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## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Currently, it is estimated that approximately 52,581 households earning under $80 \%$ of the area median income ( 34,021 renter and 18,559 owner) are either cost burdened, living in substandard or over-crowded housing conditions within the City of Albuquerque, accounting for 26 percent of all households. By FY 2011, the number of households with problems is anticipated to rise by 2,781 to approximately 55,361 . Those 52,581 households with problems are distributed among the following income categories, and distributed throughout the city's corporate limits.


Low- and moderate- income families and individuals have been especially hard hit by escalating housing costs in the Albuquerque Metropolitan area. Since 2000, real income has grown at nominal levels while housing costs have surged. As a result, the availability of affordable dwellings for those at the lower end of the income spectrum is vanishing.
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Consider the dilemna faced by Albuquerque families in the workforce.

| WORKING COUPLE HOUSING AFFORDABILITY HIGHLIGHTS | Hourly Rate For Household 1/ | Ability To Afford The Median Priced Resale Home of \$211,000 $2 /$ | Ability To Afford Median 3BR Rental At \$1,086/mo. 3/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail - Food \& Beverage | \$22.70 | No | Yes |
| Retail - Clothing \& Accessories | \$18.40 | No | Yes |
| Retail - Electrial Appliances | \$28.80 | No | Yes |
| Police Officer After One Year | \$26.96 | No | Yes |
| Firefighter After One Year | \$27.08 | No | Yes |
| Construction Workers | \$30.60 | No | Yes |
| Tier 1 APS Teachers | \$28.56 | No | Yes |
| Air Transport | \$29.92 | No | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |

1/ Source is the New Mexico Department of Labor, City of Albuquerque and APS.
2/ Assumes a 6\% fixed rate amortized over 30 years with a 5\% down and customary underwriting criteria (28\%). Also assumes no consumer debt, cash for the downpayment and reasonable creditt.
3/ Assumes the household will spend no more than $30 \%$ of their gross income on housing.
The report includes a detailed methodology to establish neighborhoods that are either "prone to disinvestment", "prone to gentrification" or "stable" as depicted below.

©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790

Page II

### 1.0 CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

### 1.1 Population and Household Growth

It is estimated that in 2007 approximately 489,693 persons reside within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque. According to projections generated by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), this figure is projected to rise to 511,492 by FY 2011, representing an annual growth rate of just under $1 \%$.

Depicted on Table 1-1, MRCOG population projections for the corporate limits of each Community Planning Area (CPA) vary substantially. Refer to Map1-1 in Appendix 1.0 for the geographic boundaries of CPAs. While the Westside, Southwest Mesa, North Valley, South Valley, North Albuquerque and Foothills CPAs all are projected to show population growth from FY 2007 through 2011, the Near Heights, Mid Heights, East Gateway and Central Albuquerque show very flat growth or limited population loss during the projection period.

As expected, household growth generally follows population yet is slightly affected by MRCOG projections associated with the number of persons per household and persons in group quarters. Limited adjustments were made to MRCOG population projections based on activity evident from 2000 through 2007 and previous growth rates for these regions generated by BBER. Shown on Table 1-2, CPA household growth is projected to follow the same trends evident for population. Of note are the concentrations of persons in group quarters (excluded from household projections) evident in the Near Heights, West Side and Central Albuquerque CPAs.

### 1.2 Research Methodology

The research methodology used to estimate and project affordable housing needs involved the application of ratios of households 'with problems' evident in 2000 to projected FY 2007 to 2011 household estimates for the City of Albuquerque and each CPA within its corporate limits. According to HUD, a household 'with problems' consists of:
(1) persons and families living in units with physical defects (lacking a complete kitchen or bath); or
(2) persons and families living in overcrowded conditions (greater than 1.01 persons/room); or
(3) persons and families cost burdened (paying more than 30 percent of income for housing including utilities).

Income limits (MFI per HUD) are as follows:
1999 (date census taken) - <30\% MFI range from \$9,700-22,100 - \$18,250 by household size; 31 - $51 \%$ MFI - \$16,150-\$30,450; 51-80\% MFI - \$21,200-\$55,450.
2007 - <30\% MFI range from \$11,750-\$22,100 - \$22,100 by household size; 31 51\% MFI - \$19,550-\$36,900; 51-80\% MFI - \$31,300-\$59,000.
©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790
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The following estimating procedure was employed to estimate affordable housing demand from FY 2007 to FY 2011:
> Generate population and household estimates for the City of Albuquerque and each CPA within its corporate limits drawn from MRCOG projections (see Tables 1-1 and 1-2).
> Project FY 2007-2011 households for the City of Albuquerque and each CPA by removing the population in group quarters and slightly adjusting MRCOG projections based on a review of activity evident from 2000-2007 and a review of BBER projections made for the City of Albuquerque.
> Project the number of households with problems in the City of Albuquerque and each CPA within its corporate limits for elderly households over age 62 comprised of up to two persons, small households comprised of $2-4$ persons, large households with 5 or more persons, and all other households by tenure. These projections were generated for households earning less than $30 \%$ of the Bernalillo County median family income (MFI), earning 31$50 \% \mathrm{MFI}$, earning 51-60\% MFI and earning 61-80\% MFI. Such estimates were established by applying applicable ratios in 2000 to projected FY 2007 and FY 2011 households by tenure. The 51-60\% and 61-80\% category estimates were extrapolated based on HUD information at the request of Albuquerque.

### 1.3 City of Albuquerque Overview

Affordable housing needs for the City of Albuquerque as a whole are presented by specific low income category. Consider the distribution of those city households with 'problems' in 2007 by income category and housing tenure.

©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790

The data suggests high concentrations of affordable rental housing need evident from persons earning below $50 \%$ of the area median, while need is more evenly distributed by income class among owners. Table 1-3 indicates a minimum deficit of at least 8,373 rental units for persons under $30 \%$ of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand.

## Households Earning Less Than 30\% Of The Median Family Income (MFI)

$\checkmark$ It is estimated that a total of 18,278 households in 2007 , or 9 percent of all households in Albuquerque are earning less than 30 percent of the median income with housing problems of some sort.
$\checkmark$ Of the 13,368 renter households earning less than $30 \%$ of the median and projected to have housing problems in FY 2007, 13 percent are elderly (over the age of 62), 34 percent are comprised of small households (2-4 persons), 7 percent are comprised of large households (5 or more persons), and 46 percent are comprised of households.
$\checkmark$ Of those 4,910 owner households earning under 30\% MFI with problems in 2007, 40 percent are elderly, 28 percent are comprised of small households, 7 percent are comprised of large households and 25 percent are comprised of all other households.
$\checkmark$ By FY 2011, it is estimated that an additional 967 households in this income category will have problems, suggesting an annual addition of approximately 193 households in need.

## Households Earning Between 31-50\% Median Family Income (MFI)

$\checkmark$ It is estimated that a total of 16,672 households in 2007 , or 8 percent of all households, in Albuquerque are comprised of households earning between 31 to 50 percent of the median income with housing problems of some sort.
$\checkmark$ Of the 11,594 renter households earning from 31 to $50 \%$ of the median and projected to have housing problems in FY 2007, 13 percent are elderly (over the age of 62), 33 percent are comprised of small households (2-4 persons), 10 percent are comprised of large households (5 or more persons), and 44 percent are comprised of all other households.
$\checkmark$ Of those 5,077 owner households earning under from 31 to $50 \%$ of the median with problems in 2007, 32 percent are elderly, 38 percent are comprised of small households, 10 percent are comprised of large households and 20 percent are comprised of all other households.
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$\checkmark$ By FY 2011, it is estimated that an additional 883 households in this income category will have problems, suggesting an annual addition of approximately 176 households in need.

## Households Earning Between 51-60\% Median Family Income (MFI)

$\checkmark$ It is estimated that a total of 7,282 households in 2007, or 4 percent of all households in Albuquerque, are comprised of households earning between 51 to 60 percent of the median income with housing problems of some sort.
$\checkmark$ Of the 3,887 renter households earning from 51 to $60 \%$ of the median and projected to have housing problems in FY 2007, 14 percent are elderly (over the age of 62), 37 percent are comprised of small households (2-4 persons), 11 percent are comprised of large households (5 or more persons), and 38 percent are comprised of all other households.
$\checkmark$ Of those 3,395 owner households earning 51 to $60 \%$ MFI with problems in 2007, 19 percent are elderly, 42 percent are comprised of small households, 15 percent are comprised of large households and 24 percent are comprised of all other households.
$\checkmark$ By FY 2011, it is estimated that an additional 385 households in this income category will have problems, suggesting an annual addition of approximately 77 households in need.

## Households Earning Between 61-80\% Median Family Income (MFI)

$\checkmark$ It is estimated that a total of 10,351 households in 2007, or 5 percent of all households in Albuquerque, are comprised of households earning between 61 to 80 percent of the median income with housing problems of some sort.
$\checkmark$ Of the 5,174 renter households earning from 61 to $80 \%$ of the median and projected to have housing problems in FY 2007, 14 percent are elderly (over the age of 62), 37 percent are comprised of small households (2-4 persons), 11 percent are comprised of large households (5 or more persons), and 38 percent are comprised of all other households.
$\checkmark$ Of those 5,177 owner households earning 61 to $80 \%$ MFI with problems in 2007, 19 percent are elderly, 42 percent are comprised of small households, 15 percent are comprised of large households and 24 percent are comprised of all other households.
$\checkmark$ By FY 2011, it is estimated that an additional 548 households in this income category will have problems, suggesting an annual addition of approximately 110 households in need.

It should be noted that for renter households earning 51 to $60 \%$ and 61 to $80 \%$ of the area median, surpluses of rental housing were evident for the city as a whole and for
©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790
each CPA. For owner households in this income category, the same situation was evident with the exception of very small deficits ( $<100$ units) in the North Albuquerque and Foothills CPAs. The combination of households with problems and inventory are both important to assess in light of prevailing market conditions. Major price moves in ownership housing costs from '00-'07 need to be considered with respect to this tenure category.

## Overview Of City Housing Needs By Household Type

Regardless of income category, affordable rental housing demand for the City of Albuquerque appears to be more extensively evident for small (2-4) and other (mostly one-person) households. Elderly and large households are evident but to a substantially lesser degree.


With respect to affordable housing demand by owners in the city, needs tends to be distributed among all household types regardless of income category.

©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790
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### 1.4 Central Albuquerque Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

The Central Albuquerque CPA is situated entirely within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque and contains approximately 9,007 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 3,682 households or $41 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with vast proportion being renters and earning under $50 \%$ of the median. Drawn from Table 1-4, housing needs in the Central Albuquerque CPA are depicted below.


Of those 2,579 renters in need in 2007, the greatest proportion of need is derived from small (2-4) and other (one-person) households.


Owners earning under 80\% of the MFI with housing problems in Central Albuquerque account for $29 \%$ of those in need and are concentrated in the lowest income categories and mostly comprised of small (2-4) and elderly households. Table 1-4 indicates a
minimum deficit of at least 748 rental units for households earning under 30\% of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand, while a deficit of 237 ownership units affordable to households earning under 50\% MFI was evident in 2007. Noted on Table 3-2, approximately 148 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values of \$131,200.

### 1.5 East Gateway Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

East Gateway is within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque and contains approximately 22,296 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 5,719 households or $26 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $57 \%$ derived from renters and $43 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-5, housing needs in the East Gateway CPA are depicted below.


Of those 3,260 renters in need in 2007, the greatest proportion of need is derived from Small (2-4) and other (one-person) households.
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Of the estimated 2,459 owner households in need in 2007, it is distributed as follows.


Table 1-5 indicates a minimum deficit of at least 805 rental units for persons earning under $30 \%$ of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand. Noted on Noted on Table 3-2, approximately 148 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values of $\$ 193,800$.

### 1.6 Mid Heights Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

Mid Heights is within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque and contains approximately 38,678 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 9,645 households or $25 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $71 \%$ derived from renters and $29 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-6, housing needs in the East Gateway CPA are depicted below.


Of those 6,842 renters in need in 2007, most of the need is derived from small (2-4) and other (one-person) households.
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Of the estimated 2,803 owner households in need in 2007, most is concentrated among small (2-4) and other (one-person) households.


Table 1-6 indicates a minimum deficit of at least 1,465 rental units for persons earning under $30 \%$ of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand, and at least 1,230 owner units affordable to households earning under $50 \%$ of the median. Noted on Table 3-2, approximately 1,236 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values at $\$ 236,300$.

### 1.7 North Valley Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

According to the City of Albuquerque Planning Department, some of the North Valley CPA is situated outside the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque. This study contains the part in the city limits. North Valley contains approximately 14,874 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 4,250 households or $29 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $60 \%$ derived from renters and $40 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-7, housing needs in the North Valley CPA are depicted below.


Of those 2,540 renters in need in 2007, most is concentrated at the lowest end of the income spectrum from small (2-4) and other (one-person) households.
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Like the situation for renter households, need evident for the 1,710 owner households in 2007 is most evident in the lowest income categories yet dispersed across households by type.


Table 1-7 indicates a deficit of at least 523 rental units for persons earning under 30\% of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand, and at least 761 owner units affordable to households earning under $50 \%$ of the median. Noted on Table 3-2, approximately 2,145 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values at $\$ 164,800$.

### 1.8 West Side Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

All of the West Side CPA is situated within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque and is the fastest growing region in the city. The West Side CPA contains approximately 31,232 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 5,758 households or $18 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $54 \%$ derived from renters and $46 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-8, housing needs in the West Side CPA are depicted below.

©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790
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Of those 3,106 renters in need in 2007, most are equitable distributed by lower income category but concentrated in small (2-4) and other (one-person) households.


Like the situation for renter households, need evident for the 2,652 owner households in 2007 are equitably distributed by lower income category and most evident for small (2-4) households.


Table 1-8 indicates a deficit of at least 498 rental units for persons earning under 30\% of the median and 488 rental units for households earning from 31 to $50 \%$ of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand. This mismatch also resulted in a deficit of at least 1,091 owner units affordable to households earning under $50 \%$ of the median. Noted on Table 3-2, at least 12,100 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values at $\$ 193,800$.

### 1.9 Southwest Mesa Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

All of the Southwest Mesa CPA is situated within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque. The Southwest Mesa CPA contains approximately 16,792 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 5,182 households or $31 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $36 \%$ derived from renters and $64 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-9, housing needs in the Southwest Mesa CPA are depicted below.


Of those 1,888 renters in need in 2007, most were comprised of small (2-4) households, large (>5) and other (one-person) in the lowest income categories.
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The Southwest Mesa CPA has nearly 70\% of its affordable housing needs comprised of owner households. In 2007, the estimated 3,294 owner households in need were distributed among the following household types and concentrated more so in the 51 to 80\% income categories.


Table 1-9 indicates a deficit of at least 211 rental units for persons earning under 30\% of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand. Noted on Table 3-2, approximately 8,614 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values at $\$ 144,700$.

### 1.10 Near Heights Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

The Near Heights CPA is situated within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque, and is comprised of 33,402 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 11,754 households or $35 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $81 \%$ derived from renters and $19 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-10, housing needs in the Near Heights CPA are depicted below.
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Of those 9,562 renters in need in 2007, most are concentrated at the lowest end of the income spectrum in small (2-4) and other (one-person) households.


For the much more limited owner household need in 2007, need is distributed among the following household types.


Table 1-10 indicates a deficit of at least 3,248 rental units for persons earning under $30 \%$ of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand, and at least 1,001 owner units affordable to households earning under $50 \%$ of the median. Noted on Table 3 - 2, approximately 248 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values at $\$ 144,100$.

### 1.11 South Valley Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

According to the Albuquerque Planning Department, most of the South Valley CPA is situated outside the city's corporate limits, and this study treats only the part in Albuquerque. This CPA is comprised of 1,772 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 582 households or $33 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $34 \%$ derived from renters and $66 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-11, housing needs in the corporate limits of the South Valley CPA are depicted below.


Of those 200 renters in need in 2007, all are concentrated at the lowest end of the income spectrum primarily in small (2-4) and other (one-person) households. The 382 owner households with problems in 2007 fall within the following household income types.
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Table 1-11 indicates a deficit of at least 27 rental units for persons earning under 30\% of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand, and at least 67 owner units affordable to households earning under 50\% of the median. Noted on Table 3-2, approximately 295 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values at $\$ 167,900$.

### 1.12 Foothills Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

The Foothills CPA is situated within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque, and is comprised of 20,532 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 3,500 households or $17 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $65 \%$ derived from renters and $35 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-12, housing needs in the Near Heights CPA are depicted in the following chart.


Of those 2,274 renters in need in 2007, most equally distributed by income class but concentrated in small (2-4) and other (one-person) households.
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For those 1,226 owner households with problems in 2007, they were distributed in the following household types.


Table 1-12 indicates a deficit of at least 440 rental units for persons earning under 30\% and 240 units for households earning 31 to $50 \%$ of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand. For owner households, a deficit of at least 222 units affordable to households earning under $50 \%$ of the median exists from the mismatch. Noted on Table 3-2, approximately 1,230 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values of $\$ 241,600$.

### 1.13 North Albuquerque Community Planning Area (CPA) Overview

All of the North Albuquerque CPA is situated within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque. The North Albuquerque CPA contains approximately 15,896 households in 2007. Of these, approximately 2,577 households or $16 \%$ are currently experiencing housing problems, with $45 \%$ derived from renters and $55 \%$ from owners. Drawn from Table 1-13, housing needs in the North Albuquerque CPA are depicted below.
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Of those 1,182 renters in need in 2007, most were in the lower income categories distributed among the following household types.


Of the 1,395 owner households with problems in 2007, all income and household types evidenced need with the exception of large (>5) households.


Table 1-13 indicates a deficit of at least 109 rental units for households earning under $30 \%$ and 57 units for households earning between 31 to $50 \%$ of the median given the mismatch between supply and demand. A deficit of at least 585 owner units affordable to households earning under $50 \%$ of the median was also evident as a result of the mismatch. Noted on Table 3-2, approximately 2,201 single-family permits were issued since 2000 with average 2006 permitting values at $\$ 286,200$.

### 1.14 Needs Of Families Displaced As A Result of Governmental Action

Patrick Sanchez of the Albuquerque Planning Department was contacted relative to the incidence of families and persons displaced as a result of governmental actions. As manager of the city's code enforcement efforts, Mr. Sanchez indicated that nominal families were displaced as a result of the implementation of land use regulations and also by efforts of the Police Department. On an annual basis, Mr. Sanchez indicated that negligible numbers of persons were displaced and never exceeded 10 households. While other city departments may induce displacement by virtue of property impacted to achieve a wide variety of public purposes, relocation procedures are typically followed. In the instance of development projects that involve federal funds, the Uniform Relocation Action would apply and mandate specific procedures to be followed by those concerned as well as offer substantial rights to affected citizens.

### 1.15 Households At Risk Of Becoming Homeless

Many national and local studies across the United States reinforce chronic and severe poverty as a major contributing factor causing homelessness among persons and families alike. The population in Albuquerque suffering from severe and chronic poverty are the most vulnerable to job loss, illness, domestic violence, substance abuse and other circumstances that may push such persons and families into homelessness at any point in time. This population remains vulnerable on a continuing basis and persons and families can and do cycle in- and out- of homelessness over time. Drawn from Table 13 , consider the 22,895 persons in Albuquerque at the greatest risk of homelessness given the fact they earn less than $30 \%$ of the area median income.


Those with the highest risk in Albuquerque would be the 13,368 renter households with problems, and note their composition by family type for the community.


By FY 2011, it is estimated that the number of 'at risk' households earning under 30\% of the median will rise by 1,210 households to 24,106 . Those renter households with problems at the greatest risk will rise by 700 to a level of 14,075 by FY 2011. Note that the aforementioned estimates exclude the 9,800 persons in group quarters in 2007 that is projected to rise to 10,800 by FY 2011.

### 1.16 Households With A Mobility Or Self Care Limitation

Households with a mobility or self care limitation are defined as those where one or more persons have either:
> a long-lasting condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying; and/or
> a physical, mental, or emotional condition lasting more than 6 months that creates difficulty with dressing, bathing, or getting around inside the home.

These disabled households hold the greatest prospect of needing supportive housing now and going forward. Supportive housing is often defined as the need for shelter and a myriad of other supportive services.

The 10,109 disabled households earning less than $80 \%$ MFI with a mobility or self care limitation in addition to a housing problem is presented in the following chart (also refer to Table 1-14). Those 4,417 disabled households earning less than $30 \%$ of the area median represent the group 'at risk' of needing supportive housing, and this income category is primarily comprised of renters. For the remaining income categories, tenure tends to be split equally.


Of the 5,821 renter households with a mobility and self-care limitation and housing problem in Albuquerque, about two-thirds are not elderly and a sizable one-third are older than age 62 .
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Indicated below, elderly households who own their own homes represent nearly 50\% of those at risk of supportive housing need in the lowest income categories in Albuquerque.


By FY 2011, the number of households at risk for supportive housing needs is projected to rise by 535 households to 10,644.

