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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This baseline report represents a critical piece of the long-term evaluation of this HOPE VI project. In order to determine the degree to which the redevelopment of Taunton’s Fairfax Gardens catalyzed positive change among residents and in the community, it is necessary to develop a comprehensive picture of where HOPE VI residents, their neighborhood, and the city currently stand. The evaluation team has used existing data, qualitative information gathered from interviews, and results from two original surveys to provide a thorough understanding of pre-development conditions. Such an understanding is not just important for the evaluation team’s ability to measure change; beyond that, this report has the potential to serve as a valuable tool that can be used by THA and its partners to inform decision-making, programming, and outreach as the HOPE VI project moves forward.

Baseline findings are reported across two major areas: HOPE VI residents and the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood. Frequently, citywide data is also presented in order to provide context.

Key findings – HOPE VI residents

- Among HOPE VI residents, there is a much larger proportion of children as compared to the City of Taunton, representing key opportunities where Community and Supportive Services (CSS) is concerned.
- A higher proportion of HOPE VI residents have high school diplomas than adults citywide, but far fewer have college degrees. Still, many have completed some college, representing another key opportunity in the area of college completion.
- Despite the many problems reported with their units at Fairfax Gardens, HOPE VI residents were generally satisfied with their former housing situations.
- Transportation is the most significant employment barrier, and the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood is not particularly walkable.
- Mental health issues are experienced by a significant proportion of HOPE VI residents, and there is significant interest in counseling services to address these concerns.
- HOPE VI residents do not consider their neighborhood particularly close-knit, and very few are engaged in civic activities.
- Unemployment is the most significant quality of life issue, while drug sales and use present the biggest safety concern.
- A slight majority (56 percent) of HOPE VI residents have relocated to Census tracts with higher concentrations of poverty (an average of 18.8 percent, compared to 13.8 percent in the tract encompassing Fairfax Gardens).

Key findings – Fairfax Gardens neighborhood

- In general, the neighborhood around Fairfax Gardens closely resembles the City of Taunton.
- More neighborhood residents consider the community to be closely knit as compared to perceptions of HOPE VI residents.
- Unemployment and drugs are the most significant quality of life and safety concerns, respectively, but to a lesser degree than HOPE VI residents reported.
- The potential economic impacts of this project are most likely to affect the city’s downtown, and may address commercial vacancy in the area around Parcel 6A.
- The area's housing market experienced a significant downturn over the past five years (much like the city and the rest of the country), with some Census tracts around Fairfax Gardens proving more resilient than others.
- Crime at Fairfax Gardens changed significantly in 2010, perhaps as a result of Operation Diesel (which targeted the drug trade at the development).
- Access to services and amenities is much better around Parcel 6A, representing an important opportunity for the transit-dependent to relocate to a place with fewer transportation barriers.
1.0 OVERVIEW

1.1 Baseline report overview

The evaluation of Taunton Housing Authority’s HOPE VI project will span the next four years, beginning with this presentation of baseline data and concluding with a final report to be issued in early 2016. The evaluation is intended to qualitatively and quantitatively assess the project’s impact on 1) original residents of Fairfax Gardens; 2) the neighborhoods surrounding both the original Fairfax Gardens site and nearby Parcel 6A; and 3) the sites of redevelopment. Throughout the project, the Urban Initiative will also work with THA to conduct a process evaluation that will be used to provide THA and project partners with ongoing feedback on the progress of this HOPE VI project toward the goals of THA and HUD.

In order to report on this project’s impacts on HOPE VI residents and the surrounding community when redevelopment has been completed and the newly built units are occupied, the Urban Initiative necessarily began the evaluation process with the collection and analysis of baseline data that provides a point of comparison against which to measure future change.

This report represents the Urban Initiative’s months-long effort to establish objective, quantitatively driven baselines, measure and present baseline data, and document methodology to ensure consistency when impacts are measured in future years.

1.2 Site & development overview

Located on DeWert Avenue about a mile west of downtown Taunton, Fairfax Gardens is a distressed, aging housing development of 150 barracks-style family units. Built in 1951 on a 15-acre site, Fairfax Gardens is described by the THA as “a center of drug activity in the region.” Fairfax Gardens is located within Census tract 6134.

Parcel 6A is an undeveloped 6.86-acre lot in downtown Taunton, located within U.S. Census tract 6138, bounded by the Greater Attleboro-Taunton Regional Transit Authority (GATRA) bus station to the northwest, railroad tracks to the northeast, Porter Street to the southeast, and Mason Street to the southwest.

For maps of these sites, see Appendix A.

The HOPE VI plan calls for 160 new mixed-income units split between the two sites. The old units at the Fairfax Gardens site will be demolished, and 88 new townhouse units will be constructed in their place. At Parcel 6A, 72 new apartment units and townhouses will be built.

Of the total 160 units, 16 units (10 percent of the total) will be handicapped-accessible, and 131 units (82 percent) will be handicapped-visitiable. 103 units will be ACC (Annual Contributions Contract) units under which the federal government provides annual subsidies in exchange for a commitment from THA to maintain the units for low-income residents. 37 units will be Section 8 PBV (Project-Based Voucher) units, and 10 units will be market-rate units.

---

1 Taunton Housing Authority HOPE VI application.
1.3 Definitions

**HOPE VI residents:** refers to original residents of Fairfax Gardens who are part of the HOPE VI caseload.

**CSS:** Community and Supportive Services

**THA:** Taunton Housing Authority

**Fairfax Gardens neighborhood:** Generally defined as the area within one mile of the Fairfax Gardens development. Depending on the availability of data, this may mean just the area within a one-mile radius, an aggregation of the Census tracts that encompass and surround Fairfax Gardens, or the area that is commonly considered to be part of that neighborhood. This report will specify which distinction applies as necessary.

**Census tracts:** When referred to collectively, this means tracts 6133, 6134, 6138, 6139.01, and 6140. See Appendix A-1 for a map of these tracts.

**Evaluation team:** Refers to the Urban Initiative staff.
2.0 HOPE VI RESIDENTS – BASELINE DATA & ANALYSIS

2.1 Overview of purpose, methods, sources

One of the goals of any HOPE VI project is to support positive outcomes for residents of both the original and redeveloped housing units in the areas of housing quality, neighborhood quality, economic opportunity, and personal self-sufficiency. Because THA is also participating in the ‘With Every Heartbeat Is Life’ (WEHL) initiative, an additional resident-level goal is achieving gains in health awareness and outcomes among residents.

In order to measure this project’s impact on the achievement of these goals, the Urban Initiative has used a combination of surveys and secondary data analysis to develop a baseline profile of HOPE VI residents across these areas (notes on methodology and sources accompany data as presented). Baselines established in this report will provide points of comparison when measuring degrees of outcome change at the conclusion of the evaluation effort.

The presentation of resident baseline data is organized into eight sections: 1) a demographic and socioeconomic profile of HOPE VI residents; 2) a compilation of information available on resident children, who comprise 57 percent of the total resident population; 3) civic engagement among residents; 4) an accounting of residents’ present needs related to the CSS aspect of this project; 5) baseline data on health interests and needs; 6) perceptions and conditions of housing at Fairfax Gardens (before relocation); 7) neighborhood conditions in and around Fairfax Gardens; and 8) poverty conditions in the neighborhoods to which HOPE VI residents have relocated. The redevelopment of Fairfax Gardens necessarily involves the temporary or permanent relocation of families to other neighborhoods, cities, and even states.

2.2 Demographic & socioeconomic profile of HOPE VI residents

(Note: Unless otherwise noted, demographic and socioeconomic data for HOPE VI residents was provided by THA through their Tracking-At-A-Glance program, which tracks both data and survey results for all active members of the HOPE VI caseload. Data sources include a November 2011 needs assessment, the December 2011 plan, and THA, who provided additional data as needed during July 2012; tables and figures are labeled accordingly.)

As of December 2011, there were 140 households and 397 individuals classified as the HOPE VI resident population. By July 2012, the number of households had dropped to 136, while the total number of individuals in the HOPE VI caseload had increased to 411.

2.2.1 Age and gender

As compared to the City of Taunton, the population of HOPE VI residents is disproportionately young and female. As of December 2011, more than half of all residents were 18 years old and younger, whereas children represent one-quarter of the city’s population. See Table 2-1 for a breakdown of age both among Fairfax Gardens and for the City of Taunton as a whole.
Table 2-1. Age breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% of HOPE VI residents</th>
<th>% of Taunton residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 18 and under</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 19-64</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: December 2011 CSS Plan

The population of HOPE VI residents is disproportionately female as compared to the population of Taunton, as Table 2-2 shows:

Table 2-2. Gender breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of HOPE VI residents</th>
<th>% of Taunton residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: THA, July 2012

2.2.2 Race/ethnicity

The population of HOPE VI residents is far more diverse than that of Taunton, a city where 84.5 percent of residents are White and not Hispanic. Table 2-3 compares the racial and ethnic composition of HOPE VI residents to the population of Taunton:

Table 2-3. Race/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>% of HOPE VI residents</th>
<th>% of Taunton residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, not Hispanic</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, not Hispanic</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: THA, July 2012

---

2 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS)
3 Note: ACS age breakdown is for 20-64, so data is not perfectly comparable.
4 Source: 2010 US Census
5 Source: Taunton Housing Authority. Here, and elsewhere, numbers may not total 100%.
6 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey
2.2.3 Education

The preponderance—84.6 percent—of HOPE VI adult residents have at least a high school diploma or equivalent, a proportion slightly higher than the population of Taunton (81.6 percent). However, far fewer HOPE VI residents have a Bachelor’s degree compared with the city as a whole. See Table 2-4 for a breakdown of adult educational attainment among HOPE VI and Taunton residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of HOPE VI residents</th>
<th>% of Taunton residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school diploma</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma/GED</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: December 2011 CSS Plan

2.2.4 Employment & income

Excluding persons with disabilities, 25.8 percent of HOPE VI adults ages 19-64 were employed in December 2011, and this number had increased to 32.1 percent by July 2012. Meanwhile, data from the November 2011 needs assessment shows that 11.4 percent of all heads of household were employed full-time, and another 32.9 percent held part-time positions. (More employment data from this survey can be found in section 2.5.1.)

According to the December 2011 CSS Plan, all but one percent of HOPE VI households earn less than 30 percent of area median income. Average HOPE VI household income is $10,808, which is just 16.7 percent of Taunton’s average (mean) household income of $64,664. Nearly half of all HOPE VI households count Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) aid as the primary source of household income. Figure 2-1 provides a breakdown of primary sources of household income among HOPE VI residents:

Source: December 2011 CSS Plan

---

7 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey
8 Note: Includes those with an Associate’s degree.
9 Based on updated TAAG data provided by HOPE VI case management staff.
10 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey
2.3 **Civic engagement**

According to November 2011 survey data collected by THA, 41.4 percent of heads of household were presently registered to vote, while another 21.8 percent expressed interest in voting. Just 4.3 percent of households reported belonging to any social or community organizations. Meanwhile, 15 percent of households were then working with at least one supportive services agency (other than THA).

