



Perceptions of Homelessness in the Greater Sacramento Region

2025 Representative Survey of Households



Institute for
Social Research
August 2025

About the Survey

The *Perceptions of Regional Homelessness Survey* collected responses from 1,750 residents across six counties in the greater Sacramento region in April 2025. The survey was conducted using the Sacramento Regional Panel, an ongoing collaboration between ISR and Valley Vision. The panel includes randomly selected households from Sacramento, Placer, Yolo, El Dorado, Sutter, and Yuba counties. Distributed in English and Spanish in April 2025, responses were weighted to reflect regional demographics. The margin of error is $\pm 2.3\%$.

The Greater Sacramento Region Panel uses probability-based sampling to recruit a random sample of the Region's residents using the United States Postal Service Delivery Sequence File. Statistical weighting to reflect various selection probabilities is performed to ensure that the panelists responding to the survey statistically represent the demographics of the Region. We adjust for nonresponse and under-coverage by calibrating these base weights to known population-based control totals for gender and age, race, ethnicity, education, income, marital status, household size, homeownership, and county.

Scan the QR code below to access survey summary reports by county and learn more about the Institute for Social Research.



About the Institute

The Institute for Social Research is an interdisciplinary research center at California State University, Sacramento. ISR partners with communities and decision-makers to conduct applied social research that fosters positive change in the Sacramento region and throughout California.

Learn more: www.csus.edu/isr

Institute for Social Research | California State University, Sacramento

Sacramento State Downtown
304 S. Street, 3rd Floor | Sacramento, CA 95811
Tel: 916.278.5737 | Email: isr-info@csus.edu

Overview of Survey Findings

Conducted in April 2025, the *Perceptions of Regional Homelessness Survey in the Greater Sacramento Region* provides timely, local data to inform service organizations, agencies, and elected officials working on homelessness response. This survey of 1,750 residents across six counties in the greater Sacramento region confirms that homelessness remains a visible and urgent concern—and that many residents are actively engaged in addressing it.

Visibility and Concern Remain High

More than half (55%) of respondents reported seeing signs of homelessness—such as encampments or people living in vehicles—almost daily in their communities. Among urban residents, that figure climbs to 75%. Additionally, 53% of all respondents expressed deep concern about homelessness in their local area.

Homelessness as a Voting Priority

Survey results show that homelessness is not only a visible issue—it's a decisive one. Many respondents expressed frustration with the lack of visible progress and reported that homelessness significantly influenced their voting decisions in the 2024 election:

- 53% strongly considered homelessness when voting on local measures and propositions
- 44% strongly considered it when voting for local or state elected officials

This influence was especially pronounced among urban residents and households earning less than \$50,000 annually, where visibility of and concern about homelessness are highest.

Civic Action and Community Support

A majority of residents (56%) believe they can make at least a small impact on homelessness—and many are taking action. The survey reveals widespread community involvement:

- 69% have personally given food, money, or supplies to someone experiencing homelessness
- 65% have donated to local organizations supporting unhoused individuals
- Over 50% have had a friendly conversation with someone experiencing homelessness
- 35% have volunteered their time to help

Additionally, 27% have signed petitions and 14% have contacted public officials, demonstrating active civic engagement.

Shifting Perceptions Over Time

Compared to a similar survey conducted in 2022 (*Experiences with Homelessness in the Sacramento Region*), several trends emerge:

- Visibility of homelessness has remained relatively stable across the region (53% in 2022 vs. 55% in 2025 reporting near-daily sightings), though notable increases were seen in El Dorado County (15% to 25%) and Yolo County (37% to 58%).
- Perceptions of worsening conditions have declined. In 2022, 77% of respondents felt homelessness was getting worse in their county; in 2025, only 50% reported the issue as worsening in their community. In Sacramento County, that figure dropped from 86% in 2022 to 56% in 2025. (Note: Question wording differed slightly between surveys.)

Residents' Overall Views on their Community

In addition to questions about the issue of homelessness, survey respondents were asked to provide their broader perceptions of their local communities. Across the region, respondents rated their local communities' quality of life the highest among the community conditions listed, with 62% reporting a rating of "excellent" or "good." Public safety was also rated highly, especially in smaller towns and rural areas, where average ratings were highest. Housing affordability stood out as the lowest rated aspect of the communities — only 21% of respondents in the region gave affordable housing favorable marks, and 38% rated it "poor." Urban residents and lower-income households expressed the most dissatisfaction with both housing and employment opportunities.

