

The HOPE VI Project: Housing and Home Ownership Summer 2006

Introduction

In 1992 the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing found that 86,000 public housing units were in unacceptable and deplorable conditions. Congress initiated the Urban Revitalization Demonstration Program, also known as HOPE VI, in response to calls for improving public housing. The HOPE VI program serves as a critical component of the federal government's Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)'s efforts to transform public housing. The program aims to modify housing in the general areas including physical improvements, management improvements, and social and community services to address resident needs. Specifically, HOPE VI aspires to change the physical shape of public housing, establish positive incentives for resident self-sufficiency and comprehensive services that empower residents, lessen concentrations of poverty by placing public housing in non-poverty neighborhoods and promoting mixed income communities, and finally, forging partnerships with other agencies, both public and private, to generate support and resources. Any Public Housing Authority that has severely distressed housing units in its inventory is eligible to apply.¹

Residents targeted by HOPE VI programs have low levels of income and experience high unemployment rates. The HOPE VI baseline report provides an overview of the employment and income situations of HOPE VI residents. Of those surveyed under the age of 62, 59 percent reported they were unemployed and only 27 percent reported that they were employed full time. The percentage of households with an income under \$10,000 ranged from 45 to 80 percent.² In the typical HOPE VI neighborhood, 9.8 percent of residents consider themselves to be White, 32.1 percent Black, and 40.1 percent identify themselves as Latino³.

Project Focus

This report evaluates perceptions of residents of the three occupied housing projects. Residents were asked how well the HOPE VI project is doing, and they provided demographic information to help in future planning for HOPE VI residents. Furthermore, the information gathered on individual households was to be used to inform decisions for planning for the Community School.

Residents have moved into Kembleton, Steuben Village, and Phase 4A of Oneida Homes thus far. Few of the original Washington Courts residents have moved into the new HOPE VI housing. In order to determine who the residents are who have moved into

¹ Department of Housing and Urban Development. "Overview". About HOPE VI. <<http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/hope6/about/>>

² Popkin, 2002. HOPE VI Program Evaluation: The Second Year, p. 6.

³ Zielenbach, 2002. HOPE VI Program Evaluation: The Second Year, p. 7.

these homes, household demographics were gathered and examined. Furthermore, concerns raised by the local school board regarding the need for and funding of a Community School in the neighborhood. This led to the need to establish the size of the incoming population of children and to determine where these new residents have come from. Household migration patterns are of interest, specifically as to whether new residents are moving from other homes within the target area, or are coming from outside.

The report is split into two sections, one that examines the demographics of the residents of Kempleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes, and the second which addresses resident satisfaction. One survey was used to gather information for both sections and was completed with residents over the telephone.

Utica

In 2003 the Utica Municipal Housing Authority (UMHA) successfully submitted a grant proposal to HUD, and was awarded \$11.5 million with the intent to generate millions of dollars more for city transformation. The goals of the Utica project were to demolish the Washington Courts Housing Project and relocate residents to improved housing in better neighborhoods. The neighborhoods were targeted to be less racially segregated and more economically diverse. A second broad goal was to revitalize a target area of the city known as Cornhill. The improvements were to include renovated housing and new housing rentals; opportunities for home ownership; improvement of community facilities, such as schools and parks; and increased well-being in the lives of neighborhood residents. The programs within the project include Relocation and Community Services Coordination, Housing and Home Ownership Development, and Community Facilities in the Cornhill Target Neighborhood.⁴

Overview of Housing /Homeownership Project

One of the primary purposes of the national HOPE VI program is to revitalize distressed public housing, thereby improving the living conditions of public housing residents.⁵ When creating the program HUD noted that the isolation of public housing residents promoted certain socioeconomic trends. Therefore, HOPE VI seeks to create mixed-income developments with the hope that fostering a culture of work as well as promoting reinvestment in the community.⁶

The Housing and Home Ownership segment of the Utica project includes 4 development phases, as shown in Figure 1. Structures in the Cornhill area of Utica had deteriorated over time due to property owners that did not keep up their properties. The city gradually began to acquire these homes. In some cases, the houses were so neglected that they were

⁴ Owens-Manley, J. (ed.) HOPE VI Program Evaluation: The Second Year. January 2006. Hamilton College.

⁵ Cuomo, 1999. HOPE VI Program Evaluation: The Second Year, p. 7.

