

APPENDIX 2

MASS SUB-INDICATORS, COMPONENTS AND GRADING

Sub-Indicator #1, Vacant Unit Turnaround Time

This sub-indicator measures the annual average amount of time it takes a PHA to turn around its vacant units. Implicit in this sub-indicator is the adequacy of a PHA's system to track the duration of vacant unit turnaround, including down time, make ready time and lease up time.

For the calculation of this sub-indicator, the following three categories of units that are not considered available for occupancy, will be completely excluded from the computation:

1. Units approved for non-dwelling use;
2. Employee occupied units; and
3. Vacant units approved for deprogramming (i.e., demolition, disposition, or units that have been combined).

Vacant units approved for deprogramming exist when a PHA's application for the demolition and/or disposition of public housing units has received written approval from HUD; or when a PHA's application to combine/convert has received written approval from HUD.

For the calculation of vacant unit turnaround time, the vacancy days for units in the following categories shall be exempted:

1. Vacant units undergoing modernization.
 - A. Only vacancy days associated with a vacant unit that meets the condition of being a unit undergoing modernization will be exempted when calculating vacant unit turnaround time. Neither vacancy days associated with a vacant unit prior to that unit meeting the condition of being a unit undergoing modernization nor vacancy days associated with a vacant unit after construction work has been completed or after the time period for placing the vacant unit under construction has expired shall be exempted.
 - B. The following apply when computing time periods for a vacant unit undergoing modernization:
 - If a unit is vacant prior to being included in a HUD-approved modernization budget, those vacancy days that had accumulated prior to the unit being included in the modernization budget must be included as non-exempted vacancy days in the calculation.
 - The calculation of turnaround time for newly modernized units starts when the unit is turned over to the PHA from the contractor and ends when the lease is effective for the

new or returning resident. Thus, the total turnaround time would be the sum of the pre-modernization vacancy time, and the post-modernization vacancy time.

- Unit-by-unit documentation, showing the date a vacant unit was included in a HUD-approved modernization budget, the date it was released to the PHA by the contractor and the date a new lease is effective for the new or returning resident, or the date the time period for placing the vacant unit under construction expired.
2. Units vacant due to circumstances and actions beyond a PHA's control. Such actions and circumstances may include:
- Litigation, such as a court order or settlement agreement that is legally enforceable. An example would be units that are required to remain vacant because of fire or police investigations, coroner's seal, or as part of a court-ordered or HUD-approved desegregation effort.
 - Laws, federal or, when not preempted federal requirements, state law of general applicability or their implementing regulations. This category does not include units vacant only because they do not meet minimum housing and building code standards pertaining to construction or habitability under federal, state, or local laws or regulations, except when these code violations are caused for reasons beyond the control of the PHA, rather than as a result of management and/or maintenance failures by the PHA.

Examples of exempted units under this category are vacant units that are documented to be uninhabitable for reasons beyond the PHA's control due to high/unsafe levels of hazardous/toxic materials (i.e., lead-based paint or asbestos), by order of the local health department or directive of the Environmental Protection Agency, where the conditions causing the order are beyond the control of the PHA; and units kept vacant because they become structurally unsound (i.e., buildings damaged by shrinking/swelling subsoil or similar situations).

Other examples are: vacant units in which resident property has been abandoned, but only if state law requires the property to be left in the unit for some period of time, and only for the period stated in the law; vacant units required to remain vacant because for fire or police investigation; coroner's seal; or court order.

- Changing market conditions. Examples of units in this category are small PHAs that are located in areas experiencing population loss or economic dislocations that face a lack of demand in the foreseeable future, even after the PHA has taken aggressive marketing and outreach measures. Where a PHA claims extraordinary market conditions, the PHA will be expected: to document the market conditions to which it refers (the examples of changing population base and competing project are the simplest); the explicit efforts that the PHA has made to address those conditions; the likelihood that those conditions will be mitigated or eliminated in the near future; and why the market conditions are such that the PHA is prevented from occupying, selling, demolishing, rehabilitation, reconstructing, consolidating or modernizing the vacant units.

In order to justify the adjustment, the PHA will need to document the specific market conditions that exist and document marketing and outreach efforts. The PHA will need to: describe when the downturn in market conditions occurred; the location(s) of the unit(s) effected; the likelihood that these circumstances will be mitigated or eliminated in the near term; and why the market conditions are such that the PHA is prevented from occupying, selling, demolishing, rehabilitation, reconstructing, consolidating or modernizing the vacant units.

