



Housing Authority of Portland

YEAR 11

HUD's "Moving to Work"
(MTW) Demonstration Program

Annual Report
FY2010

Original submission: June 24, 2010
Revision 1 submitted: August 18, 2010

HAP Board of Commissioners

Lee Moore, Chair
Harriet Cormack, Vice Chair
David Widmark, Treasurer
Jeff Bachrach, Chair Emeritus
Gretchen Kafoury, Commissioner
Brian Lessler, Commissioner
Amie Pico, Commissioner
Shelli Romero, Commissioner
James Smith, Commissioner

HAP Executive Staff

Steve Rudman, Executive Director
Catherine Such, Deputy Executive Director
Michael Andrews, Director, Development and Community Revitalization
Rebecca Gabriel, Director, Human Resources and Administration
Shelley Marchesi, Director, Public Affairs
Jill Riddle, Director, Rent Assistance
Todd Salvo, Chief Financial Officer
Dianne Quast, Director, Real Estate Operations

HAP Moving to Work Staff

Michael Buonocore, Assistant Director, Policy and Planning
Melissa Sonsalla, Project Coordinator

Table of Contents

I. Introduction		FY2010-O4: Addition of Public Housing Operating Subsidy at Affordable Housing Sites	28
Introduction & Overview	01	FY2010-O5: New Affordable Housing	29
II. General Housing Authority Operating Information		FY2010-O6: Redevelopment of University Place	30
A. Housing Stock Information	05	FY2010-O7: Opportunity Housing Initiative	31
B. Leasing Information	09	FY2010-O8: Biennial reviews – Rent Reform Activity	35
C. Waiting List Information	11	FY2010-O9: Biennial inspections	36
III. Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information	13	FY2010-O10: Simplified administrative procedures – Rent Reform Activity	37
IV. Long-Term MTW Plan	Not included	VII. Sources and Uses of Funding	
V. Proposed MTW Activities		A. Sources & Uses of MTW Funds	39
FY2010-P1: Subsidy change to preserve public housing units	15	B. Sources & Uses of State & Local Funds	40
FY2010-P6: Family eligibility for project-based voucher assistance	15	C. Sources & Uses of COCC	N/A
VI. Ongoing MTW Activities		D. Alternative Fee and/or Cost Allocations	41
FY2010-P2: Opportunity Housing Initiative at New Columbia	17	E. Use of Single-Fund Flexibility	41
FY2010-P3: Agency-based rent assistance project with local non-profits	19	VIII. Administrative	
FY2010-P4: Measures to improve the rate of voucher holders who successfully lease-up	21	A. Correction of Observed Deficiencies	42
FY2010-P5: Limits for zero-subsidy participants	23	B. Agency-Directed Evaluations	42
FY2010-P7: Resource Access Center development	25	C. Performance and Evaluation Report	42
FY2010-O2: Potential redevelopment of Hillside Terrace	27	D. Certifications	42
FY2010-O3: Redevelopment of Sears Military Base	27	Appendix	43

I. Introduction

Moving to Work (MTW) is a demonstration program that offers public housing authorities (PHAs) the opportunity to design and test innovative, locally-designed housing and self-sufficiency strategies for low-income families by allowing exemptions from existing public housing and tenant-based Housing Choice Voucher rules. The program also permits PHAs to combine operating, capital, and tenant-based assistance funds into a single agency-wide funding source, as approved by HUD.

The purposes of the MTW program are to give PHAs and HUD the flexibility to design and test various approaches for providing and administering housing assistance that accomplish three primary goals:

- Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in Federal expenditures;
- Give incentives to families with children where the head of household is working, is seeking work, or is preparing for work by participating in job training, educational programs, or programs that assist people to obtain employment and become economically self-sufficient; and
- Increase housing choices for low-income families.

HAP has been designated an MTW agency since 1998. Last year, we signed a new agreement with HUD that will ensure our participation in the program until 2018, providing a long horizon to test and assess new initiatives and approaches to our work in support of the MTW program's goals.

Overview of the Agency's ongoing MTW goals and objectives

HAP recently completed a months-long outreach process to develop its next strategic plan. What we learned from talking to staff, community and jurisdictional partners, and 2,500 residents and participants was exciting: MTW has given us the opportunity to test some promising approaches to our work and there is support to build on those in the coming years. Our goals are particularly aligned with the two MTW goals of giving incentives to families to pursue self-sufficiency and to increase housing choices for low-income housing.

Our ongoing objectives in this report that we intend to build on, and add to, are embodied in activities such as agency-based assistance, which helps us make maximum use of our limited housing resource to increase choice and access by collaborating with community partners. Similarly, the Resource Access Center finds us working closely with our local jurisdictions to better meet the needs of those with multiple barriers, while our Opportunity Housing Initiative and evolving rent reform concepts will increase the availability of self-sufficiency activities.

Overview of the Agency's MTW Activities

Activity	Description	Page
FY2010-P1: Subsidy change to preserve public housing units	Discontinued.	15
FY2010-P6: Family eligibility for project-based voucher assistance	In order to provide greater access to low-income families with high barriers, screening and eligibility requirements at certain project-based voucher properties may differ from traditional criteria.	15

Activity	Description	Page
FY2010-P2: Opportunity Housing Initiative at New Columbia	HAP has implemented a five-year family self-sufficiency program for families either living in public housing or receiving Section 8 at New Columbia.	17
FY2010-P3: Agency-based rent assistance project with local non-profits	HAP has allocated a small pool of rent assistance funds to be administered by SE Works and NW Pilot Project – local non-profits serving distinct groups of participants.	19
FY2010-P4: Measures to improve the rate of voucher holders who successfully lease-up	HAP has implemented a variety of measures to improve landlord acceptance of Section 8 vouchers in the local community.	21

Activity	Description	Page
FY2010-P5: Limits for zero-subsidy participants	HAP has implemented limits for families that have a pattern of lowering their income after subsidy ends.	23
FY2010-P7: Resource Access Center development	HAP is serving as the master developer for this new facility to serve homeless and formerly homeless households.	25
FY2010-O2: Potential redevelopment of Hillsdale Terrace	Discontinued.	27
FY2010-O3: Redevelopment of Sears Military Base	Discontinued.	27
FY2010-O4: Addition of Public Housing Operating Subsidy at Affordable Housing Sites	In FY2010, HAP began offering public housing subsidy for 25 households at Rockwood Station, a 195-unit property in Gresham.	28

Activity	Description	Page
FY2010-O5: New Affordable Housing	HAP is utilizing MTW authority to exceed the traditional limit of a 25% cap on the number of project-based voucher units at The Jeffrey and the Martha Washington.	29
FY2010-O6: Redevelopment of University Place	Discontinued.	30
FY2010-O7: Opportunity Housing Initiative	HAP operates OHI self-sufficiency programs site-based at Fairview Oaks and Humboldt Gardens, and through a collaborative program with the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS).	31
FY2010-O8: Biennial reviews – Rent Reform Activity	HAP has implemented a biennial review schedule for all MTW voucher holders in Section 8, and for elderly/disabled residents in public housing.	35
FY2010-O9: Biennial inspections	HAP conducts biennial inspections for qualifying Section 8 households.	36
FY2010-O10: Simplified administrative procedures – Rent Reform Activity	HAP has implemented several measures to relieve administrative burden and reduce intrusiveness with residents and participants.	37

