provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Two-day notice is required.

- c. Describe any difficulties in achieving homeownership experienced by

persons with disabilities and by persons with different types of disabilities in the State.

A 2015 report by the Louisiana Housing Alliance noted several barriers to homeownership in Louisiana. Tighter lending requirements in the wake of the financial crisis along with a decline in manufactured housing pose significant barriers. Additionally, high transportation costs and the difficulty of finding mid-wage jobs make homeownership more difficult to achieve.

5. Disproportionate Housing Needs

Describe any disproportionate housing needs experienced by persons with disabilities and by persons with certain types of disabilities in the State.

Persons with disabilities make up a disproportionately high percentage of individuals living in publicly supported housing. This is likely due to the connection between disability and poverty. In 2015, 24.3% of the population age 16 and over with disabilities in Louisiana lived below the poverty level compared to 17.0% of the state population as a whole. The numbers of persons with disabilities who live in publicly supported housing vary greatly by sub-region in the state. Persons with disabilities make up an especially high proportion of residents in publicly supported housing in the Houma-Thibodaux and Lafayette regions. In addition, persons with disabilities may make up a disproportionate percentage of the homeless population. The 2012-2016 New Orleans Consolidated Plan found that 55% of the city’s homeless population had at least one disability. The table below shows that households that include persons with disabilities and are renters experience disproportionately high rates of housing problems.

Housing Problems among Households Including Persons with Disabilities – Louisiana								
	Hearing or Vision Impairment		Ambulatory Limitation		Cognitive Limitation		Self-care or Independent Living Limitation	
	All	With Housing Problem(s)*	All	With Housing Problem(s)*	All	With Housing Problem(s)*	All	With Housing Problem(s)*
Renters	61,675	32,245	86,780	47,170	72,075	41,120	65,275	36,235
Homeowners	166,580	38,140	212,575	55,605	130,675	38,025	152,800	41,070
Total	228,255	70,385	299,355	102,775	202,750	79,145	218,075	77,305

Source: HUD CHAS 2016 (using ACS 2009-2013 data)

Please note that an occupied unit may be reflected more than once in the statistical counts if a household member(s) has a disability in more than one of the following categories: hearing or vision impairment; ambulatory limitation; cognitive limitation; and/or self-care or independent living limitation

*A household is said to have a housing problem if it has 1 or more of the 4 problems identified in the CHAS data: 1) housing unit lacks complete kitchen facilities; 2) housing unit lacks complete plumbing facilities; 3) household is overcrowded; and 4) household is cost burdened

6. Disability and Access Issues Contributing Factors

Consider the listed factors and any other factors affecting the State and region. Identify factors that significantly create, contribute to, perpetuate, or increase the severity of disability and access issues and the fair housing issues, which are Segregation, R/ECAPs, Disparities in Access to Opportunity, and Disproportionate Housing Needs. For each contributing factor, note which fair housing issue(s) the selected contributing factor relates to.

- Access to proficient schools for persons with disabilities

Students with disabilities face challenges in accessing proficient schools in Louisiana. In particular, the Recovery School District, which serves New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and Shreveport, has been involved in litigation over allegations of discrimination against students that need special education services. Alleged discrimination includes the denial of admission to charter schools, the failure to provide services to which students are entitled within charter schools, and disparate school discipline outcomes.

- Access to publicly supported housing for persons with disabilities

Individuals with disabilities make up a large portion of people living in publicly supported housing. However, it appears that more publicly supported units are needed to fully serve persons with disabilities given that persons with disabilities tend to earn lower wages and experience higher rates of poverty.

- Access to transportation for persons with disabilities

Public transportation exists in Louisiana's major cities but areas outside of downtowns have less frequent transit service, limiting access to transportation. Unreliable paratransit service can also impact access to transportation. A lack of reliable transportation can seriously affect access to job, educational, and recreational opportunities.

- Inaccessible government facilities or services

This Analysis did not reveal evidence that inaccessible government facilities or services are a significant contributing factor to fair housing issues. This does not necessarily mean that all government facilities and services across Louisiana are uniformly accessible to persons with

disabilities. Rather, this analysis did not reveal instances of those types of deficiencies affecting segregation, disparities in access to opportunity, disproportionate housing needs, or other fair housing issues for persons with disabilities.

