

# **Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles**

## **Year 2000 Agency Plan**

- **Five-Year Plan - Fiscal Years 2000 - 2004**
- **Annual Plan - Fiscal Year 2000**



## PHA Plan Agency Identification

PHA Name: **Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles**

PHA Number: **CA004**

PHA Fiscal Year Beginning: **January 1, 2000**

### Public Access to Information

Information regarding any activities outlined in this plan can be obtained by contacting:

- HACLA Central Offices
- HACLA Development Management Offices
- PHA Local Offices

### Display Locations for HACLA Agency Plan and Supporting Documents

The HACLA Agency Plan (including attachments) is available for public inspection at:

- HACLA Central Offices – 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor
- HACLA Development Management Offices
- HACLA Section 8 Offices – West, East, Harbor and Valley Offices
- Main administrative office of the local government
- Main administrative office of the County government
- Main administrative office of the State government
- Public library
- HACLA Internet Site: [www.hacla.org/about/hacla\\_ap/tbl\\_cnts\\_eng.html](http://www.hacla.org/about/hacla_ap/tbl_cnts_eng.html)
- Other:
  - **HACLA Public Housing Application Center**
  - **HACLA Property Management Department Office**
  - **HACLA Public Housing Developments – RAC/RMC Offices**

### HACLA Agency Plan Supporting Documents available for inspection at:

- HACLA Central Offices
- HACLA Development Management Offices
- Other

**5-YEAR PLAN**  
**PHA FISCAL YEARS 2000 - 2004**

[24 CFR Part 903.5]

**A) Mission**

The PHA's mission is:

***"The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles provides a housing and community environment that promotes self-sufficiency and economic development partnerships with all key City stakeholders in order to enrich the quality of life."***

**B. Goals**

**HUD Strategic Goal**

**Increase the availability of decent, safe, and affordable housing.**

PHA Goal: Expand the supply of assisted housing.

Objectives:

Apply for additional rental vouchers

Reduce public housing vacancies

Leverage private or other public funds to create additional housing opportunities

Acquire or build units or developments

Other:

➤ **The Housing Authority will pursue all available Federal assisted housing opportunities, and seek private and other public resources.**

PHA Goal: Improve the quality of assisted housing.

Objectives:

Improve public housing management: (PHAS score)

Improve voucher management: (SEMAP score)

Increase customer satisfaction

Concentrate on efforts to improve specific management functions:(e.g., public housing finance; voucher unit inspections)

Renovate or modernize public housing units

Demolish or dispose of obsolete public housing

Provide replacement public housing

Provide replacement vouchers

Other:

➤ **Maintain Public Housing Management/PHAS score at 90%+**

➤ **Achieve and maintain Voucher Management/SEMAP score at 90%+.**

- PHA Goal: Increase assisted housing choices
  - Objectives:
    - Provide voucher mobility counseling
    - Conduct outreach efforts to potential voucher landlords
    - Increase voucher payment standards
    - Implement voucher homeownership program – Subject to HUD’s final rule and appropriate funding
    - Implement public housing or other homeownership programs
    - Implement public housing site-based waiting lists
    - Convert public housing to vouchers
    - Other:
      - **Study and consider adjustments to voucher standards**
      - **Explore the feasibility of public housing or homeownership programs within the context of revitalization activity.**
      - **Study the appropriate potential for site-based waiting lists and proceed with the appropriate course of action.**
      - **Study and make recommendations on the conversion of any public housing to vouchers.**

**HUD Strategic Goal**

**Improve community quality of life and economic vitality**

- PHA Goal: Provide an improved living environment
  - Objectives:
    - Implement measures to de-concentrate poverty by bringing higher income public housing households into lower income developments
    - Implement measures to promote income mixing in public housing by assuring access for lower income families into higher income developments
    - Implement public housing security improvements
    - Designate developments or buildings for particular resident groups (elderly, persons with disabilities)
    - Other:
      - **The median family income in all public housing developments is less than 30% of the Area Median Income;**
      - **Implement deconcentration of poverty through combined efforts marketing housing to relatively “higher-income” low-income families and continuing efforts of self-sufficiency;**
      - **Study and recommend appropriate “designated housing options.”**

## **HUD Strategic Goal**

### **Promote self-sufficiency & asset development of families & individuals**

PHA Goal: Promote self-sufficiency & asset development of assisted households

Objectives:

- Increase the number and percentage of employed persons in assisted families
- Provide or attract supportive services to improve assistance recipients' employability
- Provide or attract supportive services to increase independence for the elderly or families with disabilities
- Other

## **HUD Strategic Goal**

### **Ensure Equal Opportunity in Housing for all Americans**

PHA Goal: Ensure equal opportunity and affirmatively further fair housing

Objectives:

- Undertake affirmative measures to ensure access to assisted housing regardless of race, color, religion national origin, sex, familial status, and disability
- Undertake affirmative measures to provide a suitable living environment for families living in assisted housing, regardless of race, color, religion national origin, sex, familial status, and disability
- Undertake affirmative measures to ensure accessible housing to persons with all varieties of disabilities regardless of unit size required:
- Other

**Other PHA Goals and Objectives: (list below)**

**Annual PHA Plan**  
PHA Fiscal Year 2000  
[24 CFR Part 903.7]

**i. Annual Plan Type:**

Standard Plan

**Streamlined Plan:**

- High Performing PHA
- Small Agency (<250 Public Housing Units)
- Administering Section 8 Only

Troubled Agency Plan

## **ii. Executive Summary of the Annual PHA Plan**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (r)]

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) has prepared the following Agency Plan in compliance with Section 511 of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 and the ensuing HUD requirements. This Agency Plan contains a 5-Year Plan, which will be updated annually, and an Annual Plan. Listed below are some of the primary goals that the Housing Authority currently plans to pursue based on its 5-Year Plan:

- *Maintain Effective Housing Authority Housing Programs In Conformance With HUD and Industry Standards;*
- *Finance the Redevelopment and Rehabilitation of the Public Housing Assets and Apply Asset Management Techniques to Preserve the Public Investment;*
- *Improve the Public Housing Community Environment through a Public Safety Approach that Focuses on Analysis and Prevention;*
- *Establish a Comprehensive Economic Development and Self-Sufficiency Environment for Very-Low and Low Income Residents and Program Participants;*

The Housing Authority's Annual Plan is based on the premise that accomplishing the above 5-year goals and objectives will move the Housing Authority in a direction consistent with its mission. The ability of HACLA to accomplish the above goals will be dependent on appropriate funding from the U.S. Congress and HUD that is commensurate with required regulations that the Housing Authority must meet. The plans, statements, budget summary, policies, etc. set forth in this Annual Plan all lead towards the accomplishment of the Housing Authority's goals and objectives. Taken as a whole, they outline a comprehensive approach towards the Housing Authority's goals and objectives and are consistent with the City of Los Angeles Consolidated Plan. Below are just a few highlights from the Housing Authority's Annual Plan:

- *Update of the Housing Authority Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy;*
- *Updates to the Housing Authority's Section 8 Administrative Plan;*
- *An Emphasis on Public Housing Revitalization and Redevelopment;*
- *Certification of Consistency with the City of Los Angeles Consolidated Plan;*
- *Profile of Current Housing Authority Resources;*

➤ *Detailed Look at the Current Housing Authority Waiting Lists;*

### iii. Annual Plan Table of Contents

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (r)]

#### Table of Contents

##### **Annual Plan**

i. Executive Summary	
ii. Table of Contents	<b><u>Page #</u></b>
1. Housing Needs	<b>7</b>
2. Financial Resources	<b>13</b>
3. Policies on Eligibility, Selection and Admissions	<b>14</b>
4. Rent Determination Policies	<b>23</b>
5. Operations and Management Policies	<b>N/A</b>
6. Grievance Procedures	<b>N/A</b>
7. Capital Improvement Needs	<b>27</b>
8. Demolition and Disposition	<b>28</b>
9. Designation of Housing	<b>N/A</b>
10. Conversions of Public Housing	<b>N/A</b>
11. Homeownership	<b>N/A</b>
12. Community Service Programs	<b>N/A</b>
13. Crime and Safety	<b>30</b>
14. Pets (Inactive for January 1 PHAs)	<b>N/A</b>
15. Civil Rights Certifications (w/ PHA Plan Certifications)	<b>33</b>
16. Audit	<b>33</b>
17. Asset Management	<b>N/A</b>
18. Other/Resident Advisory Board Recommendations	<b>33</b>
19. Consistency with Consolidated Plan	<b>34</b>
20. Attachment Chart	<b>36</b>

#### Attachments

Required Attachments:

- Admissions Policy for De-concentration
- FY 2000 Capital Fund Program Annual Statement
- Most recent board-approved operating budget (Required Attachment for PHAs that are troubled or at risk of being designated troubled ONLY)

Optional Attachments:

- PHA Management Organizational Chart
- FY 2000 Capital Fund Program 5-Year Action Plan
- Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP) Plan
- Comments of Resident Advisory Board or Boards

Other: Comments from the general public, public housing residents, Section 8 participants, non-profit housing professionals, the Legal Aid Foundation, and others.

## Supporting Documents Available for Review

Applicable & On Display	Supporting Document	Applicable Plan Component
Yes	PHA Plan Certifications of Compliance with the PHA Plans and Related Regulations	5-Year and Annual Plans
Yes	State/Local Government Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan	5-Year and Annual Plans
Yes	Fair Housing Documentation: Records reflecting that the PHA has examined its programs or proposed programs, identified any impediments to fair housing choice in those programs, addressed or is addressing those impediments in a reasonable fashion in view of the resources available, and worked or is working with local jurisdictions to implement any of the jurisdictions' initiatives to affirmatively further fair housing that require the PHA's involvement.	5-Year and Annual Plans
Yes	Consolidated Plan for the jurisdiction/s in which the PHA is located (which includes the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI)) and any additional backup data to support statement of housing needs in the jurisdiction	Annual Plan: Housing Needs
Yes	Most recent board-approved operating budget for the public housing program	Annual Plan: Financial Resources;
Yes	Public Housing Admissions and (Continued) Occupancy Policy (A&O), which includes the Tenant Selection and Assignment Plan [TSAP]	Annual Plan: Eligibility, Selection, and Admissions Policies
Yes	Section 8 Administrative Plan	Annual Plan: Eligibility, Selection, and Admissions Policies
Yes	Public Housing De-concentration and Income Mixing Documentation: 1. PHA board certifications of compliance with de-concentration requirements (section 16(a) of the US Housing Act of 1937, as implemented in the 2/18/99 <i>Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act Initial Guidance; Notice</i> and any further HUD guidance) and 2. Documentation of the required de-concentration and income mixing analysis	Annual Plan: Eligibility, Selection, and Admissions Policies
Yes	Public housing rent determination policies, including the methodology for setting public housing flat rents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> check here if included in the public housing A & O Policy	Annual Plan: Rent Determination

Applicable & On Display	Supporting Document	Applicable Plan Component
Yes	Schedule of flat rents offered at each public housing development ( <b>Note: Ceiling Rents = Transitional Flat Rents</b> ). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> check here if included in the public housing A & O Policy	Annual Plan: Rent Determination
Yes	Section 8 rent determination (payment standard) policies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> check here if included in Section 8 Administrative Plan	Annual Plan: Rent Determination
No	Public housing management and maintenance policy documents, including policies for the prevention or eradication of pest infestation (including cockroach infestation)	Annual Plan: Operations and Maintenance
No	Public housing grievance procedures <input type="checkbox"/> check here if included in the public housing A & O Policy	Annual Plan: Grievance Procedures
No	Section 8 informal review and hearing procedures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> check here if included in Section 8 Administrative Plan	Annual Plan: Grievance Procedures
Yes	The HUD-approved Capital Fund/Comprehensive Grant Program Annual Statement (HUD 52837) for the active grant year	Annual Plan: Capital Needs
No	Most recent CIAP Budget/Progress Report (HUD 52825) for any active CIAP grant	Annual Plan: Capital Needs
Yes	Most recent, approved 5 Year Action Plan for the Capital Fund/Comprehensive Grant Program, if not included as an attachment (provided at PHA option)	Annual Plan: Capital Needs
Yes	Approved HOPE VI applications or, if more recent, approved or submitted HOPE VI Revitalization Plans or any other approved proposal for development of public housing	Annual Plan: Capital Needs
Yes	Approved or submitted applications for demolition and/or disposition of public housing	Annual Plan: Demolition and Disposition
No	Approved or submitted applications for designation of public housing (Designated Housing Plans)	Annual Plan: Designation of Public Housing
No	Approved or submitted assessments of reasonable revitalization of public housing and approved or submitted conversion plans prepared pursuant to section 202 of the 1996 HUD Appropriations Act	Annual Plan: Conversion of Public Housing
No	Approved or submitted public housing homeownership programs/plans	Annual Plan: Homeownership
No	Policies governing any Section 8 Homeownership program <input type="checkbox"/> check here if included in the Section 8 Administrative Plan	Annual Plan: Homeownership

Applicable & On Display	Supporting Document	Applicable Plan Component
No	Any cooperative agreement between the PHA and the TANF agency	Annual Plan: Community Service & Self-Sufficiency
No	FSS Action Plan/s for public housing and/or Section 8	Annual Plan: Community Service & Self-Sufficiency
No	Most recent self-sufficiency (ED/SS, TOP or ROSS or other resident services grant) grant program reports	Annual Plan: Community Service & Self-Sufficiency
Yes	The most recent Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP) semi-annual performance report for any open grant and most recently submitted PHDEP application (PHDEP Plan)	Annual Plan: Safety and Crime Prevention
Yes	The most recent fiscal year audit of the PHA conducted under section 5(h)(2) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U. S.C. 1437c(h)), the results of that audit and the PHA's response to any findings	Annual Plan: Annual Audit
No	Troubled PHAs: MOA/Recovery Plan	Troubled PHAs
	Other supporting documents (optional) (list individually; use as many lines as necessary)	(specify as needed)
	Note: Sections that	

### **Note #1 on Supporting Documents**

The Section 8 Administrative Plan (listed above as a supporting document) may be amended in two ways. The Housing Authority's Section 8 Division may offer a full revision of the Plan to its Board of Commissioners or the Board may receive recommendations and take action on specific elements of the Plan. A change to the Section 8 Administrative Plan is effective on the date of Board approval unless it would constitute a significant amendment or modification of the PHA 5-year or Annual Plan in which case the amendment or modification is not implemented until approved by HUD.

In accordance with California's Brown Act, the Housing Authority provides 72 hours notice to the public prior to any meeting of the appropriate Board Committee which may recommend action to the full Board and 72 hours notice prior to any meeting of the full Board of Commissioners which will consider adoption and implementation of changes to the Plan. The public notice includes the subject matter and an agenda and provides for public comment.

### **Note #2 on Supporting Documents**

Supporting documents for Agency Plan Sections that the Housing Authority **IS NOT REQUIRED** to submit (because of High-Performer status) **ARE AVAILABLE** to the public at the Housing Authority's principal office located at:

**2600 Wilshire Blvd. 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA. 90057**

# 1. Statement of Housing Needs

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (a)]

## A. Housing Needs of Families in the Jurisdiction/s Served by the PHA

Rating Factor for each family type:

1 = “No Impact”

5 = “Severe Impact”

<b>Housing Needs of Families in the Jurisdiction by Family Type</b>							
<b>Family Type</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>Afford - ability</b>	<b>Suppl y</b>	<b>Qualit y</b>	<b>Access -ibility</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Loca -tion</b>
Income <= 30% of AMI	93,993	5	5	5	5	5	5
Income >30% but <=50% of AMI	78,385	4	4	4	4	4	4
Income >50% but <80% of AMI	77,436	3	3	3	3	3	3
Elderly	79,004	4	4	4	4	4	4
Families with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Race/Ethnicity	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

What sources of information did the PHA use to conduct this analysis? (Check all that apply; all materials must be made available for public inspection.)

- Consolidated Plan of the Jurisdiction/s  
Indicate year: **1999-2000**
- U.S. Census data: the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (“CHAS”) data set
- American Housing Survey data  
Indicate year:
- Other housing market study  
Indicate year:
- Other sources: (list and indicate year of information)

**B. Housing Needs of Families on the Public Housing and Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance Waiting Lists**

<b>Housing Needs of Families on the Waiting List</b> Public Housing and Property Management			
<b>Waiting list type:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Section 8 tenant-based assistance			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Public Housing (Including Property Management)</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Combined Section 8 and Public Housing			
	<b># Families</b>	<b>% of Total Families</b>	<b>Annual Turnover</b>
<b>Waiting List Totals</b>	<b>11,194</b>		<b>1,083</b>
<b>Extremely low income (&lt;=30% AMI)</b>	<b>9,708</b>	<b>86.7%</b>	
<b>Very low income (&gt;30% but &lt;=50% AMI)</b>	<b>1,303</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	
<b>Low income (&gt;50% but &lt;80% AMI)</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	
<b>Families with children</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
<b>Elderly families</b>	<b>2,458</b>	<b>21.9%</b>	
<b>Families with Disabilities</b>	<b>2,370</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	
<b>Bedroom Size Characteristics</b>	<b># Families</b>	<b>% of Total Families</b>	<b>Annual Turnover</b>
<b>1 BR</b>	<b>4,840</b>	<b>43.2%</b>	<b>285</b>
<b>2 BR</b>	<b>1,393</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	<b>444</b>
<b>3 BR</b>	<b>4,265</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>4 BR</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>5 BR</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>.02%</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5+ BR</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Is the waiting list closed? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes			
➤ How long has it been closed <b>N/A</b>			
➤ Does the PHA expect to reopen the list in the PHA Plan year? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <b>N/A</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
➤ Does the PHA permit specific categories of families onto the waiting list, even if generally closed? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <b>N/A</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

**Housing Needs of Families on the Waiting List**  
Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance

**Waiting list type**

- Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance**  
 Public Housing (Including Property Management)  
 Combined Section 8 and Public Housing

	# Families	% of Total Families	Annual Turnover
<b>Waiting List Totals</b>	<b>155,000</b>		
<b>Extremely low income &lt;=30% AMI</b>	<b>80,600</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	
<b>Very low income (&gt;30% but &lt;=50% AMI)</b>	<b>68,200</b>	<b>44.0%</b>	
<b>Low income (&gt;50% but &lt;80% AMI)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	
<b>Families with children</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
<b>Elderly families</b>	<b>41,850</b>	<b>28.0%</b>	
<b>Families with Disabilities</b>	<b>43,400</b>	<b>27.0%</b>	
<b>Bedroom Size Characteristics</b>	<b># Families</b>	<b>% of Total Families</b>	
<b>1 BR</b>	<b>80,600</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	
<b>2 BR</b>	<b>51,150</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	
<b>3 BR</b>	<b>20,150</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	
<b>4 BR</b>	<b>3,100</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	
<b>5 BR</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
<b>5+ BR</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	

- Is the waiting list closed  No  Yes; If yes:
- How long has it been closed (# of months)?
  - Does the PHA expect to reopen the list in the PHA Plan year?  
 No  Yes  N/A
  - Does the PHA permit specific categories of families onto the waiting list, even if generally closed?  No  Yes  N/A

## C. Strategy for Addressing Needs

### (1) Strategies

**Need: Shortage of affordable housing for all eligible populations**

**Strategy 1: Maximize the number of affordable units available to the PHA within its current resources by:**

- Employ effective maintenance and management policies to minimize the number of public housing units off-line
- Reduce turnover time for vacated public housing units
- Reduce time to renovate public housing units
- Seek replacement of public housing units lost to the inventory through mixed finance development
- Seek replacement of public housing units lost to the inventory through section 8 replacement housing resources
- Maintain or increase section 8 lease-up rates by establishing payment standards that will enable families to rent throughout the jurisdiction
- Undertake measures to ensure access to affordable housing among families assisted by the PHA, regardless of unit size required
- Maintain or increase section 8 lease-up rates by marketing the program to owners, particularly those outside of areas of minority and poverty concentration
- Maintain or increase section 8 lease-up rates by effectively screening Section 8 applicants to increase owner acceptance of program
- Participate in the Consolidated Plan development process to ensure coordination with broader community strategies
- Other

**Strategy 2: Increase the number of affordable housing units by:**

- Apply for additional section 8 units should they become available
- Leverage affordable housing resources in the community through the creation of mixed - finance housing
- Pursue housing resources other than public housing or Section 8 tenant-based assistance.
- Other: (list below)

**Need: Specific Family Types: Families at or below 30% of median**

**Strategy 1: Target available assistance to families at/below 30 % of AMI**

- Exceed HUD federal targeting requirements for families at or below 30% of AMI in public housing
- Exceed HUD federal targeting requirements for families at or below 30% of AMI in tenant-based section 8 assistance
- Employ admissions preferences aimed at families with economic hardships
- Adopt rent policies to support and encourage work
- Other:
  - **Admission process for foreseeable future maintains appropriate**

**commitment to non-preference families.**

**Need: Specific Family Types: Families at or below 50% of median**

**Strategy 1: Target available assistance to families at or below 50% of AMI**

- Employ admissions preferences aimed at families who are working
- Adopt rent policies to support and encourage work
- Other

**Need: Specific Family Types: Elderly**

**Strategy 1: Target available assistance to the elderly:**

- Seek designation of public housing for the elderly
- Apply for special-purpose vouchers targeted to the elderly, should they become available
- Other

**Need: Specific Family Types: Families with Disabilities**

**Strategy 1: Target available assistance to Families with Disabilities:**

- Seek designation of public housing for families with disabilities
- Carry out the modifications needed in public housing based on the section 504 Needs Assessment for Public Housing
- Apply for special-purpose vouchers targeted to families with disabilities, should they become available
- Affirmatively market to local non-profit agencies that assist families with disabilities
- Other
  - **Provide reasonable accommodation in all housing programs.**

**Need: Specific Family Types: Races or ethnic groups with disproportionate housing needs**

**Strategy 1: Increase awareness of PHA resources among families of races and ethnic groups with disproportionate needs:**

- Affirmatively market to races/ethnic groups shown to have disproportionate housing needs
- Other:
  - **Conduct extensive community-wide marketing and outreach.**

**Strategy 2: Conduct activities to affirmatively further fair housing**

- Counsel section 8 tenants as to location of units outside of areas of poverty or minority concentration and assist them to locate those units
- Market the section 8 program to owners outside of areas of poverty /minority concentrations
- Other

**Other Housing Needs & Strategies: (list needs and strategies below)**

**(2) Reasons for Selecting Strategies**

Of the factors listed below, select all that influenced the PHA's selection of the strategies it will pursue:

- Funding constraints
- Staffing constraints
- Limited availability of sites for assisted housing
- Extent to which particular housing needs are met by other organizations in the community
- Evidence of housing needs as demonstrated in the Consolidated Plan and other information available to the PHA
- Influence of the housing market on PHA programs
- Community priorities regarding housing assistance
- Results of consultation with local or state government
- Results of consultation with residents and the Resident Advisory Board
- Results of consultation with advocacy groups
- Other

## 2. Statement of Financial Resources

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (b)]

<b>Financial Resources</b>		
<b>Planned Sources and Uses</b>		
<b>Sources</b>	<b>Planned \$</b>	<b>Planned Uses</b>
<b>1. Federal Grants (FY 2000 grants)</b>	<b>7,398,602</b>	<b>Welfare-to-Work</b>
a) Public Housing Operating Fund	<b>24,804,408</b>	
b) Public Housing Capital Fund	<b>26,602,693</b>	
c) HOPE VI Demolition & Revitalization	<b>93,742,238</b>	
d) Annual Contributions for Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance	<b>249,833,565</b>	
e) Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (including any Technical Assistance funds)	<b>1,677,500</b>	
f) Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency Grants	<b>5,176,286</b>	
g) Community Development Block Grant	<b>N/A</b>	
h) HOME	<b>N/A</b>	
<b>Other Federal Grants</b>		
a) Safe Neighborhoods & COPS	<b>208,688</b>	<b>Resident Safety</b>
<b>2. Prior Year Federal Grants (unobligated funds only)</b>		
a) Prior Year Capital Fund Receipts	<b>36,910,398</b>	
b) Prior Year Drug Elimination	<b>1,190,255</b>	
<b>3. Public Housing Dwelling Rental Income</b>	<b>20,128,910</b>	<b>Operations</b>
<b>4. Other Income/Resources</b>		
a) Investment Income	<b>1,622,930</b>	<b>Operations</b>
b) Entrepreneurial Activities	<b>967,580</b>	<b>Operations</b>
c) Section 8 Admin Reserve Interest	<b>3,371,384</b>	<b>Operating Deficit</b>
d) Public Housing Reserves	<b>10,821,316</b>	<b>Operating Deficit</b>
e) Section 8 Admin Reserve	<b>53,061,503</b>	<b>Operating Deficit</b>
<b>4. Non-Federal Sources</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>537,518,256</b>	

### **3. PHA Policies Governing Eligibility, Selection & Admissions**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (c)]

#### **A. Public Housing**

##### **(1) Eligibility**

a. When does the PHA verify eligibility for admission to public housing?

When families are within a certain number of families to be offered a unit?

When families are within a certain time of being offered a unit?

Other:

➤ **Applicants are subject to a preliminary eligibility interview (when they apply) to determine initial eligibility. Applicants then go through a suitability interview that includes non-income screening factors including a criminal background check. Applicants passing both interviews are placed on a certified waiting list. The certified waiting list generally contains 300-400 applicants that are within 3-6 months from being offered (placed in) an available unit.**

b. Which non-income (screening) factors does the PHA use to establish eligibility for admission to public housing?

Criminal or Drug-related activity

Rental history

Housekeeping

Other (describe)

c. Does the PHA request criminal records from local law enforcement agencies for screening purposes?  Yes  No

d. Does the PHA request criminal records from State law enforcement agencies for screening purposes?  Yes  No

e. Does the PHA access FBI criminal records from the FBI for screening purposes? (either directly or through an NCIC-authorized source)  Yes  No

##### **(2) Waiting List Organization**

a. Which method does the PHA plan to use to organize the public housing waiting List?

Community-wide list

Sub-jurisdictional lists

Site-based waiting lists

Other (describe)

b. Where may interested persons apply for admission to public housing?

- PHA main administrative office  
 PHA development site management office  
 Other: **Housing Authority Application Center**

c. If the PHA plans to operate one or more site-based waiting lists in the coming year, answer each of the following questions; if not, skip to subsection **(3) Assignment**

1. How many site-based waiting lists will the PHA operate in the coming year? N/A

2. Are any or all of the PHA's site-based waiting lists new for the upcoming year

- Yes  No  N/A

3. May families be on more than one list simultaneously?  Yes  No  N/A

4. Where can interested persons obtain more information about and sign up to be on the site-based waiting lists (select all that apply)?

- PHA main administrative office  
 All PHA development management offices  
 Management offices at developments with site-based waiting lists  
 At the development to which they would like to apply  
 Other (list below)  
 N/A

### **(3) Assignment**

a. How many vacant unit choices are applicants ordinarily given before they fall to the bottom of or are removed from the waiting list?

- One  
 Two  
 Three or More

a. Is this policy consistent across all waiting list types?  Yes  No:

b. If answer to b is no, list variations for any other than the primary public housing waiting list/s for the PHA: N/A

### **(4) Admissions Preferences**

a. Income targeting: Does the PHA plan to exceed the federal targeting requirements by targeting more than 40% of all new admissions to public housing to families at or below 30% of median area income?  Yes  No

➤ **The Housing Authority uses the following income targets for admissions:**

- **Minimum of 40% of New Admissions – Less than 30% of AMI**
- **40% of New Admissions – More than 30% but less than 50% of AMI**
- **20% of New Admissions – More than 50% but less than 80% of AMI**

**Note: AMI = Los Angeles Area Median Income**

b. Transfer policies: In what circumstances will transfers take precedence over new admissions?

- Emergencies
- Overhoused
- Underhoused
- Medical justification
- Administrative reasons determined by the PHA (e.g., modernization work)
- Resident choice: (state circumstances below)
- Other:
  - **Relocation closer to new job/employment**
  - **Business and operational concerns must be considered when utilizing units for transfers.**

c. **Preferences**

1. Has the PHA established preferences for admission to public housing (other than date and time of application)?  Yes  No

2. Which of the following admission preferences does the PHA plan to employ in the coming year?

**Former Federal Preferences:**

- Involuntary Displacement (Disaster, Government Action, Action of Housing Owner, Inaccessibility, Property Disposition)
- Victims of domestic violence
- Substandard housing
- Homelessness
- High rent burden (rent is > 50 percent of income)

**Other: Local Preferences**

- Working families (at least 32 hours/week) and those unable to work because of age or disability (head of household and spouse or sole member)**
- Working families (at least 20 hrs/week but less than 32 hrs/week and those enrolled in educational, training, or upward mobility programs.**
- Veterans and veterans' families (breaks ties)**
- Residents who live and/or work in the jurisdiction
- Households contributing to meeting income goals (broad range of incomes)
- Households that contribute to meeting income requirements (targeting)
- Those previously enrolled in educational/training/upward mobility programs
- Victims of reprisals or hate crimes
- Other preference(s)

3. If the PHA will employ admissions preferences, please prioritize by placing a "1" in the space that represents your first priority, a "2" in the box representing your second priority,

and so on. If you give equal weight to one or more of these choices (either through an absolute hierarchy or through a point system), place the same number next to each. That means you can use "1" more than once, "2" more than once, etc.

### **Former Federal Preferences**

- N/A Involuntary Displacement (Disaster, Government Action, Action of Housing Owner, Inaccessibility, Property Disposition)
- N/A Victims of domestic violence
- N/A Substandard housing
- N/A Homelessness
- N/A High rent burden

### **Other: Local Preferences**

- 1 Working families (at least 32 hours/week) and those unable to work because of age or disability (head of household and spouse or sole member)**
  - 2 Working families (at least 20 hrs/week but less than 32 hrs/week and those enrolled in educational, training, or upward mobility programs.**
  - 3 Date and Time**
  - 4 Veterans and veterans' families (breaks ties)**
- N/A Residents who live and/or work in the jurisdiction
  - N/A Households contributing to meeting income goals (broad range of incomes)
  - N/A Households that contribute to meeting income requirements (targeting)
  - N/A Those previously enrolled in educational, training, or upward mobility programs
  - N/A Victims of reprisals or hate crimes
  - N/A Other preference(s) (list below)

#### 4. Relationship of preferences to income targeting requirements:

- The PHA applies preferences within income tiers
- Not applicable: the pool of applicant families ensures that the PHA will meet income-targeting requirements

### **(5) Occupancy**

#### a. What reference materials can applicants and residents use to obtain information about the rules of occupancy of public housing

- The PHA-resident lease
- The PHA's Admissions and (Continued) Occupancy policy
- PHA briefing seminars or written materials
- Other source (list)

#### b. How often must residents notify the PHA of changes in family composition?

- At an annual reexamination and lease renewal
- Any time family composition changes
- At family request for revision
- Other (list)

**(6) De-concentration and Income Mixing**

a. Did the PHA's analysis of family (general occupancy) developments to determine concentrations of poverty indicate the need for measures to promote de-concentration of poverty or income mixing?  Yes  No

- **Maintain community outreach for admissions and self-sufficiency efforts for residents;**
- **The median family income in all public housing developments is less than 30% of the Area Median Income.**

b. Did the PHA adopt any changes to its **admissions policies** based on the results of the required analysis of the need to promote de-concentration of poverty or to assure income mixing?  Yes  No

c. If the answer to b was yes, what changes were adopted?

- Adoption of site-based waiting lists
- Employing waiting list "skipping" to achieve de-concentration of poverty or income mixing goals at targeted developments
- Employing new admission preferences at targeted developments
- Other: N/A

c. Did the PHA adopt any changes to **other** policies based on the results of the required analysis of the need for de-concentration of poverty and income mixing?

Yes  No

e. If the answer to d was yes, how would you describe these changes?

- Additional affirmative marketing
- Actions to improve the marketability of certain developments
- Adoption or adjustment of ceiling rents for certain developments
- Adoption of rent incentives to encourage de-concentration/income mixing
- Other: N/A

f. Based on the results of the required analysis, in which developments will the PHA make special efforts to attract or retain higher-income families?

- Not applicable: results of analysis did not indicate a need for such efforts
- List (any applicable) developments below:
- Other: N/A

g. Based on the results of the required analysis, in which developments will the PHA make special efforts to assure access for lower-income families?

- Not applicable: results of analysis did not indicate a need for such efforts
- List (any applicable) developments below:
- Other: N/A

## B. Section 8

### (1) Eligibility

a. What is the extent of screening conducted by the PHA?

- Criminal or drug-related activity only to the extent required by law or regulation
- Criminal and drug-related activity, more extensively than required by law or regulation
- More general screening than criminal and drug-related activity (list below)
- Other

b. Does the PHA request criminal records from local law enforcement agencies for screening purposes?  Yes  No; **Beginning in the Year 2000.**

c. Does the PHA request criminal records from State law enforcement agencies for screening purposes?  Yes  No; **Beginning in the Year 2000.**

d. Does the PHA access FBI criminal records from the FBI for screening purposes? (either directly or through an NCIC-authorized source)  Yes  No; **Beginning in the Year 2000.**

e. Indicate what kinds of information you share with prospective landlords?

- Criminal or drug-related activity
- Other (describe below)
- N/A

### (2) Waiting List Organization

a. With which of the following program waiting lists is the section 8 tenant-based assistance waiting list merged?

- None
- Federal public housing
- Federal moderate rehabilitation
- Federal project-based certificate program
- Other federal or local program (list below)

b. Where may interested persons apply for admission to section 8 tenant-based assistance?

- PHA main administrative office
- Other:
  - **During the open-registration period in October 1998, registration for Section 8 applications was done by phone, mail and via the Internet.**

➤ **Continuing Registration may be made by telephone only at:**

**1-800-555-4501**

### **3) Search Time**

a. Does the PHA give extensions on standard 60-day period to search for a unit?

Yes  No

If yes, state circumstances below:

- **For hard-to-house participants, medical reasons (with 3<sup>rd</sup> party documentation) and as reasonable accommodation for a disability.**

### **(4) Admissions Preferences**

a. Income targeting

1. Does the PHA plan to exceed the federal targeting requirements by targeting more than 75% of all new admissions to the section 8 program to families at or below 30% of median area income?  Yes  No

b. Preferences

1. Has the PHA established preferences for admission to section 8 tenant-based assistance? (other than date and time of application)  Yes  No

2. Which of the following admission preferences does the PHA plan to employ in the coming year?

#### **Former Federal Preferences:**

- Involuntary Displacement (Disaster, Government Action, Action of Housing Owner, Inaccessibility, Property Disposition)
- Victims of domestic violence
- Substandard housing
- Homelessness
- High rent burden (rent is > 50 percent of income)

#### **Other: Local Preferences**

- Working families (at least 32 hours/week) and those unable to work because of age or disability (head of household and spouse or sole member)**
- Working families (at least 20 hrs/week but less than 32 hrs/week and those enrolled in educational, training, or upward mobility programs.**
- Veterans and veterans' families (breaks ties)**
- Residents who live and/or work in the jurisdiction
- Households that contribute to income goals (broad range of incomes)
- Households that contribute to meeting income requirements (targeting)
- Those previously enrolled in educational, training, or upward mobility programs
- Victims of reprisals or hate crimes
- Other preference(s):
  - **The Housing Authority has established a local preference for persons eligible for certain targeted Section 8 Programs who are referred by**

**agencies and organizations selected by a competitive process and approved by the Housing Authority Board of Commissioners.**

3. If the PHA will employ admissions preferences, please prioritize by placing a “1” in the space that represents your first priority, a “2” in the box representing your second priority, and so on. If you give equal weight to one or more of these choices (either through an absolute hierarchy or through a point system), place the same number next to each. That means you can use “1” more than once, “2” more than once, etc.

**Former Federal Preferences**

- N/A Involuntary Displacement (Disaster, Government Action, Action of Housing Owner, Inaccessibility, Property Disposition)
- N/A Victims of domestic violence
- N/A Substandard housing
- N/A Homelessness
- N/A High rent burden

**Other: Local Preferences**

- 1 Working families (at least 32 hours/week) and those unable to work because of age or disability (head of household and spouse or sole member)**
- 2 Working families (at least 20 hrs/week but less than 32 hrs/week and those enrolled in educational, training, or upward mobility programs.**
- 3 Date and Time**
- 4 Veterans and veterans’ families (breaks ties)**
- N/A Residents who live and/or work in the jurisdiction
- N/A Households that contribute to income goals (broad range of incomes)
- N/A Households that contribute to meeting income requirements (targeting)
- N/A Those previously enrolled in educational, training, or upward mobility programs
- N/A Victims of reprisals or hate crimes
- N/A Other preference(s) (list below)

4. Among applicants on the waiting list with equal preference status, how are applicants selected?

- Date and time of application
- Drawing (lottery) or other random choice technique; see below.
  - **In October 1998 the Housing Authority received 155,000 registrations for people wanting to apply for Section 8 assistance. These registrations were placed into blocks of 10,000 by a lottery. These registration blocks are then re-ordered by the date and time in which a prospective participant returns his or her actual Section 8 application.**

5. If the PHA plans to employ preferences for “residents who live and/or work in the jurisdiction”

- This preference has previously been reviewed and approved by HUD
- The PHA requests approval for this preference through this PHA Plan
- N/A

6. Relationship of preferences to income targeting requirements:

- The PHA applies preferences within income tiers
- Not applicable: the pool of applicant families ensures that the PHA will meet income-targeting requirements

**(5) Special Purpose Section 8 Assistance Programs**

a. In which documents or other reference materials are the policies governing eligibility, selection, and admissions to any special-purpose section 8 program administered by the PHA contained?

- The Section 8 Administrative Plan
- Briefing sessions and written materials
- Other

b. How does the PHA announce the availability of any special-purpose section 8 programs to the public?