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

A. Housing Stock Information

Number of public housing units at the end of FY2010

Elderly/Disabled Units	1,345
Family Units	<u>1,261</u>
Total	2,606

Change in number of public housing units in FY2010

Units added during FY2010	25
Units removed during FY2010	<u>(37)</u>
Cumulative Change	-12 (-0.5%)

Breakdown of Public Housing Units at the end of FY2010

	Bedroom Size				Total Households
	Studio/ 1 BR	2BR	3BR	4+BR	
Elderly/Disabled Units	1,331	14	0	0	1,345
Family Units	189	526	431	115	1,261
Total	1,520	540	431	115	2,606

Units added in FY2010

Development	Description	Units
Rockwood Station	Two bedroom apartments; two are accessible units	25
Total Units added in FY2010		25 units

Planned vs. actual changes to housing units

In addition to the 25 units added to Rockwood Station, HAP's FY2010 Plan proposed 90 more units to be added at four other properties. Units at The Jeffrey and the Martha Washington are now expected to be brought online in FY2011. Units at the Resource Access Center will be brought online in FY2012. Lastly, HAP is no longer planning to add any public housing units to Pine Square.

FY2010 Capital Expenditures

Community	Activity	ARRA	Capital Fund	% of Cap Fund	Total Expended	% of Total Expended
Cora Park	Flooring, heating, misc upgrades	\$27,299	\$482,844	8.42%	\$510,143	5.56%
Chateau Apts	Kitchen remodel, misc upgrades	28,069	308,206	5.38%	336,275	3.66%
Bel Park	Kitchen remodel, heating, plumbing, energy improvements, misc upgrades	357,289	64,924	1.13%	422,213	4.60%
Camelia Court	Kitchen remodel, heating, plumbing, energy improvements, misc upgrades	480,141	79,361	1.38%	559,502	6.09%
Winchell Court	Energy improvements, misc upgrades	241,327	56,125	0.98%	297,452	3.24%
Tillicum North	Energy improvements, misc upgrades	12,342	116,599	2.03%	128,941	1.40%
Tillicum South	Energy improvements, misc upgrades	12,134	100,001	1.74%	112,135	1.22%
Hunter's Run	Energy improvements, misc upgrades	12,009	102,042	1.78%	114,051	1.24%
Harold Lee Village	Energy improvements, misc upgrades	12,083	91,903	1.60%	103,986	1.13%
Alderwood	Comprehensive renovation	50,987	965,404	16.84%	1,016,391	11.07%
Powellhurst Woods	Comprehensive renovation	49,867	1,669,155	29.11%	1,719,022	18.72%
Celilo Court	Comprehensive renovation	4,325	78,119	1.36%	82,444	0.90%
Demar Downs	Comprehensive renovation	400,885	334,318	5.83%	735,203	8.01%
Stark Manor	Comprehensive renovation	479,546	302,411	5.27%	781,957	8.52%
Fir Acres	Comprehensive renovation	878,239	386,542	6.74%	1,264,781	13.77%
Townhouse Terrace	Comprehensive renovation	253,950	402,945	7.03%	656,895	7.15%
Gallagher	Comprehensive renovation	22,113	26,441	0.46%	48,554	0.53%
Lexington Court	Comprehensive renovation	-	11,614	0.20%	11,614	0.13%
Carlton Court	Comprehensive renovation	-	13,439	0.23%	13,439	0.15%
Eastwood Court	Comprehensive renovation	-	16,501	0.29%	16,501	0.18%
Sellwood Center	Comprehensive renovation	-	1,600	0.03%	1,600	0.02%
Holgate House	Comprehensive renovation	-	307	0.01%	307	0.00%
Eliot Square	Comprehensive renovation	-	10,761	0.19%	10,761	0.12%
Sweet 16 Project	Administrative Costs	125,557	-	0.00%	125,557	1.37%
Hollywood East	Window Replacement	-	39,523	0.69%	39,523	0.43%
Various properties	Misc abatement	-	72,926	1.27%	72,926	0.79%
	Total Capital Expenditures	\$3,448,162	\$5,734,012	100.00%	\$9,182,174	100.00%

Units removed in FY2010

Development	Justification	Units
Scattered Sites:	HUD approved disposition of scattered sites,	
OR002032	as first described in our FY2008 MTW Plan	3
OR002036		6
OR002044		4
OR002048		7
OR002049		9
OR002050		8
Total Units removed in FY2010		37 units

Overview of other housing managed by the Agency:

	Number of Properties	Physical Units
Affordable Owned with PBA* subsidy	6	496
Affordable Owned without PBA subsidy	10	<u>1,041</u>
Total Affordable Owned Housing	16	1,537
Tax Credit Partnerships	19	<u>2,234</u>
Total Affordable Housing	35	3,771
Duplicated PH Properties/Units	6	465
Special Needs (Master Leased)	36	422

*Project-based assistance

MTW Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) units authorized:

MTW HCV at beginning FY2010	7,639*
SRO/MODS converted to HCVs (Jefferson West)	50
Disaster Housing Assistance Program voucher converted to HCV	<u>1</u>
MTW HCV at end of FY2010	7,690
Cumulative Change	+51 (+0.7%)

***Note:** The FY2010 Plan incorrectly stated there were 7,704 HCV units authorized at the beginning of FY2010. 70 VASH vouchers (which are not MTW) were mistakenly added to the calculation, and 5 DHAP vouchers were received after submission of the Plan, but before the beginning of FY2010. [7,704 – 70 + 5 = 7,639]

Non-MTW Housing Choice Vouchers units authorized:

SRO/MODS at beginning of FY2010	562
Less 50 SRO/MODS converted to MTW HCV	<u>(50)</u>
SRO/MODS at end of FY2010	512
Cumulative Change	-50 (-9%)
Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing at beginning of FY2010	70
Additional vouchers awarded by HUD	<u>35</u>
VASH at end of FY2010	105
Cumulative Change	+35 (+50%)

Discuss changes over 10%: HUD awarded HAP an additional 35 VASH vouchers during the 2010 fiscal year based on recommendations from our VA partners.

Housing Choice Vouchers – units project-based in FY2010:

Miraflores – 8 units

- Preferences for Bridges to Housing participants and families below 50% of AMI. Services provided by Bridges to Housing program, Catholic Charities, El Programa Hispano and Morrison Family Services.

Sacred Heart – 12 units

- Preferences for chronically homeless singles and seniors. Services are provided by NW Pilot Project.

Shaver Green – 8 units

- 1-bedroom units with a preference for disabled households. Services are provided by Lifeworks Northwest via an on-site case manager who holds office hours for residents.

B. Leasing Information

Total number of MTW public housing units leased in FY2010: 2,590 units
HAP continues to have an occupancy rate of over 98% in its public housing units.

Total number of Non-MTW public housing units leased in FY2010: None

Description of issues:

There have been no issues with leasing public housing units in FY2010.