⁶ HOPE VI Program Evaluation: The Second Year, p. 7.

uninhabitable and incapable of being rehabilitated, so they were demolished. In other situations, the pre-existing structures were kept but required rehabilitation.⁷

Two of the building sites and projects are managed by Rebuild Mohawk Valley (RMV), a subsidiary part of UMHA. Two of the others are controlled by Housing Visions Unlimited, Inc., a not-for-profit organization based in Syracuse. Housing Visions defines its mission as the improvement of quality of life by revitalizing neighborhoods for low and moderate income families⁸

Figure 1 illustrates the 4 phases of construction. The table shows that the phases do overlap in construction deadlines. Phases I, II, and III are going to be all rental units, whereas Phase IV, Oneida Homes, is single-family units for home ownership. Oneida Homes aims to allow people to achieve the dream of becoming first-time homeowners.

There are overlaps in the construction. Phase III is still being completed, as well as Phase IV. Phase IV, Oneida Homes, is made up of single family detached homes to be completed in 5 cycles of building. The first sequence of building, 4A, resulted in 11 homes. As of July 1, 2006 10 of these homes were occupied. The second set, 4B, includes 8 homes which are being completed. 4C is meant to be started late this year, and includes 12 homes. This part of the project is behind schedule. The remaining 2 sets 4D, and 4E must all be completed by September 2008 when the program ends.

| Phase Name of Project | Type of Housing | Type of Building | Status | Occupation | Manager |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| Phase I Kembleton Apartments | Rental | New/Rehab | Completed | 26 out of 27 units, as of July 1, 2006 | Housing Visions Unlimited, Inc. |
| Phase II Steuben Village | Rental | New/Rehab | Completed | | RMV |
| Phase III Rutger Manor | Rental | New/Rehab | Under Construction | 41 out of 49 units, as of July 1, 2006 | Housing Visions Unlimited, Inc. |
| Phase IV Oneida Homes | Ownership | New | 4A completed; 4B under construction; 4C, 4D, and 4E not yet started | 10 out of 11 homes in 4A, as of July 1, 2006 | RMV |

Figure 1. Construction Phases

⁷ Dave Williams, Utica City Assessor, personal interview.

⁸ Housing Visions Unlimited, Inc. 2002. <<http://housingvisions.org/>>.

Part I: Migration and Demographics

Demographic information was gathered in order to establish who the residents of this population are, and where they were coming from previously. The migratory information about the school-aged population can indicate whether there appears to be a significant change in this group as the neighborhood changes, and therefore used to help in school planning.

Methods

The research questions that were posed are illustrated in Figure 2.

| Research Question | Goal | Methodology | Source |
|--|--|--|---|
| Who are the residents of Kembleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes? | - To determine the migratory patterns of residents of Kembleton, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes - To determine the demographics of current residents | Gather migratory information from housing applications. Use a telephone survey to gather other demographic information. Mail survey to residents not reached via telephone. | Residents of new housing; UMHA & Housing Applications |
| How many school-aged children are moving into Kembleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes? | - To determine the patterns of children's movement into the HOPE VI target area for school planning | Use housing applications to determine number of children living in households. Use a telephone survey to determine schools children attended previously and currently. Mail survey to residents not reached via telephone. | Residents of new housing; UMHA & Housing Applications |

Figure 2. Methodology for Evaluating Demographics and Migration

I received access to the files for Oneida Homes and Steuben Village through Rebuild Mohawk Valley. The Kembleton Apartment files were under the control of Housing Visions. I considered each individual household's application, which provided the applicants' previous address, in order to examine the migratory patterns of the people moving into Kembleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes. These

applications also provided other basic demographic information including age and sex of the head of household, age and sex of any other adults or children in the household, and source of and anticipated value for annual household income which included wages and public assistance for all members of the household, racial background of the head of household, and employment information. In combination with the migratory information, knowing the ages of the children allowed me to establish the age distribution of the children in each project and where they were coming from.

I conducted a phone interview to gather more specific information on the residents' sources of income including employment and types of public assistance. This interview also asked what grades the children in the household were entering, and what schools the children had attended prior and after moving, in order to further examine the school population. I called through several times, at different points in the day and evening in order to try to reach as many people as possible. Several residents asked me to call back at a different time. I mailed the same survey to the households that I was unable to reach via telephone or call back, and included a pre-paid envelope for returning it.

Appendix A contains the questions on the survey that pertained to demographics. .

I was able to review the applications of 38 of 41 families living in Steuben Village as of July 1, 2006. I was unable to review the applications of 3 out of 4 families who had moved in on this date. I reviewed the applications of the 26 households in Kembleton Apartments and the 10 homeowners in Oneida Homes, for a total of 74. This information is shown in Appendix B.

I was able to interview 1 resident of Oneida Homes via telephone, and received 3 mail surveys. I interviewed 11 residents of Steuben Village via telephone and received 6 in the mail. I only conducted phone interviews for the Kembleton Residents, and was able to speak with 4.

