# CDBG Income Survey Review Checklist Instructions

## How to use the Checklist:

This review checklist has been developed to assist HCD staff in reviewing income survey methodology and results submitted by grantees for the purpose of validating a geographic area to be eligible for the Low- and Moderate-Income Area (LMA) National Objective.

*Low- and Moderate-Income Area National Objective*

LMA is the most commonly used national objective for activities that benefit a residential neighborhood. An area benefit activity is one that benefits all residents in a particular area, where at least 51 percent of the residents are low- and moderate-income (LMI) persons. An area is considered to meet the test of being an LMI area if there is a sufficiently large percentage (51 percent) of LMI persons residing in the service area as determined by:

1. The most recently available decennial Census information, together with the [CDBG Income Limits](https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5334/cdbg-income-limits/) that would have applied at the time the income information was collected by the Census Bureau; OR
2. A current survey of the residents of the service area.

Grantees should confirm that the existing Census data does not indicate that the proposed service area is an LMI area **prior** to conducting an income survey of the area.

For further guidance on National Objectives, see Chapter 2 of the Grants Management Manual.

HUD has published a guidance document summarizing the requirements and process for conducting an income survey of residents of a service area ([CDBG Income Survey Toolkit](https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/cdbg/cdbg-income-survey-toolkit/?utm_source=HUD+Exchange+Mailing+List&utm_campaign=04fe1b49d4-CDBG_INCOME_SURVEY_GUIDEBOOK_TOOLKIT_22%2F9%2F29&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_f32b935a5f-04fe1b49d4-19631582) ). Prior to completing the income survey review checklist, HCD staff is encouraged to review the toolkit to understand the process and requirements of an income survey.

This checklist should be used to verify that grantees conformed with income survey requirements. If a grantee is found to have conducted an incorrect income survey, HCD should respond to the grantee using the checklist and the toolkit as the basis of the feedback.

HCD staff should save the completed checklist in the grantee’s file to document eligibility for the proposed LMA activity.

## CDBG Income Survey Review Checklist

### Survey Preparation:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * Did the grantee accurately define the service area of the activity?   + Service areas may not align with Census Tract Block Groups (CTBGs).   + The service area may be a county, city, town, neighborhood, utility district, or other geographic area based on the activity type. The service area should be documented by a map identifying the service area and a description of the activity and why it aligns with the proposed service area.   + Did the grantee take into account other boundaries, such as highways, economic divides, cultural makeup of communities in determining the service area? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Is the service area primarily residential as defined by the grantee?   + The grantee should document that the service area is primarily residential using resources such as satellite imagery of the area or local land use maps. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee create a complete sampling frame (address list) for the area?   + The grantee should document how the sampling frame was produced, including the source of address information. Source of address data could come from utility data, assessor/ tax roll documentation, or other local address logs. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee scrub the sampling frame of all non-residential and vacant properties?   + The grantee should document how non-residential and vacant properties were identified and show proof that they were removed from sampling frame. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| *Comments* | |

### Survey Design:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * Did the grantee establish a survey approach?   + Generally, this is a multi-modal approach that may include web-based, mail, telephone, and/ or in-person engagement. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee publicize the survey to the service area prior to its launch?   + Publicizing the survey prior to launch is a recommended best practice to garner buy-in and understanding of the survey's target population prior to launch. Publicizing may include descriptions of the survey in social media posts, news briefings, or a description at a local government meeting. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee develop templates for outreach letters, scripts, and other resource aids to support the survey launch?   + Did the grantee ensure the opportunity for participation by selected families with Limited English Proficiency? | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the survey instruments include the following elements?   + Informed Consent   + Household/ Family Count by Address   + Family Income | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| *Comments* | |

### Sampling:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * Did the grantee correctly calculate the minimum number of responses required for an accurate survey?   + [CPD Notice 19-02](https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5794/notice-cpd1902-low-and-moderate-income-summary-data-updates/) requires that the Confidence Level be at least 90% and the Margin of Error (MOE) not exceed the lesser of 10% or the HUD provided MOE for the equivalent area.   + Sample size based on Confidence Level and MOE can be calculated here: https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size-calculator/. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee add three unique Family IDs to each address in the sampling frame?   + This allows for documentation of multiple families residing in one housing unit.   + Three is the recommended minimum number of Family IDs in accordance with the HUD toolkit. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee draw a random sample from the sampling frame?   + The random sample may be drawn through a web-based randomizing tool such as www.random.org or an Excel function to randomly sort a list.   + It is a best practice to draw a random sample of at least 150% of the minimum number of responses required for an accurate survey. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee establish interview protocols and train interviewers?   + Interviewers should use a consistent script, have a process to confirm eligibility, collect accurate data, effectively engage interview subjects in culturally responsive ways and in their preferred language, and maintain their safety and confidentiality. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee use case management logs to document the current status of the sampled addresses?   + Case logs ensure the grantee is accurately tracking the status of the income survey and the outcome of each visit/ engagement with a family is noted. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| *Comments* | |

### Data Management

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * Did the grantee establish protocols to review collected data and verify potential data outliers?   + Cleaning data and verifying abnormalities reduces the risk of errors from data entry and ensures the income survey is accurate and complete.   + Add examples of errors i.e., duplicate addresses, etc. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| * Did the grantee accurately calculate the LMI share of the service area?   + LMI share is calculated as persons in LMI families/ persons in sample. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| *Comments* | |

### Confidentiality

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * Did the grantee take measures to ensure that PII data collected in the survey was not shared with anyone not directly responsible for conducting the income survey?   + This may include using a unique ID versus names or addresses, locking paper surveys in a secure location, or keeping electronic files in a password protected folder. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | |
| *Comments* | |