- Inaccessible sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, or other infrastructure

Inaccessible sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, or other infrastructure are a contributing factor. Non-compliant infrastructure hinders the ability of individuals to access services and be fully integrated into the community.

- Lack of affordable in-home or community-based supportive services

While Louisiana has a variety of service, there is continued need for affordable in-home or community based supportive services.

- Lack of affordable, accessible housing in range of unit sizes

Insufficient affordable, accessible housing in a range of sizes is a contributing factor. Individuals with disabilities face greater housing challenges than the population as a whole. Additionally, persons with disabilities are less likely to be employed and have a lower median income, therefore, they are likely to have a greater need for affordable housing.

- Lack of affordable, integrated housing for individuals who need supportive services

Louisiana operates a Permanent Supported Housing program that has had some success but more housing supply is needed to keep up with demand for the program.

- Lack of assistance for housing accessibility modifications

There is limited assistance for housing accessibility modifications, which is a contributing factor to segregation and disproportionate housing needs for persons with disabilities.

- Lack of assistance for transitioning from institutional settings to integrated housing

See discussion of Permanent Supportive Housing Programs, above.

- Land use and zoning laws

Land use and zoning laws can contribute to the segregation of persons with disabilities.

- Lending Discrimination

This Analysis did not reveal specific evidence of lending discrimination contributing to fair housing issues for persons with disabilities in Louisiana, which does not mean that such discrimination has not occurred and fueled fair housing issues. Fair housing testing focused on lending discrimination against persons with disabilities may be appropriate in light of the lack of available information about this subject. Common forms of lending discrimination against persons with disabilities nationally

include “form of payment discrimination,” which occurs by lenders not accepting disability income as proof of ability to and not making submission forms accessible to person with disabilities.

- Location of accessible housing

The location of accessible housing is a contributing factor to disparities in access to opportunity for persons with disabilities. Because accessible housing is disproportionately multi-family housing, it is disproportionately located in town and city centers rather than in suburban and rural areas. Across regions of the state, these areas tend to have limited access to proficient schools, low poverty areas, labor market engagement, and environmental health.

- Occupancy codes and restrictions

This analysis did not reveal evidence of occupancy codes and restrictions contributing to fair housing issues for persons with disabilities in Louisiana. Nationally, limits on the number of unrelated persons who can live in a dwelling have often been barriers to the development and operation of group homes and to persons with disabilities being able to have the support of live- in aides.

- Regulatory barriers to providing housing and supportive services for persons with disabilities

This analysis did not reveal regulatory barriers to the provision of housing and supportive services for persons with disabilities.

- State or local laws, policies, or practices that discourage individuals with disabilities from being placed in or living in apartments, family homes, and other integrated settings

The Pre-admission Screening and Resident Review process, known as PASRR, is an important tool to prevent the inappropriate institutionalization of individuals with disabilities in nursing homes. Under PASRR, states must follow stringent procedures in implementing a two-level screening and evaluation process prior to nursing facility admission. An effective PASRR process identifies individuals with mental illness, intellectual and developmental disabilities, or related conditions and determines how those individuals’ needs can be met in the community.

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

Fair housing enforcement, education, and outreach are essential to addressing fair housing issues. This section provides an overview of the agencies and organizations that enforce fair housing laws and help inform residents about fair housing issues in Louisiana. The section also describes existing fair housing laws at the state and local levels and includes analysis of housing discrimination claims in the state.

1. Analysis

- a. List and summarize any of the following that have not been resolved involving the State: 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, 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, or 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.

This Analysis did not reveal any the types of unresolved violations of fair housing or other civil rights laws included in the question above, which specifically concerns allegations of discrimination against the State.

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

The Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act, LA. REV. STAT. ANN. § 51:2601 *et seq.*, protects against discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status, and disability, which are the same protected characteristics under the federal Fair Housing Act.

