



STEPPING BEYOND EXPECTATIONS



Oakland Housing  
Authority

# MAKING TRANSITIONS WORK

**ANNUAL REPORT • FY 2017**

(July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017)

**Submitted September 30, 2017  
Revised January 22, 2019  
(DRAFT)**

# **Oakland Housing Authority**

## **Fiscal Year 2017 MTW Annual Report**

### **Board of Commissioners**

Gregory D. Hartwig, Chair  
Marlene C. Hurd, Vice Chair  
Janny Castillo  
Anne E. Griffith  
Lynette Jung Lee  
Donna Griggs-Murphy  
Barbara Montgomery

Eric Johnson, Executive Director

### **Senior Staff:**

Andres Manriquez, Chief Operating Officer  
Phil Neville, Deputy Executive Director, Real Estate Development  
Patricia Wells, Deputy Executive Director  
Tracy Stabler, Chief Financial Officer  
William Bailey, Director, Capital Improvements  
Carel Duplessis, Director, Police Services  
Lenita Wheeler, Director, Family and Community Partnerships  
LeeAnn Farner, Director, California Affordable Housing Initiatives  
Michelle Hasan, Director, Leased Housing  
Dominica Henderson, Director, Planning, Implementation, and Compliance  
Anna Kaydanovskaya, Director, Asset Management  
Drew Felder, Director, Human Resources  
Ashour Bebla, Director, Information Technology  
Mark Schiferl, Director, Property Management

Prepared by:  
Julie Christiansen

With additional contributions from Teela Carpenter, Bridget Galka, Joetta Farrow, Doug Lee, Kit Liang, Darryl Moore, Greer McVay, Michael Pope, Ron Scarborough, Donna Whitmore, Valerie Winston-Moore, Jamie Manalang, Kim Doppe and Jonathan Young.

1619 Harrison Street  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(510) 874-1500  
[www.oakha.org](http://www.oakha.org)

**Oakland Housing Authority**  
**Fiscal Year 2017 MTW Annual Report**

**Table of Contents**

Section I. Introduction.....	1
Section II. General Housing Authority Operating Information.....	5
Table 1: New HCV that were Project-Based .....	6
Table 2: Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred .....	10
Table 3: General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures.....	12
Table 4: Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by PHA at FYE .....	13
Table 5: Actual Number of Households Served at FYE .....	15
Table 6: Reporting Compliance with Statutory Requirements: 75% Families .....	17
Table 7: Reporting Compliance with Statutory Requirements: Comparable Mix.....	18
Table 8: Description of Issues Related to Leasing.....	22
Table 9: Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency .....	23
Table 10: Wait List Information at FYE .....	24
Section III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested.....	25
Section IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted.....	26
Table 11: Approved MTW Activities .....	26
Table 12: Implemented Activities .....	30
Activity #17-01 Outcomes .....	32
Activity #17-02 Outcomes .....	34
Activity #15-01 Outcomes .....	36
Activity #15-02 Outcomes .....	39
Activity #14-01 Outcomes .....	42
Activity #12-01 Outcomes .....	47
Table 13: Number of PBV Units Awarded above 25% Cap.....	49
Activity #11-01 Outcomes .....	51
Activity #11-03 Outcomes .....	54
Activity #11-05 Outcomes .....	57
Activity #10-01 Outcomes .....	62
Activity #10-02 Outcomes .....	63
Activity #10-03 Outcomes .....	65

Activity #10-05 Outcomes .....	66
Activity #10-06 Outcomes .....	68
Activity #08-01 Outcomes .....	72
Activity #06-01 Outcomes .....	74
Activity #06-02 Outcomes .....	75
Activity #06-03 Outcomes .....	76
Table 14: Approved MTW Activities Not Yet Implemented .....	78
Activity #13-01 .....	78
Activity #11-02 .....	79
Table 15: Approved MTW Activities on Hold .....	80
Activity #10-04 .....	80
Activity #10-07 .....	81
Activity #10-08 .....	81
Activity #10-09 .....	81
Activity #09-01 .....	82
Section V. Sources and Uses of Funding .....	83
Table 16: Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding .....	86
Table 17: Local Asset Management Plan .....	86
Table 18: Commitment of Unspent Funds .....	87
Section VI. Administrative .....	88
Appendices .....	90
Appendix A. Board Resolution .....	91
Appendix B. Project-Based Voucher Allocations .....	94
Appendix C. Overview of Other Housing .....	97
Appendix D. Affordable Housing Development Activities .....	98
Appendix E. MTW and Non MTW Housing Stock Inventory .....	99
Appendix F. Waitlist Demographic Information .....	101
Appendix G. Glossary of Acronyms .....	104

## **Section I. Introduction**

---

The Oakland Housing Authority (OHA), established in 1938 to assure the availability of quality housing for low-income persons, is pleased to release its Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Moving to Work Annual Report. As one of 39 participants in the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program, OHA has the opportunity to explore and test new and innovative methods of delivering housing and supportive services to low-income residents. As an MTW demonstration participant, OHA uses flexibility which waives certain provisions of the Housing Act of 1937 and HUD's subsequent regulations, as an opportunity to design its programs to address specific and local market conditions and the needs of our residents. OHA rebranded the program as "Making Transitions Work" to better describe the opportunities created for residents of all ages and stages in life, achieving goals of employment, education, housing stability and self-sufficiency while promoting and supporting strong communities and neighborhoods.

On March 31, 2004, HUD and OHA executed an MTW Demonstration Agreement governing the terms and conditions under which HUD authorized OHA to participate in MTW through March 30, 2011. On February 4, 2009, HUD and OHA executed an Amended and Restated MTW Agreement revising the terms and conditions of the agreement and extending OHA's participation in the MTW Demonstration Program through June 30, 2018. The FY 2016 Appropriations Act ("the Act"), Section 239 (Public Law 114-113), instructed HUD to extend the existing Agreements with current MTW agencies and expand the MTW demonstration program by an additional 100 high performing Public Housing Agencies over a period of seven years. The Act also stipulated that a Research Advisory Committee (RAC) be formed to advise the Secretary of HUD on specific policy proposals and methods of research and evaluation for the demonstration. In May 2016, OHA's Board of Commissioners approved a ten-year extension of the MTW Agreement with HUD, extending the contract through 2028 with the same terms and conditions as authorized by the Act and the MTW Agreement. This extension will allow OHA to continue its localized housing programs with innovations removing barriers to housing for the households served.

Per the Agreement, OHA must complete an MTW Annual Report highlighting specific information regarding the activities conducted during the fiscal year. OHA's MTW Annual Report provides HUD, OHA residents, and the public, information on OHA programs and the MTW budget, and an analysis of changes that occurred during the period between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017.

### **Overview of the Agency's Goals and Objectives for FY 2017**

Oakland continued to be in the top five most expensive real estate and rental markets in the country, causing low inventory for all renters, but impacting the low-income, disabled and other special needs populations especially hard. According to Zumper, rents increased 6.3 percent over the last year for one bedroom apartments, although rents in neighboring Bay Area cities declined slightly in December 2016. Additionally, Oakland

landlords increased their rents the most of all Bay Area owners by 5.4 percent in 2016. WalletHub ranks Oakland the 3<sup>rd</sup> “worst value for renters” city in the nation when considering factors like vacancy rate, rate of new housing construction and average square footage of apartments. OHA’s utilization numbers continued to decline in the Housing Choice Voucher program as families experienced an extremely competitive leasing environment with non-voucher holders. Neighboring jurisdictions continued absorbing residents opting to port out in search of more housing opportunities contributing to decreased utilization. In response, OHA led local collaboration through a second Rent Tsunami Summit in July 2016 of local Bay Area Housing Authorities and as a result the Bay Area agencies worked together to advocate on their behalf regarding HUD’s proposal for mandatory small area FMRs. The Bay Area was removed from the list of mandatory small FMR areas, allowing OHA greater flexibility to move forward to develop new strategies to respond to issues affecting voucher utilization.

In response to declining utilization, OHA began implementation and planning for two new activities that were approved in the FY 2017 Plan to provide incentives and extra supports to new and existing landlords. OHA issued RFQ #16-008 to invite qualified owners, property managers, and developers servicing the residents within the City of Oakland to submit proposals for the award of Project Based Voucher Rental Assistance for existing units. There are a total of 636 project based vouchers across 20 projects which received a conditional award through the Existing Project Based Voucher program.

OHA also issued RFQ #16-011 to solicit proposals from qualified owners, property managers, and developers in Oakland for securing operating subsidies to be attached to existing service enriched single-room occupancy (SRO) units, shared housing and transitional housing units set aside for veterans, emancipated youth, or other special needs populations. There are a total of 289 units which received an award through the MTW Local Housing Assistance Program.

Improved and streamlined, OHA’s public housing program had an occupancy rate of over 98% for the Fiscal Year.

Embracing our commitment to achieve excellence in all areas of the agency, the Government Finance Officers Association of the US and Canada (GFOA) awarded OHA the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting. This is the fourth consecutive year that OHA received this recognition, and we are one of only three housing authorities nationally that has won this designation. The Oakland Housing Authority Police Department (OHAPD) has been accredited for the seventh time by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), a highly prized recognition of law enforcement professional excellence. OHA also received NARHO’s National Award of Excellence for its AvéVista project’s design and integration into one of the least affordable multifamily





neighborhoods in the City of Oakland. This mixed-use building contains 68 units of affordable family rental housing and 3,400 square feet of ground-floor commercial space.

### **Preserving and Enhancing our Housing Portfolio**

OHA continued to use MTW authority to preserve its portfolio by extensively rehabbing its portfolio of Project Based and public housing units, including completing the architectural planning for a comprehensive rehabilitation of two large senior Public Housing sites in downtown Oakland.

### **Preserving and expanding affordable housing opportunities**

MTW authority allowed OHA to preserve affordable housing resources and expand housing opportunities as Oakland changes through aggressive real estate development. Expansion of affordable housing through our development activities continued to be a priority as Prosperity Place, a new 71-unit mixed use apartment building located on the edge of Oakland's historic Chinatown area, completed construction and was occupied by families. Our development project at 94<sup>th</sup> and International is nearing completion and will add 59 family units in the fall of 2017. Its prime location near the Oakland International Airport and the Coliseum Complex, make it an attractive location to begin this neighborhood's community revitalization, transforming the area into one of greater opportunity while preserving affordability.



New and diverse development projects in our pipeline include the affordable housing portion of the larger Brooklyn Basin, which will include up to 3,100 residential units (including our 465 new affordable rental units), 200,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space, approximately 32 acres of parks and public open space, two renovated marinas, representing \$1.5 billion in private investment capital; and Empyrean Towers, which will take a severely distressed privately owned SRO property and create 66 fully renovated affordable housing units in a historical building. OHA has always been a leader in facilitating Section 3 employment opportunities and continues to use real estate development projects as an opportunity to connect trained residents with employment opportunities and is capitalizing on the processes and partnerships developed through the West Oakland Jobs Plus initiative to continue these referrals and placements. These build from the ground up strategies combined with MTW and Jobs Plus employment training and OHA's education initiatives are working in combination to create better opportunities for OHA's families.

During FY 2017, OHA continued to pursue system alignment. "Systems Alignment" is a term for the need to align affordable housing policies and programs with those of other social systems to improve lifetime outcomes in the areas of health, education, and employment. OHA's new local non-traditional programs developed during FY2017 and

currently launching, seek to build on the platform of stable housing to integrate service delivery locally, and leverage scarce government and private resources more efficiently.

### **Promoting Resident Empowerment, Self-Sufficiency and Achievement**

OHA leverages MTW flexibility to enhance services provided both in-house and through subject matter expert partners to provide participants with services to support employment, education, health and wellness. OHA's efforts to improve attendance and combat chronic absenteeism have been recognized nationally as OHA was named by the Campaign for Grade-Level Reading on its 2015-2016 Honor Roll for exemplary work to boost children's literacy. OHA's Promise Plus initiative is a multi-year program in partnership with the Oakland Unified School District to foster parent engagement, student attendance and academic excellence. One of OHA student's won the 2017 Bollinger Scholarship, a prestigious national award from the Public Housing Authorities Director's Association (PHADA) as part of OHA's education initiative to support resident goals through higher education. The Jobs Plus West Oakland initiative is in its second year and OHA exceeded first year goals for enrollment. Resident participation and leadership programs continued to grow through the use of the Resident Leadership Center and various programs fostering support for both individuals and families to achieve goals spanning financial literacy and health and wellness. Building resident capacity is critical to OHA's vision, and OHA used MTW flexibility to provide a level of support beyond housing to enhance resident educational and employment outcomes.

### **MTW Statutory Objectives**

All MTW activities must meet at least one or more of the following statutory goals:

1. Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures;
2. Give incentives to families with children whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training, educational or other programs, that assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient; and
3. Increase housing choices for low-income families

Information and data collected on the progress OHA made toward implementing 18 of the 27 approved activities are included in Section IV.

The FY 2017 MTW Annual Plan and Report are available on OHA's website at [www.oakha.org](http://www.oakha.org).



## Section II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

---

### A. Housing Stock Information

#### 1) New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year

In FY2017, OHA committed 673 new PBV units, greater than the 300-500 vouchers anticipated in the FY 2017 MTW Annual Plan, primarily due to a larger than expected response to a Request For Qualifications (RFQ) issued during the year. OHA issued the RFQ to solicit proposals for the award of Project Based Voucher Rental Assistance for existing units. There are a total of 636 project based vouchers across 20 projects which received a conditional award through the Existing Project Based Voucher program. As of July 2017, twelve projects totaling 367 units have received approval from the City of Oakland for the Environmental Categorical Exclusion requirement. Seven projects have received conditional award letters and have one year to complete other requirements including all units meeting Housing Quality Standards prior to entering into a Housing Assistance Payment contract with OHA.



Five additional PBVs were awarded to new developments leased during FY2017. Construction delays on our 94<sup>th</sup> and International project caused a delay in utilizing 14 PBVs anticipated in the FY 2017 Annual Plan, however construction is now on schedule with completion anticipated in early FY2018. During the year, the Empyrean, a 99-unit severely distressed Single-room Occupancy hotel in downtown Oakland was awarded PBVs to convert it into 66 affordable studio and 1-bedroom apartments, with the rehabilitation to begin in the fall of 2017.



The Oakland Affordable Housing Preservation Initiatives (OAHPI) portfolio consists of 1,539 total allocated PBVs in small sites scattered throughout Oakland. At the end of this fiscal year, 579 disposition families remained on Tenant Protection Vouchers awarded in 2010, and 960 units had converted to PBV during FY 2017.

The total number of project-based vouchers in OHA's portfolio is 3,994, which is approximately 31% of the agency's MTW voucher allocation. A list of sites is included in Appendix B. Conditionally awarded PBVs are highlighted in orange in Table 1 below.

Table 1: New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year

Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project
Prosperity Place	35	35	The Prosperity Place project is the new construction of a 71-unit mixed use apartment building along with 3,700 square feet of ground floor commercial space. Eight (8) of the 71 apartments will be special needs Thirty-five (35) units will be supported with Project Based Vouchers (PBVs) including 5 one-bedroom units, 12 two-bedroom units and 18 three-bedroom units. The project site is located at the edge of the historic Oakland Chinatown neighborhood. The project design wraps an L-shaped building around an east-facing courtyard. This space provides the center of community life, with a patio deck, community room, offices and computer space. The central courtyard will have ample open space for residents along with a children's play area, visible from the centralized laundry room.
Rosa Parks Permanent Supportive Housing	11 units	11 units	The project, located at 521 West Grand Avenue, is a supportive transitional housing for homeless and low-income individuals. It is located downtown for easy access to services, amenities and public transportation. It includes 11 apartments and a congregated space for community activities. The 11 PBV subsidies will be attached to 2 studios, 7 one-bedrooms and 2 three-bedrooms. The owner and program manager, Building Opportunity for Self Sufficiency (BOSS) has more than 30 years of experience in supportive housing, and residents at Rosa Parks have access to comprehensive on-site services offered by BOSS.
Town Center at Acorn	50 units	50 units	ACORN, which is made up of two properties – Town Center and Courtyard at Acorn, was originally constructed in the 60s as part of the City's efforts to redevelop West Oakland, and had gone through extensive rehabilitation in late 90s by BRIDGE Housing. The project, being an integral part of the West Oakland redevelopment, is close to amenities and job centers. In addition, BRIDGE is offering on-site services programs targeting the current 225 residents who are under age 18, which include summer internships, recreation programs and computer learning at the site's computer learning center. Town Center at Acorn is Phase I & II of the redevelopment. Located at 1143 10th Street, Town Center at Acorn consists of 206 units serving low-income families. The 50 PBV subsidies will be attached to 4 studios, 10 one-bedrooms, 20 two-bedrooms, and 16 three-bedrooms.
Courtyards at Acorn	30 units	30 units	Courtyards at Acorn is Phase II of the Acorn redevelopment project. It is an 87-unit property located at 923 Adeline Street, serving low income families. The 30 PBV subsidies will be attached to 2 studios, 4 one-bedrooms, 12 two-bedrooms and 12 three-bedrooms.
Bishop Roy C. Nichols	17 units	17 units	The project, located at 1027 60th Street, is a 17-unit building, all one-bedroom units. It is a low-rise three-story building with an elevator, a community room and a laundry room built in 2003. The project is specifically set aside for low-income seniors aged 62 plus and with incomes at 45% AMI or less. The project owner, Christian Church Homes (CCH) has over 50 years of experience in developing and managing senior affordable housing. All 17 PBV subsidies will be attached to one-bedroom units.
Sylvester Rutledge Manor	64 units	64 units	The project, located at 3255 San Pablo Avenue, was built in 2002 for serving low-income seniors aged 55+. It is a low-rise development consisting of 64 one-bedroom units with full kitchens. All 64 PBV subsidies will be attached to one-bedroom units. The PBV subsidies will allow CCH to increase on-site supportive services for both Bishop Roy Nichols and Sylvester Rutledge Manor and lessen the rent burden for low-income seniors at both projects.

Hisman Hin-Nu Apartments	10 units	10 units	The project, located at 2555 International Blvd., was built in 1994. It is a 92-unit development serving low-income families. Townhomes of 3- and 4-bedrooms are located around the rear courtyards and smaller apartments of 1-2- and 3-bedrooms arranged as flats along corridors in a 4-story building. All 10 PBV subsidies will be attached to one-bedroom units only. The project is part of the owner's, EBALDC's, Fruitvale and Lower San Antonio Neighborhood redevelopment effort which also includes Oak Park Apartments and Seven Directions Apartments. The Fruitvale and Lower San Antonio neighborhood is known for high crimes. The three EBALDC projects help bring stability and improve the economic prosperity of the area by setting up amenities such as a Native American Health Center, a day care center and community serving commercial retail space.
Oak Park Apartments	10 units	10 units	The project, located at 2618 East 16th Street, serves low income families. It is formerly a motel converted and rehabilitated into 35 apartments serving extremely low-income families. The rehabilitation reduced the number of units at the complex to create larger units for families who had been living in over-crowded conditions. All 10 PBV subsidies will be attached to one-bedroom units.
Seven Directions Apartments	10 units	10 units	The project, located at 2946 International Blvd., is a 36-unit affordable housing development for low-income families. The first two floors of the building are being occupied by the Native American Health Center. 18 PBV occupant families were placed in the project when it was completed in 2008. The additional 10 PBV subsidies awarded under this recent RFQ will be attached to one-bedroom units.
San Pablo Hotel	31 units	31 units	The project, located at 1955 San Pablo Avenue, was built originally in 1907 as a commercial hotel, and then was rehabilitated in 1996 into affordable housing consisting of 111 SROs and 32 studios for low-income seniors aged 55+. Dedicated services staff is available at the site and the Center for Elder Independence is on the first floor of the building. All 31 PBV subsidies will be attached to studio units. The project, together with Swan Market Apartments, is the core of EBALDC's greater Downtown Oakland redevelopment effort.
Swans Market Apartments	10 units	10 units	The project, located at 918 Clay Street, serves low income special need individuals and families. It is a mixed-use historic preservation development of co-housing condos, affordable apartments, and retail and office spaces. It consists of 18 units, and the 10 PBV subsidies will be attached to one-bedroom units.
Ambassador Apartments	10 units	10 units	The project, located at 3610 Peralta Avenue, is a 69-unit affordable housing development for low-income families. The project is close to MacArthur BART station and other transit services, allowing residents access to a wide variety of amenities. The project owner, Resources for Community Development (RCD), offers on-site resident services to residents and dedicated resident services staff for the project. RCD has over 30 years of experience in providing affordable and supportive housing. The 10 PBV subsidies will be attached to 2 one-bedroom and 8 two-bedroom units.
Drachma LP Apartments	11 units	11 units	The project is a scattered site property of 19 apartments in old Victorian homes in West Oakland that serves low-income families. It consists of 8 buildings of 2 single-family homes, 3 duplexes, 2 triplexes, and 1 5-unit building. The project is close to transit, schools and grocery stores and health facilities. The 11 PBV subsidies will be attached to 1 studio, 2 one-bedrooms, 7 two-bedrooms and 1 three-bedroom. Resident services are not available on-site but residents have access to RCD's resident services programs.
Fox Court Apartments	13 units	13 units	The project, located at 555 19th Street, is a 4-story 80-unit development that serves low-income families. It is located close to Downtown Oakland and has easy access to daily amenities. Besides on-site resident services provided by RCD, there is also a child and family resources center at the site that operates a pre-school program. 20 PBV occupant families have been placed into the project when it was first completed in 2009. The additional 13 PBV subsidies will be attached to 5 studios, 4 one-bedrooms, 1 two-bedroom, and 3 three-bedrooms.
International Blvd. Apartments	18 units	18 units	The project, located at 6600 International Blvd. and 1406 Seminary Avenue, serves individuals and families with disabilities. It is an affordable 30-unit housing development that is within close proximity to public transit. The 18 PBV subsidies will be attached to 6 one-bedrooms, 9 two-bedrooms, and 3 three-bedrooms. Resident services are not available on-site but residents have access to RCD's resident services programs.

