

**Technical Note Series**

04-01

**Public Housing Authorities in Florida:  
An Analysis of Selected Issues**

**February 2004**

Technical Note Series  
04-01

Public Housing Authorities in Florida:  
An Analysis of Selected Issues

Anne Lockwood Williamson  
Virginia M. Battista  
Melanie Sberna

February 2004

Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing  
M.E. Rinker, Sr. Rinker School of Building Construction  
College of Design, Construction and Planning  
P.O. Box 115703  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, Florida 32611-5703  
[www.shimberg.ufl.edu](http://www.shimberg.ufl.edu)  
(800) 259-5705

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Section I:	
Introduction.....	1
Section II:	
Households Served by Public Housing Authority Programs in Florida.....	3
Residents in Public Housing Authority Units.....	3
Housing Choice Voucher Holders.....	4
Section III:	
Survey and Other Data.....	5
About the Survey Data.....	6
Other Data.....	6
Categories Used in Data Analysis.....	6
Making Use of Data Presented in this Report.....	7
Section IV:	
Public Housing Units.....	8
Section V:	
Housing Choice Vouchers.....	13
Project-Based Vouchers.....	13
Voucher Portability.....	14
Utilization Rates.....	17
Housing Choice Voucher Waiting Lists.....	18
Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP).....	18
Section VI:	
HOPE VI.....	23
Section VII:	
Financial Data.....	25
Expenditures for Public Housing Units.....	25
Expenditures for Housing Choice Vouchers.....	28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(continued)**

Section VIII:	
Telephone Interviews.....	31
Ability to Lease Public Housing Units.....	32
Housing Choice Voucher Utilization Rates.....	33
Administrative Costs in PHA Administration.....	34
Suggested Regulation Modifications.....	35
Advantages of Large, Medium and Small PHAs.....	37
Disadvantages of Large, Medium and Small PHAs.....	38
Other Comments.....	38
Section IX: Suggestions for Further Study.....	39
APPENDIX A.....	42
APPENDIX B.....	45
APPENDIX C.....	48

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1a	Public Housing Units: Large PHAs.....	10
Table 1b	Public Housing Units: Medium PHAs.....	11
Table 1c	Public Housing Units: Small PHAs.....	12
Table 2a	Housing Choice Vouchers: Number and Portability, Large PHAs.....	15
Table 2b	Housing Choice Vouchers: Number and Portability, Medium PHAs.....	16
Table 2c	Housing Choice Vouchers: Number and Portability, Small PHAs.....	17
Table 3a	Housing Choice Vouchers: Utilization, Waiting Lists and SEMAP, Large PHAs.....	21
Table 3b	Housing Choice Vouchers: Utilization, Waiting Lists and SEMAP, Medium PHAs.....	22
Table 3c	Housing Choice Vouchers: Utilization, Waiting Lists and SEMAP, Small PHAs.....	23
Table 4	HOPE VI in Florida.....	24
Table 5a	Financial Data: Public Housing Units, Large PHAs.....	26
Table 5b	Financial Data: Public Housing Units, Medium PHAs.....	27
Table 5c	Financial Data: Public Housing Units, Small PHAs.....	28

**LIST OF TABLES**  
**(continued)**

Table 6a	Financial Data: Housing Choice Vouchers, Large PHAs.....	29
Table 6b	Financial Data: Housing Choice Vouchers, Medium PHAs.....	30
Table 6c	Financial Data: Housing Choice Vouchers, Small PHAs.....	31
<b>Appendices</b>		
Table A-1	PHA Respondents: Alphabetical Listing.....	42
Table A-2	PHA Respondents: Listing by Size.....	43
Table A-3	PHA Respondents: Listing by Region.....	44
Table C-1	Port-In Housing Choice Vouchers Among the States .....	48

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The Shimberg Center gratefully acknowledges the support provided for this project by the Florida Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. We appreciate having the opportunity to explore issues crucial to Florida's ability to address affordable housing needs within our state, particularly those needs that fall among extremely low income households.

We also appreciate the time and effort public housing officials throughout Florida put into answering the survey that provides the framework for this report. Finally, we thank officials of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Jacksonville and Miami Regional Offices for sharing both data and expertise with us during our preparation of this report.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In late 2003, the Florida Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (FAHRO) asked the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing at the University of Florida to collect information on a number of issues related to public housing authority operations and performance. Florida's policy makers and administrators have spent considerable time and effort recently in studying issues related to how housing programs serve households in the extremely low income group. Thus, FAHRO's request was particularly timely, since public housing authorities have been serving households at this income level for more than 60 years.

As part of this project, the Shimberg Center administered a survey to FAHRO members. This survey was supplemented with telephone interviews with executive directors representative of the state in terms of housing authority size and geographic distribution. At 87 percent, the survey response rate was high. We also collected data from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

This report encompasses six broad areas: (1) an overview of the households served; (2) operation of public housing units; (3) administration of the Housing Choice (Section 8) Voucher program; (4) the HOPE VI program; (5) financial aspects of public housing authority operations; and (6) regulatory and other issues facing public housing authorities.

In order to facilitate analysis and presentation of results, we placed public housing authorities (PHAs) into three groups—large, medium and small, depending on the number of households served.<sup>1</sup> Those PHAs that serve 1,000 or more households are categorized as large, while those that serve between 200 and 1,000 households are classified as medium. PHAs that serve fewer than 200 households are in the small category.

Taken as a whole, survey results showed that Florida's PHAs achieve performance levels well above federal minimum standards for operation of public housing units and administration of Housing Choice Vouchers. HUD-provided financial data also indicated that administrative expenses for the Housing Choice Voucher program were slightly less than 11 percent when considered on a statewide basis. Results for each facet of PHA operations and performance vary widely, however, and readers are encouraged to explore this information more fully by reference to tabular presentations made throughout the report.

This report captures information on PHA performance in Florida for a specific period of time. Some results, such as those associated with Housing Choice Voucher utilization rates, may fluctuate on a monthly basis. A utilization rate at one point in time may not be indicative of long-term trends.

Highlights from survey results, telephone interviews and financial data analysis include:

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that under the categories used for this report, households may be served by either public housing units owned and operated by PHAs or by Housing Choice (Section 8) Vouchers these organizations administer.

## **Households Served**

- Public housing authorities primarily serve households at the extremely low income level, both through operation of public housing units and through administration of the Housing Choice Voucher program. On average, households served by these programs have incomes below the federal poverty level.
- Households with children represent the largest group served by both public housing rental units and the Housing Choice Voucher program.
- Social Security recipients make up the largest group served by both public housing rental units and Housing Choice Vouchers; 58 percent of households residing in public housing units receive Social Security, while 49 percent of households using vouchers receive this income. Note that this group includes both Social Security retirement and disability income recipients.
- Wage-earning households make up 28 percent of public housing tenants. This group comprises 36 percent of voucher-holding households.
- Households that receive Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) represent 8 percent of households served by public housing units and 10 percent of those making use of Housing Choice Vouchers.

## **Operation of Public Housing Units**

- Waiting lists for public housing units are long in many parts of Florida. Nearly 55,000 households are on waiting lists for residence in public housing units with public housing authorities that responded to our survey.
- There were 36 public housing authorities rated as high performers under HUD's Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) among the 70 survey respondents that operate public housing units. There were 27 with performance ratings of standard, while five fell into the troubled or at risk of troubled category. The median score among large public housing authorities was 87 percent. The PHAS score in both the medium and small categories was 92 percent.
- Median operating expenses for public housing developments operated by survey respondents were in the range of \$4,500 to \$5,000 per unit per year.

## **Housing Choice Voucher Administration**

- Housing Choice Voucher utilization rates are high in Florida. Utilization rates ranged from 70 to 108 percent. [Note that it is possible to have a utilization rate in excess of 100 percent under program regulations.] Of the 75 PHA respondents that administer vouchers, 65 had utilization rates of 95 percent or more. There were eight PHAs that reported utilization rates between 85 and 94 percent, and two PHAs reported utilization rates below 85 percent. The median reported utilization rate among large PHAs responding to our survey was 100 percent, while the rate for medium-sized PHAs was 99 percent. Small PHAs had a median utilization rate of 100 percent.
- Waiting lists for Housing Choice Vouchers are typically very long. Further, although some PHAs have waiting lists that are continuously open, some report that their waiting lists have been closed for as long as five (5) years. Among survey respondents, there are

more households on voucher waiting lists (79,451) than there are actual voucher-holding households (72,955).

- Among the 75 survey respondents that administer vouchers, there were 55 that have been rated as high performers under HUD's SEMAP performance measurement system. In addition, there were 14 with standard performance and five rated as troubled. (The SEMAP score was unavailable for one of the respondents.) SEMAP scores ranged from 0 to 100 percent among respondents.<sup>2</sup> The median reported SEMAP score for large, medium and small PHAs responding to our survey was 96 percent.
- Administrative expenses for the Housing Choice Voucher program were slightly less than 11 percent of total program expenditures on a statewide basis. Administrative expenses as a percentage of total Housing Choice Voucher program expenditures ranged from 3.66 percent to 37.33 percent. Large PHAs had a median value of 9.74 percent on this measure, while medium PHAs had a value of 11.63 percent. Small PHAs had a median value of 13.01 percent for administrative expenses as a percentage of total program expenditures for Housing Choice Vouchers.

## **HOPE VI**

- Florida's nine HOPE VI grantees have received 13 grants totaling nearly \$250 million since program inception in 1993. These HOPE VI funds have been leveraged with other public and private funds to bring the total investment in revitalization of distressed public housing and surrounding neighborhoods to more than \$657 million under this program.

## **Total Expenditures**

- Total expenditures by public housing authorities in Florida were more than \$819 million for fiscal years ending between September 30, 2002 and June 30, 2003.
- Median total expenditures for large PHAs were more than \$17 million per year, while the median for medium PHAs was slightly more than \$2.8 million. Small PHAs had median total expenditures of more than one-half million dollars per year.

## **Interviews with Executive Directors**

- Executive directors reported that the physical condition of public housing units is crucial to the ability to lease them. When operating and capital funds are inadequate, it is difficult to maintain aging public housing properties.
- Neighborhoods are also an important factor in the leasing of public housing units. Important factors include proximity to needed services such as grocery stores, transportation and health care. Overall neighborhood condition also plays a role in the ability to lease public housing units.
- Landlord perceptions regarding governmental assistance for housing and the households that make use of these programs have a strong impact upon Housing Choice Voucher

---

<sup>2</sup> One respondent reported a SEMAP score of 0 due to lack of timely audit opinion. In the absence of this result, the lowest reported SEMAP score would have been 38 percent.

utilization rates. These perceptions may lead some landlords to refuse to serve voucher holders.