- Through published notices
- Other:
  - **Outreach;**
  - **Marketing;**
  - **Networking;**
  - **Selecting non-profit and community-based organizations through open and competitive request-for-proposal processes;**
  - **Selected agencies refer participants to the Housing Authority.**

## 4. PHA Rent Determination Policies

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (d)]

### **A. Public Housing**

#### **(1) Income Based Rent Policies**

a. Use of discretionary policies:

The PHA will not employ any discretionary rent-setting policies for income based rent in public housing. Income-based rents are set at the higher of 30% of adjusted monthly income, 10% of unadjusted monthly income, the welfare rent, or minimum rent (less HUD mandatory deductions and exclusions). (If selected, skip to sub-component (2))

---or---

The PHA employs discretionary policies for determining income-based rent (If selected, continue to question b.)

b. Minimum Rent

1. What amount best reflects the PHA's minimum rent?

- \$0  
 \$1-\$25  
 \$26-\$50

1. Has the PHA adopted any discretionary minimum rent hardship exemption policies?  Yes  No/**Minimum Rent = \$0**

3. If yes to question 2, list these policies below:

b. Rents set at less than 30% of adjusted income

1. Does the PHA plan to charge rents at a fixed amount or percentage less than 30% of adjusted income?  Yes  No

2. If yes to above, list the amounts or percentages charged and the circumstances under which these will be used below:

#### **Ceiling Rents**

- **One bedroom - \$337**
- **Two bedrooms - \$397**
- **Three bedrooms - \$496**
- **Four bedrooms - \$556**
- **Five bedrooms - \$639**

b. Which of the discretionary (optional) deductions and/or exclusions policies does the PHA plan to employ

- For the earned income of a previously unemployed household member
- For increases in earned income
- Fixed amount (other than general rent-setting policy)  
If yes, state amount/s and circumstances below:
- Fixed percentage (other than general rent-setting policy)  
If yes, state percentage/s and circumstances below:
- For household heads
- For other family members
- For transportation expenses
- For the non-reimbursed medical expenses of non-disabled or non-elderly families
- Other:
  - **Deductions and exclusions mandated by QHWRA are reflected in changes to the Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy;**
  - **Specific rent provisions for JOBS PLUS sites: William Mead and Imperial Courts (pending HUD approval).**

e. Ceiling rents

- Yes, for all developments
- Yes, but only for some developments (all developments except scattered and senior sites)
- No

1. For which kinds of developments are ceiling rents in place?

- For all developments
- For all general occupancy developments (not elderly/disabled or elderly only)
- For specified general occupancy developments (see question e above)
- For certain parts of developments; e.g., the high-rise portion
- For certain size units; e.g., larger bedroom sizes
- Other (list below)

2. Select the space or spaces that best describe how you arrive at ceiling rents

- Market comparability study
- Fair market rents (FMR)
- 95<sup>th</sup> percentile rents
- 75 percent of operating costs
- 100 percent of operating costs for general occupancy (family) developments
- Operating costs plus debt service
- The "rental value" of the unit
- Other:
  - **Pursuant to HUD formula in effect in 1993**

f. Rent re-determinations:

1. Between income reexaminations, how often must tenants report changes in income or family composition to the PHA such that the changes result in an adjustment to rent?

- Never
- At family option
- Any time the family experiences an income increase
- Any time a family experiences an income increase above a threshold amount or percentage: (if selected, specify threshold)\_\_\_\_\_
- Other:
  - **If the resident's rent was decreased between income reexaminations;**
  - **Head of household adds a spouse or co-resident.**

g. Does the PHA plan to implement individual savings accounts for residents (ISAs) as an alternative to the required 12 month disallowance of earned income and phasing in of rent increases in the next year?  Yes  No

**(2) Flat Rents**

a. In setting the market-based flat rents, what sources of information did the PHA use to establish comparability?

- The section 8 rent reasonableness study of comparable housing
- Survey of rents listed in local newspaper
- Survey of similar unassisted units in the neighborhood
- Other (list/describe below):
  - **The Housing Authority is currently examining a flat rent transition strategy and will be conducting analyses on how best to set and implement flat rents.**

**B. Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance**

**(1) Payment Standards**

a. What is the PHA's payment standard?

- At or above 90% but below 100% of FMR
- 100% of FMR - for most areas (see below)**
- Above 100% but at or below 110% of FMR
- Above 110% of FMR (if HUD approved; describe circumstances below)
  - **For 46 exception-rent areas (44 zip codes + 2 census tracts approved by HUD); payment standards range from 110% - 117% of the FMR**

If the payment standard is lower than FMR, why has the PHA selected this standard?

- FMRs are adequate to ensure success among assisted families in the PHA's segment of the FMR area
- The PHA has chosen to serve additional families by lowering the payment standard
- Reflects market or submarket
- Other: N/A

c. If the payment standard is higher than FMR, why has the PHA chosen this level?

- FMRs are not adequate to ensure success among assisted families in the PHA's segment of the FMR area
- Reflects market or submarket
- To increase housing options for families
- Other (list below)

d. How often are payment standards reevaluated for adequacy?

- Annually
- Other
  - **Payment adequacy is monitored routinely; at a minimum payment standards are adjusted annually after the publication of FMRs.**

e. What factors will the PHA consider in its assessment of the adequacy of its payment standard?

- Success rates of assisted families
- Rent burdens of assisted families
- Other :
  - **Expanding opportunities outside of areas containing high concentrations of poverty and minorities.**

## **(2) Minimum Rent**

a. What amount best reflects the PHA's minimum rent?

- \$0
- \$1-\$25
- \$26-\$50

b. Has the PHA adopted any discretionary minimum-rent hardship exemption policies?  Yes  No/**Minimum rent = \$0**

## **5. Operations and Management**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (e)]

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is a high-performing Housing Authority and is not required to submit this section.

## **6. PHA Grievance Procedures**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (f)]

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is a high-performing Housing Authority and is not required to submit this section.

## **7. Capital Improvement Needs**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (g)]

### **A. Capital Fund Activities**

#### **(1) Capital Fund Program Annual Statement**

Select one:

The Capital Fund Program Annual Statement is provided as an attachment to the PHA Plan as: **Attachment 7-1/File Name: 710cgp**

-or-

The Capital Fund Program Annual Statement is provided below: (if selected, copy the CFP Annual Statement from the Table Library and insert here)

#### **(2) Optional 5-Year Action Plan**

a. Is the PHA providing an optional 5-Year Action Plan for the Capital Fund?

Yes  No (if no, skip to sub-component 7B)

b. If yes to question a, select one:

The Capital Fund Program 5-Year Action Plan is provided as an attachment to the PHA Plan:

**Attachments: 7-2, 7-3, 7-4/File Names: 52834-a, 52834-b, 52834-c**

-or-

The Capital Fund Program 5-Year Action Plan is provided below.

#### **(3) Statement of Additional Usage of Capital Funds**

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles reserves its right to exercise, to the fullest extent authorized by law, the rights granted to a public housing agency, as more particularly enumerated under Section 13 of the Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to transfer up to 20% of available Fiscal Year 2000 Capital Funds to Operating Fund accounts.

## B. HOPE VI and Public Housing Development & Replacement Activities (Non-Capital Fund)

a) Has the PHA received a HOPE VI revitalization grant?  Yes  No

b) Status of HOPE VI revitalization grant

1. Development name: **Aliso Village**

2. Development (project) number: **CA16-P004-002 (and 004)**

3. Status of grant:

- Revitalization Plan under development
- Revitalization Plan submitted, pending approval
- Revitalization Plan approved
- Activities pursuant to an approved Revitalization Plan underway

c) Does the PHA plan to apply for a HOPE VI Revitalization grant in the Plan year?

Yes  No; If yes, list development name/s: **Dana Strand**

d) Will the PHA be engaging in any mixed-finance development activities for public housing in the Plan year?  Yes  No; If yes, list developments: **Aliso Village**

e) Will the PHA be conducting any other public housing development or replacement activities not discussed in the Capital Fund Program Annual Statement?  Yes  No; If yes, list developments or activities below:

➤ **Pico-Aliso Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD) Program.**

### **8) Demolition and Disposition**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (h)]

1. Does the PHA plan to conduct any demolition or disposition activities (pursuant to section 18 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437p)) in the plan Fiscal Year?

Yes  No; If "No", skip to component 9; if "yes", complete below).

1. Activity Description: Has the PHA provided the activities description information in the **optional** Public Housing Asset Management Table?  Yes  No

<b>Demolition/Disposition Activity Description</b>
1a. Development name: <b>Pico-Aliso</b>
1b. Development (project) number: n <b>CA16-P004-002 (and 004)</b>
2. Activity type: Demolition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disposition <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Application status Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Submitted, pending approval <input type="checkbox"/> Planned application <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Date application <b>approved</b> /submitted/planned for submission: <b>(01/27/95)</b>
5. Number of units affected: <b>577</b>
6. Coverage of action <input type="checkbox"/> Part of the development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Total development
7. Timeline for activity: a. Actual or projected start date of activity: <b>05/01/95</b> b. Projected end date of activity: <b>07/ 01/01</b>

<b>Demolition/Disposition Activity Description</b>
1a. Development name: <b>Aliso Village</b>
1b. Development (project) number: <b>CA16-P004-005</b>
2. Activity type: Demolition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disposition <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Application status Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Submitted, pending approval <input type="checkbox"/> Planned application <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Date application <b>approved</b> /submitted/planned for submission: <b>(02/24/99)</b>
5. Number of units affected: <b>685</b>
6. Coverage of action <input type="checkbox"/> Part of the development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Total development
7. Timeline for activity: a. Actual or projected start date of activity: <b>02/24/99</b> b. Projected end date of activity: <b>08/25/03</b>

**9. Designation of Public Housing - For Occupancy by Elderly Families or Families with Disabilities or Elderly Families and Families with Disabilities)**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (i)]

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is a high-performing Housing Authority and is not required to submit this section.

**10. Conversion of Public Housing to Tenant-Based Assistance**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (j)]

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is a high-performing Housing Authority and is not required to submit this section.

**11. Homeownership Programs Administered by the PHA**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (k)]

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is a high-performing Housing Authority and is not required to submit this section.

**12. PHA Community Service and Self-sufficiency Programs**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (l)]

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is a high-performing Housing Authority and is not required to submit this section.

**13. PHA Safety and Crime Prevention Measures**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (m)]

**A. Need for measures to ensure the safety of public housing residents**

1. Describe the need for measures to ensure the safety of public housing residents:

- High incidence of violent and/or drug-related crime in some or all of the PHA's developments
- High incidence of violent and/or drug-related crime in the areas surrounding or adjacent to the PHA's developments
- Residents fearful for their safety and/or the safety of their children
- Observed lower-level crime, vandalism and/or graffiti
- People on waiting list unwilling to move into one or more developments due to perceived and/or actual levels of violent and/or drug-related crime
- Other

2. What information or data did the PHA use to determine the need for PHA actions to improve safety of residents?

- Safety and security survey of residents
- Analysis of crime statistics over time for crimes committed "in and around" public housing authority
- Analysis of cost trends over time for repair of vandalism & removal of graffiti
- Resident reports
- PHA employee reports
- Police reports
- Demonstrable, quantifiable success with previous or ongoing anticrime/anti drug programs
- Other (describe below)

3. Which developments are most affected?

**Primarily Impacted:**

- Pico Aliso
- Jordan Downs
- Nickerson Gardens
- Imperial Courts

**Extensively Impacted:**

- Estrada Courts
- Ramona Gardens
- William Mead
- Pueblo Del Rio
- San Fernando Gardens
- Rose Hill Courts
- Avalon Gardens
- Hacienda Village
- Dana Strand
- Rancho San Pedro
- Mar Vista Gardens

**B. Crime and Drug Prevention activities the PHA has undertaken or plans to undertake in the next PHA fiscal year**

1. List crime prevention activities PHA has undertaken/plans to undertake:

- Contracting with outside and/or resident organizations for the provision of crime and/or drug-prevention activities
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
- Activities targeted to at-risk youth, adults, or seniors
- Volunteer Resident Patrol/Block Watchers Program
- Other:
  - **Community-based policing with officers/teams of officers permanently assigned to developments;**
  - **Crime prevention programs focusing on spousal abuse, child abuse, hate crimes, personal safety and home security;**
  - **The Housing Authority has applied and been approved for Public Housing Drug Elimination Program grants for several year including Fiscal Year 1999;**
  - **The Housing Authority Public Safety Department organized an Investigations unit primarily concerned with narcotics law enforcement.**

2. Which developments are most affected?

**Primarily Impacted:**

- Pico Aliso
- Jordan Downs
- Nickerson Gardens
- Imperial Courts

**Extensively Impacted:**

- Estrada Courts
- Ramona Gardens
- William Mead
- Pueblo Del Rio
- San Fernando Gardens
- Rose Hill Courts
- Avalon Gardens
- Hacienda Village
- Dana Strand
- Rancho San Pedro
- Mar Vista Gardens

**C. Coordination between PHA and the police**

1. Describe the coordination between the PHA and the appropriate police precincts for carrying out crime prevention measures and activities:

- Police involvement in development, implementation, and/or ongoing evaluation of drug-elimination plan
- Police provide crime data to Housing Authority staff for analysis and action
- Police have established a physical presence on Housing Authority property (e.g., community policing office, officer in residence)
- Police regularly testify in and otherwise support eviction cases
- Police regularly meet with the PHA management and residents
- Agreement between PHA and local law enforcement agency for provision of above-baseline law enforcement services
- Other activities:
  - **Truancy Program**

2. Which developments are most affected?

- **All Developments**

**D. Additional information as required by PHDEP/PHDEP Plan**

1. Is the PHA eligible to participate in the PHDEP for the fiscal year covered by this PHA Plan?  Yes  No

2. Has the PHA included the PHDEP Plan for FY 2000 in this PHA Plan?

Yes  No

1. The PHDEP Plan is attached to this PHA Plan?  Yes  No

- **Attachment 13-1/Filename: DrugElim5**

**14. RESERVED FOR PET POLICY**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (n)]

## **15. Civil Rights Certification**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (o)]

The Civil rights certification is bundled with the PHA Plan Certification of Compliance with the PHA Plans/Related Regulations and submitted to the Los Angeles area office of HUD.

## **16. Fiscal Audit**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (p)]

1. Is the PHA required to have an audit conducted under section 5(h)(2) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c(h))?  Yes  No
2. Was the most recent fiscal audit submitted to HUD?  Yes  No
3. Were there any findings as the result of that audit?  Yes  No
4. If there were any findings, do any remain unresolved?  Yes  No  N/A
5. Have responses to any unresolved findings been submitted to HUD? If not, when are they due?  N/A

## **17. PHA Asset Management**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (q)]

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is a high-performing Housing Authority and is not required to submit this section.

## **18. Other Information**

[24 CFR Part 903.7 9 (r)]

### **A. Resident Advisory Board Recommendations**

1. Did the PHA receive any comments on the PHA Plan from the Resident Advisory Board/s?  Yes  No
2. If yes, the comments are: (if comments received, the PHA **MUST** select one)  
 Attached: **Attachment 18-1/File Name: Comments**  
 Provided below
3. In what manner did the PHA address those comments?  
 Considered comments, but determined that no changes to the PHA Plan were necessary.  
 The PHA changed portions of the PHA Plan in response to comments  
List changes below:  
 Other:  
➤ **The Housing Authority responded to every comment received and**

**provided translated copies of these responses to recognized resident leaders, development managers, housing advocacy groups and other interested parties.**

**B. Description of Election process for Residents on the PHA Board**

1. Does the PHA meet the exemption criteria provided section 2(b)(2) U.S. Housing Act of 1937?  Yes  No; (If no, continue to question 2; if yes, skip to sub-component C.)

2. Was the resident who serves on the PHA Board elected by the residents?  
 Yes  No  N/A (If yes, continue to question 3; if no skip to sub-component C.)

3. Description of Resident Election Process

a. Nomination of candidates for place on the ballot: (select all that apply)

- Candidates were nominated by resident and assisted family organizations
- Candidates could be nominated by any adult recipient of PHA assistance
- Self-nomination: Candidates registered w/ PHA & requested place on ballot
- Other: N/A

b. Eligible candidates:

- Any recipient of PHA assistance
- Any head of household receiving PHA assistance
- Any adult recipient of PHA assistance
- Any adult member of a resident or assisted family organization
- Other: N/A

c. Eligible voters:

- All adult recipients of PHA assistance (public housing and section 8 tenant-based assistance)
- Representatives of all PHA resident and assisted family organizations
- Other: N/A

**C. Statement of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan**

1. Consolidated Plan jurisdiction: **City of Los Angeles**

2. The PHA has taken the following steps to ensure consistency of this PHA Plan with the Consolidated Plan for the jurisdiction:

- The PHA has based its statement of needs of families in the jurisdiction on the needs expressed in the Consolidated Plan/s.
- The PHA has participated in any consultation process organized and offered by the Consolidated Plan agency in the development of the Consolidated Plan.
- The PHA has consulted with the Consolidated Plan agency during the development of this PHA Plan.

Activities to be undertaken by the PHA in the coming year are consistent with the initiatives contained in the Consolidated Plan. **(list below – see draft letter reprinted below)**

Other: (list below)

Mr. Don Smith, Executive Director  
Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles  
2600 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90057

Dear Mr. Smith:

**SUBJECT: CONSISTENCY OF THE HACLA AGENCY PLAN WITH THE CITY OF  
LOS ANGELES HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
CONSOLIDATED PLAN**

This is to certify that the FY 2000 Agency Plan of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Consolidated Plan and the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. Congratulations on a job well done.

Your mission statement, goals and objectives are fully consistent with the vision, priorities and strategies outlined in the Consolidated Plan. As for the HACLA Annual Plan, I particularly appreciate:

- **The homeownership program you are implementing through the HOPE VI process;**
- **Your continued participation in the Jobs-PLUS program at William Mead Homes and Imperial Courts public housing developments;**
- **Your success in writing, and now implementing grants for the HOPE VI, Economic Development/Supportive Services, School to Career, Drug Elimination, and Tenant Opportunities Program (TOP) programs, among other applications for federal assistance.**
- **Your efforts on behalf of public housing residents transitioning from welfare to work and from school to career.**

All of these initiatives are consistent with the Consolidated Plan.

**PARKER C. ANDERSON  
GENERAL MANAGER**

3. The Consolidated Plan of the jurisdiction supports the PHA Plan with the following actions and commitments:

- **See letter in above letter in question 2.**

**D. Other Information Required by HUD**

## **Attachments**

Attachments are submitted using the following index:

<b>Attachment Hard Copy Number</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Electronic File Name</b>
<b>1-1</b>	Admissions Policy for De-concentration	<b>CA004a01</b>
<b>2-1</b>	Most Recent Approved Fiscal Year Budget	<b>CA004b01</b>
<b>7-1</b>	Capital Fund Program Annual Statement	<b>CA004c01</b>
<b>7-2</b>	Capital Fund Program 5-Year Action Plan Supporting Pages	<b>CA004d01</b>
<b>7-3</b>	Capital Fund Program 5-Year Action Plan Supporting Pages	<b>CA004e01</b>
<b>7-4</b>	Capital Fund Program 5-Year Action Plan Supporting Pages	<b>CA004f01</b>
<b>13-1</b>	Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP) 5-Year Plan	<b>CA004g01</b>
<b>18-1</b>	Certification of Consistency with the LA Consolidated Plan	<b>(Hard Copy Only)</b>
<b>18-2</b>	Public Comments and HACLA Responses on the Agency Plan	<b>CA004h01</b>



## **Attachment 1-1**

### **Admissions Policy for De-concentration**

The following document was taken from the Housing Authority's Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy Handbook.

#### **J. Deconcentration Policy**

1. Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, the Housing Authority will analyze the incomes of families residing in each of the developments, the income levels of the census tracts in which the developments are located, and the income levels of families on the waiting list.
2. Based on this analysis, the Housing Authority will determine the level of marketing strategies and deconcentration incentives to implement.
3. The Housing Authority will affirmatively market its housing to all eligible income groups. Applicants will not be steered to a particular site based solely on the family's income.
4. The deconcentration policy, and any incentives adopted in the future, will be applied in a consistent and non-discriminatory manner.
5. **Fiscal Year 2000 Analysis**
  - a. The Housing Authority does not have any higher income family developments. *None* of the family developments have average incomes above the extremely low-income level.
  - b. All the family developments are in census tracts where the poverty level exceeds 30%.
  - c. 66% of the families on the waiting list have annual incomes below 20% of the City's median income. Another 18% of the families have annual incomes between 21 - 30% of the City's median income.
  - d. Less than 10% of the applications from families with incomes that exceed 30% of the City's median income require two bedroom units, the size with the largest number and turnover.

**6. Fiscal Year 2000 Strategy**

- a. The Housing Authority will continue the employment self-sufficiency efforts for residents living in public housing to increase the incomes of these families. Self-sufficiency programs include the Family Investment Center, Computer Learning Centers, Community Service Centers, Resident Service Centers, JOBS PLUS, resident owned businesses, after school tutoring programs, Kumbaya, Welfare-to-Work, and units off the rent roll for a variety of service providers.**
  
- b. The Housing Authority will utilize local preferences and income targeting to admit families whose incomes exceed 30% of the City's median income.**

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF  
SUMMARY OF FY 19  
OPERATING**

Cost Center

**TOTAL HOU**

ACCT#	ACCOUNT TITLE	1997 Actual	1998 Budget
	<b>OPERATING</b>		
311001	Dwelling	22,742,892	22,345,635
312000	Excess L	197,640	161,130
319000	Nondwell	10,851	9,600
361000	Interest c	4,465,853	3,378,336
364700	Housing	263,974,213	277,069,601
365000	Administi	25,818,657	27,876,942
367000	Grants	78,133,963	94,895,711
367100	Donation	805,460	1,334,000
367200	Loans	3,883,059	4,423,393
368000	Utility Inc	8,285	
368500	Capital F	1,120,200	
369000	PMD Tra	695	
369100	Sales & S	194,866	153,295
369200	Trade Dis	34,038	
369300	Withdraw	4,362,478	4,644,094
369400	Section E		
369600	Manager	5,843,840	456,321
369700	Operating	15,184,296	25,506,296
369800	Basic An	2,252,672	14,484
369900	Other Inc	4,781,240	5,476,820
	<b>Total Op</b>	<b>433,815,198</b>	<b>467,745,658</b>
	<b>OPERATING</b>		
	<b>Administration</b>		
411000	Salaries	28,471,467	32,740,327
411200	Overtime	785,853	509,737

454007	Bilingual	116,085	133,736
411300	70% Wor	14,213	108,068
411400	70% Disa	60,302	119,190
411500	Sick Lea	477,555	605,797
411600	Professic		
411700	Compens		
411800	Vacation		
	Total	29,925,475	34,216,855
413000	Legal Ex	776,556	1,652,514
414000	Staff Trai	245,914	437,627
414200	Staff Trai	213,558	275,000
415000	Travel:		
415100	Out-of-Tc	166,224	264,930
415200	Local	16,020	20,500
415300	Mileage I	68,481	120,159
415400	Auto/Veh	13,087	15,000
	Total	263,812	420,589
417000	Audit Fee	142,542	135,488
419000	Admin Ex	9,803,088	13,647,176
419100	Trustee F	17,319	10,350
	<b>Total Ad</b>	41,388,264	50,795,599
	<b>Tenant Services</b>		
422000	Recreatic	1,943,102	1,492,197
423000	Contract	2,999,597	3,424,832
	<b>Total Te</b>	4,942,699	4,917,029
	<b>Utilities</b>		
431000	Water	3,168,313	2,911,100
432000	Electricity	1,425,718	1,384,768
433000	Gas	1,768,730	2,090,180
439000	Sewer Cl	2,819,627	2,781,022
	<b>Total Uti</b>	9,182,388	9,167,070
	<b>Ordinary Maintenance/Operation</b>		
441000	Labor	8,830,477	9,391,329
441200	Overtime	161,225	176,286

441300	Maint Lal	10,502	64,485
441400	Maint Lal	5,256	24,448
441500	Sick Lea	172,457	215,215
441700	Compens		
441800	Vacation		
	<b>Total Ma</b>	<b>9,179,917</b>	<b>9,871,763</b>
442000	Materials	2,770,571	2,601,287
443000	Contract	3,021,494	3,898,176
	<b>Total Ma</b>	<b>5,792,065</b>	<b>6,499,463</b>
	<b>Total Or</b>	<b>14,971,982</b>	<b>16,371,226</b>

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF  
SUMMARY OF FY 19  
OPERATING**

Cost Center

**TOTAL HOU**

ACCT#	ACCOUNT TITLE	1997 Actual	1998 Budget
	<b>General Expense</b>		
451000	Insurance	4,658,913	5,772,950
451100	FHA Mor	69,833	92,562
452000	Payment	1,196,497	1,553,747
452100	Real Prop	64,674	81,546
453000	Terminal	347,472	307,649
454000	Emp. Ben	12,904,171	15,640,172
457000	Collection	111,893	167,504
459000	Other Ge	1,285,368	1,000,000
	<b>Total Ge</b>	<b>20,638,821</b>	<b>24,616,130</b>
	<b>Total Ro</b>	<b>91,124,154</b>	<b>105,867,054</b>
	<b>OTHER I</b>		
471500	Payment	253,714,364	270,861,620
561000	Interest c	140,888	134,640
561100	Interest c	2,916,073	2,852,924
561300	Interest c	122,883	122,883
561400	Other	295,681	1,628,068
	<b>Total Otl</b>	<b>257,189,889</b>	<b>275,600,135</b>
	<b>MOD/URD/Acquisition Costs</b>		
143000	Planning	2,583,216	2,693,500
144000	Site Acqt	17,530	5,068,383
145000	Site Impr	4,213,976	7,051,195
146000	Dwelling	35,287,164	57,960,896
147000	Nondwel	202,913	2,138,718
147500	Nondwel	10,843	
149500	Relocatic	1,048,554	1,064,858



12/09/1999

**THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES**  
**1999 BUDGET REQUESTS**  
**BY FUNDING SUMMARY**

Post Center No.:

6 Y-T-D Actual	1998 Projected	1999 Request	Variance 99 Req vs 98 Bud	% Of Budget Change
-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	------------------------------	-----------------------

11,496,851	22,993,702	21,982,328	(363,307)	-1.6%
65,748	131,496	153,760	(7,370)	-4.6%
2,424	4,848	9,600		
2,472,423	4,387,656	4,545,140	1,166,804	34.5%
131,737,477	263,474,954	282,357,725	5,288,124	1.9%
13,141,312	26,282,624	28,246,452	369,510	1.3%
45,655,103	80,457,633	108,401,576	13,505,865	14.2%
692,002	1,384,004	2,429,793	1,095,793	82.1%
2,211,696	4,423,392	8,181,143	3,757,750	85.0%
32,418	64,836	17,458	17,458	
76,998	153,996	138,353	(14,942)	-9.7%
13,335	32,884			
2,322,068	4,644,136	1,482,321	(3,161,773)	-68.1%
228,175	456,350	450,167	(6,154)	-1.3%
12,752,014	25,758,846	24,689,516	(816,780)	-3.2%
7,242	14,484	14,484		
3,089,463	6,269,387	4,111,347	(1,365,473)	-24.9%
225,996,749	440,935,228	487,211,163	19,465,505	4.2%

14,483,243	29,255,976	32,504,795	(235,532)	-0.7%
332,282	606,346	524,911	15,174	3.0%

60,763	121,817	141,776	8,040	6.0%
12,190	16,152	73,036	(35,032)	-32.4%
55,727	98,001	106,132	(13,058)	-11.0%
378,169	746,816	1,642,749	1,036,952	171.2%
6,138	23,516	268,568	268,568	
		125,007	125,007	
		2,053,431	2,053,431	
15,328,512	30,868,624	37,440,405	3,223,550	9.4%
506,768	1,020,536	1,550,320	(102,194)	-6.2%
127,440	312,795	297,164	(140,463)	-32.1%
118,885	244,240	526,719	251,719	91.5%
109,829	234,052	261,327	(3,603)	-1.4%
2,799	7,278	17,150	(3,350)	-16.3%
31,157	69,586	122,684	2,525	2.1%
8,750	16,500	20,000	5,000	33.3%
152,535	327,416	421,161	572	0.1%
59,242	118,488	231,700	96,212	71.0%
5,020,512	10,103,898	13,317,381	(329,795)	-2.4%
	10,350	10,350		
21,313,894	43,006,347	53,795,200	2,999,601	5.9%

584,771	1,167,362	2,504,658	1,012,461	67.9%
1,030,978	2,849,071	4,788,272	1,363,440	39.8%
1,615,749	4,016,433	7,292,930	2,375,901	48.3%

1,047,867	2,111,336	3,120,214	209,114	7.2%
600,857	1,235,448	1,670,584	285,816	20.6%
1,317,703	2,637,406	2,483,499	393,319	18.8%
1,108,620	2,218,660	2,838,309	57,287	2.1%
4,075,047	8,202,850	10,112,606	945,536	10.3%

4,455,026	8,909,610	8,481,983	(909,346)	-9.7%
75,965	150,920	152,983	(23,303)	-13.2%

3,558	5,156	58,136	(6,349)	-9.8%
16,124	28,929	16,728	(7,720)	-31.6%
90,003	178,794	421,897	206,682	96.0%
		526,373	526,373	
4,640,676	9,273,409	9,658,100	(213,663)	-2.2%
1,292,517	2,563,938	2,437,624	(163,663)	-6.3%
1,518,851	3,219,550	6,104,555	2,206,379	56.6%
2,811,368	5,783,488	8,542,179	2,042,716	31.4%
7,452,044	15,056,897	18,200,279	1,829,053	11.2%

**THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES**  
**1999 BUDGET REQUESTS**  
**BY FUND SUMMARY**

Post Center No.:

6 Y-T-D Actual	1998 Projected	1999 Request	Variance 99 Req vs 98 Bud	% Of Budget Change
2,341,247	4,682,494	6,402,000	629,050	10.9%
48,031	96,062	71,507	(21,055)	-22.7%
773,784	1,547,572	1,552,778	(969)	-0.1%
36,004	72,008	70,691	(10,855)	-13.3%
167,397	314,056		(307,649)	-100.0%
6,663,810	13,766,150	16,321,016	680,844	4.4%
75,341	150,682	1,540,300	1,372,796	819.6%
454,631	937,834	1,000,000		
10,560,245	21,566,858	26,958,292	2,342,162	9.5%
45,016,979	91,849,385	116,359,307	10,492,253	9.9%
128,681,465	257,362,930	273,680,388	2,818,768	1.0%
67,320	134,640	125,125	(9,515)	-7.1%
1,472,192	2,853,000	2,841,678	(11,246)	-0.4%
61,442	122,884	98,883	(24,000)	-19.5%
746,914	1,493,733	2,797,063	1,168,995	71.8%
131,029,333	261,967,187	279,543,137	3,943,002	1.4%
1,245,531	2,104,386	3,189,370	495,870	18.4%
1,078,453	1,124,487	9,492,328	4,423,945	87.3%
2,182,301	5,590,368	9,446,944	2,395,749	34.0%
19,138,059	38,787,948	56,946,640	(1,014,256)	-1.7%
1,060	990,140	3,842,864	1,704,146	79.7%
	753,496	2,609,283	2,609,283	
258,357	779,858	845,415	(219,443)	-20.6%



12/09/1999

**Summary**

Variance	
99 Req vs 98 Proj	
	(1,011,374)
	22,264
	4,752
	157,484
	18,882,771
	1,963,828
	27,943,943
	1,045,789
	3,757,751
	(47,378)
	(15,643)
	(32,884)
	(3,161,815)
	(6,183)
	(1,069,330)
	(2,158,040)
	46,275,935
	3,248,819
	(81,435)

19,959
56,884
8,131
895,933
245,052
125,007
2,053,431
6,571,781
529,784
(15,631)
282,479
27,275
9,872
53,098
3,500
93,745
113,212
3,213,483
10,788,853
1,337,296
1,939,201
3,276,497
1,008,878
435,136
(153,907)
619,649
1,909,756
(427,627)
2,063

52,980
(12,201)
243,103
526,373
384,691
(126,314)
2,885,005
2,758,691
3,143,382

**Summary**

Variance 99 Req vs 98 Proj
1,719,506
(24,555)
5,206
(1,317)
(314,056)
2,554,866
1,389,618
62,166
5,391,434
24,509,922
16,317,458
(9,515)
(11,322)
(24,001)
1,303,330
17,575,950
1,084,984
8,367,841
3,856,576
18,158,692
2,852,724
1,855,787
65,557



12/09/1999

12/09/1999

12/09/1999

12/09/1999

12/09/1999

12/09/1999

12/09/1999

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report  
Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)  
Part III: Implementation Schedule**

**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
Office of Public and Indian Housing **CGP 710-99**  
OMB Approval No. 2577-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Development Number/Name HA-Wide Activities	All Funds Obligated (Quarter Ending Date)			All Funds Expended (Quarter Ending Date)			Reasons for Revised Target Dates (2)
	Original	Revised (1)	Actual (2)	Original	Revised (1)	Actual (2)	
CAL 4-03 Pueblo del Rio	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
CAL 4-07 Estrada Courts	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
CAL 4-09 Avalon Gardens	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
CAL 4-13 Nickerson Gardens	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
CAL 4-15 Pueblo Extension	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
CAL 4-16 Jordan Downs	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
CAL 4-20 Estrada Courts Ext.	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
CAL 4-21 Mar Vista Gardens	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
CAL 4-22 San Fernando Gardens	31-Mar-01			30-Sep-02			
Signature of Executive Director and Date				Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Programs Administrator and Date			

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement  
2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

form HUD-52837 (10/96)  
ref. Handbook 7485.3

Non-CGP Funds Authority-Wid Development of Replacement Housing under Project No.	To be determined after consultation with HUD		To be determined after consultation with HUD		
--	--	--	--	--	--

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report  
 Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)  
 Part III: Implementation Schedule**

**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
 Office of Public and Indian Housing **CGP 710-99**  
OMB Approval No. 2577-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Development Number/Name HA-Wide Activities	All Funds Obligated (Quarter Ending Date)			All Funds Expended (Quarter Ending Date)			Reasons for Revised Target Dates (2)
	Original	Revised (1)	Actual (2)	Original	Revised (1)	Actual (2)	
CA16-P004-222							
Signature of Executive Director and Date				Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Programs Administrator and Date			

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement  
 2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

form HUD-52837 (10/96)  
 ref. Handbook 7485.3

**Five-Year Action Plan**  
**Part I: Summary**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)**

**Attachment 7-2**  
**U.S. Department of Housing**  
**and Urban Development**  
Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB Approval No 2577-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

**CGP-710-99**

HA Name: Housing Authority		Locality (City/County & State) Los Angeles/Los Angeles/California				X   Original     Revision No. _____	
A. Development Number/Name	Work Stmt for Year 1 FFY: 1999	Work Statement for Year 2 FFY: 2000	Work Statement for Year 3 FFY: 2001	Work Statement for Year 4 FFY: 2002	Work Statement for Year 5 FFY: 2003		
4-03 Pueblo del Rio	See Annual Statement	2,300,000	2,277,281	1,500,000	0		
4-06 William Mead		800,000	0	2,600,000	0		
4-07 Estrada Courts		750,000	0	1,797,939	1,500,000		
4-08 Rose Hill		100,000	0	0	400,000		
4-09 Avalon Gardens		0	0	0	700,000		
4-10 Hacienda Village		0	0	200,000	0		
- continued -							
<b>B. Physical Improvements Subtotal</b>		15,365,172	15,033,281	15,053,939	15,053,939		
<b>C. Management Improvements</b>		2,660,069	2,660,069	2,660,069	2,660,069		
<b>D. PHA-wide Nondwelling Structures and Equipment</b>		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
<b>E. Administration</b>		2,660,069	2,660,069	2,660,069	2,660,069		
<b>F. Other</b>		4,916,983	5,248,874	5,228,216	5,228,216		
<b>G. Operations</b>		0	0	0	0		
<b>H. Demolition</b>		0	0	0	0		
<b>I. Replacement Reserve</b>		0	0	0	0		
<b>J. Mod Used for Development</b>		0	0	0	0		
<b>K. Total Non-CGP Funds</b>		0	0	0	0		
<b>M. Grand Total</b>		26,602,293	26,602,293	26,602,293	26,602,293		
Signature of Executive Director and Date:			Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Programs Administrator and Date:				
X Donald J. Smith, Exec. Director							

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
ref Handbook 7485.3

**Five-Year Action Plan**  
**Part I: Summary**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)**

**U.S. Department of Housing**  
**and Urban Development**  
Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB Approval No 2577-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

**CGP-710-99**

HA Name: Housing Authority		Locality (City/County & State) Los Angeles/Los Angeles/California			X   Original     Revision No. _____	
A.	Development Number/Name	Work Stmt for Year 1 FFY: 1999	Work Statement for Year 2 FFY: 2000	Work Statement for Year 3 FFY: 2001	Work Statement for Year 4 FFY: 2002	Work Statement for Year 5 FFY: 2003
	4-13 Nickerson Gardens		888,000	0	0	2,429,611
	4-15 Pueblo del Rio Extension	See  Annual  Statement	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,200,000	0
	4-16 Jordan Downs		0	0	200,000	0
	4-19 Imperial Courts		0	1,000,000	200,000	0
	4-20 Estrada Courts Extension		2,000,000	3,400,000	0	0
	4-22 San Fernando Gardens		4,527,172	4,356,000	4,356,000	9,524,328
	4-xx Scattered Sites		0	0	0	500,000

form HUD-52834 (10/96)

ref Handbook 7485.3

OMB Approval No 2577-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

**Five-Year Action Plan**  
**Part I: Summary**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)**

**U.S. Department of Housing**  
**and Urban Development**  
Office of Public and Indian Housing

HA Name: Housing Authority		Locality (City/County & State) Los Angeles/Los Angeles/California			X   Original     Revision No. _____	
A.	Development Number/Name	Work Stmt for Year 1 FFY: 1999	Work Statement for Year 2 FFY: 2000	Work Statement for Year 3 FFY: 2001	Work Statement for Year 4 FFY: 2002	Work Statement for Year 5 FFY: 2003

**See  
Annual  
Statement**

**Five-Year Action Plan  
Part II: Supporting Pages  
Physical Needs Work Statement(s)  
Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)**

**Attachment 7-3  
U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development  
Office of Public and Indian Housing**

OMB Approval No. 2577-0157 (exp. 7/31/98)

