



**Housing Authority of the
City of Pittsburgh**

**Moving to Work Demonstration
Year 11 (FY 2011) Annual Report**

**Corrected
Submitted to HUD July 17, 2012**

**A. Fulton Meachem, Jr., Executive Director
200 Ross Street, 9th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219**

Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh

Moving To Work Annual Report

2011

Section I. Introduction

A. Table of Contents

I. Introduction

- A. Table of Contents-----Page 1
- B. Overview-----Page 3

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information-----Page 7

- A. Housing Stock Information-----Page 7
- B. Leasing Information – Actual-----Page 12
- C. Waiting List Information-----Page 16

III. Non-Moving To Work Related Housing Authority Information-----Page 23

- A. List of non-MTW sources & uses of funds
(Other HUD/Federal Funds excluding HOPE VI)-----Page 23
- B. Description of non-MTW activities proposed-----Page 23

IV. Long-term MTW Plan-----Page 24

V. Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested (New Activities)— Operation of a Combined Homeownership Program Utilizing Soft-Second Mortgage Assistance and expanded eligibility -----Page 31

VI. Ongoing MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted-----Page 32

- 1. and 2. Modified Rent Policy with Work/FSS Requirement-----Page 32
- 3. Modified recertification standards and procedures-----Page 36
- 4. Operation of a Combined Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program into a single MTW Homeownership Program---Page 37
- 5. Homeownership Program - Other Policy Modifications-----Page 37
- 6. Energy Performance Contracting-----Page 39
- 7. Establishment of a Local Asset Management Program-----Page 41

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

- 8. Modified HCV Program policy on maximum percent of adjusted monthly income permitted-----Page 41
- 9. Modified process for approval of modified payment standard-----Page 42

- VII. Sources and Uses of Funding-----Page 44
 - A. and B. Charts showing Sources and Uses of MTW Funds (Operating, Capital Fund, HCV);Non-MtW including state and local Funds; narrative on Variances --Page 49
 - C. Chart showing Sources and Uses of the COCC-----Page 53
 - D. Description of Cost Allocation and Fee for service approach that deviates from 1937 Act Requirements-----Page 44
 - E. Description of uses of Single Fund Flexibility-----Page 48
 - F. Chart showing Sources and Uses for Capital Activity-----Page 52

- VIII. Administrative-----Page 56
 - A. Description of Progress on the correction or elimination of observed deficiencies
 - B. Description of Agency Directed Evaluations of the demonstration
 - C. Performance and Evaluation Report for Capital Fund Activities not included in the MTW Block Grant (Included as Attachment B).
 - D. Agency Certification

Appendix A – Characteristics of Households Served

Appendix B – HACP ARRA CFRF Grant Performance and Evaluation Report Form 50075.1

Section 1. Introduction

B. Overview of HACP Moving To Work Goals and Objectives

HACP's overarching Moving To Work Goals are as follows:

1. To reposition HACP's housing stock. These efforts are designed to result in housing that it is competitive in the local housing market, is cost-effective to operate, provides a positive environment for residents, and provides both higher quality and broader options for low-income families; and,
2. To promote independence for residents via programs and policies that promote work and self-sufficiency for those able, and promote independent living for the elderly and disabled.

In pursuit of these goals, HACP has continued several Moving To Work Activities initiated in prior years, and added one new activity in 2010. These initiatives are summarized below, with details of results available in Section VI.

Activities Summary

1. Modified Rent Policy for the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program (new in 2011)

Building on the modified rent policy developed for the Low Income Public Housing Program and approved in 2008, HACP received approval in 2011 to require that any non-elderly, able-bodied head of household who is not working to either a) participate in a local self-sufficiency (LSS), welfare to work, or other employment preparation and/or training/educational program or b) pay a minimum tenant payment of \$150.00 per month. This policy provides additional incentives for families to work or prepare for work and increases overall accountability.

A discussion of the progress of this initiative is included in Section VI.

2. Modified Rent Policy for the Low Income Public Housing Program.

As approved in 2008, HACP requires that any non-elderly, able-bodied head of household who is not working to either participate in the Family Self-Sufficiency Program or pay a minimum rent of \$150.00 per month. Hardship exemptions are permitted. This policy provides additional incentives for families to work or prepare for work. HACP's objectives for this program include increased participation in the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, increase rent collections, and increased level of families working. A discussion of the progress of this initiative is included in Section VI.

3. Revised recertification requirements policy.

As approved in 2009 and 2010, HACP is authorized to operate both the Low Income Public Housing program and the Housing Choice Voucher Program with a recertification requirement modified to at least once every two years. Changes in income still must be reported, and standard income disregards continue to apply. This policy change reduces administrative burdens on the Authority, thereby reducing costs and

increasing efficiency. HACP's objectives for this initiative are reduced staff time and thus reduced costs, and improved compliance with recertification requirements by tenants and the HACP.

In 2010, measures indicate HACP has achieved all of these objectives for the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Implementation for the Low Income Public Housing Program was delayed, as described in Section VI..

4. and 5. Homeownership Program Policies

- a. Operation of a combined Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Homeownership Program;
- b. Homeownership Program assistance to include soft-second mortgage assistance coupled with closing cost assistance, homeownership and credit counseling, and foreclosure prevention only;
- c. Expansion of Homeownership Program eligibility to persons on the LIPH and HCV program waiting list;
- d. Establishing a Homeownership Soft-second mortgage waiting list.

As approved in 2006, HACP operates a single Homeownership Program open to both Low Income Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Program households. This approach reduces administrative costs, expands housing choices for participating households, and provides incentives for families to pursue employment and self-sufficiency through the various benefits offered. In 2011, HACP leveraged additional outside resources to support homeownership participants, increased the number of families securing mortgage pre-approval levels, and continued to have high numbers of families participating in the program. The number of closings was just under the program goal, but HACP believes this will be made up in the next calendar year.

As approved in 2010, HACP's homeownership program includes the availability of soft-second mortgage assistance, which increases affordability and thus housing choice for eligible families while decreasing costs to the HACP and providing an incentive for families to become self-sufficient. As the number of soft-second mortgages may be limited based upon budgeted spending authority, it was necessary to establish a waiting list for soft-second mortgages to ensure fair award of available funds. Several families took advantage of the soft-second mortgage option, but spending did not approach the budgeted amounts and therefore the second mortgage waiting list was not established.

Also approved in 2010 was expansion of Homeownership Program eligibility and assistance to persons on the HACP waiting lists for Public Housing and the Housing Choice Voucher program. No families from the waiting list achieved homeownership in 2011.

6. Energy Performance Contracting

Under HACP's Moving To Work Agreement, HACP may enter into Energy Performance Contracts without prior HUD approval. In 2011 HACP continued its current EPC, executed in 2008, to reduce costs and improve efficient use of federal funds.

HACP's EPC included installation of water saving measures across the authority, installation of more energy efficient lighting throughout the authority, and installation of geothermal heating and cooling systems at select communities. Installation was substantially

completed in 2010, with closeout of the installation phase completed in 2011. Preliminary data indicates HACP realized substantial energy cost savings in 2011. The initial Monitoring and Valuation Report is not expected until October, 2012.

7. Establishment of a Local Asset Management Program.

In 2003 and 2004, prior to HUD's adoption of a site based asset management approach to public housing operation and management, HACP embarked on a strategy to transition its centralized management to more decentralized site-based management capable of using an asset management approach. During HACP's implementation, HUD adopted similar policies and requirements for all Housing Authorities. HACP continues to develop and refine its Local Asset Management Program to reduce costs and increase effectiveness.

HACP's Local Asset Management Program, including deviations from HUD's asset management requirements, are described in Section VII. They aided the Authority to increase efficiency of operations, reduce costs, and improve site based accounting, more accurately reflecting actual costs at the sites.

8. Modified Housing Choice Voucher Program policy on maximum percent of Adjusted Monthly Income permitted.

Originally approved in 2002, HACP's operation of the Housing Choice Voucher Program allows flexibility in the permitted rent burden (affordability) for new tenancies. Specifically, the limit of 40% of Adjusted Monthly Income allowed for the tenant portion of rent is used as a guideline, not a requirement. HACP continues to counsel families on the dangers of becoming overly rent burdened, however, a higher rent burden may be acceptable in some cases. This policy can increase housing choice for participating families by giving them the option to take on additional rent burden for units in more costly neighborhoods.

In 2011, distribution of vouchers in use did not change significantly, and initial analysis indicates no increased risk of program failure for those taking advantage of this flexibility. Outside evaluators will assist the HACP to more fully assess this initiative.

9. Modified Payment Standard Approval.

Originally approved in 2004, HACP is permitted to establish Exception Payment Standards up to 120% of FMR without prior HUD approval. HACP has utilized this authority to establish Area Exception Payment Standards and to allow Exception Payment Standard as a Reasonable Accommodation for a person with disabilities. Allowing the Authority to conduct its own analysis and establish Exception Payment Standards reduces administrative burdens on both the HACP and HUD (as no HUD approval is required) while expanding housing choices for participating families.

HACP did not have any Area Exception Payment Standards in 2011, but continued to see use of vouchers in a broad range of neighborhoods.

HACP continues to allow an Exception Payment Standard of up to 120% of FMR as a reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities. In 2011, eleven (11) exceptions were approved enabling families to secure appropriate housing..

Use of Block Grant Funding Authority to support:

- i. Development and Redevelopment

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

- ii. Enhanced and Expanded Family Self-sufficiency and related programming.
- iii. Homeownership Program

Originally approved with the initial Moving To Work Program and expanded to include homeownership and resident service programs in subsequent years, HACP continues to use Moving To Work block grant funding to support its Moving To Work Initiatives. Please see Section VII for information on HACP's use of Block Grant funding.

Since entering the Moving To Work Program in 2000, HACP has instituted a number of Moving To Work initiatives that in 2011 no longer require specific Moving To Work Authority. Some of those initiatives are:

1. Establishment of Site Based Waiting Lists.
2. Establishment of a variety of local waiting list preferences, including a working/elderly/disabled preference and a special working preference for scattered site units.
3. Modified Rent Reasonableness Process
4. Transition to Site Based Management and Asset Management, including Site Based Budgeting and Accounting.

Outside Evaluators

In 2010, HACP procured an outside evaluator to assist in planning and evaluation of all Moving To Work initiatives with a focus on the rent policy. Unfortunately, a lengthy procurement process and even more lengthy contract negotiation with the selected provider delayed contract execution and prevented participation of the outside evaluator until well into the 2011 year. The selected entity, the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of International Affairs, Center for Metropolitan Studies, has been working with us to identify and review data. A report on their status to date is included in Section VI.

II. GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION

A. HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION

Number of Public Housing Units:

HACP had 4821 units in inventory on January 1, 2011. HACP projected inventory at 4481 for December 31, 2011. HACP had 4790 units actually in inventory on December 31, 2011. The difference is that demolition of the first 198 units at Addison Terrace, 37 units at Northview Heights, 8 units at Homewood North, and the disposition of 64 units at Broadhead manor were not completed prior to December 31, 2011. (See Table IIA-1).

Significant Capital Expenditures:

In 2011, HACP incurred significant capital expenditures at:

- Addison Terrace Redevelopment: HACP expended \$27.5 million toward Phases I and II of the redevelopment of Addison Terrace, including demolition, site and infrastructure work for Phases I and II, and financing for Phase I. A total of \$41,466,000 has been authorized and committed by the Board of Commissioners for this project. This project started in 2011 with relocation of residents from the Phase I and II area in preparation for abatement, demolition, and site work. A LIHTC application for Phase I has been approved the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Authority.
- Garfield Commons: HACP expended \$8.5 million obligated in prior years towards Phases 3 and 4 of this project in 2011.
- Oak Hill Phase II: HACP expended \$5.8 million towards Oak Hill Phase II, the continuation of its successful redevelopment of the former Allequippa Terrace public housing site.
- Mazza Pavilion: Rehabilitation of this property to address an extraordinary environmental condition (mold) that forced the vacating of the building in 2009 was begun in 2010, and completed in 2011. This project resulted in an essentially new building. 2011 expenditures were over \$4,300,000.00.
- Northview Heights: HACP expended approximately \$3,000,000 at Northview Heights for a variety of projects including final completion of UFAS work, various electrical work, partial completion of a roof and siding replacement project, and completion of the renovation of 30 units in buildings that also received UFAS units and have new roofs being installed.
- Scattered Sites: HACP expended over \$1,700,000 on scattered sites units, including completion of some UFAS renovations and Turn-key acquisition of new UFAS scattered site units.
- See Section VII for additional information on HACP's capital expenditures.

New Public Housing Units Added:

During 2011 HACP added a total of 72 new units. (See Table IIA-2.) This includes acquisition of 5 UFAS-compliant scattered sites units, and completion of development of 22 LIPH units in Garfield Phase 3 and 45 LIPH units in Oak Hill Phase 2.

Public Housing Units Removed:

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

HACP removed 99 units from inventory during 2011 (See Table IIA-3). This included:

- The demolition of the remaining 89 units in Garfield Heights, the sale of 8 scattered site units where the cost of rehabilitation was determined to be not cost effective, and the sale of two Glen Hazel homes to new homeowners.

In addition HACP proceeded with planning for demolition (with HUD authorization) for units in the following communities:

- Building #020012 at Homewood North (8 units). Structural issues in the foundation of this building would be excessively costly to address.
- Buildings 33-37 at Northview Heights containing 37 units are planned to be demolished to continue to 'right size' this property, reduce density, and achieve full occupancy.
- Disposition (which may include sale or demolition) of 64 remaining units at Broadhead Manor. 48 of 64 units were flood damaged and vacated in 2006, and all units have been vacant since 2008. Costs to rebuild or renovate the community were estimated to be excessive, with continued risk of flooding at the site. Thirty-three scattered site units were purchased in 2007 and 2008 as replacement units for the units lost at this community. HACP entered into a contingent sales agreement with the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh in 2011 for this property, subject to HUD approval.
- Demolition of 445 units at Addison Terrace in order to prepare the area for initial phases of redevelopment.

Number of Housing Choice Vouchers Authorized:

HACP had authorization for 6757 Moving To Work Vouchers and 316 non-Moving To Work Vouchers at the beginning of 2011, and did not receive any additional authorizations during 2011. It is important to note that a) funding levels associated with these authorizations are not adequate to cover the costs of leasing an equal number of units, and b) under the Moving To Work block grant, as in previous years, HACP utilized voucher funding authorization for other purposes as approved in the Moving To Work Annual Plan. See Sections VI. for information on the use of this authority. (See Table IIA – 4)

Housing Choice Vouchers Project Based:

HACP continued to support project based Housing Choice Vouchers in 2011. (See Table IIA-5). This includes:

HACP's project base Housing Choice Voucher Program includes the following:

- 48 units at Veterans Place, (all non-MtW vouchers). Veterans Place provides transitional housing and support services to formerly homeless veterans who have completed a Veterans Administration Drug and/or Alcohol treatment program. Because of income levels and other subsidies available to residents and the property, there were no eligible residents of Veteran's Place and thus no subsidy provided in 2011.
- 18 units at the Legacy, (2009 and 2010). The Legacy is a 108-unit HACP mixed finance senior citizen mid-rise housing facility.

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

- 20 units at the Hill District YMCA, (all non-MtW vouchers). These vouchers will support a Single Room Occupancy facility currently undergoing renovation at the Hill District YMCA. Financing challenges have delayed some renovations at this facility necessary for units to meet criteria for project based vouchers, so no vouchers were in use at this location in 2011.
- 4 units at Third East Hills as part of a refinancing and modernization project at this property.

In 2011, HACP conducted two selection processes for project based voucher proposals. Nine proposals including 290 units were tentatively approved. Only one of these proposals has resulted in a completed Housing Assistance Payment Contract or an Agreement to Enter Into a Housing Assistance Payment Contract. That one contract executed is as follows:

- Center City Apartments/Milliones Manor – 39 vouchers for existing units.

