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2014 Resident Satisfaction
Findings of the third annual Resident Satisfaction Survey conducted for the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara

Introduction

Since 2012, the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara (HACSC) has been conducting an annual survey to gauge the ongoing success of its new way of operating its affordable housing portfolio, asking residents about all aspects of the physical condition of their homes and the quality of the services they receive.

Beginning in 2010, HACSC transferred responsibility for managing a large number of properties from an in-house affiliate company to third party management agents. The remaining properties were transferred to third party management in mid-2012. During this time period HACSC also increased the use of a third party resident services provider, extending services to almost all of the properties.

The 2014 survey responses provide a snapshot of residents’ level of satisfaction, and highlight common issues and concerns across properties. The results also provide insight into particular strengths or weaknesses at individual properties. In addition to being a useful tool to help HACSC asset managers and leadership stay in touch with residents and their concerns, survey results are also incorporated in HACSC’s annual reporting to HUD.

With the support of its property management and resident services partners, HACSC once again was able to engage a high percentage of residents in this year's survey. As in prior years, residents generally gave their housing high ratings. This year HACSC was particularly concerned to hear how residents had been affected by rent increases, and to find out how this may have impacted their opinions about HACSC and management.

Methodology

The survey questions were the same as in prior years, which allows HACSC to note changes and to flag emerging issues. The survey asks residents sixteen multiple choice questions: three about the physical condition of their apartment, interior common areas and exterior areas; three about the quality of management services; four about maintenance services; four about resident support services and three about overall indicators of satisfaction. The survey concludes with one open-ended request for comments or suggestions. A copy of the survey template is attached (Attachment 1.)
After notifying residents of the upcoming survey through resident meetings at the beginning of the year, surveys were mailed to all HACSC households in March. Management companies were also informed about the process and provided with flyers to encourage residents to participate. Residents were given two weeks to mail back their completed surveys, though survey responses received after the deadline date were accepted and included in the results.

The surveys, along with pre-stamped return envelopes, were provided to all households in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese. A local mail house distributed and collected the surveys and did the initial data entry of the responses. HACSC Asset Management staff compiled the open-ended comments with the assistance of translators.

**Response Rate**

Once again we are pleased that so many residents took the trouble to respond to the survey. A total of 1,186 out of 2,721 households responded to the Resident Satisfaction Survey, a response rate of 44%, the same as last year. The response from senior properties was slightly higher than last year, 56% versus 54%, and response from families slightly lower, 31% versus 34%. The response rate from HACSC’s one special needs property remained steady at 34%. Residents from all 31 properties responded.

Special recognition is due to Lenzen Gardens residents, 73% of whom responded to the survey. Other senior sites with exceptionally high response rates were Cypress Gardens (70%) and Villa Hermosa (66%). On the family side, two small sites, Deborah Drive and Lucretia Gardens, had high response rates (75% and 56% respectively), as did the 130-unit Poco Way development, where 50% of the residents responded

This report will examine the overall level of satisfaction of respondents across the portfolio as a whole. We will also analyze the survey results specific to senior properties and to family properties. Within each of the subsets of properties we will highlight noteworthy differences – areas in which residents of particular properties expressed significantly higher or lower opinions about one or more aspects of their housing than average for that type of property. Charts summarizing the resident responses by property type and for each of the properties participating in the 2014 Resident Satisfaction Survey are shown in Attachment 2.

**Levels of Satisfaction: All Respondents**

---

1 Next year it would be worth a special effort to improve the response rates from Blossom River (17%) and Julian Gardens (11%), the only properties with less than 20% participation. Data from Klamath Gardens, because of its small size, would also be more reliable if it had a higher response rate than this year's rate of 24%.
Overall, HACSC residents report a high level of satisfaction.

- 87% of respondents strongly agree or agree with the statement: “I am satisfied with the value of my apartment for the rent I pay.”
- 89% of respondents strongly agree or agree: “This housing provides a safe, secure environment.”
- 93% of respondents strongly agree or agree: “I would recommend this housing to a friend or family member.”

The results are on the latter two measures - "Safety" and "Would Recommend" - are four percentage points higher than last year's survey, a return to 2012 levels.

