

**CITY OF KEY WEST WORKER SATISFACTION SURVEY
FINAL REPORT**
12/17/07

Submitted to:

Mayor Morgan McPherson and City Commission
Assistant City Manager John Jones
Dr. Jeff Sharkey, Capital Alliance Group, Inc.
People of Key West

Karen A. Larson (KCL Research)
Principal Investigator
Professor of Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Studies
Gustavus Adolphus College
800 W. College Ave.
St. Peter, MN 56082
(507) 933-7424, (507) 327-6649 cell
klarson2@gac.edu

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	3
Summary	4
History and Methodology	6
Data Presentation and Analysis	11
Overall Results	
Current and Goal Housing	
Humanly Sustainable Development	
Culture	
Housing Profile	
Narrative Comments	
Conclusions and Observations	25
Tables and Figures	30
References	34
Appendix	35

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are due to many who assisted in bringing this project to fruition. Working with the City of Key West was a pleasure, beginning with Mayor McPherson, whose idea it was to commission the study, and Assistant City Manager John Jones, under whose office the study was conducted. Their assistants, Vivian Perez and Portia Navarro, spearheaded the endlessly helpful staff at City Hall. Housing consultant Paul Clayton was absolutely instrumental at every phase of the project. The valiant Charlie Pons showed indomitable spirit when faced with the daunting task of survey mailing and distribution.

Also in Key West, Jessica Bennett of the Tourist Development Council, Francisco (Paco) Rodriguez, Marius Koller, and Reverend Arlo David Peterson provided amongst them professional research collaboration, Spanish translation, survey transportation services, and hospitality. City residents and assistants Chris Cody and Laura Larson-Cody stalwartly stuffed envelopes. In Minnesota, the mailroom staff of Gustavus Adolphus College and Jane Chouanard and her staff provided informational and secretarial support. Laura Larson-Cody navigated the rigors of sorting mailing labels, data entry, and a host of other tasks with great energy and grace.

The ultimate thanks goes to focus group members and survey respondents for their time, outspokenness, and passion about their hometown. Residing in Key West is not for the faint of heart. That people coping with the challenges demonstrated in these survey results took the time to fill out a survey many were not sure would make a difference in their lives is a tribute to their tenacity. The research team endeavored to honor their effort by working long hours on top of other job commitments to bring these results forward.

SUMMARY

This survey, with its joint focus on workforce housing and cultural development, was commissioned by the City of Key West in early 2007. The survey instrument was generated in an interactive process with citizen focus groups. The survey was distributed, via employers whose assistance was requested in distribution, to people working in the city. The return rate from all workers was 17% (or 19% from workers who “speak English well”). The respondent pool may have reflected biases toward older and more affluent workers.

Overall results indicate that the four issues most important to the satisfaction of workers in Key West are (in order of diminishing importance): 1) **Affordability and Housing**, 2) **Development and Loss of Traditional Character**, 3) **Cleanliness**, and 4) **Government**. Workers desire modest improvements in the size and quality of their housing, and the in number of jobs worked by members of the household to sustain their housing situation. Workers desire significant relief of their high housing cost burden (89% of respondents were housing cost burdened, with 45% severely burdened). One-third of all respondents are renters who aspire to own. Single person households predominate at the lowest income level, recommending a distribution of housing sizes at that level differing from the optimal distribution of housing sizes at higher income levels.

A majority of respondents would like to see developers more involved in the community by providing community housing and helping to beautify the city. With respect to the quality of life in Key West, salaries are of the greatest concern, followed by housing, health care, city cleanliness, and other job and family-related concerns.

Weather and the environment, and cultural and social diversity are the strongest factors drawing workers to Key West, with housing, affordability, and commercialization or loss of traditional island character as the strongest influences causing them to consider leaving. The concept of “One Human Family” remains a predominant element of island identity, and a resource that can be leveraged in crafting the island’s cultural future.

Narrative comments elaborate on quantitative data with detailed accounts of the difficulties of financial survival in Key West, expressed concern that Key West is losing or has already lost its unique character, and concerns about severe social schisms between rich and poor, and between elected officials and citizens. Respondents were, in particular, adamant about wanting government action, and not just more research or more talk, on issues of concern to city workers.

Key West is at a turning point. Its percentage of housing cost burdened workers is extremely high in relation to other municipalities. This situation synergizes with other concerns about the local environment for workers, such as a changing culture, the cleanliness of the city, and the atmosphere for families, into a situation of potentially increasing transience throughout the local population. An element of assuring a positive cultural future for the island, in addition to applying a systemic concept of development, will be to leverage the existing community and family ethics to help carry the uniqueness of Key West’s culture into the future.

HISTORY AND METHODOLOGY

History

Following preliminary conversation with Mayor Morgan McPherson in March 2007, this survey was commissioned through the office of Assistant City Manager John Jones. In June, the principal investigator met with focus groups of Key West workers, businesspeople, members of the Ambassadors Club, and others, as part of the process of developing the survey instrument. The discussions in those groups assisted in drafting questions that would be meaningful and relevant to Key West workers.

This process, in the case of this research, originates in “ethnographic method” from cultural anthropology. The principle involved is that people within a cultural system know better than an outside investigator how to frame questions that are useful and meaningful to insiders (Spradley, 1980). A draft version of the survey instrument was distributed to city officials and focus group members for feedback before the instrument was finalized. Survey questions honed closely to focus group participants’ understanding of how their social system is structured, and what they want to know about it.

The survey was distributed in August, with returns accepted through the end of October. An oral report with preliminary results and analysis was presented to the mayor, city managers, and members of the public on October 29th. The final report will be utilized by Dr. Sharkey in support of a city grant application to the State of Florida for affordable housing funding.

Methodology

The survey population was people employed in the city of Key West, irrespective of place of residence. Surveys with individual return envelopes were distributed to employers by U.S. mail or by courier, in accordance with a city employer list provided by InfoUSA. One survey was provided for every job in the city. Copies of survey forms and cover letters are available in the appendix to this report. The inclusion of individual return envelopes was designed to minimize the possibility of employer influence on answers. Newspaper notices announced the availability of the Spanish language version of the survey.