- Fair Market Rents (FMRs) as established by HUD are an important factor in the utilization rate for many PHAs, particularly those in areas where rents may be rising rapidly.
- A number of issues affect a PHA's administrative costs, including rising insurance costs and HUD reporting requirements.
- Unfunded mandates such as administration of the community service requirement for residents in public housing developments can impose a burden on public housing authorities.
- Changes to Florida's Statute 421 would enhance the ability of PHAs to innovate and develop private sources of funding by allowing housing authorities greater opportunities to engage in creative finance.
- Executive directors also suggested an increase in the minimum rent level. Further, this minimum rent level would apply to net rent, rather than gross rent, so that tenant utility payments are not deducted from the minimum rent figure.

### **Suggestions for Further Study**

Further study of high-performing public housing authorities in Florida may be useful. More specifically, such a study might focus on how high performers achieve their results. It may also be useful to highlight the types of innovations high performers have engaged in that allow them to offer housing outside of those programs traditionally funded through federal appropriation. These innovations may include working relationships with private sector development firms, local governments and other stakeholders.

This work would be facilitated by making ongoing data collection and dissemination efforts a priority. The Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse at the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing could provide a venue for sharing data that would make information on public housing authorities and the programs they administer available to state and local policy makers, public housing authority administrators, housing advocates and the public at large via the World Wide Web.

As with all work produced by the Shimberg Center, we invite feedback. Readers may direct questions and comments to Anne Lockwood Williamson at arwill@ufl.edu or (800) 259-8705 or at our mailing address: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, University of Florida, P.O. Box 115703, Gainesville, Florida 32611-05703.

# **PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITIES IN FLORIDA: AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED ISSUES**

## **Section I: Introduction**

In recent years, there has been increasing concern with how well housing policies and programs serve extremely low-income households in our country—those with incomes at or below 30 percent of the area median. Often, these households have one or more full-time wage earners, yet still face severe housing cost burdens, because they pay 50 percent or more of their monthly income for housing.<sup>3</sup>

Public housing authorities (PHAs) have been serving households at the extremely low income level for more than 60 years. The Housing Act of 1937 designated local public housing authorities as the means through which low-income housing units would be developed and administered. In the 1970s, the Section 8 Voucher and Certificate programs were introduced by Congress after substantial pilot testing in various regions of the country. The Section 8 Voucher and Certificate programs—now combined and known as the Housing Choice Voucher program—allow tenants to choose their own rental units in the private market, with the voucher making up the difference between 30 percent of the household’s income and the market rent for the privately owned rental unit.<sup>4</sup>

In late 2003, the Florida Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (FAHRO) asked the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing at the University of Florida to examine public housing authority (PHA) operations and the issues PHAs face in serving nearly 300,000

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Rental Housing Assistance--The Worsening Crisis: A Report to Congress on Worst Case Housing Needs*, U.S. Department of Housing and Development, March 2000.

<sup>4</sup> We will make use of the new term—Housing Choice Voucher—throughout this report, although in practice the term is used less often than the older term, Section 8.

low-income Floridians.<sup>5</sup> The report contains information gathered from a number of sources. These sources include a survey of FAHRO members conducted in November and December 2003, data obtained through Freedom of Information Act requests made to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and datasets made available by HUD on its website.

Section II of this report describes households served by public housing authorities. Section III describes the survey and other data collected and analyzed for this project. Section IV deals with the operation of public housing units. Section V provides information on the Housing Choice Voucher program. Section VI presents information on the HOPE VI program. Section VII is focused upon financial data. Section VIII presents the results of telephone interviews with executive directors from representative parts of the state and from different size housing authorities.

Appendix A contains information on survey respondents arranged alphabetically, by size, and by geographic region within Florida. A copy of the survey administered to FAHRO members is reproduced in Appendix B. The survey contains 16 questions relevant to all of Florida's PHAs and is supplemented with questions that pertain only to HOPE VI grantees. Appendix B also contains a list of six questions used in telephone interviews conducted with a sampling of executive directors from various size PHAs in different parts of the state during January and February 2003. Appendix C contains comparative information on Housing Choice Voucher portability among the states.

---

<sup>5</sup> Based on HUD data reported as of December 31, 2003.

## **Section II: Households Served by Public Housing Authority Programs in Florida<sup>6</sup>**

Florida's public housing authorities administer resources that house nearly 300,000 Floridians through public housing units and Housing Choice Vouchers. These individuals make up more than 115,000 households. The average household size for public housing units is 2.41 persons, while the average household size for those with vouchers is 2.77 persons.

Overall, about one-third of households that access public housing authority-administered programs earn wages. More than half of the households benefiting from PHA resources receive Social Security in the form of retirement or disability income. Welfare recipients account for approximately 10 percent of households making use of PHA-administered programs in Florida.

### **Residents in Public Housing Authority Units**

Nearly 60 percent of public housing units are occupied by households in the extremely low income group.<sup>7</sup> The average annual income of these households is \$9,008. This income places the average household in this group below the federal poverty level. Their average monthly total tenant payment is \$204 per month, including utilities.

Recipients of Social Security in the form of retirement or disability income make up 58 percent of the households served by public housing units in Florida. Wage earning households make up 28 percent of the residents, while 8 percent of the households receive Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

The largest group served by these units is that of households with children where no disability is present; they make up 42 percent of the total. Elderly households without children and without disabilities make up 17 percent of public housing residents, while elderly households

---

<sup>6</sup> Data for this segment of the report have been obtained through the Resident Characteristic Reports published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. These reports can be accessed via the World Wide Web at <http://pic.hud.gov/pic/RCRPublic/rcrmain.asp>.

<sup>7</sup> Note that HUD reported that income data were not available for 28 percent of households in public housing units.

with a disability but without children make up 12 percent of these households.<sup>8</sup> Households that include a person with a disability who is not elderly make up 20 percent of public housing residents.<sup>9</sup> When interpreting these data with regard to households that include a person with a disability, it is important to note that HUD and public housing authorities are not permitted to ask about the disability status of a household. Therefore, their data on number of households that include a person with a disability may be understated. As part of an earlier report, the Shimberg Center estimated that approximately 40 percent of public housing authority resources were used to serve households that include persons with disabilities in Florida. This estimate was based on a survey administered in early 2003 that captured information on both households with a known disability status, as well as on households that receive Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI).<sup>10</sup>

### **Housing Choice Voucher Holders**

Housing Choice Vouchers may be used to serve households with incomes up to 50 percent of AMI (very low income). However, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 requires public housing authorities to allocate at least 75 percent of any *new* Housing Choice Vouchers to households in the extremely low income group.<sup>11</sup>

Incomes for households served by the Housing Choice Voucher program appear to be somewhat higher than those for households residing in public housing-operated units; about 26 percent of the households making use of vouchers fall into the extremely low income group, based on available HUD data. Their average annual household income is \$10,006. Although the

---

<sup>8</sup> Federal housing programs define elderly as persons age 62 and above.

<sup>9</sup> Note that data limitations do not allow us to describe 100 percent of these households.

<sup>10</sup> See the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing's Technical Note No. 03-02, Public Housing Authorities: An Analysis of Practices and Resources for Serving Persons with Disabilities (revised December 2003). The report is available for download from the World Wide Web at [www.flhousingdata.shimberg.ufl.edu](http://www.flhousingdata.shimberg.ufl.edu).

average income of voucher-holding households is nearly \$1,000 higher than that of households residing in public housing-operated units, the average voucher-holding household still falls below the federal poverty level. Their average total tenant payment for housing is \$226, including utilities. These results must be viewed with caution, however, since HUD reports that income information is missing for 66 percent of the households receiving vouchers.

Social Security recipients—both those receiving retirement income and those receiving disability income—make up 49 percent of households using vouchers. Wage earning households make up 36 percent of voucher holders, while 10 percent of these households receive TANF.

The largest group served by Housing Choice Vouchers is that of households with children where no disability is present; they make up 55 percent of the households receiving vouchers. Households that include persons with disabilities who are not elderly account for 19 percent of the voucher holders, while elderly households with a disability make up 9 percent of voucher-holding households. As with the description of households served by public housing units, it is important to note that HUD and public housing authorities are not permitted to ask about the disability status of a household. Therefore, their data on number of households that include a person with a disability may be understated. See the description of the Shimberg Center's estimates of households that include persons with disabilities on page 4 of this report for further information.

### **Section III: Survey and Other Data**

The Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing designed and administered a survey in cooperation with the Florida Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials that provides the basis for much of this report. There were 93 survey responses out of a possible 107, yielding

---

<sup>11</sup> See *Rental Housing Assistance--The Worsening Crisis: A Report to Congress on Worst Case Housing Needs*, U.S. Department of Housing and Redevelopment, March 2000.

a response rate of 87 percent. Responses were obtained from PHAs of all sizes and in all regions of Florida. The survey was administered during November and December 2003.

All PHAs were asked 16 questions regarding issues related to public housing units and vouchers. HOPE VI grantees were asked to provide additional information on the amount of their HOPE VI grants and the public and private leveraging funds they were able to attract based on HOPE VI grants. Survey forms can be found in Appendix B.

As part of our survey activities, a series of telephone interviews with executive directors were also conducted. The goal of these interviews was to ask open-ended questions about issues important to PHA management and performance. Interviews were conducted with a total of six executive directors, representing PHAs from various regions of the state and of different sizes. Two executive directors were interviewed within each of the three size groupings. The questions asked during these telephone interviews can be found in Appendix B.

### **About the Survey Data**

Sections IV, V and VI rely solely on data collected through the survey instrument. These data are self-reported by individual PHAs. Many of these data—such as utilization rates—pertain to a specific time frame. We asked respondents to give us their most recent information. When data were not available from survey responses or where survey responses were not clear, HUD data were used, where possible. Note that in most cases survey data represent more recent information than HUD-reported data.

### **Other Data**

Sections II and VII, as well as Appendix C, contain data obtained from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Resident characteristics data found in Section II of this report were obtained from Resident Characteristics Reports made available by HUD at

their website. These data were reported as of December 31, 2003. Readers may refer to <http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/systems/pic/50058/rcr/index.cfm> to further explore this source of information.