- Natural disasters. These are vacant units that are documented to be uninhabitable because of damage suffered as a result of natural disasters such as floods, earthquakes, hurricanes, tornadoes, etc. In the case of a natural disaster claim, the PHA would be expected to point to a proclamation by the president or the governor that the county or other local area in question has, in fact, been declared a disaster area.
- Casualty losses. Vacant units that have sustained casualty damage and are pending resolution of insurance claims or settlements, but only until the insurance claim is adjusted, (i.e., funds to repair the unit are received). The vacancy days exempted are those included in the period of time between the casualty loss and the receipt of funds from the insurer to cover the loss, in whole or in part.

A PHA must maintain at least the following documentation to support its determination of vacancy days associated with units vacant due to circumstances and actions beyond the PHA's control:

- The date on which the unit met the condition of being a unit vacant due to circumstances and actions beyond the PHA's control.
- Documentation identifying the specific conditions that distinguish the unit as a unit vacant due to circumstances and actions beyond the PHA's control.
- The actions taken by the PHA to eliminate or mitigate these conditions.
- The date on which the unit ceased to meet such conditions and became an available unit.
- This supporting documentation is subject to review and may be requested for verification purposes at any time by HUD.

Criteria for Scoring Vacant Unit Turnaround Time

Grade	Average Turnaround Days
A	The average number of calendar days between the time when a unit is vacated and a new lease takes effect, for units re-occupied during the PHA's assessed fiscal year, is less than or equal to 20 calendar days.
B	The average number of calendar days between the time when a unit is vacated and a new lease takes effect, for units re-occupied during the PHA's assessed fiscal year, is greater than 20 calendar days and less than or equal to 25 calendar days.
C	The average number of calendar days between the time when a unit is vacated and a new lease takes effect, for units re-occupied during the PHA's assessed fiscal year, is greater than 25 calendar days and less than or equal to 30 calendar days.
D	The average number of calendar days between the time when a unit is vacated and a new lease takes effect, for units re-occupied during the PHA's assessed fiscal year, is greater than 30 calendar days and less than or equal to 40 calendar days.
E	The average number of calendar days between the time when a unit is vacated and a new lease takes effect, for units re-occupied during the PHA's assessed fiscal year, is greater than 50 calendar days and less than or equal to 50 calendar days.
F	The average number of calendar days between the time when a unit is vacated and a new lease takes effect, for units re-occupied during the PHA's assessed fiscal year, is greater than 50 calendar days OR actual turnaround days = 0 due to no available data.

Sub-Indicator #2, Capital Fund

This sub-indicator examines the amount of unexpended funds over three federal fiscal years (FFYs) old; the timeliness of fund obligation; the adequacy of contract administration; the quality of the physical work; and the adequacy of budget controls. Implicit in this sub-indicator is the adequacy of a PHA's system to track the obligation and expenditure of funds, the procurement process and contract administration, the resolution of findings related to this sub-indicator, and the budget process.

Components #1, #2, #3, #4 and #5 apply to:

➤ Replacement Housing Factor (RHF) funds

- Capital Fund Program (CFP)
- Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)

Components #3, #4 and #5 apply to HOPE VI.

Component #1, Unexpended Funds Over Three FFYs Old

This component measures unexpended funds over three FFYs old, and not the PHA's fiscal years (FYs). The FFY runs from October 1 to September 30. This applies to Capital Fund/modernization and/or grant programs awarded to the PHA that are more than three FFYs old and the funding that has not been expended. This component applies to the CFP, CGP and RHF programs.

Criteria for Scoring Component #1, Unexpended Funds Over Three FFYs Old

Grade	Unexpended Funds Over Three FFYs Old
A	<p>The PHA has no unexpended funds over three FFYs old or is able to demonstrate one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unexpended funds are leftover funds and will be recaptured after audit; • There are no unexpended funds pass the original HUD-approved implementation schedule deadline that allowed longer than three FFYs; or • The PHA extended the time within 30 calendar days after the expenditure deadline and the time extension is based on reasons outside of the PHA's control, such as need to use leftover funds, unforeseen delays in contracting or contract administration, litigation, material shortages, or other non-PHA institutional delay.
F	<p>The PHA has unexpended funds over three FFYs old and is unable to demonstrate any of the above three conditions; or the PHA requests HUD approval of a time extension based on reasons within the PHA's control.</p>

Component #2, Timeliness of Fund Obligation

This component is similar to component #1 in that fund obligation is measured by FFYs and not by the PHA's FYs. This component applies to the CFP, CGP and RHF programs.

