

Making Transitions Work

Annual Report

FISCAL YEAR 2014

(July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014)

Submitted on September 30, 2014



OHA's Resident Leadership Center provides a professional workspace for resident leaders.

www.oakha.org

Oakland Housing Authority

Fiscal Year 2014 MTW Annual Report

Board of Commissioners

Gregory Hartwig, Chair
Marlene Hurd, Vice Chair
Janny Castillo
Lynette Jung Lee
Moses L. Mayne, Jr.
Barbara Montgomery
Tanya Pitts

Senior Staff:

Eric Johnson, Executive Director
Phil Neville, Deputy Executive Director, Real Estate Development
Janet Rice, Deputy Executive Director, Finance & Program Administration
Patricia Wells, Deputy Executive Director, Property Operations
William Bailey, Director, Capital Improvements
Carel Duplessis, Director, Police Services
Lenita Ellis, Director, Family and Community Partnerships
LeeAnn Farner, Director, California Affordable Housing Initiatives
Michelle Hasan, Director, Leased Housing
Dominica Henderson, Director, Planning, Implementation, and Compliance
Anna Kaydanovskaya, Director, Asset Management
Florice Lewis, Director, Human Resources
Craig McBurney, Director, Information Technology
Mark Schiferl, Director, Property Management
Tracy Stabler, Director, Finance

Prepared by:
Dominica Henderson

With contributions from Teela Carpenter, Julie Christiansen, Bridget Galka, Michelle Hasan, Patricia Wells, Anna Kaydanovskaya, Doug Lee, Kit Liang, Phil Neville, Michael Pope, Janet Rice, Ron Scarborough, Mark Schiferl, Tracy Stabler, Patricia Wells, Donna Whitmore, Valerie Winston-Moore, and Jonathan Young.

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

Oakland Housing Authority
Fiscal Year 2014 MTW Annual Report

Table of Contents

Section I. Introduction	1
Section II. General Housing Authority Operating Information	2
Table 1: New HCV that were Project-Based	3
Table 2: Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred	4
Table 3: General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures	4
Table 4: Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by PHA at FYE	5
Table 5: Actual Number of Households Served at FYE	6
Table 6: Reporting Compliance with Statutory Requirements: 75% Families VLI	7
Table 7: Reporting Compliance with Statutory Requirements: Comparable Mix	7
Table 8: Description of Issues Related to Leasing	8
Table 9: Number of Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency	9
Table 10: Wait List Information at FYE	10
Section III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested	11
Section IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted	12
Table 11: Approved MTW Activities	12
Table 12: Implemented Activities	15
Activity #12-01 Outcomes	17
Table 13: Number of PBV Units Awarded above 25% Cap	17
Activity #11-01 Outcomes	19
Activity #11-05 Outcomes	21
Activity #10-01 Outcomes	24
Activity #10-02 Outcomes	25
Activity #10-05 Outcomes	27
Activity #10-06 Outcomes	28
Activity #09-01 Outcomes	31
Activity #08-01 Outcomes	33
Activity #07-01 Outcomes	35
Activity #06-01 Outcomes	36

Table 14: Approved MTW Activities Not Yet Implemented	39
Activity #14-01.....	39
Activity #13-01.....	40
Activity #11-02.....	41
Activity #11-03.....	41
Table 15: Approved MTW Activities on Hold.....	42
Activity #10-03.....	43
Activity #10-04.....	43
Activity #10-07.....	43
Activity #10-08.....	43
Activity #10-09.....	44
Activity #09-02.....	44
Activity #06-02.....	44
Section V. Sources and Uses of Funding.....	45
Table 16: Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding.....	47
Table 17: Local Asset Management Plan	48
Table 18: Commitment of Unspent Funds.....	48
Section VI. Administrative	49
Appendices.....	51
Appendix A. Board Resolution.....	52
Appendix B. Project-Based Voucher Allocations.....	55
Appendix C. Overview of Other Housing.....	57
Appendix D. Affordable Housing Development Activities.....	59
Appendix E. Glossary of Acronyms.....	61

Section I. Introduction

The Oakland Housing Authority (OHA) is pleased to release its Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Moving to Work Annual Report. OHA is one of 39 participants in the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program, which provides select housing authorities the opportunity to explore and test new and innovative methods of delivering housing and supportive services to low-income residents. OHA has designed its programs to provide targeted responses that meet the needs of residents of the City of Oakland. OHA has branded its local MTW strategies under the "Making Transition Work" moniker to emphasize the prioritization of solving local, neighborhood-based challenges with strong, community-based solutions.

OHA entered into an Amended and Restated Moving to Work Demonstration Agreement (the "Agreement") with HUD on February 4, 2009. The Agreement extended OHA's participation in the MTW program through OHA's FY 2018. As part of the Agreement with HUD, OHA must complete a MTW Annual Report and highlight specific information regarding the activities conducted during the fiscal year. OHA's MTW Annual Report provides HUD, OHA residents, and the public, baseline information on OHA programs and MTW budget, and an analysis of changes that occurred during the period between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014.

Overview of the Agency's Goals and Objectives for FY 2014

OHA's set goals in the beginning of FY 2014 that focused on improving operations which led to cost reductions and continued increases in administrative efficiency. Staff also initiated a thorough implementation plan to facilitate the launch of the new business system in FY 2015. Because of consistent challenges imposed by Sequestration and funding decreases, OHA maintained a Section 8 utilization rate near 95%, which was lower than initially anticipated. However, despite the unexpected obstacles it encountered during the fiscal year, OHA maintained its commitment to increasing housing options through its local, non-traditional programs, supporting the capital and operational needs of OHA's managed housing and furthering local partnerships which support OHA's Education Initiative and employment development programs.

OHA maintained a strategic balance between implementing activities that meet the three statutory objectives which are:

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

The details describing the progress OHA made toward implementing 11 of the 23 approved activities and continuing to reach over 15,000 low-income families in Oakland in FY 2014 are included in Section IV.

The FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan and Report are available on OHA's website at www.oakha.org.

Section II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

A. Housing Stock Information

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

OHA project-based 76 new units in FY 2014, which is about 15 percent (15%) of the amount anticipated in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. Phase II of the California Hotel, St. Joseph's Family Apartments, and MacArthur Apartments were the three sites that OHA issued new Project-Based Vouchers (PBV). The total number of project-based vouchers in OHA's portfolio is 1,653, which is about 13% of the agency's MTW voucher portfolio. A list of sites is included in Appendix B.

Table 1: New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year			
Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project
Effie's House	2	0	Low Income Families
Drachma Housing	4	0	Low Income Families
OHA Scattered Sites	200	0	Low Income Families
Madison Park	25	0	Low Income Families
Hugh Taylor House	10	0	Low Income Families
California Hotel-Phase 2	47	47	Special Needs/Homeless/HIV/AIDS
St. Joseph's Family Apartments	15	15	Senior
MacArthur Apartments	14	14	Low Income Families
Marcus Garvey Commons	22	0	Low Income Families
Cathedral Gardens	43	0	Low Income Families
Lakeside Senior Apartments	91	0	Senior
94th and International	14	0	Low Income Families
Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *		Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year * Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *
487		76	3094 Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year
			3094 1653

* From the Plan

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

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

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

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

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

OHA included the Capital Fund Program (CFP) funds as part of its MTW Block Grant. During FY 2014, OHA made improvements to its Project-Based Voucher portfolio and its Public Housing units by completing building and site renovation and unit rehabilitation for the Project-Based Voucher OAHPI portfolio, conducting exterior renovation and painting for various sites, funding roof repairs and site improvements for over a dozen sites. OHA also funded affordable housing development activities through loans with developer partners for the Lion Creek Crossings Phase V, Ave Vista, and Lakeside Senior Apartments projects.

Table 3: General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year
<p>OHA included the Capital Fund Program (CFP) funds as part of its MTW Block Grant. During FY 2014, OHA made improvements to its Project-Based Voucher portfolio and its Public Housing units by completing building and site renovation and unit rehabilitation for the Project-Based Voucher OAHPI portfolio, conducting exterior renovation and painting for various sites, funding roof repairs and site improvements for over a dozen sites. OHA also funded affordable housing development activities through loans with developer partners for the Lion Creek Crossings Phase V, Ave Vista, and Lakeside Senior Apartments projects.</p>

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

OHA engages with several professional, third-party property management firms who oversee the operations of OHA's tax credit portfolio. There are a total of 980 tax credit units, some of which have public housing or project-based voucher subsidies layered into the financing. A list of the projects is included in Appendix C.