A total of 18,632 surveys were distributed to jobs in the city, representing an over distribution in terms of the number of workers. Surveys were distributed to jobs, but returns were asked from workers. The estimated number of workers, based on extrapolation from 2000 and 2003 census figures, in Key West in August 2007 was 12,985. Workers with more than one job (survey data from these respondents indicate that 37% of workers in Key West have more than one job) may have received more than one form. A worker's receipt of a survey form was dependent on the cooperation of his or her employer in distributing the surveys as requested.

The return rate was creditable. A total of 2179 returns were made, for a raw return rate of 12% from the total distribution. The adjusted return rate, from the estimated number of workers in Key West, was 17%. The Spanish language version of the survey unfortunately, saw minimal distribution and return. If one were to assume that Key West workers who "do not speak English well," again as extrapolated from census figures, did

not effectively receive the survey, the return rate among of current workers in Key West who “speak English well” would be 19%.

By comparison to the census figures, respondents were gender representative of the city within 2 percentage points (Question 2), and had the same proportion of renters to owners (45% to 55%, Question 8d) as well as similar household size (2.45 as compared to 2.23, Question 6). Survey respondents were, however, somewhat older (Question 1) and more affluent (Question 18) than census figures would suggest, differences which may reflect sampling bias.

This survey may have encountered the same age bias as Harris’s 2004 study of attitudes towards tourism in Key West, in which older individuals responded disproportionately. The low return of the Spanish version of the survey may be suggestive of a failure to adequately tap lower income workers where Spanish speakers are heavily concentrated. The lowest income category on the survey (up to \$39,000 for a household), while set in accordance with HUD housing regulations, might profitably have been subdivided into more than one category in order to distinguish between low income and very low income workers.

With respect to years in residence, a comparison of these data (Question 3) with Harris’s data show an increase in the percentage of respondents who have been in Key West for five or fewer years (from 26% to 38%, with the caveat to the comparison being that his sample was drawn differently, by random telephone polling). The difference nevertheless may reflect a recent demographic of population outflow and worker replacement in Key West.

Further comparison of the data on years in residence indicates a possible trend toward bimodality. That is, a larger percentage (61%) of respondents are in either the shortest term (up to five years) or the longest term (over 20 years) residential categories, as compared to 42% in Harris's sample. That conclusion would also be congruent with Bennett's (2006) findings on tourism workers in Monroe County that comparatively more tourism workers who had lived in the Keys twenty years or more said that they were likely to remain. Bennett further links that result to the fact that long-term residents were the least housing cost burdened, housing cost burden being a predictive factor in relocation. Key West may be seeing a shift from a relatively even distribution of time in residence to a workforce in which transient newcomers and stable long termers predominate. Narrative responses, however, also point to a possibility that instability is developing in the group that has been in residence for over 20 years.

The primary jobs of respondents (Question 5) fell into the following occupational categories: 38% were in hospitality or sales, 18% in human services (including health care, education, police, etc.), 16% in government, 8% in infrastructure services (including construction, utilities, and transportation), 8% in finance or real estate, 4% professional, and 8% miscellaneous or "other." Seventy-seven per cent of households were kin-based, while 23% were inclusive of persons not related by blood, marriage or registered domestic partnership (Question 7). Reported results throughout are calculated from the number of respondents answering a question, rather than from the total number of surveys in the data set, omitting non-respondents to any given question.

Focus group members, citizens, and survey respondents raised a number of concerns about the survey itself in the course of the project. One concern was cost and

the utilization of taxpayer dollars for the project. The total cost of the project was kept moderate. Although supply, postage, and travel expenses were unavoidable, labor was provided at either reasonable rates or on a pro bono basis.

Another criticism was that results from previous surveys had not led to action, and that these results would be likewise unused. While corroboration in these data of findings from previous surveys on critical issues strengthens arguments for action, more importantly, these results make it clear that a general lack of confidence in local government to take action on behalf of citizens should be quickly addressed. That finding, above all, is important to address in order to improve the climate for change in the city.

A third concern was that these results would be duplicative of what is already known. While no new survey was needed to establish the fact of the need for greater affordability of living for Key West workers, these results contribute new and actionable information about patterns of housing needs in relation to income level and household size and resident attitudes about their culture.

Finally, the concept of “culture” was disavowed by some. The concept, however, is particularly well suited to a research problem that can benefit from a systemic perspective, as is the case with the island society of Key West. Workers in Key West stay or go in response to a total way of life, including economic, social, political, aesthetic, and other elements. The future of the city is likewise rooted in the evolving configuration of all of those issues in relationship to one another.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Overall Results

Examination of responses to all questions on the survey yields an overall ranking of the importance of issues to workers:

1) **AFFORDABILITY** The clearly predominant concern is the affordability of living in Key West, with special reference to the cost of housing (the base cost, plus taxes and insurance). The rising cost of general living expenses, including health care and day care, and the necessity for many workers to hold multiple jobs in order to manage financially are also incorporated in this issue.

2) **DEVELOPMENT/LOSS OF CHARACTER** The interrelated concerns of upscale development and overdevelopment (with special reference to condominium development) and changes to the traditional character and culture of the island were the second ranked concern.

3) **CLEANLINESS** The cleanliness of city streets, parks, beaches and water, and the environment in general was the third ranking concern. A related concern was over utilization of public spaces by the homeless.

4) **GOVERNMENT** Fourth ranked was a concern about local government, which is perceived to be overly responsive to development concerns and nonresponsive to the needs of locals. Related to this perception is a concern about growing social polarization between the privileged and the struggling (i.e. “rich” and “workers”).