Criteria for Scoring Component #2, Timeliness of Fund Obligation

Grade	Timeliness of Fund Obligation
A	<p>The PHA has no unobligated funds over two FFYs old, or is able to demonstrate one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no unobligated funds past the original HUD-approved implementation schedule deadline that allowed longer than two FFYs; or • The PHA has extended the time within 30 calendar days after the obligation deadline and the time extension is based on reasons outside of the PHA's control, such as need to use leftover funds, unforeseen delays in contracting or contract administration, litigation, material shortages, or other non-PHA institutional delays.
F	<p>The PHA has unobligated funds over two FFYs old and is unable to demonstrate either of the above two conditions; or the PHA requests HUD approval of a time extension based on reasons within the PHA's control.</p>

Component #3, Adequacy of Contract Administration

This component measures the PHA's ability to adequately manage contract administration for funded program(s). It also measures progress in correcting findings in contract administration, based on findings from the latest on-site review and/or audit, where a written report was provided to the PHA at least 75 days prior to the PHA's fiscal year end. "Finding" means a violation of the statute, regulation, ACC, or other HUD requirements in the areas of contract administration. Contract administration refers to all aspects of Capital Fund/modernization and/or grant programs that have specific program requirements and has construction contracting. This component applies to the CFP, CGP, RHF and HOPE VI programs.

Criteria for Scoring Component #3, Adequacy of Contract Administration:

Grade	Adequacy of Contract Administration
A	<p>Based on HUD's latest on-site inspection and/or audit, where a written report was provided to the PHA at least 75 days before the end of the PHA's fiscal year, there were no findings related to contract administration or the PHA has corrected all such findings.</p>
C	<p>Based on HUD's latest on-site inspection and/or audit, where a written report was provided to the PHA at least 75 days before the end of the PHA's fiscal year, there were findings related to contract administration and the PHA is in the process of correcting all such findings.</p>

Grade	Adequacy of Contract Administration
F	Based on HUD's latest on-site inspection and/or audit, where a written report was provided to the PHA at least 75 days before the end of the PHA's fiscal year, there were findings related to contract administration and the PHA has failed to initiate corrective action or those actions which have been initiated have not resulted in progress toward remedying all of the findings.

Component #4, Quality of the Physical Work

This component evaluates the quality of physical work for funded program(s). It measures performance based on the PHA's FYE, rather than on the FFY that was used for components #1 and #2. This component applies to the CFP, CGP, RHF and HOPE VI programs.

Criteria for Scoring Component #4, Quality of the Physical Work

Grade	Quality of the Physical Work
A	Based on HUD's latest on-site inspection, where a written report was provided to the PHA at least 75 calendar days before the end of the PHA's fiscal year, there were no findings related to the quality of the physical work or the PHA has corrected all such findings.
C	Based on HUD's latest on-site inspection, where a written report was provided to the PHA at least 75 calendar days before the end of the PHA's fiscal year, there were findings related to the quality of the physical work and the PHA is in the process of correcting all such findings.
F	Based on HUD's latest on-site inspection, where a written report was provided to the PHA at least 75 calendar days before the end of the PHA's fiscal year, there were no findings related to the quality of the physical work and the PHA has failed to initiate corrective actions for all such findings or those actions which have been initiated have not resulted in progress toward remedying all of the findings.

Component #5, Adequacy of Budget Controls

This component evaluates the adequacy of a PHA's budget controls and expenditures for funded programs for the fiscal year being assessed. It measures performance based on the PHA's FYE, rather than on the FFY that was used for components #1 and #2. This component applies to the CFP, CGP, RHF and HOPE VI programs.

Criteria for Scoring Component #5, Adequacy of Budget Controls

Grade	Adequacy of Budget Controls
A	The PHA has expended Capital Funds only on work in a HUD-approved budget or PHA Annual and 5-Year Plans, excluding emergencies, or has obtained prior HUD approval for required budget revisions.
F	The PHA has expended Capital Funds on work that was not in a HUD-approved budget or PHA Annual and 5-Year Plans, excluding emergencies, and did not obtain prior HUD approval for required budget revisions.