Table 4: Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End		
Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
LIHTC	980	OHA engages with several professional, third-party property management firms who oversee the operations of OHA's tax credit portfolio. There are a total of 980 tax credit units, some of which have public housing or project-based voucher subsidies layered into the financing.
N/A	0	N/A
N/A	0	N/A
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	980	
<p>* Select Housing Program from: Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.</p> <p>If Other, please describe: N/A</p>		

B. Leasing Information

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

OHA maintained a high level of fiscal responsibility and served very close to the maximum number of households possible during the year. The differences in the projected versus the actual outcomes can be explained by some of the non-traditional units not leasing up as quickly as was expected in the property-based programs. In the Local Housing Assistance Program, a tenant-based program, the actual number of households that elected to use of households their Tenant Protection Vouchers and move off-site was higher than anticipated. There was an unexpected increase in the number of port-in vouchers towards the end of the year, which required the Authority to shift resources to accommodate those families.

OHA also manages to serve some families in Oakland through non-housing related services through partnerships with the Food Bank and through the Oakland Housing Authority Police Department, which assists other law enforcement agencies when needed.

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

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served*	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	479	447
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	34	31
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	376
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	513	854
<p>* Calculated by dividing the planned/actual number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.</p> <p>** In instances when a Local, Non-Traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of Households served.</p>		
Housing Program:	Unit Months Occupied/Leased****	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ***	5748	5364
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	408	372
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	N/A	4512
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	6156	10248
<p>OHA served very close to the maximum number of households that was fiscally responsible during the year. The differences in the projected versus the actual outcomes can be explained by some of the non-traditional units not leasing up as quickly as expected in the property-based programs. In the Local Housing Assistance Program, a tenant-based program, OHA expects the number to decrease as households elect to use their Tenant Protection Voucher and move off-site. There was an unexpected increase in the number of port-in vouchers, which required the Authority to shift resources to accommodate those families.</p>		
<p>*** In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of households served.</p> <p>**** Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the housing PHA has occupied/leased units, according to unit category during the year.</p>		
	Average Number of Households Served Per Month	
	Planned	Actual
Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only	40	480

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

The majority of OHA's traditional programs and almost half of its non-traditional programs serve very low-income households. Table 6 shows that 48% of families that participated in MTW local, non-traditional programs were very low-income in FY 2014.

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

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

Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	X	X	X	780	X	X	X	X
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	X	X	X	372	X	X	X	X
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	X	X	X	48%	X	X	X	X

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

As reported since FY 2010, the majority of the households on the public housing and HCV waitlists are one-person households. This demographic differs greatly from the percentage of one-person families that were served in the traditional programs prior to MTW. As a result, OHA witnessed significant increase to the one-person households served in traditional programs and saw a corresponding decrease in three- and five-person households served. OHA has managed its MTW programs to meet the needs of the households on the waitlists and the shifting demographics of the local area. Additionally, the HCV program does not use family size as a selection criterion when selecting applicants from the waitlist. Given that almost 90% of OHA households are served through the HCV program, the substantial shifts in the composition of family sizes, while remarkable, reflect non-MTW characteristics which are outside of the control of OHA.

Mix of Family Sizes Served							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	30%	28%	19%	13%	6%	3%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year 2014	4923	3589	1998	1677	705	431	13,323
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year 2014	37%	27%	15%	13%	5%	3%	100%
Percentage Change	22%	-5%	-23%	-3%	-11%	3%	0%

Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages

As reported since FY 2010, the majority of the households on the public housing and HCV waitlists are one-person households. This demographic differs greatly from the percentage of one-person families that were served in the traditional programs prior to MTW. As a result, OHA witnessed significant increase to the one-person households served in traditional programs and saw a corresponding decrease in three- and five-person households served. OHA has managed its MTW programs to meet the needs of the households on the waitlists and the shifting demographics of the local area. Additionally, the HCV program does not use family size as a selection criterion when selecting applicants from the waitlist. Given that almost 90% of OHA households are served through the HCV program, the substantial shifts in the composition of family sizes, while remarkable, reflect non-MTW characteristics which are outside of the control of OHA.

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

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

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

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

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

OHA has undertaken an aggressive leasing activity strategy, however lease enforcement activities continue to lead to a higher than desired unit turn-over rate. OHA continues to address unit vacancies and while working to mitigate the impact of units in the portfolio not matching the family size needs for households on the waitlist.

Five senior developments (Oak Grove Plaza North & South, Adel Court, Palo Vista Gardens, and Harrison Towers), one family housing development (Campbell Village), and five HOPE VI sites are managed by third party property management companies. The third party management companies are responsible for administering their own site-based waiting lists, processing annual re-certifications, rehabilitation and leasing of vacant units and lease enforcement. The third-party managed sites also experience similar leasing challenges.

In its administration of the Housing Choice Voucher program, OHA slowed down the pace of leasing new vouchers in order to respond to funding concerns. The portfolio of port-out vouchers, while on the decline, still posed administrative and operational challenges to manage during FY 2014.

Non-traditional programs serve a variety of different populations, including many people that have experienced obstacles to maintaining stable housing in the past. In the local programs that serve a “hard to house” client base, community partners that administer the programs experienced similar concerns as other entities including managing past negative criminal or credit histories, assisting participants with overcoming substance abuse habits, and adequately addressing mental health concerns that present obstacles to securing and retaining quality housing through intensive services and case management.

Table 8: Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End	
Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
Public Housing	<p>OHA has undertaken an aggressive leasing activity strategy, however lease enforcement activities continue to lead to a higher than desired unit turn-over rate. OHA continues to address unit vacancies and while working to mitigate the impact of units in the portfolio not matching the family size needs for households on the waitlist.</p> <p>Five senior developments (Oak Grove Plaza North & South, Adel Court, Palo Vista Gardens, and Harrison Towers), one family housing development (Campbell Village), and five HOPE VI sites are managed by third party property management companies. The third party management companies are responsible for administering their own site-based waiting lists, processing annual re-certifications, rehabilitation and leasing of vacant units and lease enforcement. The third-party managed sites also experience similar leasing challenges.</p>
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	<p>In its administration of the Housing Choice Voucher program, OHA slowed down the pace of leasing new vouchers in order to respond to funding concerns. The portfolio of port-out vouchers, while on the decline, still posed administrative and operational challenges to manage during FY 2014.</p>
Local, Non-Traditional	<p>Non-traditional programs serve a variety of different populations, including many people that have experienced obstacles to maintaining stable housing in the past. In the local programs that serve a “hard to house” client base, community partners that administer the programs experienced similar concerns as other entities including managing past negative criminal or credit histories, assisting participants with overcoming substance abuse habits, and adequately addressing mental health concerns that present obstacles to securing and retaining quality housing through intensive services and case management.</p>

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

During FY 2014, OHA implemented two activities that assisted households in achieving self-sufficiency goals. A total of 19 households met the requirements for self-sufficiency as defined for each respective activity. OHA continued to explore the definition of self-sufficiency for activities that were not yet implemented or on hold, in order to establish clarity and consistency around the self-sufficiency goals for participant families.

Table 9: Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End		
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
PBV Transitional Housing Programs/11-05	5	Number of MOMS that move from the site with the notice of graduation
Program Extension for Households Receiving \$0 HAP/10-02	14	Successful Exits during and after the 24 months
N/A	0	N/A
N/A	0	N/A
Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	0	* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.
ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	19	

C. Wait List Information

1) Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Table 10: Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide	9334	Closed	No
MTW Public Housing (OHA Managed)	Site-Based	858	Closed	No
MTW Public Housing (Third Party Managed)	Site-Based	5249	Closed	Yes for one site, which was Campbell Village Court
Project-Based Voucher	Site-Based	3071	Closed	No

More can be added if needed.

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

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

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

The site-based, Public Housing wait list at Lion's Creek Crossing was partially open for three (3) bedroom units.
N/A
N/A

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

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

N/A

Section III. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD approval requested

All proposed activities that are granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as "Approved Activities."

