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A Letter from the Chair of the Board

Jeffrey Page, Esq.

“UPO’s Washington: a city of thriving communities and self-sufficient residents,” is the vision that has guided UPO through nearly 60 years of service as the District of Columbia’s designated Community Action Agency. This 2021 Community Needs Assessment (CNA) will serve as a tool as UPO continues striving towards that vision. The CNA identifies current needs and resources throughout the city, assesses agency programs and services, and influences the design and replication of initiatives that ensure stability for our customers and communities.

UPO is deeply influenced by the input and involvement of our partners, which include District residents, government agencies, businesses, and many others. A focus on deeply collaborative relationships helps UPO establish a positive rapport with partners across the city and supports all stakeholders in better understanding community needs and developing both short- and long-term solutions. Ensuring diverse voices from the community are incorporated into this needs assessment also serves to make UPO’s work as inclusive and reflective of the complex environments in the District of Columbia as possible.

As with prior needs assessments, this report provides background research, qualitative and quantitative data, and identification of trends and recommendations to improve the well-being and self-sufficiency of D.C. residents with low incomes. This needs assessment zeros in on the current fundamental needs of residents, as well as the resources and services they have received in the last year. The assessment also offers the board valuable insights in understanding how UPO ensures that resources are targeted where they are needed most and that services are not being duplicated where needs have already been met. I have no doubt that as additional information and needs emerge, UPO will be prepared to tackle challenges and take advantage of opportunities beneficial to the organization, community, and residents of Washington, D.C.

The UPO Board of Directors is proud to serve residents of the District of Columbia. Made up of a diverse group of District residents who are mayoral appointees, elected members, and private sector representatives, the Board uses its collective and individual knowledge and experience to govern an agency that has become an institution in the District of Columbia. We will continue to prioritize the inclusion and maximum feasible participation of residents with low incomes in agency decisions through our board membership. Accountability to the community and our constituency has allowed us to stand the test of time in this great city.

On behalf of the UPO Board, I look back on the challenges of the last few years feeling grateful to have an organization like UPO in our city. But I also look forward–to seeing a thriving community, self-sufficient residents, and the continued success of UPO.
A Letter from the Chief Executive Officer

Andrea Thomas, CEO and President

As UPO approaches 60 years of service to the residents of the District of Columbia, we are excited to deliver our tri-annual Community Needs Assessment. Stakeholders from throughout the city are asked to participate through surveys, focus groups, and conversations intended to solicit input that helps shape UPO’s planning and program development for the coming years. Over the decades, our services have remained innovative and valuable to the DC community for one very important reason: community direction. UPO relies on members of the community as “subject matter experts” in articulating the strengths and opportunities for transformation within the city.

Surveys and focus groups for this needs assessment were conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, providing unique insights into the current needs and strengths of communities throughout the city. You will find evidence of the unprecedented times that all DC residents have been living through woven throughout this report. Coronavirus has reminded us how interdependent we are, especially in a time of crisis. We have seen community organizations and individuals join together and rise to the challenge of meeting the needs of their neighbors. UPO reallocated resources over the last year because District residents shared their shifting needs with us. As we transformed the way we work to meet the daily needs of thousands of people, including some who had never sought help from UPO before, we also continued to keep our eyes on long-term, ongoing community development work.

The 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment emphasizes the current needs of residents, highlights where UPO programs are addressing the most salient needs, and illustrates where services have been received, to help UPO avoid the duplication of services or resources. This report is one of many tools UPO will use to shape programming, strategic plans, and advocacy initiatives.

UPO thrives because we remain true to our mission and vision in every aspect of our work. Maintaining close connections and building collaborative relationships with the communities we serve is at the center of everything we do. Regular research on key issues, forward-looking projections of trends, and evidence-based innovations have proven to be impactful in the work that we undertake in the District. UPO will continue to live the community action promise:

“Community Action changes people’s lives, embodies the spirit of hope, improves communities, and makes America a better place to live. We care about the entire community, and we are dedicated to helping people help themselves and each other.”

As we look forward to our 60th year of uniting the people of DC with opportunities, I hope that this needs assessment serves as a reminder that this is a city of many needs, but also of many, many amazing strengths and opportunities.
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Overview

In many ways, the District of Columbia is a thriving city. However, it is also a divided city. Those living in deep poverty, which is rooted in complex social, economic, and political dynamics, experience the realities of inequality and blocked pathways for mobility as ever-increasing trends in the nation’s capital.

Behind poverty are historical forces such as discrimination, systemic racism, social inequality, vulnerability due to health status, adverse experiences, and trends such as the changing nature of the economy and job structures. In the District, the economy has grown substantially since the Great Recession ended in 2009 and weathered the economic turmoil of the COVID-19 pandemic better than many other cities. Yet, the number of residents who live in poverty continues to increase, even as poverty rates have incrementally declined. Research presented in this Community Needs Assessment highlights trends that reveal the state of poverty in the District, the essential needs of District residents that are not currently being met, and the ways UPO is working with families and communities to help them achieve self-sufficiency.

As the District of Columbia’s only Community Action Agency (see box at right), UPO is responsible for helping all DC residents with low incomes meet their needs and work towards self-sufficiency. UPO is

What is Community Action?

Community Action Agencies are private non-profit or public organizations that were established under President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1964 to combat poverty. Status as a Community Action Agency (CAA) is the result of an explicit designation by the local or state government. The program was created to provide low-income people with the opportunity to access various resources in order to achieve their goals, become self-sufficient, and support their community by helping other people. Community Action Agencies have provided direct support for more than 34 million people in need.

A CAA involves the low-income population it serves in the planning, administration, and evaluation of its programs. A CAA carries out its mission through a variety of means including:

1. Community-wide assessment of needs and strengths
2. Comprehensive anti-poverty plans and strategies
3. A broad range of direct services
4. Mobilization of financial and non-financial resources
5. Advocacy on behalf of low-income people
6. Partnerships with other community-based organizations to eliminate poverty or address specific needs of the community

For nearly 60 years, the United Planning Organization (UPO) has stood at the forefront of the community action movement – uniting people with opportunities to help themselves and each other.
also accountable to the federal government through the requirements of the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG).

Results-Oriented Management and Accountability, or ROMA, was introduced as the federal government’s management and accountability practice as part of the 1994 amendment to the CSBG Act. The amendment specifically requires that CSBG-eligible organizations (including UPO) provide “a description of outcome measures to be used to monitor success in promoting self-sufficiency, family stability, and community revitalization.” These three areas are articulated in the three overarching goals of Community Action, as described by the National Community Action Network Theory of Change:

- **Goal 1**: Individuals and families with low incomes are stable and achieve economic security
- **Goal 2**: Communities where people with low incomes live are healthy and offer economic opportunity
- **Goal 3**: People with low incomes are engaged and active in building opportunities in communities

As part of the ROMA process, CAAs identify and address all needs by three levels at which they belong, namely:

- Family level need
- Community-level need
- Agency-level need

Alongside the goal listings and in the box below are small icons representing each of the three community action goals. Throughout this report, look for the family, community, and engagement icons to represent discussions of goals 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

The United Planning Organization completes a comprehensive Community Needs Assessment (CNA) every three years. Viewed as a critical element of the strategic planning process, this Community Needs Assessment will be utilized to determine the future direction and extent of programs and activities to be undertaken by UPO. The assessment focuses on identifying both needs and resources in DC communities and is also used to determine the need for reallocation of resources and program replication based on challenges to be addressed.

In conducting the assessment, community needs and resources were examined. The 2021 Community Needs Assessment will:

1. Improve communication between the community and UPO;
2. Achieve UPO’s required tri-annual assessment; and

---

3. Advance UPO’s goal of assisting DC residents to become self-sufficient.

The assessment was conducted through a structured process that included key stakeholders such as residents of the District of Columbia, the UPO Board of Directors and staff, and other interested stakeholders. The structured process ensured community and customer input in identifying critical needs. The 2021 Community Needs Assessment includes data and other important information to help determine which services are needed to assist all District residents, including District residents with low incomes, and is organized to highlight needs of specific wards and interest groups. The needs assessment will be updated annually and repeated every three years.

This assessment meets the requirements for Section 676 (b) (11) of the CSBG Act and the goals set forth by the Office of Economic Opportunity and Information Memorandum 49, from the Office of Community Services, United States Department of Health and Human Services. For CSBG, the Community Needs Assessment offers a focus on local conditions and enables UPO to analyze the economic opportunities and barriers for all residents of the District of Columbia.

Executive Summary

The 2021 District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment was conducted by UPO between November 2020 and August 2021. Surveys were conducted online using SurveyMonkey and were available in both English and Spanish. UPO staff and volunteers facilitated eighteen focus groups from April through August 2021. This assessment was completed in conjunction with the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) requirements and as a program and strategic planning resource for UPO. The purpose of this assessment is to ascertain critical needs in the District of Columbia as identified by District residents, key stakeholders, and service providers and to enable UPO to continue evolving its programs and services to best meet the needs articulated by members of the DC community.

UPO’s 2021 District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment reinforces what many District residents know from firsthand experience: the year presented many challenges for District residents, especially those with low incomes. Key findings include:

- On average, 2021 needs assessment respondents were more educated, more likely to be employed, and had higher incomes than respondents in previous needs assessments, and yet they also reported significantly more needs.
- The top five needs reported by survey respondents were:
  - Assistance with utilities
  - Employment services
  - Work readiness/job skills
  - Referrals/information
  - Family/individual counseling
- Concerns about mental health issues and lack of mental health services throughout the District were reported in virtually all focus groups.
- The District recovered from the economic consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic relatively quickly, but it was not a full recovery for all residents. Many workers who already face disadvantages in the labor market, including women, young workers, and those without a high school diploma, are experiencing a much slower recovery following the loss of jobs or income.
For example, 15% of DC households with children reported in fall 2021 that their children are not getting enough to eat.

- DC’s affordable housing crisis continues to grow. Over 100,000 DC households cannot afford more than $800 a month in rent. Still, only 60,000 housing units exist at that level, causing thousands of DC residents to forego other necessities and spend an excessive portion of their income on housing costs.
- Pandemic-related rental assistance and DC’s eviction moratorium helped many District families stay in their homes, even while experiencing financial hardship this year. Now that short-term relief programs have ended, DC will likely see a spike in evictions, especially in its poorest neighborhoods. Pre-pandemic, 60% of evictions were in rental units east of the Anacostia River.
- Many District residents are concerned about educational disparities and the lack of quality education available to all DC residents. The education summary section for each ward uses the District’s own STAR rating system, which highlights disparities across the city.
- Both the overall and child poverty rates in the District continue to decline, but significant disparities exist between wards. Declines in the child poverty rate in parts of the city do not reflect a decline in the number of poor children but instead an increase in the number of children in above-poverty families.
- Early childhood care and education continues to present challenges city-wide, with 2.3 infants and toddlers living in DC for each licensed early learning slot and pandemic-related staffing still a major issue for many centers.

About UPO
The United Planning Organization (UPO) was founded as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization in 1962 and became the designated community action agency (CAA) for the District of Columbia in 1965. As one of our nation’s more than 1,000 CAAs, UPO is dedicated to helping Washington, DC residents with low incomes along their journeys to becoming self-sufficient. For nearly 60 years, UPO has been at the forefront of the war on poverty. As the catalyst for economic security and growth for all Washington, DC residents, UPO has laid the groundwork for innovative social service programs such as Early Head Start, workforce development training, and youth development, among many other programs.

In 2018, UPO was recognized for its excellence in stewardship by the Community Action Partnership and granted the National Award for Excellence in Community Action. Only 12 agencies have ever achieved this best-in-class status out of the 1,000+ community action agencies across the country.

Every day UPO works tirelessly to live out its vision, mission, and promise for the people of the District of Columbia.

UPO’s VISION: UPO’s Washington: A city of thriving communities and self-sufficient residents

UPO’s MISSION: Uniting People with Opportunities

UPO’s PROMISE: Community Action changes people’s lives, embodies the spirit of hope, improves communities, and makes America a better place to live. We care about the entire community, and we are dedicated to helping people help themselves and each other.
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2021 Community Needs Assessment Methodology and Approach
Data Collection and Cleaning

The 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment survey collected just over 3,000 responses between November 2020 and June 2021, using the online survey collection platform SurveyMonkey.
Upon closure of the survey in June 2021, UPO utilized multiple techniques to identify inconsistent records in the data and then remove, remodel, or remediate the inaccurate data.

Extensive data cleaning took place during the early stages of the needs assessment process upon discovering that many survey responses were affiliated with IP addresses outside of the Washington, DC metropolitan area. The irregularities in IP addresses likely indicated responses from individuals who were not DC residents. Nearly 2,000 responses with out-of-region IP addresses were removed from the dataset prior to other cleaning or analysis to get the most accurate sample possible.

Irrelevant or useless data is data that is not required or may not fit in the context of a particular analysis. As part of the data cleaning process for this needs assessment, irrelevant fields were removed from the survey data. This included fields such as Collector ID, Email Address, First Name, and Last Name of respondents that either included no data or irrelevant data. These fields were dropped from the datasets because they had no impact on the analysis of the needs assessment survey data and thus were not required.

Contradictory or inconsistent responses reduce the credibility of the analysis and, if ignored, can impede the ability to capture valuable insights. Remodeling such responses for the needs assessment analysis was an important step in the data cleaning process. For example, correcting and recoding responses of the ‘Employment Status’ field in a single group was done to improve the credibility of the responses as many responses presented contradictory claims.

There were also some spelling mistakes and typos present in responses to open-ended questions that were corrected as part of the overall data cleaning process. The data cleaning process also included the removal of duplicate entries from the survey data. These entries were the responses that had different respondent IDs but indicated the same age, gender, education, ward, and zip code and were completed at the same time. These responses were considered duplicate records and were removed from the survey data due to likely duplicity.

Data cleaning is a critical step towards a robust and accurate data analysis. By cleaning the survey data, UPO ensured that inconsistent responses that don’t add value and have the potential to skew the analysis are eliminated.

**Digital Divide Survey**

Digital Divide survey responses were collected between July 2021 and October 2021. Upon closure of the survey in October 2021, UPO utilized multiple techniques to identify inconsistent records in the data and then remove, remodel, or remediate the inaccurate data. A total of 135 digital divide survey responses were included in the final analysis sample.

**Focus Group Methodology**

A total of 18 focus groups were conducted between April 2021 and August 2021 in order to obtain information for this Community Needs Assessment. One focus group was conducted with residents from each of the District’s eight (8) wards. Additionally, focus groups were conducted made up of individuals from the following special populations: seniors, youth, Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) members, parents of children attending UPO’s Office of Early Learning (OEL) programs, representatives
of community-based organizations, representatives of faith-based groups, public sector groups, and university students.

In three (3) cases, facilitators were unable to connect with enough individuals from a particular ward or special population to convene a full focus group. In these cases, structured interviews were conducted with two (2) individuals from each of the following groups: homeless individuals, private sector groups, and Ward 3 residents.

Three (3) focus groups made up of UPO senior staff (executives, directors, and managers) were conducted in February 2022. The purpose of these staff focus groups was to identify agency-level needs. Senior staff then completed a short survey to prioritize the agency-level needs identified in the focus groups.

Analysis and Approach

Comparisons between this needs assessment and previous needs assessments are made based on categories that are directly or nearly replicated in each assessment and do not include all of the categories in either; thus, many categories in the 2021 needs assessment are not included for comparison due to lack of compatibility.

In analyses disaggregated by race, only Black and White respondents are included. This is due to the number of respondents in other racial/ethnic groups being too small to include in the disaggregated analysis.

UPO sought a diverse survey sample and thus encouraged a variety of DC residents to complete the needs assessment survey. A total of 991 survey responses were included in the final analysis sample. This included many current or former UPO customers as well as residents who have never received services from UPO. Table 1 breaks down the sample by ward and percentage of UPO customers.

Table 1: Number of Respondents and Percentage of UPO Customers, by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents who had Ever Received Services from UPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward 1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 4</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 8</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question “Have you ever received assistance or services from the United Planning Organization (UPO)?” turned out to be a very important proxy in this analysis, as the data on income and needs in this needs assessment looks significantly different than most analyses of the District of Columbia.
Data from the U.S. Census Bureau tell us that Wards 2, 3, and 6 are the most advantaged, based on income, poverty, and housing statistics, and that Wards 7 and 8 are most disadvantaged when looking at these indicators (See Table 7: Social Impact Indicators, by Ward on p. 51 for a full ward-to-ward comparison using Census data). However, much of the needs assessment survey data indicated elevated levels of need in Wards 2 and 3, and lower levels of need in Wards 7 and 8. This discrepancy is largely due to the data presented in Table 1, which shows that Wards 2 and 3 had both had relatively few survey respondents and substantial portions of those respondents were current or former UPO customers. The opposite is true for Wards 7 and 8, both of which had more survey respondents and lower percentages of respondents who were current or former UPO customers.

This anomaly means that the data collected by UPO for this community needs assessment on residents in Wards 2, 3, 7, and 8 looks significantly different than most DC government or U.S. Census data on these wards.

Additionally, during the COVID-19 public health emergency, UPO adjusted the poverty threshold for customers. While UPO typically only serves customers at or below 125% of the federal poverty level (FPL), during the pandemic this was increased to serve anyone at or below 200% of the FPL. This change might also account for some of the increased socioeconomic diversity seen in the 2021 needs assessment survey sample.

Report Structure

In formulating the 2021 Community Needs Assessment, UPO sought to produce a community-focused, user-friendly, comprehensive document from which readers can extract free-standing sections.

This comprehensive assessment begins with the current Overview section, which introduces UPO, its staff, board, and programs, key changes since the last needs assessment, and services provided in the last year.

The Review of Literature contains several studies and city-wide analyses that focus on identifying concerns and offering insights on the needs inherent among residents in the District. It covers topics related to city-wide social impact indicators with some references to ward-specific information. Social impact indicator data are also displayed in this section to give readers a sense of the demographic character of the District.

A special section on Affordable Housing in the District of Columbia speaks to the complex program, policy, and human aspects of one of the city’s most significant challenges.

A special section on The Digital Divide in the District of Columbia examines the need for more robust technology infrastructure and training opportunities for District residents.

The special section, A Snapshot of Families with Children Aged 0-3 in the District of Columbia provides an analysis of key demographic characteristics of children ages 0-3 and examines the need for and accessibility of early childhood services in DC.

A cross-ward analysis utilizing the UPO Needs Assessment Survey Results includes quantitative data revealing residents’ concerns and needs and special population focus group reports that provide information related to specific sub-populations of District residents. This section includes demographics and background information about survey respondents, information on key needs identified by the survey, and identification of potential areas of interest and improvement based on responses to healthy neighborhood related survey questions.
Recommendations for Addressing City-Wide Needs covers daily needs, education, civic, social, physical, and economic action items for use by UPO, government agencies, and service providers to improve the quality of life for all residents in the District of Columbia. Agency-Level Needs identifies and prioritizes key organizational needs for UPO.

Finally, a comprehensive needs assessment is then conveyed on a ward-by-ward basis. Each ward is detailed and contained in what can be used as a stand-alone document. Stakeholders may examine the information and use it to formulate plans, activities, and relevant decisions that affect residents within a specific ward. Each ward’s needs assessment also includes needs and recommendations specific to that ward.

Programs
The programs and services that UPO offers are listed below. Thanks to funding from the CARES Act, UPO was able to implement many new programs to better serve customers during the unique and trying circumstances that the COVID-19 pandemic presented.

Advocacy
Affordable Housing Development
Child and Adult Care Food Program
Comprehensive Treatment Center (CTC)
CREATE After School Program
Culinary Arts Training
Early Head Start and Home Visiting Program
EBT Service Centers
Emergency Rental Assistance Program
Employment Placement Services
Foster Grandparent Program
Household Food Distribution
Housing Counseling
Joseph A. Beavers Scholarship Fund
Mental Health Counseling
Mortgage Default Counseling
Permanent Supportive Housing (PHS) Services
 Providing Opportunities with Educational Readiness (P.O.W.E.R)
Quality Improvement Network (QIN) Technical Assistance to Childcare Providers
Quarantine Support for Families
Shelter Hotline
Shelter-Plus CARE (SPC)
Strength-Based Family Worker Training
Summer Youth After-School Program
Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) Program
Volunteer Services

Workforce Institute: Training in 10 credentialed, in-demand job sectors
Youth Services (pandemic): Distance Learning and Summer Project-Based Learning

Snapshot of Services Provided in 2020

UPO operates on two fundamental principles: 1) eradicating poverty, and 2) empowering residents to achieve self-sufficiency and economic independence. UPO serves all customers seeking assistance with a variety of appropriate and available services ranging from long-term case management to one-time referrals. The data outlined in this section indicates the many ways UPO serves people with low incomes in the District and unites DC residents with opportunities.

In fiscal year 2020, UPO programs served 49,324 unduplicated customers in a variety of program areas. A snapshot of the services provided is some of these key program areas is outlined below.

Employment

- **909 customers** received employment services
- **562 customers** were referred to jobs
- **447 customers** obtained jobs
- **195 customers** completed vocational skills training and received certifications
**Education**

- UPO’s Early Head Start program served **952 children** ages 0-5
- **523 youth** were engaged through youth programs

- UPO’s Emergency Child Care Centers educated and nurtured **56 children** of first responders
- **2,693 children and youth** were mentored by Foster Grandparents

**Housing**

- **361 customers** received rental assistance
- **244 customers** received Housing Counseling

- **164 customers** received help resolving rental debt and/or threat of eviction
- UPO and partners will be opening **76 new affordable apartments** in SW DC in 2021
**Health**

- Customers attended **8,824 counseling sessions** to improve their quality of life
- **151 adults** received health education and/or counseling
- **250 customers** were treated by the Comprehensive Treatment Center (CTC)
- **826 Narcan kits** were distributed to CTC Harm Reduction Program participants

**Nutrition**

- **13,216 households** assisted with food baskets/food pantry
- **40,574 EBT cards** issued to SNAP eligible residents, ensuring that families could keep food on the table during pandemic shutdowns
- **4,565 people** were fed during the pandemic
- **Over 7,000 hot meals, 6,500 boxes of groceries/household supplies/PPE, and 4,500 Grab and Go grocery bags distributed**
Emergency Assistance

94,549 rides were provided to homeless customers through UPO’s Shelter Hotline

27,000+ meals distributed to District residents experiencing homelessness

1,407 computers were distributed to children, their mentors, and seniors to stay connected during pandemic lockdowns

The CARES Act and UPO COVID Emergency Fund helped us provide 1,644 additional families with support for immediate needs

Income

1,043 customers received free Tax Preparation Assistance

180 customers received Income Management Counseling

UPO's expert volunteers generated $3.46 million in tax refunds for customers

112 customers set up a household budget
Changes Since 2018 Community Needs Assessment

The following are comparisons of the respondents to the 2018 needs assessment survey and the 2021 needs assessment survey. Comparisons are made based on categories that are directly or nearly replicated in each assessment and do not include all categories in either. Therefore, many categories in the 2021 needs assessment are not included for comparison due to lack of compatibility.

In 2018, 643 District residents completed the Community Needs Assessment survey. In 2021, 991 residents completed the survey. The racial/ethnic makeup of survey respondents also looked different in 2018 than it did in 2021. As Figure 1 and Figure 2 show, while a large majority of respondents in 2018 were Black residents (62.9%), a large majority of respondents in 2021 were White residents (56.5%). There was also a much larger proportion of Hispanic respondents in 2018 (15.5%) than 2021 (3.0%).

*Figure 1: Race/Ethnicity of Survey Respondents, 2018*

*Figure 2: Race/Ethnicity of Survey Respondents, 2021*
There was also a large difference in educational attainment between the 2018 and 2021 survey respondents. The 2021 survey respondents had an overall higher level of educational attainment, with 60% of respondents having at least an associate’s degree, compared to 46% in 2018. Furthermore, nearly double the percentage of survey respondents were employed full-time in 2021 when compared to 2018. While only 33% of those surveyed in 2018 worked full-time, 64% of 2021 survey respondents had full-time jobs.

Table 2: Education 2018 and 2021 Needs Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School Diploma</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Technical School</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree or Higher</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey respondents in 2021 also had an overall higher level of household income than those from 2018. As Figure 3 shows, 40% of 2018 survey respondents fell into the lowest income category of $0-$24,999, whereas the 2021 survey respondents were much more evenly dispersed across all income categories.

Figure 3: Annual Household Income of Survey Respondents, 2018 and 2021

When asked about their health coverage compared to a year ago, over 80% of survey respondents indicated their health coverage was about the same or better in both 2018 and 2021. Survey respondents also had similar health insurance coverage in both 2018 and 2021. In both needs assessments, most respondents had insurance through Medicare or Medicaid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do You Have Health Insurance?</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, through Medicare/Medicaid</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, private insurance through my or a relative’s employer</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, through DC HealthLink or healthcare.gov</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both 2018 and 2021, the majority of survey respondents reported that no one in their household had health conditions, and the top health conditions reported were high blood pressure, diabetes, and asthma.

*Figure 4: Most Frequently Reported Health Conditions, 2018 and 2021*

While the number of renters continues to exceed the number of homeowners throughout the District, the gap between renters and owners narrowed substantially in the 2021 needs assessment survey. Survey responses from 2018 show a 32-percentage point difference between renters and owners, but in the 2021 survey, that gap had narrowed to seven percentage points.

*Figure 5: Percentage of Renters and Owners, 2018 and 2021*
Table 4 offers a comparison of six key needs included in the Community Needs Assessment and the percentage of respondents who needed services to assist with those needs, as well as the percentage of respondents who received assistance with those needs in both 2018 and 2021. Interestingly, across all needs, the numbers were higher for the 2021 survey respondents, despite them being a more educated, more affluent group than the 2018 survey respondents. This indicates that many families in the District experienced a high level of need in 2021, regardless of income. This might be partially due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the social and economic disruptions it caused for all residents of the District.

Table 4: Common Needs 2018 and 2021 Needs Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>2018 Needed</th>
<th>2018 Received</th>
<th>2021 Needed</th>
<th>2021 Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College or Trade/Technical School</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Readiness/Job Skills</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, the major roadblocks respondents identified as preventing them from meeting their needs were that they did not know where to go to get help (18% of survey respondents) or they did not meet the eligibility requirements for the services they needed (17% of survey respondents). In 2021, not knowing where to go for help was once again a major issue in meeting needs (identified by 17% of survey respondents), as was the fact that services are only available during limited hours (18% of survey respondents). Additionally, 15% of 2021 survey respondents had concerns about confidentiality.

When asked, “If there were a vacant lot on your block, please select your top three preferences for how the District should use the land,” respondents in both the 2018 and 2021 Community Needs Assessment surveys heavily favored using a vacant lot for a community center. Table 5 illustrates that preferences on how to use a vacant lot did not change much between 2018 and 2021. One notable change is that residential use was included as an option on the 2021 survey for the first time, and 32% of 2021 survey respondents selected that as one of their top three preferences.

Table 5: Possible Uses for Vacant Lot, 2018 and 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Uses for Vacant Lot</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Fields</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of 2021 survey respondents, 60.5% felt they were included in decisions about their neighborhood's future. This is a substantial increase from the 2018 needs assessment when only 43% of survey respondents said they felt included in neighborhood decisions. Regarding DC residents’ desire to be involved in neighborhood decision-making, not much changed between 2018 and 2021. In 2018, 80% of survey respondents wanted to be involved in making decisions about the future of their neighborhood, and in 2021 that number declined just slightly, to 77.1%.
UPO Locations

Figure 6: Map of UPO Locations
Office of Early Learning Sites

1. Anacostia High School
2. Atlantic Gardens
3. Azeeeze Bates
4. Ballou High School
5. Coolidge High School
6. C.W. Harris Elem. School
7. Dunbar Senior High School
8. Eagle Academy Public
9. EdgeWood
10. Frederick Douglass
11. Ketcham Elementary School
12. Luke C. Moore High School
13. Paradise
14. Malcolm X Elem. School
15. Marie Reed Elem. School
16. Roosevelt Senior High School

Community-Based Support Sites

1. Brentwood Recreation Center
2. Greenleaf Gardens
3. Syphax Gardens
4. James Creek
5. Tel Court Cooperative
6. Jones Memorial Methodist Church
7. Atlantic Gardens
8. Atlantic Terrace
9. Southern Hills

UPO Partner Sites

1. VIDA Senior Services Center
2. Community Service Agency of the Metropolitan Washington Council AFL-CIO
3. Edgewood/Brookland Family Support Collaborative
4. Collaborative Solutions for Communities
5. Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington
6. DC Central Kitchen
7. Thrive DC

UPO Service Centers

1. UPO Headquarters
2. Anacostia Community Service Center
3. Ralph Waldo "Petey" Greene Community Service Center
4. Benning Road Service Center
5. Building Careers Academy
6. Comprehensive Treatment Center
7. H Street Center
Review of the Literature
Demographics
Population, Age, and Gender

Although the District’s population has declined significantly since its peak in the 1950s when it was home to over 800,000 residents, it has been growing steadily over the past decade. While 601,723 residents lived in the District in 2010, the population grew by 14.6%, to 689,545 residents in 2020.³

The largest segment of the population is between the ages of 25 and 34, with 164,375 residents in that age range, or more than 23% of the District’s total population.⁴ The median age of District residents in 2019 was 34.3 years old.⁵ Seniors (age 65+) make up 12.4% of the population, while those under 18 make up 18.9%, and children under the age of five make up 6.4% of the total population.⁶ The city’s gender breakdown has remained relatively stable over the last several years, at 47.3% male and 52.7% female.⁷

Geography

The District of Columbia is part of the 6th largest Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in the nation. With a land area of only 61.1 square miles, the city is divided into eight wards and further divided into 40 Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANCs).⁸ Additionally, Washington, DC has over 200 census tracts, which are small geographic areas defined for collecting and reporting data from the U.S. Census. The tracts are appropriate for zooming in on smaller areas, and several census tracts can be added together to create a neighborhood defined by street boundary specifications. Data reported in this Community Needs Assessment reflects the needs of Washington, DC residents and may include city-wide, ward-level, or census tract data.

---
⁶ Ibid.
Residents remain relatively spread out across DC’s eight wards, with at least 75,000 residents calling each ward home and every ward’s population growing by at least 6% between 2010 and 2020. However, some wards have seen much more rapid population growth in the last decade, in particular Ward 5 and Ward 6, which grew by 20.3% and 41.9% respectively since 2010. Given the varying population growth across wards, in late 2021 the DC Council adopted new ward boundaries to create a more even distributions of the population by ward. These new boundaries took effect January 1, 2022. Figure 7 provides additional details on ward-level population growth between 2010 and 2020.

Race and Ethnicity

The racial composition in the District has been rapidly evolving over the last few decades for the two largest racial groups, Whites and Blacks. In 2000, Black residents were a clear majority of the population at 60%, compared with 30.8% for Whites. By 2010, Blacks made up 51.7% of the District’s population and Whites made up 37.4%. In 2020, the gap had further narrowed, with Black residents making up 41.4% of the population and White residents making up 39.6.

Other racial and ethnic groups have also increased as DC’s overall population has grown. Of particular note is the increase in those identifying as Hispanic or Latino (of any race), which grew from 9.1% of DC’s population in 2010 to 11.3% in 2020. Additional substantial increases were seen among the populations identifying as two or more races (2.9% in 2010 to 8.1% in 2020) and Asian (3.5% in 2010 to 4.9% in 2020). Data from the Migration Policy Institute indicates that as of 2019, 12.1% of DC’s population was foreign born, a slightly lower percentage than the District has typically seen in recent years. Of these residents, the largest portion was born in Latin America (43.5%), followed by immigrants from Asia (20.5%), Europe (17.3%), and Africa (14.3).

Household Composition

There are 284,386 households in the District, of which 123,683 are considered family households, defined by the U.S. Census Bureau as a household maintained by a householder who is in a family of two or more people related by birth, marriage, or adoption and residing together. Of these family households, 73,884 are married-couple households, 9,967 are headed by a male householder with no

---

14 NOTE FROM MPI The term "foreign born" refers to people residing in the United States at the time of the population survey who were not U.S. citizens at birth. The foreign-born population includes naturalized U.S. citizens, lawful permanent immigrants (or green-card holders), refugees and asylees, certain legal nonimmigrants (including those on student, work, or some other temporary visas), and persons residing in the country without authorization.
spouse present, and 39,832 are headed by a female householder with no spouse present.\textsuperscript{18} Of the total number of households in the District, 20.8% have one or more people under the age of 18 residing in them, while 29.5% of households have one or more residents aged 60 years or over. Individuals living alone make up 44.1% of the total households in DC.\textsuperscript{19}

**Household Income**

One of the most significant demographic changes the District has seen in recent years, and one that is expected to continue, is the income disparity between residents with very high and very low incomes. In 2019, the median household income in Washington, DC was $92,266, with 20.7% of households earning over $200,000 annually.\textsuperscript{20} In 2018, the reported median household income was it was $85,203\textsuperscript{21}, and in 2017, it was $82,372\textsuperscript{22}. The number of low-income earners in the District has continued to decline, as illustrated in Figure 8,\textsuperscript{23} with only 11.3% of households earning less than $15,000 in 2019.\textsuperscript{24} It is unclear if this trend of increasing median household income in the District will continue, as data showing the full economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is not yet available. Alongside this stunning wealth and decline in earners with the lowest incomes, the District continues to experience above-average rates of poverty. The District experienced a 16.2% poverty rate overall and a 24% poverty rate for those under the age of 18 in the last five years, according to the most current census estimates.\textsuperscript{25} The District’s poverty rate for all individuals as well as its child poverty rate continue to be well above national averages.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure8.png}
\caption{Very High and Very Low Income Households in DC, 2010-2019}
\end{figure}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Year} & \textbf{Percent of Households with Annual Income Below $15,000} & \textbf{Percent of Households with Annual Income Above $200,000} \\
\hline
2010 & 5.0% & 7.0% \\
2011 & 5.5% & 7.5% \\
2012 & 6.0% & 8.0% \\
2013 & 6.5% & 8.5% \\
2014 & 7.0% & 9.0% \\
2015 & 7.5% & 9.5% \\
2016 & 8.0% & 10.0% \\
2017 & 8.5% & 10.5% \\
2018 & 9.0% & 11.0% \\
2019 & 9.5% & 11.5% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Trends in Very High and Very Low Income District Households 2010-2019}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{18} U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *American community survey 5-year estimates*. Table S1101.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). *American community survey 1-year estimates*. Table S1901.
\textsuperscript{24} U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *American community survey 1-year estimates*. Table S1901.
\textsuperscript{25} U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *American community survey 5-year estimates*. Table S1701.
Income and Employment

Income Disparities

In recent years, researchers, service providers, and community members have become increasingly interested in income disparities and the ways that income inequality can impact economic mobility for future generations. The DC metropolitan area is considered to have relatively high upward mobility, which can be partially attributed to the region’s high level of racial diversity, lower levels of racial segregation, and a strong middle class.26

However, the District would likely see even more economic mobility if there were not such large income disparities present. One approach to looking at income inequality in the District is the 20/20 ratio, which compares the proportion of income accounted for by the lowest-income 20% with the share accounted for by the highest-income 20%. Using this ratio, DC exhibits an extremely elevated level of income inequality: the bottom fifth earns only 1.9% of total income, while the top fifth takes home 55.5% of the city’s income.27

Globally, income inequality is most commonly measured using a standard economic measure called the Gini index. A score of 0.0 on the Gini index would indicate perfect equality in the income distribution, whereas a score of 1.0 would indicate total inequality. The District continues to show higher income inequality than the nation as a whole. In 2019, the Gini index for the U.S. was 0.481, while the District of Columbia had a score of 0.512, the second highest of all states and territories, behind only Puerto Rico.28 It is important to note, however, that DC is not always comparable to other U.S. states and territories, which tend to have a much larger geographic area and different social, economic, and demographic characteristics from the District. When Washington, DC is considered alongside nine other large cities at the core of major metropolitan areas, the District’s Gini index falls right in the middle.29

Taken together, these two different measures of income inequality help to illustrate that while the District does have a large and growing gap between the highest and lowest income earners, there is also a sizeable middle class in DC, at least when compared to other major cities. The trend of income inequality is projected to continue, although the full impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on economic inequality in the District remain to be seen.

Employment and Unemployment

One reason for such variance in income inequality is that the number of low-income earners is declining while the number of extremely high-income earners continues to increase. The disparity in income is made worse by employment and job sector trends that increasingly benefit workers in certain sectors,

27 Ibid.
while leaving others behind. Between March and April of 2020, the District lost 66,900 jobs,\(^{30}\) and at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, the District had an unemployment rate of 11.1%.\(^{31}\) Women, people of color, and workers under the age of 24 made up a disproportionate share of the workers who lost their jobs in the early months of the pandemic. These groups are also the employees that have not fully recovered from the pandemic, even though overall employment has been increasing since early 2021.\(^{32}\) Furthermore, as Figure 9 illustrates, while unemployment in the District has been trending downward since peaking in the first few months of the pandemic, daily unemployment claims remained relatively high throughout 2021, and there continues to be periodic spikes in daily unemployment, including one as recently as early September.\(^{33}\) While some workers have begun to recover from the impacts of the pandemic, many remain un- and under-employed. As of July 2021, the District’s overall unemployment rate had fallen to 6.7%,\(^{34}\) but unemployment remained high in Wards 7 and 8, with unemployment rates of 12% and 15.7%, respectively.\(^{35}\)

Figure 9: Daily Unemployment Claims, 3/13/20-9/10/21


\(^{31}\) Ibid.

\(^{32}\) Ibid.


The District is home to many flourishing, and sometimes fluctuating, job opportunities and industries, but there is often a mismatch between the skills of the unemployed and the opportunities that some of these industries present. For instance, the top five job openings (based on the average monthly unique job postings) in the District from January 2020-July 2021 were for software developers, management analysts, registered nurses, information security analysts, and computer occupations (all other). These in-demand fields typically have very specific education and/or training requirements, making them inaccessible to much of the unemployed population. The three largest classes of workers in the District are those employed by a private company (48.9%), those employed by a local, state, or federal government entity (24.3%), and those employed by a private, not-for-profit company (19.4%).

**Poverty**

Due to pandemic-related economic disruptions, a strong emphasis was placed on the 2020 Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM), which "extends the official poverty measure" by taking account of many of the government programs designed to assist low-income families and individuals that are not included in the official poverty measure, such as tax credits and government assistance programs. The SPM also accounts for the cost of living and work and medical expenses. The SPM estimate of persons in poverty in the District for 2018-2020 was 16.5%, compared to an estimated official poverty rate of 14.7% for the same time period.

Nationwide, the SPM rate for 2020 was lower than the official poverty rate for the first time in history. The national SPM was 9.1% while the official poverty rate was 11.4%, likely because the stimulus payments that were enacted as part of the pandemic economic relief legislation were included in the calculation of the SPM, but not the official poverty measure. In DC as well as 11 states, SPM rates were higher than the official poverty rates. This could be due to variations in regional housing costs, different mixes of housing tenure, or higher nondiscretionary expenses, such as taxes or medical expenses.

The official poverty rate—which is different from the SPM—in DC varies significantly from ward to ward. In 2019 (the most recent year for which ward-by-ward Census data is available), Wards 3 and 4 had

---


37 U.S. Census Bureau (2019). *American community survey 5-year estimates*. Table S2406.

38 The official poverty measure consists of a set of thresholds for families of different sizes and compositions that are compared with before-tax cash income to determine a family’s poverty status.


40 Ibid.

41 Ibid.
poverty rates under 10%, while Wards 7 and 8 had poverty rates above 25%. All other wards fell somewhere in between and closer to the District’s overall poverty rate in 2019, 16.2%.

Poverty for children under age 18 in the District has gradually decreased over the last decade, although it remains much higher than the District’s poverty rate overall. The child poverty rate in DC was 29.6% in 2010 and reached a new low of 24% in 2019. However, there are large disparities throughout the city based on geography and race. As Figure 10 illustrates, Black children in the District experience child poverty at much higher rates than their White and Hispanic/Latino peers in nearly every ward. Ward 4 is the exception, where Hispanic/Latino children have a slightly higher poverty rate (14%) than Black children (11%).

Geographic disparities are also present, with Wards 1, 7, and 8 having child poverty rates well above the city-wide average, while Ward 3, known to be one of the city’s most affluent wards, has a child poverty rate of only 1.8%. There is still much work to be done to address child poverty in the District, as well as the systemic issues that contribute to the wide disparities seen in child poverty across the city.

**Employment Barriers and Needs**

Many employment barriers and needs exist in Washington, DC that must be addressed for the city to reach its full potential and for all the District’s residents to thrive. Returning citizens are one particular subset of the population that face serious barriers to employment. Although the District of Columbia

---


43 Ibid.


passed the Fair Criminal Record Screening Act (also known as the “ban the box” law) in 2014, many returning citizens still face significant obstacles in finding employment, including mental health issues, lack of education, training, or job searching experience, or implicit or explicit bias from potential employers. The District government is working to help returning citizens with finding employment and their transition back into the community. The FY 2022 Fair Shot budget includes $7 million for a new Ready Center facility, which serves as a “one-stop shop” where returning citizens can access resources from community-based organizations and District agencies including the Department of Employment Services, Department of Human Services, Department of Behavioral Health, and many others. This budget also includes $11.4 million for other programs for returning citizens including cash assistance, financial coaching, and hiring peer navigators to help with the transition back into the community and on the path to economic opportunity.

Another population with substantial employment needs is youth, in particular “disconnected youth” that are between the ages of 16-24 and are not currently employed or enrolled in an education or training program. This population is especially at risk of poor outcomes. The District’s Office of Youth Programs offers a number of workforce development programs to help DC residents aged 14-24 prepare for success in the workplace, including occupational skills training, work experience, academic enrichment, and life skills training.

Health and Wellness

Overview of Health in the District

The District of Columbia Department of Health published its most recent District of Columbia Community Health Needs Assessment in 2019, which provides a comprehensive analysis of the health of District residents. In 2017, for the first time, the District’s life expectancy (78.9 years) surpassed the nation’s (78.6). However, there were gaps in life expectancy among the wards. Ward 2 had the highest life expectancy at 86.0 years and Ward 8 had the lowest life expectancy at 70.5 years. The three leading causes of death in the District were the same as those nationwide: heart disease, cancer, and accidents.

