St. Louis Regional Sustainable Communities

Regional Plan for Sustainable Development
Local Government Housing and Community Development Survey

July 2012

Overview

On February 29, 2012 letters were sent to leaders in all municipalities in the St. Louis eight county region inviting them to take a survey online regarding priorities and concerns of their communities. The letter was addressed to the city administrator or city manager in professionally managed cities and to the mayor in non-professionally managed cities. In the letter East-West Gateway, on behalf of the RPSD effort, asked that the leader assist with the RPSD effort by having "an appropriate member of your staff who is familiar with the city's community development efforts," complete the survey[1]. The leaders were told the purpose of the survey is as follows:

> *In order to create a plan that is useful we are using meetings and surveys to gain an understanding of the priorities and concerns of the local communities that comprise our region. The information we obtain from you in this survey will strengthen our regional data analysis by adding your local, informative narrative to the research. It will also give us a better understanding of what tools and recommendations are needed to address the priorities throughout the region.*

These results will be further analyzed and drawn upon as part of the Housing Assessment for the Regional Plan for Sustainable Development in July 2012. This assessment will assist in the development of a Housing Plan for the St. Louis region.

The results will primarily be used to gain an understanding of the needs, priorities and challenges of local governments in the St. Louis region. Municipalities in the region have various population sizes, ranging from nine (Peaceful Village in Jefferson County) to over 319,000 (the city of St. Louis). In an effort to understand the differing challenges and priorities for various size local governments, the survey results are first reported in the aggregate, and then examined by population size.

The results should not be used to describe the challenges, priorities, and concerns of the region as a whole but only used to determine the types of tools and strategies that will be helpful to local governments in the region.

[1] Municipalities in St. Louis County received a slightly different letter than other municipalities because the St. Louis County Office of Community Development followed up with municipalities in the County and are using the survey results for their planning purposes as well.

Profile

Responses were received from municipalities in every county of the region. Table 1 provides the breakdown of the total number of municipalities in the region as well as the number and percent of respondents by county. The total response rate was 35.7 percent. The results are fairly representative of the number of governments in the region by county. Franklin, St. Charles and St. Louis counties are slightly overrepresented in the survey results compared to the total number of governments, while the remaining counties are slightly underrepresented.

The City Administrator (21) or Mayor (16) completed most of the surveys with the reminder being completed by City Planners (7), Community Development Directors (9), and those that fulfill other roles (17). Those in the "other" category included City/Village Clerk (7), Assistant to City Administrator/Mayor (3), Board of Trustees chairman (3), City Engineer (3) and Director of Economic Development (1).

Table 1: Number of Surveys Sent and Received by County

County	Number of Local Governments	Percent of Local Governments in the Region	Number of Survey Respondents	Percent of Survey Respondents	Percent of Local Governments Responding
Franklin	12	6.1	7	10.0	58.3
Jefferson	15	7.7	3	4.3	20.0
St. Charles	17	8.7	8	11.4	47.1
City of St. Louis	1	0.5	1	1.4	100.0
St. Louis	90	45.9	36	51.4	40.0
Madison	27	13.8	8	11.4	29.6
Monroe	6	3.1	2	2.9	33.3
St. Clair	28	14.3	5	7.1	17.9
Total	**196**	**100.0**	**70**	**100.0**	**35.7**

Table 2 provides the breakdown of municipalities in the St. Louis region by population size. In the St. Louis region the population of municipalities ranges from a low of nine persons (Peaceful Village in Jefferson County) to a high of 319,000 residents (city of St. Louis). Officials from municipalities of all sizes responded to the survey with 14 respondents (20.0 percent) who represent municipalities with a population of less than 1,000, 10 (14.3 percent) who represent municipalities between 1,000 and 3,000 persons, 21 (30.0 percent) who represent municipalities between 3,000 and 10,000 persons and 25 (35.7 percent) who represent municipalities with over 10,000 persons.

