

Eastern Area Community Fair Housing Report

Appendix 2 to the Mid-City Communities Fair Housing Review

Prepared by San Diego Fair Housing Lab

Date September 2026

Mid-City Communities Plan Update, September 2026

Contents

About this report	3
1. Narrative	4
2. Population (2000 → Current)	8
3. Population by Race Breakdown	9
4a. Housing Units & Households (2000 → Current)	10
4b. Housing Production (6th RHNA Cycle)	11
5a. Households by Race x Tenure (2000 → Current)	13
5b. Mobility	15
6. Crowding	16
7. Age Composition (2000 → Current)	17
8a. Economic Trend (Population-Weighted Medians)	18
8b. Rate-of-Change vs. Regional Benchmark (HCD Neighborhood Change)	19
8c. Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing	20
9. Supplementary Context	22
10. Climate Equity	25
11. Sources and Methods	26
12. Tract-Level Detail	28
Terms used in this document	29

About this report

Mid-City Communities Plan Update. Community planning area: Mid-City:Eastern Area. Appendix 2 to the Mid-City Communities Fair Housing Review. San Diego Fair Housing Lab, 2026.

How to read the City of San Diego columns. Every City of San Diego figure in this report is computed over the same 311 census tracts: the 323 tracts inside the city limits, less 11 tracts whose residents live mainly in group quarters (dormitories, barracks and institutions) and one tract that is entirely water.

The 11 are set aside so that household rates are not distorted by populations that do not live in households; they hold 2.7 percent of the city's residents (1,388,930 people in all 323 in-city tracts against 1,351,501 in these 311). The same basis is used in every Lab report, so figures are comparable across them. They are not the City's own published totals, and the two should not be differenced.

How to read the comparison columns. This community's 7 census tracts are split 4 in Council District 9 (57.14 percent) and 3 in Council District 4 (42.86 percent). Neither block is negligible, so the report compares the community with the city only and carries no district column.

This report covers demographic, housing and economic change from 2000 to the current period (American Community Survey 2020-2024) for one of the four communities in the Mid-City Communities Plan Update, with companion reports for City Heights, Kensington-Talmadge and Normal Heights. Sources and methods are set out in Section 11.

1. Narrative

This report examines demographic, housing, and economic change in the Mid-City:Eastern Area community planning area from 2000 to the current period, comparing the CPA against the citywide baseline only. Its 7 tracts split 57.14 percent District 9 (4 tracts) and 42.86 percent District 4 (3 tracts), a real majority paired with a minority block far too large to treat as negligible, so this report carries no district comparison column (Section 11). It draws on U.S. Census Bureau data (2000 Decennial Census and American Community Survey estimates) alongside California HCD's Neighborhood Change and Opportunity Map methodologies. The central finding of this report is a confirmed, CPA-wide instance of a gap in HCD's own detection methodology: White NH population here fell 26.0 percent while POC population grew 42.1 percent, a shift that reproduces from the tract counts in this report, and not one of the CPA's 7 tracts carries an HCD Neighborhood Change pathway flag or spillover designation of any kind. The remainder of the CPA's record sits around that finding, including a uniform Low Resource opportunity tier, an owner-mobility rate that has fallen close to zero, and an average household size moving opposite the citywide direction.

Key Findings

- a) This CPA shows a large, independently re-verified racial compositional shift that HCD's Neighborhood Change methodology does not detect at any geographic scale tested.** White NH population fell 26.0 percent CPA-wide, from 12,562 to 9,292, while POC population grew 42.1 percent, from 19,530 to 27,757 (Section 2). Within that footprint, the 3-tract District 4 slice that the Lab's earlier analysis documented shows White NH falling from 3,253.03 to 1,905 (-41.4 percent) against POC growth from 9,145.20 to 11,917 (+30.3 percent), and the 4-tract District 9 slice shows White NH falling from 9,308.89 to 7,387 (-20.6 percent) against POC growth from 10,384.85 to 15,840 (+52.5 percent), both reproduced exactly here from the tract counts. All three geographies, and the full 7-tract CPA, return zero HCD pathway flags and zero spillover (Section 9).
- b) White NH population fell more than five times as fast here as citywide, while Black NH population declined far more mildly than citywide.** White NH fell 26.0 percent against a 5.0 percent citywide decline, and Black NH fell 7.1 percent, from 5,370 to 4,990, against a 22.4 percent citywide decline (Section 2, Section 3). Hispanic or Latino population grew 73.9 percent, from 8,135 to 14,145, against 32.6 percent citywide, while Asian NH grew 64.0 percent against 46.9 percent citywide and Other/Two+ NH grew 1.5 percent against 77.9 percent citywide (Section 3). Total population grew 15.4 percent, from 32,092 to 37,049, close to the citywide 14.1 percent, so the compositional movement occurred without an unusual aggregate growth rate (Section 2).
- c) All 7 tracts sit in HCD's Low Resource opportunity tier, and no tract carries a Racial Concentration of Affluence (RCAA) classification of any kind.** No tract reaches Moderate, High, or Highest Resource, and the CPA's mean opportunity score of 1 sits below the citywide mean of 5 (Section 9). Zero tracts fall into either the RCAA-concentrated subtotal or the diversifying/opening subtotal; the RCAA screen is the top 20 percent of county tracts on affluence together with the bottom 20 percent on people-of-color share, and this CPA's highest-ranked tract sits at the 40th percentile on affluence and its lowest at the 51st on people-of-color share. No tract carries HCD's environmental burden flag (23 citywide) or its high-poverty-and-segregation flag (3 citywide) (Section 9).

d) The CPA crosses 1 of HCD's 3 regional rate-of-change thresholds against the citywide 2-of-3 profile, a second measure on which HCD's instruments register this geography as quiet. Income change registers 115.5 percent against a 50th-percentile threshold of 109.3 percent and crosses it; rent change registers 61.8 percent against a 64.5 percent threshold and does not cross, while the citywide figure of 64.8 percent does; and the home value to income gap registers -3.9 percentage points against a flat 25-point threshold, below the crossing line, as is the citywide -4.2 points (Section 8b). This aggregate result sits alongside the zero pathway flags recorded at the tract level, so both of HCD's instruments read low here (Section 8b, Section 9).

e) Owner turnover has nearly stopped: 0.1 percent of owner households moved within the last two years, against 1.8 percent citywide. The CPA's two-year owner mover rate fell from 10.6 percent in 2000 to 0.1 percent currently, while the citywide rate fell from 12.0 percent to 1.8 percent (Section 5b). Renter turnover fell on the same measure, from 42.1 percent to 6.1 percent against a citywide move from 41.4 percent to 10.0 percent, and the five-year renter rate fell from 83.1 percent to 33.4 percent against a citywide move from 81.0 percent to 45.0 percent (Section 5b).

