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2016 Resident Satisfaction
Findings of the fifth annual Resident Satisfaction Survey conducted for the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara

INTRODUCTION

The 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey results provide a snapshot of residents’ level of satisfaction at each property and highlight common issues and concerns across properties. This year, HACSC staff and its property management and services partners redoubled their efforts to encourage participation in the survey. As a result, the response rate was the highest ever. Overall, resident satisfaction levels remain high.

Since 2012, the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara (HACSC) has conducted an annual Resident Satisfaction survey to give residents an opportunity to express their concerns, and to gauge the performance of the property management and service providers at all of its housing developments. The survey responses also give HACSC insight into the impact of rent increases and property rehabilitation projects, and to identify neighborhood safety issues. The survey asks residents about all aspects of the physical condition of their homes and the quality of the services they receive.

METHODOLOGY

The survey questions are the same from year to year, allowing HACSC to note trends and to flag emerging issues. The survey asks residents seventeen 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 as 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 April. HACSC hosted resident meetings at site community rooms and management provided refreshments.

The surveys 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\(^1\). HACSC Asset Management staff compiled the open-ended comments with the assistance of translators. As in past years, consultant Cathy Craig analyzed the survey results and prepared the summary report.

**RESPONSE RATE**

With the support of its property management and resident services partners, HACSC increased resident engagement in this year's survey. This is an important accomplishment; last year's response rates made results less than reliable for a few of the smaller HACSC properties.

Fifty-one percent, 1381 out of 2721 households, responded to the Resident Satisfaction Survey, compared to 37% last year. As always, residents of the senior properties responded at a higher rate than residents at the family properties or HACSC's one special needs property. Table 1 shows the response rates over the five-year history of doing these surveys.

![Survey Responses 2012 - 2016](image)

* "Other" are nineteen surveys from unidentified properties collected in 2016. These responses could not be factored into the satisfaction levels of any specific property.

The response rate from the seniors was particularly impressive this year. Sixty-five percent of residents responded; well over 70% of residents at Bracher, Cypress, DeRose, John Burns and Lenzen responded to the survey; Lenzen's response rate was 89%! The small family properties - Deborah, Eklund I, Klamath and San Pedro Gardens improved their response rates significantly

\(^1\) This year, about 5% of the surveys were collected at resident meetings rather than being sent back to the mail house. In future, HACSC should establish protocols for collecting surveys at meetings in order to ensure that the survey responses are identified by property, and to protect confidentiality.
as well. Overall response rate from the family properties was 35% compared to 26% in 2015. Only the 9-unit Julian Gardens had no respondents.

This focus of this report will be to examine the level of satisfaction of respondents across the portfolio as a whole, and to analyze the survey results specific to senior, family and special needs properties. Within each of the subsets of properties the report 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 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey are shown in Attachment 2. Attachment 3 shows how each property compares with its peers.

**LEVELS OF SATISFACTION: ALL RESPONDENTS**

Overall, HACSC residents report a high level of satisfaction.

- 92% of respondents strongly agree or agree with the statement: “I am satisfied with the value of my apartment for the rent I pay.”
- 90% 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.”

These ratings are similar to last year, though satisfaction level increased by one or two points in each category.

Since overall, respondents rated value and safety so highly, and were so willing to recommend their housing to others, there were no outliers at the upper end of the scale. In other words no properties exceeded the average by ten percentage points.

**VALUE.** As noted above, 92% of residents feel their apartments are a good value.

- "I thank my lucky stars..."
- "The apartment is nice and the rent is very reasonable."

However, as noted in previous reports, residents with project-based or tenant-based rent subsidies now pay 32% of their income rather than 30%, and residents without subsidies are even more rent-burdened. Senior residents in particular are concerned about rent increases.

- "Thank you for all the recent remodeling and re-landscaping. It is all very nice. However please do not make these a cause of new rent increases. We cannot afford any more rent increases. Thank you."
"Compared to my monthly income the rent fee is too high. I pay $715/month and after payment my other monthly expenses (phone, food, cable, insurance) I retain $78.39..."

Two senior properties, DeRose and Villa Hermosa, had satisfaction ratings of Value more than ten percentage points below the senior portfolio average. However, respondents at both properties rated Value somewhat higher than they did in 2015, and DeRose residents were significantly more satisfied with Safety and more likely to recommend their housing to others than they were in 2015.

Two family properties with lower than average satisfaction with Value in 2014, Pinmore Gardens and Corde Terra Apartments, sustained the improvements shown in 2015; both are at or near average the 93% average satisfaction level this year.