Of the larger municipal areas, East Baton Rouge Parish, Lafayette Parish, Jefferson Parish, St. Bernard Parish, Livingston Parish, Bossier Parish, Bossier City, and the City of Slidell have ordinances that protect against discrimination on the basis of the federally protected characteristics.² The ordinances of the City of Lake Charles and the City of Monroe do not include familial status and disability. The ordinances of St. Tammany Parish and Plaquemines Parish do not include disability as a status. The ordinance for the City of Hammond does not include familial status.³ The City of New Orleans has the additional statuses of sexual orientation, gender identification, marital status, age, and creed.⁴ The City of Shreveport's ordinance has the additional statuses of age, ancestry, sexual orientation, gender identity, and political affiliation.⁵

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

The Louisiana Fair Housing Action Center (LAFHAC) is the only full-service private fair housing organization within the State of Louisiana. The conducts education and outreach activities,

² EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA. CODE §§ 8:1001 *et seq.*; LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA. CODE §§ 46-31 *et seq.*; JEFFERSON PARISH, LA. CODE §§ 12.6-1 *et seq.*; ST. BERNARD PARISH, LA. CODE §§ 7.5-16 *et seq.*; LIVINGSTON PARISH, LA. CODE §§ 8-11 *et seq.*; BOSSIER PARISH, LA. CODE §§ 66-51 *et seq.*; BOSSIER CITY, LA. CODE §§ 62-46 *et seq.*; SLIDELL, LA. CODE §§ 17-41 *et seq.*

³ HAMMOND, LA. CODE §§ 17.7-21 *et seq.*

⁴ NEW ORLEANS, LA. CODE §§ 86.28 *et seq.*

⁵ SHREVEPORT, LA. CODE §§ 39-1 *et seq.*

and engaging in policy advocacy to advance civil rights and the interests of its clients. While LAFHAC is a statewide organization, its only office is in New Orleans so its services are more accessible to clients within the New Orleans metropolitan area.

The Louisiana Department of Justice (LDOJ) Equal Housing Opportunity Section is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act. This section is active in the investigation, conciliation, and judicial enforcement of Fair Housing complaints. Staff cooperates with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development in the enforcement of statutes prohibiting discrimination in housing and housing transactions based on an individual's race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status, or disability. The section also provides information to Louisiana citizens on their rights regarding the rental and purchase of dwellings under the Louisiana Equal Housing Opportunity Act.

Multiple state and local agencies have information about fair housing on their websites including the Louisiana Housing Corporation, East Baton Rouge Parish, and Calcasieu Parish.

Louisiana's Legal Services Corporation-funded legal services organizations provide legal services to eligible low-income victims of housing discrimination. Southeast Louisiana Legal Services has a relatively high capacity to handle fair housing cases, but capacity levels in other areas of the state are not consistent.

- 2. Additional Information:** Provide additional relevant information, if any, about fair housing enforcement, outreach capacity, and resources in the State and region.

This section provides information regarding alleged violations of the Fair Housing Act in Louisiana. Fair housing complaints in the state are received by federal, state, and non-profit organizations. However, an increase in a specific type of complaint may mean that the public is better educated about their rights rather than that type of discrimination is becoming more common. As a result, complaint and enforcement data is not a definitive guide to the amount or distribution by type of housing discrimination.

PRIVATE SECTOR COMPLIANCE

Fair Housing Complaints and Studies

Complaints filed with the Department of Housing and Urban Development

HUD received a statewide total of 730 fair housing complaints from 2010-2015. East Baton Rouge had the most complaints, with a total of 146, and New Orleans was second, with a total of 115 complaints. The parishes with the highest per capita complaints were St. Bernard and Jefferson Davis. The HUD data sets record descriptive information that includes the basis of each complaint, when the complaint was received, filed, and the outcome of the investigation.

HUD complaints for the period of 2010-2015 continue previous trends in complaints. The most common bases of discrimination were race, disability, and family status because complainants may submit more than one basis for a fair housing complaint, there are more bases cited than complaints filed). In total, HUD complaints have dropped from a high of 203 in 2010 to just 67 in 2015. The decline in complaints is also consistent regardless of the basis for the complaint. It is not clear what this significant decline should be attributed to, given that recent testing studies do not suggest a

significant change in the level of discrimination in the state.

