



“What We Heard” 2012 Stakeholder Input Session

“What We Heard”

2012 Stakeholder Input Session

Table of Contents

Overview	1
Approach	2
Long-Term and Short-Term Issues Revisited	3
Activities – Establishing Priority Areas	5
Stakeholder Opinions on Other NL Housing Initiatives	9
Stakeholder Roundtable Questions/Comments	11
Conclusion	12

Appendices

- A. Attendees
- B. Chairman’s Presentation, September 28, 2012
- C. Detailed Survey Results

Overview

In August 2009, the province released *Secure Foundations* - a 10-year Social Housing Plan for Newfoundland and Labrador. In the development of this plan, extensive input was provided by a broad range of stakeholders including community-based housing providers, government departments, municipalities, tenant associations, community centres, housing developers, private-sector landlords, community-based service delivery organizations and social advocacy groups.

On September 28, 2012, NL Housing hosted its annual Stakeholder Input Session at City Hall in St. John's. Stakeholders representing a cross-section of community and government organizations engaged in discussions on social housing in the province and provided input on initiatives to be pursued in year five of the Plan. This input session was the latest of a number of different opportunities for stakeholders to engage with NL Housing and build upon regular and ongoing dialogue with government. The session was attended by 20 community partners/organizations and 7 Government groups with a total of 39 participants. Appendix A lists the organizations that participated on September 28 or provided input on housing issues and priorities by submitting written comments. In addition, CEO Len Simms and Supportive Living Supervisor, Annette Breen, met with all 10 regional housing coalitions around the province on separate occasions over the summer and fall of 2012.

Len Simms, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Newfoundland Labrador Housing, opened the session by providing an overview of NL Housing's progress in implementing the Social Housing Plan. This overview detailed other investments in housing made by Government to respond to previous input provided by stakeholders (Appendix B). Polling revealed that 30 percent of the attendees were first time participants, and that approximately 40 percent had not yet seen the overview presentation on NL Housing (see Appendix C for detailed survey results).

The objective of bringing stakeholders together is to stimulate discussion, generate ideas and obtain feedback on the current direction of the Social Housing Plan. As this is year 5 of the 10-year Social Housing Plan, this session served as an opportunity to receive input from stakeholders at the mid-way point. Primarily, the aim of this input session was to review challenges, ideas, solutions, and initiatives to support social housing.

Morley Linstead, Team Leader of Policy, Research and Monitoring with NL Housing facilitated discussions. NL Housing staff along with volunteers from CMHC and the Interdepartmental Working Group that oversees the Social Housing Plan provided facilitation and recording support for table discussions. Assistive Listening Devices and real-time captioning were used to increase overall accessibility of this event.

NL Housing and Rural Secretariat staff identified themes, supported the Turning Point Voting Technology, and recorded participant views on new ideas and current priorities.

The Approach

Stakeholders attending the meeting were asked to meet two expected outcomes:

- Primary outcome: identify new challenges/ideas/solutions/initiatives to support social housing
- Secondary outcome: probe specific initiatives and ideas that are already on the NL Housing agenda

In order to achieve these outcomes and build on the input from past sessions, attendees were asked to revisit the short-term and long-term housing issues facing the province that were presented last year and to provide facilitators with their perspectives this year. Following this, attendees were given an opportunity to list the most significant housing issues/challenges/recommendations at individual/ organizational levels. Each table was then given a fictional and finite amount of financial and human resources and asked to allocate the resources provided to address the top issues, concerns, challenges, and recommendations they identified as a group.

The intention of this activity was to encourage participants to think critically about initiatives using existing resources and to think of potential ideas that would not require significant additional resources. Each table presented its choices of the most significant housing issues, challenges and recommendations. Through collaboration and dialogue, these issues were refined to the point that they could be prioritized by voting using Turning Point technology. Summaries of the results of this survey are contained through this report, while detailed survey results are included as Appendix C.

Long-Term and Short-Term Issues Revisited

At the outset of the session, participants were asked to review the long-term needs/challenges that were raised in 2011 and to re-rank the significance of those items.

