

We seek to find causes of the results we found in our data when examining factors in affordable housing measures. These sub-questions that tie to the research question of the results of government backing and income/rent control when it comes to property and location densities are questions I seek to provide insight in the factors story.

- How does the increasing or decreasing frequency of affordable housing projects and properties contribute to the densities of projects and properties in that area?
- For Maryland, what relationship exists between new and rehabilitation housing projects and the number of units for that property?
- For the Greater Seattle Area, how does location and frequency of income/rent-controlled units affect the implementation of income/rent-controlled units?
- What differences exist in densities in affordable housing that are only government-backed and those that are only income/rent-controlled?

Here are some background information the reader should be aware of when it comes to understanding the factors story:

- In 2023, the City of Seattle successfully passed the I-135 Social Housing initiative, which will establish a public developer who will be responsible for developing social homes that serve individuals who earn 0 to 120% of the area median income (AMI). As the homes will never enter the private market, and rents are determinant on tenant income, the goal is to create affordable, mixed-income communities.
- Other state governments are conducting similar initiatives, focused on reinventing social housing in America. Social housing is a form of public housing as it focuses on state ownership and management of affordable homes. These projects aim to be mixed-income and international examples include Austria and Singapore.
- However, while there is extension research on homeownership and private housing market solutions, there is lack of unified research in affordable housing, such as data about density and government backing. This gap raises the need to look into characteristics and densities of affordable housing projects and properties.
- We will focus on Maryland and Seattle and regarding government bonds and income/rent control because Maryland is cited as a social housing precedent for Seattle, and I-135 bonds will be supported and

while rent is not strictly controlled, the rent a tenant will pay is determined by income.

- While theoretically a project can both be government-backed and have income/rent control, looking at both individually can provide more insights into both measures.

My visualization plan is I will make pie charts that indicate potential factors for the results we got.

What I preliminarily find is projects that are either rehabilitated (Maryland) or have city involvement (primarily WSHFC in Seattle) tend to see the most units in a project. Other preliminary data include Seattle, which focuses on income/rent control, has many projects with fewer than 10 units subject to income/rent control. However, only four projects in Maryland (which are government-backed) have units fewer than 10. Both units in the Maryland homes and the income/rent-controlled units in Seattle are types of affordable housing units.

Additionally, Maryland has some ZIP codes with a handful of units, while Seattle has every ZIP code with multiple units.

While we can establish factors that speak into patterns for affordable housing density (location and units) results, further research can be conducted to augment the factors analysis through intersections analysis. What are some common intersections between the data in Maryland and Seattle?

The preliminary takeaway message is while government-backing results in higher unit densities, income/rent control has stronger location densities.

Favorable Factors to Denser Properties
and More Properties in ZIP Code

