

## **SYNOPSIS OF COMMUNITY NEEDS SURVEY**

### **CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS PREPARATION ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO**

In order to better ascertain public perception of the needs and priorities for the use of CDBG and HOME funds, the City prepared a Community Survey, which was available on the City Website. The survey was developed from a review and analysis of the key topics raised in the course of the seven Focus Group discussions conducted by the City in March 2012. The survey questions focused on the concerns raised by the Focus Group and were intended to elicit more specific information from the public. Though Web-based, hard copies of the survey were distributed to a number of community service organizations and made available at Community Centers, Senior Centers, and Early Childhood Centers. The survey was available between May 7 and June 29, 2012. A copy of the survey and the participating community service organizations are included as an Appendix to the Consolidated Plan.

The survey was available in English, Spanish, Chinese and Vietnamese, both on the City Website and in hard copy. Several questions asked respondents to select and rank items as a first, second or third priority. However, a number of respondents checked too many items to be meaningful, and these surveys were not used in the final analysis.

### **DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS**

Of the 925 surveys completed, 796 (86%) were included in the analysis. This level of response was very gratifying and this community input was very helpful in evaluating community needs and priorities.

	English Language Survey	Spanish Language Survey	Chinese Language Survey	Vietnamese Language Survey	Total
Valid Surveys	750	36	3	7	796
Unusable Survey	124	5	0	0	129
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>874</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>925</b>

*Source: Swiger Consulting Analysis*

Because of the variations in responses to the survey, all responses were aggregated, regardless of priority ranking, as a means to determine the perceived needs of the community. Not all persons responded to all questions, so there is some variation in the number of responses among individual questions.

Though the response was broad in terms of race, ethnicity, income level and housing tenure, the response was especially strong from the low-income groups most affected by the CDBG and HOME programs. The table below shows that over one-quarter of respondents reported incomes under \$15,000 per year, and fifty percent reported less than \$35,000 per year.

# DRAFT

## SURVEY RESPONSE BY INCOME CATEGORY

Income	Respondents		City
	No.	%	%
<\$15,000	205	29.8%	14.2%
\$15-34,999	180	26.2%	23.5%
\$35-49,999	118	17.2%	15.1%
\$50-74,999	79	11.5%	19.0%
\$75-99,999	54	7.8%	11.0%
\$100-150,000	26	3.8%	10.9%
>\$150,000	26	3.8%	6.2%
TOTAL	688	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Swiger Consulting Analysis

Respondents identifying as Hispanic (43.2%) mirror the percentage of Hispanic persons in the City Census (46.7%), though, as the table below shows, the racial breakdown of respondents varied from the City's population. Compared to the City's census data, the percentage of White respondents was lower and the percentage of African American respondents was higher. The Asian percentage was twice as high, the Native American percentage was over two times higher, and respondents identifying with two or more races were four times the City's percentage.

These results reflect the fact that the City targeted users of services as well as the general public and the percentage of minorities that responded reflects this effort to target low- to moderate-income beneficiaries. The high percentage of minority respondents reflects this outreach effort.

## SURVEY RESPONSE BY RACE

Race	Respondents		City
	No.	%	%
White	378	52.8%	69.7%
African American	30	4.2%	3.3%
Native American	85	11.9%	4.6%
Asian	29	4.1%	2.6%
Pacific Islander	6	0.8%	0.1%
Other	56	7.8%	15.0%
Two or More Races	132	18.4%	4.6%
TOTAL	716	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Swiger Consulting Analysis

Living arrangements and tenure also differed from the City norm. Fewer than fifty percent of respondents were home owners. The relatively large number of persons in temporary housing or shelters reflects the fact that surveys were also distributed and collected at shelters and homeless assistance centers.

# DRAFT

## SURVEY RESPONSE BY LIVING QUARTERS

Living Arrangement	Respondents	
	No.	%
Own	357	49.2%
Rent	280	38.6%
Shelter	15	2.1%
Temporary Housing	73	10.1%
TOTAL	725	100.0%

*Source: Swiger Consulting Analysis*

The City thus received responses from a good cross section of the population and a strong response from those persons in the lower income levels who are most directly affected by low-moderate income programs.

## SURVEY RESULTS

### AT-RISK POPULATIONS

Respondents were asked to rank the three groups they felt were most at risk of being unable to access or maintain safe, affordable, quality housing. The twenty choices included a wide range of persons.

