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2015 Resident Satisfaction
Findings of the fourth 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) annually conducts a 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.

Beginning in 2010, HACSC transferred responsibility for managing the properties from an in-house affiliate company to third party management agents. This transfer process was completed in mid-2012. HACSC also increased the use of a third party resident services provider, extending services to almost all of the properties.

With the support of its property management and resident services partners, HACSC was able to engage a high percentage of residents in this year's survey, although not as high a percentage as in prior years. Residents generally gave their housing high ratings. The 2015 survey results provide a snapshot of residents’ level of satisfaction at each property and highlight common issues and concerns across properties. HACSC appreciates the residents taking the time to complete the survey.

METHODOLOGY

The survey questions were the same as in prior years, which allows HACSC to note trends 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 February. Management companies were also informed about the process and provided with flyers to distribute 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**

Thirty-seven percent, 1,014 out of 2,721 households, responded to the Resident Satisfaction Survey, compared to 44% last year. The overall response rate was still a respectable 37%. As in prior years, residents of the senior properties responded at a higher rate (49%) than residents at the family properties (26%). The response rate from HACSC’s one special needs property dropped from 34% in 2014 down to 16%. Residents from 29 of HACSC’s 32 properties responded\(^1\).

The family property with the highest response rate was Miramar Way; 63% of the residents of this property responded to this year's survey! Lenzen Gardens Senior Apartments once again had the top response rate at 68%.

This report will examine the overall level of satisfaction of respondents across the portfolio as a whole. It will also analyze the survey results specific to senior properties and to family 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 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey are shown in Attachment 2.

\(^1\) Unfortunately there were no survey responses from the 16-unit Eklund Gardens, now divided into Halford Way and Poinciana Drive, or the 16-unit Lucretia Gardens. Other properties with response rates of under 20% included: Julian Gardens, Blossom River, Helzer Courts, Klamath Gardens and Pinmore Gardens. The small sample size for San Pedro Gardens (4 out of 20 units), Deborah (1 out of 4 units) and Seifert (1 out of 3 units) also make the results less than reliable.
LEVELS OF SATISFACTION: ALL RESPONDENTS

Overall, HACSC residents report a high level of satisfaction.

- 90% 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.”
- 92% of respondents strongly agree or agree: “I would recommend this housing to a friend or family member.”

These ratings are similar to last year. In 2014, Value was rated at 87%, Safety at 89% and Would Recommend at 93%.

VALUE. In their comments residents state they are aware of how market-rate rents are escalating in their community and that they are thankful to be in a HACSC rent-restricted property. HACSC's residents though have been impacted with increased housing costs. As noted in last year's report, even residents with project-based or tenant-based rent subsidies have had their portion of the rent increase from 30% to 35% of their income. "Please don't increase the rental price. How can we live if our household income does not increase but the rental does?"

As usual, most of the comments and concerns about rent increases came from the senior properties. Three senior properties: Avenida, DeRose, and Villa Hermosa had satisfaction ratings of Value more than ten percentage points below the senior portfolio average. Two family properties also reported much lower satisfaction rates than the average family property: Blossom River and Helzer Courts.

When responses indicate lower than average satisfaction with Value, this is not always simply a comment about the rent or rent increases. Except for Villa Hermosa, the properties rated lower than average Value in this year's survey also had lower than average satisfaction with quality of the apartment, management responsiveness and other measures.

Since the overall satisfaction with value is so high, there were no outliers at the upper end of the scale. In other words no properties exceeded the average by ten percentage points.

Two properties that had much lower than average satisfaction with Value last year, Pinmore Gardens and Corde Terra Apartments, showed a great increase this year, from under 70% satisfied to 89% and 97% respectively².

---

² The response rate from Pinmore was too low to be certain that the change in satisfaction level is widely felt; the data from Corde Terra Apartments is more reliable.
SAFETY. The average level of satisfaction with Safety was 90% in the senior properties, two percentage points lower than last year but higher than previous years. DeRose Gardens was an outlier; only 73% of De Rose residents agreed or strongly agreed that their housing was safe and secure.

Residents at John Burns Gardens were grateful for security improvements. "The changes in the entrance system have cut down a lot of traffic. Thanks."

The level of satisfaction with Safety at the family properties averaged 86%, down one percentage point from last year. Once again the small family sites reported no concerns with Safety. Two sites, Blossom River and Poco Way, were markedly lower than average. Survey comments from Corde Terra Apartments also indicate concerns about after-hours security, though 91% of respondents still gave the property a positive rating on Safety.

MAINTENANCE. Seventy-two percent (666 out of 929) of respondents reported that they had requested maintenance within the past year, a slightly lower percentage than reported in the 2014 survey. Again this year maintenance responsiveness, courtesy and quality of the repair were all rated highly. Resident satisfaction with maintenance at two properties, Corde Terra Village and Huff Gardens, showed significant improvement while satisfaction levels at Pinmore Gardens went down.

VARIATION BY MANAGEMENT COMPANY. In past surveys there has been no particular distinction between properties managed by FPI Inc. versus the John Stewart Company in regard to resident satisfaction, except that last year, residents of JSCo-managed properties indicated a higher level of satisfaction with maintenance than at FPI-managed sites. This year, the JSCo-managed portfolio scored higher than the FPI-managed portfolio in most categories. Attachment 4 shows that JSCo's higher resident satisfaction rating stems from higher resident satisfaction at its senior sites. The fact that senior sites are a larger percentage of the JSCo portfolio than FPIs also contributes to making their overall satisfaction ratings higher.

