

# **NEW PARTNERS IN PUBLIC HOUSING**

## **Evaluation of NYCHA's Triborough Pilot Project**

### **Interim Report**

**June 2018**



# CITIZENS HOUSING & PLANNING COUNCIL

## MISSION

CHPC's mission, since 1937, is to develop and advance practical public policies to support the housing stock of the city by better understanding New York's most pressing housing and neighborhood needs.

## ABOUT US

Our agenda is practical, not political. Our work always begins with questions, not answers. It is the data, our analysis, and its relevance to the real world, that drive our conclusions. Our goal is to help decision-makers, inside and outside of government. We map out realistic steps that can result in positive change for the housing stock and the neighborhoods of New York City.

We are a Council of 90 leading professionals from every industry that shapes housing development and management across the city. CHPC speaks as a trusted and impartial voice to improve housing for all New Yorkers.

Where Experts

Put Practice

Into Policy

**CHPC**  
NEW YORK CITY



# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported by the generous assistance of the Charles H. Revson Foundation, the Deutsche Bank Americas Foundation, and Triborough Preservation Partners.

Special thanks to Anne-Marie Flatley and Sybille Louis of NYCHA, Robert Corso of C+C Apartment Management, and Micheline Blum and Janet Streicher of Baruch College Survey Research for their help designing and facilitating this study. And huge credit to our former colleague Ilene Popkin, whose vision inspired this project.

This study was conducted and authored by CHPC Senior Policy Analyst Neil Reilly.

The report layout was done by CHPC Housing Informatics Designer Dillon Massey.

## CHPC STAFF

**Jessica Katz**, Executive Director

**Sarah Watson**, Deputy Director

**Neil Reilly**, Senior Policy Analyst

**Katherine Leitch**, Policy Analyst

**Dillon Massey**, Housing Informatics Designer

**Vivienne Davis**, Administrative/Program Associate

**Jerilyn Perine**, Senior Policy Fellow

**Yashesh Panchal**, Ginsberg Fellow



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
INTRODUCTION	8
QUANTITATIVE DATA	11
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STAFF INTERVIEWS	14
TENANT SATISFACTION SURVEY	17
NOTES ON STUDY METHODOLOGY	19
APPENDIX 1: PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STAFF INTERVIEW	20
APPENDIX 2: HIGHLIGHTS FROM TENANT SATISFACTION SURVEY	21
APPENDIX 3: DETAILS OF TENANT SATISFACTION SURVEY	27

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In December 2014, the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) transitioned the management of six Section 8 developments comprised of 874 apartments to a new public-private partnership known as Triborough Preservation Partners. This transaction brought in \$80 million for renovations as well as new property management.

As part of the Next Generation NYCHA plan, this pilot was an experiment in making new capital funds available to repair existing buildings and introduce new partners and new property management. This innovative transaction could serve as a model for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)'s Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program.

In early 2015, NYCHA approached the Citizens Housing & Planning Council (CHPC) to design and implement an evaluation of the pilot. CHPC's work is supported by grants from the Charles H. Revson Foundation, the Deutsche Bank Americas Foundation, and Triborough Preservation Partners.

This report details the interim results of our study evaluating this pilot initiative. CHPC compares data from the Triborough buildings to a set of control group properties that are similar in size, resident demographics, and location but continued to be wholly owned and operated by NYCHA throughout the study period.



*Bronxchester during (left) and after (right) renovations. (Photo credit: CHPC/L+M Development Partners)*

To undertake this analysis, CHPC studied information from three sources:

1. Quantitative data from NYCHA and Triborough regarding work orders, energy consumption, turnover, re-rental time, rent collection, and evictions.
2. Property management interviews with staff from NYCHA and Triborough.
3. Tenant Survey of residents from both NYCHA and Triborough buildings (conducted in partnership with Baruch College Survey Research).

**CHPC's research shows that at the Triborough properties:**

- » **The volume of maintenance work orders is down**
- » **Rent collection rates are up**
- » **Energy usage is down**
- » **Apartment turnover rose**
- » **Re-rental time is longer**
- » **Residents are broadly satisfied**

At this interim stage of evaluation, it is clear that the properties participating in this pilot initiative have undergone large-scale improvement.

As a result, pilot group residents are far more positive about their living conditions and their outlook for the future. At the same time, apartment turnover rose at the pilot group and apartment re-rental time took longer than at the control group properties.

The results of the study to date confirm that this pilot has been a success for NYCHA, its private partners, and most importantly, the residents. This innovative policy should serve as a model for the Authority to ensure both the affordability and quality of its housing.

**THE TRIBOROUGH TRANSACTION AT A GLANCE:**

- 874 Units
- 6 Developments
- ~2,000 Tenants

**OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE:**

- 50% Triborough Preservation Partners, 50% NYCHA

**PROPERTY MANAGEMENT:**

- C+C Property Management

**RENOVATION COSTS:**

- ~\$80 million
- ~\$90k per unit

**CAPITAL FINANCING:**

- Tax Exempt Bonds from the NYC Housing Development Corporation
- Low-Income Housing Tax Credits

**OPERATING INCOME SOURCES:**

- Tenant Rent
- Project-Based Section 8 from HUD

# INTRODUCTION

In December 2014, the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) transitioned the management of six Section 8 developments comprised of 874 apartments to a new public-private partnership known as Triborough Preservation Partners. This transaction brought in \$80 million for renovations as well as new property management.