Proposals that were not completed in 2011, for up to 239 units, include the following:

- Herron Senior Living – Hill District – 8 vouchers. The proposed project did not receive a pending Tax Credit award. Thus the PBV award is on hold pending completion of financing.
- 2700 Center Avenue Senior Housing/AHRCO – 36 Vouchers for a combination of existing and renovated units. This contract is expected to be completed in 2012.
- Wood Street Commons – 65 vouchers for existing units in this single room occupancy facility with supportive services. This contract is expected to be completed in 2012.
- Shanahan Apartments – 11 units in this building conversion/rehabilitation project. Recently awarded tax credits, an Agreement to Enter Into a Housing Assistance Payment Contract is expected to be executed in 2012.
- Amani Christian Community Development Corporation – 12 vouchers for new construction in the Hill District. Financing and other planning is not yet complete.
- Hill House Economic Development Corporation – 52 units in Hill District Housing Phase I proposal. Financing and other planning is not yet complete and the total number of units may be modified, but will not exceed 52; an agreement may be completed in 2012.
- Hill House Economic Development Corporation – 55 units in the Hill District for the Ozanam/Cliff proposal. Financing and other planning is not yet complete and the total number of units may be modified, but will not exceed 55; an agreement may be completed in 2012.

Table IIA-1 – Units in the Inventory - January 1, 2001 – January 1, 2010 - January 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011

Public Housing

	Eff/1 Bedroom				2 Bedroom				3 Bedroom			
	1/1	1-10	1/11	12/11	1/1	1-10	1/11	12/11	1/1	1-10	1/11	12/11
Family	1102	707	.705	710	2653	1470	1417	1446	1894	1369	1132	1099
Elderly	1429	1142	1141	1141	.423	108	106	106	0	0	0	0
Total	2531	1849	1846	1851	3076	1578	1523	1552	1894	1369	1132	1099

4 Bedroom				5+ Bedrooms				Total			
1/1	1-10	1/11	12/11	1/1	1-10	1/11	12/11	1/1	1-10	1/11	12/11
403	284	256	237	121	65	54	51	6173	3895	3564	3543
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1852	1250	1247	1247
403	284	256	237	121	65	54	51	8025	5145	4811	4790

Table IIA-2 – LIPH Units Added to Inventory – January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

Public Housing

Family Community	Eff / 1 Bedroom		2 Bedrooms		3 Bedrooms		4 Bedrooms		5+ Bedrooms		Total	
	Std.	UFAS	Std.	UFAS	Std.	UFAS	Std.	UFAS	Std.	UFAS	Std.	UFAS
Scattered Sites						3		1		1		5
Oak Hill Phase 2	4	1	19	2	17	2					40	5
Garfield Phase 3			9	1	6	1	4	1			19	3
Total	4	1	28	3	23	6	4	2	0	1	59	13

Table IIA-3 – Units Demolished/Removed From Inventory – January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

Public Housing

Community	Eff / 1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms	5+ Bedrooms	Total
Scattered Sites		2	6	2	0	10
Garfield Heights			59	26	4	89
Total		2	65	28	4	99

**Table IIA-4 – Housing Choice Vouchers Authorized
Section 8**

	2009	2010	2011
MtW Vouchers	6757	6757	6757
Non-MtW Vouchers	316	316	316
Total	7073	7073	7073

**Table IIA-5 – Number of HCV Units to be Project-based by Community
Section 8**

Community	2009	2010	2011
Veteran’s Place*	48	48	48
Legacy Apartments	18	18	18
YMCA SRO’s *	0	20	20
3rd East Hills	0	0	4
Centre City/Milliones	0	0	39
TBD	0	0	0
Total	66	86	129

Note: Veteran’s Place and YMCA SRO’s are non-MtW vouchers and are included in the non-MtW voucher count in Table IIA-4 above. Legacy and 3rd East Hills are MTW vouchers and are included in the MTW voucher count in Table IIA-4 above.

Descriptions of Communities

1. **Veteran’s Place** – 5 buildings, 3-story walkups, constructed 2004-1005
2. **Legacy Apartments** – 4-story mid-rise for the elderly and disabled constructed 2007

3. **YMCA SRO's** – Single room occupancy (SRO) units in a renovated YMCA building constructed in 1922 for adult males referred to HACP by the Allegheny County Department of Human Services. This building continues to undergo modernization. The 20 units in 2010 in this table represent a commitment of vouchers, not a lease-up of vouchers.
4. **3rd East Hills** – Family units in larger revitalization plan in the East Hills.
5. **Centre City Towers/Milliones Manor** – Senior facility in the Hill District added in 2011 through competitive process.

Note: In 2010 HACP issued a Request For Proposals for Project Based Vouchers. Awards were made in 2011, but only Center City Apartments/Milliones Manor executed an agreement in 2011. Other pending commitments are described in the narrative above.

Table IIB-1 – LIPH Occupancy – HACP-Managed - January 1, 2011, Projected December 31, 2011 and Actual December 31, 2011

HACP – Managed	January 1, 2011			Projected December 31, 2011					Actual – December 31, 2011					Projected/Actual -/+	
	Physical Unit Count	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied	Physical Unit Count	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied	Number off-line*	Adjusted Vacancy Percentage	Physical Unit Count	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied	Number off-line*	Adjusted Vacancy Percentage	Projected/Actual -/+	% +/-
1-1 Addison Terrace	734	548	75%	536	480	90%	6	91%	734	273	37%	458	99%	-207	-43.1%
1-2 Bedford Dwellings	411	369	90%	411	401	98%	0	98%	411	374	91%	1	91%	-27	-6.7%
1-4 Arlington Heights	143	126	88%	143	136	95%	3	97%	143	130	91%	1	92%	-6	-4.4%
1-5 Allegheny Dwellings	272	239	88%	272	259	95%	1	96%	272	235	86%	2	87%	-24	-9.3%
1-7 Saint Clair Village	0	0	0%	0					0	0				0	
1-9 Northview Heights	575	384	67%	537	455	85%	2	85%	575	494	86%	42	93%	39	8.6%
1-12 Garfield Heights	89	0	0%						0	0				0	
1-15 PA Bidwell High Rise	120	112	93%	120	114	95%	1	96%	120	113	94%	1	95%	-1	-0.9%
1-17 Pressley High Rise	211	209	99%	211	209	99%	2	100%	211	205	97%	1	98%	-4	-1.9%
1-20 Homewood North	128	104	81%	126	120	95%	2	97%	134	118	88%	12	97%	-2	-1.7%
1-22 Scattered Sites South	156	145	93%	159	156	98%	0	98%	155	147	95%	5	98%	-9	-5.8%
1-31 Murray Towers	68	64	94%	68	65	96%	1	97%	68	67	99%	1	100%	2	3.1%
1-32 Glen Hazel	128	122	95%	128	125	98%	0	98%	128	126	98%	0	98%	1	0.8%
1-33 Glen Hazel High Rise	97	92	95%	97	96	99%	0	99%	97	92	95%	0	95%	-4	-4.2%
1-38 Glen Hazel Homes	6	5	83%	0	0	0%	0	n/a	4	3	75%	1	100%	3	
1-39 Scattered Sites North	141	120	85%	134	132	99%	2	100%	135	127	94%	2	95%	-5	-3.8%
1-40 Brookline Terrace	30	0	0%	30	0	0%	0	0%	30	10	0%	0	33%	10	
1-41 Allentown High Rise	104	100	96%	104	100	96%	0	96%	104	99	95%	2	97%	-1	-1.0%
1-44 South Oakland (Finello)	60	59	98%	60	60	100%	0	100%	60	55	92%	0	92%	-5	-8.3%
1-45 Morse Gardens	70	68	97%	70	70	100%	0	100%	70	68	97%	0	97%	-2	-2.9%
1-46 Carrick Regency	66	64	97%	66	64	97%	0	97%	66	61	92%	2	95%	-3	-4.7%
1-47 Gualtieri Manor	31	28	90%	31	30	97%	1	100%	31	28	90%	1	93%	-2	-6.7%
1-62 Broadhead Manor	64	0	0%	0	0	0%	0		64	0	0%	64		0	
Total	3704	2958	80%	3303	3072	93%	21	94%	3612	2825	78%	532	92%	-247	-8.0%

* Off-line Units for adjusted vacancy calculations include units used for resident services, units undergoing modernization, and units pending demolition.

Table IIB-2 – LIPH Occupancy – Privately Managed - January 1, 2011, Projected December 31, 2011 and Actual December 31, 2011

Privately Managed	January 1, 2011			Projected – Dec. 31, 2011					Actual – Dec. 31, 2011			Projected/Actual -/+	
	Physical Unit Count	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied	Physical Unit Count	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied			Physical Unit Count	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied	Projecte d/Actual -/+	% /+
1-64 New Pennley Place	38	34	89%	38	37	97%			38	38	100%	1	2.7%
1-66 Oak Hill	430	407	95%	430	423	98%			430	405	94%	-18	-4.3%
1-72 Manchester	86	85	99%	86	83	97%			86	85	99%	2	2.4%
1-73 Christopher Smith	25	25	100%	25	22	88%			25	25	100%	3	13.6%
1- 80 Silver Lake	75	74	99%	75	75	100%			75	73	97%	-2	-2.7%
1- 82 Bedford Hills	180	175	97%	180	180	100%			180	177	98%	-3	-1.7%
1- 85 North Aiken	62	61	98%	62	62	100%			62	62	100%	0	0.0%
1-86 Fairmont	50	47	94%	50	50	100%			50	47	94%	-3	-6.0%
1-87 Legacy Apartments	90	88	98%	90	90	100%			90	88	98%	-2	-2.2%
1-92 Garfield Commons	75	74	99%	97	97	100%			97	97	100%	0	0.0%
1-94 Oak Hill Phase 2	0	0	0%	45	45	0%			45	45	100%	0	0.0%
Total	1111	1070	96%	1178	1164	99%			1178	1142	97%	-22	-1.9%

**Table IIB-3 – LIPH Occupancy – January 1, 2011, Projected December 31, 2011 and Actual December 31, 2011
HACP-Managed and Privately Managed Units**

	January 1, 2010			Projected December 31, 2011					Actual – Dec. 31, 2011			Projected/Actual -/+	
	Physical Unit	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied	Physical Unit	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied			Physical Unit	Number Occupied	Percent Occupied	d/Actual -/+	% /+
HACP-Managed	3704	2958	80%	3303	3072	93%			3612	2825	78%	-247	-8.0%
Privately Managed	1111	1070	96%	1178	1164	99%			1178	1142	97%	-22	-1.9%
Agency Total	4815	4028	84%	4481	4236	95%			4790	3967	83%	-269	-6.4%

Table IIB - 4A - HACP - LIPH and HCV Families Served 01/01/01 to 01/01/12 Traditional Programs

	1/1/2001	1/1/2002	1/1/2003	1/1/2004	1/1/2005	1/1/2006	1/1/2007	1/1/2008	1/1/2009	1/1/2010	1/1/2011	1/1/2012
LIPH Family	3813	3489	3612	3573	3437	3280	3135	3017	2919	2879	2934	2766
LIPH Elderly	1433	1355	1313	1248	1219	1218	1269	1211	1195	1132	1100	1205
HCV Family	3440	3891	3973	4496	4786	6076	5649	4954	4651	4463	4538	4739
HCV Elderly	459	472	555	581	560	592	588	609	596	600	672	691
Totals	9145	9207	9453	9898	10002	11166	10641	9791	9361	9092	9244	9401

Table IIB-4B – Total Families Served – January 1, 2010 and Projected December 31, 2011

	January 1, 2010		January 1, 2011		Projected December 31, 2011		Actual January 1, 2012		Projected/Actual -/+	
	Families Served		Families Served		Families Served		Families Served		Projected/Actual -/+	% -/+
LIPH Traditional	3997		4034		4236		3967		-269	-6.4%
HCV/Section 8 Traditional	5077		5210		5500		5430		-70	-1.3%
Non-traditional rental	505		505		586		564		-22	-3.8%
Homeownership	58		72		83		80		-3	-3.6%
Total	9637		9821		10405		10041		-364	-3.5%

Variations in leasing between projected and actual numbers:

Addison Terrace lease levels were significantly below projections due to a larger than anticipated initial relocation area, and a faster relocation process than anticipated.

Bedford Dwellings and Allegheny Dwellings: Leasing at all family properties was suspended late in 2011 to ensure adequate units to accommodate relocating Addison Families.

Relocation was still ongoing on 12/31/2011.

Northview Heights: Occupancy above projections resulted from greater than anticipated numbers of Addison Terrace families choosing to relocate to Northview Heights, and a very aggressive leasing focus by management.

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

B. Leasing Information – Actual

Public Housing Units Leased:

HACP projected total LIPH occupancy of 4,236 units leased at the end of FY 2011. Projected leased units on December 31, 2011 included 3,072 leased HACP-managed units and 1,164 privately managed units.

Actual total LIPH occupancy was 3,967. Actual units leased included 2825 HACP managed units and 1142 privately managed units.

(See Tables IIB-1, IIB-2 and IIB-3.)

Housing Choice Voucher Units Leased:

The HACP projected a combined (MtW and non-MtW) HCV voucher usage of approximately 5500 vouchers at the end of FY 2011.

On December 31, 2011, actual combined voucher usage was 5430. This included 5118 MTW vouchers, 312 non-MTW vouchers.

Also in 2011, HACP completed a competitive process via a Request For Proposals for Project Based Vouchers. Only the Center City Apartments/Milliones Manor completed a Housing Assistance Payment Contract or an Agreement to Enter Into a Housing Assistance Payment Contract in 2011.

Total Units Leased/Families Served:

Total projected HACP occupancy (LIPH and Section 8) for the end of 2011 was approximately 9700 units. HACP, through the leveraging of its redevelopment dollars, is also responsible for the creation of at least 255 tax credit affordable units, and 309 affordable market rate units, all of which are at or near full occupancy, for an additional 564 families served. HACP also served 80 families through the HACP Homeownership Program and the Bedford HOPE VI Homeownership Program as of the end of 2011.

On January 1, 2012, the HACP served a total of 9397 households through its traditional programs (3967 LIPH households and 5430 Section 8 households). HACP also served 564 families through its non-traditional rental programs, and 80 through its homeownership programs, for a total of 10,041 families served. (Table IIB.-4).

The HACP Housing Choice Voucher Program waiting list remained closed during 2011. Please see Section II.C. for additional waiting list information.

Table IIC - 1 – Number of Households on the Wait List, Jan. 1, 2001 - Jan. 1, 2010 – Jan. 1, 2011 - Jan. 1, 2012

Notes on Table 2-5:

1. In preparing data, it was determined that informatin for the LIPH waiting list for 2007-2010 previously reported included total counts of all persons and all site lists. As families can appear on more than one list, this resulted in an overcount of distinct families. The numbers in blue below are corrected numbers. Numbers in Red are for 1/1/2012.
2. When HACP opened the HCV waiting list in 2010, pre-applications did not result in entering of data on family age and size, thus data on family vs. senior and bedroom size is not available for the HCV waiting list for 1/1/11 and 1/1/12.

