Annex A

**Key Informant
Interview Participants and
Interview Discussion Guide**

List of Key Informant Interview Participants

Vicky Gold
Housing Coordinator
Atlantis, Inc.

Diane Goldman
Executive Director
The Sabin Group, Inc.

Bonnie Good
Executive Director
Denver Center for Independent Living

Ted Hackworth
Councilman -- District 2
Denver City Council

Susan Hazaleus
Program Coordinator
Denver Health

Myrna Hipp
Director
Community Development Agency (CDA)
City and County of Denver

Mindy Klowden and Dave Ursone
Case Managers
Colorado Coalition for the Homeless (CCH)

This document is provided as an example of the types of questions a researcher might cover with a respondent. Exchanges are considered free-flowing dialogues.

RESEARCH DESIGN: GENERAL DISCUSSION GUIDE

Date   _____

Interviewer Initials   _____

Respondent   _____

Title   _____

Organization   _____

Address   _____

Telephone   _____

Thank you for agreeing to speak with us today.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has requested that the Urban Institute conduct a study evaluating neighborhood impacts of supportive housing programs in <u>Denver</u>. The overall assessment will focus on both qualitative neighborhood characteristics and quantitative property value and crime changes. Our discussion today is part of the qualitative effort and will focus on the economic, demographic and political landscape and interactions with supportive housing.

- Let's begin by discussing how your organization is related to community development, housing, neighborhoods or supportive housing? (tailor for respondent and level of obviousness)

- What is the history of your organization? Does it have any involvement in issues relating to special needs populations?

- What is the role of your organization in the local policy process?

- What is <u>your</u> role in the organization?

- Was your organization involved with community action, either pro or con, regarding supportive housing?

- How did your organization respond to supportive housing?

- What is it about the cultural or historical atmosphere or the mission of the organization that prompted this response?

- Were there economic or political dimensions to the organization's response? What were these?

- Did the response differ across neighborhoods or other areas of the County?

I would also like to discuss your impressions about neighborhood impacts and supportive housing.

- What do you think the neighborhood impacts from supportive housing have been, if any?
  How meaningful and long lasting have these impacts been?

- If respondent believes it is too early to detect impacts from supportive housing,
  What do you think the neighborhood impacts from supportive housing will be?

- Is there something about the history or culture of the neighborhood that contributed to (or will contribute to) this effect?

- Do you think the impacts were/are predictable?

- Were there any explicit considerations by policymakers of potential neighborhood impacts?
  If yes, what were these considerations?
  If no, why do you think policymakers did not consider neighborhood impacts?

- If respondent perceives a negative impact,
  Do you have suggestions about how policy might be revised to minimize negative outcomes in future?

- If respondent perceives a positive impact,
  Do you have suggestions about how policy might be used to encourage such benefits?

- Is there anything else you think we need to know to understand the economic, demographic, and political landscape in Denver to be able to understand reactions to and impacts of supportive housing?

- If we want to interview people to find out about the history, operation, reception and impact of supportive housing, who should be speak to (city and county government, community groups, etc.)?

This document is provided as an example of the types of questions a researcher might cover with a respondent. Exchanges are considered free-flowing dialogues.

RESEARCH DESIGN: POLICY IMPLEMENTATION DISCUSSION GUIDE

Date _____

Interviewer Initials _____

Respondent _____

Title _____

Organization _____

Address _____

Telephone _____

Thank you for agreeing to speak with us today.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has requested that the Urban Institute conduct a study evaluating neighborhood impacts of supportive housing programs in Denver. This assessment will focus on both qualitative neighborhood characteristics and quantitative property value and crime changes. Our discussion today is part of the qualitative effort and will focus on the economic, demographic and political landscape in the area and interactions with supportive housing.

• Let's begin by discussing how your organization is related to community development, housing, neighborhoods, special needs populations, or supportive housing? (tailor for respondent and level of obviousness)

• What is your role in the organization?

• Could you describe the details of the policy implementation process for supportive housing?

I would like to talk specifically about how the program was designed and is operated in Denver.

• Tell me about the tenant selection process

• How is site selection accomplished? What guidelines are in place for site selection and who prepared these procedures?

• Describe the counseling component of the Denver supportive housing program.
The cultural, political, and economic landscape in Denver is important context for us in understanding local activity. I would like to discuss what you think contributed to the local

reception of supportive housing in Denver. We'll also talk about neighborhood impacts and the program.

- How would you characterize the response to supportive housing?

- Did the response differ among neighborhoods?

- What is it about the cultural or historical atmosphere of Denver that prompted this response (or prompted the different responses)?

- Were there economic or political dimensions to the response? What were these? (If appropriate, why did they differ in each area differently?)

- What do you think the neighborhood impacts from supportive housing have been, if any?
    How meaningful and long lasting have these impacts been?

    If respondent believes it is too early to detect impacts from supportive housing,
        What do you think the neighborhood impacts from supportive housing will be? Have you seen preliminary signs of these impacts?

- Do you think the impacts were/are predictable?

- Were there any explicit considerations by policy makers of potential neighborhood impacts?
    If yes, what were these considerations?
    If no, why do you think policy makers did not consider neighborhood impacts?

- If respondent perceives a negative impact,
  Do you have suggestions about how policy might be revised to minimize negative outcomes in future?

- If respondent perceives a positive impact,
  Do you have suggestions about how policy might be used to encourage such benefits?

- Is there anything else you think we need to know to understand the economic, demographic, and political landscape in Denver and their relation to supportive housing?

Annex B

**Coding Scheme for
Property Value Impact Variables**

Coding Scheme for Property Value Model Impact Variables

Define distance rings of 0-500 ft, 501-1000 ft, and 1001-2000 ft. Let $A_i = \{A_1, A_2, ... \}$ be the set of subsidized housing sites for which we want to measure impacts. For the aggregated models, A_i is a subset of all sites that were first occupied at least two years after the earliest date in the home price sales data (*i.e.,* 1989) and were continuously occupied through the 3rd Qtr. 1997. The selection of A sites is further narrowed to those that have sufficient numbers of pre and post sales observations within 2000 feet. For the disaggregated models, A_i consists of a single site. Let $B_i = \{B_1, B_2, ... \}$ be the set of all remaining subsidized housing sites not in A_i.

Given a house sale X and the sets A_i and B_i, let dXA_i be the distance (ring) from A_i to X and dXB_i be the distance (ring) from B_i to X. Also define DPre_dXA_i as a pre flag for the distance from site A_i to X, DPost_dXA_i as a post flag for the distance from site A_i to X, and DPost_dXB_i as a post flag for the distance from site B_i to X. These pre and post flags are coded as follows:

> For each A_i, we code DPre_dXA_i = 1 if and only if (i) X occurs pre A_i, (ii) there exists no other A_i such that $dXA_i \leq 2000$ and X occurs in a quarter when A_i is occupied (*i.e.*, post), and (iii) there exists no B_i such that $dXB_i \leq 2000$ and X occurs in a quarter when B_i is occupied (*i.e.*, post).

> For each A_i, we code DPost_dXA_i = 1 if and only if X occurs post A_i.

> For each B_i, we code DPost_dXB_i = 1 if and only if (i) X occurs in a quarter when B_i is occupied and (ii) there exists some A_i such that X occurs post A_i and $dXA_i \leq 2000$.

> We delete sale X if there exists some A_i such that X occurs pre A_i and $dXA_i \leq 2000$ and some B_i such that X occurs in a quarter when B_i is occupied and $dXB_i \leq 2000$.

> We delete sale X if there exists some B_i such that X occurs while B_i is occupied and $dXB_i \leq 2000$ and there exists no A_i such that $dXA_i \leq 2000$.

To obtain the aggregated site impact variables, we add together the dummies DPost_dXA_i and DPost_dXB_i to get Post500, Post1k, and Post2k, and we add together the dummies Pre_dXA_i to get Pre500, Pre1k, and Pre2k.

To create the impact variables for unit counts, we proceed as described above but set DPost_ and DPre_ equal to the number of occupied units at the site instead of to 1.

To create the trend variables, we proceed as follows:

> Given a distance ring d:

> If Post_d = 0, then TRPost_d = 0

> If Post_d > 0, then TRPost_d = 1 if sale occured in 1st Qtr. after first site in distance ring was occupied, = 2 if sale occured in 2nd Qtr. after first site in distance ring was occupied, etc.

Use a similar approach for TRPre_d.

Annex C

**Descriptive Statistics on
Supportive Housing Sites and Neighborhoods
Property Value Model Variables
Crime Category Definitions
Crime Rate Model Variables**

Table C.1 - Neighborhood (Census Tract) Characteristics of Supportive Housing Sites for Property Value Impacts Analysis

Neighborhood	Population 1990	Pct Black 1980	Pct Black 1990	Pct. Hispanic 1980	Pct. Hispanic 1990	Pct. Renters 1990	Median House Value 1990	Pct Change in House Values 1980-90	Pct Change in House Values 1990-96
Berkeley #1	5,257	0.4	0.6	19.0	29.3	40.8	64,900	-22.5	56.5
Clayton	2,916	89.4	87.1	2.8	7.8	34.3	60,600	-20.7	71.2
Hilltop	3,809	2.9	0.8	0.6	1.6	6.1	194,500	3.8	7.8
Montbello #1	3,004	33.0	48.7	22.4	16.8	32.7	55,100	-31.2	81.5
Montbello #2	4,371	40.1	54.7	12.9	13.3	19.1	63,900	-34.8	50.0
Montbello #3	3,004	33.0	48.7	22.4	16.8	32.7	55,100	-31.2	81.5
Montbello #4	3,763	37.8	59.9	14.2	10.4	36.7	68,700	-28.2	38.8
S. Park Hill	4,048	20.4	22.3	4.0	4.1	23.0	105,300	-16.1	35.4
Speer #1	3,882	3.7	3.6	16.6	23.8	81.0	83,100	-7.3	93.7
Virginia Village	3,193	2.3	4.5	2.4	6.4	12.2	91,300	-22.7	26.6
Washington Virginia Vale	2,573	7.1	11.0	5.6	9.6	25.5	78,900	-23.5	27.5

Table C.2 – Descriptive Statistics for Property Value Models

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DALL500X	0/1 dummy: All <=500 ft.	45601	0.01075	0.10310	0	1.00000
DALL1K	0/1 dummy: All 500-1000 ft.	45601	0.02684	0.16162	0	1.00000
DALL2K	0/1 dummy: All 1000-2000 ft.	45601	0.07873	0.26931	0	1.00000
DPST500X	0/1 dummy: Post <=500 ft.	45601	0.0063157	0.07922	0	1.00000
DPST1K	0/1 dummy: Post 500-1000 ft.	45601	0.01559	0.12389	0	1.00000
DPST2K	0/1 dummy: Post 1000-2000 ft.	45601	0.04476	0.20677	0	1.00000
PST500X	# Post locs. <=500 ft.	45601	0.0064253	0.08126	0	2.00000
PST1K	# Post locs. 500-1000 ft.	45601	0.01594	0.12803	0	2.00000
PST2K	# Post locs. 1000-2000 ft.	45601	0.05798	0.31956	0	6.00000
UPST500X	# Post units <=500 ft.	45601	0.06504	1.58425	0	116.00000
UPST1K	# Post units 500-1000 ft.	45601	0.22874	3.83861	0	151.00000
UPST2K	# Post units 1000-2000 ft.	45601	0.93329	8.80041	0	167.00000
TIME500X	Trend All <=500 ft.	45601	0.22559	2.47513	0	40.00000
TIME1K	Trend All 500-1000 ft.	45601	0.52541	3.72977	0	40.00000
TIME2K	Trend All 1000-2000 ft.	45601	1.63371	6.47122	0	43.00000
TRPST50X	Trend Post <=500 ft.	45601	0.06134	0.97690	0	31.00000
TRPST1K	Trend Post 500-1000 ft.	45601	0.14155	1.49995	0	31.00000
TRPST2K	Trend Post 1000-2000 ft.	45601	0.46422	2.78089	0	34.00000
PXT50X	(PST500X * TRPST50X)	45601	0.06134	0.97690	0	31.00000
PXT1K	(PST1K * TRPST1K)	45601	0.14511	1.56731	0	56.00000
PXT2K	(PST2K * TRPST2K)	45601	0.57010	3.72989	0	81.00000
UPXT50X	(UPST500X * TRPST50X)	45601	0.43330	7.13623	0	248.00000
UPXT1K	(UPST1K * TRPST1K)	45601	1.08574	19.85665	0	3472.0
UPXT2K	(UPST2K * TRPST2K)	45601	8.04963	114.44427	0	4509.0
DBATH1	Has 1/1.5 bathrooms	45601	0.49677	0.50000	0	1.00000
DBATH2	Has 2/2.5 bathrooms	45601	0.41378	0.49252	0	1.00000
DBATH3	Has 3+ bathrooms	45601	0.08873	0.28435	0	1.00000
DCONCRT	Concrete ext. wall	45601	0.01954	0.13841	0	1.00000
DFRAME	Frame ext. wall	45601	0.38359	0.48626	0	1.00000
DMASONRY	Masonry/frame ext. wall	45601	0.05625	0.23040	0	1.00000
DSTUCCO	Stucco ext. wall	45601	0.02548	0.15759	0	1.00000
DBRICK	Brick ext. wall	45601	0.51319	0.49983	0	1.00000
DEWOTHR	Other ext. wall	45601	0.0019517	0.04414	0	1.00000

Table C.2 (continued)

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DFIREPL1	Has 1 fireplace	45601	0.51091	0.49989	0	1.00000
DFIREPL2	Has 2+ fireplaces	45601	0.01018	0.10036	0	1.00000
DSTOR15	Building 1.5 stories	45601	0.04296	0.20277	0	1.00000
DSTOR2	Building 2+ stories	45601	0.12326	0.32874	0	1.00000
DYRB1900	Built 1900-19	45601	0.10750	0.30975	0	1.00000
DYRB1920	Built 1920-39	45601	0.18701	0.38993	0	1.00000
DYRB1940	Built 1940-49	45601	0.15951	0.36616	0	1.00000
DYRB1950	Built 1950-59	45601	0.21910	0.41364	0	1.00000
DYRB1960	Built 1960-69	45601	0.07160	0.25783	0	1.00000
DYRB1970	Built 1970-79	45601	0.09452	0.29255	0	1.00000
DYRB1980	Built 1980-89	45601	0.10511	0.30670	0	1.00000
DYRB1990	Built 1990 or later	45601	0.02485	0.15566	0	1.00000
BASEFT	base square feet	45601	1073.9	315.64250	271.00000	4429.0
SQRFT	square footage	45601	6843.9	1846.4	3120.0	14100.0
DQ872		45601	0.01664	0.12794	0	1.00000
DQ873		45601	0.01568	0.12423	0	1.00000
DQ874		45601	0.02083	0.14283	0	1.00000
DQ881		45601	0.01581	0.12475	0	1.00000
DQ882		45601	0.02267	0.14887	0	1.00000
DQ883		45601	0.02829	0.16580	0	1.00000
DQ884		45601	0.02388	0.15268	0	1.00000
DQ891		45601	0.01846	0.13463	0	1.00000
DQ892		45601	0.02706	0.16226	0	1.00000
DQ893		45601	0.02695	0.16194	0	1.00000
DQ894		45601	0.02320	0.15054	0	1.00000
DQ901		45601	0.01914	0.13703	0	1.00000
DQ902		45601	0.02864	0.16679	0	1.00000
DQ903		45601	0.02987	0.17022	0	1.00000
DQ904		45601	0.02564	0.15805	0	1.00000
DQ911		45601	0.01996	0.13985	0	1.00000
DQ912		45601	0.02934	0.16876	0	1.00000
DQ913		45601	0.02724	0.16277	0	1.00000

Table C.2 (continued)

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DQ914		45601	0.02509	0.15639	0	1.00000
DQ921		45601	0.02118	0.14400	0	1.00000
DQ922		45601	0.03298	0.17859	0	1.00000
DQ923		45601	0.02998	0.17053	0	1.00000
DQ924		45601	0.03173	0.17529	0	1.00000
DQ931		45601	0.02318	0.15047	0	1.00000
DQ932		45601	0.03324	0.17928	0	1.00000
DQ933		45601	0.03110	0.17358	0	1.00000
DQ934		45601	0.02921	0.16840	0	1.00000
DQ941		45601	0.02397	0.15295	0	1.00000
DQ942		45601	0.03281	0.17813	0	1.00000
DQ943		45601	0.02888	0.16747	0	1.00000
DQ944		45601	0.02607	0.15936	0	1.00000
DQ951		45601	0.02200	0.14667	0	1.00000
DQ952		45601	0.02697	0.16201	0	1.00000
DQ953		45601	0.02879	0.16723	0	1.00000
DQ954		45601	0.02428	0.15391	0	1.00000
DQ961		45601	0.02169	0.14566	0	1.00000
DQ962		45601	0.02820	0.16555	0	1.00000
DQ963		45601	0.02647	0.16053	0	1.00000
DQ964		45601	0.01901	0.13657	0	1.00000
DQ971		45601	0.0006140	0.02477	0	1.00000
DQ972		45601	0.0010965	0.03310	0	1.00000
DQ973		45601	0.0006798	0.02606	0	1.00000
DTR2		45601	0.0098024	0.09852	0	1.00000
DTR3		45601	0.01351	0.11544	0	1.00000
DTR4		45601	0.01042	0.10153	0	1.00000
DTR5		45601	0.01221	0.10984	0	1.00000
DTR6		45601	0.0068858	0.08270	0	1.00000
DTR7		45601	0.0012719	0.03564	0	1.00000
DTR8		45601	0.0009649	0.03105	0	1.00000
DTR9		45601	0.0004824	0.02196	0	1.00000

Table C.2 (continued)