Survey Data Tables

Survey results are presented in the following tables, disaggregated by four key regional demographics:

- **County.** The survey panel included residents from six counties—El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yuba, and Yolo. For reporting purposes, responses from Yolo and Sutter Counties were combined to strengthen statistical reliability. County-level differences are notable, as both the visibility of homelessness and the availability of services vary significantly across jurisdictions.
- **Urbanicity.** Respondents self-identified their communities as urban, suburban, or small-town/rural. These classifications help illuminate differences in the visibility of unhoused individuals and the density of local services and supports.
- **Household Income.** Respondents reported their total annual household income. Income levels are closely tied to housing insecurity, housing type, and neighborhood conditions—factors that influence both exposure to and perceptions of homelessness.
- **Political Ideology.** Respondents identified their political orientation, independent of voting behavior or party registration. Political ideology plays a role in how individuals interpret the causes of homelessness. In the 2022 survey, conservative-leaning respondents were more likely to attribute homelessness to personal choices or behavioral health issues, while liberal-leaning respondents more often cited systemic factors such as lack of affordable housing or insufficient economic supports.

Table of Contents

Overview of Survey Findings.....	3
Perceptions of Regional Homelessness	6
Visibility of Homelessness in the Past Year.....	6
Perceived Change in Homelessness in the Past Year.....	7
Personal Experience with Housing Insecurity	8
Resident's Concern & Voting on the Issue	9
Level of Concern about Local Homelessness.....	9
Impact of Homeless Issue on Voting.....	10
Solutions to Address the Region's Homelessness	11
Residents' Suggestions for Improving Homelessness	11
Expectation of Future Improvement	12
Awareness of Services and/or Programs Available to Unhoused People	13
Awareness of Efforts to Address Homelessness	15
Resident's Efforts to Address Homelessness.....	18
Perception of Resident's Impact on Issue	18
Residents' Efforts Addressing Homelessness in their Communities	20
Resident's Perceptions of their Local Communities	23
Residents' Rating of Community Life and Opportunities	23
Survey Demographics	25

Perceptions of Regional Homelessness

Visibility of Homelessness in the Past Year

Q1. In the past year, how often have you seen encampments, vehicles that people are living in, and/or people who you believe are experiencing homelessness in your local area?

Table 1a | Visibility of Homelessness by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Almost everyday	36	25%	69	23%	725	70%	48	42%	88	58%	966	55%
At least once a week	49	33%	112	38%	235	23%	31	28%	53	35%	481	27%
Few times a month or less	61	42%	117	39%	81	8%	34	30%	11	7%	303	17%
Total	145	100%	298	100%	1041	100%	113	100%	152	100%	1750	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 1b | Visibility of Homelessness by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Almost everyday	561	75%	298	43%	107	34%
At least once a week	124	17%	242	35%	114	36%
Few times a month or less	63	8%	148	21%	93	30%
Total	748	100%	688	100%	313	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 1c | Visibility of Homelessness by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Almost everyday	236	64%	475	60%	255	43%
At least once a week	90	25%	208	26%	182	31%
Few times a month or less	42	11%	108	14%	152	26%
Total	369	100%	791	100%	590	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 1d | Visibility of Homelessness by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Almost everyday	319	53%	470	56%	169	59%
At least once a week	191	31%	218	26%	58	20%
Few times a month or less	96	16%	147	18%	58	20%
Total	606	100%	835	100%	286	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Perceived Change in Homelessness in the Past Year

Q2. In the past year, do you think the issue of homelessness in your community overall has...

Table 2a | Perceived Change in Homelessness by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Gotten better	7	6%	16	6%	95	9%	11	12%	14	9%	143	9%
Stayed about the same	92	71%	130	49%	353	35%	45	50%	57	38%	677	41%
Gotten worse	31	24%	117	45%	566	56%	35	38%	78	53%	827	50%
Total	131	100%	264	100%	1014	100%	91	100%	149	100%	1648	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 2b | Perceived Change in Homelessness by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Gotten better	45	6%	65	10%	33	12%
Stayed about the same	233	32%	297	46%	147	54%
Gotten worse	449	62%	285	44%	94	34%
Total	727	100%	647	100%	274	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 2c | Perceived Change in Homelessness by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Gotten better	36	10%	44	6%	63	12%
Stayed about the same	137	39%	292	39%	248	46%
Gotten worse	183	51%	419	56%	226	42%
Total	356	100%	754	100%	537	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 2d | Perceived Change in Homelessness by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Gotten better	50	9%	67	9%	24	8%
Stayed about the same	272	48%	302	39%	100	35%
Gotten worse	240	43%	410	53%	159	56%
Total	562	100%	779	100%	283	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Personal Experience with Housing Insecurity

Q3. Have you ever had a time in your life when...