It was simpler to gain access to the applications and contact information for the residents of Steuben Village and Oneida Homes because they were under the jurisdiction of Rebuild Mohawk Valley, in conjunction with the Utica Municipal Housing Authority. However, it took me several weeks to gain access to the applications and contact information for Kembleton. It was difficult to gain access to this information due to concerns regarding infringement of confidentiality rights. I needed to get approval from Housing Vision Unlimited, Inc.'s Senior Operations Manager in the main office in Syracuse prior to receiving the contact information for these residents and permission to access the files in their Utica office. That did not leave me enough time to supplement the phone interview with a mail survey.

I was unable to reach many of the residents' of Kembleton Apartments and Steuben Village via telephone because out 29 out of 64 had their telephone lines disconnected, numbers out of service, did not have a number provided, or provided the wrong number. Another 15 had no answer and no answering machine. For the most part, all of the residents that I spoke to on the phone were very receptive. A few asked me to call back at

more convenient times, but were very willing to give me a better time. Only a few seemed to be a little hesitant at first to speak to me, but after I explained myself and my purpose in more depth, I found on several occasions that these people were some of the more active participants that had more to say. Only one person actually refused to speak to me, but cited the reason to be that she had a pre-paid phone and did not want to use up the minutes. One resident did not speak English, so I talked to her daughter-in-law. In two other cases I spoke to the head of household's spouse. Finally, in one interview, the respondent did not understand my questions well due to language differences.

Results

Who are the Residents of Kembleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes?

As shown in Appendix B, 74 total household applications were reviewed; 26 were from Kembleton, 38 from Steuben Village, and 10 from Oneida Homes.

A sharp difference was noticed between the gender of the heads-of-household of ownership homes, which was mostly male, and the rental units, which was mostly female. In Steuben Village, female heads of household outnumbered males by a ratio of 18 to 1, which was all except for 2 of the 38 homes. Similarly, in Kembleton 70 percent of the heads-of-household were female. In Oneida Homes this trend was reversed; two heads of household were female, and 8 were male.

Overall, 62 percent of the residents were Black and 13 percent were White. This contrasts with a 79 percent White population for the city of Utica overall.⁹ Overall, 51 of the 74 households came from outside the target area, and 35 of those came from outside of Cornhill. Only 4 households were from outside of the city of Utica.

All three housing projects had similar mean ages for heads of household, at around 40 years old. The maximum ages for the rental projects was much higher than that for the ownership. The maximum age for Oneida Homes was 49, compared to the maximum ages for heads of households in Steuben Village and Kembleton, which were 64 and 71, respectively.

Income and employment

The mean Annual Household Income was lowest in Kembleton Apartments, and predictably highest, by a significant amount, for Oneida Homes. The means for Kembleton and Steuben Village were very similar, both just under \$14,000. The minimum income for Oneida Homes was \$14,365, and the mean was \$26,154. The applications indicated that at the time of application, 12 of the Kembleton residents were unemployed (n=26), 22 of the Steuben Village residents were unemployed (n=38) and all of the Oneida Homes heads of household were employed.

The applications were a little bit more unclear as to sources and types of public assistance received. It appeared that 16 of the 26 residents of Kembleton and 37 of the 38 residents

⁹ 2000 Census Data.

of Steuben Village were receiving some type of unemployment benefits. Due to the financial means and income stability required to own a home, the difference in income and employment between the rental units and the ownership homes is to be expected. However, more than half of the rental unit heads-of-household were unemployed at the time of application.

The survey results indicated that out of the 17 respondents for Steuben Village, 10 were employed, 7 full-time and 3 part-time. From Kembleton, 2 of the 4 respondents were employed full time. Out of the Oneida Homes residents, all (n=4) were employed and working full time. Only one resident, who was from Oneida Homes, was participating in any kind of job training, a nursing training education program, while also working a full time job.

The survey asked specifically whether any member in the household had received Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) in the past six months. In Steuben Village, 2 households were receiving TANF assistance and 1 case was pending. In Kembleton, 1 household was receiving TANF, and in Oneida Homes, 0 were.

In Steuben Village, 7 of the respondents had received disability checks or SSI in the past 6 months, and 2 of the Kembleton Apartment residents. None of the respondents from Oneida Homes had received this aid. Food stamps were received by 10 homes in Steuben Village in the past 6 months, 3 in Kembleton, and 1 in Oneida Homes.

What is the age distribution of the school-aged children moving into Kembleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes, and where have they moved from?