Current and Goal Housing

Respondents were asked to compare their current and goal housing situations in terms of:

- 1) The percentage of household income spent on housing (Questions 8e, 9e)
- 2) Whether they rented or owned (Questions 8d, 9d)
- 3) Satisfaction with current ownership (Question 8d)
- 4) Housing size (Questions 8c, 9c)
- 5) Housing quality (Questions 8b, 9b)
- 6) The number of jobs worked by members of the household (Questions 8a, 9a)
- 7) Presence or absence of a yard (Questions 8c, 9c)

Comparisons on the last four measures showed relatively small differences between the current and the goal situations. The overall desired gain in housing size was modest (from 2.2 to 2.5 bedrooms), as was the desired increase in housing quality (from an index of 3.2 to 3.7 on a 5-point scale where 3 was “adequate” and 4 was “more than adequate”). The overall goal for decrease in the number of jobs worked was similarly modest (from an index of 1.9 to 1.8, where a value of “1” represents 1 or fewer jobs and a value of “2” represents between 1 and 2 jobs). One percent of respondents who currently lack yards want a yard as a component of their goal housing situation.

Comparison on the first two measures showed strongly differentiated responses between current and goal housing situations. These data indicate an extremely high percentage (89%) of housing cost burdened Key West employees (see **Table 1**). Those in categories 2)-4) on the table, who pay 30% or more of total income for housing, are housing cost burdened. Almost half of all respondents are severely housing cost

burdened, paying half or more of their income for housing (category 4). Anecdotally, some respondents in the severely burdened category noted their housing cost burden was 75%, 90%, or even 100% of their income. The housing cost burden reported here is even higher than that reported by Bennett (2006) for tourism workers in Key West. The comparison between the two data sets held for both tourism workers and all respondents to the current survey. While the difference may be in part due to the explicitness of the question on this survey about including all costs related to housing, (such as insurances, utilities, and taxes), the overall results remain striking.

A review of **Table 1** shows that Key West workers wish to be considerably less housing cost burdened than they are. The mean response for current income spent on housing falls in the 40-49% of income category. The mean response for goal housing falls in the 30-39% of income category. Interestingly, workers by and large do not aspire to become unburdened, only less burdened than they are now. Given the situation of high housing cost burden, it is notable that current owner satisfaction is relatively high, with 3.6 being the mean response on a 5-point scale where 3 was “neutral” and 4 was “high.” Only 12% of respondents indicate that their satisfaction with ownership is “low” or “very low.”

There was also a striking difference between current and goal housing situations with regard to renting vs. ownership. While 45% of all respondents currently own, 80% wish to own. That is, over a third of all respondents are renters who wish to own. It should be noted that affordable rentals remain a high priority concern, with one-third of current renters wishing to continue to rent. The desire of renters to own increases as income rises. Only 59% of renters in the lowest income category (household income

under \$39,000) aspired to own. That figure rose to 72% for current renters in the second and third income categories (from \$39,000-\$95,999) and to 78% for renters in the fourth income category (\$96,000-\$119,999). The percentage in the fifth income category (\$120,000 to \$143,999) was 85%, and climbed to 88% for the four highest income categories combined (over \$144,000). Renters and owners alike want their housing cost burden to come down, but are by and large either satisfied with ownership or desirous of ownership, even in a difficult owning environment.

Humanly Sustainable Development

Some community members and respondents identified the concept “humanly sustainable development,” a concept which originated in focus groups and reflected a desire for a systemic approach to development that would incorporate viable worker lifestyles with economic development goals, as reflective of an anti-development attitude. While “systemically sustainable development” might have been a more neutral term, the intent was to explore what has been referred to as “directed” or “controlled” development elsewhere, i.e. development in which the interests of developers and local communities may be sculpted away from an oppositional standing and toward a posture of mutual benefit. Those in focus groups were interested in creating a concept of “development” that integrates with the well being of the entire city as a system.

Previous studies of both residents and tourists (cf. Harris, 2004 and Bennett, 2006) have indicated that city cleanliness is an arena of compromised satisfaction for both visitors and locals. Thus, any “residential” development concern, whether it be permanent housing, hotels, or condominiums might, on behalf of satisfying its target population, profitably wish to concern itself with city clean up issues. The resulting

relationship between developers and the city could be construed as symbiotic, i.e. mutually beneficial, rather than “anti-development” based on a simple quantitative diminution of a short term bottom line or profit margin.

Speaking in that vein, then, rather than in one to be construed as hostile to the concept of development or developers per se, the results to survey question about how developers should benefit the local community (Question 10) were as follows:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1) Provide community housing | 62% |
| 2) Help beautify the city | 58% |
| 3) Pay real estate transfer tax | 49% |
| 4) Contribute to local charities | 40% |
| 5) Provide housing for previous tenants | 36% |

Questions about the quality of life and work in Key West (Questions 11-13) yielded the results in **Figure 1**. Salaries are the top concern, one that is consistently high across all income categories. In other words, high and low income people in Key West have a common high level of concern about salaries. Housing, health care, and city cleanliness (for which the response was consistently at 4.60 or above, with 4 as “somewhat important” and 5 as “very important” for city residents of all durations, for a composite figure of 4.64) are clustered behind, while the related concerns of job benefits and the quality of management form a third priority set. Promotions are less salient. Day care and transportation are the least significant concerns, although it should be noted that for families with children as compared to all respondents, the importance of day care rose from 3.53 to 4.38. The interest in partnerships between the city and employers or landlords with the goal of ameliorating worker living conditions was relatively high, at

4.25 where 4 is “somewhat” and 5 is “very” important. The desirability of the city working with landlords who rent affordably to moderate taxes and consequently rents was frequently referenced in narrative comments.

Culture

Workers come to and stay in Key West because of the weather and the environment (Questions 14a, 14b, see **Figure 2**). Culture and social diversity are secondary concerns. Employment and family are less important as reasons for coming, but appreciate in importance as reasons for staying, a finding upon which the city might wish to capitalize in taking action with regard to worker retention (see, for example, data from **Figures 2 and 3** and the narrative comments section about family needs in the city). Some Conchs (18% of respondents) who had left Key West and subsequently returned provided answers to both parts of the question (i.e. whether you were born here or what attracted you to Key West).

The premiere issue that might cause workers to leave (Question 14c) is housing (see **Figure 3**). Over-commercialization, in conjunction with the loss of traditional character, comprise a secondary dyad of issues, followed by the work environment, the prospect of hurricanes, and family issues. Fewer than 20% of respondents marked traffic, lack of social cooperation, environmental issues, or the quality of schools and churches as concerns, although in family households the concern with the quality of schools and churches almost doubled from 20% to 39%.