Northgate Apartments	14 units	14 units	The project, located at 2301 Northgate Avenue, serves low income families. It is a 5-story 41-unit building completed in 2003. Local schools, public transit, grocery stores, parks are all within half a mile of the property. Resident services are not available on-site but residents have access to RCD's resident services programs. The 14 PBV subsidies will be attached to 8 two-bedrooms and 6 three-bedrooms.
Stanley Avenue Apartments	13 units	13 units	The project, located at 6000 and 6006 International Blvd., serves low-income individuals and families with disabilities. It is a 3-story 24-unit affordable housing development. The project is very close to the Coliseum BART station thus providing convenient access to a wide variety of daily amenities. Resident services are not available on-site but residents have access to RCD's resident services programs. The 13 PBV subsidies will be attached to 5 one-bedrooms, 4 two-bedrooms and 4 three-bedrooms.
Adeline Street Lofts	20 units	20 units	The project, located at 1131 24th Street, serves low-income families. It was formerly an abandoned rubber factory redeveloped into a 38-unit 2-story affordable live-work project in 2002. The project owner, Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA) is an affordable housing provider with more than 50 years of experience. SAHA offers on-site resident services programs. The 20 PBV subsidies will be attached to 7 one-bedrooms, 5 two-bedrooms and 8 three-bedrooms.
Madison at 14th Street Apartments	31 units	31 units	The project, located at 160 14th Street, serves low-income families. It is an 8-story 78-unit affordable housing property located near Downtown Oakland. The building is on a parcel that had previously been under-utilized as a parking lot. SAHA offers service coordination, community events and after school programs to residents. 19 PBV occupant families have been placed in the project when it was first completed in 2008. The additional 31 PBV subsidies will be attached to 8 one-bedrooms, 12 two bedrooms and 5 three-bedrooms.
Oak Street Apartments	25 units	25 units	The project, located at 1109 Oak Street, serves low-income seniors aged 55+. It is a 5-story 39-unit affordable senior housing property with commercial spaces on the ground floor. It is designed as a mixed use project to foster a vibrant community and serves residents of the neighborhood. SAHA provides a part-time service coordinator who helps and advocates for senior residents in navigating the social services system. All 25 PBV subsidies will be attached to studio units.
Eastside Arts & Housing	10 units	10 units	Eastside Arts and Housing is a 16 unit affordable housing property located at 2283 International Boulevard in the San Antonio neighborhood of Oakland. The building was built in 1928 and rehabbed in 2006. The ground floor retail spaces house the Eastside Cultural Center. All of the units are filled with light, featuring amenities such as high ceilings, granite countertops, large windows, wood floors, and architectural details such as arched doorways. It is a secure building with intercom, and there is an onsite laundry room.
Kenneth Henry Court	15 units	15 units	Kenneth Henry Court is a 51 unit affordable housing property located at 6475 Foothill Boulevard in East Oakland. KHC has been providing permanent affordable housing to the area's residents for over twenty years. The development was in foreclosure due to the closing of Oakland Community Housing, Inc. SAHA acquired the property, performed necessary rehabilitation in 2013, and assumed operations in order to preserve the existing housing and maintain the property as an affordable development and long-term community asset. All of the units are spacious, featuring maple cabinets, and some are townhouse-style units. All of the units have washer and dryer hook-ups. Also, the property has a community room, computer room, laundry room, and playground. It also features a secure entrance with intercom, and a security camera system.
Westlake Christian Terrace West (WCTW)	121 units	121 units	Westlake Christian Terrace West is one of the 15 Oakland properties that provides permanent affordable housing to elderly seniors. Originally built in 1978 using HUD Section 236 insured financing, the property is located in downtown Oakland at 275 28th Street along the Broadway - Valdez corridor. With a total of 198 one-bedroom units and two manager units, the project provides residents with full kitchens and bathrooms, a community room, laundry room, property management and social services offices and parking.

Empyrean Towers	none projected	32	The Empyrean is a 99 unit severely distressed Single-room Occupancy hotel in downtown Oakland which will be converted into 66 affordable studio and 1-bedroom apartments. Subject to NEPA, the rehabilitation will begin in fall 2017.
3706 San Pablo Ave	none projected	5	3706 San Pablo project is an 87-unit, mixed-use affordable housing project that will be located along the Oakland/Emeryville border at San Pablo Avenue between 37th Street and West MacArthur Blvd. The project will create family affordable housing units and 7000 square feet of ground floor commercial space. Of the 87 total units being developed, 50 will be in Emeryville and 37 units will be within Oakland city limits. Of the 37 Oakland units, OHA will attach PBV assistance to 20 total (16 two-bed and 4 four-bed) units.

  

Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year *	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *
549	673	3,125	2,125
		Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year
		3,994	2,120

\* From the Plan

## 2) Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year

OHA did not make any other changes to the housing stock during the fiscal year.

OHA submitted a disposition application to the Special Application Center on December 22, 2010 requesting approval to dispose of 383 units in five senior sites. OHA initiated the disposition application in response to the backlog of deferred maintenance, due to long-term decreases in funding in the public housing program, and the increasing operating costs that make the sites. During FY2017, OHA and HUD began discussions on the status of the application. OHA plans to remove some of these units from the public housing inventory and utilize project-based assistance on some or all of the 383 units to ensure their long term financial viability.

Table 2: Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year	
	N/A
	N/A
	N/A

Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.

### 3) General Description of Actual Capital Expenditures During the Plan Year

OHA included the Capital Fund Program (CFP) funds as part of its MTW Block Grant. In FY 2017, OHA expended approximately \$5,733,913 million of MTW funds on capital improvement projects at its public housing sites, project-based sites owned by Oakland Affordable Housing Preservation Initiative (OAHPI), administrative buildings, funding the development of new affordable housing, and purchasing vehicles, information technology, and police equipment.

Public housing sites receiving capital expenditures included Harrison Towers, Lockwood Gardens, Oak Grove North, Oak Grove South, and Palo Vista Gardens. Architecture and engineering work proceeded in preparation for a major rehabilitation of Oak Grove North and Oak Grove South. New trash compactors were installed at Harrison Towers, Oak Grove North, and Oak Grove South to replace units that had reached the end of their useful life. Extensive repairs to the elevators at Harrison Towers and Palo Vista Gardens were completed. Exterior lighting upgrades were installed at Lockwood Gardens.



In the OAHPI portfolio, several sites underwent major renovations. The rehabilitation of 5726-30 Elizabeth Street, which began in FY 2016, was completed. The scope of renovations at this 20-unit property included structural repairs, concrete site work, landscaping, and interior unit renovations. At 1430 Seminary, a 10-unit property, exterior improvements including painting and rebuilding the decks and stairs were completed. Work began on a comprehensive rehabilitation of 2425 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a 6-unit property that is currently unoccupied. Roof replacements or major repairs were completed at 5726-30 Elizabeth Street, 2425 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and seven other properties in the project-based portfolio. Comprehensive interior unit rehabilitations were completed at 35 vacant project-based units and were ongoing at an additional 38 units at the end of FY2017.



OHA funded the creation of new affordable housing properties. In FY 2017, OHA finalized the long-term debt financing for AvéVista, a 68-unit property financed with Low Income Housing Tax Credits, project-based assistance, and other sources. Predevelopment architecture, engineering, and environmental review work began for 15<sup>th</sup> & Harrison, an OHA-owned parcel where the Authority is planning to develop affordable housing.

MTW funds were expended for capital improvement projects at the Authority's administrative buildings. Extensive elevator repairs were completed at four administrative sites. At the 1619 Harrison Street headquarters building, the Board of Commissioners Room was remodeled to improve wheelchair accessibility. Design work started for a planned renovation of 1619 Harrison Street. Additionally, the Authority completed plumbing and other improvements at administrative offices throughout the city.

Finally, MTW funds were expended to purchase vehicles and other capital equipment. A total of 21 vehicles were purchased for the OHA Police Department, Capital Improvements Department, Office of Property Operations, and Department of Family and Community Partnerships. Information technology equipment, police, and security equipment were also purchased.



AvéVista

Table 3: General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

OHA included the Capital Fund Program (CFP) funds as part of its MTW Block Grant. In FY 2017, OHA expended approximately \$5,733,913 million of MTW funds on capital improvement projects at its Public Housing sites, Project Based sites owned by Oakland Affordable Housing Preservation Initiative (OAHP), administrative buildings, funding the development of new affordable housing, and purchasing vehicles, information technology, and police equipment.

Public Housing sites receiving capital expenditures included Harrison Towers, Lockwood Gardens, Oak Grove North, Oak Grove South, and Palo Vista Gardens. Architecture and engineering work proceeded in preparation for a major rehabilitation of Oak Grove North and Oak Grove South. New trash compactors were installed at Harrison Towers, Oak Grove North, and Oak Grove South to replace units that had reached the end of their useful life. Extensive repairs to the elevators at Harrison Towers and Palo Vista Gardens were completed. Exterior lighting upgrades were installed at Lockwood Gardens.

In the OAHP portfolio, several sites underwent major renovations. The rehabilitation of 5726-30 Elizabeth Street, which began in FY 2016, was completed. The scope of renovations at this 20 unit property included structural repairs, concrete site work, landscaping, and interior unit renovations. At 1430 Seminary, a 10 unit property, exterior improvements including painting and rebuilding the decks and stairs were completed. Work began on a comprehensive rehabilitation of 2425 94th Avenue, a six unit property that is currently unoccupied. Roof replacements or major repairs were completed at 5726-30 Elizabeth Street, 2425 94th Avenue, and seven other properties in the Project Based Section 8. Comprehensive interior unit rehabilitations were completed at 35 vacant Project Based Section 8 units and were in process at an additional 38 units at the end of FY2017.

OHA funded the creation of new affordable housing properties. In FY 2017, OHA finalized the long-term debt financing for AvéVista, a 68-unit property financed with Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Project Based Section 8 Vouchers, and other sources.

Predevelopment architecture, engineering, and environmental review work began for 15th & Harrison, an OHA-owned parcel where the Authority is planning to develop affordable housing.

MTW funds were expended for capital improvement projects at the Authority's administrative buildings. Extensive elevator repairs were completed at four administrative sites. At the 1619 Harrison Street headquarters building, the Board of Commissioners Room was remodeled to improve wheelchair accessibility. Design work started for a planned renovation of 1619 Harrison Street.

Additionally, the Authority completed plumbing and other improvements at administrative offices throughout the city.

Finally, MTW funds were expended to purchase vehicles and other capital equipment. A total of 21 vehicles were purchased for the OHA Police Department, Capital Improvements Department, Office of Property Operations, and Department of Family and Community Partnerships. Information technology equipment, police, and security equipment were also purchased.

#### 4) Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End

OHA has completed 14 projects through various partnerships to add a total of 1,824 affordable units to increase housing choice in Oakland. Some of these units have traditional subsidies through public housing, tenant-based vouchers, project-based vouchers as well as other State and Local and HUD funding sources such as HOPWA, 236/PBRA and HUD 202 to name only a few. Through the single fund flexibility, 71 new units in a mixed subsidy development were placed in

service for this portfolio during FY2017 with the opening of Prosperity Place. This development serves families in a vibrant local neighborhood, bordering Oakland's Chinatown District. A list of OHA's development projects is included in Appendix C. OHA has an ownership position in all these properties through property acquisition, pre-development and/or permanent development loans and partnership agreements. OHA provides property management oversight and Asset Management Services to this portfolio to ensure compliance and sustainability of the properties.



Table 4: Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End		
Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
LIHTC with other state and local and HUD funding sources	1,824	OHA has mixed finance sites developed with tax credit and HOPE VI funding that have a mix of subsidy layering including traditional subsidies and layering from State and Local funding sources such as City Redevelopment funding, Mental Health Services Act (MHSA), Multifamily Housing Program (MHP), California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA), Affordable Housing Program (AHP) and California Housing and Community Development Infill Infrastructure Grant Program (HCD/IIG), HOPWA, HUD 202, and HUD 236/PBRA.
Other	49	OHA has developments with unsubsidized units that rented to Households with income above 80% AMI. Some of these are manager's units.
<b>Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed</b>	<b>1,873</b>	
<p>* Select Housing Program from: Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.</p> <p>If Other, please describe: Units without subsidy in tax credit developments that are rented to Households with income above 80% AMI.</p>		

## B. Leasing Information

### 1) Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year

The Oakland rental market remains a challenge for tenant-based voucher holders searching for apartments in the City. Oakland has been slow to create new units to offset the rapid and sustained increase in demand over the last several years. Of the major Bay Area cities, Oakland landlords increased rents the most over 2016 by 5.4 percent. According to Zumper, rents increased 6.3 percent over the last year for one bedroom units and WalletHub ranks Oakland as the 3<sup>rd</sup> “worst value for renters” of nationwide cities factoring in vacancy rates, new construction rates, average square footage and forecasts for coming years. The impact on OHA’s large Housing Choice Voucher Program was felt strongly as participants sought extensions to their vouchers in order to have more time to locate a new unit, and property owners continued to request rent increases, averaging 527 per month, and by June 2017 rising to 912 requests. Competition with non-HCV apartment seekers and low inventory has continued the trend of increased voucher search times and failure of OHA applicants to compete with private market tenants over scarce inventory. Neighboring housing authorities also struggled with under leasing of their Housing Choice Voucher programs, and all continued absorbing OHA billed ports over the last year to meet their leasing goals. OHA continued to serve approximately 92% of the number of families possible through the MTW program. Planning and implementation began for the approved landlord incentive activities and OHA awarded hundreds of conditional PBV awards for existing units and worked with community

partners to develop local non-traditional programs to create new housing choices for participants with special needs. These program participants will benefit from systems alignment and services enriched housing options. During the reporting year, OHA absorbed all port-in vouchers, and extended search times for voucher holders struggling to find units in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

Participation in our ongoing local non-traditional programs (both tenant and property based) remained consistent with few changes. The Local Housing Assistance Program (LHAP), a tenant-based program which allowed tenants to remain housed that would not qualify for housing after disposition due to income restrictions, decreased to 19 families as participants elected to use their Tenant Protection Vouchers to move. The Sponsor Based Housing Assistance Program (SBHAP), serving chronically homeless from encampments, ex-offenders released from San Quentin prison, and emancipated foster youth exiting the juvenile justice system, maintained relatively steady participation with low turnover rates, but non-profit service providers also struggled to find new landlords willing to participate in the program due to the rapidly increasing rental market. The site based family unification/re-entry program Parents And Children Together (PACT) expanded into a new larger location and saw participation double. PACT is the new OHA program that will serve populations referred by the Alameda County Sheriff's Office (ACSO) from both the MOMs and DADS programs. Combined, all programs mentioned above, served 135 families through non-traditional housing assistance. Lastly, the new development at 94<sup>th</sup> and International had construction delays which delayed its completion to September of 2017, decreasing the number of new local non-traditional units available for lease up during the fiscal year.

The Family and Community Partnerships department (FCP) and our Police Department provide community building events and supportive services and events to further our Education and Employment Initiatives helping families achieve self-sufficiency and life goals. Both East and West Oakland administrative offices provide WiFi connected computer labs open to the public and residents to use for job searches, training and educational pursuits. Most events are open to all OHA residents from multiple program types and are often attended by the broader community. The nine week Summer Youth Program provided children in the immediate and surrounding community an opportunity to have a fun and safe summer as well as avoid the summer academic slide with education based activities. Summer lunch was provided to youth aged 3 to 15 years. Community Food Pantry services were provided with local partners and is open to all community members, promoting healthy food choices to all.



**Table 5: Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year**

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served*	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	782	752
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	24	20
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0
<b>Total Projected and Actual Households Served</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>772</b>

\* Calculated by dividing the planned/actual number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.

\*\* In instances when a Local, Non-Traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of Households served.

Housing Program:	Unit Months Occupied/Leased****	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ***	9384	8844
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	288	240
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	0	0
<b>Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased</b>	<b>9672</b>	<b>9084</b>

The Oakland rental market remains a challenge for Section 8 Voucher holders searching for apartments in the City. Oakland has been slow to create new units to offset the rapid and sustained increase in demand over the last several years. Of the major Bay Area cities, Oakland landlords increased rents the most over 2016 by 5.4 percent. According to Zumper, rents increased 6.3 percent over the last year for one bedroom units and WalletHub ranks Oakland as the 3rd "worst value for renters" of nationwide cities factoring in vacancy rates, new construction rates, average square footage and forecasts for coming years. The impact on the OHA's large Housing Choice Voucher Program was felt strongly as participants sought extensions to their vouchers in order to have more time to locate a new unit, and property owners continued to request rent increases, averaging 527 per month, with June 2017 rising to 912 requests. Competition with non-HCV apartment seekers and low inventory has continued the trend of increased voucher search times and failure of OHA applicants to compete with private market tenants over scarce inventory. Neighboring housing authorities also struggled with under leasing of their Section 8 programs, and all continued absorbing OHA billed ports over the last year to meet their leasing goals. OHA continued to serve approximately 92% of the number of families possible through the MTW program, and began planning and implementing the approved landlord incentive activities, awarded hundreds of conditional PBV awards for existing units and worked with community partners to develop local non-traditional programs to create new housing choices for participants with special needs who will benefit from systems alignment and services enriched housing options. During the reporting year, OHA absorbed all port-in vouchers, and extended search times for voucher holders struggling to find units in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

Participation in our ongoing local non-traditional programs (both tenant and property based) remained consistent with few changes. The Local Housing Assistance Program (LHAP), a tenant-based program which allowed tenants to remain housed that would not qualify for housing after disposition due to income restrictions, decreased to 19 families as participants elected to use their Tenant Protection Vouchers to move. The Sponsor Based Housing Assistance Program (SBHAP), serving chronically

\*\*\* In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of households served.

\*\*\*\* Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the housing PHA has occupied/leased units, according to unit category during the year.



	Average Number of Households Served Per Month	Total Number of Households Served During the Year
Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only	52	625

## 2) Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income

Through MTW flexibility, OHA has implemented multiple programs that aim to serve low and very low-income populations. Programs such as the Sponsor Based Assistance Program (SBHAP) are deployed through a partnership with the City of Oakland to house and provide support services to homeless citizens living in encampments, adults returning from incarceration at San Quentin and youth exiting the juvenile justice system. All of these households are very low-income. Additionally, the PACT reentry/family unification program serves families exiting the Santa Rita jail system, reuniting them with their children in service enriched transitional housing. All of the participants are very low-income. OHA has developed 14 properties that house mixed income families utilizing both traditional and other State, Local and HUD funding sources that serve a mix of incomes, including very low-income households. The majority of OHA's traditional programs and almost half of its non-traditional programs serve very low-income households. Table 6 shows that 82% of families that participated in MTW local, non-traditional programs were very low-income in FY 2017.





