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*2015 HURRICANE SANDY VOLUNTARY REBUILD ENVIRONMENT: NYC LONG TERM RECOVERY ASSESSMENT*

Copyright 2015, New York Disaster Interfaith Services
Long Term Recovery Groups (LTRG) are local coordinating bodies made up of representatives from faith-based, nonprofit, government, business, and other organizations working within a community to assist individuals and families as they recover from disaster. In New York City, these networks are predominantly organized by borough or neighborhood. Though an LTR “Group” is the term commonly used nationally, these cooperative networks use a diversity of terms in NYC other than “Group,” including Long Term Recovery “Organization” and “Coalition.” In this report, “LTRG” will be used to refer to all LTR cooperative bodies, including organizations and coalitions.

National Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (NVOAD) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, membership-based organization that builds resiliency in communities nationwide. It serves as the forum where organizations share knowledge and resources throughout the disaster cycle—preparation, response, recovery and mitigation—to help disaster survivors and their communities.

New York City Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (NYC VOAD) is the local affiliate of NVOAD whose membership consists of both locally based organizations and local representatives of national organizations. Begun in 1997, its mission is to strengthen the capabilities of organizations working together to relieve human suffering caused by disaster.

Voluntary housing recovery projects indicates projects carried out by the voluntary rebuilding sector over the course of disaster recovery efforts, which includes cleanup, home repair, and other housing rebuild projects. This is not indicative of number of families or homes served.

Voluntary rebuilding sector is inclusive of secular and faith-based nonprofit organizations and grassroots volunteer groups in the human services sector who have been active in immediate and long-term disaster recovery home rebuilding efforts.

Voluntary organizations is a term commonly used by agencies active in the VOAD movement and by government and nonprofit partners in local, state, and federal disaster recovery. The term can be construed as a misnomer because “voluntary organizations” includes (1) nonprofit service providers who do not rely solely on the use of volunteers and (2) agencies that are mandated to carry out recovery work and thus do not contribute on a voluntary basis. However, in order to remain consistent with national dialogue on nonprofit disaster recovery, this report maintains the use of the term “voluntary.” Types of VOAD and non-VOAD organizations engaging in voluntary rebuilding that are considered in this report include:

- **Rebuild organizations**: nonprofits and unincorporated groups engaged in the management of voluntary housing recovery projects, especially through the use of volunteer labor (skilled and unskilled) and in-kind donations. Rebuild organizations and groups offer a diversity of services, from cleanout of debris to home repair.
- **Volunteer group housing**: nonprofits and congregations that provide or facilitate the housing of volunteers engaging in voluntary housing recovery projects.
- **Volunteer management organizations**: nonprofits that engage in the outreach, mobilizing, matching, and training of volunteer groups engaging in voluntary housing recovery projects.
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NYDIS is a 501(c)(3) federation of sixty-one faith communities, faith-based service providers and charitable organizations who work in partnership to provide disaster readiness, response, and recovery services to New York City.

Our mission is to inspire, connect and provide resources for New York City faith communities serving in disaster to create an urban environment of social justice for all.

The NYDIS VGHP helps recruit, train, and build the capacity of congregations and nonprofit facilities to host Hurricane Sandy rebuilding volunteer groups. We also coordinate housing availability and reservation services for those groups and with LTRGs and our National VOAD partners.
INTRODUCTION

Overview

Since Hurricane Sandy, the voluntary rebuilding sector provided immediate and long-term recovery assistance for tens of thousands of New York City’s residents, especially its most vulnerable and under-resourced populations. As NYC marks the third anniversary of the superstorm’s landfall, the sector continue to serve impacted residents in nearly every facet of their long-term recovery.

The voluntary rebuilding sector has provided crucial aid to survivors who could not privately fund their recovery or whose needs presented an urgency that could not wait on city or state government-managed rebuild programs. To give that assessment context, while the government of NYC completed 20,000 temporary “rapid repairs” in 2013, its housing recovery program, Build it Back, has finished permanent repairs to approximately 960 homes. Those permanent repairs comprise approximately 5% of the estimated 18,800 permanent housing recovery projects completed by voluntary rebuild organizations. Despite its necessity as a primary lifeline for Sandy-affected individuals and communities, the voluntary rebuilding sector has experienced debilitating losses in capacity and funding in 2015 while entering year three of Hurricane Sandy long-term recovery.

In 2015, the NYDIS Volunteer Group Housing Program (VGHP) distributed surveys to voluntary rebuilding sector service providers in order produce a statistical and narrative analysis of the historical and current voluntary rebuild environment in New York City since Hurricane Sandy. The NYDIS VGHP recognized the necessity of updating the 2014 Rebuild Environment findings to provide philanthropic organizations, disaster case management agencies, government agencies, participating service providers, and the media with a wider perspective on the historical and projected status of the voluntary rebuilding sector in New York City.

The purpose of this assessment is to translate the combined contributions of voluntary organizations supporting long-term recovery rebuild services into comprehensive reporting critical to planning and advocacy efforts. These efforts are more crucial to Sandy recovery as the footprint of nonprofit Sandy-related services rapidly diminishes while significant unmet needs remain among Sandy-affected populations in NYC.

The NYDIS VGHP 2015 Hurricane Sandy Voluntary Rebuild Environment: NYC Long Term Recovery Assessment expands on the findings of the 2014 Rebuild Environment report by:

1. Providing aggregate historical data alongside projected voluntary sector capacity
2. Augmenting rebuild organization data with submissions from organizations focused on volunteer management and volunteer group housing
3. Contrasting voluntary recovery efforts against the broader rebuilding efforts of NYC
Methodology

In order to achieve a more comprehensive follow up to the 2014 Rebuild Environment report, three electronic surveys were distributed to VOAD and non-VOAD partners engaging in voluntary rebuild:

Survey 1: Rebuild Organizations
Survey 2: Volunteer Management Organizations
Survey 3: Volunteer Group Housing

All answers were kept confidential and are published in aggregate data. Accuracy in self-reporting was emphasized in outreach to recovery service providers. Most organizational participants were engaged in follow-up interviews during survey data gathering and/or after electronic submission in order to address questions or inconsistencies in reporting.