Long-Term:

Long- Term Social Housing Needs/Challenges	2011	2012
1. Availability, affordability, and accessibility	25%	27%
2. Housing lens for government that provides a variety of housing options and ensures collaborative planning	22%	21%
3. Develop a provincial housing strategy	14%	14%

At first, participants selected the same top three long-term social housing needs/challenges as last year: availability, affordability, and accessibility; housing lens for government that provides a variety of housing options and ensures collaborative planning; and develop a provincial housing strategy. As the day progressed and participants were asked to put forward needs and challenges as they see them today, there were significant changes in the suggestions and rankings (see page 9).

Short-Term:

Participants were also asked to review the short-term needs/challenges that were raised in 2011 and to re-rank the significance of those items.

2011 Short-Term Social Housing Needs/Challenges	
1. Establish a new division/office/secretariat to coordinate/regulate all housing	21%
2. Increase available housing for individuals with complex needs (who need it/most need it)	16%
3. Dialogue/engagement related to finding solutions to rent stabilization	15%

2012 Short-Term Social Housing Needs/Challenges

1. Increase available housing for individuals with complex needs (who need it/most need it)	26%
2. Increase availability of housing for people just above low-income	19%
3. Support individuals who receive rent supplements (portability)	13%

This initial voting revealed a significant change in prioritization from last year on the short-term social housing needs/challenges. Most notably, last year's top choice for short-term was to establish a new division/office/ secretariat to coordinate/regulate all housing. This year, that suggestion dropped to the bottom of the list of choices.

Participants were then asked to participate in a group activity to identify current needs/challenges.



Activities – Establishing Priority Areas

Summary

- The top long-term social housing concerns, issues and challenges raised by the group changed significantly (see p.9 for more detail).
- The top three at the end of the day were:
 1. Increase housing supports for individuals with complex needs (Housing Support Workers (HSWs)/Navigation) (22%)
 2. Increase rental supplements (portability/available to rural) (15%)
 3. More social housing/smaller unit configuration (14%)
- Developing a provincial housing strategy had been identified as a top long-term social housing need/challenge at the beginning of the session but did not re-emerge after the group activity and voting.

Results of the Group Activities

Activity 1

Each table was asked to decide on their top five social housing issues, concerns, challenges, and recommendations. The results were collected and themed by staff of NL Housing and the Rural Secretariat for later polling.

Activity 2

Each table was then given \$2,000 in Monopoly money and five action figures (each representing 20 percent of human resources) to allocate to the top five ranked issues, challenges or recommendations. Participants were tasked with dividing the hypothetical resources and to think critically about how best to use these resources for each of the five key priorities or to think of potential ideas that would not require significant additional expenditures. At the end of the activity, one person from each table made a presentation and described the factors that were considered in the team's decision-making process. The aim was to generate innovative discussion among participants.

Activity 2 results – Identifying priorities and Allocation of Resources

Table #	Idea	Money	Human Resources
#1			
	Smaller units (more appropriate for demographics)	\$1600	2
	More rent supplements	\$400	1
	Legislation to require developers to construct a number of “affordable” houses in new developments	\$0	1
	Access free crown land for construction of social housing or affordable housing	\$0	1
	Construction of more social housing units	\$0	0
#2			
	Coordinate approach of a government-wide focus on housing and homelessness Use existing budgets and data	\$1000	2
	Increased availability of housing and supports for persons with complex needs Use existing properties of municipalities (NL Housing to take the lead)	\$1000	1
	Engagement of Federal, Provincial, and Municipal governments regarding affordable housing	\$0	1
	Education and awareness of landlords to decrease stigma attached to clients with complex needs (e.g. mental health and addictions)	\$0	1
	Creating community partnerships with community groups i.e. use of NL Housing units for storage, shelters, etc		
#3			
	More housing support workers with clearly defined roles to do home visits, form relationships with landlords, teach life skills, etc	\$1500	3
	Supportive Housing (partnerships with landlords)	\$500	2
	Rent supplement attached to the person and not the property	\$0	0
	Innovative approach of linking internal renovations to people living in units who have the skills and are in need of work	\$0	0
	Establish parameters for landlords and developers to rent equally to vulnerable groups Consult with CABs and other community agencies	\$0	0
#4			
	Need accessible/universal design features incorporated into existing housing	\$600	1
	Improved access to rent supplements (including a	\$600	1

