

**CITY OF COLUMBIA: SURVEYING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDING
PRIORITIES**

By

Heng (Helen) Yang, Emily Walker, Joanna Warren, and Tyler Levens

**A Capstone Paper submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the Master of Public Affairs**

**Truman School of Public Affairs
University of Missouri-Columbia
Spring, 2014**

Approved by:_____
Dr. Mary Stegmaier

Approved by:_____
Dr. Bart Weschler

Acknowledgments

As a group we would like to thank the following people and organizations for their help and support in completing this project:

The City of Columbia, Randy Cole, Leigh Britt, Eric Hempel, Kathy Sides, Dr. Stegmaier, Dean Wechsler, Dr. Heflin, Dr. Arteaga, Daniella Kathyuska, Eduardo Crespi at Centro Latino, Father Herb at Sacred Heart, Phil Steinhaus at Columbia Housing Authority, and our colleagues who reviewed our surveys and provided advice and opinion throughout our project.

Table of Contents

I.	Problem Statement.....	4
II.	Background.....	4
III.	Literature Review.....	5
IV.	Research Methods.....	11
V.	Findings and Analysis.....	13
VI.	Community Priorities and Options for the City.....	45
VII.	Recommendations and Conclusions.....	47
VIII.	References.....	48
VIII.	Appendix.....	51

I. Problem Statement

The City of Columbia (City) seeks to identify which community development needs are most important to Columbia residents in order to prioritize its use of funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This is a multifaceted problem. First, the City wants to gather and document information on community needs and priorities to meet HUD requirements for receiving Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Programs (HOME) funding. Second, the City wants this information so it may serve residents and community organizations most effectively. Put simply, this problem is important to the City because this information helps it secure future funding for its projects and better enables it in its execution of these projects.

II. Background

The City government oversees a continually growing and diversifying population. According to the City's website, in 2012 there were 113,225 residents and 75.7 percent identified as white, whereas in 2000, the population of Columbia was estimated to be 84,531 and 81.5 percent identified as white. This increasing population places additional burdens on the City to satisfy the demand for resources and space. To meet these needs, the City must both secure funds and spend the money strategically. This is the role of the City's Community Development Department. It is divided into three divisions: Building and Site Development, Office of Neighborhood Services, and Planning and its purpose is to "help their customers plan, build, and care for the city" ("Community Development," n.d.). Every three to five years the Community Development Department undertakes the process of developing a Consolidated Plan as required by HUD. HUD, the federal funding agency, holds as its mission "to create strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and quality affordable homes for all" ("Mission," n.d.).

This plan helps the City assess and prioritize its needs in light of economic market conditions in the areas of affordable housing and community development, so that it will be able to invest the federal funds it receives according to community data and in locations that will most benefit. The City receives both CDBG and HOME funding from HUD. For each of the next five years the City predicts that HUD will provide it with approximately \$800,000 in CDBG and \$400,000 in HOME funds. These funds are largely used to assist low to moderate income households. An important component of this process is the participation of Columbia residents in the development, review, and implementation of this plan ("2015-2019 Consolidated Plan," n.d.).

Funds acquired from the CDBG program can be used for a broad set of community development needs. The CDBG program requires resident participation, particularly those from low to moderate income neighborhoods and who are non-native or non-English speaking, in the creation of the Consolidated Plan. It "works to ensure decent affordable housing, to provide services to the most vulnerable in our communities, and to create jobs through the expansion and retention of businesses" ("Community Development Block Grant Program - CDBG," n.d.).

HOME funds are intended to be used solely to expand the availability of affordable housing for low-income families. These funds are granted "to States and localities that communities use - often in partnership with local nonprofit groups - to fund a wide range of activities that build, buy, and/or rehabilitate affordable housing for rent or homeownership or provide direct rental assistance to low-income people" ("HOME Investment Partnerships Program," n.d.).

The City of Columbia organizes its community development efforts in line with these

funding sources into five areas: Affordable Housing, Fair Housing, Community Facilities, Economic Development, and Neighborhood Needs. First, Affordable Housing ensures the availability of housing with costs, including utilities, at no more than 30 percent of an individual's income. Projects which qualify for funding include needs and market analysis, rehabilitation and minor home repair, multi-family rental new construction, rental assistance, homebuyer assistance and education, single and multi-family new construction. Fair Housing protects individuals against unlawful discrimination in buying or renting a dwelling. Qualifying projects include fair housing testing, complaints investigation, counseling, education, and identifying and removing barriers to fair housing ("Your CDBG and HOME" flier, n.d.).

Community Facilities renovates, acquires, expands, and funds non-profit organizations that provide services to target populations. This includes providing funding for homeless facilities, youth centers, healthcare facilities, and transitional housing facilities. Economic Development creates employment opportunities for low to moderate income individuals. These projects include job training, micro lending, commercial and industrial development, and business incubation. Last, Neighborhood Needs improves the accessibility, safety, security, and livability of targeted neighborhoods. Funding in this area may address sidewalks, sewers, storm water management, transportation improvements, parks, removal of dilapidated structures, and neighborhood planning ("Your CDBG and HOME" flier, n.d.).

III. Literature Review

Each of the City's five areas of community development: Affordable Housing, Fair Housing, Community Facilities, Economic Development, and Neighborhood Needs, encompass a variety of important needs and projects. Investment in any of these areas has the potential to provide added benefits to Columbia. The following is a review of the research conducted on the use of HUD funding in each area and how investments within them have affected other communities.

1. Affordable Housing

The United States government spends roughly \$37 billion per year to provide housing assistance to needy families. Some scholars argue that increases in access to improved housing leads to a number of social benefits, such as in the following areas: housing quality, crowding, affordability, subsidized housing, and homeownership. Despite criticism from others, these scholars contend that focusing on these issues will increase the quality of life for low-income individuals and the society as a whole (Newman 2008).

Housing quality refers to the physical safety and adequacy of the home. Numerous studies have linked poor housing (such as buildings containing lead paint, vermin, asbestos, heating issues and other hazards) with health problems (Newman 2008). Children seem to be particularly affected by the physical quality of their surroundings and any resulting childhood health issues have the potential to contribute to problems later in life (Dedman et al. 2001, as cited in Newman 2008). While these studies have established a correlation relationship between housing quality and health, they have failed to identify the cause of this relationship. Individuals who live in poor housing are generally socially disadvantaged and have low incomes. It is possible the health issues observed in previous studies may be attributed to these characteristics rather than the adequacy of the dwellings. However, such strong correlations between housing quality and overall health suggest that communities would benefit from the establishment and

use of minimum quality standards in both private housing and assisted housing programs (Newman 2008).

Studies which address the issues of crowding and housing subsidies seem to have inconclusive results. Crowding is a measure of the ratio of people to the number of rooms in a home. Crowded homes can cause problems in three ways: “as a source of ‘stimulus overload’ (excessive social demands); as the absence of privacy; and as the inability to control external stimuli” (Newman 2008, p. 903). This may result in a lack of sleep, an increased rate of transmitted infections, and increased stress on interpersonal relationships. However, this does not take into consideration differences across cultures or the age and schedule of each family member (Newman 2008). Proponents of housing subsidies suggest that assistance enables individuals to focus on seeking employment because they do not have to worry about housing. The opposition claims that providing assistance deters low-income individuals from becoming economically self-sufficient by tying their income to their rent costs. Thus higher wage rates result in higher housing contributions. Studies of housing subsidies have shown declines in work and earnings for participants that gradually become insignificant over several years’ time (Abt Associates 2006, as cited in Newman 2008).

The argument for housing affordability is that by keeping the cost of housing low, families will be able to spend their income on other necessary items. When families must pay housing costs that make up an excessive portion of their income, they may have to cut back on other necessary expenses such as medical bills, children may be left unsupervised due to their parents working multiple jobs, and housing instability rates may rise which often negatively affects students’ performance in school. It is important to note that affordable housing may or may not mitigate these issues depending on the family’s spending priorities. However, the studies suggest that, even more than housing affordability, well-endowed communities may play a large role in the well-being of low-income children. Access to these communities allows children to develop support systems outside of the home through afterschool programs, relationships with community members, and other similar avenues of engagement.

Studies frequently show positive correlations between homeownership and student academic success. However, several researchers have questioned whether this success can be attributed to homeownership or are the result of some other characteristic of homeowners. Similar results have been observed in children who grow up in public housing. Thus, it is possible that these effects can be attributed to housing stability or housing quality (Newman 2008). Also, the majority of studies neglect the potential negative effects of homeownership on low-to-moderate income families. Aside from mortgage default rates, future research needs to examine the effects of high risk financial products and unaffordable homeownership costs on the mental status and relationships of new homeowners (Dietz & Haurin 2003, as cited in Newman 2008).

Dirk Early (1998) investigated the likelihood that an individual household would become homeless if subsidized housing were not available. In order to do this, the author compared data of homeless households (from The Urban Institute) with data of poor households that are not benefitting from subsidized housing (from the American Housing Survey). Observations come from 15 cities of 100,000 or more people across the United States. In addition to ethnicity, race, and age of the head of the household, the author uses variables measuring mental depression of the individual, per capita spending on mental health services, per capita spending on drug abuse services, average low temperature, the lowest level of housing available, the quality of homeless shelters, the availability of homeless shelters, vacancy rates for low-rent housing units, and the relative price of substandard housing. A logit regression was used to estimate the probability of a household becoming homeless as a function of the household and city characteristics.

The author found that while many variables that are commonly believed to influence homelessness, such as race, real monthly income, and gender, did indeed affect the outcome in significant ways, the relative price of housing, vacancy rates, and lowest level of housing available did not significantly impact the probability of being homeless. By estimating the fraction of the population that would become homeless if subsidized housing was not available (less than 5%), the author concluded that most individuals are not at risk (Early, 1998). “The results indicate that expanding the current subsidized housing programs cannot be expected to have much effect on homelessness” (Early 1998, p. 694). However, the benefits of providing funding for affordable housing should not be written off altogether. Although location-specific voucher programs are often ineffective due to unforeseen costs associated with the development of these units, those that are directly tied to the individual in need of assistance have higher levels of success. It is also important to note that these conclusions are based on the current HUD guidelines for income eligibility. If these guidelines were significantly lower, the author suggests that these programs may have a greater effect (Early, 1998).

2. Fair Housing

The intention of the Fair Housing Act of 1968 was to confront racial inequities but has expanded over the years to include the whole range of incorporated protected classes (Breymaier, Davis & Fron, 2013). The Fair Housing Act delegates authority to HUD to investigate and take action on any complaints of discrimination (Sidney, 2004). HUD strives to ensure that there is equal access to housing resources for those in need without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex national origin, age, familial status, or disability. The findings of the 2000 Housing Discrimination Study indicate that housing discrimination against African American and Hispanic home seekers in the United States declined significantly between 1989 and 2000. “In terms of access to housing, African American renters and homebuyers and Hispanic homebuyers saw substantial declines in net adverse treatment of between 68 and 81 percent for availability and between 53 and 84 percent for inspection” (Ross & Turner, 2005, 163).

However, while improving, racial discrimination remains a serious issue in the housing market. When anyone uses race or any other characteristic of a protected class as the basis for discrimination in the housing market, they are illegally preventing minorities from finding homes. It is the responsibility of HUD to protect the rights of all citizens to find housing.(Ross & Turner, 2005).

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was included to eliminate the discrimination of those with a disability (Milstein, Pepper & Rubenstein, 1989). For example, people who use wheelchairs have been denied the right to gain access to barrier-free facilities and people who are blind or have mental problem are regarded as not safe to live independently. This kind of discrimination will not be eliminated until American society is willing to relinquish the segregation and isolation of disabled individuals. Thus, the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, which applies to people with disabilities, has three purposes: “to end segregation of the housing available to people with disabilities, to give people with disabilities the right to choose where they wish to live, and to require reasonable accommodation to their needs in securing and enjoying appropriate housing” (Milstein, Pepper & Rubenstein, 1989).

In 2010, the Illinois case of *Williams v. Quinn* determined that 4,500 people who have severe mental illness do not need to be segregated. This resulted in all persons in Illinois with mental illness living in the Institutes of Mental Disease, have the right to choose to live in community based settings. This decision has supported them in securing equal opportunities and services and also required the government to provide more community-based services and

houses in order to provide more options to disabled population. (Breymaier, Davis & Fron, 2013). Similarly, other cities and states (New Orleans, Louisiana, Danville, Illinois, and the state of Texas) have been required to extend housing opportunities for other protected minority groups (Breymaier, Davis & Fron, 2013). For example, Westchester County, New York was required to spend \$51.6 million to provide 750 units of housing to low-income, African-American and Hispanic individuals and eliminate its segregation zoning and policies (Breymaier, Davis & Fron, 2013).

The enforcement of fair housing laws is essential for the protection of civil rights. To ensure greater success in this effort there is a need, not only for funding, but also to promote diversity and awareness through actions, such as building a fair housing commission or encouraging nonprofit organizations to advocate equity. Some organizations have focused their activities on a particular target group. In their study of fair housing initiatives in nonprofit organizations, Temkin, McCracken and Liban (2011) analyze the role of fair housing in these organizations based on organization respondent surveys. They found that in only 4 percent of these organizations was fair housing a secondary consideration. Rather, “fair housing had an exclusive role in the missions for 32 percent of respondents and a primary role for an additional 26 percent of respondents” (Temkin, McCracken & Liban, 2011). Fair housing is an essential consideration when planning the development of communities.

3. Community Facilities

The category of Community Facilities allots funding assistance to nonprofit and public organizations which collaborate to offer services for targeted populations and neighborhoods. These organizations can use this funding on renovations, new construction, expansions, or acquisitions so they can better serve the needs of the community. Some examples of these types of organizations include transitional housing facilities, healthcare facilities, youth centers, or homeless shelters.

According to Berlin and McAllister (1992), about one out of every twenty people is homeless. To address this problem, governments strive to find a way to provide assistance to these individuals without disincentivizing them from being self-sufficient and independent. Transitional housing can be integral to the success of these efforts. These shelters support homeless single adults in gaining employment and becoming financially stable so they may eventually be able to rent an apartment of their own. Best practices suggest cities and states should seek federal assistance to create transitional jobs that pay 90 percent of the minimum wage for adults who stay in a shelter for at least 60 days (Berlin and McAllister, 1992). Many of those who live on the streets are additionally mentally ill or suffer from chemical dependence. These individuals are unable to ascend out of their situation by themselves, but rather require “intensive, skilled, protracted effort” from the city or state (Berlin and McAllister, 1992, p. 17).

Transitional housing is especially critical for homeless youth. When they are provided with resources and support, young individuals are more likely to learn positive interactive behavior, avoid dangerous or risky situations, and make positive contributions to the improvements of themselves, their families, and the community around them (Anderson, Sabatelli, and Kosutic, 2007). Involvement in community organizations can be critical. Through this interaction, teens can improve self-esteem, develop their abilities to mentally process difficult situations, and develop positive behavioral patterns. “[A] distant relationship with one’s family or negative peer associations might be moderated by a strong connection with a neighborhood youth center” (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 349).

To provide these services, governments often turn to nonprofit organizations in the

community. These partnerships can be advantageous for a number of reasons. Feiock and Jang suggest that in particular, collaboration with nonprofits can provide local governments ease in service accountability, professionalism, and community legitimacy (2009).

Most nonprofit organizations are governed by a board of directors who are not allowed to financially benefit from their involvement with the organization. This limitation suggests that the members of these boards choose to be involved out of a genuine interest in serving the community. Additionally, these organizations are monitored by a number of parties, including: donors, government officials, and clients. With such high accountability associated with all government spending, this lack of self-interested behavior often makes nonprofits desirable partners for municipalities. Nonprofits are also an especially good resource for local governments because they can tailor their services for specific subsections of the population whose needs are not being met by government programs. “When local governments recognize emergent social problems, nonprofit contracting permits governments to acquire special expertise and talents for which there is flexibility to adjust programs and budgets.” (Feiock and Jang 2009, p.669). Finally, nonprofits are also seen to be representing and serving the values of the community. With this perception in mind, a nonprofit collaborator can be helpful in negotiating any issues that may arise due to differences between the governmental and community standards of care (Feiock and Jang 2009).

However, there are situations that are not conducive to local government - nonprofit partnerships. Feiock and Jang note that when there is high turnover in government leadership positions, these service contracts may be more contentious due to a desire on the part of the new administration to renegotiate contract terms. This can lead to frustration on the part of the organization because it translates into additional costs for them (2009). Additionally, while they may agree on the need for services for a targeted population, local governments and nonprofits may disagree about the priorities in providing these services. Governments should be wary of their long-term priorities being overlooked by nonprofit partners in favor of a more immediate social need. Despite these differences, there is still much to be gained from these partnerships. The authors suggest that governments stipulate only the outcomes of the partnership and general expectations for accountability, leaving the nonprofits the ability to determine how to achieve the goals (Malloy and Agarwal 2010).