Total number of MTW HCV units leased in FY2010:

7,677 units authorized

7,738 units leased

100.8% utilization

Total number of non-MTW HCV units leased in FY2010:

SRO/MODS: 525 units authorized

478 units leased

91.1% utilization

Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing: 90 units authorized

55 units leased

61.1% utilization

Description of issues:

There have been no issues with leasing MTW vouchers in FY2010.

Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers were slow to lease up, but increased staffing at the local VA office to increase issuance of referrals indicates that lease rates for these vouchers will increase significantly in the next plan year. As of the end of FY2010, 98 out of 105 (93%) VASH vouchers were leased up, and we expect that number to increase during FY2011. (The utilization rate of 61.1% above is averaged over the fiscal year; utilization rates were very low at the beginning of FY2010.)

Number of Project-Based Vouchers committed/in use: 1,098 vouchers in use
142 additional vouchers committed

Description of projects where new vouchers are placed:

Project	Date Committed	PBVs Committed	Project Description
Sandy Apartments	April 2009	14	Housing for disabled households, with services provided by the nonprofit agency Luke Dorf.
Martha Washington	July 2009	45	Housing for homeless and disabled populations. Central City Concern will provide property management and social services for residents.
Rockwood Building	Nov 2009	15	New construction, managed by Human Solutions, with a preference for homeless families. Services provided by Human Solutions and 8 partner agencies.
PCRI Scattered	Nov 2009	7	Scattered site houses that serve larger households.
Greentree Court	Nov 2009	3	Approved 3 additional PBVs for an existing project owned by Human Solutions. Preference is provided for homeless families participating in Bridges to Housing program, as well as other households who are disabled or homeless.

C. Waiting List Information

Households on the waiting lists at the end of FY2010

Public Housing

	Bedroom Size					Total Households	Percent Households
	Studio/ 1 BR	2BR	3BR	4BR	5+BR		
Elderly/Disabled Units	1,608	4	0	0	0	1,612	28%
Family Units	118	2,222	1,846	15	0	4,201	72%
Total	1,726	2,226	1,846	15	0	5,813	100%

Description of waiting lists and any changes made:

HAP currently manages public housing through site-based waiting lists in addition to a first available option for sites operated by HAP staff. Applicants have the option of choosing up to three individual properties (from those with open waiting lists) or selecting the first available option. New Columbia (which is managed by a private property management company) maintains a separate site-based waiting list. Similarly, HAP has activated previously banked public housing units by putting them into larger non-public housing developments; those sites will also manage their own waiting lists. These sites include Fairview Oaks, Rockwood Station, Martha Washington and the Jeffrey.

HAP opened a number of public housing waiting lists in FY2010. In October 2009, HAP opened waiting lists for elderly/disabled units at Hollywood East, NW Tower, Williams Plaza, Ruth Haefner Plaza, Schrunck Riverview Tower and Medallion Apartments. This opening resulted in **1,231** new applicants.

Also in October 2009, HAP opened the waiting list for 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom units at New Columbia Apartments. This opening resulted in **453** new applicants.

In June 2009, HAP opened the waiting lists for 3-bedroom units at Hillside Terrace and Slavin Court. This opening resulted in **231** new applicants.

Section 8 / Housing Choice Voucher (HCV)

At the end of FY2010, there were **2,079** households on the HCV waiting list:

Family Type (members)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+	Total
No. on wait list	882	495	340	186	104	33	39	2,079

Description of waiting lists and any changes made:

The HCV waiting list is a centralized list maintained by HAP, which is currently closed except for terminally ill applicants who provide documentation that they are expected to live for less than 12 months. The waiting list was last opened in November 2006, and HAP accepted 10,000 applications over three weeks. Applicants were randomly assigned numbers and the first 3,000 were placed on the waiting list. As HAP neared the end of the list in late 2008, letters were sent to the remaining 7,000 applicants who were given a chance to be put back on the waiting list. Approximately 3,000 people accepted this opportunity.

During FY2010, **332** applicants were pulled from the waiting list. There are currently 2,079 people remaining on the waiting list. No changes were made to the waiting list procedures during FY2010.

Description of other waiting lists:

The project-based waiting lists are site-based and maintained by management at each of the properties where project-based vouchers are placed. Nearly half of the project-based vouchers are in buildings with waiting list preferences for elderly or disabled households. Many of the buildings that do not offer an elderly or disabled preference offer a preference for homeless households. HAP audits waiting list maintenance at each site to ensure that lists are maintained in accordance with project-based voucher regulations.

III. Non-MTW Related Housing Authority Information (Optional)

Description of non-MTW activities implemented by the Agency

Over the past year, HAP implemented a non-smoking policy throughout the entire traditional public housing portfolio, and the majority of the affordable housing portfolio. The implementation process included resident meetings to inform residents of the new policy, to provide them an opportunity to comment and ask questions about the new policy, and to present resources for residents interested in quitting smoking or modifying their smoking behaviors. Public housing site managers and resident service coordinators were given additional training on how to support residents through the non-smoking transition. This included information about smoking cessation and lease enforcement procedures.

In the initial implementation process, there was a strong interest in installing free-standing, covered outdoor smoking areas prior to implementation dates to assist residents with the transition. However, since most of the intended sites (mainly elderly/disabled high-rise buildings) had additional building and neighborhood building requirements, this would have delayed installation to after the implementation date and created additional costs that were previously unaccounted for. Therefore HAP did not install these structures.

Overall, residents and staff have been pleased with the policy. Most residents have been compliant with the new policy and no residents have been formally evicted solely for violating the non-smoking policy.

This page intentionally left blank.

V. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested

FY2010-P1: SUBSIDY CHANGE TO PRESERVE PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS

A. List activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented:

In our FY2010 MTW Plan, HAP identified our intention to submit a request to HUD to change the funding for our public housing properties to project-based voucher subsidy.

B. Discuss why the activity was not implemented:

HAP decided to delay implementation of this activity in FY2010, as other large projects such as the administration of ARRA funds and the HOPE VI application required more immediate attention and effort.

FY2010-P6: FAMILY ELIGIBILITY FOR PROJECT-BASED VOUCHER ASSISTANCE

A. List activities proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not yet implemented:

In order to provide greater access to low-income families with high barriers, screening and eligibility requirements at certain project-based voucher properties may differ from traditional criteria.

B. Discuss why the activity was not implemented:

HAP is currently working with Bridges to Housing to modify criteria at properties to provide greater access to certain families. However, an agreement was not reached in FY2010 and therefore, this activity was not implemented. HAP expects this activity to be implemented in FY2011 with the Bridges to Housing properties, as well as with the Resource Access Center and the Martha Washington.