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DTR10		45601	0.0025438	0.05037	0	1.00000
DTR11		45601	0.0032017	0.05649	0	1.00000
DTR12		45601	0.00004386	0.0066225	0	1.00000
DTR13		45601	0.0001974	0.01405	0	1.00000
DTR14		45601	0.0009210	0.03033	0	1.00000
DTR15		45601	0.0057455	0.07558	0	1.00000
DTR16		45601	0.01105	0.10455	0	1.00000
DTR17		45601	0.0080481	0.08935	0	1.00000
DTR18		45601	0.0067542	0.08191	0	1.00000
DTR19		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR20		45601	0.0009868	0.03140	0	1.00000
DTR21		45601	0.01072	0.10300	0	1.00000
DTR22		45601	0.0080042	0.08911	0	1.00000
DTR23		45601	0.0023026	0.04793	0	1.00000
DTR24		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR25		45601	0.0084428	0.09150	0	1.00000
DTR26		45601	0.0008991	0.02997	0	1.00000
DTR27		45601	0.0002412	0.01553	0	1.00000
DTR28		45601	0.0008114	0.02847	0	1.00000
DTR29		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR30		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR31		45601	0.0004824	0.02196	0	1.00000
DTR32		45601	0.0061621	0.07826	0	1.00000
DTR33		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR34		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR35		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR36		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR37		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR38		45601	0.0029166	0.05393	0	1.00000
DTR39		45601	0.0052850	0.07251	0	1.00000
DTR40		45601	0.0045832	0.06754	0	1.00000
DTR41		45601	0.0094296	0.09665	0	1.00000

Table C.2 (continued)

Variable Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DTR42	45601	0.02316	0.15040	0	1.00000
DTR43	45601	0.02555	0.15778	0	1.00000
DTR44	45601	0.0037061	0.06077	0	1.00000
DTR45	45601	0.01145	0.10638	0	1.00000
DTR46	45601	0.01509	0.12190	0	1.00000
DTR47	45601	0.0060086	0.07728	0	1.00000
DTR48	45601	0.0001974	0.01405	0	1.00000
DTR49	45601	0	0	0	0
DTR50	45601	0.0005263	0.02294	0	1.00000
DTR51	45601	0.00002193	0.0046829	0	1.00000
DTR52	45601	0.01002	0.09961	0	1.00000
DTR53	45601	0.01504	0.12173	0	1.00000
DTR54	45601	0.04219	0.20103	0	1.00000
DTR55	45601	0.01048	0.10185	0	1.00000
DTR56	45601	0.0048902	0.06976	0	1.00000
DTR57	45601	0.0072367	0.08476	0	1.00000
DTR58	45601	0.0099779	0.09939	0	1.00000
DTR59	45601	0	0	0	0
DTR60	45601	0.0020614	0.04536	0	1.00000
DTR61	45601	0.0062060	0.07853	0	1.00000
DTR62	45601	0.01643	0.12710	0	1.00000
DTR63	45601	0.02311	0.15027	0	1.00000
DTR64	45601	0.0055701	0.07443	0	1.00000
DTR65	45601	0.0096051	0.09753	0	1.00000
DTR66	45601	0.0025438	0.05037	0	1.00000
DTR67	45601	0.0003289	0.01813	0	1.00000
DTR68	45601	0.01254	0.11129	0	1.00000
DTR69	45601	0.0062060	0.07853	0	1.00000
DTR70	45601	0.0097805	0.09841	0	1.00000
DTR71	45601	0.02763	0.16391	0	1.00000
DTR72	45601	0.02035	0.14120	0	1.00000
DTR73	45601	0.02035	0.14120	0	1.00000

Table C.2 (continued)

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DTR74		45601	0.0062718	0.07895	0	1.00000
DTR75		45601	0.01750	0.13112	0	1.00000
DTR76		45601	0.0071051	0.08399	0	1.00000
DTR77		45601	0.01693	0.12901	0	1.00000
DTR78		45601	0.01585	0.12492	0	1.00000
DTR79		45601	0.02998	0.17053	0	1.00000
DTR80		45601	0.01268	0.11187	0	1.00000
DTR81		45601	0.02934	0.16876	0	1.00000
DTR82		45601	0.01386	0.11691	0	1.00000
DTR83		45601	0.0032455	0.05688	0	1.00000
DTR84		45601	0.01064	0.10258	0	1.00000
DTR85		45601	0.0023464	0.04838	0	1.00000
DTR86		45601	0.0040350	0.06339	0	1.00000
DTR87		45601	0.01178	0.10788	0	1.00000
DTR88		45601	0.0086182	0.09243	0	1.00000
DTR89		45601	0.0088156	0.09348	0	1.00000
DTR90		45601	0.0030482	0.05513	0	1.00000
DTR91		45601	0.0056797	0.07515	0	1.00000
DTR92		45601	0.0037938	0.06148	0	1.00000
DTR93		45601	0.01520	0.12234	0	1.00000
DTR94		45601	0.0022149	0.04701	0	1.00000
DTR95		45601	0.0046929	0.06834	0	1.00000
DTR96		45601	0.01697	0.12917	0	1.00000
DTR97		45601	0.002412	0.01553	0	1.00000
DTR98		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR99		45601	0.00006579	0.0081108	0	1.00000
DTR100		45601	0.0014254	0.03773	0	1.00000
DTR101		45601	0.0006579	0.02564	0	1.00000
DTR102		45601	0.0070174	0.08348	0	1.00000
DTR103		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR104		45601	0.0039911	0.06305	0	1.00000
DTR105		45601	0.0069077	0.08283	0	1.00000

Table C.2 (continued)

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DTR106		45601	0.0073244	0.08527	0	1.00000
DTR107		45601	0.01208	0.10926	0	1.00000
DTR108		45601	0.0032017	0.05649	0	1.00000
DTR109		45601	0.0088595	0.09371	0	1.00000
DTR110		45601	0.0001535	0.01239	0	1.00000
DTR111		45601	0.0011842	0.03439	0	1.00000
DTR112		45601	0.0002851	0.01688	0	1.00000
DTR113		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR114		45601	0.00004386	0.0066225	0	1.00000
DTR115		45601	0.00004386	0.0066225	0	1.00000
DTR116		45601	0.0000679	0.0081108	0	1.00000
DTR117		45601	0.0004386	0.02094	0	1.00000
DTR118		45601	0.0022807	0.04770	0	1.00000
DTR119		45601	0.04599	0.20946	0	1.00000
DTR120		45601	0.01294	0.11301	0	1.00000
DTR121		45601	0.01939	0.13788	0	1.00000
DTR122		45601	0.01138	0.10608	0	1.00000
DTR123		45601	0.03513	0.18411	0	1.00000
DTR124		45601	0.03121	0.17387	0	1.00000
DTR125		45601	0.0036403	0.06023	0	1.00000
DTR126		45601	0.01322	0.11423	0	1.00000
DTR127		45601	0.0056358	0.07486	0	1.00000
DTR128		45601	0.0003728	0.01930	0	1.00000
DTR129		45601	0.0025219	0.05016	0	1.00000
DTR130		45601	0.0005702	0.02387	0	1.00000
DTR131		45601	0.02267	0.14887	0	1.00000
DTR132		45601	0.0001754	0.01324	0	1.00000
DTR133		45601	0.0003509	0.01873	0	1.00000
DTR134		45601	0.0004824	0.02196	0	1.00000
DTR135		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR136		45601	0	0	0	0
DTR137		45601	0	0	0	0

Table C.2 (continued)

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DTR138		45601	0	0	0	0
XCOORD	X coordinate	45601	0.01212	0.07944	-0.15370	0.21823
YCOORD	Y coordinate	45601	-0.0002782	0.04562	-0.09916	0.07598
XY	X * Y	45601	0.0018696	0.0043967	-0.0071297	0.01485
XX	X * X	45601	0.0064577	0.0096200	3.3356E-14	0.04763
YY	Y * Y	45601	0.0020813	0.0020406	4.2613E-12	0.0098321

C-11

Table C.3 - Definitions of Crime Categories

Violent	Property	Criminal Mischief	Disorderly Conduct
Murder, 1st Degree	Burglary	Criminal Mischief-Vehicle	Unlawful Assembly
Murder, 2nd Degree	Safe Job	Criminal Mischief- Property	Disturbing the Peace
Manslaughter, Voluntary-non-negligence	Auto Prowls	Criminal Mischief-Graffiti	Threats
Manslaughter, Involuntary-negligence	Auto Strips		Unlawful to Produce Loud Noises upon Public Property
Forcible Rape - Regardless of Age	Bicycle Theft		Unlawful to Emit Loud Noises upon Public Property
Assault with Intent to Rape	Theft of Coin Machines / Phone Booth/Park Meter		All Other Disorderly Conduct Offenses
Aggravated Robbery from Person	Theft from Building		
Aggravated Robbery from Premises	Pocket Picking		
Simple Robbery, from Person	Purse Snatching		
Simple Robbery, from Premises)	Roll Job		
Assault with Intent to Rob	Shoplifting		
Aggravated Assault and Robbery, from Person	Sneak Thief		
Aggravated Assault and Robbery, from Premises	Till Taps		
Aggravated Assault to Murder	Other Larcenies		
Aggravated Assualt to Do Great Bodily Harm	Joyriding		
Aggravated Assault with Dangerous or Deadly Weapon	Auto Theft		
Maiming, Mayhem, and Assault with Intent to Maim	Truck Theft		
Assault with Explosives	Motorcycle Theft		
Willful Obstruction of Railroads	Auto Tampering		
Assault by Police Officers	Other Vehicle Theft		
	Arson		

Table C.4 - Neighborhood (Census Tract) Characteristics of Supportive Housing Sites for Crime Impacts Analysis

Neighborhood	Population 1990	Pct Black		Pct. Hispanic		Pct. Renters 1990	Median House Value 1990	Pct Change in House Values	
		1980	1990	1980	1990			1980-90	1990-96
Berkeley #2	5,257	0.4	0.6	19.0	29.3	40.8	64,900	-22.5	56.5
Clayton	2,916	89.4	87.1	2.8	7.8	34.3	60,600	-20.7	71.2
Cole	3,715	40.5	37.0	47.3	56.1	47.1	48,300	-16.9	68.7
College View	4,123	3.3	2.8	35.6	41.8	56.9	63,000	-19.8	62.5
Globeville	3,459	5.1	10.4	47.0	66.7	46.0	45,400	-44.6	65.7
Hampden	3,084	7.4	6.8	4.4	4.2	76.2	96,500	-7.4	n/a
Hilltop	3,809	2.9	0.8	0.6	1.6	6.1	194,500	3.8	7.8
Montbello #2	4,371	40.1	54.7	12.9	13.3	19.1	63,900	-34.8	50.0
Montbello #3	3,004	33.0	48.7	22.4	16.8	32.7	55,100	-31.2	81.5
Montbello #4	3,763	37.8	59.9	14.2	10.4	36.7	68,700	-28.2	38.8
Rosedale	2,479	3.4	2.3	5.7	7.5	53.0	76,600	-28.7	40.0
Speer #1	3,882	3.7	3.6	16.6	23.8	81.0	83,100	-7.3	93.7
Speer #2	3,942	1.3	1.8	6.1	11.4	84.3	83,900	-2.9	48.4
Virginia Village	3,193	2.3	4.5	2.4	6.4	12.2	91,300	-22.7	26.6
Wellshire	2,985	0.2	1.2	0.6	0.7	7.5	137,400	-11.6	37.6

Table C.5 - Descriptive Statistics for Crime Rate Models

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DALL500	1304	0.08589	0.28031	0	1.00000
DALL1K	1304	0.09202	0.28917	0	1.00000
DALL2K	1304	0.09202	0.28917	0	1.00000
DPST500	1304	0.04141	0.19932	0	1.00000
DPST1K	1304	0.04448	0.20623	0	1.00000
DPST2K	1304	0.04448	0.20623	0	1.00000
UPST500	1304	1.26687	11.07773	0	164.00000
UPST1K	1304	1.58512	12.39156	0	164.00000
UPST2K	1304	1.58512	12.39156	0	164.00000
TIME500	1304	0.38650	1.42911	0	8.00000
TIME1K	1304	0.41411	1.47540	0	8.00000
TIME2K	1304	0.41411	1.47540	0	8.00000
TRPST500	1304	0.09663	0.53706	0	5.00000
TRPST1K	1304	0.10429	0.55670	0	5.00000
TRPST2K	1304	0.10429	0.55670	0	5.00000
DYR91	1304	0.12500	0.33085	0	1.00000
DYR92	1304	0.12500	0.33085	0	1.00000
DYR93	1304	0.12500	0.33085	0	1.00000
DYR94	1304	0.12500	0.33085	0	1.00000
DYR95	1304	0.12500	0.33085	0	1.00000
DYR96	1304	0.12500	0.33085	0	1.00000
DYR97	1304	0.12500	0.33085	0	1.00000
DTR2	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR3	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR4	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR5	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR6	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR7	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR8	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR9	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR10	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR11	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR12	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR13	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR14	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR15	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR16	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR17	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR18	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR19	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR20	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR21	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR22	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR23	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR24	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR25	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR26	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR27	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR28	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR29	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DTR30	1304	0	0	0	0

Table C.5 (continued)

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DTR31	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR32	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR33	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR34	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR35	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR36	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR37	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR38	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR39	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR40	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR41	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR42	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR43	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR44	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR45	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR46	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DTR47	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR48	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR49	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR50	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR51	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR52	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR53	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR54	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR55	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR56	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR57	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR58	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR59	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR60	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR61	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR62	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR63	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR64	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR65	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR66	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR67	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR68	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR69	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR70	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR71	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR72	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR73	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR74	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR75	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR76	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR77	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR78	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR79	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR80	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000

Table C.5 (continued)

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DTR81	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR82	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR83	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR84	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR85	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR86	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR87	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR88	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR89	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR90	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR91	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR92	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR93	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR94	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR95	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR96	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR97	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR98	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR99	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR100	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR101	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR102	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR103	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR104	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR105	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR106	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR107	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR108	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR109	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR110	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR111	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR112	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR113	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR114	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR115	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR116	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR117	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR118	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR119	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR120	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR121	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR122	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR123	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR124	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR125	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR126	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR127	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR128	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR129	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR130	1304	0	0	0	0

Table C.5 (continued)

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DTR131	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR132	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR133	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR134	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR135	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR136	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR137	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR138	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR139	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR140	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR141	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DTR142	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR143	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR144	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR145	1304	0.02454	0.15478	0	1.00000
DTR146	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR147	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR148	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR149	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR150	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR151	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR152	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR153	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR154	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR155	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR156	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR157	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR158	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR159	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR160	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR161	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR162	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR163	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR164	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR165	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR166	1304	0.0061350	0.07812	0	1.00000
DTR167	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR168	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR169	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR170	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR171	1304	0	0	0	0
DTR172	1304	0	0	0	0
DSITE117	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE118	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE119	1304	0	0	0	0
DSITE120	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE121	1304	0.01227	0.11013	0	1.00000
DSITE122	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE123	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE124	1304	0	0	0	0

Table C.5 (continued)

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
DSITE125	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE126	1304	0	0	0	0
DSITE127	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE128	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE129	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE130	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE131	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE132	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
DSITE133	1304	0	0	0	0
DSITE134	1304	0.01840	0.13446	0	1.00000
LAG_15K	1304	8.91750	4.01757	1.88466	19.77983

Annex D

Regression Results

Table D.1
Property Aggregated Model Coefficients for Impact Variables

      We show the estimated coefficients of the variables of interest for our three aggregated models in equations [1], [2], and [3] below (White consistent standard errors are given parenthetically):

Denver Aggregated Model 1 (proximity to any supportive housing site model):

$$\text{LnP} = -.0626\ \text{DAll}_{500} \qquad -.0195\ \text{DAll}_{1k} \qquad -.0145\ \text{DAll}_{2k}$$
$$(.024)^{**} \qquad\qquad\qquad (.016) \qquad\qquad\qquad (.010)$$

$$+.0134\ \text{DPost}_{500} \qquad +.0308\ \text{DPost}_{1k} \qquad +.0205\ \text{DPost}_{2k}$$
$$(.033) \qquad\qquad\qquad (.018) \qquad\qquad\qquad (.012)$$

$$+.0016\ \text{Time}_{500}\ (/100) \qquad -.0022\ \text{Time}_{1k}\ (/100) \qquad -.0015\ \text{Time}_{2k}\ (/100)$$
$$(.001) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.001)^{**} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.001)^{**}$$

$$-.0005\ \text{TrPost}_{500}\ (/100) \qquad +.0016\ \text{TrPost}_{1k}\ (/100) \qquad +.0024\ \text{TrPost}_{2k}\ (/100) \qquad [1]$$
$$(.002) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.001) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.001)^{**}$$

Denver Aggregated Model 2 (proximity to number of supportive housing sites interaction model):

$$\text{LnP} = -.0623\ \text{DAll}_{500} \qquad -.0161\ \text{DAll}_{1k} \qquad -.0156\ \text{DAll}_{2k}$$
$$(.024)^{**} \qquad\qquad\qquad (.015) \qquad\qquad\qquad (.010)$$

$$+.0109\ \text{Post}_{500}\ (/100) \qquad +.0206\ \text{Post}_{1k}\ (/100) \qquad +.0132\ \text{Post}_{2k}\ (/100)$$
$$(.032) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.018) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.007)$$

$$+\ .0015\ \text{Time}_{500}\ (/100) \qquad -.0022\ \text{Time}_{1k}\ (/100) \qquad -.0014\ \text{Time}_{2k}\ (/100)$$
$$(.001) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.001)^{**} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.000)^{**}$$

$$+.0000\ \text{TrPost}_{500}\ (/100) \qquad +.0024\ \text{TrPost}_{1k}\ (/100) \qquad +.0020\ \text{TrPost}_{2k}\ (/100)$$
$$(.002) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.004) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (.001)$$

$$-0\ (\text{TrPost}_{500} * \text{Post}_{500})\ (/1000) \qquad\qquad -.0003\ (\text{TrPost}_{1k} * \text{Post}_{1k})\ (/1000)$$
$$(.004)$$

$$+.0004\ (\text{TrPost}_{2k} * \text{Post}_{2k})\ (/1000) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad [2]$$
$$(.001)$$