4. Economic Development

Local governments are often charged with improving the economic conditions of their jurisdictions through efforts to increase the value of goods and services of individuals and enterprises within their areas (Walker, et. al. 2002). One of the ways local governments try to improve their jurisdictions is through loans to local businesses that aim to support lower income populations and create jobs within areas of the city (Walker, et. al. 2002).

These loans may help to generate new jobs or revive run-down neighborhoods to improve the economic state of distressed areas (Walker, et. al. 2002). The authors of this study found that among businesses who borrow CDBG funds, larger enterprises located in low-poverty areas were more successful with the funds than small businesses in high-poverty areas (Walker, et. al. 2002). The authors felt that smaller business in high-poverty areas may have difficulty attracting other kinds of funding beyond the federal grant money, so these businesses struggle to be successful (Walker, et. al. 2002). The study showed that if lenders understand the associated risks through their multiple characteristics, including “loan terms, financial underwriting, collateral, and business and community characteristics,” they will find greater direction in how they should give money to both ensure borrowers will be properly pay back the loan and the loan

is used to serve the populations that could benefit the most (Walker, et. al 2002).

Along with the desire to provide public sector loans to struggling business enterprises, HUD financing also aims to provide job creation for targeted populations. Johnson and Savner write that many employers may be interested in hiring and training new employees from struggling populations, and find incentives to do so through this federal funding (1999). There are a variety of programs that can help encourage job growth and training that target homeless populations, at-risk youth, single parents, recovering addicts, etc., which are funded by CDBG grant money (Johnson and Savner 1999). The authors note that because CDBG and HUD financing has been provided to cities for a few decades, the way that money is spent is entrenched in the community psyche, so reevaluating new funding activities may be difficult for cities (Johnson and Savner 1999). Understanding how federal funds can be utilized at their greatest potential will help cities to serve populations in the best manner possible and encourage changes to the way funds are spent.

5. Neighborhood Needs

The category of Neighborhood Needs is designed to encompass projects which address “the accessibility, safety, security, and livability of targeted neighborhoods” (“Your CDBG & HOME” flier). These projects are focused on the maintenance and upkeep of neighborhoods and the infrastructure that serves the citizens of these areas. Potential projects include the development and repairs of sewers and sidewalks, the removal of dilapidated buildings, the creation and maintenance of parks, neighborhood planning, and improvements to the local transportation systems.

Satisfaction with social, physical, and economic features of the neighborhood (such as crime rate, interaction with neighbors, street lighting, crowding and noise level, cost of living in the community, and neighborhood improvements) leads to an improvement in the perceived quality of life (Sirgy and Cornwell, 2002). The quality of neighborhoods may also influence residents’ stress levels. Cutrona, Wallace, and Wesner (2006) mentioned that “neighborhood characteristics influence people’s vulnerability to depression following negative events in their lives.” The atmosphere in a neighborhood, such as unpleasant physical surroundings or difficult neighbors, contributes to stress. Disrupted bonds among people will cause “lower levels of informal social control, inadequate social support, and poor family-role performance” (Cutrona, et. al., 2006, p. 189).

However, neighborhood surroundings can play a positive role as well by increasing the living quality of those in the neighborhood. When people know each other, they are more likely to obey informal norms and maintain better behaviors. “The most efficient way to improve the mental health in impoverished neighborhoods is to improve the quality of neighborhoods” (Cutrona, et. al., 2006, p. 191). They also suggest that the subsidized housing should not be built in the area where it is concentrating low-income housing, which may rise chaos in the society.

A 2005 case study of St. Joseph’s Carpenter Society (SJCS) in Camden, New Jersey examined the impact of housing rehabilitation on local neighborhoods and evaluated how a small community neighborhood develops with funding assistance. The author used a three-tiered approach including a targeted and comparison area analysis followed by a regression analysis to test the SJCS’s impact on local housing prices. There is a strategy that some nonprofits share to promote home ownership and improve community harmony, which is to buy dilapidated houses for low prices, rehabilitate them, and then sell them at an affordable price to low to moderate-income individuals. The results showed that SJCS census block groups had a greater increase in price than those in two comparison block groups where housing characteristics and demographic

variables were controlled. If housing prices are indicative of the neighborhood quality, then SJCS improved its neighborhoods as well as adjacent areas.

Other articles illustrate the impact of housing rehabilitation on surrounding neighborhoods. Expanded homeownership increases positive feelings among neighborhoods and encourage them to participate in community-related activities more (Rohe, Van Zandt, and McCarthy 2000; DiPasquale and Glaeser 1999). “In those studies where the impact of investment in both new housing and housing rehabilitation in low-and moderate-income neighborhoods is found to be capitalized in housing prices, the housing is typically a development of attached units or closely contiguous units” (Smith & Hevener, 2005 p. 56).

IV. Research Methods

The City’s intent for this research project was to collect the public opinion about community development priorities from residents to more fully inform its decisions regarding how it will invest HUD funding.

The concepts regarding community development programs and their various components were largely based on the City’s categorizations and HUD’s terminology found on its online reporting system. The researchers did not have direct access to this online system, but the system’s contents and language were reflected in a survey implemented by a comparable city (Jefferson City, Missouri) and the researchers had input from a City official who did have access to this system. The City used this system in its approaches to community development so that its efforts were in accordance with HUD to acquire funding. Because of the importance of using proper HUD terminology, the researchers drafted all surveys based on Jefferson City’s prior example and the input of the City official.

To satisfy the requirements for the CDBG and HOME Grants, the City needed to prove that they solicited the opinions of its citizens. Throughout the survey process of collecting citizen input, the researchers tried to match the demographics of the sample population with those of the population of the city as a whole. The ideal response demographics given by the City included 79 percent White, 11.3 percent African American/Black, 5.2 percent Asian, 3 percent Hispanic, .3 percent American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 11 percent non-native English speakers. Since the method of collecting citizen input involved using five different surveys, there was a fair amount of variation in response demographics across each of the surveys. Below are the significant findings for each survey. The average priority response score for each topic area will be used by the City to help prioritize funding projects. Projects that address issues where the mean priority response score was high (close to 3) will receive funding priority. Projects addressing issues with low mean priority response scores (close to 1) are unlikely to receive funding.

The researchers initially planned to gather data on a general survey and four specific topics areas including: Economic Development, Affordable Housing/Fair Housing¹, Community Facilities, and Neighborhood Needs. In total, the researchers wrote five different surveys. Each of these surveys included the same demographic questions so important demographics could be compared across surveys. Also, the surveys included importance rating questions on the program areas or needs depending on their topic. These ratings were measured using a 3-point Likert scale from low-medium-high importance. The demographic questions asked for nominal, ordinal and

¹ Affordable Housing and Fair Housing are separate HUD financing program areas. The researchers combined these programs together for survey purposes to capture respondents at the Affordable Housing focus group meeting, because the Fair Housing meeting had taken place prior to the researchers’ assignment and involvement in the project.

interval data responses. All surveys were pretested with the help of colleague constructive feedback and were then approved by the City official contact.

The City wanted the researchers to collect a total of 150 General Needs surveys and 50 surveys of each of the specific program areas. To ensure respondents did not take the same survey more than once, respondents were asked to provide their addresses. To capture survey responses, the researchers pursued a number of different methods. First, the researchers provided surveys at focus group meetings the City had already scheduled for each of the topic areas. Also, the City posted links to online versions of the surveys (by using SurveyMonkey) to obtain a higher response rate beyond the focus group meetings. In these initial stages, the researchers wanted to see how many survey responses were collected through the focus groups and online portals to see if further planning strategies for greater collection rates would be needed.

The researchers drafted the demographic questions that were included in all of the surveys to ensure respondents were comparable to the population demographics of Columbia and so that proper groups were targeted based on HUD requirements. All five surveys included the same demographic questions which covered: ward of residence, ethnicity, race, sex of the head of household, age, primary household language, size of the household, household income, and disability status. The researchers created the choices for household income based on the Federal poverty level. However, the City later informed the researchers that the HUD median income levels should be used to determine low/moderate income levels. This discrepancy has resulted in more imprecise estimates of income.

The General Needs survey was the first survey the researchers drafted and had pretested by their colleagues. The City wanted survey data regarding how CDBG and HOME funds should be spent generally and how citizens rate the importance of specific program areas. This survey was initially given at the General Needs focus group which was held on January 9, 2014. Attendees at the focus group took part in round-table discussions throughout the night based on the five program areas of HUD financing. At the end of the night they were instructed to leave survey responses behind. Initially, there were issues with the demographics questions of the first general surveys because some questions the researchers included were left off the distributed copies. This issue was communicated to the City and fixed, so that all other distributed copies from then on were correct.

The other four specific sub-surveys were drafted in the order of when their respective focus group was scheduled. They were pretested by the researchers' colleagues and were subsequently distributed at their focus group meeting. The focus group for: Affordable Housing occurred on January 23, 2014; Community Facilities occurred on March 7, 2014²; Economic Development occurred on March 7, 2014³; Neighborhood Needs occurred on March 13, 2014. The General Needs survey was also passed out at all of these focus group meetings and also at the meeting on homelessness which took place on March 19, 2014. The focus groups helped generate a fair amount of responses but other methods were required to capture enough citizen input.

The most constructive manner of survey collection was the use of the online survey website, Survey Monkey, through the links that were provided on the City's website. All of the English surveys were inputted into Survey Monkey and then the City placed links for the surveys on its website and emailed its community organizational listserve to encourage community members to take the surveys. All links to the surveys were placed online in mid-March and were accessible for three weeks afterwards.

² Due to inclement weather, the Community Facilities focus group took place on March 7 rather than on February 5.

³ Due to inclement weather, the Economic Development focus group took place March 7 rather than on February 6.

Once the researchers collected all of the focus group surveys and online responses, they realized they still needed more responses, especially from minority and low income populations, to meet the collection and demographic goals. To collect responses from these targeted groups, the researchers contacted a variety of community organizations, including: various churches, Centro Latino, and the Columbia Housing Authority. A few of these organizations agreed to allow the researchers to distribute surveys and collect responses, including: Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Columbia Chinese Christian Church, Centro Latino, Paquin Towers, and Oak Towers. This final push for survey responses helped the researchers to achieve the final count of surveys: General Needs (total: 181), Affordable Housing (total: 47), Community Facilities (total: 43), Economic Development (total: 42), and Neighborhood Needs (total: 44). These numbers do not meet the initial goals, but the City and researchers decided the amounts were adequate for the project.

After all the surveys were collected, the researchers coded the questions and answers for the five different surveys. The responses were then inputted into an excel spreadsheet. With this information the researchers conducted T-tests to compare the response ratings of different demographic groups. These results indicate which program areas and needs are the most important to Columbia residents overall and within certain demographic groups. Additionally, the researchers, using case studies and data from communities comparable to Columbia, assessed the costs and benefits of investing in certain program areas and needs. The researchers will report these analyses and findings to the City for their incorporation into the City's consolidated plan.

V. Findings and Analysis

P-values, included in parentheses, are reflective of t-tests run between the highest mean in a program area or need and the other values among all respondents or within a demographic category. Statistically significant values (P-value less than .05) will be marked with *. It is important to note that while the demographics of the respondents did match the goals set out by the City in most cases, when the data is analyzed by targeted groups, several groups do not contain enough observations (10 or below) to be generalizable to the population of Columbia as a whole. These groups have been denoted with ♦. The researchers decided to only run T-tests within select demographics for analysis.

General Needs Survey

There were a total of 181 responses to the General Needs survey. Table 1-A shows that the category with the highest mean rating was Economic Development, however statistical tests show that this rating is statistically the same as the ratings for Community Facilities, Neighborhood Needs, and Affordable Housing. Only Fair Housing was shown to have a statistically lower rating.

Table 1-A: General Needs for All Respondents

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)	
	All Respondents	Observations
Economic Development	2.5114	176
Fair Housing	2.1086 (.0001)*	175
Community Facilities	2.4463 (.3187)	177
Neighborhood Needs	2.48 (.6833)	175
Affordable Housing	2.4859 (.6682)	177

Similar results are seen in Table 1-B, that while Community Facilities has the highest mean response score for both Hispanics and non-Hispanics, overall these groups rate the program areas the same aside from Fair Housing, which has a statistically lower rating.

Table 1-B: General Needs by Ethnicity

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Not Hispanic	Hispanic	Observations
Economic Development	2.4609 (.6717)	2.5833 (.7774)	127
Fair Housing	2.1754 (.0003)*	2.3333 (.1661)	126
Community Facilities	2.5	2.6667	128
Neighborhood Needs	2.4867 (.8263)	2.3333 (.2199)	125
Affordable Housing	2.4782 (.8220)	2.3333 (.1661)	127

Table 1-C shows there is not a difference between the highest white and minority community development priorities. While the highest mean response score for white respondents is Affordable Housing and for minorities is Economic Development, all of the values are not statistically different but for Fair Housing. However, when looking at just Asian respondents, Community Facilities is the lowest priority.

Table 1-C: General Needs by Race

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)				Observations
	White	Black/African-American	Asian	Minorities (Includes Black/African-American and Asian)	
Economic Development	2.4714 (.5656)	2.8333	2.7272	2.6571	175
Fair Housing	2.0647 (.0001)*	2.3333 (.4382)	2.5455 (.4405)	2.3143 (.0210)*	174
Community Facilities	2.4823 (.6170)	2.3333 (.0527)	2.1818 (.0251)*	2.3143 (.0210)*	176
Neighborhood Needs	2.4820 (.6171)	2.4545 (.1669)	2.4545 (.2767)	2.4706 (.2450)	173
Affordable Housing	2.5177	2.6667 (.4382)	2.1818 (.0519)	2.3429 (.0321)*	176

As is shown in Table 1-D, the highest mean response score for male headed or equal responsibility households is Economic Development whereas the highest for those who live in female headed households is Neighborhood Needs. However, the only significant value from these top means is within the Fair Housing category for male headed households.

Table 1-D: General Needs by Head of Household

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		Observations
	Male Headed or Equal Responsibilities	Female Headed	
Economic Development	2.5303	2.425 (.5231)	172
Fair Housing	2.0687 (.0001)*	2.275 (.1242)	171
Community Facilities	2.4697 (.4597)	2.4146 (.3233)	173
Neighborhood Needs	2.4538 (.3907)	2.525	170
Affordable Housing	2.4848 (.5692)	2.4634 (.5550)	173

As is seen in Table 1-E, the highest mean response scores among all age groups, except for 51-65 years old, are for Economic Development. The highest for respondents in the 51-65 age group was Community Facilities and those under 18 years old and over 65 years old also had Neighborhood Needs as one of the highest means. Across all categories that could be analyzed, Fair Housing came out as being statistically unimportant, while Community Facilities was also of low priority within the 18-35 year old age group.

Table 1-E: General Needs by Age

	Mean Response Score by (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)					Observations
	Under 18 years old	18-35 years old	36-50 years old	51-65 years old	Over 65 years old	
Economic Development	3♦	2.5758	2.5490	2.4219 (.2196)	2.52¹	174
Fair Housing	2♦	2.1212 (.0229)*	2.0980 (.0006)*	2.127 (.0005)*	2.04 (.0308 ¹)* (.0047 ²)*	173
Community Facilities	1♦	2.2727 (.0392)*	2.4902 (.6440)	2.5692	2.28 (.2071 ¹)(.1850 ²)	175
Neighborhood Needs	3♦	2.375 (.3383)	2.48 (.6267)	2.4844 (.5045)	2.52²	172
Affordable Housing	2♦	2.3939 (.2260)	2.5098 (.7425)	2.5077 (.5595)	2.48 (.8659 ¹)(.8462 ²)	175

In Table 1-F, despite differences in primary language used in the home, Economic Development had the top mean response score. However, the only statistically significant rating is that for Community Facilities, which puts it as the least important program area for households who do not primarily speak English.

Table 1-F: General Needs by Language

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		Observations
	English is Not the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	English is the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	
Economic Development	2.6667	2.4937	170
Fair Housing	2.5 (.5505)	2.0637	169
Community Facilities	2.25 (.0172)*	2.4465	171
Neighborhood Needs	2.5833 (.7227)	2.4679	168
Affordable Housing	2.25 (.0538)	2.4906	171

Table 1-G shows that the highest mean response score for those who are low to moderate income is Affordable Housing, while for high income it is Economic Development. There is no statistical difference in the values, but for Fair Housing being rated the least important by low/moderate income.