**Table 6: Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income**

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory objective of “assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families” is being achieved by examining public housing and Housing Choice Voucher family characteristics as submitted into the PIC or its successor system utilizing current resident data at the end of the agency’s fiscal year. The PHA will provide information on local, non-traditional families provided with housing assistance at the end of the PHA fiscal year, not reported in PIC or its successor system, in the following format:

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	X	X	X	780	763	705	728	X
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	X	X	X	372	659	587	600	X
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	X	X	X	48%	86%	83%	82%	X

### 3) Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix

As reported since FY 2010, the majority of the households on the public housing and HCV waitlists are one-person households. This demographic differs greatly from the percentage of one-person families that were served in the traditional programs prior to MTW. As a result, OHA witnessed a significant increase to the one-person households served in traditional programs and saw a corresponding decrease in three-, four-, five, and six-person households served. OHA has managed its MTW programs to meet the needs of the households on the waitlists and the shifting demographics of the local area. Additionally, the HCV program does not use family size as a selection criterion when selecting applicants from the waitlist, nor should it. Given that almost 90% of OHA households are served through the HCV program, the substantial shifts in the composition of family sizes, while remarkable, reflect non-MTW characteristics which are outside of the control of OHA.

**Table 7: Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix**

In order to demonstrate that the statutory objective of “maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration” is being achieved, the PHA will provide information in the following formats:

**Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served**

Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	705	3158	X	3863	30%
2 Person	745	2853	X	3598	28%
3 Person	596	1877	X	2473	19%
4 Person	344	1318	X	1662	13%
5 Person	169	588	X	757	6%
6+ Person	76	324	X	400	3%
Totals	2635	10118	0	12753	100%

Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized

Provide narrative with explanation



Mix of Family Sizes Served							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	30%	28%	19%	13%	6%	3%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year 2017	4933	3479	1838	1396	606	362	12,614
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year 2017	39%	28%	15%	11%	5%	3%	100%
Percentage Change	29%	-2%	-25%	-15%	-19%	-9%	0%
Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages	As reported since FY 2010, the majority of the households on the public housing and HCV waitlists are one-person households. This demographic differs greatly from the percentage of one-person families that were served in the traditional programs prior to MTW. As a result, OHA witnessed significant increase to the one-person households served in traditional programs and saw a corresponding decrease in three-, four-, five, and six-person households served. OHA has managed its MTW programs to meet the needs of the households on the waitlists and the shifting demographics of the local area. Additionally, the HCV program does not use family size as a selection criterion when selecting applicants from the waitlist. Given that almost 90% of OHA households are served through the HCV program, the substantial shifts in the composition of family sizes, while remarkable, reflect non-MTW characteristics which are outside of the control of OHA.						

\* “Non-MTW adjustments to the distribution of family sizes” are defined as factors that are outside the control of the PHA. Acceptable “non-MTW adjustments” include, but are not limited to, demographic changes in the community’s population. If the PHA includes non-MTW adjustments, HUD expects the explanations of the factors to be thorough and to include information substantiating the numbers used.

\*\* The numbers in this row will be the same numbers in the chart above listed under the column “Baseline percentages of family sizes to be maintained.”

\*\*\* The methodology used to obtain these figures will be the same methodology used to determine the “Occupied number of Public Housing units by family size when PHA entered MTW” and “Utilized number of Section 8 Vouchers by family size when PHA entered MTW” in the table immediately above.

\*\*\*\* The “Percentages of families served by family size this fiscal year” will reflect adjustments to the mix of families served that are directly due to decisions the PHA has made. HUD expects that in the course of the demonstration, PHAs will make decisions that may alter the number of families served.

## **Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End**

The public housing stock is experiencing no leasing challenges with vacancy rates under 2%. OHA remains committed to rightsizing families to appropriately sized units to continue to maximize efficient use of the housing stock and will use the Standardized Transfer Policy to facilitate moving families to appropriately sized units to maintain low vacancy rates.

One family housing development (Campbell Village), five senior developments (Oak Grove North & South, Adel Court, Palo Vista Gardens, and Harrison Towers), and five HOPE VI sites are managed by third party property management companies and reflected typical leasing patterns in large part due to the stability of senior sites, and the quality of the housing stock offered.

The Housing Choice Voucher program continued to be affected by the tight and expensive rental market. Utilization numbers declined throughout the year and OHA averaged 527 rent increase requests per month with one month hitting a high of 912 requests. The amount of the average rent increase granted was \$348 or a 22% increase. Implementation planning progressed for two landlord incentive and support activities that OHA plans to execute to help boost utilization numbers by recruiting new owners and providing enhanced support to existing owners.

Other strategies to offset HCV leasing issues included issuing two Requests for Qualifications (RFQs) inviting qualified owners, property managers, and developers of service enriched rental housing property to submit proposals demonstrating their interest in securing MTW Local Housing Assistance Program funding and PBV assistance for existing units. The RFQ for existing housing units only was targeted to specific housing types and populations. Goals were to preserve affordable SRO units, shared and transitional units, increase the supply of affordable units and utilize MTW authority and resources to serve as many Oakland households as possible. The challenging rental market is compounded for high risk and special needs populations. OHA also has developed innovative partnerships with City and County agencies to expand local service enriched special needs housing programs that are being especially hard hit by the Oakland housing crisis. Initial pilot programs with the local Social Services agencies include supporting emancipated foster youth and homeless parents entering the CalWORKs program.

OHA's local, non-traditional housing programs target households that typically would not be successful in a traditional housing HUD assistance program and include additional leveraged support and services. In the local programs that serve a "hard to house" client base, OHA relies on a strong network of experienced and funded community partners to match social services with housing resources. These programs experienced additional leasing issues due

to the challenges of the participants. Leasing challenges include managing past negative criminal or credit histories, assisting participants with overcoming substance abuse habits, and adequately addressing mental health concerns that present obstacles to securing and retaining quality housing. Partners provide intensive services and case management to address these hurdles. Evictions due to tenant behaviors that violate the lease and program participation terms often results in higher turnover in these programs, and any legal actions can be lengthy and costly under local and state laws.



**Table 8: Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End**

Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
Public Housing	<p>The Public Housing stock is experiencing no leasing challenges with vacancy rates under 2%. OHA remains committed to rightsizing families to appropriate sized units to continue to maximize efficient use of the housing stock and will use the Standardized Transfer Policy to facilitate moving families to appropriately sized units to maintain low vacancy rates. One family housing development (Campbell Village), five senior developments (Oak Grove Plaza North &amp; South, Adel Court, Palo Vista Gardens, and Harrison Towers), and five HOPE VI sites are managed by third party property management companies and reflected typical leasing patterns in large part due to the stability of senior sites, and the quality of the housing stock offered.</p>
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	<p>The Housing Choice Voucher program continued to be affected by the tight and expensive rental market. Utilization numbers declined throughout the year and OHA averaged 527 rent increase requests per month with one month hitting a high of 912 requests. The amount of the average rent increase granted was \$348 or a 22% increase. Implementation planning progressed for two landlord incentive and support activities that OHA plans to execute to help boost utilization numbers by recruiting new owners and providing enhanced support to existing owners.</p> <p>Other strategies to offset HCV leasing issues included issuing two Requests for Qualifications (RFQs) inviting qualified owners, property managers, and developers of service enriched rental housing property to submit proposals demonstrating their interest in securing MTW Local Housing Assistance Program funding and PBV assistance for existing units. The RFQ was for existing housing units only was targeted to specific housing types and populations. Goals were to preserve affordable SRO units, shared and transitional units, increase the supply of affordable units and utilize MTW authority and resources to serve as many Oakland households as possible. The challenging rental market is compounded for high risk and special needs populations. OHA also has developed innovative partnerships with City and County agencies to expand local service enriched special needs housing programs that are being especially hard hit by the Oakland housing crisis. Initial pilot programs with the local Social Services agency include supporting emancipated foster youth and homeless mothers entering the CalWORKs program.</p>
Local, Non-Traditional	<p>OHA's local, non-traditional housing programs target households that typically would not be successful in a traditional housing HUD assistance program and include additional leveraged support and services. In the local programs that serve a "hard to house" client base, OHA relies on a strong network of experienced and funded community partners to match social services with housing resources. These programs experienced additional leasing issues due to the challenges of the participants. Leasing challenges include managing past negative criminal or credit histories, assisting participants with overcoming substance abuse habits, and adequately addressing mental health concerns that present obstacles to securing and retaining quality housing. Partners provide intensive services and case management to address these hurdles. Evictions due to tenant behaviors that violate the lease and program participation terms often results in higher turnover in these programs, and any legal actions can be lengthy and costly under local and state laws.</p>

#### 4) Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End

OHA implemented three activities that assisted households in achieving self-sufficiency goals. A total of 26 households met the requirements for self-



sufficiency as defined for each respective activity. OHA continued to explore the definition of self-sufficiency for activities that were not yet implemented or on hold, in order to establish clarity and consistency around the self-sufficiency goals for participant families.

Table 9: Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End		
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
PBV Transitional Housing Programs/11-05	1	Number of PACT participants that move from the site with the notice of graduation
Alternative Recertification Schedules / 14-01	Due to business system limitations, OHA is unable to measure this metric at this time.	Number of families that remain on a triennial or biennial recertification schedule through the fiscal year.
Program Extension for Households Receiving \$0 HAP/10-02	25	Successful Exist during and after the 24 months
Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	n/a	* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.
ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	26	

## C. Wait List Information

### 1) Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Table 10: Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Community Wide	3,200	Closed	No
MTW Public Housing (OHA Managed)	Site Based	250	Closed	No
MTW Public Housing (Third Party Managed)	Site Based	3,468	Open for select sites	Yes - Lion Creek Crossings phase 1 were open for all bedroom sizes.
Project-Based Voucher (Third Party Managed)	Site Based	29,004	Open for select sites	Yes. Waitlists were open for all bedroom sized for Lion Creek Crossing phases 1-4.
Project-Based Voucher (OHA Managed)	Site Based	4,050	Closed	No

More can be added if needed.

\* *Select Housing Program* : Federal MTW Public Housing Units; Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program; Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units; Tenant-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; and Combined Tenant-Based and Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program.

\*\* *Select Wait List Types*: Community-Wide, Site-Based, Merged (Combined Public Housing or Voucher Wait List), Program Specific (Limited by HUD or Local PHA Rules to Certain Categories of Households which are Described in the Rules for Program Participation), None (If the Program is a New Wait List, Not an Existing Wait List), or Other (Please Provide a Brief Description of this Wait List Type).

\*\*\* For Partially Open Wait Lists, provide a description of the populations for which the waiting list is open.

N/A
-----

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

<p>SBHAP (Activity #10-06) - The City of Oakland manages subcontractors who specialize in managing the program to serve three vulnerable populations: individuals living in street homeless encampments, adults being discharged from San Quentin State Prison, and youth with recent contact with the criminal justice system. These subcontractors provide program applicants via direct referral into the program managed by the City of Oakland.</p>
<p>PACT - (Activity #10-01) The Alameda County Sheriff's Office (ACSO) provides MOMS and DADS applicants to OHA through direct referral. Following ACSO program standards, ACSO staff select and refer to OHA those ACSO MOMS and DADS candidates who qualify for minimally supervised transitional housing after completion of a 6-8 week multi-faceted program while in custody including an Individual Case Management Plan (ICM). ACSO referred "applicants" are then screened by OHA Eligibility according to HUD program requirements. ACSO MOMS and DADS applicants who meet HUD program requirements are offered a unit at the 18 month OHA PACT Housing program site. Those selected for the OHA Housing Component remain in the ACSO Transitional Case Management Program for 18 months, during which they must comply with the PBV Housing Lease, PBV Program and ACSO Program requirements as well as their ICM.</p>

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

<p>MTW Public Housing (Third Party Managed) and Project-Based Voucher (Third Party Managed) contain waitlists that are combined for Public Housing, PBV and non-traditional subsidies such as tax credit units for certain sites.</p>
---

If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, provide a narrative detailing these changes.

N/A
-----

### **Section III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested**

---

All proposed activities that are granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as “Approved Activities.” OHA proposed two new activities in FY2017.

## Section IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted

The activities discussed in this section have been approved by HUD in previous fiscal years.

Table 11 provides a list of all approved MTW activities including the year the activity was implemented and the primary statutory objective(s) the activity is intended to accomplish. Each activity has been assigned a number based on the fiscal year in which the activity was identified and approved (e.g. 15-01 indicates that the activity was identified and approved in the FY 2015).

Table 11 Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted					
Activity # and Fiscal Year Approved	Fiscal Year Implemented	MTW Activity Name	Description	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
17-01	2017	Owner Incentives Program	Program to provide support and benefits to existing owners and incentives for owners to join the HCV program	Expanding housing choice and reduce costs to achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.1.d., D.5, B.1, D.1.a, B.1, and Single Fund Flexibility. Attachment D, Section D and Use of Funds
17-02	2017	Automatic Rent Increase	Offer owners an automatic rent increase on the HAP contract anniversary date	Expanding housing choice and reduce costs to achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, D.2.b&c
15-02	2016	Modified Utility Allowance Policy	Modifies utility allowance policy to be consistent with FFY 2014 federal appropriations requirements that the household's utility allowance is consistent with the minimum subsidy or occupancy standard and eliminates the utility allowance payment.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.11, D.2.a
15-01	2016	Local Area Portability Reform	Revises portability policies in the Housing Choice Voucher program to limit port-outs to local area jurisdictions except for special circumstances.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.1.g

14-01	2016	Alternative Recertification Schedules	Changes reexamination of income for elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes to every three years and every two years for wage earning households. Households with fixed income from Social Security will receive automatic adjustments to their rent in interim years based on published cost of living adjustments (COLA) to the subsidy program.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.4, D.1.c
13-01	2016	Rent Reform Pilot Program	Creates a pilot program to test rent reform strategies at Campbell Village (Public Housing) and AMP 10 (Section 8 PBV) where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Tenant Payment (TTP) calculated based on 27.5% of gross annual income for seniors and disabled households and 27% for work-eligible households</li> <li>Triennial recertification schedule for senior and disabled households, biennial schedule for work-eligible households</li> <li>Eliminate all deductions and earned income disallowance</li> <li>Recent increases in income excluded in recertification</li> <li>Absolute minimum rent of \$25</li> </ul>	-Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness -Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment C, Section C.4, C.11 Section D.1.c Section D.2.a
12-01	2012	Eliminate Caps and Time Limits on PBV Allocations	Eliminates the cap on the total number of units the Authority can project-base the number of units that can be project-based in a development and the Time Limit to add additional PBV units to an existing HAP contract.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.1.e, Section B.3, Section D.7.
11-01	2011	PBV Occupancy Standards	Modifies the occupancy standards in the PBV program to be consistent with occupancy standards required by other state or locally administered funding in a development (e.g. LIHTC program)	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
11-02	NYI	Standardized Transfer Policy	Creates standard transfer policies in the public housing, Section 8, and project-based assistance programs to increase housing choices for residents.	Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
11-03	NYI	SRO/ Studio Apartment Project-based Preservation Program	Develops a PBV sub-program tailored to the needs of developments with SRO and studio units providing service enriched housing. OHA will commit long-term PBV subsidies to developments where there is a need to preserve the housing resource.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
11-05	2011	PBV Transitional Housing Programs	Modifies PBV program rules to permit transitional service enriched housing to fill specific unmet community needs. Used to operate the PACT Program, which provides transitional service enriched housing to mothers returning from prison to reunite	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section B.1, B.4, D.1.a,b,C.D.4 Attachment D, Section B.2

			with their children.		
10-01	2010	Specialized Housing Programs	Increases allocation of resources to the PACT program to improve outcomes and enhance program coordination. PACT program is operated in partnership with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment D, Use of Funds
10-02	2010	Program Extension for Households Receiving \$0 HAP	Extends the period of time that a household can remain in the Section 8 program while receiving zero HAP assistance from 6 months to 24 months.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment C, Section D.1.b, D.3.a
10-03	2010	Combined PBV HAP Contract for Multiple Non-contiguous Sites	Allows a single PBV HAP contract to be executed for non-contiguous scattered site buildings organized by AMP or other logical grouping.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.1.a, D.7
10-04	2010	Alternative Initial Rent Determination for PBV Units	Allows for the use of a comparability analysis or market study certified by an independent agency approved in determining rent reasonableness to establish the initial PBV contract rent.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.2, D.7
10-05	2010	Acceptance of Lower HAP in PBV Units	In situations where a family becomes over housed as a result of conflicting occupancy policies in the conversion from Public Housing to Section 8, this activity allows the landlord or management agent to accept a lower HAP based on the appropriate number of bedrooms for the family and in order to keep the family in-place.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
10-06	2010	Local Housing Assistance Program	Develops a Local Housing Assistance Program (LHAP) to assist households that otherwise might not qualify for or be successful in the traditional Public Housing and/or Section 8 programs. LHAP is provided directly to eligible families and to partnering agencies providing service enriched housing to special needs populations.	Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds (SBHAP program), Attachment C, D.1.f, D.1.a and D.3.a (LHAP Programs), C.D.4
10-07	2010	Disposition Relocation and Counseling Services	Provides counseling and relocation assistance to impacted public housing residents in developments approved for disposition.	-Provide incentives for families with children to become more economically self-sufficient -Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
10-08	2011	Redesign FSS Program	Redesigns the FSS Program to incorporate best practices in the industry and encourage partnerships with community based programs and initiatives.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment C, Section E



10-09	2010	Waive 12 Month Minimum Stay Requirement in Converted PBV Units	Waives the 12 month minimum stay requirement for existing tenants in units that have converted to PBV assistance as the result of an approved disposition.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
09-01	2011	Alternative HQS System	Uses a risk-based strategy to allocate HQS inspection resources in order to improve compliance at problem properties and allocate fewer resources to properties with a history of compliance.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.5 Attachment D, Section D
09-02	2010	Short-Term Subsidy Program	Provides temporary housing assistance to preserve existing affordable housing resources and allow tenants to remain in-place.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment D, Use of Funds
08-01	2008	Fund Affordable Housing Development Activities	Utilize single-fund budget flexibility to leverage funds to preserve affordable housing resources and create new affordable housing opportunities in Oakland.	Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
07-01 (moved to 14-01)	2010	Triennial Income Recertification	Changes reexamination of income for elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes to every three years. Eligible households receive automatic adjustments to rent in interim years based on published cost of living adjustments (COLA) to the subsidy program (i.e. SS, SSI, etc.)	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.4, D.1.c
06-01	2006	Site Based Wait Lists	Establishes site based wait lists in all public housing sites, HOPE IV sites, and developments with PBV allocations.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.1
06-02	2006	Allocation of PBV Units: Without Competitive Process	Allows for the allocation of PBV subsidy to developments owned directly or indirectly, through an affiliated partner, by OHA without using a competitive process.	-Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness -Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7.a
06-03	2006	Allocation of PBV Units: Using Existing Competitive Process	Allows for the allocation of PBV subsidy to qualifying developments using the City of Oakland NOFA/RFP or other existing competitive process.	-Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness -Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7.b

## A. Implemented Activities

OHA is currently implementing the following activities:

Table 12 Implemented Activities					
Activity # and Fiscal Year Approved	Fiscal Year Implemented	MTW Activity Name	Description	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
17-01	2017	Owner Incentives Program	Program to provide support and benefits to existing owners and incentives for owners to join the HCV program	Expanding housing choice and reduce costs to achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.1.d,D.5, B.1, D.1.a, B.1, and Single Fund Flexibility. Attachment D, Section D and Use of Funds
17-02	2017	Automatic Rent Increase	Offer owners an automatic rent increase on the HAP contract anniversary date	Expanding housing choice and reduce costs to achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, D.2.b&c
15-02	2016	Modified Utility Allowance Policy	Modifies utility allowance policy to be consistent with FFY 2014 federal appropriations requirements that the household's utility allowance is consistent with the minimum subsidy or occupancy standard and eliminates the utility allowance payment.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.11, D.2.a
15-01	2016	Local Area Portability Reform	Revises portability policies in the Housing Choice Voucher program to limit port-outs to local area jurisdictions except for special circumstances.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.1.g
14-01	2016	Alternative Recertification Schedules	Changes reexamination of income for elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes to every three years and every two years for wage earning households. Households with fixed income from Social Security will receive automatic adjustments to their rent in interim years based on published cost of living adjustments (COLA) to the subsidy program.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.4, D.1.c
12-01	2012	Eliminate Caps and Time Limits on PBV Allocations	Eliminates the cap on the total number of units the Authority can project-base the number of units that can be project-based in a development and the time limit to add additional PBV units to existing HAP contracts.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.1.e, Section B.3, Section D.7
11-01	2011	PBV Occupancy Standards	Modifies the occupancy standards in the PBV program to be consistent with occupancy standards required by other state or locally administered funding in a development (e.g. LIHTC program)	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7

11-03	2017	SRO/ Studio Apartment Preservation Program	Develops a sub-program tailored to the needs of developments with SRO and studio units. OHA will commit long-term subsidies to developments where there is a need to preserve the housing resource.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
11-05	2011	PBV Transitional Housing Programs	Modifies PBV program rules to permit transitional service enriched housing to fill specific unmet community needs. Used to operate the PACT Program, which provides transitional service enriched housing to mothers returning from prison to reunite with their children.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section B.1, B.4, D.1.a,b, C.D.4 Attachment D, Section B.2
10-01	2010	Specialized Housing Programs	Increases allocation of resources to the PACT program to improve outcomes and enhance program coordination. PACT program is operated in partnership with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment D, Use of Funds
10-02	2010	Program Extension for Households Receiving \$0 HAP	Extends the period of time that a household can remain in the Section 8 program while receiving zero HAP assistance from 6 months to 24 months.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment C, Section D.1.b, D.3.a
10-03	2010	Combined PBV HAP Contract for Multiple Non-contiguous Sites	Allows a single PBV HAP contract to be executed for non-contiguous scattered site buildings organized by AMP or other logical grouping.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.1.a, D.7
10-04	2010	Alternative Initial Rent Determination for PBV Units	Allows for the use of a comparability analysis or market study certified by an independent agency approved in determining rent reasonableness to establish the initial PBV contract rent.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.2, D.7
10-05	2010	Acceptance of Lower HAP in PBV Units	In situations where a family becomes over housed as a result of conflicting occupancy policies in the conversion from Public Housing to Section 8, this activity allows the landlord or management agent to accept a lower HAP based on the appropriate number of bedrooms for the family and in order to keep the family in-place.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
10-06	2010	Local Housing Assistance Program	Develops a Local Housing Assistance Program (LHAP) to assist households that otherwise might not qualify for or be successful in the traditional Public Housing and/or Section 8 programs. LHAP is provided directly to eligible families and to partnering agencies providing service enriched housing to special needs populations.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.1.f, D.1.a and D.3.a and C.D.4 (LHAP Programs), Attachment D, Use of Funds (SBHAP Program)
08-01	2008	Fund Affordable Housing Development Activities	Utilize single-fund budget flexibility to leverage funds to preserve affordable housing resources and create new affordable housing opportunities in Oakland.	Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
06-01	2006	Site Based Wait Lists	Establishes site based wait lists in all public housing sites, HOPE IV sites, and developments with PBV	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost	Attachment C, Section C.1

			allocations.	effectiveness	
06-03	2006	Allocation of PBV Units: Using Existing Competitive Process	Allows for the allocation of PBV subsidy to qualifying developments using the City of Oakland NOFA/RFP or other existing competitive process.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness  -Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7.b

### MTW Activity #17-01: Owner Incentives Program

*Description of MTW Activity:* The Housing Choice Voucher program has been impacted by a dramatically escalating rental market and very limited inventory which has led to much longer search times and multiple voucher extensions being granted for families searching for housing. According to Zillow over the last year, market rents increased by (21.6%) in Oakland. In 2015, OHA saw many owners choose to leave the program or remove units by not releasing resulting in the loss of approximately 824 units of affordable housing. In response to these market conditions, OHA is proposing the Owner Incentives Program activity to support existing and recruit new owners to the program to offset the exodus.