2.4 **Children**

As of December 2011, there were 226 children among HOPE VI residents, comprising 56.9 percent of the HOPE VI population. (In Taunton, 22.6 percent of the population is under 18.) Because many aspects of this project relate to their specific needs (including early childhood education and afterschool programming), it is important to record baseline data specific to this cohort so that the long-term impact of this project on children can be measured accurately.

Table 2-5 breaks down the population of HOPE VI youth by age. Notably, one-third of HOPE VI youth are not old enough to be enrolled in full-time public school, making early childhood education and daytime childcare important considerations for this project. For the other two-thirds, after-school and summer enrichment represent opportunities for CSS programming. Indeed, in the needs assessment that informed the December 2011 CSS plan, it was reported that 64 percent of youth were in need of more after-school options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% of all HOPE VI youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 0-5</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-12</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 13-18</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: December 2011 CSS Plan

Other reported needs surrounding HOPE VI youth included drug prevention programs (70 percent), performing arts programs (63 percent), and, for the 27 percent of youth in the 13-18 age bracket, education surrounding safe sex and birth control (56 percent). For more data surrounding the needs of children and their families, see section 2.5.4.

2.5 **Resident needs**

Because providing CSS to promote residents’ capacity to become increasingly self-sufficient is a foundational element of this HOPE VI project, THA conducted a resident needs assessment in November 2011 to assess baseline levels of need across the following categories: employment and job training, job preparation activities, education, transportation, childcare, health, housing, finances, legal, and ‘other.’ (Note: survey data regarding health and housing are presented in sections 2.6 and 2.7, respectively.) Data from the November survey is supplemented by information provided by THA in the December 2011 CSS plan (figures are labeled accordingly).
## 2.5.1 Employment & job training

Employment is an acute need, particularly with regard to the goal of promoting self-sufficiency among HOPE VI residents. According to THA’s November 2011 survey, 44.3 percent of heads of household were presently employed; 25.8 percent of that group held full-time jobs, while 74.2 percent were employed part-time. Among all non-disabled adults, 32.1 percent were employed by July 2012.

**Figure 2-2. Head of household employment**

![Head of household employment chart](image)

Source: November 2011 survey

Meanwhile, 34.3 percent of respondents were actively seeking a job at the time of the survey, and 43 percent of that group (one-quarter of all heads of household) expressed a desire for assistance in doing so. Heads of household are not without barriers to employment: a full 40 percent expressed that they are not able to work, while other challenges reported included childcare problems (15.7 percent), transportation issues (25 percent), and others not specified by survey questions (20.7 percent).

**Figure 2-3. Barriers to employment**

![Barriers to employment chart](image)

Source: November 2011 survey
A number of questions highlighted opportunities to meet residents’ needs through job training and other job preparation activities (at the time of the survey, just 10 percent of respondents were enrolled in a job training program). One-quarter (25.7 percent) of heads of household did not know how to fill out a job application at the time of the survey, while almost two-thirds (61.4 percent) did not have a current resume. In addition to filling these gaps, job training could address the fact that 17 percent of respondents expressed interest in vocational training, 19.3 percent had interest in owning a business, and nearly 10 percent reported interest in training specific to construction work. And as the December 2011 CSS plan shows, 72 percent of all adult residents (ages 19-64) expressed interest in job/vocational training as well as employment placement.

### 2.5.2 Education

THA’s November 2011 survey also highlighted specific needs concerning residents’ education. Not only do 36.4 percent of heads of household (and 15.4 percent of all HOPE VI adult residents) lack a high school diploma or GED, but many also report having difficulty reading (23.5 percent) and doing basic math (15.7 percent). More than one-quarter (27.9 percent) responded needing help with English. Since just 7.9 percent of heads of household were enrolled in adult education programs at the time of the survey, this represents an area of significant opportunity where CSS programming is concerned. Indeed, 20 percent of all HOPE VI adults reported GED/adult education as a need.

#### Figure 2-4. Educational needs

![Educational needs chart]

Another notable opportunity is college completion: 18.6 percent of all HOPE VI adult residents have completed some college, so the obstacles to earning a Bachelor’s degree have the potential to be significantly lessened for this group of residents.

### 2.5.3 Transportation

Among heads of household, 70.7 percent have a current driver’s license and 60 percent have access to an insured, registered car. Assuming that the feedback from heads of household
reflects the transportation options for all HOPE VI residents, this would suggest that 40 percent have no access to a vehicle, though they may have the capacity to drive.

Meanwhile, December 2011 data shows that 22 percent of all HOPE VI adults have transportation needs like obtaining bus passes and securing drivers’ licenses.

### 2.5.4 Childcare

Children ages 18 and under comprise a significant proportion of HOPE VI residents—56.9 percent—while young children (ages 0-5) make up one-third of that group. Just 18 percent of households do not have a child living there. It is thus unsurprising that childcare represents a significant area of need for heads of households.

Indeed, while 45.5 percent of households with children need childcare in order to attend work or school, not all respondents had a friend or relative available to provide childcare. One limitation of the November 2011 survey is that while participants were asked about their children’s enrollment in afterschool programs, daycare, and Head Start, information on whether or not those participants had children eligible for such programs is lacking. (For example, it is difficult to extract meaning from the fact that 17 percent of households had children in Head Start when that question was asked without accounting for whether households included preschool-aged children.)

#### Figure 2-5. Childcare needs

![Bar chart showing childcare needs]

When asked about parenting skills classes, 7 percent of households expressed interest in participating.

### 2.5.5 Financial and legal needs

Questions regarding financial and legal needs of heads of household revealed limited legal needs but some key opportunities for financial education. Fewer than half of all Fairfax Gardens households have formal banking relationships: only 42.1 percent reported having checking accounts, while 31.4 percent reported having savings accounts. Most households
(93 percent) are able to pay bills on time, and 78 percent do so. Relatively few households carry credit card or loan debt (just 11.4 percent of households reported having each type). Nevertheless, 16.4 percent of households expressed interest in participating in credit repair support.

Very few legal needs were evident among heads of household. Fewer than 2 percent of respondents have ever been convicted, and no respondents were currently on parole (just one was on probation at the time of the survey). Three percent of households expressed interest in domestic violence counseling, while none were interested in gambling counseling.

2.6 Health

THA is participating in the ‘With Every Heartbeat is Life’ initiative to bolster health awareness and outcomes among HOPE VI residents. As part of WEHL, THA administered a health survey (in person, by mail, and by phone) to HOPE VI residents to compile baseline levels that may be impacted by program participation. That survey asked about existing medical conditions, behaviors, access to health services, and interests/needs around health education and support. (It should be noted that these results may reflect some degree of selection bias: respondents may have participated in the survey because they are already invested in achieving positive health outcomes for themselves and their families, so these results may skew healthier than the aggregate population of HOPE VI residents.)

Among the 49 survey respondents, the most prevalent health condition was hypertension, which has been diagnosed in 19 percent. Other conditions reported included diabetes (10.4 percent), high cholesterol (10.4 percent), and heart disease (2 percent). Notably, family histories of these conditions were reported at rates ranging from 25-50 percent. Just over half (52 percent) of respondents report doing some degree of physical activity. Over 80 percent of participants have access to “healthy food,” while almost 90 percent prepare home-cooked meals most or all of the time. Dining at fast food establishments is only an occasional behavior for 73 percent of respondents, while 25 percent never do so. Just over 70 percent of respondents do not smoke, and 96 percent support a smoke-free policy for the new development (none considered it a serious issue).

Regarding medical services and access thereto, only 2 percent of respondents did not have medical insurance at the time of the survey. Over 80 percent reported having both resources for prescriptions and medical emergencies, while a lesser proportion—60.4 percent—reported having a “medical home.”

Finally, the WEHL survey asked about the most important health issues in HOPE VI residents’ community. The choice that received the most responses was obesity (73 percent), followed by high cholesterol (58.3 percent), heart disease (52 percent), and stroke (43.8 percent).

Meanwhile, the November 2011 assessment reveals information about access to health and dental services (Figure 2-6), medical conditions experienced by heads of household (Figure 2-7), and support needs related to medical conditions (Figure 2-8).
In addition to the challenges and needs reported in the November 2011 survey, the December 2011 CSS plan also notes that 48 percent of all adult HOPE VI residents expressed a need for services to alleviate stress, anxiety, or depression, which corresponds to the fact that mental health services...
were most needed in the November 2011 survey as well. And though almost 80 percent of heads of household reporting getting regular dental checkups, among all adult residents, 47 percent reported routine dental care as a need.

### 2.7 Housing

Because the target site for any HOPE VI project must be a severely distressed public housing development, the evaluation team used surveys to gather baseline data on HOPE VI residents’ housing conditions at the original Fairfax Gardens development. With contact information and assistance provided by THA, the survey was administered by mail to all HOPE VI heads of household in early June 2012 (see the letter sent by THA to all households in Appendix D-1). An initial low response rate prompted THA case management staff to begin administering the survey by phone and in person. Questions were adopted from HUD’s HOPE VI Evaluation Instructions and Resources Guide,

\[11\] which will make findings in Taunton comparable to those of other HOPE VI sites.

#### 2.7.1 Limitations

As of August 31, a total of 51 surveys were successfully completed and returned to the Urban Initiative for analysis. The response rate for this survey (38 percent) is consistent with that for THA’s previous surveying effort (WEHL, 36 percent).

#### 2.7.2 Findings

Questions regarding housing asked participants about overall conditions and satisfaction, as well as specific issues like heating and plumbing systems, peeling paint, and vermin.

Satisfaction and perceived housing conditions varied considerably among respondents. For example, 61 percent were either very or somewhat satisfied with their unit at Fairfax Gardens, while 28 percent reported dissatisfaction. Meanwhile, 28 percent considered the conditions of their units to be poor, while only 14 percent felt their unit was in excellent condition. See Figures 2-8 and 2-9 for results on these questions.

![Figure 2-8. Satisfaction with unit at Fairfax Gardens](image-url)

---

Regarding specific conditions, the problem experienced by most respondents was peeling paint/broken plaster, experienced by 43 percent of households. Rat/mice infestations were the least problematic among all respondents, experienced by 12 percent. Figure 2-10 details the degree to which these and other conditions affected participants’ units at Fairfax Gardens.