## APPENDIX 1.0

TABLE 1-1

## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT POPULATION PROJECTIONS, FY 2007-2011

| ©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007. | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Census } \\ 2000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Adjusted Mid-Region COG Estimates 1/ |  |  |  |  | PercentageFY Change 2007-'11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FY 2007 | FY 2008 | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2011 |  |
| CITY O | 448,607 | 489,693 | 495,660 | 500,361 | 505,168 | 511,492 | 4.45\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WESTSIDE CPA 1/ | 63,302 | 82,392 | 85,276 | 88,260 | 91,349 | 94,547 | 14.75\% |
| SOUTHWEST MEAS CPA | 37,994 | 50,947 | 52,975 | 53,988 | 55,002 | 56,582 | 11.06\% |
| NORTH VALLEY CPA 3/ | 32,524 | 36,505 | 37,185 | 37,525 | 37,865 | 38,079 | 4.31\% |
| CENTRAL ALBUQUERQUE CPA | 21,541 | 21,371 | 21,340 | 21,325 | 21,309 | 21,401 | 0.14\% |
| SOUTH VALLEY CPA 3/ | 5,033 | 5,382 | 5,451 | 5,486 | 5,520 | 5,577 | 3.62\% |
| NORTH ALBUQUERQUE CPA | 35,890 | 38,495 | 38,958 | 39,190 | 39,421 | 39,615 | 2.91\% |
| MID HEIGHTS CPA | 83,310 | 82,825 | 82,654 | 82,568 | 82,482 | 82,424 | -0.48\% |
| NEAR HEIGHTS CPA | 73,110 | 73,885 | 73,520 | 73,338 | 73,155 | 73,639 | -0.33\% |
| FOOTHILLS CPA 1/ | 44,282 | 45,634 | 45,976 | 46,321 | 46,668 | 47,018 | 3.03\% |
| EAST GATEWAY CPA | 51,622 | 52,257 | 52,327 | 52,361 | 52,396 | 52,610 | 0.68\% |

SOURCE: Mid-Region Council of Governments and Crrystal \& Company, May, 2007.
1/ Projections derived from the Mid-Region COG except adjustments made to the Westside and Foothills CPAs. Westside growth rates assumed at $3.5 \%$ per annum and $.75 \% /$ annum for the Foothills CPA. Adjustments were made based on activity evident from 2000 to 2007 and projections made by BBER for the City of Albuquerque in the late 1990s.
2/ All other projections were reviewed for consistency with the 2000 Census, MR COG estimates and BBER projections for each CPA.
3/ Portions of the CPA within the corporate limits of the City of Albuquerque.

## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

 CITY HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS, 2007-'11| ©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007. <br> JURISDICTION | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { FY } 2007 \text { EST. } \\ \text { HOUSEHOLDS 1/ } 21 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | FY 2007 EST. POP IN GROUP QUARTERS | FY 2011 EST. <br> HOUSEHOLDS 21 | FY 2011 EST. POP. IN GROUP QUARTERS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FY 2007-'11 H-HOLD } \\ \text { EST. GROWTH } 3 / \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | FY 2007-'11 H-HOLD EST. \% GROWTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE | 204,481 | 9,681 | 215,294 | 10,974 | 10,813 | 5.29\% |
| WESTSIDE CPA 21 | 31,232 | 1,744 | 36,698 | 2,377 | 5,466 | 17.50\% |
| SOUTHWEST MESA CPA | 16,792 | 236 | 19,069 | 467 | 2,277 | 13.56\% |
| NORTH VALLEY CPA 3/ | 14,874 | 756 | 15,719 | 867 | 845 | 5.68\% |
| CENTRAL ALBUQUERQUE CPA | 9,007 | 959 | 9,175 | 975 | 168 | 1.87\% |
| SOUTH VALLEY CPA 3/ | 1,772 | 0 | 1,885 | 0 | 113 | 6.38\% |
| NORTH ALBUQUERQUE CPA | 15,896 | 360 | 16,580 | 390 | 684 | 4.30\% |
| MID HEIGHTS CPA | 38,678 | 561 | 38,122 | 589 | -556 | -1.44\% |
| NEAR HEIGHTS CPA | 33,402 | 4,096 | 33,751 | 4,267 | 349 | 1.04\% |
| FOOTHILLS CPA 21 | 20,532 | 695 | 21,559 | 707 | 1,027 | 5.00\% |
| EAST GATEWAY CPA | 22,296 | 274 | 22,736 | 335 | 440 | 1.97\% |

SOURCE: Mid-Region Council of Government Projections, Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

1/ Derived from the 2000 U.S. Census and excludes population not in households (persons in group quarters).
2/ Projections derived from the Mid-Region COG except adjustments made in the
Westside and Foothills CPAs. Westside growth rates assumed at $3.5 \%$ per annum and .75\%/annum for the Foothills CPA. Adjustments were made based on
activity evident from 2000 to 2007 and projections made by BBER for the
City of Albuquerque in the late 1990s. All other projections were reviewed for consistency with the 2000 Census, MR COG estimates and BBER projections for each CPA
3/ Estimates include the city limits of Albuquerque only.

## MAP 1-1 CPA BOUNDARIES



## Low to Moderate Income Census Tracts and Community Planning Areas

## Legend

 THWEST MESA$\square$ Low to Moderate Income All Other Census Tracts
$\qquad$ FOOT HILLS
$\square$ MID-HEIGHTS CENTRALABQ $\square$ NEAR HEIGHTS
$\square$
$\square$ $\square$ WEST SIDE

13-Aug-07
Crystal \& Company, May, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

|  | Census (2000) <br> Mid-Region COG Population Projections and CHAS Databook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2007 | 2011 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters |  |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Household by Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELDERLY } \\ 1 \& 2 \text { Member } \\ \text { Households } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & \text { (2 to 4) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LARGE } \\ \text { ( } 5 \text { or more) } \end{gathered}$ | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL RENTERS | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELDERLY } \\ 1 \& 2 \text { Member } \\ \text { Households } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SMALL $(2 \text { to } 4)$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL OWNERS | TOTAL (O\&R) |
| 1. Very Low Income (0 to 50\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 4,337 \\ & 4,878 \\ & 5,136 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9,052 \\ 10,182 \\ 10,720 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,924 \\ & 2,164 \\ & 2,279 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,075 \\ & 13,582 \\ & 14,300 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27,388 \\ & 30,806 \\ & 32,435 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,476 \\ & 6,159 \\ & 6,485 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,773 \\ & 4,244 \\ & 4,468 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 826 \\ & 929 \\ & 978 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,669 \\ & 3,002 \\ & 3,161 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,744 \\ & 14,334 \\ & 15,092 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40,132 \\ & 45,140 \\ & 47,527 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 2. 0 to $30 \%$ MFI* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 2,451 \\ & 2,757 \\ & 2,903 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,752 \\ 5,345 \\ 5,628 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 868 \\ 976 \\ 1,028 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,559 \\ & 7,377 \\ & 7,768 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14,630 \\ & 16,456 \\ & 17,326 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,455 \\ & 2,761 \\ & 2,907 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,559 \\ & 1,754 \\ & 1,846 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 319 \\ & 359 \\ & 378 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,392 \\ & 1,566 \\ & 1,648 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,725 \\ & 6,439 \\ & 6,780 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,355 \\ & 22,895 \\ & 24,106 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 1,567 \\ & 1,763 \\ & 1,856 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,090 \\ 4,600 \\ 4,844 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 837 \\ & 941 \\ & 991 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,391 \\ & 6,064 \\ & 6,384 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11,885 \\ & 13,368 \\ & 14,075 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,771 \\ & 1,992 \\ & 2,097 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,241 \\ & 1,396 \\ & 1,470 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 309 \\ & 348 \\ & 366 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,044 \\ & 1,174 \\ & 1,236 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,365 \\ 4,910 \\ 5,169 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,250 \\ & 18,278 \\ & 19,244 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 3. 31 to $50 \%$ MFI* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 1,886 \\ & 2,121 \\ & 2,234 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,300 \\ 4,837 \\ 5,092 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,056 \\ & 1,188 \\ & 1,251 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,516 \\ & 6,204 \\ & 6,532 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,758 \\ & 14,350 \\ & 15,109 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,021 \\ & 3,398 \\ & 3,578 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,214 \\ & 2,490 \\ & 2,622 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 507 \\ & 570 \\ & 600 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,277 \\ & 1,436 \\ & 1,512 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,019 \\ & 7,895 \\ & 8,312 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,777 \\ & 22,245 \\ & 23,421 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 1,290 \\ & 1,451 \\ & 1,528 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,401 \\ & 3,825 \\ & 4,028 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 989 \\ 1,112 \\ 1,171 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,628 \\ & 5,206 \\ & 5,481 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,308 \\ & 11,594 \\ & 12,207 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,426 \\ & 1,604 \\ & 1,689 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,722 \\ & 1,937 \\ & 2,039 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 462 \\ & 520 \\ & 547 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 904 \\ 1,017 \\ 1,071 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,514 \\ 5,077 \\ 5,346 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14,822 \\ & 16,672 \\ & 17,553 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4. Extrapolated (51 to 60\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{gathered} 845 \\ 950 \\ 1,001 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,604 \\ & 2,929 \\ & 3,084 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 488 \\ & 549 \\ & 578 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,006 \\ & 3,381 \\ & 3,560 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6,943 \\ & 7,809 \\ & 8,222 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,951 \\ & 2,194 \\ & 2,311 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,087 \\ & 2,347 \\ & 2,472 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 641 \\ & 721 \\ & 759 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,132 \\ & 1,273 \\ & 1,341 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5,811 \\ & 6,536 \\ & 6,882 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,754 \\ & 14,346 \\ & 15,104 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{array}{r} 473 \\ 532 \\ 560 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,264 \\ & 1,422 \\ & 1,497 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 385 \\ & 433 \\ & 456 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,333 \\ & 1,499 \\ & 1,579 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,455 \\ & 3,886 \\ & 4,092 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 572 \\ & 643 \\ & 677 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,287 \\ & 1,448 \\ & 1,524 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 455 \\ & 512 \\ & 539 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 704 \\ & 792 \\ & 834 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,018 \\ & 3,395 \\ & 3,574 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6,473 \\ & 7,281 \\ & 7,666 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 1,124 \\ & 1,264 \\ & 1,331 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,466 \\ & 3,899 \\ & 4,105 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 649 \\ & 730 \\ & 769 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,002 \\ & 4,501 \\ & 4,739 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9,241 \\ 10,394 \\ 10,944 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,975 \\ & 3,346 \\ & 3,523 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,183 \\ & 3,580 \\ & 3,770 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 977 \\ 1,099 \\ 1,157 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,726 \\ & 1,941 \\ & 2,044 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8,862 \\ 9,968 \\ 10,495 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,103 \\ & 20,362 \\ & 21,439 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 629 \\ & 707 \\ & 745 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,683 \\ & 1,893 \\ & 1,993 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 513 \\ & 577 \\ & 608 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,774 \\ & 1,995 \\ & 2,101 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4,599 \\ & 5,173 \\ & 5,446 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 872 \\ 981 \\ 1,033 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,963 \\ & 2,208 \\ & 2,325 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 695 \\ & 782 \\ & 823 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,073 \\ & 1,207 \\ & 1,271 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4,603 \\ & 5,177 \\ & 5,451 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9,202 \\ 10,350 \\ 10,898 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 6. Total Households 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9,328 \\ 10,492 \\ 11,047 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25,818 \\ & 29,040 \\ & 30,575 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,611 \\ & 5,186 \\ & 5,461 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32,139 \\ & 36,150 \\ & 38,061 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71,896 \\ & 80,868 \\ & 85,144 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27,939 \\ & 31,425 \\ & 33,087 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52,975 \\ & 59,586 \\ & 62,736 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9,791 \\ 11,013 \\ 11,595 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,194 \\ & 21,589 \\ & 22,731 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 109,899 \\ & 123,613 \\ & 130,150 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 181,795 \\ & 204,481 \\ & 215,294 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 3,959 \\ & 4,453 \\ & 4,689 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,438 \\ & 11,741 \\ & 12,361 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,724 \\ & 3,064 \\ & 3,226 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,126 \\ & 14,764 \\ & 15,545 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30,247 \\ & 34,021 \\ & 35,820 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,641 \\ & 5,220 \\ & 5,496 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,213 \\ & 6,988 \\ & 7,358 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,921 \\ & 2,161 \\ & 2,275 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,725 \\ & 4,190 \\ & 4,411 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,500 \\ & 18,559 \\ & 19,540 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46,747 \\ & 52,581 \\ & 55,361 \end{aligned}$ |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 |  |  |  |  | 80,868 |  |  |  |  | 123,613 | 204,481 |
| Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | 85,144 |  |  |  |  | 130,150 | 215,294 |

* Median Family Income.

TABLE 1-3(a)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:

HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
20072011

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| CITY OF |  |  |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

| CENTRAL ALBUQUERQUE CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS | Sources of Data: |  |  |  |  |  | Five Year Period: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | -Region and | Census (2000) OG Populatio CHAS Data | n Projections ook |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY: } \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { through FY: } \\ 2011 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Renters |  |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Household by <br> Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | ELDERLY $1 \& 2$ Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \end{aligned}$ | LARGE (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL RENTERS | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LARGE (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL OWNERS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { (O\&R) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| . Very Low Income (0 to 50\% MFI)* | 312 | 600 | 275 | 1,231 | 2,418 | 467 | 369 | 135 | 147 | 1,118 | 3,536 |
| 2007 Projections | 346 | 665 | 305 | 1,364 | 2,679 | 517 | 409 | 150 | 163 | 1,238 | 3,917 |
| 2011 Projections | 352 | 677 | 310 | 1,389 | 2,728 | 527 | 416 | 152 | 166 | 1,262 | 3,990 |
| 2. 0 to 30\% MFI* | 208 | 287 | 165 | 737 | 1,397 | 261 | 182 | 54 | 92 | 589 | 1,986 |
| 2007 Projections | 230 | 318 | 183 | 816 | 1,548 | 289 | 202 | 60 | 102 | 652 | 2,200 |
| 2011 Projections | 235 | 324 | 186 | 832 | 1,576 | 295 | 205 | 61 | 104 | 665 | 2,241 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 168 | 228 | 161 | 591 | 1,148 | 177 | 134 | 54 | 83 | 448 | 1,596 |
| 2007 Projections | 186 | 253 | 178 | 655 | 1,272 | 196 | 148 | 60 | 92 | 496 | 1,768 |
| 2011 Projections | 190 | 257 | 182 | 667 | 1,295 | 200 | 151 | 61 | 94 | 506 | 1,801 |
| 3. 31 to 50\% MFI* | 104 | 313 | 110 | 494 | 1,021 | 206 | 187 | 81 | 55 | 529 | 1,550 |
| 2007 Projections | 115 | 347 | 122 | 547 | 1,131 | 228 | 207 | 90 | 61 | 586 | 1,717 |
| 2011 Projections | 117 | 353 | 124 | 557 | 1,152 | 232 | 211 | 91 | 62 | 597 | 1,749 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 72 | 252 | 110 | 375 | 809 | 70 | 122 | 72 | 30 | 295 | 1,104 |
| 2007 Projections | 80 | 279 | 122 | 415 | 896 | 78 | 135 | 80 | 33 | 327 | 1,223 |
| 2011 Projections | 81 | 284 | 124 | 423 | 913 | 79 | 138 | 81 | 34 | 333 | 1,246 |
| 4. Extrapolated (51 to 60\% MFI)* | 42 | 129 | 32 | 247 | 450 | 86 | 67 | 53 | 59 | 265 | 715 |
| 2007 Projections | 47 | 143 | 35 | 274 | 498 | 95 | 74 | 59 | 65 | 294 | 792 |
| 2011 Projections | 47 | 146 | 36 | 279 | 508 | 97 | 76 | 60 | 67 | 299 | 807 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 9 | 62 | 27 | 60 | 159 | 21 | 27 | 30 | 22 | 100 | 259 |
| 2007 Projections | 10 | 69 | 30 | 66 | 176 | 23 | 30 | 33 | 24 | 111 | 287 |
| 2011 Projections | 10 | 70 | 30 | 68 | 179 | 24 | 30 | 34 | 25 | 113 | 292 |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* | 55 | 172 | 42 | 329 | 598 | 130 | 103 | 80 | 90 | 403 | 1,001 |
| 2007 Projections | 61 | 191 | 47 | 364 | 662 | 144 | 114 | 89 | 100 | 446 | 1,109 |
| 2011 Projections | 62 | 194 | 47 | 371 | 675 | 147 | 116 | 90 | 102 | 455 | 1,130 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 13 | 82 | 37 | 79 | 212 | 32 | 41 | 47 | 33 | 153 | 365 |
| 2007 Projections | 14 | 91 | 41 | 88 | 235 | 35 | 45 | 52 | 37 | 169 | 404 |
| 2011 Projections | 15 | 93 | 42 | 89 | 239 | 36 | 46 | 53 | 37 | 173 | 412 |
| 6. Total Households | 489 | 1,287 | 410 | 2,381 | 4,567 | 1,118 | 1,272 | 471 | 703 | 3,564 | 8,131 |
| 2007 Projections | 542 | 1,426 | 454 | 2,638 | 5,059 | 1,238 | 1,409 | 522 | 779 | 3,948 | 9,007 |
| 2011 Projections | 552 | 1,452 | 463 | 2,687 | 5,153 | 1,262 | 1,435 | 531 | 793 | 4,022 | 9,175 |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems | 262 | 624 | 335 | 1,105 | 2,328 | 300 | 324 | 203 | 168 | 996 | 3,324 |
| 2007 Projections | 290 | 691 | 371 | 1,224 | 2,579 | 332 | 359 | 225 | 186 | 1,103 | 3,682 |
| 2011 Projections | 296 | 704 | 378 | 1,247 | 2,627 | 339 | 366 | 229 | 190 | 1,124 | 3,751 |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 |  |  |  |  | 5,059 |  |  |  |  | 3,948 | 9,007 |
| Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | 5,153 |  |  |  |  | 4,022 | 9,175 |

Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:

CENTRAL ALBUQUERQUE CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

TABLE 1-4(b)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF
LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
Five Year Period:

## FY: through FY: <br> 20072011

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | CENTRAL |
| ALBUQUERQUE CPA |  |  |

[^0]
## TABLE 1-5(a)

©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

Sources of Data:
Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
Census (2000)
COG Population Projections
and CHAS Databook

|  | Renters |  |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household by <br> Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER Households | TOTAL RENTERS | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER Households | TOTAL OWNERS | TOTAL <br> (O\&R) |
| 1. Very Low Income (0 to 50\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{array}{r} 569 \\ 595 \\ 607 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,349 \\ & 1,411 \\ & 1,439 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 229 \\ & 240 \\ & 244 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,070 \\ & 1,119 \\ & 1,141 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,217 \\ & 3,365 \\ & 3,431 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 773 \\ & 808 \\ & 824 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 373 \\ & 390 \\ & 398 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 56 \\ & 58 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 288 \\ & 301 \\ & 307 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,488 \\ & 1,556 \\ & 1,587 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,705 \\ & 4,921 \\ & 5,018 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 2. 0 to $30 \% \mathrm{MFI}^{*}$ 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 343 \\ & 359 \\ & 366 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 797 \\ & 834 \\ & 850 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 119 \\ & 124 \\ & 127 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 514 \\ & 538 \\ & 548 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,773 \\ & 1,854 \\ & 1,891 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 354 \\ & 370 \\ & 378 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 157 \\ & 164 \\ & 167 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 10 \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 143 \\ & 150 \\ & 153 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 664 \\ & 694 \\ & 708 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,437 \\ & 2,549 \\ & 2,599 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 183 \\ & 191 \\ & 195 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 641 \\ & 670 \\ & 684 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 119 \\ & 124 \\ & 127 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 440 \\ 460 \\ 469 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,383 \\ & 1,446 \\ & 1,475 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 234 \\ & 245 \\ & 250 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 109 \\ & 114 \\ & 116 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 10 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 107 \\ & 112 \\ & 114 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 460 \\ & 481 \\ & 491 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,843 \\ & 1,928 \\ & 1,966 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3. 31 to 50\% MFI* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 226 \\ & 236 \\ & 241 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 552 \\ & 577 \\ & 589 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 110 \\ & 115 \\ & 117 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 556 \\ & 582 \\ & 593 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,444 \\ & 1,510 \\ & 1,540 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 419 \\ & 438 \\ & 447 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 216 \\ & 226 \\ & 230 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 44 \\ & 46 \\ & 47 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 145 \\ & 152 \\ & 155 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 824 \\ & 862 \\ & 879 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,268 \\ & 2,372 \\ & 2,419 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 107 \\ & 112 \\ & 114 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 460 \\ & 481 \\ & 491 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 96 \\ 100 \\ 102 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 448 \\ & 469 \\ & 478 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,111 \\ & 1,162 \\ & 1,185 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 225 \\ & 235 \\ & 240 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 188 \\ & 197 \\ & 201 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 46 \\ & 47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 108 \\ & 113 \\ & 115 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 565 \\ & 591 \\ & 603 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,676 \\ & 1,753 \\ & 1,787 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4. Extrapolated (51 to 60\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & 79 \\ & 81 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 322 \\ & 337 \\ & 343 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 60 \\ & 63 \\ & 64 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 197 \\ & 206 \\ & 210 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 655 \\ & 685 \\ & 699 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 341 \\ & 357 \\ & 364 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 308 \\ & 322 \\ & 328 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 99 \\ 104 \\ 106 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 194 \\ & 203 \\ & 207 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 942 \\ 985 \\ 1,005 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,597 \\ & 1,670 \\ & 1,703 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems <br> 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & 47 \\ & 48 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 116 \\ & 121 \\ & 124 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \\ & 37 \\ & 37 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \\ & 75 \\ & 77 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 267 \\ & 279 \\ & 285 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 107 \\ & 112 \\ & 114 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 206 \\ & 215 \\ & 220 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \\ & 82 \\ & 83 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 135 \\ & 141 \\ & 144 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 525 \\ & 549 \\ & 560 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 792 \\ & 828 \\ & 845 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 100 \\ & 105 \\ & 107 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 429 \\ & 449 \\ & 458 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 84 \\ & 85 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 262 \\ & 274 \\ & 279 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 871 \\ & 911 \\ & 929 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 521 \\ & 545 \\ & 556 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 469 \\ & 491 \\ & 500 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 151 \\ & 158 \\ & 161 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 295 \\ & 309 \\ & 315 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,436 \\ & 1,502 \\ & 1,532 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,307 \\ & 2,413 \\ & 2,460 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 59 \\ & 62 \\ & 63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 155 \\ & 162 \\ & 165 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 46 \\ & 48 \\ & 49 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 95 \\ 99 \\ 101 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 356 \\ & 372 \\ & 380 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 163 \\ & 170 \\ & 174 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 314 \\ & 328 \\ & 335 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 118 \\ & 123 \\ & 126 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 205 \\ & 214 \\ & 219 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 801 \\ & 838 \\ & 854 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,157 \\ & 1,210 \\ & 1,234 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 6. Total Households 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 1,013 \\ & 1,059 \\ & 1,080 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,264 \\ & 3,414 \\ & 3,481 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 559 \\ & 585 \\ & 596 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,648 \\ & 2,769 \\ & 2,824 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7,482 \\ & 7,825 \\ & 7,980 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4,018 \\ & 4,202 \\ & 4,285 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6,382 \\ & 6,675 \\ & 6,807 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,011 \\ & 1,057 \\ & 1,078 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,425 \\ & 2,536 \\ & 2,586 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 13,836 \\ & 14,471 \\ & 14,756 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 21,318 22,296 22,736 |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 394 \\ & 412 \\ & 420 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,372 \\ & 1,435 \\ & 1,463 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 296 \\ & 310 \\ & 316 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,055 \\ & 1,103 \\ & 1,125 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,117 \\ & 3,260 \\ & 3,324 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 729 \\ & 762 \\ & 777 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 817 \\ & 854 \\ & 871 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 250 \\ & 261 \\ & 267 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 555 \\ & 580 \\ & 592 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,351 \\ & 2,459 \\ & 2,507 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5,468 \\ & 5,719 \\ & 5,832 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | 7,825 |  |  |  |  | 14,471 | 22,296 |

