Executive Committee Meeting

May 18, 2016
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Meeting of the Boards of Commissioners

12pm May 18, 2016– Board Room
1331 Fulton Mall, Fresno, CA 93721

Interested parties wishing to address the Boards of Commissioners regarding this meeting’s Agenda Items, and/or regarding topics not on the agenda but within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Boards of Commissioners, are asked to complete a “Request to Speak” card which may be obtained from the Board Secretary (Tiffany Mangum) at 11:45 a.m. You will be called to speak under Agenda Item 3, Public Comment.

The meeting room is accessible to the physically disabled, and the services of a translator can be made available. Requests for additional accommodations for the disabled, signers, assistive listening devices, or translators should be made at least one (1) full business day prior to the meeting. Please call the Board Secretary at (559) 443-8475, TTY 800-735-2929.

12pm

1. Call to Order

2. Public Comment
   This is an opportunity for the members of the public to address the Boards of Commissioners on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Boards of Commissioners that is not listed on the Agenda. At the start of your presentation, please state your name, address and/or the topic you wish to speak on that is not on the agenda. Presentations are limited to a total of three (3) minutes per speaker.

3. Action: Consideration of the minutes of April 21, 2016

4. Discussion
   a. Review of the Proposed Board Meeting Agenda
   b. Community Stakeholder Meeting Update
   c. Development Update
   d. Administrative Matters
5. Closed Session  
   PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT  
   *Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957*

6. Adjournment
Minutes of the Meeting
Of the Fresno Housing Authority

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 21, 2016

12:00 p.m.

There was a duly noticed meeting of the Executive Committee of the Boards of Commissioners on April 21, 2016, at the offices of HACCF, located at 1331 Fulton Mall, Fresno, California.

1. The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Sablan at 12:05 p.m., and members present and absent were as follows:

   PRESENT: Stacy Sablan
             Reneeta Anthony
             Adrian Jones
             Rueben Scott

   ABSENT:  Jim Petty

   Also in attendance: Preston Prince, CEO/Executive Director; Tracewell Hanrahan, Deputy Executive Director; Jim Barker, Chief Finance Officer; Ken Price, Baker Manock and Jensen-General Counsel; and Tiffany Mangum, Special Assistant to the CEO/Executive Director.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

   Preston Prince, CEO/Executive Director, announced the following items:

   • Michael Mosely was recently hired as the new Controller and will start Monday, April 25, 2016.
   • Discussed transitioning Jim Barker to work remotely and in a broader capacity.

   There was no further public comment.


   Commissioner Anthony motioned for the Committee’s approval of the March 16, 2016 Executive Committee meeting minutes. This action was seconded by Commissioner Scott, and by unanimous vote of the Executive Committee, the minutes for March 16, 2016 were approved.

4. DISCUSSION

   a. Review of the Proposed Board Meeting Agenda

      Staff agreed to implement various amendments to the agenda.

      Commissioner Anthony announced she will not be present for the April 26, 2016 Board Meeting.

   b. 2016 Congressional-Legislative Update

      Preston Prince provided the Committee an overview of the NAHRO Washington, DC meetings, outcomes, and efforts moving forward.
c. Development Update

Preston Prince introduced a potential new site for development. Mr. Prince presented a site map and the 2018 application.

Ken Price, General Counsel, recommended running a title report for the proposed site. Mr. Price will complete running a title report and submit findings to Preston Prince.

d. Administrative Matters

Preston Prince announced the Mayor’s updated plan to end chronic homelessness. Mr. Prince provided emphasis for the plan’s priorities. Mr. Prince further discussed the outreach being done with County Leaders; the success and failures; and the shared vision.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be considered by the Executive Committee, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:55 p.m.

_____________________________________
Preston Prince, Secretary
Executive Summary

On April 27th, staff met with various tenant advocacy groups to discuss our year long analysis on housing quality standards and the housing choice voucher program.