**Value.** As noted in the Introduction, HACSC was particularly interested to learn how recent rent increases affected resident satisfaction in this year's survey. While respondents had numerous comments about the recent increases, the 87% satisfaction rate with the "Value" of the apartment is a drop of only one percentage point from last year.

Two types of rent increases impacted HACSC residents this past year. First, rents were increased in accordance with the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program. Residents who do not hold Section 8 vouchers or similar subsidies received rent increases of up to 8%, not exceeding $50 per month; some residents received no rent increase or had a rent reduction. Additionally, Section 8 voucher holders, usually shielded from increases in the contract rents, saw their portion of the rent increase from 30% to 35% of their income. HACSC made this policy change to cope with federal budget cuts and in order to avoid cutting the number of households served. A majority of the voucher-holders reside in the senior housing sites.

The Resident Satisfaction survey provided residents the opportunity to tell HACSC how the rent increases have affected them and how they feel about the situation. For the most part, respondents from the family properties did not comment on their rent. Residents of a few of the senior properties however had numerous comments about their rent, particularly at Cypress Gardens, Lenzen Gardens and Villa Hermosa². Respondents provided details about how little money they have left for other expenses after paying their rent. As one resident put it "The rent increases always exceed my annual raise from social security...my son must help me get by."

A few properties were rated especially high on Value, including Deborah Drive and Eklund Gardens I, both small family properties with 100% public housing subsidies, where rents were unchanged, and Avenida Espana Gardens, which does not have rent subsidies.

---

² All three sites have a high percentage of voucher holders; 100% at Lenzen.
Interestingly, almost all of the properties that reported exceptionally low levels of satisfaction with Value last year report somewhat higher satisfaction this year. Only Pinmore Gardens continues to have less than 70% of its respondents satisfied with the Value of their apartment, and Corde Terra Apartments also dropped below the 70% mark this year.

That the survey responses do no indicate widespread dissatisfaction with rents may be due to the fact that HACSC has been holding tenant meetings to explain the increases and give residents and opportunity to communicate their concerns in person. On the other hand it may reflect an understanding that market rate rents have skyrocketed around them and HACSC residents know they are fortunate in comparison.

**Safety.** The average level of satisfaction with Safety was 92% in the senior properties, a few percentage points higher than prior years. Residents of Morrone Gardens were 100% very satisfied or satisfied. Two senior properties, Corte Terra Village and John Burns Gardens received lower ratings, and in each case survey comments included reports of strangers coming on site and even sleeping in common areas.

The level of satisfaction with Safety at the family properties averaged 87%. Some of the smaller family sites, e.g. Eklund I, Klamath, Miramar and San Pedro Gardens, reported 100% satisfaction with Safety. Two sites, Blossom River and Huff Gardens were markedly lower than average. Though its satisfaction level was similar to the average, comments from Poco Way residents indicated safety concerns at that site. Morrone Gardens residents expressed thanks for improved security.

**Maintenance.** Seventy-four percent (798 out of 1,075) of respondents reported that they had requested maintenance within the past year, the same percentage as reported in the 2013 survey. Again this year maintenance responsiveness, courtesy and quality of the repair were all rated highly.

Further analysis reveals a drop in satisfaction at the Opportunity Center, where satisfaction with Maintenance hovered around 70%. Responses from JSCo-managed sites indicate a higher level of satisfaction with maintenance (90-96%) than at FPI-managed sites (78-89%).

**Resident Services.** Lifesteps is the services provider at all sites except for the Opportunity Center, where InnVision Shelter Network and other non-profits provide resident services. Service providers at the senior and family sites received high marks from residents. As with

---

3 Blossom River rose from 67% to 75%; Huff Gardens rose from 63% to 76%; Rivertown rose from 73% to 91%; El Parador rose from 78% to 83%; and Villa Hermosa rose from 64% to 83%.
maintenance, satisfaction with resident services at the Opportunity Center was lower than other sites, hovering around 70% as compared to about 90% at the senior and family sites.