	focus on seniors) and supports to navigate through the system		
	More wrap-around programs attached to housing options for individuals with complex needs	\$700	2
	Emergency housing options for seniors	\$100	1
	Attitudinal change: Continuing the anti-stigma campaign and including TV and social media Create community awareness working with builders Change language		
	Rent stabilization		
#5			
	Emergency Housing (choice, safety, no barriers to enter)	\$620	1
	Rent Stabilization (Research and Consultation, develop policy, implement)	\$500	1
	Attitudinal Change toward diverse housing options (TV, builders, community attitudes, social media)	\$500	1
	Making more provincial land available (Identify land, do an assessment, promote use, do a pilot project)	\$330	1
	Universal Design (expert consultation, promotion, policy/guidelines, cost/benefit analysis, social impact analysis)	\$50	1
#6			
	Need for housing and supports for people with mental health issues	\$750	2
	Increase rent supplements Portability Expand to entire province Can be overseen by housing support workers	\$750	
	Broaden community partnerships (engage corporate community, show economic spin on issue)	\$250	1
	Overall affordability (now and future) Increasing costs to buy a home, heating, rent, property taxes, down payment, etc)	\$250	1
	Plan to end homelessness with hard targets	\$0	1
	Need for policy changes More engagement of municipalities to have the "affordability" lens looked through when creating/modifying policy Inclusive housing plans for municipalities	\$0	0

Participants were then asked to vote on the priorities after all suggestions from Activity 1 were collected and themed.

Polling of Themed Suggestions

1. Increase housing supports for individuals with complex needs
2. Increase rental supplements (portability/available to rural)
3. More social housing/smaller unit reconfiguration/conversion
4. Engagement with all levels of governments (municipal housing plans/affordable housing/access lands)
5. More emergency housing (Seniors)
6. Plan to end homelessness (all levels of government)
7. Housing affordability and stabilization (plan now for increased costs/development regulations)
8. Incorporate universal design in new housing construction
9. More integrated communities (not all low income/better mix)
10. More supportive housing/promote independence

Percentage
22%
15%
14%
9%
9%
7%
7%
7%
6%
5%

The top issues, challenges or recommendations as voted on above differed significantly from the voting that took place at the beginning of the session.

The top three at the end of the day were:

- 1. Increase housing supports for individuals with complex needs**
- 2. Increase rental supplements (portability/available to rural)**
- 3. More social housing/smaller unit reconfiguration/conversion**



Activity 3

Activity 3 intended to ask participants to distribute their resources among five buckets representing the top five priorities identified in polling. However, this activity was not completed due to time restraints. Therefore, NL Housing has completed an analysis by assigning each of the 30 table priorities to a broader theme area and comparing it to the list of 10 priorities that emerged from theming. The following table indicates the top choices of the tables in terms of how much financial and human resources were allocated to specific initiatives:

Suggestion	Financial Resources	Human Resources
Housing supports for individuals with complex needs	\$2450	3
Increased access to rent supplements	\$1750	2
Coordinate approach of a government-wide focus on housing and homelessness	\$1000	2
Emergency housing (choice, safety, no barriers to enter)	\$620	1
Incorporate accessible/universal design features into existing housing	\$600	1

The table above was then compared to the list of 10 priorities that were themed. It was inferred that, if participants had completed Activity 3 the top five priorities would likely have been:

1. Increase housing supports for individuals with complex needs (HSWs/Navigation)
2. Increase rental supplements (portability/available to rural)
3. Engagement with all levels of governments (municipal housing plans/affordable housing/access lands)
4. More emergency housing (Seniors)
5. Incorporate universal design in new housing construction

Stakeholder Opinion on Additional NL Housing Initiatives

In addition to outlining their issues and setting priorities, stakeholders were also given an opportunity to vote on elements of three NL Housing proposed initiatives:

1. **Anti-Stigma Campaign:** NL Housing ran a radio ad campaign in 2011 to help reduce the stigma associated with living in social housing. A survey by NL Statistics Agency, involving 300 households who indicated they heard the ads, reported that their favourable opinion of NL Housing tenants increased by approximately 10 percent.

