

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Housing Survey Subcommittee Meeting Notes  
Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room, City Hall  
June 17, 2015  
12:00 pm

Attendance Record	Present	Absent
<b>MEMBERS</b>		
Bob Hughes		X
Dan Rosensweig	X	
Frank Stoner	X	
Jennifer McKeever	X	
Joyce Dudek	X	
Kira Drennon	X	
Lesley Fore (LEAP)	X	
Nancy Kidd	X	
<b>NON VOTING MEMBERS</b>		
Countess Hughes (UVA)	X	
<b>STAFF</b>		
Kathy McHugh	X	
Melissa Thackston	X	
<b>OTHERS</b>		

The meeting began around noon and introductions were made by all in attendance.

Kathy McHugh passed out hard copies of the affordable/low income housing survey. She advised that this version incorporates the comments received from e-mail responses sent over the past two weeks from the group (in response to her request to provide written feedback). She further advised that she had made minor tweaks to wording and order to ensure consistency between this survey and the one for workforce/employee. Kathy explained that there are some questions on the affordable/low income housing survey that are not on the workforce/employee survey (a total of 4 questions). These have been denoted with an asterisk (\*). RCLCO has provided their approval of the current version.

Kathy then proceeded to review the agreed upon amendment to the Rhodeside & Harwell/RCLCO scope of work and to explain how the survey would need to be handled by the HAC. Specifically, the revised scope of work calls for the following:

1. Based on the employee workforce housing survey, the City (working with HAC) will attempt to finalize the survey document for the low income consumer research.
2. RCLCO will make final edits to the survey and create the online survey in Survey Monkey. RCLCO will then provide the online link, a description of the uses of the survey data, and a printable version of the survey to the City.
3. HAC and other non-profits that agree to participate will reach out to their own constituents and conduct the survey in the manner they deem most feasible. In many cases, this may mean distributing paper copies and collecting the completed survey documents.
4. RCLCO is not responsible for conducting the survey. The client, the HAC, and other non-profit participants will then be responsible for entering the individual paper survey responses into the survey monkey system so that RCLCO can download a compiled table of results from the Survey Monkey system.

5. RCLCO will download the compiled results and analyze the survey data in a manner similar to the public employee survey to better understand the commuting and housing needs of this household segment.

6. Reconcile these survey results with the “synthesis” from supply-demand analysis to better understand how to serve low income housing consumers in the city. Integrate these results into the policy recommendations, as applicable.

Melissa Thackston then explained her idea for having the HAC come back together in the future to enter in surveys into Survey Monkey, if necessary. There was general consensus that this would be considered as an option should organizations find that they are not able to get this done on their own; however, the preferred way would be for each participant to be responsible for data entry themselves.

Kathy then advised that she had heard from two organizations (CRHA and PHA) that plan to participate but could not be here today. She advised that Connie Dunn had e-mailed her explaining that CRHA would plan to send out the survey to residents, but that there needs to be a dummy address/recipient to receive the surveys as she does not think that residents will return these if they are coming back to the housing authority. Connie also advised that have limited staff capacity so she is unsure how they would enter data depending upon the number of responses received. PHA (through Mark Watson) also advised that they would like to participate and that they would plan to send out the survey to their residents in Virnita Court, Monticello Vista, and Friendship Court. Finally, Kathy mentioned that Kaki Dimock had previously indicated an interest in participating – reaching out the residents of the Crossings and in the Spring for Housing program – however, since Kaki is not in attendance today, staff will need to follow up with her to see where this stands.

Otherwise, based on attendance at the meeting, Kathy denoted that it appears that MACAA, AHIP, Habitat, LEAP and Region 10 will also be participating.

Lesley Fore asked about involvement of Community Housing Partners, but Kathy and Melissa explained that without involvement by a contact / participant from that organization - that participation would not be feasible. Simply stated, those groups who want to be involved were supposed to be at this meeting (as communicated during the 5/20/15 HAC meeting) and if they are not HAC members, an invitation should have been extended asking that they attend this kick off meeting. Since participation/involvement is strictly voluntary, it is probably not unusual for involvement to be limited to those organizations who are actively involved with the HAC.

Dan Rosensweig thanked staff for doing this and apologized for previously implying that the affordable/low income consumer research should have been included in the final scope of work. He advised that Kathy had sent him an e-mail showing his review of the final scope of work and that it did not include the additional affordable/low income consumer research as he had previously thought.

