Memorandum

TO:	**Valerie Clark**, CEO, Revive & Restore Community Corporation
	Heather Logan, COO, Revive & Restore Community Corporation
FROM:	**Mallory Rappaport**, Program Officer, National Land Bank Network, Center for Community Progress
	Janell O'Keefe, Associate Director, Technical Assistance, Center for Community Progress
DATE:	March 27, 2026
RE:	West Jackson Property Condition and Resident Perception Survey Findings

The Center for Community Progress and Revive and Restore Community Corporation sought to better understand the condition of properties throughout the westside neighborhoods of Jackson, Mississippi (collectively called West Jackson) and neighborhood residents' sentiments about their community and city.

To understand property conditions, we collaboratively designed an app-based windshield survey and fourteen volunteers surveyed 7,694 properties in West Jackson. With support from the Urban Institute, we designed an online resident perception survey and collected 74 complete responses. We captured thousands of data points to better inform organizational and municipal strategies, shed light on where state policy limits interventions, and counter a narrative that public investments should be avoided because residents would leave if they had the financial means to do so.

This memorandum memorializes preliminary findings from both surveys and offers considerations for next steps. The memorandum is organized into the following sections:

- Key property condition survey findings
- Next step considerations
- Property condition survey question-by-question results
- Resident perception survey question-by-question responses

A three-page overview designed for easy sharing is available online.[1]

About the Organizations and West Jackson

Center for Community Progress

Community Progress helps people to transform vacant spaces into vibrant places. Since 2010, their team of experts has provided urban, suburban, and rural communities looking to revitalize vacant properties with the tools and resources needed to address those properties at the policy and systems level. As the only national nonprofit dedicated to vacant property revitalization, Community Progress drives change by uncovering and disrupting systems that

---

[1] Available at https://communityprogress.org/publications/west-jackson-mississippi-vacant-property-survey/

perpetuate entrenched vacancy and property deterioration. Community Progress has delivered customized, expert guidance to leaders in over 300 communities and provided hundreds of hours of free educational resources as well as leadership programming to help policymakers, practitioners, and community members across the country return properties to productive use. To learn more, visit communityprogress.org.

Revive and Restore Community Corporation

Revive and Restore is striving to change the fabric of West Jackson by addressing systemic disinvestment that is driven by negative perceptions of an area and group of people. The organization envisions West Jackson as a community that is diverse in all areas of humanity and thrives with housing that is valued, schools that excel, and is economically viable.

Born from love for the neighborhood and a deep desire to see it thrive, two West Jackson residents founded Revive and Restore in 2025 to fill a missing piece in the revitalization efforts already taking place. There are many great ideas and passionate people working to make a difference, but many efforts fall short because they are not backed by solid data. Revive and Restore is here to bridge that gap—collecting the information, research, and real stories that can turn good ideas into lasting, positive change for West Jackson. To learn more, visit reviveandrestorecc.org.

West Jackson

Revive and Restore serves West Jackson, a collection of neighborhoods loosely bounded by Bullard Street and Fortification Street on the north, Gallatin Street on the east, J.R. Lynch Street on the south, and I-220 on the west. West Jackson encompasses about 5.3 square miles and approximately 15,263 residents, over 90 percent of whom are Black.[2]

The public and private sectors have devalued this neighborhood, and others like it, for decades. The neighborhood lost nearly 20 percent of its population in the last 10 years, long-term vacancy in some parts is as high as 25 percent, and 70 percent of residents make less than $50,000.[3] Still, residents are transforming vacant properties from symbols of neglect to places of neighborhood pride. Anchored by strong community organizations, dedicated residents, the Jackson Zoo, and proximity to downtown and the Capital, West Jackson is poised for a brighter future.

Key Property Condition Survey Findings

The goal of the property condition survey was to understand the scale of vacant and deteriorated property to develop strategic, effective interventions. The results yield an abundance of useful data. Initial analysis provided five key findings:

1. **59 percent of properties are in good or very good condition.**

---

[2] Estimated population in 2019-2024. PolicyMap. Based on data from Census: US Bureau of the Census. Accessed March 12, 2026. http://www.policymap.com.

[3] Percent change in the population between 2010 and 2020; Estimated percent of all housing units that were vacant type "other" in 2020-2024; Estimated median income of a household, between 2020-2024. PolicyMap. Based on data from Census: US Bureau of the Census. Accessed March 3, 2026. http://www.policymap.com. "Other" vacant is a term used by the US Census Bureau to categorize units that are neither being held for future occupancy nor used only seasonally.