This year, 29% of all respondents reported using resident services in the past 12 months; the tendency to use services varied from site to site but was lower at the family sites than at the senior and special needs properties\(^4\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mgmt Co</th>
<th>Use of Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Center</td>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td>CHDC</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenzen Gardens</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Hermosa</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Gardens</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairgrounds/Corde Terra Senior</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poco Way</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corde Terra Villages</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Gardens</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Gardens</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinmore Gardens</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracher Senior Apts</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenida Espana Gardens</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huff Gardens</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helzer Courts</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivertown</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Willows</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burns Gardens</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Garcia/Clarendon</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Parador</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa San Pedro/Bendorf</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeRose Gardens</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blossom River</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrone Gardens</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Drive</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklund Gardens</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Gardens</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath Gardens</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretia Gardens</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramar Apts</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>JSCo</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro Gardens</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FPI</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) It should be noted that Lifesteps reports higher percentages of residents accessing services than indicated by survey respondents. It may be that survey respondents under-reported their use of services, or that residents responding to the survey were less likely than non-respondents to access services.
As in past surveys, the diversity of the population that HACSC serves is evident in the survey comments. Each housing community copes with multiple languages and habits. Some residents ask for more ethnic and cultural-specific events while others say they feel unwelcome at community activities dominated by another group.

Age-related issues were an emerging theme in this year's survey. Residents of some senior properties commented about fellow residents who are becoming unable to live independently: "...we are their caretakers". At a couple of the family properties, self-identified seniors requested grab bars, or a downstairs unit, or a home health aide, an indication that residents are 'aging in place' at both senior and family properties. As HACSC's portfolio ages, the agency and its property management and services providers will need to be prepared to deal with this challenge.

**Progress on Perennial Issues**

**Smoking.** Comments and complaints about smoking occur less often in this year's survey, and are confined to just a few properties. Congratulations to all the properties that have successfully implemented a no-smoking policy!

**Parking.** There are perhaps fewer comments this year about unfair enforcement of parking policies and assignment of parking spaces (though there are a few.) The lack of visitor parking at Corde Terra Village and Corde Terra Senior apartments continues to be a major source of dissatisfaction. Security of parking areas also continues to be a concern at several properties.

**Satisfaction with Physical Conditions.** The overall level of resident satisfaction with the quality of their apartments has remained relatively unchanged over the past three years at about 80% satisfaction at the family sites and 90% satisfaction at the senior sites. Among the senior properties, the only sites expressing significantly lower levels of satisfaction are DeRose Gardens and Morrone Gardens, both at 71%. Morrone is one of the few properties this year where survey respondents cite the great number of years their units have gone without new paint and carpet. Among the family sites there is a lot more deviation from the average, both positive and negative. A few sites report 100% satisfaction, while seven sites\(^5\) were rated under 70%. The satisfaction rating by Huff Gardens' residents improved from 47% last year to 94% in this year's survey.

---

Several residents made positive comments about the rehab of their properties: "The painting and rebuild went well. You'll be happy to know the work was excellent." while others offered detailed observations about products and the workmanship: "There are cracks in the concrete in the patio, the screen door cannot lock, and one of the outlets is upside-down."

One of the recommendations in last year's survey report was to develop portfolio level goals and guidelines about unit rehabs for long-tenured residents. HACSC asset managers worked with property management to include rehab of 10% of the units at each property annually, if possible, beginning in fiscal year 2014. We will look for the impact of that policy in the 2015 survey results.

**New Hot Topics**

HACSC and the property managers are probably well aware of the few 'out of order' elevators⁶ and the broken gates⁷ cited in the survey responses though they may not have known these would be such hot topics for survey respondents. A greater emphasis on communicating with residents about the status of repairs that affect their daily comfort or sense of security might relieve their concern.

Laundry rooms are another hot topic at several sites in this year's survey⁸, another example of how dissatisfaction with a single amenity can become a sore point for residents.

**The Opportunity Center**

The Opportunity Center is HACSC's only special needs housing site; the building itself also housing a regional homeless services center. In 2012, the first year HACSC conducted its resident satisfaction survey, the property had just transitioned to third party management, and this, in combination with a low survey response rate, made it hard to interpret the relatively low satisfaction levels reported by residents in 2012.