This page intentionally left blank

VI. Ongoing MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted

FY2010-P2: OPPORTUNITY HOUSING INITIATIVE AT NEW COLUMBIA

(Identified in Plan Year FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP has implemented a five-year family self-sufficiency program for families either living in public housing or receiving Section 8 at New Columbia.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increase enrollment	Households served	0 households served before activity began	50 households enrolled by FY2010	19 households enrolled as of FY2010 • See Part C for narrative about this benchmark
Encourage participation in workshops	Individuals who complete one or more of the following workshops: Financial Literacy, Housing Mobility or Career Enhancement	0	25 in first year	12 individuals in FY2010 • See Part C for narrative about this benchmark
Encourage education	Individuals who enroll in a vocational or post-secondary educational program	0	5 in first year	5 individuals in FY2010
Successfully graduate participants	Participants successfully graduated	0	75% / 38 participants after 5 years	0 participants have graduated, however, participants are on track to graduate after 5 years
Increase participant income	Average participant income for those with earnings	\$16,537 beginning average income for those enrolled in FY2010	5% annual increase • \$17,364 by FY2010 • \$18,232 by FY2011 • \$19,144 by FY2012 • \$20,101 by FY2013 100% at graduation • \$33,074 by FY2014	\$20,068 in FY2010

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increase employment/work opportunity	Participants receiving employment or promotion	0	75% / 38 participants by 2014	16 participants in FY2010
Increase escrow accumulation	Average dollars in escrow	\$0 at entry	\$5,000 upon graduation (FY2014)	16 participants have begun earning escrow, with an average accumulation of \$1,021

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

HAP did not meet the enrollment goal of 50 families in the OHI program at New Columbia by FY2010. OHI is a relatively new program at New Columbia and is optional. Families have been hesitant to make that commitment; however, the speed at which families are signing up has increased over the past few months, as a new staff person has started to develop relationships on site. Many families have been added to the program and HAP anticipates being at 50 families by July 2010.

Because HAP did not have 50 families enrolled in the program, there were less than 25 participants in workshops in the first year. However, HAP did achieve greater than 50% participation in workshops for the 19 enrolled household, and anticipates meeting the benchmark of 25 workshop participants once enrollment reaches 50 households.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

N/A

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

N/A

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary

N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change

N/A

FY2010-P3: AGENCY-BASED RENT ASSISTANCE PROJECT WITH LOCAL NON-PROFITS

(Identified in Plan Year FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP has allocated a small pool of rent assistance funds to be administered by SE Works and NW Pilot Project – local non-profits serving distinct groups of participants.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
SE Works				
Maintain households served	Households served	0 households served before activity began	20 households in year 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 households enrolled in year 1 • 2 households exited before reaching self-sufficiency – 1 left by choice to move in with family; 1 was terminated after being sent to prison
Maintain households retaining housing (revised metric)	Households retaining housing	0 households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% / 16 households throughout receipt of rent assistance • 75% / 15 households 6 months after assistance ends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 86% have maintained housing throughout receipt of rent assistance • No households have reached 6 months after end of assistance
Maintain high employment and participation in education/ training programs (revised metric)	Households employed or participating in education/ training programs	0 households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% / 15 households 6 months after assistance ends • 65% / 13 households 9 months after assistance ends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No households have reached 6 months after end of assistance • No households have reached 9 months after end of assistance
Maintain low re-offender rate	Participants who reoffend within one year of release date	0 participants	• Less than 15% / 3 participants	• 1 participant (7% of those enrolled) reoffended

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
NW Pilot Project				
Maintain households served	Households served	0 households	10 households in year 1	11 households enrolled (1 terminated and went to prison)
Maintain successful housing	Participants successfully housed after two years	0 participants	90% / 9 participants	10 of 11 (91%) participants have retained housing
Increase participants receiving disability income	Participants receiving disability income within two years	0 participants	70% / 7 participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 participants (55%) have already received disability benefits within 5 months or less after enrollment. • Participants continue to work toward receiving benefits within the two year timeframe.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

HAP did not reach the benchmark of serving 20 households in the first year of the SE Works program. The contract with SE Works requests that 40 households are served over the course of three years, and HAP had anticipated there would be 20 households served in year 1. The reduced number in year 1 is due to several factors, including a longer-than-expected start up period while program guidelines were being finalized, and a desire by SE Works to ensure they had services in place for all households served. SE Works still expects to serve 40 households over the contract period.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

N/A

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

N/A

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary

N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change

N/A

FY2010-P4: MEASURES TO IMPROVE THE RATE OF VOUCHER HOLDERS WHO SUCCESSFULLY LEASE-UP
 (Identified in Plan Year FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP has implemented a variety of measures to improve landlord acceptance of Section 8 vouchers in the local community.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Improve voucher lease-up rate	Voucher lease-up rate	74% in FY2009	85% in FY2010	For households pulled from the waitlist in FY2010 who had their voucher issued for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at least 60 days, the lease up rate is 77.5%. • at least 120 days, the lease up rate is 89.3%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Part C for narrative about this benchmark
Maintain landlords who accept Section 8	Number of landlords who accept Section 8	3,166 in FY2009	3,166	2,704 in FY2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Part C for narrative about this benchmark • See Part D for narrative about this metric
Increase number of new landlords who accept Section 8	Number of new landlords who accept Section 8	424	5% increase or 445 new landlords in FY2010	291 in FY2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Part C for narrative about this benchmark • See Part D for narrative about this metric
Decrease lease-up time	Average number of days for a voucher holder to lease up	51	Less than 50	46.4 days

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

HAP grants a large number of voucher extensions based on reasonable accommodation requests from disabled applicants. As a result, the lease-up rate is more representative when looking at households who have had their vouchers for 120 days (89.3% lease-up rate).

HAP did not reach the benchmark of maintaining 3,166 landlords who accepted Section 8. However, this number was impacted by work to remove duplicates in the accounting system. Historically, some landlords have had multiple account numbers. HAP is eliminating duplicate accounts, resulting in a decrease in the number of "active landlords."

HAP did not reach the benchmark of increasing new landlords who accept Section 8 to 445. With only four pulls from the waiting list during FY2010, there were few opportunities for new landlords to begin program participation.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

The number of active and new landlords who accept Section 8 is not an ideal metric for tracking the community's willingness to accept Section 8 vouchers, because it includes only landlords who currently have a Section 8 tenant. HAP hopes to include, in future reports, a metric that tracks the number of landlords in the community who indicate willingness to accept a Section 8 voucher. HAP is currently working with Metro Multifamily Housing Association to determine how this could be tracked.

In future reports, HAP will not include the metrics regarding "Number of new landlords who accept Section 8." Because there are a fixed number of vouchers, there are constraints on the number of new landlords who could join the program and any marked increase in the number of new landlords would necessarily suggest a decrease of "current" landlords.

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

HAP is working with Metro Multifamily Housing Association to determine if we can create baselines, benchmarks, and data collection methodology to track the number of landlords in the community who indicate a willingness to accept a Section 8 voucher. Metro Multifamily Housing Association issues a regular survey to landlords that may be able to include questions that would indicate landlord attitudes around accepting a Section 8 voucher.

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary
N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change
N/A

FY2010-P5: LIMITS FOR ZERO-SUBSIDY PARTICIPANTS
 (Identified in Plan Year FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP has implemented limits for families that have a pattern of lowering their income after subsidy ends.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Decrease in participants repeating pattern	Participants repeating pattern	10 zero-subsidy participants cycled back onto HAP in FY2009	10 participants or less	Number of zero-subsidy participants cycling back onto HAP in FY2010: 13

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

Although the number of participants who cycled back to subsidy increased in this plan year, the numbers are too small to be significant. Furthermore, with the current state of the economy, it is not surprising that more households would gain income for a time, and then subsequently lose their jobs.

