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INTRODUCTION

WHEDco’s Community Needs Assessment is a process through which we periodically evaluate the needs of community members in each of the three South Bronx neighborhoods where our affordable housing developments are located. This survey helps us develop a deeper understanding of the strengths, hopes, and challenges faced by the people who live, work, and shop in the neighborhood, along with the solutions that will be most effective, based on the needs expressed by community members. We use the results of these surveys to develop programs, advocate for improvements, and identify resources that will help make the neighborhood a healthier, more vibrant place for current community members.

WHEDco conducted the Jerome Avenue Area Community Needs Survey in the Fall and Winter of 2017, at a time when local elected officials were actively considering the rezoning plan from the New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) through the public review process. Significant neighborhood land use changes were under debate and community tensions were high. This particular survey in the Concourse and Highbridge neighborhoods allowed us to extend WHEDco’s neighborhood development efforts around our Urban Horizons building and to increase our knowledge to respond to the then proposed Jerome Avenue rezoning. This report describes the results of the survey and offers a snapshot of current perceptions of a neighborhood on the cusp of change.

Methodology

The Jerome Avenue Area Community Needs Survey captures responses from people who live, work, or attend school within or close to the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Study Area, as defined by the NYC Department of City Planning for its then proposed Neighborhood and Rezoning Plans. DCP’s complete Neighborhood Study Area extends along Jerome Avenue from E. 165th Street to E. 184th Street, including cross streets at E. 167th Street, E. 170th Street, Mount Eden Avenue, Tremont Avenue, Burnside Avenue, E. 183rd Street, Edward L. Grant Highway, Inwood Avenue, and Cromwell Avenue. We surveyed an expanded area around WHEDco’s flagship building Urban Horizons (50 East 168th Street) that overlaps with that study area in order to gather our own firsthand data from community members who might be affected by the City’s plans.

WHEDco’s neighborhood activities have focused on community members and businesses in the section of DCP’s Neighborhood Study Area south of the Cross-Bronx Expressway roughly defined by zip code 10452. While WHEDco originally planned to only collect surveys from respondents in this zip code, we decided to include respondents in zip code 10453 to make the survey’s findings more relevant to the City’s broader Neighborhood and
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1 The Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP), the public review process for proposed land use changes, for the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Plan began on August 21, 2017.
Zoning Plans. Our expanded survey area covers both the northern and southern halves of DCP’s Neighborhood Study Area. From September 2017 to January 2018, a total of 724 people who live, work, and study within these two zip codes completed the survey: 605 respondents from zip code 10452 and 119 from zip code 10453. With a combined population of 155,804 residents in both zip codes according to the American Community Survey (ACS) 2016 five-year data, our total response count far exceeds the suggested sample size of 384 necessary to achieve a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error. Throughout this report, we may refer to noticeable differences in responses between the two zip codes.

The survey instrument (see page 26) draws from standard survey questions that WHEDco regularly utilizes to understand community needs in all the neighborhoods in which we work, as well as customized questions specific to the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Study Area. WHEDco administered the surveys via street intercepts and community forums in zip codes 10452 and 10453, as well as by email and social media. The top five places where we collected surveys were WHEDco’s Bronx Fall Fest (a community street fair open to the public held on October 6, 2017 on Walton Avenue between E167th Street and E168th Street), PS/MS 218 (1220 Gerard Avenue), Morrisania WIC (1225 Gerard Avenue), Jerome Avenue near Botanica San Elias (1326 Jerome Avenue), and Jerome Avenue near Dollar Tree (1364 Jerome Avenue). All of these sites are in the southern part of the study area. Respondents needed to be at least 18 years old to participate in street intercepts and at least 16 years old to participate in a group at a community forum or organization. Participants were able to skip questions if they chose to; missing responses were not considered as part of the analysis. However, respondents were required to affirmatively note that they lived, worked, or attended school in the 10452 or 10453 zip codes in order to determine that the respondent had a notable connection with this area.

Survey responses were analyzed using basic quantitative analysis. Basic frequencies and percentages were provided for all applicable questions. In addition, cross-tabular analysis was utilized to provide an in-depth view of how preferences varied amongst different groups of people based on gender, language and zip code. Where applicable, survey data is compared in this report to demographic data from zip codes 10452 and 10453, Bronx County, and New York City. Unless otherwise noted, this demographic data was obtained from the US Census Bureau’s American Community Survey 2016 5-year dataset.
SURVEY FINDINGS

Respondents’ Profile

A disproportionate number of people who took the survey identified as female (79.5%). As a result, this report will present disaggregated responses to questions in which there are notable differences in male and female responses. There was also a disproportionate number of respondents who lived in 10452 (83.5%) compared with 10453 (16.5%) because, as mentioned in the Methodology, the survey primarily focused on the study area south of the Cross-Bronx Expressway. Therefore, disaggregated responses by zip code are also presented where differential responses were found.

The survey combined race and ethnicity into one question. About three-quarters of respondents (74.8%) identified as Hispanic and 17.1% identified as Black. Compared to census data for the two zip codes, Hispanics are slightly overrepresented (68%) and Blacks are slightly underrepresented (28%). A large number of respondents (483) speak Spanish, 237 of whom speak only Spanish, whereas 428 respondents speak English, 163 of whom speak only English. French, Bengali, and African languages such as Fulani, Sonnike, and Mande are also spoken by respondents. Female respondents were more likely to speak Spanish, while male respondents were more likely to speak English.

The average age of respondents was 41.4 years. As discussed in the Methodology section, WHEDco’s research protocol is to only conduct street intercept surveys with people over the age of 18, and to only survey young people between the ages of 16 and 18 in a structured group setting, such as members of a teen center, thus restricting the age of those who participated in the survey. The table on the following page shows the distribution of ages: the bulk of respondents were 21-50 years old, with the 31-40 age group being the largest. According to 2016 ACS data, the median age is 31.0 in zip code 10452 and 30.1 in zip code 10453, making this area younger on average than the Bronx and New York City as a whole.
On average, male respondents (43.6 years) were three years older than female respondents (40.4 years). The distribution of ages for men was more evenly spread out in comparison to the women's distribution of age, as a larger percentage of women (32.6%) fell within the 31-40 years old age group. This may reflect the fact that many surveys were collected at schools and family-friendly events where mothers with school-age children were likely to participate.