Sub-Indicator #3, Work Orders

This sub-indicator examines the adequacy of a PHA's performance with regard to completing maintenance work items as measured by its work order system. The sub-indicator evaluates how a PHA controls its active work orders as well as the timeliness of completion of work orders. Any work order active within the assessed year is included in the count regardless of when it was received or completed. It also examines any progress a PHA had made during the preceding three years to reduce the period of time required to complete maintenance work orders. Implicit in this sub-indicator is the adequacy of the PHA's work order system in terms of how a PHA accounts for and controls its work orders, and its timeliness in preparing/issuing work orders.

Work orders in the following three categories are included in the assessment for the fiscal year being assessed.

- Work orders received in the prior assessed year and completed in the current assessed year.
- Work orders received and completed within the current assessed year.
- Work orders received and not completed before the end of the current assessed year.

A PHA may have several priorities and/or classifications of work orders. However, it should be clearly defined as to whether a work order is an emergency work order or a non-emergency work order, regardless of a work order's priority and/or classification.

Component #1, Emergency Work Orders

Emergency work orders address an immediate threat to life, health and safety to property or to the resident, or are related to fire safety. Examples include, but are not limited to, an unhealthy or undrinkable water supply, gas leak, broken/blocked sanitary sewer line, failed heating system, hazardous electrical system, uninhabitable unit as a result of a fire, and situations causing an exposure to asbestos, lead-based paint, or other toxic materials.

Criteria for Scoring Emergency Work Orders

Grade	Emergency Work Orders
A	At least 99% of emergency work orders were completed or the emergency was abated within 24 hours or less during the PHA's immediate past fiscal year.
B	At least 98% of emergency work orders were completed or the emergency was abated within 24 hours or less during the PHA's immediate past fiscal year.
C	At least 97% of emergency work orders were completed or the emergency was abated within 24 hours or less during the PHA's immediate past fiscal year.
D	At least 96% of emergency work orders were completed or the emergency was abated within 24 hours or less during the PHA's immediate past fiscal year.
E	At least 95% of emergency work orders were completed or the emergency was abated within 24 hours or less during the PHA's immediate past fiscal year.
F	Less than 95% of emergency work orders were completed or the emergency was abated within 24 hours or less during the PHA's immediate past fiscal year.

Component #2, Non-Emergency Work Orders

A non-emergency work order measures the average number of calendar days for a PHA to complete non-emergency work orders. Non-emergency work orders are issued to correct conditions that do not pose an immediate threat to life, health and safety to property or to the resident, or are not related to fire safety.

This includes work orders generated in response to resident or staff reports of a repair requirement and/or preventive maintenance work orders. It also includes work orders resulting from annual inspections using the Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS) for public housing. However, cyclical work orders (mopping the halls, grounds care tasks, cleaning gutters), work deferred for modernization and vacant unit preparation ARE NOT INCLUDED.

Criteria for Scoring Non-Emergency Work Orders

Grade	Non-Emergency Work Orders
A	All non-emergency work orders were completed within an average of 25 calendar days.
B	All non-emergency work orders were completed within an average of greater than 25 calendar days and less than or equal to 30 calendar days.

Grade	Non-Emergency Work Orders
C	<p>The PHA is in one of the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All non-emergency work orders were completed within an average of greater than 30 calendar days and less than or equal to 40 calendar days, OR • The PHA has reduced the average time it takes to complete non-emergency work orders by at least 15 calendar days during the past three years.
D	<p>The PHA is in one of the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All non-emergency work orders were completed within an average of greater than 40 calendar days and less than or equal to 50 calendar days, OR • The PHA has reduced the average time it takes to complete non-emergency work orders by at least 10 calendar days during the past three years.
E	<p>The PHA is in one of the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All non-emergency work orders were completed within an average of greater than 50 calendar days and less than or equal to 60 calendar days, OR • The PHA has reduced the average time it takes to complete non-emergency work orders by at least 5 calendar days during the past three years.
F	<p>The PHA is in one of the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All non-emergency work orders were completed within an average of greater than 60 calendar days, OR • The PHA has not reduced the average time it takes to complete non-emergency work orders by at least 5 calendar days during the past three years.
<p>Note: For this component, the PHA will receive the highest score for either the average number of completion days or reduction in calendar days during the past three years.</p>	

Sub-Indicator #4, Annual Inspection of Units and Systems

This sub-indicator examines units and systems inspected annually using the Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS) in order to determine short-term maintenance needs and long-term modernization need. Implicit in this sub-indicator is the adequacy of the PHA's inspection program in terms of the quality of a PHA's inspections, and how a PHA tracks both inspections and needed repairs. All units and space shall be inspected. This includes units used for non-dwelling purposes, those occupied by an employee and those used for resident services.