Section IV. Approved MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted

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

Table provides a list of all approved MTW activities including the year the activity was implemented and the primary statutory objective(s) the activity is intended to impact. Each activity has been assigned a number based on the fiscal year in which the activity was identified (e.g. 14-01 indicates that the activity was identified in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan).

Table 11 Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted					
Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	MTW Activity Name	Description	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
14-01	Not Yet Implemented (NYI)	Alternative Recertification Schedules	Changes reexamination of income for elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes to every three years and every two years for wage earning households. Households with fixed income from Social Security will receive automatic adjustments to their rent in interim years based on published cost of living adjustments (COLA) to the subsidy program.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.4, D.1.c
13-01	NYI	Rent Reform Pilot Program	Creates a pilot program to test rent reform strategies at Campbell Village (Public Housing) and AMP 10 (Section 8 PBV) where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total Tenant Payment (TTP) calculated based on 27.5% of gross annual income for seniors and disabled households and 27% for work-eligible households Triennial recertification schedule for senior and disabled households, biennial schedule for work-eligible households Eliminate all deductions and earned income disallowance Recent increases in income excluded in recertification Absolute minimum rent of \$25 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness -Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient 	Attachment C, Section C.4, C.11 Section D.1.c Section D.2.a
12-01	2012	Eliminate Caps on PBV Allocations	Eliminates the cap on the total number of units the Authority can project-base and the number of units that can be project-based in a development	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.1.e, Section B.3
11-01	2011	PBV Occupancy Standards	Modifies the occupancy standards in the PBV program to be consistent with occupancy standards required by other state or locally administered funding in a development (e.g. LIHTC program)	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7

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

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

A. Implemented Activities

OHA is currently implementing the following activities:

Table 12 Implemented Activities					
Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	MTW Activity Name	Description	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
12-01	2012	Eliminate Caps on PBV Allocations	Eliminates the cap on the total number of units the Authority can project-base and the number of units that can be project-based in a development	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.1.e, Section B.3
11-01	2011	PBV Occupancy Standards	Modifies the occupancy standards in the PBV program to be consistent with occupancy standards required by other state or locally administered funding in a development (e.g. LIHTC program)	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
11-05	2011	PBV Transitional Housing Programs	Modifies PBV program rules to permit transitional service enriched housing to fill specific unmet community needs. Used to operate the MOMS Program, which provides transitional service enriched housing to mothers returning from prison to reunite with their children.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section B.1, B.4, D.1.a,b Attachment D, Section B.2
10-01	2010	Specialized Housing Programs	Increases allocation of resources to the MOMS program to improve outcomes and enhance program coordination. MOMS program is operated in partnership with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment D, Use of Funds
10-02	2010	Program Extension for Households Receiving \$0 HAP	Extends the period of time that a household can remain in the Section 8 program while receiving zero HAP assistance from 6 months to 24 months.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment C, Section D.1.b, D.3.a
10-05	2010	Acceptance of Lower HAP in PBV Units	In situations where a family becomes over housed as a result of conflicting occupancy policies in the conversion from Public Housing to Section 8, this activity allows the landlord or management agent to accept a lower HAP based on the appropriate number of bedrooms for the family and in order to keep the family in-place.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
10-06	2010	Local Housing Assistance Program	Develops a Local Housing Assistance Program (LHAP) to assist households that otherwise might not qualify for or be successful in the traditional Public Housing and/or Section 8 programs. LHAP is provided directly to eligible families and to partnering agencies providing service enriched housing to special needs populations.	Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
09-01	2011	Alternative HQS System	Uses a risk-based strategy to allocate HQS inspection resources in order to improve compliance at problem properties and allocate fewer resources to properties with a history of compliance.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.5 Attachment D, Section D

08-01	2008	Fund Affordable Housing Development Activities	Utilize single-fund budget flexibility to leverage funds to preserve affordable housing resources and create new affordable housing opportunities in Oakland.	Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
07-01 (moved to 14-01)	2010	Triennial Income Recertification	This activity is now described under activity #14-01.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.4, D.1.c
06-01	2006	Site Based Wait Lists	Establishes site based wait lists in all public housing sites, HOPE IV sites, and developments with PBV allocations.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.1

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

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

Under traditional regulations, OHA was only allowed to award PBV to 100% of the units under HUD PBV exception rules (24 CFR 983.56(b)). Traditional program rules also limit PBV awards to a cap of 20% of the units in the entire voucher portfolio, which in FY 2014 would amount to 2,561 PBV. Since implementation in FY 2010 OHA has awarded 3,094 total PBV, which exceeds the cap by 533 units. OHA has also awarded 2,000 PBVs to units above the 25% cap for a total of 2,767 PBV units. Table 13 provides a breakdown of the PBVs awarded by development.

Table 13 Number of PBV Units Awarded Above the 25% Cap				
Site Name	Total Units	25% of the Total Units	Total PBV Units Awarded	PBV Units Awarded Above the 25% Cap
Senior Housing				
Jack London Gateway - Phase II	61	15	60	45
Orchards on Foothill	65	16	64	48
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase II	81	20	40	20
St. Joseph's Senior Apartments	84	21	98	77
Merritt Crossing (formerly 6th & Oak Apts.)	70	17	50	33
Lakeside Senior Apartments	92	23	91	68
Lion Creek Crossings Phase V	<u>128</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>95</u>
<i>Senior Housing Total</i>	<i>581</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>530</i>	<i>386</i>
Special Needs Housing				
Jefferson Oaks	102	25	101	76
California Hotel	137	34	135	101
1701 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	<u>25</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>19</u>
<i>Special Needs Housing Total</i>	<i>264</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>261</i>	<i>196</i>
Family Affordable Housing				
Drachma Housing (On-going)	14	3	14	11
Oak Point Limited	31	7	15	8
James Lee Court	26	6	12	6
Drasnin Manor	26	6	25	19
MacArthur Apartments	32	8	14	6
11th and Jackson	71	17	35	18
Cathedral Gardens	100	25	43	18

460 Grand	68	17	34	17
Madison Park Apartments	98	24	96	72
Hugh Taylor House	<u>43</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>25</u>
<i>Family Affordable Housing Total</i>	542	131	323	192
OHA Former Public Housing				
OHA Scattered Sties	1,554	388	1,554	1,166
Tassafaronga Village Phase I	137	34	80	46
Tassafaronga Village Phase II	<u>20</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>14</u>
<i>Former Public Housing Total</i>	1,711	427	1,653	1,226
Total Units	3,094	767	2,767	2,000

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: No projects were awarded vouchers under this activity during FY 2014. The outcomes achieved during the fiscal year did not meet anticipated benchmarks due to funding uncertainties and Sequestration. However, because of the timing of projects, it was important that OHA keep this activity active in case any projects would require this use of MTW authority.

Status Update/Schedule: This activity was not utilized during the fiscal year but remains ongoing.

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

Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks: Changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks are included in the table below. OHA updated the metrics to reflect the original performance measures used when OHA initiated the activity.

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

Standard HUD Metrics				
HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity = Zero(0)	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Number of households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Yes.

Standard OHA Metrics				
<i>Number of Units Awarded above 20% of Total Units in the Voucher Program</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of PBV units awarded above 20% of total units in the voucher program.	Number of PBV units awarded above 20% of the total units in the voucher program = Zero (0)	Number of PBV units awarded above 20% of the total units in the voucher program = 100 new and/or preservation units	Actual number of PBV units awarded above 20% of the total units in the voucher program = Zero (0) new and/or preservation units	No.
<i>Number of Units Created in Developments with Allocations Over 25%</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of units and development opportunities created in developments with allocations over 25%.	Number of PBV units awarded above 25% of the total units in a project = Zero (0)	Number of PBV units awarded above 25% of the total units in a project = 25 new and/or preservation units	Actual number of PBV units awarded above 25% of the total units in a project = 0 new and/or preservation units	No.
<i>Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 25 households	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	No.

MTW Activity #11-01: PBV Occupancy Standards

Description of MTW Activity: Modify the occupancy standards in the PBV program to be consistent with occupancy standards required by other state or locally administered funding in a development (e.g. LIHTC program). Based on family composition, under this activity a family

may qualify for a larger bedroom size than they would have under the previous policy. The activity applies to new participants in the PBV program and to in-place families whose household composition changes would require them to relocate.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: During FY 2014, this policy was utilized for two in-place families that leased units, resulting in 40% of the benchmark being achieved. The outcomes of this activity largely depend on participant families requesting changes to household composition, and as a result the activity was not utilized as much as expected.