f) Average household size rose 4.1 percent here while the citywide figure fell 3.8 percent, over a period when this CPA's housing stock grew at less than half the citywide rate. Household size moved from 2.712 to 2.822 while the citywide figure moved from 2.619 to 2.521 (Section 4a). Total units grew 9.9 percent, from 12,056 to 13,254, against 21.7 percent citywide, with 6 of the CPA's 7 tracts in the units-grew category and 1 in the unit-loss category. The vacancy rate held essentially flat, moving from 2.4 percent to 2.3 percent, while the citywide rate rose from 4.0 percent to 6.6 percent (Section 4a).

g) Three of the CPA's 7 tracts move against its own aggregate age direction. The CPA's under-18 share fell from 25.6 percent to 21.8 percent and its 65-plus share rose from 11.6 percent to 12.7 percent, both slower movements than the citywide shifts from 24.4 percent to 18.8 percent and from 10.6 percent to 14.9 percent (Section 7). Within that aggregate, 27.11 and 29.03 show falling 65-plus shares, at -5.9 and -5.6 percentage points, and 27.02 shows a rising under-18 share, at +2.6 points (Section 7). 27.12 carries the CPA's steepest under-18 decline at -10.6 points, so the aggregate is a net figure across tracts moving against each other rather than a shared trend (Section 7).

Naturally occurring affordable housing. In 2000, 61.11 percent of this community's rentals paying cash rent rented within reach of a household at 60 percent of the county's median family income; in the current period 38.03 percent do, a change of -23.1 points and 823 fewer such rentals, against a citywide share that moved from 55.00 to 27.57 percent (-27.4 points). At 80 percent of median family income the share moved from 87.91 to 70.38 percent, -17.5 points, against a citywide share that moved from 77.12 to 53.05 percent (-24.1 points). The count moved from 4,437 to 4,184 and, because the worst-case treatment of the boundary bracket reverses the sign, the direction of the count change is not stated. These are stock figures: they describe what the rental stock rents for in each period and say nothing about where any household went (Section 8c).

Neighborhood Change: A Verified Compositional Shift Carrying No HCD Signal

All 7 of this CPA's tracts carry zero HCD Neighborhood Change designation of any kind. The Pathway 1A, Pathway 1B, and Pathway 2 counts are each zero, against 28, 9, and 35 tracts citywide; the any-pathway count is zero against 44 of 311 tracts citywide; and the spillover count is zero against 53 citywide (Section 9). That result holds at each of the three geographies examined inside this CPA, with the 3-tract District 4 slice, the 4-tract District 9 slice, and the full 7-tract footprint each returning zero

flags and zero spillover (Section 9). Underneath that uniform zero sits a compositional shift that reproduces from the tract counts: White NH down 41.4 percent (3,253.03 to 1,905) against POC up 30.3 percent (9,145.20 to 11,917) in the District 4 slice the Lab's earlier analysis documented, White NH down 20.6 percent (9,308.89 to 7,387) against POC up 52.5 percent (10,384.85 to 15,840) in the District 9 slice, and White NH down 26.0 percent (12,562 to 9,292) against POC up 42.1 percent (19,530 to 27,757) CPA-wide (Section 2, Section 9). What that establishes is that HCD's standard Neighborhood Change methodology can systematically miss real, substantial racial compositional change: the shift recorded here is large, it has been re-verified independently, it holds at every scale tested within this CPA, and it carries no HCD pathway signal whatsoever. Why the methodology does not register it is not established by this data and is not claimed here; the pattern is recorded as documented and verified, not as explained (Section 9).

Additional Context

Owner-occupied households grew 1.8 percent, from 6,152 to 6,265, while renter-occupied households grew 16.0 percent, from 5,170 to 5,998, against citywide growth of 10.8 percent and 20.8 percent respectively (Section 5a). White NH households fell on both tenures, with renter-occupied loss (-37.7 percent, 1,995 to 1,243) running well ahead of owner-occupied loss (-18.4 percent, 3,909 to 3,189), while Hispanic or Latino renter households grew 117.9 percent, from 1,213 to 2,643, and Asian (alone) owner households grew 99.4 percent, from 599 to 1,195. Black (alone) households declined on both tenures at rates milder than citywide, at -13.0 percent for owners against -28.6 percent citywide and -0.4 percent for renters against -4.6 percent citywide (Section 5a). The Lab's earlier analysis carries tenure-level detail for two tracts: 27.11, where population fell 30.0 percent while owner-occupied households fell 90.2 percent, and 27.05, where population fell 11.1 percent while owner-occupied households fell 79.4 percent (Section 12).

On CalEnviroScreen 5.0, the CPA's population-weighted overall percentile of 62.8 sits well above the citywide 37.1, with population characteristics at 62.3 against 35.7 citywide and pollution burden at 55.2 against 43.6 (Section 10). Traffic runs the other way, at 39.4 against 57.7 citywide, the one sub-metric on which this CPA reads more favorably than the city. Drinking water registers 18.6 against 20.3 citywide and carries the standing drinking-water caution described in the Sources and Methods section. The overall figure is partly concentrated: excluding 27.12, at the 89.4 percentile and 14.3 percent of the CPA's population, moves the weighted average from 62.8 to 58.4, a 4.4-point shift, leaving the CPA's environmental burden elevated above the citywide figure even after the exclusion (Section 10).

Median home value grew 347.1 percent, from \$146,879 to \$656,655, against 310.9 percent citywide, while median income grew 119.5 percent, from \$35,907 to \$78,801, against 134.0 percent citywide, and median monthly housing cost grew 156.4 percent, from \$790 to \$2,026, against 131.6 percent citywide (Section 8a). Crowding is the one measure in this report that tracks the citywide pattern closely at both endpoints, falling from 14.6 percent to 7.7 percent against a citywide move from 12.6 percent to 5.8 percent, with severe crowding falling from 7.3 percent to 2.7 percent against 7.2 percent to 2.4 percent citywide (Section 6). The CPA's tract-highlight scan surfaced age-bracket swings across all 7 tracts alongside zero HCD-flagged tracts and zero RCAA-concentrated tracts (Section 11, Section 12).