Table 3a | Personal Experience by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
a member of your family or close friend was at risk of, or experienced, homelessness	69	49%	150	50%	614	59%	80	71%	70	46%	983	56%
family or friends needed to stay with you because they did not have a permanent place to live	72	51%	128	43%	492	47%	79	70%	26	18%	797	46%
you considered yourself to be at risk of being homeless or experienced homelessness	50	36%	36	12%	299	29%	54	48%	18	12%	458	26%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 3b | Personal Experience by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Family or close friend*	476	64%	332	49%	175	56%
Family/friends need to stay	346	47%	291	43%	160	51%
Considered yourself at risk/homeless*	231	31%	132	19%	95	30%

* Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 3c | Personal Experience by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Family or close friend	289	78%	453	57%	241	41%
Family/friends need to stay	226	61%	364	46%	207	35%
Considered yourself at risk/homeless	188	51%	192	24%	78	13%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 3d | Personal Experience by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Family or close friend	306	50%	500	60%	160	56%
Family/friends need to stay	248	41%	424	51%	117	41%
Considered yourself at risk/homeless	149	25%	242	29%	60	21%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Resident's Concern & Voting on the Issue

Level of Concern about Local Homelessness

Q4. Overall, *how concerned are you* about the issue of homelessness in your community?

Table 4a | Level of Concern by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Very concerned	56	39%	110	39%	609	59%	61	55%	81	53%	917	53%
Somewhat concerned	51	35%	103	36%	383	37%	33	30%	55	36%	625	36%
Not very/not at all concerned	38	26%	70	25%	44	4%	16	15%	16	11%	185	11%
Total	145	100%	283	100%	1036	100%	111	100%	152	100%	1727	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 4b | Level of Concern by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Very concerned	482	65%	296	44%	140	45%
Somewhat concerned	223	30%	305	45%	97	31%
Not very/not at all concerned	40	5%	70	10%	75	24%
Total	745	100%	671	100%	311	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 4c | Level of Concern by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Very concerned	225	61%	426	55%	266	45%
Somewhat concerned	120	33%	266	34%	238	41%
Not very/not at all concerned	22	6%	82	11%	81	14%
Total	368	100%	774	100%	585	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 4d | Level of Concern by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Very concerned	279	46%	476	58%	150	53%
Somewhat concerned	262	43%	260	31%	103	36%
Not very/not at all concerned	62	10%	90	11%	32	11%
Total	603	100%	826	100%	284	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Impact of Homeless Issue on Voting

Respondents who answered that they **strongly considered** the issue of homelessness among those who voted in November 2024

*Q5. How much did you consider **the issue of homelessness** in how you voted [in 2024] for...*

Table 5a | Strongly Considered Homelessness in Voting by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. Local elected positions (e.g., mayor, city council, board of supervisors, sheriff and other local positions)	34	31%	81	34%	424	52%	15	20%	44	33%	599	44%
b. Local measures and propositions on the ballot	63	56%	108	46%	464	57%	25	34%	67	50%	728	53%
c. CA-level elected officials (e.g., State Assembly and State Senate)	44	39%	74	31%	404	50%	37	50%	47	35%	607	44%
d. US-level elected officials (e.g., US House, US Senate, and President)	50	44%	70	30%	357	44%	20	27%	41	31%	539	39%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 5b | Strongly Considered Homelessness in Voting by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. Local elected positions*	281	49%	236	44%	82	31%
b. Local measures/propositions	319	56%	272	51%	136	52%
c. CA-level elected officials	276	48%	218	40%	113	43%
d. US-level elected officials	247	43%	193	36%	100	38%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 5c | Strongly Considered Homelessness in Voting by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. Local elected positions	120	52%	263	41%	216	43%
b. Local measures/propositions	136	59%	341	54%	250	49%
c. CA-level elected officials*	140	61%	292	46%	175	34%
d. US-level elected officials*	133	58%	275	43%	131	26%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 5d | Strongly Considered Homelessness in Voting by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
a. Local elected positions	200	40%	289	45%	108	48%
b. Local measures/propositions	246	50%	354	55%	126	56%
c. CA-level elected officials	209	42%	294	45%	102	45%
d. US-level elected officials	177	36%	266	41%	96	42%

Results not significant.