The PHA is required to document that it has analyzed the local code and compared it to the UPCS. This narrative comparison must specifically identify those sections of local code that are more stringent than UPCS. The PHA should also include local code requirements that are not present in UPCS. The inspection form used by the PHA must be annotated to include the standard from the local code in each case where it is more stringent. If there is no local code, it is recommended that the PHA get a letter from the local jurisdiction (County or City) stating that

fact. Keep that letter or the narrative analysis in the PHA PHAS file as documentation for a minimum of three years.

Component #1, Annual Inspection of Dwelling Units

While HUD does not prescribe a specific format for the inspection of dwelling units, PHAs are required to inspect all units that are not specifically exempted under this sub-indicator, using the Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS). Units in the following categories are exempted and not included in the calculation of the total number of units and the number and percentage of units inspected.

1. Occupied units where the PHA has made two documented attempts to inspect, but only if the PHA can document that appropriate legal action (up to and including eviction of the legal or illegal occupant(s)) has been taken under provisions of the lease to ensure that the unit can be subsequently inspected.
2. Units vacant for the full immediate past fiscal year for the following reasons:
 - Vacant units that are undergoing section 9(d) capital funding.
 - Units vacant for the full immediate past fiscal year that are documented to be uninhabitable for reasons beyond the PHA's control due to high/unsafe levels of hazardous/toxic materials, by order of the local health department or a directive from the Environmental Protection Agency, natural disasters, and units that became structurally unsound.

Criteria for Scoring Annual Inspection of Dwelling Units

Grade	Annual Inspection of Dwelling Units
A	The PHA inspected 100% of its units and, if repairs were necessary for local code or UPCS compliance, either completed the repairs during the inspection; issued work orders for the repairs; or referred similar work items to the current year's Capital Fund Program, or to next year's Capital Fund Program if there were less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was completed.
B	The PHA inspected less than 100% but at least 97% of its units and, if repairs were necessary for local code or UPCS compliance, either completed the repairs during the inspection; issued work orders for the repairs; or referred similar work items to the current year's Capital Fund Program, or to next year's Capital Fund Program if there were less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was completed.

Grade	Annual Inspection of Dwelling Units
C	The PHA inspected less than 97% but at least 95% of its units and, if repairs were necessary for local code or UPCS compliance, either completed the repairs during the inspection; issued work orders for the repairs; or referred similar work items to the current year's Capital Fund Program, or to next year's Capital Fund Program if there were less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was completed.
D	The PHA inspected less than 95% but at least 93% of its units and, if repairs were necessary for local code or UPCS compliance, either completed the repairs during the inspection; issued work orders for the repairs; or referred similar work items to the current year's Capital Fund Program, or to next year's Capital Fund Program if there were less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was completed.
E	The PHA inspected less than 93% but at least 90% of its units and, if repairs were necessary for local code or UPCS compliance, either completed the repairs during the inspection; issued work orders for the repairs; or referred similar work items to the current year's Capital Fund Program, or to next year's Capital Fund Program if there were less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was completed.
F	The PHA has failed to inspect at least 90% of its units and, or failed to correct deficiencies during the inspection or issue work orders for the repairs; or failed to refer similar work items to the current year's Capital Fund Program, or to next year's Capital Fund Program if there were less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was completed.

Component #2, Annual Inspection of Systems (Including Common Areas and Non-Dwelling Space)

The purpose of this component is to ensure that, in addition to the annual inspection of individual dwelling units, PHAs are also annually inspecting and maintaining the major systems, including common areas and non-dwelling space, that are essential to decent, safe and sanitary housing. Systems that are a part of individual dwelling units that are exempted, or a part of a building where all of the dwelling units in the building are exempted, are also exempted from the calculation of this component. In order to complete this component, the PHA should have available its written Maintenance Plan.