Financial data reported in Section VII were obtained through Freedom of Information Act requests submitted to HUD's Jacksonville and Miami regional offices. The presentation of these data includes *all* Florida public housing authorities—not just those that responded to the survey.

Voucher portability data for Florida and other states were obtained from HUD's Housing Authority Profiles. Note that HUD's reported number of vouchers ported into the state of Florida is somewhat lower than the total number of ported in vouchers reported by the 93 PHAs that responded to this survey. The HUD portable voucher data were used for the purpose of comparing Florida with other states and appears in Appendix C. HUD's Housing Authority Profiles can be found at <http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/systems/pic/haprofiles/index.cfm>.

### **Categories Used in Data Analysis**

Much of the data analysis for this report is based upon categorizing public housing authorities by size. Public housing authorities have been categorized as large, medium or small based upon the number of households they serve.<sup>12</sup> These households may be served through either public housing units or Housing Choice Vouchers or through a combination of these methods. More specifically:

- *Large* public housing authorities serve 1,000 or more households.
- *Medium* public housing authorities serve between 200 and 1,000 households.
- *Small* public housing authorities serve fewer than 200 households.

---

<sup>12</sup> Note that we use three (3) size categories for public housing authorities in the interests of reporting simplicity; HUD uses six (6) size categories for official purposes.

## **Making Use of Data Presented in This Report**

As can be expected when collecting information on a large number of organizations, there are wide variations in many of the data elements reported. In order to summarize information for the reader, we frequently make use of median figures to represent averages. The use of the median average means that half of the reported values were higher than the median, and half of the reported values were lower. Readers are encouraged to review detailed information contained within the tables in this report in order to fully understand data presented here.

Readers should also keep in mind that most of the information in this report represents a “snapshot” of housing authority operations and performance at a specific point in time. While this information is useful, assessing the performance of any organization is most valid when done over a multiyear period.

### **Section IV: Public Housing Units**

We asked public housing authorities to tell us about how many public housing units they own and operate and about their waiting lists for these units. We also asked them to let us know their most recent Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) score. The PHAS score is based upon information reported electronically by PHAs to HUD. The PHAS score is a performance measurement tool that is based upon the following factors: (1) physical condition of units; (2) financial performance; (3) management operations; and (4) a customer survey.

PHAs with PHAS scores of 90 percent or above are designated as High Performers under this system. PHAs with scores between 70 and 89 percent are designated as Standard Performers. Those with scores between 60 and 70 percent are at risk of being designated as Troubled. PHAs with scores below 60 percent are designated Overall Troubled. It is possible that a PHA may be

designated as Troubled in One Area by achieving a score of less than 60 percent under one of the assessment categories. For HUD's description of the PHAS scoring system, see

[http://www.hud.gov/offices/reac/products/phas/phas\\_score.cfm](http://www.hud.gov/offices/reac/products/phas/phas_score.cfm).

Survey results for the operation of public housing units are reported in Tables 1a through 1c, based on the housing authority's size.

Overall, survey respondents reported operating 32,417 units of public housing. This is approximately 78 percent of the public housing units operated in Florida. Large PHAs responding to the survey operate nearly 23,000 public housing units. Waiting lists for residence in public housing are typically long—several large PHAs have waiting lists between two and three times the number of their actual public housing units. One PHA that is categorized as large due to the number of households it serves through both public housing units and vouchers has relatively few public housing units (185); this PHA has more than five times more households on its waiting list for its units than the number of units operated.

There were 70 survey respondents that reported operating public housing units. Overall, there were 36 PHAs that were rated as High Performers under PHAS. There were 27 rated as Standard Performers; five fell into the troubled or at risk of troubled category.

Of the 19 large PHA respondents that operate public housing units, seven are High Performers under PHAS. Ten are rated as Standard Performers, while one is at risk of being rated as Troubled. (Note that one large PHA did not supply a PHAS score.) The median PHAS score for large PHA respondents that operate public housing units was 87 (Standard).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> We use the median score to denote average in this report. Therefore, half of the large PHA respondents that operate public housing units had scores above 87, while half had scores below 87.

**Table 1a**  
**Public Housing Units: Large PHAs**

PHA Name	Public Housing Units	Public Housing Developments	Occupied Public Housing Units	Households On Waiting List For Public Housing Units	Current Public Housing Assessment Score (PHAS)
Broward	776	10	764	367	89
Clearwater	545	4	531	263	94
Daytona Beach	1,106	8	983	509	92
Delray Beach	200	1	196	170	84
Fort Lauderdale	787	8	746	1,521	79
Fort Pierce	826	10	769	671	85
Hialeah	1,118	13	1,085	2,664	86
Jacksonville	2,528	19	2,473	5,920	95
Lakeland	324	6	289	590	80
Miami Beach	200	1	200	316	95
Miami-Dade	10,340	111	8,000	30,000	60
Ocala	185	4	178	940	95
Palm Beach	543	6	532	1,000	80
Pasco	207	6	200	547	88
Pinellas	595	4	545	1,965	94
Sarasota (City)	549	6	519	210	N/A
St. Petersburg	711	5	627	645	95
Tallahassee	641	5	575	250	80
West Palm Beach	712	5	698	1,100	83
<i>Totals</i>	22,893	232	19,910	49,648	N/A

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members

**Table 1b  
Public Housing Units: Medium PHAs**

PHA Name	Public Housing Units	Public Housing Developments	Occupied Public Housing Units	Households On Waiting List For Public Housing Units	Current Public Housing Assessment Score (PHAS)
Alachua	276	17	276	150	80
Area Housing Commission (Pensacola)	603	6	601	338	95
Boca Raton	95	1	95	100	91
Bradenton	199	3	199	76	91
Crestview	273	4	273	143	92
Dania Beach	39	1	39	9	97
Deerfield Beach	198	2	193	83	96
Deland	200	1	188	101	95
Fort Myers (City)	972	6	923	211	69
Fort Walton Beach	173	2	161	96	89
Hollywood	120	2	120	185	97
Indian River	200	2	161	118	N/A
Key West	590	5	568	250	88
Lake Wales	240	2	226	100	78
Lee	142	2	142	275	89
Levy	124	4	123	59	93
Macclenny	80	3	76	51	89
Manatee	80	2	77	120	93
Milton	89	2	88	100	86
Monroe	50	1	49	49	94
New Smyrna Beach	126	4	121	132	90
Ormond Beach	41	4	40	50	95
Pahokee	515	4	509	291	92
Palatka	484	6	460	130	83
Panama City	450	6	436	123	93
Plant City	200	3	194	129	96
Punta Gorda	184	2	182	73	94
Riviera Beach	156	1	154	8	67
Sanford <sup>14</sup>	483	6	403	517	N/A
Seminole	30	1	30	124	82
Springfield	40	1	40	73	93
Tarpon Springs	225	4	224	115	93
Titusville	255	6	236	174	86
Winter Haven	229	4	176	94	70
<i>Totals</i>	8,161	120	7,783	4,647	N/A

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members

<sup>14</sup> A PHAS score was not available for Sanford Housing Authority, because it is currently under HUD receivership.

PHA respondents in the medium size category operate more than 8,100 units of public housing in Florida. All of the respondents reported waiting lists for public housing units, although the ratio of their waiting list size to the number of units operated tended to be lower than that of the large PHAs. Excess demand for public housing units appears strongest in high-growth metropolitan areas in this group.

PHAS High Performers accounted for 19 of the 34 medium-sized PHA respondents. Ten were rated as Standard Performers, while three were in the at-risk of Troubled category.<sup>15</sup> Two medium-sized PHAs did not supply PHAS information. The median PHAS score for this group was 92 (High).

---

<sup>15</sup> Note that one of the PHAs in the medium-size category (Sanford) is under HUD receivership and was unable to respond to the PHAS survey question.

**Table 1c**  
**Public Housing Units: Small PHAs**

PHA Name	Public Housing Units	Public Housing Developments	Occupied Public Housing Units	Households On Waiting List For Public Housing Units	Current Public Housing Assessment Score (PHAS)
Arcadia	126	3	110	11	77
Bartow	82	2	79	70	86
Brooksville	126	1	106	20	89
Chipley	88	4	82	9	97
Columbia	80	2	80	40	96
Defuniak Springs	50	1	50	10	93
Dunedin <sup>16</sup>	50	1	0	51	82
Eustis	60	1	56	12	82
Fernandina Beach	59	1	46	62	93
Gilchrist	10	1	10	50	93
Live Oak	104	3	102	28	86
Marianna	80	3	79	10	87
Mulberry	26	2	26	10	90
Niceville	111	2	111	63	96
Stuart	70	2	70	65	96
Suwannee	20	1	19	15	93
Venice	50	1	30	45	47
Winter Park	171	1	168	117	95
<i>Totals</i>	1,363	32	1,224	688	N/A

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members

Small PHAs responding to the survey operate more than 1,300 units of public housing in Florida. All PHAs in this group reported waiting lists; one PHA—the smallest in Florida in terms of number of public housing units operated—has a waiting list that is five times the number of units operated.

There are ten High Performers among the 18 small PHA respondents that operate public housing units in Florida, based on PHAS scores. Seven of these PHAs have been rated Standard Performers; one PHA's score falls into the Troubled category. The median PHAS score for small PHAs was 92 (High).

<sup>16</sup> Dunedin Housing Authority reported that it is awaiting HUD permission to demolish its 50 public housing units. These units will be replaced with new construction. The waiting list has been frozen until new units are available.

## **Section V: Housing Choice Vouchers**

Public housing authorities were asked a number of questions regarding their experience with Housing Choice Vouchers. PHAs responding to the survey indicated they administer 72,955 Housing Choice Vouchers. Based on HUD data as of December 31, 2003, there were an approximately 87,000 vouchers being administered by Florida PHAs.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, survey respondents administer about 84 percent of the vouchers in Florida. Note that the total vouchers administered number does not include vouchers administered on behalf of other PHAs. These “port-ins” occur when a voucher holder from one area moves to an area served by another PHA.

### **Project-Based Vouchers**

One of the survey questions asks about the number of project-based Housing Choice Vouchers administered by the responding PHA. The policy issue associated with this question revolves around the conversion of vouchers from tenant-based assistance—e.g., the tenant chooses where to use the voucher in the private sector rental market—to project-based assistance. In other words, a project-based voucher has been converted to a subsidy that is tied to a specific unit of housing.

