



Oakland Housing
Authority

MAKING TRANSITIONS WORK

ANNUAL REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2010

SEPTEMBER 27, 2010

REVISED DECEMBER 15, 2010

www.oakha.org

Oakland Housing Authority

FY 2010 MTW Annual Report

Board of Commissioners

Moses L. Mayne, Jr., Chair
Gregory Hartwig, Vice Chair
William Curry
Marlene Hurd
Tanya Pitts

Senior Staff:

Jon Gresley, Executive Director
Eric Johnson, Deputy Executive Director, Property Operations
Phil Neville, Deputy Executive Director, Real Estate Development
Janet Rice, Deputy Executive Director, Finance & Program Administration
Carel Duplessis, Director, Police Services
LeeAnn Farner, Director, California Affordable Housing Initiatives
Sean Heron, Director, Family and Community Partnerships
Patricia Ison, Director, Property Operations
Florice Lewis, Interim Director, Human Resources
Anthony Ma, Director, Finance
Craig McBurney, Director, Information Technology
Mark Stephenson, Director, Leased Housing

Prepared by:

Anna Gwyn May, with significant contributions from William Bailey, Caroline Barnett, Teela Carpenter, Bridget Galka, Jon Gresley, Rose Marie Griffin, Guadalupe Guiza, Sean Heron, Patricia Ison, Eric Johnson, Anna Kaydanovskaya, Doug Lee, Kit Liang, Anthony Ma, Valerie Moore, Robert Morgan, Boris Nemirovskiy, Phil Neville, Michael Pope, Janet Rice, Mark Stephenson, and Denis Whitfield.

1619 Harrison Street
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 874-1500
www.oakha.org

Oakland Housing Authority

Fiscal Year 2010 MTW Annual Report

Table of Contents

Section I. Introduction.....	1
Section II. General Housing Authority Operating Information.....	3
Table 1 – Inventory of Public Housing Units.....	3
Table 2 – Inventory of Housing Choice Vouchers.....	5
Table 3 – Housing Choice Voucher Units Project-based in FY 2010.....	6
Table 4 – Overview of Other Housing.....	6
Table 5 – Public Housing Units Leased.....	7
Table 6 – Housing Choice Vouchers Leased.....	8
Table 7 – Approved Project Based Voucher Allocations.....	10
Table 8 – Wait Lists for OHA Programs.....	11
Table 9a-d – Wait List Applicants by Household Size.....	13
Table 10a-d – Wait List Applicants by Family Type.....	14
Table 11a-d – Wait List Applicants by Income Group.....	16
Table 12a-d – Wait List Applicants by Race and Ethnicity.....	17
Section III. Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information.....	21
Section IV. Long-term MTW Plan.....	22
Section V. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested.....	23
Activity #16 Table A – Waive 12-month Minimum Stay Requirement.....	23
Section VI. Ongoing MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted.....	24
Activity #1 Table A-E – Triennial Income Reexamination Schedule.....	24
Activity #2 Table A-C – Site Based Wait Lists.....	27
Activity #3 Table A-D – Income Mixing at Newly Renovated Sites.....	30
Activity #4 Table A-C – Allocate PBV Units without a Competitive Process.....	33
Activity #5 Table A-C – Allocate PBV Units Using Existing Competitive Process.....	36
Activity #6 Table A-B – Exceed Project Cap for PBV Allocations at Tassafaronga.....	39
Activity #7 Table A-B – Alternative HQS Inspection System.....	41
Activity #8 Table A-B – Fund Affordable Housing Development Activities.....	43

Activity #9 Table A-B – Short Term Subsidy Program.....	44
Activity #10 Table A-B – Neighborhood Orientation Workshops.....	46
Activity #11 Table A-C – Expand Specialized Housing Program.....	48
Activity #12 Table A – Extend Zero Assistance HAP Period.....	50
Activity #13 Table A-C – Allocate PBV Units Above the Cap.....	51
Activity #14 Table A-B – Execute Non-Contiguous HAP Contracts.....	54
Activity #15 Table A-B – Alternative System to Determine Contract Rent.....	56
Activity #17 Table A-B – Allow Landlord to Accept Lower HAP.....	58
Activity #18 Table A-B – Local Housing Assistance Program.....	59
Activity #19 Table A-B – Relocation Services Related to Disposition.....	60
Activity #20 Table A – Department of Family and Community Partnerships.....	62
Activity #21 Table A-B – Family Self Sufficiency Program.....	63
Section VII. Sources and Uses of Funding.....	64
Table 13a-c – Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	64
Table 14a-c – Sources and Uses of Special Purpose Funds.....	66
Table 15a-c – Sources and Uses of All Funds.....	67
Table 16 – Sources and Uses of the COCC.....	68
Table 17 – Reserve Balance.....	69
Section VIII. Administrative.....	70
Table 18 – REAC Score Improvement by Property.....	70
List of Appendices.....	72
Appendix A. Board Resolution	
Appendix B. Certification of Compliance with MTW Statutory Requirements	
Appendix C. Performance and Evaluation Report for Capital Fund Activities	

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

The Oakland Housing Authority (OHA) is pleased to release its Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 Moving to Work Annual Report. OHA is one of 33 participants in the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program, which provides selected housing authorities with the opportunity to explore and test new and innovative methods of delivering housing and supportive services to low-income residents. OHA has tailored its program to the needs of the City of Oakland, and renamed the program "Making Transition Work".

The FY 2010 MTW Annual Report presents specific information as required in the Oakland Housing Authority's MTW agreement with HUD. OHA entered into an Amended and Restated Moving to Work Demonstration Agreement (the "Agreement") with HUD on February 4, 2009. The Agreement extended OHA's participation in the MTW program through OHA's FY 2018. The Agreement sets out a new format for the annual report. This is the first year that OHA is required to report in this new format. The report is intended to make available to OHA residents, the public and HUD, baseline information on OHA programs and an analysis of changes that occurred during the period between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010. In addition, the report provides summary financial information, including comparisons between projected and actual expenditures during the 2010 fiscal year.

Overview of the Agency's Goals and Objectives for FY 2010

The long term and ongoing goals of the Oakland Housing Authority include 1) preserving and enhancing the Public Housing portfolio, 2) preserving and expanding affordable housing opportunities, and 3) promoting resident empowerment and self sufficiency. This fiscal year, OHA used its MTW flexibility to implement several new MTW Activities, approved by HUD, to further the achievement of these goals. These objectives are outlined below under the goal that is most applicable. More information on the specific MTW Activities and the outcomes achieved this fiscal year can be found in Section V.

1. Preserving and Enhancing the Public Housing Portfolio
 - # 11 – Expansion of Service Enhanced Public Housing Options
 - #22 – Redesign Family Self Sufficiency Program

2. Preserving and Expanding Affordable Housing Opportunities
 - # 13 – Allocating PBVs to 100 Percent (100%) of the Units in a Development
 - #17 – Allowing Landlord or Management Agent to Accept Lower HAP by Modifying PBV Rules for In-place Families at Scattered Sites Developments
 - # 18 Local Housing Assistance Program

3. Promoting Resident Empowerment and Self Sufficiency
 - #12 – Extending Zero Assistance HAP Period from Six to 24 Months
 - #19 – Relocation Assistance and Counseling Services Related to Disposition of Scattered Sites Units
 - #20 – Department of Family and Community Partnerships

FY 2010 was an important year for OHA's participation in the MTW Program. The Authority continued to improve the quality of its housing stock, streamline programs and explore opportunities for innovation while assisting over 15,000 low-income families in Oakland.

The FY 2010 Plan and Report are available on OHA's website at <http://www.oakha.org/MTW/mtwplan.html>.

SECTION II. GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION

A. Housing Stock Information

1. Public Housing Units at the End of the Plan Year

As of the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2010, the Oakland Housing Authority (OHA) has 1,606 Public Housing units, described below in Table 1. Unit counts for the HOPE IV sites listed include only the public housing units.

Table 1 Inventory of Public Housing Units		
	July 1, 2009	June 30, 2010
Large Family and Mixed Population Sites		
Campbell Village	154	154
Peralta Villa	390	390
Lockwood Gardens	372	372
Subtotal	916	916
Designated Senior Developments		
Palo Vista Gardens	100	100
Harrison Towers	101	101
Oak Grove North	77	77
Oak Grove South	75	75
Adel Court	30	30
Subtotal	383	383
Scattered Sites	1,615	0
HOPE IV Sites		
Chestnut Court	45	45
Linden Court	38	38
Mandela Gateway	46	46
Foothill Family Apts.	21	21
Lion Creek Crossings (Phase 1, 2, 3)	136	136
Lion Creek Crossings (Phase 4 in development)	21	21
Subtotal	307	307
TOTAL	3,221	1,606

At the beginning of FY 2010, OHA operated 1,615 scattered family public housing units at 254 sites. In FY 2009, OHA submitted an application to HUD for the disposition of the family housing scattered sites portfolio. This decision was made based on several factors including the high cost of management and maintenance of a scattered sites portfolio; financial constraints due to more than a decade of funding shortfalls in the public housing program resulting in an inability to adequately address physical and management conditions; and OHA's long term strategy to increase the housing choice options for

residents in public housing. OHA received approval from HUD for the disposition of the family housing scattered sites units in March of 2009.

OHA's application for disposition was made contingent on the receipt of Section 8 Tenant Protection Vouchers. In March of 2009, OHA submitted an application to HUD for 1,528 Tenant Protection Vouchers, which represented all units occupied in the 24-month period prior to the application for disposition. The application was approved and the process of issuing the Tenant Protection Vouchers began in April of 2010 and is ongoing. For more information on the impact to the Housing Choice Voucher program, see Section II.A.5.

The disposition of the family housing scattered sites portfolio represents a decrease of 50 percent (50%) to OHA's inventory of public housing units.

2. Description of Significant Capital Expenditures by Development Greater than Thirty Percent (30%) of the Agency's Total Budgeted Capital Expenditures for the Fiscal Year

OHA did not have any projects for a single development totaling more than 30 percent (30%) of the overall total budgeted capital expenditures for the fiscal year.

3. Public Housing Units Added During the Year

No public housing units were added during this fiscal year. Phase 4 of Lion Creek Crossings is currently under development, which includes 21 replacement public housing units. OHA anticipates that the funding will be secured and the construction on Phase 4 will begin in FY 2011.

4. Public Housing Units Removed from the Inventory During the Year

As described above in Section II.A.1, the family housing scattered sites portfolio consisting of 1,615 units was removed from the public housing inventory as a result of a HUD approved disposition plan.

5. Number of MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) Authorized at the End of the Plan Year

At the end of FY 2010, OHA had 11,228 authorized Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) in the MTW program. The baseline number includes 14 Tenant Protection Vouchers (TPV) authorized for two expiring Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation (Mod Rehab) contracts, which were previously part of the non-MTW HCV. During the fiscal year, an additional 270 Tenant Protection Vouchers authorized as part of the disposition of the scattered sites. The TPV authorized as part of the scattered site disposition converted to MTW at the anniversary of the contract on June 1, 2010. The addition of these TPV created an increase of 2.5 percent (2.5%) to the number of MTW Housing Choice Vouchers. See Table 2 below for a summary of OHA's Housing Choice Voucher program.

6. Number of non-MTW HCV Authorized at the End of the Plan Year

The Tenant Protection Vouchers awarded as part of the disposition of the family housing scattered sites were received in phases. In the first phase, OHA received 270 Tenant Protection Vouchers on June 1, 2009. The second phase awarded included 810 TPV received on July 1, 2009. Thus, at the beginning of FY 2010, OHA had 1,080 non-MTW Tenant Protection Vouchers. OHA received the final allotment of 448 TPV on October 1, 2009. The TPV were initially issued as non-MTW, however at the anniversary of the contract, the vouchers became part of the MTW program. Therefore, at the end of FY 2010, 270 TPV had converted to MTW, while the remaining 1,258 TPV had not yet reached their anniversary date. In addition, a new award of 105 Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Vouchers was received on September 1, 2009. Thus, at the end of FY 2010, OHA had a total of 2,040 non-MTW HCV. The decrease in the Section 8 Mod Rehab Vouchers is due to the two expiring contracts mentioned above in Section II.A.5 and the conversion of those vouchers to MTW. The addition of the vouchers described account for an overall increase of 16.1 percent (16.1%) in the number of authorized non-MTW Housing Choice Vouchers. See Table 2 below for a summary of OHA's HCV program. The Agency also administers a Shelter Plus Care program under contract with Alameda County that serves approximately 242 families.

**Table 2
Inventory of Housing Choice Vouchers**

	At 7/1/2009 without Scattered Sites	At 6/30/2010 without Scattered Sites	% Change	At 7/1/2009 Scattered Sites Only	At 6/30/2010 Scattered Sites Only	% Change	At 7/1/2009 Combined Total	At 6/30/2010 Combined Total	Overall % Change
MTW HCV									
MTW HCV	10,958	10,958	0%				10,958	10,958	0%
Scattered Sites					270	100%		270	100%
Subtotal	10,958	10,958	0%		270	100%	10,958	11,228	2.5%
Non-MTW HCV									
Section 8 Mod Rehab	502	502	0%				502	502	0%
Section 8 Mainstream	175	175	0%				175	175	0%
TPV - Scattered Sites				1,080	1,258	16%	1,080	1,258	16%
VASH		105	100%					105	100%
Sub-total	677	782	15.5%	1,080	1,258	16%	1,757	2,040	16.1%
Total HCV Units	11,635	11,740	0.9%	1,080	1,528	41%	12,715	13,268	4.3%

Overall, OHA's authorized HCV increased by 4.3 percent (4.3%) due primarily to the Tenant Protection Vouchers issued as part of the disposition of the former family public housing scattered sites and other factors described above in Sections II.A.5 and II.A.6.

7. Number of HCV Units Project-based During the Plan Year

In FY 2010, OHA executed Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) contracts at three new developments for 139 Project Based Voucher (PBV) units, see Table 3 for a breakdown of the PBV units and a description of the developments. The addition of these units resulted in a total of 427 PBV units under HAP contract at the end of FY 2010; see Table 7 under Section II.B.6 for more information about approved PBV allocations.

Development Name	Date of Board Approval	# of PBV Units	Contract Date	Project Description
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
Tassafaronga Village Phase II	7/21/2008	19	5/27/2010	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
Total		139		

OHA had anticipated that HUD-provided Tenant Protection Vouchers awarded for the approved disposition of 1,615 scattered sites family public housing units could immediately become Project Based Vouchers. However, project-basing of Tenant Protection Vouchers was not allowed by HUD and was, in fact, unnecessary. With HUD's award of Tenant Protection Vouchers, existing families in former public housing scattered sites units can move at any time. Once the families move out, OHA can then issue Project Based Vouchers to the former family public housing scattered sites units. OHA anticipates that these units will begin converting to PBV units as families move out in FY 2011.

8. Overview of Other Housing Managed by the Agency (e.g. tax-credit, state-funded, market rate, etc.)

OHA has contracted with professional third party property management companies to provide management of the HOPE IV sites and Tassafaronga Village, which include 908 tax credit units. These units also include subsidy layering from public housing replacement and/or Project Based Vouchers. Table 4 provides an overview of the properties with tax credit units and a breakdown of the subsidy layering included at each property.

	Total Unit Count – All Tax Credit Units	Subsidy Layering – Public Housing Replacement Units	Subsidy Layering – Project Based Voucher Units
HOPE IV Sites			
Foothill Family Apts.	65	21	
Chestnut Court	72	45	
Linden Court	79	38	
Mandela Gateway	168	46	30
Lion Creek Crossings - Phases 1, 2, & 3	367	136	34
Other Mixed Developments			
Tassafaronga Village - Phases 1 and 2	157		99
TOTAL	908	286	163

B. Leasing Information

1. Total Number of MTW Public Housing Units Leased in the Plan Year

As of June 30, 2010, OHA had 1,443 public housing units under active lease, which includes the public housing units in the five HOPE IV developments. During FY 2010, sixty-one (61) units were taken off-line for rehabilitation, which was less than projected at the beginning of the year. Overall, OHA leased 94.7 percent (94.7%) of the available public housing units; see Table 5 for more details. A description of issues related to leasing can be found in Section II.B.5.

