

Survey of family needs in public housing

*A report to the Public Housing Agency
of St. Paul*

A P R I L 2 0 0 1

Survey of Family needs in public housing

A report to the Public Housing Agency of St. Paul

April 2001

Prepared by:

Pam Larson

Wilder Research Center
1295 Bandana Boulevard North, Suite 210
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108
651-647-4600
www.wilder.org

Contents

Summary and implications	1
Background of study	5
Survey development.....	6
Methods.....	8
Youth survey results	48
Attachment A	56
Providers' focus groups summary	56
Attachment B	67
Attachment C	72
Single responses.....	72

Figures

1. Race and ethnicity of head of household	10
2. Highest grade or year of school of resident	10
3. Highest grade or year in school for other adult.....	11
4. Length in U.S. and citizenship.....	11
5. Marital status.....	12
6. Years in neighborhood.....	13
7. Neighbors known by name	13
8. What do you like best about your house?	14
9. What do you like best about your neighborhood?	14
10. If you could change one thing about your house or neighborhood?.....	15
11. Satisfaction with current housing.....	15
12. Ever talked with management office re: Neighborhood problem.....	15
13. Five year goals: location and type of housing	16
14. Minnesota family investment program (MFIP) involvement	17
15. What are you doing to get ready for the end of MFIP benefits?.....	18
16. Anything that keeps you from meeting MFIP requirements?.....	18
17. Level of concern about what to do when benefits end.....	19
18. School and work	20
19. Work and disability.....	21
20. Children and child care	22
21. Who watches children while you are at work or school?	22
22. Greatest problems or concerns about child care	22
23. Adults in household current participation in programs in and around neighborhood	24
24. Children under 12 program participation.....	24
25. Programs that are missing.....	25
26. Ways for public housing staff to get word out about programs.....	25
27. Overall program awareness and usage.....	26
28. Dunedin program awareness and usage.....	28
29. Mcdonough program awareness and useage.....	30
30. Mount airy program awareness and useage	32

Figures (continued)

31. Roosevelt program awareness and useage.....	34
32. Scattered sites program awareness and useage.....	36
33. Health insurance and health care	38
34. Barriers to obtaining needed healthcare.....	39
35. Other health concerns	40
36. ACOP awareness and satisfaction	41
37. Safety	42
38. Safety now and one year ago	43
39. Children and safety	44
40. Types of crime	45
41. Resident comments of family needs or how to improve neighborhood	47
42. Age and gender of youth.....	48
43. What youth most like about their house	49
44. What youth like most about their neighborhood.....	49
45. If you could change one thing about your house or neighborhood, what would you change?	50
46. Neighbors known by name: Youth responses.....	51
47. Difficulty in neighborhood: Youth	51
48. Difficulty at program site: Youth.....	52
50. Members of household violent or abusive: Youth responses	53
51. Safety	54
52. Needed changes in neighborhood for youth to feel safe.....	55
53. Activities youth would like in neighborhood.....	55

Acknowledgments

Zavier Chang
Megan Cler
Phil Cooper
Kari Danielson
Anne Davis
Louann Graham
Beth Hastings
Yeu Her
Jerry Judkins
Sidney Lange
Too Lee
Nikki Leicht
Margaree Levy
April Lott
Brandon Moua
Joualery Moua
Pa Thao Moua
Marion Namemwirth
Stephanie Nelson
Sara Nichols
Su Olson
Elizabeth Songalia
Karen Swenson
Zoua Vang
Mee Xiong

Summary and implications

To help identify and document the health and human service needs of public housing families for long range planning, 367 adults and 138 youth over the age of 12 participated in the 2000 Family Needs Study in late 2000/early 2001. A random sample of residents in the four family housing developments – McDonough, Mount Airy, Roosevelt, and Dunedin – and the scattered site housing were invited to participate in the study. Key results are categorized as needs met, ongoing needs, and priority needs. In order to provide context for understanding residents' responses, the 2000 Family Needs Study results are compared to 1990 results whenever possible.

Needs that are being met

Satisfaction with housing

Satisfaction with current housing is high in 2000, with 93 percent of the 367 residents surveyed reporting being satisfied or very satisfied. In 1990, 90 percent of 400 residents were satisfied with their housing overall.

Health care

In 2000, 93 percent report that household members obtained the health care they needed in the past six months. In 1990, 96 percent obtained needed health care in the six months prior to the survey. Although these reports are positive, public housing staff recognize that health care standards and meanings may vary across cultures.

Child care

Over 80 percent of adults who have children under 12 in 2000 report that their child care arrangements are very secure or somewhat secure. In 1990, 20 percent of the families surveyed in 1990 used child care, and 32 percent lacked child care that would allow them to go to school or work.

Neighborhood program quality and participation

In 2000, nearly half of adults and just under half of children under age 12 participated in various programs in and around the neighborhood. As expected, the people in scattered site housing report lower rates of neighborhood program participation than those who live in family housing developments with programs offered on-site.

Several programs in and around the family housing developments received high marks for quality. The following were rated as excellent or good by more than 90 percent of the survey participants who knew about the programs:

- Parent education/ECFE
- Health clinics
- Head Start
- Women, Infant, and Children Clinic (WIC)
- ESL classes
- Resources for domestic abuse
- Computer classes

Ongoing needs

Children and health insurance

There is a small percentage of families (6% overall) with children in the household who are not covered by health insurance. While this represents relatively few families, it may mean that an estimated 60 children throughout family housing are uninsured.

Satisfaction with police and safety

In 2000, 10 years after A Community Outreach Program (ACOP) was introduced in the family housing development communities, about three-quarters of those surveyed are aware of ACOP. Seventy-two percent of those surveyed report being very or somewhat satisfied with *police response* to calls, which includes the responses from both ACOP and the Saint Paul Police Department. In 1990, 80 percent of adult respondents reported satisfaction with *police service* in their neighborhood. Forty-five percent of respondents feel somewhat unsafe or very unsafe out alone at night in their neighborhood, and 9 percent feel somewhat or very unsafe out alone during the day in the neighborhood. In 1990, 35 percent **never** felt safe in their neighborhood. In 2000, youth 12 and older tend to feel safer in their neighborhoods than the adults surveyed.

In 1990, crime and safety emerged as the concerns that needed the most attention to make neighborhoods better places to live. In 2000, comments about how to improve neighborhoods emphasized both safety and maintenance.

Priority needs

MFIP and employment

Of those adults surveyed who have ever received assistance from the Minnesota Family Investment Program, nearly 60 percent are not sure or don't know how much time is left on their family's five-year time limit. This group includes adults who decided to leave MFIP, those who have been sanctioned, and those who are currently enrolled in MFIP. Over 60 percent of all current and former MFIP recipients are very or somewhat concerned about what they will do when their assistance ends. This is a significant source of stress; over 50 percent report serious worries about MFIP that affect their sleep or concentration somewhat or very much.

The Mount Airy site has the highest percentages of adults attending schooling, currently employed, and in households with 1 or 2 adults working full time. The higher rates of employment among residents who have access to the *Jobs-Plus* program at Mount Airy may warrant expanding similar efforts to other sites.

Education

While over half (56%) of the adults surveyed in 2000 report not having completed high school or a GED, educational levels are higher than those reported in the 1990 Family Needs Study. In 1990, 75 percent of adults surveyed had not completed high school or a GED.

Immigrant status

Three-quarters of the adults surveyed are immigrants to the U.S. Of those, over two-fifths (41%) have been in the U.S. for fewer than five years. The issues related to being an immigrant to the U.S. are broad and continue to require attention in family housing development communities, where immigrant status is the norm rather than the exception. In addition, the immigrant community in public housing and across the Twin Cities area has diversified over the last decade.

Program needs

The programs needed most by adults and children include computer classes (48% "a lot"), tutoring/help with homework (42% "a lot"), health insurance (40% "a lot"), and emergency food services (40% "a lot"). This question addresses how important people think these programs are; whether or not they are currently using them. It is not a measure of unmet need.

Those who expressed any level of need for a program were asked to indicate the likelihood that their household would participate in this type of a program. Programs that respondents reported they are “very likely” to participate in include accessing health insurance (72%), Head Start (68%), WIC clinic (67%), computer classes (64%), and tutoring/help with homework (63%). Finally, over one-third of youth 12 and older surveyed would like more sports activities offered in their neighborhoods.

Background of study

Saint Paul Public Housing Agency (PHA) provides housing to about 1,350 households in the PHA'S four family housing developments and approximately 400 families living in scattered site housing. In 1990, Wilder Research Center conducted a family needs study with families living in these sites. The purpose of the current study is to identify and document the health and human service needs of public housing families in order to develop a long range plan for addressing those needs. Saint Paul Public Housing Agency intends to use the results to identify service needs, service gaps and obstacles preventing needs from being met. This information will assist the PHA in working with residents and other partners to maximize existing services and to develop new services to help families succeed in their public housing communities.

Survey development

In addition to reviewing the questions and the findings of the 1990 Family Needs Study with PHA staff, input from partner agency staff that provide services to public housing residents was gathered to help develop the current survey. Providers from partner agencies were invited to participate in focus groups. Participants were asked to address the following topics and questions:

Needs of residents

- What are residents' goals and dreams for themselves and for their children?
- How does living in the public housing community help meet the needs of residents?
- What are the most critical needs of these residents by age groups?
- What trends or changes in public housing residents have you observed in the last 3 – 4 years? How are you / your organization providing services differently as a result of these changes?
- What changes are occurring in public housing residents' lives with the MFIP requirements?

Barriers to using existing programs

- What keeps some families from getting to the right resources in public housing?
- To what extent are community centers and PHA neighborhoods safe?

According to partner providers who participated in the focus groups:

- Public housing families are stigmatized by other community members and face isolation from the greater community
- Public housing families vary in their intentions re: length of residence in public housing – may vary by cultural groups/immigrant/non-immigrant
- Seniors need more social and recreational support, and they face language and transportation barriers
- Adults need self-sufficiency skills, and providers observe an increase in family violence among American-born families

- Teens need role models beyond public housing and they need safe recreation outlets
- Children need greater parental involvement in school and, for especially those with special needs and higher energy, behavioral interventions based in the public housing community

The focus group feedback was used to help develop questions for the Family Needs Survey. A summary of the focus group discussions is included in Attachment A.

Methods

All 1,750 households in the four family housing developments and across the scattered housing sites were eligible to be included in the sampling for the study. Households were selected at random. The households that were selected were initially phoned or contacted in person and invited to participate in the study. Adults in the household were told that their participation was voluntary, that housing and benefits would not be affected by their participation or by their responses, and that their answers would be kept confidential. Those households that agreed to participate were offered a \$15 rent coupon to be used toward rent for the following month.

The survey contained two sections, a 52-item adult survey and a 14-item youth survey. The adult survey required approximately 25 minutes to administer in English. Surveys were also conducted in languages other than English when at least 10 respondents were identified with a specific translation need. In this study, surveys were also conducted in Hmong and Vietnamese. In households in which there were youth over the age of 12, youth were invited to participate in the youth survey if a parent gave permission and if the youth wanted to participate. Surveys were conducted by phone and in person, depending on the respondent's availability and his or her preference.

Results

Three hundred and sixty seven parents and 138 youth over the age of 12 from Saint Paul public housing households participated in the 2000 Family Needs Study during the months October 2000 – January 2001. The response rate, based on the adults surveyed, is 78.5 percent. Response rates in the individual sites ranged from 69 percent in the scattered sites to 88 percent in the Roosevelt family housing development. The following tables summarize the responses to the survey for both the overall sample and by each of the four sites (McDonough, Mount Airy, Roosevelt, and Dunedin family housing developments) and scattered site housing.

Adult survey results

Characteristics of adults

The race and ethnicity of the heads of the households that participated in the study are shown in Figure 1. Over half (58%) are listed as Asian/Pacific Islander, nearly one-third (30%) are listed as African American or Black, 12 percent are listed as white, and 1 percent are listed as American Indian or Alaskan native. Since the interview took place with any adult in the household, the respondents themselves were not necessarily the heads of household.

Nearly one-third of respondents had no formal education, and 28 percent had a high school diploma or GED. Sixty-six percent of adults who participated were not born in the U.S. and, within that group, 29 percent reported U.S. citizenship and the other 71 percent did not. Over half of those not born in the U.S. (59%) have lived in the U.S. for five years or more. Finally, 44 percent are married or living in a marriage-like relationship, with the other 56 percent reporting that they are separated, divorced, widowed, or never married (Figures 2 – 5).

1. RACE AND ETHNICITY OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD¹

	1990 Survey	2000 Survey					
	Overall (N=400)	Overall (N=367)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=121)	Mount Airy (N=65)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=84)
Asian/Pacific Islander	74%	58%	70%	57%	54%	56%	61%
African American/Black	11%	30%	15%	36%	18%	32%	25%
Caucasian/White	11%	12%	15%	7%	18%	12%	14%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1%	1%	-	1%	2%	-	-
Total	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Hispanic	3%	3%	10%	3%	6%	0%	4%
Non-Hispanic	-	97%	90%	98%	94%	100%	96%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2. HIGHEST GRADE OR YEAR OF SCHOOL OF RESIDENT

	1990 Survey	2000 Survey					
	Overall (N=400)	Overall (N=365)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=121)	Mount Airy (N=65)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=84)
No formal education	41%	31%	50%	36%	22%	36%	24%
Eighth grade or less	19%	12%	10%	8%	11%	9%	21%
Some high school	15%	13%	15%	15%	19%	9%	7%
High school diploma or GED	20%	28%	20%	24%	23%	31%	37%
Some college	4%	13%	5%	14%	20%	11%	8%
College graduate	1%	3%	-	3%	6%	3%	1%
Post graduate	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

¹ All figures in this report may contain percentages that do not total 100% due to rounding.