The average household income of respondents is extremely low. Over half of respondents report an annual household income of less than $20,000, with one-quarter of respondents reporting less than $10,000. In both zip codes 10452 and 10453, approximately 44% of households report annual income less than $20,000. According to census data, the median household income is $25,771 in 10452 and $22,914 in 10453.

Most respondents' primary source of income was employment, and most reported having a full-time job. However, a large number of respondents also received public benefits, indicating that the income they earned from employment may not be enough to cover basic needs. There were a large number of respondents who were not working at the time. The unemployment rate in the Bronx (12.7%) is the highest in New York City. While the unemployment rate within the survey area (12.2%) is slightly lower than that of the Bronx, it is significantly higher than the overall rate for New York City (8.6%).

Many respondents (297) had a personal checking account. People also indicated they had a savings account, used credit cards, and/or used money orders. Only 8% of respondents (58) stated that they used check cashing services, while 1.1% (8) stated that they used payday lending.
We believe that the use of check cashing services and payday lending may be under-reported, as a 2013 survey of 252 Bronx residents with a similar income profile found that 42% of respondents used check-cashing services. Meanwhile, the Bronx has the lowest concentration of bank branches per household in the country and the largest concentration of unbanked households in New York City, making check cashing options more convenient.

### Financial services used regularly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use a personal checking account</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a personal savings account</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use credit cards</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use money orders</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a check cashing service</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use payday lending</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major sources of income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public benefits</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension or Social Security</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bank Branches in New York City

- **Manhattan**
  - 1066 bank branches
  - 6.4 banks per 10,000 residents

- **The Bronx**
  - 151 bank branches
  - 1.0 bank per 10,000 residents

- **Queens**
  - 463 bank branches
  - 2.0 banks per 10,000 residents

- **Brooklyn**
  - 407 bank branches
  - 1.5 banks per 10,000 residents

Source: Bank branch locations retrieved from ReferenceUSA. Accessed April 12, 2018.
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**Being Connected/Informed**

Respondents mostly find out about events and resources in the neighborhood via word of mouth and flyers. This can present a challenge for community-based organizations and government agencies, particularly when launching new programs or hosting community events. Community members may be unaware of them and, therefore, unable to share within their personal networks. In-person outreach is more personal but also time-consuming when compared to mainstream outlets like television and radio or email and social media, making this strategy difficult to implement when capacity or time constraints are present. Further, the large number of Spanish speakers, including monolingual Spanish speakers, means dual-language materials are necessary for effective outreach.

Dissemination of major news stories affecting the survey area may face similar communication challenges. While some may feel that information on New York City’s rezoning of the Jerome Avenue corridor is widely known, only 13.9% of respondents said they had heard a lot about the proposed rezoning. The majority (55.8%) of all survey respondents had not heard anything about the rezoning prior to our engagement with them. Awareness among Spanish speakers was even lower, with 60.9% of respondents stating that they had not heard about the rezoning.

The Jerome Avenue Community Needs Survey also gave us an opportunity to gauge area respondents’ familiarity with WHEDco, which has served the South Bronx since 1992. In 1997, WHEDco opened its first affordable housing development, Urban Horizons, located in the heart of the survey area at 50 East 168th Street. We serve many local community residents across our programs, from high-quality early education and afterschool programs, to fresh, healthy food, cultural programming, and economic opportunity. Over half of all respondents (54.9%) were familiar with WHEDco, though women were nearly 20 percentage points more likely to be familiar with WHEDco than men. Familiarity with WHEDco also varied by zip code – 60% of respondents in 10452, where WHEDco’s headquarters are located, were familiar with WHEDco, while only 30.4% of 10453 respondents were familiar. Anecdotally, we learned that many respondents who are familiar with WHEDco are not familiar with the broad range of services that the organization provides.
**Neighborhood Perceptions**

Respondents expressed a fairly broad range of feelings toward the neighborhood, although men seemed to be more apt to agree with the statements listed in the table below. A large percentage of respondents believe that they could get healthy foods (61.3%) and that they had access to places to exercise (52.6%) in the neighborhood. There was also a sizable percentage of people who did not believe that the neighborhood was clean and well-maintained (41.5%) and that it was affordable (37.5%). Respondents in 10453 were slightly more likely to believe that their neighborhood was clean and well-maintained as well as affordable.

We asked respondents how they felt about different aspects of the neighborhood, including affordability, cleanliness, safety, and access to healthcare, healthy food and places to exercise. There was a notable percentage of respondents who indicated they had “neutral” feelings toward all of these statements. Over one quarter of respondents gave neutral responses to statements on housing affordability, neighborhood cleanliness, street lighting, healthcare access, and information about community services. This is quite different from surveys that WHEDco has conducted in other neighborhoods in the past, when there have been very few neutral responses. Based on these responses as well as informal conversations that surveyors had with respondents, we believe that most respondents used the “neutral” response to indicate a perception of the neighborhood as average, or a feeling of “it’s okay; not bad, but not good”. However, the high number of “neutral” responses may also indicate that the issue at question does not resonate with people, or that they don’t often think about the area as a cohesive neighborhood at all. It must be noted that DCP’s Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Study Area, and zip codes 10452 and 10543, overlap with Community Boards 4, 5 and 7, which cover parts of several

Tell us how you feel about your neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is affordable</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is clean and well-maintained</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is well-lit</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can get healthy foods</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to high-quality health services</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to places to exercise in my neighborhood</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know about community events and resources</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: most common answers are represented in bold.*
neighborhoods including Highbridge, Concourse, Mt. Eden, Mt. Hope, University Heights and Morris Heights. While respondents were prompted to think about the area around Jerome Avenue when completing the survey, we do not necessarily know how they interpreted this instruction, or if the conflict between the respondent’s idea of the neighborhood and WHEDco’s survey area (overlapping the study area defined by DCP) produced a “neutral” response.