As part of the Next Generation NYCHA plan, this pilot was an experiment in making new capital funds available to repair existing buildings and introduce new partners and new property management. This innovative transaction could serve as a model for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)'s Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program.

In early 2015, NYCHA approached the Citizens Housing & Planning Council (CHPC) to design and implement an evaluation of the pilot. CHPC's work is supported by grants from the Charles H. Revson Foundation, the Deutsche Bank Americas Foundation, and Triborough Preservation Partners.

This report details the interim results of our study evaluating this pilot initiative. CHPC compares data from the Triborough buildings to a set of control group properties that are similar in size, resident demographics, and location but continued to be wholly owned and operated by NYCHA throughout the study period.

This study evaluates the impact of the changes in the operation of the buildings over the following three time periods:

Baseline: 12-month period prior to the transfer to Triborough management (January 2014 through December 2014). During this period, all buildings in this study were under NYCHA management.

Interim: 12-month period after transfer of management, during which construction work was ongoing (January 2016 through December 2016)<sup>1</sup>

Final: 12-month period after the completion of construction work (June 2017 through May 2018)

---

<sup>1</sup> The interim period was initially designed to be a 12-month period (January through December 2016) immediately preceding the final period. Because the construction work at the pilot buildings took longer than anticipated, the start of the final period has been delayed accordingly. Also, note that at the time this report was compiled, the quantitative data for the interim period encompassed the twelve months of the interim period, from January through December 2016.





The six buildings included in this pilot program (henceforth the “pilot group,” which contains 874 apartments) were the following:

- Bronxchester Houses, 510 East 156<sup>th</sup> Street, Bronx
- Milbank-Frawley, 1780 Madison Avenue, Manhattan
- East 120<sup>th</sup> Street, 438 East 120<sup>th</sup> Street, Manhattan
- Campos Plaza I, 635 East 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Manhattan
- East 4<sup>th</sup> Street Rehab, 277 East 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Manhattan
- Saratoga Square, 55 Saratoga Avenue, Brooklyn

CHPC worked with NYCHA to identify a control group comprised of properties that are similar in terms of size, resident demographics, and location. The control group properties, which contain 770 apartments, are listed in order corresponding with their respective pilot group buildings:

- Murphy, 1010 East 178<sup>th</sup> Street, Bronx
- Park Ave-East 122<sup>nd</sup>-123<sup>rd</sup> Street, 120 East 123<sup>rd</sup> Street, Manhattan
- Jefferson, 335 East 111<sup>th</sup> Street, Manhattan
- Campos Plaza II, 643 East 13<sup>th</sup> Street, Manhattan
- Lower East Side Rehab (Group 5), 89 Avenue C, Manhattan
- Palmetto Gardens, 85 Palmetto Street, Brooklyn



*A renovated bathroom in an apartment at Bronxchester. (Photo Credit: CHPC)*

The goals of this study are:

1. Confirm/test the assumption that a large investment in capital improvements (in this case approximately \$90k per unit) will improve building conditions in comparison to the control group.
2. Gain an understanding of management practices that affect the physical, financial, and social conditions of the buildings on an ongoing basis.
3. Create a model that NYCHA can use when evaluating similar transfers in the future, including its Permanent Affordability Commitment Together program.

This Interim Report provides progress on the work completed to date, which includes collecting quantitative data on building performance and management, interviews with the property management staff, and a survey of residents.

# QUANTITATIVE DATA

CHPC worked with Triborough and NYCHA to arrange metrics that would track the physical and financial conditions of the buildings. This involved some “translation” between the two parties, as they use different property management software and, more importantly, have different systems of management altogether.

There is one limitation to keep in mind regarding the quantitative results we present here: the six-building pilot and control groups make for very small sample sizes.

We examined data submitted by Triborough and NYCHA on work orders, rent collection, tenant turnover, re-rental time, and energy consumption.

## Work orders

The most straightforward comparison of the levels of maintenance at the two groups of buildings is the volume of work order requests. One noteworthy fact from the interim period was the difference between the volume of work orders.

**At the control buildings, there were 12,023 work orders, compared with just 2,109 at the pilot buildings.**

The following chart demonstrates the volume of work orders for the two groups during the interim period.

Work orders	
	Interim period (January - December 2016)
Pilot group (Triborough)	2,109
Control group (NYCHA)	12,023

## Elevator repairs

The repair of elevators was of particular interest. Elevators were either repaired or replaced at each of the pilot buildings as part of the scope of capital repairs to the building. Accordingly, there were just three elevator repairs in the interim period—all at Bronxchester. Meanwhile, the control buildings had 304 elevator-related work orders.

Elevator Work Orders		
Interim period (January - December 2016)	# of work orders	Average days to complete work order
Pilot group (Triborough)	3	< 1 day
Control group (NYCHA)	304	< 1 day

## Rent collection

Clear differences emerged between the pilot and control groups in terms of rent collection. The pilot and control groups had similar rates of rent delinquency during the baseline period. However, those rates went in opposite directions during the interim period: the pilot group experienced a huge decrease in percentage of rent not collected, the control group's rate nearly doubled.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> At both the pilot and control groups, some tenants experienced rent increases. This could affect rent delinquency. We will examine this issue in greater detail in our final report.