One reason why PHAs may be willing to convert some tenant-based vouchers to project-based use is that the conversion may make permanent supportive housing for special needs groups financially feasible that would otherwise be impossible to develop.<sup>18</sup> Overall, 18 PHA respondents reported administering a total of 2,635 project-based vouchers.

HUD regulations allow PHAs to convert up to 20 percent of their voucher assistance to project-based assistance. Rental units receiving project-based assistance must be either new

---

<sup>17</sup> HUD data on number of vouchers reported in Resident Report Characteristics as of December 31, 2003.

<sup>18</sup> Special needs groups may include elderly persons (those age 62 and above), persons experiencing homelessness, persons with disabilities, and persons who have experienced domestic violence.

construction or rehabilitated dwellings. For more information on project-based vouchers, see HUD's website at <http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/hcv/project.cfm>.

### **Voucher Portability**

The survey asked respondents to tell us about the number of portable Housing Choice Vouchers (port-ins) they administer on behalf of another housing authority, as well as number of applications they typically receive each month from voucher holders seeking to port-in to their area. This issue is particularly topical in Florida, as the state ranks fourth in the number of port-ins its PHAs administer.<sup>19</sup> (See Table C-1 in Appendix C for state comparisons based on ported-in vouchers.)

Survey respondents reported administering 3,310 port-ins on behalf of other PHAs.<sup>20</sup> Popular areas within Central and South Florida appear to attract sizeable shares of port-in voucher holders. Survey respondents reported receiving an average of 611 applications from port-in voucher holders each month. Because the reported average number of monthly applications is high relative to the number of port-in vouchers reported as actually administered by PHAs, this result warrants further investigation.

One important issue associated with port-in vouchers is that they have the potential to cause cash-flow problems for the administering PHA. The administering PHA must pay the voucher holder's rent on the first of each month, but payments from originating PHAs to the administering PHA may not always be prompt.

---

<sup>19</sup> Based on data obtained from HUD's Resident Characteristics Reports dated December 31, 2003. Data available at HUD's website: <http://pic.hud.gov/pic/RCRPublic/rcrmain.asp>.

<sup>20</sup> Note that the 3,310 number of port-ins reported by survey respondents is somewhat higher than information made available by HUD in its Housing Authority Profiles. The difference may arise from the fact that the survey responses represent a more recent time frame than the data reported by HUD. See Appendix C for a comparison of port-in vouchers for all states.

Tables 2a through 2c show survey results for questions related to number and types of vouchers administered by PHAs in Florida.

**Table 2a**  
**Housing Choice Vouchers: Number and Port-ins, Large PHAs**

PHA Name	Housing Choice Vouchers	Project Based Housing Choice Vouchers	Port-In Housing Choice Vouchers	Port-In Housing Choice Applications
Broward	4,747	341	148	28
Clearwater	1,056	48	0	9
Collier	440	0	33	0
Daytona Beach	772	0	6	3
Delray Beach	906	103	54	2
Fort Lauderdale	1,960	0	0	20
Fort Myers (CRA) <sup>21</sup>	1,500	0	0	8
Fort Pierce	748	0	23	3
Hialeah	4,305	0	0	0
Hillsborough	1,793	0	0	30
Jacksonville	6,362	0	127	75
Lakeland	1,243	0	0	1
Miami Beach	2,508	70	35	5
Miami-Dade	12,803	50	300	25
Ocala	1,082	66	42	5
Orange	1,173	0	562	28
Palm Beach	2,595	0	100	12
Pasco	1,424	133	24	12
Pensacola (City)	2,055	0	36	4
Pinellas	2,737	0	0	18
Sarasota (City)	728	0	5	20
St. Petersburg	2,283	150	0	20
Tallahassee	1,891	12	8	2
West Palm Beach	1,914	0	200	5
<i>Totals</i>	59,025	973	1,703	335

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members

<sup>21</sup> Fort Myers Community Redevelopment Agency.

**Table 2b**  
**Housing Choice Vouchers: Number and Port-ins, Medium PHAs**

PHA Name	Housing Choice Vouchers	Project Based Housing Choice Vouchers	Port-In Housing Choice Vouchers	Port-In Housing Choice Applications
Alachua	397	-	82	5
Boca Raton	571	51	50	8
Bradenton	99	-	-	2
Crestview	204	204	24	2
Dania Beach	499	-	18	18
Deerfield Beach	469	-	-	2
Deland	564	-	30	5
Fort Myers (City)	-	200	-	-
Fort Walton Beach	657	-	8	20
Hernando	285	-	28	5
Hollywood	591	-	257	8
Indian River	297	-	4	-
Key West	254	-	3	1
Lake	282	-	16	3
Lake Wales	72	-	6	2
Lee	211	-	2	-
Levy	142	-	2	5
Macclenny	147	136	1	-
Manatee	707	-	6	1
Milton	292	300	6	1
Monroe	200	-	3	1
New Smyrna Beach	253	-	-	1
Ormond Beach	193	-	-	2
Osceola	860	-	667	40
Pahokee	36	-	6	1
Palatka	295	-	8	2
Panama City	418	-	12	3
Plant City	187	-	24	2
Punta Gorda	149	-	8	2
Riviera Beach	424	418	6	4
Sanford	89	-	N/A	N/A
Sarasota (County)	506	-	72	4
Seminole	334	-	104	90
Springfield	446	-	-	6
Titusville	392	-	20	1
Volusia	322	-	10	3
Walton	364	-	-	4
Winter Haven	88	65	2	2
<i>Totals</i>	12,296	1,374	1,485	255

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members

**Table 2c**  
**Housing Choice Vouchers: Number and Port-ins, Small PHAs**

PHA Name	Housing Choice Vouchers	Project Based Housing Choice Vouchers	Port-In Housing Choice Vouchers	Port-In Housing Choice Applications
Bartow	55	0	0	0
Citrus	101	0	25	4
Fernandina Beach	62	0	3	1
Green Cove Springs	193	0	44	4
Haines City	92	0	20	1
Hendry	43	0	4	0
Holmes	194	194	0	1
Jefferson	129	0	1	1
Marianna	117	0	2	2
Polk	110	0	0	2
Stuart	77	94	17	1
Sumter	132	0	4	1
Wakulla	174	0	2	1.5
Washington	155	0	0	1
<i>Totals</i>	1,634	288	122	21

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members

We also asked PHAs to tell us about their Housing Choice Voucher utilization rates, waiting lists, and Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP) scores. Tables 3a through 3c present survey results for these items.

### Utilization Rates

Housing Choice Voucher utilization rates receive widespread attention from housing policy makers, administrators and advocates. These rates result from relatively complex calculations required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; they are not based simply on the number of vouchers in use divided by a number of vouchers available. Instead, the voucher utilization rates are calculated based upon dollar amounts appropriated at the federal level.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, the number of vouchers that a particular PHA has available is not a stable number from month to month—the number of vouchers it is able to fund at any particular

<sup>22</sup> The federal requirements for calculation of utilization (lease-up) rates for Housing Choice Vouchers lead to an estimated number of vouchers for each PHA. This estimated number is referred to as the baseline, and was

time is dependent upon how far their federally appropriated dollars will stretch in a particular rental market.

Some PHAs have utilization rates in excess of 100 percent. This occurs when PHAs commit to fund vouchers in excess of their federal appropriation. This is permissible under federal regulations, although it is typically a temporary situation that is expected to be remedied through attrition within the period of a year, except under exceptional circumstances.<sup>23</sup>

Overall, Housing Choice Voucher utilization rates are high in Florida. Of the 75 PHA respondents that administer vouchers, 65 reported utilization rates of 95 percent or more. There were eight PHAs that had utilization rates between 85 and 94 percent, and two PHAs reported utilization rates below 85 percent.

Among the 37 large PHA respondents that administer vouchers, the median reported utilization rate was 100 percent. The 24 medium PHA respondents that administer vouchers reported a median utilization rate of 99 percent, while the 14 small PHA respondents that administer vouchers showed a median utilization rate of 100 percent.

### **Housing Choice Voucher Waiting Lists**

Waiting lists for Housing Choice Vouchers are typically long. Some PHAs have reported voucher waiting lists that have been closed for as long as 60 months (five years). PHA survey respondents that administer vouchers reported waiting lists totaling 79,451 households. PHAs that responded to our survey administer 72,955 vouchers. Thus, there are more households on waiting lists for vouchers in Florida than there are actual voucher holders, based on the survey results.

---

established in 1999 based on 1997 data. The HUD-determined Fair Market Rent (FMR) also plays a role in calculated utilization rates.

<sup>23</sup> See the *Federal Register*, Vol. 65, No. 76, April 19, 2000, pp. 21088-21092 for a description of how appropriation baselines are determined and utilization (lease-up) rates are calculated.

This result is partially explained by the lack of federal appropriations for new Housing Choice Vouchers between 1995 and 1998. In addition, although new appropriations resumed in 1999, the new appropriations represent an amount that is sufficient to fund relatively few vouchers relative to need among income-qualified households at the national level.

### **Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP)**

The SEMAP score is a performance measure used by HUD to monitor PHA performance in Housing Choice Voucher administration.<sup>24</sup> The SEMAP score is based upon 14 indicators.

The following list of indicators is quoted from information available from HUD at

<http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/hcv/semmap/semmap.cfm>.

1. Proper selection of applicants from the Housing Choice Voucher waiting list;
2. Sound determination of reasonable rent for each unit leased;
3. Establishment of payment standards within the required range of the HUD Fair Market Rent (FMR);
4. Accurate verification of family income;
5. Timely reexaminations of family income;
6. Correct calculation of the tenant share of the rent and the housing assistance payment;
7. Maintenance of a current schedule of allowances for tenant utility costs;
8. Ensure units comply with the housing quality standards before families enter into leases and PHAs enter into housing assistance contracts;
9. Timely annual housing quality inspections;
10. Performing of quality control inspections to ensure housing quality;
11. Ensure that landlords and tenants promptly correct housing quality deficiencies;
12. Ensure that all available Housing Choice Vouchers are used;
13. Expand housing choice outside areas of poverty or minority concentration; and
14. Enroll families in the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program as required and help FSS families achieve increases in employment income.

HUD uses the SEMAP measure to assign performance ratings of High, Standard, or Troubled. High performers are those PHAs with SEMAP scores greater than or equal to 90 percent. Standard performers are those with scores ranging from 60 to 89 percent. PHAs are rated as Troubled if their SEMAP score falls below 60 percent. More information on SEMAP can be found on HUD's website at

<http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/hcv/semmap/index.cfm>. Note that where survey results for SEMAP scores were not available or were unclear, we have inserted HUD-reported SEMAP scores.