3. HIGHEST GRADE OR YEAR IN SCHOOL FOR OTHER ADULT

	Overall (N=200)	Dunedin (N=14)	McDonough (N=54)	Mount Airy (N=39)	Roosevelt (N=36)	Scattered sites (N=57)
No formal education	37%	71%	44%	28%	36%	26%
Eighth grade or less	10%	-	11%	3%	6%	18%
Some high school	13%	7%	6%	23%	11%	14%
High school diploma or GED	27%	14%	24%	26%	28%	32%
Some college	12%	7%	7%	21%	17%	7%
College graduate	4%	-	7%	-	3%	4%
Post graduate	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

4. LENGTH IN U.S. AND CITIZENSHIP

	Overall (N=366)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=66)	Roosevelt (N=74)	Scattered sites (N=84)
Entire life	34%	20%	38%	36%	37%	30%
Less than 2 years	1%	5%	2%	2%	1%	-
Two years to less than 5 years	5%	-	7%	3%	8%	2%
Five years to less than 10 years	24%	30%	23%	21%	26%	24%
Ten years or more	35%	45%	30%	38%	28%	44%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Citizenship	(N=239)	(N=16)	(N=46)	(N=42)	(N=48)	(N=59)
Yes	29%	13%	28%	26%	23%	42%
No	71%	88%	72%	74%	77%	58%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

5. MARITAL STATUS

	1990 Survey	2000 Survey					
	Overall (N=400)	Overall (N=366)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=66)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=83)
Married	52%	40%	65%	32%	39%	31%	54%
Living in marriage-like relationship	-	4%	10%	3%	3%	5%	1%
Separated	7%	10%	-	12%	18%	7%	5%
Divorced	12%	13%	10%	12%	14%	13%	17%
Widowed	19%	11%	5%	12%	9%	15%	10%
Never married	11%	22%	10%	30%	17%	29%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Housing

Nearly one third (32%) of the adults who participated in the study have lived in their public housing neighborhood between one and less than three years. The participants from scattered site housing tend to have resided for longer periods in their neighborhoods, with nearly one- third (31%) residing in their neighborhood for between five and less than 10 years. Figure 6 summarizes these responses.

In order to get a sense of how well-connected the participants are to others in their neighborhoods and communities, they were asked to report how many of their neighbors they know by name. Overall and across the five sites, over half of respondents reported that they know 1 – 5 neighbors by name. Overall, over one-quarter (26%) of respondents could think of no one in their neighborhood that they knew by name (Figure 7).

Respondents were then asked to list those things that they like best about their house, their neighborhood, and one change that they would make to their house or neighborhood if they could. These responses were coded and are summarized in Figures 8, 9, and 10. Respondents most often cited amenities, affordability, and adequate space as most positive aspects of their house. Neighbors, location, and quiet were the aspects of the neighbors most often cited as positive. Individual comments about potential changes are listed in Attachment B.

Reports of satisfaction with current housing were positive with over 90 percent of respondents rating themselves as very satisfied or satisfied with their current housing

(Figure 11). Respondents were also asked about public housing management's responsiveness to problems identified by residents. Overall, 43 percent of respondents had contacted public housing management with a neighborhood problem. Of those, 86 percent reported that a staff member from public housing responded to them, and 69 percent reported that something was done to address the issue that initiated the call.

Figure 12 summarizes these results.

6. YEARS IN NEIGHBORHOOD

	Overall (N=367)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=66)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=84)
Less than one year	11%	-	13%	12%	11%	8%
One year to less than 3	32%	45%	31%	24%	48%	21%
Three years to less than 5	22%	20%	25%	27%	13%	23%
Five years to less than 10	19%	20%	13%	21%	15%	31%
Ten years or more	16%	15%	17%	15%	13%	17%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

7. NEIGHBORS KNOWN BY NAME

	Overall (N=366)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=65)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=84)
0	26%	30%	27%	25%	29%	23%
1-5	55%	55%	53%	51%	52%	63%
6-10	13%	10%	16%	14%	15%	8%
More than 10	6%	5%	4%	11%	4%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

8. WHAT DO YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT YOUR HOUSE?

	Overall (N=358)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=118)	Mount Airy (N=63)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=82)
Amenities (e.g., connection for wash/dryer)	16%	4%	7%	5%	3%	7%
Affordability	11%	22%	9%	12%	15%	7%
Adequate space, space	11%	13%	13%	14%	7%	9%
I like everything	10%	13%	9%	12%	9%	12%
Rooms are big or nice	10%	13%	7%	13%	14%	8%
House is right size for family	9%	4%	14%	9%	7%	6%
House in good condition	8%	9%	5%	8%	10%	8%
Livable, comfortable	7%	-	9%	6%	7%	7%
Have a house to live in	5%	4%	4%	5%	7%	5%
The basement	5%	4%	5%	2%	7%	3%
Other	9%	14%	18%	14%	14%	29%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	475	23	150	87	108	107

9. WHAT DO YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?

	Overall (N=342)	Dunedin (N=15)	McDonough (N=110)	Mount Airy (N=63)	Roosevelt (N=71)	Scattered sites (N=83)
Good/Friendly/Respectful Neighbors	26%	29%	24%	19%	21%	38%
Location	17%	18%	17%	20%	21%	8%
Quiet	16%	18%	11%	16%	13%	22%
Safety	9%	12%	8%	7%	11%	11%
Just like it	7%	-	6%	7%	7%	8%
Don't like it	5%	6%	6%	7%	5%	2%
Ethnicity considerations	4%	-	10%	2%	2%	1%
Activities available	2%	-	1%	6%	1%	-
Other	14%	17%	17%	16%	19%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	476	17	143	86	102	128

10. IF YOU COULD CHANGE ONE THING ABOUT YOUR HOUSE OR NEIGHBORHOOD?

	Overall (N=340)	Dunedin (N=17)	McDonough (N=111)	Mount Airy (N=61)	Roosevelt (N=70)	Scattered sites (N=81)
Wouldn't change anything	22%	18%	20%	20%	25%	27%
Remodel outside of building/inside	9%	-	11%	-	-	11%
Make common area larger	3%	-	-	-	-	-
Improve neighbor relations	2%	-	-	-	-	-
Building needs repair	2%	-	-	-	-	-
Carpet house	3%	-	-	-	-	-
Other ¹	59%	82% ¹	69% ¹	80% ¹	75% ¹	62% ¹
Total	100%	-	-	-	-	-
Total Responses	410	17	142	69	89	93

¹ See individual comments in Attachment B.

11. SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT HOUSING

	Overall (N=366)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=66)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=83)
Very satisfied	32%	20%	29%	33%	35%	35%
Satisfied	61%	75%	66%	59%	56%	58%
Dissatisfied	6%	5%	3%	8%	7%	6%
Very dissatisfied	2%	-	3%	-	3%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

12. EVER TALKED WITH MANAGEMENT OFFICE RE: NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEM

	Overall (N=367)	Dunedin (N=22)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=66)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=84)
Yes	43%	50%	41%	53%	41%	36%
No	58%	50%	59%	47%	59%	64%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Did someone respond?	(N=158)	(N=11)	(N=50)	(N=35)	(N=31)	(N=30)
Yes	86%	80%	86%	83%	84%	93%
No	14%	20%	14%	17%	16%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Was something done to address the problem?						
Yes	69%	50%	74%	75%	55%	76%
No	31%	50%	26%	25%	45%	24%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Adult participants were also asked to think about their five-year goals for both living location and housing type. Across all sites, one-quarter (25%) wanted to live in their same home location in five years, and over one-third (34%) would like to stay in Saint Paul, but not necessarily in the same house or neighborhood. When asked what type of housing they plan to have in five years, over half (55%) wanted to own their own home, and over one-third (38%) plan to stay in public housing. In 1990, respondents were asked to state their first choice for type of housing. Forty-nine percent selected public housing, 9 percent selected other rental, 39 percent selected home ownership, and 2 percent did not know their first choice for type of housing. Figure 13 summarize these results.

13. FIVE YEAR GOALS: LOCATION AND TYPE OF HOUSING

Location	Overall (N=362)	Dunedin (N=19)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=66)	Roosevelt (N=73)	Scattered sites (N=83)
Same home	25%	21%	26%	20%	22%	33%
Same neighborhood	19%	5%	15%	15%	23%	29%
In St. Paul	34%	53%	38%	30%	33%	29%
In Metro area	10%	-	7%	21%	12%	4%
In MN	6%	16%	9%	3%	1%	4%
Outside MN	6%	5%	5%	11%	8%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Type housing						
Public housing	38%	37%	39%	31%	45%	35%
Other rental	3%	11%	2%	5%	4%	-
Own home	55%	42%	54%	59%	51%	61%
Something else	4%	11%	5%	6%	-	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Minnesota Family Investment Program involvement

Respondents were asked if they have ever received or are receiving MFIP benefits. Of the 367 adults participating in the survey, 232 (63%) have ever received or were receiving MFIP benefits at the time of the survey. Of those, 16 percent were receiving MFIP benefits but chose to stop their involvement, 8 percent were currently sanctioned, and another 41 percent were currently receiving benefits. Many respondents (68%) reported that they see their MFIP financial and/or job worker only once per year. Over

half (59%) didn't know or weren't sure how much time their family had left to receive the MFIP benefits. Of those who did know their time limit, 14 percent had one year or less, 27 percent had over one year to two years, 32 percent had over two years to three years, 22 percent had over three years to four years, and 6 percent had more than four years to five years left (Figure 14).

14. MINNESOTA FAMILY INVESTMENT PROGRAM (MFIP) INVOLVEMENT

	Overall (N=367)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=66)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=84)
Never received	35%	10%	35%	27%	52%	33%
Started but chose to stop	16%	25%	17%	21%	7%	14%
Receiving and sanctioned	8%	-	7%	11%	7%	11%
Currently receiving MFIP	41%	65%	41%	41%	35%	42%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
How often do you meet with MFIP worker?	(N=232)	(N=18)	(N=78)	(N=46)	(N=35)	(N=55)
Never	9%	6%	6%	4%	20%	9%
One a year	68%	83%	59%	65%	60%	84%
Less than once a month	9%	6%	14%	13%	6%	-
Monthly	8%	6%	10%	9%	11%	4%
More than monthly	7%	-	10%	9%	3%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Time limits – do you know how much?						
Yes	41%	39%	39%	44%	51%	36%
Not sure	23%	28%	26%	18%	17%	24%
No	36%	33%	36%	38%	31%	40%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
How much time left?	(N=95)	(N=7)	(N=30)	(N=20)	(N=18)	(N=20)
One year or less	14%	14%	7%	15%	11%	25%
More than 1 year – 2	27%	43%	37%	25%	17%	15%
More than 2 years – 3	32%	14%	33%	30%	39%	30%
More than 3 years – 4	22%	29%	20%	25%	28%	15%
More than 4 years – 5	6%	-	3%	5%	6%	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Respondents who live in households receiving MFIP benefits were asked to list those things that they are doing to get ready for the end of their benefits, and to list those things that are barriers to meeting the MFIP requirements. Of the 26 respondents who reported that they are doing nothing to get ready, four of these expressed extreme feelings of hopelessness and despair. Nearly half (48%) of those receiving MFIP reported that nothing is keeping them from meeting the requirements. Nearly one-quarter (21%) reported that health problems and/or disabilities are barriers to meeting the requirements (Figures 15 and 16).

15. WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO GET READY FOR THE END OF MFIP BENEFITS?

	Overall (N=224)	Dunedin (N=15)	McDonough (N=75)	Mount Airy (N=46)	Roosevelt (N=35)	Scattered sites (N=53)
Working/working two jobs/spouse is working	29%	27%	31%	35%	21%	29%
Plan to find job/looking for work	13%	20%	13%	23%	19%	17%
Doing nothing/no plan/can't do anything	14%	13%	14%	8%	18%	14%
Going back to school/working on GED/going to college	12%	27%	10%	14%	26%	4%
SSI for child/I have disability	10%	-	11%	8%	5%	16%
Preparing in other ways	11%	-	12%	4%	3%	3%
Other	11%	13%	9%	8%	8%	17%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	259	15	84	52	38	70

16. ANYTHING THAT KEEPS YOU FROM MEETING MFIP REQUIREMENTS?

	Overall (N=222)	Dunedin (N=16)	McDonough (N=74)	Mount Airy (N=44)	Roosevelt (N=35)	Scattered sites (N=53)
Nothing	48%	32%	53%	57%	47%	40%
Health problems/disability	21%	26%	24%	9%	18%	26%
Language barriers/taking ESL	10%	32%	5%	10%	8%	10%
Lack of child care	5%	-	1%	2%	8%	11%
Other	16%	10%	17%	22%	19%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	240	19	75	46	38	62

Finally, adults from these households were asked to rate their own level of concern about the ending of their benefits. Three-quarters of respondents reported some level of concern (very, somewhat, or a little concerned), with nearly half (49%) reporting being very concerned. When asked if worry about MFIP affects their sleep or concentration, two-thirds reported being worried at some level with over one-third of respondents receiving MFIP reporting that their worry affects sleep and concentration “very much” (Figure 17).