	Baseline period (January - December 2014)				Interim period (January - December 2016)			
	% dollars due not collected	% households in arrears	# of evictions (total # units)	% households evicted	% dollars due not collected	% households in arrears	# of evictions (total # units)	% households evicted
Pilot group (Triborough)	15%	(not available)	2 evictions (874 total units)	0.23%	3%	4%	7 evictions (874 total units)	1.03%
Control group (NYCHA)	12%	(not available)	4 evictions (770 total units)	0.52%	22%	26%	2 evictions (770 total units)	0.26%



## Tenant turnover & re-rental time

Data for the pilot group showed an increase in both the percent of apartments that turned over and the average time to re-rent vacant units.

A caveat for this section of analysis is that some buildings in both pilot and control groups went several months, or an entire year, with no turnover, resulting in small sample sizes.

Apartment re-rental time		
Interim period (January - December 2016)	% units turned over	# days to re-rent units
Pilot group (Triborough)	6%	99 days
Control group (NYCHA)	2%	44 days

## Energy consumption

The pilot buildings experienced notable decreases in energy usage in the interim period. It is also worth noting that the pilot group was starting from a much lower monthly per-unit usage and still managed to achieve significant reductions.

Change in monthly energy usage from baseline to interim period		
Energy type	Pilot group	Control group
Electric (kWh)	-25%	+4%
Gas heat (therms)	-18%	+69%
Oil heat (gallons)	n/a*	-28%
Steam heat (Mlbs)	-34%	-34%

\*1 property in the pilot group (Bronxchester) was previously heated by oil but switched to gas heat during the study period.

# PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STAFF INTERVIEWS

The second phase of the study began in the spring of 2016, as CHPC visited the properties for an interview with the on-site managers at NYCHA and C+C Apartment Management, the subsidiary of L+M Development Partners that now manages the pilot group buildings. In all, CHPC conducted nine interviews: five with NYCHA and four with C+C. Each interviewee received the same set of questions (see Appendix 1 for the questionnaire). They included the same set of questions as at the control buildings, with some features reversed—for example, instead of asking whether the respondent had ever worked in private management, the question asked whether the respondent had ever worked at NYCHA.

The goal of these interviews was to learn more about the management processes than the quantitative data could tell us. CHPC understood that changes in operations and management would accompany the physical renovations as part of the pilot initiative. As with the quantitative component of our study, the aim for these interviews was to touch on physical needs of the buildings, financial management, and tenant-management relations. We also gathered some information about the buildings and managers to give context to the interviews that development-level quantitative data cannot provide.

The differences that emerged—both between the pilot and control group managers, but also within them—highlighted the fact that although both NYCHA and Triborough have extensive policies and procedures in place, their daily operations are the responsibility of real people.



*The roof under renovation at Campos I, a 269-unit building in Manhattan (Photo Credit: CHPC)*

## Management Interviews: Pilot Group

CHPC conducted four interviews with C+C Apartment Management. These meetings were done in person in July 2016. One meeting included three C+C staff at the company's main office; two meetings were with on-site property managers; and one meeting was with the General Manager responsible for the entire portfolio of pilot buildings.

These interviews ranged from roughly 45 to 75 minutes, including walking tours at Bronxchester and Saratoga. Among this group of interviews, the one at the C+C offices is an outlier. It differs in that it was not a one-on-one conversation. To what extent that affected or steered the conversation is unclear, though probably insignificant, but it is worth mentioning here. Each participant had a unique perspective on the management process.

One interviewee was bullish on C+C's progress. "This building is a good representation of what we've done," he explained, as it showed a strong ability to organize and prioritize work, and to relate to staff and residents. Belief in the company's mission was apparent and pervasive among staff.

Three major takeaways emerged from the C+C management interviews. First, their experience in housing management was, in addition to being extensive, varied in terms of geographic location and employer. Second, their understanding of management processes and rules was uniform. And third, staffing levels only came up once as a complaint about management processes at C+C.

Main office staff at C+C felt it was clear that the responsibility for maintaining supplies, purchasing, and budgets primarily rested with them. That sense of balance between autonomy and centralized control of management practices stood in contrast to the control group interviews.

## Management Interviews: Control Group

CHPC conducted interviews with on-site managers at the control-group buildings in May 2016. There were a total of five interviews, since one property manager was in charge of overseeing both Campos II and Lower East Side Rehab (Group 5).

The interviews at the NYCHA properties ranged in duration from 20 minutes to over an hour. They were all based on an identical set of questions (again, available in Appendix 1) and took place in the property management offices at the respective developments.

In general, the management staff displayed a consistently high level of familiarity with NYCHA management processes and parlance. The front-office staff of the five management offices also varied in terms of promptness, friendliness, and the level of formality they exhibited with colleagues, tenants, and visitors.

Over the course of the conversations, the interviewees themselves demonstrated interest in and focus on differing pieces of their work. Some had stronger interpersonal skills than others—including one who explained that he has no trouble with tenant relations because he is "not afraid to get in people's face."

The concept of arriving at work and immediately being beset with a backlog of urgent requests to respond to was a common theme. This task, which was not surprising given the scale of the work requests in this study, was, in the staff's views, exacerbated by a perpetual shortage of staff and materials.



These long-serving property managers expressed frustrations with items like sending reports to supervisors or sharing maintenance staff with other developments. There was some interest in change. Specifically, the desire for more autonomy on budgeting decisions was a common theme, but interviewees were unable to suggest specific reforms.

Finally, the managers had widely divergent opinions on the authority's new "Optimal Property Management Operating Model" (OPMOM), now known as NextGenOperations. Some were skeptical, others took a wait-and-see approach, and one interviewee stressed having volunteered to participate in the rollout of OPMOM.