Among the 75 survey respondents that administer vouchers, there were 55 that have been rated as High Performers under the SEMAP performance measurement system. In addition, there were 14 rated as Standard Performers. Five were rated as Troubled. (Note that the SEMAP score was unavailable for one respondent.)

SEMAP results reported by survey respondents indicated that there are 17 high performers, five standard performers, and one troubled PHA among the 24 large PHAs that administer vouchers and responded to our survey. Among the 37 voucher-administering medium sized PHAs responding to the survey, 25 were high performers, six were standard performers, and three fell into the troubled category. Note that one of the medium PHAs with a score in the troubled category (Palatka) earned a score in the high performer range, but a lack of timely auditor's opinion placed its SEMAP score to zero, based upon HUD requirements. There were nine high performers, three standard performers, and two PHAs for which scores were not available among the 14 small PHAs that administer vouchers and responded to our survey.

The median SEMAP score among large, medium and small PHA survey respondents was 96 percent. Therefore, on average, these voucher-administering PHAs fall into the High Performer category.

---

<sup>24</sup> Note that the name of the indicator refers to the original name of the voucher program, Section 8.

**Table 3a**  
**Housing Choice Vouchers: Utilization, Waiting Lists and SEMAP, Large PHAs**

PHA Name	Housing Choice Voucher Utilization Rate	Households on HC Voucher Waiting List	Months Since Waiting List Last Opened	SEMAP Score
Broward	104%	2,100	17	100%
Clearwater	98%	860	0	98%
Collier	98%	415	11	92%
Daytona Beach	89%	803	5	98%
Delray Beach	99%	496	45	92%
Fort Lauderdale	93%	1,752	15	92%
Fort Myers (CRA)	98%	1,620	N/A	96%
Fort Pierce	92%	742	5	96%
Hialeah	83%	467	24	66%
Hillsborough	90%	2,384	31	69%
Jacksonville	98%	1,052	5	100%
Lakeland	101%	327	N/A	79%
Miami Beach	100%	1,000	15	96%
Miami-Dade	102%	40,000	32	63%
Ocala	99%	1,349	5	98%
Orange	100%	1,316	21	96%
Palm Beach	97%	2,000	21	69%
Pasco	96%	522	29	100%
Pensacola (City)	99%	1,334	0	100%
Pinellas	98%	1,550	12	100%
Sarasota (City)	100%	465	11	58%
St. Petersburg	99%	204	37	98%
Tallahassee	101%	2,100	8	96%
West Palm Beach	102%	5,400	16	100%
<i>Totals</i>	N/A	70,258	N/A	N/A
*0 = Waiting List has never closed or has been re-opened within the last 30 days				
N/A = No response from the PHA or Not Applicable				

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members and data obtained from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**Table 3b**  
**Housing Choice Vouchers: Utilization, Waiting Lists and SEMAP, Medium PHAs**

PHA Name	Housing Choice Voucher Utilization Rate	Households on HC Voucher Waiting List	Months Since Waiting List Last Opened	SEMAP Score
Alachua	105%	700	40	92%
Boca Raton	100%	300	31	100%
Bradenton	100%	57	5	88%
Crestview	99%	125	2	100%
Dania Beach	100%	72	9	100%
Deerfield Beach	98%	114	23	98%
Deland	100%	186	25	96%
Fort Walton Beach	90%	220	0	79%
Hernando	108%	628	0	77%
Hollywood	99%	250	4	100%
Indian River	85%	349	0	94%
Key West	105%	470	0	91%
Lake	95%	10	36	96%
Lake Wales	106%	200	4	96%
Lee	101%	187	0	100%
Levy	100%	224	0	100%
Macclenny	93%	23	60	N/A
Manatee	95%	240	9	79%
Milton	100%	35	16	100%
Monroe	106%	170	0	96%
New Smyrna Beach	99%	92	0	100%
Ormond Beach	96%	0	6	92%
Osceola	100%	85	60	38%
Pahokee	100%	50	24	96%
Palatka <sup>25</sup>	99%	80	16	0%
Panama City	100%	422	5	100%
Plant City	100%	137	12	100%
Punta Gorda	100%	165	1	96%
Riviera Beach	99%	131	14	100%
Sanford <sup>26</sup>	100%	282	3	38%
Sarasota (County)	95%	785	22	59%
Seminole	98%	505	12	96%
Springfield	100%	130	4	100%
Titusville	98%	162	1	100%
Volusia	100%	140	38	93%
Walton	99%	111	0	98%
Winter Haven	102%	300	4	N/A
<i>Totals</i>	N/A	8,137	N/A	N/A
*0 = Waiting List has never closed or has been re-opened within the last 30 days N/A = No response from the PHA or Not Applicable				

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members and data obtained from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

<sup>25</sup> The survey respondent reported that the SEMAP score was reduced to zero due to a lack of timely auditor's opinion.

<sup>26</sup> This respondent is currently under HUD receivership.

**Table 3c  
Housing Choice Vouchers: Utilization, Waiting Lists and SEMAP, Small PHAs**

PHA Name	Housing Choice Voucher Utilization Rate	Households on HC Voucher Waiting List	Months Since Waiting List Last Opened	SEMAP Score
Bartow	99%	41	9	85%
Citrus	100%	25	11	92%
Fernandina Beach	100%	21	14	96%
Green Cove Springs	100%	36	23	100%
Haines City	100%	40	33	95%
Hendry	93%	53	13	65%
Holmes	100%	40	0	96%
Jefferson	100%	53	11	100%
Marianna	99%	60	2	100%
Polk	100%	198	7	75%
Stuart	100%	177	19	100%
Sumter	98%	128	15	100%
Wakulla	70%	109	8	78%
Washington	100%	75	0	61%
<i>Totals</i>	N/A	1,056	N/A	N/A
*0 = Waiting List has never closed or has been re-opened within the last 30 days N/A = No response from the PHA or Not Applicable				

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members and data obtained from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

### Section VI: HOPE VI

Florida’s public housing authorities have successfully competed at the national level for nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in federal HOPE VI funds. The HOPE VI program grew out of recommendations made by the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing. Originally titled the Urban Revitalization Demonstration program, it was first funded in 1993. The intent of the program is to revitalize public housing and the neighborhoods in which it is located by changing the physical nature of public housing, decreasing concentrations of poverty, empowering residents and building their self-sufficiency. HOPE VI is designed to help PHAs address these goals through partnerships with other public sector organizations and private sector firms.

HOPE VI developments are mixed finance, mixed income developments that provide a wide array of opportunities for residents. The mixed finance component of the program means

that federal HOPE VI funds are leveraged with other public programs, as well as with substantial private sector investment. The intent of providing mixed income housing within HOPE VI is to reduce the concentration of poverty in public housing developments and surrounding neighborhoods.

Public-private partnerships fostered through the program help to create attractive, community-oriented housing in formerly blighted areas. In addition to rental units, HOPE VI activities typically provide some opportunities for low-income households to move into homeownership. The program also fosters deconcentration of poverty by providing Housing Choice Vouchers to some households so that they are able to seek housing on the private market. HUD information on HOPE VI can be found on the World Wide Web at <http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/hope6/index.cfm>.

There have been 13 HOPE VI grants awarded among a total of nine Florida public housing authorities since program inception. HOPE VI grantees leveraged these federal grants with public and private funds totaling more than \$410 million, leading to a total HOPE VI-generated investment in Florida of more than \$657 million.

**Table 4**  
**HOPE VI in Florida**

<b>HOPE VI Grantee</b>	<b>Number of Grants</b>	<b>HOPE VI Grant Funds</b>	<b>Public/Private Leverage Funds</b>	<b>Total HOPE VI Investment</b>
Bradenton	1	\$ 24,878,288	\$ 54,957,967	\$ 79,836,255
Daytona Beach	1	17,242,383	34,360,602	51,602,985
Tampa	2	52,437,572	59,797,331	112,234,903
Jacksonville	2	37,500,000	40,030,000	77,530,000
Lakeland	1	21,842,801	50,000,000	71,842,801
Miami-Dade	2	39,697,000	82,813,200	122,510,200
Ocala <sup>27</sup>	1	1,642,957	-	1,642,957
Orlando	2	24,884,255	64,381,996	89,266,251
St. Petersburg	1	27,000,000	23,840,322	50,840,322
<i>Totals</i>	13	\$247,125,256	\$410,181,418	\$657,306,674

Source: Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, Survey of FAHRO Members and data obtained from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

### Section VII: Financial Data

Note that data used in this section of our report was supplied through a Freedom of Information Act request made to HUD’s Jacksonville and Miami Regional Offices. Thus, we are able to present and analyze information on all of Florida’s PHAs in this section.

HUD provided the most recently available financial information in response to our request. Since PHAs may have different fiscal year ending dates, the annual data reported here fall into fiscal years ending between September 30, 2002 and June 30, 2003.

Public housing authorities in Florida had total annual expenditures of more than \$819 million for the most recent year in which HUD data are available. Of this total, approximately \$179 million was for public housing operating expenditures, about \$38 million was for capital expenditures, and about \$466 million was expenditures under the Housing Choice Voucher program.

---

<sup>27</sup> Ocala’s HOPE VI grant was for demolition only. Therefore, leveraging funds are not applicable to this entry.

Most PHAs are large organizations with multi-million dollar budgets. Thus, PHA expenditures have an impact on local economies throughout the state. Tables 5a through 5c contain financial data related to total expenditures and public housing unit operations.

### **Expenditures for Public Housing Units**

Although HUD data indicate that per unit operating expenses have wide variation throughout the state, on average (measured by the median), operating expenses tend to be similar for large, medium and small PHAs. The median per unit operating expense for public housing units among large PHAs was \$5,003, while the per unit figure for medium PHAs was \$5,025. Small PHAs had a median per unit operating expense of \$4,537.

There was also wide variation in the amount of capital fund expenditures made by PHAs. This variation may arise from a focus on a single fiscal year; some PHAs may have made capital fund expenditures in recent years that are not reflected in the reported data. In addition, lack of capital funds may be an issue. Lack of available capital funds for the maintenance and repair of public housing units may lead to further deterioration of aging buildings. There were 16 public housing authorities in which no capital fund expenditures were made. The median per unit capital expenditure among large PHAs was \$562, while the median for medium PHAs was \$447. The median among small PHAs was higher, at \$1,303 per unit.