Table 2: Number of Municipalities in the Region and Number Responding to Survey, by Population Size

Population	Number of Local Governments in Region	Percent of Local Governments in the Region	Number of Survey Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Under 1,000	60	30.6	14	20.0
Between 1,000 and 3,000	38	19.4	10	14.3
Between 3,000 and 10,000	52	26.5	21	30.0
Over 10,000	46	23.5	25	35.7
Total	***196***	***100.0***	***70***	***100.0***

Housing Development

Survey respondents were asked to indicate how much of a need there is in their community for 14 common housing types, considering current conditions as well as future needs of their municipality. See Table 3 for aggregated results.

The type of housing that was indicated, as "need more" by the largest number of leaders was "energy-efficient housing", with 77 percent (54 responses). The following were also indicated as "need more" more often than not:

- Owner-Occupied Housing
- Mixed-Use (residential and commercial)
- Senior Housing
- Universal-Design Housing

The following issues were most often ranked as "need met":

- Single-Family Housing
- Multi-Family Housing
- Low-Income Housing
- Moderate-Income Housing
- Larger Housing
- Smaller Housing
- High Density Housing
- Lower Density Housing

The only issue that was most often ranked as "need less" was "rental housing".

A statistical analysis of the survey responses and the population size of municipalities of responding leaders reveal a few weak to moderately significant relationships. The results indicate that as the population size of municipalities increases, the perceived need for more universal design, higher density, mixed-use, and senior housing increases. The relationship between population size and lower density housing revealed a weak negative relationship, indicating that as population size increases the perceived need for lower density housing decreases.[2]

Additionally, observations of the variance in responses by leaders of different population size communities finds that municipal leaders with larger populations appear to see more of a demand for a variety of housing types than their less populated counterparts. Leaders of less populated municipalities were more likely to respond that the need for most housing types is already met in their community. Leaders for communities with larger populations were more likely to see a need for mixed-used development and higher density housing. Although municipal leaders in the two larger population categories indicated a need for less or the need is met for rental housing, they were still more likely than their less populated counterparts to indicate a need for more of this type of housing.

The following are the top types of housing chosen as “need more” by the most respondents in each population size category:

<u>Under 1,000</u>

- Owner-Occupied Housing
- Single-Family Housing
- Energy-Efficient Housing

<u>Between 1,000 and 3,000</u>

- Owner-Occupied Housing
- Energy-Efficient Housing

<u>Between 3,000 and 10,000</u>

- Energy-Efficient Housing
- Senior Housing
- Universal-Design Housing

<u>Over 10,000</u>

- Energy-Efficient Housing
- Universal-Design Housing
- Mixed-Use (residential and commercial)

[2] See Appendix for a lengthier description and data for statistically significant results.

Table 3: Housing Types

Responses to, "Below is a list of common housing types that may or may not be located in your community. Taking into consideration the current conditions as well as the future needs of your municipality, please indicate the NEED for the following types of housing in your community. Please make your ratings on a scale from 1 to 9, where 1 indicates a need for less and 9 indicates a need for more. Use the number on the scale that best reflects how much of a need each type of housing is for your municipality." N=69

Housing Types	Need Less (1-4)	Need Met (5)	Need More (6-9)	Average Rating
Owner-Occupied Housing	2 (3%)	29 (41%)	39 (56%)	6.4
Rental Housing	31 (44%)	24 (34%)	14 (20%)	4.1
Single-Family Housing	3 (4%)	36 (51%)	31 (44%)	6.0
Multi-Family Housing	22 (31%)	31 (44%)	17 (24%)	4.5
Mixed-Use (residential & commercial)	11 (16%)	16 (23%)	43 (61%)	6.0
Low-Income Housing (households earn between 50% and 80% of area median income)	23 (33%)	33 (47%)	14 (20%)	4.3
Moderate-Income Housing (households earn between 80% and 120% of area median income)	6 (9%)	33 (47%)	31 (44%)	5.5
Senior Housing	8 (11%)	19 (27%)	43 (61%)	6.1
Universal-Design Housing (usable to the greatest extent possible by everyone, regardless of their age, ability, or status in life)	8 (11%)	17 (24%)	44 (63%)	6.0
Energy-Efficient Housing	5 (7%)	11 (16%)	54 (77%)	6.8
Larger Housing	13 (19%)	34 (49%)	22 (32%)	5.2
Smaller Housing	13 (19%)	42 (60%)	15 (21%)	4.9
Higher Density Housing	18 (26%)	30 (43%)	20 (29%)	4.8
Lower Density Housing	16 (23%)	40 (57%)	14 (20%)	4.8