2.8 Neighborhood conditions

Along with documenting baseline housing conditions, the survey tool employed by the evaluation team also asked HOPE VI heads of household to report on conditions in the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood. These questions were also adopted from the HOPE VI Panel Study;\(^\text{11}\) they were also the same questions used in the survey conducted among residents of the area surrounding Fairfax Gardens to allow for comparisons across not just different HOPE VI projects, but also across

\(^{11}\) Ibid., Appendix D.
different stakeholder groups within Taunton. (For results of the neighborhood resident survey, see section 3.4.3).

Survey questions regarding neighborhood conditions fell into four categories: social and civic engagement, quality of life, safety, and access to amenities (which is discussed further in section 3.8). Results are presented both in the following narrative as well as in Appendix D-2, which includes response frequencies for each question.

2.8.1 Social and civic engagement. Two-thirds of HOPE VI households who participated in the survey reported having at least a few family members or friends living in the same neighborhood. Notably, 71.4 percent had no family members in the same neighborhood. When asked questions about connections with and perceptions of their neighbors, respondents provided a picture of a community that is not particularly close-knit or participatory. Indeed, just 26 percent agreed with the statement, “This is a close-knit neighborhood,” only 10.2 percent agree that their neighbors can be trusted, and just 14.3 percent feel that their neighbors share the same values. Just one-third of respondents feel that people in the neighborhood generally get along with one another. Still, 42 percent felt that their neighbors showed a willingness to help one another, and over 80 percent reported having either helped or been helped by a neighbor with a household or yard chore. And while few report sharing coffee or a meal with neighbors (45 percent have never done so), 80 percent would stop and chat with a neighbor at least a few times a year.

Along with loose social ties, respondents do not report being particularly engaged in formal community activities. Just 8.2 percent have done any volunteering in the past year (though one-quarter report working to improve the neighborhood over the past year), while three-quarters do not belong to a church or other religious group.

Finally, participants were asked about whether they feel their neighbors would intervene when quality-of-life issues arise in the community. Relative to other responses, respondents felt particularly strongly that a neighbor would intervene if they saw a fight break out (56 percent thought a response would be likely), while 48 percent believed that a neighbor would do something if they saw children showing disrespect to an adult.

2.8.2 Quality of life. The most problematic quality of life issue flagged by respondents was unemployment, which was considered a “big problem” by 47 percent. See Figure 2-11 for responses to questions concerning quality of life.

### Figure 2-11. Degree to which quality of life issues are problematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Big problem</th>
<th>Some problem</th>
<th>No problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen pregnancy</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School quality</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fairfax Gardens HOPE VI Evaluation—Baseline report
2.8.3 Safety. Safety questions referred to issues like gangs, drugs, and violence. Based on responses to these questions, the issue perceived as the biggest problem was people selling drugs, which was considered a “big problem” by 71 percent of survey participants. Figure 2-12 details responses to safety questions.

Figure 2-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Big problem</th>
<th>Some problem</th>
<th>No problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People selling drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of people hanging out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shootings/violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being attacked/robbed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police not coming when called</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional questions were asked regarding drugs and shootings, and findings were that 42 percent saw people using or selling drugs during the last 30 days during which they lived at Fairfax Gardens, while 58 percent heard gunshots during that time. Meanwhile, respondents were asked how safe they felt both outside their unit at Fairfax Gardens at night, as well as inside their unit and alone at night. A majority—58.8 percent—felt unsafe being alone while outside their unit at night, while fewer—44.4 percent—felt unsafe being alone inside their unit at night.

Access to services/amenities. As section 3.8.1 details, about 40 percent of HOPE VI households lack access to a car. Unsurprisingly, 52 percent felt that public transportation was at least somewhat problematic. A majority of respondents (64 percent) can reach a bus stop within 15 minutes, though 10 percent report that this takes 30 minutes to an hour. Just 44 percent could reach a grocery store from Fairfax Gardens within 15 minutes, while 20 percent needed between 30 minutes and an hour to access their preferred grocery store. Access to respondents’ doctor/clinic/hospital ranged from less than 15 minutes (37 percent) to 16-45 minutes (49 percent) for most.

2.9 Relocation

While it is the goal of THA that many HOPE VI residents will return to one of the two new housing developments, households have had the opportunity to relocate to either other public housing developments in Taunton or to non-public housing through a Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8). A voucher offers households the opportunity to relocate to private rental housing in a community of each household’s choosing, and it thus offers households the opportunity to move to neighborhoods with less poverty, safer neighborhoods, and better schools than the community in and around their previous home at a distressed housing complex (in this case, Fairfax Gardens).
When the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released its final report on the impact of its decade-long Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program in 2011, it noted that for those who left high-poverty neighborhoods for lower poverty communities, particularly strong benefits were seen in the areas of physical and mental health. Other gains were seen in housing quality, the creation of social ties, and feelings of safety among those who relocated to low-poverty communities.

Knowing that leaving relatively high-poverty communities like Fairfax Gardens, where 99 percent of households earn less than 30 percent of area median income, for communities with lesser concentrations of poverty can lead to positive long-term impacts for families, the Urban Initiative will endeavor to track poverty levels in the Census tracts to which HOPE VI households relocate between initial relocation and the point at which the new housing developments are relocated.

Baseline data on these efforts necessitate an important caveat: the smallest geographic area for which poverty in the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood can be measured is Census tract 6134, which includes just a few dense, urban blocks like Dewert Avenue and could otherwise be described as having a suburban feel. Indeed, the median household income in this tract is $66,500, and the poverty rate is 13.8 percent. This makes the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood atypical among HOPE VI communities, where even a 22 percent poverty rate is cited as being abnormal. Among the HOPE VI neighborhoods included in the Urban Institute’s HOPE VI Panel Study, the average baseline poverty rate was 43 percent. So because the baseline poverty rate is abnormally low and does not reflect the conditions of concentrated poverty at Fairfax Gardens, post-relocation data will show a particularly high preponderance of households moving to neighborhoods of higher poverty.

Indeed, based on addresses current as of late July 2012, 43.6 percent of households relocated to neighborhoods of lower poverty, while 56.4 percent moved to communities where there is a higher proportion of individuals living below the poverty level than the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood. (Fairfax Gardens is located in Census tract 6134, where 13.8 percent of all individuals live below poverty.) The average poverty rate in HOPE VI residents’ new neighborhoods is 18.8 percent, a 36 percent increase from Fairfax Gardens. For individual households, concentrations of poverty in current neighborhoods range from 2 percent to 62.3 percent.

Looking at the child poverty rate provides a depiction of the neighborhood that gives a closer approximation of the baseline concentration of poverty at Fairfax Gardens. In tract 6134, 25.6 percent of individuals under the age of 18 were living below the poverty level in 2010. As of July 2012, 47 percent of households had relocated to neighborhoods with lower concentrations of child poverty. The average child poverty rate is 26.7 percent, a 4 percent increase from the rate in the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood.

---


16 Source: 2010 Census
In addition to analyzing poverty in HOPE VI residents’ new neighborhoods, the evaluation team also included survey questions aimed at gauging the degree to which heads of household plan to return to the new development upon reoccupancy. Among respondents, 26 percent currently plan to return, while 40 percent did not know at the time of participation. Questions were also asked about eligibility for returning, and it was found that 30 percent either did not receive information regarding eligibility or did not know whether they had or not. Meanwhile, 68 percent felt the eligibility rules had been made clear, representing an opportunity for THA to provide more education to 32 percent of participants. Nevertheless, despite information gaps, a full 84 percent reported feeling confident that they would meet the eligibility requirements for returning to the new development (12 percent didn’t know, while just two households answered “no”.

3.0 FAIRFAX GARDENS NEIGHBORHOOD – BASELINE DATA & ANALYSIS

3.1 Overview

Along with improving outcomes for public housing residents, HOPE VI is intended to generate spillover effects that extend to the broader neighborhood surrounding the physical developments. Summarily, the evaluation team seeks to answer the following questions:

- To what extent has the HOPE VI project catalyzed change in the neighborhood?
- How has the neighborhood changed in the areas of community and economic development?
- To what extent has this project affected quality of life in the neighborhood?

Because baseline data is necessary to the evaluation team’s future ability to answer those questions at the conclusion of this HOPE VI project, we have compiled quantitative and qualitative data that establishes the metrics against which change will be measured.

The evaluation team used a mixed-methods approach to compiling such data. First, secondary data was compiled from local and national data sources which are cited as applicable. Second, new data was collected through an extensive surveying effort that polled residents of the surrounding neighborhood on existing conditions. Finally, qualitative information was gathered through key informant interviews in order to better understand the landscape in which future change will be measured.

3.2 Defining the neighborhood

As is the case with almost any community, defining a neighborhood presents significant challenges. For the people living and working in an area, neighborhood names and boundaries are typically subjective and highly variable. As the evaluation team found while conducting door-to-door surveys in Taunton, even some people living adjacent to the Fairfax Gardens site do not consider the development part of their neighborhood. Meanwhile, Census tracts, streets, and geographic features serve to define neighborhood boundaries in objective—though not always colloquially accurate—ways.

To address this challenge, the evaluation team used a multi-pronged approach to collecting neighborhood baseline data. First, when determining the population to be sampled in surveying efforts, we began by including all households within one mile of Fairfax Gardens, including those living in the community surrounding Parcel 6A. Our second step was to work with the HOPE VI project team to narrow the sampling frame by identifying blocks within that radius that are considered by neighborhood and city residents to be part of the larger neighborhood to which Fairfax Gardens belongs.

The process of defining the neighborhood is a bit less straightforward when determining the area of focus for secondary data. Five Census tracts are included within a one-mile radius of Fairfax Gardens, yet they are represented disproportionately. (See Appendix C-1) For the purposes of this baseline report, we have presented the data in two ways: by including the entire populations of each Census tract—6133 (which includes Shores Street, the northern
border of the Fairfax Gardens parcel), 6134 (the tract in which Fairfax Gardens is located), 6139.01, 6140 (the neighborhood due east of Parcel 6A), and 6138 (which includes Parcel 6A), and also by using geographic information systems (GIS) to select only the secondary data that applies to households within the one-mile radius of Fairfax Gardens. Whenever possible, data representing both approaches is presented in this section, while disaggregated Census tract data can be found in the Appendix. This approach ensures that even if Census tract boundaries change in the future, compiling data within the one-mile radius maintains consistency and allows information to be directly comparable.

3.3 Demographic & socioeconomic profile of neighborhood residents

As of the 2005-09 American Community Survey, there were approximately 4,727 people living within one mile of Fairfax Gardens. This means that about 8.5 percent of Taunton residents live in close proximity to this HOPE VI project.