Table 5 Public Housing Units Leased		
Category	FY2010 Projection	FYE 2010 Actual
Total PH Units at the beginning of FY 2010	3,221	3,221
HOPE IV Units in Development	(21)	(21)
Scattered Sites Units for Disposition	(1,615)	(1,615)
Vacant Units Off-line for Rehabilitation	(140)	(61)
<i>Total Public Housing Units Available</i>	1,445	1,524
Routine Vacancies	(30)	(81)
Total PH Units Leased at the end of FY 2010	1,415	1,443
Percent of Available Units Leased Up	97.9%	94.7%

2. Total Number of non-MTW Public Housing Units Leased in the Plan Year

OHA does not have any non-MTW public housing units.

3. Total Number of MTW HCV Units Leased in the Plan Year

As of June 30, 2010, OHA had 11,012 MTW Housing Choice Vouchers under active lease. This represents a utilization rate of 98.1 percent (98.1%). Table 6 provides a summary of the OHA's HCV units in process and in use. A description of issues related to leasing can be found in Section II.B.5.

4. Total Number of non-MTW HCV Units Leased in the Plan Year

At the end of FY 2010, OHA had 848 non-MTW Housing Choice Vouchers under active lease; see Table 6 below for more details. This represents a utilization rate of 41.6 percent (41.6%). A description of issues related to leasing can be found in Section II.B.5.

**Table 6
Housing Choice Vouchers Leased**

	Projected Authorized	Projected In Use	% Utilized	Actual Authorized	Actual In Use	% Utilized
MTW Housing Choice Vouchers						
MTW HCV	10,958	10,739	98.0%	10,958	10,751	98.1%
Scattered Sites				270	261	96.7%
Subtotal MTW HCV	10,958	10,739	98.0%	11,228	11,012	98.1%
Non-MTW Housing Choice Vouchers						
Section 8 Mod Rehab	502	487	97.0%	502	474	94.4%
Section 8 Mainstream	175	170	97.0%	175	147	84.0%
TPV Scattered Sites				1,258	159	12.6%
VASH				105	68	64.8%
Subtotal Non-MTW HCV	677	657	97.0%	2,040	848	41.6%
Total Housing Choice Vouchers	11,635	11,396	97.9%	13,268	11,860	89.4%

5. Description of Any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing or HCVs

During FY 2010, OHA was engaged in a number of ambitious reorganizations and program changes that impacted the Agency's ability to lease units in both programs. The major impact to both programs was the planned disposition of the scattered sites family public housing units.

Public Housing Program

At June 30, 2010, the vacancy rate for the public housing program was 5.3 percent (5.3%). This represents a decrease of 1.5 percent (1.5%) from last year's vacancy rate of 6.8 percent (6.8%) at June 30, 2009.

The planned disposition of the family housing scattered sites impacted the leasing of the public housing units. Other changes that impacted leasing included the ongoing conversion to asset based management, the increased use of third party property management companies, and the implementation of site based wait lists.

The long period of under funding in the public housing program had previously resulted in the deferral of maintenance and repairs resulting in difficulty leasing apartments. With the flexibility of funding under MTW, OHA has been able to invest significant resources to aggressively address deferred maintenance and building repairs. This attention to enhancing vacancy turnover influenced a decision to take portions of one senior site offline for renovations.

During FY 2010, OHA contracted with third party professional property management companies to manage the following six public housing properties.

Senior Developments:

- Oak Grove North
- Oak Grove South
- Palo Vista
- Adel Court
- Harrison Towers

Family and Mixed Population Housing Developments:

- Campbell Village

As part of the conversion to asset based management, OHA utilized MTW authority to implement site based wait lists at all Asset Management Properties (AMP) in the portfolio. This transition to site based wait lists has resulted, in some cases, in a faster rate of lease up than with a single wait list for all properties.

Housing Choice Voucher Program

From July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010, a reduction of 811 HCV leased units occurred.

On July 1, 2009, the total MTW units leased were 11,823. There were no additional units leased from July to December 2009 (first half of FY 2010) based on instructions from HUD not to lease above the baseline. In December of 2009, it was made clear that over leasing above the baseline was allowed. However, by that time the MTW voucher program had fallen below baseline. On June 30, 2010, 11,012 families were under lease, which is a reduction of 220 families over the previous year. OHA is actively leasing up to its new baseline of 12,492 as of October 1, 2010.

In the non-MTW HCV program, the decrease in the anticipated utilization rate was primarily due to the Tenant Protection Vouchers that were in process but not in use as of the end of the fiscal year. These TPV were authorized as part of the disposition of the former family public housing scattered sites. OHA expects to have these vouchers in use in FY 2011.

6. Number of Project Based Vouchers In Use or Committed at the End of the Plan Year

At June 30, 2010, a total of 427 PBV units were under a Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) contract and in use. This number includes the three sites that were project-based during the fiscal year described in Section II.A.7. This represents an increase of 139 PBV units under lease from the beginning of the fiscal year. Three new PBV commitments were made this year for a total of 1,674 additional PBV units. As described in Section II.A.7, PBVs have been committed for use at the OHA family housing scattered sites as part of the approved disposition plan. Project-basing of these units is anticipated to begin in FY 2011 as families move out. As of the end of FY 2010, OHA has 2,341 PBV units in use or committed to projects.

**Table 7
Approved Project Based Voucher (PBV) Allocations**

Development Name	Date of Board Approval	Number of PBV Units	Contract Date	Project Description
Units Under HAP Contract (In Use)				
Mandela Gateway	2/12/2003	30	10/20/2004	Low Income Families
Fox Courts / Uptown Oakland	12/3/2004	20	5/15/2009	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase I	7/13/2005	23	1/1/2007	Senior
Madison Apartments	7/13/2005	19	4/25/2008	Low Income Families
Seven Directions	7/13/2005	18	9/12/2008	Low Income Families
Lion Creek Crossings II	11/9/2005	18	7/3/2007	Low Income Families
Lion Creek Crossings III	6/14/2006	16	6/25/2008	Low Income Families
Orchards on Foothill	6/14/2006	64	11/7/2008	Senior
14 th St Apartments at Central Station	1/22/2007	20	11/25/2009	Low Income Families
Jack London Gateway - Phase II	2/26/2007	60	6/5/2009	Senior
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
Tassafaronga Village Phase II	7/21/2008	19	5/27/2010	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
Total Units Under HAP Contracts (In Use)		427		
Commitments				
Harrison & 17 th Senior Housing	5/29/2007	11	In Dev.	Senior
St. Joseph's Senior Apartments	5/29/2007	83	In Dev.	Senior
Lion Creek Crossings Phase IV	4/28/2008	10	In Dev.	Low Income Families
720 East 11 th Street	4/28/2008	16	In Dev.	Low Income Families / Persons with Disabilities
Fairmount Apartments	10/24/2008	16	In Dev.	Low Income Families / Persons with Disabilities
Willow Place Senior Homes	5/4/2009	50	In Dev.	Senior
Effie's House	5/4/2009	10	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
Slim Jenkins Court	5/4/2009	11	In Dev.	Low Income Families
Marin Way	5/4/2009	19	In Dev.	Low Income Families
Drachma Housing	5/4/2009	14	In Dev.	Low Income Families
OHA Scattered Sites	7/27/2009	1,554	Pending	Low Income Families
Jefferson Oaks	3/9/2010	101	In Dev.	Special Needs
Harp Plaza	5/24/2010	19	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
Commitments In Development or Pending		1,914		
Total Project Based Voucher Allocations		2,341		

C. Wait List Information

1. Number and Characteristics of Households on the Waiting Lists at the End of the Plan Year

At the end of FY 2010, there were a combined total of 19,298 households on wait lists for the Public Housing Program, Section 8 Program, and mixed developments with public housing, Project Based Vouchers, and tax credit units. Except for the Section 8 General wait list, all other wait lists are site based. The conversion to site based wait lists allowed families to apply for and be on more than one wait list based on their personal preferences. In some cases, these numbers may represent duplicated household counts. Table 8 provides a summary of the number of households on each wait lists by property and type.

Table 8 Wait Lists for OHA Programs			
	Public Housing	Section 8	Public Housing, PBV, and Tax Credit
OHA Managed Wait Lists			
Public Housing			
Lockwood Gardens	955		
Palo Vista	592		
Peralta	944		
Section 8			
General & Mainstream Program		5,289	
Project Based Vouchers			
Formerly scattered sites public housing units		2,099	
Mod Rehab		211	
Public Housing Sites Privately Managed for OHA			
Harrison Towers	160		
Adel Court	178		
Campbell Village	510		
Oak Grove North and South	333		
Project Based Vouchers Managed by a Third Party			
Altenheim Phases I & II, Seven Directions, The Orchards on Foothill, Jack London Gateway, Fox Courts, Ironhorse, Madison Apartments		2,655	
Combined Public Housing, PBV, and Tax Credit Managed by a Third Party			
Lion Creek Crossings Phases I, II, & III			1,163
Mandela Gateway			723
Foothill Family Apartments*			235
Chestnut Court and Linden Court*			310
Tassafaronga Village Phases I & II			2,941
Total Households	3,672	10,254	5,372
Shelter Plus Care Managed by Alameda County			
		43	
Combined Total			19,341

* These properties do not have PBV units, only public housing and tax credit units.

The OHA managed Project Based Voucher wait list includes data from the site based wait lists established for the family housing scattered sites Asset Management Properties (AMPs) formerly in the public housing inventory. Project Based Voucher wait lists managed by third parties include information from Altenheim Senior Housing, Seven Directions, The Orchards on Foothill, Jack London Gateway, Fox Courts, Ironhorse, and Madison Apartments. For the Section 8 Mainstream Program, a separate waitlist is not maintained as families are selected from the Section 8 General wait list managed by OHA based on their eligibility for the program as a disabled household. OHA provides subsidies for approximately 242 households under the Shelter Plus Care program. The Shelter Plus Care program wait list is managed by Alameda County. There is one wait list for the entire Shelter Plus Care program in this county and applicants are referred to the next available housing for which they are eligible. Demographic information for the households on the Shelter Plus Care wait list was not available at the time of the report. Therefore, the following breakdown of applicant characteristics does not include households on the Shelter Plus Care wait list.

Characteristics of Wait List Applicants

The characteristics of the wait list applicants include a breakdown of households for each grouping presented above by household size, family type, income group, race, and ethnicity. The data compares a snapshot taken at June 30, 2009, the Fiscal Year End (FYE) of 2009, and June 30, 2010, FYE 2010. The data for FYE 2010 includes an additional 5,596 families that were not included in the data for FY 2009 because the data was unavailable at that time. These additional families come from the wait list information for developments with PBVs managed by third parties and the wait list for Tassafioranga Phase I and II. Due to the large increase in the overall wait list numbers, a comparison was made between the distribution of the characteristics in each category.

Although the Shelter Plus Care applicants are not included in the following demographic breakdowns, all households on the wait list are categorized as disabled and have incomes at or below 50 percent (50%) Area Median Income (AMI).

Wait List Applicants by Household Size

In the Public Housing program, the majority of families on the wait list are one- and two-person households representing 40.4 percent (40.4%) and 37.1 percent (37.1%) of the total households respectively. In the Section 8 program, the majority of families on the wait list are one-person households as well, representing 69 percent (69%) of the total households. In the Combined Public Housing, PBV, and Tax Credit housing, the majority of the families are two-person households representing 42.1 percent (42.1%) of the total households. Thus, overall the majority of families on the wait list are one- and two-person households representing 51.5 percent (51.5%) and 26.5 percent (26.5%) of the total households respectively. In all programs, one-person households decreased by 11.5 percent (11.5%) and two-person households decreased by two percent (2%) from last fiscal year. Overall, the number of three-person households also increased significantly by 9.7 percent (9.7%) from last fiscal year primarily due to substantial increases in this category in the Public Housing program and Section 8 program of 15.4 percent (15.4%) and 11.8 percent (11.8%) respectively.

In the Section 8 program, the waitlist data from the previous fiscal year (FY 2009) was skewed to one-person households due to data conversion issues that occurred when the new database system was implemented. The new database system was implemented in September 2008; however corrections to the technical issues with the system were not finalized until FY 2010. One of the major problems with the new system was that it did not accurately account for the household size of families on the Section 8 wait list. The previous system tracked household size as it was self-reported on the application forms. Initially, when the new system was implemented, it was only tracking the information about the head of household. Thus, demographic data about the size of the household was skewed to one-person households in the Section 8 program. In FY 2010, this problem was resolved and the data was updated. Thus, the drastic decrease in one-person households and the increase in two-, three-, and four-person households in the Section 8 wait list are more significantly related to the data errors described above rather than a shift in the population served by the Section 8 program. Furthermore, zero-person households that were previously reported have been re-categorized as "Missing Data" as these households only appeared in this category due to data error. When a household did not self-report their household size on the intake form, the system entered them as a zero size household. Thus, the missing data category more accurately represents these households as they have at least one person in the household, but the total size of the household has not been determined.

Table 9a					
Wait List Applicants by Household Size: Public Housing					
Household Size	FYE 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FYE 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
1	1,991	38.8%	1,482	40.4%	1.6%
2	2,775	54.0%	1,363	37.1%	-16.9%
3	215	4.2%	718	19.6%	15.4%
4	11	0.2%	105	2.9%	2.6%
5	4	0.1%	4	0.1%	0.0%
6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Missing Data	140	2.7%	0	0.0%	-2.7%
Total	5,136	100.0%	3,672	100.0%	0.0%

Table 9b					
Wait List Applicants by Household Size: Section 8					
Household Size	FYE 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FYE 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
1	6,393	98.4%	7,080	69.0%	-29.3%
2	47	0.7%	1,484	14.5%	13.7%
3	18	0.3%	1,236	12.1%	11.8%
4	4	0.1%	327	3.2%	3.1%
5	0	0.0%	61	0.6%	0.6%
6	0	0.0%	25	0.2%	0.2%
Missing Data	37	0.6%	41	0.4%	-0.2%
Total	6,499	100.0%	10,254	100.0%	0.0%

Table 9c					
Wait List Applicants by Household Size: Combined Public Housing, PBV, Tax Credit					
Household Size	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
1	827	27.6%	1,377	25.6%	-2.0%
2	1,335	44.6%	2,259	42.1%	-2.5%
3	691	23.1%	1,145	21.3%	-1.7%
4	122	4.1%	364	6.8%	2.7%
5	21	0.7%	128	2.4%	1.7%
6	0	0.0%	95	1.8%	1.8%
Missing Data	0	0.0%	4	0.1%	0.1%
Total	2,996	100.0%	5,372	100.0%	0.0%

Table 9d					
Wait List Applicants by Household Size: All Programs					
Household Size	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
1	9,211	63.0%	9,939	51.5%	-11.5%
2	4,157	28.4%	5,106	26.5%	-2.0%
3	924	6.3%	3,099	16.1%	9.7%
4	137	0.9%	796	4.1%	3.2%
5	25	0.2%	193	1.0%	0.8%
6	0	0.0%	120	0.6%	0.6%
Missing Data	177	1.2%	45	0.2%	-1.0%
Total	14,631	100.0%	19,298	100.0%	0.0%

Wait List Applicants by Family Type

In all three housing program wait lists, the majority of households are families representing 57.4 percent (57.4%) in public housing, 73.7 percent (73.7%) in Section 8, and 91 percent (91%) in the combined public housing, PBV, and tax credit housing, resulting in 75.4 percent (75.4%) in all programs. Compared to FYE 2009, the Public Housing program and the Section 8 program saw significant increases in elderly households as a percentage of total households of 13.6 percent (13.6%) and 11.9 percent (11.9%) respectively. Overall, the number of disabled households decreased by two percent (2%) from the previous fiscal year representing 6.8 percent (6.8%) of total households on the wait list at FYE 2010.