Of the participants in this year's Stakeholder Input Session, 86 percent were in support of NL Housing renewing the anti-stigma awareness campaign, with 71 percent believing that television would be the best approach; however, 71 percent also supported the use of a social media strategy to implement an anti-stigma campaign.

- 2. Down Payment Assistance Program:** Government has directed NL Housing to continue researching and to provide options regarding a down payment assistance program for first time homebuyers with modest household incomes.

Support for the down payment assistance for homeownership program was given by 100 percent of participants, with 64 percent voting that the main target group for the program should be modest income households. The top three most critical obstacles to home ownership were identified as down payment (33%), overall cost to purchase (21%) and ability to secure a mortgage (16%).

Participants were then asked to vote on the top two biggest potential concerns for a down-payment assistance recipient. The number one choice was rising home heating costs (23%) and number two was "all of the above" which included increasing cost of living, increasing interest rates, managing regular maintenance, rising home heating costs, and increasing property taxes.

- 3. Bi-annual Stakeholder Input Sessions:** One suggestion brought forward through NL Housing's Core Mandate Analysis process was to reduce the number of stakeholder input sessions to once every two years. Participants were asked to vote to express their opinion on this suggestion. Polling results showed 31 percent agreed the stakeholder input session should be held every two years, 56 percent disagreed and 14 percent were neutral.



Stakeholder Roundtable Questions/Comments:

1. Question was posed whether it is on the radar of NL Housing to look at any land opportunities within the provincial land use strategy to help make Crown lands available for developers, so municipalities can turn it into affordable housing. NL Housing will investigate this further and follow-up with stakeholders.
2. Participants requested more geographical representation at future stakeholder sessions. Advised that support is needed with resources and capacity. NL Housing is aiming to address this issue with expanding use of technology.
3. Recommended that NL Housing encourage a collaborative approach within government to break down the silos within Department of Justice and among the Department of Advanced Education and Skills emergency shelters. The suggestion was made to take the money that is used to shelter people in hotels and use it to create more supportive housing.
4. Encourage the capacity building of community advisory boards.
5. Additional resources are needed to support the community advisory boards in rural communities with projects, proposals, etc. i.e. a project facilitator role.

Conclusion

NL Housing's annual Stakeholder Input Session is a welcomed opportunity to receive feedback and insights from housing stakeholders from across the province. The issues, challenges and recommendations presented in this forum are used to guide NL Housing's policy and decision-making processes. Perhaps most importantly, it is a prime opportunity to network, share ideas, and collaborate towards our shared goal: affordable, adequate, suitable housing for those in the greatest need. NL Housing looks forward to future opportunities to collaborate with stakeholders on the housing issues facing the province. Thanks and gratitude are extended to the facilitators, staff from NL Housing and Rural Secretariat, and especially attendees for sharing their energy, passion and ideas.

Appendix A
Stakeholder Input Session Attendees
September 28, 2012

Attendees - Stakeholders Input Session 2012

Community Groups/Organizations	City/Town	Attended
1. Canadian Mental Health Association	St. John's	2
2. Choices for Youth	St. John's	1
3. Independent Living Resource Centre	St. John's	1
4. Iris Kirby House	St. John's	1
5. Cara House	Gander	1
6. Transition House	Corner Brook	1
7. NL Housing & Homelessness Network	St. John's	2
8. Provincial Advisory Council of Status of Women	St. John's	2
9. Seniors Resource Centre of NL	St. John's	2
10. Provincial Advisory Council for Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities	St. John's	1
11. St. John's Status of Women Council	St. John's	1
12. Stella Burry Community Services	St. John's	2
13. Burin Region CAB	Burin	1
14. Clarenville/Bonavista CAB	Clarenville/Bonavista	1
15. Exploits Valley Community Coalition CAB	GF Exploits	1
16. Buckmasters Community Centre Board	St. John's	1
17. MacMorran Community Centre Board	St. John's	1
18. City of St. John's	St. John's	1
19. NLHC	St. John's	2
20. CMHC	St. John's	1