**CGP-710-99**

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1997	Work Statement for Year 2 FFY: 2000			Work Statement for Year 3 FFY: 2001		
	Development Number/Name/General Description	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description	Quantity	Estimated Cost
	Major Work Categories			Major Work Categories		
<b>See Annual Statement</b>	CAL 4-03 Pueblo del Rio Electrical System/Entry doors/Screening Windows/bars 1st phase	151 units	2,300,000	CAL 4-03 Pueblo del Rio Electrical System/Entry doors/Screening Windows/bars 2nd phase	150 units	2,277,281
	CAL 4-06 William Mead Overlayment of floors for asbestos abatement	100%	800,000	CAL 4-15 Pueblo del Rio Ext. Comprehensive Modernization General Conditions	45 units	<b>4,000,000</b> 419,000
	CAL 4-07 Estrada Courts Replace windows & entry doors. Install bars & security screens. Remove transite siding. Stucco bldg. Exteriors.	5 bldgs.	750,000	Site Work	45 units	405,000
	CAL 4-08 Rose Hill Courts Repair termite damage & overlayment of floors for asbestos abatement	100%	100,000	Water & Sewer Distribution	45 units	387,000
	CAL 4-13 Nickerson Gardens Bathroom repairs/upgrades Reroofing	To be determined 20 bldgs.	538,000 350,000	Concrete/Masonry/Metalwork	45 units	194,000
				Carpentry/Insulation & Roofing	45 units	475,000
			Doors and Windows	45 units	436,000	
			Interior Finishes	45 units	1,015,000	
			Plumbing	45 units	329,000	
			Electrical	45 units	340,000	
			CAL 4-19 Imperial Courts Crime Prevention Through Environmentally Design (CPTED)	100%	1,000,000	
	Subtotal of Estimated Cost		See Page 3	Subtotal of Estimated Cost		See Page 3

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
ref Handbook 7485.3

**Five-Year Action Plan  
Part II: Supporting Pages  
Physical Needs Work Statement(s)  
Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)**

**U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development  
Office of Public and Indian Housing**

OMB Approval No. 2577-0157 (exp. 7/31/98)

**CGP-710-99**

Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1997	FFY: 2000			FFY: 2001			
	Development Number/Name/General Description	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description	Quantity	Estimated Cost	
	Major Work Categories			Major Work Categories			
<b>See Annual Statement</b>	CAL 4-15 Pueblo del Rio Ext. Comprehensive Modernization		<b>4,000,000</b>	CAL 4-20 Estrada Courts Ext. Comprehensive Modernization		<b>3,400,000</b>	
	General Conditions	45 units	419,000	General Conditions	50 units	451,000	
	Site Work	45 units	405,000	Site Work	50 units	332,000	
	Water & Sewer Distribution	45 units	387,000	Metalwork/Carpentry	50 units	359,000	
	Concrete/Masonry/Metalwork	45 units	194,000	Insulation and Roofing	50 units	103,000	
	Carpentry/Insulation & Roofing	45 units	475,000	Doors & Windows	50 units	369,000	
	Doors and Windows	45 units	436,000	Lath & Plaster and Stucco	50 units	193,000	
	Interior Finishes	45 units	1,015,000	Ceramic Tile	50 units	101,000	
	Plumbing	45 units	329,000	Resilient Flooring	50 units	102,000	
	Electrical	45 units	340,000	Painting	50 units	126,000	
				Range Hoods/Kitchen Cabinetry	50 units	238,000	
				Plumbing & Heating	50 units	541,000	
				Electrical	50 units	485,000	
		CAL 4-20 Estrada Extension Comprehensive Modernization		<b>2,000,000</b>	CAL 4-22 San Fernando Comprehensive Modernization		<b>4,356,000</b>
		General Conditions	45 units	265,000	General Conditions	66 units	578,000
		Site Work	45 units	195,000	Site Work	66 units	425,000
		Metalwork/Carpentry	45 units	211,000	Metalwork/Carpentry	66 units	460,000
		Insulation and Roofing	45 units	61,000	Insulation and Roofing	66 units	132,000
		Doors & Windows	45 units	218,000	Doors & Windows	66 units	473,000
		Lath & Plaster and Stucco	45 units	113,000	Lath & Plaster and Stucco	66 units	247,000
		Ceramic Tile	45 units	59,000	Ceramic Tile	66 units	129,000
		Resilient Flooring	45 units	60,000	Resilient Flooring	66 units	131,000
		Painting	45 units	74,000	Painting	66 units	161,000
		Range Hoods/Kitchen Cabinetry	45 units	140,000	Range Hoods/Kitchen Cabinetry	66 units	305,000
		Plumbing & Heating	45 units	319,000	Plumbing & Heating	66 units	693,000
	Electrical	45 units	285,000	Electrical	66 units	622,000	
	Subtotal of Estimated Cost		See Page 3	Subtotal of Estimated Cost		See Page 3	

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
ref Handbook 7485.3

**Five-Year Action Plan  
Part II: Supporting Pages  
Physical Needs Work Statement(s)  
Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)**

**U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development**  
Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB Approval No. 2577-0157 (exp. 7/31/98)

**CGP-710-99**

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1997	Work Statement for Year 2 FFY: 2000			Work Statement for Year 3 FFY: 2001		
	Development Number/Name/General Description	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description	Quantity	Estimated Cost
	Major Work Categories			Major Work Categories		
<b>See</b>	CAL 4-22 San Fernando Comprehensive Modernization		<b>4,527,172</b>			
	General Conditions	67 units	600,172			
	Site Work	67 units	442,000			

<b>Annual Statement</b>	Metalwork/Carpentry	67 units	478,000		
	Insulation and Roofing	67 units	137,000		
	Doors & Windows	67 units	492,000		
	Lath & Plaster and Stucco	67 units	257,000		
	Ceramic Tile	67 units	134,000		
	Resilient Flooring	67 units	136,000		
	Painting	67 units	168,000		
	Range Hoods/Kitchen Cabinetry	67 units	317,000		
	Plumbing & Heating	67 units	720,000		
	Electrical	67 units	646,000		
Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>15,365,172</b>	Subtotal of Estimated Cost	<b>15,033,281</b>

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
ref Handbook 7485.3

**Five-Year Action Plan  
Part II: Supporting Pages  
Physical Needs Work Statement(s)  
Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)**

**U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development**  
Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB Approval No. 2577-0157 (exp. 7/31/98)

**CGP-710-99**

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1997	Work Statement for Year 4 FFY: 2002			Work Statement for Year 5 FFY: 2003		
	Development Number/Name/General Description Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost
<b>See Annual Statement</b>	CAL 4-03 Pueblo del Rio Electrical System/Entry doors/Screening Windows/bars 3rd phase	100 units	1,500,000	CAL 4-07 Estrada Courts Replace windows & entry doors. Install bars & security screens. Remove transite siding. Stucco bldg. Exterior	10 bldgs.	1,500,000
	CAL 4-06 William Mead Replace Windows, Install Bars	100%	2,600,000	CAL 4-08 Rose Hill Replace windows, install bars	100%	400,000
	CAL 4-07 Estrada Courts Replace windows & entry doors. Install bars & security screens. Remove transite siding. Stucco bldg. Exterior	10 bldgs.	1,597,939	CAL 4-09 Avalon Gardens Replace windows, install bars	100%	700,000

	Remodel Mgmt./Maint. Bldg.	1 Bldg.	200,000	CAL 4-13 Nickerson Gardens Bathroom upgrades/repairs	s needed 62 bldgs.	1,500,000 929,611
	CAL 4-10 Hacienda Village Remodel Mgmt./Community Bldg.	1 Bldg.	200,000	Roof replacement		
	CAL 4-15 Pueblo del Rio ext Comprehensive Modernization		<b>4,000,000</b>			
	General Conditions	45 units	419,000			
	Site Work	45 units	405,000			
	Water & Sewer Distribution	45 units	387,000			
	Concrete/Masonry/Metalwork	45 units	194,000			
	Carpentry/Insulation & Roofing	45 units	475,000			
	Doors and Windows	45 units	436,000			
	Interior Finishes	45 units	1,015,000			
	Plumbing	45 units	329,000			
	Electrical	45 units	340,000			
	Remodel Mgmt./Community Bldg.	1 Bldg.	200,000		Con't	
	Subtotal of Estimated Cost			See Page 5	Subtotal of Estimated Cost	

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
ref Handbook 7485.3

**Five-Year Action Plan**  
**Part II: Supporting Pages**  
**Physical Needs Work Statement(s)**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)**

**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
Office of Public and Indian Housing

OMB Approval No. 2577-0157 (exp. 7/31/98)

**CGP-710-99**

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1997	Work Statement for Year 4 FFY: 2002			Work Statement for Year 5 FFY: 2003		
	Development Number/Name/General Description	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description	Quantity	Estimated Cost
	Major Work Categories			Major Work Categories		
<b>See Annual Statement</b>	CAL 4-16 Jordan Downs Remodel Mgmt./Maintenance Bldg.	1 Bldg.	200,000			
	CAL 4-19 Imperial Courts Remodel Mgmt./Maintenance Bldg.	1 Bldg.	200,000			
	CAL 4-22 San Fernando Comprehensive Modernization		<b>4,356,000</b>	CAL 4-22 San Fernando Comprehensive Modernization		<b>9,324,328</b>
	General Conditions	66 units	578,000	General Conditions	141 units	1,236,328
	Site Work	66 units	425,000	Site Work	141 units	911,000
	Metalwork/Carpentry	66 units	460,000	Metalwork/Carpentry	141 units	985,000
	Insulation and Roofing	66 units	132,000	Insulation and Roofing	141 units	283,000
	Doors & Windows	66 units	473,000	Doors & Windows	141 units	1,013,000
	Lath & Plaster and Stucco	66 units	247,000	Lath & Plaster and Stucco	141 units	528,000
	Ceramic Tile	66 units	129,000	Ceramic Tile	141 units	277,000
Resilient Flooring	66 units	131,000	Resilient Flooring	141 units	280,000	

	Painting	66 units	161,000	Painting	141 units	345,000
	Range Hoods/Kitchen Cabinetry	66 units	305,000	Range Hoods/Kitchen Cabinetry	141 units	653,000
	Plumbing & Heating	66 units	693,000	Plumbing & Heating	141 units	1,483,000
	Electrical	66 units	622,000	Electrical	141 units	1,330,000
				Remodel Mgmt./Maintenance Bldg.	1 Bldg.	200,000
				Scattered Sites		
				Mini comp mod for scattered sites		500,000
Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>15,053,939</b>	Subtotal of Estimated Cost		<b>15,053,939</b>

form HUD-52834 (10/96)

ref Handbook 7485.3

Five-Year Action Plan

U.S. Department of Housing

OMB Approval No. 2577-0157 (exp. 7/31/98)

Five-Year Action Plan  
**Part III: Supporting Pages**  
**Management Needs Work Statement(s)**  
 Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)

**Attachment 7-4**  
**U.S. Department of Housing**  
**and Urban Development**  
 Office of Public and Indian Housing

**CGP 710-99**

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1998	Work Statement for Year 2 FFY: 2000			Work Statement for Year 3 FFY: 2001		
	Development Number/Name/General Description of	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description of	Quantity	Estimated Cost
	Major Work Categories			Major Work Categories		
See  Annual  Statement	<b>a. Resident Relations Dept. - Coordination of services and programs</b>			<b>a. Resident Relations Dept. - Coordination of services and programs</b>		
	1. Assist. Director		45,269	1. Assist. Director		45,269
	2. Special Program Coord. (2)		55,000	2. Special Program Coord. (2)		55,000
	3. Budget Analyst		30,000	3. Budget Analyst		30,000
	4. Management Clerk		35,000	4. Management Clerk		35,000
	5. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other		200,000	5. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other		200,000
	6. Revolving Loan Fund		80,000	6. Revolving Loan Fund		80,000
	7. Computer Learning Center		130,000	7. Computer Learning Center		130,000
	8. Res. Economic Development		150,000	8. Res. Economic Development		150,000
	9. Child Care		80,000	9. Child Care		80,000
	<b>b. Resident Patrol</b>			<b>b. Resident Patrol</b>		
	1. Resident Patrol Supervisor		30,000	1. Resident Patrol Supervisor		30,000
	2. Resident Patrol (18 half time)		90,000	2. Resident Patrol (18 half time)		90,000
	3. Overhead: Training/Other		20,000	3. Overhead: Training/Other		20,000
	<b>c. Resident Leadership Training</b>			<b>c. Resident Leadership Training</b>		
	1. Resident Leadership Manager Salary		40,000	1. Resident Leadership Manager Salary		40,000
	2. Clerk Typist		20,000	2. Clerk Typist		20,000
	3. Overhead: Training/Other		18,000	3. Overhead: Training/Other		18,000
	4. Resident Elections		35,000	4. Resident Elections		35,000
	5. Res. Community Training Prog.		80,000	5. Res. Community Training Prog.		80,000
	6. RAC Development Program		50,000	6. RAC Development Program		50,000
	7. Tenant Opportunity Program		90,000	7. Tenant Opportunity Program		90,000
	8. Loyola After School Program		30,000	8. Loyola After School Program		30,000
	Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>See Page 3</b>	Subtotal of Estimated Cost	

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
 ref Handbook 7485.3

Five-Year Action Plan  
**Part III: Supporting Pages**  
**Management Needs Work Statement(s)**  
 Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)

**U.S. Department of Housing**  
**and Urban Development**  
 Office of Public and Indian Housing

**CGP 710-99**

Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1998	FFY: 2000			FFY: 2001			
	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	
	See Annual Statement	<b>d. Resident Community Liaison</b>			<b>d. Resident Community Liaison</b>		
1. Resident Liaisons (7)			100,000	1. Resident Liaisons (7)		100,000	
2. Management Clerk			20,000	2. Management Clerk		20,000	
3. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other			35,000	3. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other		35,000	
<b>e. Senior Activities</b>				<b>e. Senior Activities</b>			
1. Resident Relations Coordinator			30,000	1. Resident Relations Coordinator		30,000	
2. Overhead			2,000	2. Overhead		2,000	
3. Senior Activities			20,000	3. Senior Activities		20,000	
<b>f. Youth Sports</b>				<b>f. Youth Sports</b>			
1. Overhead: Travel/Other			30,000	1. Overhead: Travel/Other		30,000	
2. 4H Program			200,000	2. 4H Program		200,000	
3. Resident Arts Program		20,000	3. Resident Arts Program		20,000		
<b>g. HARAC</b>			<b>g. HARAC</b>				
1. HARAC Secretary		20,000	1. HARAC Secretary		20,000		
2. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other		40,000	2. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other		40,000		
<b>h. Funding for Resident Newspaper</b>		150,000	<b>h. Funding for Resident Newspaper</b>		150,000		
<b>i. Employee Training - Career &amp; Professional Development to increase capacity to manage &amp; to sustain long-term viability of mod. work &amp; to address identified mgmt. Needs</b>			<b>i. Employee Training - Career &amp; Professional Development to increase capacity to manage &amp; to sustain long-term viability of mod. work &amp; to address identified mgmt. Needs</b>				
1. Housing Authority-wide employee training (related to conventional housing program)		350,000	1. Housing Authority-wide employee training (related to conventional housing program)		350,000		
Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>See Page 3</b>	Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>See Page 3</b>

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
ref Handbook 7485.3

Five-Year Action Plan  
**Part III: Supporting Pages**  
**Management Needs Work Statement(s)**  
 Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)

**U.S. Department of Housing  
 and Urban Development**  
 Office of Public and Indian Housing

**CGP 710-99**

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1998	Work Statement for Year 2 FFY: 2000			Work Statement for Year 3 FFY: 2001			
	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	
	<b>See Annual Statement</b>	2. Safety Training		60,000	2. Safety Training		60,000
3. Training for HAPD			50,000	3. Training for HAPD		50,000	
4. Training for Mod.			40,000	4. Training for Mod.		40,000	
<b>j. Resident Training for Sect. 3 Opportunities</b>			<b>185,000</b>	<b>j. Resident Training for Sect. 3 Opportunities</b>		<b>185,000</b>	
Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>2,660,269</b>	Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>2,660,269</b>

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
 ref Handbook 7485.3

Five-Year Action Plan  
**Part III: Supporting Pages**  
**Management Needs Work Statement(s)**  
 Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)

U.S. Department of Housing  
 and Urban Development  
 Office of Public and Indian Housing

CGP 710-99

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1998	Work Statement for Year 4 FFY: 2002			Work Statement for Year 5 FFY: 2003				
	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost		
	<b>See Annual Statement</b>	<b>a. Resident Relations Dept. - Coordination of services and programs</b> 1. Assist. Director 2. Special Program Coord. (2) 3. Budget Analyst 4. Management Clerk 5. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other 6. Revolving Loan Fund 7. Computer Learning Center 8. Res. Economic Development 9. Child Care  <b>b. Resident Patrol</b> 1. Resident Patrol Supervisor 2. Resident Patrol (18 half time) 3. Overhead: Training/Other  <b>c. Resident Leadership Training</b> 1. Resident Leadership Manager Salary 2. Clerk Typist 3. Overhead: Training/Other 4. Resident Elections 5. Res. Community Training Prog. 6. RAC Development Program 7. Tenant Opportunity Program 8. Loyola After School Program				<b>a. Resident Relations Dept. - Coordination of services and programs</b> 1. Assist. Director 2. Special Program Coord. (2) 3. Budget Analyst 4. Management Clerk 5. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other 6. Revolving Loan Fund 7. Computer Learning Center 8. Res. Economic Development 9. Child Care  <b>b. Resident Patrol</b> 1. Resident Patrol Supervisor 2. Resident Patrol (18 half time) 3. Overhead: Training/Other  <b>c. Resident Leadership Training</b> 1. Resident Leadership Manager Salary 2. Clerk Typist 3. Overhead: Training/Other 4. Resident Elections 5. Res. Community Training Prog. 6. RAC Development Program 7. Tenant Opportunity Program 8. Loyola After School Program		
Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>See Page 6</b>	Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>See Page 6</b>	

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
 ref Handbook 7485.3

Five-Year Action Plan  
**Part III: Supporting Pages**  
**Management Needs Work Statement(s)**  
 Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)

U.S. Department of Housing  
 and Urban Development  
 Office of Public and Indian Housing

CGP 710-99

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1998	Work Statement for Year 4 FFY: 2002			Work Statement for Year 5 FFY: 2003				
	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost		
	<b>See Annual Statement</b>	<b>d. Resident Community Liaison</b> 1. Resident Liaisons (7) 2. Management Clerk 3. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other		100,000 20,000 35,000	<b>d. Resident Community Liaison</b> 1. Resident Liaisons (7) 2. Management Clerk 3. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other		100,000 20,000 35,000	
<b>e. Senior Activities</b> 1. Resident Relations Coordinator 2. Overhead 3. Senior Activities			30,000 2,000 20,000	<b>e. Senior Activities</b> 1. Resident Relations Coordinator 2. Overhead 3. Senior Activities		30,000 2,000 20,000		
<b>f. Youth Sports</b> 1. Overhead: Travel/Other 2. 4H Program 3. Resident Arts Program			30,000 200,000 20,000	<b>f. Youth Sports</b> 1. Overhead: Travel/Other 2. 4H Program 3. Resident Arts Program		30,000 200,000 20,000		
<b>g. HARAC</b> 1. HARAC Secretary 2. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other			20,000 40,000	<b>g. HARAC</b> 1. HARAC Secretary 2. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other		20,000 40,000		
<b>h. Funding for Resident Newspaper</b>			150,000	<b>h. Funding for Resident Newspaper</b>		150,000		
<b>i. Employee Training - Career &amp; Professional Development to increase capacity to manage &amp; to sustain long-term viability of mod. work &amp; to address identified mgmt. Needs</b> 1. Housing Authority-wide employee training (related to conventional housing program)			350,000	<b>i. Employee Training - Career &amp; Professional Development to increase capacity to manage &amp; to sustain long-term viability of mod. work &amp; to address identified mgmt. Needs</b> 1. Housing Authority-wide employee training (related to conventional housing program)		350,000		
Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>See Page 6</b>	Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>See Page 6</b>	

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
 ref Handbook 7485.3

Five-Year Action Plan  
**Part III: Supporting Pages**  
**Management Needs Work Statement(s)**  
 Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)

U.S. Department of Housing  
 and Urban Development  
 Office of Public and Indian Housing

CGP 710-99

Work Statement for Year 1 FFY: 1998	Work Statement for Year 4 FFY: 2002			Work Statement for Year 5 FFY: 2003			
	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	Development Number/Name/General Description of Major Work Categories	Quantity	Estimated Cost	
	<b>See Annual Statement</b>	2. Safety Training		60,000	2. Safety Training		60,000
3. Training for HAPD			50,000	3. Training for HAPD		50,000	
4. Training for Mod.			40,000	4. Training for Mod.		40,000	
<b>j. Resident Training for Sect. 3 Opportunities</b>			<b>185,000</b>	<b>j. Resident Training for Sect. 3 Opportunities</b>		<b>185,000</b>	
Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>2,660,269</b>	Subtotal of Estimated Cost			<b>2,660,269</b>

form HUD-52834 (10/96)  
 ref Handbook 7485.3

**PLAN TO ADDRESS THE CRIME  
PROBLEM IN THE PUBLIC HOUSING  
DEVELOPMENTS  
PROPOSED FOR ASSISTANCE, INCLUDING THE  
EXTENT TO WHICH THE PLAN INCLUDES  
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR FIVE YEARS**

## OVERVIEW OF FIVE YEAR PLAN

The youth and young adults in inner cities throughout the nation have few opportunities for meaningful employment and have limited access to cultural or recreational opportunities. The youth of Los Angeles are no exception to this tragic situation. In fact, the City of Los Angeles has been designated as a High Intensity Drug Traffic Area (**HIDTA**) by the office of the National Drug Control Policy. Further, The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles' (HACLA) public housing developments are located in the most impoverished areas of Los Angeles, within communities which have an urgent and serious crime problem.

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is committed to reducing drugs and drug related crime and improving the quality of life in our public housing developments. Through linkages with residents, service providers, public and private organizations/agencies and faith based organizations a Drug Elimination Program has been developed that contains a two-prong approach, law enforcement and provision of social services, for combating drugs and drug related crime in and around the public housing developments. While the program has been in place for several years, it is constantly being revised to reflect the changing needs of the residents in our communities. The primary objective of HACLA's Drug Elimination program is educating and enabling our youth to reject illegal drugs, which is Goal # 1 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The decision by HUD to switch from a competitive funding basis to formula funding for the FY 1999 PHDEP resulted in a loss of over \$326,000 to HACLA's Drug Elimination program. The reduction of funds has required significant changes in the Housing Authority's Drug Elimination program. The 1998 application provided services at Aliso Village, Dana Strand Village, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Imperial Courts, Nickerson Gardens, Jordan Downs, Pueblo del Rio and William Mead Homes. The 1999 application requests funds for eight sites, discontinuing PHDEP funded services at William Mead Homes and Aliso Village, which is being demolished and adding Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension whose 1998 drug elimination services were funded by URD. The application has been developed with the participation of public/private agencies, the Resident Advisory Councils and the Resident Management Corporations. The application includes law enforcement services, security services, and social services for the targeted developments.

The law enforcement component provides a total of 20 officers/Community Resource Officers (CRO) and one sergeant, of those, 12 officers/CROs will be funded on an in kind basis by the Housing Authority. The sergeant and eight officers will be dedicated to Imperial Courts, Nickerson Gardens, Jordan Downs and Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension. The patrol officers will gather information from the CROs and attempt to

solve the identified problems. Four CROs will be assigned to Imperial Courts, Nickerson Gardens, and Jordan Downs and two CROs to Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension. Two in kind CROs each will be assigned to Dana Strand and San Fernando and one in kind CRO each will be assigned to Mar Vista and Pueblo. The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) will provide primary law enforcement services at all sites. The youth opportunities counselor will assist the Housing Authority Public Safety Department with progressive outreach programs.

The CRO's community-based policing approach encourages trust, improves service delivery and response time, and generates valuable intelligence on gang activity, drug trafficking, and other crimes. The CROs work cooperatively with the Housing Authority Police Department, LAPD, Los Angeles County Sheriff Department, and other law enforcement agencies.

The application contains a security component that features a Resident Safety Volunteer Program (RSVP) at Dana Strand Village, Pueblo del Rio and Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension. PHDEP funds will be allocated to provide training and equipment to the members of the RSVP. At Jordan Downs, the funds will be dedicated to the Jordan Downs Resident Management Corporation's Unarmed Security Guard Services Pilot Program. These security programs will allow residents to take proactive roles in coordinating and implementing crime prevention strategies.

Social services will be provided by PHDEP funded Resident Service Center staff at Dana Strand Village, Pueblo del Rio, Jordan Downs and Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension. Community Service Centers (CSC), funded by the Community Development Department (CDD), will be the focal point for providing available social services at Mar Vista Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and San Fernando, previously served by the RSCs. The RSCs at William Mead Homes and Imperial Courts will be closed. The Jobs Plus program will be the focal point for providing social services at Imperial.

Social services include, but are not limited to, drug counseling programs, support groups, youth drug prevention, sports and education programs. Past applications have allocated funds for contracted drug treatment service providers. This application does not include funds for contract service providers. PHDEP staff will seek partnerships with drug treatment community service providers to establish in kind drug treatment and counseling services.

The program objectives of the PHDEP human services efforts will be in the areas of primary prevention, early intervention, and treatment. Focal points of the primary prevention and early intervention will be programs for at-risk youth. For example, PHDEP would seek to implement and maintain programs for Junior Troopers (ages 8-13) and for Cadet Clubs (ages 14-18). The participants in these programs must take a pledge to remain drug-free.

A critical element in ensuring the realization of PHDEP goals will be the coordination of PHDEP programs and activities with those offered by other in-house and outside

service providers. PHDEP coordinating committees will meet monthly to fine tune the program and to evaluate the progress of PHDEP programs at all targeted sites.

In developing the proposed plan, an internal assessment of HACLA PHDEP programs was conducted. This evaluation resulted in modifications of existing programs designed to increase the overall effectiveness and responsiveness of the activities funded in the grant. The proposed program also incorporates the comments and participation of residents and Resident Advisory Councils at the proposed sites.

The PHDEP Grant for FY 1998 will provide funds for services through April 2000.

The HACLA PHDEP program has consisted of and will continue to include four main components: Program Evaluation, Management, Human Services and Law Enforcement.

The great challenge of this proposal is to transform communal mentalities from hopelessness to self-empowerment. We need to enable residents to see that options exist in their lives, that a continuum of supportive services can assist them in exercising those options, and that their own determination will enable them to change their neighborhoods into safe clean places to live and raise a family.

Over the last ten years, HACLA has changed its mission from simply providing subsidized housing to creating a nurturing collaborative of residents, HACLA staff, the Housing Authority Police Department, the Los Angeles Police Department, and social service providers, resulting in one of the most integrated social service delivery systems in the country.

## **PROPOSED PLAN TO ADDRESS THE DRUG RELATED CRIME PROBLEM**

### **EVALUATION OF HACLA PHDEP PROGRAMS**

As in past years, prior to outlining the proposed plan, an assessment of the current program was performed. A survey to determine the effectiveness of HACLA's Drug Elimination program was completed by an independent outside contractor, The Alcohol and Drug Council of Greater Los Angeles, in October 1998. The survey included residents, Resident Advisory Councils/Resident Management Corporations, Housing Authority Police officers and employees of social service agencies working under contract at the PHDEP funded sites.

The assessment revealed that progress had been made in many areas. Most residents (55%) stated that they felt that living conditions in the developments had improved. Several concerns, however, were identified that if incorporated would add to the effectiveness of the HACLA PHDEP services. This information was a key factor in recommendations to strengthen existing DEP activities and refining the proposed plan. HACLA will continue to utilize an independent outside contractor to assess the effectiveness of the drug elimination program. The following actions were taken in response to recommendations made by the evaluator.

**Recommended:** Many residents indicated that they were not aware of the services available, therefore, a three prong outreach campaign consisting of material dissemination, door to door outreach and police outreach was recommended.

**Response:** Staff will redouble efforts to disseminate fliers and information on the programs. Activity calendars, fliers and other information pertaining to the program will be posted in the Resident Service Center, site management office and RAC/RMC office. They will also be placed under the door of every apartment. Activity calendars will be distributed every month and fliers will be distributed prior to events. Staff will conduct a door to door outreach campaign to provide information about the resident Service Center. The outreach will be conducted on a weekly basis. Program information will be delivered to every apartment at the funded sites at least quarterly. Staff will also attend monthly resident meetings to provide information about on-going programs and upcoming events. Community Resource Officers will attend a minimum of six resident meetings per sites over the next year. CROs will have also been requested to attend the monthly service provider meetings at each site.

**Recommended:** Scheduling of Saturday and early evening hours so that individuals who work may still receive services.

Response: Several sites offer classes in the early evening, the Computer Learning Centers operate from 10:00 AM until 6:30 PM

Recommended: HAPD must be brought up to a full complement of officers. This is crucial to HAPD's ability to function effectively within the developments.

Response: The HAPD has been engaged in an extensive recruiting campaign to increase the number of officers.

Recommended: HAPD officers should engage in crime prevention and intervention, rather than in parking enforcement and other activities. Because officer's have expressed concerns about their abilities to make arrests and conduct searches, HACLA should conduct a review of HAPD capabilities to ensure that officers have the authority to enforce laws and regulations. Further, officers should be provided with in-service training to explain the extent of their jurisdiction and their authority within that jurisdiction.

Response: A comprehensive Community Based Policing training seminar will be presented in the latter part of 1998.

Recommended: Officers should work evening, night, and weekend shifts, when the crime rate is the highest, as well as day shifts.

Response: Community Resource Officers work day shifts. A special task force of eight officers is assigned to work nights and weekends at the sites with the highest crime level.

Recommended: Officers should increase their visibility by walking on foot or riding on bikes through the developments on an hourly or semi-hourly basis.

Response: Bike patrol officers have access to substations at Aliso Village in the East LA area and Watts City Hall to store bikes and other gear. This makes bike patrols more assessable to the developments.

## **MANAGEMENT COMPONENT**

This proposal will allow for the continued funding of the position of Drug Elimination Grant Manager. This position reports to the Director of Housing Management of the HACLA and oversees all aspects of the PHDEP grant. The Grant Manager is responsible for the overall coordination of services between the various grant components, the site managers and resident advisory committees. This coordination has significantly increased the strategic planning aspects of the program as well as assured administrative and grant compliance as required under the Grant Agreements.

The Grant Manager responds to evaluations of program needs from staff, site managers, service providers and Resident Advisory Councils/ Resident Management Corporations. This method of continuous feedback and response to evaluations of program activities/needs has resulted in a coordinated approach to this multifaceted program which minimizes delays in developing and implementing new and creative recommendations. The creation of this position has removed obstacles in forging a viable network of programs, facilitated decision making at the management level and provided a coordinated approach to various issues.

## **HUMAN SERVICES COMPONENT**

The Human Services approach will continue to build upon the strengths of drug elimination strategies developed over the past years. The proposed plan will continue to develop and refine strategies for youth at risk through and in conjunction with Resident Advisory Councils and other in-house service providers. Youth councils will continue to provide input regarding which program approaches are working and what additional resources are needed to provide viable alternatives for youth at risk.

The Human Services component will utilize Resident Service Centers (RSC) at Dana Strand Village, Pueblo del Rio, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension and Jordan Downs. Community Service Centers (CSC) will be used at Nickerson Gardens, San Fernando Gardens and Mar Vista Gardens. The Jobs Plus offices will handle the PHDEP social service programs at Imperial Courts.

Counselor and Outreach Specialists will implement, monitor and review anti-drug activities at the four Resident Service Center sites. Case Managers will handle these activities at the Community Service Center sites. These staff members will ensure important partnerships with other on and off site, non PHDEP funded, social service providers. Additionally, staff at each site will perform regular bilingual outreach with the at-risk population and advertise the availability of programs to all residents. The PHDEP Grant Manager will continue to devise and implement drug prevention and intervention strategies for all of the funded developments as well as oversee the implementation and success of all PHDEP activities.

### Resident Service Centers

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, and Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension

The Resident Service Centers (RSC) will continue to function similar to a multipurpose one stop drop-in center for residents.

The Counselor and Outreach Specialists will maintain on-site training programs for residents who wish to become peer counselors. They will work with other in-house and outside service providers to plan and implement culturally appropriate resident services and activities (based on the results of semiannual needs assessment surveys). They will also research other funding opportunities for related services.

The Outreach and Services Liaisons will continue to perform outreach in the developments to promote the availability of existing programs, to determine the needs of the community and to provide appropriate referrals for affected residents. The Liaisons will work directly with the target groups, such as gang members, to offer alternative lifestyle choices through counseling, employment preparation and educational program referrals.

On-site services will be coordinated to provide drug counseling (on a referral basis), sobriety maintenance support groups, youth drug prevention programs, field trips designed to enhance awareness of educational, recreational and employment opportunities, anti-drug and health campaigns, peer counseling, parenting skills development, group and family counseling, pre/post-secondary educational placement services, employment preparation classes, HIV awareness classes and teen pregnancy prevention counseling.

HACLA will continue a vigorous bilingual marketing campaign to stimulate resident participation. Heavy emphasis will be placed on the many benefits of this program in the outreach activities that will be conducted by the Counselor and Outreach Specialists, and the Outreach and Services Liaisons. The marketing campaign will include posters, flyers, pamphlets and other forms of written information which will contain a resounding self-sufficiency message. As the program progresses, the peer counselors will become an essential focal point for the "verbal marketing" of this program.

### Community Service Centers

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999 and Community Service Center Program FY 1999.

Targeted Developments: Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, and Nickerson Gardens.

The Community Service Center (CSC) program is funded through the Los Angeles Community Development Department. Its purpose is to provide employment barrier relief for public housing residents. CSC offices now exist at all of the above referenced sites.

CSC staff provides a variety of social service programs. Many of these programs mirror the prevention and intervention services that are required by the PHDEP. Existing CSC services include: homework assistance, educational guidance, adult education classes in Basic skills, GED preparation and English as a second language, referrals for off-site educational resources, access to on and off site sports and recreational activities, peer counseling opportunities, counseling services, field trips designed to enhance educational and cultural awareness, and adult employment, training and placement services. To ensure compliance with program objectives, CSC staff maintains linkages with community based organizations, social service agencies, schools, law enforcement agencies and community volunteers. CSC staff will maintain all required records and generate needed reports at these sites.

PHDEP will provide funds to augment prevention services (such as educational field trips) at these CSC locations.

### Jobs Plus Offices

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999, and Community Service Center Program FY 1999.

Targeted Development: Imperial Courts

All PHDEP prevention, intervention and treatment services would be administered at on-site offices dedicated for the Jobs Plus Program.

The Jobs Plus Program provides residents the necessary resources to move from welfare to work. To accomplish this goal, HACLA has formed a collaborative with other public and private sector organizations. Members of this collaborative include but are not limited to the following organizations: the Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services, the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency, the Los Angeles Unified School District (Division of Adult and Career Placement), the City of Los Angeles Private Industry Council, the Los Angeles Urban League and Xerox Corporation.

Jobs Plus staff will maintain all required records and generate needed reports at these sites.

### Community Partnership Committees

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens, and Imperial Courts

To accomplish the goals of the Human Services component, the HACLA will strengthen current partnerships and enter into new partnerships with additional service providers who interact with members of the target population on various levels. The purpose of these partnerships is to develop culturally appropriate holistic plans for providing quality services and to leverage additional outside resources to provide a comprehensive continuum of care to the residents

The PHDEP Grant Manager will help to ensure the above by entering into Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with outside service providers at all funded sites to expand the Community Partnership Committees. Members of each committee include: PHDEP staff, HACLA management staff, other on-site HACLA social service providers, the Community Resource Officer, and representatives from the RAC, local schools, the Department of Public Social Services, the LAPD DARE unit, faith based groups and other community based organizations.

Each committee meets on a quarterly basis to identify youth and young adults who would benefit by participating in prevention, intervention and treatment programs. Additionally, committee members report on individual outcomes brought about by participation in these programs. Criteria to be used to identify behavioral changes include: school attendance records, report cards, case manager notes, participant surveys and feedback from family members and program staff. Finally, if an individual should require additional services, committee members will work to secure placement(s) or provide the appropriate referral(s).

The goal of these partnerships is to assist the maximum number of participants from the targeted population through referrals by committee members. Each development will track the referrals from intake through completion to ascertain the effectiveness of the program for each participant and the resulting net effect on the community as a whole. Through exposure to this program, each participant will be made aware of the different cultural, educational and recreational opportunities available to the general population but not usually experienced by public housing residents. It is expected that the participants will then share what they have learned with the other residents of the developments and they will act as role models in their communities.

A consultant funded through the PHDEP will work with committee members to develop survey forms and other related assessment instruments.

### PRIMARY PREVENTION/EARLY INTERVENTION

The strategies designed for the Primary Prevention and Early Intervention programs are to promote anti-drug messages in a supportive environment through a peer group structure and to measure participant responses to support through continuous feedback. The Housing Authority Police Department (HAPD), in conjunction with the

Counselor and Outreach Specialist and CSC staff, will sponsor drug education sessions.

Selection and recruitment of residents will be conducted through community outreach, referrals by Community Partnership committees, parents and family members and drop-in center participants and/or schools. Members will participate in ongoing Youth Sports activities, 4-H club programs and Community Service Center programs.

Each development will participate in a monthly youth focus group for feedback, program input and evaluation. Youth focus groups will be governed by the development's Youth advisory Council and supported by the Resident Service Center staff who will assist in preparing agendas and in facilitating meetings.

Members and their parents and/or extended family members will participate in informal groups and activities once a month. These groups will focus on activities/discussions that promote a sense of self, family and community and improve individual, family and group communication.

The goal of the groups is to build self esteem, increase awareness of what constitutes drug use/abuse, how the individual fits into the family and community and how each individual's actions affect the community as a whole. The participants will in turn act as trainers and role models for other members of the community. This process will continue even after PHDEP funds are no longer available.

### Scholarship Award Program

Funding Source: FY 1999 PHDEP

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

The goal of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles', PHDEP scholarship program is to assist and motivate qualified residents living in targeted developments to continue their education through the provision of financial assistance. A one time award of \$500 per individual for up to twenty participants will be made in June. This award must be applied to tuition or book expenses. Scholarship information will be disseminated through the RAC/RMC, Community Partnership Committees, Youth Sports Program, Computer Learning Centers, Resident Service Centers and the Housing Management offices. Flyers will be distributed to all units in targeted developments.