These patterns draw on verified Census Bureau data cross-checked against HCD's independently produced Neighborhood Change and Opportunity Map classifications, with the universe filter, the 2000-vintage boundary harmonization, and the rate and median aggregation conventions documented in Section 11. Section 5a's household counts use the ACS "alone" race definition and exclude Other/Two+ NH households, while Sections 2 and 3 use the non-Hispanic-exclusive definition, so the two are not drawn from the same universe, and all 2000 dollar figures are nominal 1999 dollars rather than inflation-adjusted (Section 5a, Section 8a). ACS estimates carry margins of error that widen at the tract level and are not shown in this report's tables, so small CPA-to-city differences should be read as directional rather than precise. The data document patterns of change over time; they do not, on their own, establish why an individual household left a given tract, and they do not establish the mechanism behind HCD's non-detection of the compositional shift documented above.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau (2000 Decennial Census, American Community Survey); California HCD Neighborhood Change Mapping Tool and Opportunity Map (2026); CalEnviroScreen 5.0 (2026).

2. Population (2000 → Current)

	CPA 2000	CPA Current	Δ	City 2000	City Current	Δ
Total	32,092	37,049	+15.4%	1,184,838	1,351,501	+14.1%
White NH	12,562	9,292	-26.0%	578,087	549,251	-5.0%
POC	19,530	27,757	+42.1%	606,751	802,250	+32.2%

This CPA's total population grew slightly faster than the city (+15.4% vs. +14.1%), but its underlying racial composition shifted far more sharply: White NH population fell 26.0 percent here against a 5.0 percent citywide decline, while POC population grew 42.1 percent here against 32.2 percent citywide (Section 1). This is the CPA-wide figure across all 7 tracts; see Section 9 for the decomposition against the Lab's earlier finding, which was documented for this CPA's 3-tract District 4 slice only.

3. Population by Race Breakdown

Category	CPA 2000	CPA Current	CPA Δ	City 2000	City Current	City Δ
Asian NH	4,008	6,574	+64.0%	161,444	237,181	+46.9%
Black NH	5,370	4,990	-7.1%	88,855	68,939	-22.4%
Hispanic or Latino	8,135	14,145	+73.9%	304,758	404,143	+32.6%
Other/Two+ NH	2,017	2,048	+1.5%	51,695	91,987	+77.9%
White NH	12,562	9,292	-26.0%	578,087	549,251	-5.0%

Black NH population in this CPA fell only 7.1 percent, far more mildly than the citywide decline of 22.4 percent – the opposite pattern from White NH, which fell more than five times as fast here as citywide. Hispanic or Latino population nearly doubled its citywide growth rate (+73.9% vs. +32.6%), consistent with this CPA absorbing a large share of its population growth through that category specifically.

4a. Housing Units & Households (2000 → Current)

Metric	CPA 2000	CPA Current	CPA Δ	City 2000	City Current	City Δ
Total units	12,056	13,254	+9.9%	460,671	560,804	+21.7%
Occupied units	11,762	12,944	+10.0%	442,094	523,840	+18.5%
Vacant/Unoccupied units	294	310	+5.5%	18,577	36,964	+99.0%
of which: Seasonal/Recreational/Occasional Use	14	10	-26.3%	5,785	9,999	+72.9%
Vacancy rate	2.4%	2.3%	-0.1pp	4.0%	6.6%	+2.6pp
Avg household size	2.712	2.822	+4.1%	2.619	2.521	-3.8%

Change categories across this community's tracts, 2000 to current: 6 units grew, 1 lost units – no tract in this CPA falls into the stable category or the occupancy-pattern-change category, a narrower spread than most communities the Lab has reported. This CPA's vacancy rate is essentially unchanged and remains far below the city's (2.3% vs. 6.6% currently), and its average household size rose (+4.1%) while the city's fell (-3.8%) – the opposite direction from the citywide trend, and unusual among the CPAs examined in the Lab's Mid-City set.

4b. Housing Production (6th RHNA Cycle)

The current RHNA cycle began in April 2021. This section reports housing units that reached the Permitted phase of HCD's Annual Progress Report (Table A2) framework from that date forward, the stage at which a project has cleared entitlement and received a building permit. Figures are drawn directly from HCD's own APR submissions, reconciled against the Lab's tract-level geography and opportunity classifications.

Of the 2,331 below-moderate-income units permitted in High and Highest Resource tracts citywide during the current RHNA cycle, Mid-City:Eastern Area's own High and Highest Resource tracts accounted for 0, or 0.0%.

Units Permitted, 6th Cycle Summary (April 2021 to Present)

Metric	Mid-City:Eastern Area	City of San Diego	Geography Share
Existing housing stock (all in-city tracts)	13,254	568,857	2.3%
Total units permitted	337	35,482	0.9%
Above Moderate income	309	28,771	1.1%
Below Moderate income (deed-restricted)	28	6,711	0.4%
Units permitted per 1,000 existing units	25.4	62.4	–
Below-moderate units permitted per 1,000 existing	2.1	11.8	–

Source: HCD Annual Progress Report Table A2, Permitted phase, reconciled to the Lab's tract geography. Below-moderate income includes Acutely Low, Extremely Low, Very Low, Low, and Moderate income tiers combined; in this dataset every below-moderate unit permitted is deed-restricted, so the two figures are not independent counts. Existing housing stock is counted over all in-city census tracts with no group-quarters exclusion, a slightly wider universe than the household and demographic figures in Section 4a and elsewhere, which exclude group-quarters-heavy tracts. Production is a count of construction rather than a household rate, so the group-quarters exclusion that protects household measures does not apply to it. 2025 figures are drawn from the most recent HCD APR submission on file and may not reflect a full calendar year of reporting. Unit-type categories in the table below are HCD's own Table A2 classifications and are not independently re-derived by the Lab.

Units Permitted by Year, Mid-City:Eastern Area

Year	Total Units Permitted	Below-Moderate Units
2018	13	0
2019	23	0
2020	32	2
2021	59	0
2022	26	0
2023	88	3
2024	80	7
2025	99	18

2018-2020 predate the current RHNA cycle and are shown for trend context only; the 6th-cycle production summary above uses only permits dated April 2021 forward.

Units Permitted by Type

Year	SFD	2 to 4	ADU	Total
2018	0	0	13	13
2019	0	0	23	23
2020	0	4	28	32
2021	0	0	59	59
2022	2	0	24	26
2023	0	0	88	88
2024	1	0	79	80
2025	0	0	99	99

SFD: single-family detached. SFA: single-family attached. "2 to 4": duplex through fourplex. "5+": multifamily buildings of five units or more. ADU: accessory dwelling unit. MH: mobile home. Categories are HCD's own Table A2 classifications and are not independently re-derived by the Lab. Row totals reconcile exactly to the year-by-year totals in the table above. 2025 figures may not reflect a full calendar year of reporting.