3.3.1 Age & gender

The median age of residents in the five census tracts located within a mile of Fairfax Gardens ranges from 33.3-42 years old, compared to a median age of 39.3 years citywide. Generally, the area around Fairfax Gardens is quite similar to Taunton as a whole where age is concerned. See Table 3-1 for a breakdown of ages within a mile of Fairfax Gardens:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>% of neighborhood</th>
<th>% of HOPE VI residents</th>
<th>% of Taunton residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 18 and under</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 19-64</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, the neighborhood around Fairfax Gardens is quite representative of the City of Taunton in respect to gender. A gender breakdown of the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood (based on a one-mile radius) is provided in Table 3-2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of neighborhood</th>
<th>% of HOPE VI residents</th>
<th>% of Taunton residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 Source: 2010 US Census
14 Source for one-mile radius: 2005-09 American Community Survey; age breakdown for this data is based on under 18/19-64, so slight discrepancies may exist.
15 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey
16 Note: ACS age breakdown is for 20-64, so data may not be perfectly comparable.
17 Source: 2010 US Census
See Appendix B-1 for tabular and graphical representations of this data.

### 3.3.2 Race/ethnicity & immigration

The neighborhood surrounding Fairfax Gardens, like the City of Taunton, is a predominately non-diverse neighborhood with 84 percent of residents identified as White. Within a one-mile radius of Fairfax Gardens, 9 percent of the population is African American and 3 percent is Hispanic. See Appendix B-2 for the distribution of race and ethnicity in the Census tracts around Fairfax Gardens.

An estimated 12 percent of the residents of tracts 6133, 6134, 6138, 6139.01 and 6140 were born outside of the United States. More data on immigration is available in Appendix B-3. Twenty percent of residents in the neighborhood speak a language other than English at home and 8.5 percent of neighborhood residents speak English “less than very well”. Appendix B-3 contains this data.

### 3.3.3 Education

Educational attainment in the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood is nearly identical to that of the entire city, as demonstrated by the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of neighborhood</th>
<th>% of HOPE VI residents</th>
<th>% of Taunton residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school diploma</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma/GED</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree+</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more data and figures on educational attainment, see Appendix B-4.

### 3.3.4 Employment & income

Almost 50 percent of households within one mile of Fairfax Gardens earn less than $50,000 per year. Around 30 percent of all households earn between $50,000 and $100,000, while 20 percent of households earn over $100,000. In the City of Taunton, 46.5 percent of households earn less than $50,000 per year, 32.5 percent earn between $50,000 and $100,000, and 20.9 percent of households earn over $100,000.

---

18 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey
19 Source: 2005-2010 American Community Survey (one-mile radius)
20 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey
21 Note: Includes those with an Associate’s degree.
Unemployment rates have varied widely as a result of the state of the economy and are thus difficult to capture accurately on the neighborhood level. It is thus likely that the unemployment rate obtained through American Community Survey data is actually higher. Across the five Census tracts being measured, the average rate for the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood across 2006-10 was 7 percent. Tracts 6138 and 6139 had the highest rates of unemployment. (More data is available in Appendix B-5.)

The neighborhood poverty rate is less consistent across the tracts. Tract 6133 has the lowest poverty rate at 4.2 percent, while in tract 6138, 21.5 percent of residents are living in poverty. The aggregation of all tracts shows a poverty rate of 12.3 percent, and the one-mile-radius similarly demonstrates that 12.1 percent of all individuals are living below the poverty line. See Appendix B-6 for figures depicting neighborhood poverty.

### Neighborhood conditions & perceptions

#### 3.4.1 Methods

Developing a baseline measure of neighborhood conditions and perceptions is perhaps one of the most important activities when setting out to measure the long-term impact of HOPE VI on the surrounding community. This step has resulted in a quantifiable way to describe how neighborhood residents feel about the community in which they live, which will prove an important point of comparison at the completion of this project. After all, as the evaluation team learned early on in our efforts to survey residents, there are many negative perceptions surrounding DeWert Avenue, as it has long been associated with drugs and violence in the minds of Taunton residents, and many Fairfax Gardens neighbors have stories to tell about incidents at Fairfax Gardens that have affected their quality of life. By surveying residents before the existing development is razed, and returning after both new developments are fully occupied, we will be able to determine the degree to which the HOPE VI investment has improved outcomes for the people living nearby.

To accurately measure neighborhood conditions and perceptions from the point of view of people living in the community surrounding Fairfax Gardens (and, to a lesser extent, Parcel 6A), the evaluation team developed a survey tool based on those used for the evaluations of other HOPE VI projects.\(^\text{27}\) Notably, many questions asked of neighborhood residents were

---

\(^{26}\) This amount reflects mean household income, as median amount was not available.

\(^{27}\) US Department of Housing and Urban Development. *HOPE VI Evaluation Instructions and Resources.* Version 5 – 5.6.08.
the same questions asked of HOPE VI residents, a step that provides stakeholders with an opportunity to compare results and appropriately address discrepancies.

Members of the evaluation team administered surveys door-to-door over five weeks. Because the Fairfax Gardens site was being vacated for demolition over that period, survey participants were asked to answer their questions as though the development were still at full occupancy in order to most accurately capture the conditions of the neighborhood before redevelopment. The preponderance of households within the evaluation team’s sampling frame were located within one mile of Fairfax Gardens, though a small subset of this sample included streets immediately adjacent to Parcel 6A as well.

A total of 502 doors were knocked on and 104 residents responded, producing a survey response rate of 20.7 percent.

Because the intention is to conduct a follow-up survey upon full occupancy of the new developments at Fairfax Gardens and Parcel 6A, it is important to clearly document the protocols we used when conducting the survey so that follow-up efforts can be replicated. See Appendix E for the survey instrument, the evaluation team’s methodology, and the city blocks in which surveys were conducted.

### 3.4.2 Limitations

Three demographic data points were collected to determine the degree to which survey participants were representative of the larger neighborhood. Despite the evaluation team’s thorough attempts to give every household in neighborhoods within a mile of Fairfax Gardens an equal chance of participating, respondents do not necessarily reflect the demographics of the neighborhood in a way that allows results to be completely generalizable to the entire population surrounding Fairfax Gardens. For example, 62 percent of respondents were female, which is disproportionately higher than the neighborhood as a whole (where 51.6 percent of all residents are female). Survey respondents skewed older than the neighborhood, with 18 percent ages 65 and over (compared to 12 percent neighborhood-wide). One area in which respondents were particularly representative of the neighborhood is education attainment: 36 percent of respondents had a high school diploma or GED (compared to 34.7 percent across the neighborhood), while 19 percent held a Bachelor’s degree or higher (versus 20.7 percent neighborhood-wide).

While survey results were not weighted to reflect discrepancies in representativeness, it is nevertheless important to acknowledge these differences and the potential impacts they have on participants’ responses.

### 3.4.3 Findings

Neighborhood residents were asked questions across five categories: social and civic engagement, quality of life, safety, access to amenities, and awareness of the HOPE VI project. While many results are presented in the narrative below, response frequencies for each question can be found in Appendix E-1.
**Social and civic engagement.** Seventy-one percent of respondents have at least a few family or friends living in the same neighborhood, while 29 percent have no family or social connections in the immediate vicinity whatsoever. Based on survey responses, the neighborhood appears to be characterized by weak ties among neighbors: while 64 percent never share coffee or a meal with one another, almost 87 percent chat with neighbors at least occasionally. When asked about their degree of agreement with the statement, “This is a close-knit neighborhood,” 55.2 percent agreed, 9.5 percent remained neutral, and 29.5 disagreed. On the question of trust, just 18.1 percent disagreed that people in the neighborhood could be trusted, while 86 percent report that neighbors generally get along with one another.

Despite weak ties, there is evidence of supportive relationships among community members. Seventy-five percent of respondents have either helped a neighbor or received help from a neighbor with household or yard work. Indeed, just 15.3 respondents disagreed with the statement, “People around here are willing to help their neighbors.”

Participants communicated varying degrees of confidence that their neighbors would respond to quality-of-life concerns in the community. While it was reportedly likely that a neighbor would respond to seeing graffiti being painted or a fight breaking out, there was less confidence that a neighbor would respond when children skipped school or showed disrespect to an adult.

**Quality of life.** Quality of life conditions that were assessed in the survey included unemployment, teen pregnancy, school quality, graffiti, and garbage. Of those issues, the most problematic was reported to be unemployment, which 28.6 percent of respondents felt was a “big problem.” Figure 3.1 shows the degree to which quality of life conditions were considered to present problems for the neighborhood.

![Figure 3-1. Degree to which quality of life issues are problematic](image)

*Note: “Don’t know” responses are not included in this figure and in Figure 3-2.*
**Safety.** Regarding questions of safety, the issue that was reported to be most problematic was people selling drugs, which 28.6 percent considered a “big problem.” In fact, the same proportion of respondents reported seeing people using or selling illegal drugs in their neighborhood over the past 30 days. Gangs and groups of people hanging out were less likely to be reported as problematic by neighborhood residents, while issues like robbery and violence were considered by most to pose some problem to the community. Over the last 30 days, 23 percent of participants reported having heard gunshots in the neighborhood. Figure 3-2 provides additional data on questions of safety in the neighborhood.

**Figure 3-2. Degree to which safety issues are problematic**

Despite the safety issues expressed by respondents, most (80 percent) feel at least “somewhat safe” outside their homes at night. Even more (93.3 percent) feel safe when alone inside their homes at night.

**Access to services/amenities.** As section 3.8.1 will describe, the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood is car-dependent, with 86 percent of residents choosing to commute by car. This is reflected in the finding that just 23.1 percent of respondents felt that public transportation presented any problems. For over 80 percent of respondents, it takes less than 15 minutes to reach the nearest bus stop, though 10.5 percent did not know where the nearest bus stop was located. Meanwhile, almost 90 percent can reach their preferred grocery store in less than 15 minutes. It takes respondents slightly longer to reach the doctor or hospital they visit most frequently—72.4 percent can access health services in less than 15 minutes, while another 16.2 percent must travel 16-30 minutes.

**Perceptions/awareness of HOPE VI.** For the most part, respondents were aware that existing units at Fairfax Gardens were being demolished, though one-third were unfamiliar with the details of this project. Most respondents learned of HOPE VI through the newspaper (36.1 percent) or word-of-mouth (32 percent). When asked whether the HOPE VI project would affect their neighborhood, 65 percent agreed. Meanwhile, 52.5 percent felt that this effort would benefit the neighborhood. Another 27.2 percent either had no opinion or did not know, while 20.2 percent anticipate a negative impact.
3.5 Economic development

Because it is anticipated that this HOPE VI project may affect a number of economic development indicators, the evaluation team measured baseline data across four areas: land use, current and future projects under development, a profile of the commercial sector, and business vacancy rates across the relevant Census tracts.