*Remodeled kitchen at Saratoga Square (Photo Credit: CHPC)*



# TENANT SATISFACTION SURVEY

In the summer of 2016, CHPC retained Baruch College Survey Research for a survey of the residents at the pilot and control buildings. The survey occurred in the fall of 2016. A summary of highlights that BCSR prepared is available as Appendix 2. The full survey and responses are available in Appendix 3. The survey, conducted by phone, intended to capture the perception of tenants regarding the condition of their apartments, their buildings, their neighborhoods, and how these have changed since the time of the transfer. Survey staff made up to six attempts to call each household, at various times of day, and were allowed to take responses from any adult who lived in the apartment.

As the introduction to BCSR's highlights report says,

*The survey was designed to assess whether improvements to [the treatment buildings] is having a positive impact on resident perceptions of their homes. [Pilot group] residents (n = 188) were compared with a similar [control group] (n = 241) population.*

*[Pilot group] residents' ratings of their housing surpassed, mostly by very wide margins, those of [control group] residents, on almost every measure!*

*Positive views of [pilot group] residents about specific conditions, safety, repairs, and management extended to their overall assessment of living in their buildings and their willingness to recommend it to friends or family. [Control group] residents were less enthusiastic.*

The 50 survey questions fell into nine distinct topic areas:

1. Living conditions: inside the apartment and building
2. Grounds: the immediate surrounding area of the building
3. Safety: inside the apartment, inside the building, at the building entrance, and related to security staff
4. Management: interaction with and responsiveness of building management staff
5. Emergency repairs: frequency called, timeliness of repair, completeness of repair
6. Non-emergency repairs: frequency called, timeliness of repair, completeness of repair, convenience of repair scheduling
7. Neighbors and quality of life: good neighbors, building improvement vs. decline, value for rent
8. Overall assessment: how good a place to live or raise a family, likelihood to recommend to friends or family
9. Having an internet connection or device used to access internet

The differences in responses were stark on most topics. The consistent gap between control group and pilot group residents throughout the survey shows that the treatment group residents clearly have a brighter outlook. One of the more telling questions was whether respondents would recommend their building to friends or family. Eighty-three percent of pilot group residents replied that they would, 29 percentage points more than control group residents.

Residents were also asked whether they had plans to move—a question of particular interest for NYCHA as it pursues building conversions under the federal Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. At the pilot group, 18 percent indicated plans to move, notably less than the 34 percent at the control group who said the same.

Perceived safety was one of the most clear-cut areas of difference. The gaps in responses between the two groups extended to a question about whether cameras are in the right places and a straightforward evaluation of whether the front door lock is in good working order, a fundamental aspect of building security.

One note regarding the survey results is that the group of pilot group residents who participated in the survey had a larger percentage of seniors, were at lower income levels, and were less likely to have a college education than the control group residents who participated. The pilot group respondents, being older, were much more likely to be retired.

The one area in which responses from control group residents reflected a more positive outlook than the pilot group respondents was in internet access. Control group residents reported to have internet access (including by smartphone) at a higher rate than those in pilot group buildings, by a 61 to 54 percent margin.



*Hallway renovation underway in Milbank-Frawley, an 80-unit building in Manhattan (Photo Credit: CHPC)*

# NOTES ON STUDY METHODOLOGY

There were two aspects of the study where our approach changed as the study progressed: the collection of public safety and crime data; and the timing of the results of the study itself.

The original design of the study called for an analysis of both the residents' perceptions of crime and of actual crime data. Only the first was possible for this interim report at the time the data was gathered. With this in mind, it was critical to include a measure of residents' perceptions of security in the tenant survey, which is detailed above.<sup>3</sup>

The collection of quantitative data for this study has been the leading source of delay in the release of this interim report.

Finally, as mentioned earlier, the timeline of the study will be extended by five months. This is because we wanted, for data collection purposes, the "final" phase to begin when construction work at the pilot buildings was complete. Because the construction ended in May 2017, rather than December 2016 as originally anticipated, the final phase will run from June 2017 through May 2018.

---

<sup>3</sup> It would be interesting to compare the residents' perceptions of crime with statistics of crimes occurring at or near the buildings in this study. Whereas a decrease in crime would certainly be welcome news, attributing any change directly to the Section 8 Recap pilot would be difficult.

# APPENDIX 1: PROPERTY MANAGEMENT STAFF INTERVIEW

NYCHA—Triborough Evaluation

Building Management

Date:

Location:

Thanks for participating! Your input is crucial to our understanding of property management at NYCHA. The Authority has asked CHPC to do this work and we look forward to presenting the first component of our analysis later this year. The full report of our work will be complete in early 2018.

We want to make sure that you feel completely free to discuss the topics of building management and tenant relations. To that end, please be assured that this conversation will remain anonymous. We will compile the responses from you and your colleagues at other properties to find common themes. But at no point will any comment be attributed to an individual person, building, or development.

- 
- » How many buildings and units do you manage here?
    - » How many people work in property management here?
  - » How much of your time gets spent on managing the property vs. your staff vs. your managers?
  - » What are the most common issues you deal with on a daily basis?
  - » How do you approach the financial stability of each building? Or is this on a development-level basis?
  - » Should you have more control over your budgets?
  - » What parts of the current system/process of management work best for you?
  - » How is the approach for emergency issues different from non-emergencies?
    - » How is the urgency of a work order scored?
  - » Is rent collection/arrears an issue here? Has that changed in recent years?
  - » If you could change three things about the building management process, what would they be?
  - » What is your sense of tenant-management relations?
    - » How do you think capital issues affect tenant satisfaction?
  - » How long have you managed NYCHA properties in total?
    - » How long at this particular property?
    - » Have you worked in property management elsewhere?