Public Housing

	Eff/1 Bedroom				2 Bedroom				3 Bedroom				4 Bedroom				5+ Bedrooms				Total			
	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Family	109	629	431	843	86	297	167	316	45	150	54	106	8	94	26	44	4	21	11	7	252	1191	689	1316
Elderly	18	64	108	53	0	13	18	7	0	3	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	85	128	61
Total	127	693	539	896	86	310	185	323	45	153	56	107	8	99	26	44	4	21	11	7	270	1276	817	1377

HCV (Section 8)

	Eff/1 Bedroom				2 Bedroom				3 Bedroom				4 Bedroom				5+ Bedrooms				Total			
	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Family	585	9			592	2			275	3			63	1			0	1			1515	16		
Elderly	93	1			8	0			1	0			0	1			0	0			102	2		
Total	678	10			600	2			276	3			63	2			0	1			1617	18	6530	1980

Total Public Housing and HCV (Section 8)

	Eff/1 Bedroom				2 Bedroom				3 Bedroom				4 Bedroom				5+ Bedrooms				Total			
	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Family	694	638	431	843	678	299	167	316	320	153	54	106	71	95	26	44	4	22	11	7	1767	1207	689	1316
Elderly	111	65	108	53	8	13	18	7	1	3	2	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	87	128	61
Total	805	703	539	896	686	312	185	323	321	156	56	107	71	101	26	44	4	22	11	7	1887	1294	7347	3357

Table IIC - 2- Number of Households on the Wait List, Jan. 1, 2001 through Jan. 1, 2012

HACP - LIPH and HCV (Section 8) Wait List 01/01/01 to 01/01/12

	1/1/2001	1/1/2002	1/1/2003	1/1/2004	1/1/2005	1/1/2006	1/1/2007	1/1/2008	1/1/2009	1/1/2010	1/1/2011	1/1/2012
LIPH Family	252	411	445	1107	2079	1531	634	814	992	1191	689	1316
LIPH Elderly	18	52	80	90	374	132	60	75	96	85	128	61
HCV Family	1515	830	337	1661	4433	1982	4325	3407	1653	16	6530	1980
HCV Elderly	102	35	21	77	364	108	237	163	373	2		
Totals	1887	1328	883	2935	7250	3753	5256	4459	3114	1294	7347	3357

Table IIC - 3 – Number of Households on the Wait List by Community and Bedroom Size – January 1, 2011 - January 1, 2012

Family Communities

1-1 Addison Terrace & Addison Addition 1-		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
(Includes Addison)	Standing Units	N/A	188		381		130		23		12		N/A		734	
	Waiting List 11-12		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0

Note: The Addison waiting list was closed during 2010 when a demolition application, in anticipation of redevelopment, was submitted to HUD.

1-2 Bedford		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
	Standing Units	N/A	122		240		49		N/A		N/A		N/A		411	
	Waiting List 11-12		241	449	44	97	25	49							310	595

1-4 Arlington Heights		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
	Standing Units	N/A	31		112		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		143	
	Waiting List 11-12		172	352	17	79									189	431

1-5 Allegheny		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
	Standing Units	N/A	72		200		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		272	
	Waiting List 11-12		186	395	23	84									209	479

1-7 St. Clair Village	St. Clair Village was vacated and demolished in 2010.															
------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1-9 Northview Heights Family		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
	Standing Units	N/A	N/A		40		346		79		22		N/A		486	
	Waiting List 11-12				22	76	12	38	2	19	4	4			40	137

**Table 2-5A – Number of Households on the Wait List by Community and Bedroom Size
– January 1, 2011 – January 1, 2012**

1-12 Garfield Family	The remaining units are Garfield Heights were vacated and demolished in 2010 as part of the redevelopment process.													
-----------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1-20 Homewood	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
Standing Units	N/A	N/A		36		57		32		N/A		9		134	
Waiting List 11-12				38	85	11	39	11	21			0	1	60	146

1-22 and 1-39 Scattered Sites	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total		
(Inc. PA 1-22, 39, 42, 50, 51, 88 & 90.)	Standing Units	N/A	N/A		51		206		26		7		N/A		290	
	Waiting List 11-12			76	81	7	13	8	11	7	3			98	108	

Note: HACP operates a combined waiting list for AMPs PA-22 Scattered Sites North and PA-39 Scattered Sites South.

1-32 Glen Hazel (Family)	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total		
Inc. Glen Hazel PA 1-32, 38, 57.	Standing Units	N/A	16		34		62		20		N/A		N/A		132	
	Waiting List 11-12		180	360	63	123	38	59	14	24				295	566	

1-62 Broadhead	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total		
	Standing Units	N/A	N/A		48		16		N/A		N/A		N/A		64	
	Waiting List 11-12				0	0	0	0						0	0	

Note: Broadhead Manor was vacated after it was flooded by Hurricane Ivan in 2004.

**Table 2-5A – Number of Households on the Wait List by Community and Bedroom Size
– January 1, 2011 – January 1, 2012**

Elderly Communities

1-9 Northview (Elderly)	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
Standing Units	N/A	32		56		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		88	
Waiting List 11-12		17	66	1	1									18	67

1-15 PA-Bidwell	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
Standing Units	N/A	100		20		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		120	
Waiting List 11-12		34	94	2	2									36	96

1-17 Pressley St.	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
Standing Units	15	180		16		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		211	
Waiting List 11-12	* *	61	107	5	6									66	113

* HACP does not maintain a separate waiting list for efficiency units.

1-31 Murray Tower	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
Standing Units	38	27		3		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		68	
Waiting List 11-12	* *	84	148	7	11									91	159

* HACP does not maintain a separate waiting list for efficiency units.

1-33 Glen Hazel High Rise	Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
Standing Units	N/A	90		7		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		97	
Waiting List 11-12		21	72	1	0									22	72

**Table 2-5A – Number of Households on the Wait List by Community and Bedroom Size –
January 1, 2011 – January 1, 2012**

1-40 Brookline		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
(Mazza)	Standing Units	N/A	30		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		30	
	Waiting List 11-12		0	42											0	42

Note: The Mazza Pavilion Waiting List re-opened October 26, 2011.

1-41 Allentown		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
(Caliguiri)	Standing Units	N/A	104		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		104	
	Waiting List 11-12		30	79											30	79

1-42 South Oakland		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
(Finello)	Standing Units	N/A	60		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		60	
	Waiting List 11-12		70	136											70	136

1-45 Morse Gardens		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
	Standing Units	N/A	70		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		70	
	Waiting List 11-12		86	135											86	135

1-46 Carrick Regency		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
	Standing Units	N/A	66		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		66	
	Waiting List 11-12		55	97											55	97

1-47 Gualtieri Manor		Eff.	1-Bdrm		2-Bdrm		3-Bdrm		4-Bdrm		5-Bdrm		6-Bdrm		Total	
	Standing Units	4	27		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		31	
	Waiting List 11-12	*	*	25	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	85

* HACP does not maintain a separate waiting list for efficiency units.

II. General Housing Authority Operating Information

C. Waiting List Information

The HACP did not make any organizational or procedural changes to the HACP public housing waiting lists in 2011. The HACP continue to monitor HACP site-based waiting lists as a property management monitoring measure in 2011.

In 2010, HACP modified its Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan to allow for the acceptance of pre-applications during a specified period and the assignment of position based upon a random selection of all pre-applications received.

Following the culling of the Section 8 waiting list in 2009 and the distribution of vouchers to applicants already on the waiting list, HACP reopened the HACP Section 8 waiting list for a two-week period from February 28, 2010 through March 15, 2010. This approach was adopted in anticipation of high demand for Housing Choice Vouchers and to avoid potential problems with crowding of application locations and disputes over waiting list position. It also eliminated the need for persons to take time off from work or away from family in order to apply. HACP received over 9,000 pre-applications during the two-week period.

After assignment to the waiting list based upon a random selection, families are processed for eligibility as they near the top of the list. The pre-application included limited information, and no need to enter unconfirmed information from the pre-application, especially as that information could easily change between the time of pre-application and the offering of a voucher, information on type of family – such as elderly, family and the unit size needed, was not entered into our system. Therefore waiting list numbers for the Housing Choice Voucher Program are only available in total numbers. As of 1/1/2012, 1980 people were still on the Housing Choice Voucher pre-application waiting list.

HACP's waiting list for LIPH housing managed by HACP had 1377 applicants as of January 1, 2012. HACP believes the numbers are adequate to achieve continued occupancy increases. Marketing and other efforts targeting those properties with smaller waiting lists are planned for 2012.

Waiting list data, including waiting list information by site, follows this section.

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

- A. Planned Sources and Uses of other HUD or other Federal Funds (excluding HOPE VI):

Information on planned and actual sources and uses of other HUD or other Federal Funds (excluding Hope VI) are included and separately identified in the Sources and Uses charts included in Section VII.

- B. Description of non-MTW activities by the Agency:

HACP chose not to include in the Moving To Work Annual Plan descriptions of non-MTW activities, so has not including separate information in this section of the report.

Two non-MTW Activities were discussed in the 2011 Annual Plan: Activities related to the Voluntary Compliance Agreement, and PIC reporting requirements.

- a. Description of non-MTW activities related to the Voluntary Compliance Agreement

As of December, 2010, HACP and HUD closed the VCA and the Authority satisfied requirements set forth in the Agreement. This included updating of all policies and procedures, and certifying completion of a total of at least 264 UFAS units.

As of December, 2011, HACP was completing 4 additional UFAS units, 2 each at the Carrick and Caliguirri High Rise Buildings. In addition, one UFAS unit (in addition to the standard required number of UFAS units) will be included in Phase 1 of the Addison Terrace redevelopment project, expected to be completed by the end of 2013.

- b. Plan to achieve HUD's PIC Reporting requirements for HACP managed units.

HACP achieved over 95% compliance in 2011 for both HACP managed units and privately managed units.

Section IV. Long-Term Moving To Work Plan (Optional)

HACP's vision for its Moving To Work Program through 2018, and potentially beyond, builds upon the vision of HACP's 2001-2010 Moving To Work Plans. This vision is built around two major themes that together will achieve the three statutory objectives of the Moving To Work Demonstration Program.

Theme one is to reposition HACP's housing stock to compete in the local market, improve operational efficiencies, and expand housing choices for low-income families.

Theme two is to promote self-sufficiency and independent living through a variety of enhanced services and policy adjustments. These programs and policies will be designed to provide incentives to work for adult, able bodied, non-elderly heads of households and family members, and to promote social and academic achievement for children and youth. In addition to increasing economic self-sufficiency among assisted families, these programs and policies are expected to result in increased revenue for the Housing Authority (increasing the cost effectiveness of federal expenditures) while increasing housing choices for families (with increased work and income they will have additional housing choices both within the HACP portfolio and in the larger housing market).

While the mechanisms are not yet in place to effectively measure all of these expected outcomes, especially those that are cumulative and long-term, shorter-term measures either are or will be put into place for each specific MtW initiative. See Section VI for more detailed information on the specific initiatives.

Repositioning of HACP's Housing Stock

Since the initial HACP Moving To Work Annual Plan in 2001, a major component of HACP's moving to work strategy has been to reposition HACP's housing stock through a) preservation of successful developments and b) revitalization of distressed developments through strategic investments that re-link public housing properties to their surrounding neighborhoods and act as a driver of other public and private investments to revitalize entire neighborhoods.

Initiated prior to Moving To Work through three HOPE VI redevelopment projects and continued through the Moving To Work Program, HACP has achieved great success. Allequippa Terrace, Manchester Apartments, and Bedford Additions are replaced by Oak Hill, multiple properties across Manchester virtually indistinguishable from their neighbors, and the Bedford Hills apartments, respectively. The new senior buildings Silver Lake, the Fairmont, the Commons and North Aiken and the Legacy are new positive anchors in their neighborhoods, replacing the distressed, and neighborhood distressing, East Hills, Garfield, Auburn Towers and Addison High Rises.

A by-product of these redevelopment efforts, which feature reduced densities, mixed income, and modern conveniences, is a reduced number of traditional public housing units. This is not inappropriate in Pittsburgh, which has seen city population decline substantially over the last 40

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

years. More important is that this is balanced by the addition of new affordable units supported by tax credits, and new units rented at market rates. In Pittsburgh, many of the new market rate units are affordable to families of modest income. Section 8 Housing Choice vouchers also support low income families, provide them choices in the housing market, and support occupancy of units available in the private market.

HACP has also invested in its successful housing in recent years, including completion of partial comprehensive modernization at the Glen Hazel and PA-Bidwell highrises, and many other improvements. HACP recently completed a five year plan to create fully accessible units at all of its properties, and has implemented an Energy Performance Contract for improvements that include the installation of energy efficient and cost saving geothermal heating (and cooling) systems at several developments.

HACP is committed to continuing these preservation and revitalization efforts, to the greatest extent feasible with the funding available, throughout the Moving To Work demonstration.

The charts at the end of this chapter show projected sources of funds that can be used for capital projects, and projected uses of those funds over the next ten years. All of these numbers reflect projected obligations (not expenditure) of funds, and are projections only and are subject change based upon funding levels and opportunities, financial and real estate market conditions, new or changing regulations or requirements, and other unforeseen developments. Please note that the “callout” boxes contain notes that refer to the item below and to the left of where the small arrow touches the box.

The highlights of this plan are as follows:

- Complete the Garfield Heights redevelopment. With the high rise replacement completed, Phase One of the family development was completed near the end of 2009, and Phase Two was completed in 2010. Phase three was completed in 2011. Tax credits have been awarded and the final Phase IV is currently under construction . HACP’s investment, when combined with the private efforts of the Bloomfield Garfield Corporation, the Garfield Jubilee Association, the Friendship Development Associates and the Penn Avenue Arts Initiative, position Garfield to build on the success of the surrounding neighborhoods and become a destination for private investment and a thriving, revitalized, community. As such, HACP built on the significant commitment of capital dollars in 2011, and will continue to do so in future years until the redevelopment is complete.
- Rehabilitate Mazza Pavilion. This successful property in the heart of the Brookline neighborhood business district had to be vacated due to a failed building envelope and a resulting mold situation. Although costly, rehabilitating this property was a priority. Significant investment, made possible by Recovery Act Funding, allowed for the complete renovation of the building which was completed in 2011.
- Build on investments in Northview Heights. HACP completing conversion of 63 units into 26 new UFAS units and 26 new non-UFAS units along with substantial site work, in 2009 and 2010. An ESCO funded geothermal heating and cooling system was also installed for all family units in 2009 and 2010. HACP has built on these investments to solidify Northview Heights’ rebound. Thus investment in modernization of additional units, replacement of roofs, and other improvements were completed in 2011, with additional work planned in

future years. An additional 30 vacant units in the buildings with new UFAS units were renovated in 2010 by in-house Force Account crews, and the replacement of roofs on nine (9) buildings, and replacement of siding on all buildings, began in 2010 and was completed in 2011. Replacement of additional roofs, and other unit and community modernization projects are planned in future years.

- Begin revitalization of Addison Terrace. Addison Terrace is only two blocks from the key Centre Avenue corridor in the Hill District, which includes the brand new Legacy Apartments, the brand new Hill Public Library, an under construction new YMCA, as well as the Hill House Association and a handful of existing commercial properties. A full service grocery store, financed in part by a Community Benefits Agreement associated with the new arena about 10 blocks down the street, will broke ground in 2011. HACP is working with the larger Hill District Master Planning Process to plan redevelopment of Addison Terrace. A demolition application was approved by HUD in 2011, and initial relocation of residents from the Phase 1 demolition area was also completed in 2011, with abatement and demolition to begin in early 2011. Plans include some off-site replacement units as well as a new mixed income community on site. Because of projected high costs for such a redevelopment effort, this projected plan calls for creative financing mechanisms as included in HACP's 2012 MTW Annual Plan.
- Plan for new development in the East End, including Hamilton-Larimer. With the market and development rebound in East Liberty, and the completion of the Larimer Vision Plan for the Larimer Avenue corridor spanning East Liberty and Larimer, a growing consensus around neighborhood revitalization strategies in these neighborhoods has been demonstrated. Working with a variety of partners in Larimer and East Liberty, HACP is pursuing new development opportunities in these neighborhoods, including the Hamilton-Larimer and former Auburn Towers site on the border of East Liberty and Larimer. HACP will continue to work closely with other City agencies and neighborhood organizations to identify the opportunities with the potential for the greatest impact, and has applied for Choice Neighborhoods Initiative Planning grant funding to support this effort. Although not awarded a CN Planning Grant, HACP has selected a Master Planning firm to assist the HACP and its partners in further developing a Vision To Action Plan that can be utilized to guide future development and seek funding sources, including a possible Choice Neighborhoods Implementation Grant Application in 2013.
- Modernize other successful but aging properties. HACP recognizes that existing properties cannot be neglected. In addition to regular funding for safety and REAC items at all properties, HACP continues planning for larger modernization efforts at other properties over the next ten years, including its successful scattered sites portfolio. .