17. LEVEL OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT TO DO WHEN BENEFITS END

	Overall (N=232)	Dunedin (N=17)	McDonough (N=78)	Mount Airy (N=45)	Roosevelt (N=36)	Scattered sites (N=55)
Very concerned	49%	59%	49%	40%	47%	55%
Somewhat concerned	13%	6%	10%	20%	8%	16%
A little concerned	13%	18%	17%	16%	17%	4%
Not at all concerned	25%	18%	24%	24%	28%	26%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Does worry about MFIP affect sleep or concentration?						
Very much	38%	65%	40%	30%	22%	46%
Somewhat	14%	-	10%	14%	19%	18%
Once in a while	14%	18%	12%	18%	19%	9%
Not at all	34%	18%	39%	39%	39%	27%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

School and work involvement

All adult respondents were asked about any of the adults’ in the household involvement in school and/or work. Nearly one-quarter (22%) of the households contain adults who were currently attending classes or training. Nearly half (49%) of the households contain adults who were employed outside the home. Many households contain one adult who was working fulltime (66%) and only one-quarter of the households contain one adult who is working part time. Dunedin respondents reported the lowest number of households with no adult employed outside the home (35%) and Mount Airy respondents reported the highest number of households with at least one adult employed outside the home (62%) (Figure 18).

18. SCHOOL AND WORK

	Overall (n=367)	Dunedin (n=20)	McDonough (n=122)	Mount Airy (n=66)	Roosevelt (n=75)	Scattered sites (n=84)
Adults in household attending classes/training						
Yes	22%	25%	21%	27%	20%	19%
No	78%	75%	79%	73%	80%	81%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Adults in household currently employed outside the home						
Yes	49%	35%	49%	62%	37%	51%
No	51%	65%	51%	38%	63%	49%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number adults working outside home – fulltime						
0	20%	43%	23%	12%	21%	19%
1	66%	57%	68%	71%	64%	61%
2	14%	-	8%	17%	14%	21%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number adults working outside home – part-time						
0	74%	57%	75%	81%	71%	72%
1	25%	29%	23%	20%	29%	28%
2	1%	14%	2%	-	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall, nearly one-fifth (19%) of households contain an adult who was looking for work, with the highest number of households with adults looking for work in the scattered site respondents (28%). Over half (53%) of households overall have adults not working due to a disability and, again, the highest numbers of households with adults unable to work because of disability was reported by the scattered site respondents (61%). Scattered site respondents also reported the highest number of households with adults not working in order to care for a family member with a disability (22%) (Figure 19).

19. WORK AND DISABILITY

	Overall (N=367)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=122)	Mount Airy (N=66)	Roosevelt (N=75)	Scattered sites (N=84)
Adults looking for work						
Yes	19%	15%	17%	15%	16%	28%
No	81%	85%	83%	85%	84%	72%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Any adults not working due to disability						
Yes	53%	44%	56%	46%	48%	61%
No	47%	56%	44%	54%	53%	39%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Any adults not working to care for family member with disability						
Yes	13%	18%	12%	10%	7%	22%
No	87%	81%	88%	90%	93%	78%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Households with young children

Sixty-nine percent of the households included in the study contained children under the age of twelve. Dunedin respondents reported the highest number of households with children under 12 (85%). Across all households with children under 12, over four-fifths (83%) of these have very or somewhat secure child care arrangements for these children. Parents were asked who generally cares for their children while parents are at work or school and to list their greatest problems and concerns about child care arrangements. Figures 20, 21, and 22 summarize this child care information.

20. CHILDREN AND CHILD CARE

	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Children under age 12	(N=367)	(N=20)	(N=122)	(N=66)	(N=75)	(N=84)
Yes	69%	85%	68%	79%	57%	69%
No	31%	15%	32%	21%	43%	31%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Security of child care arrangements	(N=248)	(N=17)	(N=81)	(N=51)	(N=42)	(N=57)
Very	57%	41%	47%	61%	71%	60%
Somewhat	26%	35%	33%	22%	14%	26%
A little	8%	18%	6%	10%	5%	9%
Not at all	9%	6%	14%	8%	10%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

21. WHO WATCHES CHILDREN WHILE YOU ARE AT WORK OR SCHOOL?

	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
	(N=179)	(N=12)	(N=58)	(N=37)	(N=31)	(N=41)
Relative	28%	33%	30%	26%	44%	14%
Other parent	26%	25%	21%	29%	19%	35%
Child care staff/family day care	28%	17%	35%	21%	34%	21%
Older children	16%	17%	12%	21%	3%	28%
Children watch each other	3%	8%	3%	3%	-	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	186	12	61	38	32	43

22. GREATEST PROBLEMS OR CONCERNS ABOUT CHILD CARE

	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
	(N=246)	(N=16)	(N=80)	(N=51)	(N=42)	(N=70)
Nothing	32%	44%	38%	35%	19%	29%
None, takes care of own children	26%	25%	17%	22%	32%	37%
Affordability	9%	25%	10%	4%	6%	12%
Safety/security of child care	5%	-	4%	6%	11%	5%
No child care available	5%	-	2%	7%	4%	10%
Other	23%	6%	29%	26%	28%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	260	16	84	54	41	59

Program awareness, involvement, and need

Adults surveyed were asked to list all programs in and around their neighborhood that all adults in household and children under 12 were participating in at the time of the study. They were also asked a series of questions to determine:

- their level of awareness regarding community programs,
- if aware, their opinions about quality of service in those program areas,
- if aware, whether or not their household members were ever involved,
- their level of need for programs in that areas, and
- if needed, the likelihood that their household members would participate if the program were available.

Programs that adults and children under 12 participate in are categorized in Figures 23 and 24. Programs reported by respondents as missing or unavailable are listed in Figure 25. Over half of the adults (56%) were not participating in any programs in and around their neighborhoods. Nearly half of children (48%) were not participating in any local programs.

Figures 27 - 32 provide a summary of program awareness and usage for the overall group and for each group of respondents by site. The program with the highest number of respondents who were aware of it was Head Start, with 74 percent of participants reporting awareness. Resources for domestic abuse (44%), emergency food services (53%), and Women, Infants, and Children clinic (WIC) (46%) received the highest ratings for quality of service. Half or more of respondents' households have ever been involved in outdoor recreation areas, WIC, and health clinic or health services. At the time of the survey, the highest needs for programs overall were in the areas of computer classes (48%), tutoring/help with homework (42%), emergency food services (40%), and health insurance (40%).

23. ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD CURRENT PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS IN AND AROUND NEIGHBORHOOD

	Overall (N=332)	Dunedin (N=17)	McDonough (N=110)	Mount Airy (N=61)	Roosevelt (N=74)	Scattered sites (N=70)
None	56%	48%	45%	45%	68%	76%
Job-related programs	8%	-	8%	26%	1%	1%
Holiday/church events	2%	-	1%	4%	2%	-
Educational programs	17%	47%	20%	14%	11%	12%
Culturally-focussed programs	1%	5%	1%	-	-	3%
Support programs	10%	-	14%	7%	11%	3%
Governance	3%	-	4%	4%	1%	3%
Volunteering	2%	-	2%	1%	4%	1%
Personal/other	2%	-	3%	-	1%	-
Sports	1%	-	2%	-	-	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total response	389	21	137	74	82	75

24. CHILDREN UNDER 12 PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

	Overall (N=225)	Dunedin (N=14)	McDonough (N=75)	Mount Airy (N=47)	Roosevelt (N=42)	Scattered sites (N=47)
None	48%	41%	44%	43%	42%	69%
Boys & Girls Club	11%	6%	3%	15%	29%	2%
Other community centers	11%	12%	15%	7%	4%	12%
Sports activities	6%	6%	6%	5%	4%	10%
Head Start	6%	-	3%	8%	13%	4%
After school tutoring	4%	18%	8%	-	-	2%
Other activities or programs	14%	17%	21%	22%	8%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	263	17	87	60	48	51

A low percentage of residents reported that more child care and greater safety and security efforts are needed (Figure 25). Nearly one-fourth of participants reported that public housing staff could send out more written materials to publicize programs (Figure 26).

25. PROGRAMS THAT ARE MISSING

	Overall (N=286)	Dunedin (N=18)	McDonough (N=95)	Mount Airy (N=49)	Roosevelt (N=58)	Scattered sites (N=66)
Everything okay/have what is needed	47%	37%	56%	42%	38%	49%
More safety/security efforts	4%	5%	4%	8%	3%	1%
Child care	3%	5%	7%	-	-	3%
More tutors for children	2%	-	1%	2%	3%	4%
More activities for children under 6	2%	-	2%	2%	3%	-
Food shelf with interpreters	2%	-	1%	-	2%	5%
Availability of transportation	2%	-	1%	4%	2%	3%
Others ¹	38%	53% ¹	28% ¹	42% ¹	49% ¹	35% ¹
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	313	19	103	53	64	74

¹ See Attachment C.

26. WAYS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING STAFF TO GET WORD OUT ABOUT PROGRAMS

	Overall (N=289)	Dunedin (N=14)	McDonough (N=92)	Mount Airy (N=55)	Roosevelt (N=61)	Scattered sites (N=67)
Already doing what is needed	29%	14%	42%	35%	17%	19%
No ideas/staff should decide	12%	43%	11%	9%	12%	13%
Send/mail out more flyers and brochures	22%	21%	22%	30%	39%	37%
Call residents	6%	-	4%	6%	11%	4%
Make efforts in first language of res.	9%	7%	8%	8%	13%	9%
More meetings/better orientation	7%	7%	9%	9%	1%	5%
Other	15%	7%	4%	3%	7%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	341	14	111	66	75	75

27. OVERALL PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USAGE (N=367)

	Awareness of programs			N	Quality of services					Total	Ever involved		
	Yes	No	Total		Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor	Yes		No	Total	
A. Gym or indoor recreation	66%	34%	100%	242	18%	58%	17%	8%	100%	35%	65%	100%	
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	62%	38%	100%	227	18%	55%	21%	6%	100%	50%	50%	100%	
C. Parenting education sessions such as Early childhood family education (ECFE)	47%	54%	100%	172	39%	54%	5%	2%	100%	28%	72%	100%	
D. Health clinic or health services	64%	36%	100%	235	35%	56%	8%	1%	100%	52%	48%	100%	
E. Head Start	74%	26%	100%	271	42%	53%	4%	1%	100%	48%	52%	100%	
F. Emergency food services	66%	34%	100%	242	46%	43%	8%	4%	100%	47%	53%	100%	
G. Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) clinic	66%	34%	100%	242	53%	40%	6%	-	100%	64%	36%	100%	
H. General Education Diploma (GED) classes	43%	58%	100%	157	38%	46%	15%	1%	100%	17%	83%	100%	
I. Employment support services	55%	45%	100%	202	33%	46%	16%	5%	100%	30%	70%	100%	
J. Health insurance	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
K. English as a Second Language (ESL) classes	62%	38%	100%	227	36%	55%	8%	2%	100%	28%	72%	100%	
L. Tutoring/help with homework	45%	55%	100%	165	40%	44%	15%	1%	100%	24%	76%	100%	
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	27%	73%	100%	99	44%	50%	7%	-	100%	9%	91%	100%	
N. Computer classes	57%	43%	100%	209	32%	59%	7%	2%	100%	26%	75%	100%	
O. Other – citizenship classes, child care, health insurance, driver education, police station, day care in STRIDE, Extended day, women's group, free clothing, free furniture, library, translators, energy assistance, meals on wheels, dial-a-nurse	5%	95%	100%	18	36%	57%	7%	-	100%	53%	47%	100%	

27. OVERALL PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USAGE (CONTINUED)

	Current need for service or program					If “a lot, some, or a little,” likelihood of participation					
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Total	N	Very likely	Some-what likely	A little likely	Not likely	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	31%	24%	11%	35%	100%	221	35%	41%	19%	5%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	30%	26%	13%	31%	100%	233	43%	34%	21%	3%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	27%	15%	7%	50%	100%	164	40%	38%	16%	6%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	38%	15%	7%	39%	100%	207	57%	27%	12%	4%	100%
E. Head Start	36%	9%	4%	51%	100%	167	68%	14%	7%	10%	100%
F. Emergency food services	40%	24%	10%	27%	100%	247	57%	24%	14%	5%	100%
G. WIC clinic	39%	10%	2%	48%	100%	174	67%	15%	8%	11%	100%
H. GED classes	29%	11%	1%	59%	100%	133	51%	22%	8%	20%	100%
I. Employment support services	32%	13%	7%	48%	100%	171	47%	32%	14%	6%	100%
J. Health insurance	40%	8%	4%	48%	100%	173	72%	16%	10%	2%	100%
K. ESL classes	29%	11%	5%	56%	100%	144	43%	30%	10%	17%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	42%	16%	4%	39%	100%	200	63%	23%	10%	6%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	19%	11%	5%	65%	100%	112	34%	27%	17%	22%	100%
N. Computer classes	48%	13%	3%	36%	100%	212	64%	26%	6%	5%	100%
O. Other (N=19)	100%	-	-	-	100%	18	100%	-	-	-	100%