Health Insurance Coverage

Most District residents have health insurance coverage, with only 3.3% of Washingtonians being uninsured, including only 2% of those under the age of 19.\(^{51}\) While the District’s insurance rates greatly exceed the national average and the rates of other major metropolitan areas, behind those high cumulative numbers are disparities by race/ethnicity. Over 97% of White DC residents and over 94% of Black DC residents have health insurance coverage. However, only 87% of Hispanic DC residents have insurance coverage.\(^{52}\) In the District, the majority of residents (70.4%) have private health insurance coverage, such as employer-based coverage, direct purchase health insurance, or military/Tricare coverage.\(^{53}\) Medicare, Medicaid, or other forms of public coverage provide insurance coverage for 35.6% of District residents.\(^{54}\)\(^{55}\)

Mental Health

Mental health disorders are a variety of conditions that can affect an individual's mood, thinking, and behavior. Approximately one in five American adults suffer from mental illness each year, and among teens aged 13-18, approximately one in five will experience a severe mental disorder at some point in their lives. Despite the high prevalence of mental health conditions, most studies estimate that less than half of all people living with a mental health condition will receive appropriate treatment for their condition.\(^{56}\)

Mental health has become an issue of increasing importance in the District in recent years. In the 2019 DC Community Health Needs Assessment Survey conducted by the DC Department of Health, 37% of respondents indicated that mental health was

\[\text{Figure 11: Mental Health Issues, by Ward}\]

\[\text{Depressive Disorder and Not Good Mental Health Days, by Ward}\]

\[\text{Percentage of Residents}\]

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Ward} & \text{Depressive Disorder} & 14+ not good mental health days \\
\hline
1 & 10.0\% & 20.0\% \\
2 & 15.0\% & 15.0\% \\
3 & 20.0\% & 10.0\% \\
4 & 5.0\% & 0.0\% \\
5 & 0.0\% & 5.0\% \\
6 & 10.0\% & 10.0\% \\
7 & 15.0\% & 15.0\% \\
8 & 20.0\% & 20.0\% \\
\end{array}\]

\[\text{DC Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2017}\]

\(^{51}\) U.S. Census Bureau (2020). *Current population survey.*


\(^{54}\) Ibid.

\(^{55}\) Note that percentages will not always add up to 100 because some residents will simultaneously have multiple types of coverage in combination.

one of the most critical issues impacting community health, and 40% of individuals identified access to mental health and substance abuse treatment services as one of the most important assets a community would need to reach its full potential.\(^{57}\) In 2017, the prevalence of depressive disorder in adults reached a recent low of 14.3% after peaking at 20.9% in 2013.\(^{58}\) However, as is true of many social and health indicators, the prevalence of poor mental health varies substantially by ward. Among adults living in DC, older people, people of color, and people who live in Wards 7 and 8 reported more “not good” mental health days than other District residents.\(^{59}\) Figure 11 further outlines the differences between wards of adults reporting a diagnosis of depressive disorder and adults who have had 14 or more not good mental health days.\(^{60}\)

In 2020, 31,521 District residents received mental health services from a city-run or affiliated treatment facility.\(^{61}\) This is a large increase when compared to 2019, when 24,098 residents received mental health services.\(^{62}\) This increase could be due in part to the COVID-19 pandemic and the increase in stress and mental health challenges that accompanied it for many District residents. The most frequently used mental health services in the District in 2020 were community support (24,966 individuals), medication management (16,384 individuals), diagnostic and assessment (14,275 individuals), and individual, family or group therapy (11,000 individuals).\(^{63}\) While the variety of services offered by the DC Department of Behavioral Health and the increasing number of residents seeking services show promise, stigma and gaps in access still prevent many District residents from getting the mental health services they need.

Substance Use

Mental illness and substance use frequently co-occur, and in 2020 there were 2,656 District residents who were receiving services for both mental health and a substance use disorder.\(^{64}\) A total of 5,112 District residents received treatment for a substance use disorder (SUD) from a city-run or affiliated treatment facility in 2020.\(^{65}\) The majority of residents admitted to a SUD program were seeking


\(^{58}\) Ibid.

\(^{59}\) Ibid.


\(^{64}\) Ibid.

\(^{65}\) Ibid.
treatment for alcohol use. Heroin was the second most frequently reported drug of choice for those entering treatment.\textsuperscript{66} Alcohol and heroin use have been the most frequently cited reason for admission to SUD treatment programs in the District for the last four years (2016-2019) as well.

In 2017, 25.6% of District residents aged 18 and over reported binge drinking in the last month, defined as men drinking five or more and women drinking four or more alcoholic drinks at one time. Binge drinking is especially prevalent among DC residents who are White, male, under the age of 35, and have an income of $75,000 or more annually.\textsuperscript{67} Ward 2 had the highest rate of binge drinking, at 43.6%, while Ward 8 had the lowest, at 21.4%.\textsuperscript{68} While the number of individuals receiving substance use disorder services in DC remained consistent throughout 2017-2019, there was a 13% decline in clients served in 2020. The DC Department of Behavioral Health notes that this decline appears to be related to the COVID-19 public health emergency.\textsuperscript{69}

Opioid use remains a major issue in the District of Columbia, with the DC Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME) reporting 1,576 deaths related to opioid use in the District between January 1, 2016 and May 31, 2021.\textsuperscript{70} Like most of the country, the District saw a steady increase in opioid-related overdose deaths between 2014 and 2017. Following a small drop in fatal overdoses in 2018, the District saw increases again in 2019 and 2020, driven largely by the increased presence of fentanyl.\textsuperscript{71} In 2020, 94% of all fatal opioid overdoses in DC involved fentanyl or a fentanyl analog.\textsuperscript{72}

Medication assisted treatment for opioid use disorder has also increased steadily in recent years. In 2020, 3,500 residents in treatment for opioid use disorder were receiving medication assisted treatment using either methadone or buprenorphine/naltrexone.\textsuperscript{73} UPO works every day to be part of the solution in treating opioid use disorder in the District. UPO’s Comprehensive Treatment Center (CTC) is an outpatient methadone maintenance treatment program that focuses on combining both medical and counseling services to get patients afflicted with opioid addiction on the road to recovery, stability, self-
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\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid.

sufficiency, and resilience. In 2020, UPO’s CTC completed 495 treatment plans to help customers improve their quality of life.74

**Birth Outcomes**

The District has been working to improve its maternal and infant health outcomes in recent years through work such as the city-wide Improving Perinatal Health Outcomes Initiative. However, as with many indicators, birth outcomes vary drastically by ward. The District’s infant mortality rate decreased from 13.1 per 1,000 live births in 2007 to 5 per 1,000 live births in 2019.75 Certain wards fare much worse than the city-wide average, with Wards 7 and 8 reporting infant mortality rates substantially higher than those of the District as a whole (at 9.1 and 9.3 per 1,000 live births, respectively).76

Nationwide, approximately 10% of babies are born preterm. This is also the case for most babies born in the District, with Wards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 having preterm birth rates of 5-9% over the last few years. Unfortunately, large disparities are exposed when considering the most economically disadvantaged wards, with preterm birth rates of 11-16% in Wards 5, 7, and 8.77 Another important indicator of maternal and infant health is low birth weight, or babies that are born weighing less than 5.5 pounds. There is a similar trend on this indicator, with all wards reporting low birth weight rates below 10% except for Wards 7 and 8, which had low birth weight rates of 15% and 16%, respectively.78

Maternal health and wellness has profound impacts on birth outcomes. For example, when prenatal care is initiated in the first trimester, babies are more likely to be born a healthy birth weight. Over the last decade, the percent of women receiving prenatal care beginning in the first trimester of pregnancy has actually been...
declining in the District. As Figure 12 illustrates, in 2009, over 76% of expectant mothers in the District began prenatal care in the first trimester. This fell to a low of 58% in 2014, and recovered somewhat over the next four years, reaching over 68% in 2019. This same pattern holds true for all eight wards. Significant racial disparities are also present related to when women initiate prenatal care. While 86% of non-Hispanic White mothers in the District initiated prenatal care in the first trimester, that number was only 64% for Hispanic mothers of any race and 52% for non-Hispanic Black mothers. Systemic racism and gendered racism—the oppression that emerges from the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender—contribute to many of the disparities seen in maternal health and well-being in the United States. Systemic racism has created unequal birthing experiences for women of color, who frequently face racial bias in maternity care settings. The unique experiences of Black and Latina pregnant women in particular are often overlooked by a health care workforce that is still predominantly white and male in many parts of the country. A recent study found that Black and Latina mothers reported frequent instances of gendered racism which was strongly associated with pregnancy-specific stress, a known risk factor for adverse birth outcomes. Large disparities perpetuated by systemic and gendered racism remains a threat to positive maternal health and birth outcomes both in the District and nationwide.

**Hunger and Nutrition**

As the District continues to experience historic highs in economic prosperity for some, many residents continue to live in poverty and experience food insecurity. Food insecurity has been linked to some of the most common and expensive health problems including asthma, dental problems, developmental risk, and frequent colds in children; cancer, heart disease, pregnancy complications, and diabetes in adults; and hypertension, congestive heart failure, osteoporosis, and lower cognitive function in older adults. In fiscal year 2019, 13% of District residents (94,000 individuals, or one in eight DC residents) participated in [Figure 13: Percent of Households Receiving SNAP and SNAP Retailers](#).
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the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (also known as SNAP, formerly known as food stamps). Of District SNAP recipients in 2019, over half were in a family with children and over a third were in a family with members who are elderly or disabled. As Figure 13 illustrates, the city’s Northeast and Southeast quadrants have the most neighborhoods with high percentages of households receiving SNAP benefits. However, most SNAP retailers are concentrated in the central part of the District, not necessarily where the need is greatest.

Over the last decade, food insecurity in the District has generally trended downward. Between 2008 and 2018, the District’s overall rate of food insecurity declined from 13% to 10.6%. However, certain populations have higher rates of food insecurity than the population as a whole. For example, in 2018, 19.1% of DC children and 14.3% of DC seniors were found to be food insecure. In the early months of COVID-19 public health emergency, food insecurity increased dramatically nationwide. District data mirrors this national trend, with one study estimating that food insecurity rates in the District increased from 10.6% in February 2020 to 20.1% in May 2020. UPO provided a number of food resources to District residents and helped feed thousands of people throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. In Fiscal Year 2020, UPO’s staff and volunteers served over 7,000 hot meals, and distributed 6,500 boxes of groceries, household items, and PPE to residents in need throughout the District. UPO also prepared more than 4,500 grab and go grocery bags for customers experiencing increased food need during the pandemic. Over 13,000 DC households received some type of food assistance from UPO in 2020.

Despite these increases in food insecurity at the start of the pandemic, recently released data indicates that food insecurity levelled off as 2020 progressed and more people returned to work or obtained food assistance. The three-year food security average for 2018-2020 indicates that 10.3% of District households struggled to buy enough food for themselves and their families, and 3.6% experienced very low food security, defined as a more severe form of food insecurity where normal eating patterns are disrupted, and food intake is reduced because of lack of money to buy food.

Although there is a long way to go in ensuring all District residents are food secure, one bright spot is that the District is a national leader in child nutrition programs. Nationwide, Washington, DC has some of the highest participation rates in child nutrition programs, including being ranked first in summer and afterschool meal participation, and third in school breakfast participation.
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Access to healthy food is another key issue that must be addressed in order to make sure all District residents are food secure. While the significant population growth of the last 20 years has brought many new grocery stores to the area, they are not equitably distributed throughout the city. City-wide, there is one large full-service grocery store on average for approximately every 16,400 residents. However, in Wards 7 and 8, that ratio jumps to one full-service store for approximately every 55,000 residents. Progress is being made in this area, with the District’s Food Access Fund providing capital for three new grocery stores set to open in Wards 7 and 8 between now and summer 2022. The Food Access Fund will continue to provide investments to accelerate the development of fresh food retailers and sit-down restaurants in Wards 7 and 8.

**Housing**

**Occupancy and Ownership**

As of 2020, the District had a total of 350,364 housing units, an increase of 18.1% when compared to the number of units in 2010. Of all housing units in the District of Columbia, 89.2% are occupied and 10.8% are vacant. This is a slightly higher vacancy rate than the national average, likely due at least in part to the relatively transient nature of the District’s population.

The District of Columbia has a homeownership rate of 41.5%, well below the national average of 65.4%. There are 120,988 owner-occupied housing units in the District. As is the case with many social impact indicators in DC, there are large racial and geographic disparities in homeownership in the District. Ward 4 has the highest homeownership rate, at 59%, while Ward 8 has the lowest, at 22%. Figure 14 offers a full breakdown of ward-by-ward homeownership rates. There is also a roughly 20 percentage point gap between White residents who own their homes and Black residents.
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who own their homes in the District. This is a small disparity compared to other major metropolitan areas, some of which have gaps as high as 50% between White and Black homeownership. 99 However, it is still a notable gap that has a major impact on the housing landscape of the city.

Renters

Although the population in the District has increased substantially over the last decade, the number of rental vacancies has not increased to meet demand, hovering between 9.7% and 9.9% from 2015-2019. 100 A large segment of DC’s population are renters, with renters currently living in 58.4% of the occupied units in the District. 101 Availability is even starker when it comes to affordable units. A HUD report concluded that the supply of units that would be affordable to residents with low- and very low-incomes was inadequate nationwide, with only 59 affordable units available per 100 renter households with very low incomes, and only 40 units available per 100 renter households with extremely low incomes. 102 The fair market rent (FMR) for a one-bedroom apartment in the District was $1,328 in 2012.103 That increased to $1,402 104 in 2016 and is an astounding $1,558 for FY22.105 The rising rents are difficult for many District residents to afford.

Affordable Housing

In her second Inaugural speech, DC Mayor Muriel Bowser stated that “a fair shot to live and thrive in DC also means that we are big in our thinking about creating and preserving more affordable housing.” 106 Unfortunately, residents of the District have been living through an affordable housing crisis for years, and many have not had a fair shot to live and thrive in the District. While rents and housing prices have skyrocketed, wages have not kept up, and it has become increasingly difficult for lower-income residents to remain in the city. This crisis has been exacerbated by the ongoing pandemic and the accompanying economic challenges, which has caused thousands of District residents to lose wages and fall behind on rent, and some to move out of the city entirely.

101 Ibid.
Although there is a significant need for greater housing resources to support low-income residents, federal funding for affordable housing programs continues to stagnate. The total budget for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was $49.6 billion in 2021, a very modest increase over the 2020 HUD budget. President Biden’s fiscal year 2022 budget request included a proposed increase of 15% for HUD funding, although the final amount Congress appropriates for FY22 will likely be lower. The 2021 funding bill did include $25.78 billion for tenant-based rental assistance, an increase of nearly $2 billion over the 2020 allocation.

In May 2019, Mayor Bowser signed an order calling on the District to create 36,000 new residential units by 2025 with at least 12,000 of those units designated affordable for low-income residents. This will help ensure that all residents can continue to live in the District without being burdened by housing costs. It also calls for the preservation of at least an additional 7,200 affordable homes and to address the unequal distribution of affordable housing across the District’s eight wards.

While Washington, DC has an extremely robust set of affordable housing policies and the largest per capita housing trust fund of any city in the nation, the city’s current policies and investments alone are not enough to facilitate fair and affordable housing growth. To make this vision a reality, the DC Department of Housing and Community Development and the DC Office of Planning have launched the Housing Framework for Equity and Growth. This initiative has three goals:

- Make and commit to changes that achieve equitable goals for allocating affordable housing to each of the District’s ten Comprehensive Plan Planning Areas;
- Stimulate housing production to improve affordability and reduce the share of income that all residents spend on housing;
- Make homelessness rare, brief, and non-recurring.

See the Special Section: Affordable Housing in the District of Columbia, beginning on p. 53 for additional analyses of the state of affordable housing in DC.
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Homelessness

Despite the large influx of wealthy residents in recent years, the city continues to experience high levels of homelessness. The District’s budget to address homelessness has increased steadily over the years, although in some years that increase has been slight relative to the increase in the homeless population. The fiscal year 2021 budget provided the highest level of funding ever for homeless services in the District of Columbia; however, the budget increases are relatively modest. The 2021 budget includes new investments of over $10 million to fund over 300 new permanent supportive housing (PSH) units for both individuals and families experiencing homelessness, less than 40% of what was funded for new PSH units in 2020.\textsuperscript{112}

The point-in-time count or “PIT count” illustrates the scope and scale of homelessness in the District at a single point in time and is typically conducted in late January of each year. Based on data from the previous three PIT counts, DC has seen a gradual decline in both individual and family homelessness in recent years. In 2019, 6,521 total persons were homeless (including 815 family units). This number declined to 6,380 (768 family units) in 2020, a modest decline of 2.2%.\textsuperscript{113} In 2021, only 5,111 persons in the District (including 405 family units) were experiencing homelessness during the PIT count, a decline of 19.9% over the previous year.\textsuperscript{114} Homelessness advocates warn to interpret this decline with caution, as it could be attributed to the fact that DC enacted one of the strictest and earliest eviction moratoriums in the country, and it will be crucial to continue monitoring homelessness data as eviction moratoriums expire and the public health emergency winds down.\textsuperscript{115}

Substandard Housing

Another major concern of District residents is substandard housing. Due largely to lack of federal funding for housing programs, the majority of public housing units in the District need significant repairs, and some low-income residents live in extremely unhealthy conditions due to the ongoing neglect of these properties. This has been an especially pressing issue during the COVID-19 pandemic, as many of the issues seen in substandard housing units, such as mold and lead paint issues, are directly related to respiratory problems that could put residents at a greater risk of contracting COVID-19.\textsuperscript{116}

Throughout the District, housing conditions are unsafe and unhealthy for many residents. The National Center for Healthy Housing’s 2020 State of Healthy Housing Report ranked the DC metropolitan area #31 out of 51 cities. The report found that over 50% of the District’s housing units had at least one
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identifiable problem, while 4.7% had moderate physical problems and 1.5% of units had severe physical problems.\footnote{National Center for Healthy Housing. (2020). \textit{State of healthy housing rankings}. Retrieved September 14, 2021 from \url{https://nchh.org/tools-and-data/data/state-of-healthy-housing/rankings/location/washington-dc/?data-year=2018#}} As recently as 2019, 1,630 housing units in the District of Columbia lacked complete kitchen facilities, and 398 units lacked complete plumbing facilities.\footnote{U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). \textit{American community survey 1-year estimates}. Table DP04.} While the most common causes of substandard living conditions tend to be neglected maintenance, pests, and environmental hazards, clearly there are also some housing units in the District that do not meet basic standards for human occupancy.

\textbf{Safety}

\textbf{Violent Crime}

The District of Columbia makes crime statistics publicly available through the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). Violent crime trended slightly downward between 2019 and 2020 (4,179 offenses to 3,992) but is trending back upward so far in 2021.\footnote{Metropolitan Police Department. (2021, September 17). \textit{District crime data at a glance}. Retrieved September 17, 2021 from \url{https://mpdc.dc.gov/page/district-crime-data-glance}} There has been a substantial increase in homicides in the District in recent years. The District had 116 homicides in 2017, the lowest number since the record low of 88 in 2012. However, since 2017 homicides have been steadily increasing each year, as Figure 15 illustrates.\footnote{Ibid.} As of September 17, there had been 149 homicides in the District in 2021 so far.\footnote{Ibid.} Reported sex crimes decreased by 15\% from 2019 to 2020, while reported robberies decreased by 11\% in that same time period. Reports of assault with a dangerous weapon increased 3\% between 2019 and 2020 but remains much lower than it was a decade ago.\footnote{Ibid.}

\textbf{Property Crime}

Property crime in the District has also trended significantly downward in the last several years. In 2019, there were 29,799 property crime offenses (burglary, theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson). By 2020, 
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there were only 23,684 instances of property crime in the District, and as of September 17, 2021, there had been only 16,437 property crime offenses in 2021. Property crimes have generally been decreasing, with the exception of motor vehicle theft, which increased from 2019 to 2020 and is on track to increase again in 2021.\textsuperscript{123}

**Juvenile Crime**

Juvenile crimes are another area that remains a significant concern for District residents. Juvenile involvement in homicides has increased in recent years—as both victims and perpetrators. In 2015, eight juveniles were victims of homicides and four were arrested in connection with a homicide. By 2018, that number had risen to 13 juvenile homicide victims and 12 juveniles arrested.\textsuperscript{124} Juvenile crime in the following categories saw some of the largest increases between 2018 and 2019: robbery (26% increase), disorderly conduct (110% increase), motor vehicle theft (58% increase), sex offenses (69% increase), and weapons violations (44%). On the other hand, data from 2018 and 2019 also show a substantial decrease in juvenile involvement in a number of other violent offenses including: aggravated assault (39% decrease), homicide (80% decrease), and kidnapping (67% decrease).\textsuperscript{125}

**Bias Related Crime**

Data from the MPD reveals marked increases in bias-related crimes in the District. Also known as hate crimes, bias-related crimes are defined by DC’s Bias-Related Crime Act of 1989 as any criminal act or attempted criminal act that “demonstrates an accused’s prejudice based on the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, personal appearance, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, family responsibility, homelessness, physical disability, matriculation, or political affiliation of a victim.”\textsuperscript{126} As
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and Figure 16 illustrate, the five most common types of bias for which District residents are victims of hate crimes are ethnic/national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, and gender identity/expression.\textsuperscript{127}

Table 6: Hate Crimes by Type of Bias, 2015-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bias</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic/National Origin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity/Expression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there is not a pattern of increase in every category every year, the total number of bias-related crimes has increased each of the last five years, and crimes based on national origin and sexual orientation in particular display a consistent, concerning increase each year.

**Domestic Violence**

Domestic violence is a serious public health concern both in the District and nationwide. Intimate partner violence is of particular concern. An estimated 39% of women in the District have been physically or sexually assaulted by a current or former intimate partner. Perhaps even more concerning is the fact that domestic violence fatality rates, generally, have been increasing in recent years.\textsuperscript{128} For example, in 2019, there were 13 domestic violence related homicides in the District. As of September 2020, there had already been 11 domestic violence related homicides in 2020. While we do not yet know the full extent to which COVID-19 related stay-at-home orders throughout the country impacted victims and survivors of domestic violence, the data seems to indicate that lockdowns could have exacerbated domestic violence issues during the pandemic.\textsuperscript{129} Furthermore, District domestic violence service providers reported an increase in calls for help and requests for services in the first half of 2020, when the majority of stay-at-home orders were in place.\textsuperscript{130} In 2020, the MPD made 650 arrests for offenses against families and children, a massive increase over the 367 made in 2019.\textsuperscript{131}

**Education**

**Early Childhood Programs**

Early childhood programs in the District have undergone major changes in the last decade, with public schools dramatically increasing the number of prekindergarten slots available for three- and four-year-old children. Pre-K enrollment saw major growth from 2013-2018, including a 67% increase in
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enrollment in community-based programs, an 18% increase at charter schools, and a 4% increase at traditional public schools.\textsuperscript{132} In the 2018-2019 school year, 13,772 students were enrolled in the District pre-K program, including nearly 72% of three-year-olds and 86% of four-year-olds.\textsuperscript{133} Enrollment dropped significantly in the 2019-2020 school year, to 7,103, likely due to the challenges of virtual learning for children ages three and four.\textsuperscript{134} Figure 17 illustrates the growth in pre-K enrollment between school year 2015-2016 and school year 2018-2019, particularly in Wards 5, 7, and 8.\textsuperscript{135}

With public and community-based pre-K programs serving most District three- and four-year-olds, an overhaul of early childhood education has been sweeping across the city, with a renewed focus on early care and education for children ages zero to three. There are currently 11,662 licensed early learning slots in District, and 2.3 infants and toddlers residing in the District for each of those slots. In most wards, the difference between supply and demand is even more substantial, with between 2.6 and 3.2 children per slot.\textsuperscript{136} Only in Wards 2 and 3, which have lower child poverty rates, is the supply closer to matching the demand. Figure 18 shows the distribution of licensed infant/toddler childcare slots across the District’s eight wards.\textsuperscript{137}

Another hurdle to increasing access to care and education for the District’s youngest residents is affordability. Estimates from the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) indicate that
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the average annual cost of care at a childcare center designated High-Quality was $24,239 in 2021. While the cost of care has increased in recent years, OSSE reports that subsidy reimbursement rates in the District are meeting or close to meeting the cost of care for all age groups. Over 5,000 infants and toddlers received childcare subsidies in fiscal year 2019, which decreased to 3,344 in fiscal year 2020, likely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the city needs approximately 5,000 more subsidy seats to have one for every infant and toddler expected to be eligible for a subsidy in the next two years. The early care and education sector also continues to deal with the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. While 66% of early learning programs reopened by November 2020, many families did not rush to re-enroll their children, and only 22% of open programs were fully enrolled as of November 2020.

In 2019, the District had 7,181 children enrolled in Head Start programs, the largest number in the last decade. This included:

- 1,873 children under the age of three
- 2,462 three-year-olds
- 2,826 four-year-olds
- 20 children aged five or older.

The District currently offers Head Start services at 12 locations throughout the city and Early Head Start services at 59 locations. Head Start (HS) and Early Head Start (EHS) programs are offered through childcare providers and pre-K programs in a number of locations, including childcare centers, community-based organizations, DCPS schools, and charter schools. Several agencies also offer the Early
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Head Start Home-Based option, which provides home visiting services to Early Head Start children and families across the city. In 2020, Child Trends published a community needs assessment of Head Start and Early Head Start in the District in collaboration with the District’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE). This report identified strengths and challenges for HS and EHS programs in the District, some of which are outline below.

- **Family and community strengths included:** tight-knit communities where neighbors support each other and refer one another to HS and EHS programs; families who are deeply invested in their children’s learning and development and seek to learn from HS and EHS teachers; and programs that are situated in resource-rich communities that can support families in other ways.

- **Program strengths included:** strong teachers, staff, and curricula that are focused on child development and learning; supportive services such as health screenings for both children and families; and a focus on connecting families with resources to support other needs, such as housing and employment.

- **Systems-level strengths included:** strong coordination and information sharing between child and family serving agencies in the District; and the Quality Improvement Network (QIN), which is operated by UPO, provides vital support, especially for EHS teachers.

- **Family and community challenges included:** finding secure and stable housing; concerns about safety and violence in their neighborhoods; transportation access; consistent access to physical and mental health care; and concerns around substance use in the home when children are present.

- **Program challenges included:** a growing number of children and families whose primarily language is not English, with limited translation support; related, the need for more on-site program staff who speak Spanish; and the need for more teacher training related to working with children with behavioral challenges and families who have experienced trauma.

- **Systems-level challenges included:** a need for more support in staying connected with hard-to-reach families, such as those experiencing homelessness and children in the foster care system; a need for more childcare slots throughout the District for children with special needs as well as infants and toddlers; and parental challenges navigating the voucher and subsidy system.

**Elementary and Secondary Education**

For the 2020-2021 school year, 93,438 students were enrolled in public schools in the District of Columbia. Of these students, 53% attended DC Public Schools (DCPS) and 47% attended a public charter school in the District. Both DCPS and charter school enrollment has grown in recent years, as there were only 88,493 students enrolled in the 2018-2019 school year. District fourth graders have been
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increasing their proficiency in math in recent years, although their scores remain below national averages. While 31.5% of District fourth graders scored at or above proficient on the math portion of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in 2017, that increased to 34.2% in 2019. Fourth grade NAEP reading scores were not significantly different from those in 2017, with approximately 30% of students at or above proficient.\(^{148}\) Eighth graders also take the NAEP assessment every other year and saw an improvement in both math and reading scores between 2017 and 2019. However, eighth graders achievement still lagged significantly behind national averages with both math and reading assessments showing only 23% of District eighth graders testing at or above proficient.\(^{149}\)

The COVID-19 pandemic created a number of challenges for students throughout the District. While the full extent of the pandemic’s impact on educational attainment and opportunity might not be known for years, early data suggest some learning loss, especially for younger students. On the DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) assessment, which measures K-8 literacy, there was an 11-percentage point drop between school year 2019-2020 and school year 2020-2021 in terms of students meeting or exceeding beginning of year literacy benchmarks. Approximately 22% of students in kindergarten, first, and second grades who were meeting benchmarks prior to the pandemic fell below the benchmark at the start of the 2020-2021 school year. It is also concerning that early data shows the early literacy gap between Black and White students growing during the pandemic.\(^{150}\) English Learners, special education students, and at-risk students also saw significant learning loss when it came to meeting early literacy benchmarks. Furthermore, a “COVID Slide Study” conducted in fall 2020 assessed both math and English language arts (ELA) for a large sample of DC students from over 130 DCPS and public charter schools.\(^{151}\) Some key findings from this assessment include:

- At-risk students in grades 3-8 on average lost five months in math and four months in ELA
- Non at-risk students lost on average four months in math and did not lose ground in ELA
- DC uses the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) to measure student proficiency, but fewer students are on track for PARCC proficiency following the pandemic (especially in math)
- The share of students on track for PARCC math proficiency in school year 2020-2021 was five percentage points lower than the previous year.\(^{152}\)

While the full extent of pandemic learning loss is still being uncovered, students and teachers throughout the District have returned to their classrooms and are working to get back on track.

\(^{148}\) Ibid.
\(^{149}\) Ibid.
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In 2019, it was estimated that 8% of teens aged 16 to 19 in the District (approximately 3,000 individuals) were not currently enrolled in school and were not working. Only 2% of District teens age 16 to 19 are not in school and not high school graduates. This difference suggests that some of the teens included in the not in school and not working number have already graduated from high school or obtained a GED and have not yet found work. Furthermore, in the 2018-2019 school year, 31% of District high school students did not graduate on time, more than double the rate for the U.S. as a whole. This is important because students who graduate from high school on time are more likely to continue their education and training after high school; they are also more likely to be employed and have higher incomes than students who do not graduate on time or who fail to graduate at all. In the 2019-2020 school year, the overall four-year high school graduation rate for public schools in the District was 71%, a slight increase over recent years, but not reaching the high of 73% from school year 2016-2017. Broken down by sector, the 2019-2020 graduation rate was 69% for DC public schools and 77% for public charter schools, representing the highest graduation rate DC charter schools have seen since the 2011-2012 school year. When disaggregated, four-year graduation rates look especially bleak for certain groups of students in the District. In 2020, Latino students had a four-year graduation rate of 63%, economically disadvantaged students had a rate of 60%, English language learners had a graduation rate of 55%, and special education students and students experiencing homelessness had a rate of only 52%. While education is gradually improving in the District overall, large disparities still exist for many of the city’s most vulnerable children and youth.

**Adult Education**

The District of Columbia is often considered one of the most educated cities in the nation, with nearly 60% of DC residents holding a bachelor’s degree or higher. However, beneath that overall high number lies large disparities. Only 73.1% of Hispanic or Latino adults (of any race) in the District are high school graduates, while for those identifying as some other race, only 57.6% had graduated high school. This is important for economic stability and self-sufficiency, because while the poverty rate was 32.7% for District residents over age 25 without a high school diploma, it was only 5.0% for those over the age of 25 with a bachelor’s degree or higher.

The city is working to improve educational opportunities for all learners in the District, not just young children, and offers a variety of adult education programs to try to close some of the gaps that currently exist. The DC ReEngagement Center (REC) is a “single door” through which resident ages 16-24 who
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dropped out of high school can reconnect to educational opportunities and other services to help them obtain their high school diploma or GED. Located in the Benning neighborhood of Northeast DC, the REC is convenient to many high-poverty neighborhoods in Wards 7 and 8 that could benefit from increased adult education opportunities. The REC provides services such as targeted outreach to students who have dropped out; assessing academic and non-academic needs to help youth develop personalized reengagement plans; identifying best-fit educational options, including DCPS alternative schools, charter schools, community-based organizations, and faith-based organizations; and supporting the reenrollment process. In addition to the extensive work the city is doing to re-engage young adults without high school diplomas, OSSE provides a number of other adult education programs including those related to adult literacy, GED preparation, workforce readiness, workforce training and support, and adult college completion support.

Summary of Social Impact Indicators

Table 7: Social Impact Indicators, by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018164</td>
<td>85,134</td>
<td>77,791</td>
<td>85,067</td>
<td>87,775</td>
<td>87,850</td>
<td>94,558</td>
<td>81,299</td>
<td>85,024</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020165</td>
<td>85,285</td>
<td>81,904</td>
<td>85,301</td>
<td>84,660</td>
<td>89,425</td>
<td>108,202</td>
<td>76,255</td>
<td>78,513</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42,307</td>
<td>54,821</td>
<td>60,841</td>
<td>24,443</td>
<td>22,161</td>
<td>61,706</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>18,741</td>
<td>6,864</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>37,315</td>
<td>51,242</td>
<td>28,640</td>
<td>67,375</td>
<td>69,531</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>9,388</td>
<td>7,087</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>8,979</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>2,142</td>
<td>11,448</td>
<td>5,959</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>9,201</td>
<td>7,378</td>
<td>8,906</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>6,762</td>
<td>8,949</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>3,277</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>4,763</td>
<td>6,818</td>
<td>8,083</td>
<td>38,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>3,862</td>
<td>17,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>3,313</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>4,914</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>34,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>4,134</td>
<td>4,241</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>4,619</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>30,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>6,886</td>
<td>7,061</td>
<td>6,841</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>9,247</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>45,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>3,141</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>26,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>6,769</td>
<td>8,805</td>
<td>11,818</td>
<td>5,858</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>8,977</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>47,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$102,882</td>
<td>$111,064</td>
<td>$128,670</td>
<td>$94,810</td>
<td>$71,782</td>
<td>$114,363</td>
<td>$45,318</td>
<td>$35,245</td>
<td>$92,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Poverty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># in poverty</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,648</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18 years in poverty</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% high school graduate or higher</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing units</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38,910</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% renter occupied units</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation(^{174})</th>
<th>% without vehicle available</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% without vehicle available</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment(^{175})</th>
<th>% public transportation user</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% public transportation user</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources Available to DC Residents

This section highlights the wide range of services available to residents, the processes for accessing those services, and examples of providers. This review shows that there is a rich tapestry of community-level services available to District households with low incomes, even if it is also true that there are substantial gaps between the need for some services and the level of availability of those services.

### Services Requested and Provided

This section also highlights the demands for certain kinds of services, based on an analysis of requests for assistance made through Unite US, a digital referral platform used by health and social service providers. Residents use the referral platform by encountering one of hundreds of service providers throughout the DMV (including UPO) and seeking services. Unite Us affiliated service providers then refer those customers to area providers who may be able to meet their needs for specific services.

The Unite US data represents a sample of data of the location (via zip codes) of 938 requests for various services using the Unite US platform. These data highlight what services District residents are requesting through the platform and where requests for those services originate in the city. This assessment uses the Unite US data as an additional resource to determine residents’ place-based needs throughout the District.

This section also includes data points on select UPO services provided to District residents during the service period of October 2019 – December 2021. These data points represent the locations (via zip codes) of District residents who received over 2,000 services from UPO. Due to data limitations for some services that UPO provides, only a select subset of UPO service data is included in this analysis. Therefore, some of UPO customers are not captured as part of this sample including Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) service customers (UPO’s largest customer base), among other customers.

Figure 19 illustrates the concentration of service requests received by Unite US by zip code between June 2020 and November 2021. While some zip codes in Wards 2, 3, and 4 had between zero and ten service requests, multiple zip codes east of the river (Wards 7 and 8) had over 150 service requests in the same time period.

---
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Figure 20 illustrates UPO services by type and zip code. Much like the Unite US service request data presented above, several zip codes stand out in the UPO services provided data. Most of UPO services were provided in zip codes 20020, 20019, and 20032 (Wards 7 and 8), which were also some of the top zip codes for Unite US service requests.
Figure 21 provides visualizations of the most frequently requested services. Requests to Unite US relating to housing and shelter were more than double the amount in any other category. Given the current challenges District residents have obtaining and maintaining affordable housing, it is not surprising that housing was the most requested service, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. Food assistance and individual and family support were also frequently requested. Unite US defines individual and family support broadly to include services such as life skills training, social service/case management, peer support, respite care, and caregiving services.
Figure 22 presents an overview of some key services that UPO provided to its customers. Office of Early Learning (OEL) services stand out as the service received by the largest portion of UPO customers. This makes sense given that UPO is the largest provider of Early Head Start services in the District of Columbia and the Office of Early Learning makes up a much larger part of UPO’s programming than any other division. UPO also frequently provided rental assistance and transportation services to its customers. As noted above, this analysis only includes a subset of UPO services provided due to data limitations. Figure 22, as well as the corresponding map above (Figure 20 only contains data points for which UPO has a valid home zip code each customer who received the service. Zip code data are only available for some services UPO provides, which impacts certain service categories more than others.
For example, over 13,000 households received food assistance from UPO in 2020, but this is not reflected in these figures due to lack of location data for those customers.

Figure 22: Services Provided to UPO Customers

![UPO Services Provided Chart]

Resources for District Residents

The services outlined below include some of the need categories included in the Unite US and UPO service data. However, this narrative also examines other service sectors, provides examples of community-based organizations that provide those services, and includes links to useful resources on obtaining those services.

Services for Families with Children

General Family Support

There are nonprofit organizations throughout the District that support families by providing direct services and making referrals to other service providers for case management, housing, employment, and school-based services. Some District organizations that provide family support services include the Far Southeast Family Strengthening Collaborative, the East River Family Strengthening Collaborative, the Edgewood/Brookland Family Support Collaborative, and the Georgia Avenue Family Support Collaborative.

Child Care and Financial Support

Families seeking childcare through a child development center or home childcare support can look for childcare providers that meet their needs through the District’s My Child Care DC website. The website allows families to search for facilities by location and by type. My Child Care DC also identifies which childcare facilities accept childcare subsidy vouchers and offers instructions for applying for a voucher. Some child development facilities are able to help families complete their childcare voucher applications on-site. Families also can apply for a childcare voucher through the DC Department of Human Services Child Care Services Division.
Information on My Child Care DC can be found at https://mychildcare.dc.gov/.

**Home Visiting**

The DC Home Visiting Council states that “Home visiting programs support expectant parents and the families of young children before childbirth and in the earliest months and years of a child's life. Participation in home visiting programs is voluntary and serves as a preventative and early intervention resource for families. In these programs, trained family support workers visit families in their homes, or wherever families are most comfortable, and provide a wide variety of services meant to help families meet their goals.”

The District has 16 home visiting programs that each has its own focus. Together, home visiting programs help parents understand prenatal care and newborn and young child health and development, model positive parenting practices, provide postpartum help for mothers and child development screenings for children, and support school readiness.

DC’s home visiting providers include UPO, the Healthy Babies Project, and Mary’s Center. A full list can be found at http://www.dchomevisiting.org.

**Support for Children with Disabilities or Developmental Delays**

The District’s Strong Start program offers early intervention services for infants and toddlers with developmental delays or disabilities and their families. (This meets the requirements of the federal IDEA program, part C.) Children that present a 25% or more delay in at least one developmental area and children who have a high probability of resulting in a developmental delay or disability are eligible for services. Parents can directly reach out to Strong Start, and health providers and early childhood educators also work with parents to identify potential developmental delays and disabilities and to make referrals to Strong Start.

Strong Start conducts intake and screening for children and works with families to develop an individualized family service plan (IFSP). Additionally, Strong Start coordinates services to meet children’s needs.

Once a child turns three, the child can be screened through services through the Early Stages program operated by DCPS, which meets the requirements of the federal IDEA program, part B. Eligible families can choose to continue receiving services through Strong Start until the child’s first day of school following their fourth birthday, or they can transition to services through Early Stages.


**Behavioral Health Support for Infants and Toddlers: Healthy Futures**

Healthy Futures is based on the Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation (ECMHC) model, an evidence-based approach to support young children’s social-emotional development and address challenging behaviors in early learning environments. The DC Department of Behavioral Health operates Healthy Futures, and it works through early childhood education centers and homes to build capacity in
childcare providers to promote social-emotional development, prevent escalation of challenging behaviors, and support referrals for additional assessments and services.

More information on Healthy Futures can be found at https://dcchildcareconnections.org/resource/department-of-behavioral-health-dbhhealthy-futures-pcit/.

Head Start and Early Head Start program also provide a variety of mental health services to HS/EHS children and their families including mental health promotion, prevention, early identification, and referrals for treatment.

**Referrals for Families with Young Children: Help Me Grow**

Help Me Grow DC is an information and referral helpline for District residents that provides parents, physicians, and providers with the knowledge and resources they need to make a difference in the lives of expectant parents and families with children through age five. Help Me Grow services include: personal care coordination, free child development and perinatal screenings, answers to pregnancy, parenting, and child development questions, and connection to community resources.

More information on Help Me Grow can be found at https://helpmegrow.dc.gov.

**Housing and Homeless Services**

**Finding Low-Cost Rental Housing: DC Housing Search**

Washington, DC offers affordable housing through a variety of programs, and affordable housing is developed by a number of nonprofit and for-profit providers. The affordable housing built through these providers is very important because the waiting list for affordable housing through the DC Housing Authority has been closed since 2013.

The District offers an online tool, DC Housing Search, to make it easy for residents to find affordable housing that is available at any given time. The website collects information on rental and for-sale units that become available through one of the District’s affordable housing programs. Residents looking for housing can search by neighborhood, rent level, senior preferences, and other factors.

More information can be found at https://www.dchousingsearch.org/index.html

**Homeless Services**

Services for residents experiencing homelessness are separated into services for families with children and residents without children.

Families with children experiencing homelessness can seek short-term housing in a facility owned by the District. Short-term housing units are located throughout the city. Families experiencing homelessness also can receive a Rapid Rehousing subsidy that places them in a private apartment with temporary rental assistance.

Families experiencing homelessness seek services by going through the District’s central intake location, the Virginia Williams Center, located at 920-A Rhode Island Avenue, NE.
People without children can seek a place to sleep overnight in one of the District’s emergency shelters. The District’s shelters work together to use a “coordinated entry” system under which all providers work together to meet the needs of clients experiencing homelessness. Providers share a common database on clients seeking services and on available services. The database allows residents to easily find where they can find appropriate homeless services—such as shelters that have open capacity on a given day—and to allow individual providers to make referrals to other providers as needed. Homeless service providers also use the coordinated entry system to assess residents’ needs and refer them to other services, including mental health services and permanent housing.