Attached is the presentation given to said members. Staff will present the outcomes from that meeting and discuss potential next steps.
Leveraging the Housing Choice Voucher Program to Improve Housing Quality

April 27, 2016
Agenda

• Housing Choice Voucher Program
• Housing Stock - HCV Program
• Housing Quality Standards- HQS
• Fresno Housing Inspection Process
• Policy and Procedures Update
• Case Studies
Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program

- Formerly called Section 8
- Approx. 13,000 total combined vouchers (City and County)
- Over 38,000 program participants
- Participants must be income-eligible
  - Limit is approximately 30% Area Median Income or $24,300 for a family of four
- Participants pay roughly 30% of their monthly income toward rent
  - Agency pays the balance directly to landlord in form of a HAP payment
HCV Housing Stock

- Average age of all units was 41 years (1973)
- Multi-family - 69% of the units
  - Average age is 37 years (1977)
- Single-family - 31% of the units
  - Average age is 51 years (1963)
Housing Stock by Zip Code

Mean Year Built

1948 - 2000
# Housing Stock by Zip Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Avg Age</th>
<th>Avg Year Built</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selma</td>
<td>93662</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovis</td>
<td>93612</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93725</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanger</td>
<td>93657</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93727</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93722</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93704</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93706</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93702</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93728</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93721</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93701</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pass rates by Zip Code

• The six zip codes with the highest pass rates had an average pass rate of 67.7%

• The six zip codes with the lowest pass rates had an average pass rate of 56.4%
  — ~11.3% difference in the six highest zip codes
Geographic Areas of Concern
“Housing Quality Standards (HQS) are set in place to ensure that the assisted housing is decent, safe and sanitary.

HQS standards apply to the building and premises, as well as the unit.”
HUD provides guidance and forms

### Inspection Form

**Housing Choice Voucher Program**

**Public Reporting Burden** for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.25 hours per response, including the time for reviewing existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information unless that collection is subject to the provisions of title 3 of the United States Code.

**Privacy Act Statement.** The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is authorized to collect information under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f). Collection of this name and address of both the family and the entity to which the question is to be directed is necessary for the purpose of the program, and failure to provide it may result in delay or rejection of a request for a grant of financial assistance.

This collection of information is authorized under Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) and is used to ensure that the housing quality standards of the section 8 rental assistance program.

**Form:**

- **Page:**
- **Title:**
- **Instructions:**
- **Signature:**

### 1. Living Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Living Room Present Is there a living room?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Electricity Are there at least two working outlets and one working light fixture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Electrical Hazards Is the room free from electrical hazard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Security Are all windows and doors that are accessible outside lockable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Window Condition Is there at least one window, and are all windows and doors free of signs of severe deterioration or broken out panes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Ceiling Condition Is the ceiling sound and free from hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Wall Condition Are the walls sound and free from hazards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Kitchen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Kitchen Area Present Is there a kitchen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Electricity Are there at least one working outlet and one working, permanently installed light fixture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Electrical Hazards Is the kitchen free from electrical hazards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Security Are all windows and doors that are accessible from the outside lockable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Window Condition Are all windows free of signs of deterioration or missing or broken out panes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Ceiling Condition Is the ceiling sound and free from hazardous defects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Wall Condition Are the walls sound and free from hazardous defects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Floor Condition Is the floor sound and free from hazardous defects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Load-Based Paint Are all painted surfaces free of deteriorated paint?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, does deteriorated surfaces exceed ten square feet?
Types of Inspections

• Initial/Move-in
• Annual
  – Pass – See you next year
  – Fail – Re-inspections and potential Abatement
• Special/Complaint
• Quality Control
Inspections Analysis

• HQS staff scheduled over 32,000 initial, annual and complaint inspections
  – 60.2% of physical inspections passed
• Initial Inspections – 5000 annually
  – 67.7% passed, a 3% decrease from the 2013
• Complaint Inspections - nearly 350 annually
  – 26.4% of these inspections passed and the unit was HQS-complaint
Commonly Failed Items

• 11% of fails were a result of electrical hazards
  – Inoperable electrical outlets, missing outlet cover plates, inoperable light switches, improperly grounded three-prong outlets
• 9% of fails were a result of poor floor conditions
  – Damaged flooring and potential tripping hazards
• 9% of fails were a result of poor site and neighborhood conditions
  – Poor yard, tree, gate, patio and shed conditions, lighting
• 8% of fails pertained to failed security items
  – All accessible windows and doors accessible must be lockable
• 7% of fails were tied to poor tub or shower conditions
Abatement