This activity offers a range of services that both support and retain existing HCV owners by providing enhanced services to existing owners, especially those that are high performers. OHA is also looking to recruit new owners by offering incentives to sign on. Program components are as follows:

- Vacancy loss payments of up to two months HAP will be offered to existing HCV owners if they re-rent a unit previously occupied by an HCV tenant to another HCV participant within two months of contract cancellation. The average vacancy duration is currently about 2 weeks. Based on average HAP amounts, total average annual costs for OHA to implement vacancy loss payments will range from \$208,280 to \$832,300 for vacancy periods of 15 days to 60 days.
- Pre-qualifying unit inspections will be offered to all HCV program owners to expedite the lease up process, and minimize delays or losses due to inspections. Inspections will not be linked to a participant and allow owners up to 60 days to find a tenant once an inspection has been passed. No additional costs are anticipated.
- Owner recognition program - Recognize long term owners (5 years or more) with 5 or more units on the program that maintain at least one unit on a biennial inspection schedule. Owners will receive awards and special designations to highlight their status as long term providers of quality units. No additional costs are anticipated. MTW flexibility is not required to implement this component and it is included for consistency of grouping like programs.
- New Landlord Incentive Payment – Provides new owner participants a one-time payment of \$500 upon execution of a new HAP contract, and meet other defined eligibility criteria. OHA had 130 new landlords sign up for the program in 2015 and we project a 10% increase due to this incentive, totaling 143 new landlords. Projected costs are \$71,500.
- Capital Improvement Payment –Offer landlords that have failed a second inspection and are entering abatement a payment of up to \$2,500 to address capital improvement issues related to the reason for the HQS inspection failure. Landlords will apply for the payment and furnish documentation on the estimated repair costs for the improvement. Payments will be repaid to

OHA via reduced HAP payments made to the owner over a 6 month period. Projected costs are estimated using the maximum payment of \$2,500 per landlord and are based on the number of landlords that had failed second inspections in FY 2015 and the projected cost is approximately \$385,000. OHA intends to recoup these costs by paying a lower HAP to the landlord over a 6 month period and anticipates some loss due to landlords that may exit the program and not repay the loan. OHA will rely on its Fraud Unit in the Police Department to pursue and collect from landlords that exit prior to completely repaying the loan.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* OHA began performing biennial inspections for all landlords in April of 2016 due to the implementation of the Streamline Rule and the standard metrics for this activity are based on Activity #09-01 being combined with this activity. Since 09-01 was placed on hold, there are no standard metrics to report. OHA did begin to implement a pilot group of units for the pre-inspection sub-component and began implementation planning for all other sub-components of the activity.

*Status Update/Schedule:* Implementation planning to develop reports and processes needed for Vacancy Loss payments and New Landlord Incentive Payments occurred and OHA plans to implement payments in FY 2018. OHA expects to fully implement Pre-qualifying unit inspections in FY 2018. The Owner Recognition Program will be integrated with our current Owner Appreciation Annual event during this FY. Implementation of Capital Improvement Payments will be planned and rollout may start towards the end of the FY.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* There are no challenges or new strategies to methodology to report.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* The sub-component of Alternative HQS System (**previously approved MTW Activity #09-01**) has been placed on hold because with the publication of the streamline rule in April 2016, all owners have been moved to a biennial inspection schedule. Standard HUD metrics CE#1, CE#2 and CE#3 have been removed because they are to measure data for the Alternative HQS System subcomponent which is currently on hold as an activity.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There are no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

Standard OHA Metrics				
Number of New Landlords Recruited by Payment Incentive				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new landlords where sign on payment was an incentive to enroll in HCV program	Average number of new landlords where sign on payment was an incentive to enroll in HCV program = 0	Average number of new landlords where sign on payment was an incentive to enroll in HCV program = 13 (10% increase)	Actual number of new landlords where sign on payment was an incentive to enroll in HCV program = 0	No. We have not yet implemented this component.

## MTW Activity #17-02: Automatic Rent Increases for HCV

*Description of MTW Activity:* During the last several years the Bay Area has rebounded from the recession with a robust economy which has resulted in increased local population and a sharp decrease in available inventory in the rental market, causing rents to rise at rates that are leading the nation. As a result, the number of rent increases requested by owners in the HCV program has risen from 173 requests in January of 2015 to 565 requests at the end of 2015 and is currently averaging 333 requests per month. Compounding this challenge, OHA saw a loss of approximately 824 units from the program during 2015 due to owners opting to leave the program for various reasons.

To stem this tide of owners leaving the program for private market tenants, OHA will offer HCV owners an automatic rent increase that will be initiated by OHA. The amount of the increase will be determined by OHA for targeted small area rental markets identified by OHA. The automatic rent increase amount will be set using multiple data sources for small targeted geographic areas within the larger jurisdiction as identified by OHA. For selected targeted small rental market areas, OHA will conduct a rent increase analysis using internal and external data sources. Internal data sources may include the number of requested and approved increases and the amounts approved, and/or the average rent in the targeted small market area for new Section 8 contracts. The external data sources may include various available data sources including the Consumer Price Index, Zillow, Go Section 8, Rent.com etc. that provide information and data on rental housing market trends in the target area. If a small rental market area increase is warranted and approved by the Executive Director, or his designee, the offers will be made to all property owners in the targeted area who have not received a rent increase in the last twelve months. If the owner elects to accept the increase offered, they will not be eligible for another increase for at least twelve months.

Staff will continue to complete a Rent Reasonableness determination by using at least two comparable units within a one mile radius with like amenities and will notify the landlord of the offer for a new rent amount/increase 120 days prior to the proposed increase. The landlord will have 30 days to accept the offered rent increase and once accepted, OHA will send a lease amendment with the HAP amount and tenant portion to the participant at least 60 days prior to the change. Similarly to current practices under the traditional program, participants will not be able to challenge rent increase amounts. However, the notification that will be provided to each tenant will describe the Reasonable Accommodation and Hardship Policy procedures. Participants may use the Hardship procedures to submit a request to have their case reviewed. Under this activity it is anticipated that participants will have more time to respond to the notice of a rent increase. Currently, participants are issued notices of approved increases within 30 days of the increase. If there is a change in tenancy before the next anniversary date, an owner can request a rent increase per OHA's current process.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* OHA began planning the implementation of this activity during the FY as it requires coordination across multiple groups and department.

*Status Update/Schedule:* Implementation planning to develop reports and processes needed to implement this activity were started in FY2017 and OHA expects to fully implement this activity in FY2018.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA does not have challenges to report with this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* There are no changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks included in the Standard HUD Metrics table below.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There are no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).Rent Reasonableness	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = (staff salary)* .25 hours * number of files = (\$46.14 * .25) * 3,996 = \$46,093	Cost of task after implementation of the activity =(staff salary)* .08 hours * number of files = (\$46.14 * .08) * 3,996 = \$14,750	Total cost of task in dollars (decrease) = 68%	No. Activity is in the planning stage.
<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours  Rent Reasonableness	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = .25 hours * 3,320 households = 830 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = .08 hours * 3,320 households = 266 hours	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = .08 hours * 3,320 households (68% decrease) = 564 hours	No. Activity is in the planning stage.
<b>CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease)	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity as a percentage (decrease)	Expected error rate of task after implementation of the activity as a percentage (decrease)	Actual error rate of task after implementation of the activity as a	No. Activity is in the planning stage.



			percentage (decrease)	
<b>CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Rental Revenue /total tenant payment in Dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = 0	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = TBD	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = TBD	No. Activity is in the planning stage.

#### **MTW Activity #15-01: Local Area Portability Reform**

*Description of MTW Activity:* A local area portability policy that will limit elective moves to jurisdictions within the nine Bay Area counties identified by the Association of Bay Area Governments: Alameda County, Contra Costa County, Marin County, Napa County, San Francisco County, San Mateo County, Santa Clara County, Solano County, and Sonoma County. While the objective of the Housing Choice Voucher program is to provide increased housing options for families, OHA has found that when many households exercise the option to move with their vouchers to neighboring housing authorities, especially those without MTW programs or with higher payment standards, it creates an administrative burden. This activity is designed to allow OHA to mitigate the number and areas of concentration of port out requests, and their negative impact on program administration and self-sufficiency goals. In FY2016, it was implemented in five counties. The policy will be expanded in the future to include additional jurisdictions as needed.

A hardship policy allows families to move their tenant based vouchers locally under limited circumstances such as the following exceptions:

- Reasonable accommodation for persons with a disability
- Verifiable employment opportunity more than 35 miles from the City of Oakland limits and at least 20 hours per week minimum wage applicable in the state
- Situations covered underneath the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)
- Participants porting out for education for the head of household and or spouse only will need to show proof of full-time enrollment at a college or university
- Verifiable threat to the physical safety of the family

- OHA port-outs where the receiving Public Housing Authority (PHA) absorbs the voucher
- Port-outs for vouchers that OHA is administering (unabsorbed) due to those vouchers porting in from another PHA
- Declared natural disaster or state of emergency

Any exceptions to this policy will be reviewed by the Executive Director, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

OHA allowed current port-out households to remain in their current jurisdiction. However, upon implementation, this policy also will apply to any port-out households that request to port to another jurisdiction.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* During FY2017, OHA received a total of 499 requests for portability compared to the baseline of 1,100 total requests which is a drop of 45% in port requests overall and the number of requests has continued to decline since last fiscal year. Of the 499 requests received, 270 were for the five restricted counties compared to 924 (84% of total) requests to these counties seen in FY2015. In FY2017, all neighboring counties that were restricted continued absorbing all ports due to a tight rental market that has affected utilization numbers for all Bay Area housing authorities. This has caused a significant drop in vouchers being billed to OHA and a savings in the financial administration of port out requests. Fourteen requests to port were denied to a restricted county because they were not absorbed by the neighboring housing authority. OHA has seen a steady decrease in the amount of port outs needing to be administered by OHA as neighboring counties continue to absorb and at the end of the FY was administering 16 ports for other counties.

OHA did not see the anticipated reduction of the ported out vouchers because neighboring counties were all absorbing ports to improve their low utilization rates. Historically OHA has had over 1,200 housing choice vouchers ported to neighboring jurisdictions that have not been absorbed by the receiving jurisdiction. Currently OHA has 16 vouchers ported to neighboring jurisdictions, which have not been absorbed.

*Status Update/Schedule:* OHA initiated the activity for the first year of implementation for only five counties and does not currently plan to expand the activity to the other four restricted counties. OHA has been informed that during the next fiscal year, since the Housing Authority of Alameda County and Contra Costa County Housing Authority, the two PHA's with the most port requests (233 combined) and several others such as Livermore have decided to no longer absorb effective July 1, 2017. This will impact the number of exemption requests that OHA processes to restricted jurisdictions based upon the hardship criteria.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* Due to the lack of inventory and tightening of the rental market in the entire Bay Area, all neighboring housing authorities were absorbing port out requests during the reporting year, so the intent to restrict ports to these neighboring jurisdictions was not realized. OHA will continue this activities and track changes now that some jurisdictions have stop absorbing any ports beginning in July of 2017.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* There are no changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks included in the Standard HUD Metrics table below.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There are no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b>				
<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).  Local Port-out Requests	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$46.94 (Staff Salary) * 1.5 hours * 700 port-out requests = \$49,287	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$46.94 * 1.5 hours * 350 = \$24,643 (50% reduction)	Actual cost of task after implementation = \$19,011 (based on 270 rejected requests)	No. A 77 % cost reduction was achieved.
Administering Local Port-outs	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$46.94 (Staff Salary) * 1 hours * 1,100 port-out requests = \$51,634	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$46.94 (Staff Salary) * 825 port-out requests = \$38,726 (25% reduction)	Actual cost of task after implementation = \$2,581 (55 annual average of ports administered)	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded. This was due to almost all ports were absorbed.
Total cost of task in dollars.	Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$49,287 + \$51,634 = \$100,921	Total expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$26,644 + \$38,726 = \$63,370 (37% reduction)	Actual cost of task after implementation = \$19,011+\$2,581 = \$21,592 (66 % reduction)	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded by 34%.
<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).  Local Port-Out Requests	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = 1.5 hours * 700 requests =1,050 staff hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 1.5 hours * 350 requests = 525 hours (50% reduction)	Actual staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 1.5 hours * 55 requests = 83 hours (88% reduction)	Yes. An 88% reduction was achieved primarily due to ports being absorbed.

Administering Local Port-outs	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = 1 hour * 1,100 = 1,100 staff hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 1 hour * 825 requests = 825 hours (25% reduction)	Actual staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 1 hour * 55 requests = 55 hours (95% reduction)	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = 1,050 + 1,100 = 2,150 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 525 + 825 = 1,350 hours (37% reduction)	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 83 + 55 = 138 hours (94% reduction)	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded.

#### MTW Activity #15-02: Modified Utility Allowance Policy

*Description of MTW Activity:* A modification to past policies which streamlines utility allowances to be consistent with the household's minimum subsidy or occupancy standard and eliminates the utility allowance payment.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* OHA saw a decrease of 99% in the cost of utility allowances paid as Utility Reimbursement Payments (URP). There were no URP payments for public housing families during the past year and only six families were still receiving URP payments in the HCV program, totaling \$1,528. This is a 99% reduction since inception as all but 5 families have had URP payments eliminated. OHA projects that during FY2018, all URP payments will be eliminated. The reduction of utility allowances which took effect at recertification or interim visits, has also been staged in. This caused the savings to be lower than projected for both these components. Additionally, we projected an average of \$18 in reduction in utility allowance payments but the average savings experienced was slightly higher at \$24. We note that the number of households choosing units larger than the subsidy size was reduced from 4,256 to 3,435 in FY2017. This was anticipated as families opted for smaller sized units for economic reasons (high cost of housing in Oakland) and to avoid paying higher utility costs. Overall the greater than expected savings and reduction in households opting for larger units caused the increase in savings.

*Status Update/Schedule:* Implementation to pay allowances based on subsidy size were deployed for the HCV residents only and as described in the FY 2015 plan, we expect to develop a phased approach to execute this activity in our Public Housing portfolio.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA did not experience any challenges or the need to develop new strategies for this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* There are no changes or modifications to the metrics, baselines or benchmarks to report.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes or modifications to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). Utility Allowance	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$11,188,104 per year	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$10,228,812 (9% reduction)	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$9,693,924	Yes. A savings of 13% was achieved.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). Utility Reimbursement Payment	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = Utility Reimbursement Payment = \$220,968 per year	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$110,484 (50% reduction)	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$1,528 (99% reduction)	Yes. A reduction of 99% was achieved.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease). Staff	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = (Staff salary) * .05 hours * number of files = (\$46.14 *.05) * 2,904 = \$6,699	Cost of task after to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Cost of task after implementation of the activity = (\$46.14*.05)*6= \$14 (99.9% reduction).	No. A reduction of 99% was achieved because the implementation was staged based on recertification and 50058 changes. At the end of the FY only 5 families remain.
<b>Total cost of task in dollars.</b>	<b>Total cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$11,188,104 + \$220,968 + \$6,699 = \$11,415,771</b>	<b>Total expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$10,228,812 + \$110,484 = \$10,449,780 (8.5% reduction)</b>	<b>Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$9,693,924 + \$1,528 + \$14 = \$9,695,466 (15% reduction)</b>	<b>Yes. A 15% reduction was achieved instead of the 8.5% predicted.</b>
<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>

Total time to complete the task in staff hours  Utility Reimbursement Payment	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = .05 hours * 2,909 checks = 145 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 0 hours * 2,909 checks = 0 hours	Actual amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 0.05 hours * 6 checks = 0.5 hours	No. The activity was implemented in a staged manner so the amount of checks was reduced, but not eliminated.
---	---	---	--	--

***CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution***

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	OHA is working with the parameters of the new business system to determine how error rate of these tasks can be tracked. Custom solutions may need to be developed with the vendor and a solution is not readily available at this time.			

***CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue***

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue/total tenant payment in dollars (increase).  Housing Choice Voucher (HCV)	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$4,343,040	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$5,191,848 (21% increase)	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$4,846,418 (10% increase)	No. A 10% increase was achieved instead of the 21% projected.
Rental revenue/total tenant payment in dollars (increase).  Public Housing	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$2,215,116	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$2,222,460 (Less than 1% increase)	Public Housing sites have not implemented the activity	
<b>Total rental revenue/total tenant payment in dollars (increase). Public Housing and HCV</b>	<b>Total rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) \$6,558,156</b>	<b>Total expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$7,414,308 (12% increase)</b>	<b>Not implemented</b>	
<b>Total rental revenue/total</b>	<b>Total rental revenue prior to</b>	<b>Total expected rental revenue</b>	<b>Actual rental revenue after</b>	<b>No. A 10% increase was</b>

tenant payment in dollars (increase).	implementation of the activity (in dollars) \$4,343,040	after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$5,191,848 (21% increase)	implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$4,846,418	achieved instead of the 12% projected.
---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

#### MTW Activity #14-01: Alternative Recertification Schedules

*Description of MTW Activity:* Regulations require that a household's income is recertified for program eligibility and rent calculations once a year. In FY 2007, MTW activity #07-01 was approved allowing for a triennial recertification schedule for elderly and/or disabled households on a fixed income in the Public Housing and Section 8 programs. In the interim years, at the discretion of the Executive Director, an automatic adjustment may be applied to the households' housing payment equal to the cost of living adjustment (COLA) made to the households' related income subsidy program. This activity has been implemented in the Section 8 program and at two senior-designated properties in the Public Housing program. This schedule has been effective at reducing staff time and costs, as well as, being less intrusive and time consuming for residents. Activity #14-01 incorporates changes made by Activity #07-01 and changes the recertification schedule for wage earning households to once every two years. All households that report no income, no income from wages, or temporary income remain on an annual recertification schedule to report increases in income.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* OHA and participant families will experience time savings related to the forgone recertifications. Participant families on the biennial or triennial schedule may also see income savings as a result of OHA not recalculating rent portions during the interim.