Partners Engaging in Voluntary Rebuilding

The 47 organizations participating in the survey process included both those which completed the 2014 Rebuild Environment report and new service providers whose engagement in Sandy recovery efforts occurred after the 2014 report’s release. As previously noted, organizations offering volunteer engagement and volunteer group housing were newly included alongside rebuild organizations.

Of the 36 surveys received, 27 organizations provided full submissions. Eight organizations providing Sandy recovery services qualified for more than one of the three types of surveys. Six organizations were identified as partial submissions due to incomplete/informal data or indirect submission into the dataset by another organization’s reference to the organization as a collaborator, in electronic submissions or in follow up interviews.
1. All Hands Volunteers*
2. Calvary Presbyterian Church of Staten Island*
3. Catholic Charities Brooklyn and Queens**
4. Catholic Charities Community Services Archdiocese of New York (Catholic Charities Archdiocese of New York)*
5. Episcopal Diocese of New York Disaster Response (Episcopal Diocese of New York, Episcopal Relief & Development)*
6. First Presbyterian Church of Jamaica*
7. Friends of Firefighters NYC*
8. Friends of Rockaway (St. Bernard Project)*
9. Gerritsen Beach Cares Sandy Recovery
10. Great Kills Moravian Church
11. Guyon Rescue**
12. Habitat for Humanity New York City (Habitat for Humanity International)*
13. Heart 9/11*
14. HOPE Worldwide, Ltd.*
15. International Orthodox Christian Charities
16. Islamic Circle of North America
17. Jewish Disaster Response Corp
18. Local Initiatives Support Corporation NYC* (Local Initiatives Support Corporation)*
19. Mennonite Disaster Service*
20. Metro Baptist Ministries (Cooperative Baptist Fellowship)
21. Movement Church of Staten Island**
22. NECHAMA
23. New Dorp Moravian Church**
24. New York Cares (Points of Light Network)*
25. New York Disaster Interfaith Services*
26. Nontraditional Employment for Women
27. Occupy Sandy
28. Olivet Presbyterian Church
29. Presbyterian Disaster Assistance**
30. Presbyterian Hope in Action**
31. Project Hospitality*
32. Richmond Senior Services**
33. Reach Global**
34. Rebuilding Together NYC (Rebuilding Together)*
35. Resurrection Brooklyn Relief (Resurrection Brooklyn)*
36. The Salvation Army Greater New York Division (The Salvation Army USA)*
37. Samaritan's Purse Disaster Response
38. Sheepshead Bay United Methodist Church*
39. North American Mission Board (Southern Baptist Convention)*
40. Team Rubicon*
41. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Charities)*
42. The Elevated Studio*
43. Sandy Rebuild Corp, Stephen Siller Tunnel to Towers Foundation*
44. Buddhist Tzu Chi Foundation**
45. Unitarian Church on Staten Island*
46. Sandy Recovery Ministry New York Annual Conference United Methodist Church (United Methodist Committee on Relief)*
47. Yellow Boots Long Term Recovery Group*
Key Findings

October 2012 – August 2015

- **1,230 housing recovery projects** were reported by rebuild organizations for 2014, with **788 projected for 2015**, out of an **estimated 18,800 completed since Hurricane Sandy**. Housing recovery projects cover a range of services offered at several phases of the disaster life cycle, from cleanup to home repair. This reporting exceeds the 1,120 housing recovery projects predicted for the 2014 rebuild season in the *2014 Rebuild Environment* report.

- An estimated **101,700 volunteers** were engaged in housing recovery projects in 2014, with **5,935 housed by volunteer group housing sites**. Participating organizations projected an additional 22,429 volunteers engaged by the close of 2015, with capacity to house 4,723 in volunteer group housing. 89% of respondents frequently used unskilled volunteers, while only 44% frequently used skilled volunteers and 27% had access to licensed labor.

- **Surveyed organizations** contributed a combined total of **$155.4 million** in rebuild support, including **$93.4 million in assistance awards or services** (including contracting services). **$41 million was saved through the use of volunteer labor, with $21 million was contributed through in-kind donations**. These numbers reflect organizational submissions of fund distribution, although in follow up consultations with service providers those estimates were considered to fall short of the full contributions of the sector.

- In **2015**, NYC’s voluntary recovery sector lost nearly half of its rebuild organizations, volunteer management agencies, and volunteer group housing sites that were active at the start of the year. The most significant decrease in all sectors represented occurred in the summer of 2015:
  - 14 of the 17 rebuild organizations reported in December 2012 remained active in June 2015. **Only 6 rebuild organizations expect to remain active by December 2015.** 5 are projected to continue through December 2017, likely with diminished capacity.
  - 6 of the 9 volunteer management organizations reported in December 2012 remained active in June 2015. **Only 3 volunteer management agencies expect to remain active by December 2015.** 1 is projected to continue through December 2017, likely with diminished capacity.
  - All 8 volunteer group housing sites reported active in December 2012 remained active in June 2015. **Only 3 volunteer group housing sites expect to continue through December 2016.** No sites currently project activity through December 2017.

As predicted in the *2014 Rebuild Assessment*, more than half of the rebuild organizations active in 2014 have exhausted funding or possess minimal resources to continue services.

- **All organizations reported that funding, appropriate repair projects, and volunteer labor were their primary needs.** This finding is consistent with the *2014 Rebuild Environment* report.