28. DUNEDIN PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USAGE (N=20)

	Awareness of programs			Quality of services						Ever involved		
	Yes	No	Total	N	Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Yes	No	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	63%	37%	100%	12	8%	58%	17%	17%	100%	55%	45%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	79%	21%	100%	16	7%	73%	13%	7%	100%	75%	25%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	38%	62%	100%	8	-	7%	1%	-	8%	45%	55%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	74%	26%	100%	15	18%	64%	9%	9%	100%	60%	40%	100%
E. Head Start	61%	39%	100%	12	40%	60%	-	-	100%	60%	40%	100%
F. Emergency food services	95%	5%	100%	19	47%	47%	7%	-	100%	70%	30%	100%
G. WIC clinic	82%	18%	100%	16	69%	31%	-	-	100%	84%	16%	100%
H. GED classes	27%	73%	100%	5	50%	50%	-	-	100%	35%	65%	100%
I. Employment support services	38%	63%	100%	8	4%	2%	-	2%	8%	21%	79%	100%
J. Health care services	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
K. ESL classes	75%	25%	100%	15	50%	42%	-	8%	100%	40%	60%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	47%	53%	100%	10	50%	33%	17%	-	100%	53%	47%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	18%	82%	100%	4	4%	-	-	-	4%	6%	94%	100%
N. Computer classes	31%	69%	100%	6	-	6%	-	-	6%	22%	78%	100%
O. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

28. DUNEDIN PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USEAGE (CONTINUED)

	Current need for service or program					Likelihood of participation					
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Total	N	Very likely	Some-what likely	A little likely	Not likely	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	26%	16%	-	58%	100%	8	3%	1%	3%	1%	8%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	16%	26%	11%	47%	100%	10	50%	30%	20%	-	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	30%	15%	5%	50%	100%	10	50%	40%	10%	-	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	26%	26%	5%	42%	100%	11	27%	73%	-	-	100%
E. Head Start	35%	13%	-	50%	100%	10	7%	2%	-	1%	100%
F. Emergency food services	21%	42%	5%	32%	100%	13	62%	31%	8%	-	100%
G. WIC clinic	30%	30%	-	40%	100%	12	75%	17%	-	8%	100%
H. GED classes	40%	10%	-	50%	100%	10	80%	20%	-	-	100%
I. Employment support services	42%	5%	5%	47%	100%	10	60%	10%	30%	-	100%
J. Health insurance	32%	16%	5%	47%	100%	10	50%	30%	20%	-	100%
K. ESL classes	40%	20%	5%	35%	100%	13	54%	31%	8%	8%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	50%	10%	5%	35%	100%	13	69%	23%	8%	-	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	26%	5%	-	68%	100%	6	3%	2%	-	1%	6%
N. Computer classes	45%	15%	-	40%	100%	12	50%	42%	8%	-	100%
O. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

29. MCDONOUGH PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USEAGE (N=122)

	Awareness of programs			Quality of services						Ever involved		
	Yes	No	Total	N	Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Yes	No	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	83%	17%	100%	101	22%	57%	15%	7%	100%	50%	50%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	73%	27%	100%	89	22%	44%	28%	6%	100%	57%	43%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	49%	51%	100%	60	43%	47%	7%	3%	100%	26%	74%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	77%	23%	100%	94	42%	51%	7%	-	100%	57%	43%	100%
E. Head Start	83%	17%	100%	101	54%	41%	3%	2%	100%	49%	51%	100%
F. Emergency food services	61%	39%	100%	74	49%	38%	7%	7%	100%	50%	50%	100%
G. WIC clinic	89%	11%	100%	108	55%	40%	5%	-	100%	70%	30%	100%
H. GED classes	39%	61%	100%	48	37%	47%	16%	-	100%	16%	84%	100%
I. Employment support services	63%	38%	100%	77	33%	56%	9%	2%	100%	29%	71%	100%
J. Health insurance	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
K. ESL classes	70%	30%	100%	85	36%	51%	13%	-	100%	30%	70%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	56%	44%	100%	68	41%	39%	21%	-	100%	27%	74%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	35%	65%	100%	43	50%	45%	5%	-	100%	8%	92%	100%
N. Computer classes	76%	24%	100%	93	38%	53%	6%	2%	100%	33%	67%	100%
O. Other (child care, police station, daycare for moms in STRIDE, extended day, free clothing, free furniture, translators)	7%	2%	9%	9	2%	4%	1%	-	7%	5%	4%	9%

29. MCDONOUGH PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USEAGE (CONTINUED)

	Current need for service or program					Likelihood of participation					
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Total	N	Very likely	Some-what likely	A little likely	Not likely	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	24%	23%	8%	35%	100%	73	32%	58%	7%	4%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	32%	23%	9%	36%	100%	70	46%	34%	16%	4%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	31%	14%	5%	51%	100%	53	40%	38%	11%	11%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	40%	13%	10%	37%	100%	72	56%	31%	6%	8%	100%
E. Head Start	39%	5%	6%	50%	100%	56	68%	7%	7%	18%	100%
F. Emergency food services	51%	16%	11%	22%	100%	90	59%	20%	14%	7%	100%
G. WIC clinic	45%	5%	2%	49%	100%	57	67%	5%	7%	21%	100%
H. GED classes	31%	7%	1%	61%	100%	41	39%	22%	7%	32%	100%
I. Employment support services	33%	9%	6%	52%	100%	52	40%	40%	8%	12%	100%
J. Health insurance	43%	5%	3%	50%	100%	55	75%	11%	9%	6%	100%
K. ESL classes	29%	8%	4%	59%	100%	42	36%	24%	10%	31%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	39%	17%	2%	43%	100%	61	54%	25%	7%	15%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	23%	8%	3%	66%	100%	37	32%	16%	14%	38%	100%
N. Computer classes	51%	8%	3%	39%	100%	65	63%	20%	5%	12%	100%
O. Other (child care, free clothing, park equipment, extended hours at community center, home maintenance, extended day at school, day care for very young (0-3), furniture vouchers)	8%	-	-	-	8%	8	8%	-	-	-	8%

30. MOUNT AIRY PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USEAGE (N=66)

	Awareness of programs			Quality of services						Ever involved		
	Yes	No	Total	N	Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Yes	No	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	59%	41%	100%	39	14%	45%	35%	7%	100%	32%	68%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	60%	40%	100%	40	28%	53%	16%	3%	100%	58%	42%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	57%	43%	100%	38	41%	48%	7%	4%	100%	40%	60%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	40%	60%	100%	26	16%	68%	11%	5%	100%	49%	51%	100%
E. Head Start	87%	13%	100%	57	48%	46%	7%	-	100%	64%	36%	100%
F. Emergency food services	77%	23%	100%	51	44%	46%	5%	5%	100%	50%	50%	100%
G. WIC clinic	39%	61%	100%	26	64%	27%	9%	-	100%	65%	36%	100%
H. GED classes	71%	29%	100%	47	33%	50%	17%	-	100%	21%	79%	100%
I. Employment support services	77%	23%	100%	51	36%	39%	19%	6%	100%	45%	55%	100%
J. Health insurance	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
K. ESL classes	69%	31%	100%	46	36%	52%	9%	3%	100%	27%	73%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	68%	32%	100%	45	36%	54%	11%	-	100%	35%	66%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	14%	86%	100%	9	25%	75%	-	-	100%	12%	89%	100%
N. Computer classes	82%	19%	100%	54	36%	55%	9%	-	100%	32%	68%	100%
O. Other (health insurance/MA, driver education)	2%	-	2%	1	-	2%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	2%

30. MOUNT AIRY PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USEAGE (CONTINUED)

	Current need for service or program					Likelihood of participation					
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Total	N	Very likely	Some-what likely	A little likely	Not likely	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	33%	17%	17%	33%	100%	40	38%	28%	28%	8%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	30%	28%	25%	18%	100%	50	36%	42%	22%	-	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	28%	14%	16%	42%	100%	37	38%	30%	27%	5%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	38%	16%	8%	39%	100%	38	58%	21%	21%	-	100%
E. Head Start	38%	13%	3%	47%	100%	34	59%	29%	6%	6%	100%
F. Emergency food services	28%	28%	11%	33%	100%	43	42%	35%	21%	2%	100%
G. WIC clinic	33%	17%	5%	46%	100%	36	58%	28%	11%	3%	100%
H. GED classes	31%	11%	3%	55%	100%	28	46%	29%	11%	14%	100%
I. Employment support services	24%	13%	13%	51%	100%	31	55%	26%	16%	3%	100%
J. Health insurance	39%	8%	8%	45%	100%	35	71%	20%	9%	-	100%
K. ESL classes	30%	6%	5%	59%	100%	26	46%	31%	8%	15%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	34%	19%	9%	39%	100%	39	54%	26%	18%	3%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	16%	9%	8%	67%	100%	21	38%	29%	19%	14%	100%
N. Computer classes	42%	12%	9%	37%	100%	41	59%	34%	7%	-	100%
O. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

31. ROOSEVELT PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USAGE (N=75)

	Awareness of programs			Quality of services						Ever involved		
	Yes	No	Total	N	Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Yes	No	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	71%	29%	100%	53	23%	66%	3%	9%	100%	23%	77%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	65%	35%	100%	49	16%	66%	9%	9%	100%	41%	59%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	50%	50%	100%	38	47%	53%	-	-	100%	22%	78%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	84%	16%	100%	63	43%	55%	2%	-	100%	44%	56%	100%
E. Head Start	82%	18%	100%	62	29%	69%	2%	-	100%	34%	66%	100%
F. Emergency food services	76%	24%	100%	57	44%	42%	12%	2%	100%	54%	46%	100%
G. WIC clinic	62%	39%	100%	47	50%	35%	15%	-	100%	56%	44%	100%
H. GED classes	43%	57%	100%	32	46%	31%	15%	8%	100%	20%	80%	100%
I. Employment support services	58%	42%	100%	44	35%	44%	17%	4%	100%	30%	70%	100%
J. Health care insurance	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
K. ESL classes	76%	24%	100%	57	34%	60%	6%	-	100%	25%	75%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	41%	59%	100%	31	31%	50%	13%	6%	100%	14%	86%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	45%	55%	100%	34	43%	50%	7%	-	100%	8%	92%	100%
N. Computer classes	52%	48%	100%	39	2%0	65%	10%	5%	100%	22%	78%	100%
O. Other (Citizenship classes, monthly women's group)	1%	1%	2%	1	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	2%

31. ROOSEVELT PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USEAGE (CONTINUED)

	Current need for service or program					Likelihood of participation					
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Total	N	Very likely	Some-what likely	A little likely	Not likely	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	31%	20%	14%	35%	100%	46	48%	33%	11%	9%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	34%	24%	8%	34%	100%	49	55%	25%	18%	2%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	23%	11%	6%	60%	100%	28	43%	39%	14%	4%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	34%	15%	4%	47%	100%	39	56%	26%	15%	3%	100%
E. Head Start	32%	10%	-	58%	100%	30	80%	13%	3%	3%	100%
F. Emergency food services	42%	22%	7%	29%	100%	50	72%	20%	8%	-	100%
G. WIC clinic	44%	3%	1%	52%	100%	32	88%	9%	3%	-	100%
H. GED classes	21%	7%	72%	-	100%	20	70%	15%	5%	10%	100%
I. Employment support services	32%	10%	3%	56%	100%	32	53%	34%	6%	6%	100%
J. Health insurance	31%	7%	3%	59%	100%	29	72%	14%	14%	-	100%
K. ESL classes	22%	9%	6%	64%	100%	24	50%	29%	8%	13%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	31%	13%	1%	54%	100%	32	66%	22%	9%	3%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	10%	9%	4%	77%	100%	15	20%	53%	13%	13%	100%
N. Computer classes	44%	11%	-	45%	100%	39	72%	23%	3%	3%	100%
O. Other (dentist for adults, free clothing, ACOP)	3%	-	-	-	3%	2	2	-	-	-	2%

32. SCATTERED SITES PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USEAGE (N=84)

	Awareness of programs			Quality of services						Ever involved		
	Yes	No	Total	N	Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Yes	No	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	39%	62%	100%	33	5%	67%	24%	5%	100%	20%	80%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	38%	62%	100%	32	7%	59%	30%	4%	100%	35%	65%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	34%	66%	100%	29	35%	65%	-	-	100%	23%	77%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	43%	68%	100%	36	27%	58%	15%	-	100%	52%	48%	100%
E. Head Start	47%	53%	100%	39	28%	66%	3%	3%	100%	46%	54%	100%
F. Emergency food services	42%	58%	100%	35	43%	48%	10%	-	100%	28%	72%	100%
G. WIC clinic	53%	47%	100%	44	40%	57%	3%	-	100%	57%	43%	100%
H. GED classes	25%	75%	100%	21	36%	55%	9%	-	100%	10%	90%	100%
I. Employment support services	25%	75%	100%	21	15%	46%	31%	8%	100%	20%	80%	100%
J. Health care insurance	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
K. ESL classes	27%	73%	100%	23	31%	69%	-	-	100%	26%	74%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	13%	87%	100%	11	75%	25%	-	-	100%	15%	85%	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	17%	83%	100%	14	29%	57%	14%	-	100%	10%	90%	100%
N. Computer classes	15%	85%	100%	13	17%	83%	-	-	100%	14%	86%	100%
O. Other (health insurance, library, energy assistance, meals-on-wheels, Dial-A-Nurse)	4%	-	4%	4	3%	1%	-	-	4%	2%	3%	5%