Other Housing Types Specified as "Need More":

- Walkable Planned Unit Developments
- Starter Homes
- Newer Housing
- Housing Re-development Areas

Housing Challenges

Considering current conditions as well as future needs of their municipality, leaders were asked to indicate how much of a challenge is posed in their community by 13 common housing challenges. See Table 4 for aggregated results.

The issue that was rated as a challenge by the greatest number of municipalities was "absentee landlords", with 40 respondents (57 percent) indicating this as a challenge. The following were also indicated as a challenge more often than not:

- Physical Condition of Housing Stock
- Foreclosures
- Market for New Construction
- Market for Existing Homes
- Code Violations

The following issues were most often rated as "neutral", indicating that these are not challenges in these communities:

- Fair Lending Practices
- Access to Credit/Financing for Home Repairs/Purchase

The following issues were most often indicated as "not an issue":

- Housing Affordability
- Vacant Lots/Abandoned Buildings
- Obsolete Housing
- Access to Credit Education/Counseling
- Market for Rehabilitation

Although the last group of issues was rated most often as "not an issue", nearly as many communities rated them as a challenge, suggesting that all of these issues are a challenge in some communities while they are not in others. For example, although "housing affordability" was most often rated as "not an issue" (44 percent of respondents), a substantial number of communities still rated this as a challenge (22 respondents/31 percent).

The statistical analysis of the relationship between population size and the responses in this section reveals one statistically significant result - as the population size of municipalities increases, the perceived challenge of foreclosures increases[3].

Absentee landlords were rated as a challenge by most of the respondents in all size communities except in the lowest population category (under 1,000 persons). Fifty-seven percent of leaders in the smallest populated communities rated absentee landlords as "not an issue." By contrast, about sixty percent of respondents in the other three size categories indicated that absentee landlords are a challenge.

Leaders of different size communities chose different challenges more often than those chosen by the other size groups but all of the challenges are present in some communities, regardless of size. The following were the most often chosen challenges, by community size:

[3] See Appendix for a lengthier description and data for statistically significant results.

Under 1,000

- Market for Construction
- Market for Rehabilitation
- Code Violations

Between 1,000 and 3,000

- Absentee landlords
- Foreclosures

Between 3,000 and 10,000

- Absentee Landlords
- Code Violations

Over 10,000

- Foreclosures
- Absentee Landlords

Table 4: Housing Challenges

Responses to, "Below is a list of common housing challenges that you may or may not be facing in your community. Taking into consideration the current conditions as well as the future needs of your municipality, please indicate how much of a CHALLENGE is posed by each of the following housing issues in your community. Please make your ratings on a scale from 1 to 9, where 1 indicates no challenge and 9 indicates a serious challenge. Use the number on the scale that best reflects how much of a challenge each housing issue is for your municipality." N=70

Housing Challenges	Not an Issue (1-4)	Neutral (5)	Challenge (6-9)	Average Rating
Physical Condition of Housing Stock	28 (40%)	12 (17%)	30 (43%)	4.7
Fair Lending Practices	28 (40%)	30 (43%)	11 (16%)	4.1
Housing Affordability	31 (44%)	16 (23%)	22 (31%)	4.3
Foreclosures	22 (31%)	13 (19%)	35 (50%)	5.2
Absentee Landlords	23 (33%)	7 (10 %)	40 (57%)	5.3
Vacant Lots/Abandoned Buildings	34 (49%)	3 (4 %)	33 (47%)	4.6
Obsolete Housing	32 (46%)	16 (23 %)	21 (30%)	4.0
Access to Credit/Financing for Home Repairs/Purchase	24 (34%)	25 (36%)	21 (30%)	4.5
Access to Credit Education/Counseling	27 (39%)	25 (36%)	18 (26%)	4.3
Market for New Construction	24 (34%)	15 (21 %)	31 (44 %)	4.9
Market for Rehabilitation	27 (39%)	19 (27%)	24 (34%)	4.6
Market for Existing Homes	24 (34 %)	20 (29%)	25 (36%)	4.5
Code Violations	27 (39%)	7 (10%)	35 (50 %)	4.9

Other Housing Challenges Specified as Challenges:

• Rental inspection program

• Older homes (with only 1 bathroom and in need of lots of maintenance)

• Fair Housing

• Derelict rental property due to downturn in economy and the local builders under serious foreclosure from their banks.