This component examines: the inspection of building and sites according to the PHA's Maintenance Plan; performing the required maintenance on structures and systems in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications and established local/PHA standards; issuing work orders for maintenance/repairs; or including identified deficiencies in the current year's Capital Fund/modernization program, or in the next year's Capital Fund/modernization program if there are less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was performed.

Criteria for Scoring Annual Inspection of Systems

Grade	Annual Inspection of Systems
A	The PHA inspected all major systems at 100% of its buildings and sites, according to its Maintenance Plan. The inspection included performing the required maintenance on structures and systems in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and established local/PHA standards, or issuing work orders for maintenance/repairs, or including identified deficiencies in the current year's CFP, or in next year's CFP if there are less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was performed.
B	The PHA inspected all major systems of at least a minimum of 90% but less than 100% of its buildings and sites, according to its Maintenance Plan. The inspection included performing the required maintenance on structures and systems in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and established local/PHA code standards, or issuing work orders for maintenance/repairs, or including identified deficiencies in the current year's CFP, or in next year's CFP if there are less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was performed.
C	The PHA inspected all major systems of at least a minimum of 80% but less than 90% of its buildings and sites, according to its Maintenance Plan. The inspection included performing the required maintenance on structures and systems in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and established local/PHA code standards, or issuing work orders for maintenance/repairs, or including identified deficiencies in the current year's CFP, or in next year's CFP if there are less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was performed.
D	The PHA inspected all major systems of at least a minimum of 70% but less than 80% of its buildings and sites, according to its Maintenance Plan. The inspection included performing the required maintenance on structures and systems in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and established local/PHA code standards, or issuing work orders for maintenance/repairs, or including identified deficiencies in the current year's CFP, or in next year's CFP if there are less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was performed.

Grade	Annual Inspection of Systems
E	The PHA inspected all major systems of at least a minimum of 60% but less than 70% of its buildings and sites, according to its Maintenance Plan. The inspection included performing the required maintenance on structures and systems in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and established local/PHA code standards, or issuing work orders for maintenance/repairs, or including identified deficiencies in the current year's CFP, or in next year's CFP if there are less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was performed.
F	The PHA failed to inspect all major systems of at least a minimum of 60% its buildings and sites and perform the required maintenance on these systems in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and established local/PHA code standards, or did not issue work orders for maintenance/repairs, or did not include identified deficiencies in the current year's CFP, or in next year's CFP if there are less than three months remaining before the end of the PHA fiscal year when the inspection was performed.

Sub-Indicator #5, Security

This sub-indicator evaluates a PHA's performance in tracking crime-related problems in its developments; reporting incidences of crime to local law enforcement agencies; the adoption and implementation, consistent with section 9 of the of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, (42 U.S.C. 1437 d (r)), of applicant screening and resident eviction policies and procedures and other anticrime strategies. It also measures a PHA's performance under any HUD drug prevention and/or crime reduction grants. PHAs may get credit for their performance under non-HUD funded programs, if they choose to be assessed for these programs. Implicit in this sub-indicator is the adequacy of the PHA's systems to track activity under each of the four components.

Component #1, Tracking and Reporting Crime-Related Problems

This component examines a PHA's performance in tracking crime and crime-related problems in its developments and reporting the incidents of crime to local police authorities. The PHA has a cooperative system with the local police authorities for tracking and reporting incidents of crime to local police authorities to improve law enforcement and crime prevention.

Criteria for Scoring Tracking and Reporting Crime-Related Problems

Grade	Tracking and Reporting Crime-Related Problems
A	The Board, by resolution, has adopted policies and the PHA has implemented procedures and can document that it: Tracks crime and crime-related problems in at least 90% of its developments; Has a cooperative system for tracking and reporting incidents of crime to local police authorities to improve law enforcement and crime prevention; and Coordinates with local government officials and its residents on the implementation of anticrime strategies.
C	The Board, by resolution, has adopted policies and the PHA has implemented procedures and can document that it: Tracks crime and crime-related problems in at least 60% of its developments; and Has a cooperative system for tracking and reporting incidents of crime to local police authorities to improve law enforcement and crime prevention.
F	The Board, by resolution, has not adopted policies and the PHA has not implemented procedures or cannot document that it: Tracks crime and crime-related problems in at least 60% of its developments; or Has a cooperative system for tracking and reporting incidents of crime to local police authorities to improve law enforcement and crime prevention.