The City of San Diego's 2025 Baker Settlement commits the City to include data demonstrating that by at least 2028, at least 70 percent of the affordable housing projects in the City are permitted in moderate, high or highest resource areas. The settlement counts projects; the figures here count units, so they are a companion measure and not the settlement's own. Citywide, 51.6% of below-moderate units permitted during the current RHNA cycle have landed in those tiers. Mid-City:Eastern Area's own below-moderate units permitted in Moderate, High, or Highest Resource tracts stand at 0.0%.

5a. Households by Race x Tenure (2000 → Current)

Mid-City:Eastern Area – Owner-Occupied

Race Category	2000	Current	Δ	Δ%
Asian (alone)	599	1,195	+596	+99.4%
Black (alone)	644	561	-83	-13.0%
Hispanic or Latino	999	1,320	+321	+32.1%
White NH	3,909	3,189	-720	-18.4%
Four-race subtotal	6,152	6,265	+113	+1.8%
Not covered	148	526	–	–
Household total	6,300	6,791	+491	+7.8%

Mid-City:Eastern Area – Renter-Occupied

Race Category	2000	Current	Δ	Δ%
Asian (alone)	509	666	+157	+30.8%
Black (alone)	1,452	1,446	-6	-0.4%
Hispanic or Latino	1,213	2,643	+1,430	+117.9%
White NH	1,995	1,243	-752	-37.7%
Four-race subtotal	5,170	5,998	+828	+16.0%
Not covered	292	155	–	–
Household total	5,462	6,153	+691	+12.7%

City of San Diego – Owner-Occupied

Race Category	2000	Current	Δ	Δ%
Asian (alone)	24,172	48,159	+23,987	+99.2%
Black (alone)	11,124	7,948	-3,176	-28.6%
Hispanic or Latino	27,478	43,704	+16,226	+59.1%
White NH	152,986	139,318	-13,668	-8.9%
Four-race subtotal	215,760	239,129	+23,369	+10.8%
Not covered	4,827	10,722	–	–
Household total	220,587	249,851	+29,264	+13.3%

City of San Diego – Renter-Occupied

Race Category	2000	Current	Δ	Δ%
Asian (alone)	22,271	36,133	+13,862	+62.2%
Black (alone)	21,734	20,730	-1,004	-4.6%
Hispanic or Latino	49,980	76,480	+26,500	+53.0%
White NH	119,064	123,964	+4,900	+4.1%
Four-race subtotal	213,049	257,307	+44,258	+20.8%
Not covered	8,459	16,682	–	–
Household total	221,508	273,989	+52,481	+23.7%

Black/Asian use the ACS “alone” definition here, not the NH-exclusive definition used in Section 3 – not directly comparable across the two sections. Black (alone) households declined on both tenures in this CPA (owner -13.0%, renter -0.4%), a far milder decline than the city’s Black owner households (-28.6%), and renter-side losses are nearly flat here (-0.4%) where the city shows Black renters also declining (-4.6%). White NH households declined on both tenures here, with renter-occupied loss (-37.7%) far outpacing owner-occupied loss (-18.4%) – household counts are not on the same base as Section 3’s population-level White NH decline (-26.0%) and are not directly comparable figure-for-figure. These four race categories do not sum exactly to Section 4a’s occupied-unit totals – the race-by-tenure source excludes Other/Two+ NH households.

“Not covered” is the household total less the four categories printed above it, as printed. The categories come from a different Census table than the total and the 2000 values are allocated onto current tract boundaries, so the difference can fall below zero; where it does the cell is not stated. The row is the net of households the four categories omit and households they count twice, not a category, and no rate of change is computed on it.

5b. Mobility

Mobility (% Moved in Last 5 Years)

Metric	CPA 2000	CPA Current	City 2000	City Current
Owner	32.4%	16.0%	37.0%	14.5%
Renter	83.1%	33.4%	81.0%	45.0%

This CPA's current owner mobility (16.0%) sits slightly above the city's (14.5%).

Mobility (% Moved in Last 2 Years)

Metric	CPA 2000	CPA Current	City 2000	City Current
Owner	10.6%	0.1%	12.0%	1.8%
Renter	42.1%	6.1%	41.4%	10.0%

Source: American Community Survey, year the householder moved into the unit. 2013 is omitted entirely, not shown as zero: no bracket finer than ~4 years exists in the ACS 2009–2013 5-year vintage, so both figures are empty for every tract in this CPA and citywide in 2013. This CPA's current owner 2yr-mover rate (0.1%) is strikingly low, well below the already-low citywide rate (1.8%).

6. Crowding

Metric	CPA 2000	CPA Current	CPA Δ	City 2000	City Current	City Δ
% Crowded	14.6%	7.7%	-6.9pp	12.6%	5.8%	-6.8pp
% Severely Crowded	7.3%	2.7%	-4.5pp	7.2%	2.4%	-4.7pp

This CPA's crowding profile tracks the city closely at both endpoints and on both measures – unlike several other findings in this report, crowding here shows no CPA-specific divergence worth flagging.

7. Age Composition (2000 → Current)

Bracket	CPA 2000	CPA Current	City 2000	City Current
Under 18	25.6%	21.8%	24.4%	18.8%
18-34	32.2%	29.9%	29.0%	28.4%
35-64	30.6%	35.5%	36.0%	37.9%
65+	11.6%	12.7%	10.6%	14.9%

This CPA's under-18 share fell only 3.8 percentage points, about two thirds of the city's 5.6-point drop, and its 65+ share rose only 1.2 points against the city's 4.3-point rise – this CPA is aging more slowly than the city on both ends of the age distribution, the opposite pattern from the companion Mid-City:City Heights report.

Per-tract age-bracket swings, by district slice (2000 → Current):

Tract	District	<18 share 2000 → Current	<18 Δ	65+ share 2000 → Current	65+ Δ
27.12	D4	33.3% → 22.6%	-10.6pp	11.4% → 12.5%	+1.0pp
27.03	D9	26.5% → 22.0%	-4.5pp	9.4% → 14.4%	+5.1pp
29.02	D9	17.1% → 12.7%	-4.4pp	12.1% → 14.0%	+1.9pp
27.05	D4	27.3% → 24.5%	-2.8pp	13.6% → 20.5%	+6.8pp
27.11	D4	32.9% → 30.6%	-2.3pp	11.3% → 5.4%	-5.9pp
29.03	D9	25.2% → 23.2%	-2.0pp	14.7% → 9.1%	-5.6pp
27.02	D9	19.0% → 21.5%	+2.6pp	10.0% → 10.4%	+0.4pp

Two of this CPA's 7 tracts (27.11 and 29.03) show a falling 65+ share, and one tract (27.02) shows a rising under-18 share – three tracts running against this CPA's own aggregate direction, out of only 7 total. This CPA does not show the uniform-direction pattern documented for Mid-City:City Heights' 15 tracts. 27.05 and 27.11 are two of the three tracts in the Lab's earlier District 4 analysis – see Section 9 for the full writeup.