TABLE 1-5(b)
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:

## EAST GATEWAY CPA <br> CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

## Five Year Period:

FY: through FY:
20072011

|  | EAST GATEWAY CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 1,733 | 664 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 1,854 | 694 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 981 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 1,050 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (752) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (805) | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 1,448 | 821 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 1,510 | 862 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 2,361 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 2,462 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 913 | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reuduced from '00 | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 3,181 | 1,485 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 3,365 | 1,556 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 3,342 | 2,438 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 3,512 | 2,555 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 161 | 953 |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reduced from '00 | reduced from '00 |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.

## TABLE 1-6(a)

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

## MID HEIGHTS CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
20072011

Mid-Region COG Population Projections
and CHAS Databook

|  | and CHAS Databook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters |  |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Household by Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | ELDERLY <br> 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \end{aligned}$ | LARGE (5 or more) | OTHER Households | TOTAL RENTERS | ELDERLY <br> 1 \& 2 Member Households | SMALL $(2 \text { to } 4)$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER Households | TOTAL OWNERS | TOTAL <br> (O\&R) |
| 1. Very Low Income ( 0 to $50 \%$ MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 1,097 \\ & 1,159 \\ & 1,143 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,476 \\ & 1,560 \\ & 1,538 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 258 \\ & 273 \\ & 269 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,489 \\ & 2,631 \\ & 2,593 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,340 \\ & 5,644 \\ & 5,563 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,094 \\ & 1,156 \\ & 1,140 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 377 \\ & 398 \\ & 393 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \\ & 77 \\ & 76 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 547 \\ & 578 \\ & 570 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,091 \\ & 2,210 \\ & 2,178 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,431 \\ & 7,854 \\ & 7,741 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 2. 0 to $30 \%$ MFI* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 555 \\ & 587 \\ & 578 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 684 \\ & 723 \\ & 713 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 74 \\ & 73 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,244 \\ & 1,315 \\ & 1,296 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,553 \\ & 2,698 \\ & 2,659 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 475 \\ & 502 \\ & 495 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 170 \\ & 180 \\ & 177 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 291 \\ & 308 \\ & 303 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 948 \\ 1,002 \\ 988 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,501 \\ & 3,700 \\ & 3,647 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 357 \\ & 377 \\ & 372 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 575 \\ & 608 \\ & 599 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 70 \\ & 74 \\ & 73 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,022 \\ & 1,080 \\ & 1,065 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,024 \\ & 2,139 \\ & 2,108 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 417 \\ & 441 \\ & 434 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 146 \\ & 154 \\ & 152 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 181 \\ & 191 \\ & 189 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 756 \\ & 799 \\ & 788 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,780 \\ & 2,938 \\ & 2,896 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 3. 31 to 50\% MFI* <br> 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 542 \\ & 573 \\ & 565 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 792 \\ & 837 \\ & 825 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 188 \\ & 199 \\ & 196 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,245 \\ & 1,316 \\ & 1,297 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,787 \\ & 2,946 \\ & 2,903 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 619 \\ & 654 \\ & 645 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 207 \\ & 219 \\ & 216 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61 \\ & 64 \\ & 64 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 256 \\ & 271 \\ & 267 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,143 \\ & 1,208 \\ & 1,191 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,930 \\ & 4,154 \\ & 4,094 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 441 \\ & 466 \\ & 459 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 659 \\ & 696 \\ & 686 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 152 \\ & 161 \\ & 158 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,076 \\ & 1,137 \\ & 1,121 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,328 \\ & 2,460 \\ & 2,425 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 233 \\ & 246 \\ & 243 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 154 \\ & 163 \\ & 160 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53 \\ & 56 \\ & 55 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 213 \\ & 225 \\ & 222 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 653 \\ 690 \\ 680 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,981 \\ & 3,151 \\ & 3,105 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 4. Extrapolated (51 to 60\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 251 \\ & 265 \\ & 261 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 671 \\ & 709 \\ & 699 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 112 \\ & 118 \\ & 117 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 813 \\ & 859 \\ & 847 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,847 \\ & 1,952 \\ & 1,924 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 519 \\ \hline 549 \\ 541 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 356 \\ & 376 \\ & 371 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 80 \\ & 85 \\ & 83 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 188 \\ & 199 \\ & 196 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,143 \\ & 1,208 \\ & 1,191 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,990 \\ & 3,160 \\ & 3,115 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 139 \\ & 147 \\ & 145 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 317 \\ & 335 \\ & 330 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 86 \\ & 91 \\ & 90 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 369 \\ & 390 \\ & 384 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 910 \\ & 962 \\ & 948 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 116 \\ & 123 \\ & 121 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 219 \\ & 231 \\ & 228 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 44 \\ & 47 \\ & 46 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 113 \\ & 119 \\ & 118 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 492 \\ & 520 \\ & 513 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,402 \\ & 1,482 \\ & 1,460 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 334 \\ & 353 \\ & 348 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 894 \\ & 945 \\ & 931 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 149 \\ & 157 \\ & 155 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,082 \\ & 1,144 \\ & 1,127 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,459 \\ & 2,599 \\ & 2,562 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 791 \\ & 836 \\ & 824 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 542 \\ & 573 \\ & 565 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122 \\ & 129 \\ & 127 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 288 \\ & 304 \\ & 300 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,73 \\ & 1,842 \\ & 1,816 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,202 \\ & 4,441 \\ & 4,377 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 185 \\ & 196 \\ & 193 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 421 \\ & 445 \\ & 439 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 114 \\ & 120 \\ & 119 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 491 \\ & 519 \\ & 511 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,212 \\ & 1,281 \\ & 1,263 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 177 \\ & 187 \\ & 184 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 335 \\ & 354 \\ & 349 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \\ & 70 \\ & 69 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 173 \\ & 183 \\ & 180 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 751 \\ & 794 \\ & 782 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,963 \\ & 2,075 \\ & 2,045 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 6. Total Households 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,459 \\ & 2,599 \\ & 2,562 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5,439 \\ & 5,748 \\ & 5,666 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 720 \\ & 761 \\ & 750 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7,651 \\ & 8,086 \\ & 7,970 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,269 \\ & 17,195 \\ & 16,947 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7,177 \\ & 7,585 \\ & 7,476 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8,501 \\ & 8,985 \\ & 8,855 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,479 \\ & 1,563 \\ & 1,541 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,170 \\ & 3,350 \\ & 3,302 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 20,327 \\ & 21,483 \\ & 21,175 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 36,596 38,678 38,122 |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,122 \\ & 1,186 \\ & 1,169 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,972 \\ & 2,084 \\ & 2,054 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 422 \\ & 446 \\ & 440 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,958 \\ & 3,126 \\ & 3,081 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6,474 \\ & 6,842 \\ & 6,744 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 943 \\ & 997 \\ & 982 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 854 \\ & 903 \\ & 890 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 175 \\ & 185 \\ & 182 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 680 \\ & 719 \\ & 708 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,652 \\ & 2,803 \\ & 2,763 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 9,126 \\ & 9,645 \\ & 9,507 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | 17,195 <br> 16,947 |  |  |  |  | 21,483 | 38,678 |

Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:

TABLE 1-6(b)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

```
                                    Five Year Period:
MID HEIGHTS CPA
    FY: through FY:
CITY CORPORATE LIMITS
    2007 2011
```

|  | MID HEIGHTS CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 2,553 | 948 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 2,698 | 1,002 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 1,167 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 1,233 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | $(1,386)$ | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | $(1,465)$ | n/a |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 2,787 | 1,143 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 2,946 | 1,208 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 4,113 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 4,347 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 1,326 | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reduced from '00 | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 5,340 | 2,091 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 5,644 | 2,210 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 5,280 | 922 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 5,580 | 974 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (60) | (1,169) |
| Minimum Housing SupplylDemand Mismatch in 2007 | (63) | $(1,236)$ |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

## NORTH VALLEY CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:

|  | Mid-Region COG Population Projections and CHAS Databook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters |  |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Household by <br> Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \end{aligned}$ | LARGE (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL RENTERS | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER Households | TOTAL OWNERS | TOTAL (O\&R) |
| 1. Very Low Income (0 to 50\% MFI)* | 332 | 886 | 236 | 785 | 2,239 | 667 | 523 | 128 | 307 | 1,625 | 3,864 |
| 2007 Projections | 386 | 1,029 | 274 | 912 | 2,601 | 775 | 607 | 149 | 357 | 1,887 | 4,488 |
| 2011 Projections | 408 | 1,088 | 290 | 964 | 2,748 | 819 | 642 | 157 | 377 | 1,995 | 4,743 |
| 2. 0 to 30\% MFI* | 171 | 499 | 142 | 429 | 1,241 | 337 | 150 | 38 | 201 | 726 | 1,967 |
| 2007 Projections | 199 | 580 | 165 | 498 | 1,441 | 391 | 174 | 44 | 233 | 843 | 2,285 |
| 2011 Projections | 210 | 613 | 174 | 527 | 1,523 | 414 | 184 | 47 | 247 | 891 | 2,414 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 116 | 407 | 138 | 308 | 969 | 189 | 121 | 38 | 166 | 514 | 1,483 |
| 2007 Projections | 135 | 473 | 160 | 358 | 1,125 | 220 | 141 | 44 | 193 | 597 | 1,722 |
| 2011 Projections | 142 | 500 | 169 | 378 | 1,189 | 232 | 149 | 47 | 204 | 631 | 1,820 |
| 3. 31 to 50\% MFI* | 161 | 387 | 94 | 356 | 998 | 330 | 373 | 90 | 106 | 899 | 1,897 |
| 2007 Projections | 187 | 449 | 109 | 413 | 1,159 | 383 | 433 | 105 | 123 | 1,044 | 2,203 |
| 2011 Projections | 198 | 475 | 115 | 437 | 1,225 | 405 | 458 | 110 | 130 | 1,103 | 2,329 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 77 | 295 | 94 | 284 | 750 | 119 | 257 | 70 | 53 | 499 | 1,249 |
| 2007 Projections | 89 | 343 | 109 | 330 | 871 | 138 | 299 | 81 | 62 | 580 | 1,451 |
| 2011 Projections | 95 | 362 | 115 | 349 | 921 | 146 | 315 | 86 | 65 | 613 | 1,533 |
| 4. Extrapolated (51 to 60\% MFI)* | 20 | 175 | 32 | 166 | 392 | 158 | 171 | 61 | 97 | 487 | 879 |
| 2007 Projections | 23 | 203 | 37 | 193 | 455 | 184 | 199 | 71 | 113 | 566 | 1,021 |
| 2011 Projections | 25 | 215 | 39 | 204 | 481 | 194 | 210 | 75 | 119 | 598 | 1,079 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 14 | 79 | 31 | 77 | 201 | 37 | 60 | 37 | 48 | 182 | 383 |
| 2007 Projections | 16 | 92 | 36 | 89 | 233 | 43 | 70 | 43 | 56 | 211 | 445 |
| 2011 Projections | 17 | 97 | 38 | 95 | 247 | 45 | 74 | 45 | 59 | 223 | 470 |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* | 26 | 232 | 43 | 220 | 522 | 241 | 261 | 94 | 148 | 744 | 1,266 |
| 2007 Projections | 30 | 269 | 50 | 256 | 606 | 280 | 303 | 109 | 172 | 864 | 1,470 |
| 2011 Projections | 32 | 285 | 53 | 270 | 641 | 296 | 320 | 115 | 182 | 913 | 1,554 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 19 | 104 | 41 | 103 | 267 | 56 | 91 | 56 | 74 | 277 | 544 |
| 2007 Projections | 22 | 121 | 48 | 120 | 310 | 65 | 106 | 65 | 86 | 322 | 632 |
| 2011 Projections | 23 | 128 | 50 | 126 | 328 | 69 | 112 | 69 | 91 | 340 | 668 |
| 6. Total Households | 526 | 1,812 | 456 | 1,619 | 4,413 | 2,127 | 3,892 | 693 | 1,681 | 8,393 | 12,806 |
| 2007 Projections | 611 | 2,105 | 530 | 1,880 | 5,126 | 2,470 | 4,521 | 805 | 1,952 | 9,748 | 14,874 |
| 2011 Projections | 646 | 2,224 | 560 | 1,987 | 5,417 | 2,611 | 4,777 | 851 | 2,063 | 10,302 | 15,719 |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems | 226 | 885 | 304 | 772 | 2,187 | 401 | 529 | 201 | 341 | 1,472 | 3,659 |
| 2007 Projections | 262 | 1,028 | 353 | 897 | 2,540 | 466 | 614 | 233 | 396 | 1,710 | 4,250 |
| 2011 Projections | 277 | 1,086 | 373 | 948 | 2,684 | 492 | 649 | 247 | 419 | 1,807 | 4,491 |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 |  |  |  |  | 5,126 |  |  |  |  | 9,748 | 14,874 |
| Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | 5,417 |  |  |  |  | 10,302 | 15,719 |

Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:

TABLE 1-7b)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007

## Five Year Period:

NORTH VALLEY CPA FY: through FY: CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

20072011

|  | NORTH VALLEY CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 1,241 | 726 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 1,441 | 843 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 791 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 919 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (450) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (523) | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 998 | 899 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 1,159 | 1,044 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 1,318 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 1,531 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 320 | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reduced from '00 | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 2,239 | 1,625 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 2,601 | 1,887 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 2,109 | 970 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 2,450 | 1,127 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (130) | (655) |
| Minimum Housing SupplylDemand Mismatch in 2007 | (151) | (761) |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

## WESTSIDE CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:

| CITY CORPORATE LIMITS | Mid-Region COG Population Projections and CHAS Databook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Renters |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  |
| Household by Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | ELDERLY <br> 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL RENTERS | ELDERLY <br> 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL OWNERS | TOTAL <br> (O\&R) |
| 1. Very Low Income (0 to $50 \% \mathrm{MFI}$ )* 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 122 \\ & 163 \\ & 191 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 618 \\ & 825 \\ & 969 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86 \\ 115 \\ 135 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 504 \\ & 673 \\ & 790 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,330 \\ & 1,775 \\ & 2,086 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 182 \\ & 243 \\ & 285 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 383 \\ & 511 \\ & 601 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 36 \\ 48 \\ 56 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 251 \\ & 335 \\ & 394 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 852 \\ 1,137 \\ 1,336 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,182 \\ & 2,912 \\ & 3,422 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 2. 0 to $30 \% \mathrm{MFI}^{*}$ 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \\ & 64 \\ & 75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 309 \\ & 412 \\ & 485 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 24 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 199 \\ & 266 \\ & 312 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 574 \\ & 766 \\ & 900 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 94 \\ 125 \\ 147 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 178 \\ & 238 \\ & 279 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 24 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 148 \\ & 198 \\ & 232 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 438 \\ & 585 \\ & 687 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,012 \\ & 1,351 \\ & 1,587 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \\ & 45 \\ & 53 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 305 \\ & 407 \\ & 478 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 24 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 179 \\ & 239 \\ & 281 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 537 \\ & 717 \\ & 842 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 74 \\ 99 \\ 116 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 144 \\ & 192 \\ & 226 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 24 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 113 \\ & 151 \\ & 177 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 349 \\ & 466 \\ & 547 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 886 \\ 1,182 \\ 1,389 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. 31 to 50\% MFI* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{gathered} \hline 74 \\ 99 \\ 116 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 309 \\ & 412 \\ & 485 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 68 \\ 91 \\ 107 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 305 \\ & 407 \\ & 478 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 756 \\ 1,009 \\ 1,186 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 88 \\ 117 \\ 138 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 205 \\ & 274 \\ & 321 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 18 \\ & 24 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 103 \\ & 137 \\ & 162 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 414 \\ & 553 \\ & 649 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,170 \\ & 1,562 \\ & 1,835 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 54 \\ & 72 \\ & 85 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 259 \\ & 346 \\ & 406 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 64 \\ 85 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 305 \\ & 407 \\ & 478 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 682 \\ 910 \\ 1,070 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 88 \\ 117 \\ 138 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 205 \\ & 274 \\ & 321 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 18 \\ & 24 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 103 \\ & 137 \\ & 162 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 414 \\ & 553 \\ & 649 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,096 \\ & 1,463 \\ & 1,719 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 4. Extrapolated ( 51 to 60\% MFI)* <br> 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 47 \\ & 63 \\ & 74 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 246 \\ & 328 \\ & 386 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \\ & 49 \\ & 58 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 242 \\ & 323 \\ & 380 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 572 \\ & 763 \\ & 897 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 132 \\ & 176 \\ & 207 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 251 \\ & 335 \\ & 394 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62 \\ & 83 \\ & 97 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 105 \\ & 140 \\ & 165 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 550 \\ & 734 \\ & 863 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,122 \\ & 1,497 \\ & 1,760 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 37 \\ & 44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 236 \\ & 315 \\ & 370 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \\ & 52 \\ & 61 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 251 \\ & 335 \\ & 394 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 554 \\ & 739 \\ & 869 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 92 \\ 123 \\ 144 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 313 \\ & 418 \\ & 491 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 83 \\ 111 \\ 130 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 124 \\ & 165 \\ & 194 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 612 \\ & 817 \\ & 960 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,166 \\ & 1,556 \\ & 1,829 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 62 \\ & 83 \\ & 97 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 327 \\ & 436 \\ & 513 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 67 \\ & 78 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 321 \\ & 428 \\ & 503 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 760 \\ 1,014 \\ 1,192 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 201 \\ & 268 \\ & 315 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 382 \\ & 510 \\ & 599 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 95 \\ 127 \\ 149 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 160 \\ & 214 \\ & 251 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 838 \\ 1,118 \\ 1,314 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,598 \\ & 2,133 \\ & 2,506 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 37 \\ & 44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 236 \\ & 315 \\ & 370 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \\ & 52 \\ & 61 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 251 \\ & 335 \\ & 394 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 554 \\ & 739 \\ & 869 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 92 \\ 123 \\ 144 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 313 \\ & 418 \\ & 491 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83 \\ 111 \\ 130 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124 \\ & 165 \\ & 194 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 612 \\ & 817 \\ & 960 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,166 \\ & 1,556 \\ & 1,829 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6. Total Households 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 410 \\ & 547 \\ & 643 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,789 \\ & 3,722 \\ & 4,374 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 402 \\ & 537 \\ & 630 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,683 \\ & 3,581 \\ & 4,208 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6,284 \\ & 8,387 \\ & 9,855 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,052 \\ & 2,739 \\ & 3,218 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 10,263 \\ & 13,697 \\ & 16,095 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,727 \\ & 2,305 \\ & 2,708 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,075 \\ & 4,104 \\ & 4,822 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 17,117 \\ & 22,845 \\ & 26,843 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 23,401 <br> 31,232 <br> 36,698 |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 144 \\ & 192 \\ & 226 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,036 \\ & 1,383 \\ & 1,625 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 160 \\ & 214 \\ & 251 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 986 \\ 1,316 \\ 1,546 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,327 \\ & 3,106 \\ & 3,649 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 346 \\ & 462 \\ & 543 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 975 \\ 1,301 \\ 1,529 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 202 \\ & 270 \\ & 317 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 464 \\ & 619 \\ & 728 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,987 \\ & 2,652 \\ & 3,116 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,314 \\ & 5,758 \\ & 6,765 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{8 , 3 8 7}$ $\mathbf{9 , 8 5 5}$ |  |  |  |  | 22,845 | 31,232 |

Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:

TABLE 1-8(b)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF
LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

WESTSIDE CPA
CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
2007
2011

|  | WEST SIDE CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 574 | 435 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 766 | 585 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 201 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 268 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (373) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (498) | n/a |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 756 | 500 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 1,009 | 553 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 390 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 521 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (366) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (488) | n/a |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 1,330 | 935 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 1,775 | 1,248 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 591 | 118 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 789 | 158 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (739) | (817) |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (986) | $(1,091)$ |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

## SOUTHWEST MESA CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

Sources of Data:
Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
Census (2000)
COG Population Projections
and CHAS Databook


Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:
TABLE 1-9(b)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007

HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF
LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

## SOUTHWEST MESA CPA

 CITY CORPORATE LIMITSFive Year Period:
FY: through FY:
20072011

|  | SOUTHWEST MESA CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 717 | 639 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 981 | 882 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 563 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 770 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (154) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (211) | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 560 | 856 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 613 | 1,175 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 929 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | reduced from '00 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 369 | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reduced from '00 | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 1,277 | 1,495 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 1,594 | 2,057 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 1,492 | 1,785 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | reduced from '00 | reduced from '00 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 215 | 290 |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reduced from '00 | reduced from '00 |

TABLE 1-10 (a)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:
NEAR HEIGHTS CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

Sources of Data:

Census (2000)

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
COG Population Projections
and CHAS Databook

|  | Renters |  |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household by <br> Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & \text { (2 to } 4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL RENTERS | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL OWNERS | TOTAL <br> (O\&R) |
| 1. Very Low Income (0 to 50\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 1,276 \\ & 1,325 \\ & 1,339 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,603 \\ & 2,703 \\ & 2,731 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 531 \\ 551 \\ 557 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,770 \\ & 4,953 \\ & 5,005 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9,180 \\ & 9,532 \\ & 9,632 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 834 \\ & 866 \\ & 875 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 419 \\ & 435 \\ & 440 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 137 \\ & 142 \\ & 144 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 798 \\ & 829 \\ & 837 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,917 \\ & 1,991 \\ & 2,011 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11,097 \\ & 11,523 \\ & 11,643 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 2. 0 to $30 \% \mathrm{MFI}^{*}$ 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | 745 774 782 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,321 \\ & 1,372 \\ & 1,386 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 213 \\ & 221 \\ & 223 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,823 \\ & 2,931 \\ & 2,962 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5,102 \\ & 5,298 \\ & 5,353 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 351 \\ & 364 \\ & 368 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 183 \\ & 190 \\ & 192 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58 \\ & 60 \\ & 61 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 547 \\ & 568 \\ & 574 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 868 \\ & 901 \\ & 911 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5,970 \\ & 6,199 \\ & 6,264 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 493 \\ & 512 \\ & 517 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,152 \\ & 1,196 \\ & 1,209 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 209 \\ & 217 \\ & 219 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,385 \\ & 2,477 \\ & 2,502 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,239 \\ & 4,402 \\ & 4,448 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 238 \\ & 247 \\ & 250 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 173 \\ & 180 \\ & 182 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58 \\ & 60 \\ & 61 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 201 \\ & 209 \\ & 211 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 670 \\ & 696 \\ & 703 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,909 \\ & 5,097 \\ & 5,151 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3. 31 to 50\% MFI* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 531 \\ & 551 \\ & 557 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,282 \\ & 1,331 \\ & 1,345 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 318 \\ & 330 \\ & 334 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,947 \\ & 2,022 \\ & 2,043 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4,078 \\ & 4,235 \\ & 4,279 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 483 \\ & 502 \\ & 507 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 236 \\ & 245 \\ & 248 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \\ & 82 \\ & 83 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 251 \\ & 261 \\ & 263 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,049 \\ & 1,089 \\ & 1,101 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5,127 \\ & 5,324 \\ & 5,379 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 353 \\ & 367 \\ & 370 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 940 \\ & 976 \\ & 986 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 318 \\ & 330 \\ & 334 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,585 \\ & 1,646 \\ & 1,663 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,196 \\ & 3,319 \\ & 3,353 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 201 \\ & 209 \\ & 211 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 194 \\ & 201 \\ & 204 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \\ & 78 \\ & 79 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 161 \\ & 167 \\ & 169 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 631 \\ & 655 \\ & 662 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,827 \\ & 3,974 \\ & 4,015 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4. Extrapolated (51 to 60\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 233 \\ & 242 \\ & 244 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 608 \\ & 631 \\ & 638 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 141 \\ & 146 \\ & 148 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 842 \\ & 874 \\ & 883 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,824 \\ & 1,894 \\ & 1,914 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 306 \\ & 318 \\ & 321 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 170 \\ & 177 \\ & 178 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 34 \\ & 35 \\ & 36 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 194 \\ & 201 \\ & 204 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 704 \\ & 731 \\ & 739 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,528 \\ & 2,625 \\ & 2,652 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems <br> 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 100 \\ & 104 \\ & 105 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 244 \\ & 253 \\ & 256 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 124 \\ & 129 \\ & 130 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 293 \\ & 304 \\ & 307 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 761 \\ & 790 \\ & 798 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68 \\ & 71 \\ & 71 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 116 \\ & 120 \\ & 122 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & 20 \\ & 20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 118 \\ & 123 \\ & 124 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 321 \\ & 333 \\ & 337 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,082 \\ & 1,124 \\ & 1,135 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 311 \\ & 323 \\ & 326 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 809 \\ & 840 \\ & 849 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 187 \\ & 194 \\ & 196 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,120 \\ & 1,163 \\ & 1,175 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,427 \\ & 2,520 \\ & 2,547 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 466 \\ & 484 \\ & 489 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 259 \\ & 269 \\ & 272 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51 \\ & 53 \\ & 54 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 297 \\ & 308 \\ & 312 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,073 \\ & 1,114 \\ & 1,126 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,500 \\ & 3,634 \\ & 3,672 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 132 \\ & 137 \\ & 139 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 325 \\ & 337 \\ & 341 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 164 \\ & 170 \\ & 172 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 391 \\ & 406 \\ & 410 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,012 \\ & 1,051 \\ & 1,062 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 103 \\ & 107 \\ & 108 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 178 \\ & 185 \\ & 187 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 28 \\ & 29 \\ & 29 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 180 \\ & 187 \\ & 189 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 489 \\ & 508 \\ & 513 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,501 \\ & 1,559 \\ & 1,575 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 6. Total Households 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,434 \\ & 2,527 \\ & 2,554 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6,006 \\ & 6,237 \\ & 6,302 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,193 \\ & 1,239 \\ & 1,252 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 9,679 10,051 <br> 10,156 | 19,312 20,053 20,263 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,916 \\ & 4,066 \\ & 4,109 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,985 \\ & 5,176 \\ & 5,230 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 780 \\ & 810 \\ & 818 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,174 \\ & 3,296 \\ & 3,330 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 12,855 \\ & 13,349 \\ & 13,488 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 32,167 33,402 33,751 |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 1,078 \\ & 1,119 \\ & 1,131 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,661 \\ & 2,763 \\ & 2,792 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 815 \\ & 846 \\ & 855 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4,654 \\ & 4,833 \\ & 4,883 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 9,208 \\ & 9,562 \\ & 9,661 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 610 \\ & 633 \\ & 640 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 661 \\ & 686 \\ & 694 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 180 \\ & 187 \\ & 189 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 660 \\ & 685 \\ & 693 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,111 \\ & 2,192 \\ & 2,215 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11,319 \\ & 11,754 \\ & 11,876 \end{aligned}$ |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | 20,053 |  |  |  |  | 13,349 | 33,402 |

Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:

## NEAR HEIGHTS CPA <br> CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

TABLE 1-10(b)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
20072011

|  | NEAR HEIGHTS CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 5,102 | 868 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 5,298 | 901 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 1,974 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 2,050 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | $(3,128)$ | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | $(3,248)$ | n/a |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 4,078 | 1,049 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 4,235 | 1,089 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 9,936 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 10,317 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 5,858 | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reduced from '00 | n/a |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 9,180 | 1,917 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 9,532 | 1,991 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 11,910 | 953 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 12,367 | 990 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 2,730 | (964) |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reduced from '00 | $(1,001)$ |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

## SOUTH VALLEY CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

## Sources of Data:

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
Census (2000)
2007
2011
Mid-Region COG Population Projections
and CHAS Databook


Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

JURISDICTION:

TABLE 1-11(b)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF
LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
20072011

|  | SOUTH VALLEY CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 110 | 145 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 127 | 168 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 87 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 101 | n/a |
| Housing SupplylDemand Mismatch in 2000 | (23) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (27) | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 91 | 191 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 105 | 221 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 195 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 225 |  |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 104 | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | reduced from '00 | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 201 | 336 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 232 | 388 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 282 | 278 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 326 | 321 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | 81 | (58) |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | 94 | (67) |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

## FOOTHILLS CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

## Sources of Data:

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:

|  | Mid-Region COG Population Projections and CHAS Databook <br> Renters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Household by <br> Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \end{aligned}$ | LARGE (5 or more) | OTHER Households | TOTAL RENTERS | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER Households | TOTAL OWNERS | TOTAL (O\&R) |
| 1. Very Low Income (0 to 50\% MFI)* | 249 | 458 | 27 | 559 | 1,293 | 400 | 205 | 30 | 165 | 800 | 2,093 |
| 2007 Projections | 266 | 490 | 29 | 598 | 1,384 | 428 | 219 | 32 | 177 | 856 | 2,240 |
| 2011 Projections | 280 | 515 | 30 | 628 | 1,453 | 449 | 230 | 34 | 185 | 899 | 2,352 |
| 2. 0 to 30\% MFI* | 147 | 258 | 13 | 243 | 661 | 151 | 92 | 20 | 65 | 328 | 989 |
| 2007 Projections | 157 | 276 | 14 | 260 | 707 | 162 | 98 | 21 | 70 | 351 | 1,058 |
| 2012 Projections | 165 | 290 | 15 | 273 | 743 | 170 | 103 | 22 | 73 | 369 | 1,111 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 123 | 244 | 13 | 177 | 557 | 123 | 90 | 10 | 51 | 274 | 831 |
| 2007 Projections | 132 | 261 | 14 | 189 | 596 | 132 | 96 | 11 | 55 | 293 | 889 |
| 2011 Projections | 138 | 274 | 15 | 199 | 626 | 138 | 101 | 11 | 57 | 308 | 934 |
| 3. 31 to 50\% MFI* | 102 | 200 | 14 | 316 | 632 | 249 | 113 | 10 | 100 | 472 | 1,104 |
| 2007 Projections | 109 | 214 | 15 | 338 | 676 | 266 | 121 | 11 | 107 | 505 | 1,182 |
| 2011 Projections | 115 | 225 | 16 | 355 | 710 | 280 | 127 | 11 | 112 | 530 | 1,241 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 102 | 190 | 14 | 306 | 612 | 140 | 101 | 10 | 66 | 317 | 929 |
| 2007 Projections | 109 | 203 | 15 | 327 | 655 | 150 | 108 | 11 | 71 | 339 | 994 |
| 2011 Projections | 115 | 214 | 16 | 344 | 688 | 157 | 113 | 11 | 74 | 356 | 1,044 |
| 4. Extrapolated (51 to 60\% MFI)* | 118 | 173 | 4 | 278 | 573 | 166 | 131 | 13 | 60 | 371 | 944 |
| 2007 Projections | 126 | 185 | 4 | 298 | 613 | 178 | 140 | 14 | 64 | 397 | 1,010 |
| 2011 Projections | 133 | 194 | 4 | 312 | 644 | 187 | 147 | 15 | 67 | 417 | 1,061 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 109 | 128 | 4 | 169 | 410 | 63 | 95 | 10 | 51 | 219 | 629 |
| 2007 Projections | 117 | 137 | 4 | 181 | 439 | 67 | 102 | 11 | 55 | 234 | 673 |
| 2011 Projections | 122 | 144 | 4 | 190 | 461 | 71 | 107 | 11 | 57 | 246 | 707 |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* | 158 | 230 | 5 | 369 | 762 | 253 | 201 | 21 | 92 | 566 | 1,328 |
| 2007 Projections | 169 | 246 | 5 | 395 | 816 | 271 | 215 | 22 | 98 | 606 | 1,421 |
| 2011 Projections | 178 | 258 | 6 | 415 | 856 | 284 | 226 | 24 | 103 | 636 | 1,492 |
| Number with any Housing Problems | 145 | 171 | 5 | 225 | 546 | 96 | 145 | 16 | 79 | 335 | 881 |
| 2007 Projections | 155 | 183 | 5 | 241 | 584 | 103 | 155 | 17 | 85 | 359 | 943 |
| 2011 Projections | 163 | 192 | 6 | 253 | 614 | 108 | 163 | 18 | 89 | 376 | 990 |
| 6. Total Households | 1,249 | 2,331 | 188 | 3,251 | 7,019 | 3,440 | 6,090 | 838 | 1,798 | 12,166 | 19,185 |
| 2007 Projections | 1,337 | 2,495 | 201 | 3,479 | 7,512 | 3,682 | 6,518 | 897 | 1,924 | 13,020 | 20,532 |
| 2011 Projections | 1,404 | 2,619 | 211 | 3,653 | 7,887 | 3,866 | 6,843 | 942 | 2,020 | 13,671 | 21,559 |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems | 479 | 733 | 36 | 877 | 2,125 | 422 | 431 | 46 | 247 | 1,145 | 3,270 |
| 2007 Projections | 513 | 784 | 39 | 939 | 2,274 | 452 | 461 | 49 | 264 | 1,225 | 3,500 |
| 2011 Projections | 538 | 824 | 40 | 986 | 2,388 | 474 | 484 | 52 | 278 | 1,287 | 3,675 |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 |  |  |  |  | 7,512 |  |  |  |  | 13,020 | 20,532 |
| Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | 7,887 |  |  |  |  | 13,671 | 21,559 |

Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
JURISDICTION:

TABLE 1-12(b)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

FOOTHILLS CPA
CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
20072011

|  | FOOTHILLS CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 661 | 328 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 707 | 351 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 250 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 268 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (411) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (440) | n/a |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 632 | 472 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 676 | 505 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 408 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 437 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (224) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (240) | n/a |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 1,293 | 800 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 1,384 | 856 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 658 | 593 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 704 | 635 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (635) | (207) |
| Minimum Housing SupplylDemand Mismatch in 2007 | (680) | (222) |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007
HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007
JURISDICTION:

## NORTH ALBUQUERQUE CPA CITY CORPORATE LIMITS

Sources of Data:
Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:

| CITY | Mid-Region COG Population Projections and CHAS Databook <br> Renters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , | Total <br> TOTAL <br> (O\&R) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household by Type, Income, \& Housing Problem | ELDERLY <br> 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL RENTERS | ELDERLY 1 \& 2 Member Households | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL } \\ & (2 \text { to } 4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LARGE <br> (5 or more) | OTHER <br> Households | TOTAL OWNERS |  |
| 1. Very Low Income (0 to $50 \% \mathrm{MFI}$ )* 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 238 \\ & 262 \\ & 274 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 235 \\ & 259 \\ & 270 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43 \\ & 47 \\ & 49 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 400 \\ & 441 \\ & 460 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 916 \\ 1,010 \\ 1,053 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 502 \\ 553 \\ 577 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 245 \\ & 270 \\ & 282 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & 19 \\ & 20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 171 \\ & 189 \\ & 197 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 935 \\ 1,031 \\ 1,075 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,851 \\ & 2,040 \\ & 2,128 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2. 0 to $30 \% \mathrm{MFI}^{*}$ 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 126 \\ & 139 \\ & 145 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 122 \\ & 134 \\ & 140 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 246 \\ & 271 \\ & 283 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 504 \\ & 556 \\ & 579 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 208 \\ & 229 \\ & 239 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 90 \\ 99 \\ 103 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 15 \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 64 \\ & 71 \\ & 74 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 376 \\ & 414 \\ & 432 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 880 \\ 970 \\ 1,012 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 55 \\ & 57 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 103 \\ & 114 \\ & 118 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 185 \\ & 204 \\ & 213 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 348 \\ & 384 \\ & 400 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 183 \\ & 202 \\ & 210 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 76 \\ & 84 \\ & 87 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 15 \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \\ & 37 \\ & 39 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 308 \\ & 340 \\ & 354 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 656 \\ & 723 \\ & 754 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 3. 31 to 50\% MFI* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 112 \\ & 123 \\ & 129 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 113 \\ & 125 \\ & 130 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 33 \\ & 36 \\ & 38 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 154 \\ & 170 \\ & 177 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 412 \\ & 454 \\ & 474 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 294 \\ & 324 \\ & 338 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 155 \\ & 171 \\ & 178 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 107 \\ & 118 \\ & 123 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 559 \\ & 616 \\ & 643 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 971 \\ 1,070 \\ 1,116 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 74 \\ & 82 \\ & 85 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \\ & 86 \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 31 \\ & 32 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 130 \\ & 143 \\ & 149 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 310 \\ & 342 \\ & 356 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 192 \\ & 212 \\ & 221 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 126 \\ & 139 \\ & 145 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & 84 \\ & 87 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 397 \\ & 438 \\ & 456 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 707 \\ & 779 \\ & 813 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 4. Extrapolated ( 51 to 60\% MFI)* <br> 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & 50 \\ & 52 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 105 \\ & 116 \\ & 121 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 22 \\ & 23 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 140 \\ & 154 \\ & 161 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 310 \\ & 342 \\ & 356 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 154 \\ & 170 \\ & 177 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 156 \\ & 172 \\ & 179 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 15 \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 107 \\ & 118 \\ & 123 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 432 \\ & 476 \\ & 497 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 742 \\ & 818 \\ & 853 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 32 \\ & 35 \\ & 37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 55 \\ & 61 \\ & 63 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 20 \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \\ & 80 \\ & 84 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 178 \\ & 196 \\ & 205 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \\ & 69 \\ & 72 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 97 \\ 107 \\ 112 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 13 \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 55 \\ & 57 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 222 \\ & 245 \\ & 255 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 400 \\ & 441 \\ & 460 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 5. Extrapolated (61-80\% MFI)* 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 61 \\ & 67 \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 139 \\ & 153 \\ & 160 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 29 \\ & 30 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 187 \\ & 206 \\ & 215 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 412 \\ & 454 \\ & 474 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 236 \\ & 260 \\ & 271 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 239 \\ & 263 \\ & 275 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 24 \\ & 25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 164 \\ & 181 \\ & 189 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 660 \\ & 728 \\ & 759 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,072 \\ & 1,182 \\ & 1,233 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \\ & 46 \\ & 48 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 74 \\ & 82 \\ & 85 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 26 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ 106 \\ 110 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 236 \\ & 260 \\ & 271 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 97 \\ 107 \\ 112 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 148 \\ & 163 \\ & 170 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 20 \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 78 \\ & 86 \\ & 90 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 339 \\ & 374 \\ & 390 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 575 \\ & 634 \\ & 661 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 6. Total Households 2007 Projections 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 491 \\ & 541 \\ & 565 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,227 \\ & 1,353 \\ & 1,411 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 212 \\ & 234 \\ & 244 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,488 \\ & 1,640 \\ & 1,711 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3,418 \\ & 3,768 \\ & 3,930 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,754 \\ & 3,036 \\ & 3,167 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5,747 \\ & 6,335 \\ & 6,608 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 855 943 983 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,648 \\ & 1,817 \\ & 1,895 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 11,002 \\ & 12,128 \\ & 12,650 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14,420 \\ & 15,896 \\ & 16,580 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| <80\% MFI with any Housing Problems 2007 Projections <br> 2011 Projections | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 198 \\ & 218 \\ & 228 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 310 \\ & 342 \\ & 356 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 80 \\ & 88 \\ & 92 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 484 \\ & 534 \\ & 556 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,072 \\ & 1,182 \\ & 1,233 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 535 \\ & 590 \\ & 615 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 447 \\ & 493 \\ & 514 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 47 \\ & 52 \\ & 54 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 238 \\ & 262 \\ & 274 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,266 \\ & 1,396 \\ & 1,456 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2,338 \\ & 2,577 \\ & 2,688 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 7. Household Projections For 2007 Household Projections For 2011 |  |  |  |  | 3,768 |  |  |  |  | 12,128 | 15,896 |

Run Date:
10-Jul-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007

HOUSING ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF
LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 2007

Five Year Period:
FY: through FY:
20072011

|  | NORTH ALBUQUERQUE CPA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Renters | Owners |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2000 | 504 | 377 |
| Households Earning 0-30\% MFI in 2007 | 556 | 414 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 405 | n/a |
| Minimum Number of Units Affordable in 2007 | 446 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (99) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (109) | n/a |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2000 | 412 | 559 |
| Households Earning 31-50\% MFI in 2007 | 454 | 616 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 360 | n/a |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 397 | n/a |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (52) | n/a |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (57) | n/a |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2000 | 916 | 936 |
| Households Earning Less Than 50\% MFI in 2007 | 1,010 | 1,031 |
| Units Affordable in 2000 | 765 | 405 |
| Minimum Units Affordable in 2007 | 843 | 446 |
| Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2000 | (151) | (531) |
| Minimum Housing Supply/Demand Mismatch in 2007 | (166) | (585) |

Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.