Affordability

Overall, only 35.2% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their neighborhood was affordable. This varied slightly by zip code, with 41.7% of 10453 residents expressing that their neighborhood was affordable, while only 34.3% of 10452 residents felt the same way. Men were far more likely (52.4%) than women (30.7%) to feel their neighborhood was affordable.

Cleanliness

Overall, only 33% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their neighborhood was clean and well-maintained. This correlates strongly with another survey question regarding the things respondents would most like to see in their neighborhood: respondents overwhelmingly wanted to see less garbage on the streets. Only 30.8% of 10452 residents felt their neighborhood was clean and well-maintained, compared to 43.1% of 10453 respondents. Men (42.4%) were far more likely than women (29.6%) to feel that the neighborhood was clean and well-maintained.

Lighting

Whether or not people feel a neighborhood has adequate street lighting can be an indication of how safe they feel on the street at night. Overall, only 46.5% of respondents felt the neighborhood was well-lit, with 10453 residents and men more likely to give a positive response. This is an important indicator, given that Jerome Avenue is overshadowed by an elevated train line that is poorly lit and few businesses in the survey area stay open after 7pm.

Healthy Food

Overall, 61.3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they could get healthy foods in the neighborhood, with 10452 residents slightly more likely to give a positive response. This is somewhat inconsistent with the results of the 2016 Jerome Avenue Commercial District Needs Assessment (CDNA), in which “healthy food markets” were one of the most frequently mentioned businesses that residents wanted more of within the study area. However, several large grocery stores exist within the survey area, along with smaller markets and bodegas that offer fresh produce. While conducting the CDNA, we heard anecdotally that the issue was not access to food, but rather a lack of quality food, like organic produce or healthy items on local restaurant menus.
Healthcare

Half of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they had access to high-quality health services in the neighborhood. There are several large medical institutions in the area, including Bronx Lebanon Hospital Center, Morris Heights Health Center, and Morrisania Diagnostic and Treatment Center. It is striking, however, that 31.8% of all respondents, and 34% of women, responded “neutral” to this question. This may indicate that while respondents feel they have access to health care services, they may not consider those services to be “high-quality”.

Places to Exercise

Overall, 42.6% of respondents believe that they had access to places to exercise in their neighborhood, with men (65%) significantly more likely than women (47.1%) to give a positive response. Several low- and moderate-cost fitness facilities and recreation centers exist throughout the survey area, many of which have opened since 2015. However, there are few parks in the area that have space for active recreation and exercise, including children’s playgrounds and sports fields.

Community Events and Resources

Overall, 42.3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they knew about community events and resources, with men (48.8%) more likely than women (40.4%) to give a positive response. Neutral and negative responses comprised the majority of answers, suggesting an opportunity to improve outreach efforts to reach more people locally. As noted earlier, respondents were more likely to get information about local events and resources through word of mouth or flyers than media outlets.

One of several fruit and vegetable markets in the survey area.
Neighborhood Needs

We asked respondents to prioritize the improvements they would most like to see in the neighborhood. Respondents overwhelmingly wanted to see less garbage on the streets and sidewalks. This correlates directly to the sizable percentage of people discussed in the previous section who did not think their neighborhood was clean and well-maintained. Respondents also wanted to see a greater police presence and more community centers or social services organizations, which seems to speak to the need for more resources to promote overall safety and social supports.

Respondents were interested in more parks and public spaces. While it can be difficult to create new parkland in New York City, the need is clear: the survey area has an estimated 2.1 acres of parks and playgrounds per 1,000 children, compared to a citywide average of 13.3 acres. Further, the district has only an estimated 7.9 acres of parks and playgrounds per 1,000 seniors, compared to a citywide average of 23.3 acres. Respondents also expressed a high interest in gaining access to fresher and healthier food options, in addition to more open space, which calls out their desire to improve nutrition, physical activity, and green, recreational spaces in the neighborhood. It is also notable that fresher and healthier food options were requested more frequently than more eating/dining options. This supports the aforementioned anecdotal evidence collected during the CDNA, whereby respondents stated that they wanted access to a greater variety of higher quality and organic food options.

Three additional items — safer street crossings, better street lighting, and more walkable streets — all relate to the need to make street-related improvements for pedestrians. Overall, the neighborhood needs identified were very similar for both women and men as well as by zip code.
Given the neighborhood’s limited parks/public space and the potential population growth that may come with a rezoning, we felt it was important to further look into what improvements respondents would like to see. Respondents were overwhelmingly interested in a children’s playground. Other top responses were fitness programs and sports facilities (again, related to the desire for physical activity), as well as public art, benches, picnic tables, and community gardening (which speak to improving comfort and helping improve the scenery or “look” of the neighborhood). There were no differences seen by gender or zip code.

The services that respondents would most like help with include housing, employment/job training, ESL/literacy, computer training, lowering electricity/heat bills, youth education, and continuing education. While both men and women listed the same top four services (housing, computer training, employment/job training, and ESL/literacy), men showed an additional interest in banking and credit, while women showed an additional interest in youth education and continuing education. ESL/Literacy was a far greater need for respondents from zip code 10452 than in 10453.

When asked specifically what type of employment or job training people would find most helpful, the majority of responses centered on healthcare and nursing, technology, and media/entertainment. As Healthcare, Technology, and Media/Entertainment are some of the fastest growing industries in New York City, it follows that local residents are seeing more opportunities and seeking training in these sectors. The healthcare industry is also the second-largest employer in the Bronx, after retail.
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5 U.S. Census Bureau. 2016 County Business Patterns.
Health

Respondents generally considered themselves to be “healthy.” Only 3.7% rated their health as poor. Over three-quarters of respondents deemed their health to be “good”, “very good”, or “excellent” — with the largest percentage of respondents (35.7%) judging their health to be good. There were no discernible differences by gender. The overall distribution by zip code was slightly different, as respondents from 10452 considered themselves to be slightly healthier overall, with more respondents indicating they were in excellent health.