• The unit has failed two inspections for owner-related items
  – The owner is at risk of losing HAP $
  – These items may be cured, result in an abatement, or a contract cancellation
  – A third inspection is required to clear the abatement
  – If unit fails again, HAP contract will be cancelled and resident will be required to move
Common/Easily Cured Items

- CO/Smoke Monitors: 25%
- Entry Door: 18%
- Caulking/Waterproofing: 22%
- Electrical: 20%
- Window Condition: 15%
Common Abatement Reasons

- Electrical Hazards: 25%
- Exterior Condition: 19%
- Plumbing: 21%
- Floor Condition: 22%
- Pest Control: 13%
## May – December 2015 Abatement Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abatement Status</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passed HQS</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass before abatement</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass after abatement</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cancellations</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAP Abated</strong></td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$12,800</td>
<td>$24,200</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$89,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Approximately $90,000 in HAP was abated from May to December
Jan-Mar 2016 Abatement Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abatements Status</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed HQS</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass before abatement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass after abatement</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAP Abated</td>
<td>$19,048</td>
<td>$15,246</td>
<td>$20,884</td>
<td>$55,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Approximately $55,000 in HAP was abated from January through March 2016
## Costs of Abatements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Costs for Abatements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1015 Abatements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~3 inspections/abatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~3045 Inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$33,400 Admin Expenses (Inspector salaries, scheduling + admin, fuel, maintenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$106,575 Annual Admin Expenses (projected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Cost per Inspection:</strong> $35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$154,000 Annual HAP abated (projected)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abatement Analysis

• Repeat Owners
  – These 600+ abatements represent 450 different owners or landlords
  – 81 owners had multiple abatements
    • 8 of which had 5 or more abatements
      – 3 of the 8 had 10 or more abatements
    • 12 owners had multiple contract cancellations
      – 2 of which had 5 or more contract cancellations
  – 5 of the 81 owners are on our hot list
Impacts of Abatement

- Additional time for inspectors, accounting staff, HCV staff
- 2-3 inspections per occurrence on abatement list multiply the impact on both staff and residents
- If contract cancels, residents must move burdening residents
- Additional admin burden to staff due to processing of new “move-in”
- Lost admin fees during time between contracts
Potential Solutions

• Landlord Support and Training Program
  – Underway and delivery anticipated to start in June (collaboration with CAA)
• Recovery of some financial losses through a waiver allowing us to charge fees for excessive inspections
  – Waiver submitted; potential HUD rule change
• Additional landlord outreach to increase the number of quality housing options for residents
  – New positions to support outreach
• Disallowance of landlords with repetitive issues
  – Three landlords in disallowance process
Support for Residents

• Cancellations due to inspections failure have adverse impact on residents
• Resident concerns
  • Funds to move not readily available
  • Poor credit history limits options
  • Moving is difficult and time consuming
  • Approx ½ were more concerned w/criminal activity in area and wanted to relocate if possible
• Rent rates in North Fresno (and acceptance of voucher) limited mobility to this area
• Housing Navigator position developed and will be hired by the end of the week
Policy and Procedure Updates
Discretionary Owner Disapproval

• Applies to: owners, representatives, property management companies
  – Can apply to individual properties
• Overview of Causes
  – History of non-compliance with HQS
  – History of failing to terminate tenancy where appropriate
  – History of renting units that fail to meet State or local code
  – Has not paid State or local real estate taxes, fines or assessments
From the Eyes of an Inspector
From the Eyes of an Inspector
Joint Inspections and Collaborations

• Fresno Housing collaborated with City Code Enforcement to better understand how the agencies can work together
• Code Enforcement provided a list of owners whose properties received the most calls for service
• These owners and properties were cross-referenced with FH data and collaborative quality review inspections were performed at these properties
• Also working with POP Officers in each of the four policing districts to pinpoint some key areas in need of attention
• Participate on Mayor’s Code Enforcement Task Force
• Participate on the STOPP Team (Strike Team Overseeing problem Properties)
Inspection Results