Table D.1 (continued)
Property Aggregated Model Coefficients for Impact Variables

Denver Aggregated Model 3 (proximity to number of supportive housing units interaction model):

$LnP =$ $-.0741$ $DAll_{500}$ $-.0485$ $DAll_{1k}$ $-.0219$ $DAll_{2k}$
         $(.025)$ ** $(.016)$ ** $(.011)$*

         $+.0005$ $UPost_{500}$ (/100) $+.0020$ $UPost_{1k}$ (/100) $+.0005$ $UPost_{2k}$ (/100)
          $(.001)$ $(.000)$ ** $(.000)$**

         $+ .0024$ $Time_{500}$ (/100) $-.0006$ $Time_{1k}$ (/100) $-.0008$ $Time_{2k}$ (/100)
         $(.001)$ $(.001)$ $(.001)$

         $+.0021$ $TrPost_{500}$ (/100) $+.0017$ $TrPost_{1k}$ (/100) $+.0016$ $TrPost_{2k}$ (/100)
         $(.004)$ $(.001)$ $(.001)$ *

         $-.0005$ ($TrPost_{500}$ * $UPost_{500}$) (/1000) $-.0001$ ($TrPost_{1k}$ * $UPost_{1k}$) (/1000)
         $(.000)$ $(.000)$ **

         $+.0000$ ($TrPost_{2k}$ * $UPost_{2k}$) (/1000)   [3]
         $(.000)$

where:
     **   = coefficient statistically significant at .01 level, two-tailed test
     *   = coefficient statistically significant at .05 level, two-tailed test

Table D.2 - Regression Coefficient Estimates for Impact, Structural, Spatial, and Quarter Variables for Property Value Aggregate Model

Model: MODEL1
Dependent Variable: LNSALAMT   Log of sale price

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	199	10224.96488	51.38173	1058.922	0.0001
Error	45401	2202.97840	0.04852		
C Total	45600	12427.94328			

Root MSE	0.22028	R-square	0.8227	
Dep Mean	11.31377	Adj R-sq	0.8220	
C.V.	1.94700			

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
INTERCEP	B	10.505195	0.07553757	139.072	0.0001	B	Intercept
DALL500X	1	-0.062590	0.02354550	-2.658	0.0079	1	All <=500 ft.
DALL1K	1	-0.019493	0.01426110	-1.367	0.1717	1	All 500-1000 ft
DALL2K	1	-0.014531	0.00925083	-1.571	0.1162	1	All 1000-2000 ft.
DPST500X	1	0.013402	0.02924037	0.458	0.6467	1	Post <=500 ft.
DPST1K	1	0.030844	0.01655601	1.863	0.0625	1	Post 500-1000 ft.
DPST2K	1	0.020520	0.01061562	1.933	0.0532	1	Post 1000-2000 ft

D-1

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
TIME500X	1	0.001611	0.00136576	1.180	0.2382	1	Trend All <=500 ft.
TIME1K	1	-0.002162	0.00079402	-2.723	0.0065	1	Trend All 500-1000 ft.
TIME2K	1	-0.001490	0.00052459	-2.841	0.0045	1	Trend All 1000-2000 ft
TRPST50X	1	-0.000462	0.00207401	-0.223	0.8235	1	Trend Post <=500 ft.
TRPST1K	1	0.001561	0.00137323	1.137	0.2555	1	Trend Post 500-1000 ft
TRPST2K	1	0.002356	0.00077769	3.030	0.0024	1	Trend Pst 1000-2000 ft
DBATH1	1	0.277929	0.03860179	7.200	0.0001	1	Has 1/1.5 bathrooms
DBATH2	1	0.392603	0.03868522	10.149	0.0001	1	Has 2/2.5 bathrooms
DBATH3	1	0.427981	0.03891580	10.998	0.0001	1	Has 3+ bathrooms
DCONCRT	B	-0.079255	0.02467138	-3.212	0.0013	B	Concrete ext. wall
DFRAME	B	-0.030767	0.02357325	-1.305	0.1918	B	Frame ext. wall
DMASONRY	B	-0.017714	0.02415721	-0.733	0.4634	B	Mason/frame ext. Wall
DSTUCCO	B	-0.146762	0.02438766	-6.018	0.0001	B	Stucco ext. wall
DBRICK	B	0.030091	0.02363236	1.273	0.2029	B	Brick ext. wall
DEWOTHR	0	0	.	.	.	0	Other ext. wall
DFIREPL1	1	0.076916	0.00266694	28.841	0.0001	1	Has 1 fireplace
DFIREPL2	1	0.102384	0.01094760	9.352	0.0001	1	Has 2+ fireplaces
DSTOR15	1	0.225668	0.00553251	40.789	0.0001	1	Building 1.5 stories
DSTOR2	1	0.256816	0.00398748	64.405	0.0001	1	Building 2+ stories
DYRB1900	1	0.091685	0.00725138	12.644	0.0001	1	Built 1900-19
DYRB1920	1	0.128505	0.00746513	17.214	0.0001	1	Built 1920-39
DYRB1940	1	0.089905	0.00789256	11.391	0.0001	1	Built 1940-49

D-2

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
DYRB1950	1	0.094674	0.00809378	11.697	0.0001	1	Built 1950-59
DYRB1960	1	0.085897	0.01032411	8.320	0.0001	1	Built 1960-69
DYRB1970	1	0.138512	0.01055535	13.122	0.0001	1	Built 1970-79
DYRB1980	1	0.219031	0.01076868	20.340	0.0001	1	Built 1980-89
DYRB1990	1	0.120892	0.01192771	10.135	0.0001	1	Built 1990 or later
BASEFT	1	0.000365	0.00000487	74.869	0.0001	1	base square feet
SQRFT	1	0.000013843	0.00000081	17.104	0.0001	1	square footage
DQ872	1	0.004547	0.01254647	0.362	0.7171	1	
DQ873	1	-0.014449	0.01269553	-1.138	0.2551	1	
DQ874	1	-0.025973	0.01201805	-2.161	0.0307	1	
DQ881	1	-0.044030	0.01267969	-3.472	0.0005	1	
DQ882	1	-0.067989	0.01184810	-5.738	0.0001	1	
DQ883	1	-0.068588	0.01144915	-5.991	0.0001	1	
DQ884	1	-0.083804	0.01174812	-7.133	0.0001	1	
DQ891	1	-0.113930	0.01229037	-9.270	0.0001	1	
DQ892	1	-0.101595	0.01152696	-8.814	0.0001	1	
DQ893	1	-0.112476	0.01153061	-9.755	0.0001	1	
DQ894	1	-0.125528	0.01180338	-10.635	0.0001	1	
DQ901	1	-0.143268	0.01222216	-11.722	0.0001	1	
DQ902	1	-0.140808	0.01143247	-12.316	0.0001	1	
DQ903	1	-0.136344	0.01137042	-11.991	0.0001	1	
DQ904	1	-0.153619	0.01162800	-13.211	0.0001	1	
DQ911	1	-0.168273	0.01213053	-13.872	0.0001	1	
DQ912	1	-0.098746	0.01140492	-8.658	0.0001	1	
DQ913	1	-0.078499	0.01152687	-6.810	0.0001	1	
DQ914	1	-0.064900	0.01167378	-5.559	0.0001	1	
DQ921	1	-0.062687	0.01200770	-5.221	0.0001	1	

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
DQ922	1	0.009660	0.01123206	0.860	0.3898	1	
DQ923	1	0.009085	0.01138022	0.798	0.4247	1	
DQ924	1	0.012705	0.01128923	1.125	0.2604	1	
DQ931	1	0.036105	0.01183350	3.051	0.0023	1	
DQ932	1	0.099293	0.01122556	8.845	0.0001	1	
DQ933	1	0.131074	0.01133223	11.566	0.0001	1	
DQ934	1	0.147648	0.01142395	12.924	0.0001	1	
DQ941	1	0.168372	0.01176789	14.308	0.0001	1	
DQ942	1	0.225981	0.01125129	20.085	0.0001	1	
DQ943	1	0.232803	0.01145036	20.331	0.0001	1	
DQ944	1	0.256770	0.01162252	22.092	0.0001	1	
DQ951	1	0.286761	0.01196594	23.965	0.0001	1	
DQ952	1	0.333865	0.01158298	28.824	0.0001	1	
DQ953	1	0.354742	0.01146747	30.935	0.0001	1	
DQ954	1	0.361700	0.01176621	30.741	0.0001	1	
DQ961	1	0.404646	0.01199395	33.738	0.0001	1	
DQ962	1	0.434069	0.01150652	37.724	0.0001	1	
DQ963	1	0.458838	0.01161514	39.503	0.0001	1	
DQ964	1	0.468802	0.01228663	38.155	0.0001	1	
DQ971	1	0.432235	0.04281082	10.096	0.0001	1	
DQ972	1	0.519614	0.03266681	15.906	0.0001	1	
DQ973	1	0.507250	0.04088443	12.407	0.0001	1	
DTR2	1	-0.190094	0.02031684	-9.356	0.0001	1	
DTR3	1	-0.013722	0.02401610	-0.571	0.5677	1	
DTR4	1	-0.125234	0.02525733	-4.958	0.0001	1	
DTR5	1	-0.305956	0.02276569	-13.439	0.0001	1	
DTR6	1	-0.331180	0.02774822	-11.935	0.0001	1	

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
DTR7	1	-0.273763	0.03850501	-7.110	0.0001	1	
DTR8	1	-0.270941	0.04210028	-6.436	0.0001	1	
DTR9	1	-0.683710	0.05883693	-11.620	0.0001	1	
DTR10	1	-0.371949	0.03730971	-9.969	0.0001	1	
DTR11	1	-0.436746	0.04063007	-10.749	0.0001	1	
DTR12	1	-0.854571	0.15998283	-5.342	0.0001	1	
DTR13	1	-0.579924	0.08229317	-7.047	0.0001	1	
DTR14	1	-0.828969	0.05235882	-15.832	0.0001	1	
DTR15	1	-0.883086	0.04807182	-18.370	0.0001	1	
DTR16	B	-0.902584	0.05177319	-17.433	0.0001	B	
DTR17	1	-0.964984	0.05371122	-17.966	0.0001	1	
DTR18	1	-0.883304	0.05450855	-16.205	0.0001	1	
DTR19	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR20	1	-0.495335	0.04823772	-10.269	0.0001	1	
DTR21	B	-0.759362	0.05883007	-12.908	0.0001	B	
DTR22	1	-0.794316	0.05902677	-13.457	0.0001	1	
DTR23	1	-0.736022	0.06433968	-11.440	0.0001	1	
DTR24	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR25	1	-0.906653	0.06443324	-14.071	0.0001	1	
DTR26	1	-0.402570	0.04902865	-8.211	0.0001	1	
DTR27	1	-1.188024	0.07789682	-15.251	0.0001	1	
DTR28	1	-0.839522	0.06396658	-13.124	0.0001	1	
DTR29	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR30	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR31	1	-0.726126	0.07621365	-9.528	0.0001	1	
DTR32	1	-0.537380	0.05071282	-10.597	0.0001	1	
DTR33	0	0	.	.	.	0	

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
DTR34	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR35	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR36	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR37	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR38	1	-0.184637	0.05991815	-3.081	0.0021	1	
DTR39	1	-0.398266	0.05893530	-6.758	0.0001	1	
DTR40	1	-0.217496	0.06067365	-3.585	0.0003	1	
DTR41	1	-0.399521	0.06088664	-6.562	0.0001	1	
DTR42	B	-0.162482	0.06086692	-2.669	0.0076	B	
DTR43	B	-0.415405	0.06247530	-6.649	0.0001	B	
DTR44	1	-0.528600	0.06573094	-8.042	0.0001	1	
DTR45	1	-0.380664	0.06326347	-6.017	0.0001	1	
DTR46	B	-0.413560	0.06337766	-6.525	0.0001	B	
DTR47	1	-0.405713	0.06427415	-6.312	0.0001	1	
DTR48	1	-0.282568	0.09025074	-3.131	0.0017	1	
DTR49	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR50	1	0.094603	0.07137456	1.325	0.1850	1	
DTR51	1	0.552891	0.22773231	2.428	0.0152	1	
DTR52	1	0.311519	0.05840558	5.334	0.0001	1	
DTR53	1	0.169241	0.05982373	2.829	0.0047	1	
DTR54	B	-0.018138	0.06124260	-0.296	0.7671	B	
DTR55	1	-0.070657	0.04497298	-1.571	0.1162	1	
DTR56	1	-0.693447	0.04799742	-14.448	0.0001	1	
DTR57	1	-0.419347	0.05196831	-8.069	0.0001	1	
DTR58	1	-0.396349	0.05286647	-7.497	0.0001	1	
DTR59	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR60	0	0	.	.	.	0	

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
DTR61	1	0.025396	0.06334264	0.401	0.6885	1	
DTR62	1	0.121580	0.06135695	1.982	0.0475	1	
DTR63	1	0.055418	0.06234975	0.889	0.3741	1	
DTR64	B	-0.152276	0.06257726	-2.433	0.0150	B	
DTR65	1	-0.248457	0.06357370	-3.908	0.0001	1	
DTR66	1	-0.352413	0.06175359	-5.707	0.0001	1	
DTR67	1	-0.238588	0.06383112	-3.738	0.0002	1	
DTR68	1	-0.320716	0.08461665	-3.790	0.0002	1	
DTR69	1	-0.264574	0.06291495	-4.205	0.0001	1	
DTR70	1	-0.266573	0.05643602	-4.723	0.0001	1	
DTR71	1	-0.155608	0.05968764	-2.607	0.0091	1	
DTR72	1	0.000830	0.05704803	0.015	0.9884	1	
DTR73	1	-0.147750	0.06066356	-2.436	0.0149	1	
DTR74	1	0.287481	0.06013524	4.781	0.0001	1	
DTR75	1	0.301832	0.06174242	4.889	0.0001	1	
DTR76	1	0.158259	0.06178343	2.562	0.0104	1	
DTR77	1	0.116524	0.06164881	1.890	0.0587	1	
DTR78	1	0.261321	0.06262892	4.173	0.0001	1	
DTR79	1	0.118376	0.06305962	1.877	0.0605	1	
DTR80	1	0.104718	0.06405304	1.635	0.1021	1	
DTR81	1	-0.274284	0.06467415	-4.241	0.0001	1	
DTR82	B	-1.080296	0.05661025	-19.083	0.0001	B	
DTR83	1	-1.169324	0.05910945	-19.782	0.0001	1	
DTR84	B	-0.917409	0.06236833	-14.710	0.0001	B	
DTR85	1	-0.899659	0.06632512	-13.564	0.0001	1	
DTR86	1	-0.893123	0.06740356	-13.250	0.0001	1	
DTR87	B	-0.814713	0.06657864	-12.237	0.0001	B	

D-7

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
DTR88	B	-0.821561	0.07068601	-11.623	0.0001	B	
DTR89	B	-0.777703	0.06931245	-11.220	0.0001	B	
DTR90	1	-0.098808	0.06586836	-1.500	0.1336	1	
DTR91	1	-0.224743	0.06480619	-3.468	0.0005	1	
DTR92	1	-0.070026	0.06573963	-1.065	0.2868	1	
DTR93	1	-0.270203	0.06298915	-4.290	0.0001	1	
DTR94	1	-0.286614	0.06622990	-4.328	0.0001	1	
DTR95	1	-0.240737	0.06416437	-3.752	0.0002	1	
DTR96	1	-0.170098	0.06314460	-2.694	0.0071	1	
DTR97	1	-0.076089	0.09135046	-0.833	0.4049	1	
DTR98	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR99	1	-0.975673	0.14257809	-6.843	0.0001	1	
DTR100	1	-1.069207	0.07082346	-15.097	0.0001	1	
DTR101	1	-0.680296	0.08577647	-7.931	0.0001	1	
DTR102	B	-0.725739	0.07767885	-9.343	0.0001	B	
DTR103	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR104	1	-0.080093	0.06432459	-1.245	0.2131	1	
DTR105	1	-0.048499	0.06157490	-0.788	0.4309	1	
DTR106	1	-0.118228	0.06149656	-1.923	0.0545	1	
DTR107	1	-0.001320	0.06098128	-0.022	0.9827	1	
DTR108	1	-0.128690	0.06352691	-2.026	0.0428	1	
DTR109	1	-0.122726	0.06149972	-1.996	0.0460	1	
DTR110	1	-0.189230	0.10370987	-1.825	0.0681	1	
DTR111	1	-0.228355	0.06789006	-3.364	0.0008	1	
DTR112	1	-0.238750	0.08657753	-2.758	0.0058	1	
DTR113	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR114	1	-0.312350	0.16740244	-1.866	0.0621	1	

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
DTR115	1	-0.069387	0.16740679	-0.414	0.6785	1	
DTR116	1	-0.175818	0.14118560	-1.245	0.2130	1	
DTR117	1	0.129903	0.08015028	1.621	0.1051	1	
DTR118	1	-0.024338	0.06814968	-0.357	0.7210	1	
DTR119	1	0.847501	0.08772279	9.661	0.0001	1	
DTR120	1	0.502893	0.07398558	6.797	0.0001	1	
DTR121	1	0.524188	0.07626900	6.873	0.0001	1	
DTR122	1	0.579336	0.07407939	7.820	0.0001	1	
DTR123	1	0.603530	0.07764740	7.773	0.0001	1	
DTR124	1	0.512296	0.07584077	6.755	0.0001	1	
DTR125	1	0.018546	0.02526272	0.734	0.4629	1	
DTR126	B	-0.858602	0.07300448	-11.761	0.0001	B	
DTR127	B	-0.871956	0.07422064	-11.748	0.0001	B	
DTR128	1	-0.825670	0.09367611	-8.814	0.0001	1	
DTR129	1	-0.704223	0.07882012	-8.935	0.0001	1	
DTR130	1	-0.787199	0.09741575	-8.081	0.0001	1	
DTR131	B	-1.031025	0.09211084	-11.193	0.0001	B	
DTR132	1	-0.751139	0.11793431	-6.369	0.0001	1	
DTR133	1	-0.745875	0.10717673	-6.959	0.0001	1	
DTR134	1	-1.031528	0.10632366	-9.702	0.0001	1	
DTR135	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR136	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR137	0	0	.	.	.	0	
DTR138	0	0	.	.	.	0	
XCOORD	B	-3.751640	0.25274317	-14.844	0.0001	B	X coordinate
YCOORD	B	-7.308353	0.30839567	-23.698	0.0001	B	Y coordinate
XY	B	0.461871	4.08567616	0.113	0.9100	B	X * Y

Table D.2 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF	Variable Label
XX	1	4.192553	1.30988732	3.201	0.0014	1	X * X
YY	B	-57.954404	4.20962250	-13.767	0.0001	B	Y * Y

Table D.3
Total Crime Rate Aggregated Model Coefficients for Impact Variables

       We show the estimated coefficients of the variables of interest for our three aggregated models in equations [1], [2], and [3] below (Standard errors are given parenthetically):

Aggregated Model 1 (proximity to any supportive housing site model):

$LnP = $ .4637 $DAll_{500}$ -1.1017 $DAll_{1k}$ -1.7048 $DAll_{2k}$
        (2.130)   (1.382)   (1.138)

       +1.6834 $DPost_{500}$ -.0979 $DPost_{1k}$ +.2643 $DPost_{2k}$
        (2.533)   (1.30)   (.710)

       -.3322 $Time_{500}$ (/100)   +.0377 $Time_{1k}$ (/100)   -.0866 $Time_{2k}$ (/100)
        (.630)   (.330)   (.193)

       -.1548 $TrPost_{500}$ (/100)   +.2732 $TrPost_{1k}$ (/100)   -.0628 $TrPost_{2k}$ (/100)   [1]
        (.886)   (.464)   (.271)

Aggregated Model 2 (proximity to number of supportive housing units model):

$LnP = $ .0691 $DAll_{500}$ -1.1156 $DAll_{1k}$ -1.7743 $DAll_{2k}$
        (2.089)   (1.377)   (1.144)

       -.0151 $UPost_{500}$ (/100)   -.0032 $UPost_{1k}$ (/100)   -.0015 $UPost_{2k}$ (/100)
         (.023)   (.011)   (.007)

       -.0681 $Time_{500}$ (/100)   +.0450 $Time_{1k}$ (/100)   -.0419 $Time_{2k}$ (/100)
        (.551)   (.288)   (.167)

       +.0976 $TrPost_{500}$ (/100) +.2672 $TrPost_{1k}$ (/100)   -.0368 $TrPost_{2k}$ (/100)
        (.853)   (.451)   (.269)   [2]

Note: None of the coefficients were statistically significant at .05 level.