Residents without children needing overnight emergency housing can seek help by calling the District’s Shelter Hotline, which offers transportation to shelters with available space and wellness checks to homeless individuals wherever they are. UPO is the District’s provider of the shelter hotline program. The Shelter Hotline number at UPO is 202-399-7093.

More information on the coordinated entry system can be found at http://www.coordinatedentry.com/

Individuals or families experiencing chronic homelessness can be referred to permanent housing through DC’s Permanent Supportive Housing program.

**Permanent Supportive Housing**

DC’s Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) program provides long-term affordable housing and intensive case management to individuals and families who are chronically homeless and continue to be at imminent risk of becoming homeless. Under the PSH program, DC residents experiencing homelessness are assessed using an index to measure their vulnerability, determine homelessness status (chronic or short-term), and other relevant needs, such as a need for mental health services. This assessment tool is used to determine PSH eligibility for individuals and families.

DC’s PSH services are delivered by non-profit organizations—including UPO—who identify clients, help them secure housing, and provide intensive and ongoing case management services. Some PSH participants receive a housing voucher, and others move into housing developments that have been created for PSH recipients. UPO is in the process of developing an additional 100-unit affordable housing property, which will serve PSH families. Other PSH providers include Community of Hope, Pathways to Housing, Friendship Place, and N Street Village.


The District also offers homeless services targeted to youth. These services include street outreach and drop-in centers for youth with a housing crisis, overnight shelter and transitional housing programs, and permanent supportive housing. The providers serving youth experiencing homelessness include Sasha Bruce Youthwork, Latin American Youth Center, Casa Ruby, Covenant House, and others.

More information on services for youth experiencing homelessness can be found at https://dhs.dc.gov/page/youth-homeless-services.
Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP)

ERAP helps District residents with low incomes who are facing housing emergencies. Residents can get help to pay overdue rent if they are facing eviction, and help paying security deposits and the first month’s rent for residents moving to a new apartment. Eligible households may apply for ERAP up to two times in the twelve-month period from the date of the first application. UPO provides ERAP services at its Petey Greene office in Southeast DC.

Residents can apply for ERAP online at https://erap.dhs.dc.gov/ or by visiting one of the ERAP providers.

During the coronavirus pandemic, the District established a number of eviction prevention programs using federal relief funds. The largest of these programs, STAY DC, stopped taking new applications on October 27, 2021.

In 2021, UPO received $14 million from the federal CARES Act. UPO is using those funds to provide emergency rental assistance, other emergency assistance, employment placement services, and a variety of workforce development services.

Services for Homeless Students

Every DCPS school has a staff member (a liaison) who coordinates services to students experiencing homelessness, providing services funded under the federal McKinney-Vento Act. McKinney-Vento liaisons assist students and families with transportation assistance, school uniforms, school supplies and provide information regarding in-school or community-based resources.

Adult Education and Workforce Development

The District government offers centralized services to help residents looking for job training or a job. Several organizations provide a range of workforce development services, and many of these organizations help administer DC government programs.

Residents seeking jobs can receive guidance by visiting one of the District’s American Job Centers under the DC Department of Employment Services (DOES). These centers help jobseekers develop resumes, identify job openings, gain interviewing skills, and connect with education or training providers. Based on a resident’s needs and eligibility, some jobseekers can receive a voucher to help pay for training at one of the approved providers in the city. The list of eligible providers can be found at https://dcworks.dc.gov/page/provider-directory. The providers include UPO, Goodwill, Thrive DC, So Others Might Eat, Byte Back, and many others. Residents can go through an American Job Center or connect directly with a provider.

The District also offers job training and education through a variety of programs and institutions, including:

- United Planning Organization (UPO): UPO provides training in nine credentialed, in-demand sectors, including hospitality, IT, transportation, construction, and child development.
- University of the District of Columbia Community College: UDC-CC offers training and certification for jobs in construction, child development, hospitality, health care, and IT.
- Adult Public Charter Schools: The District’s public charter school system includes schools that serve adults and focus on workforce preparation. They include Academy of Hope Public Charter
School and Carlos Rosario Public Charter School. A number of workforce training programs offered at Carlos Rosario Public Charter School are offered in both English and Spanish.

- **Project Empowerment:** This program places DC residents into employment with private companies and the DC government, with wages paid by the program for up to six months. Project Empowerment targets services to returned citizens.

- **The DC Infrastructure Academy (DCIA)** coordinates, trains, screens, and recruits residents to fulfill the needs of the infrastructure industry and infrastructure jobs with leading companies in this high-demand field. DCIA is located in the Anacostia neighborhood in Ward 8.

- **Apprenticeships:** The District connects interested residents with apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship opportunities, which prepare people for highly skilled occupations that require certification, such as carpentry or electrician.

- **Employment and Community Service for Seniors:** The Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) helps older residents secure part-time community service and work-based training to gain skills through on-the-job training in community-based organizations. Participants are placed in Host Agencies, including childcare centers, senior centers, schools, hospitals, and government agencies.

- **Job Training in High Schools:** DC high schools offer a range of job training opportunities, particularly through Career Academies at many high schools. The Career Academies include engineering at McKinley Tech High School, automotive repair at Ballou High School, and Health Services at Eastern High School.

**Health**

The District offers health insurance to nearly all residents with low incomes through two programs, DC Medicaid and the Healthcare Alliance. The Medicaid program is a federal program that is operated in every state and DC, and it is funded with a mix of federal and state funds. DC and each state have flexibility over program rules, including income eligibility.

Under DC’s Medicaid program, children and pregnant women are eligible if their income is below 319% of the federal poverty line (FPL) or less than $71,200 for a family of three. Parents in those families are eligible if their income is below 216% of the FPL, or $48,500. Adults without children are eligible for Medicaid if their income is below 210% of the FPL, or $47,200 for a family of three. Seniors are eligible for Medicaid if their income is below 100% of the FPL, or $17,400 for a family of two.

The District provides health insurance to residents with low incomes who do not qualify for Medicaid, including undocumented immigrants, through the Healthcare Alliance Program. Residents with incomes below 200% of the FPL ($42,700 for a family of three) are eligible for the Healthcare Alliance Program.

Thanks to the broad eligibility in DC Medicaid and the Healthcare Alliance, most people in the District have health insurance. Just 3.3% of DC residents lacked health insurance in 2020, lower than in any state.

---

176 Medicaid income eligibility limits retrieved on December 21, 2021 from https://dhcf.dc.gov/service/who-may-be-eligible-medicaid
177 The DC Healthcare Alliance income eligibility limit was retrieved on December 21, 2021 from https://dhcf.dc.gov/service/health-care-alliance
other than Massachusetts. Health insurance gives most DC residents wide access to health care throughout the District.

Several non-profit organizations provide free health care, regardless of insurance, to DC residents. Seventeen organizations operate primary medical care clinics in 49 sites throughout DC.

The District’s Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) supports a network of mental health service providers, including a process to certify mental health service providers. Some 41 organizations are certified to provide mental health services.

DBH also certifies a network of community-based providers to provide substance use disorder (SUD) services. Twenty-eight organizations have been certified to provide SUD services.

**Seniors**

The District offers several services to support seniors. The District has designated a Lead Agency for senior services in each ward to provide services and service referrals.

- Ward 1: Terrific Inc
- Ward 2: Terrific Inc
- Ward 3: IONA Senior Services
- Ward 4: Terrific Inc
- Ward 5: Seabury Ward 5 Aging Services
- Ward 6: Seabury Ward 6 Aging Services
- Ward 7: East River Family Strengthening Collaborative
- Ward 8: East River Family Strengthening Collaborative

Information on Lead Agencies for Senior Services can be found at [https://dacl.dc.gov/service/lead-agencies](https://dacl.dc.gov/service/lead-agencies)

The District operates a Senior Wellness Center in every ward except Ward 2. The Wellness Centers offer group lunches, exercise equipment, computer labs, and other activities. The list of Senior Wellness Centers can be found at [https://dacl.dc.gov/service/senior-wellness-centers-0](https://dacl.dc.gov/service/senior-wellness-centers-0).

The District also offers a range of specific services for seniors, including:

- **Meals:** The District operates 40 communal meal sites throughout the District and also offers meal delivery services.

---

178 [https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/health-insurance-coverage-of-the-total-population-cps/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22,%22desc%22:%22false%7D](https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/health-insurance-coverage-of-the-total-population-cps/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22,%22desc%22:%22false%7D)

179 This list of providers was retrieved December 20, 2021 from [https://dbh.dc.gov/node/119532](https://dbh.dc.gov/node/119532)

180 This list of providers was retrieved December 20, 2021 from [https://dbh.dc.gov/page/substance-use-disorder-services](https://dbh.dc.gov/page/substance-use-disorder-services)
Transportation: The District offers transportation subsidies that seniors can use for taxis or other paid ride-sharing services, as well as for public transportation. The District also offers free round-trip transportation to seniors for certain medical appointments and $5 taxi rides for other trips.

Home Safety: The Safe at Home Program provides safety adaptations in and around the homes of qualifying seniors and adults with disabilities.

Nutrition

The District administers a number of federal food assistance programs, and it also operates several local programs. In addition, several non-profit organizations in the District offer food services.

The federally funded food programs include:

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP): SNAP provides electronic benefits that allow households with low incomes to purchase groceries at retail stores or online.

School breakfast and lunch: The District provides free breakfast and lunch in all K-12 schools

Summer meals: The District offers free meals in the summer through recreation centers and schools.

Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC): The WIC program provides a select set of free foods (such as milk and cereal), as well as nutrition education, to pregnant women and children up to age five.

Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP): The District provides free USDA commodity foods to seniors with low incomes through this program.

Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP): This program provides free meals through early childhood education centers, afterschool programs for youth, and centers serving seniors or adults with disabilities.

In addition, the District operates other services to help residents get free food or free meals

Afterschool meals for children: The District offers free meals to children after school through several recreation centers.

Produce Plus: The District provides vouchers to residents with low incomes to help them purchase produce at farmers’ markets.

The Capital Area Food Bank distributes food to providers around the Washington region and operates direct food assistance programs. In addition, there is a robust network of non-profit and community-based organizations that provide free food to people in need. A list of food distribution sites can be found at [https://dcfoodproject.org/emergency-food-access](https://dcfoodproject.org/emergency-food-access).

Domestic Violence

DC residents facing domestic violence can seek a variety of services, largely from non-profit organizations, including emergency housing, permanent housing, financial assistance, legal assistance, and mental health services. A list of services for residents facing domestic violence can be found at [https://dccadv.org/resources/get-help/](https://dccadv.org/resources/get-help/).
Legal Services

Several organizations in the District offer free legal assistance to DC residents with low incomes, including legal help with housing, employment, family needs (such as divorce or child support), public benefits, immigration issues, and more. A list of free legal services and providers can be found at https://www.lawhelp.org/dc.

Mutual Aid

A collection of volunteers and direct service providers operate a mutual aid network to help fill in the gaps in District government programs and existing non-profit service providers. Mutual aid volunteers deliver food and meals, provide transportation to medical appointments, help residents buy medical supplies, and more. Information on DC’s mutual aid network can be found at https://themamdc.com/.

Special Section: Affordable Housing in the District of Columbia

Introduction

Stable and decent housing is the foundation of stable families and stable communities. Access to affordable housing supports healthy childhood development and school success, improves the ability of adults to find and keep jobs, reduces mental health problems, and is correlated with lower crime. In other words, affordable housing plays a critical role in the success of many of UPO's direct service interventions, and the lack of affordable housing can reduce the impact of early childhood and workforce development investments.

DC's lack of low-cost housing—from affordable housing programs and private-market units with low rents (naturally occurring affordable housing) has been a consistent challenge for District residents with low incomes and for UPO customers. UPO regularly receives requests from DC residents who are at risk of eviction or in unhealthy and unstable housing conditions, and who have an immediate need for affordable housing. Given the lack of affordable housing, UPO is not always able to address all residents' housing needs.

As detailed in this section, affordable housing problems are widespread across the District of Columbia but concentrated among the poorest residents. Challenges related to affordable housing have increased in recent decades as development has spread throughout DC. A recent survey found that one-fifth of residents in Wards 7 and 8 fear that rising housing costs will displace them in the near future. Their fears are not unfounded, with evidence that over 20,000 Black DC residents were displaced from their neighborhoods between 2000 and 2013, according to a report by the National Community Reinvestment Coalition.

As this needs assessment is being conducted, access to stable and affordable housing is especially difficult, given the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on household finances, the expiration of

182Khademian, Y. (2019, July 15). One fifth of ward 7 and 8 residents believe housing costs will force them to move within three years. DCist. Retrieved November 30, 2021 from https://dcist.com/story/19/07/15/one-fifth-of-ward-7-and-8-residents-believe-housing-costs-will-force-them-to-move-in-the-next-three-years/

local and national eviction moratoriums, and the termination of DC's pandemic-related eviction prevention program, STAY DC. The impact of these conditions could mean that housing conditions for thousands of DC residents will worsen in the near term.

The Lack of Affordable Housing in DC

By any measure, there is a tremendous mismatch between household incomes and rental housing costs in DC, with many residents able to pay very little for rent based on their income, but very few units at those levels.

DC's rental housing challenge starts with the fact that there are not enough rental units in DC to serve all renter households. The District has 162,000 renter households but only 125,000 rental apartments.184 The gap is partially met through DC's "shadow" rental market, which comprises single family homes and condominiums used as rentals. The shadow market is volatile and not a guaranteed source of rental housing. The shortage of rentals for all DC residents means that competition for these units is great and puts constant upward pressure on rents.

The upward pressure has been evident in the past decade as the District's population has grown and development has spread to many parts of the city. The median rent in 2019 was $1,514, a 44% increase from 2010.185

Median rents in the District increased 44% between 2010 and 2019.

A substantial share of DC residents have incomes too low to afford DC's high and rising rents. There is a serious shortage of low-cost units, and as a result, the vast majority of residents with low incomes spend most of their income on rent each month.

- The Urban Institute found that 107,000 DC households cannot afford more than $800 a month in rent, but only 60,000 housing units are at that level, which includes housing with government subsidies. This situation

![Figure 23: District of Columbia Median Rent, 2010-2019](image)

US Census, ACS, 2010-2019
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185 U.S. Census Bureau (2019 and 2010). American community survey 1-year estimates. Table B25058.
leaves a shortage of 47,000 rental units that rent for less than $800 a month.\textsuperscript{186} • Some 29,000 households in the District spend more than 50\% of their annual income on housing costs. Another 40,000 households spend 30\% to 50\% of their income on rent and utilities.\textsuperscript{187} • Some 42\% of extremely low-income households spent more than 80\% of their income on housing. Another 20\% spent 50\%-80\% of income on housing, and an additional 18\% spent 30\%-50\% of income.\textsuperscript{188} (Extremely Low-Income households are those with incomes below 30\% of the Median Family Income, or less than $38,700 for a family of four. See box on page 68 for more information on the Median Family Income definitions used in affordable housing programs.)\textsuperscript{189} • Extreme housing hardship primarily affects Black or brown residents in the District’s highest-poverty neighborhoods. Roughly 90\% of DC households with extremely low incomes that experience severe housing burdens are Black or Latino.\textsuperscript{190} Moreover, residents of Wards 5, 7, and 8 are far more likely than other DC households to spend more than half of their income on housing costs.\textsuperscript{191} • The largest group of DC households who are extremely low-income and have severe housing cost burdens are adults without children, but many are headed by an adult with a disability, a senior, or an adult with children.\textsuperscript{192}  

\textsuperscript{187} U.S. Census Bureau (2019). \textit{American community survey 1-year estimates}. Table B25070
\textsuperscript{189} Until recently, the Median Family Income measure was known as Area Median Income, or AMI.\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{192} Zippel, C. (2016, December 8). \textit{A broken foundation: affordable housing crisis threatens DC’s low-income residents}. DC Fiscal Policy Institute. Retrieved December 5, 2021 from https://www.dcfpi.org/wp-content/uploads2016/12/DCFPI-Broken-Foundation-Housing-Report-12-8-16.pdf Note that some households may fall into more than one category, such as a household headed by a senior who also has a disability. In this chart, the share for seniors reflects seniors without a disability and without a child in the home.
The Median family Income (MFI)

How Income Is Measured for DC Affordable Housing Programs

Affordable housing programs generally do not use the federal poverty line to measure income eligibility, as some programs do (such as SNAP and Medicaid). Instead, affordable housing programs set income eligibility using the area Median Family Income (MFI) as a base. (Until a few years ago, this measure was known as Area Median Income, or AMI.) The Median Family Income reflects the median income for households in a given metropolitan area. The DC MFI is based on incomes in the District and in surrounding counties. The MFI is set differently for each household size and is adjusted annually. The MFI for the DC Metropolitan area stood at $129,000 for a family of four in 2021.*

Affordable housing programs use a variety of income eligibility levels, tied to MFI. The main income eligibility thresholds used in affordable housing programs are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>% of MFI</th>
<th>Income Level Household of 1</th>
<th>Income Level Household of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$27,100</td>
<td>$38,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$45,150</td>
<td>$64,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$72,250</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects 2021 MFI for the Washington, DC Metropolitan Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DC Income eligibility limits tied to MFI can be found at https://dhcd.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dhcd/publication/attachments/2021%20HPTF%20Program%20Limits%2008242021.pdf
Beyond the shortage of low-cost housing generally, the District has a shortage of larger apartments, three bedrooms or more, which are important to families as small as four people, as well as to multi-generational households. Only 5% of units in apartment buildings have three or more bedrooms. Thanks to the shadow rental market, which includes many single-family homes, a total of 23% of rental housing in the District contains three bedrooms or more, a still relatively small share. The challenge of finding appropriately sized housing is especially great for families with low incomes. About 6,500 large renter households (defined as those needing three or more bedrooms) need housing units that rent for less than $750 per month, but there are only 4,000 units that rent at that level in the District, a deficit of approximately 2,500 units.

**Affordable Housing is Concentrated in DC’s Poorest Communities**

The District’s private housing market and decisions over locations of subsidized housing have contributed to income and racial segregation in the city. Rents are far higher in some wards than others, with rents lowest in communities east of the Anacostia River. This results in housing opportunities for DC’s lowest income households being limited to certain neighborhoods. In addition, a large share of low-cost housing created through affordable housing programs is also concentrated in these communities.

![Figure 26: Median Rent by Ward](image)

Rents vary greatly across the District. Median rents are close to $2,000 a month in Wards 2, 3, and 6. A household would need an income of $80,000 or more to rent a unit at this cost and pay less than 30% of their income for housing. By contrast, the median rent for apartments in Ward 7 is roughly $1,000 and median rent is nearly $1,100 in Ward 8. Apartments at these

---


rents would be affordable to households with incomes of $40,000 in Ward 7 and $44,000 in Ward 8.\textsuperscript{195} Beyond the private market, much of the dedicated affordable housing in DC—owned by the DC Housing Authority or funded through other federal or local programs—is also concentrated in a limited number of neighborhoods. There are 16,000 dedicated affordable units in Ward 8, or roughly half of the rental housing stock in the ward. The 10,000 dedicated affordable housing units in Ward 7 represent one-third of the rental units in the ward. There also is a substantial number of dedicated affordable units in Ward 1—7,000, or 18\% of the rental stock. The 4,500 dedicated affordable units in Ward 5 represent 12\% of the rental stock in the ward. The smallest number of dedicated affordable housing units is in the area west of Rock Creek Park, with just 470 units.\textsuperscript{196}

With the exception of Ward 1, dedicated affordable housing has been concentrated in DC’s lowest-income communities where the large majority of residents are Black.\textsuperscript{197} In this way, the location of affordable housing developments has reinforced income and racial segregation in the District of Columbia.

\textbf{A Lack of Affordable Housing Harms DC Households and Hinders Progress in Other Social Goals}

When households with very low incomes must devote most of their income to rent and utilities—which is a typical situation for many UPO customers—they face constant financial insecurity and must make difficult choices every month between paying rent, meeting other needs, and caring for children and other household members. High housing costs help explain why many households with low incomes are routinely behind on their bills and must spend much of their time figuring out ways to maintain their

\textsuperscript{195} Median rents by ward are from Taylor, Y.S. (2020, April 1). \textit{Appraising the District’s rentals: rental housing affordability.} DC Policy Center. Retrieved November 30, 2021 from https://www.dcpolicycenter.org/publications/appraising-the-districts-rentals-chapter-iii/


\textsuperscript{197} Some 92\% of Ward 7 residents are Black, as are 89\% of Ward 8 residents and 63\% of Ward 5 Residents. See the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Kids Count Data Center. \textit{Race/ethnicity of total population by ward.} Retrieved December 5, 2021 from https://datacenter.kidscoun.org/.
housing and meet other needs. Despite these efforts, households with high housing cost burdens are at great risk of living in crowded or substandard conditions, moving frequently, or becoming homeless.\footnote{Wood, M., Turnham, J., & Mills, G. for Abt Associates. (2008). 
\textit{Housing affordability and family well-being: results from the housing voucher evaluation.} 


Unaffordable housing creates many other challenges. Households that devote most of their income to rent are forced to cut back on food, and face challenges paying for public transportation.\footnote{Horowski, M. (2012). \textit{Housing instability and health: findings from the Michigan recession and recovery study.} National Poverty Center. Policy Brief No. 29. Retrieved December 5, 2021 from http://npc.umich.edu/publications/policy_briefs/brief29/}


More generally, the stresses of poverty and financial insecurity, with high housing costs being a major contributing factor, greatly limit the ability of people with low incomes to achieve greater financial security. Living in a perpetual state of scarcity reduces a person's mental well-being. Moreover, the mental stress of monetary concerns among people with low incomes affects their cognitive abilities worse than going an entire night without sleep.\footnote{Das, K. (2020, March 12). \textit{Lower rent means more cash for the basics,} DC Fiscal Policy Institute. Retrieved November 30, 2021 from https://www.dcfpi.org/all/lower-rent-means-more-cash-for-the-basics/}

In other words, the stress that people face when they struggle to pay rent makes it harder to take advantage of the services that may be available to them.

By contrast, when people have decent and affordable housing, it has enormous benefits that go beyond preventing homelessness. For example, reducing housing costs paid by DC households with low incomes would free up a large share of their income to be used for other household needs. By one estimate, District households with extremely low incomes would pay $800 a month less for housing if they were able to obtain a housing subsidy that allows them to pay just 30% of their income towards rent.\footnote{Zippel, C. (2016, December 8). \textit{A broken foundation: affordable housing crisis threatens DC's low-income residents.} DC Fiscal Policy Institute. Retrieved December 5, 2021 from https://www.dcfpi.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/DCFPI-Broken-Foundation-Housing-Report-12-8-16.pdf} (As noted above, most DC households with low incomes pay more than half of their income for housing, and

...
many pay more than 80% of their income for housing.) An extra $800 per month in available income would help households pay for necessities such as food, transportation, clothing, and cell phones. It also would make it more likely for households to have resources to invest in a more secure future, such as education or training, afterschool programs for children, and more.

Households with affordable housing are more stable and more likely to experience economic mobility, and those households are less likely to experience homelessness or to move frequently. Households with affordable housing subsidies that allow them to rent an apartment in the private market, like a Housing Choice Voucher, often move to neighborhoods with more services and opportunities than their prior neighborhoods. Households living in affordable housing are less likely than others to experience food insecurity, and job training programs are more successful when participants have stable housing. Children who grow up in affordable housing earn more as adults than similar children who did not grow up in affordable housing.

**DC’s High Eviction Rate may get Worse in the Near Future**

The tremendous mismatch between incomes and rents in DC results in thousands of households falling behind on rent each year, which in turn results in a very high number of eviction filings and actual evictions. Even before the pandemic, one of nine DC renters—18,000 households—received an eviction notice in a given year, nearly all for non-payment of rent. Most DC households receiving an eviction filing had received another one in recent years, a sign that eviction reflects a long-term state of economic insecurity rather than a temporary financial crisis. In the years leading up to the pandemic, the number of eviction filings in DC grew notably, a sign that rising housing costs are squeezing more DC households.

---


Eviction filings often are used by landlords to pressure tenants who are behind in rent, not necessarily with an actual plan to evict. This happens in part because the cost of filing an eviction notice is just $15 in the District. Only 5.5% of eviction filings results in an eviction every year.\textsuperscript{211} However, eviction filings can be very traumatic and destabilizing. While relatively few filings result in eviction, they often result in renters leaving to avoid eviction.

The impact of evictions falls hardest on households in DC’s lowest-income neighborhoods. Over 60% of evictions that are executed are in rental units east of the Anacostia River.\textsuperscript{212} Eviction is an especially destabilizing event. Evictions contribute to job loss and worse health outcomes. Children miss more school after an eviction and face increased behavioral health problems that impede school success. Furthermore, once a family has received an eviction filing, the filing can affect their ability to rent another unit in the future, making the task of finding adequate and affordable housing even harder.\textsuperscript{213}

The coronavirus pandemic has created additional risks of eviction starting in 2022. The shutdown of the economy in 2020 resulted in widespread job losses, particularly among low-wage workers. This resulted in thousands of DC residents being unable to pay their bills, including rent, for an extended period. Steps taken by the District and federal governments protected many households from eviction, but key elements of those protections will not be available in 2022.

- The District enacted an eviction moratorium in 2020, and a prohibition on filing evictions for non-payment of rent extended through October 12, 2021.
- The federal government provided $352 million to the District for eviction prevention assistance, which the District administered through a number of programs but primarily through STAY DC, a program created in the pandemic.

\textsuperscript{211} McCabe, B. and Rosen, E. (2020). \textit{Eviction in Washington, DC: racial and geographic disparities in housing instability}. Georgetown University. Retrieved December 6, 2021 from https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1f6dBPOxt01khDALxS1sFc_Tk5DsGH3ihttps://georgetown.app.box.com/s/8cq4p8ap4nq5xm75b5mct0nz5002z3ap
\textsuperscript{212} Ibid.
These efforts proved very effective at maintaining housing stability, while also supporting landlords facing financial pressure from non-payment of rent. STAY DC provided rental assistance to 42,000 DC households, nearly all of them with incomes below 30% of the Median Family Income, with assistance averaging more than $6,000. Other programs created during the pandemic served additional households.

However, the federal resources were nearly completely spent as of mid-October 2021, and the District stopped taking new applications for STAY DC as of October 27, 2021. In addition, the eviction moratorium filing ended on October 12. Evictions for non-payment of rent during the pandemic public health emergency can be carried out 60 days after that, starting in early January 2022.

The District has a long-standing program to prevent eviction, the Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP), but the program is funded at a much lower level than STAY DC—$15 million in Fiscal Year 2022—and eligibility for ERAP is narrower than for STAY DC.

The District also funded other services during the public health emergency to provide emergency rental assistance and other help to residents with low incomes, including $14 million awarded to UPO from the federal CARES Act. UPO is using those funds to provide emergency rental assistance, other emergency assistance, employment placement services, and a variety of workforce development services.

There is uncertainty about the state of the DC rental market as pandemic-related protections end. Unemployment continues to be higher in late 2021 than before the pandemic, particularly for Black residents. An analysis of Census Bureau Pulse Data show that 39,000 DC households were behind on rent as of early October 2021. A substantial share of these households will receive STAY DC assistance (as of early October, STAY DC had 19,000 outstanding applications, but it seems likely that a substantial number of DC households with low incomes will continue to have unpaid rent and face the risk of eviction.

---


216 The Emergency Rental Assistance Program funding is part of the budget for the Department of Human Services. The Fiscal Year 2022 budget can be found at https://cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/cfo/publication/attachments/ja_dhs_chapter_2022s.pdf (Retrieved December 6, 2021.)
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A substantial increase of eviction filings, and actual evictions, would create added demand and challenges for many of the services provided by UPO. UPO helps administer DC’s Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) for households with low incomes facing eviction; foreclosure assistance; and support to participate in the lottery for affordable housing through DC’s Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) Program, including budget and credit counseling.

The State of Public Housing in the District of Columbia

Public housing, meaning housing owned and operating by the DC Housing Authority (DCHA), is a vital source of affordable housing for DC’s lowest-income residents. Public housing serves roughly 50,000 DC residents, most of whom have incomes below 30% of the Median Family Income. Public housing is a critical resource in a community where private market rents are high and rising.

While a vital resource, public housing in the District faces a number of challenges and pressures. Most important, many public housing units are in a serious state of disrepair, due to inadequate federal funding for public housing renovation and replacement needs. As a result, many public housing residents live in substandard, unhealthy, or unsafe conditions. Repair needs for DC public housing are estimated at $2.2 billion.\(^{219}\) Even though much of the public housing stock is in a state of disrepair, demand for public housing is substantial. When the waiting list for housing through DCHA was closed in 2013, there were nearly 70,000 households on the wait list.\(^{220}\)


wages as their major source of income. The average income of these residents is 15% of the MFI, or about $18,000 for a family of four and $12,000 for a single person.\footnote{222}

Public housing provides important protections to households with very low incomes. Unlike some affordable housing programs, where rents are fixed, public housing residents pay 30% of their income towards rent. Households with very low incomes pay very low rents; a household with $1,000 of monthly income pays just $300 a month for rent. In addition, if a household's income falls for any reason, the household can report the reduced income and have their rent reduced. Public housing tenants also have rights that renters in market-rate housing do not have, including a formal grievance process and a voice in Housing Authority decision-making over agency operations and development plans.

Unfortunately, public housing is a resource at-risk in the District of Columbia, as it is in communities across the country. For decades, federal aid to public housing authorities has been too low to cover operating costs and rehabilitation costs of public housing, resulting in thousands of units being in substandard condition. The DC Housing Authority (DCHA) has identified 2,600 public housing units that face "extremely urgent" renovation needs, and an additional 4,400 are in "critical condition." Renovation needs are estimated by DCHA to be $2.2 billion.\footnote{223}

Until housing repair needs are met, thousands of DC households that depend on public housing will continue to live in conditions that undermine their physical and mental health, and their overall well-being. In recent years, the District government has devoted funding for public housing repairs, to address the inadequate federal funding. The DC budget for Fiscal Year 2022 includes $50 million for public housing repairs, in addition to $50 million in FY 2021 and $24.5 million in FY 2021.\footnote{224}

The District’s Locally Operated Affordable Housing Programs

The District operates several affordable housing programs, in addition to affordable housing funded by the federal government. These programs have potential to address the affordable housing needs of DC residents with low incomes, if used at a scale that matches the need. The District currently has a goal to develop 12,000 new affordable housing units by 2025—affordable at various income levels up to 80% of Median Family Income—that would make notable progress in addressing affordable housing needs.

\footnote{222 Ibid.}
However, it is unclear if the goal will address the housing needs of DC’s lowest-income households, those with incomes below 30% of the MFI, who are the most likely to have severe rent burdens.

Beyond the challenge to fund and build enough affordable housing, another challenge is a lack of coordination across the District’s multiple housing programs. Residents often struggle to find affordable housing opportunities, as do organizations seeking to help these residents. Better coordination of affordable housing programs will make it easier to serve residents in dire need by connecting them to affordable units that may be available at any given time.

DC’s key affordable housing programs include:

- **The Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF)**: HPTF provides grants and low-cost loans to for-profit and non-profit developers to support the construction or renovation of affordable housing. Since 2019, DC law requires 50% of HPTF expenditures to support housing for households with incomes under 30% of MFI.\(^{225}\) Funding for HPTF equaled $100 million or more between 2015 and 2021. Using federal pandemic relief funds, HPTF funding equals $250 million in FY 2022.\(^{226}\)

- **The Local Rent Supplement Program (LRSP)**: LRSP operates like the federal Housing Choice Voucher program, in which low-income households pay 30% of income towards rent, and LRSP covers the remainder. Some LRSP subsidies allow DC households to rent apartments in the private market, while other LRSP subsidies are connected to specific projects developed with other subsidies (such as HPTF) to ensure that the units are affordable to residents with extremely low incomes.\(^{227}\) Funding for LRSP in Fiscal Year 2022 totals $162 million.\(^{228}\)

- **Public Housing**: Public housing is owned and operated by the DC Housing Authority, an independent entity, and funded primarily by the federal government. In recent years, the District government has provided funding for public housing repairs and renovation in response to inadequate federal funding that has left much of DC’s public housing stock in a state of disrepair. The wait list for DC public housing has been closed to new applicants since April 2013. The FY 2022 includes $50 million for public housing repairs.

- **Housing Choice Voucher (HCV)**: This program is operated by the DC Housing Authority and funded by the federal government. Like the local LRSP program, recipients of HCVs use their

---

\(^{225}\) Information on HPTF can be found on the website of the DC Department of Housing and Community Development. See [https://dhcd.dc.gov/page/housing-production-trust-fund](https://dhcd.dc.gov/page/housing-production-trust-fund) (Retrieved December 6, 2021)


\(^{228}\) LRSP is part of the budget for the DC Housing Authority Subsidy. The Fiscal Year 2022 for LRSP can be found at [https://cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ocfo/publication/attachments/hy_has_chapter_2022s.pdf](https://cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ocfo/publication/attachments/hy_has_chapter_2022s.pdf) (Retrieved December 6, 2021.)
vouchers to rent private-market units and pay 30% of their income for rent, with the voucher covering the remaining rental cost.\(^\text{229}\)

- **Inclusionary Zoning (IZ):** DC’s IZ program requires developers of private market housing to set aside a share of their new units as affordable in return for allowing developers to build more units than standard zoning would allow. For rental units developed under IZ, units must be affordable to households with incomes below 50% MFI, which works out to a rent of about $1,100 for a single person.\(^\text{230}\)

- **Public Land Disposition:** When the District sells land that will be developed into housing, developers are required to set aside a specified percentage of units as affordable. If the building is close to a public transportation corridor, up to one-third of the units must be affordable, at income levels ranging from 30% of MFI to 80% of MFI.

- **Affordable Housing Preservation (AHP):** AHP provides funding to maintain the affordability of buildings where affordable housing restrictions are set to expire.\(^\text{231}\) The DC budget for FY 2022 provides $18 million for AHP.\(^\text{232}\)

- **Tenant Opportunity to Purchase and First Right to Purchase Assistance (TOPA):** DC tenants living in private-market rental housing units have the right to purchase their buildings when they go up for sale.\(^\text{233}\) The First Right to Purchase Assistance Program provides financial assistance to help tenants exercise their TOPA rights. When tenants use the First Right Purchase Program, their buildings usually are converted to limited-equity co-ops, a form of permanently affordable homeownership.

- **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU):** ADUs are separate units in or on a homeowner’s property, such as a basement rental or a separate structure. An ADU can provide an income source, and an increase in housing equity, which can be important to low-income homeowners. Because the costs of developing an ADU tend to be lower than building a new home, ADUs also can be a source of naturally occurring affordable rentals. The FY 2022 DC budget provided $1.5 million to support creation of ADUs for homeowners with low incomes.

The District government set a goal to develop 36,000 housing units between 2020 and 2025, with 12,000 of them affordable to households under 80% of Median Family Income, using the city’s affordable

\(^{229}\) Information on HCV can be found on the website for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. See [https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/hcv/about/fact_sheet](https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/hcv/about/fact_sheet) (Retrieved December 6, 2021)

\(^{230}\) Information on IZ can be found on the website of the DC Department of Housing and Community Development. See [https://dhcd.dc.gov/service/inclusionary-zoning-iz-affordable-housing-program](https://dhcd.dc.gov/service/inclusionary-zoning-iz-affordable-housing-program). (Retrieved December 6, 2021.)

\(^{231}\) Information on the Housing Preservation Fund can be found on the website of the DC Department of Housing and Community Development. See [https://dhcd.dc.gov/page/affordable-housing-preservation-fund](https://dhcd.dc.gov/page/affordable-housing-preservation-fund). (Retrieved December 6, 2021.)


\(^{233}\) Information on TOPA be found on the website for the DC Department of Housing and Community Development. See [https://dhcd.dc.gov/service/tenant-opportunity-purchase-assistance](https://dhcd.dc.gov/service/tenant-opportunity-purchase-assistance)
It is estimated that DC needs **47,000** additional rental units that cost **$800 or less** per month.

The goal includes developing affordable housing throughout all the city’s eight wards. The goal has the potential to substantially address the city’s shortage of affordable housing, although it is unclear how well this goal will serve households most in need of affordable housing. The city-wide goal does not, for example, specify what share of the 12,000 affordable units would serve households with incomes under 30% of MFI, who have the most severe affordable housing challenges. In addition, even this ambitious goal would leave many DC residents in need of affordable housing; as noted above, the Urban Institute estimates that the District needs 47,000 additional rental units with costs under $800.

Beyond the need to develop more affordable housing, there is a need for greater coordination across the multiple affordable housing programs, especially since many of the programs result in housing that is managed by non-government entities. The current lack of coordination across programs and providers means that identifying affordable housing options for DC residents and for non-profits serving households with low incomes can be difficult. Unlike the homeless services system in the District, which operates under a coordinated entry system that connects providers, there is no system that connects affordable housing providers. DC residents in urgent need of affordable housing may not be able to identify units that may be available. Improving coordination among affordable housing providers would result in a better use of DC’s affordable housing stock to serve residents with worst-case needs.

**Special Section: The Digital Divide in the District of Columbia**

**Background**

The digital divide is commonly understood to be the gap between Americans who have useful, regular access to digital and information technologies and those who do not. The Congressional Research Service (CRS) recently released a report that supported earlier findings noting that the rates at which home broadband internet has been adopted differ drastically along socioeconomic, geographic, age, and racial/ethnic lines. Households that have adopted broadband tend to have higher incomes, more education, live in urban or suburban areas, and be younger than those without an at-home broadband subscription. The CRS report also found lower home broadband adoption rates among Black and Hispanic populations.

The causes of the digital divide are complex, but three main obstacles have emerged regarding broadband adoption: cost, access, and relevance. The issue of affordability remains a significant obstacle for District residents without home broadband service. Many Americans purchase internet service as part of a bundled package that also includes cable television and home

---


phone service. A 2020 report from the New America Foundation found that packages from the District’s main service providers averaged between $71 and $137 per month. The report notes that many consumers “struggle to determine total cost due to poor transparency, highly-complex pricing structures, and confusing itemized billing.” Households with higher incomes are more likely to have internet or broadband subscriptions. As with the cost of subscription, the cost of equipment required for broadband access, as well as installation, activation, and other ancillary fees, can be a deterrent to broadband adoption, especially for households with low incomes.

| Percent of Residents Without Internet Subscription | While the availability of some type of broadband services is nearly universal in the District, equal availability does not mean equal access. Residents who do not subscribe to home or mobile broadband, particularly residents with low incomes, require broadband access through free public wireless hotspots and public computer access made available through community institutions. In the District, 87.5% of residents have broadband access at home, however, when looking at households with annual incomes below $20,000, that number drops to 65%. Furthermore, home internet access varies significantly by ward of residence. Ward 3 has the lowest rate of residents without an internet subscription, at 6.9%, while Ward 7 had the highest, at 33.6%. As Table 8 illustrates, wards with higher concentrations of residents who are Black, Hispanic, or have low incomes have higher percentages of residents that do not have an internet subscription at home. Finally, some Americans do not fully understand the value of broadband internet access. In many cases individuals who lack an internet connection choose to remain unconnected either because

| Ward 1 | 13.0% |
| Ward 2 | 8.8% |
| Ward 3 | 6.9% |
| Ward 4 | 18.0% |
| Ward 5 | 22.1% |
| Ward 6 | 10.8% |
| Ward 7 | 33.6% |
| Ward 8 | 31.7% |
| DC Total | 12.5% |

DC Office of Planning, 2021

33.6% of Ward 7 residents do not have an internet subscription at home, the highest of any ward in DC.

---
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they do not want the internet, or they do not see it as important. These factors, coupled with poor technology literacy and concerns over privacy and security, all contribute to the complexity of the digital divide.

Lower levels of digital readiness, or the combination of technological skills and physical equipment, can be a major barrier to subscribing to internet services. Furthermore, an increasing amount of the population is foregoing subscription to internet services due to ownership of personal smartphones. However, the reasons behind choosing a smartphone over a home internet subscription are more nuanced. While a home internet connection may not be necessary for some smartphone users, others may only be able to afford one or the other. Since smartphones are seen as essential by many people, users that can only afford a smartphone or a broadband connection are frequently opting for a smartphone. The Pew Research Center’s most recent Mobile Technology and Home Broadband survey found that 15% of American adults are “smartphone-only” internet users, meaning that they have a smartphone but not a home broadband connection. Smartphone dependence is most common among Hispanics, individuals under age 30, people with a high school diploma or less, and those living in a household with an annual income below $30,000. In many cases, mobile internet is a poor substitute for fixed broadband, as tasks such as competing schoolwork or work projects on a smartphone can be challenging. Although most District households have broadband capabilities, exclusionary costs, lack of equipment, poor digital literacy, and reliance on smartphones all contribute to lower rates of internet service subscriptions.

Increased Inequities During the Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic has required social distancing in many highly populated places, urging families to stay home and conduct work, school, and social activities remotely. This has placed greater urgency on the need for many households to adopt broadband services in their homes. In April 2020, the Pew Research Center reported that over half (53%) of American adults said the internet had been essential for them personally during the pandemic. Additionally, many parents surveyed at the beginning of the pandemic (April 2020) expressed concerns about their children’s ability to complete schoolwork due to limitations related to the online format. These concerns were especially acute among families with low incomes: 43% of parents with low incomes with children whose schools moved entirely online said it was very or somewhat likely their child would have to do schoolwork on their cellphones; 40% reported
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it was very or somewhat likely that their child would have to use public wi-fi to finish schoolwork because there was not a reliable internet connection at home; and 36% said it was at least somewhat likely their child would not be able to complete their schoolwork at all because they do not have access to a computer at home. Furthermore, a 2020 study on the “homework gap” found that DC has the second-largest racial gap in the country when it comes to student’s home internet access. In the District, 27% of Black students and 25% of Hispanic students lack internet at home, while only 5% of White students are similarly disadvantaged.

The COVID-19 pandemic has also affected Americans’ overall financial stability, making high costs for broadband services an issue for an increasing number of households. The economic consequences of the pandemic continue to hit some segments of the population harder than others. The populations most likely to report that they or someone in their household lost a job or took a pay cut since the start of the pandemic are people with low incomes, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and individuals under the age of 30. These groups closely align with those most likely to be smartphone-only users.