The top three populations deemed most at risk were youth (age 18-24) transitioning from foster care or jail (252), seniors raising children/grandchildren (246), and adults with mental health issues (236). Though these groups had been raised as concerns in the focus group discussions, the focus groups identified senior homeowners, first generation immigrants, immigrants lacking documentation, families with children and homeless families with children, veterans with families as those most at risk, and persons transitioning from incarceration. Clearly there is some overlap between the two sets of responses (seniors and persons transitioning from incarceration), but the group “adults with mental health issues” is unique to the survey and the emphases on immigrants and on families are unique to the focus groups.

### NECESSARY SERVICES

Asked to choose from among 23 housing assistance services those that are most necessary to help low income residents access and maintain housing, most respondents selected short-term rental assistance (317), followed by homebuyer counseling (193), and financial literacy (176). It is notable that the short-term rental assistance received far and away the most votes. These results tracked focus group recommendations in that the focus groups noted the need for life skills training, which includes financial literacy.

### MOST NEEDED SERVICES

Asked to rank the most needed among a list of six, including construction of new homeowner units, construction of new rental units, rehabilitation of homeowner units, small business loans, down payment assistance and loan programs for home improvements, the survey respondents chose construction of new affordable rental units (273), with homebuyer down payment assistance/loans (159) a distant second.

# DRAFT

## HOUSING FEATURES

Given a choice of twenty housing features deemed necessary to make housing safe, affordable and attractive, the respondents chose walking distance to public transportation as the highest priority (374), and units affordable to persons earning less than \$18,800 as second (350). The latter reinforces the priority expressed in the previous question calling for constructing more affordable rental units, as did the third choice – affordable homeowner units throughout the City (272).

## HOMELESS PROGRAMS

The survey included four questions, asking respondents to select which of three groups – adults, families or youth -- were most in need of 1) Emergency Shelters, 2) Transitional Housing, 3) Emergency Financial assistance, and 4) Permanent Supportive Housing. Families emerged as the choice by decisive margins in each case, receiving over 500 votes for Permanent Supportive Housing and Emergency Financial Assistance and 425 votes for families for Transitional Housing.

## FAIR HOUSING QUESTIONS

As part of gathering information for the City’s new Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, the survey included five questions about fair housing issues.

Asked if they believed that there is housing discrimination in Albuquerque, one-third of the respondents said discrimination occurred “often,” and more than one-third said “sometimes.” One-quarter felt that housing discrimination never or rarely occurred or had no opinion.

Discrimination Experienced	Respondents	
	No.	%
Often	261	34.3%
Sometimes	296	38.9%
Rarely	87	11.4%
Never	26	3.4%
No Opinion	91	12.0%
TOTAL	761	100.0%

*Source: Swiger Consulting Analysis*

Nearly three-quarters (72.6%) of the 755 persons who responded to the question said persons experiencing housing discrimination would not know where to report this. Clearly there is a lack of knowledge about this aspect of fair housing.

Just over 300 respondents felt there were areas in Albuquerque where housing discrimination was occurring, with 172 naming specific areas of the City. The Northeast Heights received 35 very clear and unambiguous mentions, followed by 25 mentions for the City as a whole. The Southeast Heights received 15 mentions, the International District 12, and the South Valley 11.

The respondents were asked what they felt were the bases for discrimination and allowed to choose as many as they thought applicable from a list of thirteen. The list included the protected classes defined by the statutes (race, color, religion, national origin, sex, familial

## DRAFT

status, or handicap). Race was selected most often as the table below shows, and history of incarceration, which does not come under the protected class definition, was second. Family size, which is protected, was third, but immigration status, which is not covered, was fourth.

<b>Source of Discrimination</b>	<b>No.</b>
Race	467
History of Incarceration	423
Family Size	379
Immigration Status	360
Disability	307
Color	298
Age	298
National Origin	267
Sexual Orientation	258
Transgender	235
Sex	179
Religion	131
Veteran Status	122

*Source: Swiger Consulting Analysis*

Finally, when asked how to better inform people about fair housing, the respondents selected Public Service Announcements as the best means, followed by outreach to housing providers as second, and outreach at events as third. Advertisements and brochures received the least support.

<b>Outreach Strategies</b>	<b>No.</b>
PSA	452
Outreach to Housing Providers	440
Housing Fairs and Events	431
Media Attention	382
Outreach to Neighborhood Associations	381
Brochures	264
Ads	254

*Source: Swiger Consulting Analysis*