The applications indicated that there are 54 households with children, or about 73 percent of the households. There are 114 children total in all three projects. Steuben Village has the highest average number of children per household, 1.84. The overall mean was 1.65. The maximum number of children per household was 5, which occurred in both Steuben Village and Kembleton Apartments. The maximum number of children in Oneida Homes households was three.

The age distribution was divided into under 5 years old, age 5 to 10 which is approximately elementary school, 11 to 13 which is junior high, and 14 to 18 which is high school. Overall, and also when examined individually, the elementary school age bracket had the greatest number of children. Oneida Homes had no high school aged children.

Migratory patterns of the children included moves both within and outside of the target area for HOPE VI; 78 of the children had moved from outside the target area, which is about 68 percent. Of these children, 37 were elementary school aged. There were 17 children, or 22 percent, under 5 from outside the target area who will soon be entering elementary school. Out of all of the children currently living in these projects, about 18 percent are under 5.

Out of the survey respondents, 21 out of the 25 homes had children. When asked whether the children had changed schools after moving, a majority of the respondents indicated either that there was no change, that the child had moved up from grade school to junior high, etc, or that there was a change but MLK Jr. Elementary school was not involved. Out of the respondents, only 1 indicated that their child had switched to MLK Jr. because they had moved. Two of the respondents' children had started MLK because they were entering school for the first time.

Part II: Resident Satisfaction

After discussion with UMHA, they indicated that they wanted to gather some feedback from the residents about the HOPE VI process, and how it might be improved.

Methods

Figure 3 indicates the research question.

| Research Question | Goal | Methodology | Source |
|--|--|--|--|
| Are the residents of Kembleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes satisfied with their homes? | - To determine the satisfaction of Kembleton, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes with their new homes and the services provided to them | Use a telephone survey to conduct customer satisfaction survey. Mail survey to residents not reached via telephone | New residents at Steuben Village, Kembleton & Oneida Homes |

Figure 3. Methodology for Evaluating Resident Satisfaction

In order to determine the level of satisfaction experienced by the residents of Kembleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes with their new homes, and with the services provided to them. Questions were added at the end of the telephone interview that dealt with satisfaction with the home, neighborhood, and services provided. In addition, residents were asked if their quality of life had been improved by the move (Appendices D & E.)

Results

The residents of Oneida Homes were most satisfied, with a mean response level of satisfaction of 4.25, with 5 being the most satisfied. Residents of Steuben Village indicated 3.85, and Kembleton 3 Overall for Steuben Village and Oneida Homes, which are RMV 3.93. Overall, the total level of satisfaction with current housing had a mean of 3.78 on a scale of 1-5. (Appendix E contains the results of the survey, and individual responses to certain questions.) As far as satisfaction with their current neighborhood, Oneida Homes residents had a mean level of satisfaction of 3.5. In Steuben Village and Kembleton, the mean levels of satisfaction were 3.85 and 3.75, respectively. For the RMV projects, the mean was 3.79. Overall, the mean was 3.78 on a scale of 1-5.

Oneida Homes residents had a mean response of 4.25 for level of satisfaction with HOPE VI services, whereas Steuben Village had a mean of 3.53. These two projects had an overall mean of 3.68. Kembleton respondents were 3.25 satisfied with services provided to them by Housing Visions Unlimited. Overall, residents had a mean level of satisfaction of 3.74.

Oneida Homes residents had a mean increase in quality-of-life of 4.33. In Steuben Village and Kembleton there were mean responses of 3.94 and 2.75, respectively. Overall, respondents had a mean response of 3.71.

Respondents from Steuben Village and Kembleton had similar responses. Some respondents cited neighborhood safety as a complaint. They noted that while efforts appeared to be somewhat successful, drugs and other problems still persist. There were common complaints about the homes in Steuben Village. Many respondents mentioned the lack of storm doors. They expressed a desire to be able to maximize their experience in their homes, however, they mentioned that the lack of a back door which made enjoyment of the back yard somewhat inconvenient. A common complaint was thin walls and the subsequent ability to hear the neighbors.

Steuben Village respondents had a range of thoughts regarding HOPE VI services. Some mentioned slower maintenance responses, and a lack of thoroughness in checking up on tenants to make sure there is no drug activity. Respondents from Kembleton all mentioned slow maintenance, and one said that it was much slower there than in their previous residence in UMHA housing.

Oneida Homes residents did not have as many negative statements as the other respondents. Some complained about the neighborhood their home was in.

Appendix A. Demographics Survey Questions

Q1. How many persons, including yourself, reside in your home? _____

Q2. a. Are you currently employed? Yes ____ No ____

If yes,

b. do you currently have more than one job? Yes ____ No ____

c. Is your primary job full-time ____ or part-time ____?