Table D.4 - Aggregated Model Coefficients for Impact Variables for Crime Rate by Type

	Total		Property		Violent		Criminal Mischief		Disorderly Conduct	
	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.
Aggregated Model 1 (proximity to any supportive housing site model)										
DALL500	0.464	2.13	-0.019	1.74	0.143	0.24	0.032	0.34	0.165	0.11
DALL1K	-1.102	1.38	-1.008	1.14	0.082	0.16	0.046	0.22	-0.013	0.07
DALL2K	-1.705	1.14	-1.351	0.94	-0.045	0.13	-0.116	0.18	0.025	0.06
DPST500	1.683	2.53	1.263	2.07	-0.125	0.29	0.002	0.41	0.208	0.13
DPST1K	-0.098	1.30	-0.375	1.06	0.017	0.15	0.129	0.21	0.052	0.07
DPST2K	0.264	0.71	0.231	0.58	-0.015	0.08	0.127	0.11	0.031	0.04
TIME500	-0.332	0.63	-0.045	0.51	-0.044	0.07	-0.014	0.10	-0.058	0.03
TIME1K	0.038	0.33	0.151	0.27	-0.018	0.04	-0.043	0.05	0.005	0.02
TIME2K	-0.087	0.19	0.087	0.16	-0.017	0.02	-0.035	0.03	-0.014	0.01
TRPST500	-0.155	0.89	-0.318	0.72	0.090	0.10	0.033	0.14	0.025	0.05
TRPST1K	0.273	0.46	0.184	0.38	0.007	0.05	-0.003	0.08	-0.012	0.03
TRPST2K	-0.063	0.27	-0.181	0.22	0.013	0.03	0.004	0.04	0.001	0.01
Aggregated Model 2 (proximity to number of supportive housing units model)										
DALL500	0.069	2.09	-0.317	1.71	0.177	0.24	0.058	0.33	0.157	0.11
DALL1K	-1.116	1.38	-0.981	1.13	0.089	0.15	0.055	0.22	0.000	0.07
DALL2K	-1.774	1.14	-1.420	0.95	-0.039	0.13	-0.109	0.18	0.040	0.06
UPST500	-0.015	0.02	-0.010	0.02	0.003	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.026	0.00 *
UPST1K	-0.003	0.01	-0.004	0.01	0.002	0.00	0.002	0.00	0.001	0.00
UPST2K	-0.002	0.01	-0.001	0.01	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00
TIME500	-0.068	0.55	0.146	0.45	-0.065	0.06	-0.009	0.09	-0.041	0.03
TIME1K	0.045	0.29	0.122	0.24	-0.022	0.03	-0.028	0.05	0.009	0.02
TIME2K	-0.042	0.17	0.122	0.14	-0.019	0.02	-0.018	0.03	-0.012	0.01
TRPST500	0.098	0.85	-0.135	0.70	0.065	0.10	0.029	0.14	0.031	0.04
TRPST1K	0.267	0.45	0.158	0.37	0.005	0.05	-0.003	0.07	-0.016	0.02
TRPST2K	-0.037	0.27	-0.156	0.22	0.013	0.03	0.010	0.04	0.002	0.01

* Significant at the .001 level

D-1

Table D.5 - Regression Coefficient Estimates for Impact, Year, And Spatial Variables for Crime Rate Aggregate Model

Model: MODEL1
Dependent Variable: CRRATE   Number of crimes per 100 pop

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	152	87855.98095	577.99987	117.390	0.0001
Error	1151	5667.23692	4.92375		
C Total	1303	93523.21787			

Root MSE	2.21895	R-square	0.9394
Dep Mean	8.48711	Adj R-sq	0.9314
C.V.	26.14498		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF
INTERCEP	1	2.513982	1.36733557	1.839	0.0662	1
DALL500	1	0.463713	2.12964518	0.218	0.8277	1
DALL1K	1	-1.101676	1.38185494	-0.797	0.4255	1
DALL2K	1	-1.704826	1.13845928	-1.497	0.1345	1
DPST500	1	1.683378	2.53264416	0.665	0.5064	1
DPST1K	1	-0.097905	1.29949799	-0.075	0.9400	1
DPST2K	1	0.264289	0.70985643	0.372	0.7097	1
TIME500	1	-0.332150	0.62966743	-0.528	0.5979	1
TIME1K	1	0.037670	0.33007881	0.114	0.9092	1
TIME2K	1	-0.086602	0.19308706	-0.449	0.6539	1
TRPST500	1	-0.154807	0.88568165	-0.175	0.8613	1
TRPST1K	1	0.273237	0.46417432	0.589	0.5562	1

Table D.5 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF
TRPST2K	1	-0.062830	0.27143323	-0.231	0.8170	1
DYR91	1	0.177106	0.24747122	0.716	0.4743	1
DYR92	1	0.901473	0.26706186	3.376	0.0008	1
DYR93	1	0.895021	0.28444550	3.147	0.0017	1
DYR94	1	0.466774	0.26611817	1.754	0.0797	1
DYR95	1	0.078562	0.25644425	0.306	0.7594	1
DYR96	1	0.298057	0.25755022	1.157	0.2474	1
DYR97	1	-0.258861	0.26309542	-0.984	0.3254	1
DTR2	1	2.727860	1.24823884	2.185	0.0291	1
DTR3	1	0.630696	1.24067524	0.508	0.6113	1
DTR4	1	0.770986	1.27882613	0.603	0.5467	1
DTR5	1	0.497037	1.54836237	0.321	0.7483	1
DTR6	1	-0.740302	1.60149262	-0.462	0.6440	1
DTR7	1	1.007689	2.19600017	0.459	0.6464	1
DTR8	1	0.196099	1.41711003	0.138	0.8900	1
DTR9	1	10.004656	1.59591164	6.269	0.0001	1
DTR10	1	0.765029	1.62641896	0.470	0.6382	1
DTR11	1	2.468542	1.59970495	1.543	0.1231	1
DTR12	1	8.736452	2.15174364	4.060	0.0001	1
DTR13	1	-2.660406	4.72919622	-0.563	0.5739	1
DTR14	1	2.924961	1.64656241	1.776	0.0759	1
DTR15	1	21.294676	1.58314205	13.451	0.0001	1
DTR16	1	2.220011	1.47205163	1.508	0.1318	1
DTR17	1	-0.051473	1.31417490	-0.039	0.9688	1
DTR18	1	3.439734	1.50963661	2.279	0.0229	1
DTR19	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR20	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR21	1	9.664707	1.43939380	6.714	0.0001	1
DTR22	1	7.560787	2.96598398	2.549	0.0109	1
DTR23	1	3.054894	1.73062486	1.765	0.0778	1
DTR24	1	2.182535	1.31659248	1.658	0.0976	1
DTR25	1	2.886555	1.32528694	2.178	0.0296	1

Table D.5 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF
DTR26	1	1.527068	1.18465897	1.289	0.1976	1
DTR27	1	1.501914	3.20432772	0.469	0.6394	1
DTR28	1	9.532659	1.27526013	7.475	0.0001	1
DTR29	1	1.760320	1.64941678	1.067	0.2861	1
DTR30	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR31	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR32	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR33	1	14.572570	1.59727263	9.123	0.0001	1
DTR34	1	-2.737350	2.20922350	-1.239	0.2156	1
DTR35	1	94.183771	1.72647608	54.553	0.0001	1
DTR36	1	9.059559	1.76495635	5.133	0.0001	1
DTR37	1	23.527120	1.55584988	15.122	0.0001	1
DTR38	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR39	1	16.095330	1.48579239	10.833	0.0001	1
DTR40	1	9.053463	1.55232706	5.832	0.0001	1
DTR41	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR42	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR43	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR44	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR45	1	2.838229	5.11227383	0.555	0.5789	1
DTR46	B	6.348038	1.69306077	3.749	0.0002	B
DTR47	1	-0.150810	1.68555403	-0.089	0.9287	1
DTR48	1	3.732047	1.29312940	2.886	0.0040	1
DTR49	1	-2.060790	1.16525854	1.769	0.0772	1
DTR50	1	3.541421	1.13983842	3.107	0.0019	1
DTR51	1	4.136668	1.68160844	2.460	0.0140	1
DTR52	1	1.684253	1.24395708	1.354	0.1760	1
DTR53	1	1.528949	1.21025448	1.263	0.2067	1
DTR54	1	-2.038707	1.58013565	-1.290	0.1972	1
DTR55	1	-1.133751	3.15206834	-0.360	0.7191	1
DTR56	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR57	1	2.481865	2.03969265	1.217	0.2239	1

Table D.5 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF
DTR58	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR59	1	0.150902	1.26265441	0.120	0.9049	1
DTR60	1	0.683117	1.28354859	0.532	0.5947	1
DTR61	1	1.530220	1.10155879	1.389	0.1651	1
DTR62	1	8.397844	1.24141366	6.765	0.0001	1
DTR63	1	7.669325	1.53061004	5.011	0.0001	1
DTR64	1	4.749415	1.28279516	3.702	0.0002	1
DTR65	1	2.012605	1.36942693	1.470	0.1419	1
DTR66	1	17.802822	2.14262969	8.309	0.0001	1
DTR67	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR68	1	4.816374	2.12542889	2.266	0.0236	1
DTR69	1	7.994286	1.21595402	6.574	0.0001	1
DTR70	1	3.467543	1.18288764	2.931	0.0034	1
DTR71	1	-0.095404	1.25022664	-0.076	0.9392	1
DTR72	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR73	1	-2.552489	1.59367329	-1.602	0.1095	1
DTR74	1	-0.577015	1.48215810	-0.389	0.6971	1
DTR75	1	0.166773	1.66770605	0.100	0.9204	1
DTR76	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR77	1	0.158881	1.29802530	0.122	0.9026	1
DTR78	1	10.960077	1.29240875	8.480	0.0001	1
DTR79	1	6.218069	1.33598990	4.654	0.0001	1
DTR80	1	-0.819114	1.16049590	-0.706	0.4804	1
DTR81	1	0.247284	1.14813085	0.215	0.8295	1
DTR82	1	73.148948	1.45830198	50.160	0.0001	1
DTR83	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR84	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR85	1	2.106921	1.34549063	1.566	0.1176	1
DTR86	1	-0.427145	1.27257233	-0.336	0.7372	1
DTR87	1	14.329450	1.30188315	11.007	0.0001	1
DTR88	1	1.638700	1.49323624	1.097	0.2727	1
DTR89	1	-0.809558	1.23369850	-0.656	0.5118	1

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF
DTR90	1	-0.590215	1.14713713	-0.515	0.6070	1
DTR91	1	-1.983193	1.21409160	-1.633	0.1026	1
DTR92	1	8.885756	1.11984284	7.935	0.0001	1
DTR93	1	-3.818438	1.18050567	-3.235	0.0013	1
DTR94	1	1.325028	1.13558150	1.167	0.2435	1
DTR95	1	1.723080	1.34072143	1.285	0.1990	1
DTR96	1	0.866465	1.16470209	0.744	0.4571	1
DTR97	1	7.471117	1.84044214	4.059	0.0001	1
DTR98	1	-0.597781	1.62047383	-0.369	0.7123	1
DTR99	1	0.659154	1.21217018	0.544	0.5867	1
DTR100	1	1.172841	1.21346371	0.967	0.3340	1
DTR101	1	-0.879832	1.17184690	-0.751	0.4529	1
DTR102	1	0.681147	1.21805423	0.559	0.5761	1
DTR103	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR104	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR105	1	0.209870	1.70080655	0.123	0.9018	1
DTR106	1	1.201520	1.33837140	0.898	0.3695	1
DTR107	1	-1.126203	1.23536280	-0.912	0.3622	1
DTR108	1	0.733667	1.49044945	0.492	0.6226	1
DTR109	1	1.701225	1.47484414	1.153	0.2489	1
DTR110	1	1.931304	1.42215879	1.358	0.1747	1
DTR111	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR112	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR113	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR114	1	37.066970	2.63274357	14.079	0.0001	1
DTR115	1	7.013994	1.31700751	5.326	0.0001	1
DTR116	1	-1.097698	1.58651463	-0.692	0.4891	1
DTR117	1	-1.824718	1.24246351	-1.469	0.1422	1
DTR118	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR119	1	5.449300	1.44402184	3.774	0.0002	1
DTR120	1	-0.263729	1.20478481	-0.219	0.8268	1
DTR121	1	-0.687974	1.20235924	-0.572	0.5673	1

Table D.5 (continued)

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|	DF
DTR122	1	1.023651	1.23228624	0.831	0.4063	1
DTR123	1	-0.820657	1.38877591	-0.591	0.5547	1
DTR124	1	-4.482278	1.46744687	-3.054	0.0023	1
DTR125	1	0.458978	1.23710313	0.371	0.7107	1
DTR126	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR127	1	6.453852	1.49357838	4.321	0.0001	1
DTR128	1	-1.387083	1.73035234	-0.802	0.4229	1
DTR129	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR130	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR131	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR132	1	-4.367415	3.29421051	-1.326	0.1852	1
DTR133	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR134	1	1.050193	1.28219184	0.819	0.4129	1
DTR135	1	-2.228606	1.27358180	-1.750	0.0804	1
DTR136	1	-1.966446	1.18475615	-1.660	0.0972	1
DTR137	1	2.745811	1.31941114	2.081	0.0376	1
DTR138	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR139	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR140	1	-2.037406	3.27484254	-0.622	0.5340	1
DTR141	B	0.614242	1.60435624	0.383	0.7019	B
DTR142	1	2.730265	1.31695601	2.073	0.0384	1
DTR143	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR144	1	0.590540	1.29920149	0.455	0.6495	1
DTR145	1	-0.509805	1.30985403	-0.389	0.6972	1
DTR146	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR147	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR148	1	-2.742799	1.45379851	-1.887	0.0595	1
DTR149	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR150	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR151	0	0	.	.	.	0
DTR152	1	0.269942	1.18785383	0.227	0.8203	1

Annex E

Focus Group Protocols and Materials

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOLS

PURPOSE

Following the quantitative analyses, we conducted focus groups to gain a deeper understanding of resident thoughts on the quality of life in their neighborhoods. In particular, we wished to ascertain differences in how residents view their neighborhood's quality of life, resident composition, social cohesion, political mobilization, and social interaction patterns. Our goal was to use these insights to enrich our understanding of the quantitative findings.

Researchers did not prompt residents for their thoughts on assisted housing or tenants. These topics emerged only as they were brought up by residents. Protocols for focus groups were designed to not beg the question about the presence of subsidized sites. Indeed, in some areas the lack of awareness about such sites may be the reason for absence of property value impact, and we were reluctant to trigger a socially destructive "experimenter effect." Our focus groups asked general questions about what makes a good neighborhood, the quality of life in the neighborhood, characteristics of community residents, and perceived changes in quality of life and changes in the composition of the resident population. We probed residents' perceptions, sources of information, local social networks, and expectations of neighborhood change; any reputed role of subsidized sites or tenants emerged only if it is raised by the participants.

PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT

The initial strategy to recruit neighborhood residents for participation in focus groups was a targeted mailing offering a monetary incentive. The main steps in the recruitment strategy were: (1) identification of addresses up to 2,000 feet of selected supportive housing properties [using the 1990 census tract]; (2) initial targeted mailing to the identified properties; (3) receipt of the information form in postage paid, addressed envelope (included in the mailing) by interested residents; (4) telephone follow-up with interested residents; and (5) selection of focus group participants from successfully screened candidates.