Existing Initiatives Focused on Bridging the Digital Divide

Various DC government entities and local nonprofits have spearheaded initiatives that aim to bridge the digital divide in the District and develop solutions that help limit the impact of the digital divide, especially on students. The largest of these is the Tech Together DC Partnership, a “values-led partnership” currently made up of 43 entities (including UPO) that span the DC government, local nonprofits, academic institutions, and industry. The focus of this partnership is “working together to bridge the digital divide through access, training, and opportunity.” The Tech Together initiative is built on three key action areas: 1) to increase access to internet service; 2) to increase access to internet-enabled devices and IT support; and 3) to demystify technology through awareness, training, and access to opportunities.

One element of Tech Together that is vital to closing the digital divide is the Internet for All initiative. Launched in September 2020 by Mayor Muriel Bowser, Internet for All is a $3.3 million investment that provided free internet for disconnected students and families with low incomes for the 2020-2021 school year.

---
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Any family that meets the eligibility requirements for SNAP, Medicaid, WIC, or a number of other assistance programs and has at least one DC public school or public charter school student in the household is eligible for a year of free high-speed internet through the Internet for All program.

Given how recently these initiatives have been implemented, it is difficult to say how successful they have been in bridging the digital divide. However, it is clear that the District government and other local stakeholders are prioritizing solutions to limit the impact of the digital divide.

**Findings from UPO’s Digital Divide Survey**

In order to provide insights on the ways the digital divide was impacting UPO customers, UPO conducted a small-scale survey on the digital divide between July 2021 and October 2021. This 26-question survey was completed by 135 DC residents, many, but not all, of whom were UPO customers.

**Demographics of Digital Divide Survey Respondents**

In many ways, the individuals responding to the digital divide survey (DDS) were a very homogenous group. Over 81% of respondents indicated that they have lived in the District of Columbia for more than 20 years. Additionally, 97% of digital divide survey respondents were African American and more than 99% reported speaking English as the primary language in their home. As Figure 30 indicates, the age and gender of respondents was slightly more diverse, although the ages and genders of respondents still trended older and more female.

*Figure 30: Digital Divide Survey Results – Gender and Age*
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Residents responding to the digital divide survey tended to have lower incomes and less education than the average DC resident. Nearly half of DDS respondents reported completing high school as their highest level of education, and 45% had annual incomes of $0-$14,999. Furthermore, more respondents reported being unemployed (28.1%) than reported being employed full-time (26.7%).

*Figure 31: Digital Divide Survey Results – Annual Income*

![Digital Divide Survey Results – Annual Income](image)

*Figure 32: Digital Divide Survey Results – Employment Status*

![Digital Divide Survey Results – Employment Status](image)
Most DDS respondents indicated that they primarily use a smartphone to access the internet (see Figure 35). However, a substantial portion of respondents also reported using a computer/laptop, including many respondents who indicated they use their smartphone and computer with equal frequency.
As Figure 36 illustrates, the majority of respondents typically use the internet for a variety of uses, including streaming video, work, social media, education, and e-commerce.
Figure 37: Digital Divide Survey Results – Internet/Broadband Subscription in Home

Digital Divide Survey Results
Do You Have an Internet/Broadband Subscription in Your Home?

- Yes: 56.3%
- No: 31.9%
- No answer: 11.9%

Figure 38: Digital Divide Survey Results – If No, How Do You Typically Access the Internet?

Digital Divide Survey Results
If You do not Have Internet at Home, how do You Typically Access the Internet?

- Smartphone: 33.9%
- Public wifi: 22.0%
- Friend/family home: 20.3%
- Library/community center: 13.6%
- No answer: 10.2%
**Figure 39: Digital Divide Survey Results – If No, How Do You Typically Access the Internet? By Age**

Digital Divide Survey Results
If You do not Have Internet at Home, how do You Typically Access the Internet?
By Age

**Figure 40: Digital Divide Survey Results: Interest in Getting a Broadband Subscription at Home**

Digital Divide Survey Results
If You do not Have an Internet Subscription at Home, are You Interested in Getting One?
Figure 41: Digital Divide Survey Results – If No, Reasons for Foregoing an Internet Subscription

Digital Divide Survey Results
If No, What Reasons Influence Your Choice to Forego an Internet Subscription?

- Cost is too high: 42.4%
- Not Applicable: 27.3%
- I use a smartphone/ cell service instead: 24.2%
- Public internet fulfills my needs: 3.0%
- Wifi/Hotspot: 3.0%

Figure 42: Digital Divide Survey Results – If No, Reasons for Foregoing an Internet Subscription, Age

Digital Divide Survey Results
If No, What Reasons Influence Your Choice to Forego an Internet Subscription?
By Age

- Cost is too high
- Not available in my unit/location
- I use a smartphone/ cell service instead
- Public internet fulfills my needs
- Not Applicable
- Other (please specify)

By Age:
- 0-17: 1
- 18-24: 1
- 25-34: 1
- 35-44: 2
- 45-54: 11
- 55-64: 3
- 65+: 2

Total: 6
This special section and UPO’s digital divide survey finds that while internet usage and subscription rates vary by age, income, and race/ethnicity, overall, there were a lot of similarities between digital divide survey respondents who do not have an internet subscription at home and the general population that does not have an internet subscription in their home.

One telling finding is that many people do not want to have an internet subscription in their home (58.1% of survey respondents without an internet subscription indicated they were not interested in getting one). The primary reason survey respondents provided for not wanting a home internet subscription was that the cost was too high. Additionally, many households have adapted to a smartphone-only culture, where they feel they do not need a home internet connection because everything can be done on their phone.

Special Section: A Snapshot of Families with Children Aged 0-3 in the District of Columbia

This section examines the well-being of young children and their families, and it assesses potential ways to improve services to these families. It highlights data on the growing number of young children in the District, with a special focus on families that have heightened needs for services due to poverty or risk factors such as homelessness or being from a non-English speaking household. This section considers the needs of families with young children, particularly those related to early care and education and assesses the availability of services to help meet those needs.

This examination seeks to help identify the gaps in services and the kinds of steps needed to support families with infants and toddlers.

Public and community-based pre-K programs now serve most District three- and four-year-olds. As a result, this section focuses largely on early childhood education (ECE) and related services for children under age three.

Serving DC’s young children well, particularly children of color and children in families with low incomes, is critical to their healthy development and to the future of the entire District. The period from birth to age three is a critical stage in human development, when the brain undergoes extensive developmental activity and reaches 80% of its adult size. The stresses related to poverty can affect early brain development, and as a result there are cognitive differences between children from families with low incomes and those from higher-income families starting at a very early age. Young children living in families with low incomes often also have less access to high-quality services.
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Improving access to high-quality services for young children can make a tremendous difference in their development, especially for families with low incomes. For example, children who attend high-quality ECE programs are less likely to be placed in special education or to be retained in a grade, and they are more likely to graduate from high school than peers who do not attend high-quality ECE programs.\textsuperscript{256} High-quality early education services contribute to a greater number of adults with higher earnings and help reduce racial and socio-economic inequities.\textsuperscript{257}


Demographic and Economic Status of Families with Young Children in the District of Columbia

The District’s population has grown substantially over the last decade, especially among families with young children. The increase has added to the demand for services that young families need, including childcare, which in turn is likely to have contributed to DC’s extremely high childcare costs.

There are 27,000 children under age three in the District, and 45,000 children under age 5.\textsuperscript{258} More than one-fifth (23\%) of children under age five—over 10,000 young children—live in families with incomes below the federal poverty line (FPL), which equals $21,960 for a family of three.\textsuperscript{259} The vast majority (88\%) of the young children living in below-poverty families are Black.\textsuperscript{260}

Child poverty in the District is concentrated in Wards 7 and 8.

- More than 40\% of children under age 18 in Ward 7 and Ward 8 were in families with incomes below the FPL in 2019, compared with 26\% in Ward 1 and less than 20\% in every other ward.\textsuperscript{261}
- Child poverty rates have fallen throughout the District since 2010, but the smallest declines were in Wards 7 and 8.
- There are 18,000 children under age 18 in families with incomes that are less than half of the FPL, or less than $10,980 for a family of three. Some 60\% of these extremely poor children live east of the Anacostia River, which encompass Ward 7 and Ward 8.\textsuperscript{262}
- The number of young children in the District is growing. The number of young children grew 38\%

\textsuperscript{260} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{262} U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). \textit{American community survey 5-year estimates}. Table S1703. Note that these PUMA data cover the of the District of Columbia east of the Anacostia river. This encompasses all of Ward 8 and most of Ward 7. A small portion of Ward 7 is west of the Anacostia River.
across DC from 2010 to 2019. While the number of young children increased throughout the District, growth was concentrated in wards that have experienced substantial development and gentrification. However, the number of young children is also growing in the District’s poorest communities.

- The number of young children grew faster during this period than the city-wide average in Ward 4 (50%), Ward 5 (47%), and Ward 6 (63%). A study of gentrification across the nation, *American Neighborhood Change in the 21st Century* from the University of Minnesota Law School, found that gentrification in the District has been most substantial in Wards 1, 4, 5, and 6.
- The number of young children grew below the city-wide average in Wards 1, 2, and 3.
- The number of young children grew at about the city-wide rate in Ward 7 (38%) and Ward 8 (35%).

The growing number of young children in Wards 4, 5, and 6 appears to reflect an influx of families with moderate and higher incomes.

- In Wards 4, 5, and 6, the number of children under five in families with incomes below the FPL remained roughly the same over the past decade—about 3,000—while the number of young children in families with incomes above the FPL was growing.
- The median income of families with children nearly doubled in Wards 4, 5, and 6 over the past decade, a substantial increase that suggests an influx of higher income families.
- The child poverty rate fell in these wards over the past decade. This decline does not reflect a falling
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263 Data in this section on the increase in the number of young children by ward are from The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count Data Center. (2021). *Child population by age group in District of Columbia*. Retrieved December 13, 2021 from [https://datacenter.kidscount.org/](https://datacenter.kidscount.org/)


265 The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count Data Center. (2021). *Child poverty by ward in District of Columbia*. Retrieved December 13, 2021 from [https://datacenter.kidscount.org/](https://datacenter.kidscount.org/). Note that this reflects an estimate of the number of young child in poverty. It is based on poverty rates for children under 18 and applies that rate to the number of children under age three, under an assumption that the overall child poverty rate is roughly the same as the young child poverty rate.

number of poor children but instead an increase in the number of children in above-poverty families.

In Wards 7 and 8, the poorest DC communities, and the communities where gentrification has been limited, the child poverty rate did not fall notably over the past decade, and the number of children under age five in families with incomes below the FPL grew, from about 5,000 to more than 6,000.\textsuperscript{267} Median incomes also grew in Wards 7 and 8 over the past decade, but far slower than in other wards. These trends suggest that District families with low incomes face different experiences and pressures based on where they live. Families in Wards 7 and Ward 8 are much more likely to live in communities with a high rate of poverty and lower average incomes, and where economic conditions have not improved substantially over the past decade. High concentrations of poverty contribute to challenges to school success and higher rates of community violence.\textsuperscript{268} A 2020 study of parents of young children from the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), conducted by Child Trends, noted that community safety is a top concern.\textsuperscript{269}

Families with low incomes in Wards 4, 5, and 6, may face fewer pressures related to a high rate of poverty in their community, but they may be more likely to face other challenges, such as rising housing prices and greater competition with higher-income families for high-quality childcare slots. The 2020 OSSE/Child Trends study found that housing instability is ranked as a top concern for parents with young children.\textsuperscript{270}

The figures presented in this section reflect Census Bureau data through 2019, before the start of the coronavirus pandemic, and more recent comparable data are not available. The pandemic resulted in substantial job losses and increases in family hardship, although much of the job loss has been reversed. It is clear that the pandemic resulted in hardship for many District households, including those with children, as witnessed by long lines for food assistance and substantial demand for eviction prevention assistance.

While it is hard to assess the level of recovery from the pandemic’s economic impacts, there are signs that many District households with children continue to face economic insecurity. Some 36% of District families with children reported in October 2021 that they faced trouble paying their bills, and 13% of all

\textsuperscript{267} The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count Data Center. (2021). \textit{Child poverty by ward in District of Columbia.} Retrieved December 13, 2021 from https://datacenter.kidscount.org/. Note that this reflects an estimate of the number of young child in poverty. It is based on poverty rates for children under 18 and applies that rate to the number of children under age three, under an assumption that the overall child poverty rate is roughly the same as the young child poverty rate.


\textsuperscript{270} Ibid.
households (with and without children) reported having trouble paying rent. It is reasonable to assume that many District families remain financially vulnerable.\textsuperscript{271}

**Other Risk Factors for Young Children**

Other factors beyond economic insecurity can have an impact on a child’s healthy development. A review of these factors also reveals differences across the District of Columbia.

**Households headed by a single woman**

Children are most likely to be poor if they grow up in a family headed by a single woman, particularly a woman of color, a reflection of the combined impacts of systemic racism and sexism on the employment and wages of women of color.

- Nearly half of the District families with children headed by a single woman have incomes below the federal poverty line, and this has not improved over the past decade.\textsuperscript{272}
- By contrast, just 4\% of children in two-parent families have incomes below the FPL, and the rate has fallen modestly over the past 10 years.
- Some 20\% of families with children headed by a single man have below-poverty incomes, and the poverty rate has fallen since 2010.
- 90\% of children under age five in families with incomes below poverty live with a single female parent.\textsuperscript{273}

The fact that most DC children in families with incomes below the FPL are in a household headed by a single woman has important implications for the delivery of social services and public policy. Efforts to reduce poverty among young children must consider the economic and social challenges faced by women of color. Effective interventions to address child poverty should provide targeted support to help women enter high-wage occupations, including education and training and a focus on high-wage jobs that traditionally are held by men. Social services for families with low incomes should consider supports that address challenges a single parent faces, including transportation, respite care, and support to address stress. These families also need access to high-quality childcare that is convenient to them.

The share of DC children (under age 18) living with a single woman has fallen over the past decade, from 50\% in 2010 to 38\% in 2019.\textsuperscript{274} But this progress has been uneven throughout the District. The share of children born to a single mother is 69\% in Ward 7 and 73\% in Ward 8, and these rates have not fallen, while they have fallen in every other ward.


\textsuperscript{273} Ibid.

Table 9: Key Early Childhood Indicators, by Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Children under 3</th>
<th>Increase since 2010</th>
<th>Child poverty 2010</th>
<th>Child poverty 2019</th>
<th>Low birth-weight</th>
<th>Prenatal Care in 1st Trimester</th>
<th>Teen birth rate (per 1,000 teens)</th>
<th>Infant mortality (per 1,000 births)</th>
<th>Child SNAP Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,426</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,307</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,837</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,959</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,359</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>27,196</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>38,513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kids Count Data Center, 2010-2019

Births to Teens

The number of births to teen mothers, those 15-19 years old, has fallen notably in the District over the past decade.275

- There were 323 births to 15-19 year-olds in 2019, down from 951 in 2010.
- The rate of teen births has fallen to 17 per 1,000 teens, down from 45 in 2010.
- The teen birth rate has fallen for both Black and Latina teens (from 47 per 1,000 to 38 for Latino teens and 39 per 1,000 to 26 for Black teens between 2016 and 2019).

Prenatal Care

Access to early prenatal care is important to a healthy birth and early childhood development. Fortunately, most pregnant women—68%—in the District received prenatal care in the first trimester in 2019. But the rate is notably lower and getting worse in Wards 7 and Ward 8.276

- 56% of pregnant women in Ward 7 in 2019 received prenatal care in their first trimester, down from 63% in 2010.
- In Ward 8, slightly more than half (53%) of women received early prenatal care, down from 62% in 2010.

Low birth weight

One in ten babies born in DC has low birth weight (under 5.5 pounds), which can be a sign of poor prenatal care and can contribute to child development challenges.\(^{277}\) Unfortunately, the rate of low birth weight babies has not improved over the past decade and reflects racial and geographic inequities.

- The rate of low birth weight births is highest in Ward 8 (15%) and Ward 7 (13%), and lowest in higher-income Ward 2 (6%) and Ward 3 (7%).\(^ {278}\)
- Black babies are more than twice as likely as other babies to be born with low birth weights. Some 14% of Black babies were low birth weight in 2019, compared with 8% of Asian babies and 6% of white and Latino babies.\(^ {279}\)

Infant Mortality

One notable area of progress is seen in the reduction of infant mortality in DC, which fell to five per 1,000 live births in 2019, down from eight per 1,000 live births in 2010.\(^ {280}\) This largely reflects declines in 2018 and 2019; thus, it may be too early to conclude that the reductions will be sustained. The recent reduction includes a drop in Black infant mortality, from 10.5 per 1,000 live births in 2010 to 9.0 per 1,000 live births in 2019.

Parental Education

Among families with children under age five with below-poverty incomes, about half of the mothers (48%) have completed a high school degree, and 17% have completed one or more years of postsecondary education. About three in 10 (28%) have not completed high school.\(^ {281}\)

Non-English Speaking Families

A substantial share of children in the District live in families where English is not spoken at home. These families often need additional support, including service providers who speak their language.

Unfortunately, there is only limited information on the number of young children in the District whose parents do not speak English.

- Of 1,700 children enrolled in Early Head Start in the District, 487—or almost one-third—speak Spanish at home. Roughly 100 more speak other languages.  
- 20% of families with children under age five with incomes below poverty primarily speak a language other than English.  
- Most Latino families, the largest source of non-English speaking DC families, live in the central and north-central areas of the city, particularly Wards 1 and 4.

Most providers of early childhood education services to families with young children have noted that they often do not have an adequate number of staff who speak Spanish or other languages spoken by families they serve.

**Homelessness**

The District has made notable progress over the past decade to reduce homelessness among families with children. However, the risk of homelessness remains great for many, and the number of school-aged children who are considered homeless under education standards is substantial, which suggests that many young children also experience homelessness in the District.

- In 2021, 405 DC families with children were “literally homeless” as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing Urban Development, down from 1,104 in 2012. There were 746 children in these families experiencing homelessness. This partly reflects investments by the DC government into housing and other services for families with children.
- A much larger number of young children are considered homelessness when a broader definition is used, one that includes people who are sharing housing with others due to economic hardship or who live in motels or campgrounds due to a lack of permanent housing.

---

282 Ibid.  
283 Ibid.  
284 The OSSE/Child Trends Early Head Start and Head Start Community Needs Assessment cited in this chapter notes that 41% of DC Latino residents are in the Census Bureau’s “North PUMA,” which primarily reflects Wards 4 and 1. Another 21% live in the “Central PUMA,” which includes part of Wards 1, 2, and 6.  
286 Literally homeless children are those whose primary nighttime residence is a public or private place not meant for human habitation, or is living in a publicly or privately operated shelter, or who is exiting temporary housing and resided in a shelter or place not meant for human habitation before that.  
Under this measure, 4,500 children under age five in the District and 2,700 children under age three experienced homelessness in 2018-2019, equal to 10% of young children.\textsuperscript{288} 

- The number of young children experiencing homelessness under this broader definition increased 90% from 2013 to 2019.\textsuperscript{289}

The large number of young children with unstable housing conditions is a reflection of the loss of low-cost housing in the District and the very large number of households with low incomes who spend most of their income on housing and regularly face risks of being unable to pay rent.

These trends have important implications for child development. As noted above, research has established a strong connection between a young child’s early experiences and brain development. Homelessness in early childhood is associated with poor academic achievement and engagement in elementary school.\textsuperscript{290}

**Foster Care**

There are 651 children under age 18 in DC’s foster care system, and 178 of them are under age five.\textsuperscript{291} The largest group of children in foster care (45%) live in a non-relative foster family, while 26% live with a foster family that is related. Another 10% live in a group home; 16% live in a pre-adoptive home; and 3% are runaways.\textsuperscript{292}

The number of children in foster care in the District has fallen notably over the past decade. The 651 District children in foster care in 2019 represents a reduction of more than two-thirds since 2010, when over 2,000 children were in foster care.\textsuperscript{293}

**Children with Disabilities**

Early Head Start and Head Start programs must target at least 10% of their slots for children with disabilities, to ensure that all children get the developmental support they need. The District served 846


\textsuperscript{289} Kids Count data show that the number of students aged 5-17 experiencing homelessness increased 90% during this period, and the U.S. Department of Education assumes that the number of young children experiencing homelessness is roughly the same as the number of students experiencing homelessness. As a result, the change in homelessness among young children over time mirrors the change in homelessness among students in K-12 schools.


children with disabilities through EHS and HS services in 2018-2019, exceeding the required 10% level.\textsuperscript{294} In addition, UPO and other EHS providers that also provide EHS-related home visiting services (EHS-HB) also reserve 10% of the slots in this program for children with disabilities.

Nevertheless, there are some indications that the District could do more to support children with disabilities. The 2020 OSSE Early Head Start and Head Start Community Needs Assessment found that some providers do not feel well prepared to serve children with disabilities. In addition, services for children with specific disabilities are sometimes limited to certain locations, creating transportation problems for families who do not live nearby.\textsuperscript{295}

### Access to Childcare and Related Services

Childcare is expensive across the nation, but especially in the District, where the costs of care are among the highest. Access to high-quality early education is a challenge for many families in the District. The challenges include DC’s high childcare costs, a limited number of spaces in early education centers and homes, an insufficient number of childcare subsidies for families with low incomes, and an insufficient number of spaces in DC’s Head Start and Early Head Start programs for families with low incomes.

Many families in the District cannot afford childcare without financial help. The average annual cost of care at a childcare center that is designated high-quality was $24,239 in 2021.\textsuperscript{296} That is higher than the federal poverty line for a family of three, which is $21,960.\textsuperscript{297} Yet 10,000 District children under age five—23% of children—live in families with incomes below the poverty line,\textsuperscript{298} and 5,500 children under age three live in families with incomes below the poverty line. For these families, the market cost of childcare is higher than their entire income.

- 16,000 children under age five, and 9,100 children under age three live in a family with incomes under $50,000.\textsuperscript{299} For a family at this income level, childcare expenses of $24,239 a year would consume nearly half of their income.


\textsuperscript{295} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{299} Ibid.
The cost of childcare for just one child would take up more than 10% of income for 90% of families with infants and toddlers.\textsuperscript{300} Childcare costs for one child would take up more than half of median income for 32% of families with infants and toddlers.

Table 10: Childcare Costs Compared to Median Neighborhood Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Care Compared to Median Neighborhood Income (Cost for one child)</th>
<th>% of infants and toddlers in DC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Care is Less than 10% of median neighborhood income</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Care is 10%-30% of median neighborhood income</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Care is Less than 30%-50% of median neighborhood income</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Care is over 50% of median neighborhood income</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income unknown</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bainum Family Foundation Supply and Demand Study (2018)

Beyond the challenge of affordability, simply finding childcare can be difficult for District families. There are 27,000 children in the District under age three and 11,662 licensed early learning slots, including both centers and homes. In other words, there are 2.3 infants and toddlers living in DC for each licensed early learning slot. In most of the District, childcare supply is far less than the potential demand, while in areas with much lower child poverty (Wards 2 and 3) supply is much closer to matching potential demand.\textsuperscript{301}

In every ward except Wards 2 and 3, there are between 2.6 and 3.2 infants and toddlers for every licensed childcare slot.

- In Ward 2, one of DC’s higher-income wards, there are more licensed childcare slots than there are infants and toddlers. This partly reflects the fact that Ward 2 includes the downtown DC area, where some childcare providers locate to serve people who work there, and where some office buildings have childcare on site.


\textsuperscript{301} DC Action for Children, DC Kids Count (2021) *DC Kids Count public data.* Retrieved December 13, 2021 from 6tZM_Zck/view#gid=1749512658
In Ward 3, there are 1.7 infants and toddlers for every licensed childcare slot. Families in Ward 3, one of DC’s highest-income wards, face challenges accessing childcare near their home, but not as much as in other wards.

Families with low incomes face added challenges accessing childcare and related services.

**Child Care Subsidies:** The District’s childcare subsidy program helps families with lower incomes afford childcare. The program provided childcare subsidies to 5,173 infants and toddlers in fiscal year 2019 (which decreased to 3,344 in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic). But this is only about half of the number of childcare subsidies needed in the District. DC would need to provide almost 5,000 additional subsidized childcare slots to have one slot for every infant and toddler expected to be eligible for a childcare subsidy by 2023.\(^{302}\)

**Early Head Start (EHS)** is a program that provides family-centered services for low-income families with children aged zero to three. These programs promote the physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of infants and toddlers through safe and developmentally enriching caregiving. The District provided Early Head Start to 1,375 infants and toddlers in 59 centers in 2019.\(^{303}\) The EHS slots are

---

\(^{302}\) *Ibid.*  
enough to serve about one-fourth of the 5,500 infants and toddlers who are eligible for EHS (because they are in families with incomes below the poverty line).

The District targets HS and EHS to certain populations of young children who are especially vulnerable. Here, too, the number served falls below the potential need. Some 309 children under age three experiencing homelessness were served by DC’s Early Head Start program.\textsuperscript{304} While this represents a notable share of EHS services—22%—it reflects just one of nine of the children under age three experiencing homelessness. In addition, DC Head Start and Early Head Start served 617 children experiencing homelessness in the 2018-19 school year—or 14% of the 4,500 children under age five experiencing homelessness.\textsuperscript{305} It served 56 children in foster care, or roughly one third of the children under age five in foster care.\textsuperscript{306}

**Pandemic Challenges for the Early Childhood Sector**

The early care and education sector continues to deal with the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The resulting instability and uncertainty could have an effect on access to consistent and convenient childcare for District families.

While 66% of early learning programs reopened by November 2020, many families did not rush to re-enroll their children, and only 22% of open programs were fully enrolled as of November 2020.\textsuperscript{307}

Many providers serving children in the childcare subsidy program have expressed concern about the District’s decision to reimburse them based on daily in-person attendance rates, rather than reimbursements tied to the number of children with subsidies enrolled with the provider, which the


\textsuperscript{305} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{306} Ibid.

District used in the early part of the pandemic but suspended in November 2020.\textsuperscript{308} There are many reasons that attendance will continue to be irregular for some families, including the health of family members (such as exposure to COVID-19), unemployment uncertainties, or changes in the school attendance of older siblings. A 2020 survey of childcare providers by DC Action for Children found that many providers are concerned that this change to the reimbursement process will limit their revenues at a precarious time.\textsuperscript{309} Reduced revenue for early learning programs means making difficult choices with potentially devastating implications for the sector such as letting staff go (and potentially permanently losing members of the workforce to other sectors) and/or permanently closing part or all of an early learning program amid ongoing childcare shortages.

Many Childcare Providers Struggle with Staffing Shortages

Across the nation, and in the District of Columbia, many childcare providers are under-staffed and are having trouble hiring additional staff. Many providers stopped operating early in the pandemic, laying off staff and disrupting childcare for many families. As the economy has reopened, re-filling those positions has proved challenging. As of fall 2021, the number of people employed in childcare across the U.S. is 126,000 below the pre-pandemic level.\textsuperscript{310} In the District, half of all childcare providers have reported having staffing challenges.\textsuperscript{311}

The challenge of re-staffing childcare centers may partly reflect the generally low wages paid to early childhood educators. The average annual salary for childcare workers in DC is under $33,000 for full-time year-round work.\textsuperscript{312} Across the U.S., low-wage industries have faced more staffing challenges than other industries.\textsuperscript{313}

Birth-to-Three Law Could Improve Access to Affordable and Quality Childcare and Raise Wages for Childcare Workers

The DC Council passed the Birth-to-Three for All DC Amendment Act in 2018, which included several ambitious provisions to make childcare more affordable and improve early childhood services to families with low incomes. The legislation was adopted “subject to appropriations,” which means its provisions will go into effect when the funds to implement them are included in the DC budget. As discussed below, some Birth-to-Three Act provisions have been adopted but not all.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{308} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{309} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{313} Schweitzer, J. and Khattar, R. (2021, December 7). It’s a good job shortage: the real reason so many workers are quitting. Center for American Progress. Retrieved December 14, 2021 from https://www.americanprogress.org/article/its-a-good-jobs-shortage-the-real-reason-so-many-workers-are-quitting/
\end{itemize}
The Birth-to-Three law included the following.¹³¹⁴

- Increase reimbursement rates to childcare providers through the Child Care Subsidy program. This will help ensure that providers serving children from families with low incomes can provide high-quality care.
- Increase compensation for early childhood educators, to bring pay in line with compensation for DC Public Schools staff.
- Ensure that no family in the District pays more than 7% of its income for childcare.
- Expand other services that support families with young children, including Home Visiting, Healthy Futures (which provides behavioral health support to infants and toddlers through early childhood education facilities), Help Me Grow (a referral service to connect parents of young children with services), Healthy Steps (enhanced services provided through pediatricians), and breastfeeding supports.

Since passage of the Birth-to-Three Act in 2018, the DC Council has provided funding to expand Home Visiting, Healthy Steps, Healthy Futures, Help Me Grow, and lactation support. In addition, the Council appropriated funds in the budget for Fiscal Year 2022 to increase compensation for early childhood educators and created a taskforce to set a process for implementing this change.³¹⁵ As of the writing of this Community Needs Assessment, the process for increasing compensation has not been developed.

Other Services for Families with Young Children

The District offers a variety of other services to support families with young children. These services include the following:

Early Intervention to Address Developmental Delays

The District operates programs to address developmental delays, under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Part C of this law addresses the needs of children from birth to age three. The District’s early intervention program, Strong Start, serves infants and toddlers who have a 25% delay in one of the identified developmental areas, or have a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in a developmental delay or disability. Between

---

December 2017 and December 2018, roughly 2,000 infants and toddlers received services from Strong Start.\textsuperscript{316}

Part B of IDEA addresses services for children three and older. The District provides services to three-to-five year-olds through the Early Stages program operated by DC Public Schools. Early Stages served 1,800 children between December 2017 and December 2018.\textsuperscript{317}

**Quality Improvement Network**

The District established the Quality Improvement Network (QIN) in 2015 to oversee access to Early Head Start services for children and families served in childcare centers and family childcare homes. The QIN works to increase access to high-quality care for infants and toddlers. During the 2018-2019 program year, United Planning Organization (UPO) served as the QIN hub and supported 16 child development centers offering EHS services. UPO continues to be the largest provider of QIN services in the District. The QIN recently partnered with Easterseals to support family childcare homes in the QIN.

There were 248 children served by UPO QIN programs during the 2020-21 program year, most of whom were between birth and age two and participated in DC’s Child Care Subsidy Program.

**Healthy Futures**

Healthy Futures is based on the Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation (ECMHC) model, an evidence-based approach to support young children’s social-emotional development and to address challenging behaviors in early learning environments. Healthy Futures is operated by the DC Department of Behavioral Health, and it works through early childhood education centers and homes to build capacity in childcare providers to promote social-emotional development, prevent escalation of challenging behaviors, and support referrals for additional assessments and service.

Healthy Futures supports 135 child development centers and homes,\textsuperscript{318} including nine UPO early learning sites in Wards 7 and 8. UPO’s remaining early learning centers and home-based program are supported by Behavioral & Educational Solutions, PC (BES).

**Home Visiting**

Home visiting programs support expectant parents and families with young children through trained home visitors who meet with families in their homes to make supporting them more convenient and


\textsuperscript{317} Ibid.

accessible. Home visiting programs can be relatively short-term or last over multiple years. Home visiting programs focus on a variety of needs, including maternal health, child development, school readiness, child health, and family economic security. Home visiting programs provide direct services and also help connect families to other services.


\begin{itemize}
\item **DC’s Birth-to-Three Act called for an $11 million expansion of home visiting programs, but just over $700,000 has been funded so far.**
\item UPO provides home visiting services through Early Head Start. Qualified home visitors perform weekly 90-minute visits with parents to engage them and their children. In 2021, UPO provided home visiting to 86 families.

The Birth-to-Three Act called for an $11 million expansion of home visiting programs, which would allow the District to improve the quality of home visiting services and serve more families, but so far only $710,000 has been funded toward that goal.\endnote{320}{Under 3 DC (2020). 2020 impact report: equity must start at birth. Retrieved December 14, 2021 from https://under3dc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Under3DC-Impact-Report-November-2020-1.pdf}
\end{itemize}

Summary and Recommendations for Future Considerations

This review highlights a range of economic, geographic, and demographic factors affecting families with young children, with important implications for UPO’s future operations.

- **Widening Income Inequality and Continued Economic Segregation:** The number of young children is growing in the District, especially in Wards 4, 5, and 6, which seems to reflect an influx of middle- and higher-income families. The number of families in poverty has remained the same in those communities, suggesting increasing competition for affordable housing, childcare and other services. Meanwhile, child poverty remains concentrated in Ward 7 and Ward 8, where most residents are Black and economic conditions have not improved. Many early childhood indicators suggest that there has not been progress in the last decade to improve outcomes in Wards 7 and 8.

**Considerations:** The concentration of child poverty in Wards 7 and 8 suggests that any UPO plans to expand early childhood education services—including childcare, EHS, home visiting, and other services—should consider a focus on Ward 7 and Ward 8. Outside of Ward 7 and Ward 8, families with low incomes are likely facing increasing housing instability and economic insecurity, which may affect their ability to reliably access services. As a result, UPO services aimed at helping families who live in gentrifying areas improve their economic and housing
stability—such as affordable housing, workforce training, and emergency assistance—could play a role in helping families stay in their communities.

- **Need to Address Shortage of Early Childhood Educators:** As noted, half of all childcare providers in the District reported having staffing challenges in 2020. As the District emerges from the coronavirus pandemic and more workers return to in-person work, the demand for childcare will likely increase.

  **Considerations:** UPO is a licensed training provider for people who want to obtain a Child Development Associate credential. It may make sense for UPO (and other providers) to expand training programs and engage in targeted recruitment of District residents interested in early childhood development occupations. This should include partnerships with institutions that provide associate’s or bachelor’s degrees in child development. The expected increases in compensation for early childhood educators as a result of the Birth-to-Three for All DC creates an important recruiting opportunity. Once fully implemented, salaries for early childhood educators will match salaries within DC Public Schools.

- **Increased Need to Serve Non-English Speakers:** A substantial share of children in low-income families speak Spanish or another language other than English at home.

  **Considerations:** UPO should work with the District to ensure that early childhood training services include non-English speakers. UPO should work to hire EHS staff with similar linguistic backgrounds to the children served. UPO is a licensed training provider for people who want to obtain a Child Development Associate credential. It may make sense for UPO (and other providers as well) to engage in targeted outreach for its training program in multiple languages and specifically in communities that have a high concentration of non-English speakers. The expected increases in compensation for early childhood educators as a result of the Birth-to-Three for All DC creates an important recruiting opportunity.

- **Rising Homelessness:** Despite progress in reducing the number of literally homeless children, there is a growing number of young children who are considered homeless because their family is sharing housing with others because they cannot afford their own housing. Many children face many of the same stresses as children who are literally homeless.

  **Considerations:** Investments to expand affordable housing are critical to the success of early childhood programs. Programs serving families with young children should prioritize children who are homeless and should be sensitive to the growing housing challenges for other families. UPO could, for example, set a higher target than the 10% requirement for the share of the EHS children it serves who are experiencing homelessness. In addition, because DCPS identifies students who are experiencing homelessness, UPO could work with DCPS to reach out to the
families experiencing homelessness to make sure parents are aware of early childhood services available for any younger children they have. Finally, the District could work with all early childhood providers to ensure that they are able to connect families with housing services such as counseling and emergency rental assistance.

- **Unaffordable Child Care, Limited Supply:** With the cost of care for an infant exceeding $24,000, high-quality childcare remains out of reach for many families unless they have financial help. In almost every part of the District, there are not enough licensed childcare slots to serve all infants and toddlers. Finally, the District does not provide enough childcare subsidies to serve all of the children who are eligible.

  **Considerations:** UPO has limited ability to address the problems of childcare costs and childcare supply across the District. The tremendous demand for childcare that is affordable and convenient indicates that efforts by UPO to expand its capacity to provide childcare would be beneficial, and that any expanded UPO capacity would likely fill up quickly.

- **Programs to Help Families with Low Incomes Are Important and Need to Expand Their Reach:** The District has robust Child Care Subsidy and Early Head Start programs, but they only reach a fraction of eligible children.

  **Considerations:** UPO should work with partners to increase access to childcare that is both affordable and high-quality for families with low incomes. As noted above, UPO could consider opening more childcare centers, ideally locating them in Ward 7 and Ward 8. Ensuring that the District offers sufficient childcare subsidies would be important to making sure that any expanded UPO capacity serves families with low incomes, and it would be important to ensuring the financial viability of any new centers. UPO can seek partnerships with the DC government or with private partners to support the development of new childcare capacity and to secure adequate childcare assistance for families with low incomes who live near those sites.
CITY-WIDE SUMMARY DATA
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DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TOTAL POPULATION, 2020 CENSUS

INCOME AND POVERTY

Median Household Income: $92,266
Overall Poverty Rate: 16%
Child Poverty Rate: 24%

HOUSING

58.4%

OF DC HOUSEHOLDS ARE RENTERS

FOR RENT

Median rent city-wide: $1,603

107,000 DC households cannot afford more than $800 in rent each month, but only 60,000 housing units exist at that level.

Each icon represents 10,000 housing units

CHILD CARE

$24,239

AVERAGE ANNUAL COST OF HIGH-QUALITY CHILDCARE IN DC IN 2021

Children under age 3 in DC

Licensed early learning slots in DC

There are 2.3 infants and toddlers living in DC for each licensed early learning slot
City-Wide Needs Assessment Data

District residents completed the 2021 needs assessment survey

**Top 3 services needed by survey respondents**
1. Utilities assistance
2. Employment services
3. Work readiness/job skills

**Top 3 services requested through Unite US**
1. Housing & shelter
2. Food assistance
3. Individual & family support

**Top 3 services provided by UPO**
1. Early learning services
2. Housing
3. Employment services

City-wide, 57% of survey respondents felt safer in their neighborhood than a year ago.

High blood pressure was the household health condition most frequently reported by survey respondents, followed by diabetes and asthma.

- High blood pressure: 13%
- Diabetes: 12%
- Asthma: 9%

The most needed health service city-wide was family or individual counseling, needed by 28% of survey respondents.

- 13% of survey respondents had incomes below $25,000
- 12% of survey respondents had incomes above $100,000
City-Wide Needs Assessment Survey Results

The following tables and figures show the results from the UPO 2021 District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment survey. The city-wide needs assessment survey results convey demographic data, needs-based data, and healthy neighborhood data. A total of 991 District residents completed the needs assessment survey. Note that some survey questions allowed respondents to select all answers that apply, so responses to some questions might add up to more than 991 or 100%.

Demographics of Survey Respondents

The average respondent to UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey is a married White female between the age of 30 and 39 years. Regarding education, the typical respondent has a bachelor’s degree, is employed full-time, and has an average annual household income between $45,000 and $64,999. A wide range of DC residents completed the Community Needs Assessment survey, including many who have received services from UPO before (58%), as well as a substantial portion who have never received services from UPO (40%).

*Figure 48: Survey Results: Gender*
Figure 49: Survey Results: Age by Gender
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Figure 50: Survey Results: Marital Status

City-Wide Needs Assessment Survey Results
Marital Status
Wards 5 and 6 have nearly equal numbers of male and female survey respondents. In several wards, female respondents greatly outnumber male respondents, while only Ward 1 has significantly more male respondents to the survey than female respondents (see Figure 52).
The largest portion of survey respondents (27.5%) reported their highest level of education as being a bachelor’s degree, followed by those who completed high school (25.4%).

**Figure 53: Survey Results: Highest Level of Education**

Most respondents reported an annual household income between $45,000 and $64,999. Apart from those respondents who did not provide any response, respondents who reported an annual household income of more than $100,000 made up the smallest portion of survey respondents (12.0%).

**Figure 54: Survey Results: Annual Household Income**

Most of the respondents who had an annual income of more than $100,000 reported earning a master’s degree or greater. Respondents with annual incomes of $0 - $24,999 income had the lowest number of bachelor’s and master’s degrees.
Over 30% of the survey respondents who live in Ward 4 have an income of more than $100,000, while Wards 6 and 8 have the fewest number of residents with an income of more than $100,000. Furthermore, residents in the lowest income bracket ($0 - $24,999) predominantly live in Wards 7 and 8 and they outnumber residents with other annual income ranges in those two wards.
More than 77% of survey respondents reported being employed full-time, part-time, or being self-employed. Only 8% reported being unemployed and looking for work.

*Figure 57: Survey Results: Employment Status*

Homeowners made up 45% of survey respondents. While only 34.9% of respondents reported their housing status as “renter,” when combined with those who are living with others and assisting with paying the rent or mortgage, that number increases to 46.5%. This indicates that survey respondents were quite evenly split between homeowners and renters.

*Figure 58: Survey Results: Living Situation*
The largest percentages of people living with survey respondents were in the 30-39 years old and 0-4 years old age ranges (see Figure 59). This age disparity likely indicates that most survey respondents live with their partners/spouses and/or their children, rather than other relatives or unrelated persons. Living arrangements are confirmed and reinforced by the next question, illustrated in Figure 60, showing large percentages of survey respondents living with their partners (35.9%) and children (32.9%).

*Figure 59: Survey Results: Age Living with You*

*Figure 60: Survey Results: Who Lives with You*
In terms of the quality of health insurance, most respondents reported to have about the same quality of health insurance as they did a year ago, followed by those who said the quality of their health insurance has improved.

*Figure 61: Survey Results: Health Insurance Quality*

Regarding type of health insurance, most of the respondents with an annual income up to $64,999 received their health insurance through Medicaid or Medicare. Respondents with an annual income of more than $65,000 were more likely to receive their health insurance through their employer or their spouses’ or relatives’ employer.

*Figure 62: Survey Results: Health Insurance Type by Income*
Apart from respondents who did not report any health condition, high blood pressure was reported as the most common health condition among survey respondents and those they live with, and HIV+/AIDS was reported as the least common health condition. Asthma and diabetes were also frequently reported health conditions city-wide.