Most properties in good or very good condition need no intervention. Some vacant lots in this condition may still need intervention, such as repurposing into something more impactful than a grass lot. Addressing fair, poor, and very poor condition properties will help ensure existing good and very good properties remain so.

2. **21 percent of occupied properties are in fair or poor condition.**

   Occupied properties in fair or poor condition likely need intervention to ensure health and safety of occupants. Condition may reflect deferred maintenance due to owner's limited income, hesitancy to invest, availability of skilled labor, access to materials, or a combination. Additional analysis could determine the number of owner-occupants in these properties and repair grants could be made available to support them and prevent further deterioration and eventual vacancy.

3. **12 percent of properties are very poor.**

   This is essentially West Jackson's demolition list. These properties are not salvageable and actively causing harm—and real safety risks—to adjacent properties and neighbors. Significant resources are needed to demolish 328 hazardous structures, as the City currently funds about 20 single-family structure demolitions per year.[4]

4. **29 percent of parcels are vacant lots.**

   Of the over 5,100 vacant lots in West Jackson, over 50 percent are in fair or worse condition. These lots need significant clean-up, ranging from trash collection to tree removal, before any reuse is possible. Cleaning and clearing vacant lots can facilitate (faster) reuse which in turn can improve community health and safety.[5]

5. **West Jackson needs over $33.3 million for demolition, stabilization, and vacant lot clean up.[6]**

   - **Over $7 million for demolition**: At an estimated $20,000 per residential demolition and $50,000 per commercial/industrial demolition, razing all very poor-condition structures would cost at least $7.1 million—likely more, as commercial and industrial properties often carry additional costs. Residential demolitions alone account for at least $6.2 million of that total..

   - **Over $23.8 million for stabilization**: At an estimated $15,000 per residential stabilization and $25,000 per commercial/industrial stabilization, bringing all poor and fair condition structures to a stable state would cost at least $23.8 million—with fair-condition residential properties alone accounting for at least $14.7 million of that total.

   - **Over $2.5 million for vacant lot clean up**: At an estimated $2,500 per very poor or poor condition vacant lot and $1,500 per fair condition lot, cleaning and clearing all overgrown vacant lots would cost at least $2.5 million..

---

[4] Per conversations with City code enforcement staff.

[5] For research findings, see https://communityprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/2023-vls-greening-and-community-safety.pdf and https://communityprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/2023-vls-greening-and-community-health.pdf.

[6] Per-property cost estimates are based upon conversations with City staff and industry knowledge.

Property Types by Survey Condition

	Residential Structure	Commercial Structure	Institutional Structure	Industrial Structure	Vacant Lot	Other & Unknown	Percent Total
Very Good	26%	19%	38%	38%	21%	6%	25%
Good	38%	39%	41%	13%	27%	22%	34%
Fair	21%	21%	15%	38%	15%	33%	19%
Poor	9%	1%	5%	13%	13%	20%	10%
Very Poor	7%	8%	1%	0%	25%	18%	12%
Count of Properties	4,713	202	130	8	2,117	49	7,220

Next Step Considerations

We offer the following considerations for next steps from this work. While Community Progress did not engage in an extensive analysis of the property condition survey data or local systems, based on our national expertise and other engagements in Jackson, we view these six recommendations as ideal follow-up work to this initial property condition survey.

1. **Conduct additional analysis**: Partner with City of Jackson Code Enforcement, Working Together Jackson (who recently completed a market value analysis), and others to further analyze property condition survey data with code enforcement, market, and other data to best inform intervention strategies. *Every Neighborhood Has a Future…and it Doesn't Include Blight: Detroit Blight Removal Task Force Plan* and *Beyond Blight: City of Flint Comprehensive Blight Elimination Framework* offer useful models for how other communities have combined these data sources.[7] Some specific steps should include:

   ○ Perform additional data cleaning to further improve the quality of the dataset. Refinement could include reviewing all side lots/attached lots, reviewing all "other" or "unknown" parcels, and marking any remaining parcels within the survey area as inaccessible.

[7] Available at https://communityprogress.org/publications/every-neighborhood-detroit-blight-task-force/ and https://communityprogress.org/publications/beyond-blight/.