Solutions to Address the Region's Homelessness

Residents' Suggestions for Improving Homelessness

Q6. In a sentence or two, what would you tell an elected official to do to improve homelessness in your community?

El Dorado County

- "We need more affordable housing."
- "Throwing money at the problem from hundreds of different directions is not working."
- "Provide more resources for mental health and improve housing accessibility and affordability."
- "I would urge the elected official to prioritize affordable housing initiatives, provide better access to mental health and addiction services, and work with local organizations to create comprehensive support systems that help individuals transition out of homelessness."
- "Focus on the community's needs, not developers and big corporations' needs."
- "Be held accountable for the money put forth for homelessness."
- "Better access and mandated treatment for mental illness and substance abuse."

Placer County

- "Address mental health and drug addiction"
- "Create affordable housing that is safe and provides job opportunities, education, and health facilities."
- "Every elected official only thinks and cares about their political empowerment. The homelessness issue has been going on for decades and neither Republicans nor Democrats have given any truly care about the matter."
- "Programs without accountability do not work. There needs to be less relocating of homeless people into small towns."
- "Stop throwing money at the problem with no clear strategy to deal with the issue of mental health component. The billions spent so far seem to be wasted with no concrete solutions that would significantly improve the situation which appears to be getting worse."
- "We can reduce homelessness in our community by incentivizing an increase in the housing supply. This should be through reduced government interference (i.e. taxes, permitting, environmental impact reporting, etc.). Let the free market fix the housing problem."

Sacramento County

- "Make it easier to build all kinds of housing, make it harder for delinquent landlords to keep empty/mostly empty commercial or residential properties, and provide more treatment and healthcare services for unhoused people."
- "While it may not stop homelessness, I would like to see more respect for homeless people."
- "I am working 2 jobs to stay above water since I became a widow at the age of 68.5 and want to retire at 70 and I have a real fear of being homeless! I am seriously considering moving out of California when I retire and this makes me sad because I was born and raised in Sacramento! I have worked all my life in Sacramento, but it does not take care of its working-class seniors that have paid taxes and served the community!"
- "They throw around a lot of ideas, but I have not seen any of them actually happen."
- "It's very concerning, we have had an increase of break ins in the area, cars being stolen, and it's scary. It wasn't like this before."
- "I have low belief any elected individual/official would keep campaign promises to improve or make better regulations to address the concerns of the community."
- "Sometimes people simply do not want help no matter how often it is offered and how considerate you are in your approach."
- "It is hard to get a place to live because the prices are so high. This is why there are so many people out on the street."

Sutter/Yuba Counties

- "I would say we need to have areas for them to camp and resources available, but I believe much of our finances are wasted on trying to constantly placate them."
- "Have better programs in place to help with mental illness and substance abuse, along with better education/employment opportunities for youth and young adults, and more affordable housing"

Yolo County

- "Increase funding for addiction treatment, mental health services, and alternative sentencing and decriminalization of certain victimless crime."
- "I know a lot is being done, but nothing appears to be working."

Expectation of Future Improvement

Q7. In the future, do you think the **issue of homelessness will improve** in your local community?

Table 7a | Future Improvement by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes, definitely/maybe	53	38%	120	40%	328	32%	48	42%	48	31%	597	34%
No, probably/definitely not	56	40%	136	46%	596	57%	45	40%	100	66%	933	54%
I don't know	32	23%	42	14%	116	11%	20	18%	4	3%	213	12%
Total	140	100%	298	100%	1039	100%	113	100%	152	100%	1743	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 7b | Future Improvement by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes, definitely/maybe	223	30%	238	35%	136	44%
No, probably/definitely not	455	61%	342	50%	136	44%
I don't know	70	9%	103	15%	40	13%
Total	748	100%	682	100%	313	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 7c | Future Improvement by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes, definitely/maybe	155	42%	224	28%	217	37%
No, probably/definitely not	178	48%	463	59%	292	50%
I don't know	35	10%	103	13%	76	13%
Total	369	100%	789	100%	585	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 7d | Future Improvement by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes, definitely/maybe	214	35%	288	35%	79	28%
No, probably/definitely not	319	53%	419	51%	190	67%
I don't know	72	12%	122	15%	17	6%
Total	606	100%	828	100%	285	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Awareness of Services and/or Programs Available to Unhoused People

Q8. Have you heard of any of the following *services and/or programs* available to unhoused individuals and families in your community?