• Examples of “Owner” Fails
  - Pests/Roaches; Eaves and overhang in front of units were in disrepair; A/C issues and electrical cord overhang, garbage disposal and faucet issues, refrigerator seal broken, door knob/locks loose, Refrigerator seal broken, Front door not weatherized, cutting hazard on counter top, security door in disrepair, caulk around toilet, open ground in kitchen outlet
Inspection Results

• Examples of “Tenant” Fails
  - Writing on walls, cable tripping hazard, dirty carpet, unsanitary shower, poor housekeeping
Common Deficiencies
Common Deficiencies
Common Deficiencies
Common Deficiencies
Common Deficiencies
Common Deficiencies
Case Studies
Scenario 1 - Owner Disallowance

• Two properties affected/Same Owner:
  – Property 1:
    • Started with 11 Contracts out of 24 Units
    • Currently 3 Active Contracts; will cancel soon
  – Property 2:
    • Started with 14 Contracts out of 60 Units
    • 6 Contract Cancellations
    • 8 Active Contracts in process of cancelling
Scenario 1 – Owner Disallowance

Unpermitted balcony repair

Vacant unit left unsecured garbage and debris
Scenario 1 – Owner Disallowance

Raw sewage impacting common areas

Raw sewage impacting common areas
Scenario 1 – Owner Disallowance

Car crash
Scenario 1 – Owner Disallowance

Improper balcony repair

Exposed Wiring
Scenario 2 -
No Owner Disallowance

• One Property affected
  – HCV Staff and Management Observations
  – Outreach to Code Enforcement
  – Started with 5 Contracts out of 12 Units
  • All cancelled or voluntarily moved
Scenario 2 - No Owner Disallowance

Dead trees and broken fencing - Before
Scenario 2 - No Owner Disallowance

Dead trees and broken fencing - After
Scenario 2 - No Owner Disallowance

Trash and debris in alley

Before

After
Scenario 2 - No Owner Disallowance

Dangling wires throughout complex

Before

After
Scenario 2 - No Owner Disallowance

Deteriorating balconies

Before

After
Questions/Comments?
STOPP Update

• Collaboration with City Manager, Code, Police, Fire, Housing Authority, City Attorney
• Meet every Friday
• Approximately 30 properties on list with immediate focus on seven (7) with action by City
  – Three of the seven had Section 8 contracts
  – Two properties/owners have been disallowed by FH since team began
  – One in process of being disallowed by FH
• Fresno Housing is working on an additional property/owner that has over 70 contracts and six properties and will be added to the STOPP team action list soon
## Housing Stock by Zip Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Avg Age</th>
<th>Avg Year Built</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selma</td>
<td>93662</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovis</td>
<td>93612</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93725</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanger</td>
<td>93657</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93727</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93722</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93704</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93706</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93702</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93728</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93721</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>93701</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy and Procedure Updates
Discretionary Owner Disapproval

• Applies to: owners, representatives, property management companies
  – Can apply to individual properties
• Overview of Causes
  – History of non-compliance with HQS
  – History of failing to terminate tenancy where appropriate
  – History of renting units that fail to meet State or local code
  – Has not paid State or local real estate taxes, fines or assessments
Ongoing Process Improvement

• Training and “alignment” with Inspections Team
• Quality Assurance – HQS Enforcement Specialist
• Daily property updates with entire inspections team
• “Senior” Inspectors assigned to special projects
  – POP Officer or Code Enforcement Teams
  – STOPP Team
  – Geographic Area Focus
• Market Specialist – Focus on appropriate rent comparisons and support landlord outreach efforts
• Housing Navigator – Work with Leasing Team to support resident unit selection; support resident “moves”
Resident Support

• Improve initial briefings
• Develop neighborhood information sheets
• Monitor GoSection8
• Implement Social Move Site???
• Individual counseling sessions
  – Housing Navigator
• Collaborate with Ed Corps to consider support for barriers like security deposits and credit reports
Landlord Communication and Support

- Implement Landlord Outreach efforts
  - Assistant Manager, Housing Navigator, Market Specialist
  - Collaboration with California Apartment Association (CAA) – June Meeting
  - Develop informational packet especially for landlords
  - Create preventative maintenance training and offer to landlords (NAHRO members)