26

Government Groups	City/Town	Attended
1. Advanced Education & Skills	St. John's	3
2. Dept. Health & Community Services	St. John's	2
3. Dept. of Child, Youth & Family Services	St. John's	1
4. Dept. of Justice	St. John's	2
5. Disability Policy Office	St. John's	1
6. Executive Council	St. John's	1
7. Finance	St. John's	1

11

Summary - Total Number of Groups Attended	
Community Groups/Organizations	20
Government	7
Municipalities	0

27

Written Submission
Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat

Appendix B
Chairman's Presentation
September 28, 2012



Where we came from

- Public consultations started back in 2006/07
- Social Housing Plan released in August 2009
 - Our directions:
 - More coordination in delivering supportive living options
 - More support to those at risk of homelessness
 - More emphasis on energy efficiency efforts
 - More investment in social housing infrastructure
 - Press Feds for extension/sustained funding
 - More Private Sector involvement (rent supplements)
 - More accessible housing and partnering with Aboriginal groups

SHP - Major Milestones

- Created the Supportive Living Community Partnership Program – now known as the **Supportive Living Program**
 - This program has been transferred to NL Housing as of April 1, 2012
 - Provides \$4.8M in operating assistance to enable community-based organizations to help people who are vulnerable to homelessness, including many with complex needs such as addictions, criminal records and mental illness.

SHP - Major Milestones

- Created a new **Provincial Homelessness Fund** and since 2009, provided \$1M capital funding annually through NL Housing to help many non-profit community groups provide wrap around services vital to help persons with complex needs or others at risk of homelessness.

SHP - Major Milestones

- Substantial investments in **maintaining the current social housing stock**.
 - Tripled provincial investment for this cause
 - Major increase for years of federal-provincial economic stimulus
 - In total over 70% of the stock has received major upgrades
 - For the first time in 25 years, there has even been investments made to the interior upgrading of units

SHP - Major Milestones

- Started the two-year **Residential Energy Efficiency Program** pilot project
 - In 2011, the pilot was extended to a three year program
- Developed a very successful partnership with Choices for Youth (**Train for Trades** and our CUPE Local) to employ at-risk youth to complete retrofits on NL Housing units – 40 in 2010/11, 60 units in 2011/12 another 60 units currently being worked on in 2012/13.

SHP - Major Milestones

- Twice negotiated the extension of federal **Affordable Housing Initiative** agreements and **Home Repair Program** agreements.

Since 2007 (1133 new units) :

- 827 - **Private Sector** units (Seniors, Disabled, Families, Individuals)
- 166 - **Non-Profit Sector** units (Seniors, Disabled, Families, Individuals with complex needs)
- 140 - **Supportive Living Sector** units for persons with complex needs

Since 2007:

- More than 13,000 Home Repair Grants

SHP - Major Milestones

- Doubled investment in the **Rent Supplement Program**
 - Funding increased from \$4M to \$8M annually in 2012
 - NL Housing is providing 1,732 rent supplements overall, including a special allocation to our partners Stella Burry Community Services and the Canadian Mental Health Association for assisting persons with complex needs

SHP - Major Milestones

- Twice negotiated the extension of federal **Affordable Housing Initiative** agreements and **Home Repair Program** agreements.