- A lack of common measures for reporting Sandy voluntary housing recovery projects, especially duplications within collaborative efforts, has been a major challenge throughout long-term recovery, locally and nationally—especially in quantifying the number of homes and individuals who were collectively served.
For the first two years of Hurricane Sandy recovery efforts, coordination between city government and rebuild organizations was virtually nonexistent. Alignment has improved since the 2014 Rebuild Environment report, although communication between government and the voluntary rebuilding sector still falls short. Successes in coordination have included the integration of three of the participating rebuild organizations that are now classified as “Choose Your Own Contractor” options in the NYC Build it Back program and the use of the Build it Back counseling program to help expedite housing recovery issues that may delay homeowners’ ability to move forward in their recovery pathways.

Coordination between rebuild organizations has increased borough-wide and citywide since the 2014 Rebuild Environment report, especially with the expansion of Long Term Recovery Groups in Brooklyn and Queens and the significant decrease in organizational capacity, along with the departure of several National VOAD partners.

Remaining unmet needs in Sandy-affected populations are obscured, presenting constant challenges to long-term planning and maintenance of funding support for rebuild organizations, volunteer management agencies, and volunteer group housing sites. While isolated canvassing efforts have been carried out by individual organizations, LTRGs, and various government efforts, there has been no ongoing, unified assessment of the unmet needs of Sandy-impacted residents in NYC.
SURVEY 1: NONPROFIT REBUILD ORGANIZATIONS

Aggregate data was self-reported by 17 organizations engaged in the management of voluntary housing recovery projects:

1. All Hands Volunteers
2. Episcopal Diocese of New York Disaster Response (Episcopal Diocese of New York Relief & Development)
3. Friends of Rockaway (St. Bernard Project)
4. Habitat for Humanity New York City (Habitat for Humanity International)
5. Heart 9/11
6. Local Initiatives Support Corporation NYC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation)
7. Mennonite Disaster Service
8. Project Hospitality
9. Rebuilding Together NYC (Rebuilding Together)
10. Resurrection Brooklyn Relief (Resurrection Brooklyn)
11. North American Mission Board (Southern Baptist Convention)
12. Team Rubicon
13. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (LDS Charities)
14. The Elevated Studio
15. Sandy Rebuild Corp of the Stephen Siller Tunnel to Towers Foundation
16. Sandy Recovery Ministry New York Annual Conference (United Methodist Committee on Relief)
17. Yellow Boots Long Term Recovery Group

Data on funding support for voluntary housing recovery projects was added from the NYDIS NYC Sandy Unmet Needs Roundtable "Statistics & Assistance Report to Date" (July 2015) and from submissions by: Catholic Charities Community Services Archdiocese of NY, The Salvation Army Great New York Division, and NYDIS.
Voluntary housing recovery projects indicate the number of projects carried out by rebuild organizations over the course of Hurricane Sandy recovery efforts, which includes cleanup, home repair, and other housing rebuild efforts.

When asked how their organization measures its Hurricane Sandy housing recovery projects, 10 reported “based on completed cleanup or repair projects” and 3 reported “based on completed homes.” Other answers included: work orders (1), construction estimates (1), design consultation (1), and financial assistance (1).

Consultations with respondents revealed that collaboration between organizations is key to the completion of many Sandy-affected homes served by voluntary rebuilding service providers. Partners may have coordinated efforts on shared housing sites, but in this assessment their individual projects at those sites are counted as unique recovery contributions.
The 2014 Rebuild Environment report recorded that nearly half of the projects total for the 2014 rebuild season would occur on Staten Island. Respondents from Staten Island indicated a number that surpassed even that projection. It is important to note, as indicated in the 2014 Rebuild Environment report, that housing recovery projects reported on Staten Island are frequently a measurement of individual projects carried out by multiple organizations on a single site whereas participating agencies in Brooklyn and Queens were historically more likely to report number of homes served.

This distinction is due to the differences across boroughs in their collaborative efforts historically, and the type of rebuild organizations that led recovery efforts in particular affected neighborhoods.
At the time of the 2014 Rebuild Environment report, many homes on Staten Island were worked on by more than one rebuild organization because there were a greater number of local, smaller rebuild nonprofits and groups than in other boroughs, necessitating more collaboration.

As illustrated in the figure below, 2014 and 2015 saw a significant increase in collaboration across rebuild organizations and pace of construction in Brooklyn and Queens. Even with increased collaboration, rebuild organizations active in those boroughs continued to be the larger, nationally-affiliated agencies, though some smaller local organizations remained very active.
As noted in the 2014 Rebuild Environment report, misconceptions remain as to what the nonprofit sector will be able to do to assist clients in rebuilding and repairing their homes.

Although there has been improved education and management of expectations among Disaster Case Managers (DCMs) and Hurricane Sandy survivors, many seem still to believe that a rebuild organization will fully restore a home which sustained major damage. As noted in this report, the services provided by rebuild organizations are wide ranging, but for the most part consist of low to moderate repair projects and related support.

While developments are underway in regards to nonprofit capacity to elevate homes with respect to Base Flood Elevation (BFE), that service has not historically been offered by voluntary rebuild. Without significant new support from the government or philanthropic sectors, more advanced rebuild or elevation projects are unlikely to be offered expansively across the sector as large scale rebuild efforts are prohibitively expensive.

As was the case at the time of the 2014 Rebuild Environment report, most rebuild organizations continue to assist homeowners in any way possible, either serving an immediate need or complementing forthcoming government programs. Types of rebuild support over the three years did not differ significantly, although slight changes in services can be observed below.
Other Services Offered by Respondents Engaging in Voluntary Housing Recovery Projects (by Number of Organizations)

- Case Management: 5
- Case Work: 5
- Cash Assistance: 2
- Client Housing: 5
- Volunteer Housing: 7
- Logistics: 4
- Transportation: 2
- Warehouse: 4
- Design Services: 1
- Volunteer Management: 14

Types of Buildings Repaired

- 88% of respondents serve primary homes
- 29% of respondents serve community centers & houses of worship
- 18% of respondents serve apartment buildings
- 12% of respondents serve secondary homes
- 0.05% of respondents serve commercial buildings
Recovery federations and coalitions, like NYDIS, play a key role in the coordination of rebuild organizations, volunteer management agencies, and volunteer group housing sites, among other recovery service providers. Other citywide federations engaged in nonprofit Sandy recovery efforts include the New York City Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD) and Human Services Council (HSC).