Table 10a					
Wait List Applicants by Family Type: Public Housing					
Family Type	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
Elderly	1206	23.5%	1,360	37.0%	13.6%
Disabled	177	3.4%	206	5.6%	2.2%
Family	3753	73.1%	2,106	57.4%	-15.7%
Missing Data	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	5,136	100.0%	3,672	100.0%	0.0%

Table 10b					
Wait List Applicants by Family Type: Section 8					
Family Type	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/Decrease
Elderly	442	6.8%	1,915	18.7%	11.9%
Disabled	828	12.7%	777	7.6%	-5.2%
Family	5,189	79.8%	7,562	73.7%	-6.1%
Missing Data	40	0.6%	0	0.0%	-0.6%
Total	6,499	100.0%	10,254	100.0%	0.0%

Table 10c					
Wait List Applicants by Family Type: Combined Public Housing, PBV, Tax Credit					
Family Type	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/Decrease
Elderly	74	2.5%	155	2.9%	0.4%
Disabled	277	9.2%	326	6.1%	-3.2%
Family	2,645	88.3%	4,891	91.0%	2.8%
Missing Data	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	2,996	100.0%	5,372	100.0%	0.0%

Table 10d					
Wait List Applicants by Family Type: All Programs					
Family Type	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/Decrease
Elderly	1,722	11.8%	3,430	17.8%	6.0%
Disabled	1,282	8.8%	1,309	6.8%	-2.0%
Family	11,587	79.2%	14,559	75.4%	-3.8%
Missing Data	40	0.3%	0	0.0%	-0.3%
Total	14,631	100.0%	19,298	100.0%	0.0%

Wait List Applicants by Income Group

Households with incomes ranging from zero percent (0%) to 30 percent (30%) of Area Median Income (AMI) were the largest percentage of total households in all programs representing 85.6 percent (85.6%) of total households in Public Housing, 79.6 percent (79.6%) of total households in Section 8, and 76.1 percent (76.1%) of total households in the combined public housing, PBV, and tax credit developments. In all programs combined, this income group represents 79.8 percent (79.8%) of the total households, which was a decrease of 10.4 percent (10.4%) from the last fiscal year. The decrease in this category is primarily due to the inclusion of the mixed income developments that were not counted in the prior fiscal year. Additionally, in all programs, the number of households with incomes ranging above 30 percent (30%) up to 50 percent (50%) of AMI increased by 9.1 percent (9.1%) from the last fiscal year primarily due to increases in this income category in the Section 8 program and the mixed income developments (increases of 16.8% and 11.4% respectively).

OHA conducts an annual purge of the wait list to ensure that all applicants on the wait list meet the income requirements for the programs. For the Public Housing program, applicants that fall in the income category of over 80 percent (80%) AMI are not eligible for the program. While there are some applicants that fall into this category for FY 2010, more

analysis will be conducted to verify income range. Applicants that do not meet the eligibility requirements will be notified and withdrawn from the wait list. In the Section 8 program, applicants that fall in the income categories of over 50 percent (50%) AMI are not eligible for the program.

In FY 2010, the family housing scattered sites wait list information was included in the count for the Section 8 program because those units had converted to Section 8 as of the end of the fiscal year. However, when those wait lists were populated; those AMPs were still public housing properties. Since the public housing program allows applicants to have incomes up to 80 percent (80%) AMI, some applicants on the wait list fell into this category and were not removed when the wait list was converted to Section 8. During the annual purge of the wait list, applicants that do not meet the current requirements of the program will be notified and withdrawn from the wait list. Further analysis needs to be conducted to determine if the households reported on the Section 8 wait list as over 50% AMI (203 households) are really over-income or if they represent data collection or system errors. OHA has been monitoring the withdrawals from the wait list and will continue to do so, in order to gather more comprehensive and accurate data. As of the end of the fiscal year, there were no withdrawals from the wait list due to income ineligibility as a result of the conversion of the wait list from Public Housing to Section 8.

Table 11a					
Wait List Applicants by Income Group: Public Housing					
Income Group	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/Decrease
0% - 30% AMI	3,995	77.8%	3,144	85.6%	7.8%
31% - 50% AMI	796	15.5%	355	9.7%	-5.8%
51% - 80% AMI	309	6.0%	64	1.7%	-4.3%
Over 80% AMI	36	0.7%	17	0.5%	-0.2%
Missing Data	0	0.0%	92	2.5%	2.5%
Total	5,136	100.0%	3,672	100.0%	0.0%

Table 11b					
Wait List Applicants by Income Group: Section 8					
Income Group	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/Decrease
0% - 30% AMI	6,437	99.0%	8,165	79.6%	-19.4%
31% - 50% AMI	48	0.7%	1,794	17.5%	16.8%
51% - 80% AMI	14	0.2%	185	1.8%	1.6%
Over 80% AMI	0	0.0%	18	0.2%	0.2%
Missing Data	0	0.0%	92	0.9%	0.9%
Total	6,499	100.0%	10,254	100.0%	0.0%

Table 11c					
Wait List Applicants by Income Group: Combined Public Housing, PBV, Tax Credit					
Income Group	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/Decrease
0% - 30% AMI	2,762	92.2%	4087	76.1%	-16.1%
31% - 50% AMI	231	7.7%	1026	19.1%	11.4%
51% - 80% AMI	2	0.1%	211	3.9%	3.9%
Over 80% AMI	1	0.0%	14	0.3%	0.2%
Missing Data	0	0.0%	34	0.6%	0.6%
Total	2,996	100.0%	5,372	100.0%	0.0%

Table 11d					
Wait List Applicants by Income Group: All Programs					
Income Group	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
0% - 30% AMI	13,194	90.2%	15,396	79.8%	-10.4%
31% - 50% AMI	1,075	7.3%	3,175	16.5%	9.1%
51% - 80% AMI	325	2.2%	460	2.4%	0.2%
Over 80% AMI	37	0.3%	49	0.3%	0.0%
Missing Data	0	0.0%	218	1.1%	1.1%
Total	14,631	100.0%	19,298	100.0%	0.0%

Wait Lists by Race and Ethnicity of Household

In the Public Housing, Section 8, and mixed development programs, the majority of applicants on the wait list are African American (60.5%, 63%, and 65.6% of the total households respectively), with Asian applicants representing the second largest majority (26.9, 20.1%, and 12.8% of the total households respectively). Overall this represents a decrease of 5.2 percent (5.2%) in the number of African American applicants on the wait list and a 3.8 percent (3.8%) increase in the number of Asian applicants.

The number of Hispanic applicants increased by 4.9 percent (4.9%) from the previous fiscal year, resulting in 6.4 percent (6.4%) of the total applicants on the wait list. In addition, the number of Hispanic households increased in the other programs also, creating an overall increase of 3.4 percent (3.4%) from the previous fiscal year, resulting in Hispanic households representing 5.9 percent (5.9%) of the total applicants on the wait list.

Table 12a					
Wait List Applicants by Race & Ethnicity: Public Housing					
Race & Ethnicity	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
Race					
White	420	8.2%	305	8.3%	0.1%
Black/African American	3373	65.7%	2,222	60.5%	-5.2%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	13	0.3%	27	0.7%	0.5%
Asian	1248	24.3%	987	26.9%	2.6%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	5	0.1%	38	1.0%	0.9%
Other/ Missing Data	77	1.5%	93	2.5%	1.0%
Total	5,136	100.0%	3,672	100.0%	0.0%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic	78	1.5%	235	6.4%	4.9%
Non-Hispanic	5009	97.5%	3,311	90.2%	-7.4%
Missing Data	49	1.0%	126	3.4%	2.5%
Total	5,136	100.0%	3,672	100.0%	0.0%

Table 12b					
Wait List Applicants by Race & Ethnicity: Section 8					
Race & Ethnicity	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
Race					
White	937	14.4%	1,101	10.7%	-3.7%
Black/African American	4,697	72.3%	6,461	63.0%	-9.3%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	48	0.7%	197	1.9%	1.2%
Asian	737	11.3%	2,065	20.1%	8.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	76	1.2%	175	1.7%	0.5%
Other/ Missing Data	4	0.1%	255	2.5%	2.4%
Total	6,499	100.0%	10,254	100.0%	0.0%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic	11	0.2%	306	3.0%	2.8%
Non-Hispanic	6,488	99.8%	9,948	97.0%	-2.8%
Missing Data	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	6,499	100.0%	10,254	100.0%	0.0%

Table 12c					
Wait List Applicants by Race & Ethnicity: Combined Public Housing, PBV, Tax Credit					
Race & Ethnicity	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
Race					
White	66	2.2%	150	2.8%	0.6%
Black/African American	1,944	64.9%	3,524	65.6%	0.7%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	14	0.5%	42	0.8%	0.3%
Asian	289	9.6%	686	12.8%	3.1%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	20	0.7%	49	0.9%	0.2%
Other/ Missing Data	663	22.1%	921	17.1%	-5.0%
Total	2,996	100.0%	5,372	100.0%	0.0%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic	270	9.0%	596	11.1%	2.1%
Non-Hispanic	1,721	57.4%	3,892	72.4%	15.0%
Missing Data	1,005	33.5%	884	16.5%	-17.1%
Total	2,996	100.0%	5,372	100.0%	0.0%

Table 12d
Wait List Applicants by Race & Ethnicity: All Programs

Race & Ethnicity	FY 2009	% of Total FY 2009	FY 2010	% of Total FY 2010	% Increase/ Decrease
Race					
White	1,423	9.7%	1,556	8.1%	-1.7%
Black/African American	10,014	68.4%	12,207	63.3%	-5.2%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	75	0.5%	266	1.4%	0.9%
Asian	2,274	15.5%	3,738	19.4%	3.8%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	101	0.7%	262	1.4%	0.7%
Other/ Missing Data	744	5.1%	1,269	6.6%	1.5%
Total	14,631	100.0%	19,298	100.0%	0.0%
Ethnicity					
Hispanic	359	2.5%	1,137	5.9%	3.4%
Non-Hispanic	13,218	90.3%	17,151	88.9%	-1.5%
Missing Data	1,054	7.2%	1,010	5.2%	-2.0%
Total	14,631	100.0%	19,298	100.0%	0.0%

2. Description of Waiting Lists and Any Changes That Were Made in the Past Fiscal Year

Public Housing Wait Lists

In FY 2010, OHA opened site based wait lists for all public housing Asset Management Properties (AMP), including the AMPs removed from the public housing inventory as part of the planned disposition. From July 27, 2009 – July 31, 2009, the OHA accepted 93,654 pre-applications for these site based wait lists. To ensure access to all interested families, OHA established fully-staffed computer kiosks at its East and West District Offices. Staffed computer kiosks were also established at sixteen public libraries throughout the City of Oakland.

Following closing of the pre-application acceptance period, an automated assessment process was conducted for each application from the old and new list to identify incomplete, duplicate, non-qualified, as well as qualified applications. In order to be considered eligible for the program, applicants that applied to senior housing developments had to meet the required minimum age of 62 years old. In addition, some properties only have certain bedroom sizes in the units, for example 4 of the scattered sites properties only have three-bedroom units; therefore applicants that did not have the appropriate household size for those units were removed from those wait lists. All eligible applicants (57,706) that met the age and occupancy requirements described above were entered into the housing lottery. Of those households in the lottery, only 10,133 households were selected for placement on the site based wait lists for subsidized housing in Oakland. All incomplete, duplicate, and non-qualified applications were removed from the lottery pool. Additionally, a purge was performed of old applicants from the 2003 and 2006 wait lists. Thus, the 10,133 accepted applications are a combination of 2009 new applications and 2006 and 2003 old applications as of the end of July 2009. All applicants, whether their application was disqualified, rejected or selected during the lottery, received notification by post card (mailed on November 19, 2009) informing them of the application results.

Leased Housing Wait Lists

There were no changes in the organization of the wait lists for the HCV Program. OHA will continue to operate a single wait list for the MTW HCV Program while sites with allocations of PBV units will continue to operate site based wait lists. As described above, site based wait lists were created for the AMPs converted to Section 8 as part of the disposition process.

Shelter Plus Care Program

Alameda County manages a single wait list for the entire Shelter Plus Care program for this county. This wait list is always open for single adults eligible for a Single Room Occupancy (SRO) unit at the Harrison Hotel and for individuals or heads of households eligible for housing for people with HIV/AIDS. During the fiscal year, the wait list was opened for two months in March and April of 2010 for all eligible applicants.

SECTION III. NON-MTW RELATED HOUSING AUTHORITY INFORMATION

This section provides information about OHA's non-MTW activities.

Local Preference in the HCV program for households displaced due to government action –

OHA will develop a set of preferences and priorities in the HCV Program for households involuntarily displaced from affordable housing in Oakland due to government action or as a result of project financial difficulties that threaten the imminent loss of the affordable unit. In these circumstances, OHA may admit families that are not currently on the wait list, or without considering the family's location on the wait list.

In August 2008 a resolution was presented to the Board of Commissioners to allow OHA to issue tenant based vouchers to in-place residents in danger of being involuntarily displaced due to local government action. This proposal was in direct responses to distressed properties abandoned by Oakland Community Housing Inc. (OCHI).

Three properties in the OCHI portfolio were clearly identified as "at risk" of being shut down by the City of Oakland, Nueva Vista Apartments (30 units), Marin Way Apartments (20 units), and Drasnin Manor (26 units). After these properties were certified as substandard by the City of Oakland and at the request of the City, OHA offered Section 8 HCV's to the remaining in-place families at these three properties.

Marin Way and Nueva Vista were "certified" as substandard by the City in January 2009. Drasnin Manor was "certified" sub-standard in March 2009.

- 4 HCVs were issued to in place families at the Marin Way Apartments
- 7 HCVs were issued to in place families at Drasnin Manor
- 8 HCVs were issued to in place families at the Nueva Vista Apartments
- 19** Total (HCV) vouchers were issued to families utilizing this local preference which assisted the families in relocating to other units without having to be forcibly displaced.

SECTION IV. LONG-TERM MTW PLAN

The Oakland Housing Authority will utilize its participation in the MTW Demonstration program in the following three primary areas:

1. Preserving and Enhancing the Public Housing Portfolio
OHA has made a long-term commitment to use MTW authority to preserve and enhance its portfolio of Public Housing units through a combination of enhanced operations and aggressive efforts to address deferred maintenance and improve physical conditions.
2. Preserving and Expanding Affordable Housing Opportunities
OHA's participation in the MTW Program has allowed the Authority to preserve affordable housing resources and expand housing opportunities through real estate development, site acquisition, partnerships with non-profit developers, and active coordination with the City of Oakland. These brick and mortar strategies will be combined with new innovative subsidy programs designed to meet local needs and initiatives.
3. Promoting Resident Empowerment and Self Sufficiency
The long-term success for many of OHA's clients requires a level of support beyond simply housing. MTW allows OHA to enhance the quality and reach of client services provided both in-house and in partnership with community based service providers who are experts in their respective fields.

SECTION V. PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES: APPROVED BY HUD BUT NOT IMPLEMENTED

This section includes information on proposed Moving to Work activities that were approved by HUD but not implemented for reasons described below.

MTW Activity # 16: Waive 12 Month Minimum Stay Requirement in PBV Rules for In-place Families at Scattered Sites

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: Not Implemented and Closed Out

Activity #16 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
16. Waive 12 Month Minimum Stay Requirement In PBV Rules For In-Place Families At Scattered Sites	Using MTW authority, OHA will offer existing tenants in scattered sites units that receive PBV assistance the option to relocate using a tenant transfer voucher. Existing tenants will not be required to stay in their unit for 12 months after conversion to PBV assistance to receive the tenant transfer voucher.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient Increase housing choice	Policy change would provide incentives for families to become self-sufficient. It would also increase housing choice for families that have had relatively limited choices under the Public Housing program.	<u>Baseline</u> – Number of households eligible for transfer voucher without adoption of policy <u>Benchmarks</u> – It is estimated that approximately 500 in-place families will request a transfer voucher	Data on the number of households that utilize a transfer voucher	<u>Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 PBV Program</u> Attachment C – Section D.7

Narrative Description

This activity is being closed out.

When this activity was first designed, it was anticipated that HUD-provided Tenant Protection Vouchers awarded for the approved disposition of 1,554 scattered sites family public housing units could immediately become Project Based Vouchers and existing tenants in former family public housing scattered sites units would have to wait a year before they could move.

However, project-basing of Tenant Protection Vouchers was not allowed by HUD and was, in fact, unnecessary.

With HUD's award of Tenant Protection Vouchers, existing families in former family public housing scattered sites units could move any time they wanted. OHA could then issue Project Based Vouchers to former family public housing scattered sites units after existing tenants had used the Tenant Protection Vouchers to move elsewhere. This is consistent with OHA's stated MTW Agreement to facilitate maximum housing choice for all OHA residents and, as implemented, requires no special MTW authorization.

Section VI. Ongoing MTW Activities: HUD Approval Granted

The MTW activities listed in this section have received HUD approval. For each activity, information is provided on the relationship between the ongoing activities and the statutory objectives, as well as, detailed information on measurements and impacts.