Identification of Addresses for Targeted Mailing

The mailing was directed to residences located up to 2,000 feet from the specified supportive housing address. Given that focus groups will be composed of homeowners, addresses identified to receive the mailing were those living in housing which could be privately

owned (i.e, single family homes, duplexes, rowhouses, condos, etc). Homeowners were selected for the focus groups because the core research question concerns property value change and homeowners are more directly concerned about and aware of property values.

Appropriate addresses were gathered through public records. In cases where the name of residents are not known, mailings were sent to "resident" at the identified addresses.

Initial Targeted Mailing

The mailing included a letter from the project director describing the project, the Urban Institute, and the purpose of the focus group (copy attached). A bilingual letter was sent in Denver. The project was described as a study on the quality of life in American neighborhoods. The letter stressed that this session had nothing to do with participants purchasing a product or service and was for research purposes. It was made clear that all responses were to be kept confidential.

The letter stated that all participants would be paid $25 to cover any expenses incurred in order to attend the session. It was also noted that the Institute would be unable to provide childcare during the focus group and the prohibition against children attending the session. The letter will specified that only homeowners who had lived in the neighborhood for two or more years were eligible to participate in the focus group. In Denver, the letter also noted that groups would be conducted in English and Spanish.

Potential Participant Information Form and Postage Paid Return Envelope

The mailing included a form for potential participants to complete and return to the Urban Institute (or local subcontractor) in a provided postage paid, addressed envelope. People responding to the mailing returned the information form indicating their interest in learning more about the study and their possible participation. The letter explained that not everyone returning a form would be selected to participate in the study. We asked respondents for information such as: (1) name; (2) address; (3) telephone number where they could be reached; (4) if they were a homeowner; (5) age; (6) race; (7) presence of children in the household; and (8) the language with which they were most comfortable. The form also had a place for respondents to ask for a representative from the Urban Institute (or local subcontractor) to call them and provide more information. These forms were translated into Spanish for the Denver mailings.

Additional Recruitment Efforts

When the mailing did not generate at least 12 potential participants, phone calls were made to encourage participation in those focus groups that were undersubscribed. Using

telephone numbers provided in property tax records, neighborhood residents were called to see if they received a letter and to ask them to participate in the study. Researchers began calling from the beginning of the tax record list and progressed through the list until at least 12 potential participants were identified.

Telephone Follow-up with Willing Residents

Using the information in the form returned to the Urban Institute, a potential list of participants was selected. These persons were contacted by telephone and given a more detailed description of the study and focus groups and provided with details of participation (date, time, incentive payment). We answered any questions they had about the study or their participation. When appropriate, we asked the resident if they would like to participate in a focus group. If they did not want to participate, we thanked them for their interest and concluded the call. If they wanted to participate, we registered them for the appropriate group and asked for any additional information needed. We informed them they would receive a confirmation letter by mail or a phone call confirming their participation.

Confirmation of Participants

All registered participants were sent a letter confirming their participation and listing details on their focus group (copy attached). One day before the group, each registered respondent was called to remind them of the focus group day, time and location.

Selection of Focus Group Participants

When we had a pool of successfully screened candidates larger than the number needed for specific focus groups, we attempted to stratify potential participants by geographic area, age, race, and family composition to select a group representative of the 1990 census demographic profile of the neighborhood.

FOCUS GROUP LOCATION

Focus groups were conducted in "neutral" community spaces, such as libraries, schools or other public buildings. Neutral sites were those that were not associated with a specific individual or organization whose activities or positions could influence the responses or response rate of potential participants. Locations were also selected which were convenient for the majority of potential participants.

CHILDCARE

Childcare was not provided at the focus group due to liability concerns. All participants were notified of this in advance and no exceptions were made. If any participants brought children to the focus group, they would have been excused from participating.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information and comments gleaned from focus groups, the background survey, or other documents or contacts, were confidential. No written or verbal reports were or will be made by the research team which link individual focus group participants with specific views. Moreover, focus group responses were reported in aggregate without a corresponding list of participants. Names or specific addresses of participants will not be released to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development or others. Participants were only introduced to each other by first name.

Participants were assured that their names, addresses, or other personal information would not be linked to any individual's comments or views in the Urban Institute report. All participants were assured of confidentiality both verbally and in writing. Flyers and letters to focus group participants indicated that the focus group sessions and the resulting analysis would be held in the strictest confidence by the Urban Institute and local subcontractors.

INFORMED CONSENT

After explaining the purpose of the focus group and the broader study, participants were asked to sign a form (attached) acknowledging that they were participating freely and had been informed of the purpose of the research. The Facilitator distributed the forms, read it out loud to the group, and answered any related questions. Participants were asked to sign and return the form before the discussion began. Extra copies of the form were made available to participants who wanted to keep a copy. The forms were available in English and Spanish. As part of the informed consent procedures, participants in the focus groups were told that HUD was the sponsor of this study.

CONDUCTING THE FOCUS GROUPS

Each focus group had one person designated as Facilitator and one as Recorder. The focus group Facilitator used the discussion guide (copy attached) to steer the conversation to all

topics of interest. The Facilitator ensured that all participants joined in the discussion, saw that all issues were satisfactorily discussed, and guided the conversation so that the exchange progressed in an efficient and effective manner. The Recorder was responsible for taking notes during the meeting, monitoring the audio tape, paying participants (including collecting receipts), and providing written summary texts of the focus group discussion. The Recorder also interjected questions to the group during the discussion who he/she felt that it was appropriate. Both team members were available to answer questions and speak with focus group participants prior to and following each session.

TAPE RECORDING THE DISCUSSION

In the introduction, the Facilitator explained that we wanted to tape record the session in order to ensure accuracy in writing up the report. Tapes were used to verify and clarify comments made during the session but will not release them to anyone outside the Urban Institute. Participants were reminded that their responses would not be linked with their name or address and told the tapes were not to be released to any other person or agency outside the Urban Institute. Participants were also told that if at any time during the discussion they wanted the tape recorder turned off, they could ask and it would be turned off. The Facilitator asked if anyone objected to the session being tape recorded. Participants in each focus group gave permission to audiotape the session.

PAYMENT TO PARTICIPANTS

Each person who participated in a focus group were given $25 in cash to defray the costs of participation. Participants were not given any additional payments to cover specific expenses such as transportation, parking, or child care since these items were what the $25 was intended to cover.

A check to cover payments to focus group participants was given to the focus group Facilitator or other designee by the Urban Institute (in Denver the funds were given to LARASA). This person or organization was responsible for cashing the check, documenting who received payments, and returning to the Urban Institute any funds not documented as distributed.

Prior to the focus group, the cash for participant payments were divided in $25 increments. Single payments of $25 were placed in numbered envelopes. These envelopes were taken to the focus group for distribution along with a stack of blank receipts (copy attached).

At the beginning of the focus group when the Facilitator thanked the participants for coming, he/she reminded participants that they would receive a payment of $25 to cover any costs

incurred by participation in the group. They were told that payments would be made at the end of the session and they were asked to sign a receipt for the payment. The receipt was necessary to document that the money was distributed as reported.

During the focus group, the Recorder prepared a receipt for each person in attendance with their name, the date of the focus group, and an envelope number. The Recorder wrote the participant's name on "their" envelope (the one corresponding to the number on their receipt).

At the conclusion of the group, the Recorder distributed the receipts for signature. Each participant signed a receipt indicating they had received the $25. As each participant returned the signed receipt, they were given the envelope with their name on it. The receipt also included a space for participants to include their social security number. If a participant did not want to divulge their social security number, they were still given the payment. Social Security information was desired by the Urban Institute's Accounting Office.

A participant was given the stipend if they completed the focus group (or made prior arrangements if they had to leave early). The stipend was dependent on participation in the group. However, a participant who finished the group but refused to complete the background survey was still eligible for the stipend.

After all focus groups were completed, funds earmarked for participant payments were accounted for in full. Receipts were obtained for all payments made to participants. Receipts were forwarded to the Urban Institute to document dispersed funds. Any funds not documented by a signed receipt were returned to the Urban Institute.

GUARDING AGAINST RESEARCHER BIAS

Neither the Facilitator nor the Recorder were told the results of any of the disaggregated statistical analyses. In this way, researchers were kept from pre-judging responses or leading participants based on information about the results of the quantitative analysis.

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

As described above, the focus group discussion guide were designed to facilitate a group discussion on life in the neighborhoods targeted in the study. Focus group data were used in conjunction with the quantitative analyses to gain a fuller understanding of neighborhood life and resident feelings. We hoped that groups provided information on the impact of differences in local resident composition, social cohesion, political mobilization, assisted housing siting and

architectural characteristics, and resident social interaction patterns. However, at no time did the Facilitator or Recorder prompt the group for their feelings on publicly assisted or sponsored housing or tenants.

The focus group discussion guide (copy attached) had four main subject areas, in addition to introductory remarks and a conclusion. In the Introduction, we introduced the Facilitator and Recorder and their respective roles, described what a focus group was, and asked them if we could tape record the session. We also alerted participants that at the end of the meeting we would be asking them to sign a receipt for their expense payment and fill out a background information survey. During the introduction, we told them about the purpose of the overall study and the focus group in which they were participating as well as asked them to sign an informed consent form. The introduction set the tone for the focus group. It was important to let them know that there were no wrong answers: we wanted to hear their thoughts, both positive and negative.

The first area of discussion after the introduction concerned general issues on what makes for a good place to live and resident feelings on how their neighborhood falls into this definition. We chose to begin with a general, though pertinent, discussion to encourage everyone's participation and to put the participants at ease. We drew upon these views about quality of neighborhood life and resident composition in our understanding of neighborhood dynamics.

From this general discussion, we moved to the second discussion guide topic which was geared to elicit opinions regarding who lived in the neighborhood and what organizations/individuals represented the neighborhood. These discussions were designed to allow residents to speak as broadly or specifically as they chose about community cohesion, networks, and resident characteristics. No probes were made by the Facilitator or Recorder to encourage participants to classify residents by any demographic or economic characteristic. However, in the main introduction to the focus group, participants were told that they had been invited to participate in the group because they were homeowners. This item of information gave them the freedom to speak about renters (including those who are living in supportive housing) without fear that someone in the room was such a person. Again, their knowledge of, or feelings on, the presence of publicly supportive housing projects in their neighborhood were never raised by researchers.

The third discussion guide topic area included questions on perceived changes in the neighborhood in the last five years. We recapped answers to quality of life questions in the first section and asked if neighborhood characteristics or amenities had changed in the last five years. We also asked group members why they thought change had or had not occurred. If participants mentioned publicly sponsored housing or tenants, the Facilitator probed for more information on these comments, including sources of information on which participants based their judgements. But Facilitators never confirmed the presence of publicly assisted housing in focus group

neighborhoods or reacted in such a way as to alert participants to the importance of this topic. If property values were not spontaneously raised by participants, the Facilitator asked the group what kind of measure property values are of quality of life, if values had changed in the last five years, and why they felt the way they did.

The fourth discussion guide topic area was designed to prompt discussion on perceived changes in neighborhood residents. We asked participants if they felt that the people who lived in the neighborhood had changed much over the past 5 years and why they felt this change or lack of change had occurred. The previous discussion of residents (in part two) was designed to prompt participants to discuss a variety of resident aspects--speaking both to demographics and social cohesion. With this section, we hoped to assess any perceived changes in both the characteristics of the neighborhood and the tenor of resident interaction.

Concluding remarks of the focus group included broad questions asking for additional thoughts or comments and a time to ask any questions or concerns about the study or the group. By concluding in this way, we hoped participants felt free to make any comments they thought were important to understanding their community that our questions did not directly address.

BACKGROUND SURVEY

These forms allowed us to broadly categorize the members of each group, providing some context for the analysis of results. The survey asked basic demographic questions. If participants refused to complete the background survey, but participated in the focus group, they were still given the $25 stipend.

ATTACHMENTS

The protocols and focus group operational procedures outlined above were used in Denver. Attached to this protocol are copies of the following:

- Introduction Letter for initial mailing
- Confirmation/Invitation Letter
- Focus Group Discussion Guide
- Background Survey
- Informed Consent Form
- Payment Receipt

INTRODUCTION LETTER and RESPONSE FORM
FOR INITIAL MAILING

■ THE URBAN INSTITUTE 2100 M STREET, N.W. / WASHINGTON D.C. 20037

Peter Tatian   *Direct Dial:* (202) 261-5588
Research Associate   *Fax:* (202) 223-3043

DATE

Dear Resident:

The Urban Institute, a non-profit research organization based in Washington, DC, is conducting a study on life in American neighborhoods. Our local partner in this study is LARASA, an organization DESCRIPTION . This study is being funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As a part of this study, we are getting together groups of homeowners in Denver to discuss their thoughts and concerns about neighborhood living from a local point of view. You have been chosen as a possible participant for one of these groups.

The discussion group will last around two hours and refreshments will be served. Each participant will be paid $25 to cover any costs you might incur in order to attend the group. The groups are in no way connected to the sale or purchase of any product or service. We are interested in your opinions on neighborhood life for research purposes only. All responses, addresses, and other identifying information will be kept confidential.

The group for your neighborhood is scheduled to take place on **DAY, DATE** at the **PLACE** (address). We will confirm the location and set a specific time after speaking with potential participants about their availability. If you would like to participate, please send back the response form that came with this letter. Not everyone who returns the sheet will be selected, so please include a phone number so we can call you if you have been selected. Again, this information will not be used for soliciting or activities of any kind outside of this research project.

If you are a homeowner and have lived in your current neighborhood for two or more years, please consider participating in this important study. To be selected, return the enclosed response form to LARASA by **DATE.** Responses received earlier are more likely to be accommodated in a discussion group. Also, we will not be able to provide child care during the session and no children or guests will be allowed in the meeting room, so please leave children at home.

If you have any questions about the discussion group or the study and would like a representative of the Urban Institute to call you, just answer "Yes" to Question 1 on the response form and give us a telephone number where we can contact you. Also, if you would like to speak with someone at the Urban Institute before we are able to reach you, please contact the researchers who will be conducting the discussion groups in Denver, NAME or NAME, at TELEPHONE NUMBER.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Peter Tatian
Project Director

THE URBAN INSTITUTE
DISCUSSION GROUP APPLICANT INFORMATION FORM

Thank you for your interest in the Urban Institute discussion group in your neighborhood. Please complete this form and return it in the enclosed envelope by **DATE.** We expect a good response from people in your neighborhood and not everyone returning a form will be selected to participate. All information provided will be kept confidential and used only for the research purposes of this study. If you would like more information, please indicate below that you would like someone to call you or contact NAME or NAME at TELEPHONE NUMBER.

Would you like someone from the Urban Institute to contact you by telephone to answer questions about this study?
(Please circle one)   Yes   No

Name:_____

Address:_____

_____

Telephone #: Daytime _____ and/or Evening _____

Are you a Homeowner? (Please circle one)   Yes No

Have you lived in your neighborhood for two or more years? (Please circle one) Yes No

Do children under 18 live in your household? (Please circle one) Yes No

What is your Race/Ethnicity (Please check one)   Age
_____ White (not Hispanic)   _____ Under 25
_____ African-American/Black (not Hispanic)   _____ 25 to 35
_____ Hispanic   _____ 36 to 45
_____ Asian/Pacific Islander   _____ 46 to 55
_____ American Indian/Alaska Native   _____ 56 to 65
_____ Other (Please list: _____ _____ Over 65

This form should be enclosed in the postage paid envelope enclosed. The envelope will be returned to NAME at LARASA, 309 W. First Avenue, Denver, CO 80223.

CONFIRMATION/INVITATION LETTER

▚ THE URBAN INSTITUTE 2100 M STREET, N.W. / WASHINGTON D.C. 20037

Peter Tatian
Research Associate

Direct Dial: (202) 261-5588
Fax: (202) 223-3043

Date

Name
Address
City, State Zip

Dear Name:

Thank you for your interest in the discussion groups the Urban Institute is conducting in your neighborhood. You have been selected to participate and we invite you to attend the group being held in your area. The group for your neighborhood will be held at **TIME,** on **DAY, DATE,** at **LOCATION** (directions below). The discussion group will last two hours and you will be given $25 at the end of the group. Light refreshments will be served.

We will be asking general questions about life in your neighborhood and are interested in your opinions and experience. Your responses will be part of a report to public leaders on local perspectives on neighborhood life. Your name and address will be kept confidential and not linked with your comments. As we mentioned in our previous letter, the groups are in no way connected to the sale or purchase of any product or service.

DIRECTIONS. Information on parking.

As a reminder, we will not be able to provide child care during the session and no children or guests will be allowed in the meeting room. We want to focus on your opinions and those of your neighbors. Having children or too many people in the room can be a distraction so we ask that you leave children and guests at home. Only one person per family is invited to attend.

The discussion group leaders for your neighborhood are **NAME** and **NAME**. They will facilitate your group and be available for questions. A staff person of the Urban Institute will call you before the meeting to remind you about the group. If you need to reach the group leaders prior to their call, please call **NAME** at **PHONE NUMBER**.

We look forward to hearing your opinions and ideas. Thank you for your participation in this important study.

Sincerely,

Peter Tatian
Project Director

E-17

DISCUSSION GUIDE

Neighborhood Resident Focus Group Discussion Guide

WARM-UP AND EXPLANATION [10 minutes]

A. Introduction

Please help yourselves to some refreshments.

1. Thanks for coming and agreeing to participate in this group discussion today.

2. I'm *[name of Facilitator]*, a researcher with the Urban Institute, and I will be your moderator for the session. My associate *[name of Recorder]* will be helping with the report. She will take some notes during the discussion and may have a few questions to ask you toward the end of our session. The Urban Institute is a non-profit research organization, and we have been asked by the federal government to arrange these discussions and report the results.

3. Your presence/opinion is important. *Describe focus group* – a way to find out what people think through group discussion. We are interested in learning about your ideas, feelings, and opinions. Please understand that everything you say today will be kept strictly confidential. Nothing you say will be attributed to you or linked with information that could identify you like your address.