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

N/A

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

N/A

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary

N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change

N/A

This page intentionally left blank.

FY2010-P7: RESOURCE ACCESS CENTER (RAC) DEVELOPMENT

(Formerly FY2010-O1; Identified in Plan Years FY2008-FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP is serving as the master developer for this new facility to house the City of Portland and Multnomah County’s primary day access center for people experiencing homelessness, a 90-bed men’s shelter and approximately 130 units of affordable housing for people with very low incomes.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increase public housing units	Public housing units at RAC	0 units attributable to the RAC before the activity began	30 additional PH units attributable to the RAC by end of FY2012	Status as of March 31, 2010: Financial closing and start of construction during October 2009; construction on schedule.
Increase project-based voucher (PBV) units	PBV units at RAC	0 PBV units attributable to the RAC before the activity began	100 PBV units allocated at the RAC by FY2012	Status as of March 31, 2010: Financial closing and start of construction during October 2009; construction on schedule.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

N/A

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

Since HAP does not require MTW authority to use the Construction Manager General Contractor (CM/GC) form of construction contracting, benchmarks measuring construction contingency amounts spent on unforeseen conditions and target business participation have been removed.

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

Real Estate Operations and Rent Assistance staff will report on the number of public housing and project-based voucher units online in FY2012. The Development and Community Revitalization department will continue to track CM/GC expenses and target business participation, but these are not MTW activities and will not be included in HAP's MTW reporting.

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary

N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change

N/A

FY2010-O2: POTENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT OF HILLSDALE TERRACE

A. List activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented:

In our FY2010 MTW Plan, HAP discussed preparing an analysis for presentation to HAP's Board of Commissioners recommending how best to redevelop Hillside Terrace, a physically distressed and socially isolated 60-unit public housing development.

B. Discuss why the activity was not implemented:

In the review process of HAP's FY2011 Plan, it was determined that the CM/GC authority in Attachment D of HAP's MTW agreement does not provide any regulatory relief related to this activity, which was the only MTW authorization referenced in this activity.

FY2010-O3: REDEVELOPMENT OF SEARS MILITARY BASE

A. List activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented:

In our FY2010 MTW Plan, HAP wrote that another non-profit community development corporation was chosen to serve as the master developer of affordable housing at this site.

B. Discuss why the activity was not implemented:

HAP identified this activity as discontinued, and the activity will be dropped from MTW reporting.

FY2010-O4: ADDITION OF PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING SUBSIDY AT AFFORDABLE HOUSING SITES

(Identified in Plan Years FY2007-FY2010; Implemented FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

Utilizing public housing operating subsidy at HAP’s affordable properties allows for one-to-one replacement of public housing subsidy lost due to the sale of scattered sites and may allow for additional units to be brought back from the formerly “banked units”. In FY2010, HAP began offering public housing subsidy for 25 households (two bedroom units) at Rockwood Station, a 195-unit property in Gresham.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Increase subsidized housing units available at Rockwood Station	Subsidized housing units available at Rockwood Station	0 subsidized units available at Rockwood Station before FY2010	25 subsidized units added at Rockwood Station in FY2010	25 previously “banked” two-bedroom subsidies were turned on in December 2009-March 2010

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

N/A

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

HAP’s FY2011 MTW Plan (approval pending) proposes a rent reform activity related to the 25 units at Rockwood Station. If approved, these will be added to next year’s FY2011 MTW Report. If not approved, this activity will be removed from HAP’s MTW reporting, as it has been clarified that no MTW authority is otherwise necessary to add the banked units to an affordable property.

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

N/A

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary

N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change

N/A

FY2010-O5: NEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING

(Identified in Plan Years FY2007-FY2010; Implemented FY2009-FY2010)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP is utilizing MTW authority to exceed the traditional limit of a 25% cap on the number of project-based voucher (PBV) units in a single building. At The Jeffrey and the Martha Washington, this flexibility allows HAP to take on these projects and make the operating budgets for these two developments work.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
The Jeffrey				
Increase subsidized housing units available	Subsidized housing units available	30 PBV units online 0 public housing units	Add 20 public housing units in FY2012	Financial closing completed in February 2010; HAP is planning to turn on subsidy for all 20 units before FY2012.
Martha Washington				
Increase subsidized housing units available	Subsidized housing units available	0 public housing units 0 PBV units (vacant building)	25 public housing units online in FY2011 45 PBV units online in FY2011	Financial closing and construction began August 2009. Public housing units are scheduled to come online in June-July 2010.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

N/A

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

Since HAP does not require MTW authority to use the Construction Manager General Contractor (CM/GC) form of construction contracting, benchmarks measuring construction contingency amounts spent on unforeseen conditions and target business participation have been removed.

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

Real Estate Operations and Rent Assistance staff will report on the number of public housing and project-based voucher units brought online. The Development and Community Revitalization department will continue to track CM/GC expenses and target business participation at the Martha Washington, but these are not MTW activities and will not be included in HAP's MTW reporting.

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary
N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change
N/A

FY2010-O6: REDEVELOPMENT OF UNIVERSITY PLACE

A. List activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented:

In our FY2009 MTW Plan, HAP described the redevelopment of University Place, which provides housing via 48 Single Room Occupancy units for very low-income residents.

B. Discuss why the activity was not implemented:

HAP has identified that no MTW authority is needed in this activity and has dropped it from our MTW reporting.

FY2010-07: OPPORTUNITY HOUSING INITIATIVE (OHI)

(Identified in Plan Year FY2008; Implemented FY2008-FY2009)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP operates OHI self-sufficiency programs site-based at Fairview Oaks and Humboldt Gardens, and through a collaborative program with the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS).

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Fairview				
Maintain enrollment	Households served	40	40	40 households in FY2010
Successfully graduate participants	Participants successfully graduated	0	75% / 30 participants after 5 years	0 participants have graduated, however, participants are on track to graduate after 5 years
Increase participant income	Average participant earned income for those with earnings	\$11,414 average income at program entry	5% annual increase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$11,985 by FY2010 • \$12,584 by FY2011 • \$13,213 by FY2012 • \$13,874 by FY2013 100% at graduation • \$22,828 by FY2014	\$23,427 in FY2010
Increase employment/work opportunity	Participants receiving employment or promotion	0	75% / 30 participants by FY2014	27 participants
Increase escrow accumulation	Average dollars in escrow	\$0 at entry	\$5000 upon graduation (FY2014)	29 participants have begun earning escrow with an average accumulation of \$2,610

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Humboldt Gardens				
Maintain enrollment	Households served	57	57	59 households in FY2010
Successfully graduate participants	Participants successfully graduated	0	75% / 43 participants after 5 years	1 participant graduated early. Other participants are on track to graduate after 5 years
Increase participant income	Average participant earned income for those with earnings	\$6,756 average income at program entry	5% annual increase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$7,094 by FY2010 • \$7,449 by FY2011 • \$7,821 by FY2012 • \$8,212 by FY2013 100% at graduation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$13,512 by FY2014 	\$14,062 in FY2010
Increase employment/work opportunity	Participants receiving employment or promotion	0	75% / 43 participants in FY2014	36 participants in FY2010
Increase escrow accumulation	Average dollars in escrow	\$0 at entry	\$5000 upon graduation (FY2014)	28 participants have begun earning escrow with an average accumulation of \$1,313

