

**To: National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials.**

**From: Zogby Analytics**

**RE: Survey of US Adults on Housing and Redevelopment Issues**

---

**Methodology**  
**Interactive Survey of US Adults**  
**10/12/12 thru 10/13/12**

Zogby Analytics conducted an online survey of 1,000 US adults for National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials.

Using trusted interactive partner resources, thousands of adults were invited to participate in this interactive survey. Each invitation is password coded and secure so that one respondent can only access the survey one time.

Using information based on census data, voter registration figures, CIA fact books and exit polls, we use complex weighting techniques to best represent the demographics of the population being surveyed. Weighted variables may include age, race, gender, region, party, education, and religion.

Based on a confidence interval of 95%, the margin of error for 1,000 is +/- 3.2 percentage points. This means that all other things being equal, the identical survey repeated will have results within the margin of error 95 times out of 100.

Subsets of the data have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that subset we can make estimations based on the data, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative.

Additional factors can create error, such as question wording and question order.

## **Executive Summary**

Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding affordable housing spending by the federal government. Overall responses were often evenly split, although with some deeper digging there are some differences between demographic subgroups.

When asked if they believe the current spending is the right amount, too much, or not enough, respondents were evenly divided with 25% agreeing spending was not enough, 27% agreeing it was the right amount, 25% agreeing it was too much and 23% landing in the not sure column. Respondents most likely to select not sure, are women (28%), those over the age of 65 (28%), and respondents in the central great lakes region (28%). They are also more likely to be born again (27%), and weekly or monthly church goers (28% each). They are not social networkers.

Those most likely to agree the current spending is too much are men (33%), Republicans (43%), conservative (44%), southerners (31%), and those earning over \$100k per year. They have landlines (34%), and consider themselves a part of the investor class (34%).

When respondents were asked whether across-the-board budget cuts were the right way to handle reducing the federal deficit 40% agree that housing budgets should be protected, while 37% agreed that all programs should suffer equally. Not sure is, again, about a quarter of respondents. Those who are more likely to be not sure are women (28%), 18-29 year olds (34%), independents (33%), those living in the west (33%), and respondents who are earning less than \$50k a year (27%) and have no college degree (29%).

Similarly, regarding the “fiscal cliff” question, more than half (61%) agree that it is important that housing cuts are not unfairly high in relation to other cuts. Those who are unsure whether it is important that any cuts to affordable housing programs are not unfairly high in relation are women (25%), 18-29 year olds (27%), 25-34 year olds (30%), and independents (26%).

Predictably, respondents overall do want affordable housing in their own community. Sixty-nine percent consider it somewhat or very important, although as in other questions women and young people are more likely to agree that they are not sure, than are others.

About half (49%) would support an increase in funding for affordable housing options if the increase was funded from a reduction in a different area of the federal budget, with 29% in opposition. When asked where that cut should come from respondents are most likely to agree to deficit spending, or cuts to the National Defense budget to provide the funding. Respondents ages 50-64 are somewhat more likely to say they are not sure where the cuts should come from.

Overall the survey reflects the strong divide in the country. The national surveys on most political issues reflect a closely divided populace, and this survey is no different. That said, it is important to remember that the most positive responses are to affordable housing options in their own hometown, and that more than half agree that it is important that housing cuts are not unfairly high in relation to other cuts. Messages that strike close to home are often the most effective. Additionally there are certain demographic subgroups who have yet to make up their minds. Providing information and education to women, people either under 35 or over 55, and independents could prove useful as those groups indicate that they do not feel they have enough information to come to a conclusion.

**Narrative Summary**

**Do you believe that the current spending by the federal government for programs that help make housing more affordable for Americans with moderate, low, and very low incomes is not enough, the right amount, or too much?**

<b>Current government spending to make housing more affordable is...</b>	
<b>Not enough</b>	25%
<b>The right amount</b>	27
<b>Too much</b>	25
<b>Not sure</b>	23

Twenty-seven percent agree that the government is spending the right amount to make housing more affordable. A quarter agrees that it is not enough, and an equivalent 25% agrees it is too much. Answers here are essentially even across the board, with another 23% agreeing that they are not sure.