32. SCATTERED SITES PROGRAM AWARENESS AND USEAGE (CONTINUED)

	Current need for service or program					Likelihood of participation					
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Total	NA	Very likely	Some-what likely	A little likely	Not likely	Total
A. Gym or indoor recreation	24%	39%	9%	28%	100%	54	26%	39%	33%	2%	100%
B. Outdoor recreation areas/public parkland	27%	32%	13%	28%	100%	54	33%	33%	30%	4%	100%
C. Parenting education sessions such as ECFE	25%	23%	6%	47%	100%	36	36%	47%	14%	3%	100%
D. Health clinic or health services	44%	16%	6%	34%	100%	47	66%	17%	15%	2%	100%
E. Head Start	36%	11%	4%	49%	100%	37	68%	11%	14%	8%	100%
F. Emergency food services	33%	29%	13%	25%	100%	51	51%	26%	14%	10%	100%
G. WIC clinic	35%	16%	1%	48%	100%	37	54%	22%	11%	14%	100%
H. GED classes	30%	20%	1%	49%	100%	34	50%	21%	9%	21%	100%
I. Employment support services	36%	23%	8%	33%	100%	46	44%	30%	22%	4%	100%
J. Health insurance	47%	13%	1%	39%	100%	44	73%	16%	9%	2%	100%
K. ESL classes	32%	19%	4%	44%	100%	39	41%	36%	13%	10%	100%
L. Tutoring/help with homework	60%	15%	3%	22%	100%	55	75%	18%	7%	-	100%
M. Resources for getting help with domestic or child abuse	21%	18%	10%	51%	100%	33	36%	24%	24%	15%	100%
N. Computer classes	57%	22%	3%	18%	100%	55	66%	26%	7%	2%	100%
O. Other (Asian store, program for elderly, applying to offer foster care, swimming for adults with disabilities, a house, more child care that is paid for, mentoring program for children)	8%	-	-	-	8%	8	8%	-	-	-	8%

Well-being and health

Nearly all (93%) children in households surveyed are covered by health insurance, yet 6 percent overall are not covered. Similarly, nearly all (93%) of households were able to obtain needed health care in the six months preceding the survey. As expected, slightly fewer (91%) of the adult members of the households surveyed are covered by health insurance (Figure 34).

33. HEALTH INSURANCE AND HEALTH CARE

	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Are all children in household covered by health insurance?	(N=343)	(N=20)	(N=115)	(N=66)	(N=63)	(N=79)
Yes	93%	95%	90%	96%	89%	98%
No	6%	5%	8%	5%	10%	3%
Not sure	1%	-	2%	-	2%	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Ability to obtain need healthcare in past 6 months for self and family	(N=358)	(N=20)	(N=121)	(N=65)	(N=70)	(N=82)
Yes	93%	95%	94%	92%	91%	94%
No	7%	5%	6%	8%	9%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Are all adult members in household covered?	(N=367)	(N=20)	(N=122)	(N=66)	(N=75)	(N=84)
Yes	91%	95%	92%	89%	92%	87%
No	9%	5%	7%	11%	8%	12%
Not sure	<1%	-	1%	-	-	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Those who did not obtain needed health care in previous six months were asked to list the barriers that kept them from getting the care. A primary reason is that households that do not have insurance have not sought or located health services. A related reason provided is that insurance and prescription costs are too high, and these keep household members from seeking the needed care (Figure 35).

34. BARRIERS TO OBTAINING NEEDED HEALTHCARE

	Overall (N=22)	Dunedin (N=1)	McDonough (N=7)	Mount Airy (N=5)	Roosevelt (N=5)	Scattered sites (N=4)
No insurance	41%	1	5	2	1	-
Insurance and prescription costs too high	32%	-	1	2	2	2
Personal barrier (no time, don't want to go)	9%	-	-	-	1	1
Nothing	9%	-	1	1	-	-
Transportation and language barrier	5%	-	-	-	1	-
Switched clinics	5%	-	-	-	-	1
Total	100%	1	7	5	5	4

Sixteen percent of households surveyed have members with mental health concerns. Alcohol/drug use and violence problems were reported as present in only one percent of the households (Figure 36).

35. OTHER HEALTH CONCERNS

	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Members of household with mental health concerns	(N=367)	(N=20)	(N=122)	(N=66)	(N=75)	(N=84)
Yes	16%	5%	15%	17%	17%	17%
No	83%	95%	84%	83%	81%	80%
Not sure	1%	-	1%	-	1%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Members of household with alcohol or drug use problems	(N=366)	(N=20)	(N=122)	(N=66)	(N=75)	(N=83)
Yes	1%	5%	2%	2%	1%	-
No	99%	95%	98%	99%	99%	100%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
If so, problems with police or public housing	(N=3)	(N=1)	(N=1)	(N=1)		
Some	1	-	1	-	-	-
Not at all	2	1	-	1	-	-
Total	3	1	1	1	-	-
Members of household violent or abusive	(N=366)	(N=20)	(N=122)	(N=66)	(N=74)	(N=84)
Yes	2%	-	2%	5%	1%	1%
No	98%	20%	98%	96%	99%	98%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
If so, problems with police or public housing	(N=8)		(N=2)	(N=4)	(N=1)	(N=1)
Some	2	-	1	-	1	-
Few	1	-	1	1	-	-
Not at all	5	-	-	3	-	1
Total	8	-	2	4	1	1

A Community Outreach Program (ACOP) and satisfaction with police

Respondents who resided in one of the four family housing developments (McDonough, Mount Airy, Roosevelt, and Dunedin) were asked about their awareness of ACOP. All respondents were asked about their satisfaction levels with general police services (Figure 33). Roughly three-quarters of respondents had heard about ACOP, with the Roosevelt respondents reporting the lowest levels of ACOP awareness (63% had heard of ACOP). Overall, positive satisfaction ratings with police response (72% very satisfied or satisfied), with police interaction (80%), and with police efforts to combat illegal drug use and sales (80%) were given by over three-quarters of respondents. Satisfaction rates for these various aspects of police efforts and awareness of ACOP are both highest for the Mount Airy group of respondents.

36. ACOP AWARENESS AND SATISFACTION

	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Heard about ACOP in community	(N=259)	(N=18)	(N=111)	(N=63)	(N=67)	
Yes	74%	72%	78%	79%	63%	NA
No	26%	28%	23%	21%	37%	NA
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	NA
Satisfaction with police response to calls	(N=303)	(N=18)	(N=100)	(N=56)	(N=66)	(N=63)
Very satisfied	23%	11%	25%	27%	23%	21%
Somewhat satisfied	49%	33%	47%	39%	52%	64%
Dissatisfied	20%	39%	19%	29%	14%	14%
Very dissatisfied	8%	17%	9%	5%	12%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Satisfaction with police interaction with residents	(N=289)	(N=13)	(N=96)	(N=54)	(N=62)	(N=64)
Very satisfied	23%	15%	21%	32%	23%	19%
Somewhat satisfied	57%	54%	59%	50%	48%	70%
Dissatisfied	14%	23%	14%	11%	23%	8%
Very dissatisfied	6%	8%	6%	7%	7%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Satisfaction with efforts to combat illegal drug use and sales	(N=269)	(N=15)	(N=89)	(N=45)	(N=60)	(N=60)
Very satisfied	35%	33%	33%	40%	33%	37%
Somewhat satisfied	45%	40%	49%	47%	37%	48%
Dissatisfied	13%	13%	9%	13%	20%	10%
Very dissatisfied	7%	13%	9%	-	10%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Safety in neighborhood

Respondents were asked to rate their current feelings of safety alone at night in the homes, out alone at night walking in the immediate neighborhood, and out alone during the day. They were then asked to compare their feelings now to how they felt one year ago. Over half (51%) feel very safe alone at night in their home, while not quite one-quarter (23%) feel very safe alone at night out walking in their immediate neighborhoods. Sixty percent feel very safe out alone during the day in their immediate neighborhoods (Figure 37).

37. SAFETY

	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Level of safety alone at night in house	(N=367)	(N=20)	(N=122)	(N=66)	(N=75)	(N=84)
Very safe	51%	55%	56%	50%	48%	45%
Somewhat safe	26%	15%	25%	30%	28%	26%
Somewhat unsafe	17%	20%	17%	11%	17%	19%
Very unsafe	6%	10%	2%	9%	7%	10%
Don't know/no opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level of safety out alone at night in neighborhood	(N=358)	(N=20)	(N=121)	(N=63)	(N=74)	(N=80)
Very safe	23%	25%	24%	24%	20%	23%
Somewhat safe	30%	20%	34%	26%	25%	33%
Somewhat unsafe	26%	40%	19%	27%	27%	30%
Very unsafe	19%	15%	23%	18%	27%	10%
Don't know/no opinion	3%	-	1%	5%	2%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level of safety out alone during day in neighborhood	(N=367)	(N=20)	(N=122)	(N=66)	(N=75)	(N=84)
Very safe	60%	50%	66%	64%	56%	54%
Somewhat safe	31%	45%	25%	29%	33%	37%
Somewhat unsafe	8%	5%	8%	6%	11%	7%
Very unsafe	1%	-	1%	2%	-	2%
Don't know/no opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Roughly one in five residents surveyed report that they feel more safe as compared to one year ago when they are alone at night in their homes, out alone at night in the neighborhood, and out alone during the day in the neighborhood. Many respondents feel about the same as compared to one year ago. Those residents who report lower current safety levels tend to report feeling about the same or less safe, and those who report higher current safety levels tend to report feeling about the same or more safe. These patterns appear to be consistent across the sites (Figure 38).

38. SAFETY NOW AND ONE YEAR AGO

Compared to one year ago...	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Safe alone at night in home	(N=363)	(N=20)	(N=120)	(N=66)	(N=73)	(N=84)
More safe	24%	40%	26%	30%	17%	18%
About same	61%	45%	60%	61%	59%	69%
Less safe	14%	15%	12%	9%	21%	13%
Don't know/no opinion	1%	-	2%	-	3%	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Safe out alone at night in neighborhood	(N=356)	(N=20)	(N=119)	(N=63)	(N=73)	(N=81)
More safe	20%	20%	22%	26%	20%	12%
About same	62%	60%	60%	58%	55%	74%
Less safe	16%	20%	16%	12%	23%	11%
Don't know/no opinion	3%	-	3%	5%	3%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Safe out alone during day in neighborhood	(N=363)	(N=20)	(N=120)	(N=66)	(N=74)	(N=83)
More safe	20%	25%	21%	24%	19%	16%
About same	69%	55%	68%	67%	72%	73%
Less safe	10%	20%	10%	9%	8%	11%
Don't know/no opinion	1%	-	2%	-	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Those participants with children under the age of 17 were asked to compare their current feelings of safety related to their children playing outside during the day to one year ago. Twenty-eight percent of parents reported feeling more safe overall, with over one-third of McDonough parents reporting greater feelings of safety when compared to one year ago. Nearly one-third of Dunedin parents report feeling less safe about their children playing outside as compared to one year ago (Figure 39).

39. CHILDREN AND SAFETY

Compared to one year ago...	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Safety of children playing outside during day	(N=290)	(N=19)	(N=89)	(N=57)	(N=50)	(N=71)
More safe	28%	26%	33%	30%	27%	20%
About same	53%	42%	46%	58%	55%	61%
Less safe	18%	32%	18%	12%	16%	20%
Don't know/no opinion	1%	-	3%	-	2%	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

All respondents were asked to compare the current level of overall crime and specific types of crime to one year prior to the survey (Figure 40). While over half of the participating residents reported that crimes such as concealed drug dealing, open-air dealing, drug use by residents, and young people controlling buildings have not ever a problem, the following percentages of respondents reported higher levels across these areas:

- 17% of the respondents reported more crime in neighborhood,
- 13% reported more vandalism or graffiti,
- 21% reported more groups hanging out,
- 10% reported more concealed drug dealing,
- 7% reported more open-air drug dealing,
- 7% reported more drug use by residents, and
- 10% reported more occurrences of young people controlling the area or building where they live.