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

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

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

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

Standard HUD Metrics				
HC #4: Displacement Prevention				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease).	Number of Households losing assistance or forced to move prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households verify	Expected households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = 5 households	Number of households losing assistance/moving after implementation of the activity = 2 households (in-place families)	No. 40% of the benchmark was achieved.
HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0) households	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 5 households	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 0 households (new lease ups)	No. 40% of the benchmark was achieved.

MTW Activity #11-05: PBV Transitional Housing Program

Description of MTW Activity: Develop sub-programs modeled after the Project-Based Voucher program to allow for transitional housing opportunities at developments serving low-income special needs households who otherwise might not qualify for or be successful in the Public Housing and/or Section 8 programs. With established partnerships with the Alameda County Sheriff's Office, this activity facilitates the development of local, non-traditional housing programs like the Maximizing Opportunities for Mothers to Succeed (MOMS) initiative, which offers service-enriched transitional housing support to formerly incarcerated women seeking to reunite with their children. In addition to the housing subsidy, the MOMS program offers customized adult, family and youth case management, group counseling services, family activities and educational and employment development assistance to all participants.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: Families assisted under this activity represent some of the local, non-traditional households served by OHA. There were six new admissions during the fiscal year, which is 120% of the benchmark. All six new participant households were referred by the Office of the Sheriff after the head of household was released from custody. All new households and an additional five existing participant households complied with the program requirement to participate in services, which exceeded the benchmark by 10%.

In addition to family unification, the MOMS program seeks to support mothers in building fiscal responsibility and increasing their incomes with the support of the resources available through the program. While the average earned income for all participant households was \$2,052, the majority of the earned income came from two families for a total of \$22,570. As part of the graduation from the program and transition to stabilized housing, OHA relies on its community partners to provide skill building and job development workshops that help increase the employability of the MOMS participants.

Several other performance metrics were not measurable at the time of this report due to OHA's and partner agencies limited capacity to track performance as well as due to the mid-year implementation of some of the performance metrics. As a result, the outcomes are not available but will be incorporated into future reports going forward.

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

Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies: OHA worked with its partners to revise aspects of this program to better meet the needs of the participant families. It also seeks to amend contracts in order to be able to track performance metrics like employment status and increases in household savings.

Changes or Modifications to Metrics, Baselines or Benchmarks: Changes to the metrics, baselines, and benchmarks are included in the table below. OHA will also begin measuring the potential decrease in the average amount of HAP paid as compared to the tenant portion from the time of entry in the program through the time of graduation or point in which program self-sufficiency is attained.

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

Standard HUD Metrics				
HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 5 households	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 6 households (new admissions)	Yes. 120% of the benchmark was achieved.
HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 10 households	Number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 11 households	Yes. 110% of the benchmark was achieved.
Standard OHA Metrics				
Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars prior to implementation of this activity = Zero (0)	Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars after implementation of this activity = \$13,000	Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars = \$2,052	No. 16% of the benchmark was achieved.
Increase in Household Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Average amount of savings/escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	OHA's current business system and partner does not have the capacity to accurately measure this metric. The partner agencies were not obligated to track this information during the fiscal year. As a result, OHA will begin measurement of its performance in this area in FY 2016.
---	---

Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

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

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	OHA's current business system and partner does not have the capacity to accurately measure this metric. The partner agencies were not obligated to track this information during the fiscal year. As a result, OHA will begin measurement of its performance in this area in FY 2016.			
(1) Employed Full-Time				
(2) Employed Part-Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.				

Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	OHA's current business system and partner does not have the capacity to accurately measure this metric. The partner agencies were not obligated to track this information during the fiscal year. As a result, OHA will begin measurement of its performance in this area in FY 2016.			

Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).	Number of households receiving services prior to implementation of this activity = Zero (0) households	Expected number of households receiving services after implementation of the activity = 10 households	Number of households receiving services after implementation of the activity = 11 households	Yes. 110% of the benchmark was achieved.
Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Number of households who transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of this activity = Zero (0) households	Expected number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity = 3 households	Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity = 3 households	Yes. 100% of the benchmark was achieved.

MTW Activity #10-01: Specialized Housing Programs

Description of MTW Activity: In partnership with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department, OHA operates the MOMS program. This activity increases the allocation of resources to the MOMS program to improve outcomes and enhance program coordination among partners.

OHA created the MOMS program and implements this activity in conjunction with Activity 11-05. The partnerships established and funds leveraged to provide services to participants of the MOMS program are authorized under this activity and are critical to the success and expansion of the MOMS initiative.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: In FY 2014, OHA continued to collaborate with community partners to offer family supportive services for the duration of a family's participation in the program. Prior to implementation of this activity, program requirements limited the use of funding for resident services and non-traditional uses. During FY 2014, OHA far exceeded expected benchmarks by leveraging over \$200,000 in resources

from community based organizations and public agencies exceeding the established benchmark by 105%.

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

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

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

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

Standard HUD Metrics				
CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars) = Zero (0)	Amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$100,000	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity = \$205,636	Yes. 205% of the benchmark was achieved.

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

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

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: The baselines for this activity are set at zero given that existing program regulations require all families that reach the zero HAP status are terminated. Generally, about 90 families benefit from the safety net that the additional 18 months of program participation provide and OHA expected to serve that same number of families with this activity. In FY 2014, year 105 families were on zero HAP, and only 14 left the program during the 18 month period. The outcomes demonstrate that while several households are able to benefit from the protections provided under this activity, with an 18% increase in the average income of families on zero HAP, very few actually move on to exit the program and achieve complete self-sufficiency. However, several families were able to take advantage of the safety net due to financial difficulties that forced them back to receiving HAP subsidy. This outcome demonstrates the need for this activity, especially in times of increasing rents and a rental market and slow employment growth throughout the city.

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

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

2016 MTW Annual Plan to propose new strategies aimed at eliminating the incentive to remain on the program out of fear of losing security and helping families build the financial stability needed achieve the final step of self-sufficiency.

Due to deficiencies in the current business system, OHA also faced challenges measuring the amount of subsidy provided to participants and the subsequent rental revenue increase. The current system does not maintain historic data that will identify the potential reduction in subsidy over time. However, OHA has ensured that the new business system will capture and report on this level of data to better understand the impacts over time.

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

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

Standard HUD Metrics				
SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). \$47,711 for 109 households	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars) = \$47,711 (0% increase)	Actual average income of households affected by this policy = \$56,548	Yes. 118% of the benchmark was achieved.
SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Number of households receiving TANF assistance prior to implementation of this activity = 11 households	Number of households receiving TANF assistance after implementation of this activity = 10 (10% decrease)	Number of Households receiving TANF = 6 households	Yes. The outcomes exceeded the benchmark with a 45% decrease.
SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Due to challenges with the current business system, OHA is not able to measure this metric at this time. The current business system does not maintain historic data that will measure reductions in subsidy over time. As such, OHA is unable to adequately report on this metric until implementation of the new business system in FY 2016.			

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue/HAP in dollars (increase).	Due to challenges with the current business system, OHA is not able to measure this metric at this time. The current capacity of the business system is limited and does not allow reporting on the increase in rent as a result of self-sufficiency activities.			
SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (self-termination from the program) = Zero (0) families	Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency = 18 families	Actual number of households transitioned to self sufficiency = 14	No. 77% of the benchmark was achieved.
Standard OHA Metrics				
Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).	OHA will begin measuring this as it revises the activity to provide zero HAP families with direct referrals to the resources offered by the Family and Community Partnerships Department.			

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

Description of MTW Activity: As a result of disposition, some households may become considered "over-housed" based on differences in the occupancy policies in the Public Housing and Section 8 programs. In these situations, this activity allows the landlord or management agent to accept a lower HAP based on the appropriate number of bedrooms for the family as opposed to the actual number of bedrooms in the unit.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: In FY 2014, this activity was utilized for 6 families in PBV assisted scattered site units. These families would otherwise have had to move from their PBV assisted unit because of a change in their family composition, resulting in the family being over-housed. PBV sites rarely have an appropriately size unit readily available for a family when there is a change in their occupancy standard. Additionally, unit turnover can be very costly for a landlord and the expense often outweighs a rent reduction; so it becomes the logical choice for the PBV owner to renew the contract at lower rent. Also, a PBV owner may elect the option to accept a lower HAP if needed to fill vacant units when an appropriately sized family is not available. In total, this activity increased the housing options for 6 over-housed families in FY 2014 and created optional efficiencies for rental property owners.