Not included in the attached chart are funding and financing strategies to support and leverage HACP MtW funding targeting these developments. As funding opportunities and financing mechanisms change, HACP will adapt and adopt the approaches that are most advantageous to the agency. These approaches include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Low Income Housing Tax Credits
- Federal, State and Local Housing Trust Funds dollars as available.
- Other Federal, State and Local funds such as CDBG, HOME, PA Department of Community and Economic Development Programs, and others as can be secured.

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

- Project basing of Housing Choice Vouchers, including potential initiatives to utilize MTW Authority in approaches to project basing of Housing Choice Vouchers should that be advantageous.
- Approaches inspired by HUD's Preserving, Enhancing and Transforming Rental Assistance (PETRA) proposal.
- Pledging future year Operating and Capital Funding to support redevelopment.
- Requesting replacement vouchers at MTW-determined rates in order to support redevelopment.
- Any and all other opportunities and mechanisms that are available or can be identified or developed that will assist HACP in furthering its goals under MTW and under the Low Income Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs.

Promoting Self-Sufficiency And Independent Living Through A Variety Of Enhanced Services And Policy Adjustments.

HACP is committed to continuing to pursue programs and policies that promote self-sufficiency and independent living. This is pursued through programs and policy modifications.

HACP's Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program, called Realizing Economic Attainment For Life or REAL, includes the Resident Employment Program (REP). REAL and REP provide a variety of supports, programs, and referrals to residents to assist them in preparing for, seeking, finding, and retaining employment. The program and the Authority also work constantly to link with other programs, leverage additional services, and create positive environments for families, adults, seniors, and children. REAL and REP are complemented by the programs provided by HACP and its partners that focus on youth of various ages, including the BJWL after school and summer programs, the Clean Slate Drug Free Lifestyles and Youth Leadership Development Program, and the Creative Arts Corner state of the art studios at Northview Heights and the Bedford Hope Center.

HACP policy modifications are also designed to promote self-sufficiency, and the modified rent policy, as described in Section VI is designed to encourage families to participate in the FSS program.

The goal of these initiatives is to create an environment where work is the norm and personal responsibility is expected, and HACP continues to explore additional policy adjustments towards this end. Such policy changes may include alternative rent structures for the Low Income Public Housing program and/or the Housing Choice Voucher Program; increasing the minimum rent for those able-bodied non-elderly residents who do not work or participate in the FSS program for over one year; partnering with schools to create academic achievement support and/or incentive programs, or other mandatory school attendance programs, for residents; or other creative initiatives still to be identified or developed. Any new initiatives will be included in the appropriate portions of future Moving To Work Annual Plans.

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

It is HACP's vision to create vibrant, sustainable communities where family members of all ages can thrive and where life choices and opportunities are not limited. HACP will pursue this goal through the interconnected strategies of re-positioning the housing stock through preservation and revitalization, and promoting self-sufficiency through support programs and policy modifications.

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH
2012 - 2021 CAPITAL BUDGET OBLIGATION SUMMARY**

As of 8/1/11

SOURCES	PROJECTED SOURCES	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	5-Year SubTotals	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	5-Year Subtotals	10-Year Totals	
	MtW Funds (\$5 Mil PH & \$3 Million Voucher)*	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	62,500,000	12,500,000	12,000,000	11,500,000				36,000,000	98,500,000
	CFP Projected Future Funding	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	50,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000		50,000,000	100,000,000
	RHF Projected Future Funding	2,739,383	468,571	500,000	500,000	500,000	4,707,954	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000		2,500,000	7,207,954
	Choice Neighborhood Grant		10,000,000	13,000,000			23,000,000							0	23,000,000
	Green Building Grants/Conventional Mortgage(s) - New Central Office	4,000,000	6,000,000				10,000,000							0	10,000,000
	Addison - PETRA Funding	14,100,000	14,100,000	14,100,000	14,100,000		56,400,000							0	56,400,000
	Cove Place - Conventional Mortgage				2,000,000	5,000,000	7,000,000							0	7,000,000
	Program Income - Legacy						0							0	0
	Program Income - Garfield I/II/III						0							0	0
TOTALS ALL PROJECTED SOURCES	43,339,383	53,068,571	50,100,000	39,100,000	28,000,000	213,607,954	23,000,000	22,500,000	22,000,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	88,500,000	302,107,954	

USES	PROPOSED USES	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	5-Year SubTotals	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	5-Year Subtotals	10-Year Totals		
	HACP-WIDE	Administrative	3,658,492	3,695,077	3,805,929	3,920,107	4,037,710	19,117,315	4,078,087	4,200,430	4,326,443	4,456,236	4,589,923	21,651,119	40,768,434	
		Security	4,120,000	3,708,000	3,337,200	3,003,480	2,703,132	16,871,812	2,432,819	2,505,804	2,580,978	2,658,407	2,738,159	12,916,167	29,787,979	
		504/UFAS misc	500,000	500,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	1,600,000						0	1,600,000	
		Equipment (Range/Refrig, Vehicles, Other Misc)	515,000	515,000	515,000	515,000	515,000	2,575,000	515,000	530,000	515,000	530,000	545,900	2,635,900	5,210,900	
		LBP Abatement - Other Misc Hazmat	500,000	515,000	530,450	546,364	500,000	2,591,814	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,500,000	5,091,814	
								0							0	0
		Resident Services	2,000,000	1,800,000	1,600,000	1,400,000	1,200,000	8,000,000	100,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,100,000	12,100,000
		Garfield Debt Service to FannieMae						0							0	0
	SUBTOTAL HACP-WIDE USES	11,293,492	10,733,077	9,988,579	9,584,951	9,155,842	50,755,941	7,625,906	8,736,234	8,922,421	9,144,643	9,373,982	9,373,982	43,803,186	94,559,127	
SUBTOTAL DEVELOPMENT	32,600,000	32,600,000	41,600,000	18,600,000	4,800,000	130,200,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,130,000	14,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	42,130,000	172,330,000		
SUBTOTAL MODERNIZATION	5,700,000	2,950,000	7,450,000	3,410,000	3,500,000	23,010,000	4,610,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	1,950,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	12,160,000	35,170,000		
TOTALS ALL PROPOSED USES	49,593,492	46,283,077	59,038,579	31,594,951	17,455,842	203,965,941	19,235,906	18,036,234	18,352,421	25,094,643	17,373,982	17,373,982	98,093,186	302,059,127		

Annual Surplus/ (Deficit)	(6,254,109)	6,785,494	(8,938,579)	7,505,049	10,544,158		3,764,094	4,463,766	3,647,579	(14,594,643)	(6,873,982)			
Additional Funding Available/ (Needed)	(6,254,109)	531,385	(8,407,194)	(902,145)	9,642,013		13,406,107	17,869,873	21,517,452	6,922,809	48,827			48,827

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH
2012 - 2021 DEVELOPMENT AND MODERNIZATION SUMMARY**

As of 8/1/11

Proposed Development		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	5-Year Subtotals	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	5-Year Subtotals	10-Year Totals	Comments	
DEVELOPMENT	Addison - Step Up to Market	14,100,000	14,100,000	14,100,000	14,100,000		56,400,000						0	56,400,000	400 units redeveloped on site.	
	Addison - MtW Funds	14,500,000	2,500,000	14,500,000	2,500,000		34,000,000						0	34,000,000	Funding for site prep/ infrastructure and gap financing for all 4 phases	
	Hamilton-Larimer		10,000,000	13,000,000			23,000,000						0	23,000,000	Planning in 2011 and Choice Neighborhood funding in 2013/2014.	
	Arlington						0		500,000	6,630,000	7,000,000		14,130,000	14,130,000	Start planning in 2018. New construction budget for 60 PH at \$221,000	
	HACP/ARMDC Office	4,000,000	6,000,000				10,000,000						0	10,000,000	HACP headquarters scheduled to be sold. new office needed in 24 months	
	Allegheny Dwellings					500,000	500,000	7,000,000	6,500,000					13,500,000	14,000,000	Redevelop community with 50 new public housing units with planning starting in 2016.
	Homewood North						0			500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000		14,500,000	14,500,000	Start planning in 2019. New construction budget for 70 PH at \$200,000
	Cove Place				2,000,000	4,300,000	6,300,000							0	6,300,000	ARMDC will develop market rate/for sale units.
	SUBTOTAL DEVELOPMENT	32,600,000	32,600,000	41,600,000	18,600,000	4,800,000	130,200,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,130,000	14,000,000	7,000,000	42,130,000	172,330,000		
Proposed Modernization		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	5-Year Subtotals	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	5-Year Subtotals	10-Year Totals	Comments	
REGION I	1001/1013 Addison - Bentley Dr.	400,000	400,000	300,000		0	1,100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,100,000	Prepare Mgmt. office/community space for Bentley Drive residents	
	1002 Bedford Dwellings	0	0	500,000	510,000	0	1,010,000	100,000	0	100,000	0	0	200,000	1,210,000	REAC/Interim Safety work	
	1015 PA Bidwell	200,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	300,000	650,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	1,000,000	1,200,000	1,850,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs	
	1017 Pressley	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	100,000	250,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	0	150,000	400,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs	
REGION II	1005 Allegheny Dwellings	100,000	100,000	100,000	50,000	100,000	450,000	50,000	0	100,000	0	0	150,000	600,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs until redev start in 2016 (see above)	
	1009 Northview Heights	3,000,000	1,700,000	0	100,000	100,000	4,900,000	100,000	0		0	0	100,000	5,000,000	Change 32 flat roofs to gable roofs and upgrade electrical work in family room	
	1011 Hamilton/Larimer	100,000	0	0	0	0	100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	100,000	Interim REAC/Safety repairs at 2010-2011. Redevelopment in 2013 (see above)	
	1020 Homewood North	100,000	100,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	350,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	350,000	Interim REAC/Safety repairs until redev start in 2019 (see above)	
REGION III	1004 Arlington Heights	100,000	50,000	0	0	0	150,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	150,000	Interim REAC/Safety repairs until redev start in 2018 (see above)	
	1031 Murray Towers	0	0	3,500,000	0	0	3,500,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,500,000	Comp. Modernization in 2013/4	
	1032, 1057 Glen Hazel Family (incl. Renova)	0	0	200,000	0	200,000	400,000	0	200,000	0	200,000	0	400,000	800,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs	
	1033 Glen Hazel Highrise	50,000	0	0	0	200,000	250,000	100,000	0	100,000	0	0	200,000	450,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs	
	1041 Caliguir Plaza	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000	800,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	0	400,000	1,200,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs	
	1044 Finello Pavilion	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	0	300,000	100,000	0	100,000	0	0	200,000	500,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs	
	1045 Morse Gardens	0	0	0	100,000	50,000	150,000	100,000	0	100,000	0	0	200,000	350,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs	
	1046 Carrick Regency	900,000	0	0	100,000	0	1,000,000	0	100,000	0	0	0	100,000	1,100,000	Clear plumbing lines in 2010; Interim REAC/Safety repairs.	
	1047 Gualtieri Manor	100,000	0	0	50,000	0	150,000	1,860,000	0	0	0	0	1,860,000	2,010,000	Interim REAC and Safety Repairs; Mod in 2017	
	1051, 1052 Scattered Sites	400,000	300,000	2,600,000	2,000,000	2,200,000	7,500,000	2,000,000	1,800,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	0	7,000,000	14,500,000	Interim REAC/safety repairs, mod of some units each year, from 3-4 in 2011 to 32 in 2013	
SUBTOTAL MODERNIZATION	5,700,000	2,950,000	7,450,000	3,410,000	3,500,000	23,010,000	4,610,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	1,950,000	1,000,000	12,160,000	35,170,000			

Section V. Proposed Moving To Work Activities: HUD Approval Requested

HACP proposed, and received approval, to modify its Housing Choice Voucher Program Administrative Plan and tenant payment policy to mirror the HACP's Public Housing Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy (ACOP) to include a \$150.00 minimum tenant payment for non-elderly, non-disabled families whose tenant payment is less than \$150.00 per month and who choose not to participate in a self-sufficiency program.

Please see Section VI. for information on the results of this initiative.

Section VI. Ongoing MTW Activities: HUD approval previously granted.

1. and 2. Modified Rent Policy for the Low Income Public Housing Program and the Housing Choice Voucher Program

As approved in 2008 for LIPH and in 2011 for HCV, HACP requires that any non-elderly, able-bodied head of household who is not working to either participate in a Family Self-Sufficiency Program or Local Self-Sufficiency Program or pay a minimum rent or tenant payment of \$150.00 per month. Specifically, the HACP lease, ACOP, and Administrative Plans require that any non-elderly, able bodied head of household who is not working and is paying less than \$150.00 per month in rent/tenant payment will be required to participate in a Family Self-Sufficiency or Local Self-Sufficiency Program. For administrative purposes, this has been presented as a new minimum rent/tenant payment of \$150 per month with the following exceptions:

- Tenant actively participating in HACP, Department of Public Welfare, or other approved self-sufficiency program.
- Tenant is age 62 or older.
- Tenant is blind or otherwise disabled and unable to work.
- Tenant is engaged in at least 15 hours of work per week.
- Tenant has applied for a hardship exemption.

All other elements of rent calculation remain unchanged, and those in one of the categories listed above may have rents of less than \$150.00 per month but not less than \$25.00 per month.

Hardship Exemption Policy:

HACP may grant a hardship exemption from the rent, including the \$25.00 per month minimum required of those exempted from the \$150.00 minimum rent, under the following circumstances:

- When the family is awaiting an eligibility determination for a government assistance program;
- When the income of the family has decreased because of loss of employment;
- When a death has occurred in the family; and
- When other such circumstances occur that would place the family in dire financial straits such that they are in danger of losing housing. Such other circumstances will be considered and a determination made by the HACP.

When a family requests a hardship exemption, the HACP will determine if the hardship is temporary or long term. If the hardship is verified to be temporary (less than 90 days), when the hardship ceases, the HACP will reinstate the prior rent amount for the hardship period and offer the family a reasonable repayment agreement in accordance with the HACP Re-Payment Policy for the period the rent was suspended. Failure to comply with a reasonable repayment agreement under these circumstances may result in eviction.

If the hardship is verified to be long-term (lasting more than 90 days), the minimum rent will be suspended until the hardship ceases. Members of the family who are of working age and are not age 62 or older and are not blind or otherwise disabled may be required to participate in the Family Self-Sufficiency Program in order to qualify for the rent suspension. Although a family may not be evicted for failing to pay the minimum rent

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

while the hardship is occurring, families who are required to participate in a Family Self-Sufficiency Program may be evicted for failure to actively participate and maintain in good standing with the FSS program during that time period.

If the Housing Authority determines there is no qualifying financial hardship, prior rent will be reinstated back to the time of suspension. The family may use the formal and/or informal grievance procedure to appeal the Housing Authority's determination regarding the hardship. No escrow deposit will be required in order to access the grievance procedure.

HACP has continued implementation of these policies. Preliminary results are positive, as indicated below with increased percentages of participating families working, the increase in the percentage of overall families working, and the increase in the average rent of all LIPH families. The reduced FSS participation is a result of increased focus on participating families maintaining active participation and normal attrition after the large increase in participation in 2008 and 2009.

HACP established baseline measures in mid-2008 and mid-2009 as the full implementation of the policy was completed for LIPH. Data through 2011 is presented in the tables below.