Component #2, Screening of Applicants

This component measures whether a PHA has formally adopted applicant screening policies and procedures and can document that it denies admission to an applicant who:

- Has a recent history of criminal activity involving crime to persons or property;
- Was evicted because of drug-related activity from assisted housing within the last three years, unless the applicant has successfully completed a rehabilitation program approved by the PHA;
- The PHA has reason to believe is illegally using a controlled substance, or engages in any drug-related activity on or off PHA property; or
- The PHA has reason to believe is abusing alcohol, which interferes with the health, safety or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents.

Each PHA must develop and implement its own screening policies and procedures. Each PHA must document that it appropriately screens applicants based on the above criteria.

The date that the PHA Board adopted the current screening policies that reflect the applicable criteria must be prior to the PHA’s fiscal year end date. The date that the PHA Board implemented the current screening procedures that reflect the applicable criteria must be prior to the PHA’s fiscal year end date. If a PHA has adopted screening policies and implemented screening procedures that reflect the applicable criteria prior to the PHA’s fiscal year end date, but the PHA did not deny admissions to applicants because none of the applicants met the applicable criteria, then the PHA should answer “Yes” to Element S10700. A PHA should not be penalized because none of its applicants met the applicable criteria.

Criteria for Scoring Screening of Applicants

Grade	Screening of Applicants
A	The PHA Board, by resolution, has adopted policies and the PHA has implemented procedures and can document that it successfully screens out and denies admission to a public housing applicant who: A) Has a recent history of criminal activity involving crime to persons or property; B) Was evicted because of drug-related activity from assisted housing within the last three years, unless the applicant has successfully completed a rehabilitation program approved by the PHA; C) The PHA has reason to believe is illegally using a controlled substance, or engages in any drug-related activity on or off PHA property; or The PHA has reason to believe is abusing alcohol, which interferes with the health, safety or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents.
C	The PHA Board, by resolution, has adopted policies and the PHA has implemented procedures, but cannot document results in successfully screening out and denying admission to a public housing applicant who meets the criteria as described in grade A, above.
F	The PHA has not adopted policies or has not implemented procedures that result in screening out and denying admission to a public housing applicant who meets the criteria as described in grade A, above, or the screening procedures do not result in the denial of admission to a public housing applicant who meets the criteria as described in grade A, above.

Component #3, Lease Enforcement

This component measures whether a PHA has formally adopted policies and implemented procedures to evict residents who the PHA has reasonable cause to believe:

- Engage in criminal activity that threatens the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents or PHA personnel;

- Engage in any drug related criminal activity on or off of the PHA property; or
- Abuse alcohol in a way that interferes with the health, safety, and peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents or PHA personnel.

The PHA must develop and implement its own eviction policies and procedures. Each PHA must document that it appropriately evicts residents based on the above criteria.

The date that the PHA Board adopted the current eviction policies that reflect the applicable criteria must be prior to the PHA's fiscal year end date. The date that the PHA Board implemented the current eviction procedures that reflect the applicable criteria must be prior to the PHA's fiscal year end date. If a PHA has adopted eviction policies and implemented eviction procedures that reflect the applicable criteria prior to the PHA's fiscal year end date, but the PHA did not evict residents because none of the residents met the applicable criteria, then the PHA should answer, "Yes" to Element S11100. A PHA should not be penalized because none of its residents met the applicable criteria.

Criteria for Scoring Lease Enforcement

Grade	Lease Enforcement
A	The PHA Board, by resolution, has adopted policies and the PHA has implemented procedures and can document that it appropriately evicts any public housing resident who: A) Engage in criminal activity that threatens the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents or PHA personnel; B) Engage in any drug related criminal activity on or off of the PHA property; or Abuse alcohol in a way that interferes with the health, safety, and peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents or PHA personnel.
C	The PHA Board, by resolution, has adopted policies and the PHA has implemented procedures, but cannot document results in appropriately evicting any public housing resident who meets the criteria as described in grade A, above.
F	The PHA Board has not adopted policies or has not implemented procedures that document results in the eviction of any public housing resident who meets the criteria as described in grade A, above, or the eviction procedures do not result in the eviction of public housing residents who meet the criteria as described in grade A, above.