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

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

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

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

<i>Standard HUD Metrics</i>				
<i>HC #2: Units Preserved</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units preserved prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = the activity = Zero (0)	Housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = 6 households	Yes. The outcomes exceeded the benchmark.

MTW Activity #10-06: Local Housing Assistance Program

Description of MTW Activity: The Local Housing Assistance Program (LHAP) activity through initiatives like the Sponsor Based Housing Assistance Program (SBHAP) provides support to households, that might not qualify for or be successful in the traditional Public Housing and/or Section 8 programs. LHAP provides subsidies to eligible households and to partnering agencies operating service enriched housing for low-income households with special needs.

LHAP programs serve families in partnership with the City of Oakland's Department of Human Services and the Oakland PATH Rehousing Initiative, leveraging the expertise and experience of the non-profit, community-based service providers to provide rental housing assistance through the form of rental subsidies, utility assistance, security deposits, etc. to individuals who come from homeless encampments or are exiting the criminal justice system, or are emancipated foster youth.

The intent of this activity sought to mitigate negative impacts of the public housing disposition for households that may have been over-income for the new project-based voucher units or may have experienced a significant rent increase as a result of the conversion to project-based voucher. There are very few households left of the original LHAP families and no new families were added under this activity.

This activity also provides flexibility to implement its Sponsor-Based Housing Assistance Program and expand its portfolio of local, non-traditional units that serve households below 80% of the Area Median Income. Participant families are assisted by providers contracted by the City of Oakland and must receive supportive services along with the housing assistance offered under the activity. OHA's contract with the City leverages resources, expertise, and community connections to deliver housing related services to over 100 hard-to-house households in Oakland.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: Families assisted under this activity represent several of the local, non-traditional households served by OHA exercising its MTW authority. During FY 2014, eight former disposition households utilized their voucher and moved off of the LHAP program leaving 26 households at the end of the fiscal year to be assisted under this activity. Additionally, 192 unique households were served through the Sponsor-Based Housing Assistance program with 168 households being enrolled for at least one year.

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

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

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

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

<i>Standard HUD Metrics</i>				
<i>HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase) LHAP	Number of households who would not qualify for an available unit based on household composition = Zero (0)	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 10	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 26	Yes. 260% of the benchmark was achieved by this activity.
SBHAP	Number of households who would not qualify for an available unit based on household composition = Zero (0)	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 110	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 192	Yes. 175% of the benchmark was achieved.
Total number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase).	Total number of households who would not qualify for an available unit based on household composition = Zero (0)	Total expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 120	Total expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 218	Yes. 181% of the benchmark was achieved.

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). LHAP	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 39	Actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 26	No. 66% of the benchmark was achieved.
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase). SBHAP	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 110	Actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 192	Yes. 175% of the benchmark was achieved.

Total number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Total households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Total expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 149	Total actual households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 218	Yes. 146% of the benchmark was achieved
HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). LHAP	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 14	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 8	No. 57% of the benchmark was achieved.
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). SBHAP	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 110	Total actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 192	Yes. 155% of the benchmark was achieved
Total number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase). SBHAP	Total households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Total expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 124	Total actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity = 200	Yes. 161% of the benchmark was achieved

MTW Activity #09-01: Alternative HQS System

Description of MTW Activity: Develop an alternative inspection methodology and frequency for HQS inspections based on a risk assessment system and findings from prior inspections. Properties that are HQS compliant and pass their first inspection are only inspected every two years. Properties that fail on the first inspection remain on the annual inspection schedule. Properties that fail to pass HQS after two inspections will be inspected more frequently and require semi-annual inspections for the next year. After two inspections that pass, the property

may be placed back on an annual or biennial inspection schedule. Results of the inspections are submitted electronically to HUD via the HUD 50058 form and stored electronically in OHA's database.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: This activity remained consistent with past years and delivered significant cost savings. Under traditional program rules, OHA would have to inspect 12,980 units, which would be financially and operationally burdensome. After implementing this activity for over 5 years, OHA begun to recognize increased benefits of landlords and tenants better understanding the program and working together to ensure the units are in the condition to pass inspections. Overall, the outcomes of FY 2014 demonstrated that there was a 36% reduction in cost and number of units inspected during FY 2014.

OHA was unable to track two of the performance metrics during the year but is working with the contractor to memorialize a method of collecting the data on staff time savings and decrease in error rate for future reporting periods.

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

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

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

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

Standard HUD Metrics				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = 12,980 inspections *\$30.80 (cost per inspection) = \$399,784	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = 9,358 inspections * \$30.80 = \$288,226	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$254,192	Yes. The outcome exceeded the benchmark by achieving a 36% reduction.
CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Prior to implementation of this activity, OHA outsourced annual inspections through a contractor. OHA staff is working with the vendor to identify the appropriate mechanism for tracking and reporting on this metric. Given that this metrics was not implemented during FY 2014, there is no data to report during this period.			
CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Prior to implementation of this activity, OHA outsourced annual inspections through a contractor. OHA staff is working with the vendor to identify the appropriate mechanism for tracking and reporting on this metric. Given that this metrics was not implemented during FY 2014, there is no data to report during this period.			
Standard OHA Metrics				
Number of Units Inspected				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of units inspected/inspections conducted annually	12,980 units	9,358 units (28% reduction)	8253 units and inspections	Yes. 112% of the benchmark was achieved.

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

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

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: OHA had 388 units in development, of which 384 were restricted to households below 80% of the AMI, the other four are on-site managers units. An additional 72 units were rehabilitated as part of the managed PBV portfolio. The chart of units in Appendix D shows the list of units and the status for all units under construction or rehabilitation. Because none of units under construction were placed in service during the fiscal year, no households received direct services to increase housing choice. The services will be offered to the families that occupy the units upon completion in FY 2015.

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

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

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

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

Standard HUD Metrics				
HC #1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units of this type prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 388 units under construction during the Fiscal Year	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 384 units under construction during the Fiscal Year	No. 98% of the benchmark was achieved.
HC #2: Units of Housing Preserved				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of housing units preserved for households at or below 80% AMI that would otherwise not be available (increase). If units reach a specific type of household, give that type in this box.	Housing units preserved prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected housing units preserved after implementation of the activity = 100 units rehabilitated	Actual housing units of this type after implementation of the activity = 72 units	No. 72% of the benchmark was achieved.
HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity = Zero (0)	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity = 400	Actual number of households able to move to a better unit after implementation of this activity = 72 units	No. 18% of the benchmark was achieved.

		households		
--	--	------------	--	--

MTW Activity #07-01: Triennial Income Recertification

Description of MTW Activity: Conduct income reexaminations every three (3) years for elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes in the Public Housing and Section 8 programs. In the interim years, an automatic adjustment is applied to the households' housing payment equal to the cost of living adjustment (COLA) made to the households' related income subsidy program.

Hardship Exception (Rent Reform activity): No families requested hardship exceptions under this activity during the fiscal year.

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: OHA continued to assist families under this activity while the program-wide rent reform activity awaits implementation. As is the case with previous years, the number of recertifications increased in FY 2014 as more families became eligible. In FY 2014, OHA also included PBV families in this activity that had not been included in previous years. Overall, OHA exceeded expectations in all areas measured. Staff also explored methods of revising operating procedures to exclude the COLA calculation in the future. This would result in additional time and costs savings for both staff and residents.

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

Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies: Under the current business system, staff maintains databases separately to track the households participating in the triennial activity. Because of this, collecting rental income data for each participant is administratively burdensome and time prohibitive. Upon implementation of the new system, OHA intends to measure the amount of rental revenue produced by this activity.