Development

Survey respondents were asked to indicate how much of a need there is in their community for seven common types of development, considering current conditions as well as future needs of their municipality. See Table 5 for aggregated results.

All seven types of development listed were rated as "need more" more often than not. Retail development was the type most frequently placed in the "need more" category, with 76 percent of respondents indicating their community needs more of this type of development (53 responses). Locally owned business, restaurants and mixed-use development were also ranked as "need more" by nearly three-fourths of respondents.

The only two types of development that a majority of respondents did not indicate their communities need more of are industrial and hotel. These same two types of development also received the most responses for "need less".

The statistical analysis between population size and this group of responses reveals two significant relationships - as population increases the perceived need for more mixed-use development and locally owned businesses increases. [4]

Observations of the variance in responses by leaders of different population size communities finds that leaders of more populated communities were more likely to indicate that they need more of all types of development while fewer leaders in the smaller communities were interested all types of development. All types of development were chosen as "need more" by more than half of respondents in the "between 3,000 and 10,000" and "over 10,000" categories. Only "retail" development was indicated as "need more" by over half of respondents in the "under 1,000" category and "retail", "restaurant", "locally owned businesses" and "mixed-use" were chosen by 50 percent or more of respondents in the "between 1,000 and 3,000" category.

[4] See Appendix for a lengthier description and data for statistically significant results.

Table 5: Types of Development

Responses to, "Below is a list of common types of development that may or may not be located in your community. Taking into consideration the current conditions as well as the future needs of your municipality, please indicate the NEED for the following types of development in your community. Please make your ratings on a scale from 1 to 9, where 1 indicates a need for less and 9 indicates a need for more. Use the number on the scale that best reflects how much of a need each type of development is for your municipality." N=70

Type of Development	Need Less (1-4)	Need Met (5)	Need More (6-9)	Average Rating
Retail	5 (7%)	12 (17%)	53 (76%)	6.9
Restaurant	3 (4%)	18 (26%)	49 (70%)	6.7
Office	6 (9%)	24 (34%)	40 (57%)	6.1
Industrial	11 (16%)	27 (39%)	32 (46%)	5.6
Mixed-Use (residential & commercial)	7 (10%)	14 (20%)	49 (70%)	6.4
Hotel	13 (19%)	23 (33%)	34 (49%)	5.7
Locally-Owned Businesses	5 (7%)	15 (21%)	50 (71%)	6.6

Other Development Types Specified as "Need More":

- Medical facilities/doctors offices
- High traffic volume shows a need for service/supply types of businesses.
- Economic base needs more diversity
- Cultural land uses/specialty businesses

Public Works and Public Safety

Leaders were asked to indicate how strong of a priority it is to strengthen six public works and public safety categories. See Table 6 for aggregated results.

Again, all categories were rated as a "high priority" more often than not. Infrastructure was indicated as a "high priority" by the greatest number of municipalities, with 56 respondents (81 percent) indicating this as a priority.

Public services and public transportation access were marked as "not a priority" or "low priority" more often than the other categories. This does not necessarily mean that they are overall low priorities for the communities but could mean the municipality does not need to "strengthen" these services.

As with previous questions, there were minor differences in responses among communities of different sizes. Safety and policing, infrastructure, and public services were chosen by 50 percent or more of respondents in each population size category. Additionally, all but the smallest population size category had 50 percent or more of respondents indicating green spaces and public parks as a high priority and the two largest community size categories had 50 percent or more of respondents indicating walking and biking paths/trails as a priority. Only the between 3,000 and 10,000 category had 50 percent or more of respondents indicating public transportation access as a high priority.