Q3. a. Are you currently participating in any kind of job training or education program?
Yes ____ No ____

If yes,

b. what kind? _____

Q4. a. Have you or anyone in your household received TANF in the past 6 months? Yes ____
No ____

b. Have you or anyone in your household received disability checks/SSI in the past 6 months? Yes ___ No ___

c. Have you or anyone in your household received food stamps in the past 6 months? Yes ___ No ___

Q5. How many children live in your house? _____

Q6. How old are the children, and what is their relationship to you?

a. Child 1: Age ___ Relationship to head of household/lease-holder _____

b. Child 2: Age ___ Relationship to head of household/lease-holder _____

c. Child 3: Age ___ Relationship to head of household/lease-holder _____

d. Child 4: Age ___ Relationship to head of household/lease-holder _____

e. Child 5: Age ___ Relationship to head of household/lease-holder _____

f. Other: _____

7. What grade(s) will the children be entering this fall?

Child 1: _____ Child 2: _____ Child 3: _____

Child 4: _____ Child 5: _____ Other: _____

Q8. What school(s) did the children attend before you moved?

Child 1: _____ Child 2: _____

Child 3: _____ Child 4: _____

Child 5: _____ Other: _____

Q9. What school(s) do the children attend now?

Child 1: _____ Child 2: _____

Child 3: _____ Child 4: _____

Child 5: _____ Other: _____

Appendix B. Kembleton Apartments, Steuben Village, and Oneida Homes Resident Demographics (from Housing Visions, Inc. and UMHA applications)

| | <i>Kembleton</i> | <i>Steuben Village</i> | <i>Oneida Homes</i> | <i>Total/Overall</i> |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <i># of Households</i> | 26 | 38 (information does not include 3 of 4 families who moved in July 1, 2006) | 10 | 74 |
| <i>Gender (Head of Household)</i> | Female: 18 Male: 8 | Female: 36 Male: 2 | Female: 2 Male: 8 | Female: 55 Male: 18 |
| <i>Race/Ethnicity (Head of Household)</i> | White: 6 Black: 16 Hispanic: 2 Other: 1 N/A: 1 | White: 3 Black: 26 Hispanic: 8 Asian : 1 | White: 1 Black: 4 Hispanic: 3 Asian : 2 | White: 10 Black: 46 Hispanic: 13 Asian: 3 Other: 1 N/A: 1 |
| <i>Age (Head of Household)</i> | Min: 19 Max: 64 Median: 43 Mean: 40.69 | Min: 21 Max: 71 Median: 37 Mean: 39.5 | Min: 24 Max: 49 Median: 36.5 Mean: 38.3 | Min: 19 Max: 71 Median: Mean: 39.76 |
| <i>Total # of People</i> | 66 | 117 | 31 | 214 |
| <i># of Members in Household</i> | Min: 1 Max: 6 Median: 2 Mean: 2.54 | Min: 1 Max: 7 Median: 3 Mean: 3.08 | Min: 1 Max: 5 Median: 3.5 Mean: 3.1 | Min: 1 Max: 7 Median: 2.5 Mean: 5.71 |
| <i># of Households with Children</i> | 15 | 32 | 7 | 54 |
| <i># of Households with Head of Household age 60+</i> | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 |
| <i># of Children</i> | 36 | 64 | 14 | 113 |
| <i># of Children per Household</i> | Min: 0 Max: 5 Median: 1 Mean: 1.46 | Min: 0 Max: 5 Median: 2 Mean: 1.842 | Min: 0 Max: 3 Median: 1.5 Mean: 1.4 | Min: 0 Max: 5 Median: 1 Mean: 1.65 |
| <i>Age Distribution of Children (as of July 1, 2006)</i> | >5: 7 5-10: 17 11-13: 2 14-18: 9 | >5: 12 5-10: 34 11-13: 9 14-18: 11 | >5: 2 5-10: 10 11-13: 2 14-18: 0 | >5: 21 5-10: 61 11-13: 13 14-18: 20 |
| <i>Household Income (Annual)</i> | Min: \$5,200 Max: \$28,525.13 Median: \$13,821.26 Mean: \$13,302 | Min: \$1,080 Max: \$30,820 Median: \$13,688 Mean: \$13,999 | Min: \$14,365 Max: \$37,726 Median: \$26,500 Mean: \$26,154 | Min: \$1,080 Max: \$37,726 Median: \$14,186.40 Mean: \$15,464 |
| <i>Movement Patterns</i> | From: Outside Target | From: Outside Target | From: Outside Target | From: Outside Target |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Area: 16 Outside Cornhill: 12 Outside City of Utica: 1 Outside Oneida County: 0 | Area: 28 Outside Cornhill: 17 Outside City of Utica: 3 Outside Oneida County: 2 | Area: 7 Outside Cornhill: 6 Outside City of Utica: 0 Outside Oneida County: 0 | Area: 51 Outside Cornhill: 35 Outside City of Utica: 4 Outside Oneida County: 2 |
| <i># of Children Who Moved from Outside Target Area</i> | 31 | 47 | 0 | 78 |
| <i>Ages of Children Who Moved from Outside Target Area</i> | <5: 6 5-10: 14 11-13: 2 14-18: 9 | <5: 11 5-10: 23 11-13: 7 14-18: 6 | <5: 0 5-10: 0 11-13: 0 14-18: 0 | <5: 17 5-10: 37 11-13: 9 14-18: 15 |
| <i># of Residents Unemployed at the Time of Application</i> | 12 | 22 | 0 | 34 |
| <i># of Residents With Anticipated Annual Income Under \$10,000</i> | | | | |