Table: HUD Fair Housing Complaints by Basis							
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Race	119	107	49	46	40	29	390
National Origin	11	6	1	4	4	3	29
Sex/Gender	25	20	7	4	12	5	73
Family Status	39	20	11	19	11	7	107
Disability	59	71	38	46	39	34	287
Other	14	12	9	8	3	1	47

Source: HUD Data, 2010-2015

HUD concluded that roughly 40% of these complaints were without cause. An additional 27% of complaints were settled successfully, and 16% of complaints were withdrawn after HUD initiated investigations. The most common closure was due to lack of finding of discrimination. Settling complaints between the parties were the second highest reason for complaint closures followed by complainants' withdrawals. These numbers are similar to the 2000-2009 data, which also demonstrates lack of cause and conciliation being the highest reasons for investigation closures within the HUD complaints.

Table: HUD Fair Housing Complaints by Closure							
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Dismissed without Cause	78	73	39	46	31	24	291
Conciliation/Settled	80	53	17	14	21	8	193
Complaint Withdrawn	16	16	10	11	7	2	62
Closed for Lack of Information	9	28	18	21	16	4	96
Open Cases	1	2	5	3	12	29	52

Source: HUD Data, 2010-2015

Complaints Filed with LADOJ

LADOJ also accepts complaints from individuals who believe that they have been subjected to housing discrimination. From 2010 through 2016, LADOJ has closed 621 administrative

complaints. No cause determinations and conciliation were the two most common outcomes for the LADOJ administrative process. Complaint volume decreased from 2010 through 2015 before rebounding slightly in 2016. Race and disability are the two most common protected characteristics underlying housing discrimination complaints. The proportion of racial discrimination complaints has decreased over time while the proportion of disability complaints has increased. Some fair housing complainants allege discrimination on multiple bases. The greatest number of complainants was from East Baton Rouge Parish (150) followed by Orleans Parish (107). Other highly populated parishes like Jefferson Parish (56) and Caddo Parish (36) had far fewer complaints.

Table: LADOJ Fair Housing Complaints Closed by Outcome								
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Cases Referred Back to HUD	4	2	2	3	2	0	0	13
Cause Determination	21	11	8	1	2	1	2	46
Complainant Failed to Cooperate	5	4	8	3	7	2	1	30
Withdrawal without Resolution	1	7	5	11	3	0	0	27
Withdrawal with Resolution	1	9	9	5	2	2	0	28
Conciliation	58	56	13	7	14	7	39	194
Lack of Jurisdiction	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	6
No Cause Determination	47	51	54	36	25	31	27	271
Unable to Identify Respondent	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Unable to Locate Complainant	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	2

Table: LADOJ Fair Housing Complaints by Protected Characteristic								
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Color	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
Familial Status	25	17	9	13	9	5	6	84
Disability	39	38	28	30	25	24	70	254
National Origin	8	6	2	1	2	0	4	23
Race	109	68	34	26	25	11	17	290
Religion	3	3	2	1	2	0	0	11
Sex	22	20	7	12	9	6	7	83

Complaints Filed with LAFHAC

LAFHAC received a statewide total of 424 fair housing complaints from 2013 through mid-2016. Orleans Parish had the most complaints, with a total of 225, and Jefferson Parish was second, with a total of 82 complaints.

Table: LAFHAC Fair Housing Complaints by Basis					
	2013	2014	2015	2016 (Jan-Jul)	Total
Race	20	45	70	33	168
National Origin	6	8	6	1	21
Sex/Gender	6	10	13	7	36
Family Status	9	9	7	3	28
Disability	26	46	67	45	184
Other	7	9	11	11	38
Total	65	114	154	91	

Similar to HUD complaints, the most common bases of discrimination were race and disability (because complainants may submit more than one basis for a fair housing complaint, there are more bases cited than complaints filed). Unlike HUD complaints, LAFHAC complaints have climbed since 2013 and the organization is on pace to receive a similar number of complaints in 2016 as in 2015.

Private Rental Market

Race

Complaints to the LDOJ and HUD indicate that African American and other people of color continue to face discrimination in housing markets across the state.