Eligibility criteria:

1. Must be a resident of a PHDEP targeted development for at least six months.
2. Must be currently attending high school as a senior or enrolled in college, trade or technical school as a full time student.
3. Must have a minimum GPA of 2.0 based on previous semester or quarter.
4. Submit a one page double spaced, typed 250 word essay on the topic: "How can I best serve my community with the education I receive?"
5. Submit two letters of recommendation (non-relative) based on student's character, academic motivation and any other information the recommender can offer to describe why the student is an outstanding candidate for the scholarship.

A Scholarship Review Committee consisting of: The Drug Elimination Program Manager, a site manager, a Resident Relations staff member and a member of the RAC/RMC from each funded site, will evaluate all applications and select the twenty most qualified candidates for awards.

### Educational Field Trips

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

Field trips will be scheduled to various educational venues that include: museums, college campuses, libraries, cultural exhibits, nature sites and historical locations. Participants will be selected from youth and young adults who regularly participate in scheduled on-site programs (such as the Junior Trooper Program, community cleanups, drug education events, Computer Learning Center activities and the cadet program). Additional participants will be identified by the local Community Partnership Committees, the Departments of Probation and Parole and the California Youth Authority.

All attendees will be required to take pre and post event surveys to note any attitudinal changes caused by the outing. PHDEP staff will maintain case files for all participants to detail individual outcomes. Documentation in each case file will include survey forms, school attendance records, report cards, staff notes and case manager reports. The rationale for adopting this program and its anticipated goals are documented under the section entitled Community Partnership Committees.

### Junior Trooper Program/ Cadet Club:

Staff Funding: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs and Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension

The goals of the Junior Troopers (ages 7 to 15) and Cadet Club (ages 14 to 18) programs are to reduce the risk factors associated with drug problems in a public housing setting, to increase the resiliency of targeted high-risk youth and to decrease the likelihood that they will use drugs and other related substances by engaging the participants in positive educational, recreational and cultural activities. The youth are involved in programs that contain strong anti-drug/gang messages that are presented in a structured nurturing environment. Participants pledge to remain drug free. Activities for the Junior Troopers/ Cadet Club will be scheduled twice monthly. One hundred youth and young adults will be identified to participate in these programs. The participants will in turn mentor their peers and the younger members of the communities.

### Drug Education

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Mar Vista Gardens, Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension and Imperial Courts

At least one hundred residents are expected to participate in this program. The goal of the program is to increase the attendee's awareness of the detrimental impact that drugs and other controlled substances have on the individual and the community.

Participants will be provided with a structured educational curriculum that focuses on the dangers and repercussions of substance abuse. Anti-drug related activities will be used to reinforce the educational information presented to the groups. A questionnaire will be administered at the beginning and end of the program to measure any increase in the participants knowledge and awareness of the impact of drugs on the individual and community. The decreased use of illegal substances will be measured by participant self-reporting on a regular basis.

The participants will not only gain a substantial increase in knowledge about the dangers of using drugs and alcohol but in the process will build their self esteem thus empowering them to take leadership roles within the communities.

### Parent Participation:

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, and Nickerson Gardens

Parental participation in PHDEP will have a direct impact on the effectiveness of anti-drug programs and activities offered to youth. At least once per quarter, each PDHEP site will hold bilingual parent meetings with a minimum of five parents to inform families about current programs and to discuss youth activities. Staff will solicit feedback on existing programs as well as community needs for additional services and activities. Parent groups will be invited to attend all educational field trips scheduled for these sites. Involvement of entire family groups will increase intra familial communication, strengthen family bonds and result in increased community involvement.

#### Employment/Job Development Activities For Youth-At-Risk And Adults

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

The Counselor and Outreach Specialist will work with CSC staff to identify and solicit private sector enterprises, business organizations, faith based groups and other suitable programs to participate in a one-on-one mentor program. Jr. Trooper and Cadet ("youth") members and participating adults will be acquainted with successful role models and employment opportunities that are located in the community. They will also be informed about job/skill requirements and responsibilities through community mentor programs. A minimum of forty youth and eighty adults will be targeted to participate in this program. Those who successfully complete this program will act as mentors/role models for other residents in the developments and surrounding communities, thereby, ensuring a continual flow of individuals into the job market.

Community mentors and sponsors will be linked in a one-on-one counseling relationship with youth. Eligible youth and participating adults will take part in employment preparation workshops offered on and off-site.

The Counselor and Outreach Specialist will maintain written documentation on the progress mentor program participants are making over a six-month period of time.

#### Youth Council

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

The existing city-wide Youth Council will support the local Resident Advisory Councils and participate in community affairs. The members of this group ( at least five from each development) will serve as advocates who identify youth issues and miscellaneous services required by youth residents.

The Junior Trooper/ Cadet Programs will provide the foundation from which the Youth Advisory Council will be established.

A youth organization, existing as a separate entity, will empower youth residents and enable them to establish their own set of activities. The continuation of this program is not contingent on future PHDEP funding.

#### Youth Service Academy

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999, Family Investment Center (FIC) FY 1999 and Youth Enterprise Development Institute (YEDI) FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

A Youth Service Academy will be established at each site to complement the existing city-wide Youth Council. Eight youth will be trained and hired as interns to act as liaisons to the RAC/RMS's, Boy's and Girls Club, 4H, and Youth Council. Interns will be paid at the rate of \$9.00 per hour and will work 20 hours per week. They will assist with the development and design, outreach and recruitment and implementation of leadership development, education, prevention, diversion, and cultural diversity programs. The Interns will be stationed at various work sites such as the Community Service Centers, Computer Learning Centers, and Resident Service Centers and implement programs at PHDEP sites. Such activities include sports programs and activities, drug symposiums, support groups, beautification projects (murals and community gardens), rites of passage, red ribbon activities, etc. Youth Service Academy interns will be trained in CPR/First Aid, Youth Programing, Conflict Resolution, Resource Development, pre-employment, HIV/AIDS education, teen parenting, and be provided with resources and materials.

#### Family Counseling Education

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

The goal of the Family Counseling Education program is to significantly increase the knowledge of teen pregnancy prevention, HIV awareness and domestic violence prevention, through participation in family counseling and support group sessions. A minimum of fifteen residents at each site will be recruited to participate in this program.

The Family Counseling Education goals will be reached by developing a format and curriculum for support group sessions, birth control and family counseling/education seminars and instruction. Participant feedback and family counseling evaluations will be monitored by PHDEP staff who will track preexisting norms and trends, maintain records and document the impact of this program.

Through education and counseling, this program will continue to strive for a reduction in the number of teen pregnancies and domestic violence cases, as well as an increase in anti-drug awareness.

### Computer Learning Centers

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999, Comprehensive Grant Funds FY 1999, In Kind Services

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

The Computer Learning Centers (CLC) provide participants from ages seven through adult with on-site educational and employment training opportunities lacking in the community at large. Providing positive opportunities for skill development and educational enhancement motivates participants to strive for success and move away from a lifestyle dependent on gangs and drugs.

The Computer Learning Centers operate a variety of programs designed to lead participants into a healthy lifestyle by improving computer literacy, increasing reasoning, reading and writing skills and successfully building self esteem based on marketable skills. The CLC operates the following programs, with their corresponding outcomes:

**PC Magic:** Provides educational programming for younger children. Staff maintains a weekly interactive multimedia educational curriculum designed in-house. Quarterly contests are held to encourage participation and reward effort.

**PC Adventure:** Provides educational programming for older children. Staff maintains a weekly interactive multimedia educational curriculum designed in-house. Quarterly contests are held to encourage participation and reward effort.

**Hold joint Celebration Open House for PC Magic and PC Adventure participants twice a year to highlight participant achievements.**

**Digital Vibes:** This is an exciting program for youth, ages 16 to 25, to develop graphic art skills, express themselves and serve the community by creating a multimedia online magazine and newsletters. Participants will also design and host a web site. Groups will work as a team to design, create, and distribute a printed magazine twice a year and maintain a quarterly web site featuring anti-gang/drug artwork, events and expression of the housing community. A Digital Art Coordinator would oversee and direct this program.

**Crown Me Chess:** The mental challenge of chess is proven to develop critical thinking skills. Youth will participate in a multimedia chess course and participate in quarterly online chess tournaments with other developments.

**Adult Basic Skill and Job Training:** For the adult learner participation is designed to gain the skills necessary to meet educational and employment goals. A large percentage of adults utilize CLC services to work on a resume or improve their typing. Others engage in self-paced ESL and GED study. CLC programs enable adults to complete the Office Automation Training Program and earn a certificate of completion. This program includes exercises in office filing, resume writing, interview skills, as well as mastering standard office software. The CLC will hold two graduation events per year for successful participants.

### Youth Sports Programs

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999, Comprehensive Grant Funds FY 1999, In Kind Services

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

The single most significant effort that can be made in addressing drug-related crime in public housing is engaging young people in positive, educational, recreational and social drug-free activities. Nowhere is this more necessary than in the neighborhoods of Nickerson Gardens, Jordan Downs, Dana Strand, San Fernando, Pueblo Del Rio, Mar Vista, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension and Imperial Courts which are located in areas that have an urgent and serious crime problem.

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) is currently providing a number of sports activities, special events involving major sports figures, and field trips for youth at risk for drug use and gang involvement. HACLA supports, directly or indirectly, four basic sports programs: baseball, basketball, flag football, and soccer. HACLA staff work directly with the local Recreation and Parks Department, the University of Southern California, community sponsored sports leagues, volunteers, and residents in developing the necessary infrastructure to maintain these sports related activities. Major sports figures and professional teams visit various housing sites during the year and provide tickets to professional sports events as an incentive for youth to maintain a substance free lifestyle. This also affords the youth an opportunity to interact with positive role models.

The Youth Sports, Drug Education and Prevention Program will build on past program experience, expanding successful elements, and implementing new programs and activities which incorporate ideas and innovations gathered from staff, the Resident Management Council/Resident Advisory Council, the participants, and our city-wide Youth Council, a nonprofit group composed of youth ages 13 to 25, who will play an active role in the implementation and design of the program.

HACLA will empower youth to take control over their lives and individual decisions in terms of gang and drug issues, and provide a forum for positive peer group support. During the term of this proposal, HACLA will grow and diversify its sports and cultural activities to enhance participation and enthusiasm among its youth. With the addition of eight (8) Youth Service Academy interns, HACLA proposes to expand its current youth sports program, providing basketball, rookie baseball, bowling league, junior golf, double dutch competition, flag football, and soccer programs and activities. To engage new participants, programs for golf, and expanded women's competition will be added, and direct involvement in the Los Angeles Inner City Games will be funded through the Collaborative of which HACLA will be an active participant. The Inner City Games will host sports competition for boys and girls in basketball, karate, swimming, track and field, dance, and drill team, as well as non-athletic competitions such as essay writing, artwork contests, and a speaker's bureau.

The Youth Service Academy will provide direct outreach, recruitment, design and implementation for program activities. The City Wide Youth Council will provide leadership, recreation and field trip planning, and supervision and recruitment for all events. In partnership with Community Service Centers, field trips will be provided to sporting events and cultural and educational centers such as the Museum of Tolerance and the Getty Museum, and cultural diversity training will be held for the participants to expose youth to the rich and diverse cultures in Los Angeles. Volunteers and participants will be recognized at these events for their personal accomplishments and outstanding efforts in taking a stance against drugs and gangs, and for improving the quality of life at these developments.

Community partnerships will be used to provide homework and tutoring, learn-by-doing education, life skills and family value training, and mentoring. Partners include the University of California Regents 4-H after-school program, Hollenbeck, Inner City Games Foundation, Watts Friendship Sports League, City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, and professional sports organizations.

To reach the spirits and hearts of our youth, HACLA will partner with Father Gregory Boyle Director of the Jobs For a Future program at Proyecto Pastoral, to provide faith-based counseling and outreach to the participants, with one field trip devoted to the diversity and enrichment found in the Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension religious community, their programs and opportunities.

Transportation funds will be used to support the sports and cultural programs, and to move youth to additional special events and activities that are generated through in kind, individual, corporate, and foundation donations, with additional funding for transportation provided by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation with an annual budget amount of \$265,000.

This proposal will also fund much needed uniforms and equipment. It has been noted that participants exhibit an increased sense of pride and self esteem when they are able to display their participation and success by wearing uniforms. HACLA will continue to solicit and receive donated equipment. However, some purchase is expected. The equipment fund will be used to augment and to implement bowling, golf and an expanded young women's sports component.

The Youth Sports Program will be offered to all youth, ages 8-18, residing in public housing. Seven hundred (700) youth will participate. The program's primary goal is to reduce youth participation in gang and other antisocial behavior through implementation of well structured recreational leagues and activities. Several of the programs have been in place for a number of years. These programs reach youth from diverse backgrounds and cultures. Many of the programs offered take place at a neutral facility, in some cases they are conducted on site at particular developments. We make ongoing efforts to promote positive communication, cross-cultural awareness, violence free environments, good sportsmanship, educational focus and positive role models. For many of the youth that participate in our programs we keep case files on them in an effort to track progress, participation, and major life changes. This aspect of the program will gradually increase in the future based upon staffing and case load. \_

## **DRUG INTERVENTION/TREATMENT**

### **Bilingual Drug Information Dissemination**

Funding Source: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, and Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension

The Counselor and Outreach Specialist will organize and maintain updated drug treatment resources and referral methods, coordinate weekly community outreach activities, ensure the distribution of drug education materials to the residents, deliver weekly activity announcements, disseminate special event fliers and referral/information materials, as well as announce substance abuse preventive messages.

Monthly community outreach campaigns will be organized by RSC staff to mobilize service providers to deliver service information materials throughout the developments and surrounding communities.

Outreach scheduling and coordination and a monthly activities calendar will be maintained by the Counselor and Outreach Specialist for the residents of the development. Additionally, information fliers will be created and distributed to the residents.

The goals for this part of the program will be to provide residents with a steady flow of information regarding resources in and around their communities, a service provider partnership to leverage resources and an internal service provider referral process.

#### Resident Participation in Drug Counseling:

Staff funding: PHDEP FY 1999

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens, and Imperial Courts

The Counselor and Outreach Specialists will organize and provide support services to the families of drug users/abusers. Drug awareness classes and membership in sobriety support groups (12 step) will be offered to all interested residents either through in-house or outside service providers. The goal will be to offer services/support for a minimum of fifty affected family members. These relationships with the selected service providers will continue even after PHDEP funds are no longer available.

#### Counseling Services:

Funding Source: In-Kind Services

Targeted Developments: Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand Village, Jordan Downs, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, Nickerson Gardens and Imperial Courts

Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) will be established with drug treatment agencies in each community to provide a full range of counseling services on an in-kind basis for the residents which include: substance abuse counseling and education, a 12-step support group and a parenting support class. The Counselor and Outreach Specialists will work with the service providers to assess services offered, and to recommend appropriate alternatives and solutions.

The goal of this portion of the program is to provide affected residents with onsite treatment programs and referrals to nearby agencies/facilities. Referral mechanisms will be put in place when it is determined that an affected resident requires treatment in an extended care facility. Service providers will be required under the terms of the MOU to maintain case files for all residents served and to submit monthly reports that identify both the status of each case and the types of services provided. The Drug Elimination Manager will review all documentation on a monthly basis to make sure the programs continue to provide meaningful services of the highest quality.

Transportation will be made available to residents who are referred to off site service providers. Participants will either be transported in a van owned and operated by the service provider or given bus tokens.

### **LAW ENFORCEMENT COMPONENT**

Throughout the country drugs have maintained their tragic hold on communities large and small. In urban inner-cities such as Los Angeles the effects are even more profound due to the large numbers of victims, addicts, and traffickers. In fact, **Los Angeles has been designated a High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.** After reviewing the crime statistics for Los Angeles' public housing, it's understandable why the city is considered a HIDTA and why public housing has an **urgent and serious crime problem.**

The Housing Authority Police Department (HAPD) long ago recognized traditional policing methods have not produced the rates of success citizens and law enforcement hoped for. Our communities continue to battle narcotics trafficking, addiction, and the violent crimes associated with the drug trade.

The Housing Authority Police Department has pledged its resources and efforts to reducing drug-related crime and improving the quality of life for housing residents. The HAPD believes it can reduce both actual and perceived crime in our neighborhoods through service-oriented policing, tough enforcement of narcotic laws, and creation of partnerships with key stakeholders who are likewise committed to removing drugs from public housing developments.

Through leveraged resources within the law enforcement community we have provided increased personnel and services to the most drug-impacted neighborhoods. Through collaborations with residents, social service providers, nonprofit agencies, and faith-based organizations we have constructed a plan that both prevents and intercedes in drug usage. Prevention and intervention will be accomplished through programs for young people which offer them different educational, employment, mentoring, and sports opportunities. Our program will result in, **“educating and enabling America’s youth to reject illegal drugs,” which is Goal #1 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.**

The Plan provides the targeted developments with a blend of law enforcement and community services. Some portions of the program have been successful under previous Drug Elimination Grants and will not be substantially altered. Some elements of the program have been included before, but will be modified to strengthen that particular component. Still other portions of the plan are new. Regardless of which strategy is involved, community based policing concepts are applied.

Highlights of the program include:

- Service-oriented policing which combines community-based
- policing with linkages to other community, city, and law enforcement services. This method expands the role and mission of the department to emphasize service to the community
- Dedicated Community Resource Officers assigned to all four Drug Elimination sites
- Combined benefit of services from HAPD, LAPD, and other outside law enforcement agencies
- Youth programs emphasizing:
  - Leadership
  - Academics and mentoring
  - Sports
  - Truancy Abatement
  - Improved analysis of crime trends
  - Crime prevention programs for residents
  - Youth employment opportunities through the Cadet program
  - Maintenance of National Accreditation

## Community-Based and Service-Oriented Policing

The community-based policing philosophy has been inculcated throughout the agency. HAPD is now moving towards a service-oriented policing agency where officers: develop relationships and partnerships with residents; enforce laws; refer residents to appropriate service providers; leverage resources with other City and HACLA departments; and provide multi-agency responses to troubled developments.

The Housing Authority Police Department (HAPD) will maintain (8) additional officers over and above those currently authorized and budgeted for by the Housing Authority. These officers will be assigned to a drug elimination enforcement team that focuses on problem solving in the four drug elimination sites. Their efforts will be directed by the Community Resource Officers (CRO's) working within those developments. The CRO's position has been an integral part of previous PHDEP's and has been an effective component of the program. The CRO's will continue to be the community liaison for the developments.

The Housing Authority Police Department will deploy in kind funded community resource officers at the Drug Elimination sites **and** dedicate four (4) additional officers, also in kind, to create a Drug Elimination Investigations task force. The task force's efforts will be directed towards narcotics enforcement at all developments with at least half their time directed towards drug elimination sites.

The Housing Authority Police Department will provide in kind administrative support through one lieutenant and two full-time sergeants. In addition, one sergeant, responsible for the CRO team, will be Drug Elimination funded

The targeted drug elimination sites and the deployment of officers at those sites is as follows:

<u>Site</u>	<u>PHDEP Funded</u>	<u>HAPD/In Kind Services</u>
Jordan Downs	2	2
Imperial Courts	2	2
Nickerson Gardens	2	2
Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension	2	0
San Fernando Gardens	0	2
Dana/Rancho	0	2
Mar Vista Gardens	0	1
Pueblo del Rio	0	1
Drug Elimination Detectives	4	

## **Combined Services from HAPD, LAPD, and Other Law Enforcement Agencies**

The Housing Authority received a Safe Neighborhoods Grant in partnership with the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office and the Los Angeles Police Department. This grant provides additional enforcement efforts to the developments located in the Watts area: Jordan Downs, Imperial Courts, and Nickerson Gardens. HAPD Officers work closely with the City Attorney to prosecute all violations occurring in or near these developments.

HAPD Community Resource Officers work closely with LAPD's community officers to coordinate responses to problems. When drug traffickers and gang members modify their schedules and methods to avoid detection by the police, HAPD and LAPD change their deployment to meet the need. HAPD CRO's have received assistance from specialized units within LAPD such as the gang CRASH unit and narcotics squad.

The relationship cultivated between HAPD and LAPD has resulted in **shared information, coordinated responses** and directed patrols, cross-training, and a reduction in drug-related activity in the developments.

Parole and probation officers have also been effective partners for HAPD officers. Parole/Probation agents have helped identify disruptive and/or problem tenants and alerted officers when a prisoner is being released into one of the developments.

## **Improved Crime Analysis**

Combining services with LAPD has also resulted in an improved analysis of crime data by HAPD. LAPD's automated crime analysis unit supplements HAPD's manual collection system. LAPD divides the City into eighteen divisions. Within each division are reporting districts. LAPD has developed a database which tracks crime reporting statistics for each division and reporting district in the City. These districts are small geographical areas which include the Drug Elimination sites and for which HAPD receives statistical information.

This information is reduced to only those events occurring within HACLA developments. Each event is hand-keyed into a database which is used to produce monthly crime reports.

## **Resident Partnerships**

The Housing Authority Police Department is one of a handful of departments in the State of California to receive National Accreditation from the Commission on the Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA).

Part of the Accreditation process is a public hearing wherein the public is invited to comment on the nominated agency. The Housing Authority Police Department invited all residents to participate in public hearing held September 21, 1998. The Department was pleased by the number of residents who appeared at the hearing. More importantly, the positive nature of their comments confirmed HAPD is doing an excellent job servicing the housing developments in Los Angeles. PHDEP funds from previous grants were used to make this program a success.

Partnerships with residents foster **communication, support, and trust** and the Housing Authority is dedicated to improving relations with tenants. The Housing Authority Police Department continues to promote education and collaboration with residents. Currently, officers and tenants cooperate to produce public safety fairs and emergency preparedness workshops. They train jointly in community-based policing workshops. Residents participate in public safety committees with HAPD Community Resource Officers. CRO's are included in Jobs Plus planning committees. Residents volunteer to patrol their development and receive basic training from HAPD Officers.

We believe this commitment to resident partnerships resulted in the affirmative public hearing held by the CALEA Assessors.

### **Youth Programs Emphasizing Academics, Sports, and Scholarships**

The Housing Authority Police Department's Youth Services Officer and Youth Opportunities Counselor promote alternative programs for young people. The programs are designed to **promote youth sports, youth leadership skills, and cultural and recreational activities**. Only by improving youngsters self-esteem and giving them a variety of opportunities will we help them become self-reliant, productive adults.

The Youth Services Officer recruits at-risk high school age youth (especially those in the critical **ages of 16 to 18**) for the, "**Project Reach**" program. "Reach" partners with the Boeing Corporation to prepare young people for college through inspirational speakers, hands-on workshops, and campus visits. On completion, the "Reach" students receive scholarships.

The Youth Services Officer also coordinates with the **Watts Friendship Sports League** to give younger students positive outdoor and athletic experiences. These sporting activities also encourage interaction with youth from other developments.

**Truancy abatement** has developed into a priority for both the Youth Services Officer and the Youth Opportunities Counselor. Truancy accounts for lost revenue to the school, increased vandalism and crime in the development, and, most importantly, reduces the opportunity for the truant student. HAPD instituted a program which targets all truant children, but **especially those aged 15 to 18**. Many of these children have missed hundreds of days of school. The Youth Officer and Counselor have returned over twenty-three students to Watts area schools.

The Youth Opportunities Counselor also works toward diverting gang members from violent, gang, or other criminal activity. By improving young people's self-esteem and providing them alternatives, we give them the tools to lead crime and drug-free lives.

### **Youth Employment Opportunities through Cadet Program**

Summer and after-school jobs are an important learning opportunity for all teenagers. After-school jobs teach kids responsibility, discipline, and work habits. It's an excellent way for young people to develop pride and self-esteem and stay away from drugs. Because of limited experience and transportation, young people living in poor communities sometimes have difficulty winning part-time employment.

The Housing Authority Police Department wants to improve the chances of these kids by providing them with jobs and experience.

### **Crime Prevention Programs**

Student interns have developed crime prevention programs for Housing Authority residents. To date, a domestic violence workshop and property identification program have been created. Slides, pamphlets, and speakers assist the CRO's with their presentations. Crime reporting forms in English and Spanish are being tested in five developments. These forms give residents another option in reporting problems. HAPD wants to expand the crime prevention program to include seminars on child abuse.

### **Maintenance of National Accreditation Status**

The HAPD received national accreditation in November, 1998. This honor has been bestowed to very few California police departments. The Housing Authority is committed to maintaining both its Accredited status and the high standards demanded by the Commission on the Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies.

### **Jordan Downs Resident Security Program**

The Jordan Downs Resident Management Corporation (RMC) has formed its own security company. The Housing Authority contracted with the RMC to provide security at Jordan during comprehensive modernization, a three year effort. While the resident's unit is being modernized, the resident is moved temporarily to buildings designated as hotels, until their own unit is completed. The RMC is responsible for security at all vacant units. The success of this program was such that the Authority contracted with the RMC to expand the security services at Jordan Downs and to provide security at other housing developments.

The RMC recruits, trains, and hires residents of the development to act as security guards. The Authority designates which buildings and units are to be guarded, but the RMC is completely in charge of scheduling, deployment, payroll, accounting, and all other administrative functions which any small business entails. The security contract has resulted in greatly reduced security problems at the vacant units, and has created badly needed job opportunities among a resident population all too often considered unemployable.

The role of the security company was expanded in 1999 to a larger geographical area, and was significantly expanded in scope as well, providing an added sense of security for both residents and their guests. The new program, which is a pilot unarmed security guard program is funded by PHDEP.

The Crime Abatement by Resident Empowerment program (CARE) will act as a catalyst in changing residents' attitudes from one of passive non-active behavior to one of aggressive pro-active behavior in deterring crime in the housing development. This gives the residents a sense of control over their environment while forging a better working relationship with the City of Los Angeles and HACL A Police Departments. This is accomplished by creating a constructive, nurturing living environment for residents of Jordan Downs, by having the security staff engaging residents in informal discussions, encouraging the residents' personal pride in their homes and their community, and encouraging them to feel that the actions they take to promote security will have a tangible effect on improving their quality of life.

Uniformed resident security units provide a visual deterrent to would-be criminals. The security staff does not attempt to apprehend suspects, but to observe and immediately report any suspicious activities to the Los Angeles Police Department and/or the Housing Authority Police Department. The guards patrol the development from dusk to dawn seven days a week.

The security staff reports all incidents of vandalism and any hazardous safety conditions such as broken windows or light failures, to on-site Authority management staff. The security units also act as an escort service for senior citizen residents, assist in emergency situations, and provide advice to residents on how to avoid being victimized.

This purpose of this program is to act as a catalyst in changing residents' attitudes from one of passive non-active behavior to one of aggressive pro-active behavior in deterring crime in the development giving residents a sense of control over self determination while forging a better working relationship with LAPD and HAPD.

### **Resident Safety Volunteer Program (RSVP)**

Targeted Developments: Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Dana Strand Village and Pueblo del Rio

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles has established a Resident Safety Volunteer Program (RSVP). This program has trained residents to recognize and report physical, environmental, safety and security concerns in order to create a safer environment for the residents of the housing developments.

The Resident Safety Volunteer Program currently operates at four HACLA sites, two of which are targeted PHDEP developments, Pueblo del Rio and Mar Vista Gardens. With the approval of this application, Dana Strand and Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension will be added to the Resident Safety Volunteer Program (RSVP). Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand, and Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension will be targeted for the FY 1999 grant.

HACLA will provide each RSVP team with appropriate equipment (such as radios) and apparel to wear during patrols. HACLA will also provide patrol members with a variety of training programs that include; cultural diversity, first aid, CPR and conflict resolution.

The Resident Safety Volunteer Programs will be established by Resident Safety Advisory Committees (RSAC). Members of the RSAC will include on-site management and maintenance staff, a representative from the Housing Authority or Los Angeles Police Department, a representative from the Resident Management Corporation and the program's coordinator. The committees will meet on a monthly basis to review the effectiveness of the programs and to determine if any additional safety and security initiatives are needed. Additionally, the committees will encourage and select residents to volunteer for this program.

Teams at all sites will be supervised by coordinators whose salaries will be funded through the existing Resident Safety Volunteer Program. The coordinators will notify team members of time and locations of duty and prepare daily activity reports for the Resident Safety Advisory Committees. Team leaders will also distribute supplies and materials to team members and maintain a record of distribution.

Each team will patrol the development and report any hazardous safety and security conditions to on-site management staff or law enforcement officers. Patrol responsibilities will include regular inspections of the grounds to identify problem areas, vandalism/ graffiti, or health and safety problems. Finally, patrol members will provide basic education to other residents regarding crime prevention strategies.

Establishment of the RSVP at these developments will allow residents to play an active role in the coordination and implementation of a comprehensive safety and security program.

Recruitment and Training are vital to making the program operate effectively. This year, recruitment and training program will target 10 volunteers per development to commit to 15 hours a month for each RSVP participant. Each participant will volunteer a total of 180 hours per year. The training sessions will offer volunteers leadership development, enhance their communication skills, and provide them with an understanding of how their responsibilities and duties interact with the needs of the community, this will help build the volunteers interpersonal skills and expand their employment opportunities. Out of the 30 volunteers projected for the Pueblo del Rio, Dana Strand, and Pico Aliso housing developments, we anticipate that two of the volunteers per development will have the experience and preparation necessary to seek employment.

An annual Health and Safety Fair will be held at each development.

## **ONE STRIKE POLICY**

The “One Strike” policy is not new to the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles. In 1991, in accordance with HUD regulations and federal law, HACLA amended its rental agreement making criminal and drug related acts which threaten the rights of other residents to the free use and enjoyment of their premises an evictable offense. As part of the amendment, residents were not only made responsible for their own acts, but the acts of members of their household, guests and others under their control. Additionally, and in accordance with California State law, HACLA in 1995 began to screen applicants for criminal and drug related histories to determine whether the applicant’s past criminal history, or the past criminal history of another adult seeking admission under the same application, indicates whether they would pose a threat to other residents.

Under HACLA’s “One Strike” eviction policy, criminal charges need not be brought to commence an eviction action. Moreover, if criminal charges were brought and dismissed or a not guilty verdict entered, HACLA may still seek eviction where the evidence is strong.

Since eviction is only one tool in providing for a safer public housing community, and because eviction has dire consequences for those evicted from public housing, HACLA evaluates each potential eviction on a case by case basis. While the interests of the community are always placed above the resident family, consideration is occasionally given to families where the act is not particularly serious, there is no evidence of a past criminal record by the actor or, the actor was minor and/or the parents were actively dealing with the problem before the incident. In those rare instances where a family is not evicted on the basis of a criminal or drug related act, strong written guarantees are obtained which ensure the safety of the community.

HACLA does not provide residents with a pretermination grievance hearing for criminal and drug related evictions. However, consistent with due process, all evictions are carried out under California law which requires that tenants be given notice and opportunity to be heard before being evicted. In California, prior to the commencement of an eviction action, the resident is served with a notice to quit which specifies with certainty the drug and criminal act(s) that are (the grounds) for eviction. If the resident fails to vacate within the prescribed noticed period, an unlawful detainer action is filed with the court and served on the resident. If the resident chooses to contest the facts or law, the resident may file an answer and a trial will be held in a court of law.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

**AGENCY PLAN RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED**

***NOTICE TO RESIDENTS AND PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS***

November 12, 1999

Dear Residents and Program Participants:

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) is pleased to respond to comments received on the HACLA's Fiscal Year 2000 Draft Agency Plan (Draft Agency Plan). The Agency Plan Resident Advisory Board, Resident Organizations, residents and program participants, and interested parties have submitted comments to the Draft Agency Plan. The Housing Authority is committed to responding and addressing all the issues raised by these comments. Copies of these responses will be distributed to 22 different Housing Authority sites and offices throughout Los Angeles and will also be made available to interested parties and members of the public who request them.

**BACKGROUND**

The "Quality Housing Work Responsibility Act of 1998" (QHWRA) contains a provision whereby PHAs must submit an Agency Plan. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) published an Interim rule on February 18, 1999 implementing the requirements. The final rule was published on October 21, 1999, and is effective on November 22, 1999.

The Agency Plan has two elements, a Five-Year Plan and an Annual Plan. The Housing Authority is in the first group of Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) who must submit an Agency Plan for Fiscal Year 2000. PHAs in the first reporting group have a very compressed submission schedule and many of the final rules that implement QHWRA requirements have yet to be published. Examples: pets, site-based waiting lists, flat rents, community service requirements. HUD is requiring use of an electronic template which was being finalized when the Draft Agency Plan was disseminated. To accommodate a more complete submission, HUD has extended the submission date for January Fiscal Year Housing Authorities from October 15, 1999 to December 1, 1999.

Because of the compressed time frame and the absence of final rules on many important issues, the Housing Authority elected to make only minor changes to existing policies in the Draft Agency Plan. The exceptions were provisions required by the QWHRA or other HUD regulations.

The Agency Plan submission process is a continuing planning process, and tailored after the Consolidated Plan process. The Housing Authority must submit an Annual

Plan every year. Residents, program participants, and the public will have an opportunity for input before each submission to HUD.

## **COMMENTS ON THE HACLA DRAFT AGENCY PLAN**

During the 64-day Agency Plan comment period numerous oral and written comments on the Draft Agency Plan were received.

### ***Written Comments***

Written comments on the Draft Agency Plan were received from residents, program participants, organizations, and the general public.

#### **September 16, 1999 Agency Plan Resident Advisory Board Meeting**

Comment/feedback cards were filled out by members of the Agency Plan Resident Advisory Board during the September 16, 1999 meeting.

#### **September 22, 1999 Public Hearing**

- Representatives of the Legal Aid Foundation in conjunction with public housing residents presented a “Draft Report of the Meeting of Public Housing Resident Leaders.” This report is hereinafter referred to as “L.A.F.L.A. report”.
- The Housing Authority received a petition from the San Fernando Gardens Resident Management Corporation concerning three issues. The petition was signed by 234 residents from San Fernando Gardens.
- A letter was received from an Owensmouth Gardens resident regarding concerns specific to that site.
- A letter was received from a Section 8 program participant concerning the family self-sufficiency program.
- A copy of the report “THE IMPACT OF HOUSING AVAILABILITY, ACCESSIBILITY, AND AFFORDABILITY ON PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES” was received from one of the speakers.
- Miscellaneous written comments from Public Hearing attendees.

#### **October 8, 1999: During Comment Period**

- Comments from the Nickerson Gardens Resident Management Corporation.
- Comments from the Toberman Settlement House.

## ***Oral Comments***

Oral comments on the Draft Agency Plan were recorded via videotape and pen and paper notes. Oral comments on the Draft Agency Plan were received during the following Agency Plan-related activities/meetings:

- July 29, 1999: meeting with elected RAC/RMC Board members.
- August 25, 1999: retreat with elected RAC/RMC Board members.
- September 16, 1999: Agency Plan Resident Advisory Board meeting.
- September 22, 1999: Board of Commissioners Public Hearing.
- October 1, 1999: meeting between the Housing Authority, representatives of the Legal Aid Foundation and public housing residents.
- October 28, 1999: Agency Plan Resident Advisory Board meeting.

The discussions in this Notice are grouped by issue and acknowledges the related comments received from all sources, the Housing Authority's response and the Executive Director's recommendations, where appropriate, on making changes in the final Agency Plan.

## **REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS FOR RESIDENT PARTICIPATION IN THE AGENCY PLAN PROCESS**

The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) provisions are as follows:

- Section 903.13, (a) states: "...The role of the Resident Advisory Board...is to participate in the PHA planning process and to assist and make recommendations regarding the PHA plans."
- Section 903.13, (c) states: "The PHA must consider the recommendations of the Resident Advisory Board or Boards in preparing the **FINAL** Agency Plan. In submitting the final plan to HUD for approval, the PHA must include a copy of the recommendations made by the Board or Boards and a description of the manner in which the PHA addressed these recommendations" (emphasis added).
- Section 903.17 sets forth the public notification requirements: The Board of Commissioners "must conduct a public hearing to discuss the PHA plan...and

invite public comment on the plan(s). The hearing must be conducted at a location that is convenient to the residents served by the PHA”.

- The regulations also states: Not later than 45 days before the public hearing is to take place, the PHA must:
  - 1) Make the proposed plan(s) and all information relevant to the public hearing to be conducted available for inspection by the public at the principal office of the PHA during normal business hours; and
  - 2) Publish a notice informing the public that the information is available for review and inspection, and that a public hearing will take place on the plan, and the date, time, and location of the hearing.”

In summary, the Housing Authority would be in compliance with the above regulations if the HACLA:

- Considered the recommendations from Resident Advisory Board in the development of the Final Agency Plan;
- Published a Notice in local newspapers that the Draft Agency Plan was available for inspection at 2600 Wilshire Boulevard between the hours of 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM;
- Published a Notice regarding the Public Hearing and invited public comment; and
- Conducted a Public Hearing on the Draft Agency Plan.

## **THE HOUSING AUTHORITY AGENCY PLAN PUBLIC PROCESS**

The Housing Authority has made the Agency Plan submission/approval process a public process. The HACLA has a history of going beyond the letter of the law for resident participation requirements. The public process for the Agency Plan began July, 1999 and will continue until December, 1999. The events, communications and activities relevant to the Housing Authority’s Agency Plan public process include:

- Translated the Draft Agency Plan into: Spanish, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Armenian, Korean, Russian, and Chinese.
- Made copies of the Draft Agency Plan available at 22 sites, including the Conventional housing development offices, Section 8 and Property Management offices, and the Authority’s Central office.

- Delivery of the Draft Agency Plan to the duly elected RAC/RMC Presidents on August 5, 1999.
- Published Notices concerning the Draft Agency Plan in eight newspapers: Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles Sentinel, Watts Times, Rafu Shimpo, Los Angeles Daily Journal, La Opinion, Eastside Journal, and the Korean Times.

The Notice was published in the Los Angeles Times on August 3, 1999 and in the other newspapers on August 5, 1999.

The Notice provided the information regarding the Public Hearing, and the location and full addresses of the 22 sites where the Draft Agency Plan was available for inspection.