- ○ Conduct additional property condition survey data analysis to communicate need, inform strategies, and prioritize the allocation of limited resources. If additional data cleaning is done, the initial analysis included here should also be updated. Future analysis could include cross-tabulating questions for more nuanced observations and more immediate intervention. For example, identifying geographic concentrations of parcels with significant trash could be addressed with a community clean-up day. Additional analysis could also include layering other local data, such as:
  - properties with water service shut off for six or more months
  - properties already identified for demolition
  - tax delinquency status
  - current ownership and/or recent sales
- ○ Develop property prioritization criteria to inform immediate, short-, and long-term interventions. Some criteria to consider are poor or very poor lots on blocks with several occupied properties, structures with existing code liens, and/or significantly deteriorated or hazardous properties' proximity to elementary and middle schools.
- ○ Pursue opportunities to pilot low-cost vacant property interventions on priority parcels, from boarding structures to reusing vacant land.
- ○ Leverage survey data to build neighborhood and citywide strategies (see #3 below).

2. **Survey the entire city**: Property condition data is most powerful when it exists for all property in a city and can be leveraged for citywide strategy development. A full Jackson survey is estimated $250,000 to $300,000, depending on the number survey staffing and compensation. The City and other partners should secure funding to make this happen, ideally surveying the entire city within a single time frame and repeating every two to three years. If only incremental funding is available, additional neighborhood surveys (such as South Jackson) are still worth pursuing. The Flint Property Portal and City of Cleveland Property Inventory are strong examples of citywide survey efforts.[8]

Future surveys should also incorporate the following insights learned from the West Jackson survey:

- ○ Refine survey questions to collect better data. In implementing the initial survey and conducting preliminary data quality control, we discovered the need for the following:
  - Add railroad track and/or transportation as a use-type
  - Add stream or water as a use-type
  - Fine tune vacant lot use types to minimize "other" selection
  - Add questions about accessory structures for parcels without primary structures
  - Consider adding "tree or landscaping debris" as a trash type (e.g., a parcel with significant fallen trees or leaves).
- ○ Expand training materials to include more detail and examples to better equip surveyors and minimize response discrepancy across surveyors.
  - Provide more specific definitions for all types of vacant lot property use, especially "side lot/attached lot" and include photos for each definition.
  - Consider offering future trainings over a weekend or in a three-part series.

---

[8] Available at https://flintpropertyportal.com/ and https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/943f26c946994574a8d5f05cecf10a59

○ Repeat the property condition survey on a regular basis to capture changing conditions and refine strategies to match present conditions. Whether or not this survey is conducted citywide, Revive and Restore should aim to survey their target area every three years.

3. **Establish a citywide vacant property coalition**: Meaningful progress requires a unified, coordinated citywide strategy among all partners. Additional data gathering, analysis, and community engagement will be needed to develop that strategy. An important first step is convening all interested parties to build shared understanding and elevate resident voices. The coalition could be led by the Mayor's Office or an independent representative board. The St. Louis Vacancy Collaborative is a strong example of the latter.[9]

4. **Launch coordinated storytelling and fundraising campaign:** Draw on current and future survey results to build a collaborative public education campaign that makes the case for greater local capacity and financial investment in revitalization. The coalition should engage external communication and marketing professionals to identify the most effective formats (e.g., infographics, videos, visual storytelling) to reach target audiences. The Lucas County Land Bank's *Toledo Survey* is a useful reference for translating data findings into compelling public narratives.[10]

5. **Explore local legal tools and state policy changes**: Existing policies and practices constrain progress. Mississippi's delinquent property tax enforcement laws allow vacant properties to languish for years. Code enforcement tools—despite staff's best efforts—often fail to compel action from absentee owners. These systems need reform. The most effective strategy for harmful vacant properties is to move them to new responsible owners as quickly as possible. Whether and how to pursue this in Jackson should be explored through deeper community engagement, review of historical city practices, and a careful analysis of existing law. For a more nuanced discussion, please see our 2025 memorandum, *Assessment of Code Enforcement Activities and Priorities to Consider*, to the City of Jackson.[11]

6. **Complete analysis of the Resident Perception Survey**: Summary statistics from the Resident Perception Survey are included here. Additional analysis should be conducted, such as thematic analysis of open-ended questions and comparison of responses by certain subsections (e.g., zip code, age, length of residency).

