



MARKET
& OPINION
RESEARCH
SERVICES

811 First Avenue
Suite 451
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 652-2454 TEL
(206) 652-5022 FAX

436 14th Street
Suite 820
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 844-0680 TEL
(510) 844-0690 FAX

3857 N. High Street
Suite 302
Columbus, OH 43214
(614) 268-1660 TEL
EMCresearch.com

Office of Housing City Survey

N=800; MOE= ± 3.5 points

March 16–22, 2009

EMC #09-4054

*All numbers are reported as percentages unless otherwise noted.
Some questions may add up to more/less than 100% due to rounding*

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm conducting a public opinion survey for EMC Research. This is not a sales or telemarketing call, it is a research study of how Seattle residents feel about some of the issues facing them. Your answers are strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. May I speak with the person in your household who is over eighteen and had the most recent birthday?

(REPEAT INTRO IF NECESSARY)

1. GENDER (**RECORD BY OBSERVATION**)

Male	50%
Female	50%

2. What year were you born in? (**RECORD YEAR**)

18+ ==> CONTINUE

Under 18 ==> **ASK TO SPEAK TO 18+ WITH MOST RECENT BIRTHDAY**

(REFUSED)==> TERMINATE

2a. (**AGE - CODE AGE FROM BIRTH YEAR**)

18 to 24	13%
25 to 34	21%
35 to 44	20%
45 to 54	18%
55+	28%

3. To make sure we're calling in the right area, do you live in the City of Seattle or not?

Yes ==> **100%**

No/Don't know/Refused ==> **TERMINATE**

For each of the following statements please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. If you do not have an opinion one way or the other, please just say so.

SCALE: 1. Strongly Agree 2. Somewhat Agree
 3. Somewhat Disagree 4. Strongly Disagree 5. No Opinion/Don't Know
(RANDOMIZE)

12. Investment in low income housing helps keep neighborhoods vibrant and diverse
- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|--------------|
| Strongly Agree | 35% | |
| Somewhat Agree | 36% | => 71 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 14% | => 23 |
| Strongly Disagree | 9% | |
| No Opinion/Don't Know | 6% | |
13. Investment in low income housing is good for our economy
- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|--------------|
| Strongly Agree | 38% | |
| Somewhat Agree | 36% | => 74 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 12% | => 17 |
| Strongly Disagree | 5% | |
| No Opinion/Don't Know | 9% | |
14. Seattle already spends enough to help low income families
- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|--------------|
| Strongly Agree | 9% | |
| Somewhat Agree | 13% | => 22 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 32% | => 57 |
| Strongly Disagree | 25% | |
| No Opinion/Don't Know | 20% | |
15. Emergency rental assistance for low income residents is a good use of taxpayer dollars
- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|--------------|
| Strongly Agree | 34% | |
| Somewhat Agree | 39% | => 73 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 13% | => 19 |
| Strongly Disagree | 6% | |
| No Opinion/Don't Know | 8% | |
16. Preventing low income residents from losing their homes helps other homeowners by promoting stability
- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|--------------|
| Strongly Agree | 39% | |
| Somewhat Agree | 38% | => 76 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 8% | => 16 |
| Strongly Disagree | 8% | |
| No Opinion/Don't Know | 8% | |

17. Building or rehabbing low income housing is a good use of taxpayer dollars
- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|------|
| Strongly Agree | 36% | |
| Somewhat Agree | 42% | =>78 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 11% | =>18 |
| Strongly Disagree | 7% | |
| No Opinion/Don't Know | 4% | |
18. Investment in low income housing is good for the environment because it enables low wage workers like grocery store clerks, day care workers and others to live close to their jobs
- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|------|
| Strongly Agree | 36% | |
| Somewhat Agree | 38% | =>74 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 11% | =>18 |
| Strongly Disagree | 7% | |
| No Opinion/Don't Know | 7% | |

(END RANDOMIZE)

If you were prioritizing the City's housing funding, how would you prioritize the following programs -- use a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being a very low priority and 7 being a very high priority. You can use any number from 1 to 7.