Table 1-G: General Needs by Income Level

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Low/Moderate Income	High Income	Observations
Economic Development	2.4932 (.3800)	2.5158	168
Fair Housing	2.3472 (.0085)*	1.9368	167
Community Facilities	2.5 (.3800)	2.3789	169
Neighborhood Needs	2.4722 (.2794)	2.4787	166
Affordable Housing	2.5753	2.3895	168

Table 1-H tells us that the highest mean response score between respondents who do and who do not have disabilities in their home is different. Affordable Housing is the highest score for the former and Economic Development is the highest score for the latter. The only statistically significant rating is that Fair Housing is different from the other values, it is the least preferred, for those who have a disability in the home.

Table 1-H: General Needs by Disability

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	No Disability in the Home	Disability in the Home	Observations
Economic Development	2.5435	2.3611 (.6286)	174
Fair Housing	2.0876	2.1667 (.0309)*	173
Community Facilities	2.4604	2.3611 (.6286)	175
Neighborhood Needs	2.5255	2.2571 (.1647)	172
Affordable Housing	2.4855	2.4595	175

General Needs Summary

As is evident from the above tables, only Fair Housing is consistently ranking the lowest and is statistically different from other programs. All other category rankings are not statistically different from one another.

Economic Development

The Economic Development survey was used to gauge citizens' priorities in the area of Economic Development. Items included in this survey include Microlending, Vocational Training, Commercial and Industrial Facilities Rehabilitation and Development, and Business Mentoring. There were a total of 42 responses for this survey. Table 2-A shows that while Vocational Training has the highest mean response score, statistical significance tests prove that the rating for Business Mentoring is not statistically different. However, both Microlending and Commercial and Industrial Rehabilitation were given significantly lower ratings.

Table 2-A: Economic Development for All Respondents

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)	
	All Respondents	Observations
Microlending	2.1190 (.0177)*	42
Vocational Training	2.4524	42
Commercial Industrial Rehab Development	2.2381 (.0482)*	42
Business Mentoring	2.2381 (.1067)	42

A comparison of Hispanic or Latino respondents versus Non-Hispanic respondents in Table 2-B shows that the highest mean response score for both groups is Vocational Training. However, while this distribution does meet the goal of 3% Hispanic response rate, the sample size of Hispanic respondents is only 2, which limits the generalizability of the data.

Table 2-B: Economic Development by Ethnicity

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Not Hispanic	Hispanic	Observations
Microlending	2.0769 (.0143)*	2.5 (.5000)♦	41
Vocational Training	2.4359	3♦	41
Commercial Industrial Rehab Development	2.2564 (.0897)	2 (.5000)♦	41
Business Mentoring	2.2308 (.1464)	2.5 (.5000)♦	41

When separating the responses by race in Table 2-C, the highest mean response score for minorities as a whole is Commercial and Industrial Rehabilitation and Development while for White respondents it is Vocational Training.

Table 2-C: Economic Development by Race

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)				Observations
	White	Black/African-American	Asian	Minorities (Includes Black/African-American and Asian)	
Microlending	2.087 (.0469)*	2♦	2.0833	2.1579 (.0896)	42
Vocational Training	2.4783	3♦	2.3333	2.4211 (.5146)	42
Commercial Industrial Rehab Development	2 (.0002)*	3♦	2.5833	2.5263	42
Business Mentoring	2.2174 (.2077)	2.5♦	2.1667	2.2632 (.1716)	42

Table 2-D shows that respondents from households where females hold the primary financial responsibilities rank Business Mentoring as having the highest level of need. Those from male-headed households or households where financial responsibilities are shared equally gave Vocational Training the highest mean response score.

Table 2-D: Economic Development by Head of Household

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		Observations
	Male Headed or Equal Responsibilities	Female Headed	
Microlending	2.1875	2♦	41
Vocational Training	2.5	2.2222♦	41
Commercial Industrial Rehab Development	2.3125	2♦	41
Business Mentoring	2.2188	2.4444♦	41

When broken down by age group, the observations fall into four of the five age groups in Table 2-E. There were no respondents in the age under 18 age group. Of the other four groups, the 18-35 group, the 36-50 group, and the 51-65 group all rated Vocational Training as the highest level of importance. The over 65 group was split between Microlending and Commercial and Industrial Facilities Rehabilitation and Development. But again, with the small sample size in this group, the results are not very generalizable.

Table 2-E: Economic Development by Age

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)					Observations
	Under 18 years old	18-35 years old	36-50 years old	51-65 years old	Over 65 years old	
Microlending	-	1.8571♦	2.0625	2.125	3♦	42
Vocational Training	-	2.4286♦	2.5	2.4375	2.3333♦	42
Commercial Industrial Rehab Development	-	2.2857♦	2.25	2.0625	3♦	42
Business Mentoring	-	2.2857♦	2.0625	2.375	2.3333♦	42

As seen from Table 2-F, for individuals who primarily speak English at home, the Economic Development category with the highest mean response score is Vocational Training at 2.5. Non-Native English Speakers rated Commercial and Industrial Facilities Rehabilitation and Development as having the highest level of need.

Table 2-F: Economic Development by Language

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		Observations
	English is Not the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	English is the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	
Microlending	2.1429	2.1154	40
Vocational Training	2.3571	2.5	40
Commercial Industrial Rehab Development	2.5714	2.0385	40
Business Mentoring	2.3571	2.1538	40

Both low to moderate income respondents and high income respondents rated Vocational Training as having the highest level of importance. Statistical significance tests on low and moderate income responses show that the rating for Commercial and Industrial Rehabilitation and Development and Business Mentoring was not statistically different from the Vocational Training rating, meaning any of these categories could have the highest preference.

Table 2-G: Economic Development by Income Level

	Mean Response Score (scale 1-3)		Observations
	Low/Moderate Income	High Income	
Microlending	2.0556 (.0488)*	2.1304	41
Vocational Training	2.4444	2.4348	41
Commercial Industrial Rehab Development	2.2778 (.1872)	2.1739	41
Business Mentoring	2.3889 (.7168)	2.0870	41

Table 2-H shows that respondents who have or live with someone who has a disability gave Commercial and Industrial Facilities Rehabilitation and Development the highest mean response score. Individuals who do not have a disability or live with someone who has a disability rated Vocational Training as the highest priority in the community.

Table 2-H: Economic Development by Disability

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		Observations
	No Disability in the Home	Disability in the Home	
Microlending	2.1081	2.2♦	42
Vocational Training	2.4595	2.4♦	42
Commercial Industrial Rehab Development	2.1892	2.6♦	42
Business Mentoring	2.2162	2.4♦	42

Economic Development Summary

Tests of the Economic Development Survey show Vocational Training to be the most consistently rated high priority. Various other categories were ranked highly by targeted groups, but not with any consistency.

Community Facilities

The Community Facilities survey was used to gauge citizens' priorities in the area of services for the community provided by private and nonprofit organizations. Potential projects in this survey include Youth Services, Homeless Shelters, Transitional Housing, Transitional Housing for Youth, Senior Services, Disability Services, Employment Services, Health Services, and General Social Services. There were 43 total respondents but there were less observations for some questions due to respondents choosing not answer them. As shown in Table 3-A, Disability Services had the highest mean response score. However, significance testing shows that Transitional Housing, Senior Services, and General Social Services were the only categories that were significantly different from Disability Services.

Table 3-A: Community Facilities for All Respondents

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)	
	All Respondents	Observations
Youth Services	2.1951 (.1334)	41
Homeless Shelters	2.4048 (.7432)	42
Transitional Housing	2.2857 (.2273)	42
Transitional Housing for Homeless	2.1429 (.0408)*	42
Senior Services	2.2558 (.0183)*	43
Disability Services	2.4651	43
Employment Services	2.3256 (.2942)	43
Health Services	2.2857 (.0584)	42
General Social Services	2.2326 (.0486)*	43

Table 3-B shows that non-Hispanics rated Disability Services as the most important need within Community Facilities. There was only 1 Hispanic respondent so the preferences of this individual cannot be expanded to the general Columbia population. Also, five needs all received the mean response score of 3 which is not helpful in determining which is most important, however Disability Services was rated as a 3.

Table 3-B: Community Facilities by Ethnicity

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Not Hispanic	Hispanic	Observations
Youth Services	2.25 (.2099)	1♦	41
Homeless Shelters	2.4146 (.8682)	2♦	42
Transitional Housing	2.2683 (.2274)	3♦	42
Transitional Housing for Homeless	2.1463 (.0567)	2♦	42
Senior Services	2.2619 (.0307)*	2♦	43
Disability Services	2.4524	3♦	43
Employment Services	2.3095 (.2943)	3♦	43
Health Services	2.2683 (.0583)	3♦	42
General Social Services	2.2143 (.0486)*	3♦	43

As seen in Table 3-C, survey results show a difference between the ratings of whites and minorities regarding level of need for funding various Community Facilities. While minority individuals find Senior Services and Disability Services to be equally the most important, white individuals feel that Homeless Shelters is the most important. Black/African-American respondents, while included with other minorities, chose Health Services and General Social Services to be top funding priorities. However there were only 2 total observations from this racial category, inhibiting its generalizability.

Table 3-C: Community Facilities by Race

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)				Observations
	White	Black/African-American	Asian	Minorities (Includes Black/African-American and Asian)	
Youth Services	2.1481 (.1992)	1.5♦	2.3333♦	2.2857 (.1365) ¹	41
Homeless Shelters	2.4286	2♦	2.4444♦	2.3571 (.1039) ¹	42
Transitional Housing	2.2857 (.3555)	2.5♦	2.3333♦	2.2857 (.0961) ¹	42
Transitional Housing for Homeless	2.3214 (.3753)	2♦	1.8889♦	1.7857 (.0003)* ¹	42
Senior Services	2.069 (.0537)	2.5♦	2.7778♦	2.6429¹	43
Disability Services	2.3793 (.7127)	2.5♦	2.6667♦	2.6429	43
Employment Services	2.2759 (.3056)	2.5♦	2.5556♦	2.4286 (.3854) ¹	43
Health Services	2.1379 (.0951)	3♦	2.5556♦	2.6154 (1.0000) ¹	42
General Social Services	2.069 (.0188)*	3♦	2.5556♦	2.5714 (.7202) ¹	43

Table 3-D shows that those who live in female headed households would like to see the City fund Disability Services, whereas individuals in male headed or equal responsibility households prefer that Homeless Shelters be funded. Statistical significance tests show that among respondents from female headed households, Youth Services, Health Services, and General Social Services were not significantly different from Disability Services.

Table 3-D: Community Facilities by Head of Household

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Male Headed or Equal Responsibilities	Female Headed	Observations
Youth Services	2.1818	2.1429 (.0941)♦	40
Homeless Shelters	2.5758	1.875 (.0185)*♦	41
Transitional Housing	2.3333	2.25 (.0492)*♦	41
Transitional Housing for Homeless	2.2121	2 (.0209)*♦	41
Senior Services	2.1765	2.5 (.1970)♦	42
Disability Services	2.3529	2.875♦	42
Employment Services	2.3529	2.125 (.0479)*♦	42
Health Services	2.1818	2.625 (.3506)♦	41
General Social Services	2.1765	2.625 (.3506)♦	42

Table 3-E shows that there is some consensus among all age groups, except for Under 18 years old (no observations) and 18-35 years old, that Disability Services is the most important need area. Respondents in the 18-35 age group preferred Homeless Shelters. The Over 65 years old category had only 3 observations and thus there are numerous competing priorities all with the same mean response score.

Table 3-E: Community Facilities by Age

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)					Observations
	Under 18 years old	18-35 years old	36-50 years old	51-65 years old	Over 65 years old	
Youth Services	-	2.3♦	2.294	2.1818	1.3333♦	41
Homeless Shelters	-	2.7♦	2.2941	2.25	2.6667♦	42
Transitional Housing	-	2.5♦	2.2353	2.25	2♦	42
Transitional Housing for Homeless	-	2.6♦	1.7647	2.1667	2.6667♦	42
Senior Services	-	2♦	2.2778	2.4167	2.3333♦	43
Disability Services	-	2.3♦	2.3333	2.75	2.6667♦	43
Employment Services	-	2.5♦	2.2222	2.25	2.6667♦	43
Health Services	-	2.2♦	2.2222	2.4545	2.3333♦	42
General Social Services	-	2.2♦	2.1111	2.3333	2.6667♦	43

Table 3-F shows that for individuals where English is the primary language spoken at home, the area with the greatest need in the community is Disability Services. For respondents who primarily use a language other than English at home, the highest mean response score was Senior Services, but there were not enough observations.

Table 3-F: Community Facilities by Language

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	English is Not the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	English is the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	Observations
Youth Services	2.3♦	2.1786	38
Homeless Shelters	2.4♦	2.4138	39
Transitional Housing	2.4♦	2.2759	39
Transitional Housing for Homeless	1.9♦	2.2069	39
Senior Services	2.6♦	2.2	40
Disability Services	2.5♦	2.5	40
Employment Services	2.5♦	2.2667	40
Health Services	2.4♦	2.2759	39
General Social Services	2.4♦	2.2	40

Table 3-G can tell that those who are low to moderate income believe Disability Services is most deserving of funding, while those who are high income would like for the City to fund Homeless Shelters.

Table 3-G: Community Facilities by Income Level

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Low/Moderate Income	High Income	Observations
Youth Services	2.1429 (.3293)	2.3125	37
Homeless Shelters	2.3182 (.6283)	2.5625	38
Transitional Housing	2.3182 (.5758)	2.375	38
Transitional Housing for Homeless	2.2273 (.2956)	2.0625	38
Senior Services	2.1304 (.0159)*	2.4375	39
Disability Services	2.4348	2.5	39
Employment Services	2.3043 (.4175)	2.3125	39
Health Services	2.3043 (.3282)	2.3125	39
General Social Services	2.3043 (.3774)	2.1875	39

As seen from Table 3-H, those with no disabilities in their home and those with disabilities in their home have similar funding preferences within the program area of Community Facilities. Both types of respondents think Disability Services is the most important program. However those with disabilities in the home also found Transitional Housing to be equally needing of funding as well.

Table 3-H: Community Facilities by Disability

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	No Disability in the Home	Disability in the Home	Observations
Youth Services	2.2353	2♦	41
Homeless Shelters	2.3529	2.625♦	42
Transitional Housing	2.1818	2.6667♦	42
Transitional Housing for Homeless	2.0882	2.375♦	42
Senior Services	2.2647	2.2222♦	43
Disability Services	2.4118	2.6667♦	43
Employment Services	2.2941	2.4444♦	43
Health Services	2.3333	2.1111♦	42
General Social Services	2.2059	2.3333♦	43

Community Facilities Summary

Tests of the data from the Community Facilities Survey show that Disability Services and Homeless Shelters were most consistently given a high priority rating. Support for other categories is mixed and inconsistent.

Neighborhood Needs

The Neighborhood Needs Survey was used to gauge citizens' priorities in the area of community maintenance and governance. Items included in this survey include Trash Removal, Street Scaping, Community Gardens, Code Enforcement, Removal of Dilapidated Buildings, Drainage Improvements, Water Improvements, Street Improvements, Sidewalk Improvements, Railroad Crossing Improvements, Parks and Trails Improvements, and Bus Shelters. As seen in Table 4-A, there were between 39 and 42 responses for this survey, depending on the item being rated. Sidewalk Improvements was given the highest mean priority score, but statistical significance tests show that it has no statistical difference from Bus Shelters, Street Improvements, or Water Improvements.

Table 4-A: Neighborhood Needs for All Respondents

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)	
	All Respondents	Observations
Trash Removal	1.881 (.0081)*	42
Street Scaping	1.7619 (.0000)*	42
Community Gardens	2 (.0074)*	42
Code Enforcement	1.9552 (.0074)*	42
Removal of Dilapidated Buildings	2 (.0039)*	40
Drainage Improvements	2.1282 (.0179)*	39
Water Improvements	2.3415 (.0950)	41
Street Improvements	2.3415 (.8501)	41
Sidewalk Improvements	2.3571	42
Railroad Crossing Improvements	1.5897 (.0000)*	39
Parks and Trails Improvements	1.8049 (.0007)*	41
Bus Shelters	2.3095 (.7103)	42

Table 4-B shows non-Hispanics rated sidewalk improvements as the area with the greatest level of need. While there are several areas that were given a rating of 3 by the Hispanic respondent, since there was only 1 respondent in this category, these results are not generalizable.