City of Albuquerque Households With a Mobility or Self Care Limitation, FY 2007-FY 2011

| DISABLED HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE 1/ | Renters |  |  |  | Owners |  |  |  |  | Total <br> Households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Very Elderly $1 \& 2$ Households $(75>)$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Elderly } \\ 1 \text { \& } 2 \\ \text { Member } \\ \text { (62-74) } \end{gathered}$ | All Other Households | Total Disabled <br> Renters | Very Elderly 1 \& 2 Households | Elderly 1 \& 2 <br> Member (75>) | All Other Households (62-74) | Total Disabled Owners | Total Disabled Households |  |
| Households Earning Less Than 30\% MFI in 2000 Households Earning Less Than 30\% MFI in 2007 Households Earning Less Than 30\% MFI in 2011 | $\begin{aligned} & 585 \\ & 657 \\ & 692 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 690 \\ & 775 \\ & 816 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,260 \\ & 2,540 \\ & 2,674 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,535 \\ & 3,972 \\ & 4,182 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 650 \\ & 730 \\ & 769 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 385 \\ & 433 \\ & 456 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 810 \\ & 910 \\ & 958 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,845 \\ & 2,073 \\ & 2,183 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,380 \\ & 6,046 \\ & 6,365 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,416 \\ & 22,942 \\ & 24,156 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number With Any Housing Problem in 2000 <br> Number With Any Housing Problem in 2007 <br> Number With Any Housing Problem in 2011 | $\begin{aligned} & 355 \\ & 399 \\ & 420 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 410 \\ & 461 \\ & 485 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,761 \\ & 1,978 \\ & 2,083 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,524 \\ & 2,838 \\ & 2,988 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 435 \\ & 489 \\ & 514 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 315 \\ & 354 \\ & 373 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 655 \\ & 736 \\ & 775 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,406 \\ & 1,579 \\ & 1,662 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,927 \\ & 4,417 \\ & 4,650 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,273 \\ & 18,287 \\ & 19,254 \end{aligned}$ |
| Households Earning 31 to 50\% MFI in 2000 Households Earning 31 to 50\% MFI in 2007 Households Earning 31 to 50\% MFI in 2011 | $\begin{aligned} & 475 \\ & 534 \\ & 562 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 350 \\ & 393 \\ & 414 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,255 \\ & 1,410 \\ & 1,485 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,080 \\ & 2,337 \\ & 2,461 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 735 \\ & 826 \\ & 870 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 459 \\ & 516 \\ & 543 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 860 \\ 966 \\ 1,018 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,054 \\ & 2,308 \\ & 2,430 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,134 \\ & 4,646 \\ & 4,891 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,836 \\ & 22,291 \\ & 23,469 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Number With Any Housing Problem in 2000 <br> Number With Any Housing Problem in 2007 <br> Number With Any Housing Problem in 2011 | $\begin{aligned} & 315 \\ & 351 \\ & 370 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 195 \\ & 217 \\ & 229 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 985 \\ 1,099 \\ 1,157 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,496 \\ & 1,667 \\ & 1,756 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 305 \\ & 340 \\ & 358 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 300 \\ & 335 \\ & 352 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 590 \\ & 658 \\ & 693 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,195 \\ & 1,333 \\ & 1,403 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,691 \\ & 3,000 \\ & 3,159 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,014 \\ & 16,744 \\ & 17,630 \end{aligned}$ |
| Households Earning 51 to 60\% MFI in 2000 Households Earning 51 to 60\% MFI in 2000 Households Earning 51 to 60\% MFI in 2000 | $\begin{aligned} & 164 \\ & 183 \\ & 193 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88 \\ 99 \\ 104 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 462 \\ & 515 \\ & 542 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 715 \\ & 797 \\ & 839 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 308 \\ & 344 \\ & 362 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 219 \\ & 244 \\ & 257 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 474 \\ & 529 \\ & 557 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,001 \\ & 1,117 \\ & 1,176 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,716 \\ & 1,914 \\ & 2,015 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,771 \\ & 14,351 \\ & 15,110 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number With Any Housing Problem in 2000 <br> Number With Any Housing Problem in 2007 <br> Number With Any Housing Problem in 2011 | $\begin{aligned} & 124 \\ & 138 \\ & 146 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 29 \\ & 31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 215 \\ & 240 \\ & 253 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 366 \\ & 408 \\ & 429 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 73 \\ 81 \\ 85 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 60 \\ & 64 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 256 \\ & 285 \\ & 300 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 382 \\ & 427 \\ & 449 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 748 \\ & 835 \\ & 879 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,487 \\ & 7,290 \\ & 7,675 \end{aligned}$ |
| Households Earning 61 to 80\% MFI in 2000 Households Earning 61 to 80\% MFI in 2000 Households Earning 61 to 80\% MFI in 2000 | $\begin{array}{r} 366 \\ 408 \\ 429 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 197 \\ & 219 \\ & 231 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,028 \\ & 1,147 \\ & 1,207 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,590 \\ & 1,774 \\ & 1,868 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 687 \\ & 766 \\ & 806 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 486 \\ & 543 \\ & 571 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,056 \\ & 1,177 \\ & 1,240 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,229 \\ & 2,486 \\ & 2,617 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,819 \\ & 4,259 \\ & 4,485 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,130 \\ & 20,373 \\ & 21,451 \end{aligned}$ |
| Number With Any Housing Problem in 2000 Number With Any Housing Problem in 2007 Number With Any Housing Problem in 2011 | $\begin{aligned} & 276 \\ & 308 \\ & 324 \end{aligned}$ | 59 65 69 | $\begin{aligned} & 479 \\ & 534 \\ & 563 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 814 \\ & 908 \\ & 956 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 162 \\ & 181 \\ & 190 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 121 \\ & 135 \\ & 142 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 569 \\ & 635 \\ & 668 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 851 \\ 950 \\ 1,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,665 \\ & 1,857 \\ & 1,956 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9,222 \\ 10,363 \\ 10,911 \end{gathered}$ |

1/ This includes all households where one or more persons has 1) a long-lasting condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical
ctivity, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying and/or 2) a physical, mental, or emotional condition lasting more
than 6 months that creates difficulty with dressing, bathing, or getting around inside the home.

### 2.0 CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE NEIGHBORHOOD ANALYSIS

This section of the report defines neighborhoods that are either "stable", "prone to disinvestment" or "prone to gentrification", and the research methodology employed to make such determinations.

### 2.1 Overall Research Methodology

No national standards exist for determining neighborhoods that are either "stable", "prone to disinvestment" or "prone to gentrification". While examples do exist for measuring neighborhood conditions elsewhere in the United States, any and all research approaches are reliant on the availability of data for a given region and incorporate a level of prudent and reasonable subjectivity and judgment. A general overview of the research method employed to establish neighborhoods that are either "stable", "prone to disinvestment" or "prone to gentrification" are highlighted below:

1) A model used to measure the neighborhood stress for the City of Tucson was applied to Albuquerque. The Tucson model incorporates an approach where 27 variables from the US Census for all municipal block groups are rated and ranked against the distance in standard deviation units from the citywide mean. The similar size, demographic composition and southwestern character of both Tucson and Albuquerque support the transferability of the research approach. Those block groups that ranked within the top $10 \%$ of the stress index were then analyzed in relation to Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) residential lending data available at the census tract level from 2003 and 2005. Some correlations were evident and the top $10 \%$ of cases of the stress index were established as those neighborhoods "prone to disinvestment";
2) Neighborhoods or regions "prone to gentrification" were established by applying a series of thresholds in varying tiers to information available at the census tract and Multiple Listing Service district levels. Discussed at length in section 2.2, these thresholds included: age of housing, area within the downtown core, area within an adopted municipal redevelopment area, area eligible under CDBG area benefit, MLS district home appreciation level, tract home purchase lending ratio from '03 to '05, tract permitting activity ('00-'06), staff review of neighborhoods as needed, and interviews with Planning Department and Family and Community Services personnel. After careful scrutiny, those census tracts that include areas "prone to gentrification" were established; and,
3) If a region did not fall within the category of being "prone to disinvestment" or "prone to gentrification", it was considered "stable".

### 2.2 City of Albuquerque Stress Index and Neighborhoods "Prone To Disinvestment"
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As mentioned earlier, a model used by the City of Tucson was applied to the City of Albuquerque to establish neighborhoods that are "prone to disinvestment". Tucson has utilized this approach since 1980 to establish data it can use, in part, "to support targeting for housing rehabilitation and renewal of the physical housing stock as well as for implementing programs to support and nourish persons in need." The similar size, demographic composition and southwestern character of both Tucson and Albuquerque support the transferability of the research approach.

The Tucson model incorporates a method where 27 variables from the US Census for all municipal block groups are rated and ranked against the distance in standard deviation units from the City of Albuquerque mean (refer to Table 2-1). The variables are itemized below:
$\checkmark$ Minor Population - Persons 17 years old or less as a percentage of the total population.
$\checkmark$ Elderly Population - Persons aged 65 years or more a percentage of the total population.
$\checkmark$ Pre-School Proportion - Children 4 years or less as a percentage of the total youth population aged 17 years or less.
$\checkmark$ Dependency Index - Ratio of youths (17 years or less) and elderly (65 years or more) to working age persons ( $18-64$ years).
$\checkmark$ Fertility Index - Number of children less than 5 years of age per 1,000 women aged 15 to 44 years of age.
$\checkmark$ Linguistic Isolation - Households in which all persons 14 years of age and over have at least some difficulty speaking English as a percentage of all households.
$\checkmark$ Disability - Civilian, non-institutionalized persons 15 years and over with a disability as a percentage of all civilian, non-institutionalized persons 15 years and over.
$\checkmark$ Poverty Status - Persons - Persons below the poverty level as a percentage of all persons for whom poverty status is ascertained.
$\checkmark$ Poverty Status - Families - The number of families below the poverty level as a percentage of all families for whom poverty status is ascertained.
$\checkmark$ Poverty Status - Elderly Persons - Persons 65 years or over who are below the poverty level as a percentage of all persons 65 years or over.
$\checkmark$ Educational Attainment - Persons aged 25 years and over who have completed less than 4 years of high school as a percentage of all persons 25 years and over.
$\checkmark$ Unemployment Rate - Unemployed persons 16 years and over who are in the civilian labor force as a percentage of all persons 16 years and over in the labor force.
$\checkmark$ Not Working in 1999 - Persons 16 years and over with no employment in 1999 as a percentage of all persons 16 years and over.
$\checkmark$ Working Mothers - Females 16 years and over who are in the labor force and have children under 6 years of age as a percentage of all females 16 years and over with children under 6 years of age.
$\checkmark$ Female Householder - Families who have a female householder with related children under 18 with no husband present as a percentage of all families with related children under 18 years of age.
$\checkmark$ Neighborhood Instability - Persons 5 years old and older who lived in a different house five years ago as a percentage of all persons 5 years old and older.
$\checkmark$ Crowding - Housing units which have more than 1.01 persons per room as a percentage of all occupied housing units.
$\checkmark$ Sanitation/Crowding - Housing units that lack plumbing for exclusive use and which have more than 1.01 persons per room as a percentage of all occupied housing units.
$\checkmark$ Plumbing - Housing units that lack plumbing for exclusive use as a percentage of all housing units.
$\checkmark$ Housing Age - Housing units built before 1940 as a percent of all housing units.
$\checkmark$ Kitchen Facilities - Housing units which lack complete kitchen facilities as a percent of all housing units.
$\checkmark$ Heating Fuel - Occupied housing units lacking adequate heating fuels, i.e., that use fuel oil or kerosene, wood, coal, or no fuel at all, as a percentage of all occupied housing units.
$\checkmark$ Vacancy Rate - Vacant housing units as a percentage of all housing units.
$\checkmark$ Owner Costs - Owner households with incomes less than \$20,000 with owner costs exceeding $34 \%$ of their income as a percentage of specified owner occupied housing units.
$\checkmark$ Renter Costs - Renter households with incomes less than \$20,000 with gross rent exceeding $34 \%$ of their income as a percentage of specified renter occupied housing units.
$\checkmark$ Communications - Occupied housing units with no telephone and with a householder aged 65 years or over as a percentage of all occupied units.
$\checkmark$ Access - Occupied housing units with no vehicle available as a percentage of all occupied units

Depicted on Table 2-1 in Appendix 2.0, all 27 variables were weighted equally and individual scores were normalized to remove differences in scale and variation among the variables. This process created variables whose means are zero and whose standard deviations are plus and minus 1. A score of +1.5 indicates that the area's score was 1.5 standard deviation units greater than the mean score of the City of Albuquerque. Therefore, higher scores indicate higher stress. Maps 2-1 and 2-2 in Appendix 2.0 present those block groups that fell within the top $20 \%$ of block group ranking under the neighborhood stress index.

Residential Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) lending data for 2003 and 2005 was also reviewed at the census tract level for consistency with those block groups ranking in the top $20 \%$. Two HMDA variables were analyzed that produced the following findings:
> Ratio Of New Home Purchase Loans Denied To Total Origination In 2003 \& $\underline{2005}$ - Approximately 15 of the 21 block groups in the top $10 \%$ were situated in census tracts that exceeded the Albuquerque MSA new home purchase denial rate of $6 \%$. Over half of the remaining cases falling within the top $20 \%$ of the stress index exceeded the MSA 6\% average.
> Ratio Of Total Lending Activity In 2003 To 2005 By Census Tract - A review of this information for the top $20 \%$ of cases of the stress index produced no
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correlation whatsoever. While total HMDA lending activity for the Albuquerque MSA dropped by 18\% from 2003 to 2005, activity in the stressed tracts did not generally produce reductions greater than 18\%. It is likely that sustained low mortgage rates coupled with a high incidence of subprime lending practices and techniques increased residential lending for those at the lower end of the income spectrum.

Upon review of the HMDA data and discussions with municipal staff, it was determined that the top $10 \%$ of block groups in the stress index were neighborhoods "prone to disinvestment".

### 2.3 Neighborhoods "Prone To Gentrification"

Neighborhoods "prone to gentrification" were established by applying a series of thresholds to information available at the census tract and Multiple Listing Service (MLS) district levels. Thresholds were applied in three successive tiers as itemized below and reflected on Table 2-2 in Appendix 2.0:
$>$ Tier One Thresholds - For a census tract to make it through this tier, it was required to meet at least two of four thresholds. The thresholds included 1) the median year housing was constructed in the tract was less than 1960, 2) the tract is located in the downtown area, 3) the tract is situated in an adopted City of Albuquerque redevelopment area, and/or 4) the tract is eligible under CDBG areawide benefit requirements where over $51 \%$ of persons are earning less than $80 \%$ of the area median income.
$>$ Tier Two Thresholds - If a tract made it through Tier One, then it would need to make it through 2 of the four possible Tier Two thresholds that included: 1) the tract was situated in an MLS district where home appreciation was greater than $30 \%$ from ' 04 to ' 06,2 ) residential lending in the tract between ' 03 and ' 05 exceeded the percentage average of that for the entire MSA, 3) the ratio of new home purchase loans denied to total origination in 2003 \& 2005 was less than the MSA average for the period, or 4) the incidence of residential permitting in the tract from '00 to '06 was substantial.
> Tier Three Thresholds - For those tracts that made it through to Tier 3, two more thresholds were applied that included: 1) the tract was reviewed and/or physically inspected by Department of Family and Community Services staff and deemed to have the appropriate attributes; and/or 2) two interviews were conducted with Consensus Planning, Inc.and the Assistant Director of the Planning Department as to their perspectives on regions within the City of Albuquerque that are currently "prone to gentrification". It should be noted that both interviews identified Huning Heights, Nob Hill and the eastern and western portions of downtown as contenders. Discussions with the Department of Family and Community Services staff concurred and added all or portions of census tracts 25,26 and 14 to the mix.
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The final determination of neighborhoods "prone to gentrification" included the following regions:
$\checkmark$ The Nob Hill neighborhood generally bounded by Lomas on the North, San Pedro on the west, Yale on the east and Zuni on the South. This region includes portion of census tracts 5 and 17;
$\checkmark$ The Huning Heights, East and West downtown regions bounded by l-25 on the east, $20^{\text {th }}$ street on the west, Lomas on the north and Coal on the south. This region generally includes all or portions of tracts 20, 21, 22 (excludes area south of Laguna) and 27 from $\mathbf{2 3}^{\text {rd }} \mathbf{S t}-12^{\text {th }}$ St, Mountain - Highway).
$\checkmark$ All of tracts 25, 14 and 26 per Department of Family and Community Services staff.
$\checkmark$ If a tract included block groups determined to be "prone to disinvestment", these regions were obviously excluded. This scenario did occur in a few instances.

### 2.4 Final Neighborhood Determinations

Map 2-3 in Appendix 2.0 presents information concerning those neighborhoods within the City of Albuquerque that were identified as being "prone to disinvestment", "prone to gentrification" or "stable". "Stable" neighborhoods were those that did not fall within the first two categories, which accounted for much of the City of Albuquerque.

While some refinements were made to 'neighborhoods prone to disinvestment' note the changes not depicted on Maps 2-1 to 2-3: (1) BG1-CT37.19 is included; and (2) BG1CT18 and BG1-CT 21 are not (but in the 10-20\% stress index category).