This self-rated health question is a commonly utilized way to understand people’s health, particularly their own perception of their health. There have been a range of studies on its effectiveness and validity. Overall, this measure corresponds fairly well with mortality, but there is a general tendency by respondents to over-rate their own health, especially by people of color and people with lower levels of education. Therefore, we asked a series of additional questions to better understand the general health of the survey population.

The majority of respondents (59.6%) reported eating only 1-2 servings of fruit or vegetables per day, with close to 65% of respondents eating 2 or fewer servings of fruits or vegetables — far less than the recommended 4-5 servings per day (varies by age, sex and level of physical activity). Only 8.1% of respondents ate 5 or more pieces or servings of fruits or vegetables per day; there was no difference by gender or zip code.

Almost 40% of respondents reported that they had not participated in any physical activity or exercise within the past week. Respondents in zip code 10453 were more likely to exercise, with only 30% reporting no physical activity in the past week. The majority of respondents
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(73.1%) reported that they walked 10 or fewer blocks per day. Specifically, almost 40% of women reported that they did not participate in physical activity or exercise in the past week, while approximately 34% of men reported the same. Men reported that they walked on average 12.6 blocks per day, while women averaged only 10.1 blocks per day. Likewise, respondents from 10453 reported that they walked on average 12.5 blocks per day, while 10452 respondents walked 9.9 blocks per day, which is possibly attributable to the need to walk further in 10453 to get to various public transit options. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that adults get at least two and a half hours of moderate-intensity aerobic activity, like walking, each week. Our study indicates that most community members are falling far short of this goal.

Childcare/Education

Respondents who are the primary caretakers of a child/children were asked about their experiences with childcare, afterschool, and their K-12 school, where applicable.

Most respondents (61.7%) did not have childcare for children younger than 5 years old. For those respondents with childcare, a slight majority (55.3%) had childcare near their residence or workplace, though only 29.4% of respondents from 10453 stated that their

If your child/children are younger than 5 years old...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have childcare for them?</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— If yes, is the childcare near where you live/work?</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the quality of childcare?</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your childcare affordable?</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your child/children are in elementary or middle school...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are they in an afterschool program?</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they are not in an afterschool program, is it because there was no space in the program?</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the quality of afterschool?</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the past week, did you participate in any physical activity or exercise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a typical day, how many blocks do you walk?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 11 blocks</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 blocks</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 blocks</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 blocks</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 blocks</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

childcare was located near their home or workplace. Almost three-quarters (72.5%) of respondents were satisfied with the quality of their childcare, and over half (56.2%) find the childcare affordable. Women tended to be more satisfied with the quality of childcare (74.6%) than men (65.5%), and women were also more likely to find the childcare affordable (57.3% compared with 50.0% for men). There was a notable difference by zip code, as only about half (48%) of respondents from 10453 were satisfied with the quality of childcare, and 45.8% found the childcare affordable.

Many respondents’ children (57.1%) were not enrolled in an afterschool program; over one-third of respondents (38.4%) reported that this was due to a lack of space. There was a difference between men and women as to whether space was mentioned as the barrier to enrollment in afterschool — women were much more likely (42.3%) to indicate that a lack of space was the reason their children were not in afterschool, whereas only 19.0% of men indicated that this was the reason. The lack of space in afterschool was also far more of an issue in 10452, as 40.3% of respondents from 10452 marked this as an issue, compared to just 17.4% in 10453. A large percentage of respondents (67.9%) were satisfied with the quality of afterschool.

An overwhelming percentage (80.2%) of respondents who had a child/children in a K-12 school expressed that they were satisfied with the quality of education at their school, which, again, was fairly similar for both women and men and by zip code, though the percentage who were satisfied with quality was slightly lower for 10453 respondents (74.3%). This perception of quality starkly contrasts with some of the standard measures of school quality in this area — especially the Concourse/Highbridge neighborhoods, which have among the lowest education rankings in New York City. NYC Department of Education’s school climate survey data suggests that schools in these communities are relatively safe. One hypothesis that may explain our survey results is that safety is being equated with quality. Furthermore, given the large number of respondents whose primary language is not English and are likely to be foreign-born, respondents may assess quality by different standards than the performance metrics typically used by City agencies and organizations like WHEDco.

---


Housing

Housing related questions on the survey were specific to respondents who rent. People indicated that they paid their rent in a variety of ways — the most common were money order (34.9%), check (29.8%), and cash (20.2%).

When asked about possible housing issues respondents experienced in the last year, some concerning responses emerged. Eighty percent (80%) of respondents worried about being able to afford living in the neighborhood. This concern was even higher for Spanish-speaking survey respondents (91.7%), and there were also a higher percentage of 10452 respondents (83.7%) than 10453 respondents (60.3%) who were worried about housing affordability. This worry is not surprising, given that 68.7% of respondents already paid more than half of their monthly income on rent; it is even more drastic for Spanish-speaking respondents (76.2%), women (71.2%), and 10452 residents (71.3%). Also, just over half of all respondents (51.5%) experienced rent increases of more than $100 in the last year (which was the same for men and women, with 10452 respondents experiencing this at a higher rate, 53.1%). Bronx Community District 4 has one of the highest rates of rent burden in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you experienced any of the following housing issues in the last year?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I paid more than half of my monthly income in rent</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived in temporary housing or “doubled up” with another family member</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worried about being able to afford the neighborhood</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My rent increased more than $100</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My landlord refused to make repairs</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My landlord has tried to evict me</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My landlord made it difficult to pay my rent or will not give me a receipt for rent</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My landlord refused to give me a lease or rental agreement</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New York City — 58.8% of renters spend more than 30% of their income on rent and 42.3% of renters spend more than 50% of their income on rent. It is therefore not surprising that approximately two out of five respondents lived in temporary housing or “doubled-up”, a term that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has defined to refer to a situation where individuals are unable to maintain their housing situation and are forced to stay with friends and/or extended family members.