We also uplift the other recommendations made in *Assessment of Code Enforcement Activities and Priorities to Consider*. We look forward to continued partnership with Revive and Restore, the City of Jackson, and others to address vacant property and improve neighborhoods throughout Jackson.

---

[9] Learn more at https://www.stlvacancy.com/

[10] Available at https://drive.google.com/file/d/154O9pwcMK5Xu--QLT-wzeGrfHfRLy5Ex/view

[11] Available at https://communityprogress.org/publications/code-enforcement-jackson-mississippi/

Property Condition Survey Question-by-Question Results

We present the following summary statistics to showcase the depth of data collected in the Property Condition Survey.

Methodology

Community Progress reviewed property condition surveys from Detroit, Cleveland, Flint, Memphis, and multiple other cities to draft an initial slate of questions. With input from Revive and Restore, we refined survey questions to include local characteristics and priorities. Survey questions were loaded on the Regrid platform, which is specifically designed for parcel-based surveys.[12]

Revive and Restore recruited twelve volunteers to conduct the windshield survey. Community Progress visited Jackson and co-hosted two training sessions for volunteers with Revive and Restore. The first session included a training presentation on the survey platform, scales, and individual questions and a group survey of five properties. We refined a questions and corrected survey flow errors after group surveying. In the second session, volunteers went out in pairs and surveyed at least twelve properties each in different neighborhoods. The group came back together to discuss challenges, and we refined a few additional questions and updated the survey training presentation with additional guidance. We then adapted the training presentation into an easy to reference front and back handout.

Surveyors were paired up and assigned a specific section of West Jackson. Over three months they surveyed 7,694 parcels. Community Progress remotely tracked progress weekly and reviewed a sample of each week's completed surveys. When needed, we offered additional guidance to surveyors on how to handle confusing properties (e.g., if there is no structure present but concrete foundation still occupies most of the site, is that a "vacant lot" or not?).

Limited project funding did not permit reviewing every single entry, so Community Progress developed a quality control strategy to identify records most likely to have errors. Community Progress reviewed all parcels with duplicate entries, outstanding comments, missing photos, and survey-related inconsistencies. Revive and Restore re-surveyed ~25 parcels to fill in inconsistent or missing information.

Once we had a clean dataset, we used Excel formulas and pivot tables to develop the summary statistics presented below. We then uploaded the clean dataset into Regrid so both original and clean data are available for additional geospatial analysis.

---

[12] See https://regrid.com/ for more information on the platform.

All Properties (Count: 7,426)

Overall Property Condition

	Residential Structure	Commercial Structure	Institutional Structure	Industrial Structure	Vacant Lot	Other and Unknown
Very good	26%	19%	38%	38%	21%	6%
Good	38%	39%	41%	13%	27%	22%
Fair	21%	21%	15%	38%	15%	33%
Poor	9%	12%	5%	13%	13%	20%
Very Poor	7%	8%	1%	0%	25%	18%
Total Properties	4,714	202	130	8	2,117	49

Properties with and without Structures

	Structure	No Structure	Parcel is not accessible
Parcel Count	5,100	2,120	206

Occupancy

	Occupied (and/or in-use)	Partially occupied	Possibly occupied	Unoccupied	Cannot determine
Total	3,705	30	224	1,017	126
Residential Structure	3,479	18	205	906	105
Commercial Structure	110	8	11	66	7
Institutional Structure	100	4	6	14	6
Industrial Structure	5	0	0	3	0

Ownership[13]

	City of Jackson	State of Mississippi
Total	191	280
Residential Structure	13	71
Commercial Structure	0	4
Institutional Structure	7	3
Industrial Structure	0	0
Vacant Lot	156	181
Other & Unknown	2	21

Ownership by Condition

	City of Jackson	State of Mississippi
Very good	13	31
Good	26	31
Fair	16	44
Poor	24	45
Very poor	99	111

Abandoned Vehicles (e.g., car, truck, boat)

	Total	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Other or Unknown	Vacant Lot
Yes	808	670	26	0	2	6	104
One	509	448	6	0	1	3	51
Multiple	299	222	20	0	1	3	53
No	6,156	3,866	174	8	127	41	1,940
Cannot determine	256	175	2	0	1	2	76

---

[13] This count is meant to reflect public owners of likely "surplus" property and therefore excludes parcels owned by Jackson Public Schools, Jackson Parks, and other public entities that own property for specific public uses.