Table 8a | Awareness of Services/Programs by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Housing assistance (e.g. rent assistance, vouchers, low-cost housing)	90	62%	209	71%	702	67%	84	74%	110	72%	1195	68%
Emergency housing (e.g. shelters or short-term housing)	92	63%	219	74%	699	67%	74	66%	103	68%	1187	68%
Basic needs assistance (e.g. food, clothing, transportation, phone)*	114	79%	226	76%	719	69%	71	63%	119	78%	1249	71%
Health, mental health and/or substance abuse-services*	94	65%	185	63%	621	60%	60	53%	92	60%	1052	60%
Low/now cost legal assistance	74	51%	116	39%	413	40%	35	31%	68	45%	706	40%
Employment/training/education supports	66	45%	142	48%	520	50%	44	39%	79	52%	851	49%
Assistance for victims of violence (e.g. supports and domestic violence shelters)**	98	67%	192	65%	697	67%	55	49%	96	63%	1138	65%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level. ** Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 8b | Awareness of Services/Programs by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Housing assistance	510	68%	461	67%	224	72%
Emergency housing	492	66%	490	71%	206	66%
Basic needs assistance	517	69%	505	73%	228	73%
Health, mental health, and/or substance abuse-services	437	58%	421	61%	194	63%
Legal assistance	293	39%	275	40%	139	45%
Career training/education	365	49%	342	50%	143	46%
Assistance for victims of violence	484	65%	445	65%	209	67%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 8c | Awareness of Services/Programs by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Housing assistance	255	69%	540	68%	400	68%
Emergency housing	240	65%	534	68%	413	70%
Basic needs assistance	271	74%	566	72%	412	70%
Health, mental health, and/or substance abuse-services	239	65%	461	59%	352	60%
Legal assistance	138	37%	317	40%	252	43%
Career training/education	172	47%	382	48%	297	50%
Assistance for victims of violence**	246	67%	480	61%	413	70%

**Results are significant at the p < .01 level.

Table 8d | Awareness of Services/Programs by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Housing assistance**	406	67%	550	66%	218	77%
Emergency housing*	426	70%	523	63%	216	76%
Basic needs assistance*	450	74%	552	66%	225	79%
Health, mental health, and/or substance abuse-services*	373	62%	473	57%	192	68%
Legal assistance	243	40%	326	39%	127	45%
Career training/education	301	50%	401	48%	147	52%
Assistance for victims of violence*	405	67%	498	60%	222	78%

*Results are significant at the p < .001 level. **Results are significant at the p < .01 level.

Awareness of Local Efforts to Address Homelessness

Q9. Have you heard of any of the following **efforts to address the issue of homelessness**?

Table 9a | Awareness of Efforts by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Local/regional planning and coordination of services**	39	28%	121	41%	345	33%	31	27%	67	44%	603	35%
Local zoning or ordinances *	39	28%	125	42%	271	26%	30	27%	43	28%	508	29%
Mental health crises response	57	40%	116	39%	404	39%	32	29%	68	45%	676	39%
Encampment relocation/settlement **	51	36%	148	50%	525	50%	41	37%	79	52%	844	48%
Law enforcement efforts	66	47%	143	48%	497	48%	56	50%	84	55%	847	49%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level. **Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 9b | Awareness of Efforts by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Local/regional planning and coordination of services**	264	35%	209	31%	129	42%
Local zoning or ordinances *	190	25%	205	30%	114	37%
Mental health crises response	293	39%	256	37%	128	41%
Encampment relocation/settlement	343	46%	350	51%	152	49%
Law enforcement efforts	368	49%	313	46%	166	53%

**Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 9c | Awareness of Efforts by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Local/regional planning and coordination of services*	108	29%	247	31%	248	42%
Local zoning or ordinances *	76	21%	219	28%	213	36%
Mental health crises response	143	39%	285	36%	248	42%
Encampment relocation/settlement *	147	40%	379	48%	319	55%
Law enforcement efforts**	159	43%	376	48%	312	53%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level. **Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 9d | Awareness of Efforts by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Local/regional planning and coordination of services	238	39%	262	32%	97	34%
Local zoning or ordinances	198	33%	215	26%	80	28%
Mental health crises response	245	40%	316	38%	110	39%
Encampment relocation/settlement*	364	60%	341	41%	134	47%
Law enforcement efforts*	336	55%	351	42%	154	54%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Top Ten Services, Programs, Agencies, and Organizations

Q10. What services, programs, agencies and/or organizations are you aware of in your community that are responsible for addressing homelessness?