8a. Economic Trend (Population-Weighted Medians)

Metric	CPA 2000	CPA Current	CPA Δ	City 2000	City Current	City Δ
Income	\$35,907	\$78,801	+119.5%	\$50,274	\$117,634	+134.0%
Home value	\$146,879	\$656,655	+347.1%	\$226,860	\$932,173	+310.9%
Monthly cost	\$790	\$2,026	+156.4%	\$1,079	\$2,499	+131.6%

This CPA's home value grew faster than the city's (+347.1% vs. +310.9%) while its income grew more slowly (+119.5% vs. +134.0%) – home values in this CPA outpaced income growth by a wider margin than citywide, consistent with the home-value/income gap shown in Section 8b, which is less negative here (-3.9 points) than citywide (-4.2). 2000 figures are nominal 1999 dollars, not inflation-adjusted – see the Sources and Methods section for the nominal-dollars caveat, which applies identically here.

8b. Rate-of-Change vs. Regional Benchmark (HCD Neighborhood Change)

	Mid-City:Eastern Area	City of San Diego	Regional Threshold
Income change 2000-2023	115.5% (ABOVE)	126.1% (ABOVE)	50th pctile: 109.3%
Rent change 2013-2023	61.8% (below)	64.8% (ABOVE)	50th pctile: 64.5%
Home value/income gap	-3.9pp (below 25pp)	-4.2pp (below 25pp)	flat 25pp

This CPA crosses only the income-growth threshold (1 of 3 HCD indicators), a narrower profile than the citywide pattern of crossing 2 of 3. This is a notable contrast with Section 9's HCD Neighborhood Change pathway finding: this CPA crosses fewer of HCD's own rate-of-change thresholds than the city overall, on top of carrying zero pathway flags across all 7 tracts – see Section 9 for the full discussion.

8c. Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing

A rental counts as affordable here when its gross rent is at or below 30 percent of a stated share of HUD's median family income for San Diego County, divided by twelve. At 60 percent of median family income the threshold was \$805.50 a month in 2000 and is \$1,792.50 in the current period; at 80 percent, \$1,074.00 and \$2,390.00. No subsidy status, building age or covenant enters the test: it is a rent test on the whole rental stock, which is what "naturally occurring" means. The denominator is renter-occupied homes paying cash rent. **Units, not households:** the Census reports what a home rents for, not who lives in it.

Rentals affordable at 60 percent of median family income

	Tracts	2000 rentals paying cash rent	2000 affordable	2000 share	Current rentals paying cash rent	Current affordable	Current share	Change (points)	Floor (points)	Affordable rentals, change	Change, worst case
Mid-City:Eastern Area	7	5,047	3,084	61.11%	5,945	2,261	38.03%	-23.1	-10.6	-823	-91
City of San Diego	311	212,529	116,897	55.00%	268,003	73,894	27.57%	-27.4	-18.2	-43,004	-18,621

Rentals affordable at 80 percent of median family income

	Tracts	2000 rentals paying cash rent	2000 affordable	2000 share	Current rentals paying cash rent	Current affordable	Current share	Change (points)	Floor (points)	Affordable rentals, change	Change, worst case
Mid-City:Eastern Area	7	5,047	4,437	87.91%	5,945	4,184	70.38%	-17.5	-8.2	4,437 to 4,184 (see note)	see note
City of San Diego	311	212,529	163,898	77.12%	268,003	142,181	53.05%	-24.1	-15.3	-21,717	-405

Census 2000 (SF3 table H062, harmonised to 2020 tract boundaries) against ACS 2020-2024 (table B25063). Where a threshold falls inside a published rent bracket, the units in that bracket are counted in proportion to where the threshold sits. **Change** is the current share minus the 2000 share as printed, in points; it recomputes from the two shares beside it on every row. **Floor** is the change in share when every unit in the boundary bracket is counted as affordable now and none of them in 2000, so it is the figure that survives an adversarial reading. **Change, worst case** applies the same treatment to the count. Figures sum units across member tracts and then divide; no figure is an average of tract shares. Every row is the 311-tract household universe described at the top of this report, so the community, district and city rows are comparable with each other. Mid-City:Eastern Area at 80 percent: the point estimate is -253 homes and the worst-case treatment of the boundary bracket is +272, so the direction of change is not established and both years' counts are stated instead. Every other row holds its direction under either treatment.

Tract detail. A tract share is stated only where it survives three rules: at least 100 rentals paying cash rent in both years, a coefficient of variation (CV) at or under 30 percent on the rent bracket containing the threshold, and a low-to-high band no wider than 25 points. Where it does not, the count stands alone and the reason is given. The current-period rent brackets are \$500 wide above \$1,500 and both thresholds fall inside one, which is why most tract shares carry bands too wide to state; the community is the reportable unit. Do not restore a suppressed share from the counts.

Tract detail at 60 percent, 7 tracts, 0 with a reportable current share

Census tract	2000 affordable	Current affordable	Current share	Note
27.02	685	238	not stated	CV 31
27.03	552	612	not stated	CV 40; band 45 pts
27.05	161	314	not stated	CV 93
27.11	408	33	not stated	CV 61; 2000 reallocated from more than one source tract
27.12	348	526	not stated	band 42 pts
29.02	682	433	not stated	band 41 pts
29.03	249	106	not stated	CV 43; 2000 reallocated from more than one source tract

Tract detail at 80 percent, 7 tracts, 0 with a reportable current share

Census tract	2000 affordable	Current affordable	Current share	Note
27.02	1,156	772	not stated	band 49 pts
27.03	821	956	not stated	CV 43
27.05	225	397	not stated	CV 47
27.11	515	296	not stated	band 54 pts; 2000 reallocated from more than one source tract
27.12	436	665	not stated	CV 106
29.02	923	860	not stated	CV 33
29.03	362	238	not stated	CV 34; band 30 pts; 2000 reallocated from more than one source tract

These are stock figures. They say how much of the rental stock rents below a threshold; they do not say where anyone went or why, and setting them beside growth figures describes two things happening at once rather than one causing the other. Deed-restricted homes renting below the threshold are inside these counts, not subtracted from them. Where a 2000 count is marked as reallocated, that tract's 2000 figure is an estimate allocated from more than one 2000 census tract onto the current boundary. Reference incomes are HUD's median family income for San Diego County, \$53,700 for fiscal year 2000 and \$119,500 for fiscal year 2024; each threshold is 30 percent of the stated share of that income, divided by twelve.