(REPEAT AFTER EACH UNTIL UNDERSTOOD: How would you rate that item, with 1 being a very low priority and 7 being a very high priority?)

	Low Priority	2	3	4	5	6	High Priority	DK	Mean
(RANDOMIZE)									
19. Housing for individuals or families who are currently homeless	3%	4%	7%	10%	21%	21%	34%	1%	=> 5.41
20. Housing for low wage workers who cannot afford market rate rents	3%	3%	8%	11%	26%	23%	24%	2%	=> 5.25
21. Providing loans to first time homebuyers so that low-to-moderate income people have opportunities to purchase a home in the city	6%	5%	7%	13%	24%	19%	25%	1%	=> 5.04
22. Emergency rental assistance to keep people in their homes	3%	4%	5%	14%	24%	24%	23%	2%	=> 5.23
23. Foreclosure prevention	5%	6%	7%	15%	21%	19%	23%	4%	=> 4.99

(END RANDOMIZE)

24. Which statement is closest to your opinion even if neither one is exactly right:
(ROTATE STATEMENTS 1 AND 2)

In this economy, it's more important now than ever to make sure we keep investing strongly in low income housing programs and assistance. 73%

Times are really tough right now and we just can't afford to spend as much on low-income housing programs as we could in the past. 24%

Neither 1%

Both 1%

Don't know/Ref 2%

25. As you may know, in two thousand two (2002) Seattle residents renewed the low income housing levy which will expire in December two thousand and nine (2009). In general, do you think this levy should be continued, or should it end? **(IF CONTINUED)** Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that? **(IF SHOULD END)** Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that?

Strongly should be continued 49%

Not So Strongly should be cont'd 15% =>64

Not So Strongly should end 6% =>15

Strongly should end 9%

Undecided/Not Sure 21%

The low income housing levy helps fund affordable rental housing for seniors, formerly homeless individuals and families, and low-income residents and helps provide emergency rental assistance to prevent eviction or homelessness. The city is considering different options to continue this housing levy.

26. Option A would be a one hundred and sixty seven million dollar (\$167M) levy that would provide housing assistance to about twenty three thousand (23,000) low and moderate income people over 7 years. This levy would cost Seattle homeowners roughly twenty (20) cents per one thousand dollars (\$1,000) assessed property value. Do you support or oppose Option A? **(IF SUPPORT)** Would that be strongly or somewhat support? **(IF OPPOSE)** Would that be strongly or somewhat oppose?

	All Residents	
Strongly Support	36%	
Somewhat Support	36%	=>72
Somewhat Oppose	10%	=>20
Strongly Oppose	10%	
Don't Know/Refused	8%	

27. Option B would be a one hundred forty four million dollar (\$144M) levy that would provide housing assistance to about eighteen thousand (18,000) low and moderate income people over 7 years. This levy would cost Seattle homeowners roughly seventeen (17) cents per one thousand dollars (\$1,000) assessed property value. Do you support or oppose Option B? **(IF SUPPORT)** Would that be strongly or somewhat support? **(IF OPPOSE)** Would that be strongly or somewhat oppose?

	Do not support \$167M (n=223)	All Residents
Strongly Support	3%	37%
Somewhat Support	17% =>20	40% =>77
Somewhat Oppose	29% =>59	8% =>16
Strongly Oppose	30%	8%
Don't Know/Refused	20%	5%

28. Option C would be a one hundred seven million dollar (\$107M) levy that would provide housing assistance to about thirteen thousand (13,000) low and moderate income people over 7 years. This levy would cost Seattle homeowners roughly thirteen (13) cents per one thousand dollars (\$1,000) assessed property value. Do you support or oppose Option C? **(IF SUPPORT)** Would that be strongly or somewhat support? **(IF OPPOSE)** Would that be strongly or somewhat oppose?

	Do not support \$167M or \$145M	All Residents
Strongly Support	1%	37%
Somewhat Support	12% =>13	43% =>80
Somewhat Oppose	27% =>63	6% =>14
Strongly Oppose	36%	8%
Don't Know/Refused	24%	5%

I'd like to read you some of the things the housing levy could fund. I'm going to ask you to rank each item using a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 means that issue should be a very low priority for funding and 7 means that issue should be a very high priority for funding. You can use any number from 1 to 7.