Family properties in the FPI portfolio and the JSCo portfolio reported similar levels of satisfaction.

THE OPPORTUNITY CENTER. The Opportunity Center is HACSC's only special needs housing site. The building also houses 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. In
recent months there has been another transition, as Charities Housing chose not to renew its management contract and John Stewart Company took over management of the site. Participation in this year's survey dropped to 16%, down from 34% in the two prior years. On the other hand, those who responded rated their satisfaction higher than in previous years.

**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 82% satisfaction at the family sites (up from 80%) and a steady 90% satisfaction at the senior sites. Among the senior properties, the only site expressing significantly lower levels of satisfaction was DeRose Gardens. Satisfaction with Morrone Gardens rose from at 71% last year to 85% in 2015 after completion of rehab at that property.

At the family properties, the sites whose residents had a comparatively low level of satisfaction with the unit quality continued to have a lower than average level of satisfaction in 2015. Blossom River, Helzer Courts, and Pinmore Gardens saw modest improvement though all continued to have resident satisfaction levels at least ten percentage points or more below the portfolio average. San Pedro Garden's level of satisfaction remained unchanged at 50%. On the other hand, residents of Bendorf/Villa San Pedro rated their apartments sixteen percentage points higher than in 2014; Bendorf completed a major rehabilitation last year. Residents at The Willows rated their apartments percentage points higher than in 2014, even though at the Willows, HACSC made the decision to put off unit rehabs pending the buyout transaction and decisions regarding the possible re-syndication of the project.

**RECURRING ISSUES**

**PARKING.** The lack of visitor parking at Corde Terra Village and Corde Terra Family Apartments continues to be a major source of dissatisfaction. Security of parking areas is also a concern at Corde Terra Family Apartments and several other properties, including the Cypress, Lenzen and Rincon senior properties.

**AGING IN PLACE.** Especially in a senior property where residents spend most of their time at home and tend to be more aware of safety and security issues, a single incident can draw the attention and concern of an entire community. Two such incidents are noted in resident comments in this year's survey. A number of John Burns Gardens' residents commented on the need for more accessible walkways, citing how one community resident fell and broke her shoulder. At another property, multiple residents cited the theft of the community room TV as an example of the need for greater security measures at the property.
The 2014 survey report highlighted the need for HACSC to proactively address its aging resident population. Several quotes in this year's survey commend the effort, including the following quote from a Rincon Gardens resident: "I am an over-90 year old senior citizen. I very much appreciate that I can live in this quiet beautiful environment with peace and safety. The generous and favorable treatment I have received is really worth the rent. Thank you..."

**SMOKING.** Last year there were very few comments and complaints about smoking and we thought that no-smoking policies had become well established. This year the complaints are more numerous, suggesting that a renewed focus on enforcement is needed. Residents cited problems at Bendorf, Clarendon, Morrone, the Opportunity Center and Sunset Gardens.

**FOLLOW UP ACTION PLAN**

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.

The top priority issues and opportunities that surfaced in the 2014 survey continue to be important in 2015. Follow up action steps include:

- Continue to work on "aging in place" challenges for HACSC communities. Implement plans for management and services to respond to the challenges.
- Continue to implement unit rehabs for long-tenured residents and track overall satisfaction with property-wide rehabs.
- Make full use of the data from the survey to focus attention on areas where residents have expressed concerns.
- Improve the response rate for next year's survey, particularly for the Opportunity Center and the family properties. Response rate for the family properties has been trending downward and so provides less reliable feedback about resident satisfaction at those sites.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: Survey Template  
Attachment 2: Property Profiles  
Attachment 3: Three-Year Trends  
Attachment 4: Variation by Management Company
**<PROPERTY NAME>**

**2015 TENANT SATISFACTION SURVEY**

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>
To what extent do you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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
Corde Terra Apts  
Family Property Managed by FPI  
Response Rate: 33% (100/300)

**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
Cypress Gardens Senior Property Managed by JSCo Response Rate: 55% (69/125)

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
Julian Gardens
Family Property Managed by JSCo
Response Rate: 11% (1/9)

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

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvement | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
Miramar Way Apts
Family Property Managed by JSCo
Response Rate: 63% (10/16)

Physical Conditions
![Physical Conditions Chart]

Maintenance Quality
![Maintenance Quality Chart]

Services Quality
![Services Quality Chart]

Management Quality
![Management Quality Chart]

Overall Assessment
![Overall Assessment Chart]
Opportunity Center | Sp Needs Property Managed by JSCo | Response Rate: 16% (14/89)

**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
Rincon Gardens Senior Property Managed by JSCo Response Rate: 51% (101/200)

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
San Pedro Gardens
Family Property Managed by FPI
Response Rate: 20% (4/20)

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
Siefert House
Family Property Managed by HACSC
Response Rate: 33% (1/3)

**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

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Improvements | Not At All Satisfied | N/A
---|---|---|---|---
Sunset Gardens  
Senior Property Managed by JSCo  
Response Rate: 53% (40/75)

### 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**
The Willows Family Property Managed by FPI

Response Rate: 28% (13/47)

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

<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>ALL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL NEEDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>11</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>ALL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL NEEDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 4: Variation by Management Company

### % Very Satisfied/ Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FPI Senior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSCo Senior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FPI Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSCo Family</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % Strongly Agree/ Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FPI Senior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSCo Senior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FPI Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSCo Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Eklund or Lucretia (no data)