The statistical analysis of responses by population size finds two significant results: First, among municipal leaders in the St. Louis region, the desire to strengthen infrastructure increases with population size. Second, leaders of larger communities express more interest in creating walking/biking trails.[5]

Table 6: Public Works and Public Safety

Responses to, "Below is a list of common public works and public safety categories. Taking into consideration the current conditions as well as the future needs of your municipality, please indicate how strong of a PRIORITY it is to strengthen the following public works and public safety-related categories. Please make your ratings on a scale from 1 to 9, where 1 indicates no priority and 9 indicates a high priority. Use the number on the scale that best reflects how much of a priority each infrastructure category is for your municipality." N=68

Public Works/Public Safety Category	No or Low Priority (1-4	Somewhat of a Priority (5)	High Priority (6-9)	Average Rating
Infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, lighting, etc.)	4 (6%)	9 (13%)	56 (81%)	7.2
Public Services (trash pick-up, infrastructure maintenance, snow removal, etc.)	17(25%)	8 (12%)	43 (62%)	6.1
Safety & Policing	11(16%)	8 (12%)	50 (72%)	6.6
Green Spaces and Public Parks	14 (20%)	13 (19%)	42 (61%)	5.8
Public Transportation Access	28 (41%)	15 (22%)	26 (38%)	4.7
Walking & Biking Paths/Trails	17 (25%)	13 (19%)	39 (57%)	5.8

Other Types of Public Works/Public Safety Priorities Specified as "High Priority":

- Utilities to meet the demand for future light industrial development.
- Storm water improvements
- Perception city is unsafe

Quality of Life Factors

Leaders were asked to what degree they agree that 11 quality of life factors need to be strengthened in their community. See Table 7 for aggregated results.

[5] See Appendix for a lengthier description and data for statistically significant results.

Most leaders agreed that all 11 factors need to be strengthened in their communities. "economic development" and "job creation" were most often indicated as needing to be strengthened (52 responses, 75 percent). Next, was overall quality of life (46 responses, 67 percent) and resident leadership/civic engagement (45 responses, 65 percent).

Examining responses by population size, the only quality of life indicator that was chosen as "need to strengthen" by 50 percent or more of respondents in each population size category was "economic development/job creation" and "overall quality of life". Each indicator was chosen as "need to strengthen" by at least one leader in each population category size, suggesting that communities have different areas they need to concentrate on strengthening.

The statistical analysis between population size and this set of responses reveals two significant relationships – as population size increases, the degree to which a leader agreed there is a need to strengthen economic diversity and racial/ethnic diversity increases. [6]

Table 7: Quality of Life Factors

Responses to, "Below is a list of some general quality of life factors. Taking into consideration the current conditions as well as the future needs of your municipality, please indicate how strongly you agree with the following statement, where the blank is filled in with each item in the list below. "We need to strengthen _______________ in my municipality." Please make your ratings on a scale from 1 to 9, where 1 indicates strongly disagree and 9 indicates strongly agree. Use the number on the scale that best reflects how much you agree with the above statement for each community development item. N= 67

Quality of Life Indicator	Strongly Disagree/ Do not Need to Strengthen (1-4)	Neutral (5)	Strongly Agree/Need to Strengthen (6-9)	Average Rating
Economic Diversity	3 (4%)	25 (36%)	40 (58%)	6.2
Racial & Ethnic Diversity	5 (7%)	32 (46%)	31 (45%)	5.7
Resident Leadership/Civic Engagement	5 (7%)	18 (26%)	45 (65%)	6.3
Quality of Schools	18 (26%)	18 (26%)	32 (46%)	5.4
Recreational Opportunities (swimming pools, athletic fields, trails, etc.)	15 (22%)	20 (29%)	33 (48%)	5.7
Cultural Resources (libraries, museums, theaters, etc.)	9 (13%)	20 (29%)	39 (57%)	6.0
Access to Basic Services (doctors, grocers, child care, etc.)	16 (23%)	23 (33%)	28 (41%)	5.4
Safe/Decent Housing Choices	16 (23%)	19 (28%)	33 (48%)	5.4
Economic Development/Job Creation	7 (10%)	9 (13%)	52 (75%)	6.7
Access to Jobs	10 (14%)	16 (23%)	42 (61%)	6.3

[6] See Appendix for a lengthier description and data for statistically significant results.