Kathy stated that staff is supportive of doing the additional research; but that the on-going concern was that we needed to find a way to do the work within the approved budget. Looking to the HAC to do the heavy lifting of actually conducting the survey, the current agreement with RCLCO should allow us to accomplish the research with minimal costs. Kathy also noted that RCLCO had asked her about the City’s goal for doing this research and that she had responded that the information will provide anecdotal information about the housing needs of those in our community who least can afford market rate housing. Further, she noted that this information is needed both to inform housing policy as well as demonstrate a need for continued funding of the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund.

Dan Rosensweig and Jennifer McKeever added that this information will also help non-profits to be better able to understand/identify the needs of their constituencies.

As to the logistics of the survey, Kathy and Melissa recommended that given the diversity of programs and agencies involved, that it might be best to let each agency define who they will survey and how. While the

group might want to script certain discussions, with the exception of the *other questions* in the survey, there is very little ambiguity in the information being collected. A discussion of how each organization plans to conduct the survey followed, with specifics noted below:

Dan Rosensweig – Habitat will likely try to survey partner families one-on-one, using the family resource team.

Joyce Dudek - AHIP is not entirely sure at this point, but staff is currently considering a mail out to people who have been served over the last 3 years. It was noted that AHIP also has Park's Edge apartments and could use these residents as well as AHIP's wait list as potential sources of people to interview.

Nancy Kidd – MACAA will involve the family advocate for the Head Start program and Nancy will survey the Hope House residents. MACAA is also considering use of their rural outreach offices as a potential way to survey low income persons in areas outside the City limits.

Kira Drennon - Region 10 has not fully identified how this will be done, but are considering interviewing walk in's at the Peterson Clinic on Preston Avenue, as well as those using the Blue Ridge Club House on Elliott Avenue.

Melissa made a suggestion to include a stamped return envelope if relying on mail out surveys. Kathy added that the City might be able to help offset postage costs, if minimal. Melissa agreed that this would be feasible and that most non-profits were already City vendors, so we could issue checks. This would need to be handled on a case by case basis, so those who were interested should let Kathy / Melissa know.

The group then went through the survey and identified final changes. These included:

- Name of the survey should be Charlottesville Housing Survey.
- Under ideal housing section, question #9 should include option "k" that says "other: please specify". This was also added for question #10.
- Under the demographic information section, question #3 should add a description that annual household income is total household income inclusive of wages, child support, disability, social security, etc... Also there was a suggestion that income limits should be rounded to the nearest whole number rather than using actual HUD income limits.
- Under the housing knowledge and access section question #1, additional options should be added to accommodate responses from people who have been assisted previously and/or are in the process of being assisted currently. The group felt that if someone responded "yes - their current housing satisfies their needs" that current questions #2 and 3 would cause confusion. Accordingly, it was suggested that options for a "yes" response were needed to ask similar questions while denoting that the responses should be based on factors/challenges encountered "prior to current housing". Question #3 should include the option of "debt." Question #4 should be moved to question #1.
- Under the other questions section, question #1 should be added to the housing knowledge and access section (adjusting for the changes noted above). For question #2, the scale should be strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neutral, somewhat agree, strongly agree or not applicable (for consistency). Need to add "safe and decent" after affordable in option d. Also need to add options for: "I can't afford housing because there are not enough employment options;" "Don't feel safe in current housing;" "I consider my current house to be substandard;" and "Lack of affordable housing is impacting my children's school performance as well as their health."
- Lastly, as a catch all, need to add a general comment box for people to write in other thoughts / concerns that they may have.

The group then discussed possibly testing out the survey at West Haven Community Day on August 1<sup>st</sup>. Jennifer McKeever suggested that staff provide an on-line signup sheet for 1 to 2 hour shifts and send this out to the HAC to obtain workers for the event.

Kathy indicated that she would be glad to do this, but wanted to make sure that we can have the survey ready to go by then and that she was waiting to hear back from RCLCO on timing and other logistical matters. She expressed concern over RCLCO, noting that they have been slow to provide responses and that the level of detail / feedback could be improved. Regardless, based on what she understands from prior communications, the general plan is to try to issue the workforce survey around the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> week of August to coincide with return to school. Given this, it seems to make sense to do the affordable/low income survey around the same time to provide everyone sufficient time to prepare/gear up. As for a possible data entry event, Kathy stated that we could look to use the September subcommittee meeting.

With no other discussion, Kathy thanked everyone for coming and the meeting was then adjourned.