- Sent 10,000 public housing and property management residents a notification of the availability of the Draft Agency Plan for public inspection in the August, 1999 rent statements. This Notice was published in five languages.
- Sent 10,000 public housing and property management residents a notification of the Public Hearing in the September, 1999 rent statements. This Notice was published in five languages.
- On August 15, 1999, the HACLA sent more than 37,000 Section 8 program participants notification via U. S. mail of the public hearing and the availability of the plans for public inspection and the location of the Section 8 offices. The Notice was published in seven languages.
- Made the Draft Agency Plan available on the Internet beginning August 20, 1999.
- Provided copies of the Draft Agency Plan to Legal Aid representatives on request in both English and Spanish.
- Assembled documentation relevant to the non-required sections of the Agency Plan and made it available for public inspection beginning August, 1999.
- A workshop was held on June 24, 1999 for elected Resident Organization leaders, and included training on the QWHRA and the Agency Plan.

- The Agency Plan process was discussed at a meeting attended by 39 duly-elected Resident Organization leaders on July 29, 1999. 16 Conventional housing sites were represented.
- The content of the Draft Agency Plan was discussed at a resident leader retreat held on August 25, 1999. 58 Resident Organization Board members representing 20 conventional housing sites attended.
- On September 1, 1999 the Executive Director and the Staff met with Legal Aid Foundation attorneys and public housing residents to discuss their concerns regarding the public process.
- On September 3, 1999 all duly-elected RAC/RMC Presidents, 18 Section 8 program participants, and three Property management residents received letters regarding their appointment to the Housing Authority's Agency Plan Resident Advisory Board. The letter requested they accept the appointment. The Resident Advisory Board members were notified on September 7, 1999 of the September 16, 1999 meeting.
- A meeting of the Resident Advisory Board was held on September 16, 1999. 59 Resident Advisory Board members representing 18 public housing sites attended. There were also 12 Section 8 program participants and three Property Management residents present.

The Draft Agency Plan was discussed section by section. Oral comments were received during the meeting and questions addressed. 35 Board members provided written comments on a variety of concerns.

- The Housing Authority Board of Commissioners conducted a Public Hearing regarding the Draft Agency Plan by on September 22, 1999. The Public Hearing was attended by more than 300 residents, program participants, and members of the public. The Public Hearing was not adjourned until everyone present who wished to make comments had the opportunity to speak.
- The Draft Agency Plan public comment period was extended until October 8, 1999 at the Public Hearing. The Resident Advisory Board members were notified of this extension; extension announcements were posted at all public housing sites, and Notices were published in two local newspapers.
- On October 1, 1999 the Executive Director and staff met with three Legal Aid attorneys and seven public housing residents. The residents were from five public housing. The attendees gave input regarding the L.A.F.L.A. report received at the Public Hearing.

- The Housing Authority met with the Resident Advisory Board on October 28, 1999 to review the Agency Plan Template and the Housing Authority's responses to public comments. Additional input and recommendations concerning the Agency Plan were received.
- The Housing Authority considered all comments, not just those from the Public Hearing and the Resident Advisory Board, in drafting the Final Agency Plan.
- Resident Program participants, and the general public will have two additional opportunities to speak about the Agency Plan: the Housing Authority Board of Commissioners Operations Committee meeting on Tuesday, November 16, 1999 at 11 AM and at the Housing Authority Board of Commissioners meeting on Wednesday, November 24, 1999 at 9:30 AM.

The Housing Authority has fully engaged the minimum requirements, and far exceeded them. There was an extensive flow of information, and extensive presentation of the information. The Housing Authority considered public comment, not only from the Resident Advisory Board, but also from other residents, program participants, and interested parties.

### **COMMENTS ON THE HACLA DRAFT FINAL AGENCY PLAN TEMPLATE**

HUD published the electronic template after the Housing Authority had completed and disseminated the Draft Agency Plan.

On October 28, 1999 the Draft Final Agency Plan Template was distributed to the Resident Advisory Board members and reviewed with them. There were numerous questions and comments which are discussed in this Notice.

On October 28, 1999 a Notice was published in the newspapers advising of the availability of the Draft Final Agency Plan Template, and the location of the 22 sites where it could be reviewed. The Notice also advised of the comment period from October 28, 1999 – November 10, 1999.

No additional comments were received on the Final Draft Version (HUD Template) of the Year 2000 Agency Plan.

## **DISCUSSION OF THE COMMENTS**

## **ISSUE: RESIDENT PARTICIPATION**

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report states “residents and their supporters have a right to have meaningful input in the writing of the Plan. The rules for Resident Participation are in the Code of Federal Regulations at 24 CFR 964 and 24 CFR 903.13.

### ***Housing Authority Response:***

The requirements of the regulations were discussed previously. See “Requirements of the Code of Federal Regulations For Resident Participation In Agency Plan Process.”

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report says that most of the statements on page 11-1 of the Draft Agency Plan were not true at the time the draft was distributed including:

- a) Engaging in an extensive process of seeking resident comment to incorporate in the Agency Plan.

### ***Housing Authority Response:***

The Housing Authority would like to clarify that these activities were written as an expression of activities to be completed by the end of the public participation process. The Draft Agency Plan was released to begin the process. Section 11-1 was written based on a series of activities, meetings, and hearings which were planned as a vehicle whereby residents would be able to provide input into the development of the Final Agency Plan. The activities set forth under the Agency Plan Process demonstrate the extensive process which took place, and resulted in numerous comments which are discussed in this Notice.

- b) Translating the Draft Agency Plan in multiple languages.

### ***Housing Authority Response:***

At the time of publication and distribution of the Draft Agency Plan, the plan was available in English and Spanish. Subsequently it has been translated into (6) other languages and made available to public housing Managers, residents, program participants, and other interested persons.

- c) Made the Draft Agency Plan available to residents and the public.

### ***Housing Authority Response:***

Between August 5 – 6, 1999 the Draft Agency Plan was distributed to:

- All democratically elected RAC/RMC Presidents;
- 17 Housing Authority Public Housing Authority development offices;
- Section 8 and Property Management Offices;
- Other Housing Authority offices; and
- All Public Housing development Managers.

The Draft Agency Plan was also available at the meetings held relative to the Draft Agency Plan.

- a) Done a direct mailing to all residents.

***Housing Authority Response:***

10,000 Public Housing and Property Management residents received notification of the availability of the Draft Agency Plan in their August, 1999 rent statements.

10,000 Public Housing and Property Management residents received notification of the date, time, and location of the Public Hearing in their September, 1999 rent statements.

On August 15, 1999, 37,000+ Section 8 participants received notification of the availability of the public hearing via the U.S. mail.

- b) Told the public in all local papers that the Draft Agency Plan is available for review.

***Housing Authority Response:***

The Housing Authority published a Notice in eight local newspapers on August 3, 1999 (Los Angeles Times) and August 5, 1999 (all other publications). The Notice included:

- Notification that the Draft Agency Plan was available for public comment;
- A list of every location (22) where the Draft Agency Plan could be reviewed;
- Notification of the Draft Agency Plan Public Hearing, and the date, time and location of the hearing;

- a) Published in the papers the dates, times, and location of the Public Hearing on the draft Agency Plan.

***Housing Authority Response:***

See response e) in this section.

**Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report stated Legal Aid attorneys and residents attended the August 13, 1999 Board of Commissioners' meeting to express concern about the lack of resident input in developing the Draft Agency Plan. The L.A.F.L.A. report states that they met with the Executive Director on September 1, 1999 and asked that the Housing Authority:

- a) Meet with the group brought together by former HARAC representatives.
- b) Engage in real dialogue and negotiation of the group's ideas.

***Housing Authority Response:***

The Executive Director and staff met with the Legal Aid attorneys and seven Public Housing residents on October 1, 1999 to receive further input.

There was some dialogue; however, negotiation of issues was not appropriate as the comment period was still running.

- c) Hold public hearings at all 21 developments and allow residents to voice their concerns on both the Draft Agency Plan and the proposals in the L.A.F.L.A. report.

***Housing Authority Response:***

The compressed time frame for the Agency Plan process made it impossible to hold Public Hearings at all Public Housing sites.

The conclusion by the L.A.F.L.A. report that residents have not an opportunity to voice their concerns is false. Residents, program participants, and other interested parties *have* voiced their concerns, as is evidenced by the oral and written comments received on a variety of subjects which are discussed in this Notice.

- d) Incorporate resident input in the Draft Agency Plan;

***Housing Authority Response:***

The Housing Authority did consider all comments in the preparation of the Final Agency Plan for submission to HUD.

- e) Take advantage of HUD's extension for submission of the Agency Plan to December 1, 1999 to get further resident input.

***Housing Authority Response:***

The Housing Authority did take advantage of HUD's extension to December 1, 1999 in submission of the Agency Plan. The comment period was extended to October 8, 1999 at the Public Hearing and via posted and published Notices.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The public process for the Fiscal Year 2001 Agency Plan shall commence much earlier, and provide opportunities at each site for resident input. The process should be similar to the Modernization meetings which are conducted annually at each site.
2. There shall be ongoing input from the Resident Advisory Board, and outreach for Section 8 program participant input.

**Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report also states that residents have been denied representation of an elected Citywide leadership in developing the Plan. The report states the "HACLA withdrew recognition from HARAC after HARAC disagreed with the HACLA on some important policy issues. HACLA says that HARAC violated its bylaws. The violation consisted of appointing two replacements at the advice of Milton Patterson, head of Resident Relations, and later taking a vote that the Housing Authority disagreed with, but counting these two people in the quorum. As soon as HACLA pointed out the problem, they tried to correct it. HACLA refused to reinstate them...".

***Housing Authority Response:***

The Executive Director's June 18, 1999 letter to the Chairperson of the City-wide Housing Authority Resident Advisory Committee (HARAC) withdrawing the Housing Authority's recognition set forth the reasons for this action.

The Resident Participation Policy, adopted by the Board of Commissioners and in compliance with the Federal Regulations, states:

“HACLA/HUD shall withdraw recognition of a Resident organization and withhold resident service funds as well as funds provided in conjunction with services rendered for resident participation in public housing if:

- 1) The Resident Organization fails to satisfy HACLA/HUD minimum standards for fair and frequent elections;
- 2) The Resident Organization fails to follow its own election procedures as adopted;
- 3) Failure to comply with the Resident Organization bylaws;
- 4) The Resident Organization violates the HACLA Resident Participation Policy.”

The HARAC violated both HUD and HACLA Resident Participation policies. The violations included attempting to amend the by-laws without a quorum present, ignoring the appointments of interim HARAC representatives by RAC/RMC Presidents and making their own appointments, and not involving the current Board’s at the site of the vacancies as required by the HARAC by-laws and HUD/HACLA policies. Contrary to statements made in the L.A.F.L.A. report, the Resident Relations Director did not advise the HARAC to appoint replacements in violation of HARAC’s by-laws and HUD/HACLA policy.

There had been an ongoing lack of participation by HARAC members. There was a very limited ability to even have quorum at meetings. Communications were received from HARAC members stating that they did not participate in meetings because of the chaos and constant fighting ongoing during the meetings. There was also poor attendance by HARAC members at the Resident Management training provided by an outside vendor.

It was nearly impossible to present issues that affect residents of HACLA for constructive input due to the bickering and argumentative nature of the HARAC.

The RACs/RMCs advised the difficulty of establishing a cooperative and working relationship with the HARAC because of difficulties in communication. Several sites requested the dissolution of HARAC.

The situation which led to the withdrawal of the Authority’s recognition of the HARAC was based on the accumulation of two years of repeated efforts to work with the HARAC Executive Board to promote effective leadership, and compliance with HUD/HACLA policies. These efforts included training hours, staff hours, and responding to written communications to no avail.

The Housing Authority has an ongoing need for continuous constructive resident input and assistance with respect to policies and procedures which affect residents. Accordingly, the Executive Director immediately began consulting with duly-elected Resident Organizations of the developments after withdrawing recognition of HARAC.

The Housing Authority complied with Agency Plan regulations with the establishment on September 3, 1999 of a Resident Advisory Board whose membership includes the duly elected RAC/RMC Presidents, Section 8 program participants, and Property Management residents.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. Report alleges there has been no participation from Section 8 program participants and the scattered sites, and that RAC/RMC Presidents have met with HACLA staff without the benefit of representation from an outside agency or legal counsel.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The first statement is not true. Both Section 8 program participants and Property Management residents have participated in the Agency Plan public process. Both programs have representatives on the Resident Advisory Board. 170 Section 8 program participants attended the Public Hearing.

There is no regulatory requirement that the Resident Advisory Board have legal representation at their meetings.

### **Public Comment**

Two written comments from the Resident Advisory Board members expressed the need for more explanation of the Draft Agency Plan contents.

### ***Housing Authority Response:***

On September 16, 1999 the Resident Advisory Board meeting was attended by 59 residents and Section 8 program participants. The Agency Plan was reviewed and discussed on a section-by-section basis. Resident leaders offered input, asked questions, and provided written feedback.

### **Public Comment**

Two written comments from Resident Advisory Board members said the financial reports in the Draft Agency Plan were difficult to understand.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Financial Resources section and the Capital Improvements section formats are required by HUD in that particular format. The Housing Authority desires to better explain these sections during next year's Agency Plan process even if HUD does not reformat these sections to make them more user friendly.

### **Public Comment**

One written comment from a Resident Advisory Board member said the Housing Authority needs to understand the residents' view.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

On September 16, 1999 the Resident Advisory Board meeting was attended by 59 residents and Section 8 program participants. The Agency Plan was reviewed and discussed on a section-by-section basis. Resident leaders offered input, asked questions, and provided written feedback. The Housing Authority is open to every and all specific suggestions on how the Agency Plan could be amended.

The efforts beyond the statutory requirements demonstrate that the Housing Authority is very interested in the views of residents.

### **Public Comment**

One speaker at the Public Hearing stated residents did not have time to study the document and how it may affect them and their families. The speaker also stated that the more participation there is by residents, the better the document will be. Also it was stated that the Housing Authority is denying a huge part of the community's participation by having only two hearings where 200 people come to each one. Additionally, the Housing Authority should allow comments via the Internet. Additionally, one speaker stated there was not enough time to read the plan and type up any comments.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Draft Agency Plan was made available to the public for 64 days. The Housing Authority encouraged both solicited and unsolicited input into the Agency Plan. The Housing Authority will be conducting (3) public meetings/hearings on the Agency Plan (the September 22, 1999 Public Hearing at Independent Square, the Housing Authority Operations Committee meeting on November 16, 1999 and the full Board of Commissioners meeting on November 24, 1999). The Draft Agency Plan was posted to the HACLA.org Internet page, but online feedback was not feasible. The Housing

Authority will work to make online comments possible next year via an email link on the HACLA.org Internet page.

### **Public Comment**

Two speakers stated HACLA developed the draft plan before coming to the residents.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Draft Agency Plan was published as a work-in-progress public document on August 5, 1999. The final version of the Agency Plan incorporates the feedback of residents, program participants and other interested persons. The Agency Plan is a document made up mostly of other documents (90%) that have previously been subjected to a public process, i.e., Board of Commission approval. Further, Section 903.13, (c) states: "The PHA must consider the recommendations of the Resident Advisory Board or Boards in preparing the FINAL Agency Plan. In submitting the final plan to HUD for approval, the PHA must include a copy of the recommendations made by the Board or Boards and a description of the manner in which the PHA addressed these recommendations" (emphasis added).

### **Public Comment**

One speaker stated resident participation has to be meaningful, and requested the Housing Authority meet with the Legal Aid group, hold hearings at all 21 sites, allow residents to voice their concerns on the plan and the proposals developed by the group. It was further stated that resident input should be incorporated into the plan. The speaker stated the group wanted real negotiations and discussions regarding the Legal Aid group's proposals.

### ***Housing Authority's Response***

The Housing Authority did meet with the Legal Aid group. The request for the Housing Authority to enter into "real negotiations and discussions" regarding the group's proposals was inappropriate as the comment period was still running and not all comments had been received.

All resident comments have been considered in the final draft of the Agency Plan. These comments were balanced with statutory requirements, operational objectives, and economic expediency.

See response under "Resident Participation Requirements" and "the Housing Authority Agency Plan Process".

### **Public Comment**

One speaker questioned how many developments were represented at the meetings with the resident leaders. This speaker stated that the Housing Authority did not meet with the group and the speaker is working on draft plan proposals.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The developments were well represented at the meetings the Housing Authority had with the RAC/RMC leaders. For example:

At the September 16, 1998 meeting of the Resident Advisory Board:

- 59 Board members attended;
- The Board members represented 18 public housing sites;
- 12 Section 8 program participants present; and
- Three Property Management representatives.

At the August 25, 1999 Resident Leader Retreat:

- 58 resident leaders attended (representing 18 family sites and one senior site).

See response under "Housing Authority Agency Plan Process".

### **Public Comment**

One speaker stated there was much of the Draft Agency Plan she did not understand, and it was not fair to residents to have to travel such a distance to the Public Hearing with the parking being inconvenient. The speaker further stated the Housing Authority needed to listen to residents and what they are saying; it is not what you want for us, it is what the residents want for themselves that really matters.

### ***Housing Authority Response:***

The Housing Authority agrees that resident concerns are vital to any HACLA programs. The HACLA has a long history of soliciting resident input. Further, the Housing Authority provided transportation to the members of the Agency Plan Resident Advisory Board who requested it. This is consistent with past practice. The other issues raised by this speaker have been addressed in other responses to public comments in this document.

### **Public Comment**

There were several comments at the October 1, 1999 meeting with Legal Aid, et al, regarding the resident participation issue:

- a) No transportation for public housing residents;

**HACLA Response:**

See response to previous comment.

- b) Residents not included;

**HACLA Response:**

This is not a true statement. The meetings with RAC/RMC Board members, the Resident Advisory Board, the Public Hearing, meetings with the Legal Aid group, and the consideration of the many oral and written comments demonstrate the inclusion of the residents.

- c) Time was convenient for the Housing Authority only, residents have children in school;

**HACLA Response:**

The public hearing was scheduled for 10 AM until noon. This comment will be considered when the Housing Authority integrates the Agency Plan process with the Modernization process at individual developments in 2001.

The 10 AM time generally works well because children have gone to school, and the meeting ends before children return home.

- d) Half the people at the public hearing were HACLA staff;

The Public Hearing was attended by:

- 33 residents from 14 of the family developments;
- 12 residents from five senior citizen buildings;
- 170 Section 8 program participants;
- Six representatives from housing providers/non-profits;
- Three Legal Aid Foundation attorneys; and
- One member of the general public.

(These were residents/program participants and others who signed attendance rosters. The actual count was higher.)

- a) All residents wanted was to understand plan;

***HACLA Response***

This was addressed previously as a HACLA response.

- b) The group understands the difference between negotiations and comments;

The Housing Authority's statutory requirement is to consider the comments from the Resident Advisory Board in the development of the Final Agency Plan.

It would be inappropriate for the Housing Authority to negotiate final positions *during the comment period* with another group of residents.

As stated earlier in this Notice, the Housing Authority has considered all comments, including those from the L.A.F.L.A. group.

- c) If HACLA cannot hold meetings at all sites, could meetings be held regionally;

***Housing Authority Response:***

Previously addressed in a Housing Authority response.

- d) Request to bring former HARAC and Resident Advisory Board together;

***Housing Authority Response:***

This is not possible until the issue of HARAC recognition is resolved.

- e) Question as to whether or not tenant participation is done;

***Housing Authority Response:***

Previously addressed in a HACLA Response.

- f) RAC boards did not share information;

***Housing Authority Response:***

RAC/RMC Boards are democratically elected, and a significant part of their role is to communicate with the resident body.

The information was mailed to the three Legal Aid attorneys working with this group of residents upon publication of the Draft Agency Plan.

- g) The Housing Authority was handling the Agency Plan just like the Resident Lease Agreement where residents were not involved and their input did not count.

***Housing Authority Response:***

This statement is not true. The Housing Authority worked with residents and Resident Organizations for more than 2½ years during the drafting of the Revised Lease Agreement. Several of the people making comments were at the workshop held in July, 1998 before the Board of Commissioners approved the revised lease. The Housing Authority reviewed the comments from all residents, and made many changes based on resident input. The following facts from the revised lease process demonstrate this:

- The number one concern of residents was the 6% late charge. This provision was deleted.
- The number three concern of residents was three late payments of rent in a 12-month period was cause for termination of the lease; this provision was deleted.
- Of the remaining 18 top concerns, five were amended or deleted; one was moved to policy, three are required by regulations, seven had changes in the language, and only two were adopted as written.

**Public Comment**

The Nickerson Gardens RMC recommended the Housing Authority tell the residents who in HUD will receive the Five-Year Plan and asked if the residents will receive a copy of the Five-Year Plan. The RMC further recommended that each one of the Presidents receive a copy of the plan, so they will know what's going on in our community and with the Housing Authority.

***Housing Authority Response***

The HUD office in Los Angeles will be receiving the Final Version of the Agency Plan. Mr. Bob Cook is the Director of Public Housing for the Los Angeles area. All residents will not receive a copy of the Agency Plan (that includes the Five-Year Plan). Copies

will be distributed to all RAC/RMC Presidents and other Resident Advisory Board members, and available at all sites for public inspection.

### **Public Comment**

The Nickerson Gardens RMC asked if residents had the ability to participate, i.e. sit down and meet with the Housing Authority.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Residents have participated in the Agency Plan process, as evidenced by the volume of oral and written comments received by the Housing Authority.

The Executive Director and staff met with the Resident Advisory Board, the L.A.F.L.A. group, and the RAC/RMC Presidents and Boards before the Resident Advisory Board was appointed. The Board of Commissioners received input at the Public Hearing, and additional input will be accepted at the upcoming meetings of the Board of Commissioners.

The process will be even more inclusive for Fiscal Year 2001.

See the “Resident Participation Requirements” section.

### **Public Comment**

There are two comments from Resident Advisory members asking if the Draft Agency Plan was available in other languages.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Draft Agency Plan was translated into Spanish, Vietnamese, Armenian, Chinese, Korean, and Russian.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member asked if resident input really has any impact on the Agency Plan.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority has carefully considered all resident comments in preparing the final recommendation to the Board of Commissioners relative to the Agency Plan.

The example of how much resident input matters was demonstrated during the revised lease process. The Housing Authority considered every comment, and based on

resident input, made changes based on 18 of the top 20 resident concerns. The remaining two were required by the regulations.

***Public Comment***

One Resident Advisory Board member asked if a copy of the Agency Plan will be sent to every resident.

***Housing Authority Response***

The distribution of the Agency Plan to all residents and program participants would require the reproduction and distribution of 47,000+ copies of the Plan. The related costs are not reasonable.

The Final Agency Plan will be distributed to all Resident Advisory Board members, made available for public inspection at all sites, and will be available to individual parents/program participants on request.

## **ISSUE: CRIME**

### **Public Comment**

The number one concern of the Resident Advisory Board is crime in the developments, and gang and drug activity. There were 26 written and oral comments received on this issue during meetings.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority shares the concern of residents about criminal activity in the developments. HACLA will continue to apply for all available funding for additional police officers, and crime and drug prevention activities. There are only (12) accredited Housing Authority Police Departments in the entire nation. The Housing Authority is one of those (12), and one of two in the State of California. This demonstrates the Authority's commitment to maintaining a quality police department.

The Housing Authority has cooperative agreements with the Los Angeles Police Department, and participates on task forces for crime and drug prevention activities. During 1998, there was a 16.8% reduction in violent crime at the drug elimination sites.

Since 1996, the Housing Authority has run criminal background checks on all adult members of applicant families. These checks screen out individuals who have engaged in criminal activity which could have an adverse effect on other residents.

The Housing Authority will conduct site-by-site assessments of all public safety issues to continue the positive trend.

### **Public Comment**

There were 14 comments from Resident Advisory Board members stating they need more police surveillance at the developments and want the Housing Authority Police to be more aggressive in combating crime.

One Resident Advisory Board member recommended each development be assigned one Police Officer on a daily basis. Larger developments need two. It was stated that if there is constant patrolling and vigilance, the crime in the developments will go down and the drug houses will cease.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Performance Funding System formula, which determines the amount of subsidy received by PHAs for operating expenses, does not include funding for security. The Housing Authority has utilized funds from the Section 8 reserves, Public Housing Drug

Elimination Program (PHDEP), and other sources to pay the costs of the existing police services.

There are currently 12 Community Resource Officers providing service to: Pico Aliso, Aliso Village, Jordan Downs, Nickerson Gardens, Imperial Courts, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens and Dana Strand. Four of the officers are funded under the PHDEP and eight are funded in-kind.

THE CONGRESS IS CONTINUING TO REDUCE FUNDING OF AN ALREADY INSUFFICIENT FORMULA. Some PHAs are beginning to layoff police personnel in light of the looming funding emergency to compensate for the funding gap for protective services (\$4 million for HACLA).

While the Housing Authority would support additional police officers, there are no funds available to do so. The cost of “constant patrolling and vigilance” at all sites is millions of dollars, and is financially unfeasible. Even if 100% of the drug-elimination dollars were allocated to hire additional Police Officers (not allowed), the funding would result in constant patrolling at only two or three sites for the duration of the program.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S RECOMMENDATION**

No change to the language in the Draft Agency Plan. The Housing Authority shall continue to seek and apply for funds to support additional police officers and drug/crime prevention activities and expand the Community Resource Officer Program.

## **Public Comment**

The San Fernando Gardens RMC petition stated security funds should be allocated fairly among all HACLA communities.

The RMC expressed their disappointment that drug-elimination funds were being cut from their community and the Housing Authority was not applying for drug elimination and crime prevention funds for San Fernando Gardens. The RMC stated they wanted their fair share of drug-elimination and crime prevention technical assistance grants.

One Resident Advisory Board member said residents are afraid crime will increase when PHDEP funds are exhausted and the police officers withdrawn.

## ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority has applied for drug-elimination dollars. The Congress and HUD have reduced the amount of drug-elimination funds available, and changed the way the funds are allocated. The Housing Authority’s share of the funds available under the new formula for the 1999 application will result in a minimum 16% cut. If a significant number of PHAs, who have not been awarded PHDEP funds previously, apply for 1999 PHDEP funds, the cut will be even greater.

San Fernando Gardens has been assigned two Community Resource Officers even though it is not a high-crime development.

San Fernando Gardens is, and has been, receiving its fair share of the Drug Elimination Grant funds.

### **Public Comment**

There were several comments from the Resident Advisory Board regarding the planned public safety needs assessment to be conducted at each site beginning in the year 2000. Board members had suggestions on how the order of the sites should be determined.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Beginning in January 2000 and over the next two years the Housing Authority will be taking a comprehensive look at public safety at all public housing developments. The purpose of doing this is to assist individual public housing developments with the creation of a Community Services Plan. This approach will have 3-4 emphasis areas of which crime prevention will be one. This comprehensive analysis will use the input of resident leaders and partner public safety agencies in addition to applying Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) techniques. All public housing developments will be analyzed at the same time and there will not be a specific order in which these analyses are carried out.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member questioned what figures will be used to decide which developments have the highest crime rate. The Board Member stated many things go on in the developments which are not reported.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority uses data that comes from the HAPD and other law enforcement agencies.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member advised surveys were conducted at Pico/Aliso asking residents for their opinion on crime, drugs, and opinions on other matters. The Board member said nothing happened after the survey. The Board member said the HACLA said it was going to make changes and have more housing police at the site.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The survey was in conjunction with the Urban Revitalization taking place at this site. \$50 million is being invested in the reconstruction of this site and for resident programs.

Based on resident surveys, adjustments were made at Pico-Aliso, including the implementation of 24-hour/7-day a week Community Resource Officer coverage and other special programs. The development has been rebuilt using Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design techniques.

The requests by *all* sites for more police surveillance were discussed previously in this section.

### **Public Comment**

One speaker at the Public Hearing stated security bars were needed on the windows to prevent crime. Another speaker was opposed to the security bars stating the bars made it feel like he was in prison.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority installs security hardware during modernization activities. The decision to install security hardware is jointly made by the Housing Authority and elected resident leaders during a community planning process.

Public Housing Residents electing to install their own security hardware should always consult with their development's Management Office. The Housing Authority will continue to remove all security hardware (at the resident's expense) that is not installed in accordance with current City of Los Angeles Code. The Housing Authority considers incorrectly installed security hardware to be a violation of the terms of the lease agreement.

### **Public Comment**

Two Resident Advisory Board members and two speakers at the Public Hearing stated it is unfair to evict a family because of the criminal activity of a member of the family. One speaker at the public hearing stated the Housing Authority should change its policy and come and check with the resident to find out and verify whom a visitor was actually visiting before the resident is evicted for the actions of the individual.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The "One Strike" provisions have been law since 1988, and have been enforced by the Housing Authority for more than six years.

In 1988, a Congressional Committee investigating drugs and related crime within public housing, found much of public housing to be drug and crime infested. Congress passed anti-drug legislation in 1988 adding a requirement calling for all public housing tenancies to be terminated where a resident, household member, guest, or other individual under their control participated in drug and criminal activity. Since that time subsequent enactment have made it clear resident “knowledge and control” and/or “good cause” are not part of the legal test in applying the regulations.

HUD wrote in its 1991 response to comments to the proposed regulations:

“The Congress has determined that drug and criminal threats by public housing household members are a special danger to the security and general benefit of public housing residents, warranting special mention in the law...”.

For this reason, the Congress specified that these types of criminal activity by household members are grounds for termination of tenancy (without the need for a separate inquiry as to whether such criminal activity constitutes serious or repeated lease violations or other good cause for evictions)...*The tenant should not be excused from contractual responsibility by arguing that the tenant did not know, could not foresee, or could not control behavior by other occupants of the unit...The statute and regulation are based on a different, simpler, and more practical test, whether a household member has in fact committed the criminal activity*” (Emphasis added).

The Housing Authority amended its Rental Agreement in 1991 to include the then existing mandatory language and began enforcing these provisions.

The Board of Commissioners adopted a revised Rental Agreement in 1998 which incorporated additional required language relative to the “One Strike” provisions. The Housing Authority began having residents sign the new lease agreements in April, 1999.

The Housing Authority has not changed the way drug and criminal related evictions are handled. Each proposed termination is evaluated, commenced, and prosecuted on a case by case basis.

The regulations state, and the Board of Commissioners adopted provisions in 1998, that PHAs *may* exercise discretion in determining whether to prosecute a criminal or drug-related eviction. The exercise of discretion includes, without limitation, the past criminal history of the actor, the remedial and deterrent value of the eviction, and the cost of prosecution weighed against the benefits of the eviction to the public housing community.

In addition to the initial discretion, the HACLA looks for a certain level of legal sufficiency. Only cases where the evidence is strong will be prosecuted. Legal sufficiency requires two basic elements:

- a) The actor has a strong relationship with the dwelling; and
- b) The act negatively impacts the public housing community.

If at any stage of the eviction process the evidence is determined to lack legal sufficiency, the case will be dismissed.

Almost all “One-Strike” evictions to date have resulted from acts of residents, household members, someone who may be found so frequently at the dwelling as to be considered a household member, or someone who appears to have free access to the dwelling.

The few cases involving an infrequent guest or visitor have been limited to instances where the individual is found within the dwelling or in the presence of the resident at the time of the act.

All “One-Strike” cases dealing with “others under a resident’s control” have dealt with chore workers where the resident was previously warned.

A case would lack legal sufficiency where the only evidence linking the actor to the unit is an adult parent-child or brother-sister relationship with the resident. Without more, a relative’s arrest for some criminal act is not legally sufficient to prosecute the cause. Almost all “One-Strike” cases have resulted from acts committed within or within a few blocks of Housing Authority property.

The eviction of residents is costly and time consuming. The Housing Authority’s business is to house families, not evict them. However, the HACLA has an obligation to enforce the “One-Strike” rules and residents have expressly had the obligation to obey the “One-Strike” rules since 1991.

### **Public Comment**

Three Resident Advisory Board members said the public housing communities need to have neighborhood watch programs.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Residents interested in the Resident Patrol Program can contact the Housing Authority Public Safety Department, Resident Relations Department or Housing Management Department.

Residents interested in the Neighborhood Watch Program should contact the Los Angeles Police Department.

### **Public Comment**

Two respondents stated there needs to be more programs for the youth to keep them out of the gangs and from becoming involved in drugs.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The HAPD is active with other departments in offering a variety of programs and education for adults and youth to prevent drug, gang, and criminal activity. Examples include the Junior Trooper program; Youth Sports Activities; crime prevention programs for domestic violence, child abuse, personal safety, and property identification; and Youth Opportunities Counselors. Additionally, there are gang and drug prevention programs at the Community Service Centers and provided by service providers at some of the sites.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member asked if the criminal background checks for Section 8 applicant families will be different from the criminal background checks for public housing applicants.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The criminal background checks completed for Section 8 applicant families will be identical to those completed since 1996 for public housing families. These checks will begin in Fiscal Year 2000.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

No change in the policy or the language in the Rental Agreement.

## **ISSUE: TRANSFER POLICY**

### **Public Comment**

The second area of concern to the Resident Advisory Board was the transfer policy and its implementation for transferring families to a unit with a different bedroom size. There were four written and oral comments at one or more of the meetings regarding this matter. The Board members said that they or another resident needed a larger unit. There was a comment that there are residents in some of the units who do not need all the bedrooms. These families should be transferred to a smaller unit, and the unit made available to a family needing a bigger unit.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

There are business concerns that must be considered when transfers are made. The Housing Authority must take into consideration that leaving a unit empty too long will impact the Authority's score on the Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) and could result in vandalism to a unit.

The adjustment of unit size is also a concern to the Housing Authority. The Housing Management Director has directed staff to utilize a *minimum* of 20% of the vacancies for occupancy corrections, i.e. upward and downward transfers.

An analysis of the new leases, the transfers completed to date, and the bedroom sizes of each, shows the Housing Authority has utilized a significantly higher percentage of vacant units for transfers.

The variables that determine transfers include the turnover at the site, the bedroom sizes of the vacant units, the number of a given bedroom size in the development (most families do not want to transfer to another site), and the number of families needing upward or downward transfers. Another consideration is whether or not the Housing Management Director needs the vacant unit for an emergency transfer and other operational concerns.

*An analysis of the 559 new leases at the large family developments for the first nine months of 1999 shows:*

- 39.2% of all new leases have been transfers;
- 53.5% of the vacant three, four and five bedroom units have been utilized for transfers;
- 66.6% of the vacant units have been one and two bedroom units.

These figures exclude the activity at Jordan Downs, Pico/Aliso and Aliso Village where there has been extensive modernization and HOPE VI activity.

Examples of 1999 transfer activity are as follows:

#### Ramona Gardens

- There were 33 vacancies in Ramona Gardens during the first nine months of 1999. 17 vacant units, or 51.5% of the new leases, were utilized for transfers.
- The percentage of vacant three and five bedroom units utilized for transfers is 62.5%.
- The percentage of smaller units (one and two bedrooms) vacated during this period is 51.5% of the total vacancies.

#### Pueblo Del Rio/Pueblo Extension

- There were 73 vacancies in Pueblo Del Rio/Pueblo Extension during the first nine months of 1999. 29 vacant units, or 39.7% of the new leases, were utilized for transfers.
- The percentage of vacant three, four and five bedroom units utilized for transfers is 60.0%.
- The percentage of smaller units (one and two bedrooms) vacated during this period is 65.8% of the total vacancies.

#### Rancho San Pedro/Rancho Extension

- There were 52 vacancies in Rancho San Pedro/Extension during the first nine months of 1999. 22 vacant units, or 42.3% of the new leases, were utilized for transfers.
- The percentage of vacant three and five bedroom units utilized for transfers is 81.8%.
- The percentage of smaller units (one and two bedrooms) vacated during this period is 78.9% of the total vacancies.
- This site has 93 one bedroom units, which are typically harder to lease in a family development.

- There have been 13 one bedroom units leased during the first nine months of 1999. Eight of the vacancies were upper one bedroom units. One of these units was used for a transfer. There have been zero one bedroom vacancies at Rancho Extension.
- Five of the one bedroom units were lower one bedroom units. Two of the units were used for transfer. Three of the five vacant lower one bedroom units were vacant at the same time and leased within five days of each other.

### Nickerson Gardens

- There were 129 vacancies in Nickerson Gardens during the first nine months of 1999. 31 vacant units, or 24% of the new leases, were utilized for transfers.
- The percentage of vacant three and five bedroom units utilized for transfers is 23.8%.
- The percentage of smaller units (one and two bedrooms) vacated during this period is 67.5% of the total vacancies.

### Mar Vista Gardens

- There were 54 vacancies in Mar Vista Gardens during the first nine months of 1999. 39 vacant units, or 72.2% of the new leases, were utilized for transfers.
- The percentage of vacant three and five bedroom units utilized for transfers is 77.8%.
- The percentage of smaller units (one and two bedrooms) vacated during this period is 50% of the total vacancies.

### San Fernando Gardens

- There were 30 vacancies in San Fernando Gardens during the first nine months of 1999. Eight vacant units, or 26.7% of the new leases, were utilized for transfers.
- The percentage of vacant three and five bedroom units utilized for transfers is 35.7%.
- The percentage of smaller units (one and two bedrooms) vacated during this period is 53.3% of the total vacancies.

### **Public Comment**

One speaker at the Public Hearing stated she has a 12-year old son and a 13-year old daughter. The family receives Section 8 assistance and her children are sharing the same bedroom. The speaker asked if she is eligible for a larger voucher size.

***Housing Authority Response***

The occupancy standards governing the Section 8 Program are different from the occupancy standards for public housing. The Section 8 Program is not allowed to consider the age and sex of the children. HUD says this is a fair housing issue. HUD said there should not be discrepancies between what is paid to a family that has children of a single gender and a family that has children of two genders.

**Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report stated the current policy is too difficult to understand. It was suggested that 75% of the vacancies Authority-wide should be used for transfers. The L.A.F.L.A. suggested at the October 1, 1999 meeting that a required transfer percentage be set between 32 – 75%.

***Housing Authority Response***

The policy was originally adopted in 1988 when Managers were not doing enough transfers to correct overcrowded and underutilized occupancy of the units.

See response in this section regarding actual transfer/vacancy percentages.

The setting of a higher arbitrary percentage could impact operational flexibility required for optimum utilization of the Housing Authority's assets.

**Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report objected to a statement in the Draft Agency Plan which stated HACLA will propose revisions to the transfer policy no later than October, 1999 to the Board of Commissioners because it would not be available for public comment.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

Delete this sentence in the final Agency Plan.