**Table 5a**  
**Financial Data: Public Housing Units, Large PHAs**

PHA Name	Total Public Housing Units	Total PHA Annual Expenditures	Total Public Operating Expenditures	Per Unit Operating Expenditures	Total Capital Fund Expenditures	Per Unit Capital Fund Expenditures
Brevard	626	\$7,540,461	\$2,211,518	\$3,533	\$127,637	\$ 204
Broward	776	40,883,171	4,333,283	5,584	451,778	582
Clearwater	580	25,560,454	3,484,707	6,008	-	-
Daytona Beach	1,106	11,345,392	6,808,314	6,156	2,669,699	2,414
Delray Beach	200	6,891,579	1,158,830	5,794	43,443	217
Fort Lauderdale	888	22,322,100	4,317,255	4,862	499,350	562
Fort Pierce	829	10,252,374	5,004,579	6,037	-	-
Gainesville	635	10,545,954	3,900,757	6,143	929,306	1,463
Hialeah	1,116	34,093,274	3,556,037	3,186	38,019	34
Jacksonville	3,138	66,772,991	15,523,529	4,947	9,302,496	2,964
Lakeland	748	8,618,799	2,138,420	2,859	369,648	494
Miami Beach	200	19,838,992	1,541,485	7,707	-	-
Miami-Dade	10,348	211,655,410	40,752,472	3,938	4,361,898	422
NW FL Regional	370	5,878,553	907,264	2,452	395,400	1,069
Ocala	189	6,118,801	771,305	4,081	517,115	2,736
Orlando	1,607	29,510,784	9,356,490	5,822	5,196,508	3,234
Palm Beach	543	19,014,166	2,917,192	5,372	265,370	489
Pasco	208	11,036,470	784,305	3,771	224,576	1,080
Pinellas	595	25,560,454	3,484,707	5,857	-	-
Sarasota (City)	561	8,833,257	2,693,141	4,801	321,010	572
St. Petersburg	505	19,257,311	1,990,313	3,941	360,590	714
Tallahassee	641	15,249,899	3,667,847	5,722	1,352,424	2,110
Tampa	3,569	54,561,735	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
West Palm Beach	734	15,715,823	3,672,501	5,003	258,377	352
<i>Totals</i>	30,712	687,058,204	124,976,251	N/A	27,684,644	N/A

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**Table 5b**  
**Financial Data: Public Housing Units, Medium PHAs**

PHA Name	Total Public Housing Units	Total PHA Annual Expenditures	Total Public Operating Expenditures	Per Unit Operating Expenditures	Total Capital Fund Expenditures	Per Unit Capital Fund Expenditures
Alachua	276	\$4,441,162	\$1,439,246	\$5,215	\$1,068,077	\$3,870
Boca Raton	95	5,998,588	1,719,240	18,097	-	-
Bradenton	318	2,609,566	1,385,640	4,357	77,574	244
Cocoa	438	1,905,573	1,354,977	3,094	30,144	69
Crestview	273	2,440,976	1,634,774	5,988	357,439	1,309
Dania Beach	40	3,538,237	262,043	6,551	-	-
Deerfield Beach	196	3,233,137	1,106,733	5,647	7,988	41
Deland	200	4,845,891	1,247,421	6,237	66,821	334
Flagler	132	1,725,967	665,123	5,039	321,232	2,434
Fort Myers (City)	972	7,372,228	5,196,769	5,346	258,133	266
Ft. Walton Beach	174	3,358,073	582,810	3,349	311,645	1,791
Hollywood	120	4,596,735	544,132	4,534	-	-
Key West	590	8,390,382	3,256,574	5,520	472,959	802
Lake Wales	240	1,354,377	891,557	3,715	18,395	77
Lee	142	1,660,490	547,746	3,857	10,313	73
Levy	124	1,130,772	440,951	3,556	289,670	2,336
Manatee	80	4,661,573	418,276	5,228	-	-
Melbourne	261	1,584,913	1,055,021	4,042	50,240	192
Milton	89	1,862,485	308,253	3,464	76,351	858
Monroe	50	2,453,618	411,548	8,231	59,714	1,194
New Smyrna Beach	126	1,771,929	552,731	4,387	206,813	1,641
Ormond Beach	41	1,308,582	188,607	4,600	112,805	2,751
Pahokee	515	3,042,030	2,375,865	4,613	74,141	144
Palatka	484	5,158,955	3,722,296	7,691	512,354	1,059
Panama City	450	3,696,617	1,498,495	3,330	864,700	1,922
Pensacola (AHC)	603	5,488,884	2,664,721	4,419	1,042,639	1,729
Plant City	200	2,199,296	1,194,586	5,973	-	-
Pompano Beach	118	6,727,467	840,396	7,122	-	-
Punta Gorda	184	1,592,260	726,982	3,951	55,691	303
Riviera Beach	156	4,137,436	781,621	5,010	68,112	437
Sanford	483	5,378,511	2,797,455	5,792	978,626	2,026
Seminole	30	2,464,412	220,486	7,350	50,000	1,667
Springfield	40	2,179,715	269,312	6,733	122,497	3,062
Tarpon Springs	226	1,041,459	1,023,026	4,527	-	-
Titusville	255	3,303,675	1,472,165	5,773	116,500	457
Winter Haven	299	2,349,281	893,291	2,988	308,734	1,033
<i>Totals</i>	9,020	121,005,252	45,690,869	N/A	7,990,307	N/A

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**Table 5c**  
**Financial Data: Public Housing Units, Small PHAs**

PHA Name	Total Public Housing Units	Total PHA Annual Expenditures	Total Public Operating Expenditures	Per Unit Operating Expenditures	Total Capital Fund Expenditures	Per Unit Capital Fund Expenditures
Apalachicola	54	\$766,694	\$263,046	\$4,871	\$162,767	\$3,014
Arcadia	130	456,033	445,085	3,424	-	-
Avon Park	130	795,131	623,477	4,796	28,220	217
Bartow	84	584,503	385,131	4,585	27,024	322
Brooksville	126	641,501	626,025	4,968	215,069	1,707
Chipley	88	428,457	350,045	3,978	132,364	1,504
Columbia	80	302,823	302,823	3,785	119,609	1,495
Defuniak Springs	50	198,032	198,032	3,961	121,704	2,434
Dunedin	50	218,621	218,621	4,372	-	-
Eustis	60	591,171	385,921	6,432	92,865	1,548
Fernandina Beach	57	627,590	355,276	6,233	113,961	1,999
Gilchrist	10	42,205	40,526	4,053	39,990	3,999
Live Oak	104	376,153	376,153	3,617	115,514	1,111
Macclenny	80	529,012	505,317	6,316	162,826	2,035
Marianna	80	804,398	359,095	4,489	146,425	1,830
Mulberry	26	145,759	145,759	5,606	-	-
Niceville	111	481,178	462,326	4,165	68,538	617
Stuart	70	751,366	417,818	5,969	-	-
Suwanee	20	82,180	82,180	4,109	20,517	1,026
Union	122	565,928	546,097	4,476	511,562	4,193
Venice	50	272,381	272,381	5,448	-	-
Winter Park	171	1,595,619	931,200	5,446	67,202	393
<i>Totals</i>	1,753	11,256,735	8,292,334	N/A	2,146,157	N/A

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

### Expenditures for Housing Choice Vouchers

Expenditures for Housing Choice Vouchers in Florida for the annual period covered by HUD-provided data totaled more than \$466 million. Viewed statewide, administrative expenditures totaled nearly \$51 million for the period, or slightly less than 11 percent. After considering administrative expenditures, the Housing Choice Voucher program provided more than \$410 million in rental payments to private sector landlords for the year. Tables 6a through 6c provide financial information on voucher administration.

The median value of administrative expenditures as a percentage of total Housing Choice Voucher expenditures was 9.74 percent for large PHAs, 11.63 percent for medium PHAs, and 13.01 percent for small PHAs.

**Table 6a**  
**Financial Data: Housing Choice Vouchers, Large PHAs**

PHA Name	Number of Housing Choice Vouchers	Total Housing Choice Voucher Expenditures	Total HCV Administrative Expenditures	HCV Administrative Expenditures as % Total HCV Expenditures
Brevard	1,912	\$ 5,029,618	\$ 864,572	17.19%
Broward	4,373	31,820,964	2,403,608	7.55%
Clearwater	1,056	13,580,331	1,539,472	11.34%
Daytona Beach	772	3,741,005	373,434	9.98%
Delray Beach	906	5,559,928	371,929	6.69%
Fort Lauderdale	1,771	9,542,734	446,103	4.67%
Fort Myers (CRA)	1,470	7,389,545	818,710	11.08%
Fort Pierce	709	4,176,000	430,331	10.30%
Gainesville	1,055	5,189,817	506,778	9.76%
Hialeah	3,963	19,752,384	1,302,101	6.59%
Hillsborough	1,964	9,251,720	901,037	9.74%
Homestead	1,681	10,322,771	667,132	6.46%
Jacksonville	6,287	45,037,331	4,027,895	8.94%
Lakeland	870	5,027,000	702,846	13.98%
Miami Beach	2,508	12,618,132	2,229,956	17.67%
Miami-Dade	15,982	64,680,583	13,086,745	20.23%
NW FL Regional	821	4,175,780	355,362	8.51%
Ocala	1,080	5,117,314	658,583	12.87%
Orange	1,173	7,158,059	658,647	9.20%
Orlando	2,789	18,374,717	1,418,424	7.72%
Palm Beach	2,595	14,797,254	752,885	5.09%
Pasco	1,424	8,088,292	874,660	10.81%
Pensacola (City)	2,055	9,056,043	1,120,936	12.38%
Pinellas	2,687	13,580,331	1,563,778	11.52%
Sarasota (City)	728	5,202,008	534,161	10.27%
St. Petersburg	2,310	13,227,395	1,133,358	8.57%
Tallahassee	1,835	11,423,935	1,027,757	9.00%
Tampa	3,801	13,227,395	807,950	6.11%
West Palm Beach	1,728	9,548,941	860,221	9.01%
<i>Totals</i>	72,305	385,697,327	42,439,371	N/A

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**Table 6b**  
**Financial Data: Housing Choice Vouchers, Medium PHAs**