MTW Activity # 1: Triennial Income Reexamination Schedule

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2007

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #1 Table A Evaluation Metrics							
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization	Hardship Exception (if Rent Reform)
1. Triennial income re-examination schedule for elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes	Utilize a triennial income re-examination with annual rent adjustments based on published COLA's for Social Security and SSI	Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Reduction in administrative time associated with conducting re-examinations on households with fixed incomes.	<u>Baseline</u> – Number of full rent review reexaminations performed prior to implementation of new policy <u>Benchmark</u> – 30 percent reduction in number of full rent review reexaminations	Data on number of full rent review re-examinations performed	<u>Income Review and Reexamination Program</u> Attachment C – Section C.4 Section D.1.c.	Households may request an interim review at any time if they believe their rent portion would be lower than the stated cost of living increase or decrease.

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #1 Table B Measurement & Outcomes: Section 8 Program				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of full rent review reexaminations performed	3,092 full rent reviews conducted annually on eligible households	2,164 full rent reviews conducted in FY 2010 (30% reduction)	2,566 full rent reviews conducted	No – 17% reduction in full rent reviews. The policy did not achieve the expected benchmark because it had only been implemented for four months at the time of evaluation. OHA anticipates meeting the benchmark next year based on the preliminary success shown after four months.
Staff time to perform full rent review reexaminations	3,092 hours (= 1 hour per reexamination)	2,164 hours (30% reduction)	2,566 hours = (1 hour per full rent review)	No – 17% reduction in the amount of time to complete full rent review reexaminations. See above.
Labor cost to perform full rent review reexaminations	\$129,246 (= 3,092 hours x \$41.80* average hourly pay rate for Housing Assistance Representative (HAR) staff)	\$90,472 (30% reduction)	\$107,259 = (2,566 hours for full rent review x \$41.80* HAR staff pay rate)	No – 17% reduction in cost to complete full rent review on all eligible households. See above.

* Hourly rate includes salary plus benefits.

Narrative Description – Section 8 Program

Implementation of this policy began for the March, 2010 annual recertifications. A total of 3,092 households were identified as eligible based on their status as elderly and/or disabled and on a fixed income. Eligible households were divided into three groups of roughly equal size. Every year, one group receives a full rent review while the other two groups have their rent payment updated based on the annual cost of living increase or decrease related to their income subsidy program. This cycle rotates annually so that every group participates in a full rent review every three years; see Table 6 below. The full rent reviews are conducted by Housing Assistance Representatives, while the updates based on COLAs are handled by the Eligibility Technicians.

Activity #1 Table C		
Section 8 Program Triennial Review Schedule		
Household Group	Full Rent Review Year	Full Rent Review Year
Group A	2010	2013
Group B	2011	2014
Group C	2012	2015

Although the implementation process has not been completed for an entire year, after 4 months of implementation OHA saw a 17 percent (17%) reduction in the amount of full rent reviews conducted, the amount of staff time allocated to completing reexaminations, and the cost to complete the reexaminations. The average time to complete a full rent review was based on management estimates. The review includes the time taken to prepare the packet, follow up with residents, and perform data entry. Hourly rate calculations were based on an average of the salary and benefits for the positions described.

Since this is a rent reform initiative, a hardship policy has been established that states that households may request an interim review at any time if they believe their rent portion would be lower than the stated cost of living increase or decrease. As of the end of FY 2010, no participants have requested a full rent review as a result of implementing the triennial reexamination schedule.

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #1 Table D				
Measurement & Outcomes: Public Housing Program				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of reexaminations performed	135 full rent reviews conducted annually on eligible households	95 full rent reviews conducted (30% reduction)	76 full rent reviews conducted in FY 2010 (44% reduction)	Yes – 44% reduction in the amount of reexaminations conducted
Staff time to perform reexaminations	1,350 hours (= 10 hour per each reexamination)	945 hours (30% reduction)	760 hours (44% reduction)	Yes – 44% reduction in the amount of time to complete reexaminations as a percentage of eligible households
Labor cost to perform reexaminations	\$33,750 (= 1,350 hours x \$25.00* average hourly pay rate for Property Manager and Assistant Property Manger)	\$23,625 (30% reduction)	\$19,000 (= 760 hours x \$25* hourly pay rate)	Yes - 44% reduction in costs to perform reexaminations on all actual eligible households.

* Hourly rate includes average salary plus benefits.

Narrative Description – Public Housing Program

This activity was implemented for May, 2009 recertifications for two public housing properties managed by a third party property management company, Oak Groves North and Oak Groves South. A total of 135 households were identified as eligible based on their status as elderly and/or disabled and on a fixed income. Eligible households were divided into three groups based on the floor they occupied in the building (see table 8 below). Every year, one group receives a full rent review while the other two groups have their rent payment updated based on the annual cost of living increase or decrease related to their subsidy program. This cycle rotates annually so that every group participates in a full rent review every three years. The Property Manager and Assistant Property Manager conduct the full rent reviews.

Activity #1 Table E		
Oak Groves North & South Triennial Review Schedule		
Household Group	Full Rent Review Year	Full Rent Review Year
Floor 1 & 2	2010	2013
Floor 3	2011	2014
Floor 4 & 5	2012	2015

In FY 2010, OHA saw 44 percent (44%) reduction in the amount of full rent reviews conducted, the amount of staff time allocated to completing reexaminations, and the cost to complete the reexaminations. This resulted in a significant cost savings for OHA.

Since this is a rent reform initiative, a hardship policy has been established that states that households may request an interim review at any time if they believe their rent portion would be lower than the stated cost of living increase or decrease. As of the end of FY 2010, one household requested a full rent review as a result of implementing the triennial reexamination schedule. A full rent review was conducted and it was determined that the rent payment was correct. Therefore, no additional adjustment was made to the household's rent payment.

MTW Activity # 2: Site Based Wait Lists

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2006

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2006

Activity #2 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
2. Site Based Wait Lists	Establishment of site based wait lists at HOPE IV, Public Housing sites managed by a third party and developments with PBV allocations	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness Increase housing choices	The selection and pre-screening of prospective tenants at each site improves efficiency and reduces the duplication of administrative functions. Site based wait lists allow applicants to choose what sites or areas of the city they choose to live, and reduces the number of households rejecting an apartment because it is not near the family's support systems, work and schools. Applicants may apply for multiple lists as well. Additionally, OHA has chosen to loterize its site based wait lists down to a number that can be made offers in a reasonable period of time, and therefore will be opening and closing site based wait lists more frequently – thus increasing the frequency of access to affordable housing opportunities and reducing the long waiting periods for applicants, and the need and cost of wait list purging and maintenance.	<u>Baseline</u> – Site based wait lists in use at three senior Public Housing sites, all HOPE VI sites and developments with PBV units. <u>Benchmark</u> – Establishment of site based wait lists. Fewer households processed and less administrative time allocated to filling vacant units.	Status of site based wait lists. Number of households screened by OHA before unit is occupied at development utilizing a site based wait list.	<u>Site Based or Geographic Area With List System</u> Attachment C – Section C.1

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #2 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Time to tenant a vacant unit	19 hours per household	11 hours per household	11 hours per household (42% reduction)	Yes – OHA saved an estimated 8 hours per household of staff time.
Cost to tenant a vacant unit	\$873 per household	\$500 per household	\$499 per household (43% reduction)	Yes – OHA saved an estimated \$374 per household to tenant a vacant unit.
Number of properties with site based wait lists	Zero (0)	3 senior Public Housing sites, 5 HOPE IV sites, developments with PBV	8 Public Housing sites and 6 Public Housing AMPs, 5 HOPE IV sites, developments with PBV	Yes – OHA successfully implemented site based wait lists at all properties listed.

Narrative Description

Prior to FY 2010, site based wait lists were in use at all of the HOPE IV sites, developments with Project Based Voucher Units, and in two Public Housing sites with third party property management, Oak Groves North and Oak Groves South. In FY 2009, the OHA Board of Commissioners approved the selection of professional property management companies to manage four additional Public Housing sites. The management contracts for these sites began at the beginning of FY 2010. Currently, the sites listed in Table 10 are being managed by a third party property management company.

Activity #2 Table C	
Public Housing Sites with Third Party Property Management	
Public Housing Site Name	Type of Development
Oak Grove North	Senior
Oak Grove South	Senior
Palo Vista	Senior
Adel Court	Senior
Harrison Towers	Senior
Campbell Village	Family and Mixed Population

In addition to the implementation of site based wait lists at the properties mentioned above, OHA implemented site based wait lists at all of the remaining public housing properties during FY 2010. These properties include Lockwood Gardens, Peralta Villa, and one for each Asset Management Property (AMP) in the scattered sites portfolio. As of the end of FY 2010, all public housing properties maintain site based wait lists.

Before the implementation of site based wait lists, OHA maintained a central wait list for all public housing applicants. When a unit became available, an applicant would first go through eligibility determination. Once the applicant was identified as eligible for the program, they would be shown the available unit, which could be at any of the public housing properties. If the applicant turned down the first unit shown, which happened often, then the applicant would go back to eligibility and wait for another unit. If there was another unit vacant, the applicant would be shown a second unit. If the applicant accepted the unit, then they would begin the leasing process. Assuming that this household leased the second unit offered, the staff time involved in tenanting that unit totaled approximately 19 hours, costing OHA approximately \$873 per household.

With the implementation of site based wait lists, the process to tenant a vacant unit has been cut down considerably. When people apply for the wait list, they have the option to apply directly for the properties where they want to reside. Applicants are allowed to apply for multiple site based wait lists based on their personal preferences. This alone represents a huge increase in the household's exercising housing choice, because they are in a position to determine what area or property they will live in rather than having to take only what is offered. When a unit becomes available at a property, the applicant is brought in to look at the unit. If they accept the unit, they then go through the eligibility process to determine appropriateness for the program. Once eligibility has been determined, the household can complete the lease and begin tenanting the unit. This process now takes an estimated 11 hours of staff time to complete, a cost of approximately \$499 per household. This represents a 42 percent (42%) reduction in the amount of staff time spent on this activity and a 43 percent (43%) reduction in costs.

In addition to the cost savings noted above, there is a significant cost savings associated with the decrease in time to get the unit occupied. Prior to site based wait lists, a unit could be shown to several applicants before being leased because applicants had the right to refuse the unit. Rejection of units in the past had led to lengthy periods of vacancies at certain properties. While applicants still have the right to reject units, this is not occurring with the same frequency because applicants are applying their preferences on the front end by only applying for the properties where they choose to reside. This has significantly reduced the vacancy time and also the costs associated with vacancy rates.

The implementation of site based wait lists has resulted in a significant cost savings for OHA both in terms of the amount of staff time saved in the process of tenanting a unit as well as an increase in the efficiency and effectiveness to lease a unit promptly.

MTW Activity # 3: Income Mixing at Newly Renovated Public Housing Sites

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2008

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2008

Activity #3 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
3. Income Mixing at Newly Renovated Public Housing Sites	Goal of income mixing policy is similar to HUD's deconcentration policy but, which exempts developments with less than 100 units	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient	Reduction in the concentration of households with extremely low incomes	<p><u>Baseline</u> – Income mix at development prior to renovation</p> <p><u>Benchmarks</u> – Range of incomes when re-tenanted.</p>	Income data for households at site	<u>Deconcentration Policy</u> Attachment C – Section C.3

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #3 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Income mix in development	50% households at < 20% AMI, 28.6% households at 21%-30% AMI, 10.7% households at 31%-40% AMI, 10.7% households at 41%-80% AMI	25% households at < 20% AMI, 25% households at 21%-30% AMI, 25% households at 31%-40% AMI, 25% households at 41%-80% AMI	53.8% households at < 20% AMI, 19.2% households at 21%-30% AMI, 15.4% households at 31%-40% AMI, 11.5% households at 41%-80% AMI	No – The benchmark was not met, but the households with incomes between 21%-80% AMI were more distributed than before.
Number of “before” households who remained in Public Housing and whose incomes increased	28 households in units before renovation	Of those who remain in public housing, 50% will have an increase in income	62.5% of the 24 households that remained in public housing increased their income	Yes – 15 of the households had an increase in household income of 58.6% on average.

Activity #3 Table C					
Households by Income Group Before Renovations					
BEFORE	Number of Households				Total
Site Address	< 20% AMI	21% - 30% AMI	31% - 40% AMI	41% - 80% AMI	
2056 35th Street	5	3	1	0	9
3500 Bruce Street	3	2	2	1	8
6916 Arthur Street	5	1	0	0	6
6921 Fresno Street	1	2	0	2	5
Total	14	8	3	3	28
Percent of Total	50.0%	28.6%	10.7%	10.7%	100.0%

Activity #3 Table D					
Households by Income Group After Renovations					
AFTER	Number of Households				Total
Site Address	< 20% AMI	21% - 30% AMI	31% - 40% AMI	41% - 80% AMI	
2056 35th Street	5	3	0	1	9
3500 Bruce Street	3	2	2	1	8
6916 Arthur Street	2	0	2	1	5
6921 Fresno Street	4	0	0	0	4
Total	14	5	4	3	26
Percent of Total	53.8%	19.2%	15.4%	11.5%	100.0%

Narrative Description

The properties listed above underwent major renovations. In FY 2010, the renovations were completed and the units were brought back on-line. The properties at 6916 Arthur Street and 6921 Fresno Street were brought back on-line at the end of June 2010. Therefore, the leasing of these properties occurred in July 2010. Income data on these tenants was included in order to complete the analysis of this activity.

The goal of this initiative is to reduce the concentration of extremely low income families (income below 30 percent (30%) Area Median Income (AMI)) in OHA public housing. In an effort to accomplish this goal, the OHA Board of Commissioners passed Resolution 3908 on February 25, 2008 outlining the income mix to be used in the re-tenanting of properties that have been vacant and that have undergone renovations. The income mix is as follows.

- 25% of the units to serve families with incomes up to 20% of AMI
- 25% of the units to serve families with incomes greater than 20% up to 30% of AMI
- 25% of the units to serve families with incomes greater than 30% up to 40% of AMI
- 25% of the units to serve families with incomes greater than 40% of AMI

Despite efforts to encourage income mixing at these properties, the number of households with incomes 20 percent (20%) of AMI or less increased by 5.8 percent (5.8%) overall. However, households with incomes between 21 percent and 80 percent (21% -80%) of AMI were more distributed after the properties were re-tenanted. Looking at the properties individually, two of the properties showed little or no change to the income mix of the families occupying the units, 2056 35th Avenue and 3500 Bruce Street. At the property at 6916 Arthur Street, the household incomes as a percentage of AMI were better distributed than before, but still not reaching the benchmark of 25 percent (25%) in each category. On the other end of the spectrum, at the

property at 6921 Fresno Street, all households reported incomes less than 20 percent (20%) of AMI, increasing the percentage in this category by 80 percent (80%).

Despite efforts to recruit households with a broader range of incomes, most respondents on the wait list fall within 50 percent (50%) AMI. The wait list is predominately households with incomes less than 40 percent (40%) AMI. Approximately 80 percent (80%) of households on the public housing and Section 8 wait lists have incomes less than 30 percent (30%) AMI. This presents a significant challenge in implementing income mixing when properties are tenanted after renovation. Preferences, such as living and working in Oakland and special needs, also contribute to the challenges of encouraging income mixing at developments and yet remaining consistent with selection policies.

In addition to analyzing the income mix of these properties, analysis was conducted on the household income of tenants that had occupied the units prior to renovation. The purpose of this analysis was to determine if longevity in public housing, indicating housing stability, had an impact on a family's ability to increase their economic self sufficiency as demonstrated by an increase in their household income over time. Although most of the households that were occupying these units prior to renovation did not return to these units, twenty-four (24) of the 28 households remained in public housing units. Of the 24 households that continued to benefit from subsidized housing, fifteen (15) households had an increase in household income from the time they left these units to occupy other public housing units until June 30, 2010 (approximately two years). Prior to the renovations, the average household income at all of the sites combined was \$15,863. At the end of FY 2010, the average household income for the 24 households that remained in public housing was \$25,161, an increase of \$9,298 or 58.6 percent (58.6%). Eight of the households had a decrease in income; however on average, the decrease was fifteen percent (15%). The data demonstrates that housing stability is a factor in increasing economic self sufficiency. For these households, the opportunity to remain in subsidized housing increased their ability to become economically self sufficient.

There are no more public housing units scheduled for comprehensive modernization in the foreseeable future. Therefore, this activity is completed and closed out.