Appendix C. Survey Responses for Demographics Questions

| | <i>Kembleton Apartments</i> | <i>Steuben Village</i> | <i>Oneida Homes</i> | <i>Total/Overall</i> |
|---|---|---|--|----------------------|
| <i>Population Size (# of Households)</i> | 26 | 41 | 10 | |
| <i># of Respondents</i> | 4 | 17 | 4 | |
| <i># of Members in Household</i> | Min: 1 Max: 5 Mean: 2.75 Median: 2.5 | Min: 2 Max: 5 Mean: 3.29 Median: 3 | Min: 3 Max: 5 Mean: 4 Median: 4 | |
| <i># Currently Employed</i> | 2 | 10 | 4 | |
| <i># Currently Employed with More than One Job</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| <i>Status of Employed</i> | Full-time: 2 Part-time: 0 | Full-time: 7 Part-time: 3 | Full-time: 4 Part-time: 0 | |
| <i># Participating in Any Kind of Job Training/Education Program</i> | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| <i># of Households Who Have Received TANF in the Past 6 Months</i> | 1 | 2 (and 1 Pending) | 0 | |
| <i># of Households Receiving Disability Checks/SSI in the Past 6 Months</i> | 2 | 7 | 0 | |
| <i># of Households with Someone Who Received Food Stamps in the Past 6 Months</i> | 3 | 10 | 1 | |
| <i># of Households with Children</i> | 2 | 15 | 4 | |
| <i># of Children in Household</i> | Min: 0 Max: 2 Mean: 1.5 Median: 0.5 | Min: 0 Max: 4 Mean: 2.2 Median: 2 | Min: 1 Max: 3 Mean: 2 Median: 2 | |
| <i>Age Distribution of Children in Household</i> | >5: 1 5-1: 1 11-13: 0 14-18: 1 | >5: 5 5-10: 13 11-13: 4 14-18: 10 | >5: 4 5-10: 3 11-13: 1 14-18: 0 | |
| <i># of Children who</i> | 0 | 1* | 0 | |

| | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|
| <i>Switched to MLK School After Moving</i> | | | | |
| | 3 | | | |
| | 3.75 | | | |
| | 2.75 | | | |
| | 3.25 | | | |

* 2 children started attending school – entered MLK

Appendix D. Resident Satisfaction Survey Questions

Q10. a. Overall, how satisfied are you with the house you live in now?

| Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

b. If anything less than very satisfied, is there anything you would care to tell me about that you are not as satisfied with?

Q11. a. Overall, how satisfied are you with the neighborhood you live in now?

| Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

b. If anything less than very satisfied, is there anything you would care to tell me about that you are not as satisfied with?

Q12. a. Would you say that since you moved your quality-of-life (considering neighborhood, home, safety, etc) has:

| Decreased A lot | Decreased Somewhat | Neither Improved nor Decreased | Somewhat Improved | Improved A lot |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

b. If anything less than very satisfied, is there anything you would care to tell me about that you are not as satisfied with?

Q13. a. Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided to you by Hope VI?

| Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

b. If anything less than very satisfied, is there anything you would care to tell me about that you are not as satisfied with?

Q14. Is there anything that I have not asked you about your neighborhood, home, or quality-of-life that you would like to tell me now?