FY2010-07: OPPORTUNITY HOUSING INITIATIVE (OHI)
(Continued)

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
DHS Voucher Program				
Maintain enrollment	Households served	21	21	21 households were initially enrolled in the program, and 18 are still active. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Part D for narrative about this metric
Successfully graduate participants	Participants successfully graduated	0	75% / 16 participants after 5 years	No participants have graduated yet, although one participant left voluntarily and was working full time at \$16.83/hour.
Increase participant income	Average participant earned income for those with earnings	\$8,613	5% annual increase: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$9,044 by FY2010 • \$9,496 by FY2011 • \$9,971 by FY2012 • \$10,469 by FY2013 Double by graduation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$17,226 by FY2014 	\$14,479 in FY2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Part D for narrative about this metric
Increase employment/work opportunity	Participants receiving new employment or promotion	0	75% / 16 participants by FY2014	To date, 11 out of 21 (52%) participants have gained new employment. Two of those participants were subsequently laid off.
Increase escrow accumulation	Average dollars in participants' escrow	\$0	\$5000 upon graduation (FY2014)	8 participants have begun earning escrow, with an average accumulation of \$972

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

N/A

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

Going forward, the benchmark for maintaining enrollment in the DHS Voucher program will be 18 households. Due to funding limitations, HAP and DHS have agreed not to enroll additional families.

The baseline for DHS Voucher program participants' average earned income at the time of enrollment was calculated incorrectly in the FY2010 plan as \$6,529. The correct baseline average earned income was \$8,613.

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

N/A

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary

N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change

N/A

FY2010-O8: BIENNIAL REVIEWS – RENT REFORM ACTIVITY

(Identified in Plan Years FY2008-FY2009; Implemented FY2008)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP has implemented a biennial review schedule for all MTW voucher holders in Section 8, and for elderly/disabled residents in public housing.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Annual staff time savings for Section 8 qualifying participants	Qualifying participants	7,475, which equates to 3,737 hours saved	7,000, which equates to 3,500 hours saved	7,407 qualifying participants in FY2010, which equates to a total of 3,703 hours saved
Annual staff time savings for qualifying public housing households	Qualifying households	1,092, which equates to 548 hours saved	1,000, which equates to 500 hours saved	1,123 qualifying households in FY2010, which equates to a total of 561 hours saved

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

N/A

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

N/A

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

N/A

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary

N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change

N/A

FY2010-O9: BIENNIAL INSPECTIONS

(Identified in Plan Years FY2008-FY2009; Implemented FY2008)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP conducts biennial inspections for qualifying Section 8 households.

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Annual cost savings for Section 8 qualifying participants	Qualifying participants	1,527 qualifying participants, resulting in cost savings of approximately \$76,350	2-5% annual increase • 1,558 qualifying participants in FY2010, resulting in cost savings of approximately \$77,900	2,107 qualifying households in FY2010, resulting in a cost savings of approximately \$105,350.

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective

N/A

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised

N/A

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed

N/A

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary

N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change

N/A

FY2010-O10: SIMPLIFIED ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES – RENT REFORM ACTIVITY

(Identified in Plan Years FY2008-FY2009; Implemented FY2008)

A. List activities continued from the prior Plan year(s)

HAP has implemented several measures to relieve administrative burden and reduce intrusiveness with residents and participants:

- Disregard income related to assets valued at less than \$25,000
- Eliminate interim reviews for income increases (except in cases with an increase from zero income)
- Streamline Earned Income Disallowance (EID) for qualifying clients
- Eliminate EID for new GOALS participants

B. Provide detailed information on the impact of the activity, compared against the proposed benchmarks and metrics

Impact	Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome
Disregarding assets <\$25,000				
Decrease annual staff time spent tracking assets	Hours spent on assets tracked	2,905 hours spent tracking 5,811 assets (approx. 30 minutes per asset) in FY2007	581 hours or less spent tracking 1,162 assets	193.5 hours spent tracking 387 assets in FY2010
Eliminating Interim Reviews				
Decrease annual staff time spent on interim reviews	Hours spent on interim reviews	10,317 hours spent on 10,317 interim reviews (est. 1 hour per review)	10,000 hours or less spent on interim reviews	6,476 hours spent on interim reviews in FY2010
Changes to EID				
Decrease annual staff time spent on EID reviews	Hours spent on second interim EID reviews	90 hours spent on 180 second interim EID reviews	0 hours spent on second interim EID reviews	70 households who qualified for the EID in FY2010 0 hours spent on second interim EID reviews (resulting in savings of 35 hours)

C. Provide a narrative explanation if benchmarks were not achieved or the activity was determined ineffective
N/A

D. Identify any new indicators if benchmarks or metrics have been revised
N/A

E. Describe revisions if data collection methodology has changed
N/A

F. If a different authorization was used, provide the new authorization and describe why the change was necessary
N/A

G. Cite the specific provision(s) or regulation that authorized the Agency to make the change
N/A

VII. Sources and Uses of Funding

Due to the timing of HAP's fiscal year end audit, actual activity presented below is preliminary and unaudited.

A. Sources & Uses of MTW Funds

Sources of Funds	Actual	Budget as Adopted	Preliminary Plan*
Rental Revenue	4,409,490	4,536,383	4,874,163
Section 8 Subsidy	59,398,423	57,635,100	58,740,624
Operating Subsidy	9,427,987	9,017,481	8,443,195
HUD Grants	1,383,778	1,261,692	976,162
Other Revenue	658,377	716,016	631,273
HUD NonOperating Contributions	4,013,848	3,503,147	3,550,762
Total Sources	79,291,903	76,669,819	77,216,180

*As submitted in MTW Plan (prepared January 2009); final budget adopted March 2009.

Uses of Funds	Actual	Budget as Adopted	Preliminary Plan*
PH Subsidy Transfer	1,353,830	1,241,166	951,123
Housing Assistance Payments	53,042,685	53,129,760	52,324,373
Administration	7,522,715	7,308,898	7,007,914
Tenant Services	310,693	243,064	65,961
Maintenance	5,782,832	5,756,788	6,202,119
Utilities	2,104,442	2,355,212	2,058,535
General	441,325	390,492	407,331
Central Office Cost Allocations	3,070,842	3,077,042	2,398,695
HUD Capital Expenditures	4,013,848	3,503,147	3,550,762
Total Uses	77,643,212**	77,005,569	74,966,813

*As submitted in MTW Plan (prepared January 2009); final budget adopted March 2009.

**Excess funds reflected in Sources are held in reserve pending use by approved MTW initiatives.

(Note: ARRA funds are not included on the MTW Sources and Uses Statement)

B. Sources & Uses of State and Local Funds

Sources of Funds	Actual	Budget as Adopted	Preliminary Plan*
State, Local & Other Grants	1,427,696	1,710,154	1,803,654
Non-Operating Capital Contributions	10,562,681**	-	-
Total Sources	11,990,377	1,710,154	1,803,654

*As submitted in MTW Plan Amendment (prepared June 2009); final budget adopted March 2009.