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

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

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

Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$41.49 employee salary/hour * 3,081 hours = \$128,755	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$41.79 * 1,698 = \$70,959	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$63,175	Yes. OHA exceeded the benchmark and achieved a 50% reduction in costs to complete rent reviews.
---	---	---	---	---

CE #2: Staff Time Savings

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity = 1 hour/review * 3,081 files = 3,081 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 1 hour * 1,698 files + .33 hour * 2,064 COLA files = 1,698 hours (55% reduction)	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity = 1,614 hours	Yes. OHA exceeded the benchmark and achieved a 47% reduction in the amount of time to complete rent reviews.

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Due to challenges with the current business system, OHA is not able to measure this metric at this time. The databases maintained by staff do not capture the rental revenue for individual participants. It would be significantly burdensome to collect this data prior to the implementation of the new business system.			

MTW Activity #06-01: Site Based Wait Lists

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

Comparison of Outcomes to Baselines and Benchmarks: Outcomes for this activity were unable to be measured during FY 2014.

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

Narrative Explanation of Challenges/New Strategies: OHA initially created this activity to measure different outcomes than those required under the standard HUD metrics. Considering this, OHA is unable to report on outcomes during the 2014 fiscal year because staff was unable to implement and track the new metrics. However, OHA has begun to revisit the procedures for monitoring compliance with the newly required metrics and will be able to provide data for the next MTW Annual Report.

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

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

Standard HUD Metrics				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of determining program eligibility in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$875 per vacancy	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity \$500 per vacancy		
Total cost of lease available vacant units to public housing applicants in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity = \$110,000 annually	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity = \$77,000 annually		
CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).				
CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).				
HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).				

B. Not Yet Implemented Activities

Table 14 Approved MTW Activities Not Yet Implemented					
Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	MTW Activity Name	Description	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
14-01	Not Yet Implemented (NYI)	Alternative Recertification Schedules	Changes reexamination of income for elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes to every three years and every two years for wage earning households. Households with fixed income from Social Security will receive automatic adjustments to their rent in interim years based on published cost of living adjustments (COLA) to the subsidy program.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section C.4, D.1.c
13-01	NYI	Rent Reform Pilot Program	Creates a pilot program to test rent reform strategies at Campbell Village (Public Housing) and AMP 10 (Section 8 PBV) where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total Tenant Payment (TTP) calculated based on 27.5% of gross annual income for seniors and disabled households and 27% for work-eligible households Triennial recertification schedule for senior and disabled households, biennial schedule for work-eligible households Eliminate all deductions and earned income disallowance Recent increases in income excluded in recertification Absolute minimum rent of \$25 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness -Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient 	Attachment C, Section C.4, C.11 Section D.1.c Section D.2.a
11-02	NYI	Standardized Transfer Policy	Creates standard transfer policies in the public housing, Section 8, and project-based assistance programs to increase housing choices for residents.	Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
11-03	NYI	SRO/ Studio Apartment Project-based Preservation Program	Develops a PBV sub-program tailored to the needs of developments with SRO and studio units providing service enriched housing. OHA will commit long-term PBV subsidies to developments where there is a need to preserve the housing resource.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7

MTW Activity #14-01: Alternative Recertification Schedules

Description of MTW Activity: Regulations require that a household's income is recertified for program eligibility and rent calculations once a year. In FY 2007, MTW activity #07-01 was

approved allowing for a triennial recertification schedule for elderly and/or disabled households on a fixed income in the Public Housing and Section 8 programs. In the interim years, an automatic adjustment is applied to the households' housing payment equal to the cost of living adjustment (COLA) made to the households' related income subsidy program. This activity has been implemented in the Section 8 program and at two senior-designated properties in the Public Housing program. This schedule has been effective at reducing staff time and costs, as well as, being less intrusive and time consuming for residents. Activity #14-01 incorporates changes made by Activity #07-01 and changes the recertification schedule for wage earning households to once every two years for wage earning households. All households that report no income, no income from wages, or temporary income remain on an annual schedule for recertifications. OHA requires the households on the annual recertification schedule to report increases in income.

Actions Taken Toward Implementation: The requirements under this activity exceed the capability of the existing business system so OHA refined the details on the planned overhaul of the electronic business system. This activity will be implemented agency-wide when the new business system has been successfully launched and proves able to collect, monitor, and report on all of the performance metrics under this activity. OHA worked closely with the vendor to design program specifications that will ensure a smooth implementation of all facets of this activity. The expected timeline for implementation is FY 2016 after the new system is in effect.

MTW Activity #13-01: Rent Reform Pilot Program

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

- Total Tenant Payment (TTP) calculated based on 27.5% of gross annual income for seniors and disabled households and 27% for work-eligible households
 - Working seniors and working disabled individuals will have the option to choose to be included in the “work-eligible” group where their rent would be calculated based on 27% of their gross income and they would be on a biennial recertification schedule.
- Triennial recertification schedule for senior and disabled households, biennial schedule for work-eligible households
- Eliminate all deductions (elderly/disabled deduction, dependent deduction, medical expenses, child care expenses) and earned income disallowance
- Increases in income within six months of recertification are excluded
- Absolute minimum rent of \$25. Households will still be eligible for a utility allowance. However, no rent will be reduced below the minimum rent due to a utility allowance.
- Flat rent – In the Public Housing program, households will still have the option to choose a flat rent or the rent reform income-based rent calculation during initial eligibility or at the time of recertification.

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

Actions Taken Toward Implementation: OHA began the implementation process of the new business system, which will be able to adequately capture and track data required to report on this activity. OHA also continued to refine the timeline for implementation of this activity to launch in FY 2016, with a detailed notification and recertification process for all affected tenants.

MTW Activity #11-02: Standardize Transfer Policy

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

Actions Taken Toward Implementation: Due to challenges with funding and the overwhelming needs of families on the waitlist, OHA determined it was in the best interest of the agency to hold implementation of this activity for FY 2014. OHA will explore implementation of this activity pending the outcome of negotiations of an extension of the MTW Standard Agreement and stabilization of the operating subsidy funding in the future.

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

Description of MTW Activity: Develop a PBV sub-program to award long-term Section 8 assistance to Single Room Occupancy (SRO) and studio apartment developments offering service enriched housing.

Actions Taken Toward Implementation: OHA continued to hold this activity and not implement it due to funding uncertainties. OHA explored the viability of this activity considering the tenuous financial climate and the impact it would have on the Housing Choice Voucher waitlist.

C. Activities on Hold

Table 15 Approved MTW Activities on Hold					
Activity #	Fiscal Year Implemented	MTW Activity Name	Description	Statutory Objective(s)	Authorization(s)
10-03	2010	Combined PBV HAP Contract for Multiple Non-contiguous Sites	Allows a single PBV HAP contract to be executed for non-contiguous scattered site buildings organized by AMP or other logical grouping.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.1.a, D.7
10-04	2010	Alternative Initial Rent Determination for PBV Units	Allows for the use of a comparability analysis or market study certified by an independent agency approved in determining rent reasonableness to establish the initial PBV contract rent.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment C, Section D.2, D.7
10-07	2010	Disposition Relocation and Counseling Services	Provides counseling and relocation assistance to impacted public housing residents in developments approved for disposition.	-Provide incentives for families with children to become more economically self-sufficient -Increase housing choices	Attachment D, Use of Funds
10-08	2011	Redesign FSS Program	Redesigns the FSS Program to incorporate best practices in the industry and encourage partnerships with community based programs and initiatives.	Provide incentives for families with children to become economically self-sufficient	Attachment C, Section E
10-09	2010	Waive 12 Month Minimum Stay Requirement in Converted PBV Units	Waives the 12 month minimum stay requirement for existing tenants in units that have converted to PBV assistance as the result of an approved disposition.	Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7
09-02	2010	Short-Term Subsidy Program	Provides temporary housing assistance to preserve existing affordable housing resources and allow tenants to remain in-place.	Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness	Attachment D, Use of Funds
06-02	2006	Allocation of PBV Units: Without Competitive Process	Allows for the allocation of PBV subsidy to developments owned directly or indirectly, through an affiliated partner, by OHA without using a competitive process.	-Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness -Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7.a
06-03	2006	Allocation of PBV Units: Using Existing Competitive Process	Allows for the allocation of PBV subsidy to qualifying developments using the City of Oakland NOFA/RFP or other existing competitive process.	-Reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness -Increase housing choices	Attachment C, Section D.7.b

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

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

Actions Taken Toward Reactivation: There were no new PBV projects awarded or in the pipeline that required this activity during the fiscal year. No steps were taken toward reactivation during the fiscal year. The activity was kept on hold in case new projects were awarded, but due to funding limitations the activity was not required in FY 2014. OHA is in discussions with current PBV projects to expand their current PBS8 contract to include additional nearby properties, using this Activity for non-contiguous site awards to lessen the density of very low/extremely low income households, including those with special needs, at one location and improve housing choices for participating households.