(REPEAT AFTER EACH UNTIL UNDERSTOOD: How would you rate that item, with 1 being a very low priority and 7 being a very high priority?)

	Low Priority	2	3	4	5	6	High Priority	DK	Mean
(RANDOMIZE)									
29.	Build new low income housing.								
	7%	7%	7%	19%	22%	15%	22%	1%	=> 4.77
30.	Buy and preserve existing housing to use for low-income housing.								
	6%	4%	7%	13%	22%	20%	27%	1%	=> 5.11
31.	Provide emergency short term rental assistance to prevent people from becoming homeless.								
	2%	4%	5%	9%	20%	24%	34%	1%	=> 5.53
32.	Provide down payment loans to low-income working families who are first time homebuyers.								
	8%	8%	9%	16%	20%	17%	22%	1%	=> 4.72
33.	Buy land and buildings for low and moderate income housing in areas where City is encouraging higher density development, like near bus routes and light rail stations.								
	6%	5%	8%	13%	22%	19%	25%	2%	=> 5.01
34.	Provide temporary mortgage assistance to help low and moderate income homeowners avoid foreclosure.								
	5%	4%	6%	13%	24%	21%	25%	2%	=> 5.11
35.	Buy homes that have been foreclosed and use them for low and moderate income housing.								
	9%	4%	8%	15%	20%	17%	26%	2%	=> 4.90
36.	Build housing for individuals or families who are currently homeless.								
	7%	7%	7%	15%	21%	16%	27%	1%	=> 4.91
37.	Combine housing assistance with case management and other services like childcare, legal aid, and financial classes to help families become self-sufficient and succeed in staying housed.								
	4%	3%	4%	9%	15%	21%	43%	1%	=> 5.67
38.	Focus on environmental sustainability and green building practices when building and renovating low-income housing.								
	6%	4%	5%	13%	16%	18%	37%	0%	=> 5.33
39.	Promote housing development and other improvements in communities where private housing investment is lagging or affordable housing is being lost.								
	6%	5%	6%	17%	28%	18%	18%	2%	=> 4.86
40.	Focus on projects with a mix of affordability levels, and a mix of housing, commercial and community facility uses.								
	4%	3%	10%	12%	24%	23%	23%	1%	=> 5.14
41.	Provide counseling, health care, and other services to low income residents who are disabled or can't live totally independently.								
	2%	3%	4%	7%	18%	19%	47%	0%	=> 5.83
42.	Build housing for low income seniors.								
	3%	3%	5%	12%	21%	21%	35%	1%	=> 5.49

Now I'm going to tell you a little bit more about the low income housing levy. After each statement, please tell me how important you think that information is. Use a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 means that information is not at all important and 7 means that information is extremely important. You can use any number from 1 to 7.

(REPEAT AFTER EACH UNTIL UNDERSTOOD: How important do you think that information is, with 1 being not at all important and 7 being extremely important?)