MTW Activity # 4: Allocate PBV Units without a Competitive Process

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2006

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2006

Activity #4 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
4. Allocate PBV Units to Developments Owned Directly or Indirectly by OHA Without Use of a Competitive Process	Use MTW authority to allocate PBV without competitive process	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness Increase housing choice	Reduction in administrative and development costs associated with issuing an RFP when OHA has qualifying development. This policy will also lead to the creation of new or replacement housing opportunities.	Baseline – Process without MTW Authorization <u>Benchmarks</u> - Reduction in staff time and project timelines. Creation of new and preserved housing opportunities.	Number of PBV allocated to New housing opportunities developed or preserved utilizing PBV units allocated to OHA developments	Establishment of <u>an Agency MTW Section 8 PBV Program</u> Attachment C – Section D.7.a

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #4 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Cost to develop and issue a Request for Proposal (RFP)	\$7,500 cost to develop and issue one RFP for a competitive process	\$0 cost to develop and issue an RFP without a competitive process	\$0 cost to develop an RFP without a competitive process	Yes – OHA saved an estimated \$22,500 by not having to develop and issue 3 RFPs to select and award PBV assistance to 8 projects since 2006.
Cost to respond to a RFP	\$4,000 cost to respond to one RFP in a competitive process	\$0 cost to respond to RFP without a competitive process	\$0 cost to respond to an RFP without a competitive process	Yes – OHA saved an estimated \$32,000 by not having to prepare 8 project applications in response to a separate PBV RFP.
Number of PBV units allocated for the creation and/or preservation of affordable housing	0 units	Difficult to determine due to changing nature of development activity	1,809 PBV units	Yes – 1,809 PBV units have been awarded without the use of a competitive process

Narrative Description

Reducing Costs and Achieving Greater Cost Effectiveness

Prior to implementation of this activity, OHA would be required to develop and conduct its own competitive PBV project selection procedure and process, in accordance with 24 CFR 983.51, to select award project-based voucher assistance, regardless of any OHA ownership interest in

the project. The costs associated with issuing a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) include staff time to conduct the RFP process, development of the RFP packet, public notice, advertising costs, materials costs, and the organization of a selection committee.

An accurate determination of the actual direct and indirect costs involved in conducting a PBV specific, competitive RFP cannot be assessed for this activity. However, a reasonable estimate is approximately \$7,500 per RFP, based on information from an independent contractor that OHA has worked with in the past to provide these services. Since this policy was implemented (FY2006), at least three RFPs would have been conducted to award PBVs to the eight OHA projects selected without a formal competition. This would have cost approximately \$22,500 to develop and issue the RFPs for the projects awarded.

In addition, OHA would have had to respond to these RFPs for the projects seeking PBVs. The cost associated with the preparation of individual project applications in response to an RFP is estimated at \$4,000 per application, based on information from an independent contractor that OHA has worked with in the past to provide this service. Thus, for all eight applications, the total cost to respond to the RFPs would have been an additional \$32,000 this year. This is a combined total of \$54,500 that OHA saved as a result of this policy. Therefore, a significant cost savings for the Authority was achieved through the implementation of this policy.

Increasing Housing Choice

Since FY 2006, a total of eight projects were selected for PBV funding without a competitive process. OHA has an identity of interest in all of these sites. The projects were not required to independently apply and compete with other projects for PBV assistance. The projects were directly presented to the OHA Board of Commissioners for review and approval.

Activity #4 Table C	
Number of PBV Units Awarded without a Competitive Process	
Site Name	Number of PBV Units Awarded
Tassafaronga Village Phase 1	80
Tassafaronga Village Phase 2	19
Harrison and 17 th Street Senior Housing	11
Lion Creek Crossing Phase 2	18
Lion Creek Crossing Phase 3	16
Lion Creek Crossing Phase 4	10
Jefferson Oaks	101
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>255 units</i>
OHA Scattered Sites (conversion units)	1,554
Total	1,809 units

With the exception of the scattered sites, all of these sites were also competitively selected for local funding through the City of Oakland, annual competition (NOFA) for development, preservation or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing funding (see MTW Activity # 5). Although these projects did get awarded, the implementation of this activity allowed OHA to award the PBVs to the project in advance of receiving notice of the City award. The City NOFA application process might have subjected the project to an additional delay, possibly impacting the projects timeline for completion and ability to secure funding from other resources.

Overall, the benefit of awarding PBVs to a project without a competition cannot be measured in full. This activity allowed OHA projects to efficiently move forward and maximized the leveraging capabilities of the project. Without the PBV award, the projects could have been significantly delayed or in the worst-case scenario, withdrawn or abandoned because of the inability to secure funding from other sources.

The award of PBV assistance to OHA scattered sites developments without a competitive process, allowed OHA to secure the necessary city and community support for the public housing disposition initiative. OHA was able to provide the community with assurances that the public housing units approved for disposition would not be lost as a permanent affordable housing resource. Without this activity, OHA would have been required to conduct its own competition to award PBV's to a unique group of properties, e.g. those that are OHA owned and managed Public Housing program scattered sites units that were approved for disposition.

Thus far, this activity has contributed to the creation and/or preservation of 1,809 affordable PBV assisted units. Two hundred fifty-five (255) units are at seven sites controlled indirectly by OHA. Of the 255 units, one hundred thirty-three (133) are currently under HAP contract and leased up, one hundred twenty-two (122) units are still in development. The 1,554 former family public housing scattered sites units will be converted to PBV assisted units as in-place families who have been issued Tenant-Protection Voucher assistance move-out.

MTW Activity # 5: Allocate PBV Units Utilizing an Existing Competitive Process

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2006

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2006

Activity #5 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
5. Allocate PBV Units Utilizing an Existing Competitive Process	Use MTW authority to allocate PBV without competitive process	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness Increase housing choice	Reduction in administrative and development costs associated with issuing an RFP when OHA has qualifying development. This policy will also lead to the creation of new or replacement housing opportunities.	<u>Baseline</u> – Process without MTW Authorization <u>Benchmarks</u> - Reduction in staff time and project timelines. Creation of new and preserved housing opportunities.	Number of PBV allocated to New housing opportunities developed or preserved utilizing PBV units allocated to OHA developments	<u>Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 PBV Program</u> Attachment C – Section D.7.b

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #5 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Cost to develop and issue a Request for Proposal (RFP)	\$7,500 cost to develop and issue one RFP for a competitive process	\$0 cost to utilize an existing competitive process	\$0 cost to utilize an existing competitive process	Yes – OHA saved an estimated \$30,000 by utilizing an existing competitive process for the projects awarded.
Number of PBV units allocated for the creation and/or preservation of affordable housing	0 units	Difficult to determine due to changing nature of development activity	483 PBV units	Yes – 483 PBV units were awarded using an existing competitive process.

Narrative Description

Reducing Costs and Achieving Greater Cost Effectiveness

This activity relates to MTW Activity # 4 producing similar outcome measures. Prior to implementation of this activity, OHA would be required to develop its own competitive PBV project selection process to award PBV funding, in accordance with 24 CFR 983.51. Projects requesting PBVs, would have to individually apply and be concurrently selected for both city funding and an OHA PBV award in separate RFPs. The costs associated with issuing a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) include staff time to conduct the RFP process, development of the RFP packet, public notice, advertising costs, materials costs, and the organization of a selection committee.

An accurate determination of the actual direct and indirect costs involved in conducting a PBV specific, competitive RFP cannot be assessed for this activity. However, a reasonable estimate is approximately \$7,500 per RFP, based on information from an independent contractor that OHA has worked with in the past to provide these services. Annual public offering RFPs would have been conducted to award PBVs to City funded projects in each of the last four (4) years. This would have been a total of approximately \$30,000 to develop and issue the RFPs for the projects awarded over the past four years. Thus, OHA achieved a cost savings by implementing this policy.

This RFP estimate does not include the additional cost borne by the applicant projects who would have to prepare an additional application in response to OHA's separate RFP for PBV assistance. The cost to respond to the RFP is estimated at \$4,000 per application based on information from an independent contractor that OHA has worked with in the past to provide this service. Thus, for the sixteen applications, the total cost to the developers to respond to the RFPs would have been an estimated \$64,000. This policy not only reduces costs but also makes OHA a more attractive partner to developers due to the cost savings and project timeliness achieved.

Increasing Housing Choice

A total of 16 projects requesting a total of 483 PBV units, were selected for funding utilizing an existing competitive process, the City of Oakland, annual competition (NOFA) for development, preservation or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing funding. OHA has utilized this competition to award PBVs since the City of Oakland's 2005-06 funding round. The projects selected (by funding year), are as follows:

Activity #5 Table C				
Number of PBV Units Awarded Using an Existing Competitive Process				
Site Name	City of Oakland – Funding Round			
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Fox Courts	20			
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase 1	23			
Madison Apartments	19			
Seven Directions	18			
Orchards on Foothill	64			
Jack London Gateway Phase II	60			
Foothill Plaza	Selected, awarded, and withdrawn/expired			
14 th Street Apartments at Central Station		20		
St. Joseph's Senior Apartments		83		
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase II		40		
Fairmount Apartments			16	
720 East 11 th Street Apartments			16	
6 th and Oak Street Senior Housing				50
Effie's House				10
Slim Jenkins Court				11
Marin Way Apartments				19
Drachma Housing				14
Total	204 units	143 units	32 units	104 units

OHA does not have an identity of interest in any of these developments. The projects listed in this activity do not include the seven projects discussed above in MTW Activity # 4. The implementation of this activity allowed the applicant projects to compete for both City of Oakland development resources and PBV funding in one competitive process. If projects were required to separately compete for these two funding sources, there would be no assurance that projects selected for City funding, are also concurrently selected for a PBV award during the same funding year. This could result in significant project construction delays or in a worst case scenario, a project could be entirely withdrawn or abandoned by the developer because of the inability to secure necessary funding from other sources. Combining the PBV competitive process with the City NOFA is efficient and significantly improves delivery of resource to projects that that meet local housing priorities.

This activity has contributed to creation and/or preservation of 483 affordable PBV assisted units, which represents the total number of units approved in the 16 developments selected for PBV assistance through the City of Oakland's annual NOFA/RFP. Two hundred sixty-four (264) units at eight sites are under HAP contract and leased up, two hundred nineteen (219) units are still in development.

MTW Activity # 6: Exceed 25% per Project Cap for Project Based Voucher Unit Allocation to Tassafaronga Development

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2008

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2008

Activity #6 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
6. Exceed 25% Per Project Cap for Project Based Voucher (PBV) Unit Allocation to OHA's Tassafaronga Development	Exceed cap to provide one-for-one replacement of 87 Public Housing units and 19 special needs housing units	Increase housing choice	PBV allocation to Tassafaronga will leverage additional funding resources to replace a 87 unit public housing development with 157 affordable rental units (including the one-for-one replacement of 87 public housing units with 87 PBV units), 20 units of special needs housing, 50 additional tax credit units. The development will also include 22 affordable homeownership units in partnership with Habitat for Humanity.	<u>Baseline</u> – Number of units and income mix at development prior to redevelopment <u>Benchmarks</u> – Number of units and income mix at development at completion of redevelopment	Number and type of units and income mix at completion of development.	Establishment of <u>an Agency MTW Section 8 PBV Program</u> Attachment C – Section D.7 <u>Site and Neighborhood Standards</u> Attachment D – Section B.4

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #6 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of PBV units awarded	39 PBV units awarded (25% per project)	87 PBV units awarded (Greater than 25% per project)	99 PBV units awarded (63% per project)	Yes – 99 PBV units were awarded.

Narrative Description

Prior to redevelopment, Tassafaronga Village was a large public housing development with 87 units. Eligible families occupying public housing program units have incomes at or below 80 percent (80%) Area Median Income (AMI). Under the 25 percent (25%) per project cap for PBV allocations, the redeveloped Tassafaronga Village would have only qualified for 39 PBV units.

This activity was utilized so that OHA could provide one-for-one replacement of 87 public housing units that would be permanently lost as an affordable housing resource through the disposition process. The award also allowed the project to leverage its PBV commitment to secure other funding sources for the redevelopment of the site. After redevelopment, one hundred fifty-seven (157) new affordable units were created. The PBV award provides rental assistance for 80 family units and 19 special needs units at the site. Displaced public housing

families were given first right to return to the redeveloped site. Eligible families occupying PBV assisted units have incomes at or below 50 percent (50%) AMI.

Tassafaronga Village was awarded 99 PBV units as a result of this activity. This accounts for 60 additional PBV units above the 25 percent (25%) cap if the project were a standard development. The PBV assistance provides a deep subsidy replacement program for public housing units permanently removed from the public housing inventory.

This was a one-time activity due to its site-specific nature and has been completed. This activity has been replaced by MTW Activity # 13.

MTW Activity # 7: Utilize Alternative Housing Quality Standards (HQS) Inspection System

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2009

Plan Year Policy Implemented: under development

Activity #7 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
7. Utilize Alternative HQS Inspection System	OHA will implement a risk based strategy to allocate HQS inspection resources	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Improved compliance of HQS at problem properties and allocate fewer resources to sites with history of compliance.	Baseline – Allocation of inspection resources prior to new system <u>Benchmarks</u> – Inspection resources allocated by evidence of risk, improved compliance at sites with history of problems	Inspection Data	<u>Ability to Certify HQS</u> Attachment C – Section D.5 <u>Inspection Protocols and Procedures</u> Attachment D – Section D a

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #7 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Cost to perform HQS inspections	\$401,150 annually to perform HQS prior to implementation	approximately \$200,575 after implementation in every other year (50% reduction in costs)	N/A	This activity is under development.

Narrative Description

Currently the regulations governing inspections require each unit under a HAP contract to be inspected annually, no more than twelve months after the most recent inspection (24 CFR 982.405(a)). Using MTW authority, OHA is in the process of implementing Risk Based Inspections protocol. This protocol only alters the frequency that units are inspected, not the requirements for units to meet HQS. This protocol will be less intrusive for participant families and property owners that maintain units in good condition. Conversely, units that chronically fail to meet HQS will be inspected more frequently. Units that chronically result in enforcement action may be barred from program participation and the owner may be limited or restricted from adding any additional contracts on to the program.

Properties that pass their first inspection and are HQS compliant will only be inspected every two years. Properties that fail on the first inspection and require a second inspection to meet HQS will continue on an annual inspection schedule to ensure compliance with the Housing Quality Standards. Properties that fail to pass Housing Quality Standards after two inspections will be inspected more frequently to encourage compliance with HQS. Semi-annual inspections

will be required for the next year. (After two inspections that pass on the first or second inspection, the property may be placed back on an annual or biennial inspection schedule.)

The baseline was determined based on the actual cost to perform the HQS inspections for FY 2010. For FY 2010, the cost to perform inspections that received a "Pass" score was approximately \$226,000, 56 percent (56%) of the total cost. Once the Risk Based Inspections protocol is implemented, it is anticipated that the cost to perform the inspections will be reduced by approximately 50 percent (50%) in every other year since those receiving a pass score in the first year will not be inspected again for two years. This reduces the total cost of inspections to approximately \$200,575. Since these units will still be inspected every two years, this amount of savings may not necessarily materialize every year, but rather every other year. The Risk Based Inspections protocol will be implemented in FY 2011.

MTW Activity # 8: Fund Affordable Housing Development Activities

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2008

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2008

Activity #8 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
8. Fund Affordable Housing Development Activities	Utilize single fund flexibility to leverage funds and create new and replacement housing in Oakland.	Increase housing choice	OHA will significantly contribute to the creation of new and replacement affordable housing	Baseline – Supply of affordable housing prior to implementation of policy. Benchmarks – Units brought on line and funds leveraged as a result of policy.	Data on development activity	<u>Single Fund Budget</u> Attachment C – Section B.1 <u>Legacy and Community Specific Authorizations</u> Attachment D – Use of Funds

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #8 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of affordable housing units	87 units	157 units	157 units	Yes – 70 additional units brought on-line and approximately \$62 million leveraged as a result of implementation.

Narrative Description

The OHA unsuccessfully applied for two HOPE VI grants to revitalize Tassafaronga Village, an 87-unit severely distressed public housing development. Due to single fund flexibility the OHA was able to move forward with revitalizing Tassafaronga Village without HOPE VI grant funds by using its single fund flexibility to make a significant contribution of approximately \$16 million in “gap” loan funds.

The OHA received HUD approval to demolish and dispose of Tassafaronga Village. OHA moved forward with demolishing the 87 distressed public housing units and leasing the land to a tax credit partnership. The OHA developed a total of 157 affordable Low-Income Housing Tax Credit units (LIHTC) at Tassafaronga, effectively eradicating 87 severely distressed affordable housing units and creating an additional 70 affordable housing units. Of the 157 LIHTC units, there are 99 Section 8 Project-Based Voucher units. The revitalization of Tassafaronga is now complete and the new development is 100 percent (100%) occupied.