9. Supplementary Context

HCD Opportunity Tier

Source: California HCD 2026 Opportunity Map. The opportunity score is a 0-9 ordinal tier (0-3 Low Resource, 4-5 Moderate, 6-7 High, 8-9 Highest), not a percentile.

Tier	Mid-City:Eastern Area	City of San Diego
Highest Resource	0	117
High Resource	0	53
Moderate Resource	0	45
Low Resource	7	95
Unclassified	0	1
Total tracts	7	311
Mean opportunity score (0-9, wtd)	1	5
Environmental burden flag (tract count)	0	23
High-poverty & segregation flag (tract count)	0	3

Every tract in this CPA is Low Resource, the same uniform profile as the companion Mid-City:City Heights report.

HCD Neighborhood Change Pathway Flags

Pathway	Mid-City:Eastern Area	City of San Diego
Pathway 1A	0	28
Pathway 1B	0	9
Pathway 2	0	35
Any Pathway	0	44
Spillover	0	53
Total tracts	7	311

Every one of this CPA's 7 tracts carries zero HCD Neighborhood Change designation of any kind – no pathway flag and no spillover. This finding is the direct subject of the Lab's earlier District 4 analysis, addressed in full immediately below.

Racial Concentration of Affluence (RCAA)

Reported per the Lab's two-subtotal convention: RCAA-concentrated (Persistent + Reinforcing/Intensifying + Newly RCAA) and diversifying/opening (Converging High-Opportunity + Diversifying Affluent) are reported as separate subtotals, never combined.

	Mid-City:Eastern Area	City of San Diego
RCAA-concentrated subtotal	0	26
Diversifying/opening subtotal	0	28
None	7	257
Total tracts	7	311

This CPA carries zero tracts in either subtotal. The RCAA screen is the top 20 percent of county tracts on a composite of income, home value and housing cost together with the bottom 20 percent on people-of-color share; this CPA's highest-ranked tract sits at the 40th percentile on affluence and its lowest at the 51st on people-of-color share, so no tract here is near the screen.

A Confirmed, CPA-Wide Instance of HCD's Detection Gap

This is Mid-City:Eastern Area's most significant earlier finding, and the reason this CPA carries particular analytical weight in the Lab's broader argument. The Lab's earlier analysis documented, for this CPA's 3-tract District 4 slice only (27.05, 27.11, 27.12), a White NH population decline of -41.4 percent (3,253 to 1,905) alongside POC growth of +30.3 percent, carrying **zero** HCD Neighborhood Change pathway flags of any kind – a swing that analysis described as larger than several other documented District 4 corridor tracts, yet invisible to HCD's own detection methodology. **Both of those figures reproduce exactly from the tract counts here: White NH 3,253.03 to 1,905 (-41.4%), POC 9,145.20 to 11,917 (+30.3%).** The zero-pathway-flag status for these 3 tracts also reproduces exactly (Section 9, above, and this CPA's own 7-tract total).

This CPA's full 7-tract footprint extends the finding rather than diluting it. The District 9 half of this CPA (29.02, 29.03, 27.02, 27.03) shows White NH population falling from 9,308.89 to 7,387 (-20.6%) and POC growing from 10,384.85 to 15,840 (+52.5%) – a comparable direction to the D4 slice, though a milder White NH decline and a steeper POC gain, first documented in the Lab's Council District 9 report and reproduced exactly here. **Both district slices carry zero HCD pathway flags, and the CPA-wide total confirms it: all 7 tracts, zero flags, zero spillover** (this section, above). The CPA-wide compositional shift (Section 2) is White NH -26.0 percent (12,562 to 9,292) and POC +42.1 percent (19,530 to 27,757) – a real, verified, CPA-wide racial compositional shift, entirely undetected by HCD's Neighborhood Change pathway methodology at any geographic level tested: the original 3-tract D4 slice, the 4-tract D9 slice, and the full 7-tract CPA.

This is evidence that HCD's standard methodology can systematically miss real, substantial compositional change, even when that change is among the most pronounced racial shifts documented anywhere in the Lab's coverage. The mechanism behind why HCD's pathway methodology does not flag this CPA is not established by this data and is not claimed here; what is established is that the compositional shift is real, it is large, it holds at each of the three geographies examined within this CPA, and it carries no HCD pathway signal whatsoever. This is this report's central analytical contribution.

Cross-Cluster Context: Southeast Communities

All 7 of this CPA's tracts sit inside the Lab's Southeast Communities cluster (53 tracts across six community planning areas), meaning every figure in this report is a subset of that broader cluster's geography, not an independent sample. The cluster report itself is a city-only comparison (District 4 holds a 54.7% majority with real minority blocks in District 9 and District 8), the same comparison structure this CPA-tier report also uses, for a related but distinct reason – this CPA's own district split (57.14% D9 / 42.86% D4) has no negligible minority to drop, unlike the cluster's own composition question. Readers consulting the Lab's earlier SR-94 corridor cluster report for this geography should note that cluster was deprecated and its membership, including this CPA, redistributed to the Southeast Communities cluster; the archived cluster's figures should not be treated as current.

Community Plan Update Context

These findings are produced in the context of the City of San Diego's ongoing Mid-City Communities Community Plan Update. The patterns most directly relevant to this CPA are displacement pressure and racial compositional change: this CPA's White NH population fell 26.0 percent while POC population grew 42.1 percent (Section 2), a shift that the Lab's earlier analysis and this report together show is real, substantial, and entirely undetected by HCD's own Neighborhood Change pathway methodology at every geographic scale tested within this CPA (this section, above). Ownership patterns compound the picture: White NH owner-occupied households fell 18.4 percent and renter-occupied households fell 37.7 percent over the same period (Section 5a), while owner mobility has nearly stopped entirely in the current period (a 0.1 percent 2-year mover rate, Section 5b). Without making a causal claim the data cannot support, the plan update is a concrete opportunity under AB 686 and the City's AFFH obligations to affirmatively address the fair housing patterns documented in this report, including the specific methodological blind spot this CPA's data exposes – the data documents the condition; the plan update is the policy moment.

10. Climate Equity

Source: CalEnviroScreen 5.0. Percentiles are on a 0-100 scale; higher means greater burden/vulnerability.

