
June 19, 2012

MEMORANDUM

Memorandum To: Jessica Grantling, GTM
June Young, GTR

From: Daniel Geller, Project Director

Subject: Responses to commenters “*PBCA Customer Service Survey*”

This memorandum details the changes that HUD has requested to the survey methodology and data collection instrument developed for the “*PBCA Customer Service Survey*.” These changes are made in response to the reviewers and commenters that responded to the OMB package.

OVERALL CHANGES

1. Many commenters suggested the elimination or reduction of the tenant survey, due to the fact that PBCAs have infrequent contact with tenants, limiting the number of sample cases that would have had direct contact with the PBCA over the previous year. We understand that the results of the survey will be biased if the tenants do not know who they are evaluating and, as a result, the tenant survey will not be valuable in assessing PBCA performance. Additionally, we understand that the additional time and cost burden to owners in developing the tenant lists and contact information is prohibitive. As such, we have eliminated tenants from the PBCA customer service survey.
2. Several reviewers suggested improving the owner’s survey by allowing all project-based Section 8 owners/managers to respond, not just a sample of owners. This would involve taking a census of all owners/managers, rather than a representative survey. Owners and managers are able to provide the most valuable and reliable feedback in assessing the effectiveness of a PBCA. Since the survey will be administered through a web-based platform, it will not be difficult to modify the survey to a census of owners. Thus, we have increased the scope of the owner’s survey by extending the invitation to all owners in the State. Owners with properties in more than on State will be asked to fill out one form for each PBCA contract.
3. Many reviewers commented on the appropriateness of the timeliness questions, since the satisfactory completion of these tasks depends on the performance of both HUD and the owner, in addition to the PBCA. As such, we have removed most of the questions on timeliness. For the timeliness question that remains, we have added a follow up question to indicate what the primary and secondary reasons were for the delay.
4. A few reviewers wanted to include questions that provide a greater detail of required activities. These questions relate to specific PBTs that HUD can validate independently. Thus, we have

added several questions regarding the management and occupancy review and the voucher process.

5. The term “HAP contacts” was replaced with Performance-Based Annual Contributions contract.
6. The cost estimate has been modified in the following manner: (a) eliminated subtask 6.3, Conduct Survey with Tenants, and (b) increased resources for subtask 6.2, Conduct Survey with Owners/Management Agents to account for the increase in the total sample size (census) to 2,100 eligible respondents. The overall cost estimate has been reduced by \$91,233; from \$426,651 to \$335,418 (see attached revised cost spreadsheet).