3.5.1 Land use

A map of current land use is available in Appendix A-2.

3.5.2 Current & future projects

In order to learn more about current and future economic development projects and initiatives, the evaluation team met with Kevin Shea, Executive Director of the city’s Office of Economic and Community Development (OECD). Shea’s office works across a diverse set of issue areas: economic development done in conjunction with other agencies like the Taunton Development Corporation (which manages the city’s industrial parks) and MassDevelopment; Brownfield rehabilitation; managing Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds; coordinating downtown improvement projects; and supporting housing development and rehabilitation.

Shea provided some examples of projects across these areas that are currently underway or in development. They included the use of federal HOME Investment Partnerships Program and Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds for renovating a vacant downtown property and converting it to multiple units of affordable housing, streetscaping and infrastructure improvements downtown, a façade improvement program, and partnering with Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) like Pro-Home to rehabilitate vacant properties and sell to first-time homebuyers.

While Shea noted that the preponderance of economic development activity in Taunton has historically emphasized the Miles Standish Industrial Park, increasing attention is being paid to the city’s downtown. A business improvement district (BID) focuses its efforts on this area, and planned improvements to the downtown may combine with a growing population (as a result of development at Parcel 6A through this HOPE VI project) to reduce retail vacancy in downtown Taunton.

While retail vacancy is reportedly a challenge in the downtown, OECD is shifting its efforts away from direct support to small businesses, which it previously provided through a lending program. (The exception to this shift is the façade improvement program being launched.) Instead, small business developers can access services and support through the Taunton-based South Eastern Economic Development Corporation (SEED), which provides loans and technical assistance, as well as the city’s Chamber of Commerce and the local chapter of SCORE.

Two projects loom on Taunton’s horizon, and both have tremendous potential for dramatic impacts to the city where economic development is concerned. First, South Coast Rail, the effort aimed at extending a commuter rail line from Boston to Taunton and points south,
stands to create a direct link to a major hub of employment and resources, and could also contribute to transit-oriented development around the station to be developed in Taunton. While initial estimates projected ground breaking in 2016, the timeline is now uncertain. Meanwhile, Taunton voters recently approved a plan by the Mashpee Wampanoag tribe to develop a casino in the city, a development that is projected by the tribe to bring in as much as $512 million in annual revenues.²⁹

3.5.3 Profile of commercial sector

As of May 2012, there were an estimated 1,417 businesses operating within a one mile radius of Parcel 6A.³⁰ Among those for which data was available, median sales for these establishments was $402,000, and the median number of employees per business was 3. The following table displays the breakdown of commercial establishments as classified by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), a standard used by federal agencies to measure the business sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>24.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four largest sectors in the one-mile radius are Health Care and Social Assistance (24.42 percent), Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (12 percent), Other Services (except Public Administration) (11.29 percent), and Construction (8.96 percent). The Health Care and Social Assistance field employs 3,526 people and has median sales of $597,000. The second largest sector in the radius Professional, Scientific and Technical Services employs 573 people and has median sales of $334,000. The third largest sector, Other Services, employs 852 people and has median sales of $190,000. Construction is the fourth largest sector within a mile of Parcel 6A, employing 551 people and has median sales of $600,000. Three sectors have median sales over one million; Information ($1,257,000); Wholesale Trade ($2,556,000); and Mining, Quarrying and Oil and Gas Extraction ($4,131,000).

### 3.5.4 Business vacancy

The graph below (Figure 3-3) shows the percentages of vacant business units in the five relevant census tracts and Bristol County. At the conclusion of the third quarter of 2010, each tract had a higher vacancy rate than that of Bristol County. Tract 6133 saw the greatest increase in vacancy from quarter 4 of 2009 to quarter 1 of 2010, jumping to near 25 percent. All other tracts were more consistent, falling between 13-17 percent at the conclusion of the third quarter of 2010.

#### Figure 3-3. Proportion of business units that are vacant

![Proportion of business units that are vacant](image)

### 3.6 Housing market

Like the rest of the city, state, and country, the housing market in the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood was dealt a major blow between 2006 and 2010. There is a good deal of variance across the five Census tracts being measured in this report, with some tracts faring much better and others appearing to bear the brunt of the housing crash impacts.

---

31 Source: HUD Aggregated USPS Administrative Data on Address Vacancies, via PolicyMap.
3.6.1 Profile of housing stock

There are 1,901 housing units within a one-mile radius of Fairfax Gardens.\(^{32}\) This represents almost 8 percent of the housing stock of the City of Taunton, which stood at 23,896 as of the 2010 US Census. See Table 3-6 for a breakdown of total number of housing units for each of the five Census tracts being tracked for evaluation purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census tract</th>
<th>Total number of housing units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td>2,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6138</td>
<td>2,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9,957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the one-mile radius of Fairfax Gardens, 40 percent of the housing stock\(^{34}\) is comprised of single-family homes (11.7 percent of these homes are attached). Forty percent of housing units in this neighborhood are contained in small apartment buildings, 15 percent are characterized as two-unit homes and duplexes, and nearly 4 percent are units in large apartment buildings. See Figure 3-4 for a breakdown of housing types in the neighborhood.

Appendix C-3 breaks down housing stock by year of construction.

---

24 Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey
25 Source: 2010 Census
26 Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey
3.6.2 Housing occupancy

Based on data for a one-mile radius around Fairfax Gardens, 8 percent of properties are vacant, as compared to a vacancy rate of 6.5 percent across the City of Taunton. Census tract 6133 has the highest proportion of vacant homes—22 percent—while tract 6139.01 is 95 percent occupied (see Appendix C-4). Sixty-one percent of homes are occupied by the property owner, and the remaining 39 percent are occupied by renters (a figure is available in Appendix C-4).

3.6.3 Home values

The median home values in the five Census tracts around Fairfax Gardens range from $235,100 to $313,000. After aggregating all five tracts, 38 percent of home values fall in the range of $200,000 to $299,999, with another 33 percent between $300,000 and $399,999. Comparatively, the median home value for Taunton is $285,200.

See Appendix C-2 for more data and figures on home values in the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood.

3.6.4 Home sales

On average, home sales in the area around Fairfax Gardens are slightly more robust than home sales citywide. In 2010, 3.9 percent of Taunton’s total housing stock was sold, while the average across the five Census tracts being measured was 4.5 percent (across tracts, proportions of units sold ranged from a high of 8.4 percent in tract 6139 to a low of 1.0 percent in tract 6138). See Figure 3-5 for home sales trends by Census tract between 2006-2010. Tables presenting raw data are available in Appendix C-5.

Figure 3-5. Number of annual home sales, 2006-10

---

35 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey
27 Source: Boxwood Means, Inc. via PolicyMap
Given the turmoil experienced by the housing market nationwide, median sale prices correspondingly dropped along with the number of sales between 2006-10. Census tract 6133 had the highest median sales price during this span, with a five-year average of $255,754 (tract 6139 had the lowest at $203,217). All tracts experienced significant declines in median sales price, with the most significant decline—40 percent—in tract 6138. This is almost double the decline seen across Bristol County, which was 23 percent during that span. Figure 3-6 demonstrates these trends; see Appendix C-5 for more data on median sale prices.

![Figure 3-6. Median home sale prices, 2006-10](image)

### 3.6.5 Home lending

Like baseline data on home sales, home lending reflects the impact of the housing market crash on the neighborhood surrounding Fairfax Gardens with a sharp decline in lending between 2006-10. Nevertheless, the five Census tracts that comprise and surround Fairfax Gardens were home to 43.5 percent of all mortgages originated in Taunton during 2010. Once again, tract 6133 had the highest five-year average of annual loan originations (258), while tract 6138 had the lowest (55). Figure 3-7 demonstrates five-year trends in the number of loans originated in each of the relevant tracts, and the full data set can be found in Appendix C-6.

---

28 Source: Boxwood Means, Inc. via PolicyMap
In 2010, 0.85 percent of loans originated in Taunton were considered high-cost. However, no high-cost loans were originated in any of the Census tracts being measured. Also in 2010, the majority of loans originated in both Taunton and the Census tracts of interest were for the purpose of refinancing (see Appendix C-6).

### 3.6.6 Rental Market

In FY2012, fair market rent for a 3-bedroom dwelling in Taunton is $1,245.\textsuperscript{39} American Community Survey five-year estimates from 2006 to 2010 show that 35 percent of rents in the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood are in the range of $800 to $1,249. Additional rental market data can be found in Appendix C-7.

### 3.7 Crime

Fairfax Gardens constitutes its own crime-reporting area, and when compared to the City of Taunton, the former has significantly higher rates of crime. The Taunton Police Department classifies crime into two broad categories: Part 1 crimes include murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, theft, and auto theft, while Part 2 crimes include destruction/vandalism, disorderly conduct, drug/narcotic violations, simple assault, and weapon law violations. In 2011, the Part 1 crime rate (based on incidents per 1,000 persons) in Taunton was 27.7, while the rate at Fairfax Gardens was 45.3. Burglary incidents were reported much more frequently in Fairfax Gardens, with a rate of 27.7, as compared to Taunton’s citywide rate of 8.6.

With three years of crime data made available for analysis, there are some interesting trends to note. For example, the Part 2 crime rate in Fairfax Gardens jumped between 2009-10, then dropped significantly in 2011. Meanwhile, Part 1 crimes dropped dramatically between 2009-10, then returned to a rate close to that of 2009 by 2011. One possible explanation for these notable changes, which

\textsuperscript{29} Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), via PolicyMap

happened while the citywide crime rates remained relatively static, is the Taunton Police Department’s Operation Diesel, a sting that targeted heroin and crack cocaine dealers in and around Fairfax Gardens and led to the arrest of 55 suspects.

Crime rates and trends are presented below in Figure 3-8; additional data can be found in Appendix C-1.

Figure 3-8. Crime rates (incidents per 1,000 people) by type, 2009-11

3.8 Community services and amenities

In general, the location of Fairfax Gardens makes for difficult access to services and amenities, particularly for residents of the original development and surrounding neighborhood who are without access to a car. Access issues will be significantly mitigated for about 45 percent of HOPE VI households that will occupy the new development at Parcel 6A upon its completion, due to this site’s proximity to the city’s downtown, shopping plazas, and a bus terminal.

For the purposes of this baseline analysis, the services and amenities being inventoried include transportation, public services provided by municipal government, amenities, and civic/social organizations.

3.8.1 Transportation

Transportation is a service that is critical to fulfilling the HOPE VI project goals. Reliable transportation impacts access to and availability of many other services and amenities. In a study of a HOPE VI-funded public housing community in New York, car ownership was the most significant factor related to family economic self-sufficiency, more so than the

30 Source: Taunton Police Department
presence of children or the degree of work experience. As noted in section 2.4.3, as many as 40 percent of HOPE VI households may not have access to a car.