Several respondents noted that the cost of living should have been included as an option on this question. The pattern of narrative comments also strongly indicated that cost of living is a primary for leaving, as 17% of narrative responses in the affordability

category made reference to leaving, while references to leaving in other comment categories which referred to leaving (i.e. housing, loss of traditional character, cleanliness, etc.) were all less than 10%.

Key West's culture (Question 15) was viewed as most strongly defined by "social diversity" (64% of respondents), with "funkiness" and a "community ethic" indicated at 44% and 42% respectively. Narrative comments to the question about the culture of Key West fleshed out the picture of Key West culture in a way that might be summarized as follows: "Key West is One laid-back Human Family in an artsy small town paradise." The concept of One Human Family predominated strongly in the narrative comments and remains a conceptual resource that the city can leverage in addressing worker satisfaction issues and crafting an ongoing cultural identity.

Upscale development, indicated by 75% of respondents, was perceived as the strongest threat to the culture of Key West (Question 16). Government inaction on behalf of residents followed at 46%, with social divisions at 20%. Narrative comments, wherein predominant concerns were affordability and housing, development, and government, again expanded on the quantitative results.

Housing Profile

Respondents' goal housing size in relation to current housing size is reported in **Table 2** as a function of household size (i.e. number of people in the household). Among all respondents, goal housing size is only marginally larger than current housing size, shifting from a current level of 2.2 bedrooms to 2.5 bedrooms, in relation to an overall average household size of 2.45 members. The modest difference between current and goal housing size accounts for the relatively small numbers throughout the table. The

table reveals a pattern of housing goals, however, in which the desired size increase takes the form of more than one bedroom per person. Relevant increase figures are italicized in **Table 2**.

There is no appreciable interest anywhere among respondents in worker-style or studio housing. The former bears a social stigma as a substandard form of housing, and is consistently seen as an undesirable solution to housing issues in Key West. The very low-income population was not sufficiently tapped in this sample, however, in order to draw conclusions about their perspective on this type of housing. A single person in the lower half of the first income category (i.e. making \$18,000 or less) might favor a clean single room with a kitchenette and a bath down the hall to hot racking or renting a storage shed. Other special populations, such as students, might also be suited to these modest forms of housing.

With respect to the number of bedrooms in one and two-person households (95% of two-person households consist of two adults), there is a discernible desire for an increase in the number of bedrooms beyond one per person. There is a desired size increase in three-person households to three bedrooms, even in light of the fact that if any two people within those households share a bedroom (45% of three-person households consist of adults only, 46% consist of one adult and two children, and 9% consist of one adult and two children), a third bedroom would be put to some other use. The same dynamic applies in four-person households. More bedrooms than persons are desired. Goal housing size is geared, to a mild extent, to having more bedrooms than persons.

Table 3 shows household size in relation to income level. One person households are concentrated at the lowest income level, recommending a different distribution of

housing sizes be made available to people in this income category than to those at other income levels. For the lowest income category (less than \$39,000 per household), a distribution of 50%/30%/20% (1-Bedroom, 2-Bedroom, 3-Bedroom) might be, according to these data, optimal. For the second income category (from \$39,000 to \$71,999 per household), a distribution of 20%/60%/20% would be more likely to approximate needs. For the third income category and above, a distribution of 10%/60%/30% might more closely approximate needs, taking into account throughout the relatively ambitious goals with respect to the number of bedrooms.

Narrative Comments

Question 19 on the survey form provided for open-ended comments. Over one-third of respondents (37%) chose to comment. The comments were typed, qualitatively coded, and analyzed. The comment categories are listed below in the order of descending frequency. The levels of concern expressed about:

- A) The affordability of living and housing
- B) Development and the changing character of Key West
- C) The government (and class issues)
- D) Cleanliness (and the homeless population)
- E) Family environment
- F) Traffic, and
- G) Health

paralleled the ranking of issues derived from examining responses to all questions on the survey (as reported in the “overall results” section). The narrative richness of the

comments provides further insight into the life and opinions of Key West workers, and demonstrates linkages between comment categories:

A) On the subject of affordable living, for example, Respondent #400 linked economy and family, noting that the economic pressures that forced family and friends to move away will cause her to move as well, despite her love of the island. Respondent #1765, among others, will encourage his children to establish themselves elsewhere, because they will be financially better off doing so. He, among others, also notes that he will be unable to retire in Key West, because of the associated expense. His family raises the specter of “permanent” residents becoming a class of long-term transients.

Respondents show the math demonstrating how purchasing an “affordable” residence at \$250,000 is impractical for them. Dozens point to property taxes and insurance as beleaguering or prohibiting factors to ownership. One in six narrative comments is addressed to low pay and benefits and the associated issue of having to work multiple jobs, the high cost of living, or the connection between the two. With respect to housing, one grateful affordable owner and two respondents who saw no housing crisis were outnumbered twenty to one by those who saw a need for more affordable housing and ten to one by those who noted that “affordable housing” in Key West was not affordable.

B) Comments related to development were overwhelmingly opposed to additional new development, especially of high income properties or casinos. Two respondents noted that upscale development might continue if it could be coordinated with a stable resident

base and preservation of the cultural character of Key West. Several suggested that development impact fees be used for affordable housing or that taxes be set extremely high for second homeowners. A systemic approach to development was desired by Respondent #366, who urged that it was time to quit thinking of growth only in financial terms and identified sustainable growth as critical to the future of the city, and by Respondent #1901, who pinpointed the addictive quality of untrammelled development, noting that there would never “be enough” development from the point of view of the wealthy.