*Status Update/Schedule:* Initiated the activity for the first year of implementation and experienced challenges with the new business system. OHA worked with the business system vendor to explain the design of this activity and develop a custom modification to accommodate the activity. OHA is waiting for the vendor to deliver the solution.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* Initiated the activity for the first year of implementation. OHA experienced challenges with implementation due to the new business system that was implemented in 2015 and met with the vendor to specify custom modifications to accommodate this activity. Due to system limitations that would cause staff to do manual overrides for recertification dates for all biennial and triennial families, OHA elected to continue with the select group of triennial families for which the activity had been implemented under #07-01. When the software modifications have been delivered and tested, OHA will expand implementation for biennial and the remaining triennial eligible families.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* There are no changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks included in the Standard HUD Metrics table below.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There are no changes to the data collection methodology included in the Standard HUD Metrics table below. OHA plans to implement custom changes to its business system to accommodate this activity.



**CE #1: Agency Cost Savings**

<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).  Fixed Income HCV Reexam Calculation	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$111,940	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$57,985 (48% reduction)	Actual cost of task in dollars after implementation of the activity = \$59,002	No. The benchmark was missed by 1%.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).  Senior and Disabled Public Housing Reexam Calculation	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$42,000	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$21,000 (50% reduction)	Actual cost of task in dollars after implementation of the activity = \$2,665	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded by 87%.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).  Wage Earning HCV Reexam Calculation	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$146,300	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$73,150 (50% reduction)	Not Implemented	
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).  Wage Earning Public Housing Reexam Calculation	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$29,250	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$14,625 (50% reduction)	Not Implemented	
<b>Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).</b>	<b>Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$329,490</b>	<b>Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$166,760 (51% reduction)</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	
<b>Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).</b>	<b>Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$153,940</b>	<b>Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$78,985 (51% reduction)</b>	<b>Actual cost after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$59,002+\$2,665 = \$61,667</b>	<b>Yes. Benchmark exceeded by 22%.</b>

### CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).  Fixed Income HCV <i>Reexam</i> Calculation	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours) = 2,678 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) = 1,475 hours (37% reduction)	Actual amount of staff time to complete after implementation of the activity in hours = 1,129	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded by 23%.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).  Fixed Income Public Housing <i>Reexam</i> Calculation	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours) = 1,680 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) = 840 hours (50% reduction)	Actual amount of staff time to complete the task after implementation of the activity in hours = 51	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded by 94%.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).  Wage Earning HCV <i>Reexam</i> Calculation	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours) = 3,500 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) = 1,750 hours (50% reduction)	Not Implemented	
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).  Work Eligible Public Housing <i>Reexam</i> Calculation	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours) = 1,170 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) = 585 hours (50% reduction)	Not Implemented	
<b>Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).</b>	<b>Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementat</b>	<b>Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>	

	ion of the activity (in hours) = 9,028 hours	hours) = 4,650 hours (52% reduction)		
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease). Fixed income Public Housing and HCV only	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours) = 4,358 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) = 2,315 hours (53% reduction)	Actual amount of staff time to complete the task after implementation of the activity (in hours) = 1,129+51=1,180	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded by 49%.

**CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Calculation of this metric is unclear since this activity changes the timing of the reexamination and does not change the rent calculation formula.			

**SS #1: Increase in Household Income**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = Public Housing: \$10,926 HCV: \$14,444	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = Public Housing: \$12,020 (10% increase) HCV: \$15,888 (10% increase)	Triennial families do not have earned income. All sources of income are fixed. Not applicable	

**SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status**

*Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.*

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Triennial families do not earn income – all sources are fixed. The components of this metric are not currently measured in OHA's business system.			
(1) Employed Full-Time				
(2) Employed Part-Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other-Drug Rehab Counseling				
Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Unknown			

**SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Number of households receiving TANF prior to implementation of this activity = 100 households	Number of households receiving TANF after implementation of this activity = 90 households (10% decrease)	This is not applicable to families on fixed income. These are the only households where this activity has been implemented.	

**SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA	Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of this activity = Zero (0)	Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of this	OHA is currently unable to measure this metric. OHA will explore procedures to track this info	

uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.		activity = 10% of eligible households	or modify the definition.	
---	--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------	--

#### **MTW Activity #12-01: Eliminate Caps on PBV Allocations**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Eliminate caps on project-based voucher (PBV) allocations. Under the existing regulations, Public Housing Authorities (PHA) are limited to project-basing up to 20 percent (20%) of the amount of budget authority allocated to the PHA by HUD in the PHA voucher program. In addition, PHAs are limited to project-basing up to 25 percent (25%) of units in a single development. Previously, OHA has received approval in the FY 2010 MTW Plan to remove the cap on the number of PBVs allocated to a single development. This activity was expanded on the previously approved activity to eliminate caps on PBV allocations in all areas.

Under traditional regulations, OHA would be restricted to award PBV allocations of up to 20% of the total authorized vouchers in the HCV program and 25% per project. Since inception, OHA has contributed to the creation and preservation of 3,366 PBV assisted units. If the projects were limited to a 25% cap only 826 units would have been eligible for assistance. Through this activity, OHA has been able to assist 2,149 additional units. Table 13 provides a breakdown of the PBVs awarded by development above the 25% cap through FY17.

Under the 20% cap, OHA's current budget authority would only allow 2,573 vouchers to be project-based. Currently, OHA has 3,994 PBVs allocated, so this activity has allowed an additional 1,421 vouchers above the 20% cap.

#### *Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:*

Throughout FY17, a tight and expensive rental market severely impacted the ability for tenant-based voucher holders to find and lease available units in Oakland. To secure and reserve additional housing units that will be available to Section 8 eligible families, OHA expanded per project limits for PBV. In FY17, projects were allowed to attach PBV assistance to up to 50% of the units at a development and up to 100% for units set aside for seniors and special needs populations.

The City of Oakland offers a biennial competition for affordable housing development funding which was last opened in FY16. No new projects were awarded by the City in FY17 however projects that were selected in the FY16 competitive process were given the opportunity to increase the number of vouchers they could request from OHA to up to 50% of the units at the development.

In FY17, OHA also made a conditional award of 32 PBV units, of which 16 units were above the 25% cap, to the Empyrean Hotel. The Empyrean Hotel is a proposed OHA partnership project which involves substantial rehabilitation of the development site and the PBVs were awarded

without a competitive process. Additionally, OHA also released its own RFQ to directly solicit new PBV housing units at “existing” sites. Projects that were already operating under a PBV HAP contract were allowed to add units to their PBV allocations via this competition. OHA accepted applications from 15 new existing sites that exceeded the 25% cap limit and 4 developments that were already operating under a PBV HAP contract, requested additional vouchers above the 25% limit. The Hamilton Apartments also utilized this competition to initiate the process to convert Moderate Rehabilitation program units to PBV assistance. In total, conditional awards were made for 369 new units above the 25% per project cap in FY17.

To date, 2,543 units have been awarded above the 25% per project cap.

Development Name	Total Units	Total PBV Units Above the 25%	Service Enriched
<b>OHA Existing RFQ - New Site</b>			
1. Rosa Park	11	9	11
2. Courtyards at Acorn	87	9	
3. Bishop Roy C. Nicholas	17	13	
4. Sylvester Rutledge Manor	64	48	
5. Oak Park Apts	35	2	
6. Swan's Market	18	6	
7. Hamilton Apts -( Mod Rahab Conversion)	92	69	
8. Drachma Housing	19	7	
9. International Blvd Apts	30	11	
10. Northgate Apts	41	4	
11. Stanley Avenue Lofts	24	7	
12. Adeline Street Lofts	38	11	
13. Oak Street Apts	39	16	
14. Westlake Christian Terrace West	200	71	
15. Eastside Arts & Housing	15	7	10
<b>OHA Existing RFQ - Added Units</b>			
16. Seven Directions (add to 18 in place)	36	19	
17. Fox Court Apts (add to 20 in place)	80	13	
18. Madison Apts (add to 19 in place)	78	31	
19. Kenneth Henry Court (add to 13 in place)	51	16	
		369	
<b>New Conditional Award - Substantial Rehab</b>			
Empyrean Hotel	66	16	
		<b>385</b>	

Table 13 Number of PBV Units Awarded Above the 25% Cap				
Site Name	Total Units	25% of the Total Units	Total PBV Units Awarded	PBV Units Awarded Above the 25% Cap
<b>Senior Housing</b>				
Jack London Gateway - Phase II	61	15	60	45
Orchards on Foothill	65	16	64	48
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase II	81	20	40	20
St. Joseph's Senior Apartments	84	21	83	77
Merritt Crossing (aka 6th & Oak Apts.)	70	17	50	33
Lakeside Senior Apartments	92	23	91	68
Lion Creek Crossings Phase V	128	32	127	95
Camino 23	32	8	26	18
Bishop Roy C. Nicholas	17	4	17	13
Sylvester Rutledge Manor	64	16	64	48
Oak Street Apts	<u>39</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>16</u>
<b>Senior Housing Total</b>	<b>733</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>481</b>
<b>Special Needs Housing</b>				
Jefferson Oaks	102	25	101	76
California Hotel	137	34	135	101
1701 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	25	6	25	19
Redwood Hill Townhomes FY15	28	7	11	4
Redwood Hill Townhomes FY16			16	16
Fruitvale Transit Village - Phase IIA	92	23	66	43
Embark Apartments	62	15	61	46
Rosa Park	11	2	11	9
Eastside Arts & Housing	15	3	10	7
Empyrean	<u>66</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>16</u>
<b>Special Needs Housing Total</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>337</b>
<b>Family Affordable Housing</b>				
Drachma Housing (On-going)	14	3	14	11
Oak Point Limited	31	7	15	8
James Lee Court	26	6	12	6
Drasnin Manor	26	6	25	19
MacArthur Apartments	32	8	14	6
11th and Jackson	71	17	35	18
Cathedral Gardens	100	25	43	18
460 Grand	68	17	34	17
Madison Park Apartments	98	24	96	72
Hugh Taylor House	43	10	35	25
Coliseum Place*	59	14	37	23
Courtyards at Acorn	87	21	30	9
Oak Park Apts	35	8	10	2
Swan Market	18	4	10	6
Hamilton Apts-(Mod Rehab Conversion)	92	23	92	69
Drachma Housing	19	4	11	7
International Blvd Apts	30	7	18	11
Northgate Apts	41	10	14	4
Stanley Avenue Lofts	24	6	13	7
Adeline Street Lofts	38	9	20	11
Westlake Christian Terrace West	200	50	121	71
Seven Directions (add to 18 in-place)	36	9	10	19
Fox Court Apts (add to 20 in-place)	80	20	13	13
Madsion Apts (add to 19 in-place)	78	19	31	31
Kenneth Henry Ct (add to 13 in-place)	<u>51</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>
<b>Family Affordable Housing Total</b>	<b>1397</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>499</b>
<b>OHA Former Public Housing</b>				
OHA Scattered Sties (On going)	1,539	385	1,539	1,166
Tassafaronga Village Phase I	137	34	80	46
Tassafaronga Village Phase II	<u>20</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>14</u>
<b>Former Public Housing Total</b>	<b>1,696</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>1,638</b>	<b>1,226</b>
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>4,364</b>	<b>1075</b>	<b>3,521</b>	<b>2,543</b>



\*Family and Special Needs

The developments shaded in gray received new PBVs awarded in FY 2017.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity remains ongoing.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA does not have challenges to report with this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* No changes were made to the Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b>				
<b>HC #4: Displacement Prevention</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity = Zero(0)	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Number of households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	No.
<b>Standard OHA Metrics</b>				
<b>Number of Units Awarded above 20% of Total Units in the Voucher Program</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of PBV units awarded above 20% of total units in the voucher program.	Number of PBV units awarded above 20% of the total units in the voucher program = Zero (0)	Number of PBV units awarded above 20% of the total units in the voucher program = Zero (0) new and/or preservation units	Actual number of PBV units awarded above 20% of the total units in the voucher program = 673 new and/or	Yes – exceeded by 673 units awarded above the 20% cap

			preservation units	
<b>Number of Units Created in Developments with Allocations Over 25%</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of units and development opportunities created in developments with allocations over 25%.	Number of PBV units awarded above 25% of the total units in a project = Zero (0)	Number of PBV units awarded above 25% of the total units in a project = Zero (0) new and/or preservation units	Actual number of PBV units awarded above 25% of the total units in a project = 385 new and/or preservation units	Yes – exceeded by 385 units awarded above the cap at 19 existing sites and one substantial rehab project.
<b>Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 21 households	Yes. 21 new households will receive services and are units set aside for special needs populations.

#### **MTW Activity #11-01: PBV Occupancy Standards**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Modify the occupancy standards in the PBV program to be consistent with occupancy standards required by other state or locally administered funding in a development (e.g. LIHTC program). Based on family composition, under this activity a family may qualify for a larger bedroom size than they would have under the previous policy. The activity applies to new participants in the PBV program and to in-place families whose household composition changes would require them to relocate.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* During the FY17, 24 new leases were executed under the Modified PBV occupancy standards. These families would not have qualified for the PBV assisted unit under the Housing Choice Voucher occupancy standard. Additionally, five (5) in place PBV assisted families had a change in their family composition during the FY that would otherwise require them to relocate to a smaller unit. These families remained eligible to stay their current unit under the Modified occupancy standard. The outcomes of this activity largely depend on participant families requesting changes to household composition, and as a result the activity was not utilized as much as expected.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA does not have challenges to report with this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* Changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks are included in the table below.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b>				
<b>HC #4: Displacement Prevention</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).	Number of Households losing assistance or forced to move prior to implementation of the activity = Three (3) households	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Number of households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = 5 households (in-place families)	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded as five (5) families retained housing without moving due to family composition changes that might have required them to relocate to a smaller unit.
<b>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>

Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 24 households (new lease ups)	Yes. (24) New families were able to lease units under the modified occupancy standard and increasing their housing choice.
---	---	---	--	--

**Standard OHA Metrics**  
**Additional Units of Housing Made Available**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Number of households who would not qualify for an available unit based on household composition = Zero (0) households	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 5 households	Number of households who qualified for a unit that would not have without this activity = 24 households.	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded by 480% with 24 households qualifying for units.

**Units of Housing Preserved**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units preserved prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) units Verify	Expected housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = 2 units	Actual housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = 5 units	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded by 3 units.

**Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice**

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 5 households	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of activity = 17 households are in sites with on-site services providers.	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded by 240%.

#### **MTW Activity #11-03: SRO/Studio Apartment Project-based Preservation Program**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Develop a PBV sub-program to award long-term housing assistance to Single Room Occupancy (SRO) and studio apartment developments. Based on local market conditions, OHA will extend assistance to programs that provide service enriched housing and those programs that solely provide the housing component given the high need for housing in Oakland.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* Due to high market rate rents and very low inventory of affordable housing, hard to house populations are being adversely affected, as developers opt to convert SRO housing to other uses. In FY2017, OHA issued a Request for Qualification (RFQ) inviting qualified owners, property managers, and developers of service enriched rental housing to submit written proposals demonstrating their interest in securing Local Housing Assistance Program funding. The RFQ was for existing housing units only and limited to (3) housing types:

- 1) Service enriched single room occupancy units
- 2) Shared housing units set aside for veterans, emancipated youth or other special needs populations and programs
- 3) Transitional housing units set aside for veterans, emancipated youth or other special needs populations

A total of 289 units across 15 properties were conditionally awarded during FY2017. These awards are conditional based on units passing Housing Quality Standard inspections, projects receiving environmental clearance and existing tenants being eligible for PBV assistance. OHA is working to complete application for environmental clearance for these projects and expects to complete the lease up of the new units in FY2018.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing. OHA is working to complete application for environmental clearance for these projects and expects to complete the lease up of the new units in FY2018.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA does not have challenges to report with this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* Changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks are included in the table below.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>HC #4: Displacement Prevention</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity = Zero(0)	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = Zero (135)	Number of households who were prevented from losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = zero (0)	No. Activity has not been implemented.
<b>HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Number of units of this type prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) units	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = Zero (150) units	Number of housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = Zero units	No. Activity has not been implemented.
<b>HC#2: Units of Housing Preserved</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>

Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units preserved prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) units	Expected housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = Zero (150) units	Number of housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = Zero units	No. Activity has not been implemented.
---	--	--	---	--

***HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility***

<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = Zero (150) households	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = Zero	No. Activity has not been implemented.

***HC#7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice***

<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = Zero (110) households	Number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = Zero households	No. Activity has not been implemented.



## **MTW Activity #11-05: PBV Transitional Housing Program**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Develop sub-programs modeled after the Project-Based Voucher program to allow for transitional housing opportunities at developments serving low-income special needs households who otherwise might not qualify for or be successful in the Public Housing and/or Section 8 programs. This activity uses established partnerships with the Alameda County Sheriff's Office (ACSO), to facilitate the development of local, non-traditional housing programs like the Maximizing Opportunities for Mothers to Succeed (MOMS) initiative. This program offers service-enriched transitional housing support to formerly incarcerated mothers seeking to reunite with their children and deter recidivism. The Dads Acquiring and Developing Skills (DADS) program serves fathers exiting minimum security incarceration seeking to reunite with their children and families. Currently, ACSO refers MOMS and DADS program participants to OHA for housing. OHA has implemented the Parents and Children Together (PACT) program to provide transitional service enriched housing to both populations. In addition to the housing subsidy, the PACT program offers customized adult, family and youth case management, group counseling services, family activities and educational and employment development assistance to all participants as a condition for participation in the program.

Potential PACT participants apply and are screened while in custody at the Santa Rita jail and once accepted they complete a needs assessment and intake processing. Participants complete an 8-week gender specific educational component while in custody and create an Individual Action Plan (IAP) tailored to meet the needs of each participant. Once housed at the PACT site, case managers work with participants to complete their IAP using various supportive services for the participants and their children.

Along with the primary program partners Alameda County Sheriff's Office (ACSO) and the Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (ACBHS) Department, OHA continues to determine the strategic direction and lead the multi partner board to address program improvements. Additions to the program structure included a sober living agreement; an alumni participation agreement, stronger coordination of multi-agency intervention for lease non-compliance and additional on-site program activities to enhance parent/child engagement and workforce development for older youth and adults. During FY2017, ASCO hired a new supportive service provider Youth3 and Family Services Bureau (YFSC) to provide services to program participants in addition to the Family and Community Partnerships department within OHA.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* Families assisted under this activity represent some of the local, non-traditional households served by OHA. There were five new admissions during the fiscal year and overall eighteen participants participated in the program which achieves 162% of the MOMS benchmark. Of the eighteen participants, three households were withdrawn due to program and lease compliance issues and one graduated. OHA had 12 PACT participants on average per month.

Through the PACT program resources, participants work to become employed and increase their incomes through steady employment. The average earned income for all participant households was \$6,645. One participant completed the program requirements and transitioned to stable housing. OHA relies on its community partners to provide skill building and job development workshops that help increase the employability of the PACT participants and to refer participants to the Workforce Development initiative within the OHA Family and Community Partnerships Department.