 Particularly for households that lack access to a car, public transit and neighborhood walkability are especially important to ensure HOPE VI residents’ ability to attend classes and trainings, get to work, buy groceries, fill prescriptions, attend school and community events, and access health and social services.

 One way to objectively measure the degree to which a neighborhood promotes the ability to reach services and amenities on foot is through a recently developed measure called a “Walk Score.” This score ranges from 0-100 and is based on an algorithm that integrates an address’s proximity to amenities like restaurants, grocery stores, parks, and banks. Using the address of 100 DeWert Avenue, which maps at approximately the center of the Fairfax Gardens development, the existing development receives a walk score of 25 (designation: “car dependent”). This compares to a citywide average of 37. Sixty-three percent of Taunton residents have a higher Walk Score than former Fairfax Gardens residents. Meanwhile, the score corresponding to the neighborhood of Parcel 6A (using an address of 79 Mason Street, which is adjacent to the site of the new development) is 86, which corresponds to a designation of “very walkable.” Walking distances to basic amenities are listed by site in section 3.8.3.

 Census data reveals that few residents of Census tract 6134, which includes Fairfax Gardens, commute on foot or via public transportation. For residents in this tract, the average commuting time is 28 minutes, and the overwhelming majority of commuters—86 percent—drive alone to work. Only 1.5 percent of residents utilize public transit in their commute to work. See Table 3-7 for a breakdown of how residents of tract 6134 commute to work:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Means</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public transit is limited for the transit-dependent, though the level of service is not dissimilar to that of peer cities. The Greater Attleboro-Taunton Regional Transit Authority (GATRA), whose Taunton terminal is located adjacent to Parcel 6A, provides bus service to the region. The Fairfax Gardens site is currently serviced by one bus stop, and on weekdays, a bus arrives hourly starting at 6:04 and ending at 6:04p. Saturday service is also hourly, starting at 9:04a and ending at 5:04p.

43 Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey.
3.8.2 Public services

Public services as measured by proximity\textsuperscript{44} include police stations, fire stations, hospitals, Post Offices, schools, and libraries. Again, Parcel 6A enjoys closer proximity to public services:

Fairfax Gardens site, approximate distance in miles to nearest:
- Police station: 2.3 (Summer Street Station)\textsuperscript{45}
- Fire station: 0.6 (Kilmer Ave. Station)
- Hospital: 1.3 (Morton Hospital)
- Post Office: 1.26
- School: 0.46 (Lowell M. Maxham Elementary)
- Library: 1.26

Parcel 6A site, approximate distance in miles to nearest:
- Police Station: 0.63 (Summer Street Station)
- Fire Station: 0.6 (Kilmer Ave. Station)
- Hospital: 0.55 (Morton Hospital)
- Post Office: 0.42
- School: 0.32 (H.H. Galligan Elementary)
- Library: 0.45

3.8.3 Amenities

Fairfax Gardens site, approximate distance in miles to nearest:
- Restaurant: 0.61 (D’Angelo sandwich shop)
- Coffee: 0.74 (Honey Dew Donuts)
- Groceries: 0.8 (Shaw’s supermarket)
- Pharmacy: 0.79 (Rite Aid)
- Park: 1.13 (Mill River Park)
- Banking: 0.58 (First Citizens Fed)

Parcel 6A site, approximate distance in miles to nearest:
- Restaurant: 0.23 (Subway)
- Coffee: 0.26 (Dunkin’ Donuts)
- Groceries: 0.23 (Save-a-lot)
- Pharmacy: 0.47 (Rite Aid)
- Park: 0.32 (Mill River Park)
- Banking: 0.34 (Bank of America)

\textsuperscript{44} Note: unless otherwise noted, all distances are measured via walkscore.org.
\textsuperscript{45} Note: a police substation was located at Fairfax Gardens before the development was vacated.
Fairfax Gardens site, approximate distance in miles to parks and recreation facilities (for map, see Appendix A-3):

- Davol Field: 0.50
- Mill River: 1.06
- Old Colony YMCA: 1.12
- Boys & Girls Club: 1.17

Parcel 6A site, approximate distance in miles to parks and recreation facilities (for map, see Appendix A-4):

- Davol Field: 0.50
- Mill River: 0.32
- Old Colony YMCA: 0.27
- Boys & Girls Club: 0.36

Fairfax Gardens site, approximate distance in miles to childcare facilities:

- Head Start: 2.21
- Preschool: 0.82 (Pine Street Preschool)

Parcel 6A site, approximate distance in miles to childcare facilities:

- Head Start: 1.36
- Preschool: 0.18 (Pine Street Preschool)

In addition to the aforementioned childcare sites, the Southeast and Cape Regional Office of the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) is located at 1 Washington Street. EEC provides or coordinates income eligible childcare subsidies, supportive child care, teen parent child care services, and other services.

### 3.8.4 Social, civic, and religious institutions and organizations

Opportunities for associational relationships that build social capital and promote civic engagement may be found in both religious and non-religious contexts. One church is located within one-half-mile of the Fairfax Gardens site, and four more are located within about a one-mile radius of the site. About a dozen churches may be found within one-half-mile of the Parcel 6A site.

Nearby ethnically oriented social clubs include the Italian Naturalization Club (located within the neighborhood of Parcel 6A), Clube Espírito Santo (within one mile of both development sites), the Portuguese American Civic Club, the Polish American Citizens Club, and the Italian Social Club.

Finally, the Taunton Safe Neighborhood Initiative oversees a neighborhood watch group (the Shores Street Area group) whose territory encompasses both Fairfax Gardens and Parcel 6A. The group meets once monthly at the Olney Street Senior Center (located adjacent to THA’s main office) to discuss crime and public safety issues. Based on conversations with Safe Neighborhood Initiative Program Advisor Jennifer Bastille, the preponderance of neighborhood watch meeting attendees live north and east of Fairfax Gardens, and historically, meetings have not been attended by residents of Fairfax Gardens.
APPENDIX A: Maps

A-1 Census tracts and Fairfax Gardens one-mile radius
A-2 Land use
A-3 Park and recreation sites near Fairfax Gardens
A-4 Park and recreation sites near Parcel 6A
A-2. Land use (via MassGIS)
A-3. Park and recreation sites near Fairfax Gardens

A-4. Park and recreation sites near Parcel 6A
**APPENDIX B: Fairfax Gardens neighborhood resident data and figures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-1</th>
<th>Age distribution of neighborhood residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Race and ethnicity of neighborhood residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Immigration and language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>Income and employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6</td>
<td>Poverty rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B-1.1. Age as percentage of population, by Census tract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tract 6133</th>
<th>Tract 6134</th>
<th>Tract 6138</th>
<th>Tract 6139.01</th>
<th>Tract 6140</th>
<th>All Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 and under</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and up</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B-1.2. Age as percentage of population, by Census tract

B-1.3. Age distribution of neighborhood residents, 1 mile radius
B-2.1. Race distribution of neighborhood residents, by Census tract