The opinion that it would be to the detriment of the city to become less unique and more like “the mainland,” “Miami,” or “anywhere USA” (giving, Respondent #1096 noted, people less reason to come down from the mainland) was consistent. The charm of the “Old” Key West, with the 70s and 80s as the most common referents for “old,” was described as fading or disappearing. Some maintained that the city had already lost its character, with colorful metaphors like “Paradise Lost,” or “Hellville.” A few proclaimed the city’s magnificence and the hope of “getting it [the character] back.” Respondent #160 opined that upscale development was destroying the soul of the city and creating “a false sense of place.” Respondent #1885 cautioned that oral history was lost every time another old family left.

While the glass on this subject was definitely half empty, Respondent #1049, on the other hand, made reference to the city’s historical toughness, “This community has survived the highest highs and the lowest lows because we are adaptable,” and Respondent #1096, who urged the need to “**FIERCELY** protect what has been.” Perhaps the most poignant response came from Respondent #2098, a 6th generation Conch who

will be leaving shortly, and who characterized the new Key West as a Third World country, but without the charm.

C) On the subject of city government, criticism, which was directed equally at different administrations, far outweighed praise, with the primary complaint being the perceived association of those in office with the concerns of the “rich” rather than the interests of the “workers.” References to self-benefiting politicians in a cadre of political and moneyed interests, or “Bubbaism” were common. Respondents #611 and #751 were both succinct; “There is tremendous distrust of city government,” and “Quit prostituting the city for money.” The perceived relationship between prior bad decisions, lawsuits, and high taxes generated frustration. Respondent #1513 showed an unusual magnanimity, “I truly sympathize with government officials here because of the complexity of the problems.”

Three times as many thought that city government was too inactive compared to those who thought it was overly involved in citizen’s lives. The need for vision, a plan, focus, and better communication with citizens were all common themes. Respondent #1891 admonished the government, “to make people want to stay and live in this culture.”

Respondent #668 expressed a growing sense of class divisions in the city in spatial terms, “We live in smaller and smaller cubbyholes while watching more and more luxury homes spring up around us.” This response resonated with the unvarying comments that dorm or worker-style housing was not an appropriate solution to Key West’s housing situation. Others characterized the social organization of the city as

“polarized,” a split in the One Human Family between the rich and the normal average working person, the disadvantaged and those taking advantage of them, or as big fish eating little fish (the latter complete with compelling graphic illustration).

D) Respondent #1755 wants “a concerted, comprehensive plan” put in place to improve the cleanliness of the city, which was frequently referred to as “disgraceful” and “deplorable.” One resident chooses to meet friends elsewhere rather than locally, on this account. In this comment category, the cleanliness of the city itself was the primary concern, with a clean environment (with special reference to water pollution issues) secondary, and clean up of a “trashy” atmosphere on Duval St. as tertiary. Respondent #998 hit the concept broadly, “We need more PRIDE in how this city looks, how its residents act. Clean it up in all ways.”

Some related “cleanliness” to the homeless situation. Those who called for simple removal of the homeless outnumbered those asking for their rehabilitation. The compromised availability of parks and beaches to other residents was a common theme, particularly in households with children. The extensiveness of illegal immigrants was seen as presenting problems of both their exploitation and a negative impact on the city’s wage structure. Harris’s 2004 study also identifies cleanliness, the nature of Duval St., and homeless issues all as extremely important to city residents.

E)-G) Other comment categories were the environment of families in Key West, traffic, and health. Respondent #840 offered the opinion that “This has become a place NOT to raise a family.” Elaborations on that comment noted a lack of activities for children and

teens that one might expect in a community of Key West's size, such as a bowling alley, a skating rink, or a game arcade. Traffic comments divided between traffic, roads, and the need to make the city more bicycle friendly. Health care concerns focused on high insurance rates and the quality of available care.

CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

Key West is unique. In comparison to other American cities with affordable housing issues, its situation is intensely critical. Aspen, Colorado, Provincetown, Massachusetts, and Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts had 38%, 41%, and 32% housing cost burdened populations respectively in 1990 (Hettinger, 2005). Key West's 2006/2007 population, according to results from Bennett and Larson is somewhere in the range of 79% to 89% housing cost burdened, creating an overall situation of intense stress for its workers and in its social atmosphere, or what might be called "Key Stressed."

Key West's social diversity is both integrated into a concept of social unity (One Human Family), and presents it with challenges of ethnic, national, and class social integration. An island ecology contributes to its natural and social distinctiveness, while also creating severe topographical constraints (Hettinger, 2005) with respect not only to housing, but also to other elements of cultural development. While the city might find benefit in examining the development protocols put in place by cities such as Boulder, Colorado and Santa Fe, New Mexico, general development planning processes in Key West will demand an even tighter integration of comprehensive needs, such as housing and public spaces, than elsewhere. Key West is perhaps unique, too, in its tough, survival-oriented constitution, which is also unfortunately currently accompanied by a pessimistic, even depressive social psychology. Respondent #857 noted that, "There is an anger in Key West that is new." Hope about the future of Key West was totally and conspicuously lacking in survey responses.

Creating "sustainable" development of Key West's culture as well as its structures will demand the leveraging of human as well as economic resources. While leveraging

human resources is not predominant in American notions of development, it is a concept deeply suited to the unique character of Key West, which may still be as much the Conch Republic as part of America.

City responsiveness to concerns that workers identify has the potential to create a form of cultural intervention in a flagging system. The intertwined issues of leadership developing comprehensive plans for concerns facing the city, and citizens being mobilized for involvement in initiatives that build community cohesion and pride are central to leveraging human resources in the city. Some respondents want goals, timelines, and clearer communication from government officials. Others offer volunteer labor. Properly tapped, such offers could be a significant resource in recreating a sense of community pride and well-being.

Initiatives such as a comprehensive citywide clean up plan could leverage human resources with relatively little economic expense and tremendous pay-offs in increased worker satisfaction, cultural pride, and government-citizen cohesion. Publishing notices in the newspaper is insufficient to mobilize the population around this issue. A network of schools and churches should be enlisted. People in jail can help clean up in order to earn their free meals (that idea from Respondent #2005). People can be approached personally to ask for participation, donations, or other support. Personal contacts generate culture, as newspaper notices alone cannot. Community identity can be built around common cause.