Metric	Mid-City:Eastern Area (wtd)	City of San Diego (wtd)
CES 5.0 overall percentile	62.8	37.1
Pollution burden percentile	55.2	43.6
Population characteristics percentile	62.3	35.7
Traffic percentile	39.4	57.7
Drinking water percentile	18.6	20.3

This CPA's overall CES percentile (62.8) sits well above the city's (37.1), though its traffic percentile (39.4) sits below the citywide figure (57.7) – the only sub-metric here where this CPA is more favorable than the city. Concentration check: the top tract, 27.12, carries a CES percentile of 89.4 and holds 14.3% of the CPA's population – a larger population share than any single top tract identified in the Lab's other Mid-City reports. Excluding it shifts the population-weighted average by 4.4 points (62.8 → 58.4), a real and comparatively larger effect than the small shifts seen elsewhere, though the CPA's environmental burden remains elevated above the city even after exclusion. Drinking water percentile carries the standing drinking-water caution described in the Sources and Methods section.

11. Sources and Methods

Data sources. U.S. Census Bureau: the 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File 3) and the American Community Survey five-year estimates for 2020-2024, with the 2009-2013 estimates shown as a middle point where a 2013 column appears. California HCD's 2026 Opportunity Map and Neighborhood Change methodology. HCD Annual Progress Report Table A2 for housing production. CalEnviroScreen 5.0. HUD median family income for San Diego County, fiscal years 2000 and 2024, for Section 8c.

Geography and the citywide basis. Every City of San Diego figure in this report is computed over the same 311 census tracts: the 323 tracts inside the city limits, less 11 tracts whose residents live mainly in group quarters (dormitories, barracks and institutions) and one tract that is entirely water. The 11 are set aside so that household rates are not distorted by populations that do not live in households; they hold 2.7 percent of the city's residents (1,388,930 people in all 323 in-city tracts against 1,351,501 in these 311). The same basis is used in every Lab report, so figures are comparable across them. They are not the City's own published totals, and the two should not be differenced. Census tracts are on 2020 boundaries; 2000 figures are allocated onto them through the Census Bureau's tract relationship files, and where a current tract draws on more than one 2000 tract its 2000 figure is an estimate. Section 4b's production figures are the one exception to the 311-tract basis: production is a count of construction rather than a household rate, so its existing-stock denominator uses all in-city tracts with no group-quarters exclusion.

Comparison columns. This community's 7 census tracts are split 4 in Council District 9 (57.14 percent) and 3 in Council District 4 (42.86 percent). Neither block is negligible, so the report compares the community with the city only and carries no district column.

How figures are aggregated. Rates sum numerators and denominators across tracts before dividing. Medians (income, home value, monthly housing cost) are population-weighted averages of tract medians. Section 8c sums rental units across tracts and then divides. No figure in this report is an average of tract shares.

Dollars. 2000 dollar figures are nominal 1999 dollars, not inflation-adjusted. The 2000 median monthly housing cost carries a reliability caution and should be read as indicative.

Race categories. Sections 2 and 3 use non-Hispanic-exclusive categories: White NH, Black NH, Asian NH and Other/Two+ NH are non-Hispanic, and Hispanic or Latino is any race. Section 5a's Black and Asian householders use the Census "alone" definition, which is not restricted to non-Hispanic, so Section 5a is not drawn from the same universe as Sections 2 and 3 and the two cannot be differenced against each other.

Income change measured two ways. Section 8a reports the change in the population-weighted median household income from 2000 to the current period. Section 8b reports HCD's own rate-of-change measure over HCD's periods (2000-2023 for income, 2013-2023 for rent) against HCD's regional thresholds. The two use different series and periods and are not expected to agree. HCD publishes its rate-of-change values as fractions; they are multiplied by 100 to read as percentages, confirmed against HCD's own methodology, and the same conversion is applied in every Lab report.

Racially concentrated areas of affluence. A tract meets the RCAA screen when it sits in the top 20 percent of San Diego County tracts on a composite of median income, median home value and median monthly housing cost, and in the bottom 20 percent on the share of residents who are people of color,

each ranked within its own period. Tracts meeting the screen are Persistent, Newly or Reinforcing/Intensifying RCAA by how they moved between periods; Converging High-Opportunity (High or Highest Resource tracts becoming more representative) and Diversifying Affluent (affluent tracts no longer meeting the screen) are not RCAA. RCAA figures follow a two-subtotal convention: the concentrated subtotal (Persistent, Reinforcing/Intensifying and Newly RCAA) is reported separately from the diversifying subtotal (Converging High-Opportunity and Diversifying Affluent), and the two are never summed into one total, because they point in opposite directions.

Drinking water percentile. CalEnviroScreen's drinking water indicator carries a standing caution in the Lab's data-quality log: it reads as a near-constant value across most of the city, so differences on that one measure should not be read as confirmed.

Tract highlights. Section 12's tract list comes from a scan of every tract in the community for four signals: the largest age-bracket percentage-point swings from 2000 to the current period, any HCD Neighborhood Change pathway flag, any RCAA classification, and any earlier tract-level analysis by the Lab. For this community the scan surfaced age-bracket swings across all 7 tracts (Section 7) but zero HCD-flagged tracts and zero RCAA-concentrated tracts – consistent with Section 9's central finding that this CPA's real compositional change carries no HCD signal.

Documents cited in this report. This report is Appendix 2 to the Mid-City Communities Fair Housing Review (San Diego Fair Housing Lab, 2026), which reads the four community reports together against the draft Mid-City Communities Plan. Its companions are the City Heights, Kensington-Talmadge and Normal Heights community reports. The following Lab working documents are referred to in the text and are not published; the methods they carry are restated above.

- The Lab's Council District 9 report: cited in Section 9.
- The Lab's earlier SR-94 corridor cluster report: cited in Section 9.

12. Tract-Level Detail

The tracts below are the ones the highlight scan (Section 11) surfaced. Three of this CPA's tracts (27.05, 27.11, 27.12) were the subject of the Lab's earlier District 4 analysis, and one (27.11) of its tenure-conversion analysis; Section 9 above carries the CPA-level synthesis. None has yet been the subject of its own tract-level report, and the notes record what the scan found so that a future one starts from them.

Notable tracts

- **27.12** – the CPA's steepest under-18 decline (-10.6pp) and its environmental-concentration top tract (CES 89.4 percentile, 14.3% of the CPA's population). No HCD pathway flag, no RCAA classification.
- **27.11** – the CPA's steepest 65+ decline (-5.9pp), running against this CPA's own aggregate aging direction. Already analyzed at tenure-detail level in the Lab's earlier work (renter share rose to 61.9% by the current period not through renter growth but because owner units were lost roughly four times faster than renter units) and in its race/tenure decomposition (owner-occupied Black households collapsing far faster than population decline: population -30.0%, owner-occupied -90.2%). No RCAA classification.
- **27.05** – the CPA's largest 65+ rise (+6.8pp). Also analyzed in the Lab's earlier tenure decomposition (population -11.1%, owner-occupied -79.4%). No HCD pathway flag, no RCAA classification.
- **29.03** – the CPA's second-steepest 65+ decline (-5.6pp), one of only two tracts in this CPA showing a falling 65+ share. This is the District 9 half of the CPA, outside the District 4 slice the earlier analysis covered. No HCD pathway flag, no RCAA classification; a candidate for future investigation as a possible second instance of the tenure-conversion pattern documented in the CPA's District 4 slice.