PHA Name	Number of Housing Choice Vouchers	Total Housing Choice Voucher Expenditures	Total HCV Administrative Expenditures	HCV Administrative Expenditures as % Total HCV Expenditures
Alachua	472	\$2,443,823	\$307,229	12.57%
Boca Raton	571	3,598,055	369,863	10.28%
Bradenton	599	878,690	170,446	19.40%
Bradenton (City)	80	581,417	55,643	9.57%
City of Miami	415	464,742	N/A	N/A
Cocoa	149	273,466	74,347	27.19%
Collier	429	2,934,139	255,087	8.69%
Crestview	197	806,202	93,912	11.65%
Dania Beach	499	3,276,194	271,928	8.30%
Deerfield Beach	406	1,977,022	176,412	8.92%
Deland	549	3,511,201	409,135	11.65%
Flagler	180	1,044,346	177,410	16.99%
Ft. Walton Beach	657	2,484,218	230,684	9.29%
Hernando	285	1,347,887	241,665	17.93%
Hollywood	591	4,025,596	472,392	11.73%
Indian River	345	1,282,536	N/A	N/A
Key West	214	1,780,155	152,049	8.54%
Lake	282	1,487,067	274,148	18.44%
Lake Wales	72	313,686	36,490	11.63%
Lee	211	836,949	84,473	10.09%
Leesburg	202	764,615	144,894	18.95%
Levy	142	491,476	70,289	14.30%
Manatee	707	3,906,052	303,332	7.77%
Milton	292	1,398,887	174,201	12.45%
Monroe	200	1,486,995	151,675	10.20%
New Smyrna Beach	253	989,625	144,322	14.58%
Ormond Beach	193	1,107,467	131,204	11.85%
Pahokee	36	185,763	35,726	19.23%
Palatka	295	1,064,908	114,301	10.73%
Panama City	418	1,932,788	225,649	11.67%
Plant City	172	1,004,710	152,791	15.21%
Pompano Beach	829	4,607,396	346,062	7.51%
Punta Gorda	141	740,783	69,034	9.32%
Riviera Beach	425	2,950,807	239,102	8.10%
Sanford	89	2,581,056	94,573	3.66%
Sarasota	398	2,415,429	291,358	12.06%
Seminole	334	1,889,287	162,621	8.61%
Springfield	446	1,907,099	213,171	11.18%
Titusville	280	1,650,152	160,447	9.72%
Volusia	322	1,702,155	195,612	11.49%
Wakulla	250	786,418	81,647	10.38%
Walton	364	1,673,596	214,128	12.79%
Winter Haven	88	411,704	153,670	37.33%
<i>Totals</i>	14,079	72,996,559	7,723,122	N/A

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**Table 6c**  
**Financial Data: Housing Choice Vouchers, Small PHAs**

PHA NAME	NUMBER OF HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHERS	TOTAL HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL HCV ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES	HCV ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES AS % TOTAL HCV EXPENDITURES
Avon Park	25	\$ 112,495	\$21,324	18.96%
Baker	147	531,174	57,080	10.75%
Bartow	55	172,348	19,227	11.16%
Boley Center	75	981,660	N/A	N/A
Citrus	101	409,116	49,954	12.21%
Fernandina Beach	62	246,192	54,966	22.33%
Green Cove Springs	148	753,583	96,237	12.77%
Haines City	92	326,379	N/A	N/A
Hendry	43	122,061	N/A	N/A
Holmes	194	661,967	89,240	13.48%
Housing Partnership Inc.	75	421,773	N/A	N/A
Jefferson	122	635,485	59,567	9.37%
Marianna	117	440,648	56,944	12.92%
Osceola	193	N/A	N/A	N/A
Polk Co. (SS Div)	110	464,049	N/A	N/A
Stuart	61	323,264	42,411	13.12%
Sumter	132	534,810	107,557	20.11%
Washington	155	571,489	74,799	13.09%
<i>Totals</i>	1,907	7,708,493	729,306	N/A

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

### Section VIII: Telephone Interviews

We conducted telephone interviews with six executive directors from various regions of the state. Those interviewed represent PHAs that we have categorized as small, medium, and large for the purpose of this report. (Two executive directors from each size PHA were interviewed.) The interviews consisted of six open-ended questions and the opportunity for executive directors to add any additional comments or suggestions they might have. The

telephone interview questions can be found in Appendix B. *Note that the information presented in this section represents the opinions of individual executive directors.*

### **Ability to Lease Public Housing Units**

Executive directors reported that the physical condition of public housing units is crucial to the ability to lease them. When operating and capital funds are inadequate, it is difficult to maintain the aging public housing stock. Adequate operating funds are crucial to a PHA's ability to employ the needed number of quality maintenance staff. When maintenance staffing levels are low, it takes longer to turn a unit when a move-out occurs and make it ready for new tenants.

In addition, public housing developments (with the exception of HOPE VI developments) are 30 or more years old. The design of this housing cannot compete with market rate housing or housing developed with other federal resources such as the Low Income Housing Tax Credit that has amenities such as carpet, central air conditioning, and other features. Public housing units do not have the "curb appeal" necessary to attract tenants. In addition, even when units have been modernized through rehabilitation, their layout is obsolete.

Neighborhoods are another important factor influencing the ability to lease public housing units. Much of the nation's public housing stock has been built in high poverty areas, and this remains true with HOPE VI redevelopments, as well. Other important neighborhood factors include the proximity of grocery stores, public transportation, and health care.

Housing markets and the economy in general also influence a PHA's ability to lease public housing units. When the economy is going well and current and prospective tenants can afford to live outside of public housing, they do so.

Public perceptions also have an influence on leasing public housing units. Some may have concerns about personal security in public housing developments, as well as about social

stigma attached to living in public housing. In addition, households typically prefer to make use of the Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) if possible, rather than lease public housing units.

### **Housing Choice Voucher Utilization Rates**

Executive directors reported that landlord perceptions regarding Housing Choice Vouchers were important. Prospective and current landlords may have negative perceptions regarding government assistance for housing and about the families that rely on such assistance. Some landlords refuse to lease to voucher holders.

Neighborhood perceptions are also important, in that neighbors surrounding units leased to voucher holders may complain to landlords about the presence of voucher holders in their neighborhood. Because these landlords do not typically live near their rental properties, they are frequently unaware of the influence of Not In My Backyard (NIMBY) issues on the acceptance of their voucher-holding tenants within the community.

Fair Market Rents (FMRs) may also make it difficult for voucher holders to find rental units. In some areas, this may be more frequently associated with larger rental units (e.g., three bedrooms or more). In other areas, this may apply to all sizes of units due to market rent levels. One executive director for an urban PHA reported that raising allowable rental rates to 110 percent of FMR had been a successful strategy for increasing the utilization rate. [Note that federal guidelines permit PHAs to use their discretion in raising allowable rental payments to this level.]

Finally, one executive director described managing the utilization rate as “a real balancing act.” Federal utilization rate standards require PHAs to have lease-up rates between 95 and 100 percent. HUD has made various changes in the last five years regarding how it views leasing and over-leasing of vouchers (e.g., issuing vouchers in excess of 100 percent of the

federal appropriation). At times, HUD has encouraged over-leasing in order to ensure maximum use of appropriated funds. However, utilization rates in excess of 100 percent are expected to be temporary (less than a year's duration).

### **Administrative Costs in PHA Administration**

One executive director noted that the type of clientele—e.g., whether tenants had a propensity for behaving destructively towards property—had an important impact upon administrative costs associated with operation of public housing units. Two executive directors noted that the quality of maintenance staff also affected administrative costs. Higher quality maintenance staff can lead to lower administrative costs for public housing units.

Rapidly increasing insurance costs were also cited as having an important effect on administrative costs. Insurance for property, general liability, automobile liability, and officers and directors' liability has increased dramatically in the last year. One PHA reported that its property insurance increased by 50 percent in a single year (2002-2003). Health insurance costs for staff have also been rising, as have utility costs.

HUD reporting requirements pose particular challenges for smaller PHAs that lack staff capacity to handle all reporting requirements. One executive director of a small PHA reported that it was necessary to hire a consultant to prepare various HUD reports, as staffing in that PHA is not sufficient to cover the time required to prepare and submit these reports via the World Wide Web.

Discontinued funding for the drug elimination grant has increased the amount of administrative costs PHAs must bear. The drug elimination program included funding that could be used for recreation, police patrols, and intervention and prevention programs. Reduced or discontinued funding for various programs places a strain on primary funding sources; this

affects decisions about what services and programs may be retained or discontinued due to lack of funds.

Rules regarding income exclusions increase administrative costs. For instance, when a tenant becomes employed and leaves TANF, their rent cannot be adjusted for the first 12 months of employment. However, this first 12 months does not have to be a consecutive 12 months or even within the same calendar year. Therefore, the PHA bears the administrative burden of continually tracking the tenant's employment until the tenant reaches 12 months of employment. Once the tenant reaches that level, the PHA can adjust rent in the second 12 months, but only using 50 percent of the increase in the tenant's income. (Note that this adjustment is based on 50 percent of the increase in the tenant's income, rather than 50 percent of the tenant's total income.) In addition to adding to administrative costs, these rules regarding income exclusion decrease the amount of funding that would otherwise be available through tenant rent payments.

### **Suggested Regulation Modifications**

Unfunded requirements such as the community service program for public housing residents can have a large impact on administrative costs. Those public housing residents who are not age 62 or above or who do not have a disability or who are not full-time students must perform a certain number of community service hours each month at approved locations.<sup>28</sup> This requires substantial administrative oversight on the part of PHA staff. They must coordinate the community service with external organizations and track the number of hours all non-exempt public housing residents spend each month in approved community service activities. In addition to the administrative burden, there are liability issues associated with having public housing residents out performing community service.

---

<sup>28</sup> The respondent also noted that Housing Choice Voucher holders do not have a similar community service requirement.

One executive director of a small public housing authority noted that the “number one item is a change to Statute 421, because it currently prevents PHAs from engaging in creative finance.” Required pet policies for families were also a factor mentioned by this respondent. The federal requirement is that PHAs have a reasonable pet policy, but every conceivable arrangement is too expensive for tenants. For instance, if this PHA instituted a pet deposit or fee similar to the local market, it would require \$200 per apartment. This is beyond the means of most of the tenants in this public housing authority’s units.

Some executive directors suggested that minimum rent requirements be changed. If the current minimum rent requirement is at \$50 gross rent, once the utility allowance is deducted, the tenant pays no cash rent. Therefore, the minimum rent should be a net rent, rather than a gross rent. Then a cash payment would flow into the housing authority. Another respondent suggested that minimum rents be increased to \$100.