Appendix E. Survey Responses for Resident Satisfaction Questions

| | <i>Kembleton Apartments</i> | <i>Steuben Village</i> | <i>Oneida Homes</i> | <i>Total/Overall</i> |
|--|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| <i>Satisfaction with Current House</i> | Mean: 3 Median: 3 | Mean: 3.85 Median: 4 | Mean: 4.25 Median: 5 | Mean: 3.78 Median: 4 |
| <i>Responses</i> | no ceiling fans, my house is hot, they want us to buy ceiling fans and they will put them in for us but its too much money, should have had a side door, or back door, only through front | houses could have had more stability, sound proof, can heard a lot, need to be quiet, thin walls, when the wind blows it feels like the house will tip over, placed complaints, bedroom could have had more in it | need assistance to build a garage and build a fence around my house some kind of grant | |
| | its a small place, bedrooms very small, not too much furniture unless you get a small set, can't store in basement, 2 or 3 closets, cannot fit everything, to me its not enough room, since they cleaned up locations, its not bad, rules and regulations in building -some don't make sense, for instance, inspection look at everything. tell you what to clean, my house is not dirty, sometimes I don't have as much time to clean, I'm disabled MHA was up on everything immediately, not as fast as MHA with maintenance | no storms doors, have to keep doors closed, need security for houses, screens don't lock, people can break in to homes, storm doors front and back | No lighting in the street, noise, garbage thrown on my property constantly everyday!! Tired of cleaning not maintain landscaping of my corner home city responsible!! | |
| | sometimes the entrance, the porch outside gets wet, cracks have developed in ceiling since he moved, got carpet on floor, fearful to do more. People who did work seemed to cut corners, windows don't pull out screens keep falling out, kitchen corners seem to be sagging, it's a very decent apartment, like it, could be some room for improvement | wish I could pick up house and take elsewhere | | |
| | structure of the whole | maintenance of the apartment | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| | house in general, walls are thin, house shakes when they run, can hear downstairs | and of the yard work, we have a few problems, puddles of water, nothing done | | |
| | | did not make a back for to the house, sit back on patio, need to carry chairs through the front door, open windows because it is too hot and you go out for a few hours - unable to do so because windows are hard to close, need a man to close, needed to call housing for help, still hard | | |
| | | The only thing I'm not satisfied with is that there is no back door. There is only one entrance and just in case of a fire there should be at least two entrances | | |
| | | Something am satisfied with and something am not. The house is beautiful but something were put together half way and not completed. The 1st couple of months and had to call to have them come out and fix right away | | |
| | | 150% | | |
| | | mailbox repair time, requested a new box (mail) twice since June 1, 2006 mail box was broken at time of viewing and no one mentioned at move in - did that day 6/1/06) | | |
| Satisfaction with Neighborhood | Mean: 3.75 Median: 4 | Mean: 5 Median: 3.85 | Mean: 3.5 Median: 3.5 | Mean: 3.78 Median: 5 |
| Responses | some of the drug addicts gone, still have some drug addicts/alcoholics, not as bad as before, but could be better, it is quiet | neighbors are horrible, not all maybe 2 are very decent, me and a couple neighbors clean up make sure the neighborhood is decent, at this point lowest satisfied, should do inspections a lot more often, neighbors plumbing in basement got messed up | not too much time for relaxation because I have to work and care for the family, above all running for education | |
| | at MHA, raucous and noisy, started to clean, and quieter neighborhood - here is it louder, walls so | a lot of robberies and drug dealing in street, feel insecure when leaving home, no way to top intruders, screens can be | Noisy, Neighbors do not communicate so far | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | thin, can hear sex and snoring, no privacy, had to take apartment because can't climb stairs, not private enough, building next door- can see neighbors house with shades up, can hear everything, no privacy, in this building still have people who do drugs, cut down some, can still cut a lot more drug activity | pushed easily, said built in but not (no storm windows) | | |
| | city seems to have program "weed & seed", police give tickets, I vote in elections, feel penalized because if goes to corner store and parks outside, may get tickets for parking, neighborhood has improved - drugs and loitering have diminished, give tickets indiscriminately, bad elements - trying to hold onto bad habits in neighborhood, had quieted down, its a quiet block, some decent neighbors, no rowdiness/drug trafficking | the area where it is in general | | |
| | the drugs in the lot, want them to buy buildings, just because you change the neighborhood, can't change the neighbors | no privacy in your yard, out in the open, should have own little area | | |
| | | not neighbors in building, on the next street, a lot of loud music | | |
| | | its pretty quiet, no trouble now, at the beginning yes, they don't do nothing anyways | | |
| | | no storm doors, have to keep doors closed, need security for houses, screens don't lock, storms doors front and back, people can break into homes, other than that house is beautiful | | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | a lot of robberies and drug dealing on the street, feel insecure about leaving home, no way to stop intruders, screens can be pushed easily, as if built in but not - no storm windows | | |
| | | Satisfied with everything | | |