4. Before we begin the focus group, we will discuss the purpose of this meeting and the related research project of which it is a part. We will ask you to sign a release saying that we informed you about the study and you are freely participating.

5. The session today should last about two hours. At the end of this session, we will ask you to complete a short, anonymous background information form. We will also be giving you $25 for your participation today and will ask that you sign a receipt saying you have received this payment.

    Before we jump in to the main discussion, please help yourselves to some refreshments. Feel free to eat and drink during our discussion.

B. Purpose

1. You have been asked to join this group because you are a homeowner in Denver. The Urban Institute is studying the quality of life in American neighborhoods and Denver is

one of the study areas. Policy makers are interested in finding out the local perspective on neighborhood life in a sample of Denver neighborhoods--to put some firsthand information with the statistics found in national information sources like the census. We will be holding several discussion groups like this, and the information we learn will be used to write a report on how people feel about their neighborhoods and what types of issues are important to residents.

2. In a group interview like this it is **very** important that you express yourself openly. There are no right or wrong answers. We want to know what **you** think. We are interested in all of your ideas and comments, both positive and negative. You should also feel free to disagree with each other–we want to have as many points of view as we can.

C. Procedure

1. Use of recorder: we would like to tape record the session in order to ensure accuracy in writing up our report. Let me remind you that your responses will not be linked with your name or address in any way and the tapes will not be released to any other person or agency outside the Urban Institute. Everything will be confidential. At any time if you would like us to turn off the tape recorder, please let us know and we will do so. Does anyone have a concern at this time about the use of the tape recorder?

2. I may remind you occasionally to speak one at a time so that we can all hear your comments. I am your guide, but this is a group discussion and so everyone should feel free to speak up. To keep us on schedule, I may change the subject or move ahead. Please stop me if you have something to add.

3. Again, we are very pleased that you have taken the time today to share your ideas with us. Before we begin, I would like to pass out the informed consent forms for your signature and answer any questions you may have about the focus group or the study.

   Distribute the informed consent forms. Read the consent form out loud and answer any questions. Have participants sign the form and return before beginning the session.

D. Introductions

1. Ask each person to introduce him/herself by their first name–
   Please tell us your **first name** and something about yourself, like what street you live on and how long you and your family have lived there.

I. GENERAL THOUGHTS ON "GOOD" HOUSING AND THIS NEIGHBORHOOD [25 minutes]

1. I'd like to start the discussion today with your ideas about what makes for a "good" neighborhood in which to live?

2. I'd like to turn the discussion to this neighborhood. What do you consider the boundaries of your neighborhood?

3. Is this neighborhood a good place to live? Why?

4. What do you like most about this neighborhood?

5. What do you like least about this neighborhood?

II. THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD [20 minutes]

1. How would you describe the people who live in this neighborhood? (Probe for basic demographics).

2. How connected to each other are residents of this neighborhood? What accounts for this sense/lack of connection to others?

3. Are there organizations or institutions that draw people together in this community? What are they?

4. Are there particular individuals or organizations who you believe effectively "speak for" this neighborhood? Who?

III. PERCEIVED CHANGES IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD [20 minutes]

1. In our discussion of this neighborhood as a good place to live you mentioned many characteristics and amenities that effect the quality of life. Do you think the quality of life in this neighborhood has changed much over the past 5 years? If so, how?

2.   Why do you think change has (or has not) occurred? [*Be sure to probe if participants mention publicly sponsored housing or tenants. Probe for sources of information: media, first-hand observation, gossip, etc.*]

Probe on Property Values if not mentioned. Are property values a measure of a good place to live? Have property values changed in the last five years? Why do participants feel the way they do?   On what do they base their information?

IV.   PERCEIVED CHANGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS [20 minutes]

1.   Have the people who live in this neighborhood changed much over the past 5 years? If so, how?

2.   Why do you think change has (or has not) occurred?

CONCLUSIONS AND WRAP-UP [10 minutes]

1.   Does anyone have any additional thoughts or comments about any of the topics we have been discussing today?

2.   Is there anything else we should know to understand your community?

3.   Are there any questions or other concerns you have about this study?

Your comments and insights have been very helpful. Thank you all very much for participating today!

Explain and administer short (anonymous) Background Information Form.
Hand-out stipends as participants return completed payment receipts.

BACKGROUND SURVEY

◪ THE URBAN INSTITUTE

What street do you currently live on? _____

How long have you lived there?_____

How long have you lived in Denver?_____

Number of other adults who live with you (most of the time) _____

Number of children who live with you (most of the time) _____

Are you retired?   □ Yes   □ No

Highest Level of Education:		
	□	Grade School
	□	Some High School
	□	High School Grad or GED
	□	Some College
	□	2-Year College Degree
	□	4-Year College Degree
	□	Graduate School

Sex: □   Female   □   Male

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Consent for Participation in Discussion Group

Introduction and Sponsorship
I understand that I am being asked to participate in a research study focusing on issues related to neighborhood dynamics in my area. The study is being conducted by researchers at the Urban Institute and is funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Specifically, I am being asked to participate in a two-hour focus group discussion session facilitated by researchers from the Urban Institute.

Purpose
I understand that this discussion will focus on how people feel about their neighborhoods and identify issues that are important to residents. Results will be reported in conjunction with other quantitative information about my neighborhood and used to help explain statistical information.

Risk of Participation in the Study
There are no known risks associated with participation in this study.

Benefits of Participating in the Study
Myself, as well as the Urban Institute and federal policymakers, may benefit from the results of the study as it explores quality of life issues that are important to neighborhood residents.

Compensation
I will receive $25.00 at the conclusion of the focus group discussion to cover any expenses I may have in order to attend this session. No additional reimbursement or compensation is offered by the Urban Institute.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal
I understand that my participation is completely voluntary and that I have the right to refuse to answer any questions and I am free to leave the session at any time.

Questions
If I have any questions concerning my participation in this study now or in the future, I can contact Robin Smith or Mary Cunningham at the Urban Institute at 202-833-7200.

Confidentiality
Any information that I provide in this discussion session may be used in written or oral presentations only if my identity is disguised and anonymity is maintained. I understand that the findings of this study generally will be reported in terms of the aggregate group and not in terms of individual findings. I also understand that I can ask than any part of the information that I provide not be discussed in the research reports. Otherwise, written quotes from my comments may be used in reports as long as identifying characteristics are removed.

I also understand that the conversation is being tape recorded. I understand that the tape recorder can be turned off at any time during the session if I request it be turned off. I understand that the tape will not be labeled with my name or address, and that it will be heard by no one except the researchers and research staff.

Consent to Participation in the Research Study
I understand all of the above information about this research study, including the procedures, possible risks, and the likelihood of any benefits to me. The content and meaning of this information has been explained and is understood. All of my questions have been answered. I hereby consent and voluntarily offer to follow the study requirements and take part in the study. I understand that I may retain a copy of this consent form.

Written Consent:

_____   _____
Participant's signature   Date

_____   _____
Signature of Research Team Member   Date

PAYMENT RECEIPT

THE URBAN INSTITUTE 2100 M STREET, N.W. / WASHINGTON D.C. 20037

Envelope Number_____

My signature on this receipt signifies that I received $25 to cover my expenses as a participant in focus groups sponsored by the Urban Institute.

Printed Name   _____

Signature   _____

Social Security #   _____

Date   _____

Annex F

**Demographic Characteristics of
Focus Group Participants**

Table F.1 - Demographic Characteristics of Focus Group Participants

Characteristic	All Sites	Berkeley	Clayton	Montbello 1	Montbello 2	Congress Park	South Park Hill	Hilltop	Speer	Harvey Park
# of Participants	81	6	7	5	13	16	8	10	6	10
Tenure in neighborhood										
Average years of residence at current address	19.1	17.4	30.2	14.2	16.9	16.0	21.6	21.4	10.2	24.1
Average years of residence in Denver	34.7	26.4	40.0	27.9	36.2	26.3	46.4	39.0	24.9	45.3
Household Composition										
Average number of other adults in household	1.3	1.5	1.0	2.0	.9	1.0	1.0	.8	2.2	1.2
Average number of children in household	.6	.8	.3	1.0	1.3	.9	.3	.2	.5	.4
Percent of households with children < 18	29.0	50.0	0.0	60.0	46.2	18.8	12.5	20.0	33.3	20.0
Occupational Status										
Percent retired	32.3	33.3	57.1	0.0	46.2	31.3	12.5	60.0	0.0	50.0
Racial/Ethnic Origin										
Percent Black	11.8	0.0	100.0	20.0	85.6	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Percent Hispanic	12.1	33.3	0.0	20.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0
Percent White	73.3	66.7	0.0	60.0	0.0	87.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	60.0
Percent Other	.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender										
Percent female	62.4	33.3	85.7	60.0	46.2	75.0	75.0	70.0	66.7	50.0

Table F.1 (continued)

Characteristic	All Sites	Berkeley	Clayton	Montbello 1	Montbello 2	Congress Park	South Park Hill	Hilltop	Speer	Harvey Park
Educational Attainment										
Percent < H.S.	4.3	16.7	14.3	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Percent H.S. graduate	17.7	16.7	28.6	40.0	7.7	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
Percent some college	14.9	0.0	28.6	20.0	7.7	12.5	25.0	10.0	0.0	30.0
Percent 2-year college degree	15.2	33.3	14.3	0.0	30.8	12.5	12.5	0.0	33.3	0.0
Percent 4-year college degree	24.5	16.7	14.3	40.0	23.1	25.0	25.0	50.0	16.7	10.0
Percent graduate degree	23.5	16.7	0.0	0.0	23.1	43.8	37.5	40.0	50.0	0.0
Age Cohort										
Percent 25-35 years	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Percent 36-45 years	22.9	33.3	14.3	60.0	0.0	6.3	12.5	0.0	50.0	30.0
Percent 46-55 years	33.1	33.3	14.3	40.0	23.1	62.5	25.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
Percent 56-65 years	22.6	16.7	42.9	0.0	38.5	6.3	50.0	40.0	0.0	10.0
Percent 65+ years	15.0	16.7	28.6	0.0	15.4	12.5	12.5	20.0	0.0	30.0
Missing age	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0

Annex G

Summaries of Focus Group Findings

Berkeley (4/16/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Sheridan Blvd., Lowell Blvd., 38th Ave., 46th Avenue

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

A variety of ages, diversity of socio-economic status. Friendly neighbors. Good location. Good public transportation. Has "character." Has parks. Single family homes, not many apartments.
Not abandoned during the day.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

• Houses have porches and patios, detached garages; good-sized yards.
• Variety of age groups living in neighborhood.
• Variety of types of well-built homes.
• Nice old neighborhood.
• Big trees.
• More stable than the suburbs.
• Peaceful, quiet, family neighborhood.

Problems in This Neighborhood

• Some loud noise.
• Drug activity, criminal activity.
• Rental properties and some problem renters.
• Speeding on streets.
• Trash - too much litter in alley, lousy trash pick-up.
• Dig up street for sewage repairs.
• Too many squirrels.
• Need better police response - concern for gang activity - need more police stations.
• Poor visibility, lighting on 38th Ave.
• Residents have little control over the neighborhood; don't know how to make a
   difference.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

• Fewer people in middle age group. Mostly retired people or young couples, but some
   families. Hispanic/Anglo mix.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

• Not very connected. Friendly but not socially involved.
• Some neighbors watch out for each other.
• Afraid of some neighbors, some "gang-bangers".
• People detached, uninvolved, skeptical, frustrated.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- Churches do some neighborhood stuff.
- Berkeley Neighbors Association - but not active or effective
- Elitch redevelopment led to much neighborhood discussion.
- Block parties/activities are supported and financed by City.
- Tribune is the local paper
- West Highland Neighborhood organization is very vocal (in a different neighborhood), but we don't have anything like that.
- Nice events at public library.

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

- No leadership presently identified - need volunteers, people who are willing to volunteer.
- Dennis Gallagher - in Congress now, has been state rep, and active for many years - but not a spokesperson.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Older people have moved out, younger people have moved in.
- Less noise, less trash, less traffic with moving of Elitch Amusement Park.
- Some teenager problems, mainly rowdiness.
- Neighborhood is more crowded now.
- More traffic, parking congestion, longer lines at the stores.
- More apartments, houses being subdivided, increasing density.
- Property values going up - "skyrocketing", led to a lot of renovations.
- Property taxes going up.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

- Elitch Amusement Park moved out.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

- "NO" - but people want to move in - a measure of Denver's booming economy.
- This neighborhood is full of homes and not a community subdivision.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Mexicans are moving in.
- People have diverse professions; small businesses operating from home.
- Senior housing will be going up at Elitch site.
- Parking is always an issue, and trash.

Clayton (4/9/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: York St., Colorado Blvd., Martin Luther King Blvd., 26th Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Neighborly. Upkeep of property. Local shops and grocery stores. Free of trash, litter, and junk in yards and alleys. Homeowners, not rentals. Good councilman who helps get thing done, Housing covenants that allow any type of exterior decoration. Free from loitering.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

- Long time residents who have roots.
- Good neighbors who will assist.
- Close to family and church.
- Quiet.
- Good upkeep of properties.
- Pretty safe.
- Centrally located, amenities nearby, near bus lines.
- All our homes are paid for!

Problems in This Neighborhood

- Illegal dumping and trash.
- Loitering.
- Too few stores (especially groceries) nearby.
- Insufficient street lights.
- Many do not keep up property.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

People of all racial/ethnic groups, but predominantly Black. People moving in are primarily younger families but still many older families.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Strong inter-neighbors connections, because most are long timers.
- May be language barrier hurting connectedness between Blacks and in-movers

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- No one knew of any currently effective neighborhood organization.

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

• Did not claim any current [only past] strong spokespersons for the area.
• Current council person not effective.
• Individuals seem to be self-starters who call City individually to complain.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

• Resentment/complaints re: in-movers (becoming very private, less neighborly; general amazement that these in-comers can afford houses; most don't speak English).
• Too many vehicles and too many people in household.
• Too many folks don't keep up property and park their cars all over the lawns.
• Increasing property values.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

• Clear consensus that property values are not a good proxy for quality of life.
• Values are rising [nominally] even though the level of maintenance, social relations, and general neighborhood conditions have deteriorated.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life
• many speculators operating now.
• Denver economy is hot.
• Strong population growth leading to rising values.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

• In-migration of different racial/ethnic groups [Asian and Hispanic, some whites] who are less friendly.
• Used to be better when it was all homeowners.
• Concern about "nontraditional" family arrangements; lack of understanding of who/how many live in a unit.
• Clear undercurrent of resentment against other non-English ethnics.

Reasons for Changes in Neighborhood Residents

• Government assistance to immigrants [one asserted that government gave them houses and welfare for 5 years.
• Some newcomers pool resources.
• There exists "false rumor" that whites are moving back…but they are only speculators, not staying for long.
• Replacement of elderly black owners as they die out with others.

Montbello 1 (4/10/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Peoria St., 56th Ave.., I-70, Chambers Rd.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Diversity. Good schools. Good neighbors who are friendly and willing to watch out for each other. Safe, free of crime and drugs. Good general upkeep of properties by owners and renters. Responsible people re: buildings, kids, pets.

Good Qualities in This Neighborhood

- Good schools.
- Nice parks and rec center.
- Diversity.
- Quiet in north end of Montbello.
- Many community associations.
- Neighborhood Watch program.
- Proximity to good roads.
- Growing neighborhood in which folks are caring more for their homes and each other.
- Low crime.
- A solid, working class area with solid values.
- Great neighbors.
- Location; combination of private suburb and access to downtown.
- Clean air, uncongested.

Problems in This Neighborhood

- Lack of businesses (grocery, hardware, etc.).
- Neighbors who do not keep care of their pets; too many packs of unsupervised dogs.
- Lack of police patrols.
- Speeders.
- Unsupervised kids who vandalize and break in.
- Absentee landlords who do not take responsibility for maintenance.
- Lax enforcement of laws and poor public services.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Equal mix of whites, blacks, Hispanics; a few Asians. Estimated average family income of $35-40,000. Newer in-mover renters are of somewhat lower income. Many grew up with the neighborhood; now middle aged, finished child-rearing.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Not well-connected (often because of language).
- Improving attitude that facilitates connectedness.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

• ACORN
• Neighborhood Watch
• Neighborhood churches
• Far Northeast Neighborhood Association
• Montbello Youth Group
• Arsenal Community Program
• Montbello United Neighbors
• Family Preservation/Support run via Human Services
• Community Gardens

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

• No single one speaks for all of us.
• By reputation John Smith does.
• Hispanics or Asians rely on their numbers.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

• Crime has decreased, esp. gang activity because police and the *community itself* has cracked down on socially irresponsible actions.
• Growing number of Hispanics. Twenty years ago it was just black-white.
• Much more construction and in-moving.
• Property values have gone up a lot in last 5 years.
• New construction that will more than double the number of units in Montbello.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

• Some due to homeowners' rehab efforts.
• Because DIA twelve miles away, area is getting hotter.
• People are now more "excited"; kids from area are now buying here; sense of "community pride".
• Concerted effort to change City's negative stereotype of area.

Montbello 2 (4/10/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Chambers Rd., I-70, Peoria St., 56th Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Activities that would bring people together to discuss neighborhood. Well-maintained properties. Good neighbors who are supportive, respectful, and friendly. Creating a "village that will raise the kids." Good parenting. Residents are homeowners who are more concerned with their property. Quiet. No big truck traffic.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

•   Has good mix of age, ethnic, and racial groups.
•   Relatively low gang activity; safe.
•   Neighbors watch out for one another.
•   Know the neighbors.
•   Good schools
•   Close proximity to airport and expressways.
•   Quiet.
•   Clean.