# APPENDIX 2:

## HIGHLIGHTS FROM TENANT SATISFACTION SURVEY

### Highlights from the Survey of Triborough and NYCHA Public Housing Residents: 4Q 2016

The survey was designed to assess whether improvements to Triborough Housing is having a positive impact on resident perceptions of their homes. Triborough residents (n=188) were compared with a similar NYCHA (n=241) population.

- Triborough residents' ratings of their housing surpassed, mostly by very wide margins, those of NYCHA residents, on almost every measure!

Positives views of Triborough residents about specific conditions, safety, repairs, and management extended to their overall assessment of living in their buildings and their willingness to recommend it to friends or family. NYCHA residents were less enthusiastic.

- There are notable demographic differences between Triborough and NYCHA Housing survey respondents. The main differences are by age with Triborough being older (Age 65+- Triborough 50%; NYCHA 34%) and NYCHA younger (Age 50-64 Triborough 23%; NYCHA 33%) and employment status (Retirees -Triborough 42%; NYCHA 27%). There are important differences between Triborough and NYCHA residents among the youngest age group of 18-28 year olds\*. NYCHA 18-29 years olds are substantially more negative than Triborough their Triborough counterparts across many measures including all those related to housing conditions and grounds, feeling safe in their building, management, handling of emergency repairs, and their future plans.

\* The samples are very small for 18-29 years: Triborough n=10 and NYCHA n=16.

- The respondents in both populations were primarily Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic. The Triborough sample only includes 1 Non-Hispanic White and 7 Asian residents from a population of 26 Non—Hispanic Whites and 94 Asians, respectively. The NYCHA sample includes 11 Non-Hispanic Whites and 3 Asians from a population of 29 Non-Hispanic Whites and 58 Asians, respectively. The survey was not offered in Mandarin or Cantonese.
  - It will be important to temper, to some extent, interpretation of some survey results (e.g., Internet) considering these demographic differences.

Presented below are the questions, with those in which Triborough's ratings FAR EXCEEDED NYCHA highlighted. The positive scores are compared.

- I. **CONDITIONS** - all ratings of Triborough Housing conditions outpaced that of NYCHA. Triborough residents' ratings of their own apartments, the overall building, and elevators were 2:1 or more positive than those of NYCHA residents by at least 2:1.

	<b>Triborough</b>	<b>NYCHA</b>
1. Conditions inside apartment	83%	46%
2. Condition of kitchen	84%	56%
3. Condition of bathroom	78%	50%
4. Overall condition of the building	85%	32%
5. Overall condition of the building elevators	68%	31%

- II. **GROUND**S – While Triborough Housing residents have a more positive rating of the grounds, it is the words they use to describe the grounds that truly differentiate them from NYCHA. Triborough residents see the grounds as clean, beautiful, and inviting. While some NYCHA residents see their grounds as clean, almost an equal percent say the grounds are dirty, and others describe the grounds as gloomy or bare.

	<b>Triborough</b>	<b>NYCHA</b>
6. Conditions of the grounds	88%	49%
<b>7. One word that best describes the grounds:</b>		
• Clean	54%	32%
• Dirty	5%	31%
• Inviting	14%	7%
• Beautiful	19%	1%
• Boring	3%	7%
• Gloomy	0%	10%
• Bare	1%	8%

- III. **SAFETY**– 9 in 10 or more Triborough residents feel safe in their apartments and building. The majority feel very safe (65% very safe in apartment and 50% very safe in building). In contrast, only 37% of NYCHA residents feel very safe in their apartments, and only 1 in 5 feel very safe in their building or in areas around their building.

	<b>Triborough</b>	<b>NYCHA</b>
12. Feel safe in apartment – very/somewhat	92% (65%/27%)	77% (37%/40%)
13. Feel safe in the building – very/somewhat	90% (50%/40%)	57% (21%/36%)
14. Feel safe in area around building – very/somewhat	82% (26%/56%)	60% (20%/39%)
15. Security cameras in building (Y/N)	92%	58%
16. Lighting in good working order	91%	83%
17. Front door lock in good working order	75%	33%
18. Camera in right places to provide security	86%	63%
19. Lighting bright enough to make you feel safe	95%	83%
20. Security guard in the development (Y/N)	86%	6%
21. Guard attentive (Y/N)	82%	71%*

\*Note: only 6% of NYCHA resident's indicated that there was a security guard. The 71% saying that the guard is attentive is only among that 6%.

- IV. MANAGEMENT** – Beyond the substantial difference between Triborough and NYCHA, perceptions of NYCHA residents about their management are a serious concern. 56% have a negative view of management, about a third to not think their management is responsive or courteous, and a full 50% say they management does a poor job in handling emergencies.