Top ten services, programs, agencies and organizations mentioned by County.

	Region	El Dorado	Placer	Sacramento	Yolo	Sutter Yuba
Loaves and Fishes	1	1	4	1	1	3
Police department efforts	2	3	1	2	2	5
County-specific efforts	3	2	2	3		2
City-specific efforts	4	4	3	4	7	4
The Salvation Army	5	7	6	5	3	-
The Gathering Inn	6	8	5	7	-	1
Sheriff	7	5	-	6	5	6
WEAVE	8	-	-	8	6	-
SHRA	9	10	-	9	-	-
211	10	9	9	-	4	10
311	-	-	-	-	8	-
City of Sacramento	-	-	-	-	10	-
Code Enforcement	-	-	-	-	-	8
Fourth and Hope	-	-	10	-	-	-
HART	-	-	7	10	-	-
Section 8 Housing	-	-	-	-	9	-
St. John's Shelter	-	-	-	-	-	9
St. Vincent de Paul	-	6	-	-	-	
State of California	-	-	8	-	-	7

Other mentioned organizations/programs/agencies: Sacramento Steps Forward, Volunteers of America, DHHS, Hope Cooperative, Habitat for Humanity, Sacramento Food Bank, Fourth and Hope, Tahoe Coalition for the Homeless, Mercy Peddlers, Acres of Hope, CalWORKS

Resident's Efforts to Address Homelessness

Perception of Resident's Impact on Issue

*Q11. How much impact do you think **you can have personally** on the issue of homelessness in your community?*

Table 9a | Resident's Impact by County

	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
A lot of impact	15	11%	3	1%	39	4%	2	2%	23	15%	82	5%
Some/A little impact	72	52%	176	59%	583	56%	66	58%	78	51%	975	56%
No impact	36	26%	84	28%	312	30%	28	25%	33	21%	493	28%
I don't know	16	12%	34	12%	106	10%	17	15%	18	12%	192	11%
Total	140	100%	298	100%	1039	100%	113	100%	152	100%	1742	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 11b | Resident's Impact by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
A lot of impact	56	8%	6	1%	20	6%
Some/A little impact	385	52%	403	59%	186	60%
No impact	214	29%	209	31%	71	23%
I don't know	92	12%	64	9%	36	11%
Total	748	100%	682	100%	312	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 11c | Resident's Impact by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
A lot of impact	29	8%	48	6%	6	1%
Some/A little impact	225	61%	401	51%	349	60%
No impact	88	24%	221	28%	184	31%
I don't know	26	7%	119	15%	46	8%
Total	369	100%	789	100%	584	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Table 11d | Resident's Impact by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
A lot of impact	18	3%	44	5%	21	7%
Some/A little impact	418	69%	439	53%	114	40%
No impact	128	21%	236	29%	123	43%
I don't know	42	7%	109	13%	27	9%
Total	606	100%	828	100%	285	100%

Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Residents' Efforts Addressing Homelessness in their Communities

Q12. Have you ever....

Table 12a | Residents' Efforts by County

[chose all that apply]	El Dorado		Placer		Sacramento		Sutter/Yuba		Yolo		Total Region	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Donated to a local organization supporting people experiencing homelessness (such as a food bank or shelter)	102	73%	191	64%	672	65%	68	60%	98	64%	1131	65%
Volunteered at a local organization supporting people experiencing homelessness	50	36%	117	39%	353	34%	39	35%	50	33%	609	35%
Personally given money/food/supplies to a person who was homeless**	104	74%	181	61%	740	71%	73	64%	104	69%	1201	69%
Had a friendly conversation with a person experiencing homelessness*	81	58%	127	43%	573	55%	50	44%	63	41%	894	51%
Contacted a public official about the issue of homelessness**	15	11%	36	12%	162	16%	4	3%	21	14%	238	14%
Attended a public meeting about the issue of homelessness**	37	26%	39	13%	144	14%	16	14%	22	15%	258	15%
Signed a petition related to the issue of homelessness	28	20%	73	24%	308	30%	25	23%	43	28%	477	27%
Reported an encampment/homeless issue to a local hotline or law enforcement*	24	17%	24	8%	169	16%	2	2%	17	11%	236	14%
Actively researched the issue of homelessness in your community	29	21%	82	27%	275	26%	23	20%	31	21%	439	25%
Other	13	9%	5	2%	51	5%	8	7%	0	0%	78	4%
None of the above	12	8%	37	12%	72	7%	24	21%	7	5%	152	9%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level. ** Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 12b | Residents' Efforts by Urbanicity