Overall Quality of Life	9 (13%)	12 (17%)	46 (67%)	6.4

Other Factors Specified as Need to be Strengthened:

• No high school in city

• Economic development efforts and exposure.

• After school programs and teen programs

Partnerships

Local government leaders were asked to indicate if they currently maintain a partnership with nine common types of partnering institutions for the purpose of development or implementing housing and community development plans or programs in their municipality. See Table 8 for responses.

A majority of municipalities indicated they maintain a partnership with school districts, neighborhood organizations, other units of local government and churches. Community development corporations and community action agencies were identified as partners least often. This is not surprising since there are a fewer number of these institutions overall as well.

Table 8: Partnerships

Responses to, "Please identify the institutions you currently maintain a partnership with for the purpose of developing or implementing housing and community development plans or programs in your municipality (check all that apply)." (N = 58)

Response Options	Number of Responses	Percent of Respondents
Community Development Corporations (CDCs)	10	16.9%
Community Action Agencies (CAAs)	12	20.3%
Lenders	18	30.5%
Anchor Institutions (e.g. hospitals, universities, corporations, etc.)	18	30.5%
School Districts	40	67.8%
Churches	29	49.2%
Neighborhood Organizations	33	55.9%
Recreational, Libraries, Cultural, and/or Community Centers	16	27.1%
Other Units of Local Government	30	50.8%

Other Partnerships Specified:

• Catholic grade school and public school district

• Trailnet,

• MFH (Missouri Foundation for Health)

• Great Rivers Greenway

• St. Louis County
• Non-for-Profits
• Developers/Realtors
• CDBG
• SAVES
• Adjacent communities and townships
• State Government

Types of Assistance

Local government leaders were asked to indicate what type of assistance would be most beneficial to their municipality. They were given nine choices with one of the choices being "no assistance needed" and were allowed to choose up to 3 responses. See Table 9 for responses.

"Financial resources" was the only assistance option chosen by a majority of respondents. Partnerships with local governments and technical assistance received the next highest number of responses.

Table 9: Types of Assistance

Responses to "Please indicate which of the following types of assistance would be MOST beneficial to your municipality when creating or implementing housing and community development plans or programs (you may select up to 3 responses)." (N=67)

Response Options	Number of Responses	Percent of Respondents
Technical Assistance	17	25.4%
Financial Resources	40	59.7%
Planning Assistance/Peer Review	11	16.4%
Policy Development	13	19.4%
Analysis and Assessment Assistance	9	13.4%
A How-to Road Map for Plan Development	14	20.9%
Community Partnerships	13	19.4%
Partnerships with Other Local Governments (e.g. cooperative agreements)	19	28.4%
No Assistance Needed	13	19.4%

Model Plans and Policies

Local government leaders were asked, *"Do you have any community development or housing plans/policies in your municipality that could serve as models for implementation in other parts of the St. Louis region?"*

Twelve leaders responded affirmatively and provided the descriptions listed in Table 10. The Housing Committee will be following up with these communities to gain a better understanding of the details of these polices and programs so they can serve as models for others in the region.

Table 10: Model Plans and Policies

Responses to, "Do you have any community development or housing plans/policies in your municipality that could serve as models for implementation in other parts of the St. Louis region?" Note: responses are paraphrased or reworded to maintain anonymity and combine responses. N = 12

Polices incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan
Subsidized home repair programs (2 responses)
City's transportation program for low income and senior residents
Masonry Ordinance
Form based codes for Downtown
Equity assurance programs
Complete Streets policy
Community gardens ordinance and seed money
Housing design and construction standards for new single-family construction
Home-ownership program that provides grants, education and social service-related services
Beyond Housing 24:1 Initiative
Retail development strategy
Local adoption and adaptations of International Building Codes including International Property Maintenance Code

Follow-Up

The last two questions on the survey asked leaders to provide their contact information if:

(1) They would like to see the results of the survey, in the aggregate. Forty-two responded affirmatively and were sent a copy of this report.