Since 2007 (1133 new units) :

- 827 - **Private Sector** units (Seniors, Disabled, Families, Individuals)
- 166 - **Non-Profit Sector** units (Seniors, Disabled, Families, Individuals with complex needs)
- 140 - **Supportive Living Sector** units for persons with complex needs

Since 2007:

- More than 13,000 Home Repair Grants

SHP - Major Milestones

- Doubled investment in the **Rent Supplement Program**
 - Funding increased from \$4M to \$8M annually in 2012
 - NL Housing is providing 1,732 rent supplements overall, including a special allocation to our partners Stella Burry Community Services and the Canadian Mental Health Association for assisting persons with complex needs

SHP - Major Milestones

- Created the new **Home Modification Program** (combined with PHRP) to provide \$3M annually for home modifications for accessibility purposes
- Recognized nationally by CHRA as the first province to require Universal Design Principles in all units under the new Affordable Housing call for proposals

SHP - Major Milestones

- **Education Incentive Program** - increased funding to \$50 per month for adult tenants and tenant children in grades 7-12.
 - Result: in 2007/08—48% of NLHC kids stayed in school; and by Fall of 2011— 75% in junior high and 72% of NLHC kids in senior high were still in school.

SHP - Major Milestones

- **Anti-Stigma Campaign**
 - As recommended at our Stakeholder Annual Input Session, NLHC ran a radio ad campaign in 2011 to help reduce the stigma associated with living in social housing.
 - A survey by NL Statistics Agency, involving 300 households who indicated they heard the ads, reported that their favourable opinion of NLHC tenants increased by approx. 10%.

SHP - Major Milestones

- Partnering with the City of St. John's to enable them to construct 35 new Affordable Housing units in City's Pleasantville project. We provided:
 - \$2.3M for an NL Housing 12 unit Affordable Housing Seniors Apartment Building
 - \$2.87M – 23 units (mostly supportive living)
- AND MUCH, MUCH MORE!!!**
- Lowering RGI rate for determining rent from 30% to 25%
 - Providing technical support to supportive housing groups for AHI projects
 - etc...

2012/13 – What’s Happening

- Hired a new Senior Research/Policy Analyst (ability to look at research items beyond the traditional scope of social housing)
- Transferred Supportive Living Program (funding and staff) to NL Housing
- Core Mandate Analysis (taking a closer look at how we do business)
- Request for Proposals for use of land in Buckmaster’s Circle (no response)
- Provincial Government has directed us to continue the planning and research and to provide options regarding a down payment assistance program for first time homebuyers with modest household incomes
- Just announced: Service NL Review of the Residential Tenancies Act (a chance to present to government on items sometimes brought here that we have no authority over)

2013/14 – What We Need

- Initiatives to advance the goals of the Social Housing Plan
- They need to be:
 - Strong
 - Innovative
 - Creative
 - Efficient
 - Not Cost Prohibitive

Appendix C
Detailed Results – Stakeholder Survey
September 28, 2012

1) Please choose from the list below as it pertains to you:

1. This is my first time attending a NL Housing Stakeholder Input Session
2. This is my second time attending
3. This is my third time attending
4. I have attended all four sessions

		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
		29.41%	10
		35.29%	12
		26.47%	9
		8.82%	3
Totals		100%	34

2) Have you seen the Chairman’s NLHC Overview Presentation?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Sure

		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
		58.82%	20
		23.53%	8
		17.65%	6
Totals		100%	34

3) I have seen the NLHC Overview Presentation:

1. Never
2. Once
3. More than once

		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
		36.36%	12
		33.33%	11
		30.30%	10
Totals		100%	33

4) Which region do you call home?

1. Labrador
2. St. Anthony – Port au Choix
3. Stephenville – Port aux Basques
4. Corner Brook – Rocky Harbour
5. Grand Falls Windsor – Harbour Brenton – Baie Verte
6. Gander – New-Wes-Valley
7. Clarenville – Bonavista
8. Burin Peninsula
9. Rural Avalon
10. St. John’s CMA

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	0%	0
	0%	0
	2.86%	1
	2.86%	1
	5.71%	2
	2.86%	1
	2.86%	1
	2.86%	1
	2.86%	1
	77.14%	27
Totals	100%	35

5) If you chose the Avalon Peninsula – are you from:

- St. John’s CMA
Rural Avalon

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	100%	1
	0%	0
Totals	100%	1

6) At this session, I consider myself most affiliated with:

1. Municipal Government
2. Provincial Government
3. Federal Government
4. Non-Profit/Community
5. Business
6. Academia
7. Other

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	2.94%	1
	41.18%	14
	2.94%	1
	50.00%	17
	0%	0
	0%	0
	2.94%	1
Totals	100%	34

7) I am involved/interested in the housing sector on a ...

