

CONSOLIDATED PLAN SURVEY

City of Madison, Wisconsin

Kayley McCarthy – Community Development Intern

SNAPSHOT

- 1059 total respondents – includes City of Madison and greater Dane County
 - Previous survey - 373 resident, 138 partner (511 total)
- Survey and fliers available in English, Chinese, Hmong, and Spanish
- 36 Questions with two versions of survey for residents and community providers
- Respondents are residents of Dane County.
- Worked with the City's Community Connectors to share information with LatinX, Chinese, and Hmong residents
- Survey distribution & promotion:
 - 28+ groups/listservs received the information and passed it along
 - 1 news interview
 - 1 city blog
 - DPCED social media
 - Press release
 - CDD webpage
 - 2 Spanish radio shows

AGENDA

- Demographics
- Three Sections of Survey
 - Housing
 - Neighborhood Centers and Community Facilities
 - Business and Economic Development
- Closing Comments

This presentation reflects data for City of Madison only.



Let your voice be heard
In our community's future

Take the survey and help us prioritize federal funding for community development!

The City of Madison and Dane County want to know what you think about how we should spend money from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) over the next five years (2025–2029).

This money helps with things like:

- Affordable housing
- Economic and business development
- Neighborhood centers
- Access to resources

We need your help to figure out what our community needs most. Your ideas will help us decide where to focus our efforts.


This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete, and is available in English, Spanish, Hmong, and Chinese.

Scan the QR code or visit bit.ly/DaneConPlan2024



DEMOGRAPHICS


Figure 1. Age



- No youth input (zero reported 18 or less in the City of Madison).
- Ages 27 to 54 had the greatest participation

- White or European Descent made up over half the share of respondents
- Next 3 Largest Populations:
 - Chicano, Latino, or Hispanic
 - Southeast Asian
 - Black or African Descent

Figure 2. Race & Ethnicity



Respondents could choose multiple options.

- Majority of respondents are women.
- Males were the second largest population, followed by non-binary/genderqueer.

Figure 3. Gender





Figure 4. Household Size



- 2 person households are the most common living situation. Followed by 1 and 3 person.
- Households of 5 or greater are not as commonly reported.

- Majority of respondents took the survey in English.
- Chinese is second most reported.

Figure 5. Language






Figure 6. Annual Household Income



- Annual household income of \$100,001 to \$150,000 is most reported.
- \$50,001 to \$75,000 is second most common.
- Representation from a range of incomes is strong.

- Most respondents indicated their role in the community as resident.
- 14% reported as a Non-profit or other Community Service Provider.
- No local government staff, committee member, or public official were reported.


Figure 7. Roles in the Community



FUNDING PRIORITIES

Figure 8. Funding Priorities Community Partners vs. Residents

- Housing is ranked as number 1 priority among community partners and residents.
- Residents next most frequent priorities:
 - Public Infrastructure
 - Community and Social Services
- Community Partners next most frequent priorities:
 - Community and Social Services
 - Business and Economic Development




Respondents were asked to rank each category 1 through 5 in order of funding importance. This chart reflects the categories that were ranked most commonly as number 1 of importance.

HOUSING

- Homeowners make up over half the respondents, with renters as the second most reported living situation.
- Responses of those who selected Other:
 - Housing Cooperative
 - Living with a family member
 - Senior Housing

Figure 9. Resident Living Situation



Do you consider your current housing to be affordable to you?

Figure 10. Housing Affordability






Figure 11. Reported Reasons for Housing Unaffordability



- Most reported their housing to be affordable, however 202 respondents make an annual household income of \$100,001 or greater (Figure 6).
- Among reasons for unaffordable housing, increases in cost of living, property taxes, and rent were most frequently selected.


Figure 12. Barriers to Living in Preferred Location



- Most indicated they are living in their preferred location of those who live in the City of Madison.
- Most common barriers to living in preferred location:
 - Housing that is available is unaffordable
 - It is too competitive to find a place to live
 - Poor conditions of housing
- 21% of those living outside of the City of Madison would like to live in the City.

**NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS AND
COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

Figure 14. Programs & Services Top Priorities



Top 3 Neighborhood & Community Center Programs & Services:


1. Access to services available at the center – food pantry, essentials pantry, computer lab, phone, etc.
2. Afterschool and summer programming for children and youth
3. Information and referral services – connecting individuals and families to service providers (i.e. housing, crisis intervention & prevention, etc.)

Respondents were asked to select three programs/services that were most important to invest in. This chart reflects the categories that were selected most often.

Figure 15. Community Development Priorities

Top 3 Community Development Priorities:

1. Maintain staffing and support of services in neighborhood centers & Improve public infrastructure
2. Support community leaders & organizations to engage with neighbors, build community, and understand processes
3. Improve existing neighborhood centers and non-profit facilities




Respondents were asked to select one activity related to community development, leadership, and engagement that is most needed.

BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Figure 16. Business Development Activities Ranked Number 1

Top 3 Business Development Actions ranked 1st in priority:

1. Assist established business owners from historically marginalized communities.
2. Financial & technical assistance for business cooperatives.
3. Support business incubator organizations.




Respondents were asked to rank each category 1 through 5 in order of funding importance. This chart reflects the categories that were ranked most commonly as number 1 of importance.

Figure 17. Workforce Development Funding Needs

Top 3 Workforce Development
Actions for Lower-Income
Persons:

1. Access to childcare options to attend job training & education.
2. Paid job training to individuals facing barriers to employment.
3. Transportation subsidies to travel to/from employment



Respondents were asked to select three programs/services that were most important to invest in. This chart reflects the categories that were selected most often.

CLOSING COMMENTS

“Housing and childcare are the two greatest issues that need to be addressed.”

“Please continue to fund services for individuals & families struggling with the effects of trauma.”

“Continue programs for low-income families to receive grants or loans as first-time home buyers.”

“Housing costs are very high. Rent has increased while wages stay stagnant.”

“Equitable services for older adults.”



QUESTIONS?