Coalitions can also be found on a borough level, often known as Long Term Recovery (LTR) Groups (see Glossary for further explanation), which are established in every borough of NYC with various degrees of affiliation with FEMA Voluntary Agency Liaisons and the nationally implemented model proposed by the National Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters (NVOAD) in the “Long Term Recovery Guide,” ratified in 2012.

Three of the active remaining LTRGs convene committees which aim to coordinate the pace and equity of cases managed by rebuild organizations though coordination with Disaster Case Managers, funders, volunteer management agencies, and other service providers are:

1. Brooklyn Long-Term Recovery Group Construction, Volunteer, & Donations Management Committee
2. Queens Recovery Coalition Taskforce
3. Staten Island Long Term Recovery Organization Individual Assistance Committee
V. Financial Overview

Expenditures and In-Kind Donations

**$70,148,673**  
**$1,564,077**

TOTAL SPENT ON DIRECT HOUSING SUPPORT SERVICES TO SANDY SURVIVORS

TOTAL ESTIMATED WORTH OF VOLUNTEER DONATIONS

**$10,207,403**  
**$12,501,000**

TOTAL STAFF/ADMINISTRATION COSTS FOR SANDY RECOVERY PROGRAMMING

TOTAL ESTIMATED WORTH OF IN-KIND DONATIONS FOR SANDY RESPONSE/RECOVERY

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

58.8%  
PAY FOR PROFESSIONAL CONTRACTORS

$5.6 million  
TOTAL SPENT ON CONTRACTING SERVICES

75%  
UTILIZE THE NYC SANDY UNMET NEEDS ROUNDTABLE FOR FUNDING FOR CONTRACTORS OR BUILDING SUPPLIES

*Includes NYC Sandy Unmet Needs Roundtable funding for building supplies, contracting services, appliances, furniture, gift cards, and sustainable recovery ($8,609,013 as of July 2015).

**Does not include cash donations and grants.

Grants and Cash Donations

- Volunteer Donations, 8
- Affiliated Organizations, 5
- The United Way, 1
- The Robin Hood Foundation, 5
- Self-funded, 7
- American Red Cross, 11
- NYAC/UMCOR, 3
- NYDIS, 3
- The Salvation Army, 1
- Private Donors, 8

Nonprofit and Grassroots Funding

- Federal Government (CDBG), 6
- State Government (SSBG), 2
- City Government, 4

Government Funding

- Non-government Funding, 9

*Copyright 2015, New York Disaster Interfaith Services*
VI. Projected Capacity and Needs of Voluntary Rebuild Organizations

Number of Organizations Engaged in Voluntary Housing Recovery Projects

- Actual
- Projected

Remaining Organizational Needs

- Appropriate Projects, 6
- Funding, 7
- Materials, 3
- Partner Organizations, 1
- Volunteer Labor, 6
- Volunteer Housing, 2
- Volunteer Supervisors, 2
- Skilled Labor, 2
- No Further Needs, 4
Aggregate data was self-reported by 10 organizations engaged in volunteer management:

1. Catholic Charities Community Services Archdiocese of New York (Catholic Charities Archdiocese of New York)
2. Episcopal Diocese of New York Disaster Response (Episcopal Diocese of New York, Episcopal Relief & Development)
3. Friends of Firefighters NYC
4. HOPE Worldwide, Ltd.
5. New York Cares (Points of Lights Network)
6. Project Hospitality
7. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Charities)
8. The Elevated Studio
9. Sandy Rebuild Corp, Tunnel to Towers Foundation
10. Sandy Recovery Ministry New York Annual Conference (United Methodist Committee on Relief)

Volunteer management organizations were added as supplemental data points to include an array of necessary services they offer to rebuild organizations and groups at every stage of volunteer engagement. These services include outreach, mobilizing, matching, and training of volunteer groups.
As noted in Survey 1, collaboration between volunteer management organizations is key to the completion of some Sandy-affected homes served by voluntary rebuilding service providers. Partners may have coordinated volunteer efforts on shared housing sites, but in this assessment their individual projects at those sites are counted as unique contributions.
II. Volunteer Engagement by Geographic Area

Origin of Volunteers Recruited (by Number of Organizations)

- Brooklyn, 7
- Manhattan, 7
- Queens, 6
- Staten Island, 8
- NYC Metro Area, 6
- Long Island, 4
- New Jersey, 7
- National, 8
- International, 1

Location of Volunteer Housing Recovery Projects (by Number of Organizations)

- Manhattan, 2
- Brooklyn, 6
- Queens, 6
- Staten Island, 8
- NYC Metro Area, 3
- Bronx, 2
III. Services Offered by Volunteer Management Organizations

Types of Volunteer Engagement Service (by Number of Organizations)

- Construction Training: 3
- Local Outreach: 6
- National Outreach: 1
- Placement: 5
- Safety Training: 3
- Site Supervision: 6
- Screening: 1
- Transportation: 3
- Management: 9

Types of Service Provided by Volunteers (by Number of Organizations)

- Bathroom Remodeling: 3
- Beautification: 3
- Cabinet Installation: 3
- Debris Removal: 9
- Electrical: 2
- Flooring: 5
- Subflooring: 6
- Insulation: 8
- Kitchen Remodeling: 2
- Mold Removal: 3
- Indoor Painting: 7
- Outdoor Painting: 4
- Plumbing: 2
- Roofing: 4
- Sheetrocking: 7
- Siding: 4
Types of Housing Recovery Volunteers

Use of Unskilled Volunteers
- Sometimes (11%)
- Frequently (89%)

Use of Skilled Volunteers
- Sometimes (56%)
- Frequently (44%)

Use of Licensed Volunteers
- Sometimes (27%)
- Rarely (73%)