## APPENDIX 2.0




|  | VARIABLE 1 |  | VARIABLE 2 |  | VARIABLE 3 |  | VARIABLE 4 |  | VARIABLE 5 |  | VARIABLE 6 |  | VARIABLE 7 |  | VARIABLE 8 |  | VARIABLE 9 |  | VARIABLE 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MINOR POPULATION |  | ELDERLY POPULATION |  | PRE-SCHOOL PROPORTION |  | DEPENDENCY INDEX |  | FERTILITY INDEX |  | LINGUISTIC ISOLATION |  | DISABILITY |  | POP. POVERTY status |  | FAM. POVERTY status |  | ELDERLY POVERTY status |  |
| CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE CENSUS TRACT \& BLOCK GROUP | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { SCORE } \end{gathered}$ | STV FROM CITY AVG | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { SCORE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BG } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { sCCRE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{array}$ | BG SCORE | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { SCORE } \end{gathered}$ | STV FROM CITY AVG | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { sCCRE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BG } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { BG } \\ \text { SCORE } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { BG } \\ \text { SCore } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.24 | 36.77\% | ${ }^{1.363}$ | 5.18\% | ${ }^{-0.673}$ | 12.97\% | -0.987 | 72.28\% | 0.630 | 184 | ${ }^{-0.581}$ | 0.00\% | -0.617 | 21.33\% | -0.577 | 5.38\% | -0.675 | 4.55\% | ${ }^{-0.464}$ | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.25 | 39.39\% | 1.651 | 1.04\% | -1.086 | 34.00\% | 0.701 | 67.88\% | 0.449 | 546 | 1.961 | 4.69\% | 0.032 | 18.60\% | -0.706 | 8.70\% | -0.400 | 10.20\% | 0.021 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.25 | 31.72\% | 0.807 | 2.28\% | -0.963 | 18.04\% | -0.580 | 51.52\% | -0.226 | 245 | -0.154 | 0.00\% | -0.617 | 15.37\% | -0.860 | 2.84\% | -0.885 | 2.11\% | -0.672 | 16.33\% | 0.640 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.26 | 30.90\% | 0.716 | 2.76\% | -0.915 | 34.30\% | 0.725 | 50.73\% | -0.259 | 400 | 0.935 | 1.25\% | -0.444 | 18.46\% | -0.713 | 1.21\% | -1.020 | 0.28\% | -0.828 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.27 | 27.95\% | 0.392 | 10.13\% | -0.179 | 3.21\% | -1.771 | 61.49\% | 0.185 | 42 | -1.581 | 8.20\% | 0.518 | 24.71\% | -0.417 | 3.46\% | -0.834 | 0.00\% | -0.853 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.27 | 27.47\% | 0.339 | 10.27\% | -0.165 | 29.37\% | 0.329 | 60.60\% | 0.148 | 352 | 0.596 | 3.21\% | -0.173 | 41.43\% | 0.377 | 4.67\% | -0.734 | 0.00\% | -0.853 | 6.49\% | -0.131 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) | 14.69\% | -1.067 | 15.46\% | 0.354 | 26.32\% | 0.084 | 43.17\% | -0.571 | 275 | 0.058 | 0.00\% | -0.617 | 27.82\% | -0.269 | 10.95\% | -0.213 | 11.60\% | 0.141 | 16.67\% | 0.667 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) | 19.53\% | -0.534 | 5.87\% | -0.605 | 11.59\% | -1.098 | 34.04\% | -0.947 | 91 | -1.237 | 1.25\% | -0.444 | 16.74\% | -0.795 | 8.68\% | -0.401 | 3.91\% | -0.518 | 11.43\% | 0.256 |
| Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) | 32.34\% | 0.875 | 5.13\% | -0.679 | 6.34\% | -1.519 | 59.91\% | 0.120 | 91 | -1.237 | 3.62\% | -0.116 | 28.68\% | -0.228 | 9.51\% | -0.333 | 5.50\% | -0.382 | 16.36\% | 0.643 |
| Block Group 1 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.29 (part) | 38.05\% | 1.503 | 10.24\% | -0.167 | 41.45\% | 1.300 | 93.40\% | 1.501 | 638 | 2.608 | 0.00\% | -0.617 | 65.63\% | 1.524 | 12.85\% | -0.057 | 9.35\% | -0.052 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 2 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.29 (part) | 29.78\% | 0.594 | 5.68\% | -0.624 | 20.43\% | -0.388 | 54.94\% | -0.085 | 298 | 0.218 | 0.88\% | -0.495 | 25.20\% | -0.393 | 13.84\% | 0.026 | 8.27\% | -0.144 | 32.99\% | 1.947 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) | 24.86\% | 0.052 | 4.75\% | -0.717 | 59.17\% | 2.722 | 42.06\% | -0.617 | 478 | 1.482 | 2.12\% | -0.324 | 35.12\% | 0.077 | 17.13\% | 0.298 | 16.63\% | 0.571 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) | 25.69\% | 0.143 | 7.86\% | -0.406 | 28.35\% | 0.247 | 50.47\% | -0.269 | 241 | -0.186 | 0.00\% | -0.617 | 49.47\% | 0.758 | 18.92\% | 0.446 | 14.60\% | 0.397 | 66.42\% | 4.569 |
| Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) | 27.62\% | 0.356 | 4.82\% | -0.710 | 47.52\% | 1.787 | 48.01\% | -0.371 | 490 | 1.564 | 1.72\% | -0.380 | 20.72\% | -0.606 | 4.32\% | -0.762 | 3.42\% | -0.559 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 4, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) | 30.44\% | 0.666 | 2.83\% | -0.908 | 24.05\% | -0.098 | 49.84\% | -0.296 | 276 | 0.065 | 1.63\% | -0.391 | 29.70\% | -0.180 | 4.77\% | -0.725 | 3.25\% | -0.574 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) | 24.67\% | 0.031 | 3.30\% | -0.861 | 25.71\% | 0.035 | 38.82\% | -0.750 | 249 | -0.124 | 2.64\% | -0.252 | 27.62\% | -0.278 | 3.17\% | -0.858 | 1.54\% | -0.721 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) | 30.45\% | 0.667 | 5.56\% | -0.635 | 35.00\% | 0.781 | 56.27\% | -0.030 | 384 | 0.823 | 3.48\% | -0.135 | 19.58\% | -0.660 | 6.52\% | -0.580 | 4.05\% | -0.506 | 3.90\% | -0.335 |
| Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) | 31.32\% | 0.763 | 2.32\% | -0.958 | 31.59\% | 0.508 | 50.71\% | $-0.260$ | 362 | 0.665 | 1.94\% | -0.349 | 19.68\% | -0.655 | 1.48\% | -0.997 | 1.08\% | -0.760 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 1 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) | 38.18\% | 1.518 | 1.97\% | -0.994 | 28.51\% | 0.260 | 67.10\% | 0.416 | 389 | 0.859 | 8.13\% | 0.507 | 36.63\% | 0.149 | 10.20\% | -0.276 | 7.30\% | -0.227 | 30.36\% | 1.740 |
| Block Group 2 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) | 37.53\% | 1.446 | 0.29\% | -1.161 | 30.71\% | 0.437 | 60.83\% | 0.158 | 395 | 0.896 | 9.74\% | 0.730 | 40.63\% | 0.338 | 17.42\% | 0.322 | 19.16\% | 0.788 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) | 33.61\% | 1.014 | 0.74\% | -1.117 | 28.95\% | 0.296 | 52.30\% | -0.194 | 276 | 0.064 | 13.43\% | 1.241 | 38.54\% | 0.239 | 11.35\% | -0.181 | 6.41\% | -0.304 | 0.00\% | -0.641 |
| Albuquerque city, New Mexic Standard Deviatior | $\begin{aligned} & 24.39 \% \\ & 9.088 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 11.92 \% \\ & 10.013 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 25.27 \% \\ & 12.456 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 57.00 \% \\ 24.237 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 267 \\ 142332 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.46 \% \\ & 7.207 \end{aligned}$ |  | $33.49 \%$ |  | $13.53 \%$ |  | 9.96\% <br> 11.682 |  | $8.17 \%$ $12.749$ |  |





## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007 NEIGHBORHOOD STRESS INDEX

|  | VARIABLE 11 |  | VARIABLE 12 |  | VARIABLE 13 |  | VARIABLE 14 |  | VARIABLE 15 |  | VARIABLE 16 |  | VARIABLE 17 |  | VARIABLE 18 |  | VARIABLE 19 |  | VARIABLE 20 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT |  | UNEMPLOYMENT RATE |  | NOT WORKING IN '99 |  | WORKING MOTHERS |  | FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER |  | NEIGHBORHOOD INSTABILITY |  | CROWDING |  | SANITATIONICROWD |  | PLUMBING |  | housing age |  |
| CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE CENSUS TRACT \& BLOCK GROUP | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { sCCRE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { cITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { SCoRE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { SCoRE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { SCORE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BG } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { sCORE } \end{gathered}$ | STV FROM CITY AVG | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { score } \end{gathered}$ | STV FROM CITY AVG | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { SCORE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { sccore } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { STV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BG } \\ \text { SCRE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { STVV } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { CITY AVG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | 2.34\% | $-0.345$ | 5.79\% | 0.008 | 3.92\% | 0.036 | 45.45\% | ${ }^{-0.532}$ | 5.7\% | -1.125 | 41.0\% | -0.632 | 1.6\% | -0.492 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | $-0.328$ |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.25 | 1.11\% | -0.486 | 2.70\% | -0.421 | 2.05\% | -0.462 | 40.20\% | -0.686 | 19.0\% | -0.408 | 62.6\% | 0.449 | 2.2\% | -0.421 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.25 | 1.18\% | -0.478 | 9.09\% | 0.467 | 7.46\% | 0.978 | 78.67\% | 0.440 | 15.6\% | -0.590 | 41.5\% | -0.606 | 4.0\% | $-0.181$ | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.26 | 0.73\% | -0.529 | 3.24\% | -0.346 | 2.68\% | -0.294 | 72.97\% | 0.273 | 12.4\% | -0.761 | 45.9\% | -0.387 | 7.0\% | 0.216 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.913\% | 0.492 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.27 | 5.23\% | -0.018 | 12.43\% | 0.931 | 9.91\% | 1.628 | 0.00\% | -1.863 | 24.8\% | -0.096 | 28.5\% | -1.258 | 5.9\% | 0.065 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.27 | 5.20\% | -0.021 | 7.22\% | 0.207 | 5.25\% | 0.391 | 52.38\% | -0.330 | 24.7\% | -0.102 | 37.2\% | -0.821 | 8.2\% | 0.372 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) | 4.86\% | -0.059 | 5.19\% | -0.075 | 3.69\% | -0.025 | 50.00\% | -0.399 | 7.7\% | -1.017 | 33.5\% | -1.006 | 0.0\% | -0.710 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) | 0.00\% | -0.612 | 2.77\% | -0.411 | 2.14\% | -0.436 | 70.59\% | 0.203 | 7.4\% | -1.032 | 68.1\% | 0.722 | 3.6\% | -0.234 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) | 4.15\% | -0.140 | 7.69\% | 0.273 | 5.71\% | 0.514 | 100.00\% | 1.064 | 9.0\% | -0.946 | 38.0\% | -0.779 | 1.7\% | -0.487 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 1 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.29 (part) | 5.07\% | -0.035 | 2.67\% | -0.426 | 1.99\% | -0.477 | 100.00\% | 1.064 | 48.8\% | 1.197 | 78.2\% | 1.229 | 8.8\% | 0.450 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 2.193\% | 1.597 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 2 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.29 (part) | 4.46\% | -0.105 | 8.44\% | 0.377 | 5.92\% | 0.569 | 85.11\% | 0.628 | 18.5\% | -0.434 | 53.2\% | -0.022 | 5.7\% | 0.045 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) | 1.69\% | -0.419 | 7.79\% | 0.287 | 5.90\% | 0.562 | 64.46\% | 0.024 | 30.7\% | 0.220 | 72.7\% | 0.955 | 8.2\% | 0.368 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.93\% | -0.244 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) | 2.56\% | -0.321 | 3.43\% | -0.320 | 2.42\% | -0.362 | 63.24\% | -0.012 | 46.5\% | 1.074 | 73.1\% | 0.974 | 8.9\% | 0.471 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) | 1.22\% | -0.474 | 3.98\% | -0.243 | 3.19\% | -0.159 | 64.36\% | 0.021 | 16.9\% | -0.520 | 78.5\% | 1.242 | 2.7\% | -0.350 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 4, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) | 0.00\% | -0.612 | 4.92\% | -0.112 | 3.64\% | -0.039 | 72.94\% | 0.272 | 11.2\% | -0.828 | 65.7\% | ${ }^{0.603}$ | 1.1\% | -0.558 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) | 0.00\% | -0.612 | 2.52\% | -0.445 | 2.16\% | -0.432 | 93.85\% | 0.884 | 20.2\% | -0.341 | 49.4\% | -0.213 | 4.3\% | -0.147 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) | 2.44\% | -0.334 | 2.31\% | -0.475 | 1.79\% | -0.529 | 85.09\% | 0.628 | 24.9\% | -0.089 | 53.1\% | -0.024 | 7.6\% | 0.296 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.789\% | 0.385 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) | 0.39\% | -0.567 | 1.39\% | -0.603 | 1.15\% | -0.699 | 74.87\% | 0.329 | 12.7\% | -0.746 | 61.9\% | 0.414 | 1.5\% | -0.510 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 1 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) | 10.36\% | 0.566 | 7.76\% | 0.283 | 5.47\% | 0.448 | 72.55\% | 0.261 | 28.4\% | 0.099 | 44.5\% | -0.454 | 9.0\% | 0.482 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 2 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) | 15.06\% | ${ }^{1.100}$ | 10.55\% | 0.670 | 7.85\% | 1.080 | 64.08\% | 0.013 | 27.3\% | 0.039 | 81.9\% | 1.415 | 11.2\% | 0.767 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | $-0.297$ | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) | 7.77\% | 0.272 | 1.00\% | -0.657 | 0.81\% | -0.790 | 61.36\% | -0.067 | 30.0\% | 0.183 | 86.6\% | 1.648 | 9.6\% | 0.561 | 0.000\% | -0.087 | 0.000\% | -0.297 | 0.00\% | -0.328 |
| Albuquerque city, New Mexic Standard Deviatior | $\begin{aligned} & 5.38 \% \\ & 8.800 \end{aligned}$ |  | $5.73 \%$ $7.194$ |  | $3.78 \%$ |  | 63.64\% $34.163$ |  | $26.6 \%$ $18.567$ |  | $53.6 \%$ $19.993$ |  | $5.4 \%$ |  | $0.062 \%$ $0.716$ |  | $0.344 \%$ |  | $3.62 \%$ $11.031$ |  |





\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{VARIABLE 21

KITCHEN

FACILIIES}} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{VARIABLE 22} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{VARIABLE 23} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{VARIABLE 24} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{VARIABLE 25} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{VARIABLE 26} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{VARIABLE 27} \& \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{RANKED COMPOSITE SCORES} \& \multirow[b]{3}{*}{$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { TOP } 10 \% \\
\text { OF } \\
\text { CASES }
\end{gathered}
$$} <br>

\hline \& \& \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{heating fuel} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{VACANCY RATE} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{OWNER COSTS} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{RENTER COSTS} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{COMMUNICATIONS} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{ACCESS} \& \& \& <br>

\hline CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE CENSUS TRACT \& BLOCK GROUP \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { BG } \\
\text { sCCRE }
\end{gathered}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { STV } \\
\text { FROM } \\
\text { CITY AVG }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { BG } \\
\text { SCORE }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { STV } \\
\text { FROM } \\
\text { CITY AVG }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { BG } \\
\text { SCoRE }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { STV } \\
\text { FROM } \\
\text { CITY AVG }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { BG } \\
\text { SCORE }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { STV } \\
\text { FROM } \\
\text { CITY AVG }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { BG } \\
\text { sCCRE }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { STV } \\
\text { FROM } \\
\text { CITY AVG }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { BG } \\
\text { SCORE }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { STV } \\
\text { FROM } \\
\text { CITY AVG }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { BG } \\
\text { SCRE }
\end{gathered}
$$
\] \& \& STV FROM CITY AVG \& COMPOSITE BG

SCORE \& \& <br>
\hline  \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ \& -0.648 \& 6.5\% \& -0.039 \& 0.0\% \& -1.628 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 1.3\% \& 1.28 \& -0.768 \& -0.3992 \& 323 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.25 \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 2.180\% \& 3.895 \& 0.0\% \& -1.195 \& 0.0\% \& -0.724 \& 19.0\% \& -0.521 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 0.0\% \& \& -0.932 \& -0.0409 \& 156 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.25 \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 3.4\% \& -0.673 \& 1.5\% \& -0.562 \& 30.6\% \& 0.152 \& 0.902\% \& 0.897 \& 1.3\% \& 1.29 \& -0.766 \& -0.2069 \& 240 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.26 \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 2.8\% \& -0.767 \& 5.3\% \& -0.171 \& 18.9\% \& -0.531 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 0.0\% \& \& -0.932 \& -0.2695 \& 272 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.27 \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 0.0\% \& -1.195 \& 3.2\% \& -0.386 \& 0.0\% \& -1.628 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 0.0\% \& - \& -0.932 \& -0.4194 \& 333 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.27 \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 0.0\% \& -1.195 \& 4.6\% \& -0.239 \& 0.0\% \& -1.628 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 0.0\% \& \& -0.932 \& -0.2206 \& 249 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 0.0\% \& -1.195 \& 0.0\% \& -0.724 \& 34.8\% \& 0.394 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 0.0\% \& - \& -0.932 \& -0.3176 \& 298 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 7.2\% \& -0.075 \& 6.7\% \& -0.021 \& 10.6\% \& -1.009 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 1.6\% \& 1.60 \& -0.727 \& -0.4203 \& 334 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.28 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 5.7\% \& -0.316 \& 8.2\% \& 0.142 \& 13.6\% \& -0.835 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 1.4\% \& 1.44 \& -0.747 \& -0.2409 \& 256 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 1 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.29 (part) \& 0.000\% \& $-0.223$ \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 0.0\% \& -1.195 \& 0.0\% \& -0.724 \& 40.3\% \& 0.713 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 13.2\% \& 13.16 \& 0.760 \& 0.3689 \& 70 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 2 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.29 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 11.2\% \& 0.547 \& 17.7\% \& 1.141 \& 15.9\% \& -0.702 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 4.2\% \& 4.17 \& -0.396 \& 0.0337 \& 137 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 6.9\% \& -0.132 \& 18.7\% \& 1.245 \& 19.7\% \& -0.480 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 9.1\% \& 9.15 \& 0.244 \& 0.1655 \& 107 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) \& 1.359\% \& 0.233 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 10.2\% \& 0.386 \& 16.8\% \& 1.041 \& 18.3\% \& -0.565 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 3.2\% \& 3.18 \& -0.523 \& 0.2218 \& 91 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 6.3\% \& -0.216 \& 5.1\% \& -0.184 \& 4.7\% \& -1.355 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 0.8\% \& 0.78 \& -0.832 \& -0.1772 \& 220 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 4, Urban, Census Tract 47.30 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 4.4\% \& -0.514 \& 1.6\% \& -0.558 \& 13.0\% \& -0.870 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 0.0\% \& - \& -0.932 \& -0.3193 \& 299 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 1, Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 4.8\% \& -0.454 \& 1.6\% \& -0.551 \& 7.4\% \& -1.197 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 1.2\% \& 1.22 \& -0.776 \& -0.3739 \& 316 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 2, Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) \& 0.749\% \& 0.029 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 5.0\% \& -0.413 \& 4.4\% \& -0.265 \& 17.9\% \& $-0.586$ \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 2.7\% \& 2.65 \& -0.591 \& -0.1278 \& 192 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.31 (part) \& 0.000\% \& $-0.223$ \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 1.3\% \& -0.991 \& 4.5\% \& -0.255 \& 35.5\% \& 0.435 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 1.1\% \& 1.07 \& -0.795 \& -0.2986 \& 290 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 1 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 2.6\% \& -0.787 \& 6.2\% \& -0.066 \& 34.7\% \& 0.387 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 1.0\% \& 1.03 \& -0.800 \& 0.1103 \& 119 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 2 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 17.8\% \& 1.573 \& 3.0\% \& -0.412 \& 43.1\% \& 0.880 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 2.8\% \& 2.79 \& -0.573 \& 0.3138 \& 74 \& <br>
\hline Block Group 3 (part), Urban, Census Tract 47.32 (part) \& 0.000\% \& -0.223 \& 0.000\% \& -0.219 \& 2.0\% \& -0.882 \& 4.5\% \& -0.249 \& 0.0\% \& -1.628 \& 0.000\% \& -0.239 \& 4.6\% \& 4.58 \& -0.343 \& -0.1084 \& 181 \& <br>

\hline Albuquerque city, New Mexicı Standard Deviatior \& $$
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NEIGHBORHOODS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" THRESHOLDS

|  |  | ONE "PRON | TO GENTRIFICATIO | THRESHOLDS |  |  | R TWO "PRON | GENTRIFIC | " THRESHOLD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | THRESHOLD ONE: MEDIAN AGE OF HOUSING LESS THAN 1960 | THRESHOLD TWO: TRACT WITHIN THE DOWNTOWN CORE | THRESHOLD THREE: <br> TRACT WITHIN ADOPTED REDEVELOPMENT AREAS | THRESHOLD 4: TRACT ELIGIBLE WITHIN CDBG AREA BENEFIT (>50\% LOWIMOD) | TRACT MEETS AT LEAST TWO THRESHOLDS OF THE FOUR POSSIBLE | THRESHOLD 5: RESALE HOME APPRECIATION BETWEEN '04 TO '06 GREATER THAN 30\% PER THE MLS DISTRICT | THRESHOLD 6: HOME PURCHASE LENDING RATIO FROM '03 TO '05 MORE THAN THE MSA AVERAGE OF 82\% | THRESHOLD 7: RATIO OF TRACT LOAN DENIALS TO ORIGINATION BELOW THE MSA AVERAGE OF 6\% | THRESHOLD 8: INCIDENCE OF TRACT PERMITTING ACITIVITY | MUST MEET TWO OF FOUR THRESHOL DS |
| Census Tract 1.07 <br> Census Tract 1.08 <br> Census Tract 1.09 <br> Census Tract 1.10 <br> Census Tract 1.11 <br> Census Tract 1.12 <br> Census Tract 1.13 <br> Census Tract 1.14 <br> Census Tract 1.15 <br> Census Tract 1.16 <br> Census Tract 1.17 <br> Census Tract 1.18 <br> Census Tract 1.19 <br> Census Tract 1.20 <br> Census Tract 1.21 <br> Census Tract 1.22 <br> Census Tract 1.23 <br> Census Tract 1.24 <br> Census Tract 1.25 <br> Census Tract 1.26 <br> Census Tract 1.27 <br> Census Tract 1.28 <br> Census Tract 1.29 <br> Census Tract 2.03 <br> Census Tract 2.04 <br> Census Tract 2.05 <br> Census Tract 2.06 <br> Census Tract 2.07 <br> Census Tract 2.08 <br> Census Tract 3 <br> Census Tract 4.01 <br> Census Tract 4.02 <br> Census Tract 5 <br> Census Tract 6.01 <br> Census Tract 6.03 <br> Census Tract 6.04 (part) <br> Census Tract 7.04 <br> Census Tract 7.07 <br> Census Tract 7.08 <br> Census Tract 7.10 (part) <br> Census Tract 7.11 (part) <br> Census Tract 7.12 <br> Census Tract 7.13 (part) <br> Census Tract 7.14 (part) <br> Census Tract 8.01 (part) | Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes | Yes | Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes | Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes | Yes <br> Yes Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes | Yes, UNM South @ 33\% <br> No, SE Heights @2.5\% (MLS 70) No, SE Heights @2.5\% (MLS 70) <br> No, SE Heights @2.5\% (MLS 70) Yes, NE Heights @ 32\% <br> No, SE Heights @25.7\% | No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes |  | 2 Apt-P, 2t/h, 35 s/f <br> No t/h project <br> All Commercial Large volume s/f <br> 56 s/f | Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes |

NEIGHBORHOODS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" THRESHOLDS


Run Date:
29-Jun-07
©Crystal \& Company, July, 2007.