LAFHAC similarly reported that its 2015 study of rental housing in the New Orleans metropolitan area reflected a 44% rate of discrimination against African Americans in low-poverty neighborhoods in metro New Orleans. In the study, housing units for rent were audited for discrimination using testers. Equally qualified black and white testers with matching incomes, career paths, family types, and rental histories attempted to view and apply for 50 apartment units. The paired tests were designed to hold all variables constant except race. In twenty-two tests, the similarly situated white tester was given the opportunity to rent or otherwise experienced favorable treatment in a stark demonstration of racial preference and discrimination. The racial discrimination materialized in a number of ways: housing providers refused to respond to inquiries made by African American testers, but promptly contacted white testers asking about the property in 8% of tests (4 of 50); in 20% of tests (10 out of 50) housing providers pursued and favored the white testers while refusing to show the apartment, ceasing to respond to follow-up inquiries after a showing, or failing to provide a required rental application to the African American testers; in nine tests (18%), white testers were offered better terms and conditions than their black counter parts through reduced application fees, lowered deposit amounts, or waived application processes. A similar LAFHAC study conducted in 2007 showed comparable results, with over half of African American testers facing discrimination.

Criminal Backgrounds

Criminal background check policies can also prevent renters from finding a home. Of the state's 4.6 million residents, 2.8 million—or 60%—have criminal records, according to the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics.⁶ Unfortunately, that number is also rising; the number of residents with criminal records increased by 28% between 2010 and 2014.⁷ In Louisiana, African Americans make up 32% of the total population, yet African Americans account for a full 66% of the prison population throughout the state. Across the country, arrest rates are 2.5 times higher for African Americans than for whites, and pre-trial detention rates for African Americans are 5.2 times the rate of white criminal defendants.⁸ Statistics confirm that African Americans and Hispanics are severely impacted by initial decisions to incarcerate or grant pre-trial release, as well as by the subsequent length of sentence at conviction.⁹ LAFHAC reports that from a 2015 investigation of 50 New Orleans-area housing providers found that prospective renters with criminal backgrounds were treated different based on their race. Mystery shoppers posing as prospective renters inquired about the rental availability and criminal background policy. Of the 50 tests conducted, African American

⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Survey of State Criminal History Information Systems, 2014" (Dec. 2015), available at www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bjs/grants/249799.pdf.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Hartney, Christopher and Vuong, Linh. Prepared for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. *Created Equal: Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the U.S. Criminal Justice System*. March, 2009. Based on State Court Processing Statistics (SCPS) data on the 75 largest counties in the U.S., which represent 38% of the U.S. population as a whole.

⁹ Spohn, Cassia and DeLone, Miriam. *When Does Race Matter? An Analysis of the Conditions Under Which Race Affects Sentence Severity*. *Sociology of Crime, Law, and Deviance*, Vol. 2, 2000: 3-37.

testers experienced discrimination 50% of the time.¹⁰ LAFHAC also reported an inconsistency in the applicant of background checks.

Domestic Violence and Sex Discrimination

In 2015, the Louisiana Legislature overwhelmingly passed the Louisiana Violence Against Women Act (LaVAWA). Its provisions are largely based on the protections that were already afforded to residents of federally subsidized housing, under the federal Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). The four key provisions of the Louisiana version are:

- Anyone in need of emergency assistance can contact the police without penalty.
- Victims can no longer be evicted because of the violence of their abuser.
- Survivors can no longer be denied housing solely on the basis of past abuse.
- Survivors can now terminate a lease early and move if they need to.

Lending Market

Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data reveals patterns of disparities in access to affordable mortgage credit that are suggestive of pervasive lending discrimination in Louisiana.

Outcomes of Home Purchase Loan Applications by Race and Ethnicity, 2014-2015

¹⁰ "Locked Out: Criminal Background Checks as a Tool for Discrimination," Greater New Orleans Fair Housing Action Center (Sep. 2015), available at www.gnofairhousing.org/2015/09/25/report-criminal-background-policies-used-as-a-cover-for-discrimination/.