V. Collaboration and Coordination Efforts

77.8% Identify as members in LTRGs
4 Active LTRGs were reported

Brooklyn Long-Term Recovery Group
Queens Recovery Coalition
Lower East Side Ready!
Staten Island Interfaith & Community Long Term Recovery Organization

55.6% Identify as NYC VOAD members
40% Identify as National VOAD members
88.9% (Of all respondents) adhere to National VOAD Points of Consensus on Volunteer Management
IV. Financial Overview

Expenditures and In-kind Donations

$16,020,000  
TOTAL SPENT ON DIRECT SUPPORT TO SANDY SURVIVORS

$25,000  
TOTAL ESTIMATED WORTH OF VOLUNTEER DONATIONS

$4,013,000  
TOTAL COST OF TRAINING AND EQUIPPING VOLUNTEERS

$2,410,000  
TOTAL STAFF/ADMINISTRATION COSTS FOR SANDY RECOVERY PROGRAMMING

$8,345,000  
TOTAL ESTIMATED WORTH OF IN-KIND DONATIONS FOR SANDY RESPONSE/RECOVERY*

*Does not include cash donations and grants.

Grants and Cash Donations

Nonprofit and Grassroots Funding

Volunteer Donation, 2
American Red Cross, 2
NYAC / UMCOR, 1
Self-funded, 3
Private Donors, 3

Government Funding

Federal Government (CDBG), 2
State Government (SSBG), 1
Non-government, 6
VI. Projected Capacity and Needs of Volunteer Management Organizations


Remaining Organizational Needs

- Appropriate Volunteer Projects: 4
- Funding: 4
- Partner Organizations: 1
- Volunteer Supervisors: 2
- Volunteers: 1
- Transportation: 1
- Skilled Volunteers: 1
Aggregated data was self-reported by 8 organizations providing or facilitating volunteer group housing:

1. Calvary Presbyterian Church of Staten Island
2. Episcopal Diocese of New York Disaster Response (Episcopal Diocese of New York, Episcopal Relief & Development)
3. First Presbyterian Church of Jamaica
4. New York Disaster Interfaith Services
5. Resurrection Brooklyn Relief (Resurrection Brooklyn)
6. Sandy Recovery Ministry New York Annual Conference (United Methodist Committee on Relief)
7. Sheepshead Bay United Methodist Church
8. Unitarian Church on Staten Island

These organizations were added to reporting efforts in order to be inclusive of the full cycle of need for voluntary housing projects, which requires safe and adequate group housing for volunteers mobilized from outside of NYC.

Coordination between housing sites participating in this survey is facilitated by NYDIS’s Volunteer Group Housing Program (VGHP), which helps recruit, train, and build the capacity of congregations, nonprofit facilities, and other recovery partners to host Hurricane Sandy rebuilding volunteer groups. The VGHP also aims to coordinate housing availability and assignments for volunteer groups and with National VOAD partners. (This survey report notes when VGHP data is included in the aggregate data; while the program is not itself a hosting site, it does engage with 23 volunteer housing sites with total capacity of 961 beds.)

The following organizations did not self-report but are partially reported via their partnership in the VGHP data included in this study:

1. Great Kills Moravian Church
2. Movement Church of Staten Island
3. New Dorp Moravian Church
4. Olivet Presbyterian Church
5. Project Hospitality
*Of the 4,023 reported in 2014 from volunteer housing sites that submitted surveys, 429 individual volunteers were facilitated through the NYDIS VGH Program.

**Of the 5,351 projected in 2015 from volunteer housing sites that submitted surveys, 266 individual volunteers were facilitated through the NYDIS VGH Program as of July 2015.

***Estimate based on the $23.07 rate per hour assigned to volunteer labor by the Corporation for National & Community Service, [https://www.independentsector.org/volunteer_time](https://www.independentsector.org/volunteer_time).
II. Origin of Volunteers Placed in Volunteer Group Housing Sites

- Presbyterian Hope in Action, 1
- Presbyterian Disaster Assistance, 3
- NYDIS, 5
- Episcopal Relief & Development, 2
- NYAC/UMCOR, 2
- AmeriCorps NCCC/FEMA Corps, 3
- New York Cares, 1
- Affiliated Organizations, 3

Source of Volunteers in Need of Volunteer Group Housing

- NYC Metro Area, 3
- National, 7
- Regional Area, 3

Level of Volunteer Housing Outreach
### III. 2015 Hosting Capacity and Services at Volunteer Group Housing Sites

#### Volunteer Group Housing Capacity

- **Minimum Volunteer Capacity**
  - **Average Number of Volunteers Hosted at Single Housing Site:** 6
  - **Range of Volunteer Capacity at Single Housing Site:** 2-12
- **Maximum Volunteer Capacity**
  - **Total Minimum Volunteer Capacity at Housing Sites Combined:** 48
  - **Total Maximum Volunteer Capacity at Housing Sites Combined:** 227

#### Capabilities and Amenities

- **Meals**
  - 62.5% **Offer Breakfast**
  - 37.5% **Offer Lunch**
  - 25% **Offer Dinner**
  - 12.5% of sites charge for meals

- **Shower**
  - 75%

- **Washer/Dryer**
  - 25%

- **Parking**
  - 50%

- **Sleeping Accommodations**
  - 50% Non-Gender Specific
  - 50% Gender Specific

- **ADA Accessibility**
  - 37.5% **Offer ADA Compliant Spaces**
IV. Financial Overview

Expenditures and In-Kind Donations

$1,760,000  
TOTAL SPENT BY VOLUNTEER GROUP HOUSING ENTITIES ON DIRECT SUPPORT TO SANDY SURVIVORS

$225,460  
TOTAL ESTIMATED WORTH OF IN-KIND DONATIONS FOR SANDY RESPONSE/RECOVERY*

$20  
AVERAGE DONATION REQUESTED FOR VOLUNTEER LODGING

10–35  
RANGE OF DONATIONS REQUESTED FOR VOLUNTEER LODGING

$503,700  
TOTAL STAFF/ADMINISTRATION COSTS FOR SANDY RECOVERY PROGRAMMING

$20  
AVERAGE DONATION REQUESTED FOR VOLUNTEER LODGING

$53,650  
TOTAL DONATIONS RECEIVED

*Does not include cash donations and grants.

