



October 18, 2012

Ms. Collette Pollard
Departmental Reports Management Officer
Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street SW, Room 4160
Washington, DC 20410-500

Subject: OMB Control Number 2577-00863
Revision of MTW Family Report – HUD 50058 MTW

Dear Ms. Pollard:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) proposed revision to the MTW Family Report, HUD 50058 MTW. The Oakland Housing Authority (OHA) is writing to express strong concern over the increased reporting burden that would result from the proposed revisions to this form. The proposed addition of a "local, non-traditional" household category would dramatically increase agencies' administrative burden, thereby negating cost efficiencies realized through the implementation of innovative Moving to Work (MTW) activities.

Necessity and Practical Utility of Information Collection

The notice states that this proposed revision to the form is necessary so that MTW agencies can report households served in local, non-traditional programs into PIC. However, it is unclear why this information needs to be reported in PIC specifically. OHA understands the needs of the MTW Office to validate data provided on households served in order to report information to Congress. Yet, it is unclear how self-reporting data into the PIC system provides any more accuracy or validity than the self-reported information that MTW agencies have been providing in their baseline calculations for the past two years. Furthermore, while OHA understands that not reporting into the PIC system creates a situation within HUD where your PIC reports may show a less than complete picture of all the households served by MTW agencies, the reporting through the 50058 form seems excessive and, in many instances, is duplicative of other HUD and Federal systems where information is reported (such as reporting in the 50059 format, the Homeless Management and Information Systems (HMIS), or into the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for tax credit compliance).

With regard to the practical utility of the information, OHA has serious concerns about the capacity of the MTW Office to actually analyze and use in a meaningful way the data collected in the 50058 form. Given the additional administrative burden that this

reporting would create, it is imperative that the data collected be utilized and purposeful, rather than simply data collection using an existing system that is not designed for the complexities or the variations of MTW agencies' local programs.

Minimizing the Burden of Collection

At OHA, MTW flexibilities have been used to develop programs for special needs populations and to fund affordable housing projects outside of the traditional Section 8 or 9 programs. In many of these programs, our partners do report similar information into other HUD systems. For example, OHA has used MTW funds to support the rehabilitation of a HUD 236 tax credit property. This property receives project-based voucher awards directly from HUD and not through the housing authority. Because OHA does not administer the vouchers but did support the rehabilitation using MTW funds, OHA counts these households as part of our local, non-traditional households served. As part of the HUD 236 program, this property reports data on households in the 50059 form. This information is duplicative of the information proposed for collection on the 50058 form.

Another example of our local programs includes the Sponsor Based Housing Assistance Program. In this program, OHA provides funding for housing, but not actual units or vouchers, to service providers who administer supportive housing programs to homeless individuals and ex-offenders. Often times, our nonprofit partners are reporting into the HUD HMIS system as part of other funding they receive for providing homeless services. Again, the information provided in this system is duplicative of the information that would be reported in the 50058 form.

Finally, several of OHA's local, non-traditional households are in tax credit properties where MTW funds have been used to supplement the development costs. Although the data on these households is not currently reported into a HUD system, it is reviewed by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee for accuracy and validity. Furthermore, in all of these examples, the households served are significantly below the requirement to serve households that are at or below 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) by the nature of other regulatory requirements of the programs and/or other funding received by our partners. For example, project-based voucher households, regardless of the award coming from the housing authority or the HUD directly, all have incomes at or below 50% of AMI. Households in tax credit properties must have incomes at or below 60% of AMI. In the Sponsor Based program, these households are defined as homeless, typically having no income or income far below 30% of AMI.

Challenges with PIC

OHA has one of the highest PIC reporting rates in our local area. OHA understands the importance of meaningful data and has invested a tremendous amount of staff time and resources to ensure that information is reported timely and accurately and any errors are corrected routinely. However, this effort takes valuable staff time away from assisting families and utilizes resources that negate cost savings achieved through implementation of other creative MTW activities. Additionally, in the case of

reporting on tax credit units in a property that also has “floating” public housing subsidy, the proposed revision to the form could result in a situation where there is the appearance of double subsidy on the units because of timing issues in the submission of 50058 forms. This type of situation could result in data that is inaccurate and paints a misleading picture.

Alternative Recommendations

As stated earlier, it is unclear how HUD intends to use the extensive information collected in the 50058 form. If the purpose is to validate the number of households served in local, non-traditional programs and ensure that households are below the income threshold for the MTW program (at or below 80% of AMI), it seems that information could be collected either by connecting to other HUD and/or Federal systems outside of the Office of Public and Indian Housing or, especially in instances where other regulatory requirements ensure income threshold compliance, MTW agencies could self-certify information (with a HUD review and verification of the small number of MTW agencies nationwide). At a minimum, OHA suggests that HUD consider only having agencies report move-in and move-out information into PIC and not all of the other demographic data that may not be utilized by HUD.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments on this proposed information collection. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (510) 874-1510 if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'Eric Johnson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Eric Johnson
Executive Director