**Public Comment**

Resident Advisory Board members commented on the need for immediate transfers where an emergency situation exists. Domestic violence was the most common situation cited.

The L.A.F.L.A. report also recommended health reasons include psychological trauma, and the resident be given options of which site the transfer should be to, or to receive a Section 8 voucher.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Director of Housing Management makes the final decision on all emergency transfer requests. Emergency transfer requests are handled on a case-by-case basis and evaluated based on appropriate documentation, the current situation and an Emergency Transfer procedure. The Housing Authority considers the safety and security of its residents one of its highest priorities and as such will continue to quickly respond to all documented emergency transfer requests. Further, individual Managers at Housing Authority developments have been trained on how to handle emergency transfer requests. If there are instances where documented emergency transfer situations have not been adequately addressed, residents should contact the Housing Management Director.

It is not operationally feasible for the Housing Authority to allow victims of psychological trauma to choose the specific development where they would like to transfer. Additionally, due to both funding and operational issues, it is necessary that the Housing Authority retain discretion over whether or not to issue a Section 8 voucher in emergency transfer situations.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

No change in the emergency transfer procedure.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report also recommended the "other good cause" phrase in the current lease should either be defined or eliminated.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority received the same recommendation during the comment period for the revised lease. The HACLA considered the resident input and "other good cause" was defined in the final lease document.

The revised lease states:

- "(5) For other good cause including, but not limited to, program changes, demotion, resident transfer requests because of medical, employment, or transportation needs, social problems, or emergencies."

## **Public Comment**

One speaker at the Public Hearing said transfers are related to money, i.e., the Housing Authority transfers residents where the rental income for the unit increases.

## ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority does not make determinations to transfer a family based on the amount of tenant rent or the source of the family income. The vast majority of transfers occur because of the need to adjust the bedroom size due to changes in the family composition.

The majority of tenant rents are income based, i.e. 30% of the family's adjusted income. When a resident is transferred to a larger unit, the tenant rent *decreases* because of the increased utility allowance. When a family is transferred to a smaller unit, the tenant rent *increases* because of the decreased utility allowance.

If a family is paying ceiling rent the only way that the rent would increase would be if that family were transferred to a unit with more bedrooms. Pursuant to a 1993 Housing Authority directive, all public housing Managers were instructed **NOT** to transfer families to larger units simply to increase rents. If there is evidence of this occurring, these instances should immediately be brought to the attention of the Director of Housing Management.

## **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. group cited a problem at Rancho San Pedro where it was alleged there are seven medical transfers to one-bedroom downstairs units pending.

## ***Housing Authority Response***

The Manager has reviewed the transfer file, and the statement regarding the number of pending medical transfers to a one bedroom lower unit is not accurate. There are four pending medical transfers. (There are also three non-medical transfers pending.)

The appropriate transfers will be made.

## **Public Comment**

There was one written comment stating one of the top three reasons residents move out of public housing is because "it took too long to move into a larger apartment." The respondent further states if the Housing Authority intends to keep working residents for more than a couple of years it better transfer families faster.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority is doing a good job of transferring families to the larger bedroom sizes. THE PRIMARY REASON FAMILIES ARE NOT TRANSFERRED TO LARGER APARTMENTS IS 2/3 OF ALL VACANCIES ARE ONE AND TWO BEDROOM UNITS. See responses in this section.

The turnover of three and four bedroom units at the site where the respondent resides averaged 1.2 units per month for the first nine months of 1999. Nine of the 11 vacant three and four bedroom units were utilized for transfers. During the same period, there were 41 one and two bedroom vacancies.

The facts demonstrate that working families are remaining in public housing. There are currently 524 Conventional Housing families paying a ceiling rent, i.e. less than 30% of family income for rent.

### **Public Comment**

There were comments from the L.A.F.L.A. group suggesting a transfer list be published monthly so residents can check their status. One written comment stated RAC/RMC boards should be provided with the following information monthly:

- How many families are on the upward/downward transfer list for each bedroom size;
- The family composition of each family;
- How long the family has been on the transfer list;
- Why other families are transferred ahead of these families;
- How many vacancies by apartment size were used for transfers;
- How many units were used for transferring families from other developments;
- How many vacancies were filled by new residents; and
- How many vacancies there were at the site in each bedroom size.

The information is requested so RACs/RMCs explain to the residents the delay in their transfer and why others are being put in the units ahead of them.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The responses in this section demonstrate the Housing Authority is transferring families to adjust for occupancy requirements, AND THE MAIN REASON FAMILIES ARE NOT BEING TRANSFERRED INTO LARGER UNITS IS BECAUSE 2/3 OF THE VACANT UNITS ARE ONE AND TWO BEDROOM APARTMENTS.

Each site maintains a transfer list, and any resident with a question regarding his or her transfer request may request information on their status. This is a more appropriate forum for discussing private family data. If there are further questions about a resident's transfer request, the resident can contact the Housing Management Director.

### **Public Comment**

One written comment suggested a family with a composition of three persons should be eligible to transfer to a three bedroom apartment. (The minimum occupancy standards for a three bedroom unit are four persons.) The resident said if a single parent and one child over the age of five can transfer to a two bedroom unit, then a single parent with two children of the opposite sex should be eligible to transfer to a three bedroom apartment. The L.A.F.L.A. report suggested disabled persons should be entitled to an additional bedroom if medically necessary.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The occupancy standards are guidelines, and designed to maximize the use of available space without overcrowding. There is an abundance of two bedroom units. The number of three bedroom units is much smaller, and the turnover is limited. The occupancy standards reflect the greater need of larger families for three bedroom units.

The standards have always permitted an extra bedroom for documented medical needs.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

Review the occupancy standards in the Fiscal Year 2001 Agency Plan discussions.

## **ISSUE: INCOME TARGETING**

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report states “The Housing Authority has decided to shift its priorities from serving the very poorest people (extremely low income) to people whose incomes are somewhat higher low income people”. The report recommended 40% of new admissions should be families with incomes of 0 – 15% of the median income, 40% should be families with incomes of 16 – 30% of the median incomes, 10% should be families with incomes of 31 – 50% of the median income, and 10% should be families with incomes of 51 – 80% of the median income.

Resident Advisory Board members said the extremely low-income families need the assisted housing.

Two speakers at the Public Hearing expressed concern for the large number of homeless families and the need to target the very poor.

The L.A.F.L.A. group suggested at the October 1, 1999 meeting that the income target goals be amended as follows: a minimum of 40% of new admissions should be families with incomes 30% or below the median incomes; a maximum of 40% of new admissions should be families with incomes 31 – 50% of the median income; and a maximum of 20% of new admissions should be to families with incomes 51 – 80% of the median income.

One of the Legal Aid attorneys stated the Housing Authority’s mission is to serve the poorest of the poor.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority has invested millions of dollars in myriad economic self-sufficiency program for current residents to assist in this transition. Examples of these programs include: the Family Investment Center, Kumbaya, JOBS PLUS, Computer Learning Centers, Community Service Centers, Resident Service Centers, entrepreneurship programs, resident businesses, child care grant, resident leadership training, and units off the rent roll for a variety of service providers. Also, the Housing Authority is the only PHA awarded Welfare-to-Work program monies by the Department of Labor.

HUD has initiated a comprehensive effort to fundamentally transform public housing including “establishing incentives to reward working families, encourage families to make the transition from welfare to self-sufficiency, and to encourage a diverse mix of incomes in public housing”.

Congress and HUD are directing PHAs to operate public housing in a more business-like way, including the admission of a broader range of low income families as one means to achieve an income mix of low income families. Congress has directed PHAs to deconcentrate very low income families in public housing developments.

It is important to note that the use of income targets will never result in a current resident losing his or her rental unit. Further, based on the socio-economic makeup of the current public housing waiting list, income targets will take years and years to actually materialize.

The mission of PHAs, and the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, has changed from providing housing to extremely low income families to providing affordable housing to low income families.

The subsidy funding provided PHAs for public housing reflects the changing direction of Congress and HUD. The percentage allocated under the funding formula continues to decrease. **EVEN IF THE FORMULA WAS FUNDED AT 100%, IT WOULD NOT COVER THE COST OF OPERATING AND MAINTAINING PUBLIC HOUSING.** The economic reality is:

#### Performance Funding System (PFS)

The Congress adopted the Brooke amendment in the early 1970s so Public Housing Authorities could assist extremely low income families. The Congress committed funds to provide PHAs with subsidies to make up the difference between the amount of monies received from resident rental income and the cost of operating the program. The rental income received from Housing Authority residents is significantly less than 50% of the operating costs. Without additional funding from HUD (or another source), the Housing Authority could not continue to operate the public housing program.

*HUD ADOPTED THE PERFORMANCE FUNDING SYSTEM (PFS) FORMULA IN 1974. THE FORMULA HAS NOT BEEN CHANGED SIGNIFICANTLY IN THE LAST 25 YEARS, AND DOES NOT REFLECT THE TRUE COST OF OPERATING PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS. THE FORMULA DOES NOT INCLUDE SUCH MAJOR COSTS AS SECURITY. THE SUBSIDY FUNDING PROVIDED BY HUD IS INADEQUATE EVEN AT 100% OF THE PFS AMOUNT.*

In recent years the monies allocated by Congress for public housing subsidies have been static, and HUD has reduced the percentage of PFS subsidy monies given to PHAs to operate and maintain public housing in four of the last five fiscal years. The projected percentage of PFS for Fiscal Year 2000 is 85 – 90%. The funding percentages, and resulting dollar reductions, have been as follows:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>100% PFS Amount</u>	<u>PFS %</u>	<u>Subsidy Received</u>	<u>Difference</u>
1999	\$26,308,645	92.5%	\$24,598,583	-\$1,710,062
1998	\$25,988,564	100.0%	\$25,988,564	-0-
1997	\$25,115,649	95.0%	\$23,859,867	-\$1,255,782
1996	\$24,131,219	89.0%	\$21,476,785	-\$2,654,434
1995	\$23,259,172	96.0%	\$22,328,805	-\$ 930,367

The total operating costs for Ramona Gardens (498 units), for example, for Fiscal Year 1998 were \$1,531,186 (operating costs, resident utility allowances, PILOT). This puts the subsidy reductions in perspective.

The Housing Authority recognizes the needs of extremely low income families in the City of Los Angeles. However, the sources of funds to maintain the public housing program are resident rents and subsidies from the Federal government. The continuing reductions in Federal funding require reductions in spending and actions to increase income from other sources.

The Council of Large Public Housing Authorities (CLPHA) and other industry groups recommended operating subsidy appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000 in the amount of \$3.3 billion, plus another \$400 million for year end adjustments. The House and Senate have approved \$3.1 billion.

#### Operating Fund Formula

The QHWRA changes how public housing resources are allocated. Negotiated rule making is in progress to determine the allocation formula. The formula should include:

- Standards for the costs of operating and projections of income;
- Characteristics and location of the housing developments;
- Characteristics of the families served and to be served;
- Costs of providing comparable services in accordance with criteria or formula of a prototype of a well run public housing project;
- The number of units in the PHA's inventory;
- The number of units chronically vacant and the amount of assistance for these units;

- Self-sufficiency and management skills programs;
- Anti-crime and anti-drug activities;
- Security for residents;
- Escrow saving account monies; and
- Other factors set forth by the Secretary of HUD.

Based on the cut in PHDEP funds resulting from formula rulemaking, the Housing Authority could lose funds if the formula is based on a reallocation of existing funds rather than providing an opportunity to define PHA responsibilities and true costs. The revised PHDEP formula and the revised Capital Grant formula both have resulted in reduced revenue for the Housing Authority in order to “redistribute” subsidy from larger PHAs to smaller PHAs.

### Section 8 Administrative Fee Reserves

The Housing Authority has utilized reserves from the Section 8 program to help pay the costs of maintaining public housing, and related unfunded expenses and programs. This amount exceeded \$5 million during Fiscal Year 1998. HUD is also negotiating how Section 8 Administrative fees are allocated. A reduction in the administrative fee percentage will affect the reserve amount that is available to assist other programs, including public housing. Every ¼ percent reduction in the administrative fee will reduce this income by more than \$880,000.

### Entitlement/Discretionary Spending

The monies which fund assisted housing programs are from domestic discretionary spending. Housing programs are not entitlement programs and not required under the law to be funded. Despite projected surpluses, both the House and Senate made significant cuts (8% - 14%) in discretionary spending for housing, NASA, FEMA, and the Veteran’s Administration in their preliminary allocations. It is likely the cuts will disproportionately affect housing as funding for NASA, FEMA, and the Veteran’s Administration are not expected to be cut. CLPHA reports “Public housing is particularly susceptible to drastic cuts, as many lawmakers have committed to full funding of the Section 8 tenant based assistance program”.

“Forward funding”, a practice of “borrowing” budget authority from the following year’s appropriations, also threatens Housing Authority funds.

There is a looming emergency in operating funds.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member questioned if this family is paying the ceiling rate because the family income is \$30,000, can the Housing Authority charge more than the ceiling rent amount.

***Housing Authority Response***

No, if the family remains in the same bedroom size. There are no ceiling rents at the scattered sites.

**Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member asked for income levels for extremely low-income, very low-income, and low-income families.

***Housing Authority Response***

The Area Median Income (AMI) for families in the Los Angeles County and Long Beach metropolitan areas is \$51,300.

The statutory definitions are as follows:

Extremely Low Income: Less than 30% of AMI, or less than \$15,390 per year.

Very Low Income: More than 30% but less than 50% of AMI, or between \$15,931 and \$26,650 per year.

Low Income: More than 50% but less than 80% of AMI, or family incomes between \$25,651 and \$41,040 per year.

The average income of HACLA public housing residents is \$10,235 per year. The average income of HACLA Section 8 Program residents is \$10,941 per year.

**Public Comment**

One speaker at the public hearing said that instead of bringing higher income applicants into the developments, the Housing Authority should offer programs to residents to be able to succeed and afford higher rents. There were two written comments from the Resident Advisory Board expressing the same thought.

The L.A.F.L.A. report also stated the Housing Authority should develop more programs to help raise the income level of the existing residents.

***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority agrees with the comments regarding increasing the income of current residents. The Fiscal Year 2000 strategy for the deconcentration policy (page 3-17 and 3-18 of the Draft Agency Plan) states:

- “a. The Housing Authority will continue the employment self-sufficiency efforts for residents living in public housing to increase the income of these families.
- b. The Housing Authority will utilize the local preferences and income targeting to admit families whose incomes exceed 30% of the City’s median income.”

The Housing Authority has demonstrated its commitment to programs that help residents become self-sufficient. Examples of the many programs were set forth in this section.

Resident self-sufficiency programs and the related supportive services are very expensive. The Housing Authority will continue to expand its programs when additional funding is provided by the Congress.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member suggested that income targets should give more access to extremely low income families, low income families and veterans. The suggestion was 60% of new admissions to extremely low income families, 30% of new admissions to low income families, and 10% of new admissions to veterans.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The income targeting goals have already been discussed in this section.

Income targeting does not include preferences for groups of applicants. This is discussed under the next section entitled “Preferences.” Within each income group, the adopted preferences are applied.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S RECOMMENDATION:**

The Executive Director recommends the Board of Commissioners amend the Draft Agency Plan Income Targeting goals to:

- A *minimum* of 40% of new admissions shall be families with incomes with incomes of less than 30% of median income.
- A *maximum* of 40% of new admissions shall be families with incomes 31 - 50% of median income.

- A *maximum* of 20% of new admissions shall be families with incomes of 51 – 80%.

### **Public Comment**

There was a question from a Resident Advisory Board member asking if the income targets, which could bring families with incomes of \$24,000 - \$34,000 per year into the developments, mean HUD is replacing low income families with higher income families. The Board member said higher income families should be able to rent at the market rate. Public housing was created for low-income families.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The definition of “low-income” is 51 – 80% of median income. 80% of the current median income is \$41,040. The income target percentages are goals to provide a better mix of low incomes.

Income targeting does not mean current residents will be asked to move out of their apartments. The income targeting goals will be applied for *new admissions*.

The regulations require PHAs to utilize a *minimum* of 40% of new admissions for extremely low-income families. The percentage of extremely low-income families can exceed 40%. Extremely low income families will continue to be admitted.

Congress is asking for a better mix of families to make communities healthier, and has been reducing funding over the last several years.

The current cost of operating a unit is \$538. The average tenant rent is \$187/month. The Housing Authority needs to increase its income by increasing the income of current tenants through training programs and self-sufficiency programs, and leasing to some new families whose incomes are on the higher end of the low-income scale. Fortunately, the HACLA has been able to utilize Section 8 reserve funds to offset some of the deficits and finance other programs.

The financial aspect is important, because even if the HACLA only increases income 10% per year the Authority is reducing its deficits.

Also, see responses in this section.

## **ISSUE: PREFERENCES**

The L.A.F.L.A. report recommends first preferences be to single parents, senior citizens, and individuals and families relocated from other developments (for example because of demolition).

The L.A.F.L.A. report further recommends second preference be for victims of domestic violence, homeless families, and families whose children are in foster care, if the availability of housing would allow the family to bring their children home.

The L.A.F.L.A. report also recommends third preference be to disabled individuals or families, veterans, and families whose head of household or spouse is attending school 20 hours or more.

One speaker at the Public Hearing stated people who work have money and can afford to pay the rents for private housing. The assisted housing should go to the poorest of the poor. This was reiterated by one Resident Advisory Board member.

Two speakers at the Public Hearing referred to the numbers of the homeless in Los Angeles and the need to give this population preference for housing.

Two members of the L.A.F.L.A. group stated at the October 1, 1999 meeting that veterans deserve preference because of their sacrifice to their country, and also stressed the needs of the 235,000 reported homeless persons in Los Angeles.

There were five comments from Resident Advisory Board members expressing concern about admission preferences.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Board of Commissioners adopted the Housing Authority's local preferences on September 11, 1998. No changes were made in the Draft Agency Plan.

The local preferences support applicants making the transition from welfare to work, working-poor applicants making the transition to a better job, applicants in training programs, senior citizens, and the disabled who are unable to work.

The Housing Authority will continue to house a mix of low-income families, some with local preferences and some without local preferences. The preference status of families admitted to public housing under the revised (local) preferences is as follows:

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number of New Leases</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Employed full time	114	36.0%
Elderly/Disabled	54	17.0%
Employed part time/training	14	4.4%
No local preference	<u>135</u>	<u>42.6%</u>
Totals	317	100.0%

The new leases demonstrate the Housing Authority's local preferences have been successful in supporting low income applicants who are employed, admitting the elderly and disabled, supporting applicants who are employed part time and/or involved in training; and is still admitting applicants who did not have a local preference.

The suggestion that veterans receive first preference is unnecessary. The Housing Authority utilizes veteran's preference to break ties among applicants. Additionally, if a veteran is disabled, the family is already eligible for the first preference (i.e., head of household and spouse or sole member of the family is elderly or disabled). A disabled veteran would receive additional preference over a disabled or elderly non-veteran in breaking ties. The HACLA's preferences give housing assistance preference to the neediest of veterans.

The suggestion for preferences for single parents violates the Housing Authority's statement of non-discrimination based on marital status.

The suggestion for preference of other categories of preferences for domestic violence victims, homeless persons, and families with children with foster care only begin the list of categories suggested, or that could be suggested, by various advocacy groups. The net effect would be a social service mix based on the old Federal preference paradigm. There are existing special programs within the Section 8 program for the homeless (which also offer a variety of social services) and children in foster care.

The suggestion that first preference be for current residents who are being relocated is unnecessary. Local preferences apply to new admissions. Section I,G,8 states:

"8. Transfer of Residents

Transfer of a family within a HUD-aided , low rent development or transfer to such a development from any other HUD-aided, low rent development operated by this Authority, when such family is eligible for continued occupancy in the dwelling to which it is transferred, is not for any purpose deemed to be an admission to the development and is not subject to the established preferences".

The comments that working applicants have resources sufficient to pay for housing in the private sector is not supported by facts.

The Housing Authority has had a working preference since 1993. Previously it was a local ranking preference.

The average income of the 3,500+ employed residents is less than minimum wage. 30% of the gross average monthly wage (before any deductions) of \$941 is \$282. This amount would barely cover the rent for a single room.

The HACLA recognizes the respondents' concerns because of a tightening rental market in the Los Angeles area and the resulting increase in applications for assisted apartments. The Housing Authority will continue aggressive asset development to get new units in the housing inventory and provide affordable housing to low income families in the City of Los Angeles.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

No change to local preferences.

### **Public Comment**

The Resident Advisory Board asked if new applicants will be required to be in school or working in order to qualify for public housing.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

There is no requirement to be in school or working in order to qualify for admission to public housing. Applicants who are working or going to school will receive preference for housing. See preferences in this section.

The largest group of qualified applicants admitted since the beginning of 1999 did not have a local preference for housing. See discussion in this section.

### **Public Comment**

The Resident Advisory Board asked if it were true that if, at the end of five years, residents are not making \$40,000 per year, they will not be able to remain in public housing.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

This is not true.

## **ISSUE: SCREENING AND ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSIONS**

### **Public Comment**

There were several comments from Resident Advisory Board members concerning the criminal background checks completed as part of the screening process. The Board members said it is not fair not to give an applicant who has a criminal history a second chance. The Board members questioned how the process works, and what criminal acts would likely lead to denial of the application.

One Resident Advisory Board member stated ex-convicts have a right to stay where they want to stay. The respondent warned other Board members these restrictions might come back to haunt them, the ex-convict could be their relative.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority began performing criminal background checks on all adult members of applicant families in 1996.

PHAs began running criminal background checks after the “One-Strike” regulations were reiterated by President Clinton in 1996. The President, and the documents released at the time of the news conference, stated there is not enough assisted housing to provide assistance to all that need it. Accordingly, there should be consequences for engaging in criminal activity.

The criminal records are searched going back ten years, and include convictions for the following crimes:

- Murder or voluntary manslaughter;
- Mayhem;
- Rape;
- Sodomy or oral copulation by force, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily injury or fear;
- Lewd or lascivious act on a child under the age of 14;
- Any felony punishable by death or life imprisonment;
- Any felony where the individual personally inflicted great bodily harm;
- Any felony where the individual used a firearm;

- Arson;
- Assault with intent to commit rape or robbery;
- Assault with a deadly weapon on a police officer;
- Explosion of a destructive device or any explosive with the intent to injure, causing great bodily damage or mayhem, or with intent to murder;
- Burglary of an inhabited dwelling;
- Robbery or bank robbery;
- Selling, furnishing, offering to sell, giving, administering drugs;
- Selling or manufacturing methamphetamines in assisted housing property;
- Kidnapping;
- Grand theft involving a firearm;
- Car jacking;
- Hate crimes and/or civil rights violations;
- Possession or manufacture of an illegal weapon (short barreled shot guns);
- Domestic violence conviction;
- Conviction of possession of a firearm.

These examples are not all inclusive.

When the criminal background check results in a record which could lead to the denial of the application, the family is given an opportunity to explain/dispute the record and document rehabilitation.

Examples:

The record shows the head of household was convicted of domestic violence five years ago. The applicant can document he attended anger management classes, and has been reunited with his wife for three years. There have been no further incidents.

The Application Center Manager would likely approve this application after receiving the evidence of rehabilitation.

The record shows a conviction seven years ago for grand theft. The family member with the criminal record has been steadily employed for the last five years, and has no further arrests or convictions.

The Application Center Manager would likely approve this application after receiving the evidence of rehabilitation.

The record shows the family member was just paroled after serving time for burglary. The Application Center Manager would likely deny the application because there has been no passage of time to demonstrate rehabilitation.

Whether or not the application is approved depends on the crime, how long has passed since the crime was committed, how long the family member has been out of prison, whether the parole/probation has been completed, and what the family member has been doing since then (working, going to school, enrolled in a training program, receiving welfare). These decisions are handled on a case-by-case basis.

The receipt of housing assistance is a privilege, not a right. The number of families in need of assistance far exceeds the available housing assistance. Ex-convicts do not have the right to live in public housing, unless the individual undergoes the screening process and the Housing Authority gives approval for the person to join the family or lease a unit. It does not matter if the ex-convict is a spouse, parent of the resident's child(ren), child, grandchild, or parent of the resident family. Families who permit unauthorized persons to live in the unit may be evicted.

The HACLA must look at the broader picture, i.e., the good of the housing community and the rights and interests of other residents.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report commented on the screening requirement which states an applicant's lease must not have been terminated for cause by HACLA within the previous 12 months nor a previous application rejected for cause during the same period for disturbing neighbors, criminal activity, drug-related criminal activity or the like.

The draft report recommended language be added:

“Applicants shall be given an opportunity to explain their situation and shall have access to a grievance procedure. If the applicant is able to make a reasonable showing that they were not at fault and/or they have been rehabilitated, they shall not be denied admission on this basis.”

One speaker at the Public Hearing from the San Fernando Valley Legal Services supported this recommendation, and stated applicants should have due process to give them a chance to explain their situation.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

This requirement has been in Housing Authority policy for many years. HACLA has long offered applicants these opportunities. No change was made in the Draft Agency Plan.

Applicants currently have, and would continue to have under the Draft Agency Plan, the right to explain why the action should not have been taken. Page 3-12 of the Draft Agency Plan states:

“Each applicant determined to be ineligible will be promptly notified in writing that he/she is ineligible. This notice shall advise the applicant:

1. Of the specific grounds for denial of the application;
2. That he/she has a right to request an informal hearing;
3. That he/she may be assisted by Counsel and witnesses may offer testimony;
4. That the informal hearing is the sole remaining opportunity for the applicant to offer information or argument in support of why the action should not be taken;
5. That the request for an informal hearing must be received within 30 days of the date of this letter.”

This policy is in compliance with 24 CFR 960.207 which states:

- “(a) The PHA must promptly notify any applicant determined to be ineligible for admission to a project of the basis for the determination, and must provide the applicant upon request, within a reasonable time after the determination is made, with an opportunity for an *informal hearing* on such determination.” (Emphasis added.)

Additionally, the section concerning prohibition of a local preference on page 3-14 further demonstrates consideration of the circumstances or changed circumstances of the applicant. Section I, G, 7 states:

“The Housing Authority shall not give any preference to an applicant if any member of the family is a person who was evicted during the prior three years

because of drug-related criminal activity from housing assisted under a 1937 Housing Act program.

The Authority may give an admission preference in any of the following cases:

- a) If the HACLA determines that the evicted person has successfully completed a rehabilitation program approved by HACLA;
- b) If the HACLA determines that the evicted person clearly did not participate in or know about the drug-related activity; or
- c) If the HACLA determines that the evicted person no longer participates in any drug-related activity.”

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S RECOMMENDATION**

Retain language in the Draft Agency Plan.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report commented on the screening requirement which inquires of whether the applicant has a poor past performance in meeting financial obligations, especially rent.

The L.A.F.L.A. report recommended language be added:

“Applicants shall be given an opportunity to explain poor past performance in meeting financial obligations by: 1) showing the reason(s) for their past history; and/or 2) illustrating changed circumstances; and/or 3) demonstrating current ability to meet financial obligations. Applicants shall have access to the grievance procedure. If an applicant is able to make a reasonable showing that he or she can meet future financial obligations, he or she shall not be denied admission on this basis”.

One speaker from the San Fernando Valley Legal Services commented about the draft report recommendations, and stated applicants should be able to show the reasons for their past history and illustrate how their circumstances have changed.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority has given applicants an opportunity to explain negative credit or unlawful detainer items since 1989.

The Board of Commissioners adopted Exhibit 201:1C on September 6, 1989 which requires giving applicants an opportunity to explain negative credit or unlawful detainer

items before a decision is made on their applications. Staff must investigate possible mitigating circumstances prior to the informal hearing.

Exhibit 201;1C, II, E, 4 states:

“If the credit report contains a negative item, such item must be evaluated based on the facts and circumstances of the individual applicant’s situation. Factors to be considered include:

- a) The nature of the negative item;
- b) When the item occurred;
- c) If there were mitigating factors which can be documented concerning the applicant family’s failure to satisfy the debt;
- d) Whether there was a loss of income, serious illness, or other financial difficulties which are related to the negative credit item;
- e) In case of evictions, the amount of rent, the amount owed, and the ratio of tenant income to rent;
- f) The demonstrated performance of the applicant family in meeting financial obligations since the date of the negative item.

Staff verbally discusses the negative item(s) with the applicant and gives the applicant an opportunity to present mitigating factors.

If the Application Manager makes a determination to deny the application, the applicant still can request an informal hearing as set forth previously.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S RECOMMENDATION**

Retain language in the Draft Agency Plan.

### **Public Comment**

There was one comment from a Resident Advisory Board member regarding the need for parolees to be allowed to rejoin their family at the public housing unit. Otherwise the parolee may end up homeless. One Resident Advisory Board member questioned why parolees cannot be put on the lease after being out on parole and reunited with their families.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

See response in this section.

### **Public Comment**

There were two comments objecting to the criminal background checks completed by the Housing Authority on all applicants and adult family members.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority is evaluated by HUD on whether or not it adequately screens prospective applicants, including checking for criminal histories.

During 1998, 1,739 criminal background checks were completed for pending applications. 188 applications showed criminal records meeting the criteria for possible rejection of the application. In all cases, when the criminal background check shows a criminal history which could cause rejection of the application, the applicant is offered an opportunity to meet with the Manager and show evidence of rehabilitation or that the report was in error. 28 applicants showed evidence of rehabilitation and these applications were approved by the Manager. 160 applications were denied based on the criminal background history.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

No change in the screening policy or the provisions in the lease agreement.

### **Public Comment**

There were two questions from Resident Advisory Board members concerning felons regaining custody of their children. The Board members wanted to know what the Housing Authority is doing to assist them.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Individuals needing assistance to regain the custody of their children should consult a legal agency such as the Legal Aid Foundation.

Also, see response to previous comment in this section.

### **Public Comment**

There was a question from a Resident Advisory Board member regarding how the Housing Authority checks the criminal backgrounds of applicants/family members who were born in other countries.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The criminal background check includes local, State, and information from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI is the same source utilized by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

### **Public Comment**

There were two comments concerning the definition of a “lifetime sex offender”.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

A lifetime sex offender is any individual who is subject to a lifetime registration under a sex offender registration program.

When a sex offender is sentenced, the presiding judge makes the determination whether or not the individual is subject to the lifetime registration requirements. These requirements include registration with local law enforcement wherever the offender resides. The requirements vary from State to State.

The QWHRA *requires* PHAs to prohibit housing assistance to any family which has a family member who is subject to these requirements. The ban on assistance is forever, and applies to all assisted housing programs.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory member questioned whether or not the Manager of the development has the right to refuse an applicant referred to the site. The Board member said Managers are telling residents they have no choice.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The screening of all applicant families is completed at the Application Center. The Application Center determines the eligibility or ineligibility of the applicant family. This assures uniformity in the screening process.

If there is something that the Application Center missed, income sources need to be re-verified, or there are other discrepancies, the site Manager can return the application to the Application Center for further follow-up.

The criminal record report is *not* part of the application package referred to the sites. These records are confidential, and only the Application Center Manager has authorization to review the reports.

During the last 2½ years, the Application Center has referred approximately 3,700 approved applications to the sites. Less than 10 have been returned.

### **Public Comment**

There were two comments from members of the Resident Advisory Board stating the residents of the development should be involved in the screening process and selection of applicants who will be offered units. The Resident Advisory Board members said residents who live in the development know things about applicants the Housing Authority's screening procedures does not show.

Another Resident Advisory Board member said the Housing Authority evicts a problem resident and moves in another family who does the same thing and is just as bad as the evicted family.

One Resident Advisory Board member stated there are a lot of undesirables who come into the developments and also those who live there. She stated the screening procedures need to be improved, and questioned what is done now.

One Resident Advisory Board member said the Oxnard Housing Authority has a screening panel in conjunction with the RAC and management. Suggested such a system be implemented here.

One Resident Advisory Board member wanted to know who screens the screener.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The screening criteria and the verification processes for applicant families have become more stringent over the last 15 years.

Verification procedures include: a criminal background check of all adults (the regulations prohibit the checking of the records of minors), a credit check, housekeeping inspection, citizenship certification or eligible immigration status check through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, check of prior record in assisted housing, certification of social security numbers or a certification the family member has none for all family members age six or older. The Housing Authority has always verified income and family composition, and interviewed each applicant family.

*Any criteria which determines whether or not an applicant family is or is not eligible for housing must be objective and verifiable, and reasonably related to individual attributes and behavior of the applicant family.*

Subjective feelings or knowledge of the applicant family that cannot be verified or applied to all applicant families cannot be used in the screening process.

One concern of direct resident involvement in the screening and selection process is confidentiality of family information. The Housing Authority could have serious financial liability if applicant confidentiality is breached. Knowledge of one resident about another resident's personal family and financial information could also affect ongoing resident relations after the family is admitted to housing.

The Oxnard Housing Authority is much smaller than the Los Angeles Housing Authority. Oxnard has a total of 780 public housing units, just over 2/3 of the units in just Nickerson Gardens.

The regulations permit PHAs to establish Resident Advisory Boards for consultation in connection with the tenant selection process. The Housing Authority recognizes the importance of resident input in this vital area.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

Consult the Resident Advisory Board on recommendations to improve the tenant selection screening process during the discussions regarding site-based waiting lists next year. *The criteria must be objective and verifiable.*

The Resident Advisory Board's recommendations shall be reviewed for inclusion in the Fiscal Year 2001 Agency Plan.

## **ISSUE: ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION AT THE APPLICATION CENTER/ DESEGREGATION OF THE EAST LOS ANGELES DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Public Comment**

There was comment from the Resident Advisory Board that “discrimination still seems to be part of the application selection process”.

There were also several comments by Board members regarding integrating the East Los Angeles developments, as has been done at the South Central Los Angeles developments.

One Resident Advisory Board member suggested accumulating 30 vacancies at an East Los Angeles development, and then moving in non-dominant race/ethnicity families.

One Resident Advisory Board member suggested not permitting Hispanic applicants to move into the East Los Angeles developments until the sites were integrated like the South Central developments.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

THE HOUSING AUTHORITY DOES NOT MAKE OFFERS FOR VACANT UNITS AT THE DEVELOPMENTS BASED ON THE RACE OR ETHNICITY OF APPLICANT FAMILIES.

Beginning in 1988, HUD required the Housing Authority to use a centralized waiting list when filling vacant public housing units. The offers made to families are based on the HUD prescribed “three offer system”. (The other HUD option is the “one offer system”.) The development offered an applicant depends on where the vacancies are located and how many units are vacant at the development(s) at the time the applicant reaches the top of the waiting list. Applicants may refuse three offers before dropping to the bottom of the list.

The reason more applicant families were offered units in South Central developments during the first nine months of 1999 is there were more vacant units at these sites.

During the first nine months of 1999, there were 203 vacant units in the South Central Los Angeles developments which were leased to new families (not used for transfers). During the same time period, there were 36 vacant units in the East Los Angeles developments which were leased to new families. There were 5.6 times more vacant units in the South Central Los Angeles area developments. Aliso Village, Pico Aliso, and Jordan Downs are not included in these figures because of HOPE VI and modernization activity at these sites.

One development, Nickerson Gardens, accounted for more than 28.8% of the total units leased to new applicant families during the first nine months of 1999. This is the reason more applicant families were offered housing at this site.

The reasons families gave, and continue to give, for not wanting to move from a neighborhood are family, friends, churches, doctors, and location to employment. These are the same reasons given by more affluent families for not wanting to move from an area.

Despite a vacancy rate of less than 1%, low turnover rates, the absence of a significant number of new conventional housing units or Section 8 certificates or vouchers to free up units, a Section 8 waiting list that has over 150,000 registrants, and a public housing waiting list and a low income City population which is predominantly Hispanic, the Housing Authority has made efforts and progress to counteract segregation.

The developments located in East Los Angeles are predominantly Hispanic, as is in surrounding community. The increase in the Hispanic population in the housing developments reflects the increasing low income Hispanic population of the City of Los Angeles. The City's Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan – Final, April 1, 1999 – March 31, 2000 report shows the overall Hispanic population increased 70% from 1980 – 1990. The Hispanic population is expected to double in the next 25 years.

Ten years ago the developments in South Central Los Angeles, and the surrounding community, were predominantly occupied by African-American families. These developments are becoming increasingly more integrated, as is the surrounding community.

The City's report shows the overall African-American population decreased 23.5% from 1980 – 1990. The City's report states: "Many areas once considered African-American communities now have substantial Latino populations. For example, 58.6% of the population of Southeast Los Angeles and 44.7% of the population of South Central Los Angeles is Latino".

The race/ethnicity of the families living in the communities surrounding the South Central developments has changed over the last decade, and is reflected in the race/ethnicity of the families living in public housing.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

If there are fact-based instances of discrimination at the Application Center in the selection and assignment process, it should be reported to the Housing Management Director.

## **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member stated that 90% of the new leases at Jordan Downs have been to Hispanic families. The Board member further stated she was concerned about issues of race, religion, and creed because African-American families are not being offered units in the East Los Angeles developments, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, or other sites outside the South Central Los Angeles area.

## ***Housing Authority Response***

The statement that 90% of the new leases at Jordan Downs have been to Hispanic families is not true. During the first nine months of 1999, 62.8% of the new leases were to Hispanic families and 37.2% of the new leases were to African-American families.

The majority of units leased at Jordan Downs, 61.4%, were larger bedroom sizes (three, four, five). The majority of applicants for the larger bedroom sizes, 77.8%, are Hispanic families. The reason more Hispanic applicants were housed at Jordan Downs is the number of Hispanic applicant families for the larger bedroom sizes outnumber the applications from African-American families more than 3.5 to one.

The number of families on the waiting list varies from bedroom size to bedroom size:

<u>Bedroom Size</u>	<u>African-American Applicants</u>		<u>Hispanic Applicants</u>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	2,481	68.8%	1,127	31.2%
2	753	43.9%	964	56.1%
3	963	23.0%	3,223	77.0%
4	136	17.8%	628	82.2%
5	<u>11</u>	<u>20.0%</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>80.0%</u>
Totals:	4,344	42.1%	5,986	57.9%

The greatest turnover (66.6% of the new leases) is in the two bedroom unit size. However, the percentage of the total applications for this bedroom size comprise just 16.6% of the total applications.