- 1. Provincial level
- 2. Community level
- 3. Personal level

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	55.88%	19
	44.12%	15
	0%	0
Totals	100%	34

8) Are you male or female?

- Male
- Female

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	29.41%	10
	70.59%	24
Totals	100%	34

9) How many years have you been involved in housing issues?

- 1. 0-4
- 2. 5-9
- 3. 10-14
- 4. 15-19
- 5. 20-24
- 6. 25-29
- 7. 30-34
- 8. 34 +

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	20%	7
	31.43%	11
	20%	7
	8.57%	3
	8.57%	3
	5.71%	2
	5.71%	2
	0%	0
Totals	100%	35

10) The top LONG-TERM social housing needs/challenges as raised in 2011 are: (select 3) (priority ranking)

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. Housing lens for gov't that provides a variety of housing options and ensures collaborative planning	20.94%	191
2. More engagement of municipalities (ie. Policy review, tax rebates and industry supplying employee housing)	12.06%	110
3. Protect, preserve and promote housing	10.42%	95
4. Availability, affordability, and accessibility	26.64%	243
5. Provincial housing plan should address homeownership	7.68%	70
6. Negative impacts of "economic boom" on housing (eg NIMBY)	8%	73
7. Develop a provincial housing strategy	14.25%	130
Totals	100%	912

11) The top SHORT-TERM social housing needs/challenges as raised in 2011 are: (select 3) (priority ranking)

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. Support individuals who receive rent supplements (portability)	12.53%	111
2. Establish a new division/office/ secretariat to coordinate/regulate all housing	8.13%	72
3. Increase availability of housing for people just above low-income	19.30%	171
4. Increase available housing for individuals with complex needs (who need it/most need it)	25.96%	230
5. Increase the maximum value of rent supplements to match local markets	10.61%	94
6. Dialogue/engagement related to finding solutions to rent stabilization	12.30%	109
7. Initiate public awareness campaign to change attitudes about social, affordable, accessible housing needs	6.66%	59
8. Create a housing advocate devoted to housing only	4.51%	40
Totals	100%	886

12) My level of support for NLHC renewing the anti-stigma awareness campaign is:

1. Very Strong
2. Strong
3. Neutral
4. Weak
5. Very Weak

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. Very Strong	37.14%	13
2. Strong	48.57%	17
3. Neutral	8.57%	3
4. Weak	5.71%	2
5. Very Weak	0%	0
Totals	100%	35

13) I believe the best approach to an anti-stigma campaign is:

1. Radio
2. Social media (ex. Twitter)
3. Television
4. Other

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. Radio	14.71%	5
2. Social media (ex. Twitter)	8.82%	3
3. Television	70.59%	24
4. Other	5.88%	2
Totals	100%	34

14) My level of support for the idea of using a social media strategy to implement an anti-stigma campaign is:

1. Very Strong
2. Strong
3. Neutral
4. Weak
5. Very Weak

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. Very Strong	22.58%	7
2. Strong	48.39%	15
3. Neutral	19.35%	6
4. Weak	0%	0
5. Very Weak	9.68%	3
Totals	100%	31

15) My level of support for down payment assistance for homeownership is:

1. Very Strong
2. Strong
3. Neutral
4. Weak
5. Very Weak

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. Very Strong	63.64%	21
2. Strong	36.36%	12
3. Neutral	0%	0
4. Weak	0%	0
5. Very Weak	0%	0
Totals	100%	33

16) The main target group for down payment assistance for homeownership should be:

1. Modest income households
2. Low income households
3. First time homeowners
4. Households in boom communities with low supply of affordable housing
5. Other

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	63.64%	21
	15.15%	5
	12.12%	4
	6.06%	2
	3.03%	1
Totals	100%	33