Action taken	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
% Approved But Not Accepted	4.9%	5.5%	3.9%	7.0%	5.6%
% Denied by Financial Institution	13.6%	30.5%	12.7%	30.4%	23.2%
% Withdrawn by Applicant	10.5%	10.0%	12.5%	7.1%	10.0%
% File Closed for Incompleteness	2.5%	4.2%	2.2%	6.6%	4.1%
% Loan Originated	68.5%	49.8%	68.6%	48.9%	57.1%
% Denied by Financial Institution	24.4%	54.1%	40.4%	41.7%	43.5%
% Withdrawn	7.7%	6.7%	12.8%	10.0%	10.2%

As the table above illustrates, non-Hispanic White and Asian applicants are much more likely to successfully originate home purchase loans than are Black and American Indian applicants, in particular, and Hispanic applicants, to a somewhat lesser degree.

Outcomes of Home Improvement Loan Applications by Race and Ethnicity, 2014-2015

Action taken	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
% Approved But Not Accepted	6.9%	7.5%	8.3%	1.7%	6.5%
% Denied by Financial Institution	24.4%	54.1%	40.4%	41.7%	43.5%
% Withdrawn by Applicant	7.7%	6.7%	12.8%	10.0%	10.2%
% File Closed for Incompleteness	3.3%	4.1%	8.3%	8.3%	6.5%
% Loan Originated	57.8%	27.6%	38.5%	38.3%	33.3%

With regard to home improvement loan applications, non-Hispanic White applicants are similarly more likely to successfully originate loans, and Black applicants are the group least able to originate loans and most likely to have applications denied. However, unlike with home purchase loans, Asian applicants do not successfully originate home improvement loans at higher rates than other groups. The comparatively smaller number of home improvement loan applications, particularly for groups other than non-Hispanic White and Black applicants, may explain this deviation from the broader trend.

Outcomes of Refinance Loan Applications by Race and Ethnicity, 2014-2015

Action taken	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
% Approved But Not Accepted	4.6%	5.4%	4.4%	4.2%	4.6%
% Denied by Financial Institution	22.3%	39.9%	28.0%	40.5%	31.3%
% Withdrawn by Applicant	14.0%	15.0%	16.1%	14.1%	15.0%
% File Closed for Incompleteness	4.7%	7.1%	6.8%	8.6%	8.8%
% Loan Originated	54.3%	32.7%	44.7%	32.6%	40.3%

Refinance loans follow a pattern that is somewhat more similar to home purchase loans although there remains a gap between non-Hispanic White and Asian applicants in the origination of refinance loans. The total number of refinance loans is lower than the number of home purchase loans but higher than the number of home improvement loans.

Percentage of Home Purchase Loans That Are or Are Not High Cost by Race and Ethnicity, 2014-2015

Loan Cost	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
% High Cost	14.5%	29.3%	9.1%	23.6%	20.9%
% Not High Cost	85.5%	70.7%	90.9%	76.4%	79.1%

In addition to facing higher rates of denial and lower rates of origination than non-Hispanic White and Asian applicants, Black, American Indian, and Hispanic applicants are more likely to receive high cost loans. These loans are often predatory and are more likely to result in foreclosures

than are prime rate mortgages.

Percentage of Home Improvement Loans That Are or Are Not High Cost by Race and Ethnicity, 2014-2015

Loan Cost	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
% High Cost	11.3%	8.6%	7.9%	5.7%	8.1%
% Not High Cost	88.7%	91.4%	92.1%	94.3%	91.9%

Rates of high cost lending for home improvement loans appear to be relatively similar across groups with non-Hispanic Whites actually experiencing a higher incidence of high cost loans. In light of the small total number of home improvement loans, particularly for smaller racial and ethnic groups, this data should not be used to support any strong conclusions.

Percentage of Refinance Loans That Are or Are Not High Cost by Race and Ethnicity, 2014- 2015

Loan Cost	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
% High Cost	11.0%	11.7%	6.5%	10.8%	9.6%
% Not High Cost	89.0%	88.3%	93.5%	89.2%	90.4%

The data on high cost refinance loans is quite similar to that for home improvement loans though the fact that the total volume of such loans is higher suggests that, at least for non-Hispanic White and Black applicants, this data is meaningful.