FSS Program Stats	Baseline (2005)	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Annual Total	2010 LIPH	2010 HCV	2011 Annual Total	2011 LIPH	2011 HCV
FSS Participants	974	1149	609	1101	1190	1078	630	448	951	598	353
Number of families working (of FSS participants)	342	444	428	419	670	452	204	248	479	237	242
Percentage of families working (of FSS participants)	35.11%	38.64%	70.28%	38.06%	56.30%	42%	32%	55%	50%	40%	69%
# graduating from FSS					32	26	14	12	20	5	15
# of FSS participants with escrow accounts	95	86	176	193	318	382	191	191	387	194	193

Item (Public Housing Only, all families)	Baseline July 2008	Jul-09	Dec-09	Dec-10	Dec-11
HACP Rent Roll Amounts (\$)	\$685,682.44	\$681,627.69	\$649,290.56	\$622,099.14	\$598,036.02
HACP Rent collection amounts (\$)	\$612,027.55	\$686,855.32	\$654,811.47	\$700,812.21	\$560,161.35
	Aug-08		Dec-09	Dec-10	Dec - 11
Average Rent All Communities	\$ 198.88		\$ 204.71	\$ 202.43	\$205.76
Number of families working (reporting wage income)	713		708	712	697
Percentage of families working	22%		23%	24%	25%

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

Data is collected primarily via Emphasys Elite software, with periodic reports based on the tenant database. Additional data from the Tracking At A Glance case management software is also used.

HACP anticipated that this policy would result in increased rent roll and collections, increased participation in the FSS program, and increased number and percentage of families working.

Actual results have begun to reflect this trend. FSS participation again declined slightly, as the emphasis on enforcing program requirements and accuracy of data records continued.

Rent rolls and collections also declined, and this is a result of a declining economy and the declining number of households in HACP managed communities as a result of ongoing redevelopment and demolition efforts. The average income and average tenant rent for the entire HACP population remained fairly constant, as did the overall number of families reporting wage income. The percentage of LIPH of families reporting wage income continues to go up slightly, and we are hopeful this will represent an ongoing trend.

HACP did not receive any hardship exemption requests in 2011. More detailed review of these statistics on a property by property level is being pursued by the outside evaluator but results are not yet complete.

In order to more fully understand the impacts of this policy, HACP has also gathered the following data for December, 2011:

LIPH Rent Policy Impact Data for December, 2011

Item	Number 2010	Number 2011
Total non-disabled non-elderly families	1394	1309
Number of families working (reporting wage income)	595	556
Percentage of non-disabled, non-elderly families working	43%	43%
Number of families impacted (non-elderly non-disabled, and rent less than \$150)	828	797
Number exempt due to disability (disabled, rent <\$150)	206	210
Number exempt due to elderly (age 62+, rent <\$150)	72	69
Number enrolling in FSS (not elderly, not disabled, Tenant Rent <= \$150 and enrolled in FSS)	353	397

In assessing the impact of this policy, additional data will be extracted from current and historical database files. Additional research, including interviews of various categories of residents, may also prove valuable. In 2010, HACP procured outside evaluators to assist in evaluation of this initiative. Unfortunately, the timetable for procurement, and finalizing contractual arrangements with the selected provider, the University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs (GSPIA), Center for Metropolitan Studies, were not completed until well into 2011. Some preliminary results are included, with more in depth results expected in the coming months. Further development of data collection tools and

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

analysis is also planned. Please see the final pages of this section for additional details on the status of the 3rd party evaluation.

As part of its modified rent policy strategy, HACP offers an enhanced Family Self-Sufficiency Program and related services utilizing block grant authority to support this programming. This includes not only our FSS program, but also our Resident Employment Program and other support services, collectively known as Realizing Economic Attainment for Life, or REAL. Some additional description of this program and some statistics for that initiative are as follows:

HACP's enhanced Family Self-Sufficiency Program - REAL - allows more program slots than would be required under standard rules, provides extra services, including more intensive case management and the Resident Employment Program, than would normally be possible. Utilizing this flexibility increases the incentives for families to become self-sufficient. It is important to note that the existence of the Enhanced Family Self-Sufficiency Program is necessary to fairly implement the HACP rent policy, as requiring participation in an ineffective program would punish low-income families with many obstacles to work. It is, however, a separate activity.

One of the benefits of HACP's REAL Family Self-Sufficiency Program is its flexibility in responding to an individual's or family's needs. Service range from intensive case management to employment training and placement, and include referral for assistance with nearly any obstacle a family may face including mental health and addiction issues. The frequency of case management contacts varies based upon the individual's situation and needs. The Resident Employment Program component offers or refers participants to appropriate services from job readiness to specific skill training and job placement assistance, and includes a database of participants seeking work for use by participating employers. Employment place in Section 3 opportunities generated by HACP contracts is a part of the Resident Employment Program component of the REAL Family Self-Sufficiency Program.

HACP measures the impact of this program based on a number of factors including the rent policy impact factors listed above, and the following:

FSS Program Stats	2009	2010 Annual Total	2010 LIPH	2010 HCV	2011 Annual Total	2011 LIPH	2011HCV
Other measures							
# participating in training programs	320	248	147	101	218	73	145
# completing training programs	305	152	84	68	33*	14*	19*
# placed in employment	198	231	121	110	191	99	92
# retaining employment	645	480	239	241	455	219	236
# increasing income	269	249	131	118	263	136	127

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

* Beginning in 2011, HACP began counting only formal skill focused training programs in this category. Attendance at a pre-employment workshop, for example, no longer is counted as a training program ‘completed.’

This policy is authorized by section C. 11. of Attachment C, and Section C. 3 of Attachment D of the Moving To Work Agreement.

3. Revised recertification requirements policy.

Approved in 2008 for the Housing Choice Voucher Program and in 2009 for the Low Income Public Housing Program, recertification requirements are modified to require recertification at least once every two years rather than annually. Changes in income still must be reported, standard income disregards continue to apply, and HACP continues to utilize the EIV system in completing recertifications. This policy change reduces administrative burdens on the Authority, thereby reducing costs and increasing efficiency.

HACP has calculated the average time to process a recertification, the number of recerts previously completed annually, and the resulting costs, and has compared this to the same total calculations subsequent to the change in policy to measure the annual cost savings. The tables below show the recertifications completed and the estimated costs:

Re-certification Policy for HCV	2008	2009	2010	2011
Number of Annual Recerts			2698	2455
Number of interim Recerts			1889	1933
Total Recerts (estimated 2008 & 2009)	5500	2750	4596	4380
Average cost per recert	\$53.63	\$53.63	\$53.63	\$53.63
Total estimated costs	\$294,965.00	\$147,482.50	\$246,483.48	\$234899.40

Re-certification Policy for LIPH	2009	2010	2011
Number of Annual Recerts	2826	2587	2383
Number of interim Recerts	1070	1052	947
Total Recerts	3896	3639	3330
Average cost per recert	\$53.63	\$53.63	\$53.63
Total estimated costs	\$208,942.480	\$195,159.57	\$178,587.90

In addition to cost savings, this new policy has improved HACP’s performance and compliance with recertification requirements in the HCV program.

No changes to Moving To Work Authority related to this initiative are planned for 2012, although non-MTW changes to interim recertification policy to reduce the number of interim recertifications required are planned.

Authorized by Section C. 4. of Attachment C (for public housing) and Section D.1. c. of Attachment C (for Housing Choice Voucher Program).

4. Operation of a combined Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program.

Approved in 2007. HACP operates a single Homeownership Program open to both Low Income Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Program households. This approach reduces administrative costs, expands housing choices for participating households, and provides incentives for families to pursue employment and self-sufficiency through the various benefits offered. By combining the programs, increased benefits are available to some families.

Please see item #4 below for program performance information.

5. Homeownership Program assistance to include soft-second mortgage assistance coupled with closing cost assistance, homeownership and credit counseling, and foreclosure prevention only (no monthly homeownership voucher option): expand eligibility to persons on the LIPH and HCV program waiting list; establish a Homeownership Soft-second mortgage waiting list.

HACP data indicates that there are over 1000 families receiving Housing Choice Voucher assistance who have income high enough to be considered for homeownership. HACP tracks the number, and success rate, of Homeownership Program participants from the LIPH or HCV program. The total number of homeownership sales and the number of participants in the program are also tracked to measure the impact of this initiative.

Homeownership Statistics	2009	2010	LIPH 2010	HCV 2010	2011	LIPH 2011	HCV 2011
Closings / Purchase	12	14	6	8	8	2	6
Sales Agreements		14	9	5	27	0	27
Pre-Approval Letters		12	9	3	12	2	10
Number of applicants		64	53	11	101	12	89
Homeownership Education completed	56	40	32	8	39	13	26
HACP funds for closing (total)		\$28,833	\$19,620	\$9,213	\$26,176	\$3,000	\$23,176
Average HACP 2nd mortgage amount*		\$4,781	\$7,218	\$2,344	\$16,946.5	0	\$16,946.50
Average Purchase price		\$73,015	\$57,250	\$84,839	\$74,756	\$50,000	\$84,007
Amount of non-HACP assistance**		\$23,946	\$10,340	\$13,607	\$96,108	\$1,350	\$94,758
Foreclosures	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

- In 2011, four HACP second mortgages were utilized by homebuyers. Other homebuyers who completed homebuyer training and were counseled on available resources, might have either utilized no assistance, only closing assistance, assistance from other sources, etc.
- Assistance from other sources was as follows:

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

	2010	2011
<u>Housing Choice Voucher Program Buyers:</u>		
Seller's assist	\$ 7,856.57	0
State	\$ 3,000.00	\$4,808.00
Dollar Bank 3-2-1	\$ 2,750.00	0
URA Soft-Second Mortgage	\$103,000.00	\$58,000.00
American Dream Grant	0	\$3,000.00
Bartko Foundation	0	\$4,095
Parkvale Savings Banks	0	\$20,000.00
East Liberty Development, Inc.	0	\$4,855.00
Total	\$116,606.57	\$94,758.00
<u>Low Income Public Housing Buyers:</u>		
Seller's assist	\$ 1,039.62	0
State	\$ 3,000.00	0
Dollar Bank 3-2-1	\$ 3,300.00	0
Habitat for Humanity	\$0	\$1,350.00
Total	\$10,339.62	\$1,350.00
Grant Total Other Assistance:	\$126,946.19	\$96,108.00

Total Direct Financial Assistance from HACP provided to Homebuyers in 2010: \$59,997.00.

Total Direct Financial Assistance from HACP provided to Homebuyers in 2011: \$93,962.00.

Foreclosure Prevention: One family was foreclosed upon this year, the first in our program's history, with well over 100 families supported to become homeowners in the last 10 years.

Homeownership Soft-Second Mortgage Waiting List: This was not established this year, as at no point did we have enough pre-approvals and closings combined to approach our budgeted level.

Eligibility of persons on the waiting lists: Our homeownership program policy requires those interested in participation in our program to have received a letter of eligibility for public housing or the Housing Choice Voucher Program from the HACP. However, because we do not process families on the waiting list for eligibility until they near the top of the list, the added pool of potential homeownership program candidates from the waiting list was smaller than anticipated.

No significant changes are planned for this program in 2012. However, HACP will improve its outreach efforts, and will consider a change in procedure so that those families on the waiting

list who are interested in homeownership can have their eligibility determined even if they are not near the top of the list, and can pursue a homeownership option while on the waiting list.

This activity is Authorized by Section B. 1. and D. 8 of Attachment C and Section B. 4. of Attachment D of the Moving To Work Agreement.

The tables above show Homeownership Program Statistics relevant to this Section VI. 4., and also to Section VI. 3. above.

6. Energy Performance Contracting

Most recently approved in 2008. Under HACP's Moving To Work Agreement, HACP may enter into Energy Performance Contracts without prior HUD approval. HACP will continue its current EPC, executed in 2008, to reduce costs and improve efficient use of federal funds, with full reporting as required by the Moving To Work Agreement to be included in future Annual Report.

HACP's current EPC substantially completed installation of all items in 2010, including water saving measures and energy efficient lighting throughout the Authority's dwelling units. It also installed geothermal heating and cooling systems (and associated minor weatherization) of homes at Northview Heights, Arlington Heights, and Homewood North.

HACP has experienced substantial reductions in energy use and cost savings from these improvements. Overall utility costs have declined from \$11,157,176 in 2007, prior to the ESCO, to \$8,38,640.06 in 2011 with the ESCO substantially complete. Note that the 2011 total cost amount includes ESCO Debt Service Payments. These cost savings were achieved despite increases in utility rates.

Closeout of the installation phase has been completed in 2011 and therefore the monitoring phase of the agreement has just begun. More detailed information on energy savings will be available in future years reports once the monitoring phase reporting begins. The initial M & V report is expected in October 2012 and will be available for the 2012 annual report.

As per Attachment D of the MTW Agreement, the following information is provided:

- HACP's project is an ESCO for multiple properties.
- 3,181 units are included in the project.
- 17 AMPS are included in the project.
- The Total Investment is \$25,110,801.
- The Total Financed is \$25,110,801.
- Annual Debt Service is variable, and based on a set schedule as defined in the contract. \$1,188,199.60 in interest and \$1,407,742.40 in principal was paid in 2010, for total of \$2,595,942.00.
- Guaranteed Savings are also variable, increasing each year to account for expected increases in utility rates. The amount ranges from \$2,584,170 in Year 1 to \$3,468,744 in Year 12, for an average of \$3,004,706 annually.

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

- Actual Savings are not yet available, as we have not yet completed a Monitoring and Verification Reporting cycle. The first M & V report is anticipated in October, 2012.
- Investment per unit is \$7,894.
- Finance per unit is \$7,894.
- Savings per unit is \$11,334.
- Savings per AMP is an average total over 12 years of \$2,120,784.
- The Term of the contract is 12 years.
- The RFP was issued December 16, 2006.
- An initial Energy Audit with a third party was executed in August, 2006.
- A subsequent Energy Audit by the ESCO contractor was Executed August 30, 2007.
- The Energy Services Agreement was executed July 30, 2008.
- Repayment began on November 16, 2009.
- Types of Energy conservation measures by AMP are identified in the chart below:

ENERGY PERFORMANCE WORK BY COMMUNITY

	AMP	Lighting Retrofit	Water Retrofit	Building Envelope	Roof Insulation	New Roof	Limiting Thermostats	Radiator Valves	Refrigerators	New Boilers	Geo-Thermal	New Rooftop Unit
Addison Terrace	1	Y	Y	Y					Y			
Bedford Dwellings	2	Y		Y					Y			
Arlington Heights	4	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y				Y	
Allegheny Dwellings	5	Y	Y	Y					Y			
Northview Heights	9	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y	
Glen Hazel Family	32	Y	Y				Y		Y			
Hamilton-Larimer	11	Y	Y				Y					
PA-Bidwell	15	Y	Y	Y				Y				
Pressley	17	Y	Y	Y								
Homewood-North	20	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y				Y	
Murray Towers	31	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y				Y
Caliguri Plaza	41	Y	Y	Y			Y					
Finello Pavilion	44	Y		Y			Y					
Morse Gardens	45	Y	Y				Y			Y		
Carrick Regency	46	Y	Y	Y			Y					
Gualtieri Manor	47	Y	Y									
Northview High Rise	9	Y	Y	Y								

This activity is Authorized by Section A. 4. of Attachment D of the Moving To Work Agreement.

7. Establishment of a Local Asset Management Program.

Initially approved in 2003 and 2004, prior to HUD's adoption of a site based asset management approach to public housing operation and management. At that time, HACP embarked on a strategy to transition its centralized management to more decentralized site-based management capable of using an asset management approach. During HACP's implementation, HUD adopted similar policies and requirements for all Housing Authorities. HACP continues to develop and refine its Local Asset Management Program to reduce costs and increase effectiveness. Please see the narrative accompanying Section VII which describes HACP Local Asset Management Program, deviations from standard fee-for-service and cost-allocation approaches, use of single fund budget authority, and provides an update on this program.