The survey also revealed a high rate of issues with landlords. Nearly half of respondents (48.8%) answered that their landlord had refused to make repairs. About one-quarter of respondents (28.9%) stated that their landlord had made it difficult to pay rent or that they do not receive a rent receipt. A similar percentage (27.1%) said that they did not have a lease. Almost one in four (23.1%) stated that their landlord had tried to evict them. These issues were fairly similar by gender, though a higher percentage (27.1%) of men reported their landlord had tried to evict them. Respondents in 10452 reported experiencing issues with their landlords at an even higher rate than those in 10453.

These issues are all common practices landlords engage in to harass and eventually displace current residents in order to charge higher rents, particularly in below-market rate rent-stabilized apartments, an important source of New York’s affordable housing stock. Under New York City’s existing Rent Stabilization Laws, annual rent increases are regulated through the NYC Rent Guidelines Board (NYCRGB). In recent years, NYCRGB has limited annual lease renewals to 0–2.5% increases. However, it is more lucrative for a landlord to attract new tenants to their rental properties than to maintain long-term tenants, as landlords are able to increase the legal rent on a new lease by up to 20% — far higher than the typical rent adjustments on a lease renewal. Further, once an apartment’s legal monthly rent exceeds $2,700, the unit is deregulated, allowing landlords to set rents without restriction. Past neighborhood rezonings throughout New York City have led to speculative and predatory behavior on behalf of some landlords and resulted in the loss of the neighborhood’s affordable housing stock.

These trends are alarming as, according to the NYC Department of Housing Preservation & Development (HPD), two-thirds of the housing stock in the Jerome Avenue area are rent-regulated. Many of these apartments are homes to residents that have been in the neighborhood for a long time, are low-income, and people of color, who may be displaced from the Bronx, NYC’s most affordable neighborhood, through an accelerated gentrification process exacerbated by real estate speculation.

---


13 NYCRGB sets rent adjustment rates for one- and two-year leases on an annual basis. From October 2015 through September 2018, the rent adjustment rate was 0% for one-year lease renewals and 2% for two-year leases. Effective October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019, one-year lease renewals will see up to a 1.5% increase, while two-year lease renewals will see up to a 2.5% increase. http://on.nyc.gov/2MoixHc


RECOMMENDATIONS

Protecting Housing Affordability

Housing groups should continue to advocate for community-wide housing affordability and increased tenant protections through partnership with other local groups.

Housing affordability and tenant protections are major community concerns. Four out of five survey respondents worried about being able to afford housing in the neighborhood, and 68.7% reported that they already paid more than half of their monthly income on rent. Nearly half of respondents (46%) experienced at least one issue with their landlords that is commonly associated with tenant harassment, including high rent increases, refusals to make repairs, and refusals to renew their leases. In March 2018, the Office of the Mayor of the City of New York released the Jerome Avenue Rezoning Points of Agreement (POA) — a non-legally binding document that outlines the City’s proposed strategies and future investment in projects and initiatives within the Jerome Avenue rezoning area. While the POA includes services to combat tenant harassment, we suspect that these resources will not be sufficient to curtail tenant harassment and prevent residential displacement.

Furthermore, nearly all of the new affordable housing stock that will be constructed in rezoned areas in the Concourse and Highbridge neighborhoods will not be affordable for current residents. New housing within the rezoned areas will be subject to NYC’s Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) guidelines, in which even the most affordable option requires an average household income (AMI) of $41,720 for a family of four — over $15,000 higher than the median income for the survey area. It is imperative that local residents have the adequate protections to be able to stay in their current apartments, as it will be increasingly difficult to relocate within the neighborhood as rental costs rise. While the POA allocates funding to promote tenant organizing and anti-harassment efforts, community development organizations like WHEDco and New Settlement Apartments, as well as membership agencies such as the Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development (ANHD) can continue to advocate for deeper community-wide housing affordability, increased tenant protections, and deeper subsidies. In addition to supporting anti-tenant harassment efforts, local elected officials can work with the NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) and the New York State Department of Homes and Community Renewal (DHCR) to explore strategies for preserving long-term affordability. In conjunction with the City’s recently announced Partners in Preservation pilot program, which is expected to launch in early 2019, HPD and DHCR should also make the maximum legal rent for vacant rent-stabilized apartments publicly accessible to ensure that landlords are not illegally inflating neighborhood rental costs.

---

16 The MIH program allows developers to choose from several options to meet their requirement of affordable housing units. These options dictate the percentage of residential floor area that must be reserved for affordable housing as well as the corresponding maximum rental costs based on AMI. Under MIH’s “Deep Affordability Option”, 20% of the total residential floor area must be for housing units for residents with incomes averaging 40% AMI (http://on.gov.nyc/2nTpotP). According to the NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development, 40% AMI for a family of four is $41,720 in the New York City Area in 2018 (http://on.gov.nyc/2MJtGgI).

17 According to the US Department of Health and Human Services, the 2018 federal poverty guideline for a family of four is $25,100. According to US Census American Community Survey 2016 5-year data, the median household income is $25,771 in 10452 and $22,914 in 10453. This means that almost half of households in both zip codes live below the federal poverty level.

18 DHCR currently releases an apartment’s rent history upon request only to an apartment’s existing tenant. With little oversight, predatory landlords could rent out rent-regulated apartments for higher than the legal rent until a tenant initiates an evaluation, thus influencing the average rental costs in the neighborhood.
Supporting Local Jobs and Employment

City agencies should research local workforce needs to create job training options that match the community’s requests.