*Figure 63: Survey Results: Household Health Conditions*

Asthma was the most commonly reported health condition for survey respondents aged 15-19 years old. For all other age groups, high blood pressure was the most commonly reported condition (see Figure 64). Physical disability was frequently reported by those in the 30-39, 40-49, and 60+ age groups. More survey respondents between the ages of 30 and 49 reported mental illness than other age groups. When analyzed by respondent’s gender, females reported more health conditions than males, and high blood pressure was the most commonly reported condition for both genders (see Figure 65). It is important to note, however, that this survey question asked people if they or anyone in their household had any of the conditions, so in some cases a single survey respondent might have been reporting multiple conditions for multiple family members via this single question.
Figure 64: Survey Results: Household Health Conditions by Age
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Figure 65: Survey Results: Household Health Conditions by Gender
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Needs-Based Survey Results
The following analysis displays the rates at which respondents indicated that they needed or received a variety of services. While the majority of survey respondents identified at least one area in which they needed or received assistance, 189 respondents (19.1%) responded that they did not need assistance or N/A to all 24 need categories.

Regarding city-wide needs, 58% of respondents had received services from UPO at some point, and 33.4% of respondents had no problem accessing services. Barriers that the remaining respondents encountered while trying to access services included lack of knowledge regarding where to go, services that are only available during limited hours, and concerns about confidentiality.
Assistance with utilities was reported to be the most needed service followed by employment services and work readiness/job skills. Food stood out as the most received service followed by assistance obtaining healthcare/insurance and Medicare/Medicaid. The small gap between those needing food assistance (23.5% of respondents) and those receiving food assistance (20.5% of respondents) could be partially due to the increased food distribution services that UPO and other community-based organizations throughout the District provided when the COVID-19 pandemic started.
Figure 67: Survey Results: City-Wide Services Needed and Received
Based on the need-based categories from the needs assessment survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in the District. They are highlighted in Figure 68.

Figure 68: Survey Results: City-Wide Top 5 Needs

Apart from the 33% of survey respondents who reported they did not encounter any challenges when meeting needs, a sizeable portion of survey respondents either did not know where to go for help (17%) or had difficulties accessing services that were only available during limited hours (17%).

Figure 69: Survey Results: Roadblocks to Meeting Needs

A major category of needs identified in the 2021 UPO Community Needs Assessment survey relates to health services. For the purpose of this analysis, health services include the following survey categories:
obtaining healthcare/insurance, Medicaid/Medicare, family/individual counseling, mental health services, and drug and alcohol abuse counseling.

Family/individual counseling stood out as the most needed health service followed by obtaining healthcare/insurance (see Figure 70). As Figure 71 illustrates, when broken down by gender, men both needed and received considerably more health services than women.

Figure 70: Survey Results: Individual Health Services Needed and Received

![City-Wide Needs Assessment Survey Results](image.png)

Figure 71: Survey Results: Health Services by Gender

![City-Wide Needs Assessment Survey Results](image.png)
Based on the health services needed for each ward, Ward 4 had the highest percentage of respondents reporting health needs (20%) among all wards followed by Ward 5 and Ward 3. Somewhat surprisingly, Ward 8 had the lowest percentage of respondents reporting health needs (8%) among all wards. This could be due to the fact that the survey sample for this needs assessment looked very different than the population as a whole for several of DC’s wards (see the methodology section for additional background information regarding the sample).

*Figure 72: Survey Results: Health Services Needed by Ward*

![Bar chart showing health services needed by ward](image)

Ward 4 also had the highest percentage of respondents reporting receiving assistance with a health need (19%), followed by Ward 5 and Ward 1. Ward 8 reported the lowest percentage of respondents receiving health services (5%).

*Figure 73: Survey Results: Health Services Received by Ward*

![Bar chart showing health services received by ward](image)
Five different income/employment related services were included in this needs assessment: employment services, work readiness/job skills, skills training, income tax preparation, and unemployment compensation.

Employment services and work readiness/job skills stood out as the most needed income/employment services, with 294 and 293 respondents needing assistance with these services, respectively (see Figure 74). As Figure 75 illustrates, when broken down by gender, men both needed and received considerably more income/employment services than women.

*Figure 74: Survey Results: Individual Income/Employment Services Needed and Received*

*Figure 75: Survey Results: Income/Employment Services by Gender*
Based on employment services needed in each ward, Ward 4 had the highest percentage of respondents reporting income/employment needs (18%), followed by Ward 5 (17%). On the contrary, Ward 8 had the lowest percentage of respondents reporting income/employment needs (9%) among all wards.

*Figure 76: Survey Results: Income/Employment Services Needed by Ward*

![Bar Chart: Income/Employment Services Needed by Ward](image)

Ward 4 also had the highest percentage of respondents reporting receiving assistance with an income/employment need (19%), followed by Ward 5 (17%). Ward 8 reported the lowest percentage of respondents receiving assistance with an income/employment need (8%).

*Figure 77: Survey Results: Income/Employment Services Received by Ward*

![Bar Chart: Income/Employment Services Received by Ward](image)
Healthy Neighborhood Survey Results
The majority (60%) of survey respondents indicated that they agree or strongly agree with the statement, “I feel included in the decisions of what my neighborhood would look like in the future.” In response to a related question, 77% of survey respondents indicated that they would like to be involved or very involved in decisions that affect their neighborhood’s future.

Figure 78: Survey Results: Included in Neighborhood Future
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I feel included in the decisions of what my neighborhood would look like in the future.

- 36% Agree
- 24% Strongly agree
- 18% Undecided
- 13% Disagree
- 9% Strongly disagree
- 2% No Answer

Figure 79: Survey Results: Interest in Involvement in Neighborhood Future

City-Wide Needs Assessment Survey Results
How involved would you like to be in the decisions that affect what your neighborhood would look like in the future?

- 40% Very involved
- 33% Involved
- 11% Undecided
- 9% Somewhat involved
- 9% Not involved
- 2% No Answer

57% of survey respondents reported feeling safer in their neighborhood than the previous year. In contrast, 24% did not feel safer in their neighborhood than the previous year, and 17% were undecided.
Perception of neighborhood safety compared to a year ago varied significantly by age and race. Survey respondents under the age of 50 were more likely to report feeling safer in their neighborhood than a year ago when compared to those over the age of 50, who had a much wider range of responses. When analyzed by race, the majority of White residents indicate feeling safer in their neighborhood than they did last year. On the other hand, nearly 40% of Black survey respondents disagreed or strongly disagree with the statement “I feel safer in my neighborhood than I did last year.” This shows a significant disparity between Black and White residents’ sense of safety in their neighborhoods. The number of responses from residents of other races/ethnicities was too small to include in this analysis.
While most survey respondents (62%) believed the police in DC had been respectful or very respectful of their rights as citizens, a sizeable portion felt neutral or did not respond to the question. This could indicate that many DC residents still feel conflicted about the role of the police in the city and how they interact with communities.

Neary 70% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I can afford to continue to live in my neighborhood.” Considering how rapidly home prices and rents are increasing throughout the District, it is good that so many respondents were confident in their ability to continue affording housing in their current neighborhood. However, the number of respondents who cannot
continue to afford to live in their neighborhood is still quite high, and those residents are at risk of displacement or unstable housing.

Figure 84: Survey Results: Neighborhood Affordability
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To what extent do you agree with the following statement?
I can afford to continue to live in my neighborhood

![Graph showing survey results on neighborhood affordability](image)

Over half (58%) of respondents said they would still send their children to their neighborhood school even if given other choices, while 19% disagreed with this statement, implying that they would prefer to send their children somewhere other than the neighborhood school. Note that this question had a very high nonresponse rate when compared to other healthy neighborhood questions, likely due to a substantial number of survey respondents who do not have school-aged children.

Figure 85: Survey Results: Neighborhood Schools
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If I had the choice to send my children to school elsewhere, I would still send my children to my neighborhood school.

![Graph showing survey results on neighborhood school choice](image)
Just over 73\% of respondents had some level of confidence (Confident, Very Confident, or Somewhat Confident) in the DC government’s ability to provide jobs.

*Figure 86: Survey Results: City’s Ability to Provide Jobs*

**City-Wide Needs Assessment Survey Results**

*What is your level of confidence in the DC Government’s ability to provide jobs?*

![Confidence Levels](image)

- Somewhat confident: 36\%
- Very confident: 20\%
- Not very confident: 19\%
- Confident: 17\%
- Uncertain of my confidence: 5\%
- No Answer: 2\%

When asked how they would prefer a vacant lot on their block be used, most survey respondents indicated a preference for a community center (17\%) or a community garden (16\%).

*Figure 87: Survey Results: City-Wide Preferences on How to Use a Vacant Lot*

**City-Wide Needs Assessment Survey Results**

*What to do with a Vacant Lot on Your Block*

![Lot Preferences](image)
UPO Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

In addition to questions about needs and services provided, the 2021 UPO Community Needs Assessment survey also included a series of questions regarding how satisfied respondents were with the services they received from UPO.

Figure 88: Survey Results: UPO Help in Achieving Goals

Figure 88 shows that 56% of survey respondents indicated that UPO helped them in achieving their goals. However, this question had a very high nonresponse rate (29%), likely from survey respondents who did not receive services from UPO. When the nonresponses are excluded, the percent of respondents who said UPO helped them achieve their goals was even higher, at 78%. The needs assessment survey also asked respondents how satisfied they were with the customer service they received from UPO, as well as their overall experience with UPO. Survey respondents rated these two indicators on a scale from very satisfied to very dissatisfied.

Figure 89: Survey Results: Customer Satisfaction
Figure 89 illustrates that for both customer service and overall experience, more than 50% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with their experience. Only 6.6% of respondents indicated they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with UPO’s customer service, and only 5.5% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their overall experience. As with the data presented in Figure 88, a large number of survey participants did not respond to the customer satisfaction questions (18%).

Additional Customer Satisfaction Data
In addition to the questions about customer satisfaction asked in the 2021 community needs assessment survey, UPO also conducted a small-scale customer satisfaction survey in Spring 2021. This survey, conducted by UPO’s Office of Performance Management, was completed by 210 UPO customers.

Of the 210 customers who completed this survey, 85% indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with their most recent interaction with UPO, while 78% of respondents indicated they were likely or very likely to use UPO services again in the next 12 months.

Furthermore, 62% of respondents agreed that UPO provided them with information about other services available, while 77% of respondents noted that UPO made it “easy” or “very easy” for them to receive services.

This survey also inquired about the communications preferences of UPO customers. The top three preferences identified were: email (55%), in-person (53%), and phone calls (46%). This information helps UPO ensure that staff is consistently communicating with customers in a way that is easiest and most accessible for them.

Finally, this survey offered customers an open-ended question to provide recommendations to help UPO improve customer experience in the future. A total of 17% of survey respondents provided feedback on areas for improvement, which included: increasing UPO visibility/brand awareness, better customer service, quicker response time to phone calls, additional job placement/matching services, and increased community engagement.

Key Themes from Special Population Focus Groups
The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities in which they live. UPO sought to conduct ten special population focus groups as part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment. Ultimately, facilitators were unable to connect with enough individuals from a particular special population to convene a full focus group in two cases. Therefore, for the homeless individuals and private sector groups, structured interviews were conducted with two individuals from each of these special populations. Focus groups of five to ten participants each were conducted made up of individuals from the following special populations: Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) members, seniors, youth, parents of children attending UPO’s Office of Early Learning (OEL) programs, representatives of community-based organizations, representatives of faith-based groups, public sector groups, and university students.

Each focus group was asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix. Despite the wide range of individuals and voices represented in the special
population focus groups, a number of essential themes emerged. Below is a discussion of several key themes that came out of the focus group conversations.

Need for Increased Mental Health Services

The need for more mental health services was discussed in seven of the eight focus groups and one of the two structured interview sessions conducted. Many facets of this issue were noted across the groups. For example, the type of mental health services available was addressed in multiple groups. Parents of children attending UPO’s Office of Early Learning (OEL) programs saw a need for more readily available grief counseling services and mentioned the difficulty of finding culturally- and age-appropriate mental health services for children. The community-based organization focus group discussed a range of mental health services participants said were needed throughout the District, including support for trauma survivors, a city-wide campaign to normalize seeking mental and behavioral health care—to reduce the stigma associated with seeking mental health services—and additional training and support for mental health crisis services. The key health concern identified by participants in the youth focus group was additional support for young people with mental and emotional health challenges. The accessibility of mental health services across the city was also discussed in multiple focus groups, with many participants noting that certain types of care are only available in some parts of the city, and all types of mental health services need to be more readily available citywide. Furthermore, given the mental health challenges that the COVID-19 pandemic has brought to the forefront for many individuals, focus group participants expressed that this was an issue that needed to be addressed immediately across the city.

Lack of Affordable Housing in DC

The lack of affordable housing options and need for additional affordable housing units in the District was conveyed in four of the eight focus groups and one of the two structured interview sessions conducted. In these focus groups and interviews, low-income residents discussed their frustrations with new housing being built in their neighborhoods that do not include any affordable units. Focus group participants also expressed concerns related to displacement due to redevelopment. Redevelopment was a particular concern for individuals living in neighborhoods with a significant amount of naturally occurring affordable housing, meaning rental properties that maintain low rents without federal or city subsidies. Furthermore, participants across groups expressed concerns about the lack of long-term affordable housing in the city, as rents and home prices continue to rise across the District.

For example, the representatives of faith-based organizations focus group had a robust conversation about the issues surrounding affordable housing in D.C, with some participants sharing that “some of the new housing developments do not have affordable or low-income housing,” and “in Ward 8, some of the residents are on social security [income] and cannot afford affordable housing.”

Concerns About Crime and Safety

Concerns about crime and safety were expressed in four of the eight focus groups and both of the structured interview sessions conducted. Although most focus groups had a mix of responses regarding
how safe individual participants felt in their neighborhoods, six groups had at least one participant express increased crime as a major concern. In particular, focus group participants were concerned with an increase in gun violence (including drive by shootings and armed robberies), and other violent crime. At least one participant in both the homeless individuals focus group and the faith-based organizations focus group noted that they hear gunshots in their neighborhood almost every night. Participants in several focus groups also expressed concerns about neighborhood conflicts between a few individuals that escalate and turn violent, as well as concerns about youth getting involved in harmful or violent activities at a very young age.

Multiple participants also noted an increase in loitering, drinking, and drug use outside of apartment buildings, stores, and in parks as a concern. They discussed how frustrating and uncomfortable it was to have to “step over” or “push through” groups of people just to exit their buildings or take their children to nearby playgrounds. One participant stated that almost every day, there were “people out front [of her building] who smoke all day” and that “it’s very uncomfortable to step over 17 guys just to get out [of the building].”

Environmental and Health Issues

While the special population focus group participants produced a number of responses when asked what their top health and environmental concerns were, four issues were cited more frequently than any others: trash, rodents, water contamination, and food access.

Respondents across four of the eight focus groups highlighted trash as a major issue. They noted trash piling up on sidewalks, in streets, in parks, and in local bodies of water, such as the Anacostia River. Participants discussed how city-owned trash cans throughout the District often have trash overflowing out of them, causing trash to pile up in public places. Many focus group participants noted that the trash piling up across the city is likely related to the increase in rodents and other pests.

Rodents were another major concern that were discussed in three of the eight special population focus groups. Residents noted an increase in sightings of rats and other rodents and pests around their homes, as well as in commercial areas where food and other trash is frequently discarded. A parent in the OEL parents focus group addressed both the trash and rodent issues seen across the city, stating: “In the last couple of years, the streets have been getting worse . . . you can see piles of trash on the sidewalks. I feel that in my neighborhood, we have a rat infestation. In my building, you can see rat feces which is not supposed to be there.”

Three out of eight focus groups identified water contamination, and particularly concerns about lead in their water, as an environmental and health issue of great concern. Given the age of DC’s infrastructure, virtually all water lines in the District are made of lead pipes. Focus group participants expressed concerns about lead contamination impacting the water in their homes and in local schools and businesses.
Food was also frequently mentioned when focus group participants were asked about health and environmental concerns. Respondents in five of the eight focus groups highlighted food access issues as being a major concern. Participants addressed food issues from a variety of perspectives, including concerns about food deserts, the cost and quality of food that is available in some neighborhoods, and access to food and nutrition education for all DC residents. For example, in the community-based organizations focus group, respondents not only stated that “addressing the cost of food” was a very high priority for their organizations, but they also stated that they strive to “promote healthy eating and living [and] the benefits of growing your own food.”

**Frustration with DC’s Political Leadership**

Frustration with the District’s political leaders and how they address residents’ needs was expressed by participants in three of the eight focus groups and one of the two structured interview sessions. Focus groups and interviewees discussed how political leaders are often not visible in their communities, and that community or religious organizations do more to ensure needs are met than political leadership. Some participants also noted that political leaders seem to only engage residents when it is most beneficial to the politicians, such as when there is an election coming up and they need residents’ votes. Participants who had direct experience working with political leadership in the city recalled it being a difficult, cumbersome process.

In particular, groups that are frequently ignored by the political system, such as temporary residents and homeless individuals, expressed significant disillusionment with the District’s political leaders. A participant in the university students focus group stated, “I don’t know who the ANC [representative] is in this area. There is a lack of visibility . . . [except for] during elections,” emphasizing that politicians often pay little attention to new or temporary residents, who might be seen as unreliable voters. Furthermore, a participant in the homeless individuals focus group noted, “I have never seen anyone from the councilmember’s office around . . . The neighbors have been better [to me] than any of [the community leaders].”

**Concerns About Educational Disparities**

Participants in seven of the eight special population focus groups noted concerns about some type of educational disparities when they were asked if quality education is available to residents of all ages in their community. Several focus group participants noted that they have had positive experiences at their children’s elementary schools, experiencing high-quality instruction and a positive learning environment. These same individuals, however, expressed concerns regarding whether the quality of education would remain high in middle and high school. For example, one participant in the OEL parents group stated, about their 5th grade daughter, “I’m hoping that the next school she goes to will follow the same high-quality curriculum that the [current school] has.” Participants in two focus groups discussed that schools did not pay enough attention to helping students learn life skills. Additionally, participants in the youth focus group noted that because of this, some students end up graduating or dropping out without much direction and unprepared for life after school.

Additionally, participants discussed disparities in the types of resources and opportunities available, including those related to overcrowding, disparate educational quality based on location, varied quality of teaching, and declines in educational quality during the COVID-19 pandemic. Respondents also said the quality of school education varies by type, with some participants sharing their perspective that
public charter schools and selective public schools (e.g., those that require applications or other admissions requirements) offer a higher quality of education than traditional public schools, at least in some parts of the city. Many focus groups noted how better educational opportunities seem to be concentrated in the wealthier parts of the city. For example, one respondent in the university students group stated, “I’ve done a lot of tutoring in Ward 3, and there’s a huge disparity . . . throughout DC. Students have not been taught the same way.”

**Need for Financial Trainings and Supports**

Conversations about the need for additional financial literacy programs and supports took place in six of the eight focus groups and both of the structured interview sessions conducted. While some of these conversations were in the context of what supports a new business owner or first-time homebuyer in their neighborhood might need, many of these discussions also emerged organically from conversations about the overarching needs in the city. Respondents noted that District residents across all parts of the city and all walks of life could benefit from additional trainings or resources to better understand their finances.

Respondents discussed a wide range of financial services that would be beneficial to District residents including guidance on how to open and grow a savings account, investment classes, trainings on the different types of financing available when buying a home or starting a business, and general financial literacy trainings. Multiple focus groups also conveyed the need to provide financial literacy training to youth, either in school or at after-school or community-based programs, to help them learn the basics of money management and budgeting while they are still young. Several groups also emphasized the importance of good credit in obtaining financial security, and the need for trainings on how to build and maintain good credit.

**Varied Pandemic Experiences**

In six of the eight special population focus groups and both of the structured interview sessions, participants highlighted both positive and negative consequences that they experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic. While it might be expected that participants would focus on the extremely challenging aspects of this experience, including the death of friends and family members, loneliness, job and income losses, and fear about one’s own health, many respondents also found silver linings in their pandemic experiences. These included spending more time and increased closeness with immediate family members, the ability to slow down and simplify their lives, a renewed focus on what really matters, and a sense of their neighbors and community coming together to help one another. The full scale of the long-term effects of the pandemic on physical and mental health have yet to be seen, but participants across virtually all focus groups were able to reflect upon the positive and negative ways the pandemic has shaped their lives.
Regarding the challenges the pandemic presented, a member of the community-based organization focus group stated, “Managing work and home school has been very challenging,” which was an issue that was also expressed in the OEL parents focus group. The faith-based representatives group also discussed a number of challenges, with one participant stating, “My daughter and her children had COVID, and it was very hard being away from [them] with no communication.” Other faith-based group respondents simply said the experience of living through a pandemic was “pretty intense” and “very hard . . . especially during the holidays.”

When it came to the positives that emerged from the pandemic experience, many participants focused on the closeness felt with family and community members. For example, one participant in the OEL parents group shared how neighbors in her building helped each other with food and other necessities throughout the pandemic and said, “In some ways, we have learned to become closer to our neighbors . . . so get to know your neighbors because you never know when you will need them or when they may need you.” A homeless individual interviewed also had a very positive experience with neighbors offering support during the pandemic. This respondent noted that a family in the neighborhood offered them a place in the family’s yard during the pandemic so that they could better isolate, so they “moved [their] tent and things into [my] backyard and have been there since.”

The table below notes the frequency in which the themes identified in the narrative above were noted in the special population focus groups. Concerns related to mental health, educational disparities, a need for financial trainings, and pandemic related issues were all mentioned in seven or more groups, indicating that these are some of the key cross-cutting issues of interest and concern to populations across the District.

Table 11: Frequency of Key Themes in Special Population Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Homeless Individuals*</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>ANC</th>
<th>OEL Parents</th>
<th>Community-Based</th>
<th>Faith-Based</th>
<th>Private Sector*</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>University Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Leadership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendations for Addressing City-Wide Needs**

The following recommendations include considerations based on information and input from the focus group discussions and responses to the UPO needs assessment survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Many DC residents lack the skills to obtain jobs that pay a living wage</td>
<td>Improve access to employment services overall; Increase vocational training opportunities in high-demand sectors that pay a living wage; Target employment services in neighborhoods with high unemployment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>DC needs more housing that is affordable to low-and middle-income families</td>
<td>Increase access to affordable housing; Facilitate access to rental and mortgage assistance; Increase and improve collaboration between affordable housing programs to make it easier to connect residents to affordable units that are available at any given time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Advocate for service providers to provide services during non-traditional hours to ensure scheduling issues do not prevent people from getting the help they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>DC students are underperforming compared to national averages and significant disparities exist, depending on students’ demographics and where in DC they live</td>
<td>Increase equity in educational opportunities at both traditional public schools and public charter schools across all wards; Increase STAR ratings at underperforming schools across the city; Improve math and reading proficiency scores in all wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>The number of young children is increasing in the District, and early childhood resources are not keeping up.</td>
<td>Increase access to early education and childcare facilities in underserved wards; Increase focus on early literacy; Ensure early care and education is high-quality and affordable for all families in the District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates populations where a full focus group could not be convened. Instead, structured interviews with two individuals were conducted.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Education</strong></th>
<th>DC’s high school graduation rate remains below the national average, and at-risk groups of students fare even worse</th>
<th>Prioritize high school graduation; Provide additional resources to at-risk students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>The COVID-19 pandemic continues to disrupt learning for DC students</td>
<td>Promptly address learning loss related to COVID-19 education disruptions; Research and implement innovative ways to keep students on track as pandemic disruptions continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic</strong></td>
<td>Many residents feel ignored by the city’s political leadership</td>
<td>Improve year-round engagement efforts between elected officials and all residents; Encourage political and community leaders to prioritize connecting with often underserved residents, including residents with low incomes, short-term residents (e.g., students, military), and youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic</strong></td>
<td>Many residents feel they are not informed about major changes to their neighborhoods</td>
<td>Improve communication efforts between developers/planners and residents to facilitate greater inclusion in decisions that affect their neighborhoods; Support residents to be more informed and active in the decision making in their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic</strong></td>
<td>Residents are unable to meet their needs due to a lack of information</td>
<td>Ensure that DC residents are aware of programs and services available to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>District residents continue to have high rates of severe and chronic health conditions</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of District residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure, asthma, and diabetes among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Maternal and infant health outcomes have improved in some parts of the city, but significant racial and geographic disparities remain</td>
<td>Increase access to high-quality prenatal care in Wards 7 and 8, where the rates of women receiving early prenatal care are the lowest; Provide educational resources to women across the city about the importance of early prenatal care; Address the high rate of low birthweight babies born in the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Residents express significant concerns about untreated mental health conditions and the lack of services available to them</td>
<td>Increase access to mental health services across the city; Ensure specialized services and services targeted specifically to certain populations (e.g., homeless individuals, new parents, youth) are available to all District residents who need them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Opioid overdoses continue to increase throughout the city, and many District residents continue to struggle with substance use/abuse. Residents express concern about increasing illegal drug use in public.</td>
<td>Increase access to substance abuse treatment; Increase outreach about treatment; Increase information and resource sharing among community-based organizations working in substance use treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Parents, especially those with low incomes, indicate increased stress and difficulties juggling all of their responsibilities</td>
<td>Increase availability of parenting classes so that new, young, or inexperienced parents can get off to a good start; Create opportunities for parents to engage in peer-to-peer learning, group counseling, or other community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Residents express concerns about increasing numbers of young people loitering around the city, not in school, and engaging in criminal activity</td>
<td>Provide additional academic and recreation services for youth and young adults; Create job training or work opportunities specifically targeted to at-risk youth and young adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Single parents with low incomes in DC experience many challenges</td>
<td>Address the unique challenges that single parents with low incomes face, including transportation, respite care, and supports to address stress and anxiety; Advocate for social service providers to share best practices and resources for wraparound services for families headed by single parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Gun violence and homicides are increasing in DC</td>
<td>Address increasing gun violence in the city with emphasis on neighborhoods identified as problem areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Despite many efforts, homelessness, including family homelessness, remains high in the District</td>
<td>Address homelessness through effective programming and transitional housing options; Ensure that people experiencing homelessness are screened and provided services for daily needs, physical or mental health conditions, and any other significant needs identified; Focus efforts on reducing the substantial and increasing number of young children experiencing homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Many neighborhoods in DC have limited access to fresh, affordable foods on a regular basis</td>
<td>Address concerns related to food deserts, particularly east of the river; Increase accessibility of fresh food markets or mobile markets year-round; Consider all food access issues, including where healthy food is available in stores, restaurants, and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Residents have expressed concern about the District’s aging infrastructure, especially the number of lead pipes in the city</td>
<td>Ensure residents know that they can request a water test kit from DC Water; Address water contamination issues, particularly those related to lead pipes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To prioritize the needs identified in this Community Needs Assessment, stakeholders (including UPO staff, UPO board members, and ANC representatives) were asked to complete a short survey prioritizing the city-wide needs. The results are displayed in the tables below by category. A full ranking of all city-wide needs, regardless of category, is available in the appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Need for more housing city-wide that is affordable to low-and moderate-income families</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Need for more living wage jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Need for increased access to vocational skills training and adult education opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Need for improved communication about available human services</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Need for increased service accessibility (time, location, accessible to public transit)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Need to increase opportunities for high-quality education across the city</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Need for additional supports for at-risk students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Need to improve math and reading proficiency scores</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Need to address access and affordability of early childhood services in underserved neighborhoods</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Need to prioritize increasing the high school graduation rate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Need to promptly address COVID-19 learning loss at all levels</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Need for increased opportunities for residents to be involved in decision-making in their communities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Need to improve communication efforts between developers and residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Need for more opportunities for political and community leaders to connect with residents, especially in underserved communities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need for increased access to mental health services across the city</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need for job training specifically for at-risk youth and young adults</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need for increased access to care in medically underserved neighborhoods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need for increased out-of-school academic and recreational services for youth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need for high-quality prenatal and maternity care east of the river</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need for increased access to and outreach about substance abuse treatment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need for comprehensive health services city-wide that address high levels of high blood pressure, asthma, and diabetes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need for publicly accessible parenting classes in DC</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Need to address increasing overdoses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Need for proactive solutions to address gun violence in DC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Need for increased supports for families with young children experiencing homelessness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Need for opportunities to foster collaborative relationships between police and residents, especially in high-crime neighborhoods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Need for full-service grocery stores and fresh food markets equitably distributed throughout the city</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Need for measures to reduce rodent infestations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Need for increased transitional housing for formerly homeless persons</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Need to address water contamination issues related to lead pipes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Need for increased attention to public trash issues</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Economic Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Need for increased job opportunities for DC residents with low incomes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Need for increased access to financial resources and institutions in underserved neighborhoods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Need for financial trainings related to budgeting, saving, and building and maintaining credit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Need for first-time homebuyer support and assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Need for residents to be educated regarding their rights as renters or homeowners</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Need for increased business start-up funding</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Need for increased access to business and entrepreneurship training</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agency-Level Needs

The following agency-level needs were formulated based on information and input from three focus group discussions with UPO staff as well as data from a UPO employee satisfaction survey. To determine what key organizational needs should be included in this needs assessment, two focus groups were conducted with UPO directors and managers, and one focus group was conducted with UPO executives. All three focus groups were asked to define need as “any gaps or issues that would require strategies to address at the agency-level or the lack of something that is vital to achieve UPO's mission,” for the purpose of the focus group discussion.

Senior UPO staff were then asked to complete a survey to prioritize the needs identified. The agency-level needs fell into two major categories: operational/programmatic and staff-related. The tables below outline the needs identified and their rank based on the staff prioritization.

### Operational and Programmatic Agency-Level Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Need for improved communication and collaboration between programs and divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Need for shortened turnaround time and increased responsiveness of support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Need for streamlined program reporting requirements to minimize duplicative reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Need for a strategy to refer and track internal customers more effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Need for increased coordination between programs to provide wrap-around and case management services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Need for standardized and improved intake process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Need for more client-facing staff (including bilingual staff) in high-need programs like job development, affordable housing, and mental health case management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Need for increased access to automated tools to increase operational efficiency (e.g., grants management and hiring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Need for virtual and hybrid service delivery policies and practices for customer-serving programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Need for UPO to increase its visibility and brand awareness across DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improved internal communication was the highest priority operational or programmatic need, with over 45% of survey respondents ranking it as their highest priority need. This issue was also discussed extensively in the staff focus groups, with one participant stating, “improved transparency and ongoing communication across the organization will help program employees better serve their customers.” Another focus group participant noted that “a lot of our programs have the same clients, but we don’t
always . . . work together to serve them. More collaboration between the [customer]-facing programs that serve a lot of the same families [is needed].” Shortened turnaround time and increased responsiveness was also ranked as a high priority for focus group participants, with a third of survey respondents ranking it as their first or second priority need. Focus group participants noted that slow turnaround can be a challenge in many aspects of their work, including the onboarding process for new employees, receiving project deliverables from other departments, and general office communications. Some participants also discussed concerns about responsiveness in general, stating that they “tend to do two or three follow ups [to other departments] with no response.” Focus group participants also identified the need for streamlined program reporting requirements as a high priority, with over 18% of respondents ranking it as their first or second priority need. Regarding duplicative reporting, one focus group participant stated, “I think right now the organization has too many different reporting tools and a lot of them are requesting the same information.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Need for equitable pay structures and salaries that are in line with market rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Need for customer service training for all customer-facing roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Need for participatory decision-making to ensure staff have input in policies and decisions that impact their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Need for organization-wide diversity, equity, and inclusion training (e.g., language and LGBTQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Need for increased opportunities for telework, additional virtual tools, and staff and manager training to ensure UPO continues to evolve regarding virtual and hybrid work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Need for Mental Health First Aid training and related self-care trainings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding staff-related organizational needs, the need to evaluate pay structures to make them more equitable and in line with market rates was ranked the highest priority need by over 36% of respondents. Focus group participants noted that many positions at UPO offer salaries substantially lower than market rate, with one participant stating, “I don’t think there is equality in the salaries.” The need for customer service training was also a high-priority staff-related need, with over 27% of respondents ranking it as their highest priority need. Focus group participants discussed how many UPO employees are in customer-facing roles but have had limited customer service training. One participant noted, “I feel that all of us can use some type of ongoing customer service training,” while others discussed the lack of consistency in customer service across the organization. The third-highest ranked need on the staff-related side was the need for more participatory decision-making opportunities for staff at all levels. Over 30% of respondents ranked this as their first or second highest priority need.
WARD 1 SUMMARY DATA

85,285
WARD 1 POPULATION, 2020 CENSUS

KEY INDICATORS

Ward 1 Child Poverty Rate: 26%
Ward 1 Poverty Rate: 12%
Ward 1 schools have an average STAR rating of 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5)
Ward 1 Median Rent: $1,702

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

110
Ward 1 residents completed the 2021 needs assessment survey

Most frequently reported Ward 1 health conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental illness</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66% of Ward 1 survey respondents felt safer in their neighborhood than a year ago

Top 3 services needed by Ward 1 survey respondents

1. Work readiness/job skills
2. Utilities assistance
3. Referrals/information

The most needed health service in Ward 1 was family or individual counseling
Ward 1 Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section includes a comprehensive needs assessment of Ward 1. It begins by outlining social impact data for Ward 1 from the U.S. Census Bureau, D.C government, and other secondary sources. The social impact data provides an overview of Ward 1’s demographic, income, housing, education, and employment characteristics and provides a comparison to the District as a whole on the same indicators.

Next is a summary of education data for Ward 1, including an overview of all of the traditional public and public charter schools in the ward. Information on grades served and school rating is also provided in this section.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed for this needs assessment is presented at the ward level. The Ward 1 focus group report provides insights from personal conversations with Ward 1 residents, while the needs assessment survey results summarize findings from the 110 Ward 1 residents who completed the 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey.

Social Impact Data

The following table briefly outlines the demographic, income, housing, and other important characteristics of Ward 1 residents.

Table 12: Ward 1 Social Impact Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>85,134</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>85,285</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42,307</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>18,741</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>8,979</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>9,201</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</td>
<td>17,269</td>
<td>77,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

324 Ibid.
### Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Bracket</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>38,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>17,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>34,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>4,134</td>
<td>30,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>6,886</td>
<td>45,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>26,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>6,769</td>
<td>47,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$102,882</td>
<td>$92,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Indicator</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in poverty</td>
<td>9,648</td>
<td>107,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in poverty</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18 years in poverty</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Indicator</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% high school graduate or higher</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Indicator</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>38,910</td>
<td>311,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied units</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% renter occupied units</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% vacant units</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>35,796</td>
<td>291,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median home value</td>
<td>$649,100</td>
<td>$646,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$1,702</td>
<td>$1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% living alone</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% without internet</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Indicator</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% without vehicle available</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% public transportation user</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment Indicator</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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331 Ibid.
Education Summary Data

In late 2018, the District of Columbia’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) introduced a new resource for comparing public schools across the District: The DC School Report Card. A key element of the annual DC School Report Card is that each traditional public or public charter school in the District earns a rating between one and five on the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework.

The STAR Framework uses a variety of data to measure a school’s performance across five domains: academic achievement, academic growth, school environment, English language proficiency, and graduation rate. These domains are weighted differently depending upon the grades served and if a school is classified as alternative or not. The Framework also measures the performance of students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and each racial/ethnic group to ensure that schools are accountable for educating the city’s most vulnerable students. All of these factors are used to calculate a school’s composite STAR rating.

The following table presents an overview of the schools in Ward 1.

Table 13: Ward 1 Education Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>STAR Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Banneker High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce-Monroe Elementary School @ Park View</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardozo Education Campus</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-12th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Heights Education Campus</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-12th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.L. Haynes PCS - Middle School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th-8th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.D. Cooke Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University Middle School of Mathematics and Science PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Reed Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubman Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for this report, schools that offer only early childhood education (Pre-K3 and/or Pre-K4) or only offer adult education were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, due to the impact of COVID-19, STAR scores are unavailable for some schools on the 2020 report card.

Ward 1 is home to six elementary schools, two middle schools, one high school, and three education campuses. With only three charter schools and only 12 schools total, it has a relatively low number of educational institutions compared to other wards. Ward 1 schools overall have an average STAR rating

---
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of 3.25, while Ward 1 elementary schools do slightly better than the overall average, with an average STAR rating of 3.5.

Focus Group Results

The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities where they live. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix.

Overview

This focus group was conducted virtually from approximately 6:30-7:45 pm on May 14, 2021. The group consisted of six Ward 1 residents, five females and one male. As with all of the focus groups, the participants were asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic.

Civic

Overall, participants in this focus group felt that leaders in their community do a good job ensuring that the community’s needs are met. For example, participants stated that the ANC webpage is a good resource for knowing what is going on in their neighborhood. They also indicated that the DC 311 line is “very responsive” to issues such as streetlights not working and other neighborhood concerns. Another respondent noted that churches often reach out to the community and that there are many different organizations in Ward 1 that provide significant assistance with food, clothing, and other physical needs.

A variety of opinions were shared regarding neighborhood involvement. Several participants said they felt there were opportunities to be included in the future design of the neighborhood for those who wanted to be included. One participant stated, “we are included only if we apply ourselves. We need to go out to our ANC meetings, more people need to be more in tune with the ANCs.” Another participant echoed this sentiment, saying, “if you don’t attend the meetings, you’re not going to be included.” One participant offered a contrary view, saying that they did not think the community had been included in major decisions and that they “feel that we are being pushed out of our neighborhoods.”

Social

Ward 1 residents who participated in this focus group identified a number of social supports that would be useful in their community, including increased mental health services and mentorship programs for youth. This focus group also identified several social supports specifically for seniors that would be beneficial, including group exercise classes, nutrition courses, and opportunities for youth or young adults to help teach seniors new skills, such as how to use new technologies.

Ward 1 residents felt that quality education is not available throughout the District. One participant said, “I have not seen quality education available for adult education services.” Another participant compared two District middle schools, one a wealthy part of Ward 3 and one in a “Most of the books and school materials that students receive in the low-income communities are outdated, old, and used.”

-Ward 1 Focus Group Participant, on educational quality in DC
lower-income part of Ward 4, saying, “most of the books and school materials that students receive in the low-income communities are outdated, old, and used.”

Physical

Most Ward 1 residents agreed that they felt safer in their community now than they did a year ago. Participants provided a variety of reasons for this increased sense of safety, including: more stop signs, more and better protected bike lanes, more lighting on the streets, neighborhood watch, and an increased police presence.

The top health and environmental concerns identified by Ward 1 residents were:

- Teens/young adults who are not in school or working
- Gun violence
- Youth smoking K2 (a synthetic cannabinoid) in public
- Truancy

Economic

Ward 1 residents identified a number of support services that would be necessary for someone to start a new business in their community. These included resources on how to write a business proposal and a 5–10-year business plan, access to start-up funding, partnerships and connections in the community, and resources on how to market a new business.

Ward 1 residents also had many ideas about the types of training programs that would be beneficial to members of their community. Several of the suggestions were related to education and training opportunities, such as GED classes and vocational training in plumbing and electrical work. Other participants noted that trainings related to parenting and nutrition and food education would be beneficial to many families in their community.

In order for a young family with a limited income to buy or rent a home in Ward 1, focus group participants believe they would need some or all of the following supports:

- Rental assistance
- Affordable housing
- Budget management training
- Financial literacy classes
- A credit advisor/classes on achieving and maintaining good credit

COVID-19

In 2021, an additional question was added to all needs assessment focus groups, asking “How has the pandemic affected you and your family members?” Ward 1 residents had a variety of experiences throughout the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Some of these experiences are documented below, in residents’ own words.
“Anxiety! My anxiety went up. I appreciate that people respect your personal space.”

-Ward 1 Focus Group Participant, on the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic

“I wouldn’t say it impacted me in a bad manner. It brought me and my family closer together. We sit and eat meals together now. It was one of the worst best things that could happen.”

“It was terrifying because a lot of people died.”

“I have not taken the vaccine yet and I’m not sure. I need more information regarding the vaccine.”

“Anxiety! My anxiety went up. I appreciate that people respect your personal space. I appreciate being home. I feel that we are a stronger community [than before].”

“I’m a social person. I like to go outside. I don’t like my children in the house all day.”

“I did catch COVID after I took the vaccine . . . It felt like I had a bad cold. I had so much love from my family.”

Needs Assessment Survey Results

Ward 1 UPO 2021 District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey Results

A total of 110 Ward 1 residents completed UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey. The average Ward 1 survey respondent was a married white male in his 30s. The typical survey participant for Ward 1 had earned a bachelor’s degree and was employed full-time with an average income between $45,000 and $64,999 per year. This indicates that on average, Ward 1 survey respondents had incomes below the Ward 1 median income, which is $102,882 (see Table 12).

Figure 90: Ward 1 - Gender
Figure 91: Ward 1 – Marital Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Marital Status

- Married: 70.0%
- Single: 27.3%
- Widowed: 0.9%
- Divorced: 0.9%
- Partnered: 0.9%

Figure 92: Ward 1 – Age

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Age Range

- 15-19: 6.4%
- 20-24: 5.5%
- 25-29: 7.3%
- 30-39: 24.5%
- 40-49: 46.4%
- 50-59: 8.2%
- 60+: 1.8%
- 60+: 1.8%
Figure 93: Ward 1 – Race/Ethnicity

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Race/Ethnicity

![Pie chart showing race/ethnicity distribution in Ward 1]

- White: 63.9%
- Black: 24.1%
- Hispanic: 4.6%
- American Indian: 1.9%
- Native Hawaiian: 1.9%
- Asian: 1.9%
- Other: 0.9%
- Two or more races: 0.9%

Figure 94: Ward 1 – Education

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Highest Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earned Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed High School</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Master’s Degree or greater</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Technical School</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 95: Ward 1 – Annual Household Income

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income ($)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 24,999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 44,999</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000 - 64,999</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 +</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 96: Ward 1 – Employment Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Employment Status

- Employed full-time: 68.2%
- Employed part-time: 10.0%
- Unemployed, looking for work: 6.4%
- Self-employed: 1.8%
- Retired: 0.9%
- Student: 0.9%
- Homemaker: 0.9%
- Other: 0.9%
- No Answer: 0.9%
The household health conditions reported by Ward 1 residents closely mirror the city-wide data, with high blood pressure and diabetes as the two most frequently reported conditions. Asthma and mental illness were also frequently reported by Ward 1 survey respondents, with 8.7% of respondents indicating that they or someone in their household has either asthma or a mental illness.
Just over 68% of Ward 1 survey respondents reported that they had ever received assistance or services from UPO, somewhat higher than the citywide average of 58% of respondents who had ever received assistance or services from UPO.

*Figure 99: Ward 1 – Ever Received Help from UPO*

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents who received help from UPO.]