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

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

Actions Taken Toward Reactivation: This activity was on hold because no projects required the use of this activity during the fiscal year. OHA began exploring options to update the comparability analyses used for this activity to ensure accuracy and usefulness when the activity is reactivated in the future.

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

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

Actions Taken Toward Reactivation: OHA held this activity off-line due to the pending nature of the disposition application for the senior sites. No steps were taken to reactivate the activity during FY 2014, but the activity will be reactivated when the application is approved in the future.

MTW Activity #10-08: Redesign FSS Program

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

Actions Taken Toward Reactivation: OHA elected to keep this activity on hold until the implementation of the new business system and until further guidance is provided with direction on consolidating Public Housing and HCV FSS programs. This activity will be reactivated after

staff develops a thorough implementation plan for both programs, which will include a clear strategy for monitoring it via the new electronic business system.

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

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

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

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

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

Actions Taken Toward Reactivation: This activity remained on hold until viable projects come on-line that would require use of this MTW authorization. There were no projects in the pipeline that required this infusion of short-term subsidy, however OHA wishes to keep the activity active to ensure the availability of the resource if needed in the future.

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

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

Actions Taken Toward Reactivation: Due to funding uncertainty, this activity was on hold during the fiscal year. OHA will reactivate the activity when there are available funding opportunities that permit the development and preservation of new project-based voucher units. Thus far, the activity has assisted OHA in creating and preserving 2,163 PBV units in Oakland.

D. Closed Out Activities

OHA does not have any closed out activities to report for FY 2014.

Section V. Sources and Uses of Funds

This section describes the sources and uses of funding included in the consolidated MTW and Special Purpose (Non-MTW) Program Budgets. Actual funding for FY 2013 is compared with budget projections for FY 2013 made at the beginning of the fiscal year.

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

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

OHA submitted its unaudited financial information in the prescribed format in the Financial Assessment System on August 29, 2014.

2) Activities that Used Only the Single Fund Flexibility

OHA used its MTW authorization for single fund flexibility by allocating funding to several initiatives designed to meet local community needs. At the forefront of OHA's priorities remains preserving and expanding affordable housing opportunities for residents of Oakland, ensuring those housing opportunities are in communities that are safe and secure, and connecting the residents of OHA communities to resources and neighborhood amenities that promote economic stability and self-sufficiency.

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

Fund Deferred Maintenance and Capital Improvements

Due to decades of decreased capital funding and the resulting deferred maintenance, OHA sites have needs that far exceed the annual amount of capital funds the agency receives. As a result, OHA used the single fund flexibility to provide supplemental funding and address capital needs at its sites.

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

OHA had an approved RHF plan which allowed for the accumulation of RHF funding over time and use on affordable housing units that do not have a Public Housing subsidy attached. With this authorization, OHA made development loans to its affiliates for the construction of Lion's Creek Crossing Phase V, Ave Vista senior housing, and Lakeside Senior apartments.

Fund Operations

The single fund flexibility allowed OHA to invest in high-priority areas and fund OHA operations particularly in the area of providing resident services and increasing the level of security through police services.

- OHA utilized its MTW flexibility to build partnerships that ultimately support the social, educational, and economic success of OHA residents. Through the Family and Community Partnerships Department, OHA worked diligently to improve academic outcomes and job readiness of its residents. The partnership with the Oakland Unified

School District on OHA's Education Initiative was a direct product of the single fund flexibility. Through this partnership, OHA is able to enhance the quality and reach of client services offered both in-house and in partnership with community-based service providers for both Public Housing and Section 8 residents. OHA continued to address community connections to education and employment and through the single fund budget, OHA supported the Parent Ambassadors project, the FEAP initiative, and other programs designed to promote the importance of parent involvement in childhood education as a means of addressing the problem of chronic absenteeism and improving level of academic achievement among OHA children.

During FY 2014, OHA also opened the first ever Resident Leadership Center, which is managed by resident leaders with support from FCP, and is used exclusively by resident graduates of OHA's 12-week Leadership Academy and Resident Advisory Board to conduct business, meet with community partners, and support the needs of the Resident Advisory Board. While FCP works closely with all residents, including elderly and disabled households, FCP was very successful in delivering its annual variety of programs and services directly aimed at engaging families with children through the annual summer lunch program, Back Pack Giveaway, Summer Youth Education and Employment Program and the Mayor's Summer Youth Employment Program.

- Through the single fund flexibility, OHA funded the Oakland Housing Authority Police Department to provide high-quality, public safety and crime prevention services to OHA communities. Through several strategies including community policing, youth engagement, participating in National Night Out activities, and the Crime Alert program, OHA increased safety at OHA sites through both physical design and law enforcement strategies, for our residents. The Oakland Housing Authority Police Department also employed various technical approaches to diminishing program abuse and violations through its Fraud Investigations Unit.

Table 16: Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system

Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

OHA used its MTW authorization for single fund flexibility by allocating funding to several initiatives designed to meet local community needs. At the forefront of OHA's priorities remains preserving and expanding affordable housing opportunities for residents of Oakland, ensuring those housing opportunities are in communities that are safe and secure, and connecting the residents of OHA communities to resources and neighborhood amenities that promote economic stability and self-sufficiency.

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

Fund Deferred Maintenance and Capital Improvements

Due to decades of decreased capital funding and the resulting deferred maintenance, OHA sites have needs that far exceed the annual amount of capital funds the agency receives. As a result, OHA used the single fund flexibility to provide supplemental funding and address capital needs at its sites.

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

OHA had an approved RHF plan which allowed for the accumulation of RHF funding over time and use on affordable housing units that do not have a Public Housing subsidy attached. With this authorization, OHA made development loans to its affiliates for the construction of Lion's Creek Crossing Phase V, Ave Vista senior housing, and Lakeside Senior apartments.

Fund Operations

B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan

OHA did not implement a local asset management plan during FY 2014.

Table 17: MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan

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

 No

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

 or **No**

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

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

 or **No**

OHA did not implement a local asset management plan in FY 2014.

C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds

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

Table 18: Commitment of Unspent Funds

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

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

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

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

Section VI. Administrative

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

There are no items to report under this section.

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

OHA engaged with an outside contractor and subject matter expert on homelessness to perform a program evaluation of the Sponsor-Based Housing Assistance Program authorized by Activity #10-06. The evaluation team collected and analyzed data for 125 clients who entered the SBHAP from June 1, 2010 to June 30, 2012. The evaluation focused on the first groups of people served by SBHAP, homeless people in encampments (both with and without diagnoses of severe mental illness), adults returning from incarceration at San Quentin, and youth involved with the criminal justice system. The results of the evaluation are not yet available and the final report will be completed in fall 2015. OHA will report the results in the FY 2015 MTW Annual Report.

C. Certification from the Board of Commissioners

Certification of Compliance with MTW Statutory Requirements

The Oakland Housing Authority Board of Commissioners approves the submission of the Fiscal Year 2014 MTW Annual Report. The Oakland Housing Authority Board of Commissioners certifies that the Oakland Housing Authority has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Authority are very low-income families; 2) continuing to assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families as would have been served had the amounts not been combined; and 3) maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration. The FY 2014 MTW Annual Report is in compliance with all applicable MTW regulations and requirements.

Oakland Housing Authority:

Gregory D. Hartwig
Chair, Board of Commissioners

Date

Certification of Compliance with MTW Statutory Requirements

The Oakland Housing Authority Board of Commissioners approves the submission of the Fiscal Year 2014 MTW Annual Report. The Oakland Housing Authority Board of Commissioners certifies that the Oakland Housing Authority has met the three statutory requirements of:

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

The FY 2014 MTW Annual Report is in compliance with all applicable MTW regulations and requirements.