B-2.2. Race distribution of residents, aggregate of all Census tracts

B-2.3. Race distribution of residents, one-mile radius
B-3.1. Foreign-born population of neighborhood, all tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign-born Population</th>
<th>6133</th>
<th>6134</th>
<th>6138</th>
<th>6139.01</th>
<th>6140</th>
<th>All Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>7433</td>
<td>3755</td>
<td>3623</td>
<td>2697</td>
<td>4218</td>
<td>21726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Pop Foreign Born</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B-3.2. Foreign-born population of neighborhood, all tracts

```
+-----------------+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+---------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language spoken at home</th>
<th>6133</th>
<th>6134</th>
<th>6138</th>
<th>6139.01</th>
<th>6140</th>
<th>All Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>6930</td>
<td>3444</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>2501</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>20357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
B-4. Educational attainment, by Census tract

- **Graduate or professional degree**
  - 1 Mile Radius: 6.5%
  - All Tracts: 14.2%

- **Bachelor's degree**
  - 1 Mile Radius: 8.4%
  - All Tracts: 17.8%

- **Associate's degree**
  - 1 Mile Radius: 12.0%
  - All Tracts: 34.7%

- **Some college, no degree**
  - 1 Mile Radius: 10.4%

- **High school graduate (includes equivalency)**
  - 1 Mile Radius: 34.7%

- **9th to 12th grade, no diploma**
  - 1 Mile Radius: 10.4%

- **Less than 9th grade**
  - 1 Mile Radius: 8.3%
**B-5.1. Household income, aggregate of all tracts**

![Pie chart showing household income distribution for all tracts.](image)

- <$10,000 to $49,999: 2%<br>- $50,000 to $99,999: 13%<br>- $100,000 to $149,999: 30%<br>- $150,000 to $199,999: 5%<br>- $200,000 or more: 51%

**B-5.2. Household income, one-mile radius**

![Pie chart showing household income distribution for one-mile radius.](image)

- <$25,000: 1.40%<br>- $25,000 to $50,000: 32.54%<br>- $50,000 to $100,000: 19.59%<br>- $100,000 to $200,000: 23.51%<br>- >$200,000: 22.95%

**B-5.3. Unemployment rate, all tracts**

![Bar chart showing unemployment rate for all tracts.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6133</td>
<td>6134</td>
<td>6138</td>
<td>6139.01</td>
<td>6140</td>
<td>All Tracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B-6.1. Poverty rate, all individuals, by Census tract

B-6.2. Poverty rate, Census tract aggregate vs. City of Taunton
APPENDIX C – Neighborhood crime & housing

C-1  Crime
C-2  Home values
C-3  Housing profile
C-4  Housing occupancy
C-5  Home sales
C-6  Home lending
C-7  Rental market

C-1. Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1 Crimes</th>
<th>Fairfax Gardens</th>
<th>City of Taunton</th>
<th>Fairfax Gardens</th>
<th>City of Taunton</th>
<th>Fairfax Gardens</th>
<th>City of Taunton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part 1 Crimes</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select Part 2 Crimes</th>
<th>Fairfax Gardens</th>
<th>City of Taunton</th>
<th>Fairfax Gardens</th>
<th>City of Taunton</th>
<th>Fairfax Gardens</th>
<th>City of Taunton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction/Vandalism</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Narcotic Violations</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Assault</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon Law Violation</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Select Part 2 Crimes</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C-2.1. Median home values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td>$309,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td>$313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6138</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139.01</td>
<td>$235,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140</td>
<td>$275,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Taunton</td>
<td>$285,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-2.2. Assessed home values, aggregate of all tracts

- <$10,000 to $99,999: 4%
- $100,000 to $199,999: 6%
- $200,000 to $299,999: 9%
- $300,000 to $399,999: 10%
- $400,000 to $499,999: 33%
- $500,000 to $749,999: 38%
- $750,000 or more: 1%
C-3. Year of Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 or Later</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2004</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-4.1 Housing vacancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
<th>% Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6138</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139.01</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Tracts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mile Radius</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-4.2 Owner-occupancy

- Owner-Occupied: 60.67%
- Renter-Occupied: 39.33%
C-5.1. Total number of home sales, by Census tract (2006-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011, Q1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6138</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-5.2. Median sale price, by Census tract (2006-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011, Q1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td>$296,000</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$223,768</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>$232,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$256,000</td>
<td>$194,937</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$186,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6138</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$257,500</td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$162,500</td>
<td>$202,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$209,000</td>
<td>$162,087</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140</td>
<td>$257,500</td>
<td>$242,000</td>
<td>$191,707</td>
<td>$180,398</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol County</td>
<td>$282,667</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$233,454</td>
<td>$219,000</td>
<td>$217,000</td>
<td>$202,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-6.1. Number of loans originated, by Census tract (2006-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6138</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-6.2. Loans by type, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Purchase</th>
<th>Refinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6133</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6138</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6139</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C-7.1. Gross rent distribution, aggregate of all tracts

C-7.2. Fair market rents, City of Taunton (FY12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>$659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>$831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
<td>$1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
<td>$1,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: HOPE VI resident survey

D-1 HOPE VI resident survey letter

D-2 HOPE VI resident survey & results
June 13, 2012

Dear Fairfax Gardens Head of Household:

In order to ensure that Taunton's HOPE VI project has a positive impact on former residents of Fairfax Gardens like you, the Taunton Housing Authority is working with the UMass Dartmouth Urban Initiative to collect baseline and follow-up data on your perceptions of housing and neighborhood conditions both while you lived at Fairfax Gardens and at the end of this project.

Enclosed is a brief, two-page survey that we are asking you, the head of household, to complete and mail back in the enclosed stamped envelope. Please ensure that you answer each question by checking the box that matches your response.

Just like other surveys we have asked you to take, your responses will be kept confidential and your contact information will not be linked to your responses or shared with anyone outside of the Taunton Housing Authority.

We are asking that you return the completed survey in the stamped envelope provided by June 30, 2012. As a way to thank you for participating, all households that return a completed survey will be entered into a drawing to win a $100 Walmart gift card provided by the Urban Initiative. Two households will be chosen, so please be sure to return your survey by June 30th to be eligible to win!

If you have any questions, please contact Ann Sullivan, Lead Case Manager at 508-824-0315
**HOUSING QUALITY**

The following questions ask about your living situation at Fairfax Gardens (FG), even though you may not live there now.

1. At FG, did you (or do you still)...
   - [ ] Rent your own room, apartment, or home? 91.8%
   - [ ] Live with family or friends and do not pay the rent 0%
   - [ ] Live with family or friends and pay part of the rent? 2%

2. For how long did you live at FG?
   - [ ] Years __________
   - [ ] Months __________

3. At FG, who is/was the head of your household?
   - [ ] Self 98%
   - [ ] Relative 0%
   - [ ] Spouse/Partner/Boyfriend/Girlfriend 2%
   - [ ] Friend 0%
   - [ ] Don't know 0%

4. Overall, how satisfied were you with your unit at FG? Would you say that you were:
   - [ ] Very satisfied 27.5%
   - [ ] Somewhat satisfied 33.3%
   - [ ] Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 11.8%
   - [ ] Somewhat dissatisfied 13.7%
   - [ ] Very dissatisfied 13.7%

5. Overall, how would you describe the condition of your unit at FG?
   - [ ] Excellent 13.7%
   - [ ] Good 35.3%
   - [ ] Fair 23.5%
   - [ ] Poor 27.5%
   - [ ] Refused 0%
   - [ ] Don't know 0%

6. During last winter when you lived at FG, was there any time when your heating system broke down?
   - [ ] Yes 16%
   - [ ] No 82%
   - [ ] Did not live here last winter 0%
   - [ ] Don't know 2%

**In the last 3 months you were living at FG...**

7. …was there any time when any of the toilets in the home were not working?
   - [ ] Yes 17.6%
   - [ ] No 82.4%
   - [ ] Don’t know 0%

8. …were there ever water leaks in your unit?
   - [ ] Yes 26%
   - [ ] No 74%
   - [ ] Don’t know 0%

**Did your unit at FG...**

9. …have any areas of peeling paint or broken plaster?
   - [ ] Yes 43.1%
   - [ ] No 54.9%
   - [ ] Don’t know 2%

10. …have an exposed radiator without a cover?
    - [ ] Yes 35.3%
    - [ ] No 62.7%
    - [ ] Don’t know 2%

11. …ever get infested with cockroaches?
    - [ ] Yes 33.3%
    - [ ] No 66.7%
    - [ ] Don’t know 0%

12. …ever get infested with rats or mice?
    - [ ] Yes 11.8%
    - [ ] No 88.2%
    - [ ] Don’t know 0%

13. …ever have significant problems with mold on walls or ceilings?
    - [ ] Yes 21.6%
    - [ ] No 76.5%
    - [ ] Don’t know 2%

**As you know, the existing units at FG will be demolished and replaced by two new developments: one at the same location, and the other on a parcel in downtown Taunton (next to the bus terminal).**

14. Do you want to live in the development after it is rebuilt?
    - [ ] Yes 26.1%
    - [ ] No 34.8%
    - [ ] Don’t know 39.1%

15. Has the Taunton Housing Authority provided information on screening criteria for eligibility rules for moving to the new HOPE VI developments?
    - [ ] Yes 70%
    - [ ] No 12%
    - [ ] Don’t know 18%

16. Do you feel like the Housing Authority has made the rules clear?
    - [ ] Yes 68%
    - [ ] No 14%
    - [ ] Don’t know 18%

17. Do you think you will meet the eligibility requirements to move to the new development?
    - [ ] Yes 83.7%
    - [ ] No 4.1%
    - [ ] Don’t know 12.2%

**NEIGHBORHOOD**

Please answer the following questions about the Fairfax Gardens neighborhood, even though you may not live there now.

**When you lived at FG,**

18. how many of your friends lived in the same neighborhood?
    - [ ] None 38.8%
    - [ ] A few 53.1%
    - [ ] Many 6.1%
    - [ ] Don’t know 2%

19. how many of your family members lived in the same neighborhood?
    - [ ] None 71.4%
    - [ ] A few 24.5%
    - [ ] Many 4.1%
    - [ ] Don’t know 0%

**While living at FG,**

- [ ] Almost every day
- [ ] Once a week
- [ ] Once a month
- [ ] Few times a year
- [ ] Once
- [ ] Never
- [ ] Don’t know

20. how often did you have coffee or a meal with a neighbor?
    - [ ] 5.9%
    - [ ] 9.8%
    - [ ] 3.9%
    - [ ] 17.6%
    - [ ] 13.7%
    - [ ] 45.1%
    - [ ] 3.9%

21. how often did you stop to chat with a neighbor in the street?
    - [ ] 32%
    - [ ] 16%
    - [ ] 2%
    - [ ] 30%
    - [ ] 8%
    - [ ] 12%
    - [ ] 0%

22. how often did you help any of your neighbors by doing things like looking after their child, letting them borrow something, or helping them with things around the house or yard?
    - [ ] 22%
    - [ ] 10%
    - [ ] 8%
    - [ ] 30%
    - [ ] 8%
    - [ ] 20%
    - [ ] 2%

23. how often do any of your neighbors help you by doing any of those types of things?
    - [ ] 9.8%
    - [ ] 9.8%
    - [ ] 7.8%
    - [ ] 29.4%
    - [ ] 15.7%
    - [ ] 27.5%
    - [ ] 0%

**While living at FG during the last year, did you ever...**

24. …do volunteer work in any programs in the community (like daycare, youth groups, programs for the elderly, or recreation programs)?
    - [ ] Yes 8.2%
    - [ ] No 89.8%
    - [ ] Don’t know 2%

25. …participate in the activities of a church, mosque, temple, or other religious group?
    - [ ] Yes 24.5%
    - [ ] No 71.4%
    - [ ] Don’t know 4.1%

26. …take part in community efforts to make the neighborhood better for children and youth?
    - [ ] Yes 28.6%
    - [ ] No 63.3%
    - [ ] Don’t know 8.2%
These questions ask about what is has been like to live in FG. Think about the area that you think of as the FG neighborhood when you answer how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. People around here are willing to help their neighbors.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. People in the neighborhood share the same values.</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. This is a close-knit neighborhood.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. People in the neighborhood can be trusted.</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. People in the neighborhood generally get along with each other.</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about when you lived at FG, how likely was it that your neighbors would do something if they saw...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neither likely nor unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. ...children skipping school and hanging out on a street corner?</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. ...children spray painted graffiti on a local building?</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. ...children showing disrespect to an adult?</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. ...a fight break out in front of their home?</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about the area within and around FG neighborhood, how much of a problem were the following issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Big problem</th>