40. TYPES OF CRIME

Compared to one year ago...	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Level of crime in neighborhood	(N=354)	(N=20)	(N=115)	(N=63)	(N=73)	(N=83)
Less	26%	45%	31%	26%	29%	11%
About the same	28%	5%	27%	32%	32%	26%
More	17%	30%	14%	17%	13%	20%
Not a problem then or now	26%	20%	22%	21%	23%	42%
Don't know/no opinion	4%	-	6%	5%	3%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level of vandalism or graffiti	(N=352)	(N=20)	(N=116)	(N=62)	(N=74)	(N=80)
Less	26%	35%	24%	24%	35%	20%
About the same	23%	20%	22%	32%	25%	16%
More	13%	10%	14%	14%	11%	12%
Not a problem then or now	35%	35%	35%	24%	28%	48%
Don't know/no opinion	4%	-	5%	6%	1%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level of groups hanging out	(N=354)	(N=20)	(N=117)	(N=64)	(N=73)	(N=80)
Less	28%	30%	31%	33%	28%	19%
About the same	21%	20%	22%	26%	25%	14%
More	21%	45%	21%	23%	19%	17%
Not a problem then or now	26%	5%	21%	15%	25%	45%
Don't know/no opinion	4%	-	4%	3%	3%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Concealed drug dealing	(N=319)	(N=19)	(N=105)	(N=48)	(N=71)	(N=76)
Less	13%	15%	12%	17%	17%	6%
About the same	10%	-	16%	6%	7%	7%
More	10%	20%	3%	8%	17%	11%
Not a problem then or now	55%	60%	54%	42%	53%	67%
Don't know/no opinion	13%	5%	14%	27%	5%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

40. TYPES OF CRIME (CONTINUED)

Compared to one year ago...	Overall	Dunedin	McDonough	Mount Airy	Roosevelt	Scattered sites
Open-air drug dealing	(N=321)	(N=17)	(N=106)	(N=53)	(N=70)	(N=75)
Less	13%	10%	11%	21%	15%	7%
About the same	10%	-	17%	9%	4%	8%
More	7%	15%	3%	3%	16%	7%
Not a problem then or now	58%	60%	56%	47%	59%	67%
Don't know/no opinion	13%	15%	13%	20%	7%	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Drug use by residents	(N=316)	(N=18)	(N=106)	(N=50)	(N=67)	(N=75)
Less	10%	10%	12%	12%	9%	6%
About the same	10%	10%	12%	11%	8%	7%
More	7%	15%	5%	8%	12%	5%
Not a problem then or now	59%	55%	58%	46%	60%	71%
Don't know/no opinion	13%	10%	13%	24%	11%	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Young people controlling building/area	(N=352)	(N=20)	(N=116)	(N=64)	(N=73)	(N=79)
Less	18%	15%	16%	29%	23%	7%
About the same	17%	45%	16%	15%	15%	13%
More	10%	10%	12%	9%	4%	12%
Not a problem then or now	52%	30%	51%	44%	56%	62%
Don't know/no opinion	4%	-	5%	3%	3%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Although ratings of safety are positive, those residents who offered comments regarding neighborhood improvements most often made comments about improving safety further. Comments were made regarding the need to increase police patrolling the neighborhoods and to increase efforts in going after gangs, among several other individual comments. The most cited comment regarding improved maintenance was related to remodeling the houses in public housing (Figure 41).

41. RESIDENT COMMENTS OF FAMILY NEEDS OR HOW TO IMPROVE NEIGHBORHOOD

	Overall (N=354)	Dunedin (N=20)	McDonough (N=118)	Mount Airy (N=63)	Roosevelt (N=74)	Scattered sites (N=79)
Safety, e.g. increase police patrol, go after gangs	14%	19%	10%	16%	25%	6%
Maintenance, e.g. remodel houses, increase garbage pick-up	7%	-	13%	1%	5%	5%
More activities, e.g. more educational activities	4%	-	5%	1%	4%	5%
Personal needs, e.g. help with paying bills	4%	5%	1%	-	4%	-
Miscellaneous, e.g. bigger parking lot	4%	10%	5%	7%	1%	2%
Parenting, e.g. better supervision on playground	3%	-	4%	3%	1%	4%
Relationships, e.g. fear of people of another race	3%	-	2%	3%	5%	2%
Positive comments, e.g. I'm happy to live in public housing	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	4%
More child care	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-
Nothing, no comment	62%	67%	60%	67%	52%	71%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	382	21	125	69	84	83

Youth survey results

Youth participating in the youth portion of the interview ranged in ages from 12 – 18, with just under half of the youth male and just over half of the youth female. After the parent gave permission for the interviewer to talk with the youth, the youth was asked if he or she wanted to participate. They were told that the survey was being done to identify the help and services that are most needed by families who live in public housing (Figure 42).

42. AGE AND GENDER OF YOUTH

	Overall (N=138)	Dunedin (N=12)	McDonough (N=35)	Mount Airy (N=27)	Roosevelt (N=20)	Scattered sites (N=44)
12 years old	12%	-	20%	7%	-	16%
13 years old	22%	-	23%	41%	25%	14%
14 years old	11%	-	9%	7%	35%	7%
15 years old	16%	50%	6%	11%	10%	21%
16 years old	20%	25%	26%	11%	30%	14%
17 years old	15%	17%	11%	15%	-	25%
18 years old	5%	8%	6%	7%	-	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Male	45%	75%	27%	37%	80%	39%
Female	55%	25%	74%	63%	20%	61%

Housing

Youth were asked to list what they most liked about their house and their neighborhood. More than half of the youth overall mentioned the adequate space that their family has in public housing, specifically that the youth has his or her own bedroom, the family has a basement, or the kitchen is large (Figure 43).

43. WHAT YOUTH MOST LIKE ABOUT THEIR HOUSE

	Overall (N=144)	Dunedin (N=11)	McDonough (N=37)	Mount Airy (N=29)	Roosevelt (N=21)	Scattered sites (N=46)
Space	58%	36%	62%	52%	62%	59%
Personal/quality of life	10%	27%	8%	7%	-	15%
Environment	14%	18%	11%	14%	14%	15%
Maintenance	2%	-	5%	3%	-	-
Nothing I like	5%	-	5%	7%	14%	-
Like everything	12%	18%	8%	17%	10%	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Youth reported that what they most like about their neighborhoods are the neighbors (e.g. nice neighbors and my friends) and the environment (e.g. it is quiet) (Figure 44). Youth reported liking similar aspects of their houses and neighborhoods when compared to the adults surveyed.

44. WHAT YOUTH LIKE MOST ABOUT THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD

	Overall (N=165)	Dunedin (N=14)	McDonough (N=37)	Mount Airy (N=30)	Roosevelt (N=24)	Scattered sites (N=60)
Neighbors	38%	29%	46%	40%	42%	32%
Location	16%	-	19%	10%	29%	17%
Safety	6%	-	8%	7%	4%	7%
Environment	27%	29%	14%	33%	13%	37%
Maintenance	1%	7%	-	-	-	-
Don't like it	3%	21%	3%	-	-	2%
Just like it	4%	7%	5%	3%	4%	2%
Nothing, neighborhood is bad	6%	7%	5%	7%	8%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Nearly one-fifth of youth would change the environment in the neighborhood if they could, however. Youth offered comments such as that neighbors should keep their yards cleaner, that youth would like bigger yards, and that the playground is a “ghetto.” Over one-quarter of youth would change nothing about their house, and another 15 percent would like more space in their houses (Figure 45).

45. IF YOU COULD CHANGE ONE THING ABOUT YOUR HOUSE OR NEIGHBORHOOD, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?

	Overall (N=137)	Dunedin (N=14)	McDonough (N=34)	Mount Airy (N=28)	Roosevelt (N=18)	Scattered sites (N=43)
Neighborhood						
Environment	18%	21%	18%	29%	17%	12%
Safety	9%	29%	-	14%	22%	-
Relationships	7%	-	9%	-	6%	16%
Neighbors	7%	-	6%	7%	6%	12%
Activities	4%	-	6%	-	11%	5%
Parking	1%	-	-	4%	-	-
Maintenance	1%	-	-	-	-	2%
Location	1%	-	-	-	-	2%
House						
Nothing	28%	21%	35%	18%	22%	33%
Space	15%	7%	12%	25%	17%	12%
Maintenance	7%	14%	12%	-	-	7%
Miscellaneous	2%	7%	-	4%	-	-
Safety	1%	-	3%	-	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Youth reported knowing more people in the neighborhood by name than did the adults in the sample. Whereas 19 percent of adults reported knowing six or more people in the neighborhood by name, 36 percent of the youth reported that they knew six or more of their neighbors by name. The range of neighbors youth reported knowing by name varies from 0 to 50 people (Figure 46).

46. NEIGHBORS KNOWN BY NAME: YOUTH RESPONSES

	Overall (N=135)	Dunedin (N=12)	McDonough (N=34)	Mount Airy (N=26)	Roosevelt (N=20)	Scattered sites (N=43)
0	22%	25%	18%	23%	30%	21%
1-5	42%	42%	44%	35%	25%	54%
6-10	21%	8%	21%	23%	30%	19%
More than 10	15%	25%	18%	19%	15%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Youth were asked if they had ever had difficulties in their neighborhood or at a nearby program site that kept them from enjoying themselves. While most youth denied having any problems, 15 percent of youth reported a problem in the neighborhood and these problems were most often related to fighting. Only 4 percent of the youth reported a problem or difficulty at a program site and these problems tended to be related to fighting, as well (Figures 47 and 48).

47. DIFFICULTY IN NEIGHBORHOOD: YOUTH

	Overall (N=135)	Dunedin (N=12)	McDonough (N=35)	Mount Airy (N=27)	Roosevelt (N=19)	Scattered sites (N=44)
Yes	15%	17%	20%	15%	21%	9%
No	85%	83%	80%	85%	79%	91%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
What was difficulty?	(N=21)	(N=2)	(N=7)	(N=4)	(N=4)	(N=4)
Fighting	38%	-	-	3%	1%	-
Peer relationships	14%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%
Stealing	14%	-	1%	-	-	1%
Groups/gangs	29%	2%	3%	-	2%	2%
No basketball court	5%	-	1%	-	-	-
Total	100%	2%	7%	4%	4%	4%

48. DIFFICULTY AT PROGRAM SITE: YOUTH

	Overall (N=135)	Dunedin (N=12)	McDonough (N=35)	Mount Airy (N=27)	Roosevelt (N=20)	Scattered sites (N=44)
Yes	4%	8%	3%	7%	-	5%
No	96%	92%	97%	93%	100%	96%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100	100%	100%
What was difficulty?	(N=6)	(N=1)	(N=1)	(N=2)	(N=0)	(N=2)
Fighting	5%	1%	-	2%	-	2%
Limited hours for older teens at recreation center	1%	-	1%	-	-	-
Total	6%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%

Youth older than 12 reported greater involvement in programs than the adults or children under 12 in their households. While over half of adults reported no current program participation for adults in the household, just one-third of youth over 12 report no current program participation. Fourteen percent of the youth surveyed mentioned Boys and Girls Club as a current program participated in by someone over 12 in the household. Keeping in mind that adults identified after-school tutoring as need for youth, no youth in Dunedin, Roosevelt, or in the scattered sites reported current participation in an after-school tutoring program (although youth can also receive tutoring at Boys and Girls Club). Youth respondents who were also program participants gave positive ratings to the staff of the neighborhood programs, with 80 percent of youth reporting that staff know a lot or some about working with youth (Figure 49).

49. YOUTH PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

	Overall (N=160) responses	Dunedin (N=10) responses	McDonough (N=41) responses	Mount Airy (N=30) responses	Roosevelt (N=23) responses	Scattered sites (N=56) responses
None or nothing	33%	30%	34%	30%	39%	32%
Boys & Girls Club	14%	10%	10%	27%	35%	4%
Sport activities	9%	-	7%	7%	4%	16%
Don't know	6%	10%	5%	3%	4%	9%
Community Center	4%	10%	5%	3%	-	4%
After school tutoring	4%	-	5%	10%	-	-
Other	25%	40%	34%	20%	18%	35%
Is R participant?	(N=97)	(N=6)	(N=26)	(N=19)	(N=13)	(N=33)
Yes	74%	4%	62%	74%	77%	85%
No	26%	2%	39%	26%	23%	26%
Total	100%	6%	100%	100%	100%	100%
If so, how much do staff know and understand youth?	(N=70)	(N=4)	(N=16)	(N=12)	(N=10)	(N=28)
A lot	69%	3%	69%	67%	70%	68%
Some	11%	-	19%	8%	-	14%
A little	13%	-	13%	8%	20%	14%
Not much	7%	1%	-	17%	10%	4%
Total	100%	4%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Safety reports from youth

Youth reported that 2 percent of their households had members who were violent or abusive (Figure 50).

50. MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD VIOLENT OR ABUSIVE: YOUTH RESPONSES

	Overall (N=137)	Dunedin (N=12)	McDonough (N=34)	Mount Airy (N=27)	Roosevelt (N=20)	Scattered sites (N=44)
Yes	2%	-	3%	4%	-	2%
No	98%	100%	97%	96%	100%	98%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Youth reported greater feelings of safety while out alone at night in their neighborhood than the adults in their households reported. While 54 percent of adults reported feeling very safe or somewhat safe out alone at night, 66 percent of youth reported feeling very safe or somewhat safe in the same situation. Youth and adult reports regarding feelings of safety while out alone during the day tend to be similar, however, with 91 percent of the adults reporting feeling very safe or somewhat safe as compared to 94 percent of the youth surveyed (Figure 51).