Table 4-B: Neighborhood Needs by Ethnicity

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Not Hispanic	Hispanic	Observations
Trash Removal	1.9 (.0161)*	2♦	41
Street Scaping	1.775 (.0001)*	2♦	41
Community Gardens	1.95 (.0034)*	3♦	41
Code Enforcement	1.95 (.0060)*	3♦	41
Removal of Dilapidated Buildings	2 (.0259)*	3♦	39
Drainage Improvements	2.1351 (.1324)	2♦	38
Water Improvements	2.3333 (.8445)	2♦	40
Street Improvements	2.3077 (.7002)	3♦	40
Sidewalk Improvements	2.35	3♦	41
Railroad Crossing Improvements	1.6216 (.0000)	1♦	38
Parks and Trails Improvements	1.7692 (.0005)	2♦	40
Bus Shelters	2.275 (.5703)	3♦	41

In Table 4-C, when separating the responses by race, the Asian respondents were split between water improvements and street improvements, with the same rating for both needs. When combining all the minority groups together, the category with the highest mean response score is water improvements. White respondents rated sidewalk improvements as having the greatest need. While several items were tied in the responses of the Black/African American group, there were only two observations in this group, which limits its usefulness.

Table 4-C: Neighborhood Needs by Race

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)				Observations
	White	Black/African-American	Asian	Minorities (Includes Black/African-American and Asian)	
Trash Removal	1.6786 (.0123)*	2.5♦	2.5556♦	2.3846 (.0269)*	41
Street Scaping	1.5714 (.0003)*	1.5♦	2.4444♦	2.2308 (.0052)*	41
Community Gardens	1.8929 (.0249)*	2♦	2.2222♦	2.1538 (.0128)*	41
Code Enforcement	1.8929 (.0460)*	2.5♦	2.1111♦	2.1538 (.0019)*	41
Removal of Dilapidated Buildings	1.9615 (.1332)	2.5♦	2.1111♦	2.1538 (.0128)*	39
Drainage Improvements	1.88 (.0298)*	2♦	2.7778♦	2.6154 (.1902)	38
Water Improvements	2.0741 (.1846)	2.5♦	2.8889♦	2.8462	40
Street Improvements	2.1429 (.3807)	2.5♦	2.8889♦	2.75 (.6742)	40
Sidewalk Improvements	2.2857	2.5♦	2.5556♦	2.5385 (.1039)	41
Railroad Crossing Improvements	1.24 (.0000)*	2♦	2.5556♦	2.3077 (.0279)*	38
Parks and Trails Improvements	1.5556 (.0004)*	2.5♦	2.2222♦	2.3077 (.0052)*	40
Bus Shelters	2.25 (.8392)	2.5♦	2.4444♦	2.3846 (.0269)*	41

As seen in Table 4-D, respondents from households where females hold the primary financial responsibilities rate Bus Shelters as having the highest level of need. Those from male-headed households or households where financial responsibilities are shared equally gave Water Improvements the highest mean response score.

Table 4-D: Neighborhood Needs by Head of Household

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Male Headed or Equal Responsibilities	Female Headed	Observations
Trash Removal	1.9667	1.6667	42
Street Scaping	1.9333	1.3333	42
Community Gardens	2	2	42
Code Enforcement	2	1.8333	42
Removal of Dilapidated Buildings	2.0333	1.9♦	40
Drainage Improvements	2.1379	2.1♦	39
Water Improvements	2.4667	2	41
Street Improvements	2.3448	2.3333	41
Sidewalk Improvements	2.3667	2.3333	42
Railroad Crossing Improvements	1.5714	1.6364	39
Parks and Trails Improvements	1.8667	1.6364	41
Bus Shelters	2.2333	2.5	42

Table 4-E shows that when broken down by age group, the observations fall into four of the five age groups. There were no respondents in the age under 18 age group. Of the other four groups, the 36-50 group, and the over 65 group both rated Street Improvements as the category with the highest level of need. The 51-65 group preferred Sidewalk Improvements, and the 18-35 group rated Bus Shelters as having the greatest amount of need.

Table 4-E: Neighborhood Needs by Age

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)					Observations
	Under 18 years old	18-35 years old	36-50 years old	51-65 years old	Over 65 years old	
Trash Removal	-	1.4444♦	2.3333	1.6154	2♦	42
Street Scaping	-	1.6667♦	1.7333	1.6923	2.2♦	42
Community Gardens	-	2.5556♦	2	1.5385	2.2♦	42
Code Enforcement	-	1.7778♦	2.1333	1.7692	2.2♦	42
Removal of Dilapidated Buildings	-	1.7778♦	2.2	1.9167	2♦	40
Drainage Improvements	-	2.1111♦	2.2857	1.8333	2.5♦	39
Water Improvements	-	2♦	2.6	2.1667	2.6♦	41
Street Improvements	-	2.3333♦	2.4286	2	3♦	41
Sidewalk Improvements	-	2.4444♦	2.3333	2.2308	2.6♦	42
Railroad Crossing Improvements	-	1.3333♦	1.6667	1.6364	1.75♦	39
Parks and Trails Improvements	-	2♦	1.8	1.6667	1.8♦	41
Bus Shelters	-	3♦	2.0667	2.0769	2.4♦	42

In Table 4-F, for individuals who primarily speak English at home, the Neighborhood Needs category with the highest mean response score is a tie between Sidewalk Improvements and Bus Shelters. Non-Native English Speakers rated Water Improvements and Street Improvements as having the highest level of need.

Table 4-F: Neighborhood Needs by Language

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	English is Not the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	English is the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	Observations
Trash Removal	2.5♦	1.7353	42
Street Scaping	2.5♦	1.5882	42
Community Gardens	2.375♦	1.9118	42
Code Enforcement	2.125♦	1.9118	42
Removal of Dilapidated Buildings	2.25♦	1.9375	40
Drainage Improvements	2.75♦	1.9677	39
Water Improvements	2.875♦	2.2121	41
Street Improvements	2.875♦	2.2121	41
Sidewalk Improvements	2.625♦	2.2941	42
Railroad Crossing Improvements	2.5♦	1.3548	39
Parks and Trails Improvements	2.125♦	1.7273	41
Bus Shelters	2.375♦	2.2941	42

Table 4-G shows that both low to moderate income respondents and high income respondents rated Sidewalk Improvements as having the highest level of importance. The low to moderate group also felt that Street Improvements had a high level of need. The high income group rated Water Improvements and Bus Shelters as having a high level of need.

Table 4-G: Neighborhood Needs by Income Level

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Low/Moderate Income	High Income	Observations
Trash Removal	1.8333 (.0659) ¹ (.0861) ²	1.9565	41
Street Scaping	1.4444 (.0014) ^{*1} (.0000) ^{*2}	2.0435	41
Community Gardens	1.8333 (.0560) ¹ (.0204) ^{*2}	2.087	41
Code Enforcement	2.0556 (.1376) ¹ (.1631) ²	1.9130	41
Removal of Dilapidated Buildings	2.25 (.8056) ¹ (.6091) ²	1.8696	39
Drainage Improvements	2 (.3008) ¹ (.0541) ²	2.2174	38
Water Improvements	2.2941 (.7909) ¹ (.5795) ²	2.3478	40
Street Improvements	2.3889¹ (1.0000)²	2.2727	41
Sidewalk Improvements	2.3889² (1.0000)¹	2.3478	41
Railroad Crossing Improvements	1.5294 (.0026) ^{*1} (.0012) ^{*2}	1.6667	38
Parks and Trails Improvements	1.7059 (.0522) ¹ (.0180) ^{*2}	1.8261	40
Bus Shelters	2.2222 (.3808) ¹ (.4210) ²	2.3478	41

Table 4-H shows that respondents who have or live with someone who has a disability gave Bus Shelters the highest mean response score. Statistical significance tests show that this rating is not statistically different from the ratings for Community Gardens, Code Enforcement, Water Improvements, Street Improvements, or Sidewalk Improvements. Individuals who do not have a disability or live with someone who has a disability rated Street Improvements as the highest priority in the community.

Table 4-H: Neighborhood Needs by Disability

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	No Disability in the Home	Disability in the Home	Observations
Trash Removal	1.8571	2 (.0465)*♦	42
Street Scaping	1.8286	1.4286 (.0041)*♦	42
Community Gardens	1.9143	2.4286 (.1723)♦	42
Code Enforcement	1.8857	2.2857 (.0781)♦	42
Removal of Dilapidated Buildings	2.0294	1.8333 (.0422)*♦	40
Drainage Improvements	2.1515	2 (.0250)*♦	39
Water Improvements	2.3235	2.4286 (.3559)♦	41
Street Improvements	2.3823	2.1429 (.1030)♦	41
Sidewalk Improvements	2.3714	2.2857 (.2894)♦	42
Railroad Crossing Improvements	1.5938	1.5714 (.0047)*♦	39
Parks and Trails Improvements	1.8235	1.7143 (.0038)*♦	41
Bus Shelters	2.2286	2.7143♦	42

Neighborhood Needs Summary

Four categories were consistently rated high priority needs: Sidewalk Improvements, Street Improvements, Water Improvements, and Bus Shelters. The other categories were rated significantly lower.

Affordable Housing (Fair Housing)

The Affordable Housing (Fair Housing) survey was used to gauge citizens' priorities in the areas of access and need for Affordable and Fair Housing available in the community. Concepts included in this survey include the rehabilitation of owner-occupied residences, the rehabilitation of rental occupied residences, homeownership assistance, rental properties for seniors, accessibility improvements for the disabled, developing single family housing, affordable housing, fair housing, removal of lead based paint, the preservation of historic residences, and energy efficiency. There were 47 total respondents but there were less observations for some questions due to respondents choosing not answer them. Table 5-A shows that overall, Affordable Housing had the highest mean response score, but this rating is not statistically different from the rating for Energy Efficiency.

Table 5-A: Affordable Housing for All Respondents

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)	
	All Respondents	Observations
Rehab Owner Occupied Residence	2.1064 (.0000)*	47
Rehab Rental Occupied Residence	2.1702 (.0008)*	47
Homeownership Assistance	2.1702 (.0000)*	47
Rental Housing for Seniors	2.3556 (.0032)*	45
Accessibility Improvements for Disabled	2.3617 (.0091)*	47
Single Family Housing Development	1.9656 (.0000)*	46
Affordable Housing	2.6596	47
Fair Housing	1.8696 (.0000)*	46
Lead Based Paint	1.7333 (.0000)*	45
Residential Historic Preservation	1.766 (.0000)*	47
Energy Efficiency	2.5319 (.3225)	47

As seen in Table 5-B, Non-Hispanics rated Affordable Housing as the most important need within Community Facilities. The Hispanic respondents had a tie between Energy Efficiency and the Rehabilitation of Rental Occupied Residences. However, with only three respondents in this category, the data is not especially useful for making generalizations about the Hispanic population in Columbia as a whole.

Table 5-B: Affordable Housing by Ethnicity

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Not Hispanic	Hispanic	Observations
Rehab Owner Occupied Residence	2.1395 (.0001)*	1.6667♦	46
Rehab Rental Occupied Residence	2.1628 (.0006)*	2.6667♦	46
Homeownership Assistance	2.1628 (.0001)*	2♦	46
Rental Housing for Seniors	2.3415 (.0031)*	2.3333♦	44
Accessibility Improvements for Disabled	2.3488 (.0089)*	2.3333♦	46
Single Family Housing Development	1.9767 (.0001)*	1.5♦	46
Affordable Housing	2.6744	2.3333♦	46
Fair Housing	1.8571 (.0001)*	1.6667♦	45
Lead Based Paint	1.7317 (.0001)*	1.6667♦	44
Residential Historic Preservation	1.7442 (.0001)*	2♦	46
Energy Efficiency	2.5116 (.2412)	2.6667♦	46

As shown in Table 5-C, there is a difference between white and minority Community Facilities need priorities. The researchers were unable to collect any responses that identified as Asian. While both Black/African American and minority individuals as a whole find Energy Efficiency as the category with the highest need, white individuals feel that Affordable Housing is the most important. Statistical significance testing show that only Lead Based Paint Abatement and Residential Historic Preservation have significantly different ratings from Energy Efficiency among minorities.

Table 5-C: Affordable Housing by Race

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)				Observations
	White	Black/African-American	Asian	Minorities (Includes Black/African-American and Asian)	
Rehab Owner Occupied Residence	2.122 (.0001)*	2♦	-	2 (.0250)*♦	47
Rehab Rental Occupied Residence	2.1707 (.0008)*	2♦	-	2.1667 (.2031)♦	47
Homeownership Assistance	2.1707 (.0001)*	2♦	-	2.1667 (.2956)♦	47
Rental Housing for Seniors	2.359 (.0018)*	2.5♦	-	2.3333 (.3632)♦	45
Accessibility Improvements for Disabled	2.4146 (.0214)*	2♦	-	2 (.1019)♦	47
Single Family Housing Development	1.9756 (.0001)*	2♦	-	1.8 (.0161)*♦	46
Affordable Housing	2.7073	2♦	-	2.3333 (.4650)♦	47
Fair Housing	1.875 (.0001)*	2♦	-	1.8333 (.0925)♦	46
Lead Based Paint	1.7179 (.0001)*	2.5♦	-	1.8333 (.0422)*♦	45
Residential Historic Preservation	1.7317 (.0001)*	2♦	-	2 (.0250)*♦	47
Energy Efficiency	2.5122 (.1462)*	3♦	-	2.6667♦	47

Table 5-D shows that both those who live in female headed households and respondents who live in male headed households or households where the financial responsibilities are shared equally would like to see the City fund Affordable Housing. Respondents from female headed households also gave Energy Efficiency a high mean response score.

Table 5-D: Affordable Housing by Head of Household

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Male Headed or Equal Responsibilities	Female Headed	Observations
Rehab Owner Occupied Residence	2.027	2.5♦	45
Rehab Rental Occupied Residence	2.1081	2.625♦	45
Homeownership Assistance	2.1351	2.5♦	45
Rental Housing for Seniors	2.3143	2.5♦	43
Accessibility Improvements for Disabled	2.3243	2.625♦	45
Single Family Housing Development	1.8108	2.7143♦	44
Affordable Housing	2.6216	3♦	45
Fair Housing	1.7297	2.7153♦	44
Lead Based Paint	1.5278	2.625♦	44
Residential Historic Preservation	1.6757	2.125♦	45
Energy Efficiency	2.4054	3♦	45

As seen in Table 5-E, Affordable Housing was chosen as a top priority for three of the five age groups - the 18-35 group, the 36-50 group, and the Over 65 group. The last of these, the Over 65 years age group also felt that Rental Housing for Seniors and Energy Efficiency were a priority. The respondents from the 51-65 age group felt that Energy Efficiency was the category with the highest need in the community. There were no responses from the Under 18 age group.

Table 5-E: Affordable Housing by Age

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)					Observations
	Under 18 years old	18-35 years old	36-50 years old	51-65 years old	Over 65 years old	
Rehab Owner Occupied Residence	-	2.0909	2	2.1765	2.3333♦	47
Rehab Rental Occupied Residence	-	2.4545	2	2.1765	2♦	47
Homeownership Assistance	-	2.2727	2.125	2.1765	2♦	47
Rental Housing for Seniors	-	2.4♦	2.1875	2.375	3♦	45
Accessibility Improvements for Disabled Single Family Housing	-	2.3636	2.125	2.5294	2.6667♦	47
Development Affordable Housing	-	1.8♦	1.8125	2.1765	2♦	46
Fair Housing	-	2.7273	2.5625	2.6471	3♦	47
Lead Based Paint	-	1.9091	1.6875	1.9375	2.3333♦	46
Residential Historic Preservation	-	1.8182	1.3333	2.0625	1.6667♦	45
Energy Efficiency	-	1.7273	1.3125	2.1765	2♦	47
	-	2.2727	2.1875	2.9412	3♦	47

Table 5-F shows that the researchers were unable to get any responses from individuals who do not use English as their primary language at home. For those who do, Affordable Housing was the greatest need in the community.

Table 5-F: Affordable Housing by Language

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	English is Not the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	English is the Primary Spoken Language in the Home	Observations
Rehab Owner Occupied Residence	-	2.1064	47
Rehab Rental Occupied Residence	-	2.1702	47
Homeownership Assistance	-	2.1702	45
Rental Housing for Seniors	-	2.3556	45
Accessibility Improvements for Disabled	-	2.3617	47
Single Family Housing Development	-	1.9565	46
Affordable Housing	-	2.6596	47
Fair Housing	-	1.8696	46
Lead Based Paint	-	1.7333	45
Residential Historic Preservation	-	1.766	47
Energy Efficiency	-	2.5319	47

Interestingly, both the low/moderate income group and the high income group chose Affordable Housing as having the highest mean response score, as shown in Table 5-G.