The Jerome Avenue Rezoning will significantly change the business landscape along Jerome Avenue and the surrounding commercial corridors, altering the types of employment opportunities available in the neighborhood. WHEDco’s 2018 Jerome Business Needs Study found that 90% of businesses in DCP’s Neighborhood Study Area rent their commercial space. Through conversations with merchants, we learned that many commercial tenants in the survey area did not have a rental lease, making them highly vulnerable to displacement from sudden rental increases. Furthermore, the Jerome Avenue Rezoning has changed local land use to allow for more high-density residential development. This city government approved change effectively incentivizes landlords to sell or convert their commercial, manufacturing, and other low-density properties for residential development, as residential properties yield a higher real estate value and return on investment than other uses. Many local businesses and jobs may be displaced from the area due to redevelopment. Auto-related businesses are particularly susceptible, as the land that they occupy has the lowest average price per square foot within the rezoning area. This trend is already being borne out. Within six weeks of the City approving the Jerome Avenue rezoning, two properties were sold for over $11 million each. During the same period, Madd Equities, a real estate development corporation, filed plans to develop a high density residential project on two additional properties that they purchased in 2015 and 2016 while DCP was conducting the Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Planning Study. As of June 2018, at least six businesses (4 auto-related and 2 retail) on these four properties have received a notice to vacate the premises; these businesses collectively employ an estimated 25 workers.

Roughly one quarter of the land in the Jerome Avenue Rezoning area was previously zoned for automotive (C8) and light industrial (M1) use, suggesting that a high percentage of businesses and jobs that may be displaced or lost will be in these sectors. Previous research has found that the auto and industrial sectors provide decent wages in New York City, with higher average annual incomes than the retail sector. The average annual wage is $44,000 for auto workers in New York City and $51,934 for industrial and manufacturing workers. Replacing existing employment opportunities in these sectors with lower-paying retail jobs — which on average pay $20,000 less per year — could exacerbate the already high poverty level in the survey area, and possibly contribute to higher levels of unemployment (currently 12.2%) and underemployment.

The Jerome Avenue Rezoning POA acknowledges, in part, that training opportunities will be necessary to assist the area’s current workforce to transition into new careers and employment opportunities. Training opportunities under the POA are limited to the automotive and construction sectors. Our survey findings, however, show a strong desire for training opportunities in healthcare and IT, two high growth industries in New York City. NYC Department of Small Business Services’ (SBS) and workforce development providers should conduct additional research on local workforce needs to determine if the currently available training options match the community’s requests. Furthermore,

---

20 NYS Department of Labor Occupation Employment Statistics, 2015
while a workforce partnership comprised of CBOs and local institutions is in the early stages of formation, SBS WorkForce1 Career Centers should explore other opportunities to connect local employers to local workers and expand their existing recruitment efforts for training programs. For example, as the healthcare industry is one of the largest employers in the Bronx, there may be opportunities to develop or strengthen a workforce pipeline between local residents and local healthcare facilities. Hospitals and clinics may also serve as critical places for outreach and recruitment of training programs in the healthcare industry. Similarly, special attention should be placed to connect local manufacturing employers to trained local personnel.

Increasing Community Awareness of Neighborhood Changes
Stemming from the Jerome Avenue Rezoning

City agencies should provide timely updates in accessible ways (i.e. language, mode of communication) regarding changes that may affect community members due to the Jerome Avenue Rezoning.

Over half of all community members we surveyed had not heard about the rezoning in the Jerome Avenue during the multi-year neighborhood planning process. This suggests that the City was unable to inform the majority of local residents about the process, let alone obtain their input. Many community members may continue to be unaware of the types of changes that may be coming to the survey area now that the Rezoning Action has been approved, as well as possible assistance programs that could result from the Jerome Avenue Rezoning POA. City agencies should take deliberate actions to deliver timely updates regarding the status of programs included in the POA and how community members can get involved in those programs. While the POA proposes future outreach efforts from various City agencies, planned land-use changes are already underway. As such, it is imperative for the City to collaborate with local stakeholders to ensure that community residents and businesses affected by the rezoning process can take advantage of available City services, such as access to residential and commercial tenant legal assistance programs and reimbursement grants for auto businesses that need to relocate. To enhance their outreach efforts, City agencies could allocate additional funding for dedicated staff that can conduct direct outreach with community members and businesses. For example, SBS could utilize additional staff members to proactively promote the schedule and location of its Mobile Unit, which provides general information about free City services for small businesses and one-on-one business counseling, as well as other services available to businesses. The City should also ensure that all materials and resources are available in commonly spoken foreign languages of the Neighborhood Study Area, including, but not limited to, Spanish.

Connecting Residents to Services and Resources

Community-based organizations (CBOs) and government agencies should strengthen the ways they work with smaller community groups, local institutions, and each together to help deliver social services and increase awareness of other resources available to community members.

The Jerome Avenue Community Needs Assessment helped surface several services that community members commonly requested, including help with housing, employment/job training, ESL/literacy, computer training, and educational programs for both youth and adults. While the neighborhood’s CBOs already provide assistance in many of these areas, our survey findings suggest that CBOs may
not possess the resources or personnel capacity to meet the high level of demand. The City has allocated some funding for tenant organizing in the Jerome Avenue Rezoning POA, but no dedicated funding has been set aside to assist in creating broader access to general social services. Given that the demand for services may increase due to the expected population growth and changes in the neighborhood, CBOs should continue to advocate for additional opportunities to build up organizational capacity and create or expand dedicated programs.

CBOs should also seek funding to improve their capacity to work with each other. This may include securing funds to create a community liaison position to assist with client referrals across neighborhood organizations or to explore additional ways in which community residents can connect to services and resources. For example, CBOs and local government officials could compile a neighborhood services resource guide translated into commonly spoken languages, if one does not already exist. The proposed resource guide could also be distributed in high foot-traffic areas throughout the neighborhood, including local businesses, healthcare institutions, schools, places of worship, nonprofit organizations, and government offices. The guide could also serve as a tool for front-line staff members across organizations, especially new staff and others in providing referrals outside of their specific area of expertise.