Performance metrics on participant savings and subsidy cost savings were not measurable at the time of this report due to OHA's and partner agencies limited capacity to track performance. OHA is working with the new services provider to track metrics for this activity.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing. Referrals from ACSO of Dads Acquiring and Developing Skills (DADS) program participants began during FY2017 and there is currently one DADS referral housed through PACT.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* No challenges to report for this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* No changes to the metrics, baselines or benchmarks are reported.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b> <b>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 8 households	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 12 households (5 new admissions)	Yes. The PACT benchmark was exceeded.
<b>HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 8 households	Number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 12 households	150% of the PACT benchmark was achieved.
<b>Standard OHA Metrics</b> <b>Additional Units of Housing Made Available</b>				

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Number of households who would not qualify for an available unit based on household composition = Zero (0) households	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 8 households	Average number of households made available after implementation of this activity = 12 households	Yes. 150% of the PACT benchmark was achieved.
<b><i>Increase in Household Income</i></b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars prior to implementation of this activity = Zero (0)	Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars after implementation of this activity = \$12,740 (1040 hours at \$12.25 minimum wage)	Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars = \$6,644	No.
<b><i>Increase in Household Savings</i></b>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average amount of savings/escrow of households prior to this policy = Zero (0) in dollars.	Average amount of savings/escrow of households after implementation of this policy = \$500 in dollars	Amount of savings/escrow of households after implementation of this policy = \$0 dollars	No.
<b><i>Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i></b>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following				

information separately for each category:				
(1) Employed Full- Time	Number of participants employed at start of program = Zero (0)	Number of participants employed at during program = Zero (0)	Number of participants employed at during program = 3	Yes. 150% of benchmark achieved.
(2) Employed Part-Time	Number of participants employed at start of program = Zero (0)	Number of participants employed during program = Two (2)	Number of participants employed during program = 4	Yes. 100% of the benchmark was achieved.
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program	Number of participants in Educational program at start of program = Zero (0)	Number of participants in Educational program during program = Three (3)	Number of participants in Educational program during program = 13	Yes. Benchmark was exceeded.
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program	Number of participants in Job Training program at start of program = Zero (0)	Number of participants in Job Training program during program = one (1)	Number of participants in Job Training program during program = 2	Yes.
(5) Unemployed	Number of participants unemployed at start of program = Eight (8)	Number of participants unemployed during program = six (6)	Number of participants unemployed during program =11	Yes.
(6) Other – Drug Rehab Counseling	Number of participants in drug rehab =0	Number of participants in drug rehab =0	Number of participants in drug rehab =12	Yes.
Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.				
<b>Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>

Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Number of households receiving TANF assistance = eight (8)	Number of households receiving TANF assistance = eight (8)	Number of households receiving TANF assistance during program = seventeen (17)	Yes.
Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).	Number of Households receiving services prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected number of Households receiving services after implementation of the activity = 10 households	Number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 18 households	Yes. The benchmark was exceeded.
Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	OHA's current business system and partner does not have the capacity to accurately measure this metric. The partner agencies were not obligated to track this information during the fiscal year. OHA will explore a customization to track this information with the business system vendor.			
Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self- sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II)	Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of this activity = Zero (0)	Expected number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of this activity = 3 households	Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of this activity = 1 Household	No.

Operating Information in the space provided.				
--	--	--	--	--

#### **MTW Activity #10-01: Specialized Housing Programs**

*Description of MTW Activity:* In partnership with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department (ACSO), OHA operates the PACT program which takes referrals from the MOMS and DADS programs operated by ACSO. This activity increases the allocation of resources to the PACT program to improve outcomes and enhance program coordination among partners.

OHA created the PACT program and implements this activity in conjunction with Activity 11-05. The partnerships established with the ASCO, the Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (ACBHS) Department, and family supportive services subcontractors allow funds to be leveraged to provide services to participants of the PACT program and are authorized under this activity. These funds are critical to the success and expansion of the existing PACT program.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* In FY 2017, OHA collaborates with community partners that provide dedicated staff to provide on-site case management and training and operational support funding from the Inmate Welfare Fund. OHA exceeded the expected benchmark of \$100,000 by leveraging \$426,773 from local non-profits and public agencies in salaries and operating costs.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA does not have challenges to report with this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* There are no changes to the baselines and benchmarks for this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b>				
<b>CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = Zero (0)	Amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$100,000	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity = \$426,773	Yes. The Benchmark was exceeded.

## MTW Activity #10-02: Program Extension for Households Receiving Zero HAP

*Description of MTW Activity:* Modify the HCV program rules to allow participants receiving a Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) of zero (\$0) to remain in the program for up to 24 months before being terminated from the program.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* The baselines for this activity are set at zero given that existing program regulations require all families that reach the zero HAP status are terminated after six months. Over the course of the Fiscal Year, 234 families have been in a “zero HAP” status, with 153 families using the safety net of the additional 18 months on the program to maintain their income stability. At year-end 83 families were utilizing the allowed extension to 24 months. During the year 119 families changed status from no longer zero HAP due to income decreases, changes in household compositions, rent increases, removal of a wage earner or move to a more expensive unit. Twenty five families achieved self sufficiency as defined by this activity, by exiting the HCV program after being at zero HAP for 24 months. The outcomes demonstrate that while households are able to benefit from the protections provided under this activity, with a 17% increase in the average income of families on zero HAP, the majority of families return to subsidy due to various reasons. With the extremely competitive and expensive rental market in the Bay Area, families seem to opt for decreasing income or changing family composition over exiting the program. This outcome demonstrates the need for this activity, especially in times of increasing rents and a rental market with low inventory.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA continues to research strategies that will encourage families to utilize the extension provided by the activity and achieve economic self-sufficiency by graduating and exiting from the Section 8 program.

OHA has made some organizational changes that allow this group to be tracked in more detail as staff has been assigned to monitor the status changes to this population outside of the constraints of the business system.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* There were no changes or modifications to the metrics, baselines or benchmarks to report.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

Standard HUD Metrics				
SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of	Actual average income of households affected by this policy = \$57,275	Yes. It was exceeded by 17%.



	dollars). \$47,711 for 109 households	the activity (in dollars) = \$47,711 (0% increase)		
SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Number of households receiving TANF assistance prior to implementation of this activity = 11 households	Number of households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of this activity = 10 (10% decrease)	Number of Households receiving TANF = 7 households	Yes. The outcomes exceeded the benchmark with a 30% decrease.
SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household prior to implementation of this policy in dollars = \$995	Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household after implementation of this policy in dollars = \$200 (80% decrease)	Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household after implementation of this policy in dollars = \$766	No.
SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue/HAP in dollars (increase).	Due to challenges with the current business system, OHA is not able to measure this metric at this time. The current capacity of the business system is limited and does not allow reporting on the increase in rent as a result of self-sufficiency activities.			
SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use	Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (self-termination from the program) = Zero (0) families	Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency = 18 families	Actual number of households transitioned to self sufficiency = 25	Yes. The benchmark was achieved and exceeded by 38%.

for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.				
<b>Standard OHA Metrics</b>				
<b>Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).	OHA began referring families to the Family and Community Partnerships (FCP) department to receive services and going forward OHA will develop procedures to track zero HAP participants in FCP programs and services. Currently, only a few FCP program participants are tracked in the OHA business system.			

#### **MTW Activity #10-03: Combined PBV HAP Contract for Non-Contiguous Scattered Sites**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Modify PBV program rules to allow HAP contracts to be executed for non-contiguous buildings.

*Anticipated Impacts:* Reduce agency administrative costs associated with staff time and preparing, executing, and managing the HAP contracts.

*Status Update:* Ongoing. During FY2017, OHA approved conditional awards to multiple projects as a result of proposals received as a result of a Request for Qualifications. One of the projects awarded for PBV allocations, Drachma LP, will utilize this activity in FY18. This activity was not used in Fiscal Year 2017 to combine any HAP contracts for Non-Contiguous scattered sites.

*Changes or Modifications to Activity:* OHA does not anticipate any changes or modifications to the activity in FY 2017.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* There are no changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks included in the Standard HUD Metrics table below except the staff salary/hour rate has been updated.

#### **Standard HUD Metrics**

<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$70 (staff salary/hour) * 80 hours = \$5,600	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$70 * 10 hours = \$700	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity = zero	No. The activity was not used during FY2017.
<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = 10 hours/contract * 8 contracts = 80 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 10 hours/contract * 1 contracts = 10 Hours	Actual time to complete the task after implementation of the activity = zero	No. The activity was not used during FY2017.

#### **MTW Activity #10-05: Acceptance of Lower HAP in PBV Units**

*Description of MTW Activity:* As a result of disposition, some households may meet the definition of “over-housed” based on differences in the occupancy policies in the Public Housing and Section 8 programs. In these situations, this activity allows the landlord or management agent to accept a lower HAP based on the appropriate number of bedrooms for the family as opposed to the actual number of bedrooms in the unit. This activity is also being used to accept a lower HAP to house families in units when there are no families on the waitlist that qualify for the size units that are available.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* Ensure access to housing for families impacted by disposition and preservation of affordable units for families whose subsidy standard is less than the PBV unit size. This activity was initiated in FY2010 as a result of the conversion of Public Housing scattered site units to the PBV program. In house families in former Public Housing scattered sites were allowed to remain in place with tenant protection voucher (TPV) assistance, which does not require enforcement of the minimum number of family members per bedroom size, as is the case with PBV assisted units. This activity continues to be used for the former Public Housing sites, and for PBV sites to reduce vacancies when a smaller unit is unavailable and there are no appropriately sized families on the waitlist. In FY2017, nine new families were assisted under this activity.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA does not have challenges to report with this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* Changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks are included in the table below.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units preserved prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = 60 units preserved	Actual housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = 9 units preserved	No. The benchmark was established when the 2010 disposition happened and will be revised with the next Plan.
<b>SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) =\$645	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity = zero (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity = \$1,625 (in dollars).	Yes.
<b>HC #4: Displacement Prevention</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity (number) = 0 units	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity (number) = Zero (0)	Actual households that would lose assistance or have to move after implementation of the activity (number) = one (0)	Yes. It was exceeded.

## **MTW Activity #10-06: Local Housing Assistance Program**

*Description of MTW Activity:* The Local Housing Assistance Program (LHAP) activity through initiatives like the Sponsor Based Housing Assistance Program (SBHAP) provides support to households that might not qualify for or be successful in the traditional Public Housing and/or Section 8 programs. LHAP provides subsidies to eligible households and to partnering agencies operating service enriched housing for low-income households with special needs. LHAP programs serve families in partnership with the City of Oakland's Department of Human Services and the Oakland PATH Rehousing Initiative. LHAP programs leverage the expertise and experience of the non-profit, community-based service providers to provide rental housing assistance through the form of rental subsidies, utility assistance, security deposits, etc. to individuals who come from homeless encampments or are exiting the criminal justice system, or are emancipated foster youth.

Eligibility requirements are that SBHAP program participants pay no more than 30% of their income towards rent and must meet the same income limits as the Section 8 program and meet the immigration eligibility requirements. All housing units subsidized must meet the Housing Quality Standards (HQS). This activity also provides flexibility to implement its Sponsor-Based Housing Assistance Program and expand its portfolio of local, non-traditional units that serve households below 80% of the Area Median Income. Participant families are assisted by providers contracted by the City of Oakland and must receive supportive services along with the housing assistance offered under the activity. OHA's contract with the City leverages resources, expertise, and community connections to deliver housing related services to on average over 130 hard-to-house households on an annual basis in Oakland.

First Place for Youth supports the young adults in the SBHAP program with a variety of supportive services. An ongoing focus was on education and employment and making sure the youth in the program are informed about college access and alternative programs. The goal of the My First Place Program is to see all of the youth served accessing the community resources available to them. Education and Employment Specialists (EES) work closely with the youth on the four E's. Explore with them their career interests, or if they do not have a career in mind, explore their hobbies. Many youth do not realize that the things they like to do in their free time, could lead them to a career choice. Once they have honed in on ideas for careers, EES's help to educate the youth on what it means to pursue that goal. What education is needed, what stackable certificates can be achieved to reach the goal, and where do they start. The next step is to help the youth experience and explore career options. This is achieved by inviting guest speakers to present, volunteering, job shadowing or spending time one on one with a professional in that field. Finally, the EES's work with the youth to help them get employment in their chosen field and to gain hands on experience.

In addition to the Education and Employment Specialists, each young adult has a trauma-trained, strength based Youth Advocate (YA) that they work with weekly. YA's assist the young adult participants to make sure that they are practicing self-care and being mindful of their emotions and reactions to strong emotions in their daily lives. YA's work closely to determine if youth participants need additional mental health support or community resources and help connect them to the resources that will best allow them to feel supported and balanced, so they can focus on their education and employment goals.

An additional function of this activity initially was to mitigate any negative impacts of the public housing disposition for households that may not have been housed because they were over-income for the new project-based voucher units, or may have experienced a significant rent increase as a result of the conversion from public housing to a project-based voucher subsidy. Originally 44 households were on this program and there are now only 20 households left of the original LHAP families and only four families have elected to take their tenant protection voucher and move during FY2017.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* Families assisted under this activity represent several of the local, non-traditional households served by OHA exercising its MTW authority. During FY 2017, four former disposition households utilized their voucher and moved off of the LHAP program leaving an average of 20 households at the end of the fiscal year to be assisted under this activity. On average, the SBHAP program served 103 families per month. The goal of SBHAP is to serve a minimum of 100 and maximum of 125 families on average per month. The numbers were not as high as projected because four properties housing 16 participants were sold and the new owners did not want to continue to work with the program.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* This activity is experiencing similar challenges in a tight rental market where landlords have multiple options for tenants. Since this population is hard to house with many service needs, it is challenging to maintain and recruit new landlord participants. Partner agencies work closely with OHA, clients and landlords to continue to ensure that any leasing challenges are addressed in a timely manner. In FY 2017, OHA and its partners implemented a new Step-Down initiative, where participants that have remained housed successfully for one year, will be offered a voucher to use to move or remain in place if the landlord chooses to enter the HCV program. Convincing existing landlords to enter the Housing Choice Voucher program has been a challenge. Some of the reasons landlords have given for not wanting to participate are:

- The current SBHAP and Case managers are very responsive to the landlord requests for support when there are any issues with the participant. The landlords perceive they will lose this benefit if they enter the HCV program.
- They preferred the current lease structure and did not want to enter into a contract with OHA which they felt limited their authority/power to end the terms of the lease.
- Past experiences with Section 8 tenants and OHA were not positive and there were no additional support or dedicated staff to call when issues with the participants in dealing with participant issues

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* Changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks are included in the table below.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b>				
<b>HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase) <b>LHAP</b>	Number of households who would not qualify for an available unit based on household composition = Zero (0)	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 39	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 20	No. Only 51% of the benchmark was achieved.
<b>SBHAP</b>	Number of households who would not qualify for an available unit based on household composition = Zero (0)	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 110	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 103	No. Only 92% on average of the families projected were served.
<b>Total number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase).</b>	<b>Total number of households who would not qualify for an available unit based on household composition = Zero (0)</b>	<b>Total expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 149</b>	<b>Total housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 123</b>	<b>No. Only 83 % of the benchmark was met.</b>
<b>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). <b>LHAP</b>	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 39	Actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 20	No. 62% of the benchmark was achieved.



Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). <b>SBHAP</b>	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 110	Actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 103	No. The benchmark was not met.
<b>Total number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).</b>	<b>Total households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)</b>	<b>Total expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 149</b>	<b>Total actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 123</b>	<b>No. Only 83% of the benchmark was achieved.</b>
<b>HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). <b>LHAP</b>	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 14	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 0	No. 0% of the benchmark was achieved. These households do not receive services.
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). <b>SBHAP</b>	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 110	Total actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 103	No. The benchmark was not achieved.

<b>Total number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).</b>	<b>Total households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)</b>	<b>Total expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity =124</b>	<b>Total actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 103</b>	<b>No. 83% of the benchmark was achieved.</b>
---	---	---	--	---

#### **MTW Activity #08-01: Fund Affordable Housing Development Activities**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Utilize Single Fund Flexibility to leverage funds to preserve affordable housing resources and create new affordable housing opportunities in Oakland.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* In FY2017, OHA completed construction and lease up of Prosperity Place, placing 71 new units in service for families and special needs households. This development is located in close proximity to Oakland's vibrant Chinatown district and contributes to the revitalization of Oakland's thriving downtown area, as it continues to be rehabilitated due to Oakland's booming economy and job market. OHA has 465 units in pre-development for the Brooklyn Basin development in partnership with the City of Oakland and Mid-Penn Housing Construction. Construction continued on 94<sup>th</sup> and International with 59 units of family housing. An additional 38 units were rehabilitated in OHA's existing project-based Section 8 portfolio. The chart of units in Appendix D shows the list of units in these developments and the status for all units under construction or rehabilitation.

- 11<sup>th</sup> and Jackson (Prosperity Place) – A new family development with (71) one, two- and three-bedroom apartments along with ground floor commercial space to serve families with incomes up to 60% of the area median income.
- 94<sup>th</sup> and International – A development with 59 units of one, two and three bedrooms for families with income from 30-50% of the area median income. The site will have commercial space and on-site community space for supportive services, a computer room, kitchen, tot-lot and laundry facilities.
- Brooklyn Basin – A 65-acre site that will be completely transformed, with more than 3,000 residences, 32 acres of parks and open spaces, restored wetlands, a new marina and 200,000 sq ft of retail and commercial space. The Authority is working with the City of Oakland and nonprofit developer, MidPen, to develop the affordable housing portion of this larger development. A total of 465 affordable units (110 for seniors and 355 for families) will be built in four phases.
- Empyrean Towers – Renovation of a market-rate Single Room Occupancy (SRO) building built in 1911 consisting of 99 small units with no kitchens into permanently affordable self-contained units. Among other work, the renovation involves expanding the units to studios and one-bedroom apartments, all including baths and kitchenettes. The resulting property will house 66 units (54 studios and 12 one-bedrooms) targeting low-income individuals and small households. The Authority is working with nonprofit developer Resources for Community Development.
- 15<sup>th</sup> and Harrison – A 0.7 acre development site located in downtown Oakland that is currently owned by the Authority. This project is in the predevelopment planning phase.

The goal is to leverage private and public financing in order to construct up to 118 units of new affordable rental housing for low-income families.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA does not have challenges to report with this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* Changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks are included in the table below.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b>				
<b>HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 130 units under construction and completed during the Fiscal Year	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 71 units under construction during the Fiscal Year	No. 55% of the benchmark was achieved. Of the 130 in construction, 71 were completed and placed in service for families.
<b>HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units preserved prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = 100 units rehabilitated	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 38 units	No. Units substantially rehabbed were in the OAHPI portfolio.

<b>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 239 households	Actual number of households able to move to a better unit after implementation of this activity = 71 units	No. 30% of the benchmark was achieved. Construction delays pushed completion of one project to FY2018.

#### **MTW Activity #06-01: Site Based Wait Lists**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Establish site based wait lists at all public housing sites, HOPE VI sites, and developments with PBV allocations.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* Outcomes for this activity were unable to be measured during FY 2017.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA initially created this activity to measure different outcomes than those required under the standard HUD metrics. The new standard metrics do not represent the activity and we respectfully request that they be revised to more accurately represent the activity outcomes.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* OHA will change the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks to more adequately measure performance in the areas defined by the standard HUD metrics.

*Changes or Modifications to the Data Collection Methodology:* There were no changes to the data collection methodology to report.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b>				
<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>

Total cost of determining program eligibility in dollars (decrease).	Indicators do not represent the activity and we respectfully suggest that they be revised to represent outcomes.			
Total cost of lease available vacant units to public housing applicants in dollars (decrease).	Indicators do not represent the activity and we respectfully suggest that they be revised to represent outcomes.			
CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Indicators do not represent the activity and we respectfully suggest that they be revised to represent outcomes.			
CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Indicators do not represent the activity and we respectfully suggest that they be revised to represent outcomes.			
HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Indicators do not represent the activity and we respectfully suggest that they be revised to represent outcomes.			

#### **MTW Activity #06-02: Allocation of PBV Units: Without Competitive Process**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Allocate PBV units to developments owned directly or indirectly by OHA without using a competitive process.

*Anticipated Impacts:* Reduce the administrative time and development costs associated with issuing an RFP. Increase housing choices by creating new or replacement affordable housing opportunities.

*Status Update:* Ongoing. OHA awarded 32 PBVs to the Empyrean Towers project in support of redeveloping it into a 66-unit affordable housing development in FY17.

*Changes or Modifications to Activity:* OHA does not anticipate any changes or modifications to the activity in FY 2017.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* There are no changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks included in the Standard HUD Metrics table below.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b>			
<b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>			
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$7,500 per RFP	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$0	One project was awarded PBV funding in FY17 without competitive process, saving = \$7500
<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>			
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = 100 hours per RFP	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 15 hours per RFP	One project awarded PBV funding without competitive process in FY 17, saving = 85 hours of staff time

#### **MTW Activity #06-03: Allocation of PBV Units: Using Existing Competitive Process**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Allocate PBV units to qualifying developments using the City of Oakland Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)/ RFP or other existing competitive process.

*Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* This activity was created to reduce the administrative time and development costs associated with issuing a RFP and to increase housing choices by creating new or replacement affordable housing opportunities. One project, the Emphyrean, was awarded PBV funding for 32 units as a result of their selection for City of Oakland Notice of Funding, a competitive selection process. OHA is working with a developer to convert a 99 unit severely distressed Single-room Occupancy hotel in downtown Oakland into a 66 unit affordable housing site with studio and 1-bedroom apartments.