| | | very quiet and clean neighbors very friendly and family like aura in the park living home area | | |
| <i>Quality-of-Life</i> | Mean: 2.75 Median: 2.5 | Mean: 3.94 Median: 4 | Mean: 4.33 Median: 4 | Mean: 3.71 Median: 4 |
| <i>Responses</i> | got way worse | everything ties in together with conditions and neighbors, will not renew lease because of birth of child | you make your life by the way you live. A house or car even money cannot change your lifestyle, if you live a care free life. It doesn't matter what lifestyle you like, it will not change. If you got god the father the creator of all things. He make the difference. | |
| | housing is decent save for little things, could be a lot worse, its affordable for me, I feel naturally peace of mind, comfort of apartment building itself - having this allowed me a certain amount of serenity | likes house, feels different living in house instead of project, when alone, scared, no security, cannot add locks, area bothers tremendously, at least storm doors in projects, they would learn how to get in, don't feel safe but love house would not change, go back | Prior street...of Utica was much worse than what I have now! | |
| | | coming from homeowner to this, but thankful | | |
| | | depressed, nothing will change, a lot of pressure because of disability and financial, no one can change situation, must do it for herself | | |
| | | likes house, feels different hear living in instead of project, but when alone, scared, no security, cannot add locks, area bothers tremendously, at least storm doors in projects, here they would learn how to get in, don't feel safe but love house, | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | would not change/go back | | |
| | | only one lock on door due to people twice have tried to come in to my door thinking it's a porch to get bottles or to come in from the rain. There should be 2 locks I think to feel safer for me and my son | | |
| <i>Satisfaction with Services Provided by HOPE VI (Housing Visions Unlimited, for Kembleton Respondents)</i> | Mean: 4 Median: 4 | Mean: 4 Median: 3.82 | Mean: 5 Median: 4.25 | Mean: 3.74 Median: 5 |
| <i>Responses</i> | they come sometimes they take longer to come fix the bathroom when they know you have 2 bc they think you can just use the other one | should check into apartments more | Flooding issues not responsive enough, they started construction on other homes but never completely fixed the livable ones completely! | |
| | maintenance is not fast enough, certain amount of days to pay rent or fines, won't take cash, has a hard time walking, not fair for disabled, getting a money order is physically hard | still waiting on window shade fixed, blinds broken shop first waved in | | |
| | service moves kind of lethargically, problems w/ screens, blew off, screens replace too small - is it worth asking them to come back to fix? They are indifferent | we do not have screen doors, houses put up fast, should have taken the time | | |
| | | they are slow about mowing the lawn but other then that am satisfied now | | |
| | | still waiting on window shade to be fixed, blinds broken since first moved in | | |
| | | maintenance timely repairs as discussed new mail box installed Hope VI made a home visit to say it would be | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | fixed the next day - still no correction | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | need more jobs up here, her husband has a hard time, side doors, no lights in the hallway, stairwell | screening of tenants should be more thorough, thought it was thorough incomes concern, etc for it to seem as thorough as it was, they focus more on money, background, people on block living here, condition of the houses are atrocious, should be more thorough, grown people throw garbage on the lawn that she cleans, love the apartment | I would like to see a neighborhood watch where police patrol more often, not enough. Many homeowners are unsatisfied, too much being done at the same time | |
| | not as expensive, fairly cheap, rent is good, past winter - did not put screen windows, fell out window was down on top, they never showed up to fix it, gas bill sky high, sometimes a lot of problems, its an older house - furnace stops, older building, basement flooded, I don't know what people expect because i am low income but i expect some back from them they have unequal standards | house is good, neighborhood is good | | |
| | its an apartment, its decent, ive seen some that are worse, I don't really have much to complain about, the proverbial cup - I have a lot of gratitude, I'm thankful because it could be worse | wishes for better security, like winning the lottery, pressure on chest, very scared of noises alone, thinks someone is breaking in | | |
| | evaluation to get in, have to do process all over once in to move into new apartment, needs a 3 bedroom, has a 2 bedroom - loses priority, place in list | I love the house, the area...this is the best I have ever done | | |
| | | the storm windows, neighborhood is 2 years old- pushed fan out of window and storm door pushed out- safety issue, backyard is a puddle, submerged with water, no storm doors, no ventilation, a lot of little things that should | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | have been done to make it more comfortable in new apartment, you expect things to be better done, | | |
| | | no screen doors, cannot sit with door open | | |
| | | wishes for better security, feels like she "winning the lottery" but pressure on chest, very scared of noises alone, thinks someone is breaking in | | |
| | | just the locks | | |
| | | I am very satisfied with my home, and right now with my neighborhood. I love it where I live | | |
| | | say no grilling outside, only problem, backyard is so big, gorgeous, this is the only disadvantage, everything else is excellent | | |