Table 5-G: Affordable Housing by Income Level

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	Low/Moderate Income	High Income	Observations
Rehab Owner Occupied Residence	2.1053 (.0004)*	2.1154	45
Rehab Rental Occupied Residence	2.4211 (.0245)*	2.0769	45
Homeownership Assistance	2.5263 (.0305)*	1.9615	45
Rental Housing for Seniors	2.3889 (.0032)*	2.3462	44
Accessibility Improvements for Disabled	2.3158 (.0019)*	2.4231	45
Single Family Housing Development	2.2222 (.0007)*	1.7692	44
Affordable Housing	2.8947	2.5769	45
Fair Housing	2.1667 (.0017)*	1.7308	44
Lead Based Paint	1.9444 (.0001)*	1.52	43
Residential Historic Preservation	1.9474 (.0001)*	1.5769	45
Energy Efficiency	2.4737 (.0163)*	2.5385	45

In Table 5-H, one of the most interesting results of this survey was found when comparing the responses of individuals who either have or live with someone who has disabilities to individuals who do not. Both groups chose Affordable Housing as the top need priority. This category was preferred even over Accessibility Improvements for the Disabled.

Table 5-H: Affordable Housing by Disability

	Mean Response Score (1=Low Importance – 3=High Importance)		
	No Disability in the Home	Disability in the Home	Observations
Rehab Owner Occupied Residence	2.1176	2.0833	46
Rehab Rental Occupied Residence	2.2059	2.1667	46
Homeownership Assistance	2.1471	2.25	46
Rental Housing for Seniors	2.375	2.3333	44
Accessibility Improvements for Disabled	2.2941	2.5833	46
Single Family Housing Development	1.9091	2.0833	45
Affordable Housing	2.5882	2.8333	46
Fair Housing	1.9091	1.8333	45
Lead Based Paint	1.7813	1.6667	44
Residential Historic Preservation	1.8235	1.6667	46
Energy Efficiency	2.5294	2.5833	46

Affordable and Fair Housing Summary

Affordable Housing was by far the most consistently highly rated need. Energy Efficiency was also frequently chosen as a high priority. All other categories had inconsistent support.

VI. Community Priorities and Options for the City

Columbia’s growing population puts a burden on the City to meet the ever increasing needs with limited resources in the community. To meet these needs, the City must strategically

spend the CDBG and HOME funds it receives. Every three to five years the City has to create a Consolidated Plan which helps the City prioritize its needs related to local economic conditions and the community development situation. The funds are used to help low to moderate income households and are to be spent according to the data collected above which was gathered from the community to make the City's investment as beneficial as possible.

Based on the results and findings above, if the City wants to consider the opinions of the survey respondents it should invest most of its resources into Economic Development, Neighborhood Needs, and Community Facilities projects. This is because Economic Development was ranked the highest, but there was no statistically significant difference between it and Neighborhood Needs and Community Facilities. Fair Housing was statistically significant in that it was not a major priority of the survey respondents. While Affordable Housing was not statistically significant either, external sources have shown that a loss of money to these programs will not have a large negative effect on most citizens. The City therefore, will want to use the responses and outside sources to determine the best manner in which it may spend its funds to serve the most people.

The four specific surveys also provided some insight into which areas of development citizens care most about. Based purely on means, to meet the general needs of all respondents, the City should focus on Vocational Training in Economic Development; Disability Services are important in Community Facilities, Sidewalk Improvements receive more attention in Neighborhood Needs; and Affordable Housing should be the main concern within Affordable Housing. The significance of other specific areas within the sub-specialty surveys should be examined to determine which needs are important to citizens and which do not matter as much.

The City should also pay attention to the demographic breakdowns of the survey responses. In order to meet the needs of underrepresented groups, the City needs to be aware of what needs are statistically significant within the different population groups. Even though it is important to look at the significance of the population responses, it still needs to be stressed that overgeneralizations should not be made with the information stemming from low response rates. Further, looking at detailed aspects within each program area is illuminating of preferences within the City's targeted groups. Provided below are some examples of how each of the sub-survey classifications can be broken down to provide specific insight into population needs.

For low/moderate income respondents the Economic Development need of Vocational Training had the highest mean of 2.4444. The only area that was statistically unimportant to this group was Microlending. For this reason, the City should be aware that Commercial Industrial Rehab Development and Business Mentoring are also important to low/moderate income respondents. As these were not statistically significant, the City should invest equal resources into these three areas of Economic Development.

Within the Community Facilities area, we chose to highlight the differences of importance among female headed household members. The highest mean for female headed households in this development type was Disability Services at 2.875. The services that were statistically unimportant to this group of respondents were Youth Services, Senior Services, Health Services, and General Social Services. The areas that were possibly as important as Disability Services were Homeless Shelters, Transitional Housing, Transitional Housing for Homeless, and Employment Services.

The Neighbor Needs survey was analyzed for respondents who have a disabled person in his or her home. For this group, Bus Shelters had the highest mean at 2.7143. There were some services that were not as important to those with disabilities as the differences were statistically significant: Trash Removal, Street Scaping, Removal of Dilapidated Structures, Drainage Improvements, Railroad Crossing Improvements, Parks and Trails Improvements. There were

other areas that may have been as important to people with disabled residents in their home as the difference between Bus Shelters and these other services were not significant, including: Community Gardens, Water Improvements, Street Improvements, and Sidewalk Improvements.

In the Affordable Housing survey we examined the significance of responses among minority respondents. The highest mean score service was Energy Efficiency at 2.6667. The services that were statistically significant in their difference with Energy Efficiency, and therefore, not important to respondents were: Rehab Rental Occupied Residence, Single Family Housing Development, and Lead Based Paint. The services that were not found to be statistically significant in their differences with Energy Efficiency were: Rehab Rental Occupied, Homeownership Assistance, Rental Housing for Seniors, Accessibility Improvements for Disabled, Affordable Housing, and Fair Housing.

By examining a targeted group in each of the specific surveys, the City is able to see what importance different populations place in the development services. It is crucial to see what services underrepresented groups want the City to provide the most to ensure HUD funds are spent effectively.

VII. Recommendations and Conclusions

Based on our research and findings it is our opinion that the City should focus on Economic Development, Community Facilities, and Neighborhood Needs as their priority investments. The reasons are as follows.

Economic Development had the highest mean score among all the services the City could provide in the General Survey. This would be a helpful service for the City to focus on because when the government places money in developing the economy, it not only helps improve the jurisdiction but it also helps create jobs. This occurs when the government gives loans to local businesses whose aims are to support lower income populations. The loans help small businesses in high-poverty areas to be more successful. Respondents also listed Vocational Training as a priority within Economic Development. This would provide low- and moderate- income individuals the opportunity to learn new skills, which can make them more employable. With better jobs, these individuals will be able to raise their incomes. The economic success of the City of Columbia could help provide all citizens with an all around better quality of life.

Secondly, we recommend that the City prioritize projects that fall into the category of Community Facilities. The funds for this service allows nonprofit and public organizations to build or renovate facilities to help targeted populations and neighborhoods. Because partnerships with nonprofits can allow for greater cost efficiencies and flexibility, they have great potential to successfully accomplish the City's goals. Services for disabled people received the most support from respondents, so nonprofit collaborations will be important in this area. With the growing homeless population in Columbia, we also recommend that the City support programs that serve this population. Given these preferences and recommendations, we believe it will be in the best interest of the government to continue funding the partnerships that serve the citizens of Columbia.

Finally, our third recommendation is for the importance of Neighborhood Needs. We suggest the City put funds in this service area because living in a well-maintained, and safe, neighborhood is tied to personal satisfaction. Previous literature shows that the maintenance of neighborhoods, and their infrastructure, can influence residents' stress levels and quality of life while a negative atmosphere in a neighborhood contributes to stress and chaos in the society. In our findings, Sidewalk Improvement has the most support. This would be a good choice for City funding because it will not only improve the safety of neighborhoods, but it will also bring

benefits to children, the elderly and disabled by allowing them easy access to walkways.

Although it was rated as the second highest need in the community, we recommend that the City use caution when considering the funding of Affordable Housing projects. The literature in this subject area is somewhat inconclusive, and it would seem to suggest that expanding the location-based subsidized housing program may not have much effect on homelessness. In other words, there is not a large proportion of the population that would become homeless if the government chooses not to subsidize these housing units. A better alternative may be to direct funding towards individual-based affordable housing vouchers or towards organizations and services that can target the homeless population in a more efficient and flexible way.

In conclusion, the City of Columbia has gone above and beyond the requirements of the CDBG and HOME grants when it comes to collecting citizen input. The community forums, in conjunction with the survey responses, have provided clear insights into the priorities of Columbia's population. However, as with every method, there are some drawbacks and limitations to this technique. First, there may be a selection bias. The majority of the surveys were collected either at community forums or online, via a link on the City's website. Because of this, it is reasonable to assume that most of these responses will be from people who are already more civically minded. As a result, these responses may not be representative of the population as a whole. Secondly, because of the scope and timeframe of this project, the researchers were only able to collect a small number of responses from many of the targeted groups, such as those living in female headed households or those with disabilities. The small sample size of these populations limits the extent to which the data can be generalized to the population as a whole. Finally, it is important to keep in mind that while a given focus or category may have been given a high rating of importance by the respondents, previous research and literature may suggest that providing funding towards these areas is generally not effective. The City of Columbia will have to take all of these issues into account when deciding how to allocate the money from the CDBG and HOME grants. As with any challenge, they will need to find creative solutions and monitor their progress towards addressing these issues.

VIII. References

2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. Retrieved from

https://www.gocolumbiamo.com/community_development/neighborhoods/ConsolidatedPlan/index.php

Anderson, S., Sabatelli, R., and Kosutic, I. (2007). Families, Urban Neighborhood Youth Centers, and Peers as Contexts for Development. *Family Relations*, 56(4), 346-357.

Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2007.00464.x/abstract>

Berlin, G. and McAllister, W. (1992). Homelessness: Why Nothing Has Worked, and What Will. *The Brookings Review*, 10(4), 12-17. Retrieved from

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20080336>

Breymaier, R. Davis, M. Fron, P. (2013). *Fair Housing and Equity Assessment: Metropolitan Chicago*. Retrieved from :

<http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/137210/Chicago+Region+FHEA+November+2013+HUD+Submission.pdf/b0c6946e-4425-49fe-8d0a-f336903bc464>

- Columbia, Missouri. Retrieved from <http://www.city-data.com/city/Columbia-Missouri.html>
- Community Development. Retrieved from https://www.gocolumbiamo.com/community_development/
- Community Development Block Grant Program - CDBG. Retrieved from http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/community_development/programs
- Cutrona, C. E., Wallace, G., and Wesner, K. A. (2006). Neighborhood Characteristics and Depression: An Examination of Stress Processes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(4), 188-192. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2186297/>
- DiPasquale, Denise, and Edward Glaeser. (1999). "Incentives and Social Capital: Are Homeowners Better Citizens?" *Journal of Urban Economics* 45: 354–384.
- Early, D.W. (1998). The Role of Subsidized Housing in Reducing Homelessness: An Empirical Investigation Using Micro-Data. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17(4), 687-696. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/stable/pdfplus/3325719.pdf?&acceptTC=true&jpdConfirm=true>.
- Feiock, R.C. and H.S. Jang. (2009). Nonprofits as Local Government Service Contractors. *Public Administration Review*, 69(4), 668-680. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.02016.x/pdf>
- HOME Investment Partnerships Program. Retrieved from http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/affordablehousing/programs/home
- Johnson, C.M., and Savner, S. (1999). Federal Funding Sources for Public Job Creation Initiatives. Retrieved from <http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/0055.pdf>
- Malloy, D.C., and J. Agarwal. (2008). Ethical Climate in Government and Nonprofit Sectors: Public Policy Implications for Service Delivery. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94 (1), 3-21. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/stable/pdfplus/40665196.pdf>.
- Milstein, B., Pepper, B., & Rubenstein, L. (1989). Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988: What It Means for People with Mental Disabilities. *Clearinghouse Rev.*, 23, 128.
- Mission. Retrieved from <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/about/mission>
- Newman, S.J. (2008). Does Housing Matter for Poor Families? A Critical Summary of Research and Issues Still to be Resolved. *Policy Retrospectives*, 27(4), 895-925. Retrieved from

<http://www.jstor.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/stable/pdfplus/30163567.pdf?acceptTC=true&acceptTC=true&jpdConfirm=true>.

- Ong, P. M., & Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Jobs and Economic Development in Minority Communities*. Temple University Press.
- Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000 Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data. Retrieved from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk>
- Rohe, William, Shannon Van Zandt, and George McCarthy. (2000). "The Social Benefits and Costs of Homeownership: A Critical Assessment of the Research." Working Paper No. 00-01. Washington, DC: Research Institute for Housing America.
- Ross, S. L., & Turner, M. A. (2005). Housing Discrimination in Metropolitan America: Explaining Changes Between 1989 and 2000. *Social Problems*, 52(2), 152-180.
- Sidney, M. S. (2004). The Struggle for Housing Equality: Impact of Fair Housing and Community Reinvestment Laws on Local Advocacy. *Cityscape*, 135-163.
- Sirgy, M. Joseph and Cornwell, T. (2002). How Neighborhood Features Affect Quality of Life. *Social Indicators Research*, 59(1), 79-114. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1016021108513>
- Smith, M. M., & Hevener, C. C. (2005). *The Impact of Housing Rehabilitation on Local Neighborhoods: The Case of St. Joseph's Carpenter Society* (No. 05-02). Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.
- Temkin, K., McCracken, T., & Liban, V. (2011). Study of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program. Available at SSRN 1914465.
- Walker, C., Abravanel, M.D., Boxall, P., Kormendi, R.C., Temkin, K., and Tonkovich, M. (2002). Public Sector Loans to Private Sector Businesses: An Assessment of HUD-Supported Local Economic Development Lending Activities. *The Urban Institute*.
- Williams, T. T. (1974). The role of low-income rural cooperatives in community development. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 56(5), 913-918. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/stable/pdfplus/1239019.pdf?&acceptTC=true&jpdConfirm=true>
- Weinberg, A. S. (2000). Sustainable economic development in rural America. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 570(1), 173-185. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/stable/pdfplus/10.2307/1049248.pdf>
- "Your CDBG and HOME" Flier

VIII. Appendix

1. General Needs (English)

City of Columbia – Community Development General Needs Assessment Survey

Each year the City of Columbia receives federal funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) due to its population, demographics and available funding. The City estimates it will receive approximately \$800,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and \$400,000 in HOME funds each of the next 5 years. These funds primarily benefit low to moderate income households, and can be used for economic development, fair housing, community facilities, neighborhood needs, and affordable housing.

This survey is designed to collect public opinion regarding how the City should use funding among the five different program areas. This survey is voluntary, your answers will be kept confidential and you may choose not to answer any question. *Please do not take this survey again if you have already completed it.* Thank you for providing your valuable input!

1. Please rate the following funding categories based on level of need (**1=low, 2= medium, 3=high**).

Economic Development - Creates employment opportunities for low to moderate income individuals (includes job training, commercial or industrial development, business incubation and micro lending).

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

Fair Housing - Protects individuals against unlawful discrimination in buying or renting a dwelling (includes complaint investigation, fair housing testing, counseling, education, and identifying and removing barriers to fair housing).

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

Community Facilities - Renovates, acquires, expands, and funds non-profit organizations that provide services to target populations (includes homeless facilities, youth centers, healthcare facilities, and transitional housing facilities).

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

Neighborhood Needs - Improves the accessibility, safety, security, and livability of targeted neighborhoods (includes sidewalks, sewers, storm water management, transportation improvements, parks, removal of dilapidated buildings, and neighborhood planning).

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

Affordable Housing - Ensures the availability of housing with costs, including utilities, no more than 30% of an individual's income (includes rehabilitation and minor home repair, multi-family rental new construction, rental assistance, homebuyer assistance and education, single and multi-family new construction).

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

2. Which Columbia Ward do you live in? _____
(A map of Columbia's Wards is on the last page of this survey)
- or -
_____ I am not sure which Ward I live in
_____ I do not live in Columbia
3. What is your home address? (This information will only be used for the purpose of analyzing your survey responses relative to your location of residence. **The City will not use this information to contact you or share this information with anyone else.**)
-
4. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latin origin?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
5. What is your race?
- a. White
 - b. Black/African American
 - c. Asian
 - d. American Indian/Alaskan Indian
 - e. Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
 - f. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & White
 - g. Asian & White
 - h. Black/African American & White
 - i. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & Black /African American
 - j. Other
6. Do you live in a female headed household?
- a. Yes
 - b. No (Male headed or responsibilities shared equally)
7. What is your age?