8. Modified Housing Choice Voucher Program policy on maximum percent of Adjusted Monthly Income permitted.

Originally approved in 2001, HACP's operation of the Housing Choice Voucher Program allows flexibility in the permitted rent burden (affordability) for new tenancies. Specifically, the limit of 40% of Adjusted Monthly Income allowed for the tenant portion of rent is used as a guideline, not a requirement. HACP continues to counsel families on the dangers of becoming overly rent burdened, however, a higher rent burden may be acceptable in some cases. This policy increases housing choice for participating families by giving them the option to take on additional rent burden for units in more costly neighborhoods.

While this is a long-standing HACP policy, HACP's initial effort to identify data regarding the percentage of families renting in non-impacted census tracts prior to the policy change to establish a baseline, and to compare this to the percentage of new leases approved in non-impacted census tracts, has been elusive. Preliminary data will require additional and more expert analysis. That preliminary data as previously reported (and updated below) indicates the following:

- Out of 712 new admissions in 2010 (488 regular and 224 port-ins), 223 families were approved for initial tenancy with rent at more than 40% of income in 2010. This includes 110 families that were porting into HACP's jurisdiction, but does not include zero income families.
- Only 10 of these 223 families ended participation in 2010, and only one (1) of these families ended participation due to rent related issues.

In 2011, those numbers are as follows:

- Out of 821 new admissions in 2011 (667 regular and 154 port-ins), 87 families were approved for initial tenancy with rent at more than 40% of income in 2011. This includes 28 families that were porting into HACP's jurisdiction, but does not include zero income families.
- Only 18 of these 87 families ended participation in 2011, and only two (2) of these families ended participation due to rent related issues.

With the assistance of the outside evaluators, HACP intends to review the criteria used to determine impacted areas, utilize new 2010 census data, and review internal procedures to determine if these preliminary results are accurate, if the policy is necessary or beneficial to families, and if improved education of families will impact these results.

This activity is authorized in Section D. 2. C. of Attachment C and Section D. 1. b. of Attachment D of the Moving To Work agreement.

9. Modified Payment Standard Approval.

Originally approved in 2004, HACP is authorized to establish Exception Payment Standards up to 120% of FMR without prior HUD approval. HACP has utilized this authority to establish Area Exception Payment Standards and to allow Exception Payment Standards as a Reasonable Accommodation for a person with disabilities. Allowing the Authority to conduct its own analysis and establish Exception Payment Standards reduces administrative burdens on both the HACP and HUD (as no HUD submission and approval is required) while expanding housing choices for participating families.

HACP does not currently have any Area Exception Payment Standards, having eliminated them in prior years due to budgetary constraints, and did not anticipate establishing any such areas in 2011.

HACP continued to allow an Exception Payment Standard of up to 120% of FMR as a reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities and to increase housing choices for persons with disabilities. In 2011, eleven (11) such exceptions were approved.

This activity is authorized under Section D. 2. a. of Attachment C of the Moving To Work Agreement.

Outside Evaluators

In 2010, HACP procured an outside evaluator to assist in planning and evaluation of all Moving To Work initiatives with a focus on the rent policy. Unfortunately, a lengthy procurement process and even more lengthy contract negotiation with the selected provider delayed execution of the three year contract and prevented participation of the outside evaluator until well into the 2011 year. The selected entity, the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of International Affairs, Center for Metropolitan Studies, has been working with us to identify and review data. A report on their status to date is below.

The Center for Metropolitan Studies (CMS) and its subcontractor, Numeritics, initiated data analysis relevant to the project. The initial summary of the data analysis progress completed is currently under review by HACP.

In addition, the CMS and HACP continue work on other evaluation strategies and elements, including the following:

- The CMS developed a structured interview script that will be administered to appropriate personnel at the HACP. The script was revised based on comments by HACP higher-level staff and is awaiting approval from the University of Pittsburgh's Institutional Review Board.
- The CMS developed a survey that will be administered to residents of HACP's family public housing developments. The purpose of the survey is to ascertain resident perspectives on their progress towards self-sufficiency, the effectiveness of HACP programs to support

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

families impacted by the modified rent policy, and the overall impact of the modified rent policy. The project will target responses from 250 residents using a stratified random sample approach. The sampling approach and survey instrument are awaiting approval from the University of Pittsburgh's Institutional Review Board.

The CMS has also developed a list of metrics on which to evaluate the HACP's MTW initiatives. The CMS is reviewing administrative data and working with staff from HACP to determine additional data necessary to complete the metrics and to ensure identified metrics are appropriate for evaluating program effectiveness in meeting Moving To Work objectives, and for informing HACP policy and practice.

Section VII. Sources and Uses of Funding

A. B. C. Planned Sources and Uses of Funds (MTW, Non-MTW, State and Local)

Please see the charts at the end of this Chapter, which show sources and uses of MTW and non-MTW funds.

D. Deviations in Cost Allocation and Fee For Service Approach - Approach to Asset Management

In implementing its Moving To Work Initiatives, HACP's Local Asset Management Approach includes some deviations in cost allocation and fee for service approaches, as well as other variations to HUD asset management regulations. Because these all relate to accounting and sources and uses of funds, the information on HACP's Local Asset Management Program and Site Based Budgeting and Accounting is included in this section.

Approach to Asset Management

HACP followed HUD's guidelines and asset management requirements including AMP-based financial statements. HACP retained the HUD chart of accounts and the HUD crosswalk to the FDS. Under the local asset management program, HACP retained full authority to move its MTW funds and project cash flow among projects without limitation. The MTW single fund flexibility, after payment of all program expenses, was utilized to direct funds to the HACP development program, wherein HACP is worked to redevelop its aging housing stock.

HACP's plan is consistent with HUD's ongoing implementation of project based budgeting and financial management, and project-based management. Operations of HACP sites were coordinated and overseen by Property Managers on a daily basis, who oversaw the following management and maintenance tasks: maintenance work order completion, rent collection, leasing, community and resident relations, security, unit turnover, capital improvements planning, and other activities to efficiently operate the site. HACP Property Managers received support in conducting these activities from the Central Office departments, including operations, human resources, modernization, Resident Self-Sufficiency, Finance, and others.

HACP Property Managers developed and monitored property budgets with support from the HACP Finance staff. Budget training was held to support the budget development process. HACP continues to develop and utilize project-based budgets for all of its asset management projects (AMPs). Property managers have the ability to produce monthly income and expense statements and use these as tools to efficiently manage their properties. All direct costs were directly charged to the maximum extent possible to the AMPs.

HACP utilized a fee for Service and frontline methodology as outlined in 24 CFR 990 and in the HACP Operating Fund Rule binder, which describes the methodology used for allocating its expenses.

New Initiatives and Deviations from General Part 990 Requirements

During FY2011 the authority undertook the following initiatives to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Authority:

- ❖ HACP maintained the spirit of the HUD site based asset management model. It retained the COCC and site based income and expenses in accordance with HUD guidelines, but eliminated inefficient accounting and/or reporting aspects that yielded little or no value from the staff time spent or the information produced.
- ❖ HACP established and maintained an MTW cost center that held all excess MTW funds not allocated to the sites or to the voucher program. This cost center and all activity therein was reported under the newly created Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for the MTW cost center. This cost center also held some of the large balance sheet accounts of the authority as a whole. Most notably most of the banking and investment accounts were maintained within the MTW cost center.
- ❖ The MTW cost center essentially represented a mini HUD. All subsidy dollars were initially received and resided in the MTW cost center. Funding was allocated annually to sites based upon their budgetary needs as represented and approved in their annual budget request. Sites were monitored both as to their performance against the budgets and the corresponding budget matrix. They were also monitored based upon the required PUM subsidy required to operate the property. HACP maintained a budgeting and accounting system that gave each property sufficient funds to support annual operations, including all COCC fee and frontline charges. Actual revenues included those provided by HUD and allocated by HACP based on annual property-based budgets. As envisioned, all block grants were deposited into a single general ledger fund.
- ❖ Site balance sheet accounts were limited to site specific activity, such as fixed assets, tenant receivables, tenant security deposits, unrestricted net asset equity, which were generated by operating surpluses, and any resulting due to/due from balances. Some balance sheet items still reside in the MTW fund accounts, and include such things as workers compensation accrual, investments, A/P accruals, payroll accruals, payroll tax accruals, employee benefit accruals, Family Self-sufficiency escrow balances, etc. The goal of this approach was to minimize extraneous accounting, and reduce unnecessary administrative burden of performing monthly allocation entries for each, while maintaining fiscal integrity.
- ❖ All cash and investments remain in the MTW cost center during the year. Sites had a due to/due from relationship with the MTW cost center that represented cash until the authority performed its year-end accounting entries and allocated to each site a share of the cash and investments. This is a one-time entry each year for Financial Data Schedule presentation purposes and is immediately reversed on the first day of the next calendar year. This saves the authority the time and effort of breaking out the cash and investments monthly on the General Ledger.

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

- ❖ All frontline charges and fees to the central office cost center were reflected on the property reports, as required. The MTW ledger did not pay fees directly to the COCC. As allowable under the asset management model, however, any subsidy needed to pay legacy costs, such as pension or terminal leave payments, were transferred from the MTW ledger or the projects to the COCC.
- ❖ The ESCO accounting was broken out to the sites for the third consecutive year. This included all assets, liabilities, debt service costs, and cost savings.
- ❖ No inventory exists on the books at the sites. A just in time system has been implemented. This new inventory system has been operational and more efficient, both in time and expense.
- ❖ Central Operations staff, many of whom performed direct frontline services such as home ownership, self-sufficiency, and/or relocation, were frontlined appropriately to the low income public housing and/or Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher programs, as these costs are 100 percent low rent and/or Section 8.
- ❖ Actual Section 8 amounts needed for housing assistance payments and administrative costs were allotted to the Housing Choice Voucher program, including sufficient funds to pay asset management fees. Block grant reserves and their interest earnings were not commingled with Section 8 operations, enhancing the budget transparency. Section 8 program managers have become more responsible for their budgets in the same manner as public housing site managers.
- ❖ Management Information System costs were directly charged to the programs benefiting from them, e.g. the LIPH module cost was directly charged to AMPs; all indirect MIS costs were charged to all cost centers based on a "per workstation" charge rather than a Fee for Service basis. This allowed for equitable allocation of the expense while saving time and effort on allocating out each invoice at the time of payment.
- ❖ MTW initiative funded work, such as contributions to the HACP development program, also funded a 10 percent administration budget, in order to adequately and commensurately fund the administrative work to support the MTW initiatives. The authority used MTW initiative flexibility to fund development related costs for Garfield Phases 3 & 4 during FY 2011. For each Garfield construction invoice a 10 percent fee was paid to the COCC.

HACP 2011 Moving To Work Annual Report

Flexible use of Phase in of Management Fees –

As a component of its local asset management plan, the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh elected to make use of phase-in management fees for 2010 and beyond. The HUD prescribed management fees for the HACP are \$57.17 PUM. HACP proposed and received approval on the following phase-in schedule and approach:

Schedule of Phased-in Management Fees for HACP –

2008 (Initial Year of Project Based Accounting)	\$91.94
2009 (Year 2)	\$84.99
2010 (Year 3)	\$78.03
2011 (Year 4 and beyond)	\$78.03

The above numbers reflect 2011 dollars.

HACP has diligently worked to reduce its staffing and expenditure levels and reduce unnecessary COCC costs; it continues to do so, in an effort to cut costs further, in order to comply with the COCC cost provisions of the operating fund rule. It is also working to increase its management fee revenues in the COCC, through aggressive, and we believe, achievable, development and lease up efforts in both the public housing and leased housing programs. The 2011 budget shows a COCC surplus; this is benefiting from \$1,246,000 in allowed phase in management fees. As such, HACP is continuing to lock in at current levels the phase in fees as approved in the 2012 Annual Plan. HACP, as indicated above, has made dramatic cuts to its COCC staffing, in virtually every department. It has reduced staff, reduced contractors, cut administration, and made substantial budget cuts to move toward compliance with the fee revenue requirements. Nevertheless, we are not yet able to meet the PUM fee revenue target until we grow our portfolio size. Fortunately, a major component of the HACP strategic plan is to grow its public housing occupancy, both through mixed finance development and management, as well as in house management, so as to better serve our low income community and to recapture some of the fees lost to demolition. This requires central office staff, talent and expense. To make this plan work, i.e. to assist in the redevelopment of the public housing portfolio, we will need the continued benefit of the locked in level of phase in management fees.

As further support for this fee lock, we should note that HACP has historically had above normal central office costs driven by an exceedingly high degree of unionization. HACP has over a half dozen different collective bargaining units; this has driven up costs in all COCC departments, especially in Human Resources and Legal. In addition, HACP is governed by City laws that require City residency for all its employees. This has driven up the cost to attract and retain qualified people throughout the agency, but especially in the high cost COCC areas, where HACP has had to pay more to attract the necessary talent to perform these critical functions.

The phase in fee flexibility, coupled with HACP's planned growth in public housing occupancy and increases in voucher utilization, will enable HACP's COCC to become sustainable in the

long term and fully compliant with the operating fund rule. It should also be noted that this fee flexibility will come from HACP's MTW funds, and will require no additional HUD funding. This flexibility is the essence of the MTW program, and will go a long way towards enabling HACP to successfully undertake and complete its aggressive portfolio restructuring efforts.

E. Use of Single Fund Flexibility

The HACP had budgeted to utilize its single fund flexibility to direct funding from the HCVP and Low Income Public Housing Program to support the HACP Moving To Work Initiatives and other activities. This included budgeting of \$10,000,000 towards the HACP development program, \$4,000,000 towards HACP security and protective services, and \$1,876,286 towards resident services. During FY 2011 actual spending was \$42,023,719 towards HACP actual Development at Garfield, Oak Hill and Addison, \$2,385,012 for security and protective services, and \$1,764,780 for resident services.

For Development activities, please see Section II.A. and Section IV for additional information on these projects. For resident services, please see Section IV. and Section VI., items 1 and 2 for additional information on these activities. For security and protective services, HACP has entered into contracts with Security Firms to provide security services at HACP properties to improve and enhance the safety and security of HACP communities. In addition, in 2011 HACP began installation of a state of the art security camera system, which will allow for centralized monitoring to supplement on the ground security services and to support efforts to prevent and prosecute crimes committed on HACP property.