TABLE 2-2
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007
NEIGHBORHOODS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" THRESHOLDS

|  | TIER ONE "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" THRESHOLDS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | THRESHOLD ONE: MEDIAN AGE OF HOUSING LESS THAN 1960 | THRESHOLD TWO: TRACT WITHIN THE DOWNTOWN CORE | THRESHOLD THREE: <br> TRACT WITHIN ADOPTED REDEVELOPMENT AREAS | THRESHOLD 4: <br> TRACT ELIGIBLE <br> WITHIN CDBG <br> AREA BENEFIT <br> (>50\% <br> LOWIMOD) | TRACT MEETS AT LEAST TWO THRESHOLDS OF THE FOUR POSSIBLE |
| Census Tract 37.27 <br> Census Tract 37.28 <br> Census Tract 37.30 (part) Census Tract 37.32 (part) Census Tract 37.33 <br> Census Tract 37.34 (part) Census Tract 40.01 (part) Census Tract 43 (part) Census Tract 44.01 (part) Census Tract 46.03 (part) Census Tract 46.04 (part) Census Tract 47.05 (part) Census Tract 47.12 (part) Census Tract 47.13 (part) Census Tract 47.14 (part) Census Tract 47.15 (part) Census Tract 47.16 (part) Census Tract 47.17 Census Tract 47.18 (part) Census Tract 47.19 (part) Census Tract 47.20 (part) Census Tract 47.21 (part) Census Tract 47.22 (part) Census Tract 47.23 (part) Census Tract 47.24 Census Tract 47.25 Census Tract 47.26 Census Tract 47.27 Census Tract 47.28 (part) Census Tract 47.29 (part) Census Tract 47.30 (part) Census Tract 47.31 (part) Census Tract 47.32 (part) | Yes |  | Yes | Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes <br> Yes | Yes <br> Yes |



NEIGHBORHOODS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" THRESHOLDS

|  | TIER THREE | RESHOLDS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | THRESHOLD 9: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE COMMUNITY SERVICES STAFF INSPECTION OF TIER TWO TRACT AREAS | THRESHOLD 10: STRATEGIC INTERVIEWS | ALBUQUERQUE REGIONS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" (MUST MEET ONE OF TWO TIER THREE THRESHOLDS) |
| Census Tract 1.07 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.08 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.09 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.10 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.11 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.12 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.13 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.14 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.15 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.16 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.17 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.19 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.20 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.21 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.22 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.23 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.24 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.25 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.26 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.27 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.28 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 1.29 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 2.03 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 2.04 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 2.05 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 2.06 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 2.07 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 2.08 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 3 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 4.01 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 4.02 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 5 Yes <br> Census Tract 6.01  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 6.03 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 6.04 (part) No No |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 7.04 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 7.07 No No |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 7.08 No  <br> Census Tract 7.10 (part)  No |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 7.12 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 7.13 (part) No No |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

NEIGHBORHOODS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" THRESHOLDS

|  | TIER THREE | RESHOLDS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | THRESHOLD 9: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE COMMUNITY SERVICES STAFF INSPECTION OF TIER TWO TRACT AREAS | THRESHOLD 10: STRATEGIC INTERVIEWS | ALBUQUERQUE REGIONS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" (MUST MEET ONE OF TWO TIER THREE THRESHOLDS) |
| Census Tract 9.01 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 9.03 (part) | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 9.04 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 11.01 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 11.02 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 12 (part) | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 13 (part) | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 14 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Census Tract 15 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Census Tract 16 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 17 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Census Tract 18 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 19 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 20 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Census Tract 21 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Census Tract 22 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Census Tract 23 (part) | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 24.01 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 24.02 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 25 (part) | Yes | No | Yes |
| Census Tract 26 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Census Tract 27 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Census Tract 29 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 30.01 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 30.02 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 31 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 32.01 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 32.02 | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 34 (part) | No | No |  |
| Census Tract 35.01 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 35.02 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 36 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.07 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.12 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.14 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.15 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.17 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.18 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.19 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.21 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.22 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.23 (part) |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.24 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.25 |  |  |  |
| Census Tract 37.26 |  |  |  |

©Crystal \& Company, July, 2007

TABLE 2-2
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007

NEIGHBORHOODS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" THRESHOLDS

|  | TIER THREE | RESHOLDS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | THRESHOLD 9: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE COMMUNITY SERVICES STAFF INSPECTION OF TIER TWO TRACT AREAS | THRESHOLD 10: STRATEGIC INTERVIEWS | ALBUQUERQUE REGIONS "PRONE TO GENTRIFICATION" (MUST MEET ONE OF TWO TIER THREE THRESHOLDS) |
| Census Tract 37.27 Census Tract 37.28 Census Tract 37.30 (part) Census Tract 37.32 (part) Census Tract 37.33 Census Tract 37.34 (part) Census Tract 40.01 (part) Census Tract 43 (part) Census Tract 44.01 (part) Census Tract 46.03 (part) Census Tract 46.04 (part) Census Tract 47.05 (part) Census Tract 47.12 (part) Census Tract 47.13 (part) Census Tract 47.14 (part) Census Tract 47.15 (part) Census Tract 47.16 (part) Census Tract 47.17 Census Tract 47.18 (part) Census Tract 47.19 (part) Census Tract 47.20 (part) Census Tract 47.21 (part) Census Tract 47.22 (part) Census Tract 47.23 (part) Census Tract 47.24 Census Tract 47.25 Census Tract 47.26 Census Tract 47.27 Census Tract 47.28 (part) Census Tract 47.29 (part) Census Tract 47.30 (part) Census Tract 47.31 (part) Census Tract 47.32 (part) | No <br> No | No <br> No |  |



### 3.0 CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING AFFORDABILITY AND MARKET IMPLICATIONS, 2000-2007

### 3.1 City of Albuquerque Household Income Trends

From 1989 through 1999, Albuquerque median family income grew from \$33,746 to $\$ 46,979$, accounting for a rise of $39 \%$ over this period. However, when considering the growth in constant 1999 dollars (thereby factoring in consumer price index hikes), real income only rose by $7 \%$.

|  | 1999 | 1989 | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Families | 113,301 | 100,170 | 13.1\% |
| Less than \$10,000 | 6,805 | 9,884 | -31.2\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 5,926 | 7,783 | -23.9\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 13,118 | 17,048 | -23.1\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 14,188 | 17,360 | -18.3\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 20,246 | 20,230 | 0.1\% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 24,195 | 17,746 | 36.3\% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 13,997 | 5,655 | 147.5\% |
| \$100,000-\$149,999 | 10,206 | 3,123 | 226.8\% |
| \$150,000 Or More | 4,620 | 1,341 | 244.5\% |
| Median Family Income (\$) | \$46,979 | \$33,746 | 39.2\% |
| Median Family Income (in '99 \$) | \$46,979 | \$43,798 | 7.3\% |

Since 2001, median family income (MFI) in Albuquerque has risen approximately $14.1 \%$ according to HUD estimates. When factoring in inflation during this period, real median family only grew by approximately $3 \%$.

| CN | Median <br> Family <br> Income | CPI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\$ 49,000$ | 177.1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | $\$ 51,000$ | 179.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $\$ 51,400$ | 184.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $\$ 54,200$ | 188.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\$ 54,200$ | 195.3 |
| 2006 | $\$ 53,200$ | 201.6 |
| 2007 | $\$ 55,900$ | 197.1 |
| \% Change | $\mathbf{1 4 . 0 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 2 9 \%}$ |

©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790

Derived from the American Community Survey, the distribution of household income (refer to Table 3-1) is displayed on the following chart. Of concern is the actual growth in households earning under $\$ 10,000$ in 2000 vs. 2005 when adjusted for inflation.


### 3.2 Residential Resale and Permitting Activity

## Resale Activity

Noted below, the volume of resale activity rose steadily in Albuquerque through 2005, yet in 2006 dropped between 3 to $5 \%$ off previous levels ('05). In 2007, this trend appears to be continuing. Home appreciation appears to be stable or heading higher notwithstanding reduced sales activity.

|  | CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE |  |  | ALBUQUERQUE MSA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MEDIAN <br> RESALE PRICE | AVERAGE <br> RESALE PRICE | NUMBER OF SALES | MEDIAN RESALE PRICE | AVERAGE <br> RESALE PRICE | NUMBER OF SALES |
| 2000 | \$128,000 | \$150,287 | 5,520 | \$125,000 | \$145,798 | 7,606 |
| 2001 | \$130,000 | \$153,026 | 6,531 | \$127,000 | \$148,239 | 8,870 |
| 2002 | \$136,500 | \$157,237 | 7,119 | \$132,000 | \$153,521 | 9,829 |
| 2003 | \$138,500 | \$164,203 | 8,006 | \$135,900 | \$161,325 | 10,942 |
| 2004 | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$143,243 | \$175,643 | 12,024 |
| 2005 | \$164,900 | \$198,135 | 10,301 | \$161,437 | \$197,338 | 14,300 |
| 2006 | \$180,000 | \$220,524 | 9,750 | \$182,000 | \$219,893 | 13,757 |
| April of 2007 | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$198,012 | \$243,023 | 910 |
| Change '00-'06 | 40.63\% | 46.74\% | 76.63\% | 45.60\% | 50.82\% | 80.87\% |

Source: Albuquerque Metropolitan Board of Realtors, May, 2007.
According to the Albuquerque Board of Realtors.... "The April 2007 Residential Home Sales statistics show a slowdown in the housing market in the Greater Albuquerque area
compared to last April. We've seen a 9\% decrease in sales for April 2007 versus April of 2006," said Scott Dean, Chairman of the Albuquerque Metropolitan Board of REALTORS®, "The Albuquerque Resale Housing Market has continued to slow down from last year and the housing inventory has continued to increase. Unlike many areas around the country, resale home prices stay strong and we're seeing good home appreciation rates," concluded Dean.

Home sales have risen consistently in Albuquerque as reflected on the following chart depicting the long-term trend.


Between 2001 and 2006, the average price of resale dwellings increased approximately $44 \%$. If one considers the CPI adjustment of $14 \%$ for that period, the cost of resale housing jumped about $30 \%$ to the consumer. Most of this increase has been in the last several years (since 2003). Drawn from information collected by the City of Albuquerque, resale activity for homes under \$100,000 have dropped dramatically in the last several years.

©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790

Based on information prepared by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development in July of 2006, consider the estimated annual new units of market demand for the City of Albuquerque based on its share (60\%) of population in the region through July of 2009. The application of customary mortgage underwriting criteria over a 30 -year amortization term at $6.5 \%$ APR with a $5 \%$ downpayment would enable households earning \$44,700 (80\% of the area median for a family of four) to afford no greater than \$135,000.

| Home Sales Price Range |  | Annual Regional Abuquerque Units of Market Demand (7l'06-7l'09) | Annual City of Albuquerque Market Demand @ 60\% Share Of Region (7l'06-7l'09) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 90,000 | \$ 99,999 | 210 | 70 |
| \$100,000 | \$ 119,999 | 557 | 186 |
| \$120,000 | \$ 139,999 | 560 | 187 |
| \$140,000 | \$ 159,999 | 1,093 | 364 |
| \$160,000 | \$ 179,999 | 1,257 | 419 |
| \$180,000 | \$ 199,999 | 1,047 | 349 |
| \$200,000 | \$ 249,999 | 700 | 233 |
| \$250,000 | \$ 299,999 | 553 | 184 |
| \$300,000 | \$ 349,999 | 453 | 151 |
| \$350,000 | \$ 399,999 | 173 | 58 |
| \$400,000 | \$ 449,999 | 133 | 44 |
| \$450,000 | \$ 499,999 | 127 | 42 |
| \$500,000 | Plus | 103 | 34 |

Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development,
Albuquerque Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis,
July of 2006.

## Residential Permitting Activity

Single-family permitting activity in 2006 in the City of Albuquerque was off $30 \%$ from record levels evident in 2004 and 2005. Alternatively, multi-family activity was up 141\% over 2005 levels to 757 units in 2006 (regardless of tenure).
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Analyzed by Community Planning Area, the West-Side and Southwest Mesa appeared to include the greatest volume of single-family permitting activity (refer to Table 3-2). Both of these regions are off dramatically from recent, record years.


While the Near Heights, North Valley, Foothills and East Gateway CPAs experienced significant permitting activity over the years, all are sustaining major drops at present. The remaining CPAs in the urban core displayed low levels of sporadic, single family infill with increasing levels of condominium and townhome development.


[^1]Current single family permitting values vary considerably by Community Planning Area as portrayed in the following chart.


Regardless of the community planning area, information supplied by the City of Albuquerque indicates the construction of new homes for under \$100,000 are presently non-existent.


### 3.3 Multi-Family Rental and Vacancy Rates

Rental rates in the Albuquerque MSA derived from annual HUD surveys indicate levels have risen approximately 3.5\% per year, and about 27\% from 2001 through 2007.

|  | STUDIO | ONE BEDROOM | TWO BEDROOM | THREE BEDROOM | FOUR BEDROOM | HUD <br> MEDIAN <br> FAMILY <br> INCOME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | \$424 | \$505 | \$632 | \$871 | \$1,028 | \$49,000 |
| 2002 | \$439 | \$522 | \$654 | \$901 | \$1,063 | \$51,000 |
| 2003 | \$450 | \$537 | \$671 | \$925 | \$1,092 | \$51,400 |
| 2004 | \$451 | \$539 | \$673 | \$926 | \$1,096 | \$54,200 |
| 2005 | \$470 | \$553 | \$690 | \$1,017 | \$1,224 | \$54,200 |
| 2006 | \$485 | \$571 | \$721 | \$1,059 | \$1,259 | \$53,200 |
| 2007 | \$502 | \$591 | \$746 | \$1,086 | \$1,303 | \$55,900 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change '06-'07 | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 2.5\% | 3.5\% | 5.1\% |
| Change '01-'07 | 18.4\% | 17.0\% | 18.0\% | 24.7\% | 26.8\% | 14.1\% |
| Est. Annual Change '01-'07 | 2.6\% | 2.4\% | 2.6\% | 3.5\% | 3.8\% | 2.0\% |

Source: US Department of HUD, 2007.
Compared with HUD median family income estimates for the region, rent levels have risen from .6 to 1.8\% per annum greater than hikes in median income between 2001 and 2007. According to an apartment survey of about 9,000 units by the Apartment Association of New Mexico in the winter of 2006, the average rent per sq. ft. was $\$ .79$ for the Albuquerque region and the average deposit per unit was $\$ 218$.


Derived from the Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis For Albuquerque, New Mexico prepared by HUD in July of 2006, the apartment market is balanced as of the
current date (July of 2006) with few or no concessions and a vacancy rate of approximately 6 percent. This was reinforced by a 7.1 vacancy rate for the Albuquerque region derived from an Apartment Association of New Mexico survey mentioned earlier.According the HUD market report, "Vacancies are most prevalent in smaller rental properties and in single-family home rentals that typically are older and have difficulty competing with amenities found in newer multifamily rental properties. Nearly 25 percent of rental units in the Albuquerque region consist of single-family homes and units in smaller three- and four-story structures. The overall rental vacancy rate in the region was estimated at $11.1 \%$ as of July of 2006." Consider the estimated annual market demand for new rental units for the City of Albuquerque by price and bedroom size through 2009 drawn from the HUD market report.

| ONEBEDROMMUNTS |  |  | TMOBEDROMMUNTS |  |  | TFPIEBEROOMUNTS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monthly Gross Rent | Anual Regional Abuquerque Market Rental Unit Demand (7'06-7/09) | Annual Oity of Albuquerque Market Demand@60\% Share Of Region (7'06-71'09) | Montilly Gross Rent | Anual Regional Abuquerque Market Rental Unit Demand (7'06-7/'09) | Amural Oty of Albuquerque Market Demand@ 60\%Share Of Region (7/'06-7/'09) | Monthly Gross Rent | Annual Regional Abuquerque Market Rental Unit Demand (7106-71'09) | Annual City of AlbuquerqueMarket Demand @60\% Share Of Region (7'06-7'09) |
| \$550 | 90 | 54 | \$700 | 85 | 51 | \$900 | 15 | 9 |
| \$600 | 80 | 48 | \$750 | 70 | 42 | \$950 | 10 | 6 |
| \$650 | 73 | 44 | \$800 | 65 | 39 | \$1,000 | 12 | 7 |
| \$700 | 67 | 40 | \$950 | 57 | 34 | \$1,050 | 10 | 6 |
| \$150 | 57 | 34 | \$000 | 50 | 30 | \$1,100 | 8 | 5 |
| \$800 | 48 | 29 | \$950 | 43 | 26 | \$1,150 | 7 | 4 |
| \$950 | 40 | 24 | \$1,000 | 37 | 22 | \$1,200 | 7 | 4 |
| \$900+ | 32 | 19 | \$1,060+ | 30 | 18 | \$1,250+ | 3 | 2 |

Sarœ: USDepartment of Housing and U hban Development, Albuquerque Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis, July of 2006.

### 3.4 Residential Lending Activity

Home purchase residential lending activity (refer to Table 3-3) is presented below for the period 2000 through 2005. The reduction in home mortgage rates commencing in 2002 accelerated all aspects of home purchase financing activity. Of note too was the growing level of non-occupant investor financing evident. Given the sizable reduction in permitting activity, reduced activity in the resale market and growing levels and concerns about mortgage foreclosures, residential financing across the board is most likely down in the region.


As expected, the ratio of home purchase origination to denials was comparatively low from 2002 through 2005, and is likely down now given stiffer bank underwriting criteria brought on by increasing foreclosure action.


While the ratio of home improvement denials to origination has been historically high since 2000 it peaked in 2005 suggesting the easing of underwriting criteria, attractive lower rates and consumer liquidation of rising home equity for a myriad of purposes.


As the volume of home improvement lending and home appreciation rose in Albuquerque so did the borrowing amount per loan by the consumer. Shown on Table $3-3$, the average home improvement loan rose tripled from $\$ 21,300$ in 2000 to $\$ 64,260$ in 2005.

### 3.5 Trends In Housing Affordability

The National Association of Homebuilders measures housing affordability of communities across the country by generating a statistic referred to as the 'housing opportunity index' that guages the ability of consumers to afford the median priced home in the area. Since 2000, Albuquerque was generally less affordable to the consumer than the national average housing opportunity index, but by 2006 Albuquerque appeared to be right at the national average.
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The Albuquerque MSA tends to fall in the middle of the pack when compared to other western cities. Realizing a high opportunity index indicates affordability and vice-versa, consider Albuquerque's middle ranking which is closest to Phoenix and El Paso.


Discussed earlier in this report, inflation adjusted family income only rose 3\% from 2000 through 2006, while home valuations rose $30 \%$. Mortgage rates during the period have generally remained a low levels. According to the Joint Center of Housing Studies of Harvard University, "the affordability decline trend cuts across all incomes. The bottom $25 \%$ of earners have been hit the hardest....".

With respect to lower income persons, affordable housing appears to be a growing need. Those lower income households with 'problems' (cost burdened, overcrowded or residing in dilapidated conditions) grew of consequence from 1990 to 2000 as identified on Table 3-4 and depicted below. Note the sizeable increase in need among owners earning from 51-80\% of the median between 1990 and 2000
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The adverse consequences of housing affordability on lower income households and persons appears to continuing when current estimates of households with problems are presented.


When we look at the impact housing affordability trends in Albuquerque are having on individual consumers, the situation comes more into focus. Consider the following prospects faced by one-person and family households in the workforce.

| SINGLE PERSON HOUSING AFFORDABILITY HIGHLIGHTS | Hourly Rate For Individual $1 /$ | Ability To Afford <br> The Median Priced Resale Home of \$211,000 21 | Ability To Afford Median 1BR Rental At \$591/mo. 3/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail - Food \& Beverage | \$11.35 | No | No |
| Retail - Clothing \& Accessories | \$9.20 | No | No |
| Retail - Electrial Appliances | \$14.40 | No | Yes |
| Police Officer After One Year | \$15.86 | No | Yes |
| Firefighter After One Year | \$15.93 | No | Yes |
| Construction Workers | \$18.00 | No | Yes |
| Tier 1 APS Teachers | \$16.80 | No | Yes |
| Air Transport | \$17.60 | No | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |


|  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Ability To Afford } \\ \text { The Median } \\ \text { Priced Resale }\end{array}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Ability To <br>

Afford Median <br>
3BR Rental At\end{array}\right\}\)

1/ Source is the New Mexico Department of Labor, City of Albuquerque and APS.
2/ Assumes a 6\% fixed rate amortized over 30 years with a 5\% down and customary underwriting criteria (28\%). Also assumes no consumer debt, cash for the downpayment and reasonable creditt.
$3 /$ Assumes the household will spend no more than $30 \%$ of their gross income on housing.