Breaking the cycle of pessimism (also noted by Harris, in that a majority of his respondents lacked confidence that the City Commission would ever take action on the issues of concern to them) and mistrust between citizen workers and their officials on one

or two such issues has the potential to pave the way for reversing a spiraling psychological negativity in the city. Currently, the city government appears to be the recipient of reasonable criticism, but also scapegoating. Any extremely stressed population will select a focus for dumping its negative emotion. For example, after 9/11, the FBI endured not just justifiable criticism, but also became an intensive focus of negativity for Americans (Larson, 2003), who thereby diffused their own sense of discomfort. Functioning productively in such an atmosphere will provide an extreme challenge to leadership.

One avenue for ameliorating the critical relationship between government and working citizens in Key West would be for the city to initiate action on some of the many suggestions provided by the respondents to this survey. Some suggestions would lead smaller and easily managed initiatives, such as putting a welcome sign at the entrance to the city, or giving locals discounted parking rates. Others would be more substantial in scope, such as undertaking an initiative to retain Conch families, leading city businesses toward establishing health or wind storm insurance pools, or creating incentives for family-oriented businesses such as a bowling alley or a skating rink. With 3 in 10 Key West households including children, the family environment in Key West is more significant to the overall social system than in, for example, Vail, Colorado, where only 1 in 10 households include children.

Still other issues, such as stabilizing a viable relationship between rich and poor in Key West by bringing worker compensation more in line with the cost of living, would require significant effort and creativity. Santa Fe, New Mexico will go to a city minimum wage of \$10.50 in 2008. The ramifications of introducing a city minimum wage in Key

West would be extensive, but entertaining the concept presents a starting place for thinking about the problem of the relationship between salaries and cost of living in the city. Developing a comprehensive concept of sustainable systemic development is a likewise Herculean task, but one which potentially could pay huge dividends in the stabilization of the population and the continued anchoring of community identity in human dignity and the concept of “One Human Family.”

These data make clear that any action to prevent a fundamental transformation of “resortification” of Key West must take place immediately. Key West is at a cultural turning point. While affordable housing is a cornerstone issue related to whether there will be substantial cultural continuity between Key West’s past and its future, it is only that. Key West needs not just a cornerstone to guide it into the future, but an entire edifice.

Survey respondents ask for vision, planning, and accountability from their leaders. Respondent #1820 asks for these survey results to be published (as they will be), and then continues with imperatives that could also be applied more widely, “Set goals—track progress—provide updates—be accountable.” Beyond even such critical infrastructure issues as workforce housing, synergistic approaches that marshal human energy to heal Key West’s problems of social organization and social psychology can be used to restore the rapidly deteriorating “sense of place” that is critical to a healthy culture. It’s not just about the Deli. It’s about people working together to save or create places like the Deli.

Key West needs a cultural revitalization if it is to maintain the culture of historic Key West as a meaningful part of the island’s future. While the New Key West will, of

course, not be the Old Key West, the critical questions about its future revolve around the viability of the new Key West as a community where people from its One Human Family remain dedicated to comprising its culture, and whether that culture will be based in those historical roots. In the final analysis, paradise may be less about palm trees and more about community.

Paradise is for those who make Paradise.

----*The Dispossessed*

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can change the world.

Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.

---Margaret Mead

TABLE 3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND HOUSEHOLD INCOME (%)

<i>Household size/ Household income</i>	1	2	3	4	4+	=
To \$39,000	45	29	15	6	6	101%
To \$72,000	25	44	16	10	5	100%
To \$96,000	7	52	18	14	9	100%
To \$119,999	6	51	20	17	6	100%
To \$144,000	5	48	23	17	8	101%
Over \$144,000	4	54	19	16	7	100%

REFERENCES

- Bennett, Jessica. (2006) *Study of the Monroe County Tourism Workforce*. Key West, FL: Monroe County Tourist Development Council Research Department.
- Harris, Louis and Peter Harris Research Group (2004). *Key West Survey on Tourism and the Community*. Key West, FL: Leading Key West Citizens.
- Hettinger, William S. (2005). *Living and Working in Paradise*. Windham, CT: Thames River Publishing.
- Key West Chamber of Commerce. (2007) *Wage and Benefit Survey*.
- Larson, Karen A. (2003). *Culture and Terror: The Jackal and the Phoenix in America*. Philadelphia: Xlibris.
- LeGuin, Ursula K. (1974) *The Dispossessed*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Spradley, James P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

APPENDIX

- A) English language survey form
- B) Employee cover letter
- C) Employer cover letter
- D) Spanish language survey form

A) CITY OF KEY WEST WORKER SATISFACTION SURVEY

WORKER INFORMATION (Check One for Questions 1-7)

1. Age: under 30 30 to 39 40-49 50 and over
2. Sex: male female
3. Years in residence: 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 over 20
4. Number of jobs (1 job=40 hours/week): 1 or less up to 2 more than 2
5. Your primary job: construction/maintenance educator government
 health care hospitality/tourism police/fire
 retail transportation other (specify)_____
6. Number of adults in your household: 1 2 3 4 more than 4
Number of children in household: 0 1 2 3 4 more than 4
7. All members of your household are related by blood, marriage, or registered domestic partnership OR Household includes people not related in any of the above ways

COMMUNITY HOUSING

8. Your current housing situation:
 - a. Number of jobs worked by members of your household (Check One):
 1 or less up to two up to 4 more than 4
 - b. Quality of current housing (Check One):
 substandard somewhat substandard *adequate more than adequate luxury
(*adequate means clean, safe, and properly maintained)
 - c. Size (Check All That Apply): worker lodging style* studio 1-bedroom
 2-bedroom 3-bedroom more than 3-bedroom yard
(*sometimes called "dormitory" housing)
 - d. Do you rent or own ? (Check One)
If you own, what is your degree of satisfaction with ownership?: (Check One)
 very low low neutral high very high

e. What percentage of total household income is spent on housing? (ADD utilities, taxes, insurances, and other basic housing costs to rent or mortgage amounts)(Check One): under 30% 30-39% 40-49% 50% or more