HACP Fiscal Year 2011 Sources and Uses Total - Actual
SOURCES

Line Item	LIPH	COCC	MTW S8	CFP	TOTAL MTW	NON-MTW S8	S8 FSS	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	PROGRAM INC	Actual	Planned	Variance
													TOTALS	TOTALS	TOTALS
Net Tenant Rental Revenue	\$ 6,909,849	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,909,849	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,909,849	\$ 7,372,258	\$ (462,409)
Tenant Revenue Other	\$ 49,806	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49,806	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49,806	\$ 6,175	\$ 43,631
HUD PHA Operating Grants	\$ 43,215,924	\$ -	\$ 41,354,528	\$ 11,432,990	\$ 96,003,442	\$ 2,169,715	\$ 288,817	\$ 3,999,386	\$ 618,571	\$ 27,657	\$ 92,183	\$ -	\$ 103,199,770	\$ 113,232,634	\$ (10,032,863)
S8 - Ongoing Administrative Fees Earned	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
S8 - Housing Assistance Payments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Investment Income - Unrestricted	\$ 68,875	\$ 19,938	\$ (8,509)	\$ -	\$ 80,304	\$ 10,011	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (111,598)	\$ (21,284)	\$ 325,894	\$ (347,178)
Management Fees	\$ -	\$ 8,095,703	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,095,703	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,095,703	\$ 7,983,123	\$ 112,580
Frontline / Fee For Service Fees	\$ -	\$ 8,730,914	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,730,914	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,730,914	\$ 10,019,245	\$ (1,288,332)
Fraud Recovery Funds	\$ 7,362	\$ -	\$ 73,979	\$ -	\$ 81,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 81,341	\$ 39,041	\$ 42,300
Other Income	\$ 2,332,212	\$ 111,690	\$ 121,480	\$ -	\$ 2,565,381	\$ 70,530	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,435,875	\$ 6,071,786	\$ 863,735	\$ 5,208,051
Total Revenues	\$ 52,584,027	\$ 16,958,245	\$ 41,541,477	\$ 11,432,990	\$ 122,516,739	\$ 2,250,256	\$ 288,817	\$ 3,999,386	\$ 618,571	\$ 27,657	\$ 92,183	\$ 3,324,277	\$ 133,117,885	\$ 139,842,105	\$ (6,724,219)

USES

Line Item	LIPH	COCC	MTW S8	CFP	TOTAL MTW	NON-MTW S8	S8 FSS	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	PROGRAM INC	TOTALS	TOTALS	TOTALS
Administrative	\$ 11,290,679	\$ 9,739,009	\$ 3,987,575	\$ 3,357,983	\$ 28,375,246	\$ 233,031	\$ -	\$ 850,571	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 69,325	\$ 3,180	\$ 29,531,350	\$ 31,074,107	\$ (1,542,757)
Asset Management Fee	\$ 550,670	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 550,670	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 550,670	\$ 1,432,612	\$ (881,942)
Tenant Services	\$ 560,150	\$ 70,033	\$ 104,572	\$ 1,764,780	\$ 2,499,536	\$ -	\$ 288,817	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,657	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,816,010	\$ 4,230,235	\$ (1,414,225)
Utilities	\$ 8,838,730	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,838,730	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,838,730	\$ 10,898,505	\$ (2,059,775)
Maintenance	\$ 10,125,947	\$ 3,922,707	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,048,655	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,048,655	\$ 14,299,788	\$ (251,133)
Protective Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,385,012	\$ 2,385,012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,385,012	\$ 4,000,000	\$ (1,614,988)
General / Insurance	\$ 6,521,740	\$ 2,480,784	\$ 256,387	\$ -	\$ 9,258,912	\$ 10,843	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,269,756	\$ 6,403,270	\$ 2,866,486
Other	\$ 2,455,053	\$ 14,429	\$ 31,393,647	\$ 84,593	\$ 33,947,722	\$ 1,323,499	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,271,221	\$ 35,777,377	\$ (506,156)
Debt Service Payments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 618,571	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 618,571	\$ 3,900,000	\$ (3,281,429)
Capital Budget Hard Costs	\$ 26,292,014	\$ -	\$ 16,917,746	\$ 3,840,622	\$ 47,050,382	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,148,815	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,859	\$ 3,435,875	\$ 53,657,931	\$ 22,681,000	\$ 30,976,931
Other Financials	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,090,206	\$ (3,090,206)
Total Uses	\$ 66,634,984	\$ 16,226,962	\$ 52,659,927	\$ 11,432,990	\$ 146,954,864	\$ 1,567,373	\$ 288,817	\$ 3,999,386	\$ 618,571	\$ 27,657	\$ 92,183	\$ 3,439,055	\$ 156,987,903	\$ 137,787,100	\$ 19,200,803
Excess of Revenue over Expenses	\$ (14,050,956)	\$ 731,284	\$ (11,118,450)	\$ -	\$ (24,438,124)	\$ 682,883	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (114,778)	\$ (23,870,018)	\$ 2,055,005	\$ (25,925,023)

VII. A. HACP 2011 Sources and Uses MTW - Actual with Planned and Variance

SOURCES

Line Item					Actual	Planned	Variance
	LIPH	COCC	MTW S8	CFP	TOTAL MTW	TOTAL MTW	TOTALS
Net Tenant Rental Revenue	\$ 6,909,849	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,909,849	\$ 7,372,258	\$ (462,409)
Tenant Revenue Other	\$ 49,806	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49,806	\$ 6,175	\$ 43,631
HUD PHA Operating Grants	\$ 43,215,924	\$ -	\$ 41,354,528	\$ 11,432,990	\$ 96,003,442	\$ 100,454,147	\$ (4,450,705)
S8 - Ongoing Administrative Fees Earned	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
S8 - Housing Assistance Payments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Investment Income - Unrestricted	\$ 68,875	\$ 19,938	\$ (8,509)	\$ -	\$ 80,304	\$ 321,574	\$ (241,270)
Management Fees	\$ -	\$ 8,095,703	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,095,703	\$ 7,983,123	\$ 112,580
Frontline / Fee For Service Fees	\$ -	\$ 8,730,914	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,730,914	\$ 10,019,245	\$ (1,288,332)
Fraud Recovery Funds	\$ 7,362	\$ -	\$ 73,979	\$ -	\$ 81,341	\$ 37,027	\$ 44,314
Other Income	\$ 2,332,212	\$ 111,690	\$ 121,480	\$ -	\$ 2,565,381	\$ 846,842	\$ 1,718,539

Total Revenues	\$ 52,584,027	\$ 16,958,245	\$ 41,541,477	\$ 11,432,990	\$ 122,516,739	\$ 127,040,391	\$ (4,523,652)
-----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

USES

Line Item	LIPH	COCC	MTW S8	CFP	TOTAL MTW	TOTAL MTW	TOTALS
Administrative	\$ 11,290,679	\$ 9,739,009	\$ 3,987,575	\$ 3,357,983	\$ 28,375,246	\$ 30,870,986	\$ (2,495,740)
Asset Management Fee	\$ 550,670	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 550,670	\$ 1,432,612	\$ (881,942)
Tenant Services	\$ 560,150	\$ 70,033	\$ 104,572	\$ 1,764,780	\$ 2,499,536	\$ 3,776,129	\$ (1,276,593)
Utilities	\$ 8,838,730	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,838,730	\$ 10,898,505	\$ (2,059,775)
Maintenance	\$ 10,125,947	\$ 3,922,707	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,048,655	\$ 14,299,788	\$ (251,133)
Protective Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,385,012	\$ 2,385,012	\$ 4,000,000	\$ (1,614,988)
General / Insurance	\$ 6,521,740	\$ 2,480,784	\$ 256,387	\$ -	\$ 9,258,912	\$ 6,401,218	\$ 2,857,694
Other	\$ 2,455,053	\$ 14,429	\$ 31,393,647	\$ 84,593	\$ 33,947,722	\$ 33,977,658	\$ (29,936)
Debt Service Payments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Capital Budget Hard Costs	\$ 26,292,014	\$ -	\$ 16,917,746	\$ 3,840,622	\$ 47,050,382	\$ 16,575,000	\$ 30,475,382
Other Financials	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,090,206	\$ (3,090,206)

Total Uses	\$ 66,634,984	\$ 16,226,962	\$ 52,659,927	\$ 11,432,990	\$ 146,954,864	\$ 125,322,102	\$ 21,632,762
-------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Excess of Revenue over Expenses	\$ (14,050,956)	\$ 731,284	\$ (11,118,450)	\$ -	\$ (24,438,124)	\$ 1,718,289	\$ (26,156,414)
--	------------------------	-------------------	------------------------	-------------	------------------------	---------------------	------------------------

VII. B. HACP 2011 Sources and Uses Non-MTW - Actual with Planned and Variance

SOURCES

Line Item								Actual	Planned	Variance
	NON-MTW S8	S8 FSS	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	PROGRAM INC	TOTAL NON-MTW	TOTAL NON - MTW	TOTALS
Net Tenant Rental Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tenant Revenue Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
HUD PHA Operating Grants	\$ 2,169,715	\$ 288,817	\$ 3,999,386	\$ 618,571	\$ 27,657	\$ 92,183	\$ -	\$ 7,196,328	\$ 12,778,487	\$ (5,582,158)
S8 - Ongoing Administrative Fees Earned	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
S8 - Housing Assistance Payments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Investment Income - Unrestricted	\$ 10,011	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (111,598)	\$ (101,587)	\$ 4,320	\$ (105,907)
Management Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Frontline / Fee For Service Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fraud Recovery Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,014	\$ (2,014)
Other Income	\$ 70,530	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,435,875	\$ 3,506,405	\$ 16,893	\$ 3,489,512
Total Revenues	\$ 2,250,256	\$ 288,817	\$ 3,999,386	\$ 618,571	\$ 27,657	\$ 92,183	\$ 3,324,277	\$ 10,601,146	\$ 12,801,714	\$ (2,200,568)

USES

Line Item	NON-MTW S8	S8 FSS	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	PROGRAM INC	TOTAL NON-MTW	TOTAL NON - MTW	TOTALS
Administrative	\$ 233,031	\$ -	\$ 850,571	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 69,325	\$ 3,180	\$ 1,156,106	\$ 203,121	\$ 952,985
Asset Management Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tenant Services	\$ -	\$ 288,817	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,657	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 316,474	\$ 454,106	\$ (137,632)
Utilities	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Maintenance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Protective Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
General / Insurance	\$ 10,843	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,843	\$ 2,052	\$ 8,791
Other	\$ 1,323,499	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,323,499	\$ 1,799,719	\$ (476,220)
Debt Service Payments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 618,571	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 618,571	\$ 3,900,000	\$ (3,281,429)
Capital Budget Hard Costs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,148,815	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,859	\$ 3,435,875	\$ 6,607,549	\$ 6,106,000	\$ 501,549
Other Financials	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Uses	\$ 1,567,373	\$ 288,817	\$ 3,999,386	\$ 618,571	\$ 27,657	\$ 92,183	\$ 3,439,055	\$ 10,033,041	\$ 12,464,998	\$ (2,431,957)
Excess of Revenue over Expenses	\$ 682,883	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (114,778)	\$ 568,105	\$ 336,716	\$ 231,389

HACP 2011 Capital Activity - Actual

Source:	Revenues	Item	Community	CFP	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	S8 FSS	Prog Inc	Section 8	LIPH
\$	19,895,424	Available All Grants	Various	\$ 11,432,990	\$ 3,999,332	\$ 618,571	\$ 27,657	\$ 92,183	\$ 288,817	\$ 3,435,875	\$ -	\$ -
\$	43,798,374	Operating Transfer In	Garfield Phase III & IV	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,917,746	\$ 26,880,629

Uses: Development

Cost	Item	Community	CFP	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	S8 FSS	Prog Inc	Section 8	LIPH
\$ 5,861,702	New Development	Oak Hill - Phase II	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,435,875	\$ -	\$ 2,445,827
\$ -	New Development	Garfield Phase I & II	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 8,577,650	New Development	Garfield Phase III & IV	\$ 58,228	\$ -	\$ 618,571	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,900,852	\$ -
\$ 27,564,367	New Development	Addison Phase I & II	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,016,894	\$ 18,547,473
\$ -	New Development	Auburn Hamilton/Larimer	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total:	\$ 42,023,719		\$ 58,228	\$ -	\$ 618,571	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,435,875	\$ 16,917,746	\$ 20,993,300

Uses: Modernization

Cost	Item	Community	CFP	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	S8 FSS	Prog Inc	Section 8	LIPH
\$ 34,347	REAC/UFAS Completion/LBP Abatement	Addison Terrace / Additions	\$ 22,454	\$ 11,893	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 206,746	REAC/Fire Alarm System Replacement	Bedford Dwellings	\$ 206,746	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 45,926	REAC/Balcony Repair	PA Bidwell	\$ 45,926	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 64,834	REAC	Pressley St Highrise	\$ 64,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 122,793	REAC/Safety Items	Allegheny Dwellings	\$ 122,793	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 2,997,304	UFAS Completion/Roofs/Electrical	Northview Heights Community & High-rise	\$ 1,117,936	\$ 86,234	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,793,134
\$ 205,229	Forced Account Rehab of 30 Units	Northview Heights Community & High-rise	\$ 205,229	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ -	Electrical Work	Northview Heights High-rise	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 9,740	REAC/UFAS	Hamilton-Larimer	\$ 9,740	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 274,833	REAC/UFAS Completion	Homewood	\$ 288,806	\$ 6,027	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 106,791	REAC	Arlington Heights	\$ 106,791	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 13,401	REAC	Murray Towers	\$ 13,401	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 77,318	Abatement/ Demolition	St. Clair Village	\$ 76,221	\$ 1,097	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 220,373	REAC	Glen Hazel Family	\$ 220,373	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 12,193	REAC	Glen Hazel Highrise	\$ 12,193	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 4,370,177	Comprehensive Modernization	Mazza Pavilion	\$ 1,037,843	\$ 3,332,334	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 54,485	REAC	Caliquiri Plaza	\$ 54,485	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 25,179	REAC/Retaining Wall	Finello Pavilion	\$ 9,845	\$ 15,334	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 42,890	REAC	Morse Gardens	\$ 42,890	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 29,199	Clearing Plumbing Lines	Carrick Regency	\$ 29,199	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 359,960	REAC/Elevator	Gualtieri Manor	\$ 208,358	\$ 151,603	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 1,737,782	504/UFAS/Turnkey Developments	Scattered Sites	\$ 1,691,149	\$ 46,633	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 18,250	REAC	Scattered Sites	\$ 18,250	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 11,007	A/E Mixed Finance	Authority-Wide	\$ 11,007	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ -	Hazardous Materials Abatement	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 3,505,581	Security Camera	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,505,581
\$ -	Equipment / Appliances	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 92,183	Materials at Broadhead	Broadhead Manor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,183	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total:	\$ 14,638,519		\$ 5,596,467	\$ 3,651,154	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,183	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,298,714

Uses: Administration

Cost	Item	Community	CFP	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	S8 FSS	Prog Inc	Section 8	LIPH
\$ 92,997	ARRA Administration	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ 92,997	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 724,072	Technical Assistance Services - CVR	Authority-Wide	\$ 523,031	\$ 201,041	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 54,140	A/E Technical	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ 54,140	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ -	Construction Management Services	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 2,385,012	Protective Services	Authority-Wide	\$ 2,385,012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 1,111,492	Management Fees	Authority-Wide	\$ 1,111,492	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 1,758,760	Resident Services	Authority-Wide	\$ 1,758,760	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ -	Resident Services - PH-FSS	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 288,817	Resident Services - HCV	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288,817	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 27,657	Resident Services - ROSS	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,657	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ -	Resident Services - ROSS II	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ -	Fannie Mae Debt Service	Garfield	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 374,474	Relocation	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 374,474
\$ 214,140	Legal	Authority-Wide	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 214,140
Total:	\$ 7,031,561		\$ 5,778,295	\$ 348,178	\$ -	\$ 27,657	\$ -	\$ 288,817	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 588,614

	CFP	ARRA	RHF	ROSS	MROP	S8 FSS	Prog Inc	Section 8	LIPH
\$42,023,719	\$ 58,228	\$ -	\$ 618,571	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,435,875	\$ 16,917,746	\$ 20,993,300
\$14,638,519	\$ 5,596,467	\$ 3,651,154	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,183	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,298,714
\$7,031,561	\$ 5,778,295	\$ 348,178	\$ -	\$ 27,657	\$ -	\$ 288,817	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 588,614
\$56,662,237	\$ 11,432,990	\$ 3,999,332	\$ 618,571	\$ 27,657	\$ 92,183	\$ 288,817	\$ 3,435,875	\$ 16,917,746	\$ 26,880,629

Section VII. C. HACP 2011 Sources and Uses COCC - Actual with Planned and Variance**SOURCES**

Line Item	Actual	Planned	Variance
	COCC	COCC	Over (under)
Investment Income - Unrestricted	\$ 19,938	\$ 1,358	\$ 18,580
Management Fees	\$ 8,095,703	\$ 7,983,123	\$ 112,580
Frontline / Fee For Service Fees	\$ 8,730,914	\$ 10,019,245	\$ (1,288,331)
Other Income	\$ 111,690	\$ 9,530	\$ 102,160
Total Revenues	\$ 16,958,245	\$ 18,013,256	\$ (1,055,011)

USES

Line Item	Actual	Planned	Variance
	COCC	COCC	Over (under)
Administrative	\$ 9,739,009	\$ 11,260,711	\$ (1,521,702)
Tenant Services	\$ 70,033	\$ 1,539,666	\$ (1,469,633)
Utilities	\$ -	\$ 21,619	\$ (21,619)
Maintenance	\$ 3,922,707	\$ 2,832,306	\$ 1,090,401
Protective Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
General / Insurance	\$ 2,480,784	\$ 270,593	\$ 2,210,191
Extraordinary Maintenance	\$ 14,429	\$ 471,500	\$ (457,071)
Total Uses	\$ 16,226,962	\$ 16,396,395	\$ (169,433)
Excess of Revenue over Expenses	\$ 731,283	\$ 1,616,861	\$ (885,578)

Section VII. Sources and Uses of Funding - continued

A. Planned Vs. Actual Sources and Uses of Funds – Total Funds and MTW Funds

B. Planned Vs. Actual Sources and Uses of Funds – Non- MTW Funds

Narrative on significant variances from the Approved Annual Plan

Sources:

Dwelling Rental Income: Dwelling rent recognized through December 31st was below expectations by \$462,000. The decrease below the budgeted amount can be attributed to a reduction in occupied units. A major contributor to this was the vacating and relocation process related to the redevelopment at Addison.