Oakland Housing Authority:



Gregory D. Hartwig
Chair, Board of Commissioners

9/22/14

Date

Appendices

- Appendix A. Board Resolution
- Appendix B. Project-Based Voucher Allocations
- Appendix C. Overview of Other Housing
- Appendix D. Affordable Housing Development Activities by Unit Type
- Appendix E. Glossary of Acronyms

APPENDIX A

Board Resolution

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

On Motion of Commissioner: Janny Castillo

Seconded by Commissioner: Tanya Pitts

And approved by the following vote:

AYES: 0

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

EXCUSED: 0

ABSENT: 0

THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED: NUMBER: 4594

**RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 MOVING TO
WORK ANNUAL REPORT AND CERTIFICATIONS OF COMPLIANCE**

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

WHEREAS, the Oakland Housing Authority adopted the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 MTW Annual Plan on April 8, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report provides HUD, OHA residents and community stakeholders with the information necessary to compare OHA's performance during the past fiscal year to the expectations OHA set for itself at the beginning of the fiscal year in its FY 2014 Annual Plan; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report is in compliance with all HUD regulations and requirements;


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

THAT, the Board of Commissioners accepts the Oakland Housing Authority FY 2014 MTW Annual Report; and

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

THAT, the Executive Director, on behalf of the Authority, is hereby authorized to submit the FY 2014 MTW Annual Report and Certification of Compliance to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and to take all actions necessary to implement the foregoing resolution.

*I certify that the foregoing resolution is a full, true and
correct copy of a resolution passed by the
Commissioners of the Housing Authority
of the City of Oakland, California on September 22, 2014.*


Eric Johnson, Secretary/Executive Director

ADOPTED: September 22, 2014

RESOLUTION NO. 4594

APPENDIX B

Project-Based Voucher Allocations

Project-based Voucher Allocations as of June 30, 2014				
Development Name	Date of Board Approval	# of PBV Units	Contract Date	Population Served
<i>HAP contracts</i>				
Mandela Gateway	2/12/2003	30	10/20/2004	Low Income Families
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase I	7/13/2005	23	1/1/2007	Senior
Lion Creek Crossings II	11/9/2005	18	7/3/2007	Low Income Families
Madison Apartments	7/13/2005	19	4/25/2008	Low Income Families
Lion Creek Crossings III	6/14/2006	16	6/25/2008	Low Income Families
Seven Directions	7/13/2005	18	9/12/2008	Low Income Families
Orchards on Foothill	6/14/2006	64	11/7/2008	Senior
Fox Courts / Uptown Oakland	12/3/2004	20	5/15/2009	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
Jack London Gateway - Phase II	2/26/2007	60	6/5/2009	Senior
14 th St Apartments at Central Station	1/22/2007	20	11/25/2009	Low Income Families
Tassafaronga Village Phase I	2/25/2008	80	4/23/2010	Low Income Families
Altenheim Senior Housing Phase II	4/28/2008	40	4/5/2010	Senior
Fairmount Apartments	10/24/2008	16	3/8/2010	Low Income Families / Persons with Disabilities
Tassafaronga Village Phase II	7/21/2008	19	5/27/2010	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
*Harp Plaza (19)	5/24/2010	18	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
*Effie's House (10)	5/4/2009	7	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
*Drachma Housing (14)	5/4/2009	10	12/1/2010	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
Foothill Family Partners	6/28/2010	11	8/1/2011	Low Income Families
St. Joseph's Senior Apts	5/29/2007	83	8/22/2011	Senior
*OHA Scattered Sites (1554)	7/27/2009	598	In Progress	Low Income Families / Public Housing Disposition
Lion Creek Crossings IV	4/28/2008	10	1/13/2012	Low Income Families
Savoy Phase 1	6/28/2010	55	2/14/2012	Special Needs
*Hugh Taylor house (35)	6/11/2011	28	5/8/2012	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
*Madison Park (96)	6/11/2011	27	6/7/2012	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
Merritt Crossing Apts (6 th and Oak)	5/4/2009	50	6/27/2012	Senior
720 E 11 th Street Apts (aka Clinton Commons)	4/28/2008	16	10/2/2012	Low Income Families / Homeless with HIV/AIDS
Harrison Street Senior Housing	4/23/2007	11	11/15/2012	Senior
Kenneth Henry Court	4/11/2011	13	2/8/2013	Low Income Families
California Hotel Phase 1 and 2	2/28/2011	88	3/1/2013	Special Needs / Homeless / HIV/AIDS
James Lee Court	10/25/2010	12	3/21/2013	Low Income Families
Savoy Phase 2	6/28/2010	46	3/29/2013	Special Needs / Homeless / HIV/AIDS
Slim Jenkins Court	5/4/2009	11	5/8/2013	Low Income Families
Oak Point Limited (OPLP)	10/25/2010	15	5/30/2013	Low Income Families
Drasnin Manor	10/25/2010	25	6/27/2013	Low Income Families
St. Joseph's Family Apts	10/25/2010	15	12/3/2013	Low Income Families
MacArthur Apts	10/25/2010	14	10/13/2013	Low Income Families
California Hotel Phase 3	2/28/2012	47	11/22/2013	Special Needs / Homeless / HIV/AIDS
Units under HAP Contract		1653		
<i>Conversion Projects</i>				
*Harp Plaza (19)	5/24/2010	1	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
*Effie's House (10)	5/4/2009	3	8/1/2010	Low Income Families
*Drachma Housing (14)	5/4/2009	4	12/1/2010	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
*OHA Scattered Sites (1554)	7/27/2009	956	In Progress	Low Income Families / Public Housing Disposition
*Hugh Taylor house (35)	6/11/2011	7	5/8/2012	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
*Madison Park (96)	6/11/2011	69	6/7/2012	Low Income Families / Mod Rehab Conversion
Units under HAP that will convert to PBV at turnover		1040		
<i>AHAP Contracts</i>				
Marcus Garvey Commons	4/11/2011	10	<i>in development</i>	Low Income Families
Cathedral Gardens	5/23/2011	43	<i>in development</i>	Low Income Families
Lakeside Senior Apartments	1/23/2012	91	<i>in development</i>	Senior
Lion Creek Crossings V	10/17/2011	127	<i>in development</i>	Senior
MacArthur Transit Village	2/28/2011	22	<i>in development</i>	Low Income Families
460 Grand	3/16/2010	34	<i>in development</i>	Low Income Families
1701 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	5/20/2013	25	<i>in development</i>	Special Needs / Homeless / HIV/AIDS
Units under AHAP Contract		352		
<i>Conditional Awards</i>				
94th and International	10/17/2011	14	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
11th and Jackson	11/30/2010	35	<i>pending</i>	Low Income Families
Units with conditional award		49		
Total PBV Units Allocated		3,094		

* Conversion to PBV ongoing as units currently occupied by HCV-assisted families turnover

APPENDIX C

Overview of Other Housing

Overview of Other Housing			
	Total Unit Count - All Tax Credit Units	Subsidy Layering - Public Housing Replacement Units	Subsidy Layering - Project Based Voucher Units
HOPE IV Sites			
Chestnut Court	72	45	
Linden Court	79	38	
Mandela Gateway	168	46	30
Foothill Family Apartments	65	21	11
Lion Creek Crossings - Phases 1 - 4	439	157	44
Other Mixed Developments			
Tassaforanga Village - Phases 1 and 2	157		99
Total Units	980	307	184

APPENDIX D

Affordable Housing Development Activities

Affordable Housing Development Activities by Unit Type						
	FY 2014 Outcomes Non- traditional Units	FY 2014 Outcomes Traditional Units	Total Units	Public Housing	Project- Based Vouchers	Tax Credit Only
PREDEVELOPMENT						
1110 Jackson St.	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<i>Total Predevelopment</i>	0	0	98	0	0	0
UNDER CONSTRUCTION						
Cathedral Gardens	57	43	100	0	43	57
Lakeside Senior Apts.	0	91	92	0	91	0
Lion Creek Crossings V	0	127	128	0	127	0
460 Grand Ave.	<u>34</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Total Under Construction</i>	91	295	388	0	295	57
REHABILITATION						
OAHP	<u>0</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>1,554</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,554</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Total Rehabilitation</i>	0	72	1,554	0	1,554	0
COMBINED TOTAL	91	367	2,040	0	1,849	57

APPENDIX E

Glossary of Acronyms

Glossary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OHA – Oakland Housing Authority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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