*Status Update/Schedule:* This activity was active during the fiscal year and remains ongoing. This activity is dependent upon the number of projects that go through the City of Oakland Notice of Funding annual competitive process. With the State elimination of redevelopment

funds to the City, fewer awards are being made currently by the City and the number of high quality new units being generated through this activity has slowed. However, voters approved a \$580 million bond referendum in November of 2016 which will provide \$460 million for rental housing programs and \$120 million for homeowner programs, in Alameda County and may provide additional opportunities for OHA to award PBV funding for future projects awarded funding from the City.

*Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies:* OHA does not have challenges to report with this activity.

*Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks:* No changes were made to the metrics, baselines or benchmarks.

<b>Standard HUD Metrics</b> <b>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$7,500 per RFP	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$0	One project was awarded PBV funding without an OHA administered RFP = Cost savings of \$7,500	Yes. OHA saved \$7,5000 and maintained a benchmark of zero expenditures.
<b>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Benchmark Achieved?</b>
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = 100 hours per RFP	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 15 hours per RFP	One project was awarded PBV funding without an OHA administered RFP - Saving = 85 hours staff time	Yes. OHA spent 15 hours instead of 100 hours of staff time to complete the task.



## B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

Table 14 Approved MTW Activities Not Yet Implemented					
Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	MTW Activity Name	Description	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
13-01	2016	Rent Reform Pilot Program	<p>Creates a pilot program to test rent reform strategies at Campbell Village (Public Housing) and AMP 10 (Section 8 PBV) where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Tenant Payment (TTP) calculated based on 27.5% of gross annual income for seniors and disabled households and 27% for work-eligible households</li> <li>Triennial recertification schedule for senior and disabled households, biennial schedule for work-eligible households</li> <li>Eliminate all deductions and earned income disallowance</li> <li>Recent increases in income excluded in recertification</li> <li>Absolute minimum rent of \$25</li> </ul>	<p>-Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness</p> <p>-Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient</p>	Attachment C, Section C.4, C.11 Section D.1.c Section D.2.a
11-02	2017	Standardized Transfer Policy	Creates standard transfer policies in the public housing, Section 8, Section 9 and project-based assistance programs to increase housing choices for residents.	Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds. Attachment C.D.3.b, Attachment C.C.2
<b>MTW Activity #13-01: Rent Reform Pilot Program</b>					

*Description of MTW Activity:* Create a pilot program to test rent reform strategies at Campbell Village (Public Housing) and AMP 10 (Section 8 PBV) where:

- Total Tenant Payment (TTP) calculated based on 27.5% of gross annual income for seniors and disabled households and 27% for work-eligible households
  - Working seniors and working disabled individuals will have the option to choose to be included in the “work-eligible” group where their rent would be calculated based on 27% of their gross income and they would be on a biennial recertification schedule
- Triennial recertification schedule for senior and disabled households, biennial schedule for work-eligible households

- Eliminate all deductions (elderly/disabled deduction, dependent deduction, medical expenses, child care expenses) and earned income disallowance
- Increases in income within six months of recertification are excluded
- Absolute minimum rent of \$25. Households will still be eligible for a utility allowance. However, no rent will be reduced below the minimum rent due to a utility allowance
- Flat rent – In the Public Housing program, households will still have the option to choose a flat rent or the rent reform income-based rent calculation during initial eligibility or at the time of recertification

During the test phase of the pilot program, OHA will, at its discretion, withdraw components that are not working and/or move forward with implementing the policy for additional participants or properties based on the outcomes, after providing an opportunity for the public to comment on proposed changes. More details about this program and its components can be found in the FY 2013 MTW Annual Plan.

*Comparisons of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks:* Because the activity was not implemented beyond testing of the recertification strategy, outcomes were not generated.

*Actions Taken Toward Implementation:* OHA worked with the business system vendor to develop a specification for a modification to allow biennial and triennial recertifications to be tracked and scheduled. OHA is currently waiting for the vendor to deliver the software modification so that it can be tested and implemented and the appropriate metrics for this activity can be tracked.

#### **MTW Activity #11-02: Standardize Transfer Policy**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Adopt a policy to allow residents to transfer between Section 8 and Section 9 programs within the OHA portfolio. Amend the current transfer policies to standardize the procedures across programs. Policy may include provisions such as the length of tenancy required to request a transfer voucher, impacts to the HCV wait list, and a cap on the number of transfer vouchers issued annually. Families may be required to complete a two-year tenancy in order to be eligible to request a transfer voucher from either the public housing or PBV program. In order to limit the impact on the HCV waitlist, the issuance of vouchers may be subject to a one-for-one policy whereby at least one or more new vouchers are issued to families selected from the HCV tenant-based waiting list for every Public Housing or PBV transfer voucher issued. In order to control demand, OHA is considering limiting the number of transfer vouchers available to no more than 10 percent (10%) of the total units in the Public Housing and PBV programs combined per year and the amount of transfer requests granted is subject to the Executive Director's discretion.

*Actions Taken Toward Implementation:* OHA began establishing meetings and processes between various program types and the departments that administer them to establish a process and implementation plan for cross program transfers. OHA expects to begin implementation in FY2018.

## C. Activities on Hold

<b>Table 15</b> <b>Approved MTW Activities on Hold</b>					
<b>Activity # and Fiscal Year Approved</b>	<b>Fiscal Year Implemented</b>	<b>MTW Activity Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Statutory Objective(s)</b>	<b>Authorization(s)</b>
10-04	2010	Alternative Initial Rent Determination for PBV Units	Allows for the use of a comparability analysis or market study certified by an independent agency approved in determining rent reasonableness to establish the initial PBV contract rent.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.2, D.7
10-07	2010	Disposition Relocation and Counseling Services	Provides counseling and relocation assistance to impacted public housing residents in developments approved for disposition.	-Provide incentives for families with children to become more economically self-sufficient  -Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
10-08	2011	Redesign FSS Program	Redesigns the FSS Program to incorporate best practices in the industry and encourage partnerships with community based programs and initiatives.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment C, Section E
10-09	2010	Waive 12 Month Minimum Stay Requirement in Converted PBV Units	Waives the 12 month minimum stay requirement for existing tenants in units that have converted to PBV assistance as the result of an approved disposition.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
09-01	2011	Alternative HQS System	Uses a risk-based strategy to allocate HQS inspection resources in order to improve compliance at problem properties and allocate fewer resources to properties with a history of compliance.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.5 Attachment D, Section D
09-02	2010	Short-Term Subsidy Program	Provides temporary housing assistance to preserve existing affordable housing resources and allow tenants to remain in-place.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment D, Use of Funds

### MTW Activity #10-04: Alternative Initial Rent Determination for PBV Units

*Description of MTW Activity:* Modify the PBV program requirement to use a state certified appraiser to determine the initial contract rent for each PBV project. Under this activity, initial contract rents are determined using a comparability analysis or market study certified by an independent agency approved to determine rent reasonableness for OHA-owned units. In addition, the definition of PBV “project” is expanded to include non-contiguous scattered sites grouped into Asset Management Properties (AMPs). Initial PBV contract rents are determined for each bedroom size within an AMP. The rent established for a two-bedroom unit is applicable to all two-bedroom units within an AMP and so on for all bedroom sizes.

*Status Update/Schedule:* On hold pending disposition application approval. OHA is working to revise and resubmit an application during FY2018 to dispose of a number of senior site Public Housing units and will use this activity once the application has been approved.

#### **MTW Activity #10-07: Disposition Relocation and Counseling Services**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Provide counseling and relocation assistance to residents impacted by an approved disposition of public housing units.

*Actions Taken Toward Reactivation:* OHA held this activity off-line due to the pending nature of the disposition application for the senior sites. No steps were taken to reactivate the activity during FY 2017, but the activity will be reactivated if and when the application or a new disposition application is approved in the future.

#### **MTW Activity #10-08: Redesign FSS Program**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Redesign the Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) program building on best practices in the industry and, where applicable, working in tandem with other community-based programs and initiatives.

*Action Taken:* OHA reviewed the FSS program and updated the Action Plan but determined that none of the changes required MTW waivers to implement.

*Status Update:* On hold.

*Reason Activity is on hold:* OHA recently updated its FSS Action Plan and none of the changes required MTW waivers to implement. OHA will continue to monitor FSS waivers implemented by other MTW housing authorities to determine if any are relevant and useful to OHA’s FSS program.

#### **MTW Activity #10-09: Waive 12 Month Minimum Stay Requirement in Converted PBVs**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Waives the 12 month minimum stay requirement for existing tenants in units that have converted to PBV assistance as the result of an approved disposition. Under the existing PBV regulations, households must complete a one year tenancy in the unit before they can request a tenant-based voucher and move with continued assistance. This activity would allow residents that are in-place at the time of an approved disposition where the units are being converted to PBV assistance, to move at any time.

*Actions Taken Toward Reactivation:* No steps were taken toward reactivation of this activity during the fiscal year since this activity is used during a disposition or conversion processes. This activity will be reactivated when OHA conducts dispositions/conversion of public housing property in the future. Until such time, the activity will remain on hold.

#### **MTW Activity #09-01: Alternative HQS System (merged with #17-01)**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Develop an alternative inspection methodology and frequency for HQS inspections based on a risk assessment system and findings from prior inspections. Properties that are HQS compliant and pass their first inspection are only inspected every two years. Properties that fail on the first and second inspection remain on the annual inspection schedule. After two inspections that pass, the property may be placed back on an annual or biennial inspection schedule. Results of the inspections are submitted electronically to HUD via the HUD 50058 form and stored electronically in OHA's database.

*Actions Taken Toward Reactivation:* OHA plans to reactivate this activity as needed. OHA may use this activity to alter the inspection schedule as it relates to any new inspection protocols issued by HUD to increase or decrease the frequency of inspections based on inspection scoring and history. OHA would seek HUD review and approval prior to reactivating this activity with any significant changes.

#### **MTW Activity #09-02: Short-Term Subsidy Program**

*Description of MTW Activity:* Provide temporary subsidy funding to buildings 1) that were developed with assistance from the City of Oakland, 2) where there is a risk of an imminent threat of displacement of low income households, and 3) where it can be reasonably expected that providing short-term subsidy assistance will provide the necessary time to preserve the affordable housing resource.

*Actions Taken Toward Reactivation:* This activity remained on hold until applicable projects become available that would require use of this MTW authorization and OHA determines that funding is available. OHA wishes to keep the activity active to ensure the availability of the resource for future needs, particularly in light of the current escalating rental market and displacement from naturally occurring affordable housing units that is occurring in the City.

#### **D. Closed Out Activities**

OHA does not have any closed out activities to report for FY 2017.

## **Section V. Sources and Uses of Funds**

---

### **A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of Funding for the Fiscal Year**

#### **1) Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year**

OHA submitted its unaudited financial information in the prescribed format in the Financial Assessment System on August 31, 2017.

#### **2) Activities that Used Only the Single Fund Flexibility**

The single fund flexibility afforded by MTW allows OHA to plan and respond to the local needs of the community. OHA chose to allocate funding to several initiatives that support OHA goals and priorities of preserving and expanding affordable housing opportunities for residents of Oakland, ensuring OHA communities are safe and secure, and connecting the residents of OHA to resources and neighborhood services that promote economic stability and self-sufficiency.

The OHA activities and initiatives described below rely solely on the single fund flexibility and no other MTW waiver or authorization.

#### **Fund Deferred Maintenance and Capital Improvements**

Decades of decreased capital funding and the following deferred maintenance have resulted in needs at OHA sites that far exceed the amount of funding that OHA receives. As a result, OHA used the single fund flexibility to provide supplemental funding and address capital improvement needs at its sites.

#### **Fund Development of Non-Public Housing Units Using Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) Funds**

OHA had an approved RHF plan which allowed for the accumulation of RHF funding over time to be used on affordable housing units that do not have a Public Housing subsidy attached. In FY 2017, OHA completed the use of RHF grants that were received when it removed the Scattered Site portfolio from the Public Housing program. In FY 2017, OHA used approximately \$3.5 Million in RHF funding to help finance the AvéVista and 94<sup>th</sup> and International affordable housing developments.

#### **Fund Operations**

OHA uses the single fund flexibility to invest and develop new affordable housing in high-opportunity districts, increase resident safety and security through community policing and create positive outcomes in the areas of education, job readiness and health and wellness. These all extend the impact of MTW beyond just housing.

- OHA used the single fund budget to acquire the property and extend a pre-development and permanent loan to AvéVista to complete 68 new units of affordable housing in the Grand Lake District of Oakland, a booming area with many amenities. Construction continued on 94<sup>th</sup> and International and Prosperity Place to add 108 new units of family and special needs affordable housing.
- Supportive services above and beyond housing are part of OHA's vision to improve outcomes in all areas for families. The Department of Family and Community Partnerships (FCP) was created under single-fund flexibility and provides information and referral services and other family supportive services to households served by OHA. FCP has completed its first year of the Jobs Plus Grant, a four year grant awarded in December 2015, to implement West Oakland Works and Skilled Training Employment Pathways (STEP) academies to facilitate employment for West Oakland public housing residents across five developments in West Oakland. The grant involves coordination among multiple community partners and county service providers, in addition to other agency programs that involve partnerships with community serving agencies ranging from the City of Oakland to neighborhood non-profits. OHA exceeded the enrollment goals for the grant in the first year and is on target for year two. Through MTW flexibilities, OHA continues to expand the impact of client services offered both in-house and in partnership with community-based service providers for both Public Housing and Section 8 residents.

In FY 2017, FCP will continue leveraging partnerships to improve education outcomes for school-aged children through OHA's Education Initiative. Through the single fund budget, OHA will continue its work on data collection and family outreach with the Oakland Unified School District with a focus on mitigating chronic absenteeism and improving academic achievement among OHA children. FCP will also continue to connect residents to training and employment opportunities that build resident capacity and offer valuable skill-building opportunities that result in families moving closer to self-sufficiency.

OHA applied and was accepted to participate in a demonstration testing the effectiveness of combining housing choice vouchers for eligible youth (ages 18-21) lacking adequate housing under the Family Unification Program (FUP) with assistance under the FSS program. This opportunity directly benefits youth by giving them more time in a stable housing environment to achieve their education & employment goals and to assist in their efforts to become self-sufficient. An orientation was held for all FUP participants, as well as individual case management meetings to provide needs assessments, education, employment, and housing search assistance. FCP also holds monthly meetings with Alameda County Social Services and Beyond Emancipation to effectively coordinate services on behalf of the FUP participants and will continue to collaborate with other community based organizations to provide services for this demonstration.

Building resident capacity is critical to OHA's vision, and OHA utilizes MTW flexibility to provide a level of support beyond housing to enhance resident educational, health and wellbeing outcomes. Using subject matter expert



partners, FCP added a Baby Play Group held at Lockwood Gardens in partnership with Safe Passages, geared for parents with babies aged “0-12” months and covers the following learning components: Child Development, Positive Parenting and Attachment, Social-Emotional Development, Early Literacy and more. In partnership with the Alameda County Public Health Department, FCP hosted the “Food as Medicine” program where residents learned about the importance of cooking with whole grains and vegetables and other healthy food choices.

- To create safer communities and improve the quality of life for our residents, funding was allocated to the Oakland Housing Authority Police Department (OHAPD) to provide high-quality, public safety and crime prevention services. OHAPD uses a multi-faceted approach including community policing, youth engagement, participating in National Night Out activities, and the Crime Alert program, in addition to increased patrols of our conventional housing sites and conducting investigations. OHA increases physical safety for residents through both crime prevention environment (physical) design assessments and law enforcement strategies. OHAPD also employs various approaches to address program abuse and violations through its Fraud Investigations Unit.

OHAPD is a state accredited Police Department as well as a Nationally Accredited Department through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) where it is honored to have been designated as a “Flagship” agency twice, the second being awarded in March 2017. In addition, in keeping residential strategies at the forefront of the Department’s operating philosophy the Department has been a recipient of 15 National NAHRO awards.

Additional OHAPD crime prevention resident services include, an Explorer/ Cadet Program which supports youth between the ages of 14 and 21 in learning aspects of law enforcement. The program also assists youth in achieving their secondary and college educational goals, and provides annual youth engagement activities including museum visits, fishing, educational field trips, bike riding excursions, camping trips, hikes, and attendance to professional ball games. Through these activities, youth establish not just a partnership with officers but friendships with youth from other parts of the city. These crime prevention strategies support the Authority in achieving its goal of providing a safe nurturing environment that supports OHA families in their education, employment and health goals.

**Table 17. Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility**

OHA uses the single fund flexibility to invest and develop new affordable housing in high-opportunity districts, increase resident safety and security through community policing and create positive outcomes in the areas of education, job readiness and health and wellness. These all extend the impact of MTW beyond just housing.

OHA used the single fund budget to acquire the property and extend a pre-development and permanent loan to AvéVista to complete 68 new units of affordable housing in the Grand Lake District of Oakland, a booming area with many amenities. Construction continued on 94th and International and Prosperity Place to add 108 new units of family and special needs affordable housing.

Supportive services above and beyond housing are part of OHA's vision to improve outcomes in all areas for families. The Department of Family and Community Partnerships (FCP) was created under single-fund flexibility and provides information and referral services and other family supportive services to households served by OHA. FCP has completed its first year of the Jobs Plus Grant, a four year grant awarded in December 2015, to implement West Oakland Works and Skilled Training Employment Pathways (STEP) academies to facilitate employment for West Oakland public housing residents across five developments in West Oakland. The grant involves coordination among multiple community partners and county service providers, in addition to other agency programs that involve partnerships with community serving agencies ranging from the City of Oakland to neighborhood non-profits. OHA exceeded the enrollment goals for the grant in the first year and is on target for year two. Through MTW flexibilities, OHA continues to expand the impact of client services offered both in-house and in partnership with community-based service providers for both Public Housing and Section 8 residents.

In FY 2017, FCP will continue leveraging partnerships to improve education outcomes for school-aged children through OHA's Education Initiative. Through the single fund budget, OHA will

## **B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan**

OHA did not implement a local asset management plan during FY 2017.

**Table 17: MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan**

Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?

Yes

Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?

No

or

If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

No

or

OHA did not impleement a local asset management plan in FY 2016

## **C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds**

OHA is not required to complete this section at this time.

**Table 18: Commitment of Unspent Funds**

In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.

Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X
Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X
Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X
Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X
Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X
Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X
Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X
Type	Description	\$ X	\$ X
Total Obligated or Committed Funds:		0	0

OHA is not required to complete this portion at this time.

**Note:** Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of obligations and commitments, MTW agencies are not required to complete this section.

## **Section VI. Administrative**

---

### **A. General description of any HUD reviews, audits, or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue**

There are no items to report under this section.

### **B. Results of the Latest Agency-directed Evaluations of the Demonstration**

There are no items to report under this section.

### **C. Certification from the Board of Commissioners**

### **Certification of Compliance with MTW Statutory Requirements**

The Oakland Housing Authority Board of Commissioners approves the submission of the Fiscal Year 2016 MTW Annual Report. The Oakland Housing Authority Board of Commissioners certifies that the Oakland Housing Authority has met the three statutory requirements of:

- 1) Assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Authority are very low-income families; and
- 2) Continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and
- 3) Maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

The FY 2016 MTW Annual Report is in compliance with all applicable MTW regulations and requirements.

Oakland Housing Authority:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory D. Hartwig  
Chair, Board of Commissioners

9/25/2017  
Date

## **Appendices**

---

Appendix A. Board Resolution

Appendix B. Project-Based Voucher Allocations

Appendix C. Overview of Other Housing

Appendix D. Affordable Housing Development Activities by Unit Type

Appendix E. MTW & Non-MTW Housing Stock

Appendix F. Waitlist Demographic Data

Appendix G. Glossary of Acronyms

## **APPENDIX A**

---

### **Board Resolution**



**THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA**

On Motion of Commissioner: Marlene Hurd

Seconded by Commissioner: Lynette Jung-Lee

And approved by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Hurd, Jung-Lee, Montgomery, Castillo, Griffith, Hartwig

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

EXCUSED: Donna Griggs-Murphy

ABSENT: 0

**THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED:**

**NUMBER: 4771**

**RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2017 MOVING TO  
WORK ANNUAL REPORT AND CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE**

WHEREAS, the Moving to Work (MTW) Agreement requires the Oakland Housing Authority Board of Commissioners to submit to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) a MTW Annual Report for each fiscal year in which it submits a MTW Annual Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Oakland Housing Authority adopted the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 MTW Annual Plan on April 4, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2017 MTW Annual Report provides HUD, OHA residents and community stakeholders with the information necessary to compare OHA's performance during the past fiscal year to the expectations OHA set for itself at the beginning of the fiscal year in its FY 2017 Annual Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners certifies that the Oakland Housing Authority has met the three statutory requirements of:

- 1) Assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families; and
- 2) Continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and

- 3) Maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size), as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2017 MTW Annual Report is in compliance with all HUD regulations and requirements;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF  
COMMISSIONERS OF THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF  
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA:**

THAT, the Board of Commissioners accepts the Oakland Housing Authority FY 2017 MTW Annual Report; and

THAT, the Chair of the Board of Commissioners is authorized to certify that the Oakland Housing Authority has complied with all regulations as stated in the Certification of Compliance; and

THAT, the Executive Director, on behalf of the Authority, is hereby authorized to submit the FY 2017 MTW Annual Report and Certification of Compliance to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and to take all actions necessary to implement the foregoing resolution.