Last year, HACSC and site staff made a special effort to improve the response rate at the Opportunity Center, increasing the level from 12% to 34%, and this year the property also achieved a 34% survey response rate. Therefore it is concerning to see that resident satisfaction

---

⁶ Residents cite out of order elevators at Lenzen and Rincon. Both properties have multiple elevators.
⁷ Residents at Corde Terra Village variously cite a broken parking gate or garage door; John Burns Garden residents cite damage to iron gate and fencing; DeRose residents cite an entrance door that does not close.
⁸ Avenida, El Parador, Huff and Rivertown survey responses had multiple negative comments about laundry room cleanliness and/or equipment.
levels have dropped to at or below 2012 levels. While the majority of the responses still rate the housing as very satisfactory or satisfactory, the ratings and comments also indicate concerns about safety, smoking, and other issues at this site.

**Recognition and Gratitude**

"I am very happy living here! I feel safe and the environment is clean and wonderful."

" I want to thank you for all of your help for my grandson & I would personally thank the owners of our building for caring about the lives of the people who reside here..."

"Manager is really nice. Easy to talk to."

The main focus in analyzing these survey results tends to be uncovering what is not working well, in order to fix it. Residents also use the surveys to praise site staff and express gratitude to HACSC for their housing. While preserving appropriate confidentiality, HACSC makes sure that praise is shared with the site staff along with the critiques and suggestions for improvement.

**Follow Up Action Plan**

HACSC Asset Management staff and the property management agents review the all the survey results and follow-up with individual residents about individual requests. All the instances of "outliers", i.e. properties that exceed or fall short of the average response by 10 percentage points or more within property type categories, have been reviewed by staff to see what is causing that property to stand out from its peers. HACSC and the management companies will collaborate to produce an article reporting on survey results for upcoming resident newsletters. We believe that the continued high response rate to the annual survey depends on residents' trust that they are being heard and that HACSC and its property management and resident services partners are trying to respond to the issues that residents are concerned about.

The top priority issues and opportunities emerging from the 2014 survey include:

- To engage stakeholders to discuss "aging in place" challenges ahead for HACSC communities. Develop a plan for how management and services will respond to the challenges.
- To continue to plan unit rehabs for long-tenured residents and overall satisfaction with property-wide rehabs.
- To examine the outlier properties, including the Opportunity Center, and to monitor property management services and rehab needs at these sites throughout the year.
- Looking ahead to next year's survey, discuss ways to increase the response rate from family properties. Response rate averaged 31% this year, down from 34%, which is still a good measure for the larger properties but not as reliable for the smaller sites.
ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1: Survey Template
Attachment 2: Property Profiles
Attachment 3: Three-Year Trends
ATTACHMENT 1:  Survey Template
The goal of the Housing Authority of Santa Clara County (HACSC) is to provide exceptional housing to our tenants. Your comments and suggestions are helpful to us. Please assist us by completing the following brief questionnaire and returning it to us in the stamped envelope provided. A private research company is conducting this survey and your answers will be completely confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you with the following:</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The quality and condition of your apartment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The quality and condition of the lobby and other indoor areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The quality and condition of the outside grounds and parking lot?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ease of contacting the site manager?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Site manager’s responsiveness to your questions and concerns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adequate written communication from management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have you requested any repairs to your apartment in the past year?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you requested repair(s), how satisfied were you with the following:</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Not At All Satisfied</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Response time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Courtesy of staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Quality of the repair?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Have you made use of optional resident services in the past year (e.g. afterschool program, referral to education or health services)?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you used resident services, how satisfied were you with the following:</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Not At All Satisfied</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Response time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Courtesy of staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ability to help your situation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(over)
**To what extent do you agree with the following statements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. I am satisfied with the value of my apartment for the rent I pay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. This housing provides a safe, secure environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would recommend this housing to a friend or family member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments and Suggestions:

As noted above, this survey is being conducted by a private research company and your responses are completely confidential. However, if you would like a personal follow up, please provide the following information:

- Yes, I want a Housing Authority representative to contact me regarding unsatisfactory conditions in my apartment or at my property.

  Name ________________________
  Address_____________________

Please return your survey by **March 10th**. Thank you for your assistance!