	<b>Triborough</b>	<b>NYCHA</b>
22. Day to day building management	86%	39%
23. Responsiveness of building management	86%	55%
24. Building management courteous	90%	62%
25. Managing of emergencies or crisis	77%	41%

- V. EMERGENCY REPAIRS**– While C+C Management was far more responsive to emergency maintenance or repair calls than was NYCHA, there is some room to improve. Triborough residents reported fewer emergency repair calls than residents of NYCHA, which may be part be attributed to the recent upgrades to the kitchens, elevators and grounds at Triborough.
- 45% of Triborough residents never called for an emergency repair versus 20% of NYCHA residents. 48% of NYCHA residents called 3 or more times compared with 20% of Triborough residents.
  - 24% of Triborough housing residents had their repairs made within one hour, and another 31% within a day. By comparison only 5% of NYCHA residents had their repairs made within an hour, and another 27% within a day.
  - 18% of emergencies reported by NYCHA residents were never repaired, compared with 8% reported by Triborough residents.

	<b>Triborough</b>	<b>NYCHA</b>
27. Emergency repairs made within two days	73%	47%
28. Quality of most recent emergency repair	78%	57%



**VI. NON- EMERGENCY REPAIRS**– As was true for emergency repairs, C+C Management was more responsive to non-emergency maintenance or repair calls than was NYCHA.

- 51% of Triborough residents never called for about a non-emergency repair versus 33% of NYCHA residents. 38% of NYCHA residents called 3 or more times compared with 16% of Triborough residents.
- 17% of Triborough housing residents had their repairs made within one hour, and another 38% within a day. By comparison, only 6% of NYCHA residents had their repairs made within an hour, and another 23% within a day.
- 21% of non-emergencies reported by NYCHA residents were never repaired, compared with 12% reported by Triborough residents.

	<b>Triborough</b>	<b>NYCHA</b>
30. Non-emergency repairs made within two days	70%	45%
31. Quality of most recent non-emergency repair	87%	58%
32. Convenient Scheduling of Repairs	74%	63%

**VII. NEIGHBORS AND PLANS**– Both Triborough and NYCHA residents like their neighbors. Triborough residents overwhelmingly see that living their building has improved over the last two years, and they are more optimistic than NYCHA residents about the future in their building.

	<b>Triborough</b>	<b>NYCHA</b>
8. Good neighbors Y/N	77%	73%
9. Building better / worse over the past two years	72%/6%	11%/27%
10. Expectation for better/worse over next two years	64%/4%	33%/16%
11. Right direction or Wrong Direction	85%/6%	44%/41%
34. Value for Rent Paid	92%	65%
36. Plans to move Y/N	18%	34%

- VIII. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF HOUSING**– Despite their lower ratings on important dimensions of housing, both NYCHA as well as Triborough think their building is a great or pretty good place to live. However, the more positive views of Triborough residents are reflected in their assessments of their buildings as a great or good place to raise a family and their willingness to recommend the building to a friend or family member.

	<b>Triborough</b>	<b>NYCHA</b>
33. New Yorkers perception of NYCHA residents	43%	27%
37. Description of building as a great/pretty good place to live	95% (18%/77%)	94% (34%/60%)
38. Great/Pretty good place to raise a family	73% (27%/46%)	38% (7%/31%)
39. Likely to recommend building to friend or family	83%	54%

- IX. INTERNET PENETRATION**- There is a slightly higher internet penetration among NYCHA residents that probably is due to having a slightly younger resident population: 54% of Triborough residents have an internet connection versus 61% of NYCHA residents.

# APPENDIX 3: DETAILS OF TENANT SATISFACTION SURVEY

## CHPC TOPLINE 2016

Triborough n=188 and NYCHA  
n=241, unless otherwise noted.

Due to rounding some percentages  
will not equal 100%.

Question		Triborough n	NYCHA n
1.	How would you rate the overall conditions inside your apartment?	Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
	1. Excellent	32%	8%
	2. Good	51%	38%
	3. Not so good	14%	36%
	4. Poor	2%	17%
	8. Not sure	1%	1%
	9. Refused	—	—
2.	How would you rate the overall condition of your kitchen?	Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
	1. Excellent	28%	10%
	2. Good	56%	46%
	3. Not so good	11%	29%
	4. Poor	3%	14%
	8. Not sure	—	1%
	9. Refused	2%	1%

3. How would you rate the overall condition of your bathroom?		Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
1. Excellent		26%	10%
2. Good		52%	40%
3. Not so good		12%	29%
4. Poor		9%	19%
8. Not sure		1%	0
9. Refused		0	1%
4. How would you rate the overall condition of your building?		Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
1. Excellent		33%	5%
2. Good		52%	27%
3. Not so good		13%	34%
4. Poor		2%	31%
8. Not sure		0	1%
9. Refused		—	2%
5. How would you rate the overall condition of the building elevators?		Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
1. Excellent		26%	4%
2. Good		42%	27%
3. Not so good		19%	38%
4. Poor		12%	29%
8. Not sure		1%	1%
9. Refused		—	—

6. How would you rate the overall condition of the grounds?	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Excellent	34%	6%
2. Good	54%	43%
3. Not so good	8%	31%
4. Poor	3%	17%
8. Not sure	1%	3%
9. Refused	—	1%
7. Which ONE of the following words best describes the grounds:	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Inviting	14%	7%
2. Beautiful	19%	1%
3. Clean	54%	32%
4. Gloomy	0%	10%
5. Bare	1%	8%
6. Dirty	5%	31%
7. Boring	3%	7%
8. Not sure	2%	4%
9. Refused	0	—
8. Do you consider most of the residents in your building to be good neighbors?	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Yes	77%	73%
2. No	15%	21%
8. Not sure	7%	5%
9. Refused	1%	1%