The total project budget to revitalize Tassafaronga was approximately \$78 million. The OHA's significant contribution of \$16 million to the redevelopment of Tassafaronga was critical to its ability to successfully compete for and secure approximately \$62 million in leveraged funding from eleven local, state, federal and private funding sources such as the City of Oakland, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the State of California Multifamily Housing Program, the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, the California Housing Finance Agency, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco Affordable Housing Program, Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department, Citi Community Capital and the National Equity Fund, Inc.

MTW Activity # 9: Short Term Subsidy Program

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2009

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #9 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
9. Short Term Subsidy Program	Utilize MTW flexibility to provide temporary housing assistance to preserve existing affordable housing resources.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness Increase housing choice	Preserving existing housing resources with a short term subsidy is more cost effective in many circumstances than relocating in-place families and providing a HAP. Keeping units in service and providing options for tenant to stay in place increases housing choice.	Baseline – Resources available to community without this program. Benchmark – Number of units kept in service and families provided with an option to stay in place. Costs savings of program compared to cost of issuing new HCV.	Number of households kept in place and amount of short term subsidy provided	<u>Single Fund Budget</u> Attachment C – Section B.1 <u>Legacy and Community Specific Authorizations</u> Attachment D – Use of Funds

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #9 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Amount of short term subsidy provided	Zero prior to implementation	Short term subsidy funds available to qualified properties	\$133,000 in short term subsidy funding was made available to the Oaks Hotel.	Yes – \$133,000 in subsidy funding was made available.
Number of units kept in place	85 SRO units at the Oaks Hotel	85 SRO units remained in service	85 SRO units remained in service at the Oaks Hotel	Yes – 100% of benchmark achieved
Number of families with the option to remain in place	61 units occupied prior to implementation	61 units remained occupied	78 units remained occupied at the Oaks Hotel	Yes – the benchmark was exceeded by 28%
Cost to issue new HCV versus cost to issue subsidy	Cost to issue new HCV (and assist with housing placement) \$233,727	Cost to issue subsidy \$133,000	\$100,727 in saving realized over a one year period (in addition to the fact that there was no displacement of extremely low income residents)	Yes – OHA saved \$100,727 in resources related to this activity

Narrative Description

Increasing Housing Choice

OHA made commitments of short term subsidy assistance to two affordable housing developments under this program: the Oaks Hotel, an 85-unit SRO, and Slim Jenkins Court, a 32-unit family development. Both developments were part of a portfolio of properties owned by OCHI, a non-profit developer that went out of business, and were at risk of closure and the subsequent displacement of families. The short term subsidy funding for the Oaks Hotel was expended during FY 2010. The funds for Slim Jenkins Court have not been expended and are currently subject to a new ownership structure and refinancing of the property. As a result of OHA's commitment of short term subsidy assistance, 17 additional units were occupied at the Oaks Hotel by the end of FY 2010 and the long term strategy to redevelop the building to ensure sustainability has made significant progress.

Reducing Costs and Achieving Greater Cost Effectiveness

In addition to the stability provided to each household, the savings to OHA over a one year period is estimated at \$100,727. Issuing a new Housing Choice Voucher and assisting each household with locating a new unit would have averaged approximately six staff hours per client for a total of 366 hours for all 61 households. The cost of this staff time is estimated at \$17,055. In addition, each of the households would have qualified and been issued a one-bedroom HCV. The difference in Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) for the SRO unit at the Oaks Hotel and the average one-bedroom HAP is approximately \$296 per month or \$18,056 for all 61 occupied units. Over one year the increase in average potential HAP payments from an SRO to a one-bedroom is estimated at \$216,672. Total baseline staff cost to issue a new HCV, provide each household with assistance locating a new unit, and the difference in one year of HAP payments total \$233,727. Thus, this activity resulted in a significant cost savings to OHA, allowing the Authority to deploy resources more effectively.

MTW Activity # 10: Neighborhood Orientation Workshops (formerly the Good Neighbor Program)

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2009

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2009

Activity #10 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
10. Neighborhood Orientation Workshops (formerly the Good Neighbor Program)	Provide all new clients in the Public Housing and Section 8 program with an orientation and training program that establish expectations and provides skills to be a good neighbor.	<p>Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness</p> <p>Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient</p> <p>Increase housing choice</p>	Development of an Agency-wide and shared definition of the expectations for good neighbor behavior. Improved skills for residents and participants that translate into skills that improve the success of self sufficiency programs and the ability to access broader selection of housing choices. Greater participation of clients in community activities.	<p>Baseline – Status quo before implementation of program</p> <p>Benchmarks – Number of people trained through program, use of program to preserve program assistance, number of Public Housing or Section 8 clients participating in community-wide activities.</p>	Data on participants in program and information on any relative success in self sufficiency activities. Expansion of community participation related to participation in the program.	<p><u>Single Fund Budget</u> Attachment C – Section B.1</p> <p><u>Legacy and Community Specific Authorizations</u> Attachment D – Use of Funds</p>

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #10 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of people trained	Zero prior to implementation	238 people trained	129 people trained	No – 54% of the benchmark was achieved.
Number of clients participating in community-wide service	Zero prior to implementation	25 people participating	12 people participating	No – 48% of the benchmark was achieved.

Narrative Description

The Neighborhood Orientation Workshops (NOW) program consists of two components: a four-hour Orientation Workshop and a twelve-week Leadership Development program. The four-hour trainings were first made available on October 2009 and were targeted to public housing residents and Section 8 participants. The Orientation Workshops are designed for 20 participants with an estimated 70 percent (70%) attendance rate. A total of 129 individuals attended one of the 17 four-hour trainings scheduled during the fiscal year.

The twelve-week Leadership Development program is designed for 25 students and offered in conjunction with a local community college. The program provides an opportunity for participants to learn new skills related to meeting facilitation, public speaking, conflict mediation,

and identification of community assets and resources. The first class started in January 2010 with 16 individuals signing-up for the program initially and 12 students graduating the program in the spring. Of the 12 students that graduated, two groups of three were awarded mini-grants to implement two community service projects. One group received \$1,800 to provide nutritional cooking classes for youth and the other group received \$1,500 to coordinate and facilitate community activities for seniors.

The NOW program did not meet the benchmarks established for the fiscal year due to challenges with implementation. Initially, both components were voluntary for residents. Despite efforts to promote the program, residents were not attending the workshops in the numbers anticipated. Once a tenant received a notice to attend the Orientation Workshop, follow up calls were attempted in order to get confirmation of attendance. One challenge faced was that many of the phone numbers on file were incorrect or disconnected, thereby limiting the ability to ensure resident attendance at the workshops. In addition, the Department of Family and Community Partnerships overseeing the program was in the initial formation stages. At the time the program started, the department had no staff dedicated to promoting the program to the Authority residents.

By the end of the fiscal year, staff were in place to help promote the program and focus more heavily on achieving the outcomes. The program has been gradually increasing momentum with more residents attending the workshops and participating in the Leadership Development program. In addition, in July 2010 (FY 2011) the Administrative Plan for the Section 8 program was revised to include mandatory resident attendance at the Orientation Workshops as a requirement for new Section 8 program participants and current Section 8 participants who requested a transfer voucher: to another unit and from a project-based voucher to a tenant-based voucher (scattered site disposition units only). The Orientation Workshops are still voluntary for the Public Housing program participants and the Leadership Development program is voluntary for residents in both programs.

As part of the contract with the service provider for this program, more extensive outcome measures are being developed to assess the impacts and effectiveness of the NOW program. Preliminary data has been gathered, but the analysis has not yet been completed.

MTW Activity # 11: Expand Specialized Housing Program

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: under development

Activity #11 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
11. Expand Specialized Housing Program	OHA currently operates the MOMS Program that provides 11 units of service enriched housing for mothers leaving the county jail system and reuniting with children. The program is run in collaboration with the Alameda County sheriffs department. Graduates of the program are provided with the option to transfer into OHA's other Public Housing units. OHA will expand resources to this program and explore expanding and replicating the program to additional sites and populations.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient Increase housing choice	OHA will increase its allocation of staff resources to the project to improve outcomes and address staffing reductions at the partner agency. OHA will focus on pre-release training and support, the delivery of on-site services and the day to day coordination of the program with the sheriffs department. The changes will improve outcomes for participants and reduce vacancies.	<u>Baseline</u> – number of qualified applicants, 50 percent vacancy rate, limited access to services <u>Benchmarks</u> – 50 percent increase in the number of qualified applicants, 10 percent vacancy rate, and expanded access to services.	Tracking number of applicants, vacancy rate and type and hours of services available	<u>Single Fund Budget</u> Attachment C – Section B.1 <u>Transitional/Conditional Housing Program</u> Attachment C – Section B.4 <u>Legacy and Community Specific Authorizations</u> Attachment D – Use of Funds

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #11 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of applicants	4 applicants	6 applicants (50% increase)	5 applicants	No – 83% of the benchmark was achieved.
Vacancy Rate	50% vacancy rate	10% vacancy rate	64% vacancy rate	No
Amount of services available	Zero (0) services available	4 types of services offered	4 types of services offered	Yes

Narrative Description

OHA operates the Maximizing Opportunities for Mothers to Succeed (MOMS) Program, which provides 11 units of service enriched housing for mothers leaving the county jail system. This program provides an opportunity for these women to reunite with their children and families while living in a supportive environment. OHA works together with the Alameda County Sheriff and the Alameda County Social Services Department to implement this program.

During FY 2010, the number of applicants that met the minimal requirements for the program was increased by one. In FY 2009, there were four applicants that met all of the minimal requirements and were housed by the program. In FY 2010, there were five applicants that met the minimal requirements; however, only four applicants were housed. One applicant did not pass the remaining eligibility review. Thus, although the number of applicants increased, the number of participants housed remained the same. Graduates of the program are offered an option to transfer into the next available Project Based Voucher unit within the current Asset Management Property (AMP) grouping, AMP 10.

The vacancy rate was less in fiscal year 2010 by 28%. In fiscal year 2009, there were a total of 10 vacancies (91% vacancy rate), while in fiscal year 2010 the number of vacancies was seven (64% vacancy rate). Efforts are being made to work with partners to increase the number of qualified applicants.

Prior to the implementation of this initiative, services to this population were becoming more limited due to funding reductions in agencies typically providing these services. OHA's allocation of resources to the MOMS program has allowed for the development of four new types of services being offered in FY 2010. These addition services included:

Activity #11 Table C Services Offered in FY 2010		
Type of Service	Frequency	Timeframe
The Birthday Club	2 hours every month	November 2009 – June 2010
Homework Club	2 hours, 3 days per week for 3 months	January – March 2010
Resume Preparation	2 hours, 1 day per week for 3 months	January – March 2010
Art Therapy	2 hours every month	December 2009 – March 2010

These services are intended to provide life enrichment activities to the families in the program. In addition, case workers from a partnering nonprofit organization provide on-site workforce development support and referrals to participants in the program. OHA is working with the collaborative partners in this program to improve services offered to participants in order to provide them with incentives to become economically self sufficient. OHA continues to work with its collaborative partners to expand the day-to-day coordination of the program including a pre-release orientation and training as well as the delivery of on-site services. The changes are expected to improve outcomes for participants and reduce vacancies.

MTW Activity # 12: Extend Zero Assistance HAP Period from 6 to 24 Months

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #12 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
12. Extend From Six To 24 Months the Period Of Time That HCV Participant May Receive Zero Assistance Before Being Terminated From Program	Current policy allows HCV participants six months of zero HAP before they are terminated from the program. The new policy would allow HCV participants 24 months of zero HAP before losing assistance. Clients receiving zero HAP will be referred to Client Services Program.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient	Change would remove the choice between efforts to become more self sufficient and housing assistance. Remove incentive to lose employment or reduce sources of income to maintain housing assistance. Encourage employment and provide additional security and confidence for participants trying to increase their wage income.	<u>Baseline</u> – Number of participants who receive notice of zero HAP and subsequently report loss of income <u>Benchmark</u> – Full evaluation will require a 24 month period. Reduction in number of households losing employment or reporting loss of income at 6 months of zero HAP. Increase in incomes of households after 12 months of zero HAP.	Track number and status of households receiving zero HAP	<u>Operational Policies and Procedures</u> Attachment C – Section D.1.b Section D.3.a

Measurement and Outcomes

Under Development

Narrative Description

The baseline and benchmarks for this activity are under development. Implementation of this policy began this fiscal year. However, since the policy is intended to provide assistance that extends up to 24 months, there is not enough data at this time to evaluate the progress of this initiative.

MTW Activity # 13: Allocate PBVs to 100% of the Units in a Development

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #13 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
13. Adopt Policy that Allows OHA to Allocate PBVs to 100 Percent of the Units in a Development	Eliminating the cap will allow OHA to leverage housing development funds while expanding opportunities to preserve affordable units, support service enriched housing, support tax credit senior developments that use a different definition of senior, and ensure project feasibility in Oakland's high cost market.	Increase housing choice	Expanded opportunities to develop new and replacement housing.	Baseline – Opportunities prior to implementation of specific MTW authorization. Benchmarks – New units and developments made available by removing cap.	Data on the number of units and development opportunities created in developments with allocations above the 25% cap.	Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 PBV Program Attachment C – Section D.7 Site and Neighborhood Standards Attachment D – Section B.4

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #13 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Percentage of PBV units per project allocated for the creation and/or preservation of affordable housing	PBVs awarded up to 25% of total units in a project	PBVs awarded above the 25% cap	1,985 PBV units awarded at 9 projects	Yes – 1,475 PBV units were awarded above the 25% cap in the 9 projects.

Narrative Description

Prior to the implementation of this activity, OHA was only allowed to award PBV to 100 percent (100%) of the units in a development if it fit into the eligible HUD PBV exception criteria. During FY 2010, OHA was able to award PBVs to 100% of units in the following developments, see the table below.

Activity #13 Table C			
Number of PBV Units Awarded Above the 25% Cap			
Site Name	Number of PBV Units	25% of Total Number of Units at Site	PBV Units Awarded above 25% cap
Senior Housing			
Jack London Gateway Phase II	60	15	45
Orchard on Foothill	64	16	48
St. Joseph's Senior Apartments	83	21	62
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase II	40	20	20
6 th and Oak Street Senior Homes	50	17	33
<i>Subtotal Senior Housing</i>	<i>297</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>208</i>
Special Needs Housing			
Jefferson Oaks	101	25	76
Family Affordable Housing			
Marin Way Apartments	19	5	14
Drachma Housing	14	3	11
<i>Subtotal Family Housing</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>25</i>
OHA Former Public Housing Scattered Sites	1,554	388	1,166
Total	1,985	510	1,475

Without this activity, senior housing developments would be subject to the 25 percent (25%) PBV cap or would have to enforce the age 62 or older standard for all units awarded with PBV assistance. Of the nine projects listed above, the five senior sites, Jack London Gateway Phase II, Orchard on Foothill, and St. Joseph's Senior Apartments, Altenheim Phase II and 6th and Oak Street Senior Homes, qualify for the HUD PBV 25 percent (25%) cap exceptions for units set aside for seniors (age 62 and older). OHA could have awarded PBVs for 297 units at these five new construction projects based on the eligible HUD PBV exception for units set aside for seniors, age 62 and older. However, all five of these projects also applied and received tax credit financing from the California Tax credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC). CTCAC awards projects utilizing the definition of senior as age 55 or older. By implementing this activity, tax credit senior developments are allowed to utilize the applicable age 55+ standard for senior housing. Therefore, this activity allows OHA to award PBVs to up to 100 percent (100%) of the units at these senior only developments and allows them to utilize the CTCAC definition of senior as age 55 or older.

At the former family public housing scattered sites, units will be converted to the PBV program as in-place families who have been issued Tenant-Protection Voucher (TPV) assistance move-out. Therefore, the PBV awards provide a one-for-one deep subsidy replacement program for public housing units approved for disposition. Without this activity, PBV awards would be limited by the 25 percent (25%) per project cap.

Overall, activity has contributed to the creation and/or preservation of 1,985 PBV assisted units. If these projects were limited to a 25 percent (25%) per project cap, then only 510 units would be eligible for PBV assistance at these sites. The implementation of this activity has allowed for the award of PBV assistance to an additional 1,475 units.

Of the 1,985 PBV assisted units awarded under this activity, 164 units are currently under HAP contract and leased up, 1,821 units are committed units pending rehabilitation or still in development.