Presence of Trash by Volume

	Total	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Vacant Lot
No, no trash	5,284	3,806	115	113	5	1,216
Yes, trash	1,936	905	87	17	3	901
Yes, less than a kitchen trash bag	752	345	48	9	3	341
Yes, kitchen trash bag up to a rolling bin	407	202	19	4	0	179
Yes, rolling bin up to a small dumpster	316	165	5	1	0	141
Yes, small dumpster up to a full-size dumpster	224	105	9	2	0	103
Yes, more than a full-sized dumpster	237	88	6	1	0	137

Types of Trash—most prominent type of trash on site

	Total	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Other or Unknown	Vacant Lot
Household waste	1,043	478	59	13	3	0	480
Contractor waste	96	63	5	1	0	0	25
Furniture/appliances	58	41	1	1	0	0	15
Mattresses	4	3	0	0	0	0	1
Car parts	26	12	4	0	0	0	10
Tires	89	37	4	1	0	3	44
Other	234	55	8	1	0	7	163
No prominent type	389	217	6	0	0	2	164

Vegetation condition

	Total	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Other or Unknown	Vacant Lot
No vegetation (e.g., parking lot, paved)	123	41	48	8	0	3	23
Maintained, no obvious issues	5,118	3,856	120	111	8	27	996
Needs maintenance	1,979	814	34	11	0	19	1,098
Overgrown, but nothing taller than ~8 inches	549	335	11	7	0	8	188
Overgrown, grass/weeds/brush taller than 8 inches	479	213	16	4	0	2	244
Significantly overgrown, grass/weeds/brush block visibility and/or structure	951	266	7	0	0	9	669

Vegetation issues

	Total	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Vacant Lot
Vegetative growth impeding sidewalk or driveway	530	196	16	4	0	302
Fallen tree limbs	198	90	0	0	0	108
Dangerous standing tree	93	43	0	1	0	49
Two or more of the above	570	227	1	3	0	336

Residential Structures (Count: 4,714)

Condition by Occupancy

	Occupied (and/or in-use)	Partially occupied	Possibly occupied	Unoccupied	Cannot determine
Very good	1,189	2	22	19	1
Good	1,554	4	59	122	31
Fair	609	9	77	243	40
Poor	115	3	44	233	27
Very Poor	12	0	3	289	6

Condition of Accessory Structures

	Parcel Count
Very good	83
Good	135
Fair	117
Poor	58
Very poor	27
Cannot determine	23

Open to Trespass

	Parcel Count
Yes	359
No, boarded	218
No, fully secured	1,111
Cannot determine	75

Fire Damage

	Parcel Count
No	4,552
Cannot determine	89
Yes	72
Minor	5
Moderate	10
Major	32
Collapsed	25

Structure Component Conditions

	Roof	Exterior walls (e.g., siding, bricks, etc.)	Windows	Porch
Very good	1,109	1,303	1,224	1,172
Good	1,743	1,718	1,716	1,635
Fair	918	945	895	906
Poor	401	425	385	360
Very Poor	299	268	298	239
Cannot determine or N/A	243	54	190	401

Vacant Lots (Count: 2,120)

Overall Condition

	Parcel Count
Very good	446
Good	575
Fair	309
Poor	270
Very poor	520

Clear Use

	Parcel Count
No	1,441
Site lot/attached lot	423
Park	13
Parking Lot	135
Other public space	54
Other private space	54

Type of Other Public or Private Use

	Parcel Count
Landscaping (e.g., flowers, bushes)	5
Fencing	2
Benches, tables, or other gathering spaces	4
Public art (e.g., murals, sculptures)	3
Vegetable garden or other urban agriculture	20
Other	72

Maintained

	Parcel Count
Yes	1,099
No	1,021

Vegetation condition

	Parcel Count
No vegetation (e.g., grass, bushes)	23
Maintained, no obvious issues	996
Needs maintenance	1,098
Overgrown, but nothing taller than ~8 inches	188
Overgrown, grass/weeds/brush taller than 8 inches	244
Significantly overgrown, grass/weeds/brush block visibility and/or structure	669

Significant vegetation issues

	Parcel Count
Vegetative growth impeding sidewalk or driveway	302
Fallen tree limbs	108
Dangerous standing tree	49
Two or more of the above	336