This year, three family properties were negative outliers in the Value rating. Only 81-83% of Blossom River, Klamath and Rivertown respondents were satisfied with the value of their apartments.

**SAFETY.** The average level of satisfaction with Safety was 92% in the senior properties, a 2-percentage point gain over 2015, and 4 percentage points over 2014. Last year DeRose Gardens was a negative outlier; only 73% of De Rose residents agreed or strongly agreed that their housing was safe and secure. However this year, DeRose residents report a much higher (91%) satisfaction rate on safety.

The one property in this year's survey responses that scored more than 10 points under average on satisfaction with Safety is Bracher Senior Apartments, with only an 80% satisfaction rate. Commenters note security issues: *"Too many people in and out that have keys"*, and request that the intercom be connected.

The level of satisfaction with Safety at the family properties averaged 88%, up two percentage points from last year. Once again the small family sites reported no concerns with Safety. Two sites, Blossom River and Pinmore, were markedly lower than average. Satisfaction with safety at Poco Way was much improved, increasing from 75% to 86%.

**MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE.** Past reports have highlighted how satisfied HACSC residents are with maintenance responsiveness, courtesy and quality of repairs, and this remains true in 2016. The other noteworthy trend to highlight this year is the steady increase in resident satisfaction at the family properties, with both management and maintenance services.
Two family properties that show improvement but continue to report mixed results are Blossom River and Pinmore Gardens. Blossom River residents report lower satisfaction with the quality of their apartments but are much more satisfied with indoor and outdoor common areas. They also rate management significantly higher than in prior years; maintenance and services are still rated below average. At Pinmore Gardens, residents are much more satisfied with the quality of their apartments; management and maintenance ratings are improved but still below average.

Seventy-six percent (971 out of 1294) of respondents reported that they had requested maintenance within the past year, about the same percentage as in previous surveys. In a few instances, residents were upset by water leaks or flooding problems in their apartments in the past year; residents at several properties noted overgrown trees. Residents made a point of praising customer service improvements at several properties: "I have been living here for many years and this year I can see the difference..."

**RESIDENT SERVICES.** Survey respondents focused their attention on property management topics and did not have many comments about resident services. On the other hand, there were several requests for accommodation of disabilities, issues that are likely to require the assistance of the service providers.

Twenty-six percent of respondents reported that they had used services during the past year, with usage of over 40% at three senior properties - Corde Terra Village, Lenzen Gardens and Sunset Gardens. The Opportunity Center also reported higher than 40% usage of services. Many residents at Lenzen Gardens voiced a desire to have a Mandarin-speaking service coordinator.

**THE OPPORTUNITY CENTER.** The 89-unit Opportunity Center is HACSC’s only special needs housing site. The building also houses a regional homeless services center. This property has undergone two management company transitions in recent years, first from HACSC’s in-house management to Charities Housing, and then in 2015 from Charities to the John Stewart Company. Participation in the resident satisfaction survey has varied widely from year to year. Last year, the 14 respondents were relatively satisfied with their housing. This year more than double that number responded, however the results were less positive. Several respondents reported problems with bed bugs and delays in obtaining replacement mattresses and bed frames in infested units (this property provides furnished units.) HACSC and its partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of Contact</td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should review the adequacy of staffing levels and other resources for this management-intensive property.

SATISFACTION WITH PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

The overall level of resident satisfaction with the quality of their apartments has risen from 80% to 84% over the past few years at the family sites and remains a steady 89-90% satisfaction at the senior sites. Among the senior properties, the two sites expressing significantly lower levels of satisfaction are DeRose Gardens and Morrone Gardens.²

At the family properties, 100% of the respondents from Clarendon, the Eklunds and Miramar were satisfied with the quality of their apartments. The family sites whose residents had a comparatively low level of satisfaction with the unit quality in past years continued to have a lower than average level of satisfaction in 2016, including Blossom River, Helzer Courts, and Klamath Gardens. San Pedro Garden's level of satisfaction was much improved, even though the rehab of this property is still pending. Likewise, 83% of residents at The Willows were satisfied with the quality of their apartment though the rehab of this property is also still pending.