- a. Under 18 years old
- b. 18-35 years old
- c. 36-50 years old
- d. 51-65 years old
- e. Over 65 years old

8. Is English the main language you use at home?

- a. Yes
- b. No

9. How many individuals live in your household? _____

10. What is your annual household income?

- a. Under \$11,490
- b. \$11,491 - \$15,510
- c. \$15,511 - \$19,530
- d. \$19,531 - \$23,550
- e. \$23,551 - \$27,570
- f. \$27,571 - \$31,590
- g. \$31,591 - \$35,610
- h. \$35,611 - \$39,630
- i. \$39,631 - \$44,999
- j. \$45,000 - \$54,999
- k. \$55,000 - \$64,999
- l. \$65,000 and above

11. Are you or anyone in your household a person with disabilities?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!



2. Economic Development (English)

City of Columbia – Economic Development Needs Assessment Survey

Each year the City of Columbia receives federal funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) due to its population, demographics and available funding. The City estimates it will receive approximately \$800,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and \$400,000 in HOME funds each of the next 5 years. These funds primarily benefit low to moderate income households, and can be used for economic development, fair housing, community facilities, neighborhood needs, and affordable housing.

This survey is designed to collect public opinion regarding how the City should use funding in the area of Economic Development. This survey is voluntary, your answers will be kept confidential, and you may choose not to answer any question. Please do not take this survey again if you have already completed it. Thank you for providing your valuable input!

1. Which Columbia Ward do you live in? _____
(A map of Columbia's Wards is on the last page of this survey)
- or -
_____ I am not sure which Ward I live in
_____ I do not live in Columbia

2. What is your home address? (This information will only be used for the purpose of analyzing your survey responses relative to your location of residence. **The City will not use this information to contact you or share this information with anyone else.**)

3. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latin origin?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

4. What is your race?
 - a. White
 - b. Black/African American
 - c. Asian
 - d. American Indian/Alaskan Indian
 - e. Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
 - f. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & White
 - g. Asian & White
 - h. Black/African American & White
 - i. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & Black /African American
 - j. Other

5. Do you live in a female headed household?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No (Male headed or responsibilities shared equally)

6. What is your age?

- a. Under 18 years old
- b. 18-35 years old
- c. 36-50 years old
- d. 51-65 years old
- e. Over 65 years old

7. Is English the main language you use at home?

- a. Yes
- b. No

8. How many individuals live in your household? _____

9. What is your annual household income?

- a. Under \$11,490
- b. \$11,491 - \$15,510
- c. \$15,511 - \$19,530
- d. \$19,531 - \$23,550
- e. \$23,551 - \$27,570
- f. \$27,571 - \$31,590
- g. \$31,591 - \$35,610
- h. \$35,611 - \$39,630
- i. \$39,631 - \$44,999
- j. \$45,000 - \$54,999
- k. \$55,000 - \$64,999
- l. \$65,000 and above

10. Are you or anyone in your household a person with disabilities?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Please rate the following areas based on level of need in your community (**1=low, 2= medium, 3=high**) The focus of these areas is to serve low to moderate income individuals.

11. Micro-lending (providing loans to small businesses with 5 or fewer employees [to qualify businesses must be owned by low to moderate income individuals or a majority of their employees must be low to moderate income])

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

12. Vocational training (specific skill development for highly needed jobs in the community)

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

13. Commercial/industrial development or rehabilitation (a majority of the employees on these projects must be low to moderate income)

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

14. Business mentoring (assisting new businesses in planning and budgeting)

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!



3. Community Facilities (English)

City of Columbia – Community Facilities Needs Assessment Survey

Each year the City of Columbia receives federal funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) due to its population, demographics and available funding. The City estimates it will receive approximately \$800,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and \$400,000 in HOME funds each of the next 5 years. These funds primarily benefit low to moderate income households, and can be used for economic development, fair housing, community facilities, neighborhood needs, and affordable housing.

This survey is designed to collect public opinion regarding how the City should use funding in the area of Community Facilities. This survey is voluntary, your answers will be kept confidential, and you may choose not to answer any question. Please do not take this survey again if you have already completed it. Thank you for providing your valuable input!

1. Which Columbia Ward do you live in? _____

(A map of Columbia's Wards is on the last page of this survey)

- or -

_____ I am not sure which Ward I live in

_____ I do not live in Columbia

2. What is your home address? (This information will only be used for the purpose of analyzing your survey responses relative to your location of residence. **The City will not**

use this information to contact you or share this information with anyone else.)

3. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latin origin?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

4. What is your race?
 - a. White
 - b. Black/African American
 - c. Asian
 - d. American Indian/Alaskan Indian
 - e. Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
 - f. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & White
 - g. Asian & White
 - h. Black/African American & White
 - i. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & Black /African American
 - j. Other

5. Do you live in a female headed household?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No (Male headed or responsibilities shared equally)

6. What is your age?
 - a. Under 18 years old
 - b. 18-35 years old
 - c. 36-50 years old
 - d. 51-65 years old
 - e. Over 65 years old

7. Is English the main language you use at home?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

8. How many individuals live in your household? _____

9. What is your annual household income?

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| a. Under \$11,490 | g. \$31,591 - \$35,610 |
| b. \$11,491 - \$15,510 | h. \$35,611 - \$39,630 |
| c. \$15,511 - \$19,530 | i. \$39,631 - \$44,999 |
| d. \$19,531 - \$23,550 | j. \$45,000 - \$54,999 |
| e. \$23,551 - \$27,570 | k. \$55,000 - \$64,999 |
| f. \$27,571 - \$31,590 | l. \$65,000 and above |

10. Are you or anyone in your household a person with disabilities?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Please rate the following types of service providing facilities based on level of need in your community. (**1=low, 2= medium, 3=high**) The focus of these facilities is to serve low to moderate income individuals.

11. Youth services (for individuals less than 18 years old)

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

12. Homeless shelters

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

13. Transitional housing

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

14. Transitional housing for homeless youth (for individuals less than 18 years old)

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

15. Senior services

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

16. Services for persons with disabilities

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

17. Employment services

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

18. Health services

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

19. General social services (for any services not specified above)

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!



4. Neighborhood Needs (English)

City of Columbia – Neighborhood Needs Assessment Survey

Each year the City of Columbia receives federal funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) due to its population, demographics and available funding. The City estimates it will receive approximately \$800,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and \$400,000 in HOME funds each of the next 5 years. These funds primarily benefit low to moderate income households, and can be used for economic development, fair housing, community facilities, neighborhood needs, and affordable housing.

This survey is designed to collect public opinion regarding how the City should use funding in the area of Neighborhood Needs. This survey is voluntary, your answers will be kept confidential, and you may choose not to answer any question. *Please do not take this survey again if you have already completed it.* Thank you for providing your valuable input!

1. Which Columbia Ward do you live in? _____

(A map of Columbia's Wards is on the last page of this survey)

- or -

_____ I am not sure which Ward I live in

_____ I do not live in Columbia

2. What is your home address? (This information will only be used for the purpose of analyzing your survey responses relative to your location of residence. **The City will not use this information to contact you or share this information with anyone else.**)
-
-

3. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latin origin?

- a. Yes
- b. No

4. What is your race?

- a. White
- b. Black/African American
- c. Asian
- d. American Indian/Alaskan Indian
- e. Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- f. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & White
- g. Asian & White
- h. Black/African American & White
- i. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & Black /African American
- j. Other

5. Do you live in a female headed household?

- a. Yes
- b. No (Male headed or responsibilities shared equally)

6. What is your age?

- a. Under 18 years old
- b. 18-35 years old
- c. 36-50 years old
- d. 51-65 years old
- e. Over 65 years old

7. Is English the main language you use at home?

- a. Yes
- b. No

8. How many individuals live in your household? _____

9. What is your annual household income?

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| a. Under \$11,490 | g. \$31,591 - \$35,610 |
| b. \$11,491 - \$15,510 | h. \$35,611 - \$39,630 |
| c. \$15,511 - \$19,530 | i. \$39,631 - \$44,999 |
| d. \$19,531 - \$23,550 | j. \$45,000 - \$54,999 |
| e. \$23,551 - \$27,570 | k. \$55,000 - \$64,999 |
| f. \$27,571 - \$31,590 | l. \$65,000 and above |

10. Are you or anyone in your household a person with disabilities?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Please rate the following areas based on level of need in your community (**1=low, 2= medium, 3=high**).

11. Trash and debris removal

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

12. Tree planting along streets (street “scaping”)

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

13. Community gardens

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

14. Code enforcement for the exterior of buildings

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

15. Destruction of dilapidated buildings (those in a state of disrepair or ruin)

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

16. Drainage improvements (for homes built on flood planes)

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

17. Water/sewer improvements (piping for both storm water and sanitary purposes)

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

18. Street improvements

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

19. Sidewalk improvements

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

20. Railroad crossing improvements

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

21. Parks and trails improvements

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

22. Bus shelters

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!



5. Affordable Housing (English)

City of Columbia – Affordable Housing Needs Assessment Survey

Each year the City of Columbia receives federal funds from the Department of Housing and

Urban Development (HUD) due to its population, demographics and available funding. The City estimates it will receive approximately \$800,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and \$400,000 in HOME funds each of the next 5 years. These funds primarily benefit low to moderate income households, and can be used for economic development, fair housing, community facilities, neighborhood needs, and affordable housing.

This survey is designed to collect public opinion regarding how the City should use funding in the area of Affordable Housing. This survey is voluntary, your answers will be kept confidential, and you may choose not to answer any question. Please do not take this survey again if you have already completed it. Thank you for providing your valuable input!

1. Which Columbia Ward do you live in? _____
(A map of Columbia's Wards is on the last page of this survey)
- or -
_____ I am not sure which Ward I live in
_____ I do not live in Columbia

2. What is your home address? (This information will only be used for the purpose of analyzing your survey responses relative to your location of residence. **The City will not use this information to contact you or share this information with anyone else.**)

3. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latin origin?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

4. What is your race?
 - a. White
 - b. Black/African American
 - c. Asian
 - d. American Indian/Alaskan Indian
 - e. Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
 - f. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & White
 - g. Asian & White
 - h. Black/African American & White
 - i. American Indian/Alaskan Indian & Black /African American
 - j. Other

5. Do you live in a female headed household?

- a. Yes
- b. No (Male headed or responsibilities shared equally)

6. What is your age?

- a. Under 18 years old
- b. 18-35 years old
- c. 36-50 years old
- d. 51-65 years old
- e. Over 65 years old

7. Is English the main language you use at home?

- a. Yes
- b. No

8. How many individuals live in your household? _____

9. What is your annual household income?

- a. Under \$11,490
- b. \$11,491 - \$15,510
- c. \$15,511 - \$19,530
- d. \$19,531 - \$23,550
- e. \$23,551 - \$27,570
- f. \$27,571 - \$31,590
- g. \$31,591 - \$35,610
- h. \$35,611 - \$39,630
- i. \$39,631 - \$44,999
- j. \$45,000 - \$54,999
- k. \$55,000 - \$64,999
- l. \$65,000 and above

10. Are you or anyone in your household a person with disabilities?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Please rate the following areas based on level of need in your community (**1=low, 2= medium, 3=high**).

11. Rehabilitation of owner-occupied residences

1 (Low)

2 (Med)

3 (High)

12. Rehabilitation of rental residences

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

13. Homeownership assistance

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

14. Rental housing for seniors

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

15. Accessibility improvements for persons with disabilities

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

16. Single family housing development

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

17. Affordable housing

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

18. Fair housing (efforts to reduce discrimination in housing)

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

19. Lead-based paint test/abatement

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

20. Residential historic preservation

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

21. Energy efficient improvements

1 (Low) **2 (Med)** **3 (High)**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!



6. General Needs (Spanish)

Ciudad de Columbia – Encuestad de evaluación sobre las Necesidades de Desarrollo General para la Comunidad

Cada año la Ciudad de Columbia recibe fondos federales del Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano, dependiendo de la población, demografía y la financiación disponible. La Ciudad estima que recibirá aproximadamente \$ 800.000 dólares para el Desarrollo Comunitario y \$ 400.000 dólares en fondos para programa HOME en cada uno de los próximos 5 años. Estos fondos beneficiarían principalmente a los hogares de bajos y medios ingresos, y se pueden utilizar para el desarrollo económico, igualdad de vivienda, instalaciones para la comunidad, las necesidades del barrio y vivienda asequible.

Esta encuesta está diseñada para recolectar la opinión pública con respecto a cómo la ciudad debería usar los fondos en cinco áreas del programa diferentes. Esta encuesta es voluntaria, sus respuestas serán confidenciales, y usted puede optar por no responder a cualquier pregunta. Por favor, no tome esta encuesta nuevamente si ya se ha completado. Gracias por su valiosa ayuda!

1. Por favor califique las siguientes categorías de financiación basados en el nivel de necesidad (**1 = bajo, 2 = medio, 3 = alto**).

Desarrollo Económico - Crea oportunidades de empleo para las personas de ingresos bajos a medios (incluye capacitación para el trabajo, el desarrollo comercial o industrial, la creación de empresas y microcréditos).

1 (Baja)

2 (Med)

3 (Alta)

Equidad de Vivienda - Protege a las personas contra la discriminación ilegal en la compra o alquiler de una vivienda (incluye investigación de la queja, las pruebas de vivienda justa, el asesoramiento, la educación, y la identificación y eliminación de barreras a la equidad de vivienda).

1 (Baja)

2 (Med)

3 (Alta)

Instalaciones Comunitarias - Renueva, adquiere, expande, y da fondos de las Organizaciones sin ánimo de lucro que prestan servicios a las poblaciones específicas (incluye instalaciones para personas sin hogar, centros juveniles, centros de salud, y las viviendas de transición).

1 (Baja)

2 (Med)

3 (Alta)

Necesidades Barrio - Mejora de la accesibilidad, la seguridad, y la habitabilidad de los barrios objetivos (incluye aceras, alcantarillas, manejo de aguas pluviales, mejoras de transporte, parques, remoción de edificios en ruinas, y la planificación del barrio).

1 (Baja)

2 (Med)

3 (Alta)

Vivienda asequible - Asegura la disponibilidad de viviendas con costos, incluidos los servicios públicos, no más del 30 % de los ingresos de una persona (incluye la rehabilitación y reparaciones de la vivienda, alquiler multifamiliar de nueva construcción, ayuda para el alquiler, la ayuda para compradores de vivienda y educación, independiente y multi-familiar de una nueva construcción).

1 (Baja)

2 (Med)

3 (Alta)

2. ¿En qué Distrito de Columbia vives? _____
(El mapa de Distritos de Columbia se encuentra en la última página de esta encuesta)

- O -

_____ No estoy seguro en que distrito vivo

_____ Yo no vivo en Columbia

3. ¿Cuál es su dirección? (Esta información sólo será utilizada con el propósito de analizar la información obtenida con respecto a su lugar de residencia. La ciudad no utilizará esta información para comunicarse con usted o compartir esta información con nadie más.)

4. ¿Es usted de origen español, hispano o latino?

a. Sí

b. No

5. Usted se identifica como:

a. Blanco

b. Negro / Afroamericano

c. Asiático

d. Nativo Americano / Nativo
de Alaska

e. Nativo de Hawaii / Otras
Islas del Pacífico

f. Nativo Americano / Nativo
de Alaska & Blanco

g. Asiático y Blanco

h. Negro / Afro Americano y
Blanco

i. Nativo Americano / Nativo
de Alaska & Negro /
Afroamericano

j. Otro

6. ¿Usted vive en un hogar donde la mujer es cabeza de hogar?

a. Sí

b. No (Dirigido un por hombre ó responsabilidades por partes iguales)

7. ¿Cuál es su edad?

a. Menores de 18 años

b. 18-35 años

c. 36-50 años

d. 51-65 años

- e. Más de 65 años
8. ¿Es Inglés el idioma principal que usa en su hogar?
- a. Sí
 - b. No
9. ¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar? _____
10. ¿Cuál es su ingreso familiar anual?
- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| a. Menos - \$ 11,490 | g. \$ 31,591 - \$ 35,610 |
| b. \$ 11,491 - \$ 15,510 | h. \$ 35,611 - \$ 39,630 |
| c. \$ 15,511 - \$ 19,530 | i. \$ 39,631 - \$ 44,999 |
| d. \$ 19,531 - \$ 23,550 | j. \$ 45,000 - \$ 54,999 |
| e. \$ 23,551 - \$ 27,570 | k. \$ 55,000 - \$ 64,999 |
| f. \$ 27,571 - \$ 31,590 | l. \$ 65,000 y por encima |
11. ¿Es usted o alguien en su hogar una persona con discapacidades?
- a. Sí
 - b. No

Gracias por tomarse el tiempo para completar esta encuesta!