*I certify that the foregoing resolution is a full, true and correct copy  
of a resolution passed by the Commissioners of the Housing Authority  
of the City of Oakland, California on September 25, 2017*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric Johnson, Secretary/Executive Director

**ADOPTED: September 25, 2017**

**RESOLUTION NO. 4771**

## **APPENDIX B**

---

### **Project-Based Voucher Allocations**

Project-Based Voucher Allocations as of June 30, 2017				
Development Name	Date of Board Approval	# of PBV Units	Contract Date	Population Served
<b>HAP contracts</b>				
Mandela Gateway	2/12/2003	30	10/20/2004	Low Income Families
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase I	7/13/2005	23	1/1/2007	Senior
Lion Creek Crossings II	11/9/2005	18	7/3/2007	Low Income Families
Madison Apartments	7/13/2005	19	4/25/2008	Low Income Families
Lion Creek Crossings III	6/14/2006	16	6/25/2008	Low Income Families
Seven Directions	7/13/2005	18	9/12/2008	Low Income Families
Orchards on Foothill	6/14/2006	64	11/7/2008	Senior
Fox Courts / Uptown Oakland	12/3/2004	20	5/15/2009	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
Jack London Gateway - Phase II	2/26/2007	60	6/5/2009	Senior
14 <sup>th</sup> St. Apartments at Central Station	1/22/2007	20	11/25/2009	Low Income Families
Tassafaronga Village Phase I	2/25/2008	80	4/23/2010	Low Income Families
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase II	4/28/2008	40	4/5/2010	Senior
Fairmount Apartments	10/24/2008	16	3/8/2010	Low Income Families / Persons with Disabilities
Tassafaronga Village Phase II	7/21/2008	19	5/27/2010	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
*Harp Plaza (19)	5/24/2010	18	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
*Effie's House (10)	5/4/2009	7	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
*Drachma Housing (14)	5/4/2009	11	12/1/2010	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
Foothill Family Partners	6/28/2010	11	8/1/2011	Low Income Families
St. Joseph's Senior Apts	5/29/2007	83	8/22/2011	Senior
*OHA Scattered Sites (1539)	7/27/2009	960	In Progress	Low Income Families / Public Housing Disposition
Lion Creek Crossings IV	4/28/2008	10	1/13/2012	Low Income Families
Savoy Phase 1	6/28/2010	55	2/14/2012	Special Needs
*Hugh Taylor house (35)	6/11/2011	32	5/8/2012	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
*Madison Park (96)	6/11/2011	50	6/7/2012	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
Merritt Crossing Apts (6 <sup>th</sup> and Oak)	5/4/2009	50	6/27/2012	Senior
720 E 11 <sup>th</sup> Street Apts (aka Clinton Commons)	4/28/2008	16	10/2/2012	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
Harrison Street Senior Housing	4/23/2007	11	11/15/2012	Senior
Kenneth Henry Court	4/11/2011	13	2/8/2013	Low Income Families
California Hotel Phases 1 and 2	2/28/2011	88	3/1/2013	Special Needs / Homeless / HIV/AIDS
James Lee Court	10/25/2010	12	3/21/2013	Low Income Families
Savoy Phase 2	6/28/2010	46	3/29/2013	Special Needs / Homeless / HIV/AIDS
Slim Jenkins Court	5/4/2009	11	5/8/2013	Low Income Families
Oak Point Limited (OPLP)	10/25/2010	15	5/30/2013	Low Income Families
Drasnin Manor	10/25/2010	25	6/27/2013	Low Income Families
St. Joseph's Family Apts	10/25/2010	15	12/3/2013	Low Income Families
MacArthur Apts	10/25/2010	14	10/13/2013	Low Income Families
California Hotel Phase 3	2/28/2012	47	11/22/2013	Special Needs / Homeless / HIV/AIDS
Lion Creek Crossings V	10/17/2011	127	8/11/2014	Senior
Cathedral Gardens	5/23/2011	43	10/27/2014	Low Income Families
Lakeside Senior Apartments	1/23/2012	91	1/26/2015	Senior
Marcus Garvey Commons	4/11/2011	10	3/17/2015	Low Income Families
1701 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	5/20/2013	25	12/7/2015	Special Needs / Homeless / HIV/AIDS
MURAL aka MacArthur Transit Village	2/28/2011	22	1/20/2016	Low Income Families
AveVista aka 460 Grand	3/16/2010	34	1/27/2016	Low Income Families
11th and Jackson (Prosperity Place)	11/30/2010	35	2/1/2017	Low Income Families
Units under HAP Contract		2,430		

<b>Conversion Projects</b>				
*Harp Plaza (19)	5/24/2010	1	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
*Effie's House (10)	5/4/2009	3	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
*Drachma Housing (14)	5/4/2009	3	12/1/2010	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
*OHA Scattered Sites (1539)	7/27/2009	579	In Progress	Low Income Families / Public Housing Disposition
*Hugh Taylor house (35)	6/11/2011	3	5/8/2012	Low Income Families /Mod Rehab Conversion
*Madison Park (96)	6/11/2011	46	6/7/2012	Low Income Families /Mod Rehab Conversion
<b>Units under HAP that will convert to PBV at turnover*</b>		<b>635</b>		
<b>AHAP Contracts</b>				
94th and International	10/17/2011	14	<i>in development</i>	Low Income Families
Civic Center TOD	7/22/2014	10	<i>in development</i>	Special Needs / Homeless
Redwood Hill Townhomes	6/1/2015	11	<i>in development</i>	Low Income Families/Special Needs
Additional vouchers awarded	5/23/2016	16		
3706 San Pablo Avenue	6/1/2015	10	<i>in development</i>	Low Income Families
Additional vouchers awarded	5/23/2016	5		
Additional vouchers awarded	5/22/2017	5		
<b>Units under AHAP Contract</b>		<b>71</b>		
<b>Conditional Awards</b>				
Fruitvale Transit Village - Phase IIA	5/23/2016	66	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families/VASH (20)
Camino 23	5/23/2016	26	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families/Special Needs
Coliseum Place	5/23/2016	37	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families/Special Needs
Embark Apartments	5/23/2016	61	<i>pending</i>	Affordable Housing for Veterans / VASH (31)
Empyrean	10/24/2016	32	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Rosa Park	12/5/2016	11	<i>pending</i>	Low income and homeless individuals
Courtyards at Acom	12/5/2016	30	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
The Town Center	12/5/2016	50	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Bishop Roy C. Nicholas	12/5/2016	17	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Seniors
Sylvester Rutledge Manor	12/5/2016	64	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Seniors
Hisman Hin-Nu Apts	12/5/2016	10	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Oak Park Apts	12/5/2016	10	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
San Pablo Hotel	12/5/2016	31	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Seniors
Seven Directions	12/5/2016	10	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Swan Market	12/5/2016	10	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Hamilton Apts	12/5/2016	92	<i>pending</i>	Low income and homeless individuals
Ambassador Apts	12/5/2016	10	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Drachma Housing	12/5/2016	11	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Seniors
Fox Court Apts (additional vouchers)	12/5/2016	13	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
International Blvd Apts	12/5/2016	18	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Northgate Apts	12/5/2016	14	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Stanley Avenue Lofts	12/5/2016	13	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Adeline Street Lofts	12/5/2016	20	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Madsion Apts (additional vouchers)	12/5/2016	31	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Oak Street Apts	12/5/2016	25	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Seniors
Westlake Christian Terrace West	2/27/2017	121	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Seniors
Kenneth Henry Court	2/27/2017	15	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Eastside Arts & Housing	2/27/2017	10	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
<b>Units with conditional award</b>		<b>858</b>		
<b>Total PBV Units Allocated</b>		<b>3,994</b>		

\* Conversion to PBV ongoing as units are currently occupied by HCV-assisted family

## APPENDIX C

### Overview of Other Housing

Overview of Other Housing						
	Total Unit Count - All Tax Credit Units	Subsidy Layering - Public Housing	Subsidy Layering - Project Based Voucher	Tax Credit Only *	Other HUD Funding	Unsubsidized Units
<b>HOPE VI Sites</b>						
Chestnut Court	72	45		11		1
Linden Court	79	38		12		1
Mandela Gateway	168	46	30	36		2
Foothill Family Apartments	65	21	11	12		0
Lion Creek Crossings - Phases 1 - 5	567	157	171	153		5
<b>Other Mixed Developments</b>						
Tassafaronga Village - Phases 1 and 2	157		99	45		2
Cathedral Gardens	100		43	55		1
Keller	201			166	157	33
Harrison Senior	73		11	61	62	1
Lakeside Senior Apts.	92		91			1
Prosperity Place	71		35	36	8	
AveVista	68		34	30		1
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>1713</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>48</b>

## APPENDIX D

### Affordable Housing Development Activities

Affordable Housing Development Activities by Unit Type						
	FY 2017 Outcomes Non-traditional Units	FY 2017 Outcomes Traditional Units	Total Units	Public Housing	Project- Based Vouchers	Tax Credit Only
<b>PREDEVELOPMENT</b>						
Brooklyn Basin	207	258	465	0	258	203
15th and Harrison	<u>62</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>62</u>
<i>Total in Predevelopment</i>	207	269	583	0	269	265
<b>UNDER CONSTRUCTION</b>						
94th and International	45	14	59	0	14	44
Empyrean Towers	<u>33</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>33</u>
<i>Total Under Construction</i>	79	46	125	0	46	78
<b>PLACED IN SERVICE</b>						
Prosperity Place	<u>36</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>
<i>Total Placed in Service</i>	36	35	71	0	35	36
<b>REHABILITATION</b>						
OAHP	0	38	1,539	0	1,539	0
Oak Groves	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Total Rehabilitation</i>	0	59	1,691	152	1,539	0
<b>COMBINED TOTAL</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>2,470</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,889</b>	<b>379</b>



## **APPENDIX E**

---

### **MTW and Non-MTW Housing Stock**

FY 2017 MTW Housing Inventory MTW and Non-MTW housing stock		
		End of FY 2017
<b>MTW PUBLIC HOUSING</b>		
<b>Large Family Sites</b>		
	Campbell Village*	154
	Lockwood Gardens	372
	Peralta Villa	<u>390</u>
		916
<b>Designated Senior Sites*</b>		
	Harrison Towers	101
	Adel Court	30
	Oak Grove North	77
	Oak Grove South	75
	Palo Vista Gardens	<u>100</u>
		383
<b>HOPE VI Sites*</b>		
	Linden Court	38
	Mandela Gateway	46
	Chestnut Court	45
	Foothill Family Apts.	21
	Lion Creek Crossings Phase 1	45
	Lion Creek Crossings Phase 2	54
	Lion Creek Crossings Phase 3	37
	Lion Creek Crossings Phase 4	<u>21</u>
		307
	<b>TOTAL PUBLIC HOUSING</b>	<b>1,606</b>
<b>VOUCHER PROGRAM</b>		
<b>MTW</b>		
	General MTW HCV	12,866
<b>Non -MTW</b>		
	VASH	326
	Section 8 Mod Rehab	251
	Section 8 Mainstream	175
	FUP	50
	NED	65
	Tenant Protection Vouchers	No new allocations in the 12 months
	Shelter plus Care (S+C)	331
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>15,670</b>

## **APPENDIX F**

---

### **Waitlist Demographic Data**

### Voucher Programs Waitlist Demographic Information

	Count	% of Total
Total HH on Wait List	24,270	100.0%
Family Type Based on HoH		
Elderly (≥ 62 years old)	3,686	15.2%
Elderly Disabled	821	3.4%
Elderly Non-Disabled	2,945	12.1%
Disabled (< 62 years old)	2,131	8.8%
Family	12,905	53.2%
Total	22,488	92.7%
Age of All HH Members		
0 - 5 years old	1,641	11.3%
6 - 12 years old	1,574	10.8%
13 - 17 years old	649	4.5%
18 - 24 years old	1,437	9.9%
25 - 55 years old	5,796	39.9%
56 - 61 years old	1,171	8.1%
≥ 62 years old	2,271	15.6%
Total	14,539	100.0%
Race Based on HoH		
White	595	2.5%
Black/African American	5,572	23.0%
American Indian/Alaskan		
Native	129	0.5%
Asian	3,078	12.7%
Native Hawaiian/Other		
Pacific Islander	60	0.2%
More than 1 Race and/or	712	2.9%
Other		
Not Reported	14,119	58.2%
Total	24,265	100.0%
Ethnicity Based on HoH		
Hispanic	662	2.7%
Non-Hispanic	6,357	26.2%
Not Reported	4,296	17.7%
Total	11,315	46.6%
HH Size by Income Group	Percent of Area Median Income	
	0% - 30%	31% - 50%
1 Person HH	8023	1263
2 Person HH	5350	1020
3 Person HH	2360	603
4 Person HH	1183	223
5 Person HH	389	86
6+ Person HH	247	46
Total	17,552	3,241
%	72.3%	13.4%

	Count	% of Total
Gender of HoH		
Female	5383	22.2%
Male	3363	13.9%
Total	8746	36.0%
HH by Unit Size		
0 BD (Studio)	2,281	9.4%
1 BD	9,463	39.0%
2 BD	5,873	24.2%
3 BD	1,606	6.6%
4 BD	86	0.4%
5 BD	1	0.0%
6 BD	0	0.0%
Total	19,310	79.6%
Average HH Size		1.96

\*Not available for OAHPI or HCV waitlists.

HoH = Head of Household

HH = Household

# Public Housing Waitlist Demographic Information

	Count	% of Total
Total HH on Wait List	3468	100.0%
Family Type Based on HoH		
Elderly (≥ 62 years old)	840	24.2%
Elderly Disabled	423	12.2%
Elderly Non-Disabled	1,665	48.0%
Disabled (< 62 years old)	80	2.3%
Family	924	26.6%
Total	3,932	100.0%
Age of All HH Members		
0 - 5 years old	132	3.8%
6 - 12 years old	313	9.0%
13 - 17 years old	198	5.7%
18 - 24 years old	35	1.0%
25 - 55 years old	580	16.7%
56 - 61 years old	134	3.8%
≥ 62 years old	2,089	60.0%
Total	3,481	100.0%
Race Based on HoH		
White	257	7.4%
Black/African American	1,197	34.5%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	27	0.8%
Asian	1,667	48.1%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	40	1.2%
More than 1 Race and/or Other	76	2.2%
Not Reported	120	3.5%
Total	3,384	97.6%
Ethnicity Based on HoH		
Hispanic	580	16.7%
Non-Hispanic	1,986	57.3%
Not Reported	600	17.3%
Total	3,166	91.3%
HH Size by Income Group	Percent of Area	
	0% - 30%	31% - 50%
1 Person HH	1982	60
2 Person HH	672	24
3 Person HH	268	15
4 Person HH	72	7
5 Person HH	12	2
6+ Person HH	38	2
Total	3,044	110
%	87.8%	3.2%

	Count	% of Total
Gender of HoH		
Female	1245	35.9%
Male	1110	32.0%
Total	2355	67.9%
HH by Unit Size		
0 BD (Studio)	0	0.0%
1 BD	1,901	54.8%
2 BD	590	17.0%
3 BD	251	7.2%
4 BD	35	1.0%
5 BD	3	0.1%
6 BD	1	0.0%
Total	2,781	80.2%
Average HH Size	1.57	

\*Not available for Lockwood or Peralta Village.

HoH = Head of Household

HH = Household

## **APPENDIX G**

---

### **Glossary of Acronyms**

## Glossary

**AMI** – Area Median Income. HUD estimates the median family income for an area in the current year and adjusts that amount for different family sizes so that family incomes may be expressed as a percentage of the area median income. Housing programs are often limited to households that earn a percent of the Area Median Income.

**AMP** – Asset Management Project. A building or collection of buildings that are managed as a single project as part of HUD's requirement that PHAs adopt asset management practices.

**ARRA** – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Signed into law by President Obama to provide economic stimulus. The Act includes funding for PHAs to spend on capital improvements.

**ASCO** – Alameda County Sheriff's Office

**COLA** – Cost of Living Adjustment. The federal government adjusts assistance programs, such as Social Security, annually based on changes in the cost-of-living index. The adjustment is a percentage amount that is added to the prior year's amount.

**FCP** – OHA's Department of Family and Community Partnerships.

**FSS** – Family Self-Sufficiency. A program operated by a PHA to promote self-sufficiency of families in the Section 8 and Public Housing programs.

**FY** – Fiscal Year. A 12 month period used for budgeting and used to distinguish a budget or fiscal year from a calendar year. OHA's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

**FYE** – Fiscal Year End. OHA's fiscal year end is June 30.

**HAP** – Housing Assistance Payment. The monthly payment by a PHA to a property owner to subsidize a family's rent payment.

**HCV** – Housing Choice Voucher. Sometimes referred to as a Section 8 voucher or tenant-based voucher, the voucher provides assistance to a family so that they can rent an apartment in the private rental market.

**HOPE VI** – Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere. A national HUD program designed to rebuild severely distressed public housing. The program was originally funded in 1993.

**HQS** – Housing Quality Standards. The minimum standard that a unit must meet in order to be eligible for funding under the Section 8 program.



**HUD** – United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. The federal government agency responsible for funding and regulating local public housing authorities.

**LHAP** – Local Housing Assistance Programs. Under this MTW Activity, OHA has developed local housing programs that provide support to households that might not qualify for or be successful in the traditional Public Housing and/or Section 8 programs.

**Mod Rehab** – Moderate Rehabilitation. The Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation program provides project-based rental assistance for low income families. Assistance is limited to properties previously rehabilitated pursuant to a HAP contract between an owner and a PHA.

**MOMS** – Maximizing Opportunities for Mothers to Succeed. A partnership between OHA and the Alameda County Sheriffs Department. The program provides 11 units of service enriched housing for women leaving the county jail system and reuniting with their children.

**MTW** – Moving to Work. A national demonstration program for high performing public housing authorities. OHA has named its MTW program “Making Transitions Work”.

**NED** – Non-Elderly Disabled vouchers. This is a voucher program that provides subsidies to families where the head of household or a family member is disabled but not a senior citizen.

**NOFA** – Notice of Funding Availability. As part of a grant process, NOFAs are issued to dictate the format and content of proposals received in response to funding availability.

**OHA** – Oakland Housing Authority.

**PACT** – Parents And Children Together. A partnership between OHA and the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office. The PACT site provides service enriched housing for women and men leaving the county jail system and reuniting with their children who are participating in the MOMs and DADs program.

**PBV** – Project Based Voucher. Ongoing housing subsidy payments that are tied to a specific unit.

**REAC** – Real Estate Assessment Center. A HUD department with the mission of providing and promoting the effective use of accurate, timely and reliable information assessing the condition of HUD's portfolio; providing information to help ensure safe, decent and affordable housing; and restoring the public trust by identifying fraud, abuse and waste of HUD resources.

**RFP** – Request for Proposals. As part of a procurement or grant process, RFPs are issued to dictate the format and content of proposals received in response to funding availability.

**RHF** – Replacement Housing Factor. These are Capital Fund Grants that are awarded to PHAs that have removed units from their inventory for the sole purpose of developing new public housing units.

**SNHAP** – Special Needs Housing Assistance Programs

**SRO** – Single Room Occupancy. A unit that only allows occupancy by one person. These units may contain a kitchen or bathroom, or both.

**TANF** – Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. A federal assistance program providing cash assistance to low-income families with children.

**TPV** – Tenant Protection Voucher. A voucher issued to families displaced due to an approved demolition/disposition request, natural disaster, or other circumstance as determined by HUD. The vouchers provide families with tenant-based rental assistance that they can use in the private rental market.

**VASH** – Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing. This HUD program combines tenant-based rental assistance for homeless veterans with case management and clinical services provided by the Department of Veteran's Affairs at their medical centers and community-based outreach clinics.