HUD PHA Operating Grants: RHF was under budget by \$9.3 million. Fannie Mae Debt Service was budgeted for \$3.9 million but the majority of that was spent at the end of 2010. The new development of Garfield phase IV was delayed causing the majority of the work to happen in 2012. This was budgeted for \$6 million.

Investment Income: A deficit of \$21,000 is due to the recording of unrealized investment losses on bonds against the investment income account. This occurred because bonds lost value on paper due to an increase in market rates after their purchase. For the financial statement presentation the bonds are recorded at the lower cost or market value. Since we hold the bonds to maturity, we anticipate no actual loss will occur.

Management Fees: Asset Management Fees LIPH / Capital were \$230,000 greater than anticipated.

Frontline / Fee For Service Fee: The Fee for Service sector was budgeted at \$3.8 million, but posted \$4.8 million. The maintenance staff was restructured in 2011 by transferring specialty service employees from the sites to the COCC, therefore receiving more revenue for COCC. Also, the large increase in revenue is due in part to the adoption of higher rates for billed time. The Frontline revenue was budgeted to be \$6.2, but posted \$3.9 million. The Resident Services department would have accounted for an additional \$1.9 million but was funded from Capital Funds and not treated as a frontline revenue for the COCC.

Other Income: Of the \$6 million earned, \$3.4 million was Program Income for the Oak Hill Development. The top sources for other income for LIPH were telecom receipts, legal fees and admin fees.

Uses:

Administrative: Salaries were down by \$1.1 million due to vacant positions not being filled.

Tenant Services: The Resident Services department would have accounted for an additional \$1.9 million but was funded from Capital Funds and not treated as a frontline expense.

Utilities: Utility cost savings related to the ESCO Contract were significant and greater than anticipated.

Protective Services Other Contract Costs: Some reduction is related to the costs for services that the Authority paid to the City of Pittsburgh when the Protective Services contract expired and transitioned to private security firms.

General: COCC had a budget of \$269,000 for insurance but expended \$667,000 for the year. COCC also did not budget for compensated absences for 2011 but incurred \$1.8 million of expense. This is due to the reorganization of the maintenance staff.

Debt Service Payments: Fannie Mae was almost completely repaid in FY 2010 to accelerate the retirement of the debt. The final payoff in 2011 was less than projected when the budget was created.

Capital Budget Hard Costs: The amount of \$27.5 million was funded for future Addison developments and will be paid out from both LIPH and Section 8 MTW funds. Program Income spent \$3.4 million on Oak Hill Phase II.

Other Financials: Planned demolition and modernization at Addison Terrace did not begin until late in the year, therefore none of the funds budgeted for these purposes were expended.

Section VIII. Administrative

The following pages include the additional documents required for the Administrative section of the Moving To Work Annual Report.

A. Description of progress on the correction or elimination of observed deficiencies cited in monitoring visits, physical inspections, or other oversight and monitoring mechanisms.

HACP does not have any unresolved observed deficiencies. Urgent items identified in prior year physical inspections have been addressed and reported to HUD as required, while other physical deficiencies continue to be addressed through a variety of strategies.

B. Agency Directed Evaluations of the Moving To Work Demonstration

HACP has engaged a third party to provide ongoing support and evaluation of the Moving To Work Demonstration. Work began in 2011. Please see Section VI for information on the status of that work.

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

Please see appendix 2 for the Performance and Evaluation Report, Form 50075.1, for the HACP's ARRA CFRF Grant.

D. Agency Certification

HACP certifies that it has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) assuring that at least 75% of the families assisted by the HACP 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.



A. Fulton Meachem, Jr., Executive Director

3/30/2012

Table A-1 – Unit Sizes of Households Served, Jan. 1, 2001 - Jan. 1, 2011 - Jan. 1, 2012**Public Housing**

	Eff/1 Bedroom			2 Bedroom			3 Bedroom			4 Bedroom			5+ Bedrooms			Total		
	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12
Family	568	645	763	1434	1219	959	1427	829	823	300	202	188	84	39	33	3813	2934	2766
Elderly	1146	1053	861	287	47	240	0	0	86	0	0	18	0	0	0	1433	1100	1205
Total	1714	1698	1624	1721	1266	1199	1427	829	909	300	202	206	84	39	33	5246	4034	3971

HCV (Section 8)

	Eff/1 Bedroom			2 Bedroom			3 Bedroom			4 Bedroom			5+ Bedrooms			Total		
	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12
Family	669	1137	1289	1418	1607	1682	1119	1429	1411	207	304	298	27	61	59	3440	4538	4739
Elderly	325	478	491	118	149	152	15	39	42	1	5	5	0	1	1	459	672	691
Total	994	1615	1780	1536	1756	1834	1134	1468	1453	208	309	303	27	62	60	3899	5210	5430

Total Public Housing and HCV (Section 8)

	Eff/1 Bedroom			2 Bedroom			3 Bedroom			4 Bedroom			5+ Bedrooms			Total		
	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12
Family	1237	1782	2052	2852	2826	2641	2546	2258	2234	507	506	486	111	100	92	7253	7472	7505
Elderly	1471	1531	1352	405	196	392	15	39	128	1	5	23	0	1	1	1892	1772	1896
Total	2708	3313	3404	3257	3022	3033	2561	2297	2362	508	511	509	111	101	93	9145	9244	9401

HACP - LIPH and Section 8 Occupancy 01/01/01 to 01/01/12

	1/1/2001	1/1/2002	1/1/2003	1/1/2004	1/1/2005	1/1/2006	1/1/2007	1/1/2008	1/1/2009	1/1/2010	1/1/2011	1/1/2012
LIPH Family	3813	3489	3612	3573	3437	3280	3135	3017	2919	2879	2934	2766
LIPH Elderly	1433	1355	1313	1248	1219	1218	1269	1211	1195	1132	1100	1205
HCV Family	3440	3891	3973	4496	4786	6076	5649	4954	4651	4463	4538	4739
HCV Elderly	459	472	555	581	560	592	588	609	596	600	672	691
Totals	9145	9207	9453	9898	10002	11166	10641	9791	9361	9092	9244	9401

Source: HACP MIS archived rent roll profile of 1/1/01, 1/1/02, 1/1/03, 1/1/04, 1/1/05, 1/1/06, 1/1/07, 1/1/08, 1/1/09, 1/1/10, 1/1/11,1/1/12

Table A -2 – Income of Households Served, Jan. 1, 2001 - Jan. 1, 2011 – Jan. 1, 2012**Public Housing**

	Under 30% AMI			30% to 50% AMI			51% to 80% AMI			81% or Greater			Total		
	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Number	3867	3030	3033	1047	693	680	273	250	192	53	61	66	5246	4034	3971
Percent	74%	75%	76%	20%	17%	17%	6%	6%	5%	1%	2%	2%	100%	100%	100%

HCV (Section 8)

	Under 30% AMI			30% to 50% AMI			51% to 80% AMI			81% or Greater			Totals		
	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Number	2723	4012	4164	980	1041	1102	192	155	158	4	2	6	3899	5210	5430
Percent	70%	77%	77%	25%	20%	20%	5%	3%	3%	0.10%	0.04%	0.01%	100%	100%	100%

Total Public Housing and HCV (Section 8)

	Under 30% AMI			30% to 50% AMI			51% to 80% AMI			81% or Greater			Totals		
	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	1-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Number	6590	7042	7197	2027	1734	1782	471	405	350	57	63	72	9145	9244	9401
Percent	72%	76%	77%	22%	19%	19%	5%	4%	4%	1%	0.7%	0.7%	100%	100%	100%

Source: HACP MIS archived rent roll profile of 1/1/01, 1/1/10, 1/1/11,1/1/12

Table A-3 – Pittsburgh Area (Allegheny County) Median Family Income Levels by Family Size - 2012

	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons
30% of Median	\$13,650	\$15,600	\$17,550	\$19,450	\$21,050	\$22,600
50% of Median	\$22,750	\$26,000	\$29,250	\$32,450	\$35,050	\$37,650
80% of Median	\$36,350	\$41,550	\$46,750	\$51,900	\$56,100	\$60,250
HUD Metro FMR Area: Median Income \$64,900						

Table A-4– Race / Ethnicity of Households Served, Jan. 1, 2001 - Jan. 1, 2011 – Jan. 1, 2012**Public Housing**

	Black			White			Hispanic			Asian			Other			Total		
	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12
Family	3636	2800	2531	165	93	201	2	38	25	2	1	3	8	7	6	3813	2939	2766
Elderly	1008	784	991	399	290	193	22	11	13	1	4	3	3	6	5	1433	1095	1205
Total	4644	3584	3522	564	383	394	24	49	38	3	5	6	11	13	11	5246	4034	3971

HCV (Section 8)

	Black			White			Hispanic			Asian			Other			Total		
	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12
Family	2336	3675	3843	800	793	827	7	38	47	3	11	12	294	16	10	3440	4533	4739
Elderly	183	400	416	265	266	262	2	5	5	1	2	4	8	4	4	459	677	691
Total	2519	4075	4259	1065	1059	1089	9	43	52	4	13	16	302	20	14	3899	5210	5430

Total Public Housing and HCV (Section 8)

	Black			White			Hispanic			Asian			Other			Total		
	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12	1/1	1/11	1/12
Family	5972	6475	6374	965	886	1028	9	76	72	5	12	15	302	23	16	7253	7472	7505
Elderly	1191	1184	1407	664	556	455	24	16	18	2	6	7	11	10	9	1892	1772	1898
Total	7163	7659	7781	1629	1442	1483	33	92	90	7	18	22	313	33	25	9145	9244	9401

Source: HACP MIS archived rent roll profile of 1/1/01, 1/1/09, 1/1/10, 1/1/11, 1/1/12

Table A-5 – Unit Sizes Of Households Containing Disabled Residents – January 1, 2011 - January 1, 2012**Public Housing**

	Eff / 1 Bedroom		2 Bedrooms		3 Bedrooms		4 Bedrooms		5+ Bedrooms		Total	
	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12
Family	325	529	374	253	221	182	59	38	11	13	990	1015
Elderly	714	509	38	164	0	51	0	11	0	0	752	735
Total	1039	1038	412	417	221	233	59	49	11	13	1742	1750

HCV (Section 8)

	Eff / 1 Bedroom		2 Bedrooms		3 Bedrooms		4 Bedrooms		5+ Bedrooms		Total	
	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12
Family	746	868	426	477	237	252	62	66	11	9	1482	1672
Elderly	367	373	125	128	32	36	5	5	1	1	530	543
Total	1113	1241	551	605	269	288	67	71	12	10	2012	2215

Total Public Housing and HCV (Section 8)

	Eff / 1 Bedroom		2 Bedrooms		3 Bedrooms		4 Bedrooms		5+ Bedrooms		Total	
	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12	1/11	1/12
Family	1071	1397	800	730	458	434	121	104	22	22	2472	2687
Elderly	1081	882	163	292	32	87	5	16	1	1	1282	1278
Total	2152	2279	963	1022	490	521	126	120	23	23	3754	3965

Source: HACP MIS rent roll profile of 01/01/12

The HACP uses the definitions of disabilities used by the Social Security Administration. All households counted in Table A-5 are public housing or HCV (Section 8) households in which the leaseholder has a verified SSI disability lowering rent payments. Members of the family with disabilities who are not the designated head of household are not included.

Table A-6– Race / Ethnicity of Disabled Households Served - Jan. 1, 2009 – Jan. 1, 2010 – Jan. 1, 2012**Public Housing Disabled Households**

	Black			White			Hispanic			Asian			Other			Total		
	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12
Elderly	503	530	609	205	214	113	9	14	9	1	4	3	1	5	1	716	767	735
Family	703	922	855	2	36	145	13	15	12	5	1	1	3	1	2	729	975	1015
Total	1206	1452	1464	207	250	258	22	29	21	6	5	4	4	6	3	1445	1742	1750

HCV (Section 8) Disabled Households

	Black			White			Hispanic			Asian			Other			Total		
	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12
Elderly	267	317	332	164	204	202	4	6	5	1	0	2	3	3	2	439	530	543
Family	1034	1048	1179	467	403	457	14	15	15	5	7	8	10	9	13	1530	1482	1672
Total	1301	1365	1511	631	607	659	18	21	20	6	7	10	13	12	15	1969	2012	2215

Total Race / Ethnicity of Disabled Households Served - Jan. 1, 2006

	Black			White			Hispanic			Asian			Other			Total		
	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12	1/09	1/11	1/12
Elderly	770	847	941	369	418	315	17	20	14	6	4	5	6	8	3	1168	1297	1278
Family	1737	1970	2034	469	439	602	23	30	27	6	8	9	11	10	15	2246	2457	2687
Total	2507	2817	2975	838	857	917	40	50	41	12	12	14	17	18	18	3414	3754	3965

Source: HACP MIS archived rent roll profile of 1/1/08, 1/1/09, 1/1/10, 1/1/11

Note: A Disabled Household is a public housing or HCV (Section 8) household in which the leaseholder has a verified SSI disability lowering rent payments. Disabled members of the family who are not the designated head of household are not included.

Table A-7– Income of Disabled Households Served – Jan. 1, 2010 - Jan. 1, 2011 – Jan. 1, 2012**Public Housing Disabled Households**

	Under 30% AMI			30% to 50% AMI			51% to 80%			81% or Greater			Total		
	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Number	1188	1443	1452	225	242	246	37	46	42	11	11	10	1461	1742	1750
Percent	81%	83%	83%	15%	14%	14%	3%	3%	2%	1%	.6%	.6%	100%	100%	100%

HCV (Section 8) Disabled Households

	Under 30% AMI			30% to 50% AMI			51% to 80%			81% or Greater			Total		
	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Number	1625	1673	1864	332	322	331	24	17	18	1	0	2	1982	2012	2215
Percent	82%	83%	84%	17%	16%	15%	1%	.8%	.8%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%

Total Income (Public Housing and Section 8) of Disabled Households Served - Jan. 1, 2010 – Jan. 1, 2011 – Jan. 1, 2012

	Under 30% AMI			30% to 50% AMI			51% to 80%			81% or Greater			Total		
	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan	10-Jan	11-Jan	12-Jan
Number	2813	3116	3316	557	564	577	61	63	60	12	11	12	3443	3754	3965
Percent	82%	83%	84%	16%	15%	15%	2%	1.7%	1.5%	0%	.3%	.3%	100%	100%	100%

Note: A Disabled Household is a public housing or HCV (Section 8) household in which the leaseholder has a verified SSI disability lowering rent payments. Disabled members of the family who are not the designated head of household are not included.