		Triborough	NYCHA
9. Thinking back over the past 2 years, has living in your building:		n=188	n=241
1. Gotten better		72%	11%
2. Gotten worse		6%	27%
3. Stayed about the same		19%	56%
4. Have not lived in building for 2 years		3%	3%
8. Not sure		—	3%
9. Refused		—	—
10. Over the next 2 years, do you expect that living in your building will:		Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
1. Get better		64%	33%
2. Get worse		4%	16%
3. Will stay about the same		25%	42%
8. Not sure		6%	9%
9. Refused		—	0
11. In general do you think (NYCHA OR C+C Housing) is moving in the right direction or in the wrong direction?		Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
1. Right direction		86%	44%
2. Wrong track		6%	41%
8. Not sure		7%	15%
9. Refused		1%	0
12. How safe do you feel in your apartment?		Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
1. Very safe		65%	37%
2. Somewhat safe		27%	40%
3. Not so safe		7%	15%
4. Not at all safe		—	6%
8. Not sure		—	1%
9. Refused		1%	1%

		Triborough	NYCHA
13. How safe do you feel in your building?		n=188	n=241
1. Very safe		50%	21%
2. Somewhat safe		40%	36%
3. Not so safe		8%	25%
4. Not at all safe		1%	17%
8. Not sure		1%	1%
9. Refused		0	0
14. How safe do you feel in the immediate area around your building?		Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
1. Very safe		26%	20%
2. Somewhat safe		56%	39%
3. Not so safe		11%	25%
4. Not at all safe		4%	13%
8. Not sure		3%	1%
9. Refused		—	0
15. Are there security cameras in your building?		Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
1. Yes		92%	58%
2. No		3%	32%
8. Not sure		4%	9%
9. Refused		0	0

16. In general, is the lighting in your building in good working order?	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Always	76%	54%
2. Most of the time	15%	29%
3. Some of the time	8%	11%
4. Rarely	1%	4%
5. Never	—	2%
8. Not sure	—	0
9. Refused	—	0
17. In general, is the front door lock in your building in good working order?	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Always	58%	11%
2. Most of the time	17%	22%
3. Some of the time	12%	40%
4. Rarely	4%	16%
5. Never	7%	10%
8. Not sure	1%	0
9. Refused	1%	1%
18. Are the cameras in the right places to provide security?	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=176	n=138
1. Yes	86%	63%
2. No	6%	22%
8. Not sure	7%	15%
9. Refused	—	—



<b>19.</b>	<b>Is the lighting in the hallways and stairwells bright enough to make you feel safe?</b>	Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
	1. Yes	95%	83%
	2. No	4%	16%
	8. Not sure	0	1%
	9. Refused	—	—
<b>20.</b>	<b>Is there a security guard in your development?</b>	Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
	1. Yes	86%	6%
	2. No	13%	91%
	8. Not sure	1%	3%
	9. Refused	—	—
<b>21.</b>	<b>Is the security guard attentive?</b>	Triborough n=168	NYCHA n=17
	1. Yes	82%	71%
	2. No	10%	17%
	8. Not sure	7%	12%
	9. Refused	1%	—
<b>22.</b>	<b>Would you say the day-to-day management of your building is:</b>	Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
	1. Excellent	39%	6%
	2. Good	48%	33%
	3. Not so good	9%	34%
	4. Poor	3%	22%
	8. Not sure	1%	5%
	9. Refused	—	0

<b>23.</b>	<b>How responsive is your building's management to your questions and concerns?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		56%	19%
		30%	36%
		6%	18%
		3%	18%
		4%	8%
		0	2%
		Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		66%	28%
		24%	34%
		4%	19%
		2%	13%
		5%	6%
		1%	—
<b>25.</b>	<b>How would you rate your building's management of emergencies or crises?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		31%	10%
		45%	31%
		14%	29%
		3%	21%
		6%	9%
		1%	—

26.	<b>Over the last year, how many times have you called for emergency maintenance or repairs?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		16%	11%
		16%	20%
		11%	13%
		5%	6%
		4%	29%
		45%	20%
		2%	1%
		—	0
27.	<b>Thinking of your most recent emergency, how quickly were the emergency repairs made?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=109	n=196
		24%	5%
		31%	27%
		18%	15%
		9%	13%
		9%	18%
		8%	18%
		2%	4%
		—	1%
28.	<b>How would you rate the quality of the most recent emergency repair?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=103	n=159
		38%	15%
		40%	42%
		10%	23%
		9%	18%
		2%	2%
		0	1%

29.	<b>Over the last year, how many times have you called for NON-emergency maintenance or repairs?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		17%	11%
		14%	16%
		4%	14%
		8%	7%
		4%	17%
		51%	33%
		2%	3%
		—	—
30.	<b>On your most recent call, how quickly were the non-emergency repairs made?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=86	n=161
		17%	6%
		38%	23%
		15%	16%
		13%	21%
		2%	11%
		12%	21%
		3%	2%
		—	—
31.	<b>How would you rate the quality of the most recent non-emergency repair?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=75	n=127
		24%	20%
		64%	39%
		9%	26%
		2%	12%
		—	2%
		1%	1%