	Urban		Suburban		Small Town/ Rural Community	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Donated	498	67%	420	62%	213	68%
Volunteered	271	36%	247	36%	92	29%
Personally given	544	73%	455	67%	202	65%
Had a friendly conversation	408	55%	339	50%	146	47%
Contacted a public official	101	14%	87	13%	50	16%
Attended a public meeting*	118	16%	67	10%	73	23%
Signed a petition*	262	35%	135	20%	79	25%
Reported an encampment*	116	16%	98	14%	21	7%
Actively researched the issue	205	27%	153	22%	82	26%
Other	43	6%	17	2%	18	6%
None of the above	41	5%	74	11%	36	12%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level. ** Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 12c | Residents' Efforts by Income

	Less than \$50k		\$50k-\$150k		\$150k+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Donated*	199	54%	508	64%	424	72%
Volunteered	114	31%	278	35%	217	37%
Personally given*	291	79%	514	65%	396	68%
Had a friendly conversation*	231	63%	389	49%	274	47%
Contacted a public official	37	10%	111	14%	91	16%
Attended a public meeting	60	16%	103	13%	96	16%
Signed a petition**	125	34%	196	25%	156	27%
Reported an encampment*	28	8%	119	15%	89	15%
Actively researched the issue	98	27%	195	25%	146	25%
Other	30	8%	37	5%	10	2%
None of the above	24	6%	63	8%	65	11%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level. ** Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 12d | I Residents' Efforts by Political Ideology

	Progressive		Moderate		Conservative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Donated	413	68%	536	65%	176	62%
Volunteered*	251	41%	271	33%	76	27%
Personally given**	415	69%	593	72%	174	61%
Had a friendly conversation	336	55%	417	50%	133	47%
Contacted a public official**	103	17%	106	13%	27	10%
Attended a public meeting*	110	18%	125	15%	22	8%
Signed a petition*	212	35%	211	26%	51	18%
Reported an encampment*	59	10%	117	14%	55	19%
Actively researched the issue **	179	29%	208	25%	52	18%
Other	18	3%	54	7%	3	1%
None of the above	44	7%	75	9%	29	10%

*Results are significant at the $p < .001$ level. ** Results are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Resident's Perceptions of their Local Communities

Residents' Rating of Community Life and Opportunities

Q13. How would you rate your local community overall in terms of....

Table 13a | Community Ratings by County

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
EL DORADO										
Employment opportunities	13	9%	26	18%	70	48%	37	25%	145	100%
Housing availability/affordability	1	1%	16	11%	72	50%	56	39%	145	100%
Opportunities for children/youth	42	29%	40	27%	41	28%	22	15%	145	100%
Public safety and crime	48	33%	57	39%	35	24%	6	4%	145	100%
Quality of life it offers	57	39%	64	44%	21	14%	4	3%	145	100%
PLACER										
Employment opportunities	21	7%	142	48%	111	37%	22	8%	297	100%
Housing availability/affordability	12	4%	73	25%	135	45%	77	26%	298	100%
Opportunities for children/youth	86	29%	133	44%	67	22%	13	4%	298	100%
Public safety and crime	100	33%	137	46%	49	16%	13	4%	298	100%
Quality of life it offers	125	42%	133	45%	37	13%	3	1%	298	100%
SACRAMENTO										
Employment opportunities	74	7%	318	31%	448	43%	195	19%	1035	100%
Housing availability/affordability	55	5%	168	16%	398	38%	417	40%	1038	100%
Opportunities for children/youth	136	13%	335	32%	394	38%	168	16%	1034	100%
Public safety and crime	105	10%	306	29%	386	37%	245	24%	1041	100%
Quality of life it offers	144	14%	416	40%	354	34%	127	12%	1041	100%
SUTTER/YUBA										
Employment opportunities	1	1%	19	17%	49	43%	44	39%	113	100%
Housing availability/affordability	0	0%	22	19%	53	47%	37	33%	113	100%
Opportunities for children/youth	2	1%	25	22%	34	30%	52	46%	113	100%
Public safety and crime	8	7%	45	40%	36	32%	23	20%	113	100%
Quality of life it offers	1	1%	57	50%	29	26%	26	23%	113	100%
YOLO										
Employment opportunities	2	1%	44	29%	82	54%	25	16%	152	100%
Housing availability/affordability	1	1%	19	13%	64	42%	68	45%	152	100%
Opportunities for children/youth	21	14%	58	38%	63	41%	11	7%	152	100%
Public safety and crime	18	12%	48	31%	65	42%	22	15%	152	100%
Quality of life it offers	24	16%	74	48%	46	31%	8	5%	152	100%