	Not at all Important	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely Important	DK	Mean
(RANDOMIZE)									
43.	For low income rental housing that the City funds, the City leverages, on average three dollars (\$3) of non-city funds for every one dollar (\$1) of housing levy dollars invested. In the past six years, the Housing Levy has brought two hundred and fifty million (\$250) million of non-city dollars into the city, creating over four thousand (4,000) jobs in the construction and housing industries.								
	3%	3%	5%	11%	21%	23%	31%	3%	=>5.47
44.	Emergency rent assistance helps bridge the gap and get people back on their feet over the long term – seventy seven percent (77%) of households assisted are still in stable housing six months later. And given the state of the economy, demand for assistance is only going to increase.								
	3%	3%	5%	11%	20%	26%	30%	2%	=>5.47
45.	As part of the down payment loan program, the City works with nonprofits and banks to ensure homebuyers are well prepared. All participants must take homebuyer education courses, which involve significant financial counseling; participants may only use a thirty year (30) year fixed rate mortgage; and the City's nonprofit partners offer post purchase counseling. This ensures families have stable loans that they can actually afford. As a result, not a single two thousand two (2002) Levy loan has gone into foreclosure.								
	3%	1%	3%	6%	12%	23%	50%	1%	=>5.98
46.	The City has a Housing Levy Oversight committee made up of private sector and non-profit community leaders who make sure your tax dollars are spent as efficiently and effectively as possible.								
	5%	3%	5%	10%	21%	20%	34%	2%	=>5.40
47.	Whether renting or owning, having a permanent place to live empowers people to have a stake in their community. Residents are more inclined to care about their neighborhoods and neighbors, are more engaged civically and their kids do better in school.								
	3%	2%	3%	8%	15%	21%	48%	1%	=>5.86
48.	The City partners with non-profits like the Gates Foundation to address both the immediate crisis and longer-term barriers to stable housing. The program provides on-going support and maintains contact with clients to give them the best chance at long term housing stability. After households leave the program, eighty percent (80%) are still in stable housing six months later.								
	2%	2%	4%	10%	21%	27%	34%	1%	=>5.67
49.	Housing funded by the housing levy is "green" housing, which helps the environment and provides healthier housing for the residents.								
	5%	4%	6%	11%	19%	22%	32%	2%	=>5.32

50. Given what you have heard, in general, do you think the low income housing levy should be continued, or should it end? **(IF CONTINUED)** Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that? **(IF SHOULD END)** Do you feel strongly or not so strongly about that?
- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Strongly should be continued | 70% | |
| Not So Strongly should be continued | 13% | =>83 |
| Not So Strongly should end | 4% | =>11 |
| Strongly should end | 7% | |
| Undecided/Not Sure | 6% | |
51. Which statement is closest to your opinion, even if neither one is exactly right:
(ROTATE STATEMENTS 1 AND 2)
- In this economy, it's more important now than ever to make sure we keep investing strongly in low income housing programs and assistance. 74%
- Times are really tough right now and we just can't afford to spend as much on low-income housing programs as we could in the past. 24%
- Neither/Both/Don't Know 3%
52. And which of the three options do you prefer most, Option A which is one hundred and sixty seven million dollars (\$167M) and would serve about twenty three thousand (23,000) people, Option B which is one hundred and forty four million dollars (\$144M) and would serve about eighteen thousand (18,000) people, or Option C which is one hundred and seven million dollars (\$107M) and would serve about thirteen thousand (13,000) people? **(IF UNDECIDED)** Well, which way do you lean, towards Option A, B, or C?
- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|------|
| Option A | 52% | =>53 |
| Lean A | 1% | |
| Option B | 19% | =>20 |
| Lean B | 1% | |
| Option C | 14% | =>16 |
| Lean C | 2% | |
| Undecided/Don't know/Refused | 9% | |
53. Given the changing economy, some people have suggested that we should include a provision in this levy to give the City the ability to direct money for housing assistance to where it is needed most instead of the money being dedicated to specific programs. This could include things like a fund to buy abandoned properties for use as low income housing, providing assistance to homeowners to prevent foreclosure, and provide emergency rental assistance. The City's housing department would determine which of the various programs to implement according to economic conditions. Do you think giving the City this additional flexibility with the levy money is a good idea or a bad idea?
- | | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Good idea | 60% |
| Bad idea | 29% |
| Don't Know/Refused | 11% |

Finally, I'd like to ask you a few questions for statistical purposes only.

54. Do you own or rent your apartment or home?

Own/buying	60%
Rent	37%
Don't Know/Refused	3%

55. Do any children under the age of 18 live in your household?

Yes	31%
No/Refused	69%

56. Next, which of the following categories includes your annual household income? (READ 1-5)

Less than \$30,000	18%
\$30,000 - \$49,999	19%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	19%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	12%
\$100,000 or more	19%
Don't Know/Refused	12%

57. What race would you classify yourself as-- African-American, White, Hispanic, Asian, multiracial, or something else:

African-American/Black	9%
White/Caucasian	65%
Hispanic/Latin-American	3%
Asian/Asian-American	6%
Multiracial	7%
Other (Don't specify)	6%
Refused	3%

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING, WE APPRECIATE YOUR HELP!