7. Economic Development (Spanish)

Ciudad de Columbia - Encuesta de Evaluación de las Necesidades para el Desarrollo Económico

Cada año la Ciudad de Columbia recibe fondos federales del Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano, dependiendo de la población, demografía y la financiación disponible. La Ciudad estima que recibirá aproximadamente \$ 800.000 dólares para el Desarrollo Comunitario y \$ 400.000 dólares en fondos para programa HOME en cada uno de los próximos 5 años. Estos fondos beneficiarían principalmente a los hogares de bajos y medio ingresos, y se pueden utilizar para el desarrollo económico, igualdad de vivienda, instalaciones para la comunidad, las necesidades del barrio y vivienda asequible.

Esta encuesta está diseñada para recolectar la opinión pública con respecto a cómo la ciudad

debería usar los fondos en el área del desarrollo económico. Esta encuesta es voluntaria, sus respuestas serán confidenciales, y usted puede optar por no responder a cualquier pregunta. *Por favor, no tome esta encuesta nuevamente si ya se ha completado.* Gracias por su valiosa ayuda!

1. ¿En qué Distrito de Columbia vives? _____

(El mapa de Distritos de Columbia se encuentra en la última página de esta encuesta.)

- O -

_____ No estoy seguro en que distrito vivo

_____ Yo no vivo en Columbia

2. ¿Cuál es su dirección? (Esta información sólo será utilizada con el propósito de analizar la información obtenida con respecto a su lugar de residencia. **La ciudad no utilizará esta información para comunicarse con usted o compartir esta información con nadie más.**)

3. ¿Es usted de origen español, hispano o latino?

a. Sí

b. No

4. Usted se identifica como:

a. Blanco

b. Negro / Afroamericano

c. Asiático

d. Nativo Americano/ Nativo de Alaska

e. Nativo de Hawaii / Otras Islas del Pacífico

f. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska & Blanco

g. Asiático y Blanco

h. Negro / Afro Americano y Blanco

i. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska & Negro / Afroamericano

j. Otro

5. ¿Usted vive en un hogar donde la mujer es cabeza de hogar?

a . Sí

b . No (Dirigido por un hombre ó responsabilidades por partes iguales.)

6. ¿Cuál es su edad?

a. Menores de 18 años

b. 18-35 años

c. 36-50 años

d. 51-65 años

e. Más de 65 años

7. ¿Es Inglés el idioma principal que usa en su hogar?

- a . Sí
- b . No

8. ¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar? _____

9. ¿Cuál es su ingreso familiar anual?

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| a. Menos - \$ 11,490 | g. \$ 31,591 - \$ 35,610 |
| b. \$ 11,491 - \$ 15,510 | h. \$ 35,611 - \$ 39,630 |
| c. \$ 15,511 - \$ 19,530 | i. \$ 39,631 - \$ 44,999 |
| d. \$ 19,531 - \$ 23,550 | j. \$ 45,000 - \$ 54,999 |
| e. \$ 23,551 - \$ 27,570 | k. \$ 55,000 - \$ 64,999 |
| f. \$ 27,571 - \$ 31,590 | l. \$ 65,000 y por encima |

10. ¿Es usted o alguien en su hogar una persona con discapacidades?

- a. Sí
- b. No

Por favor califique las siguientes áreas según el nivel de necesidad en su comunidad (**1 = bajo, 2 = medio, 3 = alto**). El enfoque de estas instalaciones es el de servir a las personas de bajos y medios ingresos.

11. Micro-crédito (concesión de préstamos a las pequeñas empresas con 5 o menos empleados [para calificar las empresas deben ser de propiedad de individuos de bajos a medianos ingresos o la mayoría de sus empleados debe ser de bajo o medianos ingresos])

- | | | |
|----------|---------|----------|
| 1 (Baja) | 2 (Med) | 3 (Alta) |
|----------|---------|----------|

12. La formación profesional (desarrollo de habilidades específicas para trabajos altamente necesarios en la comunidad)

- | | | |
|----------|---------|----------|
| 1 (Baja) | 2 (Med) | 3 (Alta) |
|----------|---------|----------|

13. Desarrollo industrial / comercial o la rehabilitación (la mayoría de los empleados en estos proyectos debe ser de bajos o medianos ingresos)

- | | | |
|----------|---------|----------|
| 1 (Baja) | 2 (Med) | 3 (Alta) |
|----------|---------|----------|

14. Tutoría de negocios (asistencia a nuevas empresas en la planificación y elaboración de presupuestos)

1 (Baja)

2 (Med)

3 (Alta)

Gracias por tomarse el tiempo para completar esta encuesta!



8. Community Facilities (Spanish)

Ciudad de Columbia - Encuesta de Evaluación para las Necesidades de Instalaciones en la Comunidad

Cada año la Ciudad de Columbia recibe fondos federales del Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano, dependiendo de la población, demografía y la financiación disponible. La Ciudad estima que recibirá aproximadamente \$ 800.000 dólares para el Desarrollo Comunitario y \$ 400.000 dólares en fondos para programa HOME en cada uno de los próximos 5 años. Estos fondos beneficiarían principalmente a los hogares de bajos y medio ingresos, y se pueden utilizar para el desarrollo económico, igualdad de vivienda, instalaciones para la comunidad, las necesidades del barrio y vivienda asequible.

Esta encuesta está diseñada para recolectar la opinión pública con respecto a cómo la ciudad debería usar los fondos en el área de los instalaciones en la comunidad. Esta encuesta es voluntaria, sus respuestas serán confidenciales, y usted puede optar por no responder a cualquier pregunta. *Por favor, no tome esta encuesta nuevamente si ya se ha completado.* Gracias por su valiosa ayuda!

1. ¿En qué Distrito de Columbia vives? _____

(El mapa de Distritos de Columbia se encuentra en la última página de esta encuesta.)

- O -

_____ No estoy seguro en que distrito vivo

_____ Yo no vivo en Columbia

2. ¿Cuál es su dirección? (Esta información sólo será utilizada con el propósito de analizar la información obtenida con respecto a su lugar de residencia. **La ciudad no utilizará esta información para comunicarse con usted o compartir esta información con nadie más.**)

3. ¿Es usted de origen español, hispano o latino?

- a . Sí
- b . No

4. Usted se identifica como:

- a. Blanco
- b. Negro / Afroamericano
- c. Asiático
- d. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska
- e. Nativo de Hawaii / Otras Islas del Pacífico
- f. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska & Blanco
- g. Asiático y Blanco
- h. Negro / Afro Americano y Blanco
- i. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska & Negro / Afroamericano
- j. Otro

5. ¿Usted vive en un hogar donde la mujer es cabeza de hogar?

- a . Sí
- b . No (Dirigido por un hombre ó responsabilidades por partes iguales)

6. ¿Cuál es su edad?

- a. Menores de 18 años
- b. 18-35 años
- c. 36-50 años
- d. 51-65 años
- e. Más de 65 años

7. ¿Es Inglés el idioma principal que usa en su hogar?

- a . Sí
- b . No

8. ¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar? _____

9. ¿Cuál es su ingreso familiar anual?

- a. Menos - \$ 11,490
- b. \$ 11,491 - \$ 15,510
- c. \$ 15,511 - \$ 19,530
- d. \$ 19,531 - \$ 23,550
- e. \$ 23,551 - \$ 27,570
- f. \$ 27,571 - \$ 31,590
- g. \$ 31,591 - \$ 35,610
- h. \$ 35,611 - \$ 39,630
- i. \$ 39,631 - \$ 44,999
- j. \$ 45,000 - \$ 54,999
- k. \$ 55,000 - \$ 64,999
- l. \$ 65,000 y por encima

10. ¿Es usted o alguien en su hogar una persona con discapacidades?

- a. Sí
- b. No

Por favor califique las siguientes áreas según el nivel de necesidad en su comunidad (**1 = bajo, 2 = medio, 3 = alto**). El enfoque de estas instalaciones es el de servir a las personas de bajos y medios ingresos.

11. Los servicios para jóvenes (para personas menores de 18 años)

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

12. Refugios para personas sin hogar

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

13. Vivienda provisional

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

14. Vivienda de provisional para jóvenes sin hogar (para personas menores de 18 años)

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

15. Servicios para personas mayores

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

16. Servicios para personas con discapacidades

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

17. Los servicios de empleo

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

18. Servicios de salud

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

19. Servicios sociales generales (por cualquier servicio no especificado anteriormente)

1 (Baja)

2 (Med)

3 (Alta)

Gracias por tomarse el tiempo para completar esta encuesta!



9. Neighborhood Needs (Spanish)

Ciudad de Columbia –Encuesta de Evaluación sobre las Necesidades en el Barrio en el que Habita

Cada año la Ciudad de Columbia recibe fondos federales del Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano, dependiendo de la población, demografía y financiación disponible. La Ciudad estima que recibirá aproximadamente \$ 800.000 dólares para financiar Desarrollo Comunitario y \$ 400.000 dólares en fondos para programa HOME en cada uno de los próximos 5 años. Estos fondos beneficiarían principalmente a los hogares de bajos y medios ingresos, y se pueden utilizar para el desarrollo económico, igualdad de vivienda, instalaciones para la comunidad, las necesidades del barrio y vivienda asequible.

Esta encuesta está diseñada para recolectar la opinión pública con respecto a cómo la ciudad debería usar los fondos en el área de las necesidades en el barrio en el que habita. Esta encuesta es voluntaria, sus respuestas serán confidenciales, y usted puede optar por no responder a cualquier pregunta. Por favor, no tome esta encuesta nuevamente si ya se ha completado. Gracias por su valiosa ayuda!

1. ¿En qué Distrito de Columbia vives? _____

(El mapa de Distritos de Columbia se encuentra en la última página de esta encuesta)

- O -

_____ No estoy seguro en qué distrito vivo

_____ Yo no vivo en Columbia

2. ¿Cuál es su dirección? (Esta información sólo será utilizada con el propósito de analizar la información obtenida con respecto a su lugar de residencia. **La ciudad no utilizará esta información para comunicarse con usted o compartir esta información con nadie más.**)

3. ¿Es usted de origen español, hispano o latino?

- a . Sí
- b . No

4. Usted se identifica como:

- a. Blanco
- b. Negro / Afroamericano
- c. Asiático
- d. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska
- e. Nativo de Hawaii / Otras Islas del Pacífico
- f. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska & Blanco
- g. Asiático y Blanco
- h. Negro / Afro Americano y Blanco
- i. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska & Negro / Afroamericano
- j. Otro

5. ¿Usted vive en un hogar donde la mujer es cabeza de hogar?

- a . Sí
- b . No (Dirigido por un hombre ó responsabilidades por partes iguales)

6. ¿Cuál es su edad?

- a. Menores de 18 años
- b. 18-35 años
- c. 36-50 años
- d. 51-65 años
- e. Más de 65 años

7. ¿Es Inglés el idioma principal que usa en su hogar?

- a . Sí
- b . No

8. ¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar? _____

9. ¿Cuál es su ingreso familiar anual?

- a. Menos - \$ 11,490
- b. \$ 11,491 - \$ 15,510
- c. \$ 15,511 - \$ 19,530
- d. \$ 19,531 - \$ 23,550
- e. \$ 23,551 - \$ 27,570
- f. \$ 27,571 - \$ 31,590
- g. \$ 31,591 - \$ 35,610
- h. \$ 35,611 - \$ 39,630
- i. \$ 39,631 - \$ 44,999
- j. \$ 45,000 - \$ 54,999
- k. \$ 55,000 - \$ 64,999
- l. \$ 65,000 y por encima

10. ¿Es usted o alguien en su hogar una persona con discapacidades?

- a. Sí
- b. No

Por favor califique las siguientes áreas según el nivel de necesidad en su comunidad (**1 = bajo, 2 = medio, 3 = alto**).

11. La recolección de basura y escombros

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

12. La plantación de árboles a lo largo de las calles

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

13. Los jardines comunitarios

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

14. La aplicación del código para el exterior de los edificios

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

15. La destrucción de edificios en ruinas (aquellos en un estado de deterioro o ruina)

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

16. Mejoras del drenaje (para aquellos hogares construidos en áreas de inundación)

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

17. Mejoras de agua / alcantarillado (tuberías tanto de aguas pluviales e instalaciones sanitarias)

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

18. Mejoras en las calles

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

19. Mejoras en las aceras

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

20. Mejoras de cruce de ferrocarril

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

21. Mejoras en parques y senderos

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

22. Mejoras en las paradas de autobús

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

Gracias por tomarse el tiempo para completar esta encuesta!



10. Affordable Housing (Spanish)

Ciudad de Columbia – Encuesta de Evaluación sobre las Necesidades de Vivienda Asequible

Cada año la Ciudad de Columbia recibe fondos federales del Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano, dependiendo de la población, demografía y la financiación disponible. La Ciudad estima que recibirá aproximadamente \$ 800.000 dólares para el Desarrollo Comunitario y \$ 400.000 dólares en fondos para programa HOME en cada uno de los próximos 5 años. Estos fondos beneficiarían principalmente a los hogares de bajos y medio ingresos, y se pueden utilizar para el desarrollo económico, igualdad de vivienda, instalaciones para la comunidad, las necesidades del barrio y vivienda asequible.

Esta encuesta está diseñada para recolectar la opinión pública con respecto a cómo la ciudad debería usar los fondos en el área de vivienda asequible. Esta encuesta es voluntaria, sus respuestas serán confidenciales, y usted puede optar por no responder a cualquier pregunta. Por favor, no tome esta encuesta nuevamente si ya se ha completado. Gracias por su valiosa ayuda!

1. ¿En qué Distrito de Columbia vives? _____

(El mapa de Distritos de Columbia se encuentra en la última página de esta encuesta)

- O -

_____ No estoy seguro en que distrito vivo

_____ Yo no vivo en Columbia

2. ¿Cuál es su dirección? (Esta información sólo será utilizada con el propósito de analizar la información obtenida con respecto a su lugar de residencia. La ciudad no utilizará esta información para comunicarse con usted o compartir esta información con nadie más.)
-
-

3. ¿Es usted de origen español, hispano o latino?

- a. Sí
- b. No

4. Usted se identifica como:

- a. Blanco
- b. Negro / Afroamericano
- c. Asiático
- d. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska
- e. Nativo de Hawaii / Otras Islas del Pacífico
- f. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska & Blanco
- g. Asiático y Blanco
- h. Negro / Afro Americano y Blanco
- i. Nativo Americano / Nativo de Alaska & Negro / Afroamericano
- j. Otro

5. ¿Usted vive en un hogar donde la mujer es cabeza de hogar?

- a. Sí
- b. No (Dirigido un por hombre ó responsabilidades por partes iguales)

6. ¿Cuál es su edad?

- a. Menores de 18 años
- b. 18-35 años
- c. 36-50 años
- d. 51-65 años
- e. Más de 65 años

7. Es Inglés el idioma principal que usa en su hogar?

- a. Sí
- b. No

8. ¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar? _____

9. ¿Cuál es su ingreso familiar anual?

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| a. Menos - \$ 11.490 | g. \$ 31.591 - \$ 35.610 |
| b. \$ 11.491 - \$ 15.510 | h. \$ 35.611 - \$ 39.630 |
| c. \$ 15.511 - \$ 19.530 | i. \$ 39.631 - \$ 44.999 |
| d. \$ 19.531 - \$ 23.550 | j. \$ 45.000 - \$ 54.999 |
| e. \$ 23.551 - \$ 27.570 | k. \$ 55.000 - \$ 64.999 |
| f. \$ 27.571 - \$ 31.590 | l. \$ 65.000 y por encima |

10. ¿Es usted o alguien en su hogar una persona con discapacidades?

- Sí
- No

Por favor califique las siguientes áreas según el nivel de necesidad en su comunidad (**1 = bajo, 2 = medio, 3 = alto**).

11. Rehabilitación de viviendas ocupadas por sus propietarios

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

12. Rehabilitación de viviendas de alquiler

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

13. Asistencia para la adquisición de vivienda

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

14. Alquiler de vivienda para las personas mayores

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

15. Mejoras para accesibilidad de personas con discapacidad

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

16. Desarrollo de la vivienda para una sola familia

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

17. Vivienda asequible

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

18. Equidad de vivienda (los esfuerzos por reducir la discriminación en la vivienda)

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

19. Prueba de pintura a base de plomo / reducción

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

20. Preservación histórica residencial

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

21. Mejoras para crear viviendas energéticamente eficientes

1 (Baja) 2 (Med) 3 (Alta)

Gracias por tomarse el tiempo para completar esta encuesta!