Table 13b | Community Ratings by Region

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
REGION										
Employment opportunities	111	6%	549	31%	760	44%	322	18%	1742	100%
Housing availability/affordability	70	4%	298	17%	723	41%	656	38%	1746	100%
Opportunities for children/youth	286	16%	591	34%	599	34%	266	15%	1742	100%
Public safety and crime	279	16%	592	34%	570	33%	308	18%	1749	100%
Quality of life it offers	351	20%	743	42%	488	28%	168	10%	1749	100%

Table 13c | Average Community Rating by Urbanicity

	Excellent = 4 Average = 2	Good =3 Poor = 1	Urban	Suburban	Small Town/Rural Community	Region Average
Employment opportunities			2.1	2.4	2.1	2.3
Housing availability/affordability			1.7	2.0	1.8	1.9
Opportunities for children/youth			2.3	2.8	2.4	2.5
Public safety and crime			2.1	2.7	2.9	2.5
Quality of life it offers			2.5	2.9	3.0	2.7
All Categories			2.2	2.5	2.4	2.4

Table 13d | Average Community Rating by Annual Income

	Excellent = 4 Average = 2	Good =3 Poor = 1	Less than \$50k	\$50k- \$150k	\$150k+	Region Average
Employment opportunities			2.1	2.2	2.5	2.3
Housing availability/affordability			1.8	1.8	2.0	1.9
Opportunities for children/youth			2.4	2.4	2.8	2.5
Public safety and crime			2.2	2.3	2.8	2.5
Quality of life it offers			2.6	2.5	3.1	2.7
All Categories			2.2	2.3	2.6	2.4

Table 13e | Average Community Rating by Political Ideology

	Excellent = 4 Average = 2	Good =3 Poor = 1	Progressive	Moderate	Conservative	Region Average
Employment opportunities			2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3
Housing availability/affordability			1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
Opportunities for children/youth			2.5	2.6	2.5	2.5
Public safety and crime			2.5	2.5	2.3	2.5
Quality of life it offers			2.8	2.7	2.6	2.7
All Categories			2.4	2.4	2.3	2.4

Survey Demographics

A total of 1,750 survey panelists responded to the survey. Survey responses are weighted to reflect the demographics of the region. The poll's margin of error is +/- 2.2%.

COUNTY of RESIDENCE	RESPONDENTS	
	#	%
Sacramento	1,041	60%
Placer	298	17%
Yolo	152	9%
El Dorado	145	8%
Yuba	57	3%
Sutter	56	3%
Total	1,750	100%

AGE	RESPONDENTS	
	#	%
18 to 24	169	10%
25 to 34	314	18%
35 to 44	335	19%
45 to 54	253	14%
55 to 64	272	16%
65 and over	406	23%
Total	1,750	100%

RACE & ETHNICITY	RESPONDENTS	
	#	%
White	860	49%
Hispanic	366	21%
Asian & Pacific Islander	284	16%
Other	127	7%
Black or African American	113	6%
Total	1,750	100%

GENDER	RESPONDENTS	
	#	%
Male	810	46%
Female	940	54%
Total	1,750	100%

EDUCATION	RESPONDENTS	
	#	%
Up to high school diploma	484	28%
Some College	439	25%
Associate's Degree	178	10%
Bachelor's Degree +	650	37%
Total	1,750	100%

HOUSEHOLD INCOME	RESPONDENTS	
	#	%
Less than \$15,000	121	7%
\$15,001-\$20,000	71	4%
\$20,001-\$25,000	177	10%
\$25,001-\$30,000	212	12%
\$30,001-\$40,000	252	14%
\$40,001-\$50,000	327	19%
\$50,001-\$75,000	252	14%
\$75,001-\$100,000	143	8%
\$100,001-\$150,000	195	11%
\$150,001 or above	192	11%
Total	1,750	100%

POLITICAL IDEOLOGY	RESPONDENTS	
	#	%*
Very progressive	242	14%
Progressive	364	21%
Moderate	835	48%
Conservative	215	12%
Very conservative	71	4%
Total	1,727	100%
No response	23	-

* Only valid % shown.

URBANICITY	RESPONDENTS	
	#	%
Urban	748	43%
Suburban	688	39%
Small Town/Rural Community	313	18%
Total	1,750	100%