Problems in This Neighborhood

•   Not enough shopping, theaters and other amenities for kids.
•   Too many poorly maintained and noisy rentals.
•   Kids playing in street and throwing trash.
•   Too many in-movers that are "street folks" who don't believe in same value system [unstructured life, fast life, gangs].
•   Too many vehicles.
•   Too close to Rocky Mt. Arsenal.
•   Concern about Section 8 people who do not know how to keep up home, or do not have money for upkeep. If there's "too many of them in an area it spells trouble."

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Reflects many groups; predominantly black but growing percentage of Mexicans. Many multigenerational extended families in area.

Sense of Connections Among Residents

•   Neighborly.
•   Wide variety of social interactions.
•   Those who are close are so because of mutual longtime residence.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

• Little league sports bring together.

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

• Far Northeast Neighborhood Association [and its leader, John Smith].

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

• More absentee owners.
• More families with kids.
• HUD activities.
• More demand for housing by Mexicans and whites.
• More traffic.
• Some more stores in shopping center.
• Big home price inflation.
• Booming local property values has led owners to take more pride in their properties.
• Wide stereotype of "Mont-ghetto" and few people knew the high quality of life here.
• Rumored that some home homes are used to house illegals; port of entry until they work.
• Blacks are still being steered into area.

Congress Park (4/17/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Colorado Blvd., University Ave., Colfax Ave., 6th Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Low crime, sense of safety and security. People know each other and watch out for each other. Stability of residents, not transient. Proximity to services, public transportation, stores. Variety, diversity of neighbors. Trees, parks. Upkeep and renovation of homes. Pride in ownership, upkeep of homes. Good schools.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

• Centrally located, easy access, proximity.
• Neighborhood has character, appeal, architectural mix.
• Big old houses and trees.
• Sense of continuity, stability of residents.
• Flagstone sidewalks where people can walk around neighborhood.
• Two story houses.
• Small commercial enterprises.
• Socio-economic and cultural diversity of residents.
• Property values are up. Safe neighborhood to invest in.
• Pride of ownership.

Problems in This Neighborhood

• Becoming less diverse, more upscale.
• Noise (neighbors, traffic, music, dogs).
• Too many apartment buildings.
• Too high density, housing close together.
• Traffic and parking problems.
• Litter, trash on streets and alleys.
• Irresponsible landlords.
• Pigeons, squirrels and woodpeckers.
• Vandalism.
• Drunks in the neighborhood, beggars
• Hotel on Colfax with prostitution
• Speeding on one-way streets.
• Complex issues about the development on Colfax.
• Police station is too far away – police have slow response time.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Upper income. White, not terribly diverse ethnically. Single family homes, but quite a few rentals with high turnovers in residents. Have some group homes in area for developmentally disabled children and chronically mentally ill. These residents are seen as adding to the color of the neighborhood. Older people moving out, younger families moving in.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

•   Depends on the block – residents on active blocks know each other, do things together.
•   People too busy, limited time to visit with neighbors.
•   Know people, though not close. Recognize who lives there.
•   Neighbors would help if needed.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

•   Congress Park Neighborhood Association
•   Capitol Hill United Neighbors
•   Colfax on the Hill Business Association
•   Bartering group
•   Babysitters group
•   Neighborhood schools

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

•   No one really speaks for the neighborhood, some people like to think that they do.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

•   Neighborhood is safer, less violent crime. There is petty crime – but is less than before.
•   There have been improvements on Colfax For example, better handicapped access.
•   Houses are being fixed up – home-owners who take pride.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

•   Lower downtown development and Cherry Creek development.
•   Booming Denver economy.
•   The end of school busing brought people, younger families back into the city.
•   Housing values going up.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

•   No, rising values make owners happier but it is people who make the neighborhood.
•   Rising values are making it hard to duplicate neighborhood amenities.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

•   More families, younger families, more children.
•   More homeowners.

Reasons for Changes in Neighborhood Residents

•   Area is a nice place to live, good location.
•   More house and better quality of house for the money.

South Park Hill (4/17/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Colorado Blvd., Quebec St., Colfax Ave., to 35th Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Neighbors know each other, watch out for each other. Front porches, alleys and sidewalks. People take care of their lawns/houses. Proximity to services, events, public transportation. Good quality schools and resident commitment to schools. Feeling of belonging, stability, pride in homes, schools, themselves. Variety of people (backgrounds, ages, etc.). People are friendly. Sense of security and safety.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

• Diversity: economic, racial, housing styles.
• Parks, parkways, trees.
• Architecturally interesting and rich.
• Quieter after airport left.
• Park Hill Neighborhood Association is active.
• People - "neighbors make a neighborhood".
• Proximity to downtown.
• Few rentals.
• Dedication and commitment to community.
• Porches, sidewalks, and alleys – places for interaction with neighbors.

Problems with This Neighborhood

• Perception of people outside the neighborhood that this is a high crime area.
• Colfax used to be nice.
• Proximity to Colfax (traffic, noise, prostitution, trash).
• Police don't care for the neighborhood as they should - long response time.
• Bus stops not well maintained.
• Not enough retail opportunities.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

• Has changed, more young professionals and children.
• Used to be more transient, and more older people.
• Tolerant of differences and diversity.
• Gay/straight, married/single, ethnic groups, ages.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

• Easy to get to know families with young children, others find it more challenging
• Neighbors meeting through various activities - schools, groups, churches
• Do have a sense of responsibility for each other
• People talk, don't have a lot of time to socialize.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

•   Park Hill Neighborhood Association
•   Churches
•   Scouts, youth sports teams
•   Schools; community centers in schools
•   Block parties
•   Library

Individuals/Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

•   Park Hill Neighborhood Association
•   Not a single voice that expresses the views and opinions of the community

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

•   Decreased crime rate.
•   Increased property values making in harder for people to move in here.
•   Airport gone - quieter.
•   Activities of the police and Mayor have reduced gang activity.
•   More graffiti.
•   Quality of life better in the city than in the suburbs.
•   Closing of crack houses and cleanup of red-light district.
•   Increased traffic congestion.
•   Clustering of group homes in neighborhood.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

•   Closing and subsequent redevelopment of Stapleton Airport area.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

•   "NO" - in whole metro area, quality of life is related to neighborhood sentiment, and feel - not property values.
•   Barrios have a better sense of community. Community is not tied to property values.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

•   People are younger.
•   Kids who grew up here are moving back into neighborhood as adults.

Reasons for Changes in Neighborhood Residents

•   Proximity to downtown. People want to avoid long commutes, get away from suburbs.
•   Per square foot, houses are still less expensive than elsewhere in the suburbs.
•   School choice has impacted people moving back into the inner city.
•   Homes are well-built, space for growth, larger yards.

Hilltop (4/18/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Colorado Blvd., Quebec St., 8th Avenue, Alameda Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Free of crime. Attractive neighborhood. Nice neighbors. Proximity and access to shopping, public transportation, downtown.   Good schools. Not too much traffic and good parking. Low density housing - not too many apartments. Mixed neighborhood with young and old residents. Sense of open space, parks, and personal space.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

- Access to public transportation, services.
- Not a lot of traffic, quiet.
- Sense of safety.
- Physically beautiful.
- Nice parks that are well used.
- People make the neighborhood.
- People are out in the neighborhood.
- Schools are close and there is enough selection.
- Location.
- Rising property values.
- Neighborhood is desirable, everyone wants to live here.
- Spaciousness.
- Cleanliness.

What do you like the least?

- Some property crimes, not violent crimes.
- Changing composition of the neighborhood. Newcomers not as connected or friendly.
- People don't talk to each other.
- Noise (dogs, other street).
- Need more street lights.
- Redevelopment is threatening to residents - means change that is beyond their control
- New developments are edge to edge.
- Developers ignore a lot of covenants and housing laws.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Middle to upper class. Some Asians and other ethnic groups but mainly White. Older, middle-aged couples. People are getting younger and there are more families although from all age ranges. Mostly home-owners with few rentals.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Varies from minimal to moderate to very connected.

- People don't talk much to each other because they are too busy.
- Block meetings lead to more familiarity.
- The more upscale the neighborhood, the less people know each other.
- People help each other in crises.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- Hilltop Neighborhood Association
- Schools.
- Neighborhood Watch

Individuals or Organization that "Speak" for Neighborhood

- Hilltop Neighborhood Association
- Civic associations
- Polly Flobeck, City Council woman should but is not effective.
- Cherry Creek Times

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Some threats to quality of life are coming - change is happening, but not here yet.
- Many new, large single-family homes.
- Increased use of "pop-tops" (addition of second floor dormers).
- Property values are going up, taxes are up.
- Addition of multifamily units.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

- Desirable location of neighborhood.
- Rising property values. Can't buy or afford anything else.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

- Mostly "NO" - many unhappy but wealthy families.
- If homes were not valuable or were not being improved then families would move in who were "not aspiring to a quality of life that we aspire to. "
- Property values are a baseline but not a sufficient measure of quality of life.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- More two-career neighbors.
- Influx of people from other states with no ties to Denver or to the neighborhood.
- People are wealthy – more professionals (doctors, lawyers).
- Neighborhood is considered to be more upscale now.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Proximity to Cherry Creek, 6th Ave.

Speer (4/19/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Speer Blvd., Alameda Ave., Broadway, Downing St.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Community – a shared sense of place. Sense of safety. People know their neighbors. Sense of responsibility for the area – more than just your own property. Proximity to work, church, school. Diversity of residents. Not much traffic. Low densities. Architectural and structural compatibility. Continuity, sense of the past. Mixed use/zoning is OK because it allows for economic diversity.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

- Convenient access to other neighborhoods and downtown.
- People are out and about; interact with others and use porches.
- People have invested sweat equity, done lots of renovation – so people are vested in the neighborhood.
- Diversity of ages, income levels, length of residence in neighborhood.
- People are neighborly, have block parties.
- Community Gardens and Art Students League promote interaction.
- Proximity to everything.
- Access to trails, Bike Path.
- Services are good – fast response time for the police.
- Diversity of homes, lifestyles.
- Quiet.

Problems in This Neighborhood

- Traffic – from City and suburban residents. Need better public transportation.
- Not many homeowners in the neighborhood.
- Not ethnically diverse – we are basically White.
- Absentee landlords.
- Many of the houses are subdivided.
- No good schools.
- There is a halfway house for criminals right across from the Elementary school. Group home on another block –2-3 others nearby.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Multi-use zoning leads to more diversity age, socioeconomic status, and relationships although this is declining with rising housing costs. Rentals and single family units. Residents – often Hispanics – live in the worst housing.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Residents can be "as connected as they want to be."For those who want to interact, opportunities are there.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- Neighborhood Watch
- Community Gardens
- Art Students League
- W est Washington Park Neighborhood Association
- Don't Build the Big Buildings
- Political caucuses

Individuals/Organizations that "Speak" for the Neighborhood

- W est Washington Park Neighborhood Association.
- Not one single voice for the neighborhood.
- Kathleen Himmelman, City Council representative and other politicians, caucuses.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Old houses have been bought and renovated, now homes are much nicer.
- Old boarding houses have been converted back into single family homes, lower densities.
- More small businesses in area (shops, restaurants).
- Gentrification of the area which is a threat to diversity.
- Conversion of rentals to homeownership.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

- Revitalization of downtown and Cherry Creek Mall redevelopment.
- People coming back from the suburbs.
- Boom in the Denver economy.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

- Colorado may see that much property value increases are just "paper gain".
- Some areas have increases, but the neighborhoods are not really cohesive.
- Neighborhood ambience is key to the quality of life in the neighborhood.
- People are committed to the area in spite of economic ups and downs.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Elderly are dying out or have moved on.
- Younger, more wealthy people moving in.
- Some turnover to young professionals.

Reasons for Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Moving in because of neighborhood's location, accessibility.
- Sense of and appreciation for the neighborhood's history.

Harvey Park (4/11/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Yale Ave., Florida Ave., Sheridan Blvd., Federal Blvd.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Single family homes only with no rentals, no apartments. Churches. No crime. People who care about their lot, no trash piling up, good property maintenance.   Good schools. Good, well- maintained parks.   Good merchant access. City intervention-enforcement: regulation on animals, building, trash, law enforcement.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

- There are parts that are nice.
- Proximity to downtown.
- Nice, well-kept park, with trails, and a playground.
- Good access to retail stores…it is getting better.
- Johnson's School, library, churches.
- Good accessibility to public transportation.
- New construction, new building.

Problems in This Neighborhood

- Some bad apartment buildings.
- No parental supervision of kids.
- Absentee property managers.
- There is a lot of trash that blows around.
- We need some sidewalks, and potholes fixed in the streets.
- Drainage is a problem.
- Council people just don't listen, and don't do anything.
- The school property is unkempt - the lawn is overgrown, the building is neglected.
- Some rental properties are not controlled and too many people move.
- Loud, noisy apartment tenants.
- Presence of halfway houses.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Hard to find people to volunteer.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- There are few strong community organizations now.
- Mar Lee Community Association.
- The Archdiocese of Denver; the Baptist church, other churches.

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

- Not really.
- City and politicians are not responsive to the needs of the neighborhood.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Quality of life has gotten worse.
- New construction of single family homes, increased retail opportunities.
- Improved the storm sewers. They put in a 100 year storm sewer system.
- Some of the homes are much better.
- Neighborhood has gotten better over the course of five years.
- Other than the business district, there are some interesting families moving in, some positive aspects of diversity.
- The library has been improved and well kept - it was remodeled.
- They put a stop sign by Johnson school.
- We got a street light - it was too dark.
- New lighting at Brentwood shopping center.
- Pockets of property pieces that have been poorly maintained.
- Neighbors that do not care for their property.
- Large number of half-way houses.
- Many Vietnamese, South American, Mexican people coming in. This gives the perception of decline, but actually there are some businesses that are doing well.
- "Flea-market atmosphere" of crowded, informal ethnic stands give bad impression.
- Perceived increase in the level of crime.
- Car thefts, shootings, drug dealing.
- Speeders, and fatalities from drag racing.
- Apathy of public officials
- Graffiti is getting worse as well.
- Property values have been going up.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- There have been many new people - immigrants - coming in.
- The Vietnamese and the Latin Americans moving in - don't respect the area."

Berkeley (4/16/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Sheridan Blvd., Lowell Blvd., 38th Ave., 46th Avenue

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

A variety of ages, diversity of socio-economic status. Friendly neighbors. Good location. Good public transportation. Has "character." Has parks. Single family homes, not many apartments.
Not abandoned during the day.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

- Houses have porches and patios, detached garages; good-sized yards.
- Variety of age groups living in neighborhood.
- Variety of types of well-built homes.
- Nice old neighborhood.
- Big trees.
- More stable than the suburbs.
- Peaceful, quiet, family neighborhood.

Problems in This Neighborhood

- Some loud noise.
- Drug activity, criminal activity.
- Rental properties and some problem renters.
- Speeding on streets.
- Trash - too much litter in alley, lousy trash pick-up.
- Dig up street for sewage repairs.
- Too many squirrels.
- Need better police response - concern for gang activity - need more police stations.
- Poor visibility, lighting on 38th Ave.
- Residents have little control over the neighborhood; don't know how to make a difference.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

- Fewer people in middle age group. Mostly retired people or young couples, but some families. Hispanic/Anglo mix.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Not very connected. Friendly but not socially involved.
- Some neighbors watch out for each other.
- Afraid of some neighbors, some "gang-bangers".
- People detached, uninvolved, skeptical, frustrated.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- Churches do some neighborhood stuff.
- Berkeley Neighbors Association - but not active or effective
- Elitch redevelopment led to much neighborhood discussion.
- Block parties/activities are supported and financed by City.
- Tribune is the local paper
- West Highland Neighborhood organization is very vocal (in a different neighborhood), but we don't have anything like that.
- Nice events at public library.

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

- No leadership presently identified - need volunteers, people who are willing to volunteer.
- Dennis Gallagher - in Congress now, has been state rep, and active for many years - but not a spokesperson.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Older people have moved out, younger people have moved in.
- Less noise, less trash, less traffic with moving of Elitch Amusement Park.
- Some teenager problems, mainly rowdiness.
- Neighborhood is more crowded now.
- More traffic, parking congestion, longer lines at the stores.
- More apartments, houses being subdivided, increasing density.
- Property values going up - "skyrocketing", led to a lot of renovations.
- Property taxes going up.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

- Elitch Amusement Park moved out.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

- "NO" - but people want to move in - a measure of Denver's booming economy.
- This neighborhood is full of homes and not a community subdivision.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Mexicans are moving in.
- People have diverse professions; small businesses operating from home.
- Senior housing will be going up at Elitch site.
- Parking is always an issue, and trash.

<u>**Clayton (4/9/99)**</u>

Boundaries of Neighborhood: York St., Colorado Blvd., Martin Luther King Blvd., 26th Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Neighborly. Upkeep of property. Local shops and grocery stores. Free of trash, litter, and junk in yards and alleys. Homeowners, not rentals. Good councilman who helps get thing done, Housing covenants that allow any type of exterior decoration. Free from loitering.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

• Long time residents who have roots.
• Good neighbors who will assist.
• Close to family and church.
• Quiet.
• Good upkeep of properties.
• Pretty safe.
• Centrally located, amenities nearby, near bus lines.
• All our homes are paid for!

Problems in This Neighborhood

• Illegal dumping and trash.
• Loitering.
• Too few stores (especially groceries) nearby.
• Insufficient street lights.
• Many do not keep up property.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

People of all racial/ethnic groups, but predominantly Black. People moving in are primarily younger families but still many older families.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

• Strong inter-neighbors connections, because most are long timers.
• May be language barrier hurting connectedness between Blacks and in-movers

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

• No one knew of any currently effective neighborhood organization.

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

• Did not claim any current [only past] strong spokespersons for the area.
• Current council person not effective.
• Individuals seem to be self-starters who call City individually to complain.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

• Resentment/complaints re: in-movers (becoming very private, less neighborly; general amazement that these in-comers can afford houses; most don't speak English).
• Too many vehicles and too many people in household.
• Too many folks don't keep up property and park their cars all over the lawns.
• Increasing property values.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

• Clear consensus that property values are not a good proxy for quality of life.
• Values are rising [nominally] even though the level of maintenance, social relations, and general neighborhood conditions have deteriorated.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life
• many speculators operating now.
• Denver economy is hot.
• Strong population growth leading to rising values.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

• In-migration of different racial/ethnic groups [Asian and Hispanic, some whites] who are less friendly.
• Used to be better when it was all homeowners.
• Concern about "nontraditional" family arrangements; lack of understanding of who/how many live in a unit.
• Clear undercurrent of resentment against other non-English ethnics.