Commercial (Count: 202)

Condition by Occupancy

	Occupied (and/or in-use)	Partially occupied	Possibly occupied	Unoccupied	Cannot determine
Very good	37	1	1	0	0
Good	54	4	7	12	2
Fair	13	1	1	25	3
Poor	6	2	0	15	1
Very Poor	0	0	2	14	1

Commercial Property Use

Parcel Condition	Parcel Count
Alcohol and/or marijuana retail (e.g., liquor store)	4
Auto services (e.g., gas station, auto repair)	44
Entertainment (e.g., lounge, movie theatre, club, venue)	9
Grocery and/or food market	4
Office and business (e.g., hair salon, dance studio, private gym, doctor's office)	52
Restaurant, bar, and/or coffee shop	12
Retail (e.g., dollar store, clothing, shoes, beauty supplies)	26
Multi-use (even combination of above uses)	8
Other	21
Cannot determine	22

Structure Component Conditions

	Roof	Exterior walls (e.g., siding, bricks, etc.)	Windows	Porch
Very good	26	50	46	32
Good	36	68	53	40
Fair	8	43	29	17
Poor	12	25	30	6
Very poor	17	16	16	6
Cannot determine or N/A	102	0	26	101

Condition of Accessory Structures

	Parcel Count
Very good	4
Good	2
Fair	1
Poor	2
Very poor	1
Cannot determine	0

Open to Trespass

	Parcel Count
Yes	13
No, boarded	23
No, fully secured	80

Fire Damage

	Parcel Count
No	194
Cannot determine	5
Yes	3
Minor	0
Moderate	0
Major	1
Collapsed	2

Industrial (Count: 8)

Condition by Occupancy

	Occupied (and/or in-use)	Unoccupied	Partially occupied, Possibly occupied or cannot determine
Very good	3	0	0
Good	1	0	0
Fair	0	3	0
Poor	1	0	0
Very Poor	0	0	0

Condition of Accessory Structures

	Parcel Count
Very good	1
Good	0
Fair	0
Poor	0
Very poor	0

Open to Trespass

	Parcel Count
Yes	1
No, boarded	0
No, fully secured	4
Cannot determine	0

Fire Damage

	Parcel Count
No	7
Yes	0
Cannot determine	1

Structure Component Conditions

	Roof	Exterior walls (e.g., siding, bricks, etc.)	Windows	Porch
Very good	2	3	2	1
Good	1	1	1	1
Fair	0	2	1	0
Poor	0	2	1	1
Very poor	0	0	1	0
Cannot determine or N/A	5	0	2	5

Institutional (Count: 130)

Condition by Occupancy

	Occupied (and/or in-use)	Partially occupied	Possibly occupied	Unoccupied	Cannot determine
Very good	49	0	0	0	1
Good	44	4	2	2	1
Fair	7	0	4	5	4
Poor	0	0	0	6	0
Very Poor	0	0	0	1	0

Institutional property use

Parcel Condition	Parcel Count
Government (e.g., court house, municipal building)	2
Hospital	1
Public amenities (e.g., library, museum, zoo)	4
Public safety (e.g., police officers, fire department)	3
Recreation (e.g., community rec center)	3
Religious (e.g., church, temple)	65
School (e.g., daycare, early childhood, grad school)	24
Multi-use or other	27
Cannot determine	1

Condition of Accessory Structures

	Parcel Count
Very good	5
Good	8
Fair	4
Poor	0
Very poor	1
Cannot determine	2

Open to Trespass

	Parcel Count
Yes	1
No, boarded	9
No, fully secured	43
Cannot determine	2

Fire Damage

	Parcel Count
No	128
Cannot determine	1
Yes	1
Minor	0
Moderate	0
Major	1
Collapsed	0

Structure Component Conditions

	Roof	Exterior walls (e.g., siding, bricks, etc.)	Windows	Porch
Very good	31	53	50	46
Good	33	49	41	34
Fair	7	19	13	7
Poor	2	4	9	3
Very poor	6	3	3	2
Cannot determine or N/A	51	2	14	38

Other & Unknown (Count: 49)

Condition by Occupancy

	Occupied (and/or in-use)	Partially occupied	Possibly occupied	Unoccupied	Cannot determine
Very good	3	0	0	0	0
Good	3	0	1	2	5
Fair	5	0	1	8	2
Poor	0	0	0	10	0
Very Poor	0	0	0	8	1

Condition of Accessory Structures

	Parcel Count
Very good	1
Good	3
Fair	2
Poor	1
Very poor	0
Cannot determine	0

Open to Trespass

	Parcel Count
Yes	12
No, boarded	6
No, fully secured	16
Cannot determine	4

Perception Survey Summary Question-by-Question Responses

The summary statistics presented below are from the automatic reporting tool in Community Progress' survey platform Alchemer and only include complete surveys.