Rates of Home Purchase Loan Application Denial and Origination by Race and Ethnicity and by Income, 2014-2015

Income Segment and Outcome	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
\$0 to \$50,000 % Denied	26.3%	34.8%	30.8%	44.4%	31.9%
\$0 to \$50,000 % Originated	57.8%	41.6%	53.8%	38.9%	49.0%
\$50,000 to \$75,000 Denied	12.3%	22.8%	12.7%	21.9%	19.8%
\$50,000 to \$75,000 Originated	69.8%	57.8%	69.1%	54.7%	58.3%
\$75,000 to \$100,000 Denied	9.6%	20.1%	6.8%	19.7%	18.4%
\$75,000 to \$100,000 Originated	73.6%	59.7%	74.5%	62.3%	62.6%
\$100,000+ Denied	7.2%	18.7%	6.3%	19.1%	11.3%
\$100,000+ Originated	76.3%	63.6%	73.3%	66.0%	71.2%

The data above, along with that in the tables that follow, shows that racial and ethnic disparities in denial and origination rates depicted are not explained by differences in income by race. At every income stratum, non-Hispanic White and Asian applicants are less likely to have their applications denied and more likely to get mortgages originated than are members of other groups. Black and American Indian applicants are less able to obtain home purchase loans than are Hispanic applicants of the same income level. The disparity is so extreme that non-Hispanic White and Asian applicants with incomes of \$50,000 to \$75,000 are noticeably more likely to successfully originate home purchase loans than are Black and American Indian households with incomes of \$100,000 or more.

Rates of Home Improvement Loan Application Denial and Origination by Race and Ethnicity and by Income, 2014-2015

Income Segment and Outcome	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
\$0 to \$50,000 % Denied	35.6%	63.2%	55.1%	53.6%	51.3%
\$0 to \$50,000 % Originated	47.3%	22.4%	24.5%	39.3%	30.8%
\$50,000 to \$75,000 Denied	23.3%	43.1%	25.0%	46.2%	40.5%
\$50,000 to \$75,000 Originated	59.5%	34.4%	37.5%	46.2%	40.5%
\$75,000 to \$100,000 Denied	19.1%	42.3%	21.4%	33.3%	54.2%
\$75,000 to \$100,000 Originated	63.6%	36.2%	71.4%	33.3%	33.3%
\$100,000+ Denied	15.6%	38.7%	25.0%	11.1%	24.3%
\$100,000+ Originated	66.1%	34.5%	35.7%	44.4%	37.8%

With the caveat that the total number of applications for less populous racial and ethnic groups is small, the table above shows that income does not explain differences in outcomes by race and ethnicity between non-Hispanic White applicants and other applicants. The difference is particularly salient between non-Hispanic White and Black applicants. The denial rate for Black applicants with incomes of \$100,000 or more is higher than the denial rate for non-Hispanic White applicants with incomes of \$50,000 or less.

Rates of Refinance Loan Application Denial and Origination by Race and Ethnicity and by Income, 2014-2015

Income Segment and Outcome	White, Not Hispanic or Latino	Black, Not Hispanic or Latino	Asian, Not Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic or Latino	Hispanic or Latino
\$0 to \$50,000 % Denied	31.2%	49.2%	37.8%	47.2%	40.1%
\$0 to \$50,000 % Originated	47.9%	28.2%	37.5%	31.3%	34.4%
\$50,000 to \$75,000 Denied	23.4%	41.3%	31.1%	42.9%	35.0%
\$50,000 to \$75,000 Originated	54.3%	32.0%	42.9%	28.2%	38.1%
\$75,000 to \$100,000 Denied	19.5%	36.8%	22.9%	36.5%	27.9%
\$75,000 to \$100,000 Originated	58.1%	34.7%	44.6%	31.8%	46.0%
\$100,000+ Denied	16.2%	32.8%	19.9%	32.3%	22.1%
\$100,000+ Originated	61.0%	38.2%	51.4%	33.5%	48.2%

The trends for refinance loans fall somewhere in between those for home purchase loans and those for home improvement loans. Asian applicants are less able to obtain credit than they are in the home purchase realm and more likely than they are in the home improvement area. Disparities remain stark with Black applicants with incomes of \$100,000 or more being denied at higher rates than non-Hispanic White applicants with incomes of \$50,000 or less.