17) The most critical obstacles to homeownership are (select top 3) (priority ranking)

1. Closing costs
2. Ability to budget properly
3. Ability to secure a mortgage
4. Property taxes
5. Knowledge of how to maintain a home
6. Poor credit
7. Cost to purchase
8. Cost to maintain a home
9. Other

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	0%	0
	21.62%	8
	27.03%	10
	0%	0
	0%	0
	0%	0
	51.35%	19
	0%	0
	0%	0
Totals	100%	37

18) The most critical obstacles to homeownership are... (select top 3) (priority ranking)

1. Closing costs
2. Ability to budget properly
3. Ability to secure a mortgage
4. Property taxes
5. Knowledge of how to maintain a home
6. Down payment
7. Poor credit
8. Cost to purchase
9. Cost to maintain a home
10. Other

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
	4.41%	35
	6.56%	52
	15.51%	123
	4.54%	36
	1.26%	10
	32.53%	258
	5.93%	47
	21.06%	167
	8.20%	65
	0%	0
Totals	100%	793

19) What do you think is the biggest potential concern for a down-payment assistance recipient? (select top2) (priority ranking)

1. Increasing cost of living
2. Increasing interest rates
3. Managing regular maintenance
4. Rising home heating costs
5. Increasing property taxes
6. All of the above
7. Other

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. Increasing cost of living	18.97%	114
2. Increasing interest rates	17.97%	108
3. Managing regular maintenance	7.82%	47
4. Rising home heating costs	23.29%	140
5. Increasing property taxes	4.83%	29
6. All of the above	19.63%	118
7. Other	7.49%	45
Totals	100%	601

20) I would support NLHC's plan to host Stakeholder Input Session every two years.

1. Strong Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. Strong Agree	8.82%	3
2. Agree	20.59%	7
3. Neutral	14.71%	5
4. Disagree	44.12%	15
5. Strongly Disagree	11.76%	4
Totals	100%	34

21) My top social issues, concerns and challenges are ...select top 3. (priority ranking)

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
1. More social housing/smaller unit configuration	13.97%	112
2. More integrated communities(not all low income/better mix)	5.61%	45
3. More supportive housing/promote independence	4.61%	37
4. Increase housing supports for individuals with complex needs (HSWs/Navigation)	22.19%	178
5. Increase rental supplements (portability/available to rural)	14.71%	118
6. Engagement with all levels of governments (municipal housing plans/affordable housing/access lands)	9.23%	74
7. Plan to end homelessness (all levels of government)	7.48%	60
8. More emergency housing (Seniors)	8.60%	69
9. Housing affordability and stabilization (plan now for increased costs/development regulations)	6.98%	56
10. Incorporate universal design in new housing construction	6.61%	53
Totals	100%	802

22) I found the round table discussions stimulating and useful.

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Strongly Agree	48.28%	14
Agree	51.72%	15
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	29

23) I have learned something of value from this session.

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Strongly Agree	21.43%	6
Agree	71.43%	20
Neutral	7.14%	2
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	28

24) There was sufficient time for discussion during the session.

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Strongly Agree	11.11%	3
Agree	74.07%	20
Neutral	11.11%	3
Disagree	3.70%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	27

25) I found the TurningPoint technology useful to this session.

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Strongly Agree	68.97%	20
Agree	24.14%	7
Neutral	6.90%	2
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	29

26) I found the CART technology useful to this session.

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Strongly Agree	20.69%	6
Agree	48.28%	14
Neutral	31.03%	9
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	29

27) The “allocation of resources” activity made me think critically about the suggestions my table put forward.

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Strongly Agree	31.03%	9
Agree	62.07%	18
Neutral	3.45%	1
Disagree	3.45%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	29

28) Overall, I was satisfied with this event.

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Strongly Agree	42.31%	11
Agree	57.69%	15
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	26



Housing

P.O. Box 220
2 Canada Drive
St. John's, NL A1C 5J2

Tel: (709)724-3000
Fax: (709)724-3250

www.nlhc.nl.ca