Methodology

Revive and Restore drafted questions of interest, which Community Progress refined into well-formatted survey questions. We then reviewed perception survey examples provided by the Urban Institute and added additional questions. We designed and distributed the survey through Alchemer. Revive and Restore distributed the survey link through email and social media, at community meetings, and other organizations' communication channels. We received 82 survey responses, 74 complete and 8 partially completed. We used Alchemer's automatic reporting tool to analyze the fully complete surveys. Open-ended questions are not included in the analysis. An Excel spreadsheet with all survey responses is included for additional analysis.

Question 3: What is your West Jackson zip code (where you reside)?

Zip Code	Percent	Count
39203	23.0%	17
39204	6.8%	5
39206	2.7%	2
39209	58.1%	43
39211	2.7%	2
I do not live in West Jackson	5.4%	4
I choose not to answer	1.4%	1

Question 4: How long have you lived in West Jackson?

	Percent	Count
1-5 years	1.4%	1
6-10 years	5.7%	4
11-20 years	14.3%	10
21+ years	78.6%	55

Question 5: How much influence do the following factors have on your decision to live in West Jackson?

	A lot of influence	Some influence	No influence	I don't know	I choose not to answer
Friends and family nearby	35	15	18	0	1
Close-knit neighborhood community	20	33	9	1	0
Cost of living	30	27	11	0	0
Access to services and amenities (e.g., grocery stores, doctor's offices, parks, playgrounds)	19	13	34	1	0
Access to public transportation	10	14	39	1	1
Access to local public schools	10	20	35	0	0

Question 6: What is your current housing situation?

	Percent	Count
House or apartment owned by you or someone in your household that is completely paid off	59.4%	41
House or apartment owned by you or someone in your household with a mortgage or loan	29.0%	20
Renting a house or apartment	11.6%	8

Question 7: How do you want your housing situation to change in the next five years?

	Percent	Count
No change, stay in the same place	46.4%	32
Move to a new place in West Jackson	8.7%	6
Move to a different neighborhood in Jackson	2.9%	2
Move to a different part of Mississippi	11.6%	8
Move out of state	5.8%	4
Other (please describe)	10.1%	7
I don't know	14.5%	10

Question 8: In addition to yourself, who else lives in your household? (Select all that apply).

	Percent	Count
Young child(ren) (ages 0-4)	4.3%	3
School-age child(ren) (ages 5-18)	22.9%	16
Adult family member(s) (spouse, parents, siblings, adult children)	52.9%	37
Roommate(s) and/or friend(s)	1.4%	1
Other (please describe)	5.7%	4
No one else, I live alone	27.1%	19
I choose not to answer	4.3%	3

Question 9: What type of school(s) does the child(ren) in your household attend? (Select all that apply).

	Percent	Count
Public	68.8%	11
Charter	6.3%	1
Private	18.8%	3
Home school	25.0%	4

Question 10: The child(ren) in my household is receiving a high-quality education.

	Percent	Count
Strongly agree	6.3%	1
Agree	50.0%	8
Neither agree nor disagree	18.8%	3
Disagree	25.0%	4

Question 11: How long have you owned your home?

	Percent	Count
Less than one year	1.7%	1
1-4 years	6.9%	4
5-10 years	17.2%	10
10+ years	60.3%	35
Someone else in my household owns the home I reside in	13.8%	8

Question 12: How do you think the value of your home has changed in the last five years?

	Percent	Count
Significantly increased	3.4%	2
Slightly increased	20.7%	12
No change	17.2%	10
Significantly decreased	39.7%	23
Slightly decreased	8.6%	5
I don't know	10.3%	6

Question 13: Have you applied for a home equity line of credit in the last ten years?