9. Specify your housing goals:

a. Number of jobs to be worked by members of your household to accomplish goals (Check One): 1 or less up to 2 up to 4 more than 4

b. Quality of housing desired (Check One): substandard somewhat substandard adequate more than adequate luxury

c. Size (Check All That Apply): worker lodging style studio 1-bedroom 2-bedroom 3-bedroom more than 3-bedroom yard

d. Would you prefer to rent or own ? (Check One)

e. What percentage of total household income you would be willing to spend on housing (same calculation as for 8e.) (Check One): under 30% 30-39% 40-49% 50% or more

HUMANLY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

10. In what ways should developers benefit the local community? (Check All That Apply) contribute to local charities help beautify the city pay real estate transfer tax provide community housing provide housing for previous tenants

11. How important are each of the following to your quality of life in the City of Key West?

	<u>1 Not at all/2 Only slightly/3 No opinion/4 Somewhat/5 Very</u>				
a. City cleanliness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Day care/family services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Health care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. How important are each of the following in determining the quality of your work environment in Key West?

	<u>1 Not at all/2 Only slightly/3 No opinion/4 Somewhat/5 Very</u>				
a. Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Pay	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Promotions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- d. Quality of management
- e. Transportation

13. How interested are you in seeing partnerships between the City and employers or landlords designed to improve worker/resident satisfaction (i.e. creation of health care pools, real estate loan programs, renter tax benefits, etc.)?(Check One):
 __not at all __only slightly __no opinion __somewhat __very

CULTURE

14. Key West culture:

- a. What attracted you to Key West? (Check All That Apply) __character of the culture
 __employment __environment __family __social diversity __weather
 __ OR Were you born here?
- b. What influences you to stay in Key West? (Check All That Apply) __character of culture
 __employment __environment __family __social diversity __weather
- c. What could cause you to leave? (Check All That Apply) __environmental issues
 __family concerns __lack of cooperation between segments of the community
 __lack of reasonable housing options __impact of hurricanes
 __loss of traditional Key West character __over-commercialization
 __poor work environment __quality of schools and churches __traffic

15. What defines the culture of Key West? (Check All That Apply)
 __community ethic __“funkiness” __social diversity __other (specify) _____

16. What threatens the future of Key West’s culture? (Check All That Apply)
 __government inaction on behalf of residents __social divisions
 __upscale development __other (specify) _____

17. What is your annual individual income? (Check One) __less than \$36,000
 __\$36,000-47,999 __\$48,000-59,999 __\$60,000-71,999 __\$72,000-89,999
 __\$90,000-107,999 __\$108,000 to 125,999 __over \$126,000

18. What is the annual income of your household? (Check One) __less than \$39,000
 __\$39,000-71, 999 __\$72,000-95,999 __\$96,000-119,999 __\$120,000-143,999
 __\$144,000-179,999 __\$180,000-215,999 __\$216,000-251,999 __over \$252,000

19. Do you have any additional comments related to this survey? (attach one extra sheet if necessary):

B) August 1, 2007

Dear Key West worker,

The City of Key West is addressing issues of workforce retention and suitable worker housing. This survey will allow the City to plan for truly affordable community housing and a stable workforce.

The City cannot do this without your help. PLEASE BE PART OF THIS PROCESS by filling out and returning your survey within TEN DAYS in the pre-paid envelope. Survey questions were written based on input from focus groups of Key West employees, employers, and residents. Results will include all workers at all income levels, and will be distributed broadly to the community. Questions about the survey may be directed to Karen Larson of KCL Research at klarson2@gac.edu or (507) 327-6649. THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. NOTE: IF YOU WORK MORE THAN ONE JOB AND RECEIVE MORE THAN ONE SURVEY, FILL OUT AND RETURN ONLY ONE FORM.

Definitions of terms used in the survey:

*“Community housing” is a cover term including “workforce housing,” “affordable housing,” and other housing serving the needs of the local working population at all income levels.

*“Development” for most people means construction. “Humanly sustainable development” means development that benefits the community with worker housing, contributions to city beautification, etc.

*“Household” is a group of people co-residing in the same structure who cooperate economically (they routinely pool resources for housing, food, transportation, or other costs.) Relationship may be by blood, marriage, partnership, friendship, or roommate status. Those occupying the same structure but NOT cooperating economically constitute separate households (i.e. renters and landlords).

THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT

Sincerely,

Mayor Morgan McPherson

C) August 1, 2007

Dear Business Owner,

The City of Key West is addressing issues related to the retention of Key West's workforce, especially the availability of suitable housing. The growing problem of the short supply of truly affordable housing is connected to worker out-migration. When workers leave, businesses are burdened with expenses related to employee turnover and other problems. The City is collecting information about levels of worker satisfaction in relation to both residency and employment.

Information from responses to the attached survey will help create a profile of Key West worker housing and life style needs. The profile will allow the City to target the needs of workers at varying income levels as it develops plans for community housing and to help keep workers in Key West.

The City needs your help:

1. Please distribute the enclosed surveys to the employees in your establishment, (including yourself and all managerial personnel), asking workers to return the survey in the pre-paid envelope supplied WITHIN TEN DAYS. If additional survey forms are needed, contact City affordable housing consultant Paul Clayton at (305) 304-9614. Any questions about the survey may be directed to Karen Larson of KCL Research at klarson2@gac.edu or at (507) 327-6649.
2. After five days, ask employees again to return the survey if they have not already done so. A good return rate is important so that the information collected useful.
3. Any assistance you can offer to employees who need help in filling out the survey would be appreciated. Otherwise, you may contact Paul Clayton about the possibility of your business receiving a volunteer from the City to help your employees complete the survey forms.

THANK YOU in advance for your assistance in helping the City craft a positive future for the workers and businesses of Key West.