11. General Needs (Chinese)

密苏里州哥伦比亚市——社区发展综合需求调查问卷

每年，哥伦比亚市根据其人口数量，人口特征和可用资金会从联邦住房和城市发展部（HUD）接受资金补助。城市预估在今后五年会从社区发展补助金中获得大约 80 万美元以及从房屋补助金中获得 40 万美元的补助。这些补助金会首先使用于中低收入人群，并将用于经济发展，公平住房，社区设施建设，社区需求和保障性住房的建设。

这项调查的目的在于收集民众对哥伦比亚市政府该如何将资金分配到这五个不同领域的意见。这项调查完全是出于自愿的前提，您的回答将被严格保密，您也可以选择不回答任何问题。如果您已经完成过这份问卷请不要再次作答。非常感谢您提供的宝贵意见！

请在每项内容中圈出您认为的重要等级（1=不重要，2=一般重要，3=很重要）。

1.经济发展：为中低收入家庭创造更多就业机会（包括提供职业培训，商业工业发展，企业孵化以及卫星贷款）。

1 (不重要) 2 (一般重要) 3 (很重要)

2. 公平住房：保护个人在买房或租房时不受到非法歧视（包括，投诉调查，公平住房测试，咨询，教育和识别并消除获得公平住房的障碍。）

1 (不重要) 2 (一般重要) 3 (很重要)

3. 社区设施建设：翻新，收购，扩张，为服务目标人群的非营利组织提供资金（这些设施包括救助无家可归者的设施，青少年中心，医疗设施和过渡性住房）。

1 (不重要) 2 (一般重要) 3 (很重要)

4. 社区需求：提高可使用率，安全性和社区的宜居性（包括人行道，下水道，雨水管理，改善交通，公园，拆除危房和社区规划）。

1 (不重要) 2 (一般重要) 3 (很重要)

5.经济适用房：确保住房成本的有效性，包括水电费，不超过个人收入的 30%（包括复原和小型房屋的维修，新建集合式住宅，租金补助，对购房者的帮助和教育，单一和复合式住宅的修建。）

1 (不重要) 2 (一般重要) 3 (很重要)

6. 您住在哥伦比亚市哪一个区域？您可以在哥伦比亚市地图上找到你居住的对应区域。 https://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Maps/documents/Council_Wards.pdf

1 2 3 4 5 6

我不确定住在哪个区域

我不住在哥伦比亚市

7. 您的家庭住址是什么？（这个信息将仅用于分析问卷中有关地理位置的问题。**市政府不会用这个信息来联系您并且和他人共享您的信息**）。

8.您有西班牙，西班牙裔或是拉丁裔的血统吗？

a) 是

b) 否

9.您属于哪个人种？

a) 白人

b) 黑人/非洲裔美国人

c) 亚洲人

- d) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人
- e) 夏威夷原住民/ 其他太平洋岛民
- f) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人与白人的混血
- g) 亚洲和白人的混血
- h) 黑人/非洲裔美国人和白人的混血
- i) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人和美国黑人
- j) 其他混合人种

10. 您住在户主为女性的家庭里吗？

- a) 是
- b) 否

11. 您的年纪是多少？

- a) 18岁以下
- b) 18-35岁
- c) 36-50岁
- d) 51-65岁
- e) 65岁以上

12. 英语是在家里主要使用的沟通语言吗？

- a) 是
- b) 否

13. 家中有几口人？_____

14. 您家的家庭年收入是多少??

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| a) 低于 \$11,490 | g) \$31,591 - \$35,610 |
| b) \$11,491 - \$15,510 | h) \$35,611 - \$39,630 |
| c) \$15,511 - \$19,530 | i) \$39,631 - \$44,999 |
| d) \$19,531 - \$23,550 | j) \$45,000 - \$54,999 |
| e) \$23,551 - \$27,570 | k) \$55,000 - \$64,999 |
| f) \$27,571 - \$31,590 | l) 高于\$65,000 |

15. 您家中有残疾人吗？

- a) 是
- b) 否

感谢您的参与！



12. Economic Development (Chinese)

哥伦比亚市——经济发展需求评估调查

每年，哥伦比亚市根据其人口数量，人口特征和可用资金从联邦住房和城市发展部（HUD）接受资金补助。城市预估在今后五年会从社区发展补助金中获得大约 80 万美元以及从房屋补助金中获得 40 万美元的补助。这些补助金会首先使用于中低收入人群，并将用于经济发展，公平住房，社区设施建设，社区需求和保障性住房的建设。

这项调查的目的在于收集民众对哥伦比亚市政府该如何将资金分配到这五个不同领域的意见。这项调查完全是出于自愿的前提，您的回答将被严格保密，您也可以选择不回答任何问题。如果您已经完成过这份问卷请不要再次作答。非常感谢您提供的宝贵意见！

1. 您住在哥伦比亚哪个区域？ ____

(哥伦比亚市的区域分布图在问卷最后)

-或者-

____ 我不清楚我住在哪个区域

____ 我不住在哥伦比亚

2. 您的家庭住址是什么？（这个信息将仅用于分析问卷中有关地理位置的问题。市政府不会用这个信息来联系您并且和他人共享您的信息）。

3. 您有西班牙，西班牙裔或是拉丁裔的血统吗？

a. 是

b. 否

4. 您属于哪个人种？

k) 白人

- l) 黑人/非洲裔美国人
- m) 亚洲人
- n) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人
- o) 夏威夷原住民/ 其他太平洋岛民
- p) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人与白人的混血
- q) 亚洲和白人的混血
- r) 黑人/非洲裔美国人和白人的混血
- s) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人和美国黑人
- t) 其他混合人种

5. 您住在户主为女性的家庭里吗?

- a. 是
- b. 否 (男性主导或男女责任均分)

6. 您的年纪是多少?

- c) 18 岁以下
- d) 18-35 岁
- e) 36-50 岁
- f) 51-65 岁
- g) 65 岁以上

7. 英语是在家里主要使用的沟通语言吗?

- a. 是
- b. 否

8. 家中有几口人? _____

9. 您家的家庭年收入是多少?

- a. 低于 \$11,490
- b. \$11,491 - \$15,510
- c. \$15,511 - \$19,530
- d. \$19,531 - \$23,550
- e. \$23,551 - \$27,570

- f. \$27,571 - \$31,590
- g. \$31,591 - \$35,610
- h. \$35,611 - \$39,630
- i. \$39,631 - \$44,999
- j. \$45,000 - \$54,999
- k. \$55,000 - \$64,999
- l. 高于\$65,000

10. 您家中有残疾人吗？

- a. 是
- b. 否

请根据您社区的需求对以下方面评估 (1=不重要, 2=一般, 3=很重要) 这些方面主要用于服务中低收入人群

11. 小额贷款 (为只有五名或更少员工的小企业贷款【符合要求的企业必须是由中低收入人群运营或大部分员工是中低收入人群】)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

12. 职业培训 (对社区中高度需要的工作的相关技能的培训)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

13. 商业/工业的发展和恢复 (这些领域的员工大多数需为中低收入人群)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

14. 业务指导 (协助新业务的开发和制定预算)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

谢谢您的参与!

13. Community Facilities (Chinese)

哥伦比亚市——社区设施需求评估调查

每年，哥伦比亚市根据其人口数量，人口特征和可用资金从联邦住房和城市发展部（HUD）接受资金补助。城市预估在今后五年会从社区发展补助金中获得大约 80 万美元以及从房屋补助金中获得 40 万美元的补助。这些补助金会首先使用于中低收入人群，并将用于经济发展，公平住房，社区设施建设，社区需求和保障性住房的建设。

这项调查的目的在于收集民众对哥伦比亚市政府该如何将资金分配到这五个不同领域的意见。这项调查完全是出于自愿的前提，您的回答将被严格保密，您也可以选择不回答任何问题。**如果您已经完成过这份问卷请不要再次作答**。非常感谢您提供的宝贵意见！

1. 您住在哥伦比亚哪个区域？ ____

(哥伦比亚市的区域分布图在问卷最后)

-或者-

____我不清楚我住在哪个区域

____我不住在哥伦比亚

2. 您的家庭住址是什么？（这个信息将仅用于分析问卷中有关地理位置的问题。市政府不会用这个信息来联系您并且和他人共享您的信息）。

3. 您有西班牙，西班牙裔或是拉丁裔的血统吗？

a. 是

b. 否

4. 您属于哪个人种？

u) 白人

v) 黑人/非洲裔美国人

w) 亚洲人

x) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人

y) 夏威夷原住民/其他太平洋岛民

z) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人与白人的混血

aa) 亚洲和白人的混血

bb) 黑人/非洲裔美国人和白人的混血

cc) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人和美国黑人

dd) 其他混合人种

5. 您住在户主为女性的家庭里吗?
- a. 是
 - b. 否 (男性主导或男女责任均分)
6. 您的年纪是多少?
- h) 18 岁以下
 - i) 18-35 岁
 - j) 36-50 岁
 - k) 51-65 岁
 - l) 65 岁以上
7. 英语是在家里主要使用的沟通语言吗?
- a. 是
 - b. 否
8. 家中有几口人? _____
9. 您家的家庭年收入是多少?
- a. 低于 \$11,490
 - b. \$11,491 - \$15,510
 - c. \$15,511 - \$19,530
 - d. \$19,531 - \$23,550
 - e. \$23,551 - \$27,570
 - f. \$27,571 - \$31,590
 - g. \$31,591 - \$35,610
 - h. \$35,611 - \$39,630
 - i. \$39,631 - \$44,999
 - j. \$45,000 - \$54,999
 - k. \$55,000 - \$64,999
 - l. 高于\$65,000
10. 您家中有残疾人吗?

- a. 是
- b. 否

请根据您的社区的需求对以下方面评估 (1=不重要, 2=一般, 3=很重要) 这些方面主要用于服务中低收入人群

11. 青年服务

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

12. 无家可归收容所

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

13. 临时住所

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

14. 为无家可归的年轻人建过渡性住房

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

15. 老年人服务

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

16. 残疾人服务

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

17. 就业服务

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

18. 健康服务

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

19. 综合社区服务 (上述未提到的)

1 (不重要)

2 (一般)

3 (很重要)

感谢您的参与!

14. Neighborhood Needs (Chinese)

哥伦比亚市——社区需求评估调查

每年，哥伦比亚市根据其人口数量，人口特征和可用资金从联邦住房和城市发展部（HUD）接受资金补助。城市预估在今后五年会从社区发展补助金中获得大约 80 万美元以及从房屋补助金中获得 40 万美元的补助。这些补助金会首先使用于中低收入人群，并将用于经济发展，公平住房，社区设施建设，社区需求和保障性住房的建设。

这项调查的目的在于收集民众对哥伦比亚市政府该如何将资金分配到这五个不同领域的意见。这项调查完全是出于自愿的前提，您的回答将被严格保密，您也可以选择不回答任何问题。**如果您已经完成过这份问卷请不要再次作答。**非常感谢您提供的宝贵意见！

1. 您住在哥伦比亚哪个区域？ ____

(哥伦比亚市的区域分布图在问卷最后)

-或者-

____ 我不清楚我住在哪个区域

____ 我不住在哥伦比亚

2. 您的家庭住址是什么？（这个信息将仅用于分析问卷中有关地理位置的问题。市政府不会用这个信息来联系您并且和他人共享您的信息）。

3. 您有西班牙，西班牙裔或是拉丁裔的血统吗？

a. 是

b. 否

4. 您属于哪个人种？

ee) 白人

- ff) 黑人/非洲裔美国人
- gg) 亚洲人
- hh) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人
- ii) 夏威夷原住民/ 其他太平洋岛民
- jj) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人与白人的混血
- kk) 亚洲和白人的混血
- ll) 黑人/非洲裔美国人和白人的混血
- mm) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人和美国黑人
- nn) 其他混合人种

5. 您住在户主为女性的家庭里吗?

- a. 是
- b. 否 (男性主导或男女责任均分)

6. 您的年纪是多少?

- m) 18 岁以下
- n) 18-35 岁
- o) 36-50 岁
- p) 51-65 岁
- q) 65 岁以上

7. 英语是在家里主要使用的沟通语言吗?

- a. 是
- b. 否

8. 家中有几口人? _____

9. 您家的家庭年收入是多少?

- a. 低于 \$11,490
- b. \$11,491 - \$15,510
- c. \$15,511 - \$19,530
- d. \$19,531 - \$23,550
- e. \$23,551 - \$27,570
- f. \$27,571 - \$31,590

- g. \$31,591 - \$35,610
- h. \$35,611 - \$39,630
- i. \$39,631 - \$44,999
- j. \$45,000 - \$54,999
- k. \$55,000 - \$64,999
- l. 高于\$65,000

10. 您家中有残疾人吗？

- a. 是
- b. 否

请根据您社区的需求对以下方面评估 (1=不重要, 2=一般, 3=很重要) 这些方面主要用于服务中低收入人群

11. 垃圾碎片清理

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

12. 沿街绿化 (街道人造景观)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

13. 小区公园修建

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

14. 强制修复房屋外观

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

15. 修建荒废的房屋 (哪些失修或损坏的房屋)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

16. 改建排水系统 (指建在洪水常发区域的房屋)

1 (不重要)

2 (一般)

3 (很重要)

17. 改建下水道 (改建排放污水和雨水的管道)

1 (不重要)

2 (一般)

3 (很重要)

18. 路面修复

1 (不重要)

2 (一般)

3 (很重要)

19. 人行道改建

1 (不重要)

2 (一般)

3 (很重要)

20. 铁路公路交叉道口修复

1 (不重要)

2 (一般)

3 (很重要)

21. 公园和小径的改建

1 (不重要)

2 (一般)

3 (很重要)

22. 公车候车亭改建

1 (不重要)

2 (一般)

3 (很重要)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!



15. Affordable Housing (Chinese)

哥伦比亚市——保障性住房需求评估调查

每年，哥伦比亚市根据其人口数量，人口特征和可用资金从联邦住房和城市发展部（HUD）接受资金补助。城市预估在今后五年会从社区发展补助金中获得大约 80 万美元以及从房屋补助金中获得 40 万美元的补助。这些补助金会首先使用于中低收入人群，并将用于经济发展，公平住房，社区设施建设，社区需求和保障性住房的建设。

这项调查的目的在于收集民众对哥伦比亚市政府该如何将资金分配到这五个不同领域的意见。这项调查完全是出于自愿的前提，您的回答将被严格保密，您也可以选择不回答任何问题。**如果您已经完成过这份问卷请不要再次作答。**非常感谢您提供的宝贵意见！

1. 您住在哥伦比亚哪个区域？ ____

(哥伦比亚市的区域分布图在问卷最后)

-或者-

____我不清楚我住在哪个区域

____我不住在哥伦比亚

2. 您的家庭住址是什么？（这个信息将仅用于分析问卷中有关地理位置的问题。市政府不会用这个信息来联系您并且和他人共享您的信息）。

3. 您有西班牙，西班牙裔或是拉丁裔的血统吗？

a. 是

b. 否

4. 您属于哪个人种？

- oo) 白人
- pp) 黑人/非洲裔美国人
- qq) 亚洲人
- rr) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人
- ss) 夏威夷原住民/其他太平洋岛民
- tt) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人与白人的混血
- uu) 亚洲和白人的混血
- vv) 黑人/非洲裔美国人和白人的混血
- ww) 美洲印第安人/阿拉斯加印第安人和美国黑人
- xx) 其他混合人种

5. 您住在户主为女性的家庭里吗?

- a. 是
- b. 否 (男性主导或男女责任均分)

6. 您的年纪是多少?

- r) 18岁以下
- s) 18-35岁
- t) 36-50岁
- u) 51-65岁
- v) 65岁以上

7. 英语是在家里主要使用的沟通语言吗?

- a. 是
- b. 否

8. 家中有几口人? _____

9. 您家的家庭年收入是多少?

- a. 低于 \$11,490
- b. \$11,491 - \$15,510
- c. \$15,511 - \$19,530
- d. \$19,531 - \$23,550

- e. \$23,551 - \$27,570
- f. \$27,571 - \$31,590
- g. \$31,591 - \$35,610
- h. \$35,611 - \$39,630
- i. \$39,631 - \$44,999
- j. \$45,000 - \$54,999
- k. \$55,000 - \$64,999
- l. 高于\$65,000

10. 您家中有残疾人吗？

- a. 是
- b. 否

请根据您社区的需求对以下方面评估 (1=不重要, 2=一般, 3=很重要) 这些方面主要用于服务中低收入人群

11. 修复自有住宅

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

12. 修复租赁住宅职业培训 (对社区中高度需要的工作的相关技能的培训)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

13. 购房援助商业/工业的发展和恢复 (这些领域的员工大多数需为中低收入人群)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

14. 为老年人设立的租赁住房

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

15. 为残疾人改善无障碍措施

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

16. 建造单一家庭适合的住宅

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

17. 保障性住房开发

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

18. 公平住房 (减少住房歧视)

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

19. 含铅油漆检测/减排

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

20. 历史古迹房屋的保护

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

21. 提高能源效用

1 (不重要) 2 (一般) 3 (很重要)

感谢您的参与!