**Improving Parks and Public Space**

*New York City Department of Parks and Recreation should increase access to parks amenities and programming that reflect the needs and desires of existing residents.*

Neighborhood residents requested more parks and public spaces as one of the top things that they would like to see in the area in our survey. It is encouraging to see that the Jerome Avenue Rezoning Points of Agreement recognizes the need for additional parkland and calls for the construction and renovation of neighborhood parks. Of note, Bridge Playground on Boscobel Place and University Avenue just south of the Cross-Bronx Expressway is expected to include play equipment for children. Adding this equipment would help respond to our findings, as a children’s playground was the top request from respondents when asked which activities and amenities they would like to see in their parks. Similarly, the proposed outdoor fitness equipment at Bridge Playground may help to address the desire for fitness programs and sports facilities, given limited park space in the survey area. We encourage NYC Parks to assess if there are other parks where similar active use equipment might also be installed. NYC Parks should collect additional input from community members to gain clarification on the types of equipment that should be installed for the age groups with greatest needs. Additionally, NYC Parks should consider hosting regular free public fitness programs throughout the survey area’s parks during the summer months.
Advocating for Neighborhood Cleanliness

Local government officials should work with the NYC Department of Sanitation and CBOs to expand waste management efforts and highlight community residents’ role in advocating and promoting for neighborhood cleanliness.

Having less garbage on the streets is a recurring community request that surfaced in both this 2018 Jerome Avenue Community Needs Survey and in the 2016 Jerome Avenue Commercial District Needs Assessment (CDNA) conducted by WHEDco and Davidson Community Center. In response to the results of the CDNA, SBS installed or replaced 25 trash bins throughout the neighborhood. The original site selections for these trash cans were primarily based on observations of high foot-traffic areas where trash accumulated. Monitoring may be necessary to gauge the effectiveness of trash bin placement in reducing garbage on the streets, as well as to identify new sites for additional receptacles or alternate waste management options. For example, unmanaged dog waste is a highly visible sanitation problem along many residential blocks. Installing dog waste bag dispensers within close proximity

Survey respondents stated that they wanted more children’s playgrounds, fitness programs, and sports facilities in their neighborhood parks. Top: Goble Park at Goble Place and Macombs Road. Bottom: Free Zumba lessons from NYC Parks’ Shape Up NYC program at WHEDco’s Bronx Fall Fest.

In Fall 2017, the NYC Department of Small Business Services installed 25 new garbage bins to help address garbage concerns within the southern part of DCP’s Jerome Avenue Neighborhood Study area.
of garbage bins may help reduce this issue. While the Jerome Avenue Rezoning POA allocates funding for trash pickup services, it is unclear if this funding will bring additional maintenance capacity, such as street sweeping, or if it will only support the maintenance costs associated with the 25 trash bins added in 2017. Local Council Members and Community Boards may need to follow up with the NYC Department of Sanitation to obtain details regarding future waste management services and the possibility to build on waste management efforts already in progress. For its part, WHEDco and other CBOs can explore spearheading a community-facing campaign to help residents advocate for and take care of their neighborhood.

Improving Access to Information

Community-based organizations (CBOs) should explore alternate communication channels to reach a wider range of community members.

Through surveying and informal conversations, we learned that many respondents were unaware of the various social services, community events and pressing news relevant to the survey area. While our findings show that most respondents learn about local resources, events, and news through word of mouth, other communication channels may still play an important role in disseminating information which can then be shared between individuals directly. Although organizations like WHEDco commonly disseminate outreach materials regarding programs via community events, local government offices, libraries, schools, community partners, electronic media, and direct mail, other communication channels, such as local or ethnic newspapers/radio stations, newsletters, blogs, or the newly installed LinkNYC kiosks, may be utilized less frequently. Leveraging these media sources may be important to reaching a wider range of community members who are underserved. Additionally, CBOs should continue to strengthen their relationships with smaller organizations, social groups, places of worship, and informal community spaces such as businesses, particularly those that serve new immigrant populations or recent arrivals who may be isolated by language barriers.

For their part, government officials could sponsor physical interventions, such as community bulletin boards and information kiosks like LinkNYC, that provide an easy to use method for local groups to promote resources and events in the area. Companies like CityBridge, LinkNYC’s developer, can create alternate ways to distribute information to community members. For example, local events that are displayed as rotating advertisements on LinkNYC kiosks could be compiled into a community calendar that is accessible at the kiosks’ tablet as well as online so that individuals can browse all upcoming events conveniently in one place.
CONCLUSION

The Jerome Avenue Community Needs Survey confirmed some of WHEDco’s previous findings about the neighborhood, but also yielded new data and raised new questions that require further exploration. Many survey responses reinforced the need for open space, opportunities for physical activity, and healthier food options. The high number of “neutral” responses, and the perceptions of “quality” healthcare and education that seem to contradict institutional knowledge, warrant additional study. The most troubling, although not most surprising, responses were those related to housing conditions. These are especially important considering the Jerome Avenue Rezoning Plan, which will create new affordable housing but not in the quantity or at the level of affordability most needed by current residents. As the community grows and changes and new developments bring in new residents, it will be especially important to monitor and address the tenant harassment issues and displacement already taking place in the area. WHEDco will continue to work with community members and partners to understand pressing community needs and adapt our programming to serve the Jerome Avenue community, even as it changes.

Exploring Local Perceptions around Educational Quality and Good Health

Further analysis around educational quality and good health is needed to understand community members’ perception on these topics.

Education: Four out of five survey respondents stated that they were satisfied with the quality of local schools (K-12), diverging from findings of other reports about quality as previously mentioned. The NYC Department of Education (DOE) should collaborate with child advocacy groups such as the Citizens’ Committee for Children of New York and the New Settlement Parent Action Committee to explore if the feeling of satisfaction with local schools is consistent neighborhood-wide or if it varies from school to school. Although the DOE already surveys parents annually to evaluate a school’s performance, it may be necessary to conduct further research to understand how community members define terms such as “satisfactory” and “quality.”

Personal Health: Most respondents self-reported as being in good personal health, which conflicts with findings from other reports, as previously mentioned. Answers to more in-depth questions in the Community Needs Survey suggest a disassociation between the perception of good health versus actively engaging in healthy lifestyle choices, such as eating fruits and vegetables or performing daily exercise. Community-based organizations and coalitions such as the Bronx Health REACH, in partnerships with public health organizations and city agencies like the NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, could explore the feasibility of developing a public awareness campaign to disseminate materials on healthy choices, gauge public awareness before and throughout the campaign, and increase access to opportunities for healthy lifestyles.