** \$4,750,000 was received from Multnomah County in FY2010 for the Martha Washington Project. The funds are being held in reserve pending use for future Martha Washington costs.

Uses of Funds	Actual	Budget as Adopted	Preliminary Plan*
Housing Assistance Payments (STRA)	1,165,635	1,482,426	1,405,802
Administration	168,847	217,040	316,427
Tenant Services	65,866	10,500	10,500
Maintenance	7,665	-	-
Utilities	-	-	-
General	126	-	-
Other Personnel Expense	-	-	11,394
PH Subsidy Transfer	-	-	-
Central Office Cost Allocations	9,057	188	59,530
Capital Expenditures	5,812,681	-	-
Total Uses	7,229,877	1,710,154	1,803,654

*As submitted in MTW Plan Amendment (prepared June 2009); final budget adopted March 2009.

C. Sources & Uses of COCC (If Applicable):

Not applicable. HAP uses a cost allocation system.

D. Allocation Method for Central Office Costs

The Housing Authority of Portland has elected to use an allocation method for central office costs. We have a variety of administrative departments and have developed a method to allocate these departments based on the key drivers of expense. This methodology meets the requirements of OMB A-87.

The allocation method is as follows:

1. Level 1:
 - a. The cost of the administrative office building is allocated to the departments based on space occupied
2. Level 2:
 - a. The executive department is allocated equally to each of the operating groups
 - b. Human Resources, Purchasing and IT are allocated to the operating groups based on FTEs within the operating groups
 - c. Accounting and Finance is allocated to the operating groups based on a combination of operating expenses and fixed assets
3. Level 3:
 - a. Public Housing Administration as well as the central office allocations to public housing are then allocated to the properties based on units
 - b. Rent Assistance Administration (Housing Choice Vouchers and other Rent Assistance Programs) as well as the central office allocations to Rent Assistance are then allocated to the departments within this operating group based on vouchers
 - c. Resident Services Administration as well as the central office allocations to Resident Services are then allocated to the departments within this operating group based on operating expenses

Allocated overhead is reported separately from direct operating costs in the operating group financial reports. The allocations result in a net zero Net Operating Income/Loss for the administrative departments.

E. Uses of Single-Fund Flexibility

HAP currently uses fungibility within the Section 8 funding stream for activities such as agency-based assistance and measures to increase landlord participation, such as a landlord guarantee fund. HAP does not currently blend public housing and Section 8 funds.

VIII. Administrative

A. Correction of Observed Deficiencies

HUD did not visit HAP for an MTW review during FY2010.

The Rent Assistance Department had a HUD VMS Data Integrity Review in August 2009. The department had an outstanding audit with no findings.

Public Housing had full REAC inspections across the portfolio in 2009. On a 30-point scoring basis, the average inspection score was 25.4, which is considered passing.

B. Agency-Directed Evaluations, as applicable: N/A

C. Performance and Evaluation Report for Capital Fund activities not included in the MTW Block Grant See Appendix

D. Certifications See attached Board Resolution

Appendix

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
 Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
 Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Office of Public and Indian Housing
 OMB No. 2577-0226
 Expires 4/30/2011

Part I: Summary					
PHA Name: Housing Authority of Portland		Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: OR-16S00250109 Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: Date of CFFP:			FFY of Grant: 2009 FFY of Grant Approval:
Type of Grant <input type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised Annual Statement (revision no:1) <input type="checkbox"/> Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending: <input type="checkbox"/> Final Performance and Evaluation Report					
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost ¹	
		Original	Revised ²	Obligated	Expended
1	Total non-CFP Funds				
2	1406 Operations (may not exceed 20% of line 21) ³				
3	1408 Management Improvements				
4	1410 Administration (may not exceed 10% of line 21)	-0-	230,000		
5	1411 Audit				
6	1415 Liquidated Damages				
7	1430 Fees and Costs	758,188	387,523		
8	1440 Site Acquisition				
9	1450 Site Improvement	-0-	614,750		
10	1460 Dwelling Structures	5,243,419	4,812,491		
11	1465.1 Dwelling Equipment—Nonexpendable	-0-	69,917		
12	1470 Non-dwelling Structures				
13	1475 Non-dwelling Equipment				
14	1485 Demolition				
15	1492 Moving to Work Demonstration				
16	1495.1 Relocation Costs	266,132	153,058		
17	1499 Development Activities ⁴				

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.


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

³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.

⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report
 Capital Fund Program, Capital Fund Program Replacement Housing Factor and
 Capital Fund Financing Program

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 Office of Public and Indian Housing
 OMB No. 2577-0226
 Expires 4/30/2011

Part I: Summary						
PHA Name: Housing Authority of Portland		Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: OR- 16S00250109 Replacement Housing Factor Grant No: Date of CFFP:			FFY of Grant:2009 FFY of Grant Approval:	
Type of Grant <input type="checkbox"/> Original Annual Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Reserve for Disasters/Emergencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised Annual Statement (revision no: 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Performance and Evaluation Report for Period Ending: <input type="checkbox"/> Final Performance and Evaluation Report						
Line	Summary by Development Account	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost ¹		
		Original	Revised ²	Obligated	Expended	
18a	1501 Collateralization or Debt Service paid by the PHA					
18ba	9000 Collateralization or Debt Service paid Via System of Direct Payment					
19	1502 Contingency (may not exceed 8% of line 20)					
20	Amount of Annual Grant:: (sum of lines 2 - 19)	6,267,739	6,267,739			
21	Amount of line 20 Related to LBP Activities					
22	Amount of line 20 Related to Section 504 Activities					
23	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Soft Costs					
24	Amount of line 20 Related to Security - Hard Costs					
25	Amount of line 20 Related to Energy Conservation Measures					
Signature of Executive Director		Date		Signature of Public Housing Director		
		2-23-10				

¹ To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.
² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report or a Revised Annual Statement.
³ PHAs with under 250 units in management may use 100% of CFP Grants for operations.
⁴ RHF funds shall be included here.

Part II: Supporting Pages								
PHA Name: Housing Authority of Portland			Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: OR-16S00250109 CFFP (Yes/ No): Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			Federal FFY of Grant: 2009		
Development Number Name/PHA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Development Account No.	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Work
				Original	Revised ¹	Funds Obligated ²	Funds Expended ²	
Capital Fund Project wide Admin	Relocation Staff direct coding for projects Development Finance Construction Accounting Stimulus Coordinator Salary and Benefits for above positions	1410		-0-	230,000			
OR 2-21	Fir Acres		28					Listed in 5yr
	A&E services - Design, Drawings	1430		42,284	42,291			plan. Included in MTW amended plan for FY 2010
	Site Improvements - New wrought iron fencing, playground	1450		-0-	148,780			
	Comprehensive modernization kitchen and bathroom	1460		324,653	1,171,185			
	Appliances	1465.1		-0-	12,488			
	Window Treatments	1465.1		-0-	4,097			
	Tenant relocation cost for modernization	1495.1		14,842	5,199			
OR 2-21	Subtotal			381,779	1,384,040			Listed in 5yr
OR 2-22	Townhouse Terrace		30					plan. Included in MTW
	A&E service Design, Drawings	1430		195,852	57,626			amended plan for FY 2010
	Site Imp - new irrigation system	1450			145,677			
	Comprehensive modernization kitchen and bath	1460		319,510	982,839			
	Appliances	1465.1		-0-	2,336			
	Window Treatments	1465.1		-0-	16,497			
	Tenant relocation cost for modernization	1495.1		41,025	246			
OR 2-22	Subtotal			556,387	1,205,221			