Reasons for Changes in Neighborhood Residents

• Government assistance to immigrants [one asserted that government gave them houses and welfare for 5 years.
• Some newcomers pool resources.
• There exists "false rumor" that whites are moving back…but they are only speculators, not staying for long.
• Replacement of elderly black owners as they die out with others.

Montbello 1 (4/10/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Peoria St., 56th Ave.., I-70, Chambers Rd.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Diversity. Good schools. Good neighbors who are friendly and willing to watch out for each other. Safe, free of crime and drugs. Good general upkeep of properties by owners and renters. Responsible people re: buildings, kids, pets.

Good Qualities in This Neighborhood

- Good schools.
- Nice parks and rec center.
- Diversity.
- Quiet in north end of Montbello.
- Many community associations.
- Neighborhood Watch program.
- Proximity to good roads.
- Growing neighborhood in which folks are caring more for their homes and each other.
- Low crime.
- A solid, working class area with solid values.
- Great neighbors.
- Location; combination of private suburb and access to downtown.
- Clean air, uncongested.

Problems in This Neighborhood

- Lack of businesses (grocery, hardware, etc.).
- Neighbors who do not keep care of their pets; too many packs of unsupervised dogs.
- Lack of police patrols.
- Speeders.
- Unsupervised kids who vandalize and break in.
- Absentee landlords who do not take responsibility for maintenance.
- Lax enforcement of laws and poor public services.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Equal mix of whites, blacks, Hispanics; a few Asians. Estimated average family income of $35-40,000. Newer in-mover renters are of somewhat lower income. Many grew up with the neighborhood; now middle aged, finished child-rearing.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Not well-connected (often because of language).
- Improving attitude that facilitates connectedness.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- ACORN
- Neighborhood Watch
- Neighborhood churches
- Far Northeast Neighborhood Association
- Montbello Youth Group
- Arsenal Community Program
- Montbello United Neighbors
- Family Preservation/Support run via Human Services
- Community Gardens

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

- No single one speaks for all of us.
- By reputation John Smith does.
- Hispanics or Asians rely on their numbers.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Crime has decreased, esp. gang activity because police and the *community itself* has cracked down on socially irresponsible actions.
- Growing number of Hispanics. Twenty years ago it was just black-white.
- Much more construction and in-moving.
- Property values have gone up a lot in last 5 years.
- New construction that will more than double the number of units in Montbello.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

- Some due to homeowners' rehab efforts.
- Because DIA twelve miles away, area is getting hotter.
- People are now more "excited"; kids from area are now buying here; sense of "community pride".
- Concerted effort to change City's negative stereotype of area.

Montbello 2 (4/10/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Chambers Rd., I-70, Peoria St., 56th Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Activities that would bring people together to discuss neighborhood. Well-maintained properties. Good neighbors who are supportive, respectful, and friendly. Creating a "village that will raise the kids." Good parenting. Residents are homeowners who are more concerned with their property. Quiet. No big truck traffic.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

• Has good mix of age, ethnic, and racial groups.
• Relatively low gang activity; safe.
• Neighbors watch out for one another.
• Know the neighbors.
• Good schools
• Close proximity to airport and expressways.
• Quiet.
• Clean.

Problems in This Neighborhood

• Not enough shopping, theaters and other amenities for kids.
• Too many poorly maintained and noisy rentals.
• Kids playing in street and throwing trash.
• Too many in-movers that are "street folks" who don't believe in same value system [unstructured life, fast life, gangs].
• Too many vehicles.
• Too close to Rocky Mt. Arsenal.
• Concern about Section 8 people who do not know how to keep up home, or do not have money for upkeep. If there's "too many of them in an area it spells trouble."

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Reflects many groups; predominantly black but growing percentage of Mexicans. Many multigenerational extended families in area.

Sense of Connections Among Residents

• Neighborly.
• Wide variety of social interactions.
• Those who are close are so because of mutual longtime residence.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

• Little league sports bring together.

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

• Far Northeast Neighborhood Association [and its leader, John Smith].

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

• More absentee owners.
• More families with kids.
• HUD activities.
• More demand for housing by Mexicans and whites.
• More traffic.
• Some more stores in shopping center.
• Big home price inflation.
• Booming local property values has led owners to take more pride in their properties.
• Wide stereotype of "Mont-ghetto" and few people knew the high quality of life here.
• Rumored that some home homes are used to house illegals; port of entry until they work.
• Blacks are still being steered into area.

Congress Park (4/17/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Colorado Blvd., University Ave., Colfax Ave., 6th Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Low crime, sense of safety and security. People know each other and watch out for each other. Stability of residents, not transient. Proximity to services, public transportation, stores. Variety, diversity of neighbors. Trees, parks. Upkeep and renovation of homes. Pride in ownership, upkeep of homes. Good schools.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

- Centrally located, easy access, proximity.
- Neighborhood has character, appeal, architectural mix.
- Big old houses and trees.
- Sense of continuity, stability of residents.
- Flagstone sidewalks where people can walk around neighborhood.
- Two story houses.
- Small commercial enterprises.
- Socio-economic and cultural diversity of residents.
- Property values are up. Safe neighborhood to invest in.
- Pride of ownership.

Problems in This Neighborhood

- Becoming less diverse, more upscale.
- Noise (neighbors, traffic, music, dogs).
- Too many apartment buildings.
- Too high density, housing close together.
- Traffic and parking problems.
- Litter, trash on streets and alleys.
- Irresponsible landlords.
- Pigeons, squirrels and woodpeckers.
- Vandalism.
- Drunks in the neighborhood, beggars
- Hotel on Colfax with prostitution
- Speeding on one-way streets.
- Complex issues about the development on Colfax.
- Police station is too far away – police have slow response time.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Upper income. White, not terribly diverse ethnically. Single family homes, but quite a few rentals with high turnovers in residents. Have some group homes in area for developmentally disabled children and chronically mentally ill. These residents are seen as adding to the color of the neighborhood. Older people moving out, younger families moving in.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

•	Depends on the block – residents on active blocks know each other, do things together.
•	People too busy, limited time to visit with neighbors.
•	Know people, though not close. Recognize who lives there.
•	Neighbors would help if needed.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

•	Congress Park Neighborhood Association
•	Capitol Hill United Neighbors
•	Colfax on the Hill Business Association
•	Bartering group
•	Babysitters group
•	Neighborhood schools

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

•	No one really speaks for the neighborhood, some people like to think that they do.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

•	Neighborhood is safer, less violent crime. There is petty crime – but is less than before.
•	There have been improvements on Colfax For example, better handicapped access.
•	Houses are being fixed up – home-owners who take pride.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

•	Lower downtown development and Cherry Creek development.
•	Booming Denver economy.
•	The end of school busing brought people, younger families back into the city.
•	Housing values going up.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

•	No, rising values make owners happier but it is people who make the neighborhood.
•	Rising values are making it hard to duplicate neighborhood amenities.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

•   More families, younger families, more children.
•   More homeowners.

Reasons for Changes in Neighborhood Residents

•   Area is a nice place to live, good location.
•   More house and better quality of house for the money.

South Park Hill (4/17/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Colorado Blvd., Quebec St., Colfax Ave., to 35th Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Neighbors know each other, watch out for each other. Front porches, alleys and sidewalks. People take care of their lawns/houses. Proximity to services, events, public transportation. Good quality schools and resident commitment to schools. Feeling of belonging, stability, pride in homes, schools, themselves. Variety of people (backgrounds, ages, etc.). People are friendly. Sense of security and safety.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

- Diversity: economic, racial, housing styles.
- Parks, parkways, trees.
- Architecturally interesting and rich.
- Quieter after airport left.
- Park Hill Neighborhood Association is active.
- People - "neighbors make a neighborhood".
- Proximity to downtown.
- Few rentals.
- Dedication and commitment to community.
- Porches, sidewalks, and alleys – places for interaction with neighbors.

Problems with This Neighborhood

- Perception of people outside the neighborhood that this is a high crime area.
- Colfax used to be nice.
- Proximity to Colfax (traffic, noise, prostitution, trash).
- Police don't care for the neighborhood as they should - long response time.
- Bus stops not well maintained.
- Not enough retail opportunities.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

- Has changed, more young professionals and children.
- Used to be more transient, and more older people.
- Tolerant of differences and diversity.
- Gay/straight, married/single, ethnic groups, ages.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Easy to get to know families with young children, others find it more challenging
- Neighbors meeting through various activities - schools, groups, churches
- Do have a sense of responsibility for each other
- People talk, don't have a lot of time to socialize.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- Park Hill Neighborhood Association
- Churches
- Scouts, youth sports teams
- Schools; community centers in schools
- Block parties
- Library

Individuals/Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

- Park Hill Neighborhood Association
- Not a single voice that expresses the views and opinions of the community

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Decreased crime rate.
- Increased property values making in harder for people to move in here.
- Airport gone - quieter.
- Activities of the police and Mayor have reduced gang activity.
- More graffiti.
- Quality of life better in the city than in the suburbs.
- Closing of crack houses and cleanup of red-light district.
- Increased traffic congestion.
- Clustering of group homes in neighborhood.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

- Closing and subsequent redevelopment of Stapleton Airport area.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

- "NO" - in whole metro area, quality of life is related to neighborhood sentiment, and feel - not property values.
- Barrios have a better sense of community. Community is not tied to property values.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- People are younger.
- Kids who grew up here are moving back into neighborhood as adults.

Reasons for Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Proximity to downtown. People want to avoid long commutes, get away from suburbs.
- Per square foot, houses are still less expensive than elsewhere in the suburbs.
- School choice has impacted people moving back into the inner city.
- Homes are well-built, space for growth, larger yards.

Hilltop (4/18/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Colorado Blvd., Quebec St., 8th Avenue, Alameda Ave.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Free of crime. Attractive neighborhood. Nice neighbors. Proximity and access to shopping, public transportation, downtown.   Good schools. Not too much traffic and good parking. Low density housing - not too many apartments. Mixed neighborhood with young and old residents. Sense of open space, parks, and personal space.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

•	Access to public transportation, services.
•	Not a lot of traffic, quiet.
•	Sense of safety.
•	Physically beautiful.
•	Nice parks that are well used.
•	People make the neighborhood.
•	People are out in the neighborhood.
•	Schools are close and there is enough selection.
•	Location.
•	Rising property values.
•	Neighborhood is desirable, everyone wants to live here.
•	Spaciousness.
•	Cleanliness.

What do you like the least?

•	Some property crimes, not violent crimes.
•	Changing composition of the neighborhood. Newcomers not as connected or friendly.
•	People don't talk to each other.
•	Noise (dogs, other street).
•	Need more street lights.
•	Redevelopment is threatening to residents - means change that is beyond their control
•	New developments are edge to edge.
•	Developers ignore a lot of covenants and housing laws.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Middle to upper class. Some Asians and other ethnic groups but mainly White. Older, middle-aged couples. People are getting younger and there are more families although from all age ranges. Mostly home-owners with few rentals.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

•	Varies from minimal to moderate to very connected.

- People don't talk much to each other because they are too busy.
- Block meetings lead to more familiarity.
- The more upscale the neighborhood, the less people know each other.
- People help each other in crises.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- Hilltop Neighborhood Association
- Schools.
- Neighborhood Watch

Individuals or Organization that "Speak" for Neighborhood

- Hilltop Neighborhood Association
- Civic associations
- Polly Flobeck, City Council woman should but is not effective.
- Cherry Creek Times

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Some threats to quality of life are coming - change is happening, but not here yet.
- Many new, large single-family homes.
- Increased use of "pop-tops" (addition of second floor dormers).
- Property values are going up, taxes are up.
- Addition of multifamily units.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

- Desirable location of neighborhood.
- Rising property values. Can't buy or afford anything else.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

- Mostly "NO" - many unhappy but wealthy families.
- If homes were not valuable or were not being improved then families would move in who were "not aspiring to a quality of life that we aspire to. "
- Property values are a baseline but not a sufficient measure of quality of life.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- More two-career neighbors.
- Influx of people from other states with no ties to Denver or to the neighborhood.
- People are wealthy – more professionals (doctors, lawyers).
- Neighborhood is considered to be more upscale now.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Proximity to Cherry Creek, 6th Ave.

Speer (4/19/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Speer Blvd., Alameda Ave., Broadway, Downing St.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Community – a shared sense of place. Sense of safety. People know their neighbors. Sense of responsibility for the area – more than just your own property. Proximity to work, church, school. Diversity of residents. Not much traffic. Low densities. Architectural and structural compatibility. Continuity, sense of the past. Mixed use/zoning is OK because it allows for economic diversity.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

- Convenient access to other neighborhoods and downtown.
- People are out and about; interact with others and use porches.
- People have invested sweat equity, done lots of renovation – so people are vested in the neighborhood.
- Diversity of ages, income levels, length of residence in neighborhood.
- People are neighborly, have block parties.
- Community Gardens and Art Students League promote interaction.
- Proximity to everything.
- Access to trails, Bike Path.
- Services are good – fast response time for the police.
- Diversity of homes, lifestyles.
- Quiet.

Problems in This Neighborhood

- Traffic – from City and suburban residents. Need better public transportation.
- Not many homeowners in the neighborhood.
- Not ethnically diverse – we are basically White.
- Absentee landlords.
- Many of the houses are subdivided.
- No good schools.
- There is a halfway house for criminals right across from the Elementary school. Group home on another block –2-3 others nearby.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Residents

Multi-use zoning leads to more diversity age, socioeconomic status, and relationships although this is declining with rising housing costs. Rentals and single family units. Residents – often Hispanics – live in the worst housing.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

- Residents can be "as connected as they want to be."For those who want to interact, opportunities are there.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

- Neighborhood Watch
- Community Gardens
- Art Students League
- W est Washington Park Neighborhood Association
- Don't Build the Big Buildings
- Political caucuses

Individuals/Organizations that "Speak" for the Neighborhood

- W est Washington Park Neighborhood Association.
- Not one single voice for the neighborhood.
- Kathleen Himmelman, City Council representative and other politicians, caucuses.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Old houses have been bought and renovated, now homes are much nicer.
- Old boarding houses have been converted back into single family homes, lower densities.
- More small businesses in area (shops, restaurants).
- Gentrification of the area which is a threat to diversity.
- Conversion of rentals to homeownership.

Reasons for Perceived Changes in Quality of Life

- Revitalization of downtown and Cherry Creek Mall redevelopment.
- People coming back from the suburbs.
- Boom in the Denver economy.

Property Values as Indicator of Quality of Life

- Colorado may see that much property value increases are just "paper gain".
- Some areas have increases, but the neighborhoods are not really cohesive.
- Neighborhood ambience is key to the quality of life in the neighborhood.
- People are committed to the area in spite of economic ups and downs.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Elderly are dying out or have moved on.
- Younger, more wealthy people moving in.
- Some turnover to young professionals.

Reasons for Changes in Neighborhood Residents

- Moving in because of neighborhood's location, accessibility.
- Sense of and appreciation for the neighborhood's history.

Harvey Park (4/11/99)

Boundaries of Neighborhood: Yale Ave., Florida Ave., Sheridan Blvd., Federal Blvd.

Qualities of "Good" Neighborhoods

Single family homes only with no rentals, no apartments. Churches. No crime. People who care about their lot, no trash piling up, good property maintenance.   Good schools. Good, well- maintained parks.   Good merchant access. City intervention-enforcement: regulation on animals, building, trash, law enforcement.

Good Qualities of This Neighborhood

• There are parts that are nice.
• Proximity to downtown.
• Nice, well-kept park, with trails, and a playground.
• Good access to retail stores…it is getting better.
• Johnson's School, library, churches.
• Good accessibility to public transportation.
• New construction, new building.

Problems in This Neighborhood

• Some bad apartment buildings.
• No parental supervision of kids.
• Absentee property managers.
• There is a lot of trash that blows around.
• We need some sidewalks, and potholes fixed in the streets.
• Drainage is a problem.
• Council people just don't listen, and don't do anything.
• The school property is unkempt - the lawn is overgrown, the building is neglected.
• Some rental properties are not controlled and too many people move.
• Loud, noisy apartment tenants.
• Presence of halfway houses.

Sense of Connection Among Residents

• Hard to find people to volunteer.

Organizations/Institutions that Draw People Together

• There are few strong community organizations now.
• Mar Lee Community Association.
• The Archdiocese of Denver; the Baptist church, other churches.

Individuals or Organizations that "Speak" for Neighborhood

• Not really.
• City and politicians are not responsive to the needs of the neighborhood.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Quality of Life

• Quality of life has gotten worse.
• New construction of single family homes, increased retail opportunities.
• Improved the storm sewers. They put in a 100 year storm sewer system.
• Some of the homes are much better.
• Neighborhood has gotten better over the course of five years.
• Other than the business district, there are some interesting families moving in, some positive aspects of diversity.
• The library has been improved and well kept - it was remodeled.
• They put a stop sign by Johnson school.
• We got a street light - it was too dark.
• New lighting at Brentwood shopping center.
• Pockets of property pieces that have been poorly maintained.
• Neighbors that do not care for their property.
• Large number of half-way houses.
• Many Vietnamese, South American, Mexican people coming in. This gives the perception of decline, but actually there are some businesses that are doing well.
• "Flea-market atmosphere" of crowded, informal ethnic stands give bad impression.
• Perceived increase in the level of crime.
• Car thefts, shootings, drug dealing.
• Speeders, and fatalities from drag racing.
• Apathy of public officials
• Graffiti is getting worse as well.
• Property values have been going up.

Perceived Changes in Neighborhood Residents

• There have been many new people - immigrants - coming in.
• The Vietnamese and the Latin Americans moving in - don't respect the area."