RECURRING ISSUES

PARKING, PARKING, PARKING. The issue of parking comes up at almost every property. Lack of guest parking, parking lot security, people who park in spots reserved for the handicapped - all these issues fill the Corde Terre Family Apartments survey responses. Parking is not as huge an issue at most other sites, but it is clear that residents watch with eagle-eyes to see if parking rules are fair, and are being enforced. Scarcity of parking is acknowledged, "Need to have a limit on the number of cars or more parking needs to be built", and a predominant theme is that there is not enough guest parking.

SMOKING. Sporadic complaints about violations of the no-smoking rules came up again this year, and both tobacco and marijuana smoking was mentioned. Some of the properties with smoking complaints last year did not report problems this year (e.g. Bendorf, Clarendon and Sunset) while other properties were cited for the first time (e.g. Corde Terre Family and Blossom River.) Complaints persist at Morrone Gardens and the Opportunity Center.

² Morrone Gardens had improved from 71% to 85% satisfaction last year after completion of rehab at that site, but dropped back down to 75% this year. Morrone residents' satisfaction with the quality of their lobby and common areas also dropped this year, and survey respondents mentioned that janitorial staffing has been reduced.

DeRose residents' level of satisfaction was much higher than last year in many areas, including quality of the lobby, and satisfaction with management and maintenance. However residents' satisfaction with their own units remained well below average, at 76%.
NEW TOPICS

HACSC residents in this year’s survey raised two new topics. It may or may not be a result of climate change, but residents at several properties had comments and questions about air conditioners and ceiling fans. It appears that some properties have air conditioning or allow residents to install air conditioning units while others do not. The other new topic was the quality of internet service and the request for free Wi-Fi connection for residents. HACSC may need to develop portfolio-wide policies and design standards for these emerging issues.

FOLLOW UP ACTION PLAN

Every year HACSC Asset Management staff and the property management agents review 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 ten percentage points or more within property type categories, are 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.

In addition to following up with individual resident requests, and addressing property-specific concerns, the following portfolio-level action items include:

• Continue to emphasize good customer service, and make sure site staff know how much residents appreciate it.
• Remain vigilant in enforcing parking rules and no-smoking policies.
• Continue to implement unit rehabs for long-tenured residents and track overall satisfaction with property-wide rehabs.
• Convene the Opportunity Center stakeholders - what can be done to improve resident satisfaction at this site?
• Keep up the good work of encouraging high levels of participation in next year's survey. Develop a protocol for handling any surveys that may be collected at site meetings.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1: Survey Template
Attachment 2: Property Profiles
Attachment 3: Three-Year Trends
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.

### 2015 Tenant Satisfaction Survey

**How satisfied are you with the following:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</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>
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 9th. Thank you for your assistance!

To contact the Housing Authority about this survey, please call 408-975-4671
Family Properties

Response Rate: 35% (451/1279)

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
Avenida Espana Gardens  Senior Property Managed by JSCo  Response Rate: 67% (56/84)

Physical Conditions

- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Response Rate: 67% (56/84)

Maintenance Quality

- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

Services Quality

- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

Overall Assessment

- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
**Physical Conditions**

- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

**Response Rate:** 47% (47/100)

**Management Quality**

- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

**Services Quality**

- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

**Overall Assessment**

- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend

**Bendorf (Villa San Pedro)**

Family Property Managed by JSCo

**Very Satisfied** | **Satisfied** | **Needs Imp** | **Not At All Satisfied** | **N/A**
Bracher Senior Apts  Senior Property Managed by FPI  Response Rate: 74% (53/72)

**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
Clarendon (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

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

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

**Overall Assessment**
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
Eklund Gardens II
Family Property Managed by JSCo
Response Rate: 17% (1/6)

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

Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

Maintenance Quality
- Maint Response Time
- Maint Courtesy

Services Quality
- Services Response Time
- Services Courtesy

Overall Assessment
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
**El Parador Senior**
Senior Property Managed by JSCo
Response Rate: 56% (70/125)

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

**Response Rate:** 56% (70/125)

**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

**Overall Assessment**
- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Needs Imp
- Not At All Satisfied
- N/A

**Maintenance Quality**
- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Needs Imp
- Not At All Satisfied
- N/A

**Services Quality**
- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Needs Imp
- Not At All Satisfied
- N/A

**Management Quality**
- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Needs Imp
- Not At All Satisfied
- N/A

**Physical Conditions**
- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Needs Imp
- Not At All Satisfied
- N/A
Opportunity Center  
Sp Needs Property Managed by CHDC  
Response Rate: 34% (30/89)