	Percent	Count
Yes, and was approved	9.1%	5
Yes, and was denied	7.3%	4
No	72.7%	40
I don't know	7.3%	4
I choose not to answer	3.6%	2

Question 14: In general, how satisfied are you with the type of housing in West Jackson that is available to you on your budget?

	Percent	Count
Somewhat satisfied	12.5%	1
Somewhat dissatisfied	50.0%	4
Very dissatisfied	37.5%	3

Question 15: Do you want to buy a home in the next five years?

	Percent	Count
Yes	75.0%	6
No	12.5%	1
I don't know	12.5%	1

Question 16: How much of a problem are the following on your street?

	Big problem	Somewhat of a problem	Not a problem at all	I don't know	I choose not to answer
Occupied homes that are deteriorated	30	24	8	2	0
Abandoned homes that are deteriorated	35	17	11	1	0
Vacant lots with trash and debris	26	18	15	0	0
Poorly maintained sidewalks and roads	40	18	5	0	0
Petty crime	23	17	15	8	0
Serious crime	22	14	18	9	0

Question 17: How much do you agree/disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	I don't know	I choose not to answer
I feel safe in West Jackson.	2	29	25	7	5	0	0
People who are not from West Jackson have an accurate view of what it is like to live here.	7	10	7	16	21	4	0
City government cares about making sure West Jackson is a nice place to live.	2	8	5	21	28	1	0
I know who to contact in city government to report homes and lots that are deteriorated (broken windows, peeled paint, overgrown grass, etc.).	13	23	4	15	8	2	0
I know who to contact in city government to report other issues (like potholes or crumbling sidewalks).	16	25	4	12	7	1	0
I know who to contact in city government to report a petty or serious crime.	16	38	3	4	3	0	0

Question 18: How often do you report code enforcement issues to the City of Jackson?

	Percent	Count
Very often	16.1%	10
Sometimes	30.6%	19
Rarely	11.3%	7
Never	38.7%	24
I don't know	3.2%	2

Question 19: What method(s) do you use to report code enforcement issues? (Select all that apply)

	Percent	Count
Phone (311 or department phone number)	75.0%	27
City website	33.3%	12
In-person	16.7%	6
Other (please describe)	19.4%	7

Question 20: How often do you do the following in West Jackson?

	Often	Sometimes	Not at all	I don't know	I choose not to answer
Participate in school parent teacher association	8	9	47	0	2
Attend or volunteer with my place of worship or religious group	19	29	17	0	2
Volunteer with a neighborhood group or organization	30	22	14	0	1
Spend time with friends and/or family	38	24	4	0	0
Spend time with neighbors	18	38	7	0	1
Visit local public services (e.g., libraries, playgrounds, community centers)	23	32	12	0	0
Shop or spend time at local amenities (e.g., grocery stores, restaurants, other retail, theaters)	32	29	5	0	0

Open-Ended Questions

We also asked the following open-ended questions. Responses can be found in the accompanying Excel file.

- What else would you like us to know about living in West Jackson (challenges, opportunities, how the neighborhood has changed, etc.)?
- What else would you like us to know about your experience in West Jackson (challenges, opportunities, how the neighborhood has changed, etc.)?
- What changes do you hope to see in West Jackson in the future?

Demographic Questions

These questions were optional.

What is your age?

	Percent	Count
25-34 years old	14.8%	9
35-44 years old	14.8%	9
45-54 years old	16.4%	10
55-64 years old	23.0%	14
65+ years old	29.5%	18
I choose not to answer	1.6%	1

What is your gender?

	Percent	Count
Female	76.1%	51
Male	23.9%	16

What is your race? (Select all that apply).

	Percent	Count
Black or African American	82.4%	56
Hispanic or Latino	2.9%	2
White	8.8%	6
I choose not to answer	7.4%	5

Are you employed?

	Percent	Count
Full time	45.6%	31
Part time	13.2%	9
Temporary or seasonal	2.9%	2
Unemployed	4.4%	3
Retired	26.5%	18
I choose not to answer	7.4%	5

What is your annual household income?

	Percent	Count
$1 - $10,000	3.2%	2
$10,001 - $25,000	8.1%	5
$25,001 - $50,000	29.0%	18
$50,001 - $75,000	22.6%	14
$75,001 - $100,000	9.7%	6
$100,001 - $125,000	3.2%	2
$125,001 - $150,000	3.2%	2
$200,001-$250,000	1.6%	1
I choose not to answer	19.4%	12