UPO offers many services to residents of the District of Columbia. As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked if they needed or received assistance in the past 12 months in 24 different service areas (see chart below) including but not limited to: employment services, food assistance, childcare, healthcare, education, housing, transportation, and income supports. Figure 100 illustrates the different UPO services needed and received by Ward 1 residents. Work readiness/job skills and utilities assistance were the two most frequently cited needs among Ward 1 survey respondents, while the most received services by Ward 1 respondents were assistance with obtaining healthcare/insurance and Medicare/Medicaid.
Based on the need-based categories from the survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in Ward 1. They are highlighted in Figure 101. Figure 102 and Figure 103 look at the needs of Ward 1 residents categorically, by looking at all income/employment needs in one table and all health needs in another.
Figure 101: Ward 1 – Top 5 Needs

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Top 5 Services Needed

- Family/Individual Counseling: 36
- TANF: 38
- Referrals/Information: 39
- Utilities: 40
- Work Readiness / job skills: 45

Figure 102: Ward 1 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

- Unemployment Compensation: 24 Needed Assistance, 25 Received Assistance
- Income Tax Preparation: 28 Needed Assistance, 22 Received Assistance
- Skills Training: 32 Needed Assistance, 20 Received Assistance
- Employment services: 34 Needed Assistance, 25 Received Assistance
- Work Readiness / job skills: 45 Needed Assistance, 17 Received Assistance

Figure 103: Ward 1 – Health Services Needed and Received

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Health Services Needed and Received

- Alcohol or drug abuse counseling: 25 Needed Assistance, 22 Received Assistance
- Mental Health Services: 29 Needed Assistance, 18 Received Assistance
- Obtaining Healthcare/Insurance: 33 Needed Assistance, 29 Received Assistance
- Medicaid/Medicare: 34 Needed Assistance, 31 Received Assistance
- Family/Individual Counseling: 36 Needed Assistance, 20 Received Assistance
Apart from the 28% of respondents did not report any challenges to meeting their needs in Ward 1, a sizeable number of the respondents either did not know where to go for help (22%) or were concerned about confidentiality (28%).

Figure 104: Ward 1 – Roadblocks to Meeting Needs

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – Roadblocks to Meeting Needs

Over 70% of Ward 1 survey respondents felt they were included in decisions about what their neighborhood would look like in the future. This is a somewhat different perspective from the Ward 1 focus group, where responses about being included in neighborhood decisions were more mixed.

Figure 105: Ward 1 – Included in Neighborhood Future

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 1 – I Feel Included in The Decisions of What My Neighborhood Would Look Like in the Future

66% of Ward 1 respondents reported feeling safer in their neighborhood than the previous year. This is a similar finding to the Ward 1 focus group, where most participants also stated that they felt safer in their neighborhood than they did a year ago.
While most Ward 1 residents agreed that the police were respectful of their rights as citizens, a large number of respondents also indicated they were neutral or did not provide a response to this question.

Most Ward 1 survey respondents (nearly 80%) agreed that they can afford to continue to live in their neighborhoods.
Most Ward 1 respondents indicated that they were somewhat confident in the District government’s ability to provide jobs.

As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked their top three preferences for how the city should use the land if there were a vacant lot on their block. The top three choices indicated by Ward 1 residents were a community center, a community garden, and residential use.
Recommendations for Addressing Ward 1 Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Many residents lack the education skills to obtain jobs that pay a living wage</td>
<td>Increase access to vocational skills training; Increase adult education opportunities; Target opportunities to neighborhoods and populations with especially high unemployment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 1 residents fear displacement as development and gentrification spreads throughout their neighborhoods</td>
<td>Increase access to affordable housing; Facilitate access to rental and mortgage assistance; Ensure Ward 1 residents know their rights as renters or homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 1 residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Ensure confidentiality in service encounters whenever possible to ease residents’ concerns about confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 1 residents identified assistance with utilities as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase access to and availability of utilities assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 1 residents identified referrals/information as one of their most</td>
<td>Ensure all residents requesting referrals or information receive the services they need;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>DC students are underperforming, and Ward 1 residents indicated they do not think a quality education is available to all District residents</td>
<td>Share information and resources with other service providers to reduce duplication of services and ensure customers are referred to the organization best equipped to provide the services they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civics</strong></td>
<td>Many Ward 1 residents are not informed about major changes to their neighborhoods</td>
<td>Increase equity in educational opportunities at both traditional public schools and public charter schools; Increase STAR ratings at underperforming Ward 1 schools; Improve math and reading proficiency scores in Ward 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 1 residents have high rates of serious, chronic health conditions</td>
<td>Improve communication efforts between developers/planners and residents to facilitate greater inclusion in decisions that affect their neighborhoods; Support residents to be more informed and active in the decision making in their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 1 residents express significant concerns about untreated mental health conditions and the lack of services available to them, and identified family/individual counseling as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of Ward 1 residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure, asthma, diabetes, and mental illness among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 1 residents express concerns about increasing numbers of young people loitering around the city, not in school or working, and truancy</td>
<td>Increase access to mental health services, including specialized services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Increased isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic has made certain subgroups of Ward 1 residents, such as senior citizens and new parents, especially vulnerable</td>
<td>Provide additional academic and recreation services for youth and young adults; Encourage young people to participate in mentorship programs; Engage parents, schools, and community groups to work together to solve truancy issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Increased isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic has made certain subgroups of Ward 1 residents, such as senior citizens and new parents, especially vulnerable</td>
<td>Publicize the senior services already available, and engage Ward 1 seniors in planning new programs to engage seniors; Promote social engagement through community interest groups or classes, such as cooking or wellness groups; Offer classes and workshops for parents on positive parenting practices and child development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Gun violence is an increasing concern for Ward 1 residents</td>
<td>Address increasing gun violence with an emphasis on neighborhoods identified as problem areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Ward 1 residents identified Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Ensure residents eligible for TANF are able to promptly apply and start receiving benefits; Work with families needing TANF to determine what other services could be beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>DC residents are interested in starting businesses but lack the training and resources</td>
<td>Increase access to and awareness of business start-up capital and business and entrepreneurship training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WARD 2
Needs Assessment
WARD 2 SUMMARY DATA

81,904
WARD 2 POPULATION, 2020 CENSUS

KEY INDICATORS

Ward 2 Child Poverty Rate: 8%
Ward 2 Poverty Rate: 14%
Ward 2 schools have an average STAR rating of 4.22 (on a scale of 1-5)
Ward 2 Median Rent: $2,024

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

81
Ward 2 residents completed the 2021 needs assessment survey

Most frequently reported Ward 2 health conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71% of Ward 2 survey respondents felt safer in their neighborhood than a year ago

Top 3 services needed by Ward 2 survey respondents

1. Child Support
2. Medicare/Medicaid
3. Employment services

The most needed health services in Ward 2 were family or individual counseling and Medicare/Medicaid (both needed by 41%)
Ward 2 Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section includes a comprehensive needs assessment of Ward 2. It begins by outlining social impact data for Ward 2 from the U.S. Census Bureau, D.C government, and other secondary sources. The social impact data provides an overview of Ward 2’s demographic, income, housing, education, and employment characteristics and provides a comparison to the District as a whole on the same indicators.

Next is a summary of education data for Ward 2, including an overview of all of the traditional public and public charter schools in the ward. Information on grades served and school rating is also provided in this section.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed for this needs assessment is presented at the ward level. The Ward 2 focus group report provides insights from personal conversations with Ward 2 residents, while the needs assessment survey results summarize findings from the 81 Ward 2 residents who completed the 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey.

Social Impact Data

The following table briefly outlines the demographic, income, housing, and other important characteristics of Ward 2 residents.

Table 14: Ward 2 Social Impact Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>77,791</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>81,904</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54,821</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>6,864</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9,388</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>7,378</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</td>
<td>8,959</td>
<td>77,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>38,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>17,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>34,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>4,241</td>
<td>30,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>7,061</td>
<td>45,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>26,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>8,805</td>
<td>47,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$111,064</td>
<td>$92,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty

- # in poverty: 9,147
- % in poverty: 14.0%
- % under 18 years in poverty: 7.6%

## Education

- % high school graduate or higher: 96.6%
- % bachelor’s degree or higher: 85.8%

## Housing

- Housing units: 42,962
- % owner occupied units: 36.9%
- % renter occupied units: 63.1%
- % vacant units: 11.7%
- Households: 37,598
- Median home value: $690,300
- Median Rent: $2,024
- % living alone: 27.1%
- % without internet: 8.8%

## Transportation

- % without vehicle available: 50.1%
- % public transportation user: 23.9%

## Unemployment

- Unemployment rate: 3.8%
- Unemployment rate: 5.7%

---

339 DC State Data Center. (2019). *DC data viz ward income indicators.*


345 Ibid.

In late 2018, the District of Columbia’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) introduced a new resource for comparing public schools across the District: The DC School Report Card. A key element of the annual DC School Report Card is that each traditional public or public charter school in the District earns a rating between one and five on the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework.

The STAR Framework uses a variety of data to measure a school’s performance across five domains: academic achievement, academic growth, school environment, English language proficiency, and graduation rate. These domains are weighted differently depending upon the grades served and if a school is classified as alternative or not. The Framework also measures the performance of students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and each racial/ethnic group to ensure that schools are accountable for educating the city’s most vulnerable students. All of these factors are used to calculate a school’s composite STAR rating.347

The following table presents an overview of the schools in Ward 2.348

Table 15: Ward 2 Education Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>STAR Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASIS DC PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th-12th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Ellington School of the Arts</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Global Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill Excel Center PCS</td>
<td>Charter (Alternative)</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy Middle School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde-Addison Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Without Walls @ Francis-Stevens</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Without Walls High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for this report, schools that offer only early childhood education (Pre-K3 and/or Pre-K4) or only offer adult education were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, due to the impact of COVID-19, STAR scores are unavailable for some schools on the 2020 report card.

Ward 2 is home to four elementary schools, one middle school, four high schools, and two education campuses. With only three charter schools and only 11 schools total, it has the second-fewest number of educational institutions compared to other wards. Ward 2 schools have an average STAR rating of 4.22, but two of the three charter schools in Ward 2 did not have reported STAR ratings for 2020.

Focus Group Results

The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities where they live. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix.

Overview

This focus group was conducted virtually from approximately 1:15-3:00 pm on July 29, 2021. The group was made up of six Ward 2 residents, three females and three males. As with all of the focus groups, the participants were asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic.

Civic

Ward 2 residents shared a range of responses regarding how political, religious, and community organizations ensure that needs are being met in their neighborhoods. Two respondents noted that ANC 2F places a strong focus on engaging with the community and meeting the diverse needs of residents. The two participants discussed how ANC 2F collaborates with religious organizations in Ward 2 to post information about community meetings and frequently shares resources related to employment opportunities and food distributions. Another participant stated that their ANC provided “great communication,” that they were very impressed with the new Ward 2 council member, and that “good communication from elected officials is very important.” One Ward 2 resident noted that they see several churches in the area assisting residents with food and other basic needs and that Mutual Aid has supported residents throughout the District during the pandemic. Another focus group participant shared that they frequently see representatives from churches and other community organizations in the neighborhood but would like to see their elected officials more involved in the neighborhood. Another resident discussed how the needs in some of the poorer communities in Ward 2 are not being prioritized and noted that these are often neighborhoods with large Hispanic and Asian populations.

Most Ward 2 focus group participants felt that they had many opportunities to participate in the future design of their neighborhood through ANC meetings, neighborhood newsletters, and communications from community leaders. One participant noted that while they feel they have had numerous opportunities to contribute to the future design of their neighborhood, they still have concerns, especially about upcoming redistricting. Another participant said they did not feel included in the future design of their neighborhood, stating, “they just put a liquor store at the corner of our block which used to be a coffee shop. We did not know that there was going to be a liquor store there. We don’t know what is going on in Chinatown. We don’t need more store and restaurants . . . we need more low- to moderate-income housing.”

Social

349 ANC 2F represents the neighborhoods of Logan Circle, Thomas Circle, Old City, Blagden Alley, Franklin Square, as well as parts of Shaw and Downtown
Ward 2 focus group participants identified increased homelessness services and mental health services as the key social supports needed in their community.

Regarding education in the District, Ward 2 residents had a range of responses. Several participants noted their families had good experiences at elementary schools in Ward 2. One participant stated that “we shifted my grandchildren all over the place so they [can] receive a quality education.” Other respondents discussed concerns about the lack of out-of-school-time programming and early care and education options in Ward 2, especially during the pandemic.

Physical

Regarding neighborhood safety, Ward 2 focus group participants primarily discussed elements that made their neighborhoods feel less safe. They highlighted many issues, including lack of police presence, homeless encampments, people brandishing weapons in public, untreated mental health issues, and increased robberies. One participant noted that they have changed their lifestyle due to concerns about their physical safety and no longer go out at night.

The top health and environmental concerns identified by this focus group were:

- Old infrastructure, including lead pipes
- Rodents
- COVID-19 and differences in safety precautions (masks, vaccines)
- Lead in schools

Economic

When asked about what type of support services someone might need to start a new business in their community, participants in this focus group had a range of suggestions. One participant noted that many services are already available, including a DCRA (Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs) service center that provides information on how to start a business, grants, and low-interest loans. Other participants suggested materials translated into the main languages spoken by Ward 2 residents and resources related to maintaining a business through a crisis, given all the challenges small business owners are facing during the pandemic.

Regarding what training programs would be most beneficial to their community, Ward 2 residents primarily focused on job-related opportunities. These included increased vocational training for young people, increased opportunities with the DC Infrastructure Academy, and training programs focused on employment opportunities for seniors who want or need to work after retirement.

For a young family on a limited income to buy or rent a home in their neighborhood, Ward 2 focus group participants believe a family looking to buy would need down payment assistance, and a family looking to rent would need rental assistance or a rent-controlled unit. One Ward 2 resident offered a different perspective, stating that they do not think a family on a limited income would be looking in Ward 2 in the first place, given how expensive it is and that there are parts of the city with better options for families that are also less costly.

COVID-19
In 2021, an additional question was added to all needs assessment focus groups, asking “How has the pandemic affected you and your family members?” Ward 2 residents had a variety of experiences throughout the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Some of these experiences are documented below, in residents’ own words.

“I came to realize how much I miss and enjoy [DC] . . . I missed visiting the museums.”

“I didn’t mind being home. I was diagnosed with cancer for the second time and was very blessed to have a cancer team and cancer center that was one of the safest places to be.”

“I was very disappointed with those that did not protect their health or others' health.”

“I think the mayor really stepped up during the pandemic. She did a great job in . . . assuring health precautions for residents.”

“I work with young women and experienced an uptick of addressing their mental health needs.”

“I feel privileged in many ways of having a home and escape from some concerns that others were experiencing.”

“In the beginning, the lockdown impacted me. Society as a whole bothered me . . . the pandemic affected my emotional stability. I’ve also observed how selfish people are by not wearing masks or practicing social distancing.”

- Ward 2 Focus Group Participant, on the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic

Needs Assessment Survey Results

Ward 2 UPO 2021 Community Needs Assessment Survey Results

A total of 81 Ward 2 residents completed UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey.

The average Ward 2 survey respondent was a married White male in his 30s. The typical survey participant for Ward 2 had earned a bachelor’s degree and was employed full-time with an average income between $45,000 and $64,999 per year. This indicates that on average, Ward 2 survey respondents had incomes below the Ward 2 median income, which is $111,064 (see Table 14).
Figure 111: Ward 2 - Gender

![Pie chart showing gender distribution in Ward 2]

Figure 112: Ward 2 - Marital Status

![Pie chart showing marital status distribution in Ward 2]
Figure 113: Ward 2 - Age

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Age Range

- 30-39: 50.6%
- 25-29: 19.8%
- 40-49: 14.8%
- 20-24: 6.2%
- 60+: 4.9%
- 50-59: 3.7%

Figure 114: Ward 2 – Race/Ethnicity

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Race/Ethnicity

- White: 75.0%
- Black: 11.3%
- Asian: 6.3%
- American indian: 2.5%
- Hispanic: 2.5%
- Other: 2.5%
- Native hawaiian: 1.3%
- Other: 1.3%
Figure 115: Ward 2 - Education

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Highest Education Level

- Earned Bachelor’s Degree
- Earned Associate’s Degree
- Completed High School
- Earned Master’s Degree or greater
- Completed Technical School
- Less than High School Graduate
- No Answer

Figure 116: Ward 2 – Annual Household Income

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Annual Household Income

- 0 - 24,999: 6.0
- 25,000 - 44,999: 21.0
- 45,000 - 64,999: 34.0
- 65,000 - 100,000: 14.0
- 100,000 +: 6.0
- No Answer
Figure 117: Ward 2 – Employment Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Employment Status

- Employed full-time: 69.1%
- Employed part-time: 13.6%
- Retired: 6.2%
- Unemployed, looking for work: 6.2%
- Self-employed: 2.5%
- Student: 1.2%
- Homemaker: 1.2%

Figure 118: Ward 2 – Health Insurance

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Do you have Health Insurance

- Yes, through Medicaid/Medicare: 22.2%
- Yes, through my employer or my spouse’s or relative’s employer: 13.6%
- Yes, through healthcare.gov or DC Health Link: 2.5%
- No: 60.5%
- Other: 1.2%
As Figure 119 illustrates, the household health conditions most frequently reported by Ward 2 survey respondents were high blood pressure, asthma, and learning disabilities.

Figure 119: Ward 2 – Household Health Conditions

Just over 69% of Ward 2 survey respondents reported that they had ever received assistance or services from UPO, somewhat higher than the citywide average of 58%. Given that most Ward 2 survey respondents were UPO customers, the UPO data on Ward 2 residents looks significantly different than most DC government or U.S. Census data on Ward 2.
UPO offers many services to residents of the District of Columbia. As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked if they needed or received assistance in the past 12 months in 24 different service areas (see chart below), including but not limited to: employment services, food assistance, childcare, healthcare, education, housing, transportation, and income supports. Figure 121 illustrates the different UPO services needed and received by Ward 2 residents. Child support was the most frequently cited need among Ward 2 survey respondents, followed by Medicare/Medicaid, employment services, and individual/family counseling. The services most frequently received by Ward 2 respondents were utilities assistance and mental health services.
Based on the need-based categories from the survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in Ward 2. They are highlighted in Figure 122.

Figure 123 and Figure 124 look at the needs of Ward 2 residents categorically, by looking at all income/employment needs in one table and all health needs in another.
Figure 122: Ward 2 – Top 5 Needs

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Top 5 Services Needed

- Food stamps/SNAP: 32
- Employment services: 33
- Medicaid/Medicare: 33
- Child support: 37
- Family/individual Counseling: 33

Figure 123: Ward 2 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

- Skills Training: Needed Assistance 17, Received Assistance 22
- Unemployment Compensation: Needed Assistance 16, Received Assistance 29
- Work Readiness / Job skills: Needed Assistance 17, Received Assistance 29
- Income Tax Preparation: Needed Assistance 18, Received Assistance 29
- Employment services: Needed Assistance 12, Received Assistance 33

Figure 124: Ward 2 – Health Services Needed and Received

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 2 – Health Services Needed and Received

- Alcohol or drug abuse counseling: Needed Assistance 18, Received Assistance 21
- Mental Health Services: Needed Assistance 21, Received Assistance 22
- Obtaining Healthcare/Insurance: Needed Assistance 20, Received Assistance 31
- Family/individual Counseling: Needed Assistance 17, Received Assistance 33
- Medicaid/Medicare: Needed Assistance 9, Received Assistance 33
Apart from the 30% of respondents who did not report any challenges to meeting their needs in Ward 2, a sizeable number of the respondents either reported that obtaining services was too much trouble (27%), they lacked adequate transportation (21%), or had concerns about confidentiality (21%).

*Figure 125: Ward 2 – Roadblocks to Meetings Needs*

Nearly 80% of Ward 2 survey respondents felt they were included in decisions about what their neighborhood would look like in the future. This is somewhat surprising given the Ward 2 focus group responses, where some participants felt very included in neighborhood decisions and others did not feel included at all.

*Figure 126: Ward 2 – Included in Neighborhood Future*

Over 70% of Ward 2 respondents reported feeling safer in their neighborhood than the previous year. This is also somewhat surprising given the Ward 2 focus group responses, when respondents primarily focused on elements that made the neighborhood feel less safe than a year ago.
The vast majority of Ward 2 residents agreed that the “police were respectful of their rights as a citizen” (47% respectful, 30% very respectful). However, 11% respondents maintained that the police been “disrespectful” or “very disrespectful” of their rights as citizens and 12% remained neutral.

Most Ward 2 survey respondents (46%) agreed that they can afford to continue to live in their neighborhoods.
Most Ward 2 respondents (37%) indicated that they were somewhat confident in the District government’s ability to provide jobs.

As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked their top three preferences for how the city should use the land if there were a vacant lot on their block. The top choices indicated by Ward 2 residents were a community center, a community garden, social services, and residential use.
### Recommendations for Addressing Ward 2 Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Many residents lack the education skills to obtain jobs that pay a living wage</td>
<td>Increase access to vocational skills training; Increase adult education opportunities; Target opportunities to neighborhoods and populations with especially high unemployment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 2 is increasingly unaffordable for many residents as housing costs continue to increase</td>
<td>Increase access to affordable housing; Focus on low-to-moderate income housing, which is lacking throughout Ward 2; Facilitate access to rental and mortgage assistance; Ensure Ward 2 residents know their rights as renters or homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 2 residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Ensure confidentiality in service encounters whenever possible to ease residents’ concerns about confidentiality; When possible, offer virtual options or transportation vouchers so that residents without reliable transportation can still obtain services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>The COVID-19 pandemic continues to disrupt learning for DC students, and families struggle with limited out of school time resources.</td>
<td>Promptly address learning loss related to COVID-19 education disruptions; Compile and provide resources to families outlining childcare and out of school time offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civics</strong></td>
<td>Many Ward 2 residents are not informed about major changes to their neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Improve communication efforts between developers/planners and residents to facilitate greater inclusion in decisions that affect their neighborhoods; Support residents to be more informed and active in the decision making in their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civics</strong></td>
<td>Ward 2 residents who are not native English speakers have fewer opportunities to participate in their community than native English speakers.</td>
<td>Increase the availability of written, visual, and recorded materials in languages other than English; Focus engagement efforts on large Hispanic and Asian populations that reside in Ward 2 who may have been excluded from previous community engagement efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 2 residents have high rates of serious, chronic health conditions.</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of Ward 2 residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure, asthma, diabetes, and learning disability among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 2 residents identified assistance with Medicare/Medicaid as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Make inquiring about health insurance a standard practice for all social service providers in DC; Ensure partnerships/referral systems are in place for Medicare/Medicaid eligible residents that are not currently enrolled; Have resources and FAQs related to Medicare/Medicaid services and enrollment available throughout the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 2 residents express significant concerns about untreated mental health conditions and the lack of services available to them, and identified family/individual counseling as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Increase access to mental health services, including specialized services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Despite many efforts, homelessness remains high throughout the District, including in Ward 2.</td>
<td>Address homelessness through effective programming and transitional housing options; Assure that people experiencing homelessness are screened and provided services for daily needs, physical or mental health conditions, and any other significant needs identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Ward 2 residents identified SNAP/Food Stamps as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Address food insecurity issues in Ward 2; Increase accessibility of fresh food markets or mobile markets year-round;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ward 2 residents expressed concern about the District’s aging infrastructure, especially the number of lead pipes in the city</td>
<td>Provide resources on SNAP eligibility requirements, how and where to apply, and how to use SNAP. Ensure residents know that they can request a water test kit from DC Water; Address water contamination issues, particularly those related to lead pipes; Leverage federal interest in and focus on infrastructure and lead pipe replacement to advocate for DC to speed up its lead pipe replacement project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Neighborhoods are seeing increased issues with trash and pests</td>
<td>Reduce rodent infestations; Reduce issues related to trash piling up on sidewalks and streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Ward 2 residents identified employment services as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment, specifically vocational training and opportunities for older adults</td>
<td>Increase vocational training opportunities in Ward 2; Create training programs for older adults looking to change careers or return to the workforce.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WARD 3
Needs Assessment
WARD 3 SUMMARY DATA

85,301
WARD 3 POPULATION, 2020 CENSUS

KEY INDICATORS

Ward 3 Child Poverty Rate: 2%

Ward 3 Poverty Rate: 8%

Ward 3 schools have an average STAR rating of 4.44 (on a scale of 1-5)

Ward 3 Median Rent: $1,867

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

94
Ward 3 residents completed the 2021 needs assessment survey

Most frequently reported Ward 3 health conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76% of Ward 3 survey respondents felt safer in their neighborhood than a year ago

Top 3 services needed by Ward 3 survey respondents

1. Referrals/information
2. College or trade school
3. Work readiness/job skills

The most needed health service in Ward 3 was mental health services
Ward 3 Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section includes a comprehensive needs assessment of Ward 3. It begins by outlining social impact data for Ward 3 from the U.S. Census Bureau, D.C government, and other secondary sources. The social impact data provides an overview of Ward 3’s demographic, income, housing, education, and employment characteristics and provides a comparison to the District as a whole on the same indicators.

Next is a summary of education data for Ward 3, including an overview of all of the traditional public and public charter schools in the ward. Information on grades served and school rating is also provided in this section.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed for this needs assessment is presented at the ward level. The Ward 3 focus group report provides insights from personal conversations with Ward 3 residents, while the needs assessment survey results summarize findings from the 94 Ward 3 residents who completed the 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey.

Social Impact Data

The following table briefly outlines the demographic, income, housing, and other important characteristics of Ward 3 residents.

Table 16: Ward 3 Social Impact Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population(^{350})</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018(^{351})</td>
<td>85,067</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020(^{351})</td>
<td>85,301</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity(^{353})</th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60,841</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7,087</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>2,142</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>8,906</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</td>
<td>8,293</td>
<td>77,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{351}\) U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). American community survey 5-year estimates. Table DP05.


\(^{353}\) Ibid.
## Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>38,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>17,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>34,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>30,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>6,841</td>
<td>45,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>26,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>11,818</td>
<td>47,342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Measure</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in poverty</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>107,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in poverty</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18 years in poverty</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% high school graduate or higher</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Measure</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>40,950</td>
<td>311,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied units</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% renter occupied units</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% vacant units</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>37,623</td>
<td>291,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median home value</td>
<td>$929,200</td>
<td>$646,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$1,867</td>
<td>$1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% living alone</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% without internet</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Measure</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% without vehicle available</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% public transportation user</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment Measure</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Education Summary Data

In late 2018, the District of Columbia’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) introduced a new resource for comparing public schools across the District: The DC School Report Card. A key element of the annual DC School Report Card is that each traditional public or public charter school in the District earns a rating between one and five on the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework.

The STAR Framework uses a variety of data to measure a school’s performance across five domains: academic achievement, academic growth, school environment, English language proficiency, and graduation rate. These domains are weighted differently depending upon the grades served and if a school is classified as alternative or not. The Framework also measures the performance of students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and each racial/ethnic group to ensure that schools are accountable for educating the city’s most vulnerable students. All of these factors are used to calculate a school’s composite STAR rating.  

The following table presents an overview of the schools in Ward 3.

Table 17: Ward 3 Education Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>STAR Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deal Middle School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearst Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janney Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murch Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster-Adams Bilingual School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoddert Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for this report, schools that offer only early childhood education (Pre-K3 and/or Pre-K4) or only offer adult education were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, due to the impact of COVID-19, STAR scores are unavailable for some schools on the 2020 report card.

Ward 3 is home to seven elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and one education campus. With only ten schools total and no charter schools, Ward 3 has the fewest elementary and secondary educational institutions of all wards in the District. Ward 3 schools also have the highest average STAR rating of any ward in the District, at 4.44.

---


Focus Group Results

The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities where they live. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix.

Overview

Facilitators were unable to connect with enough Ward 3 residents to constitute a full focus group. Instead, structured interviews were conducted with two Ward 3 residents. These interviews were conducted virtually from 1:00 -2:15 pm on July 27, 2021. These interviews, like all of the focus groups, asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic.

Civic

When asked how community leaders ensure their needs are being met, one resident noted that a nearby church provides food, which is a “very helpful” resource to have in the neighborhood. Both interviewees felt that their community leaders help ensure the neighborhood is safe.

One Ward 3 resident said they do not feel included in the future design of their neighborhood, but also that they have not made an effort to be involved. The only concern the participants had about the future of the neighborhood was that the neighborhood might get overcrowded because of all the new buildings being built.

Social

The Ward 3 residents interviewed did not identify any social supports that they think people in their community need. They did note that they feel well supported, and that they appreciate having a recreation center in their community. Regarding if quality education is available to all in the District, the Ward 3 interviewees said they believe that there is quality education available in their community, but that many residents do not take advantage of the educational opportunities available.

Physical

The interviewees stated that they felt very safe in their community and that there is very little crime. They also noted that they rarely leave their neighborhood, so they do not know much about the safety of the city outside of their neighborhood.

The top health and environmental concerns identified by the two individuals interviewed were homelessness and panhandling.

Economic

In order to start a new business in their community, the participants believe that someone would need consultants to help them get started, a web designer, professional writing services, and financial support. In terms of training programs that the community needs, one interviewee stated that the community would benefit from more job training programs.
The two individuals interviewed thought it was unreasonable for a young family with limited income to try to buy or rent a home in their neighborhood. The only suggestions for support they offered were getting a new job that provides a higher income, applying for a Section 8 waiting list, or asking family members for support to help buy or rent a home.

**COVID-19**

One of the residents interviewed had cancer during the pandemic. When they wanted to go out, it was hard for them to accept that they had to wear a mask because it was difficult to breathe. Eventually this resident got used to wearing a mask and is very cautious now. The other resident felt like people were more united as a community during the pandemic, and that now people are “going back to their old ways” and not being friendly anymore. This resident did not like it when everything shut down and everyone had to wear a mask everywhere.

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**

**Ward 3 UPO 2021 Community Needs Assessment Survey Results**

A total of 94 Ward 3 residents completed UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey. The average Ward 3 survey respondent was a married White male in his 30s. The typical survey participant for Ward 3 had completed high school and was employed full-time with an average income between $45,000 and $64,999 per year. This indicates that on average, Ward 3 survey respondents had incomes below the Ward 3 median income, which is $128,670 (see Table 16).

*Figure 132: Ward 3 - Gender*
Figure 133: Ward 3 – Marital Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 3 – Marital Status

- 74.5% Married
- 17.0% Single
- 4.3% Divorced
- 2.1% Widowed
- 1.1% Separated
- 1.1% Partnered

Figure 134: Ward 3 – Age

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 3 – Age Range

- 45.7% 30-39
- 25.5% 40-49
- 11.7% 50-59
- 6.4% 60+
- 4.3% 15-19
- 3.2% 20-24
- 2.1% 25-29
Figure 135: Ward 3 – Race/Ethnicity

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 3 – Race/Ethnicity

- White: 78.5%
- Black: 12.9%
- Other: 2.2%
- Hispanic: 2.2%
- Asian: 1.1%
- American Indian: 1.1%
- Two or more races: 2.2%

Figure 136: Ward 3 – Education

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 3 – Highest Education Level

- Completed High School: 24
- Earned Bachelor's Degree: 20
- Earned Associate's Degree: 10
- Earned Master's Degree or greater: 8
- Less than High School Graduate: 2
- Completed Technical School: 1
- No Answer: 1
Figure 137: Ward 3 – Annual Household Income

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 3 – Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income ($)</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>0 - 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 - 44,999</th>
<th>45,000 - 64,999</th>
<th>65,000 - 100,000</th>
<th>100,000 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 138: Ward 3 – Employment Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 3 – Employment Status

- Employed full-time: 77.7%
- Student: 3.2%
- Employed part-time: 3.2%
- Unemployed, looking for work: 3.2%
- Self-employed: 3.2%
- Homemaker: 3.2%
- Retired: 2.1%
- Other: 7.4%
As Figure 140 shows, high blood pressure was by far the most frequently reported health condition for Ward 3 residents.

Over 72% of Ward 3 survey respondents reported that they had ever received assistance or services from UPO, substantially more than the citywide average of 58%. Given that most Ward 3 survey respondents were UPO customers, the UPO data on Ward 3 residents looks significantly different than most DC government or U.S. Census data on Ward 3.
UPO offers many services to residents of the District of Columbia. As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked if they needed or received assistance in the past 12 months in 24 different service areas (see chart below), including but not limited to: employment services, food assistance, childcare, healthcare, education, housing, transportation, and income supports. Figure 142 illustrates the different UPO services needed and received by Ward 3 residents. Referrals/information and college or trade/technical school were the two most frequently cited needs among Ward 3 survey respondents, while the most received services by Ward 3 respondents were food assistance and Medicare/Medicaid.
Based on the need-based categories from the survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in Ward 3. They are highlighted in Figure 143. Figure 144 and Figure 145 look at the needs of Ward 3 residents categorically, by looking at all income/employment needs in one table and all health needs in another.
Apart from the 35% of respondents who did not report any challenges to meeting their needs in Ward 3, a sizeable portion of the respondents either had a prior bad experience (17%) or were unable to access services due to the services only being available during limited hours (17%).
74% of Ward 3 survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they were included in decisions about what their neighborhood would look like in the future.

Figure 147: Ward 3 – Included in Neighborhood Future

76% of Ward 3 respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “I feel safer in my neighborhood than I did last year.”
While most Ward 3 residents (50%) agreed that the police were respectful of their rights as a citizen, a large number of respondents (27%) also indicated they were neutral.

Most Ward 3 survey respondents (52% agreed, 24% strongly agreed) agreed that they can afford to continue to live in their neighborhoods.
Most Ward 3 respondents (44%) indicated that they were somewhat confident in the District government’s ability to provide jobs.

*Figure 151: Ward 3 – City’s Ability to Provide Jobs*

As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked their top three preferences for how the city should use the land if there were a vacant lot on their block. The top three choices indicated by Ward 3 residents were a community center, a community garden, and a playground.

*Figure 152: Ward 3 – Preferences on How to Use a Vacant Lot*
## Recommendations for Addressing Ward 3 Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Many residents lack the education and skills to obtain jobs that pay a living wage. Ward 3 residents identified college or technical school, employment services, and work readiness/job skills as some of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Increase access to vocational skills training; Increase adult education opportunities, including GED classes, technical/trade school, and college programs; Create opportunities to gain job skills that can transfer to a wide variety of career paths; Target opportunities to neighborhoods and populations with especially high unemployment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 3 is increasingly unaffordable for many residents as housing costs continue to increase</td>
<td>Increase access to affordable housing; Facilitate access to rental and mortgage assistance; Ensure Ward 3 residents know their rights as renters or homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 3 residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Advocate for service providers to provide services during non-traditional hours, to ensure scheduling issues do not prevent people from getting the help they need; Emphasize customer service across all agencies and all interactions to help serve individuals who have had a prior bad experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 3 residents identified referrals/information as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Ensure all residents requesting referrals or information receive the services they need; Share information and resources with other service providers to reduce duplication of services and ensure customers are referred to the organization best equipped to provide the services they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 3 residents have high rates of serious, chronic health conditions</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of Ward 3 residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure and diabetes among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Despite many efforts, homelessness remains high throughout the District</td>
<td>Address homelessness through effective programming and transitional housing options; Assure that people experiencing homelessness are screened and provided services for daily needs, physical or mental health conditions, and any other significant needs identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Ward 3 residents identified a number of economic services including unemployment compensation, TANF, and immediate crisis assistance as some of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Ward 3 residents through their economic recovery, whatever that may look like for their family; Provide referrals, resources, and guidance on how to apply for unemployment and TANF; Ensure families experiencing an immediate crisis have access to basic needs support; Ensure all residents have the information and technology needed to follow up about benefit applications, as many agencies are backlogged during the pandemic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WARD 4
Needs Assessment
WARD 4 SUMMARY DATA

84,660
WARD 4 POPULATION, 2020 CENSUS

KEY INDICATORS

Ward 4 Child Poverty Rate: 10%

Ward 4 Poverty Rate: 10%

Ward 4 schools have an average STAR rating of 3.39 (on a scale of 1-5)

Ward 4 Median Rent: $1,300

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

199
Ward 4 residents completed the 2021 needs assessment survey

Most frequently reported Ward 4 health conditions

- High blood pressure
- Diabetes

48% of Ward 4 survey respondents felt safer in their neighborhood than a year ago

Top 3 services needed by Ward 4 survey respondents

1. Family/individual counseling
2. Obtaining transportation
3. Food stamps/SNAP

The most needed health service in Ward 4 was family or individual counseling
Ward 4 Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section includes a comprehensive needs assessment of Ward 4. It begins by outlining social impact data for Ward 4 from the U.S. Census Bureau, D.C government, and other secondary sources. The social impact data provides an overview of Ward 4’s demographic, income, housing, education, and employment characteristics and provides a comparison to the District as a whole on the same indicators.

Next is a summary of education data for Ward 4, including an overview of all of the traditional public and public charter schools in the ward. Information on grades served and school rating is also provided in this section.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed for this needs assessment is presented at the ward level. The Ward 4 focus group report provides insights from personal conversations with Ward 4 residents, while the needs assessment survey results summarize findings from the 199 Ward 4 residents who completed the 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey.

Social Impact Data

The following table briefly outlines the demographic, income, housing, and other important characteristics of Ward 4 residents.

Table 18: Ward 4 Social Impact Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>87,775</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>84,660</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24,443</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>37,315</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>11,448</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</td>
<td>18,646</td>
<td>77,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th># of Households</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>38,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>17,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>34,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>30,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>45,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>3,141</td>
<td>26,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>5,858</td>
<td>47,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$94,810</td>
<td>$92,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th># in Poverty</th>
<th>% in Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in poverty</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>107,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in poverty</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18 years in poverty</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>% High School Graduate or Higher</th>
<th>% Bachelor's Degree or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% High school graduate or higher</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Median Home Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>33,282</td>
<td>$647,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owner occupied units</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renter occupied units</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Vacant units</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>30,675</td>
<td>$646,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median home value</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$1,603</td>
<td>$1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Living alone</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Without internet</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>% Without Vehicle Available</th>
<th>% Public Transportation User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Without vehicle available</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Public transportation user</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Education Summary Data

In late 2018, the District of Columbia’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) introduced a new resource for comparing public schools across the District: The DC School Report Card. A key element of the annual DC School Report Card is that each traditional public or public charter school in the District earns a rating between one and five on the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework.

The STAR Framework uses a variety of data to measure a school’s performance across five domains: academic achievement, academic growth, school environment, English language proficiency, and graduation rate. These domains are weighted differently depending upon the grades served and if a school is classified as alternative or not. The Framework also measures the performance of students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and each racial/ethnic group to ensure that schools are accountable for educating the city’s most vulnerable students. All of these factors are used to calculate a school’s composite STAR rating.376

The following table presents an overview of the schools in Ward 4.377

Table 19: Ward 4 Education Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>STAR Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnard Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakthrough Montessori PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightwood Education Campus</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City PCS - High School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City PCS - Lower School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-4th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City PCS - Middle School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th-8th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center City PCS - Brightwood</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center City PCS - Petworth</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia International School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>6th-12th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy I. Height Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.L. Haynes PCS - Elementary School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-4th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.L. Haynes PCS - High School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Ideal Elementary</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Ideal Middle</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>4th-8th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Online</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>K-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Community PCS - Lamond</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida B. Wells Middle School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-7th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK4-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSalle-Backus Education Campus</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Latin American Montessori Bilingual PCS  Charter  PK3-5th  4
MacFarland Middle School  DCPS  6th-8th  2
Paul PCS - International High School  Charter  9th-12th  3
Paul PCS - Middle School  Charter  6th-8th  3
Powell Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  4
Raymond Education Campus  DCPS  PK3-5th  4
Roosevelt High School  DCPS  9th-12th  1
Roosevelt STAY High School  DCPS (Alternative)  9th-adult  1
Roots PCS  Charter  PK3-5th  2
Sela PCS  Charter  PK3-5th  4
Shepherd Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  4
Takoma Education Campus  DCPS  PK3-8th  3
Truesdell Education Campus  DCPS  PK3-5th  4
Washington Latin PCS - Middle School  Charter  5th-8th  4
Washington Latin PCS - Upper School  Charter  9th-12th  5
West Education Campus  DCPS  PK3-5th  4
Whittier Education Campus  DCPS  PK3-8th  4

Note: for this report, schools that offer only early childhood education (Pre-K3 and/or Pre-K4) or only offer adult education were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, due to the impact of COVID-19, STAR scores are unavailable for some schools on the 2020 report card.

Ward 4 is home to 16 elementary schools, six middle schools, seven high schools, and eight education campuses. With 20 charter schools and 17 DCPS schools, Ward 4 is one of the few wards with more public charter schools than traditional public schools. Ward 4 schools have an average STAR rating of 3.39. Charter schools had an average STAR rating of 3.53 while DCPS schools had an average STAR rating of 3.25. In 2020, one DCPS school and three charter schools did not have STAR scores.

Focus Group Results

The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities where they live. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix.

Overview

This focus group was conducted virtually from 6:00-8:15 pm on July 22, 2021. The group was made up of nine Ward 4 residents, six females and three males. As with all of the focus groups, the participants were asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic.

Civic

The Ward 4 residents who participated in this focus group had a variety of opinions related to if and how community leaders ensure residents’ needs are being met. Participants spoke highly of churches and community organizations that shifted priorities during the pandemic to provide food, PPE, diapers, and household items to residents, saying that these organizations have “done an awesome job” and “blessed the community.” Regarding political leaders, participants felt less positive, noting that
politicians only show up when it is beneficial for them, such as around elections. However, one participant noted that because the mayor lives nearby, they think that needs in their neighborhood are often prioritized.

Some Ward 4 focus group participants said they felt involved in decisions about their neighborhood because they used neighborhood apps, newsletters, and ANC meetings to stay informed about neighborhood events and priorities. Other participants stated that they did not feel involved, especially regarding new development, with one resident saying, “when they finally share with the community, they are already ten steps ahead, and the project is about to happen.”

Social

The Ward 4 residents in this focus group identified several social supports that are needed in their community, including:

- Mentoring and support groups for teenagers
- Neighborhood safety zones
- Tutoring programs for students who experienced learning loss during the pandemic
- Accessible recreation centers that those with disabilities can use
- A community health center with a significant emphasis on mental and behavioral health care

Ward 4 residents generally felt that quality education was available in the District. One participant noted that “quality education can be subjective. I think that some schools in Ward 4 really provide quality education to students,” while another participant indicated that most of the quality schools are public charter schools or private schools. Another resident indicated that they would like to see more adult learning opportunities in Ward 4.