Grants and Cash Donations

Nonprofit and Grassroots Funding

- CERG Grant, 2
- Affiliate Organizations, 2
- Volunteer Donations, 2
- NYAC/UMCOR, 2
- Self-funded, 3
- NYDIS, 4
- Private Donors, 1
- Presbyterian Disaster Assistance, 1

Government Funding

- City, 1
- Non-government, 6
V. Future Capacity and Needs of Volunteer Group Housing Sites

Number of Organizations Offering Volunteer Group Housing

Future Housing Capacity

100% of respondents offering housing to Hurricane Sandy recovery volunteers would continue to host in a future disaster

4.8 Days average time necessary to prepare the facility in the case of a disaster

Remaining Organizational Needs
The respondent data included in this assessment report is statistically representative of 77% of voluntary rebuilding sector efforts, although NYDIS’s knowledge of the efforts of the remaining programs is incorporated in the narrative. The context necessary to frame the data presented herein requires some understanding of the wider recovery landscape in which these agencies function. In particular, gauging the progress of the sector and its remaining needs requires an overview of independent disaster case management and the federally funded Disaster Case Management Program (DCMP), as well as the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funded NYC Build it Back Program (NYC BiB). Both greatly affect the pace and planning of voluntary sector rebuild, volunteer management, and volunteer group housing entities.

Disaster Case Management Program (DCMP), Non-DCMP Case Management, and the NYC Sandy Unmet Needs Roundtable (UNR)

Disaster case management (DCM) in NYC is both included within and independent of the federally funded New York State Disaster Case Management Program (DCMP), which is managed by Catholic Charities Community Services, Archdiocese of New York, under the auspices of the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services, Office of Emergency Management and funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

DCMP and non-DCMP case management provides professional case coordination to support Sandy survivors and victims’ families by providing a single point of contact to access services from various social service organizations and government entitlement programs, working within an individual/household recovery plan.

Since 9/11, The Unmet Needs Roundtable(s) in New York City have been administered by New York Disaster Interfaith Services (NYDIS). According to the “NYC Sandy Unmet Needs Roundtable Assessment and Statistics to Date 7.31.15,” the remaining needs identified by DCM include:

- **1,014 cases out of 5,779 opened in DCMP**
  - 436 active cases in the DCMP
  - 578 estimated non-DCMP cases

To date, 5,779 cases have been closed, serving 23,219 households.

NYC Build it Back Program

An estimate of remaining housing needs in the NYC Build it Back Program of the Mayor’s Office of Housing Recovery is difficult to calculate. The number of total initial applicants to Build it Back ranges in its reporting depending on the source and varies throughout the timeline of recovery efforts. The “NYC Recovery Sandy Funding Tracker” claims **20,204 initial applicants in the Single Family Program** (with an additional 6,476 initial applications in the Multi Family Program). The NYC
Comptroller’s “Audit Report on the Administration of the New York City Build It Back Single Family Program by the Mayor’s Office of Housing Recovery Operations” claimed that the Housing Recovery Office (HRO) received approximately 19,500 registrations for the Single Family Program from the open registration period from June 3, 2013, to October 31, 2013. Other reports, such as the NYDIS Unmet Needs Roundtable 2014 Annual Report, claim a 20,500 estimate for initial applications.

According to the “NYC Recovery Sandy Funding Tracker” at www1.nyc.gov, as of September 2, 2015 the NYC Build it Back Program served 6,597 applicants through:

- **1493 construction starts**
- **957 construction completed**
- **4147 reimbursement checks sent out**

Following the Sandy Funding Tracker resource over the other conflicting resources indicated (the data is provided by the City of New York and updated more consistently):

- **An estimated 13,607 initial applicants have not yet received support from BiB**
- **A maximum of 5,220 individuals of those 13,607 applicants are still being considered for a pathway in BiB**

It is difficult to gauge how many of the 13,607 initial applicants who have not received support have remaining needs that might require disaster case management, UNR, or voluntary rebuild assistance to ensure sustainability. Nevertheless, a more thorough breakdown of household progress shows at least 11,817 with award calculation completed, which indicates the above net estimate of **5,220 homeowners still in need of housing recovery**. Further details on household progress can be seen below in the number of applicants listed as awaiting various phases in the Build it Back process, from document collection reviews (19,530 awaiting), to award calculation completed (11,817), to award selected (8,032), up through construction start and completion.
New York City’s present Mayor’s Office of Housing Recovery Operations and the Build it Back Program inherited a complex and troubled program from the previous administration. In the initial stages of the program’s development, there was little partnership with local or national nonprofit rebuild organizations or contracting to use professional contractors to build homes. Many rebuild organizations also lacked the capacity to effectively navigate the complex government recovery systems—similarly to homeowners who struggled with the same issues in their personal recovery.

The 2014 historical data included in this report for the voluntary rebuilding sector would be better contrasted against the Build it Back data for that year, which was significantly lower with only 686 applicants receiving any benefits (from reimbursement to construction starts, as of August 1, 2014), nearly two years after the storm hit New York and fifteen months after the BIB program began accepting registrations.1

**Under the current administration, Build it Back has seen most of its progress to date, now within the third year of Sandy recovery.** Successes in coordination around rebuilding of Sandy-affected homes have included: (1) the integration of three of this report’s surveyed rebuild organizations that are now classified as “Choose Your Own Contractor” options and (2) partnerships with nonprofits through the Build it Back counseling program to help expedite housing recovery issues that may delay homeowners’ ability to move forward in their recovery pathways.