Component #4, Grant Program Goals

This component examines the PHA's management of HUD-funded programs. The PHA may self-certify to HUD-funded and non-HUD funded programs, or only to the HUD-funded programs. This component measures whether or not the PHA has ESTABLISHED a drug

prevention and/or crime reduction program, identified and set GOALS and CAN DOCUMENT that it is meeting its goals under the requisite plan(s). Please remember to include only the number of goals to be accomplished in the year being assessed.

Non HUD-funded program reporting is voluntary; the PHA does NOT have to be assessed on non HUD-funded programs. There is no penalty for opting not to be assessed on these programs. If the PHA does not have any non HUD-funded programs, there is no penalty. The number of documented program goals that are related to drug prevention and/or crime reduction are the number of goals that are scheduled for completion in the fiscal year being assessed. The number of program goals should not include goals accomplished in the prior fiscal year or scheduled for completion in the next fiscal year. The number of goals that the PHA can document it met under the implementation plan(s) for all programs should only be the number of goals met that were scheduled to be met in the fiscal year being assessed. The number of program goals should not include goals accomplished in the prior fiscal year or scheduled for completion in the next fiscal year.

PHAs must have and maintain several years of comparative drug prevention and/or crime reduction statistics. Using these statistics against the baseline can show how the program goals are directly related. Ultimately, there should be some correlation between the decline in the drug and crime rates AND the successful achievement of the program goals.

Criteria for Scoring Grant Program Goals

Grade	Grant Program Goals
A	If the PHA has any special drug prevention program or crime reduction program that is HUD-funded or non-HUD funded, the PHA can document that the goals are related to drug and crime rates, and it is meeting at least 90% of its goals under the implementation plan for any and all of these programs.
B	If the PHA has any special drug prevention program or crime reduction program that is HUD-funded or non-HUD funded, the PHA can document that the goals are related to drug and crime rates, and it is meeting at least 60% of its goals under the implementation plan for any and all of these programs.
C	If the PHA has any special drug prevention program or crime reduction program that is HUD-funded or non-HUD funded, the PHA does not have a system for documenting or cannot document that the goals are related to drug and crime rates, or cannot document that it is meeting 60% or more of its goals under the implementation plan for any and all of these programs.

Sub-Indicator #6, Economic Self-Sufficiency

This sub-indicator examines PHA management of HUD-funded, and/or non-HUD funded, ESS programs. This component measures whether the PHA has established ESS program goals and can document that it is meeting the goals under the plan(s).

PHAs must select either to be assessed for all or none of the non-HUD funded programs. This is voluntary; the PHA does NOT have to be assessed on the non-HUD funded programs. There is no penalty for opting not to be assessed. Also, if the PHA does not have any non- HUD funded programs, there is no penalty. The number of documented program goals that are related to ESS should only be the number of goals that are scheduled to be met in the fiscal year being assessed. The number of program goals should not include goals accomplished in the prior fiscal year or scheduled to be accomplished in the next fiscal year. The number of goals that the PHA can document it met under the implementation plan(s) for any and all programs should only be the number of goals met that were scheduled to be met in the fiscal year being assessed. The number of program goals should not include goals accomplished in the prior fiscal year or scheduled to be accomplished in the next fiscal year.

PHAs must have comparative ESS statistics over time, against a baseline, that can be used to show how the program goals are directly related. Ultimately, there should be some correlation between the increase in the number of residents that participate in programs and achieve ESS AND the successful achievement of the program goals.

Criteria for Scoring Economic Self-Sufficiency

Grade	Economic Self-Sufficiency
A	If the PHA has any economic self-sufficiency program that is HUD-funded or non-HUD funded, the PHA can document that the goals are related to economic self-sufficiency, and it is meeting at least 90% of its goals under the implementation plan for any and all of these programs.
C	If the PHA has any economic self-sufficiency program that is HUD-funded or non-HUD funded, the PHA can document that the goals are related to economic self-sufficiency, and it is meeting at least 60% of its goals under the implementation plan for any and all of these programs.
F	If the PHA has any economic self-sufficiency program that is HUD-funded or non-HUD funded, the PHA does not have a system for documenting or cannot document that the goals are related to economic self-sufficiency, or cannot document that it is meeting 60% or more of its goals under the implementation plan for any and all of these programs.