<b>32.</b>	<b>Are non-emergency repairs scheduled at convenient hours for you?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=86	n=161
		53%	33%
		21%	30%
		11%	15%
		12%	17%
		3%	4%
		—	1%
<b>33.</b>	<b>What do you think is the impression that other New Yorkers have of NYCHA residents?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		19%	4%
		24%	23%
		5%	7%
		16%	21%
		16%	31%
		19%	13%
<b>34.</b>	<b>Based on what you pay in rent, do you think your apartment is:</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		28%	19%
		64%	47%
		3%	12%
		2%	17%
		2%	3%
		1%	2%

35. How long have you lived in your building?	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Less than one year	4%	2%
2. 1-2 years	5%	5%
3. 3-5 years	19%	12%
4. 6-10 years	17%	17%
5. 11-15 years	12%	14%
6. 16-20 years	12%	11%
7. More than 20 years	29%	36%
8. Not sure	1%	1%
9. Refused	1%	1%
36. Do you hope to move in the next two years?	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Yes	18%	34%
2. No	77%	60%
8. Not sure	4%	6%
9. Refused	1%	1%
37. Overall, how would you describe your building as a place to live?	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. A great place to live	18%	34%
2. A pretty good place to live	77%	60%
3. A second rate place to live	—	—
4. A terrible place to live	—	—
8. Not sure	4%	6%
9. Refused	1%	1%

38.	<b>Overall, how do you feel about your building as a place to raise a family?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		27%	7%
		46%	31%
		14%	33%
		3%	20%
		6%	6%
		3%	3%
39.	<b>How likely would you recommend living in your building to a friend or family member?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		58%	21%
		25%	33%
		7%	11%
		7%	28%
		1%	4%
		1%	3%
40.	<b>Do you (or anyone in your household) have access to the Internet in your apartment (including by smartphone)?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
		54%	61%
		43%	36%
		1%	1%
		2%	2%

<b>41.</b>	<b>How do you (or anyone living in your household) access the Internet in your home? <i>Please check all that apply.</i></b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=100	n=144
	1. Through a high-speed internet subscription	82%	82%
	2. Through a smartphone data plan	55%	52%
	3. Through a dial-up connection	13%	16%
	4. Through Wi-Fi based outside of your home	21%	22%
	5. Other: _____	2%	5%
	8. Not sure	7%	1%
	9. Refused	2%	1%
<b>42.</b>	<b>Which devices do you (or anyone living in your household) use to access the Internet in your home? <i>Accept multiple responses.</i></b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=100	n=144
	1. Smart phone	63%	63%
	2. Desktop computer	47%	40%
	3. Laptop, Notebook, or Netbook	60%	47%
	4. Tablet	45%	41%
	5. Gaming console	25%	18%
	6. Smart TV or device that connects TV to the Internet	26%	29%
	7. Other: _____	3%	—
	8. Not sure	2%	1%
	9. Refused	5%	2%
<b>43.</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
	1. 18-29	6%	6%
	2. 30-49	18%	22%
	3. 50-64	23%	33%
	4. 65 and over	50%	34%
	8. Not sure	—	—
	9. Refused	3%	5%



	Triborough	NYCHA
<b>44. Are you of Hispanic or Latino descent?</b>	n=188	n=241
1. Yes	47%	53%
2. No	48%	41%
8. Not sure	2%	1%
9. Refused	3%	5%
<b>45. Which of the following best represents your race?</b>	Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
1. White	15%	26%
2. Black or African-American	44%	34%
3. Asian	12%	3%
4. Something else (specify): _____	14%	20%
8. Not sure	5%	6%
9. Refused	10%	10%
<b>46. What is the highest grade of school you completed?</b>	Triborough n=188	NYCHA n=241
1. Grade school	16%	14%
2. Some high school	20%	16%
3. High school graduate	32%	24%
4. Some college – Associate Degree	18%	26%
5. College Graduate – Bachelor Degree	5%	9%
6. More than college	2%	4%
8. Not sure	2%	2%
9. Refused	6%	5%

47.	Are you currently employed? If “Yes,” ask: “Full time or part-time?” If “No,” ask: “Are you a student, a homemaker, retired, or unemployed and looking for work?”	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
	1. Yes, full time	15%	21%
	2. Yes, part time	10%	15%
	3. Student	3%	1%
	4. Homemaker	12%	4%
	5. Retired	42%	27%
	6. Unemployed, looking for work	4%	6%
	7. Volunteer	—	1%
	8. Disabled	9%	16%
	77. Not sure	0	2%
	88. Refused	4%	5%
48.	How many children are under age eighteen and currently living in your household?	Triborough	NYCHA
		n=188	n=241
	0. None	66%	67%
	1. One	14%	12%
	2. Two	7%	10%
	3. Three	4%	3%
	4. Four	1%	2%
	5. Five	1%	—
	6. Six	2%	0
	7. Seven or more	1%	—
	8. Not sure	0	—
	9. Refused	4%	4%

49. If you added together the yearly income of all the members of your family living at home last year, would the total be:	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Less than \$30,000	68%	59%
2. \$30,000 to \$50,000	12%	15%
3. \$50,000 to \$100,000	1%	4%
4. More than \$100,000	—	2%
8. Not sure	9%	10%
9. Refused	10%	10%

Gender	Triborough	NYCHA
	n=188	n=241
1. Male	28%	23%
2. Female	67%	73%
9. Refused	5%	4%



CHPC  
NEW YORK CITY

42 Broadway, Suite 2010 | New York, NY 10004

phone | (212) 286-9211

fax | (212) 286-9214

email | [info@chpcny.org](mailto:info@chpcny.org)

[www.chpcny.org](http://www.chpcny.org)