Sincerely,

Mayor Morgan McPherson

D) ENCUESTA DE SATISFACCION DE LOS TRABAJADORES EN LA CIUDAD DE KEY WEST

INFORMACION DEL TRABAJADOR (Marque una de la 1 a la 7)

1. Edad: ___ Menos de 30 ___ 30 a 39 ___ 40 a 49 ___ 50 o más
2. Sexo: ___ Hombre ___ Mujer
3. Años de residir en la ciudad: ___ 0-5 ___ 6-10 ___ 11-15 ___ 16-20 ___ más de 20
4. Número de Empleos (1 trabajo)(40 horas/Semanal) ___ 1 ó menos ___ to 2 ___ más de 2
5. Su Trabajo Principal: ___ construcción/mantenimiento ___ Maestro ___ gobierno
___ Cuidado Médico ___ Industria Hospitalaria/turismo ___ Policía/ Bombero
___ Ventas ___ transporte ___ Otros (especifique) _____
6. Número de Adultos en su Vivienda: ___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ más de 4
Número de niños en su Vivienda: ___ 0 ___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ más de 4
7. Todos los ocupantes de su vivienda:
_____ son sus familiares de sangre, o estan relacionados con usted por unión civil.
_____ ó la gente que vive un su casa NO estan todas relacionadas con usted.

VIVIENDA DE LA COMUNIDAD

8. Su situación actual de Vivienda:

- a. El número de empleos que trabajan los miembros de su casa (marcar solo uno):
___ 1 ó menos ___ hasta 2 ___ hasta 4 ___ más de 4
- b. Calidad de su Vivienda actual (marque solo uno):
___ Baja Calidad ___ de alguna manera de baja calidad ___ *Adecuado
___ mejor que adecuado ___ Lujoso
(*adecuado: significa limpio, seguro, y mantenido correctamente)
- c. Tamaño de su vivienda (marcar uno):
___ cuartos de trabajadores ___ estudio ___ departamento de 1 cuarto
___ Departamento de 2 cuartos ___ departamento de 3 cuartos
___ Departamento de mas de 3 cuartos ___ Con patio
(*Tambien llamado “dormitorios” de Empleados)
- d. ¿Usted Renta _____ Usted es Dueño de su Vivienda _____? (marque uno)
Si es usted Dueño, cual es su grado de satisfaccion por ser dueño de propiedad?:(marque uno)
___ Muy Bajo ___ Bajo ___ Neutro ___ Alto ___ Muy Alto

e. Qué porcentaje de los ingresos totales de su casa se Gasta en Renta: ¿en la Vivienda? (AGREGAR Recibos de luz, agua, impuestos, seguros, y otros costos básicos de alquiler. o de la hipoteca (marque Uno):
_____ menos del 30% _____ 30-39% _____ 40-49% _____ 50% o más

9. Especifique sus metas de vivienda:

a. Número de trabajos de que tienen que tener los miembros de tu casa para lograr sus metas (marcar solo una): _____ 1 o menos _____ hasta 2 _____ hasta 4 _____ más de 4

b. La calidad de la vivienda que desea (marque uno):

_____ Baja Calidad _____ de alguna manera de baja calidad
_____ *Adecuado _____ mejor que adecuado _____ Lujoso

c. Tamaño de vivienda que desea (Marque todo lo que el coincida) _____ cuartos de trabajadores _____ estudio _____ departamento de 1 cuarto
_____ Departamento de 2 cuartos _____ departamento de 3 cuartos
_____ Departamento de mas de 3 cuartos _____ Con patio

d. ¿Preferiría Rentar _____ o Ser Dueño _____? (Cheque uno)

e. Qué porcentaje de sus ingresos totales estaria dispuesto a gastar en renta? el mismo cálculo que para 8e.) (marque uno):
_____ menos del 30% _____ 30-39% _____ 40-49% _____ 50% o más

DESARROLLO HUMANO SOSTENIBLE

10. De qué manera deberían, las constructoras locales, beneficiar a la comunidad (marque mas de uno) _____ contribuir organizaciones Caritativas locales
_____ Ayudar a embellecer la ciudad _____ pagar los impuestos de transferencia de propiedades
_____ proveér viviendas para la comunidad
_____ proveér vivienda para los arrendatarios anteriores.

11. Qué tån importante es cada uno de los siguientes para determinar su calidad de vida en Key West?

1 No Importante /2 un poco importante/3No tengo opinion/ 4 Algo importante /5 muy importante

a. Limpieza de la ciudad

b. Servicios de guardería de la familia

c. Servícios medicos y de salud

d. Vivienda

12. Que tan importante es cada uno de los siguientes para determinar la calidad de su ambiente de trabajo?

1 No Importante /2 un poco importante/3No tengo opinion/ 4 Algo importante /5 muy importante

a. Beneficios y prestaciones

b. Paga (salario o sueldo)

c. Oportunidad de Subir de puesto

d. Calidad de la Gerencia

e. Transporte

13. Qué tan interesado está en ver sociedades entre la Alcaldía y los patronos o los caseros (propietarios de viviendas) para diseñar acuerdos para mejorar la satisfacción del trabajador/ Habitante (es decir creación de oportunidades de servicio médico, programas de préstamo para vivienda, beneficios fiscales para el arrendador)

1 No Importante /2 un poco importante/3No tengo opinion/ 4 Algo importante /5 muy importante

CULTURA

14. La cultura de Key West:

a. ¿Qué te atrajo a Key West? (Marque mas de uno)

El carácter de la cultura El Trabajo El Ambiente La familia
 La diversidad social El Clima ¿O naciste aquí?

b. ¿Qué te influencia a permanecer en Key West? (marque mas de uno)

El carácter de la cultura El Trabajo El Ambiente La familia
 La diversidad social El Clima

c. ¿Qué podría hacerle irse de Key West? (Marque mas de uno) las condiciones ambientales Asuntos de Familia la falta de cooperación entre partes de la comunidad la falta de opciones razonables de vivienda impacto de los huracanes la perdida del caracter tradicional de Key West la excesiva comercialización

El deterioro del ambiente de trabajo La calidad de escuelas e iglesias
 El tráfico

15. ¿Qué define la cultura de Key West? (marque mas de una)

Etica De la comunidad "Extravagante" diversidad social
 Otro (especifique)

16. ¿Qué amenaza el futuro de la cultura de Key West?

(marque mas de una) la falta de acción del gobierno en nombre de los habitantes