<th>Some problem</th>
<th>No problem at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Unemployment</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Groups of people hanging out</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The number of teenage mothers</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Lack of public transportation</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Quality of schools</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Graffiti (writing or painting on the walls of the buildings)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Trash and junk in the parking lots, streets, lawns, and sidewalks</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Police not coming when called</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. People being attacked or robbed</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. People selling drugs</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. People using drugs</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Gangs</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Rape or other sexual attacks</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Shootings and violence</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last 30 days that you lived in FG,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. ...did you ever see people using or selling illegal drugs?</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. ...did you ever hear gunshots?</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When living at FG, how long would it take...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Less than 15 minutes</th>
<th>16-30 minutes</th>
<th>31-45 minutes</th>
<th>46-60 minutes</th>
<th>More than an hour</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. ...to get to the nearest bus or train stop?</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. ...to get to the grocery store you used most of the time?</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. ...to get to the doctor, health clinic, or hospital you visit most?</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Living at FG, how safe did you feel...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Somewhat safe</th>
<th>Somewhat unsafe</th>
<th>Unsafe</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55. ...being alone in the parking lots, lawns, street, or sidewalks right outside your unit at night?</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. ...being alone inside your unit at night?</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: Fairfax Gardens neighborhood survey tools and methodology

E-1 Fairfax Gardens neighborhood survey & results
E-2 Sampling frame and methodology
E-3 Survey area block descriptions

E-1. Fairfax Gardens neighborhood survey & results

The survey tool in its entirety is presented along with response frequencies on the following page.

E-2. Sampling frame and methodology

As noted in the text, the objective of this surveying effort was to give all households in the area of interest an equal opportunity to participate in the survey. Therefore, multiple visits were made to each block at different times of day (early afternoon, late afternoon, or evening). One limitation to this effort was that at least a handful of potential participants spoke only Portuguese, and the surveying team was not equipped to engage these neighborhood residents in the surveying process.

The evaluation team established a goal of 20 percent participation in all blocks that were determined to be within one mile of Fairfax Gardens/Parcel 6A and that are colloquially considered to be part of or adjacent to the same neighborhood as Fairfax Gardens. This goal was achieved both on the block and sample-wide level, though some re-visits were required to reach that rate of participation.

The neighborhood survey methodology was patterned on US Census Bureau methods. Working initially from a base map showing streets surrounding Fairfax Gardens, the survey area expanded east to also include neighborhoods closer to Parcel 6A (see block descriptions in E-3). Evaluation team members knocked on every door of every property in each block unless the property was determined to be vacant or a potential safety concern was present. Survey assignment areas were mapped as small blocks that could be easily walked by always turning the same direction at an intersection, until the interviewer arrived back at the car with no retracing of steps and with all of the day’s work accomplished for the block. Evaluation team members used tracking forms to date and document each visit to each property so that return visits could be made as needed and appropriate. Surveys were completed either by the respondent or by the surveyor, who would ask questions of participants when that method of participation was preferred or necessary.

E-3. Survey area block descriptions

Group B – Parcel 6A

A1: Smith Ave (both sides from #5 to #18); Highland Ave (northwest side); Grove Ave (southwest side).
A2: Grove Ave (northeast side); Highland Ave (northwest side); Oak Ave (west side), Kilmer Ave (south side), Foss Ave (southeast side).
A3: Clifford St (east side); Kilmer Ave (north side); Chase St (west side), Shores St (south side).
A4: Clifford St (west side from #93 to #61); Shores St (both sides from #100 to #129).
A5: Shores St (both sides from #135 to #164).
A6: Ron Circle (both sides from #17 to #34); Shores St (both sides from #163 to #192).
A7: Vinson St (east side); Greylock Ave (north side); Oak Ave (west side), Highland Ave (south side).
A8: Vinson St (east side); Belvoir Ave (north side); Oak Ave (west side), Greylock Ave (south side).
A9: Vinson St (east side); Woodbine St (north side); Oak Ave (west side), Belvoir Ave (south side).
A10: Oak Ave, (both sides from #2 to #155).
A11: Highland St (both sides from #194 to #318).
A12: Highland St (north side from #203 to #261); Clark St; Floyd St., Wilson St.
A13: Chase St (east side); Kilmer Ave (north side); Bliss St (west side), Shores St (south side).
A14: Bliss St (east side); Kilmer Ave (north side); Friend St (northwest side), Kilton St (southwest side); Shores St (south side, including Gushee Lane).
A15: Kilmer Ave (north side, from Oak Ave to Hern Ave); Hern Ave(southwest side), Oak St (northwest side).

Group A – Fairfax Gardens

B1: Wales St (northwest side); Reed St (southwest side; Oak St (northeast side).
B2: Reed St (east side); Wales St (north side); Mason St (west side); Wales St (south side).
B3: Vernon St (east side); Myrtle St (north side, including Myrtle Place); Olney St (west side); Oak St (south side).
B4: Wales St (south side from #96 to #82); Vernon St (west side from #5 to #23).
B5: Myrtle St (south side).
The UMass Dartmouth Urban Initiative is conducting an evaluation of the Taunton Housing Authority’s HOPE VI project to determine the impact of this effort on Fairfax Gardens residents, the surrounding neighborhood, and the City of Taunton.

We want to learn more about current neighborhood conditions from you, a resident of the neighborhood surrounding Fairfax Gardens. Your responses are completely anonymous, so please respond as candidly as possible. Thank you for your help!

1. How many of your friends live in the same neighborhood? □ None 28.6% □ A few 47.6% □ Many 20% □ Don’t know 2.9%
2. How many of your family members live in the same neighborhood? □ None 49.5% □ A few 40% □ Many 9.5% □ Don’t know 1%

3. How often do ...
   □ you have coffee or a meal with a neighbor? □ Almost every day 4.8% □ Once a week 8.6% □ Once a month 5.7% □ Few times a year 10.5% □ Once 6.7% □ Never 63.8% □ Don’t know 0%
   □ you stop to chat with a neighbor in the street? □ Almost every day 31.4% □ Once a week 30.5% □ Once a month 11.4% □ Few times a year 13.3% □ Once 1.9% □ Never 10.5% □ Don’t know 1%
   □ you help any neighbors by doing things like looking after their child, letting them borrow something, or helping them with things around the house or yard? □ Almost every day 3.8% □ Once a week 10.5% □ Once a month 22.9% □ Few times a year 24.8% □ Once 5.7% □ Never 31.4% □ Don’t know 0%
   □ any of your neighbors help you by doing any of those types of things? □ Almost every day 3.8% □ Once a week 10.5% □ Once a month 21% □ Few times a year 21.9% □ Once 3.8% □ Never 37.1% □ Don’t know 1.9%

4. In the last year, have you ever...
   □ done volunteer work for any programs in the community, like daycare, youth groups, programs for the elderly, or recreation programs? □ Yes 22.9% □ No 76.2% □ Don’t know 1%
   □ participated in the activities of a church, mosque, temple, or other religious group? □ Yes 41.9% □ No 57.1% □ Don’t know 1%
   □ taken part in community efforts to make the neighborhood better for children and youth? □ Yes 24.8% □ No 73.3% □ Don’t know 1.9%

5. With your specific neighborhood in mind, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
   □ People around here are willing to help their neighbors. □ Strongly agree 26.7% □ Somewhat agree 45.7% □ Neither agree or disagree 6.7% □ Somewhat disagree 8.6% □ Strongly disagree 6.7% □ Don’t know 5.7%
   □ People in the neighborhood share the same values. □ Strongly agree 19% □ Somewhat agree 32.4% □ Neither agree or disagree 6.7% □ Somewhat disagree 12.4% □ Strongly disagree 5.7% □ Don’t know 23.8%
   □ This is a close-knit neighborhood. □ Strongly agree 20% □ Somewhat agree 35.2% □ Neither agree or disagree 9.5% □ Somewhat disagree 16.2% □ Strongly disagree 13.3% □ Don’t know 5.7%
   □ People in the neighborhood can be trusted. □ Strongly agree 33.3% □ Somewhat agree 38.1% □ Neither agree or disagree 2.9% □ Somewhat disagree 6.7% □ Strongly disagree 11.4% □ Don’t know 7.6%
   □ People in the neighborhood generally get along with each other. □ Strongly agree 42.9% □ Somewhat agree 42.9% □ Neither agree or disagree 3.8% □ Somewhat disagree 4.8% □ Strongly disagree 3.8% □ Don’t know 1.9%

6. Thinking about your neighborhood, how likely is it that your neighbors would do something if they saw...
   □ children skipping school and hanging out on a street corner? □ Very likely 20% □ Likely 17.1% □ Neither likely nor unlikely 8.6% □ Unlikely 30.5% □ Very unlikely 8.6% □ Don’t know 13.3%
   □ children spray-painted graffiti on a local building? □ Very likely 44.8% □ Likely 30.5% □ Neither likely nor unlikely 5.7% □ Unlikely 12.4% □ Very unlikely 1% □ Don’t know 4.8%
   □ children showing disrespect to an adult? □ Very likely 21% □ Likely 35.2% □ Neither likely nor unlikely 8.6% □ Unlikely 15.2% □ Very unlikely 4.8% □ Don’t know 14.3%
   □ a fight break out in front of their home? □ Very likely 31.4% □ Likely 41% □ Neither likely nor unlikely 3.8% □ Unlikely 14.3% □ Very unlikely 1% □ Don’t know 1%

The following questions ask about the redevelopment project going on with the Fairfax Gardens housing development.

7. Are you aware that the existing units at Fairfax Garden are being demolished? □ Yes 86.7% □ No 11.4% □ Don’t know 1.9%

8. How familiar are you with this project? □ Very much 29.5% □ Somewhat 36.2% □ Undecided 1% □ Not really 13.3% □ Not at all 17.1%

9. How did you learn about this project?
   □ Newspaper 33.3% □ Internet 2.9% □ Television 4.8% □ Radio 0% □ Mail 4.8% □ Friend/family/neighor 29.5% □ Other 17.1%

10. Do you think this project will affect your neighborhood? □ Very much 30.5% □ Somewhat 31.4% □ Undecided 20% □ Not really 9.5% □ Not at all 3.8%

11. Do you think that this project will be beneficial to your neighborhood? □ Strongly agree 32.4% □ Somewhat agree 17.1% □ Neither agree or disagree 13.3% □ Somewhat disagree 8.6% □ Strongly disagree 10.5% □ Don’t know 12.4%
## 12. Thinking about your neighborhood only, how much of a problem are the following issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Big problem</th>
<th>Some problem</th>
<th>No problem at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of people hanging out</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of teenage mothers</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public transportation</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti (writing or painting on the walls of the buildings)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash and junk in the parking lots, streets, lawns, and sidewalks</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police not coming when called</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being attacked or robbed</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People selling drugs</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using drugs</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape or other sexual attacks</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shootings and violence</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 13. During the last 30 days in your neighborhood,

- have you ever seen people using or selling illegal drugs? □ Yes 28.6% □ No 64.8% □ Don’t know 6.7%
- have you ever heard gunshots? □ Yes 22.9% □ No 72.4% □ Don’t know 4.8%

## 14. From your house, how long would it take...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Less than 15 minutes</th>
<th>16-30 minutes</th>
<th>31-45 minutes</th>
<th>46-60 minutes</th>
<th>More than an hour</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...to get to the nearest bus or train stop?</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to get to the grocery store you use most of the time?</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to get to the doctor, health clinic, or hospital you use most of the time?</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 15. How safe do you feel...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Somewhat safe</th>
<th>Somewhat unsafe</th>
<th>Unsafe</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...being alone right outside your house at night?</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...being alone inside your house at night?</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 16. What is your gender? □ Female 61.9% □ Male 38.1% □ Other 0%

## 17. What is your age? □ 18 and under □ 19-24 □ 25-34 □ 35-44 □ 45-54 □ 55-64 □ 65 and higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1.9%</th>
<th>6.7%</th>
<th>16.2%</th>
<th>15.2%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>18.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 18. What best describes your educational background?
- No high school diploma □ High school graduate/GED □ Some college □ Associate’s degree □ Bachelor’s degree □ Graduate degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>12.4%</th>
<th>36.2%</th>
<th>25.7%</th>
<th>6.7%</th>
<th>13.3%</th>
<th>5.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time!