51. SAFETY

	Overall (N=137)	Dunedin (N=12)	McDonough (N=35)	Mount Airy (N=27)	Roosevelt (N=20)	Scattered sites (N=43)
Level of safety out alone at night in neighborhood						
Very safe	30%	33%	26%	19%	30%	41%
Somewhat safe	36%	25%	40%	37%	30%	36%
Somewhat unsafe	25%	33%	23%	37%	30%	16%
Very unsafe	8%	8%	11%	11%	10%	5%
Don't know/no opinion	1%	-	-	-	-	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level of safety out alone during day in neighborhood						
	(N= 138)	(N=12)	(N=35)	(N=27)	(N=20)	(N=44)
Very safe	68%	58%	63%	59%	80%	75%
Somewhat safe	26%	42%	31%	26%	15%	23%
Somewhat unsafe	4%	-	6%	15%	-	2%
Very unsafe	1%	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know/no opinion	1%	-	-	-	5%	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Nearly half of the suggestions offered by youth to increase their feelings of safety are related to interventions by the police or public housing. Youth suggested increased safety measures such as keeping gangs out, increased police patrols, and the installation of more street lights (Figure 52).

52. NEEDED CHANGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD FOR YOUTH TO FEEL SAFE

	Overall (N=114)	Dunedin (N=10)	McDonough (N=29)	Mount Airy (N=22)	Roosevelt (N=13)	Scattered sites (N=40)
Increase safety measures/activities	45%	60%	38%	77%	29%	32%
Better neighbors	9%	-	10%	4%	21%	9%
Youth supervision and programs	4%	10%	3%	4%	-	5%
Relationships	7%	-	10%	-	7%	11%
Can't get safer than it is	9%	-	14%	-	7%	14%
Don't know	1%	-	-	-	-	2%
None or nothing	25%	30%	24%	15%	36%	27%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	123	10	29	26	14	44

Finally, youth were asked to list the kinds of activities they would like to see in their neighborhoods. Over one-fifth of the youth reported that there are enough activities and that new offerings are not needed. One-third (34%) of the suggestions related to adding sports in general and, specifically, more soccer fields and other types of outside sports spaces. Youth who mentioned youth programs (19%) specifically mentioned programs that offer tutoring and job placement services. Youth who mentioned neighborhood and community activities (18%) were specific about wanting more “get acquainted” events and more family-oriented get-togethers in the community (Figure 53).

53. ACTIVITIES YOUTH WOULD LIKE IN NEIGHBORHOOD

	Overall (N=118)	Dunedin (N=9)	McDonough (N=30)	Mount Airy (N=22)	Roosevelt (N=18)	Scattered sites (N=39)
Sports	34%	64%	34%	27%	43%	30%
Nothing, have enough	21%	18%	26%	15%	19%	23%
Neighborhood/Community activities	18%	-	9%	29%	19%	19%
Youth programs	17%	18%	20%	21%	5%	17%
Community resources	5%	-	3%	3%	5%	4%
Don't care about activities	5%	-	6%	3%	10%	6%
Other	2%	-	3%	3%	-	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total responses	154	11	35	34	21	53

Attachment A

Providers' focus groups summary

Needs of residents

Question 1: Goals and Dreams of Residents

- Becoming homeowners
- Interested in the steps needed (i.e. education, better jobs) to getting beyond public housing
- Making a “livable wage”
- Financial independence
- Freedom from intrusive assistance (living lives like an open book)
- Don't want to be nagged by job coach
- Kids and Elderly (primarily) want to go places, do different things and have experiences outside the home setting. Field trips, group activities were given as examples.
- Kids also want freedom from parents' “protection” (see family cultural issues)
- Parents/adults want to develop good language skills, attain American citizenship, and develop those educational/job skills that will provide safe homes, safe neighborhoods, friendships in the community, and happy families.
- To have a life of harmony, with perspective on public housing as one stage in life, with goals beyond public housing, working for self-sufficiency.
- Adults want self-sufficiency, with role models for children.
- Somali philosophy: they look at public housing as a very short stage.
- This varies by population: different populations have different approaches to public housing. A difference in Somali philosophy is that public housing is temporary, but they expect service providers to set up everything for them. Different groups have different aspirations. Immigrants have more expectations to leave; American-born populations are more likely to stay, like public housing is *home*.
- Societal pressures in regards to public housing; they are expected not to succeed.
- But, even though societal battering is pervasive, retention rate is high if you can get them self-sufficient.
- Parents have lots of hopes and dreams for their children.

- Safety – all parents want their kids to be safe. Kids more likely to be victims in an enclosed community than they would be in other neighborhoods. Lots of kid-on-kid stuff.
- Not just safety for kids: dream for adults is safety for selves as well. Has more to do with economic situation than with public housing. Family violence is an enormous issue.
- Crime and family violence are part of the same issue, but perhaps can be separated into separate categories.
- People across street did not even know the kids that were shot right across the street – the separation between public housing and outside world.
- Pointed out that crime rates are lower in public housing than in the rest of the city.
- But the perception is that crime is higher in public housing, so they are not necessarily connected to the community. Residents isolated from the rest of the community.
- Because a fence or line is there, community does not know people in Mt. Airy. A lot of interaction happens through the schools. Even kids will stereotype the public housing kids. With kids, they want to make it not matter that kids live in Mt. Airy.
- People do move out of public housing into Frogtown, so there are more connections than people are aware of. Now moving into Maplewood. People out of Roosevelt have moved into the East Side; connections exist between these communities that didn't exist fifteen years ago. The isolation now is nothing compared to fifteen years ago.

Question 2: How does public housing help families?

- By offering services close to home and in a central location in which many different programs can be supported because the service providers can act cooperatively and proactively (e.g. job fairs, health fairs, financial classes and seminars)
- Dissemination of information regarding community resources and programs
- Create a service provider partnership wherein providers can work much more effectively with outreach programs and services than if they were making the same efforts individually.
- Does not help promote services for those not living in public housing sites with community centers– the key seems to be nearness to home.
- Providers did not mention anything about stable housing or issues surrounding family stability except for financial services families receive while on housing.

- Public Housing provides affordable rent in a safe environment. The safety factor is an important concern of the families. In addition, the services are centrally located and close enough to homes so that people do not have to travel anywhere to take advantage of what is offered. This is particularly important for elderly residents. It is not helpful if residents don't know what is offered.
- Lao Family provides ESL classes and specifically education in the following areas:
 - Reading listening
 - Vocabulary
 - Parenting
 - Citizenship
- Provide outside speakers from the community to talk about topic such as drug abuse, safety, job market/education
- Historically services have been provided on site, which has not been provided in private low-income housing. Connections attempted to be made.
- Advantage of services on-site is that transportation is not a barrier; off-site transportation becomes a big issue.
- Former residents will come back to visit. Some are still connected to the community, and still receive some services.
- Public housing is a training ground for immigrants in how to seek and use services. Helps them to learn how to use services when they go off-site.

Question 3: Needs of family, seniors, adults, teens, children

Elderly/Seniors

- Social/recreational support. Suffer from isolation and depression and clinically present with pain or other symptoms. Issues are identified through social/psychological services and referred into social support group. This seems to make a big difference.
- Income related worries– basic needs
- Information regarding community resources
- School/parent communication for those caring for grandchildren
- Help with negotiating forms/document and processes for benefits – particularly for non-English speaking elders who need someone to read and interpret their mail, fill out forms, translate forms, explain benefits, etc.
- Chemical dependency
- Explanation regarding elderly age definitions and status expectations that are different from one culture to the next

- American citizenship
- Language skills
- Make friends where they live
- Basic living skills in community dwelling (e.g. use of elevator)
- A respite from childcare. So many of elderly are daycare grandmas and grandpas.
- The language barriers and transportation barriers. They get stuck at home, and are afraid of the outside world. Isolation.
- Personal safety; when high-rises were opened up to non-seniors, it caused a loss of security.
- Seniors want part time work, but had limits because of social security - \$500 limit. Community involvement is limited, and the experiences and skills are there, but again there is limited access to transportation.
- Self-esteem; feeling involved and feeling like a contributing member of society.
- No money for “extras” in life; economic strains on those who have barely enough for their own needs. Some seniors without prescription benefits are having to make choices between eating and medicine.

Adults

- Day care for service provider appointments/job counseling/job searching (Suggested: Combine job and financial worker appointments into one meeting in one place which would place less of a burden on child care needs/stress and time factors)
- Time & family stress reductions
- GED completion. Education seems to be less of a priority because so much emphasis is placed on work
- Language and Cultural issues. Quality family programs have expectations on parents even when the program focuses on the child. In American culture this includes things like volunteering at local school or coaching a child sport team.
- Focus group attendee has observed that immigrant populations may not:
 - read to children
 - play with children
 - do not attend (with child) community activities or refuse to allow children to attend.
- Others need to recognize that there are needs among different culture groups and that minority group problems are different from immigrant group problems.
- Language skills
- Work skills – to attain self-sufficiency
- Training

- American citizenship
- What resources to use to participate in their children's education
- Participate in job readiness because of the cash assistance program changes
- They have transportation barriers. Language barriers prevent them from responding to important notices on time. They cannot read notices, so responses aren't made to important mail.
- Employment: soft-skills and hard-skills are critical needs of adults.
- Basic literacy skills are an underestimated need. Reading capacity is low even among English speakers, so that providers have to spend time reading through notices with them.
- Education – high school and post-secondary – anything that helps with employment.
- Affects their ability to help their kids in school; will not admit to kids and others because of embarrassment that they cannot read letters from teachers. Cannot effectively parent and support kids in schools. The ability to support kids in school is severely impaired by low education.
- Kids need to be asked if they've done their homework – if they're not asked, they do not make school a priority and will not do their work. Often, adults don't do this.
- Acculturation of kids in school, resulting in enormous gaps in cultural values causing strains in families. Kids become more in control because they know more about culture than their parents – role-reversal.
- Especially in the case of Asian and Hmong kids, parents think they're "running wild." Perhaps there could be courses for parents to try to bridge those cultural gaps.
- Chemical use and abuse, and mental illness are very prevalent. Need some money for these to be addressed. If they find marijuana on the premises, they are evicted within five days. What happens to those kids?
- Issue of role reversal, where children who have language and communication skills wind up communicating for parents. Intensifies the sense of inadequacy in the parental role, resulting in frustration.

Teens

- Raise quality of language skills so they are competitive in school and in job market
- Jobs
- Safe recreational programs/places where they FEEL safe and comfortable
- Build relationships with other children
- Safe playground/play area
- Education
- Finish high school

- Prepare for good jobs
- Keeping them constructively busy; constructive activities.
- Education. Both cultural and regular academic education. Both that they should be in school, and tutoring programs. Need role models that have been through college. If they see only parents living in public housing, they need role models to show that a high school diploma and post-secondary school is attainable.
- Need pregnancy and sexual education within families. In some cultures it is not acceptable to discuss this with your kids. Kids see parents who married and had kids at 13, and do the same. Economics plays an enormous role in these situations.
- Parents need daycare, so kids aren't expected to care for younger siblings. If they've been taking care of siblings since age six, why can't they have kids at sixteen?

Children (-12)

- Safe child care
- Parental/adult interest in school activities
- (or school activities that recognize parents need to work, parental lack of transportation, and cultural viewpoints)
- Sense of belonging
- The opportunity to be a child.
- No one is at home to feed the kids. Eight-year-olds go to food programs because parents are at work and are not at home to feed them.
- Fetal alcohol syndrome, crack babies. Support for kids who experience developmental disabilities. Can lead to child abuse if parents don't understand the issues, i.e. child not responding to discipline.
- Goes back to adult needs for education about responsible parenting and responsible sexuality.
- Six and seven year olds have wild energy, which by twelve or thirteen turns into criminal activity. It doesn't go away, it just turns into something worse: sex, drugs, etc. Need to nip this in the bud.
- People give up on these kids young; i.e. "You're just a bad kid."
- No childcare program that will tolerate a special needs child for an extended length of time. We need so much special needs childcare, because there are so many ADHD kids, fetal alcohol kids, etc.
- Lots of kids act violently. Lots of need for behavioral support. Parents need to know how to discipline their kids constructively, as opposed to dealing with issues violently.

- Some kids will be suspended very first day of school. Teachers, principals, etc. need to be able to do their jobs, but it does more harm than good in the long run to expel them for two to three weeks at a time.
- Another part of the issue is that we need to develop new ways to deal with the special needs kids so that they and the “mainstream” kids are not deprived of the needed attention.

Question 4: Common themes

- Fear (of court systems, support services, intimidation, etc.) may be a barrier to services
 - Language
 - Money issues/concerns
 - Day care
 - Substance abuse
 - Family violence

Question 5: Trends or changes in public housing

- More residents are working
- Providers having a harder time filling centers (e.g. HeadStart Full Day not full)
- Cultural changes (more African Americans not being served – Non-Asians don’t feel welcome).
- From a policy perspective, there has been a big increase in drugs. But demographics have changed, too. A few years ago residents were mostly Asian, so the only drug they would find was opium. Now other populations use more marijuana, meth, etc. People are moving in, not necessarily Minnesota natives but American-born, and they are bringing different issues than those dealt with in the past.
- Enormous increase in family violence. Not in immigrant population for the most part. More of the American-born.

What about changes related to MFIP requirements? Any changes in other areas?