Physical

Most participants in this focus group said they felt less safe in their neighborhood than they did a year ago. Some of their reasons for feeling less safe included: the need for more police in “hot spot” areas, an increase in armed robberies and violence in general, and individuals loitering outside of apartment buildings.

Ward 4 residents identified the following as their top health and environmental concerns:

- Lack of grocery stores and lack of quality food in existing grocery stores
- Violence
- Rodents
- Trash on the street
- Wildlife close to new construction
- Lack of health clinics/mobile health unit

Economic

If someone wanted to start a new business in their community, the Ward 4 residents believe they would need: grants, small business loans, or other financial support; support from the community; money management courses; and a business location that would enable growth.
Participants in this focus group believe their community would benefit from the following training programs:

- Cooking/Nutrition classes
- Entrepreneurship courses
- Adult literacy classes
- Technology training for all ages
- Elder care training for family caregivers
- Courses for small business owners on how to grow a business

If a young family with a limited income were looking to buy or rent a home in their community, Ward 4 focus group participants outlined a number of supports they would need, including financial management, credit, and savings courses, and support to help them better understand how home financing works.

**COVID-19**

In 2021, an additional question was added to all needs assessment focus groups, asking, “How has the pandemic affected you and your family members?” Ward 4 residents had a variety of experiences throughout the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Some of these experiences are documented below, in residents’ own words.

“I’ve learned the importance of never taking life for granted.”

- Ward 4 Focus Group Participant, on impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic

“The pandemic affected my mental stability . . . not having an outlet was a struggle.”

“We witnessed residents coming together to help each other . . . and [realized] the value of family.”

“This showed us how important and powerful technology is to keep us connected.”

“My family was tested during this time, and it brought us closer.”

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**

**Ward 4 UPO 2021 Community Needs Assessment Survey Results**

A total of 199 Ward 4 residents completed UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey.

The average Ward 4 survey respondent was a married White female in her 30s. The typical survey participant for Ward 4 had earned a bachelor’s degree and was employed full-time with an average income of over $100,000 per year. This indicates that on average, Ward 4 survey respondents had incomes above the Ward 4 median income, which is $94,810 (see Table 18), as well as incomes higher than the survey respondents from any other ward.
Figure 153: Ward 4 – Gender

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 4 – Gender

- F: 57.1%
- M: 42.9%

Figure 154: Ward 4 – Marital Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 4 – Marital Status

- Married: 61.8%
- Single: 25.1%
- Divorced: 6.0%
- Partnered: 5.0%
- Widowed: 2.0%
Figure 155: Ward 4 – Age

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 4 – Age Range

- 30-39: 42.7%
- 40-49: 18.6%
- 25-29: 12.6%
- 60+: 11.1%
- 20-24: 9.5%
- 50-59: 5.0%
- 15-19: 0.5%

Figure 156: Ward 4 – Race/Ethnicity

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 4 – Race/Ethnicity

- White: 69.7%
- Black: 19.0%
- Hispanic: 6.2%
- Asian: 2.6%
- Other: 1.5%
- Two or more races: 1.0%
Figure 157: Ward 4 – Education

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**  
**Ward 4 – Highest Education Level**

- Earned Bachelor's Degree: 62
- Earned Master's Degree or greater: 64
- Earned Associate's Degree: 23
- Completed High School: 21
- Less than High School Graduate: 13
- Completed Technical School: 11
- No Answer: 2

Figure 158: Ward 4 – Annual Household Income

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**  
**Ward 4 – Annual Household Income**

- 0 - 24,999: 8
- 25,000 - 44,999: 26
- 45,000 - 64,999: 57
- 65,000 - 100,000: 43
- 100,000+: 6
- No Answer: 3

Figure 159: Ward 4 – Employment Status

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**  
**Ward 4 – Employment Status**

- Employed full-time: 73.4%
- Retired: 5.5%
- Employed part-time: 3.5%
- Self-employed: 1.5%
- Unemployed, looking for work: 6.0%
- Student: 2.5%
- Homemaker: 0.5%
- No Answer: 7.0%
Figure 160: Ward 4 – Health Insurance

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 4 – Do you Have Health Insurance

- Yes, through my employer or my spouse’s or relative’s employer: 33.7%
- Yes, through Medicaid/Medicare: 51.8%
- Yes, through healthcare.gov or DC Health Link: 11.6%
- No: 3.0%

Figure 161 indicates that Ward 4 survey respondents reported high blood pressure, diabetes, and asthma as the most common household health conditions. This is in line with the city-wide findings.

Figure 161: Ward 4 – Household Health Conditions

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 4 – Household Health Conditions

- None: 30.1%
- High Blood Pressure: 14.5%
- Diabetes: 10.3%
- Asthma: 9.2%
- Hearing Impairment/Deaf: 7.4%
- Vision Impairment/Blind: 6.0%
- Mental Illness: 5.7%
- Learning Disability: 5.3%
- Other: 5.3%
- Physical Disability: 3.9%
- Alcohol/Substance Abuse: 3.5%
- No Answer: 1.4%

Just over 40% of Ward 4 survey respondents reported that they had ever received assistance or services from UPO, lower than the citywide average of 58%.
UPO offers many services to residents of the District of Columbia. As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked if they needed or received assistance in the past 12 months in 24 different service areas (see chart below), including employment services, food assistance, childcare, healthcare, education, housing, transportation, and income supports. Figure 163 illustrates the different UPO services needed and received by Ward 4 residents. Family/individual counseling and assistance obtaining transportation were the two most frequently cited needs among Ward 4 survey respondents, while the most received services by Ward 4 respondents were referrals/information and Medicare/Medicaid.
Based on the need-based categories from the survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in Ward 4. They are highlighted in Figure 164. Figure 165 and Figure 166 look at the needs of Ward 4 residents categorically, by looking at all income/employment needs in one table and all health needs in another.
Apart from the 30% of respondents who did not report any challenges to meeting their needs in Ward 4, a sizeable portion of the respondents either were unable to access services because of limited hours (21%) or were concerned about confidentiality (15%).
Just over half of Ward 4 survey respondents (53%) felt they were included in decisions about what their neighborhood would look like in the future. This is in line with the responses of the Ward 4 focus group, where participants were fairly evenly split between those who felt included in decisions about their neighborhood’s future and those who did not.

Less than half of Ward 4 survey respondents (48%) reported feeling safer in their neighborhood than the previous year. The Ward 4 focus group shared similar sentiments, noting concerns about increasing crime and violence in neighborhoods throughout the ward.
While most Ward 4 residents (64%) agreed that the police were respectful of their rights as a citizen, a large number of respondents also indicated they were neutral or did not provide a response to this question.

Most Ward 4 survey respondents (73%) agreed that they can afford to continue to live in their neighborhoods.
Most Ward 4 respondents (38%) indicated that they were somewhat confident in the District government’s ability to provide jobs.

Figure 172: Ward 4 – City’s Ability to Provide Jobs

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 4 – What is Your Level of Confidence in the DC Government’s Ability to Provide Jobs?

As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked their top three preferences for how the city should use the land if there were a vacant lot on their block. The top three choices indicated by Ward 4 residents were a community garden, a community center, and a playground.

Figure 173: Ward 4 – Preferences on How to Use a Vacant Lot

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 4 – What to do With a Vacant Lot on Your Block?
## Recommendations for Addressing Ward 4 Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 4 residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Ensure confidentiality in service encounters whenever possible to ease residents’ concerns about confidentiality; Advocate for service providers to provide services during non-traditional hours to ensure scheduling issues do not prevent people from getting the help they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 4 residents identified assistance with utilities as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase access to and availability of utilities assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 4 residents identified assistance obtaining transportation as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Provide education on transportation options and assistance programs; Increase access to resources that cover ‘last mile’ transportation; Provide advocacy training so that residents know how to participate in community transportation planning efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>The COVID-19 pandemic continues to disrupt learning for DC students</td>
<td>Promptly address learning loss related to COVID-19 education disruptions; Provide resources for students to access tutoring programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civics</strong></td>
<td>Many Ward 4 residents are not informed about major changes to their neighborhoods</td>
<td>Improve communication efforts between developers/planners and residents to facilitate greater inclusion in decisions that affect their neighborhoods; Support residents to be more informed and active in the decision making in their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civics</strong></td>
<td>Many Ward 4 residents feel ignored by the city’s political leadership</td>
<td>Improve year-round engagement efforts between elected officials and all residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 4 residents have high rates of serious, chronic health conditions</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of Ward 4 residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure, asthma, and diabetes among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 4 residents identified obtaining healthcare/insurance as one of their most</td>
<td>Make inquiring about health insurance a standard practice for all social service providers in DC;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Ward 4 residents expressed significant concerns about untreated mental health conditions and the lack of services available to them and identified family/individual counseling as their most needed service in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Increase awareness of community-based health centers, mobile health clinics, and other community-focused health services; Increase access to mental health services, including specialized services; Increase the number of community health centers or mobile health centers available to Ward 4 residents, with an emphasis on clinics that provide extensive behavioral health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ward 4 residents identified SNAP/Food Stamps as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Address food insecurity issues in Ward 4; Increase accessibility of fresh food markets or mobile markets year-round; Provide resources on SNAP eligibility requirements, how and where to apply, and how to use SNAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Neighborhoods are seeing increased issues with trash and pests.</td>
<td>Reduce rodent infestations; Reduce issues related to trash piling up on sidewalks and streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ward 4 residents expressed concerns about increasing violence in their ward.</td>
<td>Address increasing gun violence in the city with emphasis on neighborhoods identified as problem areas; Work to increase the number of police in “hot spot” areas of violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Ward 4 residents expressed interest in entrepreneurship but lacked resources to start a business.</td>
<td>Increase access to and awareness of business start-up capital and business and entrepreneurship training; Advocate for community organizations and financial institutions in Ward 4 to offer small grants or business development loans to local entrepreneurs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WARD 5 SUMMARY DATA

WARD 5 POPULATION, 2020 CENSUS

89,425

KEY INDICATORS

Ward 5 Child Poverty Rate: 18%

Ward 5 Poverty Rate: 16%

Ward 5 schools have an average STAR rating of 3.11 (on a scale of 1-5)

Ward 5 Median Rent: $1,316

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

158

Ward 5 residents completed the 2021 needs assessment survey

Most frequently reported Ward 5 health conditions

- High blood pressure
- Diabetes
- Asthma

61% of Ward 5 survey respondents felt safer in their neighborhood than a year ago

Top 3 services needed by Ward 5 survey respondents

1. Supplemental security income
2. Utilities assistance
3. Assistance obtaining healthcare/insurance

The most needed health service in Ward 5 was assistance obtaining healthcare/insurance
Ward 5 Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section includes a comprehensive needs assessment of Ward 5. It begins by outlining social impact data for Ward 5 from the U.S. Census Bureau, D.C government, and other secondary sources. The social impact data provides an overview of Ward 5’s demographic, income, housing, education, and employment characteristics and provides a comparison to the District as a whole on the same indicators.

Next is a summary of education data for Ward 5, including an overview of all of the traditional public and public charter schools in the ward. Information on grades served and school rating is also provided in this section.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed for this needs assessment is presented at the ward level. The Ward 5 focus group report provides insights from personal conversations with Ward 5 residents, while the needs assessment survey results summarize findings from the 158 Ward 5 residents who completed the 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey.

Social Impact Data

The following table briefly outlines the demographic, income, housing, and other important characteristics of Ward 5 residents.

Table 20: Ward 5 Social Impact Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>87,850</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>89,425</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22,161</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>51,242</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>5,959</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>6,762</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</td>
<td>10,401</td>
<td>77,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

381 Ibid.
### Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Under 15,000</th>
<th>15,000-24,999</th>
<th>25,000-34,999</th>
<th>35,000-49,999</th>
<th>50,000-74,999</th>
<th>75,000-99,999</th>
<th>100,000-149,999</th>
<th>150,000-199,999</th>
<th>&gt;200,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>3,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$71,782</td>
<td>$92,266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty

- # in poverty: 13,521
- % in poverty: 15.7%
- % under 18 years in poverty: 17.5%

### Education

- % high school graduate or higher: 89.5%
- % bachelor’s degree or higher: 48.9%

### Housing

- Housing units: 37,586
- Median home value: $540,200
- Median Rent: $1,316
- % living alone: 16.9%
- % without internet: 22.1%

### Transportation

- % without vehicle available: 30.9%
- % public transportation user: 34.1%

### Unemployment

- Unemployment rate: 6.6%

---

382 DC State Data Center. (2019). *DC data viz ward income indicators.*
388 Ibid.
Education Summary Data

In late 2018, the District of Columbia’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) introduced a new resource for comparing public schools across the District: The DC School Report Card. A key element of the annual DC School Report Card is that each traditional public or public charter school in the District earns a rating between one and five on the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework.

The STAR Framework uses a variety of data to measure a school’s performance across five domains: academic achievement, academic growth, school environment, English language proficiency, and graduation rate. These domains are weighted differently depending upon the grades served and if a school is classified as alternative or not. The Framework also measures the performance of students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and each racial/ethnic group to ensure that schools are accountable for educating the city’s most vulnerable students. All of these factors are used to calculate a school’s composite STAR rating.390

The following table presents an overview of the schools in Ward 5.391

Table 21: Ward 5 Education Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>STAR Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridges PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briya PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookland Middle School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne Education Campus</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunker Hill Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Village PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th-6th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center City PCS - Trinidad</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK4-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Minds International PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Bilingual PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Prep PCS - Edgewood Elementary School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Prep PCS - Edgewood Middle School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>4th-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Whitlow Stokes Community Freedom PCS -</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Armstrong Elementary</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Armstrong Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th-8th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Woodridge International Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Woodridge International Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony DC PCS - School of Excellence</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>K-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope Community PCS - Tolson</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired Teaching Demonstration PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP DC - College Preparatory PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP DC - Connect Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP DC - Northeast Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP DC - Spring Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>1st-4th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Montessori PCS - Brookland</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-6th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke C. Moore High School</td>
<td>DCPS (Alternative)</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McLeod Bethune Day Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Middle School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Technology High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundo Verde Bilingual PCS - Calle Ocho</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundo Verde Bilingual PCS - J.F. Cook</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyes Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Street Preparatory PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps Architecture, Construction and Engineering High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocketship PCS - Infinity Community Prep</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Within-School @ Goding</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-6th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th-6th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Children's Guild DC PCS</td>
<td>Charter (Alternative)</td>
<td>K-8th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sojourner Truth School PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>6th-7th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers PCS - Young Elementary School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers PCS - Young Middle School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Leadership Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Yu Ying PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatley Education Campus</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for this report, schools that offer only early childhood education (Pre-K3 and/or Pre-K4) or only offer adult education were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, due to the impact of COVID-19, STAR scores are unavailable for some schools on the 2020 report card.

Ward 5 is home to 22 elementary schools, 10 middle schools, six high schools, and 10 education campuses. Of all of DC’s wards, Ward 5 has the largest number of public education institutions, at 48. Public charter schools vastly outnumber traditional public schools in Ward 5, with 34 charters 14 DCPS schools. Ward 5 schools overall have an average STAR rating of 3.11. Charter schools had an average STAR rating of 3.24 while DCPS schools had an average STAR rating of 2.84. However, over 20% of Ward 5 schools did not have STAR ratings for 2020, with the majority of those schools being in the charter sector.
Focus Group Results

The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities where they live. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix.

Overview

This focus group was conducted virtually from 6:00-7:30 pm on August 18, 2021. Nine Ward 5 residents participated in this focus group, six females and three males. As with all of the focus groups, the participants were asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic.

Civic

When asked if and how political, religious, and community organizations ensure the community’s needs are being met, Ward 5 residents shared a variety of responses. One participant stated that needs may or may not be met depending “on what area of Ward 5 you live in.” Other participants praised their Councilmember for making sure seniors in the community are taken care of, and religious organizations for making sure residents had food and other basics during the pandemic. On the other hand, some participants felt they were largely ignored, saying “the politicians don’t come around . . . until they need our vote,” and “I saw very few organizations in my area until the pandemic happened.”

Most participants in this focus group felt that they were included in the future design of their neighborhood. They provided examples of their involvement, such as: attending ANC meetings, getting information from a neighbor in the ANC, reading the Councilmember’s newsletter, and signing up for different neighborhood listservs to stay informed.

Social

Ward 5 residents identified numerous social supports that would be beneficial to individuals in their communities. These included: renovated recreation centers, parks and trails for walking and biking, and community health centers that offer mental health services.

The Ward 5 focus group participants had a number of opinions related to education. One participant noted that Ward 5 has a very large number of both traditional public and public charter schools, but the quality of the schools is inconsistent. Another participant stated that they think the teachers in local schools are “doing a great job,” but that most teachers do not have the resources and support they need to meet the needs of every student. Participants were generally more positive about educational opportunities for adults, noting that they were lucky to have the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) located in Ward 5 and community-based programs that provide adult education opportunities.

Physical
Most participants in this focus group felt less safe in their neighborhoods compared to a year ago. Focus group participants discussed many factors that made them feel less safe in their neighborhoods, which included: gun violence, excessive loitering outside of local stores, drug dealing, “turf wars” between neighborhood groups, and reckless driving.

The top health and environmental concerns identified by Ward 5 residents were:

- Food deserts
- Heart disease
- Diabetes
- Trash on the streets
- Rodents
- Air pollution
- Traffic
- Abandoned vehicles

**Economic**

If someone wanted to start a new business in their community, participants in this focus group believe they would need mentors in the community, a business advisor, a clear vision and plan for their new business, financial stability, and the mindset for change.

Ward 5 focus group participants identified several different types of trainings that would be beneficial to members of their community. In particular, they discussed the need for training on how to create and run a neighborhood watch program. Ward 5 residents also noted that their community would benefit from a variety of technology trainings.

If a young family with limited income was looking to rent or purchase a home in their neighborhood, the participants in this focus group believe they would need a number of resources, including classes on saving and investing, credit assistance resources, and access to a first-time homebuyer’s assistance program.

**COVID-19**

In 2021, an additional question was added to all needs assessment focus groups, asking “How has the pandemic affected you and your family members?” Ward 5 residents had a variety of experiences throughout the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Some of these experiences are documented below, in residents’ own words.

“I have learned the true value of life, family, and friends.”

-Ward 5 Focus Group Participant, on impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic

Gun violence
Loitering
Drug Dealing
Turf wars
Reckless driving

-Reasons Ward 5 residents feel less safe than they did a year ago
“I’ve learned the importance of eating right and why that’s important for my health overall.”

Needs Assessment Survey Results

Ward 5 UPO 2021 Community Needs Assessment Survey Results

A total of 158 Ward 5 residents completed UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey.

The average Ward 5 survey respondent was a married White individual in their 30s. The typical survey participant for Ward 5 had earned a bachelor’s degree and was employed full-time with an average income between $45,000 and $64,999 per year. This indicates that on average, Ward 5 survey respondents had incomes slightly below the Ward 5 median income, which is $71,782 (see Table 20).

Figure 174: Ward 5 - Gender
Figure 175: Ward 5 – Marital Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Marital Status

- Married: 64.6%
- Single: 29.1%
- Widowed: 2.5%
- Divorced: 1.3%
- Partnered: 1.3%
- No Answer: 1.3%

Figure 176: Ward 5 – Age

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Age Range

- 30-39: 38.0%
- 40-49: 17.7%
- 50-59: 15.2%
- 60+: 10.1%
- 20-24: 8.2%
- 15-19: 7.6%
- 25-29: 3.2%
Figure 177: Ward 5 – Race/Ethnicity

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Race/Ethnicity

- White: 60.3%
- Black: 34.0%
- Asian: 2.6%
- Hispanic: 1.9%
- American Indian: 0.6%
- Two or more races: 0.6%

Figure 178: Ward 5 – Education

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Highest Education Level

- Earned Bachelor's Degree: 41
- Completed High School: 38
- Earned Associate's Degree: 35
- Earned Master's Degree or greater: 29
- Less than High School Graduate: 14
- Completed Technical School: 11
Figure 179: Ward 5 – Annual Household Income

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Annual Household Income

Income ($)  
0 - 24,999: 23
25,000 - 44,999: 30
45,000 - 64,999: 52
65,000 - 100,000: 40
100,000+: 8
No Answer: 5

Figure 180: Ward 5 – Employment Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Employment Status

- Employed full-time: 65.2%
- Employed part-time: 11.4%
- Student: 6.3%
- Self-employed: 6.3%
- Retired: 5.1%
- Unemployed, looking for work: 4.4%
- Homemaker: 0.6%
- Other: 0.6%
Figure 181: Ward 5 – Health Insurance

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Do you Have Health Insurance

- Yes, through Medicaid/Medicare: 23.4%
- Yes, through my employer or my spouse’s or relative’s employer: 46.8%
- Yes, through healthcare.gov or DC Health Link: 22.2%
- No: 0.6%
- Other: 1.3%
- No Answer: 5.7%

Figure 182 illustrates that 20.7% of Ward 5 survey respondents reported someone in their household has high blood pressure, more than double the percentage of respondents reporting any other condition.

Figure 182: Ward 5 – Household Health Conditions

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Household Health Conditions

- None: 28.5%
- High Blood Pressure: 20.7%
- Diabetes: 10.3%
- Asthma: 9.5%
- Learning Disability: 7.4%
- Physical Disability: 4.5%
- Mental Illness: 3.7%
- Hearing Impairment/Deaf: 2.9%
- Other: 1.2%
- Vision Impairment/Blind: 1.1%
- Alcohol/Substance Abuse: 0.8%
- No Answer: 0.8%
- HIV+/AIDS: 0.5%

Nearly 66% of Ward 5 survey respondents reported that they had ever received assistance or services from UPO, somewhat higher than the citywide average of 58%.
UPO offers many services to residents of the District of Columbia. As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked if they needed or received assistance in the past 12 months in 24 different service areas (see chart below), including but not limited to: employment services, food assistance, childcare, healthcare, education, housing, transportation, and income supports. Figure 184 illustrates the different UPO services needed and received by Ward 5 residents. Supplemental security income and utilities assistance were the two most frequently cited needs among Ward 5 survey respondents, while the most received services by Ward 5 respondents were work readiness/job skills and assistance with obtaining healthcare/insurance.
Based on the need-based categories from the survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in Ward 5. They are highlighted in Figure 185. Figure 186 and Figure 187 look at the needs of Ward 5 residents categorically, by looking at all income/employment needs in one table and all health needs in another.
Figure 185: Ward 5 – Top 5 Needs

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Top 5 Services Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Compensation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals/Information</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Healthcare/Insurance</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Security Income</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 186: Ward 5 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Readiness / Job skills</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Training</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Preparation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Compensation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 187: Ward 5 – Health Services Needed and Received

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – Health Services Needed and Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or drug abuse counseling</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Individual Counseling</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid/Medicare</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Healthcare/Insurance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the 35% of respondents who did not report any challenges to meeting their needs in Ward 5, a sizeable portion of the respondents either had a prior bad experience (18%) or did not know where to go for help (16%).

*Figure 188: Ward 5 – Roadblocks to Meeting Needs*

65% of Ward 5 survey respondents felt they were included in decisions about what their neighborhood would look like in the future. For the most part, this is in line with the Ward 5 focus group participants, the majority of whom also felt they were included.

*Figure 189: Ward 5 – Included in Neighborhood Future*
Over 60% of Ward 5 respondents reported feeling safer in their neighborhood than the previous year. This is somewhat surprising given the Ward 5 focus group responses, which were primarily focused on elements that made the neighborhood feel less safe than a year ago.

*Figure 190: Ward 5 – Neighborhood Safety*

![Needs Assessment Survey Results: Ward 5 – I Feel Safer in My Neighborhood than I did Last Year](image1)

While most Ward 5 residents (61%) agreed that the police were respectful of their rights as a citizen, a large number of respondents also indicated they were neutral or did not provide a response to this question.

*Figure 191: Ward 5 – Police Respectful of Rights*

![Needs Assessment Survey Results: Ward 5 – To what extent do You Believe the Police have Generally Been Respectful of Your Rights as a Citizen](image2)

Most Ward 5 (73%) survey respondents agreed that they can afford to continue to live in their neighborhoods.
Most Ward 5 (34%) respondents indicated that they were somewhat confident in the District government’s ability to provide jobs.

As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked their top three preferences for how the city should use the land if there were a vacant lot on their block. The top three choices indicated by Ward 5 residents were a community center, a community garden, and residential use.
Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 5 – What to do With a Vacant Lot on Your Block?

Recommendations for Addressing Ward 5 Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 5 residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Emphasize customer service across all agencies and all interactions to help serve individuals who have had a prior bad experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 5 needs more housing that is affordable to low-and middle-income families</td>
<td>Increase access to affordable housing; Facilitate access to rental and mortgage assistance; Educate residents about assistance programs for first-time homebuyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 5 residents identified assistance with utilities as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase access to and availability of utilities assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 5 residents identified referrals/information as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Ensure all residents requesting referrals or information receive the services they need; Share information and resources with other service providers to reduce duplication of services and ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>DC students are underperforming, and Ward 5 residents indicated they do not think a quality education is available to all District residents</td>
<td>Increase equity in educational opportunities at both traditional public schools and public charter schools; Increase STAR ratings at underperforming Ward 5 schools; Improve math and reading proficiency scores in Ward 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civics</strong></td>
<td>Many Ward 5 residents feel ignored by the city’s political leadership</td>
<td>Improve year-round engagement efforts between elected officials and all residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 5 residents have high rates of serious, chronic health conditions</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of Ward 4 residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure, heart disease, asthma, and diabetes among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 5 residents identified obtaining healthcare/insurance as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Make inquiring about health insurance a standard practice for all social service providers in DC; Increase awareness of community-based health centers, mobile health clinics, and other community focused health services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 5 residents express significant concerns about untreated mental health conditions and the lack of services available to them</td>
<td>Increase access to mental health services, including specialized services; Increase the number of community health centers or mobile health centers available to Ward 5 residents, with an emphasis on clinics that provide extensive behavioral health services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 5 residents indicated a need for more recreation opportunities in their communities</td>
<td>Consider opening additional recreation centers or renovating current facilities to better serve current residents; Advocate for increased outdoor recreation opportunities, such as bike trails and community gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Ward 5 residents expressed concerns about food insecurity in their neighborhoods</td>
<td>Address food insecurity issues in Ward 5; Address the issue of food deserts; Increase accessibility of fresh food markets or mobile markets year-round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Ward 5 residents expressed concerns about increasing traffic, reckless driving, and pollution from traffic in their neighborhoods</td>
<td>Increase police presence in areas where reckless driving and serious vehicle-related accidents are common; Provide advocacy training so that residents know how to participate in community transportation planning efforts and can advocate for less car-dependent communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Neighborhoods are seeing increased issues with trash and pests</td>
<td>Reduce rodent infestations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ward 5 residents expressed concerns about increasing violence in their ward</td>
<td>Address increasing gun violence in the city with emphasis on neighborhoods identified as problem areas; Work to increase the number of police in “hot spot” areas of violence; Engage the community in the development of positive solutions for decreasing loitering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Ward 5 residents expressed interest in entrepreneurship but lacked resources to start a business</td>
<td>Increase access to and awareness of business start-up capital and business and entrepreneurship training; Advocate for community organizations and financial institutions in Ward 5 to offer small grants or business development loans to local entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Ward 5 residents identified supplemental security income and unemployment compensation as two of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Ensure residents eligible for these programs are able to promptly apply for and start receiving benefits; Screen residents needing SSI or unemployment compensation to identify other needs and determine what other services could be beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WARD 6 SUMMARY DATA

108,202
WARD 6 POPULATION, 2020 CENSUS

KEY INDICATORS

Ward 6 Child Poverty Rate: 18%
Ward 6 Poverty Rate: 12%
Ward 6 schools have an average STAR rating of 3.2 (on a scale of 1-5)
Ward 6 Median Rent: $2,038

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

96
Ward 6 residents completed the 2021 needs assessment survey

Most frequently reported Ward 6 health conditions:
- High blood pressure
- Asthma

62% of Ward 6 survey respondents felt safer in their neighborhood than a year ago

Top 3 services needed by Ward 6 survey respondents:
1. Referrals/information
2. Utilities assistance
3. College or trade school

The most needed health service in Ward 6 was family or individual counseling

30%
Ward 6 Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section includes a comprehensive needs assessment of Ward 6. It begins by outlining social impact data for Ward 6 from the U.S. Census Bureau, D.C government, and other secondary sources. The social impact data provides an overview of Ward 6’s demographic, income, housing, education, and employment characteristics and provides a comparison to the District as a whole on the same indicators.

Next is a summary of education data for Ward 6, including an overview of all of the traditional public and public charter schools in the ward. Information on grades served and school rating is also provided in this section.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed for this needs assessment is presented at the ward level. The Ward 6 focus group report provides insights from personal conversations with Ward 6 residents, while the needs assessment survey results summarize findings from the 96 Ward 6 residents who completed the 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey.

Social Impact Data

The following table briefly outlines the demographic, income, housing, and other important characteristics of Ward 6 residents.

Table 22: Ward 6 Social Impact Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018^393</td>
<td>94,558</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020^394</td>
<td>108,202</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity^395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61,706</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>28,640</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>8,949</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</td>
<td>7,949</td>
<td>77,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^393 U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). American community survey 5-year estimates. Table DP05.
^395 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income(^{396-397})</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>4,763</td>
<td>38,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>17,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>34,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>4,619</td>
<td>30,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>9,247</td>
<td>45,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>26,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>8,977</td>
<td>47,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$114,363</td>
<td>$92,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty(^{398})</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in poverty</td>
<td>11,820</td>
<td>107,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in poverty</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18 years in poverty</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education(^{399})</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% high school graduate or higher</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing(^{400-401})</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>48,831</td>
<td>311,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied units</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% renter occupied units</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% vacant units</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>46,264</td>
<td>291,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median home value</td>
<td>$703,100</td>
<td>$646,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$2,038</td>
<td>$1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% living alone</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% without internet</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation(^{402})</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% without vehicle available</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% public transportation user</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment(^{403})</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{396}\) DC State Data Center. (2019). *DC data viz ward income indicators.*


\(^{399}\) U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *American community survey 5-year estimates.* Table S1501.

\(^{400}\) U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *American community survey 5-year estimates.* Table DP05.


\(^{402}\) Ibid.

Education Summary Data

In late 2018, the District of Columbia’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) introduced a new resource for comparing public schools across the District: The DC School Report Card. A key element of the annual DC School Report Card is that each traditional public or public charter school in the District earns a rating between one and five on the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework.

The STAR Framework uses a variety of data to measure a school’s performance across five domains: academic achievement, academic growth, school environment, English language proficiency, and graduation rate. These domains are weighted differently depending upon the grades served and if a school is classified as alternative or not. The Framework also measures the performance of students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and each racial/ethnic group to ensure that schools are accountable for educating the city’s most vulnerable students. All of these factors are used to calculate a school’s composite STAR rating.404

The following table presents an overview of the schools in Ward 6.405

Table 23: Ward 6 Education Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>STAR Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amidon-Bowen Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hill Montessori School @ Logan</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center City PCS - Capitol Hill</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center City PCS - Shaw</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK4-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Pioneers Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Academy Capitol Riverfront</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot-Hine Middle School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Chamberlain Elementary</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Chamberlain Middle</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>4th-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.O. Wilson Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Middle School Academy</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsman Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter (Alternative)</td>
<td>6th-12th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP DC - Grow Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP DC - Lead Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>1st-4th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP DC - WILL Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>5th-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow-Taylor Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ward 6 is home to 16 elementary schools, eight middle schools, two high schools, and six education campuses. There are nearly equal number of charter and traditional public schools in Ward 6, with 18 DCPS schools and 14 public charter schools. Ward 6 schools had an average STAR rating of 3.2 in 2020. Charter schools had an average STAR rating of 2.92 while DCPS schools had an average STAR rating of 3.41. Only one charter school and one DCPS school did not have a 2020 STAR rating.

Focus Group Results

The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities where they live. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix.

Overview

This focus group was conducted from 1:00 – 3:00 pm on July 24, 2021 at Hopkins Apartments, a public housing complex in Ward 6. Six Ward 6 residents participated in this focus group. As with all of the focus groups, the participants were asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic.

Civic

Ward 6 focus group participants shared opinions that leaders in their community are not doing enough to ensure that residents’ needs are being met. They discussed how it is often a long process to request services from community organizations, and even once they have been approved, services are often delayed. One participant said, “the community needs to be more engaged. We never know about things happening [in our neighborhood].”

“The community needs to be more engaged. We never know about things happening [in our neighborhood].”

-Ward 6 Focus Group Participant, on civic participation
Overall, Ward 6 residents in this focus group did not feel that they were included in the future design of their neighborhood. They discussed how Ward 6 is changing rapidly but that the changes are primarily focused on accommodating newcomers, not long-term residents.

Social

Ward 6 residents identified a number of social supports that would be beneficial to members of their community. Most of the suggestions focused on health and social services, including increased mental health services, disability services, and social workers or navigators to help Ward 6 residents find and access the social services that they need. Some participants also addressed the need for specific social supports for senior citizens, such as clubs or interest groups that provide socialization opportunities for seniors who live alone.

Regarding quality education, Ward 6 residents shared a range of opinions. One participant said that a quality education used to be available to everyone in the District, but that the quality had not been good for a long time. Another participant stated that “children with trauma are harder to teach . . . emotional needs have to be considered.” Respondents also offered suggestions on improving education, including offering more creative out-of-school time programming in the community, providing more opportunities for school staff to be involved with families, and increasing opportunities for parents to be active advocates in the school.

Physical

When asked if they felt more or less safe in their neighborhood than a year ago, most Ward 6 focus group participants indicated that very little had changed in the last year. They noted that the problems the neighborhood was experiencing a year ago are the same as the ones they are experiencing today: overall lack of safety and security, lack of security cameras in public places and apartment buildings, and limited opportunities for young people who engage in crime or other dangerous behaviors were also shared.

The top health and environmental concerns identified by this focus group were:

- Lead in the water
- Air pollution
- Extreme heat
- Dust mites and other allergens

Economic

If someone was starting a new business in their community, Ward 6 residents believe they would need a business plan and start-up funding. One participant suggested that the new business owner conduct a survey or focus group in the community to match their business model to the community’s needs.
Regarding training programs needed in their community, the participants in this focus group emphasized that the major need was skills and job training programs for those currently receiving government benefits.

When asked what type of support a young family with limited income would need in order to buy or rent a home in their community, participants identified the following supports:

- Homebuying workshops
- Credit management courses
- Subsidies
- First-time homebuyer’s programs
- A realtor that is well informed and has worked with families with limited incomes before

**COVID-19**

In 2021, an additional question was added to all needs assessment focus groups, asking, “How has the pandemic affected you and your family members?” Ward 6 residents had a variety of experiences throughout the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Some of these experiences are documented below, in residents’ own words.

“It made me scared to be around people.”

“I saw a lot of job loss[es] and loss of life.”

“People dealing with mental health were affected more.”

“It helped me [and my community] volunteer more.”

“I saw a lot of job loss[es] and loss of life.”

-Ward 6 Focus Group Participant, on impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**

**Ward 6 UPO 2021 Community Needs Assessment Survey Results**

A total of 96 Ward 6 residents completed UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey. The average Ward 6 survey respondent was a married White individual in their 30s. The typical survey participant for Ward 6 had completed high school and was employed full-time with an average income between $25,000 and $44,999 per year. This indicates that on average, Ward 6 survey respondents had incomes well below the Ward 6 median income, which is $114,363 (see Table 22). With regard to income, Ward 6 had the largest gap in income between survey respondents and census data of the eight wards.
Figure 195: Ward 6 – Gender

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 6 – Gender

50.5%
49.5%

F
M

Figure 196: Ward 6 – Marital Status
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Ward 6 – Marital Status

Married
Single
Partnered
Divorced
No Answer
Widowed
Separated

26.0%
59.4%
3.1%
1.0%
1.0%
5.2%
4.2%
Figure 197: Ward 6 – Age

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 6 – Age Range

- 30-39: 46.9%
- 40-49: 15.6%
- 60+: 12.5%
- 50-59: 11.5%
- 25-29: 5.2%
- 15-19: 4.2%
- 20-24: 1.0%
- No Answer: 3.1%

Figure 198: Ward 6 – Race/Ethnicity

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 6 – Race/Ethnicity

- White: 60.4%
- Black: 32.3%
- Hispanic: 2.1%
- Two or more races: 2.1%
- American Indian: 1.0%
- Other: 1.0%
- Asian: 1.0%
Figure 199: Ward 6 – Education
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Figure 200: Ward 6 – Annual Household Income
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Figure 201: Ward 6 – Employment Status
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Figure 202: Ward 6 – Health Insurance

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 6 – Do you Have Health Insurance
Figure 203 illustrates that significant numbers of Ward 6 survey respondents reported that they or someone in their household have high blood pressure, asthma, or diabetes.

Figure 203: Ward 6 – Household Health Conditions

Nearly 65% of Ward 6 survey respondents reported that they had ever received assistance or services from UPO, slightly higher than the citywide average of 58%.

Figure 204: Ward 6 – Ever Received Help from UPO
UPO offers many services to residents of the District of Columbia. As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked if they needed or received assistance in the past 12 months in 24 different service areas (see chart below), including but not limited to: employment services, food assistance, childcare, healthcare, education, housing, transportation, and income supports. Figure 205 illustrates the different UPO services needed and received by Ward 6 residents. Referrals/information and utilities assistance were the two most frequently cited needs among Ward 6 survey respondents, while the most received service by Ward 6 respondents was Medicare/Medicaid.

Figure 205: Ward 6 – Services Needed and Received
Based on the need-based categories from the survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in Ward 6. They are highlighted in Figure 206. Figure 207 and Figure 208 look at the needs of Ward 6 residents categorically, by looking at all income/employment needs in one table and all health needs in another.

Figure 206: Ward 6 – Top 5 Needs

![Needs Assessment Survey Results](image)

Figure 207: Ward 6 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

![Needs Assessment Survey Results](image)

Figure 208: Ward 6 – Health Services Needed and Received

![Needs Assessment Survey Results](image)
Apart from the 32% of respondents who did not report any challenges to meeting their needs in Ward 6, a sizeable portion of the respondents either did not know where to go for help (21%) or had a prior bad experience (19%).

*Figure 209: Ward 6 – Roadblocks to Meeting Needs*

Nearly 60% of Ward 6 survey respondents felt they were included in decisions about what their neighborhood would look like in the future. This is a somewhat different perspective from the Ward 6 focus group, where discussion focused on the lack of inclusion in decisions about the future of the neighborhood.

*Figure 210: Ward 6 – Included in Neighborhood Future*
62% of Ward 6 respondents reported feeling safer in their neighborhood than the previous year. This is in line with the focus group discussion, during which participants concluded not much had changed in terms of neighborhood safety in the last year.

Figure 211: Ward 6 – Neighborhood Safety

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 6 – I Feel Safer in My Neighborhood than I did Last Year

While most Ward 6 residents (67%) agreed that the police were respectful of their rights as a citizen, a large number of respondents also indicated they were neutral or did not provide a response to this question.

Figure 212: Ward 6 – Police Respectful of Rights

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 6 – To what extent do You Believe the Police have Generally Been Respectful of Your Rights as a Citizen

Most Ward 6 survey respondents agreed that they can afford to continue to live in their neighborhoods. However, at 63%, it is a lower proportion of respondents than in many of the other wards.
Most Ward 6 respondents (38%) indicated that they were somewhat confident in the District government’s ability to provide jobs.

As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked their top three preferences for how the city should use the land if there were a vacant lot on their block. The top three choices indicated by Ward 6 residents were a community center, a community garden, and a playground.
## Needs Assessment Survey Results

### Ward 6 – What to do With a Vacant Lot on Your Block?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward 6</th>
<th>Community Center</th>
<th>Children's Playground</th>
<th>Social services</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Community garden</th>
<th>Residential use</th>
<th>Athletic Field</th>
<th>Commercial use</th>
<th>Dog park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations for Addressing Ward 6 Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 6 residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Emphasize customer service across all agencies and all interactions to help serve individuals who have had a prior bad experience; Increase use of social workers or navigators to help hard-to-reach populations find and access the services they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 6 needs more housing that is affordable to low-and middle-income families</td>
<td>Increase access to affordable housing; Facilitate access to rental and mortgage assistance; Educate residents about assistance programs for first-time homebuyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Many residents lack the education and skills to obtain jobs that pay a living wage. Ward 6 residents identified higher college or technical school and skills training as some of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Increase access to vocational skills training; Increase adult education opportunities, including GED classes, technical/trade school, and college programs; Create opportunities to gain job skills that can transfer to a wide variety of career paths; Target opportunities to neighborhoods and populations with especially high unemployment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents identified higher college or technical school and skills training as some of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Increase access to and availability of utilities assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents identified assistance with utilities as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Ensure all residents requesting referrals or information receive the services they need; Share information and resources with other service providers to reduce duplication of services and ensure customers are referred to the organization best equipped to provide the services they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents identified referrals/information as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Provide education on transportation options and assistance programs; Increase access to resources that cover ‘last mile’ transportation; Provide advocacy training so that residents know how to participate in community transportation planning efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents identified assistance obtaining transportation as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment.</td>
<td>Increase equity in educational opportunities at both traditional public schools and public charter schools; Increase STAR ratings at underperforming Ward 6 schools; Improve math and reading proficiency scores in Ward 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>DC students are underperforming, and Ward 6 residents indicated they do not think a quality education is available to all District residents.</td>
<td>Improve communication efforts between developers/planners and residents to facilitate greater inclusion in decisions that affect their neighborhoods; Support residents to be more informed and active in the decision making in their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>Many Ward 6 residents are not informed about major changes to their neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of Ward 6 residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure, asthma, and diabetes among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents have high rates of serious, chronic health conditions.</td>
<td>Increase access to and availability of utilities assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents expressed significant concerns about untreated mental health conditions and the lack of services available to them</td>
<td>Increase access to mental health services, including specialized services; Increase the number of community health centers or mobile health centers available to Ward 6 residents, with an emphasis on clinics that provide extensive behavioral health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents have expressed concern about the District’s aging infrastructure, especially the number of lead pipes in the city</td>
<td>Ensure residents know that they can request a water test kit from DC Water; Address water contamination issues, particularly those related to lead pipes; Leverage federal interest in and focus on infrastructure and lead pipe replacement to advocate for DC to speed up its lead pipe replacement project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents expressed concerns about a number of environmental hazards, including air pollution, extreme heat, and regular exposure to allergens</td>
<td>Engage with DC landlords to remediate allergen issues in housing complexes; Advocate for stronger environmental regulations, especially in low-income communities; Provide advocacy training for residents to bring their environmental concerns to the city government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ward 6 residents expressed concerns about increasing violence in their ward</td>
<td>Address increasing gun violence in the city with emphasis on neighborhoods identified as problem areas; Work to increase the number of police in “hot spot” areas of violence; Engage the community in the development of positive solutions for decreasing loitering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Income tax preparation
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Ward 7 Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section includes a comprehensive needs assessment of Ward 7. It begins by outlining social impact data for Ward 7 from the U.S. Census Bureau, D.C government, and other secondary sources. The social impact data provides an overview of Ward 7’s demographic, income, housing, education, and employment characteristics and provides a comparison to the District as a whole on the same indicators.