Although Build it Back has made significant progress in homeowner rebuild reimbursements (over 50% of checks sent), the Single Family Program for rebuild and elevation has reportedly completed approximately 10% of all enrolled homes.

In 2015, Build it Back conducted renewed outreach efforts since the initial registration period to reengage with inactive, potential, and withdrawn registrants.2 The program is still evolving to meet complex needs and more efficiently and sustainably distribute significant remaining financial resources. An overview of the Federal Recovery Funding for New York City illustrates the resources allocated can be found on www1.nyc.gov/sandytracker, including the use of the funds to date:

---


2 Those efforts may account for some of the aforementioned inconsistencies in reporting statistics, but Sandy recovery data released by various government agencies has varied at other points in the recovery effort as well and may simply result from inconsistent coordination across agencies.
By Summer 2015, the voluntary rebuilding sector had lost a significant portion of its rebuild, volunteer management, and volunteer group housing capacity. Despite this loss, these entities continue to work collaboratively and creatively to meet increasingly complex Sandy-related needs with decreasing resources and attention. Several pathways remain to sustaining and even expanding the remaining programs, separated here into recommendations for (1) rebuild organizations, volunteer management organizations, volunteer group housing sites, (2) government housing recovery services, and (3) the entire rebuilding sector (voluntary and government).

1. Recommendations for Rebuild Organizations, Volunteer Management Organizations, and Volunteer Group Housing Sites

As recommended in the 2014 Rebuild Environment report, rebuild efforts are the most fruitful where organizations communicate and collaborate regularly. **A few ways to improve internal voluntary rebuilding sector collaboration include:**

- **Strengthening engagement in LTRGs and NYC VOAD in order to bring peer accountability, transparency, and efficiency through leadership of participating organizations that are sincerely committed to these values.** No rebuild organization should be working without support or communication from a rebuild committee of a local LTRG, alongside the key recovery functions of DCMP and the UNR. Organizations that do not operate in these systems, withholding cases in isolated queues, can compromise or prevent sustainable recovery of individual homeowners through lack of transparency around their organizational capacity and needs.

- **Solidifying inter-borough collaboration around following National VOAD best practices, especially by setting standards for data collection to better aggregate successes and gaps**

- **Establishing points of consensus** (building on NYC and National VOAD points of consensus) around transparency of queues, peer accountability, and quality of services among local collaborative networks that bring together voluntary rebuild, DCM, UNR, and other partners

- **Re-engaging with original funding resources and seeking out new funding partners**

- **Building a stable base of local, skilled volunteers and further engagement with national voluntary rebuild organizations,** as recommended in the 2014 Rebuild Environment report

- **Designing better, more formalized referral, tracking, and support mechanisms** between DCM providers and the voluntary rebuilding sector
2. Recommendations for Government Housing Recovery Services

There are parallel conflicting timelines between the voluntary and government recovery sectors in NYC. The voluntary rebuilding sector programs are scaling down disproportionately to Build it Back, which is reaching full rebuild and elevation capacity. If this continues, significant nonprofit partnership opportunities will be lost around efficient long-term recovery, outreach, education, and information-gathering with affected communities. Even modest improved alignment with and support from Build it Back will provide new pathways to sustain the crucial resources and knowledge of the nonprofit sector. A few approaches to improve government housing recovery coordination with the voluntary rebuilding sector include:

- **Create better sharing of data related to historical, present, and projected government-supported recovery efforts.**

  By continuing to work predominantly independently of government-funded recovery programs, voluntary rebuilding sector organizations are barred from a full understanding of the remaining needs of households enrolled in city programs. More transparency and information-sharing would better streamline support of Sandy-affected homeowners and potentially access the financial opportunities still in the coffers of wider recovery efforts.

- **Align messaging across sectors that sustaining voluntary rebuilding capacity and improving partnerships with LTRGs and VOAD (the disaster human services sector) is crucial to the success of government recovery and resilience efforts.**

- **Continue to design partnerships between Build it Back and rebuild organizations, volunteer management organizations, and volunteer group housing—expanding the city’s present efforts to better align recovery timelines with DCMP and the UNR in order to address gaps in registrants’ needs.** Suggestions for streamlining efforts with service providers engaging in voluntary rebuilding include:

  1. Develop a robust referral process that moves homeowners with outstanding or non-payable transfer amounts to DCMP, UNR, LTRGs and their rebuild partners.
  2. Subsidize insurance policies for rebuild organizations, either on a case-by-case basis, in partnership with larger rebuild organizations already approved for “Choose your own Contractor” options, or through a consortium of voluntary rebuild groups.
  3. Strengthen the formal referral process to disaster case management for vulnerable cases with modest scopes of work in need of expedited service or unmet needs assistance.
  4. Add a “Choose Your Own Community-Based Rebuild Group” option, similar to the “Choose your own Contractor,” at least for clients with low to moderate repairs or reimbursements, if not for all Build it Back registered clients.
  5. Offer grants or other direct financial support for rebuild organizations, Disaster Case Management, Unmet Needs Roundtables/Temporary Rental Housing, and Long Term Recovery Groups assisting in addressing the Build it Back queue, since their volunteer work results in ultimate savings to the program.

---

3. Recommendations for a Unified Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Sector (Voluntary & Governmental)

A commitment to community resilience derives from a long-term recovery model that envisions preparedness efforts through direct sustained connection and commitment to community members, especially those who are most vulnerable. Only when the local and national voluntary recovery sector is fully integrated at every phase of the disaster lifecycle can New York City’s vulnerable residents achieve sustainable recovery and whole community resilience. Presently, there are gaps in what government housing recovery services need and what voluntary rebuilding sector services can provide. These gaps are not resourced, legislated, or anticipated.