- STEP Program – about three years into it, and we now have MFIP job counselors on site at McDonough. More traffic because of that, more urgency to find employment. In the past few years need for stress-related services increased: mental health needs.
- Families are more on the “tread mill” than they used to be. Welfare used to be reliable; women could count on that during childcare years. Now they are pulled in different directions – like a five-year timepiece about to go off. People who make it out of public housing don’t have the long-term planning skills needed to plan beyond the five years.
- Changes we’ve observed in the last three years have involved greater mental health and social service needs related to depression in particular. As a result, we have added a contract psychologist and social worker. Also, greater requests for SSI and citizenship waivers.

Question 6: Changes related to MFIP

- We have seen and heard from our patients re: greater depression, stress, and fear re: MFIP. Many of our patients are age 40 plus and don’t speak English well are afraid to get work due to their limitations. Many are wanting us to help them complete SSI forms and citizenship waiver forms.

Question 7: Barriers

- Need evening hours for programs and services for working parents
- Language
- The need for adequate language skills:
in order to get a good education and get good jobs
to communicate with neighbors and take part in the life of the community
- Good working opportunities and the necessary training/education
- Strong focus on the safety and quality of the home environment
- Many more residents are working, more adults and seniors are becoming American citizens. We have changed the program to meet the resident’s needs by adding a Native American citizenship instructor, other bilingual speakers, bringing in speakers from other community organizations
- They (residents) worry a lot about being prepared for self-sufficiency
- Some families do not participate in the services – maybe because they don’t know what is available, they don’t come to the center and they don’t participate in council meetings.
- Silos, grant funding restrictions, who to serve, when to serve, what we serve, etc. Rules are frequently broken. All programs need to bend the rules.

- Not going to send people away who want to learn skills and look for employment because rules prohibit it.
- Knowledge of services, what services are available to them.
- Childcare.
- Language – just about the time we become competent in an area, another group comes in. Now we're learning to deal with Somali and Russian and Ethiopian immigrants. Developing language competency, both on the part of the immigrants and the providers.
- Isolation, lack of knowledge about services.
- One other barrier is the mandatory reporting issue. Because we are mandatory reporting agencies, that is a barrier in working with families. Children at risk are not getting their needs met because we are required to report these people to social services, etc.

Question 8: Interactions with public housing

- They coordinate meetings with other service providers so we all know what is going on and what is available, they help us referrals. I have not had any difficulties at all with the public housing staff.
- Most useful is the group training and input sessions where we come together to discuss our vision and plan in serving public housing. Also, I would love to receive regular statistical information regarding the make up of public housing (ages, ethnicity, amount insured, number of new residents, number of adults, children) This can help service providers adjust their programming. The most hindering is the lack of office and storage space in each public housing center. It is difficult because our staff do not have adequate space to meet with patients/residents. A number of staff do not have their own desks.

Question 9: Safety for providers

- I feel McDonough is very safe. It is well lit, clean and pleasant. Roosevelt is an older building with major needs for updating. I don't feel as safe at Roosevelt. My car has been broken into at Roosevelt.
- I feel very safe. I haven't had any problems, no negative experiences in the 10 years that I have been working in this community.

Descriptions of participants'/agencies' roles in public housing communities:

Ramsey Action Head Start in 3 housing locations, Eagan, the West side, serve 250-300 families

They are considering or have begun programs for early and full-day Head Start

Serve about 1300 families in Ramsey county in 13 different centers

Attendees represent the following organizations:

Job Placement Services (Life Track Resources)

McDonough site serves 100 people on a regular caseload basis

The assist with job coaching, job searching, follow-up

Jobs Plus Saturation program serving 350 clients

(over 100 clients per staff member. This is a monthly contact by phone program/ quarterly face-to-face

Parks and Recreation. After school recreational activities, sports activities, programs.

Summer program open

8 a.m. – 9 p.m. About 2-600 people “cross the doorway” daily

West Side Community Clinic

400 daily visits per site

95000 visits annually – primarily women and children

Lao Family does not provide services to young people – the ESL program is for those who are 21 years of age and older. Many of her students are 65+ and take advantage of the citizenship part of the ESL services. Citizenship seems to be very important

STEP Program, in all four public housing sites. Several services provided, including: employment and training services, ESL, case management. Clients are voluntary. They are not an MFIP provider.

Neighbor to Neighbor (formerly Capitol Community Services). Involved in McDonough. Provide services to McDonough residents out of another center. One of 15 sites around country to move people from people living in high poverty and crime areas to areas of low poverty and crime areas.

ACOP, a community outreach program, patrols sites. Works at all four sites; all high-rises.

Sheriff's Department Shared Youth Literacy Program at Mt. Airy and another center. Works with kids to keep them out of trouble, to help them with homework, to help them to read. Sports are also offered.

Boys and Girls club as Branch Director at Mt. Airy site, together with school. Recent increase in family programming, i.e. parenting classes and activities.

Early Childhood Family Education program at McDonough, as the lead teacher.

Girl Scout Council of St. Croix County, with work at public housing sites. Recent arts programs for girls in public housing, and families pay nothing for program. Volleyball team with 150 kids, in conjunction with Boys and Girls Clubs.

Attachment B

If you could change one thing about your house or neighborhood, what would you change? (The following comments were made by one person and make up the “Other” category in Figure 10.)

SITE: Dunedin

- Have two stories
- One family house
- Have Section 8
- Take down concrete wall for safety
- Each unit w/own parking space
- Neighbors helping neighbors
- Prevent vehicle stealing/broken into/bikes/stealing
- Make common area bigger/bigger house
- One story house
- Building needs repair
- More pest control
- Fence yards for children's safety/higher fences
- Fence around the community

SITE: McDonough

- Want my own house
- Carpeting in the house
- One family house
- Downstairs bathroom
- More pest control
- Toilet doesn't flush well
- Leaky pipes
- Update Appliances
- Be allowed to have pets
- Another bedroom/bigger bedrooms
- Cupboards/surface seal on shelves
- Basement gets water when it rains
- Change where heating ducts are located
- More parking spaces/assigned
- More police patrolling/less crime
- No hanging out by teenagers w/drugs
- More people who speak my language
- Want to move
- Make common area bigger/bigger house
- Have Section 8
- Building needs repair
- Change filter more often
- Need heaters to work better-house drafty
- Appliances
- Replace refrigerator
- Remodel outside of building/inside
- 2 exits
- PHA respond quicker to calls from the residents
- My apartment shouldn't have to pay higher NSP bills than others
- Parking
- Safety

SITE: McDonough (Continued)

- Get rid of gangs
- Police monitor parking lot at night
- More activities for kids
- Noise – house too close to freeway/railroad
- New playground/improve/bigger
- Ethnicity/relationships
- Need better race relationships
- Ease of communicating with other Hmong residents
- Eliminate blacks from public housing
- A lot of bad young teenagers running around
- Need neighborhood watch program
- Sanitation/garbage away from the house/s
- Houses are too close together
- Control rowdiness
- Fence yards for children's safety/higher
- Loud music-afraid to ask them to lower
- Post speed limit signs
- Neighbors helping neighbors
- People (Blacks) throw trash around
- Help w/cutting the grass/shoveling
- Use of shaman in apt. below mine; smoke
- Ethnic groups should live in the
- More awareness of parents
- Prevent vehicle stealing/broken into/bike
- Police shouldn't block 1-way street when making arrests/traffic stops
- Improvement of neighbor relationships
- The park in front of my house

SITE: Mount Airy

- Want my own house
- Make common area bigger/bigger house
- Downstairs bathroom
- Leaky pipes
- Remodel outside of building/inside
- Change the rules. I feel like I'm guest
- Put fan and light on different switch
- Each unit w/own parking space
- Safety
- Get rid of gangs
- Post speed limit sign
- Activities for Grandparents raising Grandchildren
- Neighbors helping neighbors
- New playground/improve/bigger
- More ESL, more people speaking English
- More awareness of parents
- Prevent vehicle stealing/broken into/bike stealing
- Landscape around my house
- Want to move
- Carpeting in the house
- One family house
- Need heaters to work better-house drafty
- Put gas & NSP bill into 1 bill
- Another bedroom/bigger bedrooms
- The state won't let us change anything
- Better insulation
- Parking lot near my house
- Fence yards for children's safety/higher
- Police monitor parking lot at night
- Afraid for children to go out & play
- Residents taking responsibility to clean
- Very hilly- not convenient
- Help w/cutting the grass/shoveling
- Resident should be evicted that has been breaking rules
- A lot of bad young teenagers running around
- Everyone volunteer to help the community

SITE: Roosevelt

- Want to move
- Make common area bigger/bigger house
- Eliminate annual cleanliness inspection
- More pest control
- Be allowed to have pets
- Another bedroom/bigger bedrooms
- Bigger Yard
- Change rules so people don't have people moving in illegally
- Lower Rent
- More parking spaces/assigned
- More police patrolling/less crime
- No hanging out by teenagers w/drugs
- Post speed limit signs
- New playground/improve/bigger
- More ESL, more people speaking English
- Resident should be evicted that has been reported by 3 people – nothing done
- Most residents should be kicked out
- More awareness of parents
- Sanitation/garbage away from the house/source of rodents
- More handicap accessible/sidewalks in back
- Carpeting in the house
- Building needs repair
- Fix street light so we can see the parking
- Small garden in backyard
- Remodel outside of building/inside
- Bigger bathrooms
- Change the windows
- Better insulation
- Parking
- Safety
- Control rowdiness
- Get rid of gangs
- Very hilly- not convenient
- Need better race relationships
- Hmong stick to own culture
- Eliminate blacks from public housing
- Kids in at proper time
- A lot of bad young teenagers running around
- Improvement of neighbor relationships
- The park in front of my house

SITE: Scattered Sites

- Want my own house
- Have two stories.
- Have a basement
- One story house
- Downstairs bathroom
- Toilet doesn't flush well
- Replace air conditioner/fix
- Closer to relatives
- Cupboards/surface seal on shelves
- Own the house
- Parking lot near my house
- No hanging out by teenagers w/drugs
- Afraid for children to go out & play
- Noise – house too close to freeway/railroad
- New playground/improve/bigger
- Prevent vandalism
- More handicap accessible/sidewalks in
- Need closer shopping/grocery
- Carpeting in the house
- Make common area bigger/bigger house
- Change mats on stairs
- Have Section 8
- Building needs repair
- Appliances
- Small garage or storage shed for equipment
- Remodel outside of building/inside
- Basement gets water when it rains
- Need a garage
- Control rowdiness
- Fence yards for children's safety/higher
- Residents taking responsibility to clean
- People (Blacks) throw trash around
- Need better race relationships
- Improvement of neighbor relationships
- The park in front of my house
- Better bus service

Attachment C

Single responses

**What service or program is missing in what is available in or near your community?
(These following comments were made by single respondents and make up the
“Other” category in Figure 25.)**

SITE: Dunedin

- Everything is okay/no problems
- Don't know what's available
- Nothing, have everything
- More tutorial programs for children/ment
- More activities for children under 6
- Food shelf/interpreters
- Availability of transportation

SITE: McDonough

- Everything is missing
- Don't know what is available
- Family planning
- Sunday school
- Someplace for teenagers
- Food shelf/interpreters
- Recreation center for kids to play
- Support group for poor people
- Someone to talk to
- Programs for African Americans
- No other deaf people
- Driver to take me places
- Help with checks
- Availability of transportation
- Rent subsidy
- Transportation to doctor/hospitals
- Near laundromat
- Parenting classes
- Spanish classes for adults and kids
- Interpreters available at the Community Center

SITE: Mount Airy

- Education
- Driver's education
- Home buyers education
- Financial management (budgeting)
- College courses
- Money for education beyond high school
- ECFE program
- Recreation center for kids to play
- Outdoor recreation (basketball hoops)
- Health clinic
- Support group for poor people
- Domestic abuse prevention (treatment group)
- Arbitration to resolve neighborhood problems
- Block Club/Neighborhood Watch
- Allowing pets
- More parking spaces
- Evening ESL classes
- Program to talk about available resource

SITE: Roosevelt

- Up to PHA staff what's done
- Home buyers education
- More activities for teenagers
- Activities for kids to be by themselves
- Neighborhood activities
- Clothing shelf
- Health clinic
- Better maintenance by staff personnel
- Relationship groups
- Someone to talk to
- Block Club/Neighborhood Watch
- Peace
- Need help with utilities
- WIC clinic
- YMCA
- Swimming pool
- Safe and clean playgrounds/parks
- Computer classes
- Evening ESL classes
- Program to talk about available resources
- Dental services for adults
- Skate boarding park

SITE: Scattered Sites

- Tutors for English (adults)
- Financial management (budgeting)
- Money for education beyond high school
- More activities for teenagers
- Activities for kids to be by themselves
- Well supervised community centers
- Someplace for teenagers
- Recreation center for kids to play
- Better maintenance by staff personnel
- Support group for poor people
- Block Club/Neighborhood Watch
- Pay phones available
- Child care
- More police
- Transportation to doctor/hospitals
- Computer classes
- Evening ESL classes
- Interpreters available at the Community Center
- Access in community for elderly and disabled
- More programs providing enrichment and help
- Enough volunteers
- Skate boarding park