**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
### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Q1 Quality of Apt</th>
<th>Q2 Quality of Lobby</th>
<th>Q3 Quality of Grounds/Parking</th>
<th>Q4 Ease of Contact</th>
<th>Q5 Mgmt Response</th>
<th>Q6 Written Communications</th>
<th>Q8 Maint Response</th>
<th>Q9 Maint Courtesy</th>
<th>Q10 Quality of Repair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL SITES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>1008 86%</td>
<td>976 85%</td>
<td>922 81%</td>
<td>1021 88%</td>
<td>988 86%</td>
<td>1006 89%</td>
<td>786 85%</td>
<td>860 93%</td>
<td>784 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>881 87%</td>
<td>863 88%</td>
<td>777 80%</td>
<td>874 88%</td>
<td>844 86%</td>
<td>856 88%</td>
<td>704 88%</td>
<td>752 94%</td>
<td>702 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>750 90%</td>
<td>758 91%</td>
<td>702 86%</td>
<td>745 90%</td>
<td>728 88%</td>
<td>731 90%</td>
<td>624 90%</td>
<td>641 94%</td>
<td>620 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>318 80%</td>
<td>305 81%</td>
<td>288 75%</td>
<td>333 86%</td>
<td>316 81%</td>
<td>334 87%</td>
<td>258 77%</td>
<td>289 89%</td>
<td>260 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>270 82%</td>
<td>253 82%</td>
<td>235 75%</td>
<td>281 87%</td>
<td>269 84%</td>
<td>276 88%</td>
<td>223 83%</td>
<td>228 90%</td>
<td>208 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>377 84%</td>
<td>379 88%</td>
<td>339 78%</td>
<td>397 90%</td>
<td>386 89%</td>
<td>391 91%</td>
<td>321 87%</td>
<td>343 93%</td>
<td>312 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENIOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>671 90%</td>
<td>655 89%</td>
<td>615 84%</td>
<td>667 90%</td>
<td>654 89%</td>
<td>653 90%</td>
<td>513 89%</td>
<td>556 96%</td>
<td>510 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>599 90%</td>
<td>599 91%</td>
<td>532 82%</td>
<td>581 89%</td>
<td>564 87%</td>
<td>569 89%</td>
<td>487 90%</td>
<td>518 96%</td>
<td>490 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>781 89%</td>
<td>792 91%</td>
<td>739 87%</td>
<td>783 90%</td>
<td>767 89%</td>
<td>772 91%</td>
<td>651 90%</td>
<td>674 94%</td>
<td>645 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>19 66%</td>
<td>16 55%</td>
<td>19 68%</td>
<td>21 78%</td>
<td>18 67%</td>
<td>19 66%</td>
<td>15 71%</td>
<td>15 75%</td>
<td>14 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>12 86%</td>
<td>11 85%</td>
<td>10 83%</td>
<td>12 86%</td>
<td>11 85%</td>
<td>11 85%</td>
<td>4 57%</td>
<td>6 75%</td>
<td>2 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>17 63%</td>
<td>16 62%</td>
<td>17 65%</td>
<td>17 68%</td>
<td>16 62%</td>
<td>16 62%</td>
<td>12 63%</td>
<td>14 78%</td>
<td>14 78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>2014 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>
<td>989 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>361 94%</td>
<td>335 89%</td>
<td>335 89%</td>
<td>863 90%</td>
<td>848 89%</td>
<td>822 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>352 91%</td>
<td>346 89%</td>
<td>346 89%</td>
<td>736 91%</td>
<td>744 91%</td>
<td>733 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 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>
<td>321 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>95 89%</td>
<td>107 94%</td>
<td>99 88%</td>
<td>290 92%</td>
<td>318 89%</td>
<td>253 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>158 93%</td>
<td>162 93%</td>
<td>155 88%</td>
<td>410 93%</td>
<td>318 89%</td>
<td>376 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENIOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 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>
<td>652 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>230 91%</td>
<td>248 94%</td>
<td>231 90%</td>
<td>562 89%</td>
<td>571 90%</td>
<td>559 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>361 89%</td>
<td>366 91%</td>
<td>359 89%</td>
<td>776 92%</td>
<td>786 92%</td>
<td>779 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL NEEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 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>
<td>16 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
<td>6 86%</td>
<td>5 71%</td>
<td>11 85%</td>
<td>9 75%</td>
<td>10 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VS/Satisfied/SA/Agree</td>
<td>9 64%</td>
<td>10 71%</td>
<td>9 64%</td>
<td>18 69%</td>
<td>15 60%</td>
<td>13 54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>