### 3.6 Impacts Of Prevailing Housing Market Conditions On Lower Income Persons

$\checkmark$ Housing market conditions in Albuquerque are in a state of transition, and the forsale market is currently soft.
$\checkmark$ Reduced permitting and resale activity appear to be raising the volume of for-sale inventories which could, but not necessarily will, put a downward pressure on home appreciation and thereby strengthen affordability for lower income consumers.
$\checkmark$ Some low- and moderate- income homeowners are facing the adverse consequences of their existing, sub-prime mortgages being reset at higher interest rates. This is contributing to heightened levels of foreclosure action nationwide. This challenges affordable housing providers to stimulate residential production and retain the inventory currently in service.
$\checkmark$ Recent high levels of non-occupant lending (investor) coupled with slower 'for sale' market conditions and rising inventories may ultimately offer affordable home purchase opportunities for lower income consumers (and providers) as well as temporarily increase the available supply of rental units on the market.
$\checkmark$ The comparatively high incidence of foreclosure action has motivated lenders to strengthen their residential underwriting criteria which has a chilling affect for lower income consumers in need.
$\checkmark$ According to Forbes, market troughs in the for-sale markets in the west are projected between the second quarter of '08 through the first quarter of '09 depending on the specific metropolitan region.
$\checkmark$ According to a recent HUD market report, "Vacancies are most prevalent in smaller rental properties and in single-family home rentals that typically are older and have difficulty competing with amenities found in newer multifamily rental properties. Nearly 25 percent of rental units in the Albuquerque region consist of single-family homes and units in smaller three- and four-story structures. The overall rental vacancy rate in the region was estimated at $11.1 \%$ as of July of 2006."
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## APPENDIX 3.0

Run Date:
29-Jun-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007

TABLE 3-1
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
INFLATION ADJUSTED HOUSEHOLD INCOME ESTIMATES, 2000-2005

|  | 2000 | \% Distribution | 2001 | \% <br> Distribution | 2002 | \% <br> Distribution | 2003 | \% <br> Distribution | 2004 | \% <br> Distribution | 2005 | \% Distribution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than \$10,000 | 12,213 | 6.98\% | 16,871 | 9.82\% | 16,148 | 8.41\% | 19,194 | 9.59\% | 19,579 | 9.03\% | 18,489 | 8.85\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 14,883 | 8.51\% | 8,385 | 4.88\% | 14,031 | 7.31\% | 16,310 | 8.15\% | 12,267 | 5.66\% | 14,713 | 7.05\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 28,916 | 16.54\% | 28,052 | 16.33\% | 29,895 | 15.57\% | 23,849 | 11.91\% | 29,192 | 13.47\% | 30,102 | 14.42\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 24,814 | 14.19\% | 21,431 | 12.48\% | 23,396 | 12.19\% | 27,765 | 13.87\% | 30,342 | 14.00\% | 22,551 | 10.80\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 26,254 | 15.01\% | 31,251 | 18.20\% | 28,464 | 14.83\% | 36,801 | 18.38\% | 36,237 | 16.72\% | 32,594 | 15.61\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 32,479 | 18.57\% | 32,029 | 18.65\% | 36,876 | 19.21\% | 33,261 | 16.61\% | 37,685 | 17.39\% | 39,611 | 18.97\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 17,039 | 9.74\% | 16,269 | 9.47\% | 19,757 | 10.29\% | 18,457 | 9.22\% | 18,828 | 8.69\% | 20,536 | 9.83\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 11,879 | 6.79\% | 13,326 | 7.76\% | 18,095 | 9.43\% | 18,789 | 9.38\% | 23,720 | 10.94\% | 20,246 | 9.70\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 3,599 | 2.06\% | 1,662 | 0.97\% | 3,808 | 1.98\% | 2,961 | 1.48\% | 5,136 | 2.37\% | 5,124 | 2.45\% |
| \$200,000 or more | 2,800 | 1.60\% | 2,461 | 1.43\% | 1,506 | 0.78\% | 2,827 | 1.41\% | 3,751 | 1.73\% | 4,858 | 2.33\% |
| Total Households | 174,876 | 100.00\% | 171,737 | 100.00\% | 191,976 | 100.00\% | 200,214 | 100.00\% | 216,737 | 100.00\% | 208,824 | 100.00\% |
| Inflation Adjusted Median |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household Income | \$38,078 |  | \$40,179 |  | \$40,852 |  | \$40,061 |  | \$40,527 |  | \$41,820 |  |

Source: American Community Survey, 2000-2005.
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SINGLE-FAMILY PERMITTING ACTIVITY BY CPA, 1997-2006

| NUMBER OF SINGLE-FAMILY PERMITS BY YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMMUNITY PLANNING AREA | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
| CENTRAL ALBUQUERQUE | 14 | 21 | 23 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 11 | 17 | 27 | 44 |
| EAST GATEWAY | 114 | 82 | 276 | 187 | 249 | 234 | 134 | 247 | 116 | 225 |
| FOOT HILLS | 213 | 291 | 283 | 292 | 254 | 195 | 140 | 109 | 129 | 111 |
| MID-HEIGHTS | 21 | 23 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 37 | 26 | 27 |  | 17 |
| NEAR HEIGHTS | 24 | 44 | 34 | 39 | 42 | 29 | 17 | 22 | 42 | 57 |
| NORTH ALBUQUERQUE | 300 | 340 | 410 | 284 | 180 | 342 | 485 | 525 | 311 | 74 |
| NORTH VALLEY | 68 | 84 | 91 | 335 | 283 | 369 | 645 | 196 | 155 | 162 |
| SOUTH VALLEY | 2 | 6 | 17 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 51 | 94 | 79 | 36 |
| SOUTHWEST MESA | 279 | 801 | 924 | 965 | 1,166 | 1,127 | 1,149 | 1,470 | 1,518 | 1,219 |
| WEST SIDE | 1,412 | 1,679 | 1,497 | 1,173 | 1,682 | 2,069 | 2,337 | 2,165 | 1,847 | 813 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPA TOTAL | 2,447 | 3,371 | 3,564 | 3,312 | 3,899 | 4,423 | 4,995 | 4,872 | 4,224 | 2,758 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANNUAL \% CHANGE |  | 37.8\% | 5.7\% | -7.1\% | 17.7\% | 13.4\% | 12.9\% | -2.5\% | -13.3\% | -34.7\% |

VALUE OF SINGLE-FAMILY PERMITS BY YEAR

| COMMUNITY PLANNING AREA | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CENTRAL ALBUQUERQUE | \$45,954 | \$71,551 | \$67,661 | \$69,643 | \$78,212 | \$80,333 | \$56,818 | \$103,502 | \$114,280 | \$131,190 |
| EAST GATEWAY | \$104,757 | \$109,832 | \$86,735 | \$89,665 | \$88,374 | \$91,031 | \$117,150 | \$104,381 | \$117,750 | \$193,834 |
| FOOT HILLS | \$136,014 | \$133,194 | \$149,196 | \$141,154 | \$143,673 | \$147,738 | \$189,006 | \$230,771 | \$268,437 | \$241,628 |
| MID-HEIGHTS | \$114,619 | \$111,101 | \$107,057 | \$110,756 | \$84,535 | \$88,925 | \$99,631 | \$94,254 |  | \$236,312 |
| NEAR HEIGHTS | \$97,666 | \$102,637 | \$91,567 | \$86,308 | \$78,740 | \$94,818 | \$130,930 | \$115,936 | \$157,632 | \$140,105 |
| NORTH ALBUQUERQUE | \$95,817 | \$98,552 | \$97,554 | \$105,244 | \$112,652 | \$125,857 | \$132,650 | \$139,020 | \$205,006 | \$286,200 |
| NORTH VALLEY | \$99,689 | \$101,422 | \$114,646 | \$87,900 | \$92,113 | \$102,932 | \$116,948 | \$147,443 | \$162,975 | \$164,857 |
| SOUTH VALLEY | \$35,000 | \$54,833 | \$62,433 | \$68,020 | \$74,985 | \$69,979 | \$83,765 | \$94,305 | \$132,017 | \$167,967 |
| SOUTHWEST MESA | \$72,821 | \$68,744 | \$75,758 | \$75,019 | \$76,208 | \$80,040 | \$86,202 | \$103,197 | \$137,107 | \$144,769 |
| WEST SIDE | \$93,938 | \$90,877 | \$92,583 | \$97,224 | \$97,347 | \$104,985 | \$110,321 | \$131,212 | \$161,619 | \$193,860 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPA AVERAGE | \$95,979 | \$90,876 | \$93,121 | \$93,576 | \$93,391 | \$100,886 | \$109,811 | \$124,038 | \$157,216 | \$172,670 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANNUAL \% CHANGE |  | -5.3\% | 2.5\% | 0.5\% | -0.2\% | 8.0\% | 8.8\% | 13.0\% | 26.7\% | 9.8\% |

Source: City of Albuquerque.
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29-Jun-07
©Crystal \& Company, May, 2007.

TABLE 3-3

## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007

## ALBUQUERQUE MSA

RESIDENTIAL LOAN ACTIVITY BY TYPE, 2000-2005

|  | Loans On 1-4 Family Dwellings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Purchase Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 禺 | FHA/VA <br> Purchase | Conventional Purchase | Average Loan Amount | Refinancings | Home Impr. <br> Loans | Home Impr. Loan Amount | M/F <br> 5> Units | Non-Occupant 1-4 Family | TOTAL | Loans For Manuf. Housing |
| CY 2000 <br> Loans Originated <br> Applications Denied Ratio of Denials To Origination | $\begin{gathered} 3,960 \\ 677 \\ 17.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,339 \\ 4,610 \\ 55.3 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 112,035 \\ \$ 63,254 \\ \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6,670 \\ 7,486 \\ 112.2 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,634 \\ 1,341 \\ 82.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | \$21,364 \$21,340 n/a | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ 2 \\ 8.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,138 \\ 531 \\ 46.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,765 \\ & 14,647 \end{aligned}$ | n/a <br> n/a |
| CY 2001 <br> Loans Originated Applications Denied Ratio of Denials To Origination | $\begin{gathered} 5,395 \\ 632 \\ 11.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9,916 \\ & 2,941 \\ & 29.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 115,970 \\ \$ 73,510 \\ \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19,758 \\ 9,582 \\ 48.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,770 \\ & 1,438 \\ & 81.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | \$22,566 <br> \$18,879 <br> n/a | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ 6 \\ 27.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,945 \\ 665 \\ 22.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39,806 \\ & 15,264 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n/a } \\ & \text { n/a } \end{aligned}$ |
| CY 2003 <br> Loans Originated <br> Applications Denied Ratio of Denials To Origination | $\begin{gathered} 5,351 \\ 784 \\ 14.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13,519 \\ 1,972 \\ 14.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 129,458 \\ \$ 105,391 \\ \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40,982 \\ & 12,370 \\ & 30.2 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,314 \\ & 1,232 \\ & 93.8 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \$24,869 <br> \$26,213 <br> n/a | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ 8 \\ 16.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,603 \\ 896 \\ 19.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65,818 \\ & 17,262 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n/a } \\ & \text { n/a } \end{aligned}$ |
| CY 2004 <br> Loans Originated <br> Applications Denied Ratio of Denials To Origination | $\begin{gathered} 4,278 \\ 895 \\ 20.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17,969 \\ 3,280 \\ 18.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 128,801 \\ \$ 106,367 \\ \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18,170 \\ 9,950 \\ 54.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,832 \\ 2,285 \\ 124.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | \$42,298 <br> \$34,853 <br> n/a | $\begin{gathered} 72 \\ 5 \\ 6.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,087 \\ 916 \\ 22.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46,408 \\ & 17,331 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 884 \\ 1,225 \end{gathered}$ |
| CY 2005 <br> Loans Originated <br> Applications Denied Ratio of Denials To Origination | $\begin{gathered} 2,985 \\ 427 \\ 14.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24,786 \\ 4,240 \\ 17.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 131,182 \\ \$ 110,399 \\ \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,338 \\ & 12,988 \\ & 70.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,976 \\ 2,508 \\ 126.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | \$64,260 <br> \$46,992 <br> n/a | $\begin{gathered} 74 \\ 8 \\ 10.8 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,327 \\ & 1,380 \\ & 18.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55,486 \\ & 21,551 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 735 \\ 1,222 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act filing activity.
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TABLE 3-4
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT, 2007

AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS, 1990 \& 2000

|  | $1990$ <br> Number | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $2000$ <br> Number | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Numerical Change | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-30\% Of The Median | 17,355 | 100.0\% | 20,627 | 100.0\% | 3,272 | 18.9\% |
| With Problems | 13,641 | 78.6\% | 17,085 | 82.8\% | 3,444 | 25.2\% |
| Renters | 10,192 | 100.0\% | 12,631 | 100.0\% | 2,439 | 23.9\% |
| Elderly | 1,612 | 15.8\% | 1,584 | 12.5\% | (29) | -1.8\% |
| Small Families (2-4) | 3,349 | 32.9\% | 4,795 | 38.0\% | 1,446 | 43.2\% |
| Large Families (5+) | 1,076 | 10.6\% | 865 | 6.8\% | (210) | -19.6\% |
| Other | 4,155 | 40.8\% | 5,387 | 42.7\% | 1,232 | 29.7\% |
| Owners | 3,455 | n/a | 4,454 | n/a | 999 | 28.9\% |
| Severely Cost Burdened (>50\%) | 12,171 | 100.0\% | 13,478 | 100.0\% | 1,307 | 10.7\% |
| Owners | 2,332 | 19.2\% | 3,618 | 26.8\% | 1,286 | 55.2\% |
| Renters | 9,839 | 80.8\% | 9,861 | 73.2\% | 21 | 0.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31-50\% Of The Median | 17,266 | 100.0\% | 20,112 | 100.0\% | 2,846 | 16.5\% |
| With Problems | 12,891 | 74.7\% | 15,014 | 74.7\% | 2,123 | 16.5\% |
| Renters | 9,359 | 100.0\% | 10,386 | 100.0\% | 1,027 | 11.0\% |
| Elderly | 1,260 | 13.5\% | 1,290 | 12.4\% | 30 | 2.4\% |
| Small Families (2-4) | 3,223 | 34.4\% | 3,437 | 33.1\% | 213 | 6.6\% |
| Large Families (5+) | 871 | 9.3\% | 1,006 | 9.7\% | 135 | 15.5\% |
| Other | 4,004 | 42.8\% | 4,654 | 44.8\% | 650 | 16.2\% |
| Owners | 3,532 | n/a | 4,628 | n/a | 1,096 | 31.0\% |
| Severely Cost Burdened (>50\%) | 5,260 | 100.0\% | 5,827 | 100.0\% | 567 | 10.8\% |
| Owners | 1,923 | 36.6\% | 2,722 | 46.7\% | 800 | 41.6\% |
| Renters | 3,337 | 63.4\% | 3,104 | 53.3\% | (232) | -7.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 51-80\% Of The Median | 25,530 | 100.0\% | 31,286 | 100.0\% | 5,756 | 22.5\% |
| With Problems | 12,098 | 47.4\% | 15,540 | 49.7\% | 3,442 | 28.5\% |
| Renters | 7,074 | 100.0\% | 7,774 | 100.0\% | 700 | 9.9\% |
| Elderly | 1,020 | 14.4\% | 1,146 | 14.7\% | 126 | 12.3\% |
| Small Families (2-4) | 2,748 | 38.9\% | 2,971 | 38.2\% | 222 | 8.1\% |
| Large Families (5+) | 898 | 12.7\% | 529 | 6.8\% | (369) | -41.1\% |
| Other | 2,407 | 34.0\% | 3,128 | 40.2\% | 721 | 29.9\% |
| Owners | 5,024 | n/a | 7,767 | n/a | 2,742 | 54.6\% |
| Severely Cost Burdened (>50\%) | 1,855 | 100.0\% | 3,170 | 100.0\% | 1,315 | 70.9\% |
| Owners | 1,372 | 74.0\% | 2,236 | 70.5\% | 864 | 62.9\% |
| Renters | 482 | 26.0\% | 934 | 29.5\% | 451 | 93.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development, CHAS Data, 1990 and 2000.
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## MEMORANDUM

Elizabeth Dwyer<br>Marti Luick<br>City of Albuquerque Department of Family and Community Services

FROM: Richard Crystal, Principal ©Crystal \& Company

DATE: July 18, 2007
SUBJECT: Future Data Collection and Information Processing Strategies
This memorandum is in response to a June 20, 2007 email prepared by Elizabeth Dwyer concerning recommendations sought associated with City of Albuquerque data collection and information processing strategies.

## Data Collection Perspectives: Existing and New Construction Sale Price Points

The City Council has requested that staff collect information from homebuilders associated with the price points at which new housing is constructed. The information sent to my firm for review included the price distribution of both resale and new construction. The city is requesting perspectives associated with the continuing need to collect the information, present, analyze and utilize this data.

Perspectives: In terms of collection, there is a continuing need to collect the information in an economical fashion as long as market conditions suggest viability for households earning under $80 \%$ of the area median. Relative to new construction, three collection choices would appear viable to pursue: (1) the first is to collect this information from permitting data, (2) the second is to purchase the information from Salestraq or Datatraq (private market research firms), and (3) the third is to secure the information from the Bernalillo County Assessor if proprietary arrangements can be worked out. As to resale housing, the easiest source to tap would be the Albuquerque Metropolitan Board of Realtors. The reason to collect information concerning new construction is to document to private and non-profit builders that homes at price points affordable to low and moderate income purchasers are being constructed and are viable in the marketplace. Relative to resale dwellings, which comprise the bulk of homes affordable to low- and moderate income households in Albuquerque, the purpose is to monitor the affordable inventory in the marketplace and target homeownership programs accordingly. Data collection here would appear to involve any costs of consequence. Most jurisdictions collect both new and resale housing sales activity from permitting activity or from the local assessor. The information is often used to fashion and target homeownership programs. Many jurisdictions use this information for housing demand projections associated with single-family mortgage revenue bonds or mortgage credit certificates. It can be a vehicle to ensure that a jurisdiction's fair share is being secured.

Approximately eight years ago the City of Albuquerque instituted an "affordable housing" hotline to market homeownership opportunities in mixed-income project developments to low- and moderate- income consumers. Currently, four non-profits are listed on the hotline presently, and the website secures about 130 hits a day. The city is seeking input relative to other ways to use the hotline, merge it with an existing rental hotline, etc.

Perspectives: Two suggestions are offered for consideration. The first is to create a "real" affordable housing network in partnership with the Albuquerque Metropolitan Board of Realtors to market affordable properties to consumers, lenders and realtors alike. Such an initiative could incorporate affordable properties for sale through the MLS in addition to any properties being marketed by non-profits. These continually updated listings would be offered with available homeownership resources (lending, counseling, utility support, etc) from within the community. To effectively market homeownership programs, consumers, lenders, builders and realtors would all be targeted to increase the prospect for success. If the city wished to continue the operation of its existing affordable housing hotline for homeownership, it is suggested that it be merged with the current rental hotline and incorporate a facility for interested clients to leave their telephone numbers.

## Analysis Methodology: Projection of Housing Need Based On Growth

The methodology you employ to project affordable housing need for Albuquerque is not unreasonable, however some suggestions are appropriate. You will need to remove those households in group quarters first from projections. In addition, you may want to consider that housing needs are not only derived from cost burden, but also from the incidence of substandard housing and overcrowding. The approach also assumes that the income distribution for Albuquerque and those in need in 2000 will hold for 2007 and five years hence. Income data suggests the assumption is more or less valid in 2007, yet obviously an unknown going forward. However, the assumption currently appears quite reasonable. You may want to consult Section 1.0 of the City of Albuquerque Housing Needs Assessment prepared by my firm, as needs are projected in detail for the city as a whole and each Community Planning Area (CPA).

## Analysis Methodology: Calculating The ‘Real’ Deficit

It is important to remember that what you construe as a deficit are essentially indicators of housing need from the vantage point of the existing and projected inventory by tenure. Additions and deletions to the affordable inventory since CY 2000 also need to be considered. In your analysis of the "real deficit" you suggest two alternatives to calculate: (1) the first scenario is to subtract the number of households in a given low income category from the units affordable to that category, and (2) the second is to subtract the number of households in a given low income category from a percentage of the units affordable to that income category only occupied by households in that category. Your inquiry here prompted a call to HUD in Washington DC. Consider the following perspectives:
> The veracity of deficit calculations are most germane to rental housing, and it is possible that the deficit may be calculated two ways. Using the first approach itemized above is valid. The second approach is also valid but not how it was calculated since the approach applied a percentage of occupancy by income category to vacant units. This is an obvious error, and proper calculations produce a surplus of 1,299 units for rental households earning from 31 to $50 \%$ of the median and not a deficit of 499. The volume of vacant rental units is also germane here. Also remember that the need for affordable rental housing is not solely derived from cost burden but also from the incidence of substandard and overcrowded dwellings in a given area. This is especially relevant to rental households earning under $50 \%$ of the
median. Again, the "deficit" calculations are an indicator of need; and,
> With respect to existing, ownership properties, it should be noted that housing in Albuquerque has appreciated of consequence since 1999 (the 2000 Census) and this affects the veracity of both current and projected estimates relative to existing housing. If a deficit were evident for a given income category in 2007, it would be understated. Again, the information is best used as one indicator of need in a given area in light of prevailing market conditions.

## Other Data Collection Or Information Processing Instruments Of Value

One opportunity worth investigating is the use of the Bernalillo property tax rolls as a means to estimate the incidence of affordable housing in a given geography. The city may wish to utilize the substandard housing survey recently executed and compare its findings with indicators of substandard housing derived from data characteristics drawn from the property tax rolls. If a statistical correlation were established with the findings of the windshield surveys to selected characteristics from the tax rolls, the city could estimate the volume and location of the incidence of substandard housing within its corporate limits. It might be also possible to work out arrangements with the Bernalillo Assessor to add a data element indicating the incidence of substandard housing when field inspectors periodically inspect properties for the purposes of the mass appraisal system (MAS). Discussions are being raised with the Bernalillo County Assessor in this regard.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter and contact me at 480.998.2790 for any information you may require.

Cc:
file


[^0]:    Source: HUD Special Census CHAS Run, 2003.

[^1]:    ©Crystal \& Company, Scottsdale, Arizona. 480.998.2790