Next is a summary of education data for Ward 7, including an overview of all of the traditional public and public charter schools in the ward. Information on grades served and school rating is also provided in this section.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed for this needs assessment is presented at the ward level. The Ward 7 focus group report provides insights from personal conversations with Ward 7 residents, while the needs assessment survey results summarize findings from the 111 Ward 7 residents who completed the 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey.

Social Impact Data

The following table briefly outlines the demographic, income, housing, and other important characteristics of Ward 7 residents.

Table 24: Ward 7 Social Impact Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ward 7</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong>&lt;sup&gt;406&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018&lt;sup&gt;407&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>81,299</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020&lt;sup&gt;408&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>76,255</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong>&lt;sup&gt;409&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>67,375</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</td>
<td>3,559</td>
<td>77,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>407</sup> U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *American community survey 5-year estimates*. Table DP05.


<sup>409</sup> Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>410</th>
<th>411</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>6,818</td>
<td>38,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>17,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>3,313</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>4,914</td>
<td>34,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>30,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>45,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>26,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>47,342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Median household income | $45,318 | $92,266 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>412</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in poverty</td>
<td>20,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in poverty</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18 years in poverty</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>413</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% high school graduate or higher</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>414</th>
<th>415</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>34,414</td>
<td>311,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied units</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% renter occupied units</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% vacant units</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>30,877</td>
<td>291,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median home value</td>
<td>$313,400</td>
<td>$646,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$1,023</td>
<td>$1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% living alone</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% without internet</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>416</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% without vehicle available</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% public transportation user</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>417</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Summary Data**

---

410 DC State Data Center. (2019). *DC data viz ward income indicators.*
416 Ibid.
In late 2018, the District of Columbia’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) introduced a new resource for comparing public schools across the District: The DC School Report Card. A key element of the annual DC School Report Card is that each traditional public or public charter school in the District earns a rating between one and five on the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework.

The STAR Framework uses a variety of data to measure a school’s performance across five domains: academic achievement, academic growth, school environment, English language proficiency, and graduation rate. These domains are weighted differently depending upon the grades served and if a school is classified as alternative or not. The Framework also measures the performance of students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and each racial/ethnic group to ensure that schools are accountable for educating the city’s most vulnerable students. All of these factors are used to calculate a school’s composite STAR rating.  

The following table presents an overview of the schools in Ward 7.

*Table 25: Ward 7 Education Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>STAR Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiton Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bard High School Early College DC (Bard DC)</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beers Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrville Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.W. Harris Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Chavez Public Charter Schools for Public Policy</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>6th-12th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Prep PCS - Benning Elementary School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Prep PCS - Benning Middle School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>4th-8th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Scholars PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Whitlow Stokes Community Freedom PCS - East End</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Blow Pierce Elementary</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Blow Pierce Middle</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>4th-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Collegiate Academy</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.D. Woodson High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Dream PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Note: for this report, schools that offer only early childhood education (Pre-K3 and/or Pre-K4) or only offer adult education were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, due to the impact of COVID-19, STAR scores are unavailable for some schools on the 2020 report card.

Ward 7 is home to 20 elementary schools, six middle schools, seven high schools, and four education campuses. There are nearly equal numbers of charter and traditional public schools in Ward 7, with 19 public charter schools and 18 DCPS schools. Ward 7 schools had an average STAR rating of 2.65 in 2020. Charter schools in Ward 7 had an average STAR rating of 3.13, while DCPS schools in Ward 7 had an average STAR rating of 2.19. Of the 37 schools in Ward 7, six did not have STAR ratings for 2020 – four charters and two DCPS campuses.

Focus Group Results

The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities where they live. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix.

Overview

This focus group was conducted virtually from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm on May 28, 2021. Six Ward 7 residents participated in this focus group. As with all of the focus groups, the participants were asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic.

Civic
When asked how political, religious, and community organizations ensure the needs in their community are being met, Ward 7 residents shared a variety of responses. Participants noted that religious and community organizations have done a good job meeting needs in the community by providing food and other essentials to residents throughout the pandemic. One participant stated that there is often “a delay in response for urgent needs and services,” and another focus group member noted that organizations like DCRA (the District’s Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs) have been filling in where there have been gaps. Ward 7 focus group participants generally agreed that political leadership has not been doing much to meet their community’s needs. Participants shared comments about political figures such as “they only show up when it is election time,” “the system has let us down,” and “we need an advocate.”

“The system has let us down.”
-Ward 7 Focus Group Participant, on political leadership

When asked about social supports their community needs, this focus group emphasized social and recreational activities for families and parents, such as community retreats, parenting workshops, community playdates, and peer-to-peer learning and reflection opportunities for parents, such as parent cafes.

Ward 7 residents expressed a range of opinions when discussing if a quality education was available to people of all ages in the District. One participant said they believe that there is a quality education available to everyone in the District, but that sometimes residents must seek out the best educational opportunities, and a lot of people do not do that. Another respondent noted that “parents have to be advocates for their children” and that strong advocacy from parents and community members could help improve education in neighborhoods where it is subpar. The group also discussed the challenges that students with delays, disabilities, and behavioral challenges often face in school, noting that too often they are “passed around” between classrooms and schools, and that their educational and basic needs are not being met by the current system.

Physical

Regarding neighborhood safety, the participants in this focus group expressed that very little had
changed in their neighborhood in the last year. One participant stated, “It’s the same as always . . . people from outside our community come here and cause trouble.”

Ward 7 residents identified the following as their top health and environmental concerns:

- Dirty streets
- Need for a more approachable police presence
- Environmental stressors and the impact on children
- Loitering
- Drug use in public

“It’s the same as always . . . people from outside our community come here and cause trouble.”

-Ward 7 Focus Group Participant, on neighborhood safety

Economic

If someone wanted to start a new business in their community, Ward 7 residents noted that they would need support services such as grants, small business loans, and support from the local community. One participant stated, “We need to support our local businesses more . . . we don’t need businesses here who try to rip off our community.”

Regarding training programs that would be beneficial to those in their community, this focus group mostly focused on job training opportunities, including:

- Training for jobs that can sustain a small or single-family household
- Training for jobs within the immediate neighborhood or community you live in
- Mentoring or training for youth to start preparing them for professional jobs at a young age
- Incentive programs to bring Ward 7 natives who have moved elsewhere back to the community to start businesses or otherwise help add value to the community

If a family with a limited income wanted to buy or rent a home in their community, Ward 7 focus group participants discussed how they would need access to low-tax properties and programs that make housing more accessible for low- and middle-income people.

COVID-19

In 2021, an additional question was added to all needs assessment focus groups, asking, “How has the pandemic affected you and your family members?” Ward 7 residents had a variety of experiences throughout the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Some of these experiences are documented below, in residents’ own words.

“The pandemic has put a lot of people in bad positions, leaving them homeless and jobless.”

“There are not many services available if you are a single individual.”

“The pandemic has also brought a lot of families together . . . showing us that life is too short.”

Needs Assessment Survey Results

Ward 7 UPO 2021 Community Needs Assessment Survey Results

A total of 111 Ward 7 residents completed UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey.
The average Ward 7 survey respondent was a married Black female in her 30s. The typical survey participant for Ward 7 had completed high school and was employed full-time with an average income between $0 and $24,999 per year. This indicates that on average, Ward 7 survey respondents had incomes below the Ward 7 median income, which is $45,318 (see Table 24), as well as some of the lowest incomes reported by all survey respondents.

*Figure 216: Ward 7 - Gender*

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 7 – Gender

*Figure 217: Ward 7 – Marital Status*
Figure 218: Ward 7 – Age

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 7 – Age Range

Figure 219: Ward 7 – Race/Ethnicity

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 7 – Race/Ethnicity
Figure 220: Ward 7 – Education

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 7 – Highest Education Level

Figure 221: Ward 7 – Annual Household Income

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 7 – Annual Household Income
Figure 222: Ward 7 – Employment Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 7 – Employment Status

- Employed full-time: 53.2%
- Unemployed, looking for work: 13.5%
- Employed part-time: 12.6%
- Self-employed: 6.3%
- Student: 5.4%
- Retired: 4.5%
- Other: 2.7%
- Homemaker: 0.9%
- No Answer: 0.9%

Figure 223: Ward 7 – Health Insurance

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 7 – Do you Have Health Insurance

- Yes, through Medicaid/Medicare: 35.1%
- Yes, through my employer or my spouse’s or relative’s employer: 43.2%
- Yes, through healthcare.gov or DC Health Link: 18.0%
- Other: 1.8%
- No: 1.8%
Figure 224 shows the high rates of high blood pressure, diabetes, and asthma that Ward 7 survey respondents reported.

Figure 224: Ward 7 – Household Health Conditions

Just over 52% of Ward 7 survey respondents reported that they had ever received assistance or services from UPO, slightly lower than the citywide average of 58%. Given that just over half of all Ward 7 survey respondents were UPO customers, the UPO data on Ward 7 residents looks significantly different than most DC government or U.S. Census data on Ward 7.

Figure 225: Ward 7 – Ever Received Help from UPO
UPO offers many services to residents of the District of Columbia. As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked if they needed or received assistance in the past 12 months in 24 different service areas (see chart below), including but not limited to: employment services, food assistance, childcare, healthcare, education, housing, transportation, and income supports. Figure 226 illustrates the different UPO services needed and received by Ward 7 residents. Income tax preparation and skills training were the two most frequently cited needs among Ward 7 survey respondents, while the most received services by Ward 7 respondents were food assistance and mental health services.

Figure 226: Ward 7 – Services Needed and Received

![Chart showing needs and received services for Ward 7]
Based on the need-based categories from the survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in Ward 7. They are highlighted in Figure 227. Figure 228 and Figure 229 look at the needs of Ward 7 residents categorically, by looking at all income/employment needs in one table and all health needs in another.

**Figure 227: Ward 7 – Top 5 Needs**

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**
**Ward 7 – Top 5 Services Needed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Readiness / Job skills</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Training</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Preparation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 228: Ward 7 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received**

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**
**Ward 7 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed Assistance</th>
<th>Received Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Compensation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Readiness / Job skills</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Training</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Preparation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 229: Ward 7 – Health Services Needed and Received**

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**
**Ward 7 – Health Services Needed and Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed Assistance</th>
<th>Received Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or drug abuse counseling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Individual Counseling</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid/Medicare</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Healthcare/Insurance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the 33% of respondents who did not report any challenges to meeting their needs in Ward 7, a sizeable portion of the respondents either did not know where to go for help (22%) or were unable to access services because they were only available during limited hours (21%).

*Figure 230: Ward 7 – Roadblocks to Meeting Needs*

![Needs Assessment Survey Results](chart)

Just over half of Ward 7 survey respondents (51%) felt they were included in decisions about what their neighborhood would look like in the future. This is in line with discussions that took place in the Ward 7 focus group, where many residents noted that they are often not included in conversations about the future of their neighborhood.

*Figure 231: Ward 7 – Included in Neighborhood Future*

![Needs Assessment Survey Results](chart)

54% of Ward 7 respondents reported feeling safer in their neighborhood than the previous year. Large numbers of respondents also reported they did not feel safer or were unsure if their neighborhood felt
safer. This is in line with the focus group conclusions, which noted that not much had changed in terms of safety in the last year.

*Figure 232: Ward 7 – Neighborhood Safety*

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**

**Ward 7 – I Feel Safer in My Neighborhood than I did Last Year**

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents who feel safer in their neighborhood.]

While most Ward 7 residents agreed (57%) that the police were respectful of their rights as citizens, there was more variation in answers from Ward 7 respondents than from many other wards.

*Figure 233: Ward 7 – Police Respectful of Rights*

**Needs Assessment Survey Results**

**Ward 7 – To what extent do You Believe the Police have Generally Been Respectful of Your Rights as a Citizen**

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents indicating their opinion on police respectfulness.]

Most Ward 7 survey respondents (64%) agreed that they can afford to continue living in their neighborhoods, but nearly 20% felt their neighborhood was no longer affordable.
Most Ward 7 respondents (32%) indicated that they were somewhat confident in the District government’s ability to provide jobs.

As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked their top three preferences for how the city should use the land if there were a vacant lot on their block. The top three choices indicated by Ward 7 residents were a community center, a playground, and a community garden.
Figure 236: Ward 7 – Preferences on How to Use a Vacant Lot

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 7 - What to do With a Vacant Lot on Your Block?

Recommendations for Addressing Ward 7 Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Many residents lack the education skills to obtain jobs that pay a living wage, and Ward 7 residents identified skills training, work readiness, and employment services as some of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase access to vocational skills training; Increase adult education opportunities; Target opportunities to neighborhoods and populations with especially high unemployment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 7 residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Advocate for service providers to provide services during non-traditional hours to ensure scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Needs</td>
<td>Ward 7 residents identified assistance with utilities as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase access to and availability of utilities assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>DC students are underperforming, and Ward 7 residents indicated they do not think a quality education is available to all District residents.</td>
<td>Increase equity in educational opportunities at both traditional public schools and public charter schools; Increase STAR ratings at underperforming Ward 7 schools; Improve math and reading proficiency scores in Ward 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>Many Ward 7 residents are not informed about major changes to their neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Improve communication efforts between developers/planners and residents to facilitate greater inclusion in decisions that affect their neighborhoods; Support residents to be more informed and active in the decision making in their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>Many Ward 7 residents feel ignored by the city’s political leadership.</td>
<td>Improve year-round engagement efforts between elected officials and all residents; Encourage political and community leaders to prioritize connecting with often underserved residents, including residents with low incomes, short-term residents (e.g., students, military), and youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Ward 7 residents have high rates of serious, chronic health conditions.</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of Ward 7 residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure, asthma, and diabetes among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Ward 7 parents report feeling isolated and having limited opportunities to meet other parents of young children.</td>
<td>Publicize existing opportunities for families with young children in Ward 7; Encourage community groups to offer retreats, playdates, and peer-to-peer learning opportunities for Ward 7 parents; Create new opportunities for parent and community engagement in childcare and education settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Neighborhoods in Ward 7 are seeing increased issues with trash and pests.</td>
<td>Reduce rodent infestations; Reduce issues related to trash piling up on sidewalks and streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ward 7 residents expressed not feeling safe in their neighborhoods and feeling the police presence in their community is not approachable.</td>
<td>Advocate for neighborhoods and police to work together to increase police presence in high crime areas and foster collaborative relationships between police and neighborhood residents; Engage the community in the development of positive solutions for decreasing loitering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>An increasing number of Ward 7 residents are at risk of displacement as</td>
<td>Increase access to first-time homebuyer programs; Increase access to rental assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Ward 7 residents expressed interest in entrepreneurship but lacked resources to start a business</td>
<td>Increase access to and awareness of business start-up capital and business and entrepreneurship training; Advocate for community organizations and financial institutions in Ward 7 to offer small grants or business development loans to local entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ward 8 Summary Data

78,513
Ward 8 Population, 2020 Census

Key Indicators

- Ward 8 Child Poverty Rate: 43%
- Ward 8 Poverty Rate: 33%
- Ward 8 schools have an average STAR rating of 2.38 (on a scale of 1-5)
- Ward 8 Median Rent: $1,129

Needs Assessment Data

142
Ward 8 residents completed the 2021 needs assessment survey

Most frequently reported Ward 8 health conditions

- High blood pressure
- Asthma

35% of Ward 8 survey respondents felt safer in their neighborhood than a year ago

Top 3 services needed by Ward 8 survey respondents

1. Employment services
2. Referrals/information
3. Utilities assistance

The most needed health service in Ward 8 was family or individual counseling
Ward 8 Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section includes a comprehensive needs assessment of Ward 8. It begins by outlining social impact data for Ward 8 from the U.S. Census Bureau, D.C government, and other secondary sources. The social impact data provides an overview of Ward 8’s demographic, income, housing, education, and employment characteristics and provides a comparison to the District as a whole on the same indicators.

Next is a summary of education data for Ward 8, including an overview of all of the traditional public and public charter schools in the ward. Information on grades served and school rating is also provided in this section.

Finally, qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed for this needs assessment is presented at the ward level. The Ward 8 focus group report provides insights from personal conversations with Ward 8 residents, while the needs assessment survey results summarize findings from the 142 Ward 8 residents who completed the 2021 UPO District of Columbia Community Needs Assessment Survey.

Social Impact Data

The following table briefly outlines the demographic, income, housing, and other important characteristics of Ward 8 residents.

Table 26: Ward 8 Social Impact Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ward 8</th>
<th>DC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>85,024</td>
<td>684,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>78,513</td>
<td>689,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 and over</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign born</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>69,531</td>
<td>285,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>33,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>37,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>3,277</td>
<td>56,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin (of any race)</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>77,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

423 Ibid.
### Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th># Households</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>8,083</td>
<td>38,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>3,862</td>
<td>17,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>17,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>34,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>30,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>45,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>26,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>47,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median household income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,245</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,266</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># in poverty</th>
<th>% in poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in poverty</td>
<td>27,782</td>
<td>107,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in poverty</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% under 18 years in poverty</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% high school graduate or higher</th>
<th>% bachelor’s degree or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% high school graduate or higher</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing units</th>
<th>Median home value</th>
<th>Median Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>34,610</td>
<td>$301,600</td>
<td>$1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied units</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% renter occupied units</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% vacant units</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>30,657</td>
<td>291,570</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median home value</td>
<td>$301,600</td>
<td>$646,500</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$1,129</td>
<td>$1,603</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% living alone</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% without internet</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% without vehicle available</th>
<th>% public transportation user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% without vehicle available</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% public transportation user</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

424 DC State Data Center. (2019). *DC data viz ward income indicators.*
430 Ibid.
Education Summary Data

In late 2018, the District of Columbia’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) introduced a new resource for comparing public schools across the District: The DC School Report Card. A key element of the annual DC School Report Card is that each traditional public or public charter school in the District earns a rating between one and five on the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework.

The STAR Framework uses a variety of data to measure a school’s performance across five domains: academic achievement, academic growth, school environment, English language proficiency, and graduation rate. These domains are weighted differently depending upon the grades served and if a school is classified as alternative or not. The Framework also measures the performance of students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and each racial/ethnic group to ensure that schools are accountable for educating the city’s most vulnerable students. All of these factors are used to calculate a school’s composite STAR rating.432

The following table presents an overview of the schools in Ward 8.433

Table 27: Ward 8 Education Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>STAR Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS - Wahler Place Elementary</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacostia High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballou High School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballou STAY High School</td>
<td>DCPS (Alternative)</td>
<td>9th-adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Tree Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center City PCS - Congress Heights</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Prep PCS - Anacostia Elementary School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Prep PCS - Anacostia Middle School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Academy PCS - Congress Heights</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Academy PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel Academy</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Southeast Elementary</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Southeast Middle</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>4th-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship PCS - Technology Preparatory High School</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart Middle School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendley Elementary School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>PK3-5th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingenuity Prep PCS</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>PK3-7th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Middle School</td>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>6th-8th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ketcham Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  3
King Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  2
KIPP DC - AIM Academy PCS  Charter  5th-5th  2
KIPP DC - Discover Academy PCS  Charter  5th-8th  4
KIPP DC - Heights Academy PCS  Charter  1st-4th  3
KIPP DC - Honor Academy PCS  Charter  3rd-8th  
KIPP DC - Somerset College Preparatory PCS  Charter  9th-12th  
Kramer Middle School  DCPS  6th-8th  1
Lawrence E. Boone Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  3
Leckie Education Campus  DCPS  PK3-8th  2
Lee Montessori - East End  Charter  PK3-K  
Malcolm X Elementary School @ Green  DCPS  PK3-5th  3
Moten Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  1
Patterson Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  1
Rocketship PCS - Rise Academy  Charter  PK3-5th  3
Savoy Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  3
Simon Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  1
Stanton Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  2
Statesmen College Preparatory Academy for Boys PCS  Charter  4th-6th  2
Thurgood Marshall Academy PCS  Charter  9th-12th  4
Turner Elementary School  DCPS  PK3-5th  2

Note: for this report, schools that offer only early childhood education (Pre-K3 and/or Pre-K4) or only offer adult education were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, due to the impact of COVID-19, STAR scores are unavailable for some schools on the 2020 report card.

Ward 8 is home to 22 elementary schools, seven middle schools, six high schools, and five education campuses. Of the 40 elementary and secondary schools located in Ward 8, 20 are traditional public schools and 20 are public charter schools. Ward 8 schools had an average STAR rating of 2.38 in 2020, the lowest average of any ward in the District. Charter schools in Ward 8 performed better than DCPS schools with regard to STAR ratings, as charters had an average of 2.92 and DCPS schools had an average of 2.00. However, 20% of Ward 8 schools did not have a STAR rating for 2020, and all but one of the schools without a rating were in the charter sector.

Focus Group Results

The following section details the results from personal conversations with community members on their views and attitudes regarding the health and well-being of the communities where they live. A listing of all questions presented to focus group participants is available in the appendix.

Overview

This focus group was conducted virtually from 11:15 am – 1:45 pm on July 27, 2021. Seven Ward 8 residents participated in this focus group, four females and three males. As with all of the focus groups, the participants were asked questions in four categories: civic, social, physical, and economic, as well as a question about the COVID-19 pandemic.
The Ward 8 focus group participants indicated that religious and community organizations were doing better ensuring residents’ needs were met than political leaders. Participants discussed how churches frequently distribute clothes, food, and other essentials. One respondent noted that “more neighbors stepped up during the pandemic to make sure seniors were getting groceries.” Another participant stated that it depends on where you live in Ward 8 because many resources and services are poured into some neighborhoods while others continue to struggle. The Ward 8 focus group participants were mostly dissatisfied with their political leadership, saying that they only see political leaders in the community around election time and that their councilmember “comes around for photos and major holidays.”

There was consensus among Ward 8 residents that they do not feel included in the future design of their neighborhood. One participant said they did not feel included “because the elected people don’t tell residents until after new construction starts.” Another participant bluntly said, “they [political leaders] don’t care about Ward 8.” The focus group discussed how oftentimes, Ward 8 residents do not know about major changes coming to their neighborhoods because they are kept in the dark or intentionally misled by those in power.

**Social**

Ward 8 residents identified the following social supports their community needs:

- More recreation centers
- Affordable summer camps
- Job training
- Additional services to support chronically unemployed people
- Drug treatment
- Programs to get people off the street - to prevent loitering, doing, and selling drugs

There was consensus among participants that there is not quality education available to all residents in their community and that, in general, schools in Ward 8 lack resources and do not provide the quality education available at some schools in other parts of the District. Participants noted that schools in other parts of the city seem to be better funded, and teachers in Ward 8 often complain about a lack of resources.

**Physical**

Ward 8 residents shared a variety of responses when it came to neighborhood safety. Overall, most felt that the neighborhood had not gotten safer in the last year due to increasing gun violence and crime overall. One participant noted that “the crime is out of control.” Ward 8 focus group participants discussed the lack of resources to stop gun violence in their community and the need to reduce all violence in the community so that residents will feel safer.
Ward 8 residents identified the following as their top health and environmental concerns:

- Trash piling up
- Rodents
- Lack of medical facilities
- Lack of grocery stores and fresh food
- Too many liquor stores
- Crime
- Overall poor quality of life

**Economic**

If someone was going to start a new business in their community, Ward 8 residents believe they would need several support services, such as:

- Financial literacy classes
- Business loans
- Local partners
- Mentors
- Community support

Participants in this focus group think their community needs the following training programs:

- Vocational training: HVAC, electric, carpentry
- Technology training: IT, cybersecurity, software development
- Parenting classes
- Credit classes and counseling
- Adult literacy
- Spanish classes

If a young family with limited income were looking to buy or rent a home in their neighborhood, members of this focus group believe they would need to do background research on grants for homebuyers and the different banks and credit unions available to help them finance a home. One respondent suggested that anyone looking to buy a home should take a class on building and sustaining good credit. Another participant said this family should look into DC’s Home Purchase Assistance Program (HPAP), which helps first-time homebuyers with closing costs and down payments.

**COVID-19**

In 2021, an additional question was added to all needs assessment focus groups, asking, “How has the pandemic affected you and your family members?” Ward 8 residents had a variety of experiences throughout the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Some of these experiences are documented below, in residents’ own words.

“Our family lost two loved ones to COVID.”

“As a Black community it is so important to educate our families and generations to come about eating better and staying healthy.”

-Ward 8 Focus Group Participant, on impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic
“As a Black community, it is so important to educate our families and generations to come about eating better and staying healthy.”

“I learned the importance of taking better care of your health.”

“We learned why it’s important to go to the doctor and talk about health issues.”

Needs Assessment Survey Results

Ward 8 UPO 2021 Community Needs Assessment Survey Results

A total of 142 Ward 8 residents completed UPO’s 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey.

The average Ward 8 survey respondent was a single Black female in her 30s. The typical survey participant for Ward 8 had completed high school and was employed full-time with an average income between $0 and $24,999 per year. This indicates that on average, Ward 8 survey respondents had incomes slightly below the Ward 8 median income, which is $35,245 (see Table 26), as well as some of the lowest incomes reported by all survey respondents.

Figure 237: Ward 8 - Gender
Figure 238: Ward 8 – Marital Status

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Marital Status

- Single: 54.2%
- Married: 25.4%
- Divorced: 7.7%
- Partnered: 4.2%
- Widowed: 4.2%
- Separated: 2.1%
- No Answer: 2.1%

Figure 239: Ward 8 – Age

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Age Range

- 30-39: 35.9%
- 40-49: 16.2%
- 50-59: 15.5%
- 60+: 9.9%
- 25-29: 9.2%
- 15-19: 7.0%
- 20-24: 6.3%
Figure 240: Ward 8 – Race/Ethnicity

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Race/Ethnicity

- Black: 74.5%
- White: 20.6%
- Two or more races: 1.4%
- American Indian: 1.4%
- Hispanic: 1.4%
- Other: 0.7%

Figure 241: Ward 8 - Education

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Highest Education Level

- Completed High School: 30
- Earned Bachelor’s Degree: 21
- Less than High School Graduate: 14
- Earned Master’s Degree or greater: 9
- Earned Associate’s Degree: 8
- Completed Technical School: 5
- No Answer: 2
Figure 242: Ward 8 – Annual Household Income

![Bar chart showing income distribution for Ward 8.]

Figure 243: Ward 8 – Employment Status

![Pie chart showing employment status distribution for Ward 8.]

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Annual Household Income

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Employment Status
Figure 244: Ward 8 – Health Insurance

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Do you Have Health Insurance

![Pie chart showing health insurance status](chart1)

Figure 245 indicates that Ward 8 survey respondents reported very high rates of high blood pressure and asthma in their households, as well as moderately high rates of diabetes and mental illness.

Figure 245: Ward 8 – Household Health Conditions

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Household Health Conditions

![Pie chart showing household health conditions](chart2)

Nearly 53% of Ward 8 survey respondents reported that they had ever received assistance or services from UPO, slightly lower than the citywide average of 58%. Given that just over half of all Ward 8 survey
respondents were UPO customers, the UPO data on Ward 8 residents looks significantly different than most DC government or U.S. Census data on Ward 8.

Figure 246: Ward 8 – Ever Received Help from UPO

UPO offers many services to residents of the District of Columbia. As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked if they needed or received assistance in the past 12 months in 24 different service areas (see chart below), including but not limited to: employment services, food assistance, childcare, healthcare, education, housing, transportation, and income supports. Figure 247 illustrates the different UPO services needed and received by Ward 8 residents. Employment services, referrals/information, and utilities assistance were the most frequently cited needs among Ward 8 survey respondents, while the most received services by Ward 8 respondents were food stamps/SNAP and general food assistance.
Based on the need-based categories from the survey data, five needs emerge as key issues in Ward 8. They are highlighted in Figure 248. Figure 249 and Figure 250 look at the needs of Ward 8 residents categorically, by looking at all income/employment needs in one table and all health needs in another.
Figure 248: Ward 8 – Top 5 Needs

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Top 5 Services Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed Assistance</th>
<th>Received Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family/Individual Counseling</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Readiness / Job skills</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals/Information</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 249: Ward 8 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Income/Employment Services Needed and Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed Assistance</th>
<th>Received Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Compensation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Preparation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Training</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Readiness / Job skills</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 250: Ward 8 – Health Services Needed and Received

Needs Assessment Survey Results
Ward 8 – Health Services Needed and Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Needed Assistance</th>
<th>Received Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or drug abuse counseling</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid/Medicare</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Healthcare/Insurance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Individual Counseling</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the 43% of respondents who did not report any challenges to meeting their needs in Ward 8, a sizeable portion of the respondents either did not know where to go for help (18%) or were unable to access services because they were only available during limited hours (14%).

Figure 251: Ward 8 – Roadblocks to Meeting Needs

Half of Ward 8 survey respondents felt they were included in decisions about what their neighborhood would look like in the future. This is in line with the focus group conclusions, where most participants stated that Ward 8 residents are often not included in decisions about their neighborhoods.

Figure 252: Ward 8 – Included in Neighborhood Future
Only 35% of Ward 8 respondents reported feeling safer in their neighborhood than the previous year. As discussed in the Ward 8 focus group, increased violence in Ward 8 likely contributes to residents feeling less safe.

*Figure 253: Ward 8 – Neighborhood Safety*

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents feeling safer in their neighborhood than last year.]

Less than half of Ward 8 respondents (47%) indicated that they believe the police have been respectful of their rights as citizens. Nearly 20% indicated the police had not been respectful of their rights, and a sizeable portion chose the neutral option or chose not to answer this particular question.

*Figure 254: Ward 8 – Police Respectful of Rights*

![Bar chart showing the extent to which respondents believe the police have generally been respectful of their rights.]

Over half of the Ward 8 survey respondents agreed that they can afford to continue to live in their neighborhoods. However, at 54%, it is a much smaller portion of the respondents than seen in some other wards.

*Figure 255: Ward 8 – Affordability of Neighborhoods*
Most Ward 8 respondents (30%) indicated that they were somewhat confident in the District government’s ability to provide jobs.

As part of the 2021 Community Needs Assessment survey, respondents were asked their top three preferences for how the city should use the land if there were a vacant lot on their block. The top choices indicated by Ward 8 residents were a community center, a playground, a community garden, and an athletic field.
### Recommendations for Addressing Ward 8 Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Many residents lack the education skills to obtain jobs that pay a living wage, and Ward 8 residents identified employment services, work readiness, and job skills as some of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase access to vocational skills training; Increase adult education opportunities; Target opportunities to neighborhoods and populations with especially high unemployment rates; Provide specialized employment services and training for the chronically unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 8 residents cannot always access the services they need due to a variety of barriers</td>
<td>Improve communication regarding programs and services available within the community, including eligibility and location, so that residents know where to go for help; Advocate for service providers to provide services during non-traditional hours to ensure scheduling issues do not prevent people from getting the help they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 8 residents identified assistance with utilities as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase access to and availability of utilities assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Needs</strong></td>
<td>Ward 8 residents identified referrals/information as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Ensure all residents requesting referrals or information receive the services they need; Share information and resources with other service providers to reduce duplication of services and ensure customers are referred to the organization best equipped to provide the services they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>DC students are underperforming, and Ward 8 residents indicated they do not think a quality education is available to all District residents</td>
<td>Increase equity in educational opportunities at both traditional public schools and public charter schools; Increase STAR ratings at underperforming Ward 8 schools; Improve math and reading proficiency scores in Ward 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civics</strong></td>
<td>Many Ward 8 residents are not informed about major changes to their neighborhoods</td>
<td>Improve communication efforts between developers/planners and residents to facilitate greater inclusion in decisions that affect their neighborhoods; Support residents to be more informed and active in the decision making in their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civics</strong></td>
<td>Many Ward 8 residents feel ignored by the city’s political leadership</td>
<td>Improve year-round engagement efforts between elected officials and all residents; Encourage political and community leaders to prioritize connecting with often underserved residents, including residents with low incomes, short-term residents (e.g., students, military), and youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 8 residents have high rates of serious, chronic health conditions</td>
<td>Increase efforts to improve the health of Ward 8 residents by addressing the high percentages of survey respondents who list high blood pressure, asthma, and diabetes among their top health problems; Increase access to health care, especially specialty care, in neighborhoods that are currently medically underserved; Address the lack of medical facilities in Ward 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Residents express significant concerns about untreated mental health conditions and the lack of services available to them, and Ward 8 residents identified individual/family counseling as one of their most needed services in the 2021 needs assessment</td>
<td>Increase access to mental health services in Ward 8; Ensure specialized services and services targeted specifically to special populations (e.g., homeless individuals, new parents, youth) are available to all District residents who need them; Liaise with community partners/stakeholders to address the lack of medical facilities in Ward 8, including mental/behavioral health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Ward 8 residents expressed a need for more recreation opportunities, especially for children and youth</td>
<td>Publicize existing recreation opportunities in Ward 8; Explore opportunities to expand the number of community and recreation centers in Ward 8; Ensure increased accessibility and affordable summer program availability for Ward 8 children and youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Many neighborhoods in Ward 8 have limited access to fresh, affordable foods on a regular basis</td>
<td>Address concerns related to food deserts, particularly east of the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Neighborhoods in Ward 8 are seeing increased issues with trash and pests</td>
<td>Reduce rodent infestations; Reduce issues related to trash piling up on sidewalks and streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Ward 8 residents expressed concerns about increasing crime violence in their ward</td>
<td>Address increasing gun violence in the city with emphasis on neighborhoods identified as problem areas; Work to increase the number of police in “hot spot” areas of violence; Engage the community in the development of positive solutions for decreasing loitering; Address concerns related to public drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>An increasing number of Ward 8 residents are at risk of displacement as housing costs continue to rise and affordable housing fails to keep up</td>
<td>Increase access to first-time homebuyer programs; Increase access to rental assistance; Assure that residents know their rights as renters or homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Ward 8 residents expressed interest in entrepreneurship but lacked resources to start a business</td>
<td>Increase access to and awareness of business start-up capital and business and entrepreneurship training; Advocate for community organizations and financial institutions in Ward 8 to offer small grants or business development loans to local entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Many Ward 8 residents would like financial education resources and lacked basic knowledge of the financial resources available to them</td>
<td>Provide financial programs and training to teach residents how to budget, save, build and maintain good credit, and access financial resources; Connect residents who need them to existing asset-building programs in the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Community Needs Assessment Focus Group Questions

All focus groups were asked the following questions broken into four categories: Civic, Social, Physical, and Economic. An additional question regarding the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic was also included in all of the 2021 focus groups.

Civic

- Do leaders in your community (political, religious, and community organizations) ensure that your needs are being met?
- Are you included in the future design of your neighborhood? Why or why not?

Social

- What social supports (human, recreational, etc.) do you think people need in your community?
- Is quality education available to residents of all ages in your community? If so, how? If not, why?

Physical
• What are the factors that make the neighborhood more or less safe than it was a year ago?
• What are some of the top health and environmental concerns in your community?

Economic
• What type of support services do you believe someone might need to start a new business in your community?
• What types of training programs do you think need to be offered in your community?
• What type of support do you think a young family with limited income would need in order to purchase or rent a home in your neighborhood?

COVID-19
• How has the pandemic affected you and your family members?

Community Needs Assessment Survey Questions
Q1 Are you a DC resident?
Q2 What ward do you live in?
Q3 How long have you lived in your ward?
Q4 How long have you lived in the District of Columbia?
Q5 What is your zip code?
Q6 What is your gender?
Q7 What is your marital status?
Q8 What is your age range?
Q9 What is your race or ethnic group?
Q10 Were you born in the United States?
Q11 What is the primary language spoken in your home?
Q12 What is your annual household income?
Q13 Please indicate your highest educational level:
Q14 What best describes your employment status? (Select all that apply)
Q15 If others live with you, please indicate the age ranges that best describe the majority of those who live with you.
Q16 If others live with you, what is your relationship to them? (Check all that apply)
Q17 Which of the following best describes your household situation?
Q18 If you rent, do you receive Section 8, rental assistance, or a housing voucher?
Q19 Do you have health insurance?
Q20 Since a year ago, would you say that your health insurance or health care coverage is better, worse, or about the same?
Q21 Is there anyone in your household (including yourself) who has any of the following health conditions? (Check all that apply)
Q22 United Planning Organization (UPO) offers many services. Have you needed or received assistance with any of the following in the past 12 months? Select all that apply.
Q23 Have you ever received assistance or services from the United Planning Organization (UPO)?
Q24 Did UPO’s services/programs help you in achieving your goals?
Q25 How would you rate the following services that you received at UPO? Please check one.
Q26 How or what can UPO do better to assist you to assure that your needs are being met?
Q27 Were there any other needs you had in the past year, other than those listed above?
Q28 Did you face any difficulties meeting basic needs (food, shelter, employment) in the past year?
Q29 If you faced difficulties meeting basic needs, what problems did you face when trying to get help? (Check all that apply).
Q30 If there were a vacant lot on your block, please select your to three preferences for how the District should use the land.
Q31 How much do you agree with the following statement: I feel included in the decisions of what my neighborhood would look like in the future?
Q32 How involved would you like to be in the decisions that affect what your neighborhood would look like in the future?
Q33 How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I feel safer in my neighborhood than I did last year.
Q34 On a scale from very respectful to very disrespectful, please indicate the extent to which you believe the police have generally been respectful of your rights as a citizen.
Q35 To what extent do you agree with the following statement: I can afford to continue to live in my neighborhood.
Q36 If I had a choice to send my children to school elsewhere, I would still send my children to my neighborhood school.
Q37 The District of Columbia guarantees Pre-K education for 3 and 4 year olds. I believe this is a worthy investment of government funds.
Q38 What is your level of confidence in the DC government’s ability to provide jobs?
Q39 What do you like best about your neighborhood?
Q40 What improvements would you like to see in the District of Columbia?
Q41 Please indicate the degree of concern you have that the following type of crime might happen in your neighborhood:

Digital Divide Survey Questions
Q1 Are you a DC resident?
Q2 What is your age?
Q3 How long have you lived in DC?
Q4 What ward do you live in?
Q5 What is your gender?
Q6 With which racial group do you identify yourself?
Q7 What is the primary language spoken in your home (choose only one)
Q8 Please indicate your highest educational level
Q9 What best describes your employment status? (Select all that apply)
Q10 What is your annual income?
Q11 Do you or anyone in your household have a disability?
Q12 Do others live with you?
Q13 If others live with you, please indicate the age range that best suits them (select all that apply)
Q14 Which of the following best describes your household situation?
Q15 How many people in your household use the internet?
Q16 How comfortable or experienced are you with using the internet?
Q17 Who is your internet provider?
Q18 How satisfied are you with your internet services?
Q19 Do you have an internet/broadband subscription in your home?
Q20 If you do not have an internet subscription in your home, how do you most often access the internet? (Choose all that apply)
Q21 If you do not have an internet subscription in your home, are you interested in subscribing to one?
Q22 If you answered no, what reasons influence your choice to forego an internet subscription (select all that apply)
Q23 With what device do you typically access the internet?
Q24 Select any items you need to access the internet
Q25 What do you typically use the internet for?
Q26 Any additional services needed that UPO can provide?

City-Wide Needs Prioritization
Full city-wide needs prioritization, without regard to category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Identified</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for proactive solutions to address gun violence in DC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more housing city-wide that is affordable to low-and moderate-income families</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more living wage jobs</td>
<td>3 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased supports for families with young children experiencing homelessness</td>
<td>3 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased job opportunities for DC residents with low incomes</td>
<td>3 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased access to mental health services across the city</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for job training specifically for at-risk youth and young adults</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to increase opportunities for high-quality education across the city</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for opportunities to foster collaborative relationships between police and residents, especially in high-crime neighborhoods</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for full-service grocery stores and fresh food markets equitably distributed throughout the city</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for measures to reduce rodent infestations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased transitional housing for formerly homeless persons</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased access to financial resources and institutions in underserved neighborhoods</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for additional supports for at-risk students</td>
<td>12 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased access to care in medically underserved neighborhoods</td>
<td>12 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased out-of-school academic and recreational services for youth</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for high-quality prenatal and maternity care east of the river</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for financial trainings related to budgeting, saving, and building and maintaining credit</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to address water contamination issues related to lead pipes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for first-time homebuyer support and assistance</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to improve math and reading proficiency scores</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to address access and affordability of early childhood services in underserved neighborhoods</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased access to and outreach about substance abuse treatment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for comprehensive health services city-wide that address high levels of high blood pressure, asthma, and diabetes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to prioritize increasing the high school graduation rate</td>
<td>22 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased opportunities for residents to be involved in decision-making in their communities</td>
<td>22 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for residents to be educated regarding their rights as renters or homeowners</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for publicly accessible parenting classes in DC</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to address increasing overdoses</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased access to vocational skills training and adult education opportunities</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased business start-up funding</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased attention to public trash issues</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for improved communication about available human services</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to improve communication efforts between developers and residents</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased access to business and entrepreneurship training</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to promptly address COVID-19 learning loss at all levels</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more opportunities for political and community leaders to connect with residents, especially in underserved communities</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for increased service accessibility (time, location, accessible to public transit)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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