To contact the Housing Authority about this survey, please call 408-975-4675
ATTACHMENT 2: Property Profiles
## Julian Gardens Family Property Managed by JSCo

### Response Rate: 11% (1/9)

#### Physical Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Needs Imp</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby &amp; Common Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds &amp; Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Maintenance Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Needs Imp</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Management Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Needs Imp</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Contacting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Services Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Needs Imp</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overall Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Recommend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rincon Gardens  
Senior Property Managed by JSCo  
Response Rate: 58% (116/200)

**Physical Conditions**

- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

**Management Quality**

- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

**Maintenance Quality**

- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

**Services Quality**

- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

**Overall Assessment**

- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
San Pedro Gardens  Family Property Managed by FPI  Response Rate: 30% (6/20)

**Physical Conditions**
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

**Maintenance Quality**
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

**Services Quality**
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

**Management Quality**
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

**Overall Assessment**
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
### Siefert House

**Family Property Managed by HACSC**

**Response Rate:** 33% (1/3)

#### Physical Conditions
- **Apartment**
- **Lobby & Common Area**
- **Grounds & Parking**

#### Maintenance Quality
- **Response Time**
- **Customer**
- **Quality of Repair**

#### Management Quality
- **Ease of Contacting**
- **Responsiveness**
- **Written Communication**

#### Services Quality
- **Response Time**
- **Customer**
- **Ability to Help**

#### Overall Assessment
- **Good Value**
- **Safe Environment**
- **Would Recommend**
Villa Garcia
Family Property Managed by JSCo
Response Rate: 36% (29/80)

Physical Conditions
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Maintenance Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

Services Quality
- Response Time
-Courtesy
- Ability to Help

Overall Assessment
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
Villa Hermosa
Senior Property Managed by JSCo
Response Rate: 66% (66/100)

Physical Conditions
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Maintenance Quality
- Response Time
-Courtesy
-Quality of Repair

Services Quality
- Response Time
-Courtesy
-Ability to Help

Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
-Responsiveness
-Written Communication

Overall Assessment
- Good Value
-Safe Environment
-Would Recommend
**Villa San Pedro**

*Family Property Managed by JSCo*

Response Rate: 31% (31/100)

### Physical Conditions
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

### Maintenance Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

### Services Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

### Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

### Overall Assessment
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend

---

**Response Rate:** 31% (31/100)
The Willows Family Property Managed by FPI

Response Rate: 36% (17/47)

**Physical Conditions**
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

**Maintenance Quality**
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

**Services Quality**
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

**Management Quality**
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

**Overall Assessment**
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
ATTACHMENT 3:   Three-Year Trends
### ATTACHMENT 3: Three-Year Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Q12 Services Response</th>
<th>Q13 Services Courtesy</th>
<th>Q14 Services Ability to Help</th>
<th>Q15 Satisfied with Value</th>
<th>Q16 Satisfied with Safety</th>
<th>Q17 Would Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL SITES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>300 90%</td>
<td>309 90%</td>
<td>281 85%</td>
<td>880 90%</td>
<td>869 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>366 92%</td>
<td>386 93%</td>
<td>355 89%</td>
<td>1008 88%</td>
<td>968 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>387 88%</td>
<td>409 93%</td>
<td>389 88%</td>
<td>976 87%</td>
<td>1012 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>92 89%</td>
<td>99 88%</td>
<td>87 82%</td>
<td>275 90%</td>
<td>269 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>127 89%</td>
<td>133 92%</td>
<td>125 87%</td>
<td>352 87%</td>
<td>326 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>117 86%</td>
<td>122 93%</td>
<td>118 89%</td>
<td>338 87%</td>
<td>330 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENIOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>199 90%</td>
<td>202 91%</td>
<td>187 88%</td>
<td>597 90%</td>
<td>593 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>222 93%</td>
<td>237 94%</td>
<td>215 90%</td>
<td>626 90%</td>
<td>609 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>256 90%</td>
<td>272 93%</td>
<td>258 90%</td>
<td>616 87%</td>
<td>664 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>9 90%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
<td>7 70%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
<td>7 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>14 93%</td>
<td>14 93%</td>
<td>13 87%</td>
<td>21 75%</td>
<td>24 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>14 70%</td>
<td>15 75%</td>
<td>13 65%</td>
<td>22 73%</td>
<td>18 62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>