Healthy Food Access: While respondents reported satisfactory access to healthy food options, other neighborhood research, including the 2016 Commercial District Needs Assessment previously discussed, suggests that there is limited access in the survey area. Further research may be necessary to understand what the community defines as “healthy” food.
APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Note: the Jerome Community Needs Survey was also distributed in Spanish. This version is available at http://whedco.org/

**WHEDco**, a community development organization in the South Bronx, is surveying community members on their needs and interests. We will use this information to design programs to meet those needs and advocate around the community’s pressing concerns. **Your responses will be confidential.**

**Jerome Community Needs Survey 2017**

This survey is for people who either live/work/or go to school in the Jerome Avenue area:

1. I live in zip code: ☐ 10452 ☐ 10453
2. I work or go to school in zip code: ☐ 10452 ☐ 10453
3. Are you familiar with WHEDco? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. How do you find out about events and resources in the neighborhood? **Check all that apply.**
   - Website
   - Social Media
   - Newspaper
   - Television Station
   - Email
   - Radio Station
   - Word of mouth
   - Flyer/poster
   - Other __________

5. Tell us how you feel about your neighborhood. **Check one per row.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is clean and well-maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is well-lit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can get healthy foods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to high-quality health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know about community events and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to places to exercise in my neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What are the top three things that you would most like to see in your neighborhood. **Check only three answers.**
   - Less garbage on the streets
   - More parks and public spaces
   - More benches
   - Better street lighting
   - More eating/dining options
   - More shopping options
   - Fresh and healthier food options
   - More community centers or social service organizations
   - Safer street crossings
   - More walkable streets
   - Greater police presence
   - Less police presence

7. What kinds of activities and amenities would you like to see added to your neighborhood park/public space? **Check all that apply.**
   - Benches
   - Picnic Tables
   - Gaming Tables
   - Children’s Playground
   - Public art
   - Dog Park
   - Fitness programs
   - Sports facilities
   - Community gardening
   - Other __________

**Your Children:** If you are the primary caretaker of a child/children, please answer the following questions.

8. If your child/children are younger than 5 years old:
   a. Do you have childcare for them? ☐ Yes ☐ No  If yes, is the childcare near where you live/work? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   b. Are you satisfied with the quality of childcare? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   c. Is your childcare affordable? ☐ Yes ☐ No

9. If your child/children are in elementary or middle school:
   a. Are they in an After School program? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   b. If they are not in an After School program, is it because there was no space in the program? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   c. Are you satisfied with the quality of After School? ☐ Yes ☐ No

10. If your child/children are in school (K-12):
    a. Are you satisfied with the quality of education at their school? ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Your Health:**

11. In general, how would you rate your own health? ☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

12. Typically, how many pieces of fruits or servings of vegetables do you eat a day? ☐ None ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

13. During the past week, did you participate in any physical activity or exercise? ☐ Yes ☐ No

14. On a typical day, how many blocks do you walk? ___________
15. What things would you like some help with, if any? Please check all that apply.
- Banking and credit
- Debt management
- Employment/job training
- Starting/growing a business
- Avoiding business violations
- Immigration
- Youth education
- Continuing education
- Computer Training
- ESL/Literacy
- Re-entry from Incarceration
- Legal issues
- Child welfare
- Counseling
- Domestic violence
- Mental Health
- Public benefits
- Emergency food
- Housing
- Lowering electricity/heat bills
- Health/dental care
- Health/dental insurance
- Nothing at this time

16. If you need help with employment or job training, which type of training would you find most helpful?
- Construction
- Commercial Driving
- Starting/growing a business
- Other ____________
- Welding/Woodworking
- Media/Entertainment
- Technology (IT/Computer Programming)
- Nothing at this time

Zoning laws are New York City government’s rules for what can be built on a piece of land (housing, offices, stores, or manufacturing). Rezoning is the process of changing the existing rules.

17. How informed do you feel about the City’s interest in rezoning the Jerome Avenue area?
- I have never heard about it
- I have heard a little about it
- I have heard a lot about it

18. Your Apartment/House: If you rent where you live, please answer the following questions:
   a. Do you have a lease? Yes No
   b. Do you live in a rent stabilized apartment? Yes No I don’t know
   c. How do you pay for your rent: Cash Check Money order Online Voucher/Public assistance

19. Have you experienced any of the following housing issues in the last year? Check yes or no for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I paid more than half of my monthly income in rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived in temporary housing or “Doubled up” with another family member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worried about being able to afford the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My rent increased of more than $100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My landlord refused to make repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My landlord tried to evict me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My landlord makes it difficult to pay my rent or will not give me a receipt for rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My landlord refuses to give me a lease or rental agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, some basic questions about you and your household.

20. What is your: Age _____ Gender _____

21. What is your race/ethnicity: Asian Black Hispanic/Latino White Other __________

22. What language(s) do you speak? Check all that apply.
- English
- Spanish
- Fulani
- Kru
- Sonnike
- Ibo
- Yoruba
- Mandé
- Bengali
- Other

23. How many people in your household are: Seniors (over 65) ___ Adults (18-65) ___ Children (under 18) ___

24. Please check ALL of your major sources of income:
- Employment
- Public benefits
- Pension/Social Security
- Other

25. Please tell us about your current employment/education status. Check ALL that apply.
- I have a full time job
- I have a part time job
- I have more than one job
- I am a full time student
- I am a part time student
- I am not working
- I am retired

26. Please check ALL of the financial services you use regularly:
- I use a personal checking account
- I use a personal savings account
- I use credit cards
- I use Pay-day lending
- I use a check cashing service
- I use money orders

27. Please circle which of the following best describes your annual household income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>0-9,999</th>
<th>10,000-19,999</th>
<th>20,000-29,999</th>
<th>30,000-49,999</th>
<th>50,000-74,999</th>
<th>75,000-99,999</th>
<th>100,000 or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$19,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$24,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would like to be able to follow-up with you to connect you to resources and services.
If you are interested, please provide your contact information below.
Name: ___________________________ Primary Phone #: __________________ Email: ________________________