(2) They would be interested in discussing the topic in more detail with East-West Gateway staff. Eighteen responded affirmatively and will be followed up with on an individual basis.

Appendix: Statistical Analysis - Responses by Population Size

Due to the difference in the population size of the local governments in the region, additional analysis was completed to examine any variation in responses based on population. Additionally, the logarithm of population was calculated and correlations were run with each variable to correct for outliers. The statistically significant results of the correlations are in Table 11.

The results indicate that in most cases, responses do not appear to be affected by population size.

Statistically significant relationships were found between population size and the perceived need for the following types of housing:

- Universal Design (weak positive relationship)[7]
- Higher Density (moderate positive relationship)
- Lower Density (weak negative relationship)

To correct for outliers in population size, the natural logarithm of population was correlated with responses. In every case, the logarithmic transformation did not affect the direction of the relationship. However, the logarithmic transformation yielded more statistically significant correlations than did the initial correlation. The following statistically significant relationships were observed in the correlation between responses and log of population.

Housing Types: A positive relationship indicates as population size increases, the perceived need for more of the type of housing increases.

- Mixed-Use (weak positive relationship)
- Senior (weak positive relationship)
- Universal Design (strong positive relationship)
- Higher Density (moderate positive relationship)

Housing Challenges: A positive relationship indicates as population size increases, the perceived degree of the challenge increases.

- Foreclosures (weak positive relationship)

Types of Development: A positive relationship indicates as population size increases, the perceived need for more of the type of development increases.

---

[7] The strength of the relationship was indicated using the following rule of thumb: If r = +.70 or higher Very strong positive relationship, +.40 to +.69 Strong positive relationship, +.30 to +.39 Moderate positive relationship, +.20 to +.29 weak positive relationship, +.01 to +.19 No or negligible relationship, -.01 to -.19 No or negligible relationship, -.20 to -.29 weak negative relationship, -.30 to -.39 Moderate negative relationship, -.40 to -.69 Strong negative, relationship -.70 or higher Very strong negative relationship.

- Mixed-Use Development (weak positive relationship)
- Locally Owned Businesses (moderate positive relationship)

Public Works and Public Safety: A positive relationship indicates as population size increases, the perceived strength of the priority issue increases.

- Infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, lighting, etc.) (weak positive relationship)
- Walking and biking paths/trails (weak positive relationship)

Quality of Life Factors: A positive relationship indicates as population size increases, the perceived need to strengthen the factor increases.

- Economic Diversity (moderate positive relationship)
- Racial/Ethnic Diversity (weak positive relationship)

Table 11 shows the results of the correlations between responses and population. Relationships that were statistically significant at $p<.10$ are highlighted.

Table 11: Correlation of Population and Logarithm of Population and Survey Responses, Significant Results

Survey Indicator		2010 Population	Log of Population
Mixed Use Housing	Pearson Correlation	.164	.258*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.175	.031
	N	70	70
Senior Housing	Pearson Correlation	.161	.242*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.184	.044
	N	70	70
Universal Design Housing	Pearson Correlation	.297*	.434**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.000
	N	69	69
Higher Density Housing	Pearson Correlation	.308*	.372**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.002
	N	68	68
Lower Density Housing	Pearson Correlation	-.258*	-.065
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.031	.595
	N	70	70
Foreclosures	Pearson Correlation	.171	.265*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.157	.027
	N	70	70
Mixed Use Development	Pearson Correlation	.121	.296*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.318	.013
	N	70	70
Locally Owned Businesses	Pearson Correlation	.191	.350**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.113	.003
	N	70	70
Infrastructure	Pearson Correlation	.074	.251*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.545	.038
	N	69	69
Walking and Biking Paths/Trails	Pearson Correlation	-.041	.247*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.741	.041
	N	69	69
Economic Diversity	Pearson Correlation	-.004	.361**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.974	.002
	N	68	68
Racial Diversity	Pearson Correlation	-.175	.245*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.154	.044
	N	68	68

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).