In achieving the shared goal of serving Sandy-impacted New Yorkers, the voluntary rebuilding sector and government-supported housing recovery programs can advocate side by side for disaster recovery reform and planning through pragmatic projects and dialogue, including:

- **Integrating VOAD and the human services sector into immediate and long-term planning discussions.**

  Realistic immediate and long-term recovery planning that would address the gaps and dwindling capacity identified in this report or in future recovery efforts requires the input of various levels of voluntary rebuilding service providers and coalitions, along with the active involvement of government agencies. The ideal scenario would bring together these various levels of recovery expertise to revisit former plans, explore new models from other post-disaster landscapes, and commit to developing funding streams, along with flexible and accessible frameworks for Sandy long-term recovery and other future incidents. **This will need to happen within 2016 to engage the rapidly shrinking window of opportunity to work with active voluntary rebuilding partners.**

- **Facilitating honest and pragmatic debriefings inclusive of present and former leadership in Sandy long-term recovery efforts (both governmental and voluntary).**

  A frank debriefing about what went wrong between government and the human services sector post-Sandy is required—one which identifies when systems built to expedite services created a sea of discordant bureaucracies that were impediments to individual recovery. This circumstance left human services agencies with unrealistic government contracts and contract timelines that could be avoided through better, committed communication channels.

- **Solidifying any long-term disaster recovery and resiliency planning with voluntary rebuilding sector into legally-empowered legislation and policies.**

  New York City remains vulnerable and less resilient in the face of future hazards without significant changes in recovery policies. There is a need for legislated policies which require broader coordination and collaboration between state and city as well as voluntary sector rebuilding efforts. Those policies must establish defined roles in preparedness, planning, and relief, as well as roles and responsibilities in short- and long-term recovery functions. Legislated policies would protect Emergency Management plans from executive decisions which undermine established plans and partnerships – thus preventing challenges the sectors faced after Sandy. **Immediate and long-term examples of policy recommendations include:**

    - **Pre-defined VOAD member and LTRG roles in each of phase of the disaster lifecycle.**
Pre-defined and mutually discerned VOAD member and LTRG roles in all relevant NYC Emergency Management plans, including:

- A planning review role that allows for voluntary rebuilding sector experts to access the cultural and religious competency of city plans in addressing the mass care and recovery needs of unique communities within New York City.
- Inclusion of voluntary rebuilding sector partners in asset coordination.

Sustained funding streams for nonprofit force-multipliers for each phase of the disaster lifecycle, as well as pre- and post-disaster activation funds and contract-launch timelines.

Formalized agreements around recovery functions and funding prior to disaster events would limit the complexities and slow service provision which derives from a present system of reimbursements from government funding sources to voluntary sector partners. There is an urgent need for plans established prior to disaster events that address emergency startup funding—especially in administrative costs—to be made available for voluntary recovery functions requiring instantaneous support, including:

- LTRG coordination
- Volunteer group housing and management
- Unmet Needs Roundtable
- Disaster Case Management Program

Formalized data sharing around client intake, unmet needs assessments, and duplication of benefits and avoidance of shifting policies and practices.

Streamlined Department of Buildings permitting and code exemptions which allow for experienced national and local rebuild organizations to work in New York City. This includes policies that allow shower, office, and dorm trailers to be installed city-wide within days of a disaster.

A shared coordination mechanism between government and voluntary rebuilding sectors comprised of a multi-function relief and recovery system, spanning from start-up to sun-setting of intake, home debris removal, mental health, DCM, UNR, and volunteer housing, with volunteer rebuild integrated with city and state government mass care, mental health, repair and rebuild human services.

Plans for government-sector coordination with the voluntary sector around NYC’s volunteer management plans (not sufficient support during Hurricane Sandy response/recovery).

Plans should be more broadly inclusive of regional and national volunteer recruitment and consider how volunteer group housing funding plays a significant role in supporting volunteers. NYC needs to anticipate how to avoid losing volunteer streams to New Jersey and other affected areas in New York State due to lack of adequate housing for volunteers (i.e., affordable spaces with showers, cots, and cultural/religious sensitivities).

Advocacy initiatives with state leaders to reframe how SSBG grants are solicited and awarded.

This should ensure that all grantees are experienced in the roles for which they apply, and that funded services are coordinated with VOAD members and major recovery functions such as the DCMP. SSBG grants should consider supporting administrative needs for up to three years after disasters similar in scopeyscale to Hurricane Sandy.
Voluntary rebuilding sector organizations active in Hurricane Sandy recovery efforts continue to offer unparalleled strengths that warrant increased funding and partnerships with the well-resourced, wider government landscape of long-term recovery. These strengths include:

1. Established and sustainable community and faith-based leadership – proven success.
2. Collaborative, creative solutions and partnerships established over three years of partnership and coalition building – and existing credibility amongst donors.
3. Knowledge of the trajectory and typology of Sandy-related needs, impact-to-date.
4. Mapping of and direct communication with diverse recovery services and resources
5. Credibility on the ground, amongst service providers and in affected neighborhoods

It is simple: partnership with the voluntary rebuilding sector is cost-efficient, supports local recovery efforts, and creates community resilience. Like for-profit contractors and construction management firms, nonprofit rebuild organizations are an essential tool in a city’s recovery framework. Although they are not staffed with licensed contractors and elevation experts, they subcontract effectively, are cost-efficient, and have a proven track record for completing rebuild in partnership with homeowners.

The recommendations offered herein are sustainable steps toward increasing resiliency in New York City through changes in recovery policies which include better funding support, communication, and coordination between the voluntary and governmental rebuilding sectors.

To that end, a review of where Sandy activation and relief systems were sidestepped is necessary. The sector needs earnest open ears from leaders who have seen the trials and successes of recovery. Without skilled and broad representation among the boroughs and diverse city-wide VOAD members, a resilient New York will not be possible.

The voluntary rebuilding sector offers its knowledge, resources, and partnership after leading recovery efforts over the last three years. Now is a crucial window of opportunity to lead in the policy changes that would produce stronger models of support for protecting this city and the homes and lives of its still-struggling, still-vulnerable residents.
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