African-American applicants *were offered and accepted* units in locations other than the South Central developments. The developments include Estrada Courts Extension,

William Mead, Rancho San Pedro, Rancho San Pedro Extension, Mar Vista Gardens, San Fernando Gardens, and Dana Strand.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

If there are fact-based instances of discrimination at the Application Center in the selection and assignment process, it should be reported to the Housing Management Director.

### **Public Comment**

The Nickerson Gardens Resident Management Corporation recommended the Housing Authority cease to accept applications from any other ethnic group of people until the developments in East Los Angeles and the Valley are integrated and have a racial balance.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

This suggestion is contrary to Federal law. See response in this section.

### **Public Comment**

One member of the L.A.F.L.A. group stated she remembered years ago the Housing Authority had been directed by HUD to desegregate its developments.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The agreement with HUD was dated in 1978 *and* predicated on HUD providing 12,000 new housing units and 4,000 Section 8 Certificates for this purpose. The additional housing assistance did not materialize.

The Housing Authority markets its programs, accepts applications, and processes those applications in accordance with the rules and regulations.

See response in this section.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

Retain the language in the Draft Agency Plan.

## **ISSUE: SITE-BASED WAITING LISTS**

The L.A.F.L.A. draft report recommends the Housing Authority utilize site-based waiting lists in order to offer applicants choice in where they wish to live.

The recommendations include having no limit on the number of waiting lists an applicant could request to be on, no limit on the number of years an applicant could be on the waiting list(s), giving applicants the right to refuse three offers of housing before being removed from all waiting lists, and the removal of the applicant's name from all waiting lists once an offer has been accepted.

The L.A.F.L.A. report notes the drawbacks of a site-based system are a lack of diversity and longer waiting lists.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority recognizes the advantages and disadvantages of a site-based waiting list system.

There are three options:

- Retain a centralized waiting list and the three offer option.
- Retain a centralized waiting list and adopt a one offer plan.
- Adopt site-based waiting lists.

The final regulations for adopting a site-based waiting list system have not been published. Additionally, the "Blue Ribbon Committee" has not yet published its recommendations. Time constraints of being in the first group of PHAs submitting their Agency Plans to HUD for fiscal year 2000, and the lack of these items, did not permit the time needed to adequately evaluate whether or not to make a major policy change.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

1. Retain the language in the draft Agency Plan for Fiscal Year 2000.
2. Review the adoption of site-based waiting lists for Fiscal Year 2001 after examination of the relevant documents, regulations, and the positive and negative ramifications of such a change.

## **ISSUE: RENT SETTING/RENT PAYMENT**

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report suggested flat rents be defined because the draft Agency Plan does not say at what level the flat rents will be set. It was further suggested the Housing Authority clearly set forth to the residents what procedures they must follow and how their choice will affect them.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Flat rents are based on the market value of the unit. Residents, regardless of family income, could choose to pay this rent. The other choice to residents is to pay an income-based rent, i.e. generally 30% of family income. The proration provisions for mixed families will continue to apply.

Before PHAs can establish the flat rents, the Housing Authority must:

- Take reasonable steps to determine market value;
- Conduct a comparability study;
- Determine relevant factors for the community where the unit is located;
- Determine the unassisted rents for housing of similar age, location, condition, amenities, design, and size;
- Establish flat rents for every public housing unit.

The flat rents cannot exceed the actual cost of providing and operating the unit, and a deposit into replacement reserve. The minimum flat rent is 75% of these costs. The flat rents may be different from site to site.

The family will be able to switch rent payment methods in case of hardship, such as an income decrease because of the loss of a job.

The final rule for establishing flat rents has not been published. Once the rule is published, the comparability studies will be completed and the flat rents established.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No change in the Draft Agency Plan language.
2. The Housing Authority should complete the required studies for inclusion of flat rents in the Fiscal Year 2001 Annual Plan.

## **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member questioned if a resident is paying a ceiling rent and the family income increases to \$30,000 if the HACLA can raise the ceiling rent amount.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The ceiling rent would not change unless the family moves to a different bedroom size unit. If the family moves to a larger unit, the ceiling rent would increase. If the family moves to a smaller unit, the ceiling rent decreases. The rent will be the lower of the ceiling rent or 30% of the family's adjusted income.

## **Public Comment**

The San Fernando Gardens Resident Management Corporation and the L.A.F.L.A. report objected to the provision that there will be no reduction in the amount of tenant rent if the welfare grant reduction is because the recipient did not comply with CalWORKS requirement or fraud. The SFGRMC said the provision was "mean-spirited, unnecessary, and unfair." The RMC said there are many good reasons for not participating in CalWORKS Program.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

This provision is required under provisions of the QHWRA. Residents who comply with the CalWORKS requirement and are unable to locate work, will have their tenant rent reduced.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

No change in the Draft Agency Plan language.

## **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member asked if non-payment of the tenant rent will result in the eviction of the family. Four other Board members said they had problems about paying the rent that was coming due.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The tenant rent is based on the family's income. It is reasonable for the Housing Authority to expect the family will pay the tenant rent in a timely manner.

Non-payment of rent is grounds for evicting a family. If there is a legitimate problem, residents should contact the Management Office.

### **Public Comment**

The draft report states the provision regarding incremental income (page 3-22; section II, c, 4) is vague and confusing.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The conditions for this provision are set forth in Exhibit 201:1, Definitions of Eligibility and Income, which states:

“Annual income does not include...Incremental income increases for 12 months, and 50% of the incremental increase for an additional 12 months, providing resident:

- a) Was employed 12 months or more prior to the date of employment; or
- b) Earned \$2,875 or less in the 12 months prior to the date of employment; or
- c) Earning increase while the resident is participating in a job training or self-sufficiency program; or
- d) Is or was receiving welfare within six months of employment.”

This provision is required under the QHWRA.

Residents who became employed, and qualify for this provision, would continue to pay the rent based on the old income for 12 months. The tenant rent for the second 12 months will be based on the old income plus 50% of the incremental income for the next 12 months.

The rent savings to residents could be significant. The average rent for a family receiving welfare is \$108/month. The average rent for a working family is \$238/month. The difference is \$130/month. A family qualifying for the incremental exclusion would save \$130/month or \$1,560 for 12 months. The family would save another \$780 the second year for a total of \$2,340. These figures are conservative.

The tenant rent charged under this provision is significantly below 30%.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S RECOMMENDATION**

Amend this section adding a reference to where the provision details are located. Add “See Exhibit 201:1A”.

**Public Comment**

Some members of the group that developed the L.A.F.L.A. report disagreed with the Draft Agency Plan provision where if some family members are citizens or have eligible immigration status and some are not, the family will pay a prorated rent. The prorated rents are more than 30% of the family’s income.

***Housing Authority Response***

The Federal regulations require PHAs to prorate the amount of housing assistance for mixed families, i.e. some family members are citizens or have eligible immigration status and some do not.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S RECOMMENDATION**

No changes to the Draft Agency Plan.

**Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member asked why the ceiling rents do not apply to the scattered sites.

***Housing Authority Response***

The scattered sites have comparable units in the neighborhoods where the buildings are located. Under these circumstances, the regulations required the minimum ceiling rent be the Section 8 Fair Market Rent.

The study conducted of tenant incomes at that time (1993) showed ceiling rents at the Section 8 Fair Market Rent level would not have benefited families at the scattered sites. There were only two families Authority-wide whose total payment exceeded the Fair Market Rent amount.

The ceiling rents are compared to the Fair Market Rents below:

<i>Bedroom Size</i>	<i>Ceiling Rent</i>	<i>Fair Market Rent (1993)</i>
1	\$337	\$ 704
2	\$397	\$ 829

3	\$496	\$1,036
4	\$556	\$1,161
5	\$639	\$1,335

**Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report suggested the Housing Authority develop less stringent eviction policies in cases where the head of household is unable to pay the higher rent because of increases caused by an adult child’s income. The adult child refuses to contribute to the rent payment.

The L.A.F.L.A. report suggested the Housing Authority should calculate the adult child’s portion of the rent and execute a separate agreement with the adult child. The adult child should be evicted if he/she does not pay the portion due, not the entire family.

One speaker at the Public Hearing also reiterated these suggestions.

***Housing Authority Response***

California law does not permit the execution of two leases for one unit.

While the Management Office staff can calculate the adult child’s portion of the rent for the use by the head of household in speaking with their adult child, it remains the responsibility of the head of household to make the full payment of the rent and handle the related family relationships.

Federal law requires the inclusion of the adult child’s income in the calculation of the family’s rent.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S RECOMMENDATION**

The HACLA should not make changes to existing policies.

## **ISSUE: INCOME DISREGARDS/EMPLOYMENT BARRIERS**

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report, comments from the Resident Advisory Board, and speakers at the Public Hearing recommend the Housing Authority consider providing additional deductions to the residents' annual income in determining adjusted income including:

- Work related uniforms.
- Work related tools.
- Child care.
- Tuition and books.
- Transportation where the distance to a job presents a hardship to the resident.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The HUD regulations permit PHAs to adopt "permissive deductions". However, HUD will not fund the rental income losses that occur because of the application of permissive deductions. PHAs must maintain two rent rolls, one without and one with the permissive deductions. The subsidy funding is based on the rent roll without the permissive deductions. While the Housing Authority is supportive of some of the permissive deductions, the adoption of such deductions would adversely affect Conventional housing resources.

Example – transportation allowance:

- There are 3,546 residents with reported earned income. If the Housing Authority adopted a \$25 per week disregard for transportation to and from work, the resulting reduction in rental income would total \$1,382,940.
- The total rental income for fiscal year 1998 was \$18,689,040. This transportation disregard would reduce the rental income by 7.39%.

A deduction for child care is a mandatory deduction. The Housing Authority has had a deduction for child care for many years. Exhibit 201:1A, adjusted income states:

"A deduction of amounts, and only to the extent such amounts are not reimbursed, anticipated to be paid by the family for the care of children under 13 years of age during the period for which annual income is computed, but only where such care is necessary to enable a family member to be gainfully

employed or to further his/her education. The amount deducted shall reflect reasonable charges for child care and in the case of child care necessary to permit employment, shall not exceed the income received from such employment.”

Additionally, residents making the transition from welfare-to-work may receive child care assistance from the Department of Social Services, and/or Housing Authority self-sufficiency programs.

Also, employed residents earning between \$6,650 and \$12,300 who have one qualifying child could receive up to \$2,271 from the Earned Income Tax. Residents earning between \$9,350 and \$12,300 who have two or more qualifying children could receive up to \$3,756 from the Earned Income Tax. These amounts are *not* used in the calculation of tenant rent.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S RECOMMENDATION**

No changes to the Draft Agency Plan are required.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. Report suggested the Housing Authority should provide grants or loans to assist residents in purchasing cars and paying the car insurance. Such a program would remove one of the barriers to employment.

It was also suggested the Housing Authority should assist residents in clearing problems with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and obtaining driving licenses.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The incremental income exclusions and Federal programs like the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) already provide families with extra income for such items. A family with two children, and qualifying for the incremental income exclusion, would have \$9,852 of disposable income over two years. (EITC of \$3,756 per year and reduced rent). The amount for a family with one child is \$6,882.

These monies are *not* used in the calculation of tenant rent, and represent approximately \$133 per month in rent savings for a two child family during the first year, and \$113 per month the second year. The rent saving for a family with one child is approximately \$96 per month the first year and \$76 per month the second year.

The cost of providing just the 1,200 welfare-to-work participants with a \$5,000 grant/loan to purchase a car is \$6,000,000. If \$500 was provided for minimal insurance, the cost is another \$600,000. \$6.6 million is 13.4% of the total 1998 operating expenses for the Conventional housing sites. The cost would be more than

the entire welfare-to-work grant. Welfare-to-work programs do provide transportation allowances for public transportation.

This is the era of *decreasing* Federal dollars for public housing programs. The Housing Authority does not have the resources for such a program, and there are competing programs with higher priority where funding is needed. Many, such as more police officers, are discussed in this Notice.

The problem residents have with the DMV in obtaining a Driver's License is one more appropriately handled by a legal services office, such as the Legal Aid Foundation.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

No changes to the Draft Agency Plan are required.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory member asked why the Housing Authority includes SSI received on behalf of a child in the calculation of tenant rent. It was stated the Social Security department had advised the family this SSI income was to be excluded.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Code of Federal Regulations defines annual income. Section 5.609 states:

- “(a) *Annual income* means all amounts, monetary or not, which:
  - (1) Go to, or on behalf of, the family head or spouse (even if temporarily absent) or to any other family member ....
  - (b) (6) Welfare assistance.” (SSI is a welfare program).

The list of exclusions does not include SSI payments on behalf of a child.

The regulations support the HACLA's policy on this matter.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

No action is required.

## **ISSUE: DEMOLITION/HOPE VI**

### **Public Comment**

There were speakers at the Public Hearing, comments from the Resident Advisory Board, and comments from the L.A.F.L.A. group regarding demolition in general, and specific points from making the initial application to re-housing families after the work is completed.

### ***Housing Authority Response:***

There appears to be a misunderstanding of the HOPE VI program goals and HUD's objectives for assisted housing programs.

- One of the strategic objectives of HUD is to increase the availability of affordable housing in standard condition to families and individuals, particularly the poor and disadvantaged.

HUD has initiated a comprehensive effort to fundamentally transform public housing. The effort has four main components:

- “1. Tearing down and replacing the 100,000 worst public housing units;
2. Aggressively intervening to improve troubled PHAs;
1. Establishing incentives to reward working families, encourage families to make the transition from welfare to self-sufficiency, and encourage a diverse mix of incomes in public housing; and
2. Cracking down on crime and drugs.”

Congress has not allocated funds to create additional housing for extremely low-income families. HUD is concentrating its programs on:

- “1. Creating a supply of housing that is affordable to renters and homeowners whose income are low but who do not have extremely low or poverty level incomes; and
  2. Maintaining the public and assisted housing programs that currently serve over 4 million needy households...”.
- The HOPE VI program purpose is not to build back the same housing development.

- The HOPE VI program is designed to change public housing into a community, with a mix of housing opportunities, economic development, job opportunities, support services, and a mix of low incomes.
- HOPE VI programs funds are for public housing units where the cost to repair the units exceeds the cost of rebuilding new ones. The current units are considered obsolete.
- In order to create a community that offers a greater variety of housing choices, there must be less density, i.e., fewer units. This does not mean current residents lose housing assistance. Residents at a HOPE VI site have **greater** housing choice than residents at a non-HOPE VI site including:
  - Vacant units at other developments;
  - Section 8 vouchers;
  - Home ownership opportunities (if income eligible);
  - New public housing units; or if included in the plan,
  - Senior housing.
- The Section 8 Voucher offers the holder a greater choice of where they want to live. The Housing Authority has obtained a HUD approval to approve amounts 10 – 17% above the payment standard amount in 44 Los Angeles City zip codes and two census tracts. This offers families a better opportunity to live in a lower poverty neighborhood. Additionally, Section 8 voucher holders can use their voucher to move to another city anywhere in the U.S. after the first 12 months in Los Angeles. This is the “portability” feature of the program.
- *There is one-to-one replacement of housing assistance, not one-to-one build back.*
- Modernization dollars are shrinking. The law prohibits modernization at developments where the cost of remodeling exceeds 90% of the cost of rebuilding.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report recommended the Five-Year Plan state specifically which developments are proposed to be demolished over the next five years, the time frame, and a statement that no other public housing developments will be demolished.

### ***Housing Authority Response:***

The purpose of the Five-Year Plan is to list the primary goals of the Housing Authority will pursue over the next five years. The Annual Plan sets forth more detail on how the HACLA will be consistent with its mission during the coming fiscal year.

The ability of the Housing Authority to accomplish the goals and objectives in the Agency Plan is dependent on appropriate funding from both the Congress and HUD that is commensurate with required regulations that the HACLA must meet. HOPE VI funds may or may not be available, and only one in five of the HOPE VI applications is funded. The HOPE VI program “sunsets” at the end of 2001.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report suggests residents be included in the development and writing of funding applications for all proposed plans for demolition and construction. A committee consisting of minimum of 15% of the number of residents living in the development be formed one year before the deadline for submitting the application including the RAC/RMC members, the former HARAC representative(s), and other resident organizations and groups in the development. The committee will explain the pros and cons of the HOPE VI program to residents. Sign in sheets for meetings regarding HOPE VI shall not be used in evidence in support for the application. Residents would vote on the application. At least 66% would have to support the application in order for HACLA to submit it to HUD.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The HOPE VI process has always included meetings with residents where input is solicited. The Housing Authority has always exceeded resident participation requirements. For example the Housing Authority conducted four public meetings related to the Dana Strand HOPE VI proposal. Meetings were held on week nights, weekdays, and weekends to ensure the greatest degree of resident participation. Ads were placed in the L.A. Times, La Opinion, and the local News Pilot; flyers were distributed by hand to the community prior to every meeting, and personal invitations sent to community interested parties. Additionally, surveys were distributed and completed by residents to identify community and supportive services needs as they relate to the proposal. The public meetings were very well attended with a great deal of resident involvement. A total of 531 residents and community interested parties completed sign-in sheets for these meetings.

On May 18, 1999 the Housing Authority attended the monthly Dana Strand Resident Advisory Committee (RAC) meeting to report back on the application. All HOPE VI public meetings were video taped, as well as the follow-up RAC meeting on May 18, 1999; there were nearly ten hours of resident participation in all. Additionally, the

Executive Director attended monthly Dana Strand RAC meetings to update the community on the status of the HOPE VI application.

The 1999 HOPE VI Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was published on February 26, 1999. The completed application was due at HUD no later than May 27, 1999. There was 90 days to prepare an application with pages and pages of HUD requirements.

The minimum size of the committee suggested to “explain the pros and cons” to other residents would be prohibitive in size. Examples: Ramona Gardens has 2,045 residents; the committee would have a minimum of 307 members. Rancho San Pedro/Extension has 1,536 residents; the committee would have a minimum of 230 residents. Nickerson Gardens has 3,420 residents; the committee would have a minimum of 513 residents. The planning participation suggestions are not commensurate with the timeframes given to the Housing Authority to submit an application.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report and public comment stated all plans for demolition shall include one-for-one replacement.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

*HUD will not fund applications for one-to-one replacement of public housing units. There is one-to-one replacement of housing assistance.*

The first two applications the Housing Authority submitted to HUD for HOPE VI funds at Aliso Village were turned down. One of the reasons was the number of build back units was too high. The proposed number of build back units in the second application was 550 units of public housing. The number of units at the site was 685. The approved application has 269 build back units of public housing.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report recommended an independent contractor outside HUD be hired to determine if the development is severely distressed.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

There was a very comprehensive study completed on the costs, structural repairs, and architectural needs at Aliso Village before the HOPE VI application was submitted. Modernization dollars are shrinking and developments where the cost of remodeling exceeds 90% of the cost of rebuilding will not be authorized.

## **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report and speakers at the Public Hearing recommended that the demolition/construction be completed in phases. Current residents will stay in the development during the work.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

When HOPE VI demolition/construction is completed in phases there are delays in construction, vastly increased costs, and a relocation nightmare for a high occupancy PHA. This is not practical in an era of decreasing funding.

## **Public Comment**

Two Resident Advisory Board members asked for the definition of “obsolete housing” and how it is determined.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The definition of obsolete housing is a site where the cost of modernizing the site exceeds 90% of the cost to demolish and rebuild the housing.

Example: 90% of the total development cost at a development is \$80,000 per unit. The cost of modernization is \$84,000 per unit. PHAs are prohibited by law from using Comprehensive Grant Modernization funds at such developments.

A physical assessment of the development is completed to make the determination. Factors include how old the development is and the type of construction; condition of electrical, plumbing, and heating systems, sewer lines, water lines, roof, and other items.

The assessments at some sites have determined it would cost too much to modernize the apartments. The sites include Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension, Normont Terrace, Aliso Village, and Dana Strand.

Most of the Housing Authority’s developments are approaching 60 years old. The developments need to be rehabilitated every 15 years, but HUD and Congress have not provided the funding to do so.

The funding has been such that Modernization work is being completed in increments (a specified number of units each year) at Jordan Downs, Pueblo Del Rio/Extension, Hacienda Village, and San Fernando Gardens.

The available funding, and Washington's estimate of what is needed to rehabilitate the developments is shrinking. Example: the GAO report stated \$11,000 per unit should rehabilitate Nickerson Gardens. The Housing Authority estimates it would cost a minimum of \$45,000 per unit.

The Housing Authority is preparing to complete a new needs assessment because there will be less modernization money beginning in Fiscal Year 2000.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report proposed HOPE VI site residents be given a guarantee in writing of return for residents who relocate off site during the work. The guarantee shall provide for changes in family size.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Aliso Village Hope VI Revitalization Program was funded with a leveraged finance package. Due to the structure of the HOPE VI Program Aliso Village residents had to be relocated in offsite locations during the demolition and construction phases. Because HUD will not allow one-for-one replacement of public housing units, it is therefore impossible for the Housing Authority to guarantee in writing that every relocatee is re-housed in the "new" Aliso Village. Permanently relocated Aliso Village residents were guaranteed housing choice in the form of a Section 8 voucher and were also given priority status when applying for readmission to the "new" Aliso Village.

### **Public Comment**

One speaker at the Public Hearing advised of the problem where the mother of a gang member was re-housed in a unit in another gang's territory in the development. She is being denied visitation by her son and is very sad.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The family whose son is involved in gang activity should remember the "One-Strike" regulations, and the potential impact drug and/or criminal activity by the gang member could adversely affect the assisted housing for the other family members.

## **ISSUE: JOBS**

### **Public Comment**

There were comments from the Resident Advisory Board, speakers at the Public Hearing, and from the L.A.F.L.A. group regarding employment opportunities for residents.

There were questions asking why the Housing Authority only hires residents for four – six months under Kumbaya, and why can't residents be hired for permanent, full-time work. The L.A.F.L.A. report said the Housing Authority should hire residents for permanent, full-time jobs, with union pay and benefits. The pay should equal the pay of non-resident employees. Other residents stated there should be an increase in the number of residents hired in these jobs.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority does not have the resources or the work to be the full-time employer for every resident needing work.

The Housing Authority's function is not to provide every unemployed resident with a full-time, permanent job on his/her site. The HACLA's role is to provide as many residents as possible opportunities to gain employment skills, overcome work barriers, obtain on the job experience, and expand the ability of residents to take those skills into the market place to obtain work.

The Housing Authority has provided professional training (by the trade unions) in many crafts for several dozen residents in carpentry, plumbing, painting, and electronics. When the apprenticeship is completed, these residents have the skills and experience necessary, and are fully qualified journeymen. The job opportunities will abound.

The contract with the trade unions also provides training and experience for laborers, maintenance helpers, asbestos removal, and other supportive work. The work experience and training are met to be a step up in finding work in the market place. Residents are paid commensurate to their skill level and status. The Housing Authority pays the union fees and purchases equipment for the participants.

More than 550 employees have worked for one or more of the private contractors. During 1998, 181 residents worked for Kumbaya, including 22 apprentices. There are currently 35 apprentices.

These jobs are tied to modernization and HOPE VI work funding. Kumbaya hires workers on an as-needed basis. There are no funds to keep residents on the payroll year round regardless of the availability of work. Again, the work experience and

training is to provide the resident with skills and experience to take into the market place.

Some residents have completed programs and on the job experience and been hired by the private contractors. Some residents have competed for regular Housing Authority jobs and are employed by the Housing Authority.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

1. Continue to offer resident employment and training opportunities to the maximum extent possible under available funding.
2. Continue to explore other opportunities for economic development.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member stated most resident-owned businesses are structured through modernization work. There is concern about what happens when the modernization is finished.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Modernization funds are not going to be around forever. It is essential that new resident business, particularly construction business, be set up to operate like typical private sector concerns, i.e. landing additional work and taking risks for profit. The Housing Authority is looking at numerous models, including Kumbaya Construction Company, to be the vehicle that can help create these businesses. The Housing Authority is willing to assist any residents with business ideas that they have. Assistance can be in the form of technical assistance and/or locating funds.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report recommended the Housing Authority set objectives for the number of jobs/training opportunities at each development and meet them.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Residents at all the developments have access to the centralized training opportunities at the Family Investment center and the Community Service/Resident Service Centers. Employment opportunities at the site remain tied to modernization work. While there are some employment and training activities at the sites, it is not cost effective to maintain multiple programs.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. recommended creating self-sufficiency programs by putting \$1 per unit in a fund.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Unfortunately Self-sufficiency Programs are very costly. Setting aside \$1 per month per unit would generate a very small amount of new funds; not enough to cover the costs associated with a Self-Sufficiency Program. The Housing Authority spends millions of dollars on Self-Sufficiency Programs and will continue to do so as long as funds are made available by Congress.

### **Public Comment**

Speakers at the Public Hearing questioned whether residents are getting training which will qualify them for long-term employment.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The programs being offered include GED, English as a second language, computer skills, child care worker, certified nurses' assistance, entrepreneurial skills, and the construction related jobs already discussed.

More than 3,000 residents a year receive assistance at the Community Service Centers. Approximately 10% receive full caseload assistance.

The \$5 million welfare-to-work grant will assist over 1,200 residents to make the transition from welfare-to-work and provide a variety of supportive services.

The Housing Authority was also awarded a \$1 million plus grant to provide child care assistance to residents making the transition from welfare-to-work.

The service centers also provide counseling for residents with drug abuse problems.

The JOBS PLUS program will provide incentives for residents making the transition from welfare-to-work.

The Computer Learning Centers allow residents to search for jobs and teach residents how to complete resumes. Some job searches have led to work positions.

The Housing Authority has also awarded millions of dollars to resident owned business at several sites.

The Housing Authority has, and will continue, to provide training opportunities to residents.

### **Public Comment**

The Nickerson Gardens RMC recommended the Housing Authority train residents to be on the maintenance crews (plumbers, electricians, board up crews).

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority is training residents for craft positions under the apprenticeship program.

### **Public Comment**

The resident Advisory Board asked if a resident move from the development if he/she will lose their job.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Residents who are enrolled in the apprenticeship program, employed by Kumbaya, or work under other Section 3 programs may move from the developments and retain their jobs.

Residents who work in the community-related liaison work are required to live in the development to keep their positions.

The establishment of policy relative to resident owned businesses is a new area for the Housing Authority and HUD. The HACLA will research this issue and formulate policy in Fiscal Year 2000.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

The Housing Authority shall research and develop policy relative to this issue, and bring it to the Board of Commissioners for consideration during Fiscal Year 2000.

## **ISSUE: SECTION 8 PROGRAM**

### **Public Comment**

There were several speakers at the Public Hearing, and several written comments from attendees, who expressed concerns related to individual problems with owners or other tenants at a Section 8 private owner apartment.

There was also one speaker who stated owners did not want to accept Section 8 program participants at their buildings. Another speaker was family self-sufficiency program participant and had concerns and a written comment relative to the FSS program. There were also five written comments concerning these issues.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Section 8 Director was at the Public Hearing, and the program participants were able to speak directly to him regarding their concerns. The written comments have been forwarded to the Section 8 Director for follow-up.

### **Public Comment**

A Resident Relations staff member advised some of the Section 8 program participants in attendance were afraid they were going to lose their housing assistance because of the conversion of Section 8 certificates to vouchers.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The conversion of a Section 8 Certificate to a Section 8 Voucher does not mean that the program participant is losing her/his housing assistance. The QWHRA requires that the two programs be merged into the Housing Choice Voucher Program.

All new families entering the program after October, 1999 will receive Housing Choice Vouchers. All families currently receiving Section 8 assistance will be converted to the Housing Choice Voucher Program over the next two years.

The Housing Authority has started, and will continue, an information campaign to tell tenants and new owners how the conversion will take place. There will be some changes to how the program operates; however, the Congress continues to provide funding to maintain Section 8 assistance to families in the program.

### **Public Comment**

The L.A.F.L.A. report proposed the Voucher Payment Standards be set at 110% of the Fair Market Rents.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority received HUD approval to establish higher payment standards in parts of the City where rents are higher. Payment standards in these areas, which cover 44 zip codes and two census tracts, run from 110% to 117% of the current Fair Market Rents.

The HACLA is also continuing to identify neighborhoods which will qualify for payment standards above 100% and gathering and analyzing data in support of a higher Fair Market Rent.

The Housing Authority supports the use of the Section 8 Voucher program to help families live in neighborhoods which provide opportunities for employment, education, and advancement, and, to that end, is reviewing the impacts of setting the Voucher Payment Standard at 110%.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

Continue to review the impacts of setting the voucher payment standards at 110% of the FMR. Review for inclusion in the 2001 Agency Plan.

### **Public Comment**

The Resident Advisory Board asked if the MTO (Moving to Opportunity) program was included in the Draft Agency Plan.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

Section 8 will continue as one of the Housing Authority's major programs to provide affordable housing for low-income families, seniors, and persons with disabilities. The Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program was a demonstration program established by HUD to study the effects of moving families in public housing communities in high-poverty areas to affordable housing in low-poverty areas through a combination of Section 8 Vouchers and housing counseling services. All of the MTO Vouchers have been used, so the MTO program is not included in the Draft Agency Plan for the next five years.

The HACLA will continue its efforts to expand the information and assistance proved to families to help make them the best choice of the housing they rent through the Section 8 program. The Housing Authority is developing partnerships with community-based organizations and other government agencies which provide information, counseling, and resources to the families HACLA serves.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

Prepare changes to the Administrative Plan during Fiscal Year 2000 which outline the Housing Authority's efforts to aid Section 8 program participants mobility efforts for inclusion in the 2001 Agency Plan.

### **Public Comment**

The Resident Advisory Board questioned what the difference was between the Section 8 Certificate and Voucher programs, and why the program participant could not make a choice.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

HUD has provided Section 8 rental assistance which families can use in the private rental unit of their choice for 25 years. The original tenant-based Section 8 program was called the Certificate program. It limited tenant payment to 30% of income and required tenants to find units which rented at or below the maximum Fair Market Rent limit. In the 1980's, Congress authorized the Voucher program as an alternative form of tenant-based Section 8. It limited the subsidy amount and allowed tenants to pay more or less than 30% of their income toward rent, without the restriction of the Fair Market Rent limit.

Congress merged the two programs into the Housing Choice Voucher Program in the QHWRRA. The Housing Authority is mandated to follow the law, which will completely merge the two programs over the next two years.

### **Public Comment**

One speaker at the Public Hearing recommended the Housing Authority exercise its authority to operate a project-based assistance (PBA) program with its tenant-based Section 8 assistance. The PBA could be used to assist non-profit housing providers serving special populations.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority has dedicated over 1,000 Section 8 Certificates to the PBA program under two competitive funding funds: one for Single Room Occupancy (SRO) buildings and one for housing for persons with special needs. Both funding rounds took place before HUD started its SRO Moderate Rehabilitation, Shelter Plus Care, and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS programs, which provide long-term (5 to 10 year) subsidies for housing for special needs populations (e.g., homeless persons, persons with disabilities and HIV/AIDS).

The Housing Authority has worked with non-profit developers through the SRO Moderate Rehabilitation and Shelter Care programs over the last seven years to expand the availability of this type of housing. HUD will provide additional funding in 2000 for this purpose.

The HACLA is reviewing the feasibility of conducting a third round of the PBA program. The ability to commit only one year of subsidy under the current Section 8 funding process may limit the future viability of this option. HUD has announced that it will issue new PBA regulations under the Housing Choice Voucher program. A decision on expanding the PBA program will be made after the regulations are issued.

## **ISSUE: COMPLIANCE WITH 504 REGULATIONS**

### **Public Comment**

One speaker at the Public Hearing asserted the Housing Authority was in violation of the Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act because he thought HACLA didn't even have a list of the units which were accessible. The speaker stated this is blatant discrimination against people with disabilities. Another speaker stated the Housing Authority needed to install wheelchair curbs. Another speaker stated she agreed with what had been said on this subject.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The Housing Authority complies with 504 regulations.

There are one or more accessibility features at 21.7% of the Housing Authority owned units. The features include:

- Wheelchair units;
- Disabled adapted unit;
- Wheelchair ramps;
- Ramps in the common areas;
- One level units;
- Handicapped doorway;
- Smoke detectors for the hearing impaired
- Flashing door bell for the hearing impaired;
- Smoke detector for the vision impaired;
- Grab bar for toilet;
- Grab bar for shower;
- Grab bar for tub;
- Other grab bars;
- Lower counter;

- Lower sink;
- Handicapped parking;
- TDD lines for all programs.

There are 2,077 apartments with 3,725 accessibility features.

The majority of the wheelchair apartments have been in the buildings which house seniors and the disabled, or the newer scattered site units.

The large, family developments were built in the 1940s and 1950s. The majority of the apartments are two story townhouse style units. When a family development undergoes comprehensive modernization, the residents are surveyed to determine accessibility needs before the modernization work is started. Example: when Imperial Courts was modernized, the work included the construction of 13 wheelchair units, including seven, three bedroom units and six, one bedroom units.

The Housing Authority's Board of Commissioners approved the "Section 504 – Non-Discrimination and Reasonable Accommodation Policy" on August 9, 1996. Section I., B of the policy states:

- “B. The HACLA does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities and will provide reasonable accommodation to all housing programs and related facilities under its jurisdiction. The HACLA will seek to identify and eliminate situations or procedures that create a barrier to equal opportunity for all and will make physical and procedural changes in order to reasonably accommodate people with disabilities.”

There are thousands of disabled family members being assisted by one of the Housing Authority's programs.

One of the speakers requested, and has been provided, a site-by-site listing with the number of units with one or more accessibility features.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Residents/program participants/applicants who need reasonable accommodation should contact the applicable program office.
1. Residents/program participants/applicants who have a 504 related complaint should contact the Authority's 504 Coordinator.

## **ISSUE: HOME OWNERSHIP**

### **Public Comment**

There were two speakers at the Public Hearing, two written comments, and one comment from the Resident Advisory Board questioning if Section 8 assistance could be used to purchase a home.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The QHWRA contains provisions which authorizes a demonstration program which allows PHAs the option of using Section 8 vouchers to increase home ownership opportunities. HUD has published the rules for the program.

The program does not increase the amount of housing assistance to the program participant. The program assumes lenders will utilize the assistance amount in the calculations of determining eligibility for mortgage loans. Instead of using the housing assistance to pay rent, the program participant can utilize the same amount of housing assistance to help pay a mortgage.

One of the eligibility requirements is the head of household and/or spouse must have a minimum employment income which equals at least two times the voucher payment standard. These amounts are equivalent to \$17,976 for a two bedroom home or \$24,264 for a three bedroom home.

The median sales prices of homes in the Los Angeles area make the Section 8 Home Ownership program unworkable without other assistance. The lowest median income is \$115,000. The highest is over \$600,000. The HACLA has already been in contact with the Community Development regarding some of the City's home buyer assistance programs.

The Housing Authority's Section 8 Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program also provides home ownership opportunities. During the five-year program, participants receive assistance in meeting self-sufficiency goals, and deposits are made into an escrow account after the participant has earned income or increases the amount of earned income. Upon graduation from the program, one of the uses of the escrow account funds can be a down payment on a house.

There are currently 2,578 FSS participants. 952 participants have escrow accounts with funds totaling \$2,235,385. There have been 35 graduates from the FSS program, and eight families have purchased homes.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

1. Explore partnering with the City's Community Development Department to obtain home buyer assistance to make a demonstration program possible.
2. Develop guidelines and priorities for a home ownership program.
3. Consider including the program in the Annual Plan for Fiscal Year 2001.
4. Conduct additional outreach to public housing families regarding the FSS program opportunities.

### **Public Comment**

One Resident Advisory Board member asked for an explanation of the home ownership section which discusses home ownership opportunities at the HOPE VI sites.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The HOPE VI and Urban Revitalization developments will be offering qualified residents at those sites, and other low income families, the opportunity to purchase a home.

There will be 39 units at Pico/Aliso when the URD program is complete. Home ownership units will also be available at Aliso Village.

The self-sufficiency programs will offer families escrow accounts to accumulate money that can be used to purchase a home in combination with programs like the "first time buyer" program.

Residents at JOBS PLUS sites will be able to start escrow accounts as well.

Residents who qualify for the incremental income exclusion (public housing only) may elect to pay the full rent and have the difference deposited into an individual saving account. This money can go towards a down payment on a home.

There are 71 families who lived in Aliso Village and that are buying homes and in escrow now.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

1. Develop the eligibility criteria for the home ownership program at the URD and HOPE VI sites.
2. Partner with the City's Community Development Department to provide home buyer's assistance for qualified residents and other low income families.

3. Continue the outreach to encourage residents to enroll in training programs and other economic self-sufficiency programs.

## **ISSUE: NICKERSON GARDENS GYM REPAIR**

### **Public Comment**

Two speakers at the Public Hearing stated the gymnasium at Nickerson Gardens needed to be repaired. The young residents at the site need the gym to participate in sports and stay out of trouble.

### ***Housing Authority Response***

The maintenance and repair of recreational facilities on property owned by the Housing Authority is the responsibility of the City's Department of Parks and Recreation.

The Housing Authority, including the Board of Commissioners Chairperson and the Executive Director, have had several meetings with City personnel on this subject. The HACLA will continue to pursue this matter.

## **MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS RELATED TO SITE – REFERRED TO APPROPRIATE DEPARTMENTS**

There were a number of comments related to a specific site issue, an individual family, or a general comment which have been referred to the site or department for follow-up.

The comments include:

- Parking spaces and parking stickers.
- Self-sufficiency programs:
  - More resident participation about what types of programs work and what is needed;
  - More outreach and clearer information about the programs and the program requirements;
  - More input from residents regarding the service providers utilizing the units off the rent roll;
  - Requirements for some programs too strict;
  - Access is being denied because of gender or age.
- Community Service Centers/Resident Service Centers need resident input regarding services offered and needed.
- More training for residents to start own businesses, business loans, and extra bedrooms in units to accommodate businesses.
- Resident input on after school programs. Need evening and weekend hours and to pick children up at school for working parents.
- Longer hours for the Computer Learning Centers.
- Air conditioning for San Fernando Gardens units.
- Other modernization requests such as an additional half bathroom for three bedroom units, bigger apartments (square footage), showers, move up on the modernization schedule, garages, more outside lights, and closets with doors.
- Quality of materials used in modernization work.
- Specific allegation at a HOPE VI site.