VII. Fair Housing Goals and Priorities

For its 2020 Analysis of Impediments, the State of Louisiana has the following priorities and goals in the furtherance of removing or mitigating impediments to fair housing choices:

1. A Holistic Approach to Housing Opportunities in Non-Entitlement Areas

On February 14, 2020, through Executive Order 2020-3, Governor Jon Bel Edwards, recognizing that rural areas of Louisiana suffer from a disproportionate burden of poverty, lack of access to health care and poor quality of life, launched a holistic initiative for strategies for revitalization of rural communities. With the creation of the Governor's Advisory Council on Rural Revitalization, multiple factors contributing to the quality of life in non-entitlement areas will be analyzed and a comprehensive strategic plan delivered to Governor Edwards to address those needs. The Council is to identify potential local, state and federal resources and recommend legislation necessary to achieve that strategic plan.

This broadly encompassing initiative presents a unique opportunity within the non-entitlement areas to address at a policy, legislative and economic level many of the factors that can operate as impediments to housing choices to persons in classes protected under the Fair Housing Act. The Office of Community Development will guide a working group of the members of the Council whose various missions overlap and can impact choice of housing opportunities.

Under the executive order, the strategic plan is due to Governor Edwards on January 5, 2021. This date may be impacted by the consequences of the current COVID 19 pandemic, which limits the ability of the advisory commission to meet or hold local listening tours or public hearings.

Using the comprehensive strategic plan as a road map, the state will strive through policy and legislation to implement measures necessary to address the conditions of housing and poverty that limit choices to those in poverty, those protected under the Fair Housing Act, and all citizens impacted by these forces in the non-entitlement areas. This initiative is ambitious. While it stems from an executive order prior to the COVID 19 pandemic, the impact of the pandemic makes moving forward with the initiative all the more critical.

2. Addressing the Effect of Zoning and Land Use Regulations and Processes

The impact of zoning and land use laws and regulations and the processes relative to navigating them can be factors causing or perpetuating segregation or promoting integration. This can be true even though laws, regulations and procedures do not expressly reference the relationship of the subject land and a class of persons protected under the Fair Housing Act.

Partnered with the Louisiana Municipal Association and Policy Juror Association of Louisiana, the Office of Community Development will lead interactive workshops and trainings sessions for municipal and parish leaders and permitting/zoning officers to promote a more thorough understanding of the direct and indirect consequences laws and processes play in segregation, integration, and housing choices. Building upon this deepened understanding, these continuing sessions will invite an evolving dialogue between affordable housing developers, local and state government, and other stakeholders to explore mechanisms which may address the long standing impact which these laws and regulations can have on both the entitlement areas and non-entitlement areas of Louisiana.

3. Consideration of Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Protected Classes in CDGB-MIT Determinations

Following the historic Louisiana floods of 2016, Governor Jon Bel Edwards undertook changing how the state and local jurisdictions address drainage and flooding issues. Through the opportunities presented by the Community Development Block Grant for mitigation activities (CDBG-MIT) program, the Louisiana Watershed Initiative (LWI) has launched. In its initial stages, eight watershed regions have been established, within which eight regional steering committees have been formed through a representative and inclusive process. These committees will work over the course of the next year to address water management issues and priorities at regional scales across the state.

In establishing the priorities of each watershed region, the committees are to consider impacts to areas of concentrated poverty and classes protected under the Fair Housing Act. Additionally, as the state administers the program and issues future notices of funding opportunities to the local jurisdictions to submit appropriate mitigation and resilience projects for funding, the state will (1) include a requirement that jurisdictions identify areas with urgent mitigation needs and (2) work to fund resilience projects in or impacting areas of concentrated poverty. These measures do not guarantee each need will be addressed; but are intended to encourage and assist the state and local jurisdictions with identifying and ensuring these needs are both identified and appropriately considered in decision-making processes.