**As part of deficit reduction, Congress passed and the President signed a law that sets the stage for "across-the-board" budget cuts. Which of the following statements comes closer to your views on federal government programs that help make housing more affordable for Americans with moderate, low, and very low incomes?**

Statement A - Across-the-board budget cuts are not the right way to reduce the federal deficit. Priorities must be identified and programs that help make housing affordable for Americans with moderate, low, and very low incomes should be protected from spending cuts.

Statement B - Across-the-board budget cuts are a way of ensuring that all federal government programs share the pain, and Congress should move forward with cuts to programs that help make housing affordable for Americans with moderate, low, and very low incomes.

<b>Across the board budget cuts are...</b>	
<b>Statement A</b>	40%
<b>Statement B</b>	36
<b>Not sure</b>	24

Statement A, reflecting that across-the-board cuts don't take into account priorities and protect affordable housing has a slight edge over Statement B, which stands more in favor of across-the-board cuts. The difference is just 4 percentage points, nearly within the margin of error. And nearly a quarter are not sure.

**The President and Congress are considering different ways to avoid the "Fiscal Cliff", the tax hikes and spending cuts slated for the first of next year. Bearing in mind the federal programs that assist Americans with moderate, low, and very low incomes obtain modest, decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing - how important is it to you that any cuts to affordable housing programs are not unfairly high in relation to cuts to other federal programs?**

**Importance that housing cuts are not unfairly high in relation to cuts to other federal programs**

<b>Very important</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>Important</b> <b>61%</b>
<b>Somewhat important</b>	<b>34</b>	
<b>Somewhat unimportant</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Unimportant</b> <b>20%</b>
<b>Very unimportant</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>Not sure</b>	<b>20</b>	

Overall respondents agree that it is important that any cuts to affordable housing programs are not unfairly high in relation to cuts to other federal programs. More than half respond that it is either very or somewhat important (61%) while 20% consider it unimportant.

**Thinking about the use and involvement of federal policies and programs that assist Americans with moderate, low, and very low incomes obtain modest, decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing. How important is it to you that affordable housing options for homeownership and rental are available in your local community?**

**Importance that affordable housing options available in local community**

<b>Very important</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>Important</b> <b>69%</b>
<b>Somewhat important</b>	<b>36</b>	
<b>Somewhat unimportant</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Unimportant</b> <b>19%</b>
<b>Very unimportant</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>Not sure</b>	<b>12</b>	

When respondents consider their own community, importance rises to 69% and unimportance lowers to 19%. Not sure drops to just 12%.

**Taking into consideration the different spending priorities of the country going forward and in light of the federal deficit. Would you support or oppose an increase in funding for affordable housing options if the increase was funded from a reduction in a different area of the federal budget?**

<b>Support or oppose an increase in funding for affordable housing option</b>		
<b>Strongly support</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>Support 49%</b>
<b>Somewhat support</b>	<b>34</b>	
<b>Somewhat oppose</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>Oppose 29%</b>
<b>Strongly oppose</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>Not sure</b>	<b>22</b>	

Taking into consideration different spending priorities of the country, about half would support an increase in funding for affordable housing options if the increase was funded from a reduction in a different area of the federal budget.

**Thinking about the different ways of paying for the increases in funding for affordable housing options, which of the following do you support? (Choose all that apply)**

\*asked if response to previous question was strongly support or somewhat support

<b>Ways to pay for the increase in funding for affordable housing</b>	
<b>Deficit Spending</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>Cuts to National Defense spending</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Cuts to Federal Transportation budget</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Cuts to mass transit benefits</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Increased federal income taxes</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Cuts to the food stamps program</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Cuts to the Medicare, Medicaid, and Other Health Care entitlement programs</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Cuts to the Social Security entitlement program</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Cuts to Veterans' benefits and services</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Not sure</b>	<b>11</b>

Respondents are most likely to want to use deficit spending, cuts to the National Defense budget or to the Federal Transportation Budget, to pay for an increase in funding for affordable housing. Just about a quarter agree that they would support an increase in federal income taxes while about 20% would support cuts to food stamps. Other potential cuts fall below 10% in support.