Additionally, this activity contributed to the creation of the 99 PBV units discussed in Activity # 6. However, these units were counted in Activity #6 and therefore are not represented in the figures presented for this activity.

MTW Activity # 14: Execute HAP Contracts by Non-Contiguous Scattered Sites Buildings

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: anticipated for FY 2011

Activity #14 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
14. Execute HAP contracts by non-contiguous scattered sites buildings	OHA's scattered sites portfolio consists of 254 developments with 336 buildings containing 1,615 units. Currently these units divided into 6 Asset Management Properties. This policy would eliminate requirement that HAP contracts are limited to developments comprised of contiguous buildings. OHA will use its MTW authority to enter into 6 HAP contracts by AMP instead of 254 contracts by development.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Reduction in the staff time and administrative costs associated with preparing, executing and managing the HAP contracts for the former scattered sites portfolio.	<p><u>Baseline</u> – Requirement to execute 254 separate HAP contracts prior to adoption of new policy. Administrative time required to execute HAP contract.</p> <p><u>Benchmarks</u> – Ability to execute contracts by non-contiguous developments 6 AMPs using MTW authority. Approximate 75 percent reduction in time required to execute HAP contract by unit.</p>	Number of HAP contracts executed vs. number required without MTW authority. Time required to execute HAP contracts for scattered sites	<p><u>Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 PBV Program</u> Attachment C – Section D.7</p> <p><u>Operational Policies and Procedures</u> Attachment C – Section D.1.a</p>

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #14 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of HAP contracts executed	254 contracts	6 contracts	N/A	Implementation is expected to begin in FY 2011.
Staff time to execute HAP contracts	762 hours	18 hours	N/A	Implementation is expected to begin in FY 2011.

Narrative Description

HUD's definition of a PBV "Project" is a single building, multiple contiguous buildings, or multiple buildings on contiguous parcels of land. Accordingly, each scattered site in OHA's portfolio is considered a "project". Thus, the PBV program rule requires that one PBV HAP contract be executed for each project, requiring a total of 254 HAP contracts for the scattered sites portfolio.

Implementation of this MTW initiative will allow OHA to execute one PBV HAP contract for each AMP resulting in significant reduction in the number of PBV HAP contracts to be prepared, from

254 PBV HAP contracts to 6 PBV HAP contracts. Additionally, the reduction in the amount of contracts to be executed will result in a reduction of staff time spent on this activity.

Staff time involved in typing up and collating the PBV HAP contract is projected at 3 hours per HAP contract. This projection does not include document preparation such as drafting and revising the exhibits. The time involved in the document preparation described above is not predictable and therefore cannot be consistently projected. Without implementation of this policy, the time to execute the HAP contracts for the 254 projects is estimated at 762 hours (= 3 hours x 254 contracts). Once the policy is implemented, the time to execute the HAP contracts is projected to decrease to 18 hours (= 3 hours x 6 contracts).

The outcomes for this activity could not be calculated for this fiscal year because implementation has not begun yet. Units at the family housing scattered sites will only be available for project-basing when there is a turnover. All existing residents were provided with Tenant Protection Vouchers authorized by HUD. When residents with Tenant Protection Vouchers move to private housing, Project-Based Voucher contracts will be executed to fill the resulting vacancy with new residents from the wait list.

As of the end of the FY2010, no in-place family had requested to move with their Tenant Protection Voucher, so no PBV HAP contract was executed. However, requests to move started to come in the beginning of FY 2011. It is expected that all six PBV HAP contract will be executed and the associated time savings will be fully materialized in FY 2011.

MTW Activity # 15: Adopt Alternative System to Determine Initial Contract Rent for PBV Units Allocated to Scattered Sites Developments

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #15 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
15. Adopt Alternative System to Determine Initial Contract Rent for PBV Units Allocated to Scattered Sites Developments	Utilizing MTW authority, initial contract rent will be determined using comparability analysis or market study certified by an independent agency approved to determine rent reasonableness for OHA-owned units. This would replace the requirement to use a state certified appraiser. Available data base is well suited for establishing initial contract rents in this existing portfolio of small building and does not warrant the costs associated with using a state certified inspector.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Significant reduction in cost associated with establishing reasonable rents.	<u>Baseline</u> – Per unit cost to utilize a state certified appraiser to perform comparability analysis or market study <u>Benchmarks</u> – A 75 per unit savings to perform comparability analysis or market study certified by an independent agency.	Data on number of units certified, per unit costs for state certified appraiser, cost of services performed by authorized entities, and staff time allocated to establishing initial rent levels	<u>Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 PBV Program</u> Attachment C – Section D.7 <u>Rent Policies and Term Limits</u> Attachment C – Section D.2

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #15 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
The per unit cost to determine initial PBV program rents units awarded at former family public housing scattered sites developments. A comparability analysis based on market rent study performed by a state certified appraiser is required to be done for each PBV “project”.	\$192 per unit cost to use a state certified appraiser for a market rent study for each PBV “project”.	\$48 per unit cost for a state certified appraiser (or an alternative independent agency) to perform a comparability analysis and market rent study based on scattered sites AMP property groups. (75% cost reduction)	\$11 per unit cost to use a state certified appraiser for a comparability analysis and market rent study based on scattered sites AMP property groups. (94% cost reduction)	Yes – OHA saved \$181 per unit , a total savings of \$281,550 , resulting in a 94% reduction in costs

Narrative Description

The HUD definition of a PBV “Project” is a single building, multiple contiguous buildings, or multiple buildings on contiguous parcels of land, and; the determination of the initial contract

rent for a PBV assisted units in a “ project” where the PHA has ownership interest, must be based on an appraisal by a licensed, state-certified appraiser (24 CFR 983.59 (1)).

The OHA public housing scattered sites developments approved and eligible for conversion to PBV assistance consist of 1,554 units at 249 sites. The scattered sites are not on contiguous parcels of land and therefore cannot be considered a single project. A separate market rent study would be necessary to determine the initial contract rent at each individual scattered site property. The approximate cost for an individual State Certified Appraiser Market Rent Study is \$2,000. Quantity discounts would lower the per unit cost, down to an estimated \$1,200 per study. The estimated cost to have a State Certified Appraiser Market Rent Study prepared for each of the 249 scattered sites (249 x \$1,200) would be \$298,800.

OHA scattered sites developments are broken out into six (6) major geographical areas within the City of Oakland. Each of these Asset Management Projects (AMP) areas consists of approximately 40-50 project sites that are in close proximity and similar in age, size, amenities and condition. Each AMP is also served by a single site-based waiting list for tenanting vacant units (within the AMP), and PBV units in each AMP are contracted under a single master (PBV) HAP contract as discussed in MTW Activity # 14.

In this activity an alternative system was developed to determine PBV rents based on grouping similar, like kind units within each AMP area. Originally, the activity also involved utilizing an alternate “independent agency” other than a state certified appraiser, however it was later determined that a state certified appraiser could still be used. OHA contracted with two state certified appraisers to prepare Market Rent Study’s that could be used to establish the initial PBV program contract rent for each bedroom size within an AMP. The negotiated cost was \$750 per bedroom size. Each AMP contained three to four different bedroom sizes, therefore the cost for a Market Rent Study to establish 2-Bedroom, 3-Bedroom, 4-Bedroom, and 5-bedroom rents in an AMP would be: $4 \times \$750 = \$3,000$. The rent determined for 2-Bedroom units in the appraiser market rent study is applicable to all 2-Bedroom units in the AMP and so on for each unit size.

The Actual cost, using this alternative system for determining the PBV rents for the 249 scattered sites units was \$17,250. The overall cost savings due to this activity was \$281,550 ($=\$298,800 - \$17,250$), a per unit cost saving of 94%. Therefore, this activity resulted in a significant cost savings to OHA.

MTW Activity # 17: Allow Landlord or Management Agent to Accept Lower HAP by Modifying PBV Rules for In-place Families at Scattered Sites Developments

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #17 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
17. Allow Landlord or Management Agent To Accept Lower HAP by Modifying PBV Rules For In-Place Families At Scattered Sites Developments	After disposition and conversion to PBV assistance some in-place families may either chose to stay or be unsuccessful using a transfer voucher. And, some of these families might be over housed. Using MTW authority, owners could accept lower HAP based on the appropriate number of bedrooms for the family.	Increase housing choice	This policy will ensure that households that remain and are over housed have access to assistance.	<u>Baseline</u> – Number of households who would be eligible to remain in their unit with PBV assistance without adoption of policy. <u>Benchmarks</u> – It is estimated that approximately 100 over housed families would remain in place after disposition	Data on the family, unit size and actual HAP for in-place families remaining after disposition.	<u>Establishment of an Agency MTW Section 8 PBV Program</u> Attachment C – Section D.7

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #17 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of over housed households allowed to remain in place with PBV assistance	Zero (0) overhoused households were eligible to remain with PBV assistance prior to implementation	Approximately 100 overhoused households would remain in place after the disposition	To date 628 overhoused households have remained in place.	Yes – 628 overhoused households have remained in place achieving the benchmark by over 600%

Narrative Description

Implementation of this initiative began during FY 2010. As a result of the conversion of the scattered sites family public housing units to Section 8, many families were considered overhoused based on the Section 8 regulations regarding the appropriate number of bedrooms per family. The number of overhoused families may have been impacted by the fact that Section 8 bedroom subsidy standards are not gender sensitive. Many families have expressed a desire to have separate bedrooms for female and male children, particularly older or adult children. However, currently, the Section 8 subsidy standards do not allow for this preference. As a result, the number of overhoused families that remained in place exceeded the benchmark by 600 percent (600%) with a total of 628 families remaining in place. Thus, over 600 families had access to housing assistance that otherwise might have resulted in displacement.

MTW Activity # 18: Local Housing Assistance Program

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #18 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
18. Local Housing Assistance Program (LHAP)	Use MTW flexibility to provide housing assistance outside of Section 8 and Section 9 (Public Housing Program), to leverage additional funding and directly assist low income households who otherwise might not qualify or be successful in either of the two standard programs. Program could be used directly in OHA-owned housing or provided directly to a service provider.	Increase housing choice	Leverage new funding resources and program expertise in the community where ongoing operating subsidy is needed for programs to successfully assist hard-to-house clients. Provide transitional support for households before they receive Section 8 or Public Housing assistance.	<p><u>Baseline</u> – Number of households assisted prior to adopting MTW Local Housing Assistance Vouchers. Average HAP subsidy.</p> <p><u>Benchmarks</u> – 200 households assisted with MTW Local Housing Assistance Program. Average assistance for families served</p>	Data on the number and characteristics of households served and per household costs of providing subsidy with new program.	<p><u>Single Fund Budget</u> Attachment C – Section B.1</p> <p><u>Legacy and Community Specific Authorizations</u> Attachment D – Use of Funds</p>

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #18 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of hard to house clients assisted by LHAP	Zero (0) households were assisted by new funding resources prior to LHAP	200 households assisted with MTW LHAP	36 households have been assisted by LHAP to date. The average HAP is \$400	No – only 18% of the benchmark was met. Benchmark needs to be revised to reflect changes in assumptions.

Narrative Description

We anticipated up to 115 families who were paying the public housing Flat Rent in HUD-approved former family housing scattered sites may have chosen the Local Program as a means to protect themselves against a large increase in rent upon conversion of the unit to Section 8. Continued loss in family income (due to reduced wages, hours, or even loss of jobs) during the fiscal year, coupled with some families choosing the Section 8 program even if it meant a rent increase (to gain housing choice options possible with Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers), has meant that the Local Program was not needed to the extent estimated. In addition, OHA was finalizing an agreement with the City of Oakland to provide housing subsidy assistance for up to 90 individuals who are either homeless or living in encampments or ex-offenders reentering the community upon release from prison or jail. OHA has revised the measurement for this activity by removing the statutory objective related to self-sufficiency.

MTW Activity # 19: Relocation Assistance and Counseling Services Related to Disposition of Scattered Sites Units

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #19 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
19. Relocation assistance and counseling services related to disposition of scattered sites units	Using Single Fund Flexibility, OHA will provide counseling and relocation assistance to impacted Public Housing residents in the scattered sites approved for disposition. Activities will help residents identify new housing options and support self sufficiency activities.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient Increase housing choice	Improved outcomes for households that want to use a transfer voucher. Improved knowledge of various housing options and choices	<u>Baseline</u> – Resources available without utilizing MTW authority. <u>Benchmarks</u> – 45 group briefings, 1,000 one-on-one counseling sessions and 518 requests for transfer vouchers.	Data collected on resident counseling services provided by OHA staff and consultants	<u>Single Fund Budget</u> Attachment C – Section B.1 <u>Legacy and Community Specific Authorizations</u> Attachment D – Use of Funds

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #19 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Amount of resources available for relocation and housing options assistance	Zero resources available for relocation and housing options assistance prior to program.	45 group briefings 1,000 one-on-one counseling sessions	90 group briefings 1,368 one-on-one counseling sessions	Yes – the amount of group briefings were double the benchmark, achieving 200% of the benchmark. The amount of one-on-one counseling sessions was exceeded by 368, achieving 137% of the benchmark.
Number of transfer vouchers requested	Zero (0) transfer vouchers requested related to the disposition of scattered sites units prior to implementation (not an option for public housing residents without this policy)	518 transfer vouchers requested	129 transfer vouchers requested in FY 2010	No – 25% of the benchmark was achieved.

Narrative Description

Providing incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient

Using Single Fund Flexibility as an MTW agency, OHA provided counseling and relocation assistance to residents impacted by the disposition of the family public housing scattered sites units. Group briefings were conducted with residents impacted by the disposition and conversion of the units to the Section 8 program. In the group briefings, the family was provided with information on how the voucher program works, family and owner responsibilities, where a family can rent a unit (including renting inside and outside OHA's jurisdiction), and an explanation of portability for those households that are eligible. All households that attended the group briefings also participated in one-on-one counseling sessions to further discuss the options available to them and answer any questions they may have regarding how the voucher program works. Households that decided to pursue obtaining a Section 8 voucher were then required to attend another one-on-one counseling session prior to attending the Section 8 orientation meeting and obtaining their voucher.

For FY 2010, the benchmarks related to relocation and housing options counseling were exceeded. This indicates that families took advantage of the opportunities provided to be more informed about their housing choices. As a result of being more informed, families were able to make housing choices that were best for their unique situation allowing them to become more economically self sufficient.

Increasing Housing Choice

OHA overestimated the number of families that would request a transfer voucher as a result of the disposition. Families that wished to relocate were provided with transfer vouchers, however in FY 2010, this was only 25 percent (25%) of the benchmark. This activity is ongoing because families can request a transfer voucher anytime in the future. Relocation benefits are available from OHA for up to two years, or until March 2012. Performance on this benchmark for the FY was impacted by the fact that we could not begin the conversion of the disposed units until March 2010.

MTW Activity # 20: Department of Family and Community Partnerships (formerly Department of Resident Initiatives)

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: FY 2010

Activity #20 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
20. Department of Family and Community Partnerships (Department of Resident Initiatives)	Using Single Fund Flexibility, OHA will enhance resident initiatives across all programs. The establishment of a new director level position will coordinate delivery of services and benefits. Program will also coordinate management of partnerships with community agencies and service providers.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient	Improved outcomes for clients. Expanded reach and quality of programs. Improved level of coordination between OHA and outside agencies.	<u>Baseline</u> – Client services delivered prior to adoption of new program. <u>Benchmarks</u> – Establish new director level position. Centralized delivery of services to all households receiving assistance from OHA. Provide services to 500 households.	Data collected on type and frequency of services delivered. Data collection on outcomes of client services.	<u>Single Fund Budget</u> Attachment C – Section B.1 <u>Legacy and Community Specific Authorizations</u> Attachment D – Use of Funds, and Section B.1.ix

Measurement and Outcomes

Under Development

Narrative Description

A new Director was hired in October, 2009 and the balance of the fiscal year was used developing department goals, an initial staffing plan (which included the reassignment of four existing staff and the hiring of two new staff) and first year department budget. The department became formally operational as of July 1, 2010. The measurements and outcomes for this MTW activity are under development.