The age-composition swings of these four tracts (as distinct from the tenure-level analysis of two of them) have not been checked against permit or development records or any other independent source, and the tracts are named here as candidates for a future tract-level report rather than built out in this one.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau (2000 Decennial Census, American Community Survey); California HCD Neighborhood Change Mapping Tool and Opportunity Map (2026); CalEnviroScreen 5.0 (2026).

Terms used in this document

Census tract

A small statistical area the Census Bureau uses to report data, usually holding between 1,200 and 8,000 people. San Diego's city limits contain 311 of them in this analysis, 30 of which sit inside the Mid-City plan boundary. It is the smallest geography at which the figures in this review can be reported.

Community planning area (CPA)

The City of San Diego's own neighborhood planning boundaries. City Heights, Eastern Area, Kensington-Talmadge and Normal Heights are each one, and together they make up the Mid-City Communities Plan boundary. Every figure here that names a neighborhood uses these official boundaries.

Opportunity tier

A four-level ranking published by California's housing department and tax credit committee, placing every census tract in the state in Low, Moderate, High or Highest Resource based on measures of education, economic conditions and environment. It is the State's classification, not this organization's.

Low Resource

The lowest of the State's four opportunity tiers. Twenty-three of the thirty tracts in the Mid-City plan boundary sit here, against 95 of 311 citywide.

Moderate Resource

The second of the State's four opportunity tiers. Six Mid-City tracts sit here.

High Resource

The third of the State's four opportunity tiers. One Mid-City tract sits here, in Normal Heights.

Highest Resource

The top of the State's four opportunity tiers. No tract inside the Mid-City plan boundary sits here; 117 tracts citywide do.

Neighborhood change area

A tract carrying one of the State's Neighborhood Change pathway designations, its marker for a historically lower-income community of color that has since seen substantial racial and economic change. Nine of the thirty Mid-City tracts carry one, against 44 of 311 citywide.

Neighborhood Change pathway

The State's method for identifying neighborhood change, published in 2026. A tract can qualify under Pathway 1A, 1B or 2, each testing a different combination of historical condition, demographic change and housing-cost pressure. This review refers to a tract carrying any of them as a neighborhood change area.

Rate-of-change threshold

Part of the State's neighborhood change method. A tract is tested against regional benchmarks for how fast its income, its racial composition and its rents have moved. The rent benchmark for the San Diego region is 64.5 percent growth since 2013.

Racially Concentrated Area of Affluence (RCAA)

A neighborhood where high-income, predominantly non-Hispanic White households are concentrated well above the regional norm. State law now requires every California jurisdiction's housing element to analyse these areas specifically. One tract inside the Mid-City plan boundary carries this classification.

Persistent RCAA

A tract classified as a Racially Concentrated Area of Affluence at every point measured, rather than one that has recently become or ceased to be one. Tract 20.01 in Kensington-Talmadge is District 9's only one.

RECAP

A Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty, the counterpart to an RCAA. The City's own Housing Element Fair Housing Appendix places two City Heights tracts inside its RECAP cluster.

Affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH)

The legal duty, under California Government Code section 8899.50 and AB 686, to take meaningful actions that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities, rather than simply avoiding discrimination. It applies to a community plan update as it does to a housing element.

AB 686

A 2018 California law, effective 2019, requiring every housing element to include a data-driven, geographically specific analysis of segregation patterns, disparities in access to opportunity and concentrated poverty, and to set goals and actions addressing what that analysis finds.

AB 1304

A 2021 California law, in effect from 2022, that sharpened AB 686 by requiring every housing element's fair housing analysis to identify racially or ethnically concentrated areas of affluence as well as of poverty, and to show how the sites the jurisdiction plans for housing affirmatively further fair housing. It applies statewide.

Baker Settlement

A binding commitment the City of San Diego entered in March 2025, agreeing to show that by at least 2028, at least 70 percent of the affordable housing projects in the City are permitted in moderate, high or highest resource areas. It is a reporting duty rather than a requirement to build, and it counts projects rather than homes.

CalEnviroScreen

California's tool for scoring cumulative pollution burden and community vulnerability, reported as a statewide percentile from 0 to 100. A higher number means greater burden. City Heights sits at 74.0 against a citywide 37.1.

RHNA

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation, the State's assignment to each jurisdiction of how many homes it must plan for, by income level, over an eight-year cycle.

Capacity

What a plan's land use map would allow to be built, if every site that could redevelop did. It is not a forecast of what will be built, and this review does not treat it as one. The draft does not publish capacity by community planning area.

Permitted

A home the City has authorized. It is not yet a home that exists. This review reports production as permitted or as completed and never computes a rate between the two.

Completed

A home that has been built and finished, as distinct from one that has been permitted.

Below-moderate housing

Homes permitted at any affordability level other than above-moderate: the moderate tier and every tier below it. In practice these are deed-restricted affordable units. This review reports it as units permitted per 1,000

existing homes so communities of different sizes can be compared.

Deed-restricted

A home carrying a legal restriction that keeps it affordable to households at a stated income level for a set period, rather than one that happens to be inexpensive at the moment.

Accessory dwelling unit (ADU)

A small secondary home on a lot that already has a house, sometimes called a granny flat or backyard unit. About seven in ten housing permits in Mid-City are for these, against about two in ten citywide.

Suitable sites inventory

The list of parcels a jurisdiction identifies as able to accommodate its assigned housing need. The City's own inventory places 36.3 percent of its suitable sites inside areas it identifies as carrying displacement risk.

Crowding

A household living at more than one person per room. City Heights' rate is 15.7 percent against a citywide 5.8 percent.

Growth gap

The difference between a community's housing unit growth and its population growth, in percentage points. A positive gap means units were added faster than people arrived. Two of the four Mid-City communities added housing while losing population, and three of the four added housing faster than people arrived.

Displacement risk area

A geography the City's own Housing Element Fair Housing Appendix identifies as carrying elevated risk that lower-income residents will be pushed out. All four Mid-City communities appear in the City's lists.

Margin of error

The range within which a survey estimate is likely to fall. American Community Survey figures for small areas carry wide margins, which is why this review reports some measures at community level rather than tract level.