- Suggestions specific to Owensmouth Gardens.
- Questions/suggestions regarding the Section 8 Family Self-Sufficiency program.
- Complaints about site personnel.
- Comment regarding dogs doing their business in the tot lots.
- Comments that residents need to work together.
- Compliments from non-profits about the Housing Authority providing housing assistance to homeless families and individuals.
- Senior stress is a problem.
- Want pets allowed.
- Pets will be a health and safety issue.
- Families housed after the earthquake want more services.
- Developments need more resources.
- Thanks from residents/program participants for assisted rent, which had enabled them to purchase things for their children.

We hope this discussion of the comments and the process will provide information and assurances to all residents and program participants. We appreciate the written and oral input received, and carefully considered each comment.

Sincerely,

Donald J. Smith  
Executive Director

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP) and Urban Development**

OMB Approval No 2577-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Office of Public and Indian Housing Capital Fund 501-00

HA Name: Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles  
 Comprehensive Grant: CA16P00450100  
 FFY of Grant Approval: 2000

Original Annual Statement  Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies  Revised Annual Statement/Revision Number \_\_\_\_\_  Performance and Evaluation Report for Program Year Ending \_\_\_\_\_  
 Final Performance and Evaluation Report

Line No	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost (2)	
		Original	Revised (1)	Obligated	Expended
1	<b>Total Non-CGP Funds</b>	0			
2	<b>1406 Operations (May not exceed 10% of line</b>	0			
3	<b>1408 Management Improvements</b>	2,529,081			
4	<b>1410 Administration</b>	2,529,081			
5	<b>1411 Audit</b>	0			
6	<b>1415 Liquidated Damages</b>	0			
7	<b>1430 Fees and Costs</b>	1,032,658			
8	<b>1440 Site Acquisition</b>	0			
9	<b>1450 Site Improvement</b>	1,230,000			
10	<b>1460 Dwelling Structures</b>	13,190,617			
11	<b>1465.1 Dwelling Equipment-Nonexpendable</b>	0			
12	<b>1470 Nondwelling Structures</b>	0			
13	<b>1475 Nondwelling Equipment</b>	1,000,000			
14	<b>1485 Demolition</b>	0			
15	<b>1490 Replacement Reserve</b>	0			
16	<b>1495.1 Relocation Costs</b>	1,756,109			
17	<b>1498 Mod Used for Development</b>	0			
18	<b>1502 Contingency (may not exceed 8% of line</b>	2,023,265			
19	<b>Amount of Annual Grant (Sum of lines 2-18)</b>	25,290,811			
20	<b>Amount of line 19 Related to LBP Activities</b>	0			
21	<b>Amount of line 19 Related to Section 504 Com</b>	0			
22	<b>Amount of line 19 Related to Security</b>	0			
23	<b>Amount of line 19 Related to Energy Conserv</b>	0			

Signature of Executive Director and Date  
 X Donald J. Smith, Executive Director

Signature of Public Director/Office of Native American Programs  
 Administrator and Date  
 X

(1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.  
 (2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report

form HUD-52837 (10/96)  
 ref Handbook 7485.3

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP) Part II: Sand Urban Development**

77-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Office of Public and Indian Affairs **Capital Fund 501-C**

Development Number/Name	General Description of Major Work Categories	Devel. Account Number	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Proposed Work (2)
				Original	Revised (1)	Funds Obligated (2)	Funds Expended (2)	
CAL 4-03	Pueblo d Rio	Electrical System/Entry Screens Windows/Bars 1st Phase	1460	51 units	#####			Work to be perfor Kumbaya constru under Force Acco
CAL 4-06	William Mead	Roof Replacement	1460	100%	682,617			Work to be perfor under contract
CAL 4-08	Rose Hill Courts	Repair termite damage Refinish floors	1460	50 units	100,000			Work to be perfor Kumbaya constru under Force Acco
CAL 4-13	Nickersd Gardens	Bathroom repair/upgra Reroofing	1460	60 units	888,000 538,000			Work to be perfor Kumbaya constru under Force Acco
CAL 4-1	Pueblo d Rio Ext.	<b>Comprehensive Modernization</b> Site Work Water & Sewer Distrib Concrete/Mansory/Met Carpentry/Insulation & Doors and Windows Interior Finishes Plumbing Electrical	1450	45 units	##### 450,000			Work to be perfor Kumbaya constru under Force Acco
			1460	45 units	430,000			
			1460	45 units	220,000			
			1460	45 units	530,000			
			1460	45 units	490,000			
			1460	45 units	#####			
			1460	45 units	370,000			
			1460	45 units	380,000			

Signature of Executive Director and Date  
X

Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Program  
X

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement  
 2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

form HUD-52837 (10/96)  
 ref. Handbook 7485.3

CAL 4-2	Estrada Courts E	<b>Comprehensive Modernization</b> Site Work Metalwork/Carpentry Insulation and Roofing Doors and Windows Lath & Plaster and Stu Ceramic Tile	1450	50 units	##### 310,000			Work to be perfor Kumbaya constru under Force Acco
			1460	50 units	330,000			
			1460	50 units	100,000			
			1460	50 units	340,000			
			1460	50 units	180,000			
			1460	50 units	100,000			

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP) Part II: Sand Urban Development**

77-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Office of Public and Indian Affairs **Capital Fund 501-C**

Development Number/Name	General Description of Major Work Categories	Devel. Account Number	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Proposed Work (2)
				Original	Revised (1)	Funds Obligated (2)	Funds Expended (2)	
	Resilient Flooring	1460	50 units	100,000				
	Painting	1460	50 units	120,000				
	Range Hoods/Kitchen	1460	50 units	220,000				
	Plumbing & Heating	1460	50 units	500,000				
	Electrical	1460	50 units	450,000				
CAL 4-2	<b>Comprehensive Modernization</b>			#####				Work to be performed under Force Account
San Fernando Gardens	Site Work	1450	68 units	470,000				
	Metalwork/Carpentry	1460	68 units	490,000				
	Insulation and Roofing	1460	68 units	130,000				
	Doors and Windows	1460	68 units	500,000				
	Lath & Plaster and Stud	1460	68 units	260,000				
	Ceramic Tile	1460	68 units	130,000				
	Resilient Flooring	1460	68 units	130,000				
	Painting	1460	68 units	160,000				
	Range Hoods/Kitchen	1460	68 units	300,000				
	Plumbing & Heating	1460	68 units	760,000				
	Electrical	1460	68 units	670,000				
Signature of Executive Director and Date				Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Programs				
X				X				

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement

form HUD-52837 (10/96)

2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

ref. Handbook 7485.3

CAL-4XX	<b>Authority Wide Administrative Costs</b>	1410		#####				
	Mod. Director							
	Asst. Director Const.							
	Asst. Director Plan/Sup.							
	Project Manager (9)							
	Administrative Analyst							
	Environmental Coord.							
	Contract Admin.							
	Res. Dev. Program Coord.							
	Data Program Analyst							
	Admin. Assistant (3)							
	Secretary (1)							
	Management Clerk (5)							

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP) Part II: Sand Urban Development**

77-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Office of Public and Indian Affairs **Capital Fund 501-C**

Development Number/Name HA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Devel. Account Number	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Proposed Work (2)
				Original	Revised (1)	Funds Obligated (2)	Funds Expended (2)	
	<b>Allocation of Direct Costs for the following support/Admin. Depts. (Based on time-alloc:</b>	1410						
	Executive General Services Planning Finance/Budget Human Resources MIS							
	<b>B. Fringe Benefits</b>	1410		<b>606,980</b>				
	<b>C. Other Eligible Admin</b>	1410		<b>354,071</b>				
	Costs: long-term lease of office space, publications, travel, printing, advertising, sundry							
Signature of Executive Director and Date X				Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Program X				
1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement				form HUD-52837 (10/96)				
2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.				ref. Handbook 7485.3				
CAL-4X	<b>Authority Wide</b> Planning for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) approaches. Initial sites: Nickerson Gardens, Imperial Cts, Jordan Downs, Independent Sq. Additional planning for Comp Mod sites, scattered sites, senior sites, plan review.	1430		<b>100,000</b>				
CAL-4X	<b>Authority Wide A/E Fund</b>	1430		<b>457,658</b>				
CAL-4X	<b>Authority Wide CGP Planning Costs</b>	1430		<b>50,000</b>				
CAL-4X	<b>Authority Wide Inspection Costs</b>	1431		<b>425,000</b>				
CAL-4X	<b>Authority Wide Relocation Fund</b>	1495		<b>#####</b>				

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP) Part II: Sand Urban Development**

77-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Office of Public and Indian Affairs  
**Capital Fund 501-C**

Development Number/Name HA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Devel. Account Number	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Proposed Work (2)
				Original	Revised (1)	Funds Obligated (2)	Funds Expended (2)	
CAL-4X	<b>Authority Wide Contin</b>	1502		#####				
CAL-4X	<b>Authority Wide Dwelling and Nondwelling Equipment Costs</b> Stoves, playground equipment, computer learning centers, maintenance vehicles and construction equipment	1475		#####				

Signature of Executive Director and Date  
X

Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Program  
X

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement  
2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

form HUD-52837 (10/96)  
ref. Handbook 7485.3

CAL-4X	<b>Authority Wide - Management Improvements</b>	<b>1408</b>		#####				
	<b>a. Resident Relations Coordination of services and programs</b>	1408						
	1. Assist. Director			45,081				
	2. Special Program Coord. (2)			50,000				
	3. Budget Analyst			30,000				
	4. Management Clerk			30,000				
	5. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other			150,000				
	6. Revolving Loan Fund			80,000				
	7. Computer Learning Center			120,000				
	8. Res. Economic Development			150,000				
	9. Child Care			80,000				
	<b>b. Resident Patrol</b>	1408						
	1. Resident Patrol Supervisor			30,000				
	2. Resident Patrol (18 half time)			90,000				
	3. Overhead: Training/Other			20,000				
	<b>c. Resident Leadership</b>	1408						
	1. Resident Leadership Manager Salary			40,000				
	2. Clerk Typist			20,000				
	3. Overhead: Training/Other			18,000				
	4. Resident Elections			35,000				
	5. Res. Community Training Prog.			80,000				
	6. RAC Development Program			50,000				

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
 Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP) Part II: Sand Urban Development**

77-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Office of Public and Indian Affairs **Capital Fund 501-C**

Development Number/Name HA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Devel. Account Number	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Proposed Work (2)
				Original	Revised (1)	Funds Obligated (1)	Funds Expended (2)	
	7. Tenant Opportunity Program			80,000				
	8. Loyola After School Program			30,000				
Signature of Executive Director and Date X				Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Program X				

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement form HUD-52837 (10/96)  
 2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report. ref. Handbook 7485.3

<b>d. Resident Community Liaison</b>	1408							
1. Resident Liaisons (7)				100,000				
2. Management Clerk				20,000				
3. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other				35,000				
<b>e. Senior Activities</b>	1408							
1. Resident Relations Coordinator				30,000				
2. Overhead				2,000				
3. Senior Activities				20,000				
<b>f. Youth Sports</b>	1408							
1. Overhead: Travel/Other				30,000				
2. 4H Program				160,000				
3. Resident Arts Program				20,000				
<b>g. HARAC</b>	1408							
1. HARAC Secretary				20,000				
2. Overhead: Training/Travel/Other				40,000				
<b>h. Funding for Resident Newspaper</b>	1408							
				150,000				
<b>i. Employee Training &amp; Professional Development to Increase capacity to manage &amp; to sustain long-term viability of mod. work &amp; to address identified mgmt. Needs</b>	1408							
1. Housing Authority-wide employee training (related to conventional housing program)				350,000				
Signature of Executive Director and Date X				Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Program X				

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement form HUD-52837 (10/96)

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP) Part II: Sand Urban Development**

77-0157 (Exp. 7/31/98)

Office of Public and Indian Affairs  
**Capital Fund 501-c**

Development Number/Narrative	General Description of Major Work Categories	Devel. Account Number	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Proposed Work (2)
				Original	Revised (1)	Funds Obligated (2)	Funds Expended (2)	
	2. Safety Training			60,000				
	3. Training for HAPD			50,000				
	4. Training for Mod.			40,000				
	<b>j. Resident Training Opportunities</b>	1408		174,000				
	<b>Grand Fund Total</b>			<b>#####</b>				
Signature of Executive Director and Date				Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Program				
X				X				

2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

ref. Handbook 7485.3

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement

form HUD-52837 (10/96)

2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

ref. Handbook 7485.3

**Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**  
**Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP) and Urban Development**  
**Part III: Implementation Schedule** Office of Public and Indian Affairs **Capital Fund 501-00**

Development Number/Name HA-Wide Activities	Funds Obligated (Quarter Ending Date)			Funds Expended (Quarter Ending Date)			Reasons for Revised Target Dates (2)
	Original	Revised (1)	Actual (2)	Original	Revised (1)	Actual (2)	
CAL 4-03 Pueblo del Rio	#####			#####			
CAL 4-06 William Mead	#####			#####			
CAL 4-08 Rose Hills	#####			#####			
CAL 4-13 Nickerson Gardens	#####			#####			
CAL 4-15 Pueblo Extension	#####			#####			
CAL 4-20 Estrada Courts Ext.	#####			#####			
CAL 4-22 San Fernando Gardens	#####			#####			
Signature of Executive Director and Date				Signature of Public Housing Director/Office of Native American Programs Administrator and Date			

1) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation or a Revised Annual Statement  
 2) To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

form HUD-52837 (10/96)  
 ref. Handbook 7485.3

# Public Housing Drug Elimination Program Plan

**Note: THIS PHDEP Plan template (HUD 50075-PHDEP Plan) is to be completed in accordance with Instructions located in applicable PIH Notices.**

**Annual PHDEP Plan Table of Contents:**

- 1. General Information/History**
- 2. PHDEP Plan Goals/Budget**
- 3. Milestones**
- 4. Certifications**

**Section 1: General Information/History**

- A. Amount of PHDEP Grant \$1,845,960.**
- B. Eligibility type (Indicate with an “x”) N1\_\_\_\_\_ N2\_\_\_\_\_ R X\_\_\_\_\_**
- C. FFY in which funding is requested 2000**
- D. Executive Summary of Annual PHDEP Plan**

In the space below, provide a brief overview of the PHDEP Plan, including highlights of major initiatives or activities undertaken. It may include a description of the expected outcomes. The summary must not be more than five (5) sentences long

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles will provide law enforcement personnel, resident security programs and social/human service programs in collaboration with community service providers, faith based organizations and public and private agencies in order to reduce crime and drug activity and their related problems in and around the targeted communities. Police Officers will be dedicated to specific communities to work with the residents to identify problems and target criminal activities. A Resident Safety Volunteer patrol has been established in four (4) developments, which will allow residents to take a proactive role in community safety. The social services component will provide, but is not limited to, drug counseling programs, support groups, drug prevention sports, education and youth leadership programs.

**E. Target Areas**

Complete the following table by indicating each PHDEP Target Area (development or site where activities will be conducted), the total number of units in each PHDEP Target Area, and the total number of individuals expected to participate in PHDEP sponsored activities in each Target Area

<b>PHDEP Target Areas (Name of development(s) or site)</b>	<b>Total # of Units within the PHDEP Target Area(s)</b>	<b>Total Population to be Served within the PHDEP Target Area(s)</b>
Imperial Courts	479	1512
Dana Strand Village	384	1275
Jordan Downs	691	2278
Mar Vista Gardens	595	2232
Nickerson Gardens	1056	3421
Pueblo del Rio	659	2167
Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension	236	787
San Fernando Gardens	446	1712

**F. Duration of Program**

Indicate the duration (number of months funds will be required) of the PHDEP Program proposed under this Plan (place an “x” to indicate the of program by # of months. For “Other”, identify the # of months).

**6 Months** \_\_\_\_\_ **12 Months** \_\_\_\_\_ **18 Months** \_\_\_\_\_ **24 Months** **X** **Other** \_\_\_\_\_

**G. PHDEP Program History**

Indicate each FY that funding has been received under the PHDEP Program (place an “x” by each applicable Year) and provide amount of funding received. If previously funded program has not been closed out at the time of this submission, indicate the fund balance and anticipated completion date. For grant extensions received, place “GE” in column or “W” for waivers.

Fiscal Year of Funding	PHDEP Funding Received	Grant #	Fund Balance as of Date of this Submission	Grant Extensions or Waivers	Anticipated Completion Date
FY 1995	\$2,180,500.	CA16DEP0040195	0.00		
FY 1996	\$2,190,500.	CA16DEP0040196	0.00		
FY 1997	\$2,199,600.	CA16DEP0040197	0.00		
FY1998	\$2,129,140.	CA16DEP0040198	\$691,898.	None	09/30/00
FY 1999	\$1,845,960.	CA16DEP0040199	\$1,843,501.	None	08/31/01

**Section 2: PHDEP Plan Goals and Budget**

**A. PHDEP Plan Summary**

In the space below, summarize the PHDEP strategy to address the needs of the target population/target area(s). Your summary should briefly identify: the broad goals and objectives, the role of plan and your system or process for monitoring and evaluating PHDEP-funded activities. This summary should not exceed 5-10 sentences.

The primary objective of HACLA’s Drug Elimination program is educating and enabling our youth to reject illegal drugs. The ultimate goal is twofold: 1) Reduce crime and gang activity in the community by increasing resident awareness of drug/criminal activity while reducing the tolerance for these activities. Improved communication and reporting methods are expected to result in 10% increase of residents reporting crime that occurs in the community. Increased reporting of crimes will result in at least a 5% increase in arrests related to drug and criminal activity. This will result in a subsequent decrease in crimes committed in the community. 2) Assist 5 to 10% of the targeted population in joining the mainstream of society by making them aware of the available educational, cultural, recreational and health resources available and by providing them with the interpersonal, technological and job skills required to function as a productive member of the communities of the 21st century. The impact of the law enforcement component will be measured by compiling statistical crime data throughout the term of the grant. The success of the human services component will be measured by a survey of the targeted population.

## B. PHDEP Budget Summary

Enter the total amount of PHDEP funding allocated to each line item.

FY 2000 PHDEP Budget Summary	
Budget Line Item	Total Funding
9110 - Reimbursement of Law Enforcement	\$784,566.
9120 - Security Personnel	
9130 - Employment of Investigators	
9140 - Voluntary Tenant Patrol	69,500.
9150 - Physical Improvements	
9160 - Drug Prevention	365,816.
9170 - Drug Intervention	365,815.
9180 - Drug Treatment	164,699.
9190 - Other Program Costs	95,564.
<b>TOTAL PHDEP FUNDING</b>	<b>\$1,845,960.</b>

## C. PHDEP Plan Goals and Activities

In the tables below, provide information on the PHDEP strategy summarized above by budget line item. Each goal and objective should be listed sequentially for each budget line item (where applicable). Use as many rows as necessary to list proposed activities (additional rows may be added in the tables). PHAs are not required to provide information in shaded boxes. Information provided must be concise—not to exceed two sentences per any column. Tables for line items in which the PHA has no planned goals or activities may be deleted.

9110 - Reimbursement of Law Enforcement					Total PHDEP Funding: \$784,566.		
Goal(s)	1) Community Resource Officers (CROs) will attend resident meeting to increase communication between the residents and the CROs to provide feedback programs. 2) Conduct truancy sweeps of the four designated law enforcement developments and refer violators to Truancy Abatement Programs for counseling and monitoring.						
Objectives	1) Provide service-oriented policing which combines community-based policing with linkage to other community, city and law enforcement services. 2) To reduce school absenteeism, vandalism and other crimes committed by youth and encourage them to continue/complete their education.						
Proposed Activities	# of Persons Served	Target Population	Start Date	Expected Complete Date	PHDEP Funding	Other Funding (Amount/Source)	Performance Indicators
1. CROs law enforcement			01/01	12/02	725,113		Crime analysis reports
2. Youth Opportunities Counselor			01/01	12/02	52,653		Number of youth referred to programs
3. Community Safety events			01/01	12/02	6,800		Resident participation

9140 - Voluntary Tenant Patrol					Total PHDEP Funding: \$69,500.		
Goal(s)	Encourage residents to play an active role in the coordination and implementation of a comprehensive safety security program.						
Objectives	Reduce crime, gang and drug related activities in the community						
Proposed Activities	# of Persons Served	Target Population	Start Date	Expected Complete Date	PHDEP Funding	Other Funding (Amount /Source)	Performance Indicators
1. Conduct Health and Safety fairs	6461	Residents of Mar Vista Gardens, Pueblo del Rio, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension and Dana Strand Village	05/01	09/02	23,167		Resident participation
2. Maintain Volunteer Tenant Patrols for Safe passage to and from school	6,461	Elementary school youth at Mar Vista Gardens, Pueblo del Rio, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension and Dana Strand Village	01/01	12/02	23,167		Tenant patrol Incident reports
3. Resident Safety volunteer to note and report incidents (vandalism, health and safety problems)	6461	Residents of Mar Vista Gardens, Pueblo del Rio, Pico Gardens/Aliso Extension and Dana Strand Village	01/01	12/02	23,166		Tenant patrol Incident reports

<b>9160 - Drug Prevention</b>					<b>Total PHDEP Funding: \$365,816.</b>		
Goal(s)	Reduce crime and drug related activities in the targeted communities by increasing resident awareness of the adverse impact on the community while reducing tolerance of the activities.						
Objectives	Educating and enabling residents to reject illegal drugs and improving the quality of life in the public housing developments.						
Proposed Activities	# of Persons Served	Target Population	Start Date	Expected Complete Date	PHDEP Funding	Other Funding (Amount /Source)	Performance Indicators
1. Computer learning center will train residents in developing computer skills and assist with additional educational needs.	775	Residents from age 7 through adult	01/01	12/02	59,623		20% of youth who complete the program will advance their reading skills by two grade levels
2. Publish electronic magazine at each computer center	45	Residents from age 14 through 24	03/01	07/01	9,937		Participants will have developed publishing and layout skills leading to submission of articles and graphic arts
3. Provide Literacy and ESL programs	60	Youth and adults	01/01	12/02	31,832		25 % of participants will read at third grade or better
4. Award Scholarships	20	Youth and adults	04/01	07/01	5,000		20 residents will be awarded scholarships
5. Maintain Junior Trooper activities	120	Youth ages 7 through 13	01/01	12/02	31,832		Increase awareness of adverse affects of drug use/abuse
6. Conduct drug education classes/workshops	145	Residents from age 13 through adult	01/01	12/02	31,832		Increase awareness of impact of drug use/abuse on the community and decrease tolerance of drug use in the community
7. Continue parenting classes	148	Parents, Guardians and Grandparents	01/01	12/02	31,832		Participants will develop better coping, parenting and life skills
8. Maintain job club and school to career programs	90	Resident youth ages 14 thru 21	01/01	12/02	31,832		Either improved grades or obtain employment
9. Continue youth council and youth service academy	68	Resident youth ages 13 through 24	01/01	12/02	31,832		Participants will become mentors for other youth and become involve in community issues
10. Conduct teen pregnancy/HIV awareness workshops	95	Resident youth ages 13 through 24	01/01	12/02	31,834		Reduction of at-risk behavior by participants
11. Expand Youth Sports program	500	Resident youth ages 14 through 21	01/01	12/02	48,430		Decrease in at-risk behaviors and an increase in academic performance
12. Conduct job, health and educational fairs	15384	All resident at targeted development	08/01	11/02	20,000		Resident will have attended and obtained health, education and employment referrals
<b>9170 - Drug Intervention</b>					<b>Total PHDEP Funding: \$365,815.</b>		

Goal(s)	Provide at-risk youth and adults with the objective skills and opportunity to pursue productive healthy lifestyle as an alternative to gang/crime activity and drug use.						
Objectives	Empower youth and adults to take control over their lives and provide a forum for positive support through recreational cultural and educational activities.						
Proposed Activities	# of Persons Served	Target Population	Start Date	Expected Complete Date	PHEDEP Funding	Other Funding (Amount /Source)	Performance Indicators
1. Computer learning center will train residents in developing computer skills and assist with additional educational needs.	775	Residents from age 7 through adult	01/01	12/02	59,623		20% of youth who complete the program will advance their reading skills by two grade levels
2. Publish electronic magazine at each computer center	45	Residents from age 14 through 24	03/01	07/01	9,937		Participants will have developed publishing and layout skills leading to submission of articles and graphic arts
3. Provide Literacy and ESL programs	60	Youth and adults	01/01	12/02	31,832		25 % of participants will read at third grade of better
4. Award Scholarships	20	Youth and adults	04/01	07/01	5,000		20 residents will be awarded scholarships
5. Maintain Junior Trooper activities	120	Youth ages 7 through 13	01/01	12/02	31,832		Increase awareness of adverse affects of drug use/abuse
6. Conduct drug education classes/workshops	145	Residents from age 13 through adult	01/01	12/02	31,832		Increase awareness of impact of drug use/abuse on the community and decrease tolerance of drug use in the community
7. Continue parenting classes	148	Parents, Guardians and Grandparents	01/01	12/02	31,832		Participants will develop better coping, parenting and life skills
8. Maintain job club and school to career programs	90	Resident youth ages 14 thru 21	01/01	12/02	31,832		Either improved grades or obtain employment
9. Continue youth council and youth service academy	68	Resident youth ages 13 through 24	01/01	12/02	31,832		Participants will become mentors for other youth and become involve in community issues
10. Conduct teen pregnancy/HIV awareness workshops	95	Resident youth ages 13 through 24	01/01	12/02	31,833		Reduction of at-risk behavior by participants
11. Expand Youth Sports program	500	Resident youth ages 14 through 21	01/01	12/02	48,430		Decrease in at-risk behaviors and an increase in academic performance
12. Conduct job, health and educational fairs	15384	All resident at targeted development	08/01	11/02	20,000		Resident will have attended and obtained health, education and employment referrals
<b>9180 - Drug Treatment</b>					<b>Total PHEDEP Funding: \$164,699.</b>		
Goal(s)	Reduce drug use/abuse within the targeted developments						
Objectives	Provide drug education, counseling and treatment referrals for abusers, affected family members and co-offenders						
Proposed Activities	# of	Target	Start	Expected	PHEDEP	Other	Performance Indicators

	Persons Served	Population	Date	Complete Date	Funding	Funding (Amount /Source)	
1. Provide referrals and support services to drug users and affected family members	300	All affected residents	01/01	12/02	82,350		Drug uses and affected family members receive appropriate referral services
2. Continue drug treatment counseling services	88	All affected residents	01/01	12/02	82,349		Drug uses and affected family members will receive appropriate service

<b>9190 - Other Program Costs</b>						<b>Total PHDEP Funds: \$95,564.</b>	
Goal(s)							
Objectives							
Proposed Activities	# of Persons Served	Target Population	Start Date	Expected Complete Date	PHDEP Funding	Other Funding (Amount /Source)	Performance Indicators
1. Program Manager			01/01	12/02	95,564		Monitor programs and performance indicators

### **Section 3: Expenditure/Obligation Milestones**

Indicate by Budget Line Item and the Proposed Activity (based on the information contained in Section 2 PHDEP Plan Budget and Goals), the funds that will be expended (at least 25% of the total grant award) and obligated (at least 50% of the total grant award) within 12 months of grant execution.

<b>Budget Line Item #</b>	<b>25% Expenditure of Total Grant Funds By Activity #</b>	<b>Total PHDEP Funding Expended (sum of the activities)</b>	<b>50% Obligation of Total Grant Funds by Activity #</b>	<b>Total PHDEP Funding Obligated (sum of the activities)</b>
<i>e.g Budget Line Item # 9120</i>	<i>Activities 1, 3</i>		<i>Activity 2</i>	
9110	Activities 1 - 3		Activities 1 - 3	
9120				
9130				
9140	Activities 1 - 3		Activities 1 - 3	
9150				
9160	Activities 1 - 12		Activities 1 - 12	
9170	Activities 1 - 12		Activities 1 - 12	
9180	Activities 1 - 2		Activities 1 - 2	
9190	Activities 1		Activities 1	
<b>TOTAL</b>		\$		\$

### **Section 4: Certifications**

A comprehensive certification of compliance with respect to the PHDEP Plan submission is included in the “PHA Certifications of Compliance with the PHA Plan and Related Regulations.”

## **Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles**

### PHDEP Outreach 2000 - RAB and Public Comments

**Comment:** How is the PHDEP program measured and/or evaluated.

**Comment:** How do you plan to deal with the massive cuts proposed by HUD as a result of the formula system and not the competitive system?

**Comment:** PHDEP should include training and education that tells youth how to be a "good citizen" and what are the consequences of their behavior.

**Comment:** Why can't Independent Square be written into the budget for 2000 to get PHDEP funds?

**Comment:** What is the system you use to decide which developments get PHDEP resources and which do not.

**Comment:** What programs are funded by PHDEP.

**Comment:** Meetings at the developments are useless. Residents won't come because of gangs and if they come they are afraid to speak their minds out of fear of retaliation.

**Comment:** Hacienda Village has never gotten PHDEP funds. Nickerson gets them, Jordan gets them and Hacienda is right in the middle of those two and has a crime and drug problem yet it gets no funds.

**SUMMARY OF GENERAL ISSUES  
RAISED BY RESIDENTS, LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND OTHERS  
AND  
ADDRESSES OF RESIDENTS INCLUDED IN THE CF PLANNING PROCESS**

**CONTENTS**

- 1. Master schedule of CF Community Meetings and Public Hearing**
- 2. Public Hearing Report (including summary of public testimony)**
- 3. List of Resident Leaders included in CF Planning Process**
- 4. Public Hearing Notice published in ten newspapers serving the Los Angeles area**
- 5. Example of letter sent to Local Government Officials soliciting participation in the CF planning process**

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CAPITAL FUND  
PUBLIC HEARING REPORT**

**Date of Hearing:** Saturday, May 13, 2000  
**Time:** 10:00 am  
**Location:** Housing Authority Main Office  
2600 Wilshire Blvd.  
5th Floor, Board Room  
Los Angeles, CA 90057

**Public Hearing Notices were published in the following newspapers on the dates indicated (proof of publication available upon request):**

- |                       |                                |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Los Angeles Times  | April 30, 2000 and May 7, 2000 |
| 2. La Opinion         | May 1, 2000 and May 8, 2000    |
| 3. Sentinel           | April 27, 2000 and May 4, 2000 |
| 4. LA Daily News      | May 1, 2000 and May 8, 2000    |
| 5. Daily Journal      | May 1, 2000 and May 8, 2000    |
| 6. Eastside Journal   | April 26, 2000 and May 3, 2000 |
| 7. Korean Times       | May 1, 2000 and May 8, 2000    |
| 8. Rafu Shimpo        | May 1, 2000 and May 8, 2000    |
| 9. Chinese Daily News | May 1, 2000 and May 8, 2000    |
| 10. Philippine News   | April 26, 2000 and May 3, 2000 |

**Public Hearing Notices were posted or otherwise made available as follows:**

1. 2600 Wilshire Blvd. (posted)
2. Housing Community Management Offices (posted)
3. Verbal invitation during Advanced Resident Meetings at the large family public housing communities and Conventional Senior Sites
4. Public Hearing date was also provided to residents on notices for resident meetings conducted at each community
5. Written letters to the city Mayor and all Council Members

**Public Hearing Data:**

Number of persons attending: 23  
Number of persons testifying: 7

**Public Hearing Minutes Summary:**

The public hearing was called to order at the above location. The hearing was conducted by **William J. Davis**, Grant Administrator. **Mr. Davis** welcomed all present, thanked residents for appearing, and introduced and thanked Housing Authority (HA) staff present, who were: **Jorge Rosales**, Director of Design and Construction Services; **Claudia Moore**, Resident Community Liaison Coordinator; **Andres Manriquez**, Assistant Director of Housing Management; and **Dianne Wright**, Administrative Analyst for the Executive Department. **Mr. Davis** reviewed Hearing procedures, inviting residents to speak and to fill out request to speak forms in order to do so. He said that residents' comments, questions, and suggestions would be included in the public record and also in the HA submission to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). He introduced **Jorge Rosales** again, who thanked residents for appearing on behalf of HA Executive Director **Don Smith**. Mr. Rosales also asked residents' to share their concerns and suggestions today, and promised that the HA would try to respond to every comment.

**Mr. Davis** then pointed out that he would not go over in detail the same presentation everyone had already experienced at each development, but he asked folks to refer to the printed materials handed out at the door today, which included: a printout of the slide presentation used at developments describing the history and scope of the Capital Fund Program; a very important pamphlet in English and Spanish describing in detail the risks of lead based paint exposure as well as protections against exposure; a financial report detailing all uses of Capital Grant Funds for FY2000 (previously called the "Comprehensive Grant Program"); and a collection of reports, in alphabetical order, of Capital Improvement tasks of the past, present, and future. [These materials are included herein as an attachment.] **Mr. Davis** explained the difference between capital improvements and maintenance activities, and then outlined the progress of lead based paint abatement work at the Pueblo del Rio and San Fernando Gardens developments, where LBP work has made significant progress. Commenting on the Capital Grant Program (CGP) timeline, **Mr. Davis** explained that this year HA is catching up the CGP to its Agency Plan activities, meaning the Agency Plan Hearing upcoming this summer will include a CGP component to plan for the year 2001. He invited those present to return for that hearing as well to express their capital-related-ideas and concerns.

The first speaker, **Maria Aguilar** from Estrada Courts, testified that she would like the printed materials to be presented in Spanish as well as English to facilitate increase understanding of them.

**Rosa Fausto**, also from Estrada Courts, made a similar suggestion. **Mr. Davis** responded that, in the CGP meetings at each development, HA staff reads aloud from the English-only handouts so that the material can get translated for the comprehension of those present; however he pledged to provide Spanish language versions of the handouts next year, in 2001.

The third speaker, **Sandra Obando** from San Fernando Gardens, spoke to the issue of air conditioning (a/c) at that development. She handed to staff 21 comment cards that she said also addressed this issue [the comments on those cards can be found translated and attached herein.] Ms. Obando reminded HA representatives that the summer climate in the San Fernando Valley is appreciably hotter than other Los Angeles area communities. **Mr. Rosales** reported in response that his analysis of the issue revealed a number of technical problems surrounding the installation of a/c units, however he said that HA will be doing the improvement work needed to provide residents with the right openings under downstairs windows in which to install a/c units. He warned that his research suggested that energy expenses will rise significantly for those residents using a/c, depending on the length of operation. He put the HA cost for making the change at \$700 per residence, and the a/c purchase cost for residents at about \$450 per unit.

The fourth speaker, **Miss Butler** from Independent Square, reported that some residents at that development have similar heat problems during the summer. She thanked HA for providing room fans for the warmer units last year, but requested that HA look into the possibility of providing a/c for some units at Independent Square, as well. Miss Butler also reported a noise problem with an oil well operation located across the street from the development. She said there was some improvement after residents complained to the Police Department and to Councilman Holden, but that still the noise is a problem at night. She hopes there is something HA can do to help. **Mr. Davis** responded that he hadn't heard about this till today, that he would look into it and the a/c questions, and he thanked Miss Butler for reporting the problem today.

**Ms. Obando** returned to the speaker's microphone and testified that some residents at San Fernando Gardens (SFG) are concerned about the sites trash barrels, which are sometimes messy and smelly, giving the development an unsightly appearance. She also said that some of the recently modified units have leaks in the roof. **Andres Manriquez** explained that HA has researched different trash bin options with the City, but that none of the options were adequate to suit the needs. For this reason he urged residents to inform Management staff as soon as possible whenever the trash bins are not kept clean and covered. Regarding roof leaks he reported that funds for roof replacements on two SFG buildings have been approved and this work will commence soon. **Mr. Davis** explained that HA is examining roofs at all developments and will repair and/or replace them as needed.

The fifth speaker, **Sandra Moreen** from Avalon Gardens, expressed her thanks to HA for building a new Art Center for youth at that site, as well as for commencing disabled access work and resurfacing the basketball court. She said she appreciated HA keeping its promises and wished all present a happy Mother's Day.

**Ms. Hernandez** from Pico Aliso, the sixth speaker, said a/c would be nice, but specifically requested screen doors at that site so residents can utilize cross breezes in the summer while still maintaining the security of leaving the front door closed. She also invited HA staff to

come see some small problems with torn pipes, and she said as well that Pico Aliso Extension is in need of new trash bins. **Mr. Manriquez** reported that HA will start a screen door pilot project to see how that works, and said someone will respond to the trash and pipe problems as soon as possible. He asked residents to report maintenance problems to management staff as soon as they can to get a swift response from maintenance staff. **Mr. Davis** said HA will look into a/c for that development, and agreed that the development's design can produce effective cooling through cross ventilation.

The seventh speaker, **Lucia Lopez** from Dana Strand Village, reported that some units at that site continue to have problems with the plumbing, which often clogs. **Mr. Rosales** explained that Dana Strand, built in 1941, is almost 60 years old, and is severely distressed and obsolete. For this reason, HUD will not allow capital improvements, and instead we must demolish and rebuild. We are pursuing a Hope VI grant and we think we have a good chance of succeeding this year. Our proposal is due this week, May 18<sup>th</sup>. We will let you know as soon as we find out. **Mr. Davis** added that HA would never allow residents to live in unsafe or unhealthy conditions, and will find the funds to do emergency work whenever that is needed. In fact, last year emergency electrical and plumbing repairs were made at Dana Strand.

### **Addendum: Capital Fund Outreach 2000 RAB Comments** **(6/8/2000) RAB Meeting**

**Comment:** Air conditioning is badly needed at San Fernando Gardens

**Comment:** The window bars at San Fernando Gardens need to be modified so residents can install their own air conditioning units.

**Comment:** The safety screen doors at Nickerson Gardens need to be examined

**Comment:** The HA should put residents through a good housekeeping orientation before they move in.

**Comment:** My kitchen at Nickerson needs to be remodeled.

**Comment:** The sewer system at Avalon needs to be looked at.

**Comment:** The security screen doors at Dana Strand need to be looked at.

**Comment:** The security screen doors at San Fernando Gardens need to be looked at. Many have been removed. Residents cannot keep the door open when it is very hot as there is no security and residents do not have air conditioners.