MTW Activity # 21: Redesign Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) Program

Plan Year first Identified and Adopted: FY 2010

Plan Year Policy Implemented: under development

Activity #21 Table A Evaluation Metrics						
MTW Initiative	Description	Statutory Objective	Anticipated Impacts	Baseline and Benchmarks	Data Collection and Measurement	MTW Authorization
21. Redesign FSS Program	Build on flexibility of MTW authority to design an FSS program that builds on best practices, and where applicable, works in tandem with other community based programs and initiatives. Changes would be coordinated through the Department of Resident Initiatives.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient	Greater participation in FSS program. Improved outcomes by better matching program design with participant needs.	<p><u>Baseline</u> – 222 families enrolled, 43 new contracts signed, three workshops held with 28 participants</p> <p><u>Benchmarks</u> – 300 enrolled, 80 new contracts, and 8 workshops</p>	Data collected through the Client Services Program on FSS activities	<u>Authorizations Related to Family Self Sufficiency</u> Attachment C – Section E.

Measurement and Outcomes

Activity #21 Table B Measurement & Outcomes				
Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcomes	Achieved Benchmark?
Number of families enrolled in FSS	222 families enrolled in FSS	300 families enrolled	214 families enrolled	No – 71% of the benchmark was achieved.
Number of new contracts signed	43 new contracts signed	80 new contracts signed	54 new contracts signed	No – 67% of the benchmark was achieved.
Number of workshops held	3 workshops held	8 workshops held	4 workshops held	No – 50% of the benchmark was achieved.

Narrative Description

During the 2010 fiscal year, the Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) program was assigned to the new Department of Family and Community Partnerships. As the redesign of the FSS program is related to activity number #20 it was not completed during the fiscal year. As a result, it turned out not feasible to hit the benchmark goals with the current staff of two FSS coordinators. Going forward, the measurements and outcomes will be further refined and will focus on the primary outcome of providing incentives for families with children to become economically self sufficient.

Section VII. Sources and Uses of Funding

This section describes the sources and uses of funding included in the consolidated MTW and Special Purpose Program Budgets. Actual funding for FY 2010 is compared with budget projections for FY 2010 made at the beginning of the fiscal year.

A. List of Planned Versus Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

MTW Sources

Under MTW, OHA consolidates the public housing operating subsidy, the capital fund program, and the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Block Grant program funding into a Single Fund Budget. The table below compares actual revenue received with the projections for FY 2010. Overall, OHA received \$20 million more in consolidated MTW funding than projected. This was primarily as a result of a significant increase in Tenant Protection Vouchers awarded as a result of the disposition of the scattered sites public housing units.

Table 13a Sources of MTW Funds			
Consolidated MTW SOURCE:	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Public Housing Dwelling Rental Income	\$8,109,871	\$9,830,897	\$1,721,026
Public Housing Operating Subsidy Block Grant	11,869,000	12,494,286	625,286
Capital Fund Block Grant	10,224,624	7,065,938	(3,158,686)
Housing Choice Voucher Block Grant	156,324,841	174,516,250	18,191,409
Other Income	345,504	3,727,570	3,382,066
Investment Income	1,339,948	1,005,979	(333,969)
Total Consolidated MTW Revenue	\$188,213,788	\$208,640,920	\$20,427,132

Notes:

1. The Public Housing Operating Subsidy Block Grant was funded at a higher rate than projected.
2. The funds remaining in the Capital Fund Block Grant were obligated but not expended at the end of the fiscal year.
3. The increase in the Housing Choice Voucher Block Grant was due to the additional 1,528 Tenant Protection Vouchers received as part of the disposition of the scattered sites public housing units.

MTW Uses

Overall, the consolidated MTW expenses were over budget by \$4.5 million primarily due to maintenance costs related to the conversion of the scattered site units to Section 8 voucher units.

Table 13b Uses of MTW Funds			
CONSOLIDATED MTW USES:	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Line Item:			
Administration Salaries	\$10,914,762	\$12,598,694	\$1,683,932
Administration Benefits	5,428,424	6,644,823	1,216,399
Administration Temporary Personnel	-	-	-
Administration Other	3,978,750	(497,714)	(4,476,464)
Tenant Services Salaries	-	315,938	315,938
Tenant Services Benefits	-	897,257	897,257
Tenant Services Materials/Contracts	156,180	679,697	523,517
Utilities	2,407,000	2,743,169	336,169
Maintenance Salaries	4,362,499	5,288,961	926,462
Maintenance Benefits	3,564,413	3,501,361	(63,052)
Maintenance Temporary Personnel	-	-	-
Maintenance Materials	1,897,688	2,772,163	874,475
Maintenance Contracts	7,369,457	16,591,044	9,221,587
Police Services Salaries	1,696,897	2,327,921	631,024
Police Services Benefits	776,934	1,195,057	418,123
Police Services Materials/Contracts	231,482	403,708	172,226
Housing Assistance Payments	118,518,030	118,433,385	(84,645)
General	4,945,903	3,105,354	(1,840,549)
Capital Fund Salaries/Benefits	1,290,909	711,257	(579,652)
Capital Projects (HUD Funds)	7,729,091	4,443,984	(3,285,107)
Capital Projects Locally Developed Housing program (Site Acquisition)	2,414,419	868,868	(1,545,551)
Capital Equipment	773,203	475,149	(298,054)
Short-Term Affordable Housing Preservation Program	500,000	-	(500,000)
Total Consolidated MTW Expenditures	\$178,956,041	\$183,500,076	\$4,544,035

Table 13c Net Change to Reserves from MTW Funds			
CONSOLIDATED MTW	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Total Revenue	\$188,213,788	\$208,640,920	\$20,427,132
Total Expenditures	\$178,956,041	\$183,500,076	\$4,544,035
Total Net Change To Reserves	\$9,257,747	\$25,140,844	\$15,883,097

B. List of Planned Versus Actual Sources and Uses of State or Local Funds

Special Purpose Sources

Table 14a			
Sources of Special Purpose Funds			
Special Purpose SOURCE:	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Sec 8 Moderate Rehab Subsidy	\$3,832,541	\$3,510,333	\$(322,208)
Sec 8 Moderate Rehab Investment Income	49,758	11,051	(38,707)
Sec 8 Voucher Opt Out Subsidy	-	-	-
Sec 8 Mainstream Subsidy	1,906,650	1,543,269	(363,381)
Shelter Plus Care Subsidy	2,394,621	2,639,810	245,189
Shelter Plus Care Investment Income	714	-	(714)
Family Self Sufficiency	127,896	-	(127,896)
HOPE VI Grants	1,000,000	523,690	(476,310)
ROSS Homeownership Grant	100,000	70,159	(29,841)
Local Fund Rental Income	6,500	7,886	1,386
Local Fund Investment Income	216,485	93,592	(122,893)
Local Fund Other Income	429,508	148,362	(281,146)
Other Special Purpose Income	375,382	10,116	(365,266)
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)	10,575,376	2,203,372	(8,372,004)
Total Special Purpose Revenue	\$21,015,431	\$10,761,640	\$(10,253,791)

Notes: ARRA funds were obligated but not expended at the end of the fiscal year. This funding is projected to be fully expended in FY 2011.

Special Purpose Uses

Table 14b			
Uses of Special Purpose Funds			
Special Purpose PROGRAMS USES:	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Line Item:			
Administration Salaries	\$1,639,583	\$ -	\$(1,639,583)
Administration Benefits	770,572	-	(770,572)
Administration Other	160,877	-	(160,877)
Tenant Services Salaries	-	-	-
Tenant Services Benefits	-	-	-
Tenant Services Materials/Contracts	100,000	-	(100,000)
Maintenance Materials	4,896	-	(4,896)
Maintenance Contracts	50,059	-	(50,059)
Police Services Salaries	7,520	692	(6,828)
Police Services Benefits	2,865	-	(2,865)
Police Services Materials/Contracts	9,085	-	(9,085)
Housing Assistance Payments	7,435,658	7,340,380	(95,278)
General	-	-	-
Retirees Medical Premiums	1,012,000	892,724	(119,276)
Capital Equipment	-	50,131	50,131
Capital Projects (Capital Fund Program - ARRA)	9,700,000	2,105,567	(7,594,433)
HOPE VI Projects (HUD Funds)	1,000,000	1,054,067	54,067
HOPE VI Projects (Sec 8 Reserves)	400,000	1,699,648	1,299,648
Capital Projects (Sec 8 Reserves)	-	-	-
Total Special Purpose Expenditures	\$22,293,115	\$13,143,209	\$(9,149,906)

Table 14c			
Net Change to Reserves from Special Purpose Funds			
SPECIAL PURPOSE PROGRAMS	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Total Revenue	\$21,015,431	\$10,761,640	\$(10,253,791)
Total Expenditures	\$22,293,115	\$13,143,209	\$(9,149,906)
Total Net Change To Reserves	\$(1,277,684)	\$(2,381,569)	\$(1,103,885)

Total Sources

Table 15a			
Total Sources of Funds			
TOTAL SOURCE OF FUNDS	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Consolidated MTW Revenue	\$188,213,788	\$208,640,920	\$20,427,132
Special Purpose Funding not included in MTW	\$21,015,431	\$10,761,640	\$(10,253,791)
Total	\$209,229,219	\$219,402,560	\$10,173,341

Table 15b			
Total Uses of Funds			
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Consolidated MTW	\$178,956,041	\$183,500,076	\$4,544,035
Special Purpose not included in MTW	\$22,293,115	\$13,143,209	\$(9,149,906)
Total Expenditures	\$201,249,156	\$196,643,285	\$(4,605,871)

Table 15c			
Net Change to Reserves from All Funds			
ALL PROGRAMS	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2010 Actual	Variance
Total Revenue	\$209,229,219	\$219,402,560	\$10,173,341
Total Expenditures	\$201,249,156	\$196,643,285	\$(4,605,871)
Total Net Change To Reserves	\$7,980,063	\$22,759,275	\$14,779,212

C. Planned Versus Actual Sources and Uses of the COCC

Table 16 Sources & Uses of the COCC			
	FY2010 Budget	FY2010 Actual	Variance
SOURCES			
Administration	\$5,965,513	\$7,779,928	\$1,814,415
Tenant Services	262,578	1,645	(260,933)
Maintenance	91,600	69,000	(22,600)
Utilities	-	61,028	61,028
General	3,268,149	208,948	(3,059,201)
Total Sources	\$9,587,840	\$8,120,549	\$(1,467,291)
USES			
Salaries	\$3,737,366	\$3,615,119	\$(122,247)
Benefits	1,537,886	2,271,031	733,145
Office Expenses	856,340	1,972,451	1,116,111
Maintenance & Contract Costs	188,100	123,086	(65,014)
General Expenses	3,268,148	138,862	(3,129,286)
Total Uses	\$9,587,840	\$8,120,549	\$(1,467,291)
Net Income (Deficit)	\$0	\$0	\$0

D. Describe Actual Deviations from the Cost Allocation or Fee-for-Service Approach in the 1937 Act Requirements That Were Made During the Plan Year

OHA utilizes a Cost Allocation Approach.

- OHA developed Asset Management Properties (AMP) as part of a requirement for preparing the Operating Budget.
- A Central Office Cost Center (COCC) budget is recommended but not required.
- OHA has prepared budget for each of the AMPs in addition to a COCC budget. Included in the COCC budgets are the Executive Office, Human Resources, Information Technology, Finance, Contract Compliance and General Services, Property Operations, Program Administration, and the Administration Building.
- A cost allocation plan which is compliant with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB A-87) has been prepared in order to allocate the COCC costs to the Agency's programs and properties.
- OHA has a cost allocation method which allows the COCC to allocate monthly to several Departments including for example, all the AMPs, Section 8, and Central Maintenance.
- All COCC expenses are reconcilable to the Financial Data Schedule (FDS) line.

E. List Planned Versus Actual Use of Single Fund Flexibility

Single-Fund Budget Flexibility was used to meet many of the Agency's goals under the MTW Program. The sources included in the MTW Single-Fund Budget are summarized in the

Consolidated MTW Sources Table above. The primary MTW activities that require Single-Fund Budget authority are summarized below by their respective MTW activity number:

Ongoing Activities that utilize Single-Fund Budget Flexibility:

- 8. Fund Affordable Housing Development Activities
- 9. Short Term Subsidy Program
- 18. MTW Local Housing Assistance Program
- 19. Transfer Voucher Privileges for Public Housing Residents

In addition, there are three MTW Activities that only utilize the Single-Fund budget flexibility. These activities include the following:

- Convert Incremental Section 8 Units into Section 8 Block Grant
 - This activity was not approved. Consistent with HUD's processes, OHA will convert incremental Section 8 units at contract renewals to the MTW Block Grant.
- Fund Public Housing Operations
 - Block granting flexibility has allowed OHA to use funds based on local needs and identified strategies.
- Fund Deferred Maintenance and Capital Improvements at Public Housing Sites
 - Block granting flexibility has allowed OHA to address decades of deferred maintenance at public housing sites due to under-funding of the Capital Funds Program.

F. List Planned Versus Actual Reserve Balances at the End of the Plan Year (Optional)

Table 17: Reserve Balance	
Sources	
FYE Reserve Balance	\$27,971,887
Commitments	
Payment of Post Medical Retirement Benefits*	(16,818,811)
Early Repayment of HELP Loan for Tassaforanga Phases 1 & 2	(1,500,000)
Tenant Protection Voucher Reconciliation Fund	(7,544,440)
Land Purchase of Lakeside Property	(552,000)
Reserves after Commitments	\$1,556,636

Notes:

1. In July 2004, the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) issued Statement No. 45, Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Post-employment Benefits Other Than Pensions (GASB 45). This statement requires governmental entities to begin accounting for post-employment benefits on an accrual basis rather than using pay-as-you-go accounting. OHA implemented GASB 45 in FY 2008. Beginning in 2010, OHA elected to begin funding the Post Medical employment benefits.

G. Planned Versus Actual Sources and Uses by AMP (Optional)

Section VIII. Administrative

A. Description of Progress on the Correction or Elimination of Observed Deficiencies Cited in Monitoring Visits, Physical Inspections, or Other Oversight and Monitoring Mechanisms

1. Public Housing Program

Work Orders

Emergency Work Orders: OHA received 173 emergency work orders (in comparison with 318 received during FY 2009), of which 99.4 percent (99.4%) were abated within 24 hours.

Non-Emergency Work Orders: OHA received a total of 11,178 compared to 6,055 non-emergency work orders during FY 2009. The average completion time was 9.76 days, which was a reduction from 11.71 days during FY 2009.

REAC Score Improvement

The 2009 Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC) inspections took place from September through December of 2009 falling within the FY 2010. The table below shows the results of the last two annual inspections. Improvement from the previous year is shown by comparing the score for 2009 to the score for 2008. MTW authority has allowed OHA to address years of under funding in the Capital Funds Program through the use of the Single Fund Budget flexibility. This has provided OHA with the opportunity to address deferred maintenance issues, thus minimizing deficiencies and improving REAC scores.

AMP	Property Name	2008 Score	2009 Score	Point Improvement
AMP 1	Harrison Tower	70	91	+21
AMP 2	Adel Courts	53	95	+42
AMP 3	Campbell Village	36	69	+33
AMP 4	Lockwood Gardens	53	69	+16
AMP 7	Palo Vista Gardens	36	90	+54
AMP 8	Peralta Village	56	91	+35

2. Section 8 Program

Independent Public Audit (IPA)

All findings and weaknesses identified in the IPA were either resolved or will be resolved by October 1, 2010. Most findings related to weaknesses in the Section 8 accounting and internal control, general contracting and procurement, and Housing Quality Standards (HQS) quality control inspections procedures.

Internal Audit

Findings related to weaknesses in handling payments for deceased tenants were noted and recommendations for additional language in the Administrative Plan were made. Some of these changes were effective July 1, 2010 and others will be effective October 1, 2010. A general weakness in the recording and collection of funds was noted. This has been corrected.

Voucher Management System (VMS) Audit

VMS staff from HUD provided technical assistance on calculation of Housing Assistance Payments and Administrative Fee, even though OHA's MTW contract is funded independent from VMS based on its MTW status. There was a recommendation that OHA re-reconcile and come up with re-stated lease up figures for VMS. Reconciled and verified figures have been resubmitted to HUD and we are now confident in reporting our lease up numbers on and after the first of the month.

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

At this time, OHA does not have an agency directed evaluation of the demonstration.

C. Performance and Evaluation Report for Capital Fund Activities not Included In the MTW Block Grant

See Appendix C.

D. Certification from the Board of Commissioners

See Appendix B.

List of Appendices

Appendix A. Board Resolution

Appendix B. Certification of Compliance with MTW Statutory Requirements

Appendix C. Performance and Evaluation Report for Capital Fund Activities