Part II: Supporting Pages								
PHA Name: Housing Authority of Portland			Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: OR-16S00250109 CFFP (Yes/ No): Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			Federal FFY of Grant: 2009		
Development Number Name/PHA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Development Account No.	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Work
				Original	Revised ¹	Funds Obligated ²	Funds Expended ²	
OR 2-23	Stark Manor		30					Listed in 5yr
	A&E Services - Design, Drawings	1430		49,647	57,138			plan. Included in MTW amended plan for FY 2010
	Site Improv - Demolition, new trash enclosures	1450		-0-	215,194			
	Comprehensive modern Kitchn & Bath	1460		381,186	981,683			
	Appliances - Ranges	1465.1		-0-	12,000			
	Window Treatments	1465.1			8,897			
	Tenant relocation costs for modernization	1495.1		17,427	1,755			
OR 2-23	Subtotal			448,260	1,276,667			
OR 2-32	Camelia, Bel Park, Demar Downs		42					Listed in 5yr
	A&E Services - Design, Drawings	1430		104,498	71,427			plan. Included in MTW
	Site work - Overlay parking lots, new striping	1450		-0-	92,122			
	Site work - landscaping replacing diseased trees with new trees	1450		-0-	7,110			amended plan for FY 2010
	Comprehensive modernization Kitchen and Bath	1460		1,350,362	1,216,745			
	Appliances - ranges	1465.1		-0-	2,208			
	Window Treatments	1465.1		-0-	7,755			
	Tenant relocation costs for modernization	1495.1		39,920	59,822			
OR 2-32	Subtotal			1,494,780	1,457,189			

Part II: Supporting Pages								
PHA Name: Housing Authority of Portland		Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: OR - 16S00250109 CFFP (Yes/ No): Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			Federal FFY of Grant: 2009			
Development Number Name/PHA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Development Account No.	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Work
				Original	Revised ¹	Funds Obligated ²	Funds Expended ²	
OR 2-36	Winchell, Cora Park, Chateau		30					Listed in 5yr plan. Included
	A&E Services - Design, Drawings	1430		121,562	31,644			in MTW
	Site work - New fencing and landscaping	1450			5,867			amended plan
	Window Treatments	1465.1			3,639			for FY 2010
	Comprehensive interior modernization including kitchen,bath, replaced carpet in each unit, replace doors and hardware, painting, etc.	1460		991,660	199,687			
	Tenant relocation costs for modernization	1495.1		67,150	44,798			
OR 2-36	Subtotal			1,180,372	285,634			
OR 3-37	Alderwood, Powellhurst, Gallagher		139					Listed in 5yr plan. Included
	A&E Services - Design, Drawings	1430		208,453	70,418			in MTW
	Comprehensive interior modernization including kitchen, bath, resilient flooring, painting, new insulation, etc	1460		1,600,477	-0-			amended plan for FY 2010
	Tenant relocation costs for modernization	1495.1		73,169	41,238			
OR 3-37	Subtotal			1,882,099	111,656			
OR 2-51	Tillicum North, Tillicum South		30					Listed in 5yr plan. Included
	A&E Services - Design, Drawings	1430		21,161	23,921			in MTW
	Comprehensive exterior renovation includes replacing window sills, replace wood siding.	1460		162,471	-0-			amended plan for FY 2010
	Tenant relocation costs for modernization	1495.1		7,428	-0-			
OR 2-51	Subtotal			191,060	23,921			

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

² To be completed for the Performance and Evaluation Report.

Part II: Supporting Pages								
PHA Name: Housing Authority of Portland		Grant Type and Number Capital Fund Program Grant No: OR-16S00250109 CFFP (Yes/ No): Replacement Housing Factor Grant No:			Federal FFY of Grant: 2009			
Development Number Name/PHA-Wide Activities	General Description of Major Work Categories	Development Account No.	Quantity	Total Estimated Cost		Total Actual Cost		Status of Work
				Original	Revised ¹	Funds Obligated ²	Funds Expended ²	
OR 2-52	Hunter's Run, Harold Lee		20					Listed in 5yr plan. Included
	A&E Services - Design, Drawings	1430		14,731	23,536			in MTW amended plan for FY 2010
	Comprehensive exterior renovation includes replacing window sills, replace wood siding.	1460		113,100	-0-			
	Tenant relocation cost for modernization	1495.1		5,171	-0-			
OR 2-52	Subtotal			133,002	23,536			Listed in 5yr plan. Included
OR 2-42	Celilo Court							in MTW amended plan for FY 2010
	A&E Services - Design, Drawings	1430		-0-	9,522			
	Comprehensive interior renovation includes replace underlayment and floor tile, replace kitchen and laundry cabinets and countertops, etc	1460		-0-	260,352			
OR 2-42	Subtotal			-0-	269,874			
Grand Total								
				-0-	230,000			
				758,188	387,523			
				-0-	614,750			
				5,243,419	4,812,491			
				-0-	69,917			
				266,132	153,058			

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



DATE: June 15, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners

FROM: Michael Buonocore, Assistant Director, Policy and Planning

SUBJECT: Resolution 10-06-02 authorizes the Housing Authority of Portland (HAP) to submit the MTW Eleventh-Year Annual Report, with certifications, to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

The Board of Commissioners is requested to authorize HAP to submit the MTW Eleventh-Year Annual Report, with certifications, to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This year's report corresponds to HAP's fiscal year 2010.

Background

As a housing authority with the MTW designation, HAP is obligated to submit an annual report detailing its progress toward objectives proposed in its prior year's annual MTW plan. This year's report follows the format prescribed in HAP's new 10-year agreement with HUD, which requires certifications to ensure the agency serves primarily the same population of people as it would absent the MTW flexibility. These are incorporated in the resolution.

Conclusion/Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the attached resolution.



RESOLUTION 10-06-02

RESOLUTION 10-06-02 AUTHORIZES THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PORTLAND (HAP) STAFF TO SUBMIT THE MOVING TO WORK (MTW) ELEVENTH YEAR ANNUAL REPORT, WITH CERTIFICATIONS, TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD)

WHEREAS, HAP is obligated by its MTW agreement with HUD to submit an annual report detailing its progress toward objectives proposed in its prior year's annual MTW plan; and

WHEREAS, as part of its MTW reporting obligation, HAP certifies that more than 75% of families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families; that it continues to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served without MTW; and that it maintains a comparable mix of families as would have been served had the agency not participated in the MTW demonstration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority of Portland that staff is directed to submit this approved Moving to Work Eleventh Year Annual Report to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Adopted: June 15, 2010

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PORTLAND

Attest: 
Steven D. Rudman, Secretary


Lee E. Moore, Sr., Chair