Another suggestion was that income qualifications should be done as they were in the past, when a two-income family would have half of the second income deducted from its qualifying income for residence in public housing. These households should then have strong homeownership education and assistance as soon as they become public housing residents. This system of income qualification would also have the merit of reducing the likelihood that tenants will fail to report who is living with them out of fear of going over income.

One respondent suggested that tenant damage limits be increased. The current formula limits damages that can be charged to tenants to \$2,000, while it may actually cost the PHA \$5,000 to get the damaged unit ready for new occupants.

Finally, one executive director expressed concern about HUD reliance upon the 2003 cost study conducted by Harvard. The respondent commented that it may be ill-advised to adopt the

performance funding system as presented in the Harvard report, since the study was flawed by being based on housing finance authority (rather than public housing authority) programs.

### **Advantages of Large, Medium and Small PHAs**

Large PHAs have more internal staff expertise than smaller PHAs; medium-sized respondents agreed with this assessment, as well. While small PHAs have less staff capacity, their staff members frequently are able to know all public housing residents and voucher holders served.

Medium PHAs have the advantage of a reasonable level of staffing, combined with the ability to focus on people (which larger PHAs cannot do). A medium PHA that cross-trains staff can make working with tenants and voucher holders a seamless process. It is also more efficient, because residents and voucher holders can talk with any member of staff in order to get questions answered or issues addressed. Overall, medium PHA respondents appeared to feel that they have the ability to be very effective by being neither too large nor too small.

### **Disadvantages of Large, Medium and Small PHAs**

Large PHAs that have a large number of public housing units are very visible within a community. When capital funds are not available to properly maintain these units, it can create a negative image public image.

One executive director of a medium-sized PHA indicated that there is a disadvantage in their size, because they cannot serve everyone who needs housing.

Small PHAs are disadvantaged by having the same multiple reporting requirements as large PHAs. Small PHAs must still report annually; the only difference between them and larger PHAs is that the reporting does not have to be done electronically every year. This reporting is so

burdensome that an outside consultant is necessary for most of the reporting; large PHAs have internal resources to fulfill these requirements, despite funding cutbacks of recent years.

Small PHAs are also disadvantaged by being unable to meet HUD goals for developing private funding sources to become less dependent on operating subsidy in the same way larger PHAs can. Small PHAs do not have the resources to accomplish this. In addition, recent decreases in capital fund grants are particularly difficult for small PHAs to deal with, as they have difficulty doing creative things like floating bond issues. That would require the participation of a larger PHA.

### **Other Comments**

One executive director noted that ported-in vouchers can cause cash flow problems. Although the administering PHA must pay landlords promptly on the first of each month for the ported-in vouchers, the originating PHA may not pay the administering PHA for 60 to 90 days, in some cases. Since Florida continues to be attractive to those migrating from elsewhere (particularly migrating into South Florida and other areas of the state such as Osceola County), this is a growing problem.

In closing, the words of one executive director may be most appropriate: “It’s still a good business to be in.”

### **Section IX: Suggestions for Further Study**

Survey results and HUD-provided financial data have indicated that Florida’s public housing authorities include a number of high-performing organizations. Future efforts to study public housing authorities might focus on gaining insights into how these organizations achieve results. In addition, it may be productive to look at ways in which public housing authorities have innovated in delivering housing to extremely low income households outside of programs

traditionally funded through federal appropriations. These innovations may include working with private sector development firms, local governments, and others to provide unique housing solutions for individual communities.

Further study of public housing authorities in Florida would be aided by making ongoing data collection and dissemination a priority. The Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse at the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing has been designed to facilitate this kind of data collection and presentation in a web-based format that is freely available to state and local policy makers and administrators, private-sector development firms, housing advocates and the public at large.

Certain types of data are not widely available at this time. For instance, SEMAP data—measuring PHA performance in administration of the Housing Choice Voucher program—are only available to the public via Freedom of Information Act request at this time. In addition, while PHAS scores—measuring the performance of public housing authorities with regard to the operation of public housing units—are available via HUD’s Housing Authorities Profiles system on the World Wide Web, they are only available on a housing authority-by-housing authority basis, nor are they available for download. This means that those who wish to perform an analysis of this performance measure for more than one PHA within the state must manually transcribe data into a spreadsheet or other electronic analysis format. Further, information on underlying indicators that make up the SEMAP and PHAS scores are only available through a Freedom of Information Act request.

Finally, there is little, if any, information available on where Housing Choice Voucher holders live. While it would be important to report data in a way that preserves the privacy of voucher holders, it may be useful from the standpoint of public housing authority management,

as well as from the state housing policy perspective, to know where voucher holders tend to locate.

For instance, under the SEMAP assessment system, public housing authorities located in Metropolitan Statistical Areas may earn bonus points for demonstrating that households using vouchers are living outside of areas of concentrated poverty. This is referred to as the deconcentration bonus, and in order to earn this bonus, PHAs must use geographic information system (GIS) software programs to place the addresses of their voucher holders into census tracts. These census tracts are then matched with demographic data from the most recent census, and an analysis of location vis-à-vis poverty is performed. While few public housing authorities have this capacity internally, organizations such as the Shimberg Center are able to produce this type of analysis on their behalf.

The results of the analysis of Housing Choice Voucher household locations may have broader policy implications. Policy makers at the state and local level may have an interest in knowing whether this federal program has fostered deconcentration of poverty. They may also have an interest in knowing the extent to which voucher holders reside in developments funded under various programs administered at the state and local levels. Among state-administered housing programs, it may be particularly important to understand the proportion of units developed with the federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit that serve households using vouchers.<sup>29</sup> At the local level, housing finance agencies may wish to know the extent to which voucher holders reside in properties funded through tax-exempt municipal bonds.

---

<sup>29</sup> A report released by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) in 1999 indicated that nationally an estimated 30 percent of Low Income Housing Tax Credit units housed those making use of tenant-based rental assistance. See the GAO's website at [www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov) for a full text of GAO/RCED 99-279R: Tenant-Based Assistance at Tax Credit Properties.

Finally, a number of public housing authorities have reported that they have developed and operate properties that serve extremely low, very low and low-income households outside the federal appropriations process for public housing and vouchers. Dissemination of information about these developments could aid those public housing authorities that intend to pursue their own innovations, as well as aid state and local policy makers in designing or adapting policies and programs that will facilitate the efforts of PHAs that take on these types of housing efforts.

## APPENDIX A

**Table A-1  
PHA Respondents: Alphabetical Listing**

Alachua	Hendry	Palatka
Arcadia	Hernando	Palm Beach
Area Housing Commission (Pensacola)	Hialeah	Panama City
Bartow	Hillsborough	Pasco
Boca Raton	Hollywood	Pensacola
Bradenton	Holmes	Pinellas
Brooksville	Indian River	Plant City
Broward	Jacksonville	Polk
Chipley	Jefferson	Punta Gorda
Citrus	Key West	Riviera Beach
Clearwater	Lake	Sanford
Collier	Lake Wales	Sarasota (City)
Columbia	Lakeland	Sarasota (County)
Crestview	Lee	Seminole
Dania Beach	Levy	Springfield
Daytona Beach	Live Oak	St. Petersburg
Deerfield Beach	Macclenny	Stuart
Defuniak Springs	Manatee	Sumter
Deland	Marianna	Suwannee
Delray Beach	Miami Beach	Tallahassee
Dunedin	Miami-Dade	Tarpon Springs
Eustis	Milton	Titusville
Fernandina Beach	Monroe	Venice
Fort Lauderdale	Mulberry	Volusia
Fort Myers (City)	New Smyrna Beach	Wakulla
Fort Myers (CRA)	Niceville	Walton
Fort Pierce	Ocala	Washington
Fort Walton Beach	Orange	West Palm Beach
Gilchrist	Ormond Beach	Winter Haven
Green Cove Springs	Osceola	Winter Park
Haines City	Pahokee	

**Table A-2  
PHA Respondents: Listing by Size**

<b>Large PHAs</b>	<b>Medium PHAs</b>	<b>Small PHAs</b>
Broward	Alachua	Arcadia
Clearwater	Area Housing Commission (Pensacola)	Bartow
Collier	Boca Raton	Brooksville
Daytona Beach	Bradenton	Chipley
Delray Beach	Crestview	Citrus
Fort Lauderdale	Dania Beach	Columbia
Fort Myers (CRA)	Deerfield Beach	Defuniak Springs
Fort Pierce	Deland	Dunedin
Hialeah	Fort Myers (City)	Eustis
Hillsborough	Fort Walton Beach	Fernandina Beach
Jacksonville	Hernando	Gilchrist
Lakeland	Hollywood	Green Cove Springs
Miami Beach	Indian River	Haines City
Miami-Dade	Key West	Hendry
Ocala	Lake	Holmes
Orange	Lake Wales	Jefferson
Palm Beach	Lee	Live Oak
Pasco	Levy	Marianna
Pensacola	Macclenny	Mulberry
Pinellas	Manatee	Niceville
Sarasota (City)	Milton	Polk
St. Petersburg	Monroe	Stuart
Tallahassee	New Smyrna Beach	Sumter
West Palm Beach	Ormond Beach	Suwannee
	Osceola	Venice
	Pahokee	Wakulla
	Palatka	Washington
	Panama City	Winter Park
	Plant City	
	Punta Gorda	
	Riviera Beach	
	Sanford	
	Sarasota (County)	
	Seminole	
	Springfield	
	Tarpon Springs	
	Titusville	
	Volusia	
	Walton	
	Winter Haven	

**Table A-3  
PHA Respondents: Listing by Region**

<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>North Florida</b>	<b>Central Florida</b>	<b>Southwest Florida</b>	<b>Southeast Florida</b>
Area Housing Commission (Pensacola)	Alachua	Arcadia	Collier	Boca Raton
Chipley	Columbia	Bartow	Fort Myers (City)	Broward
Crestview	Fernandina Beach	Bradenton	Fort Myers (CRA)	Dania Beach
Defuniak Springs	Gilchrist	Brooksville	Hendry	Deerfield Beach
Fort Walton Beach	Green Cove Springs	Citrus	Punta Gorda	Delray Beach
Holmes	Jacksonville	Clearwater		Fort Lauderdale
Jefferson	Levy	Daytona Beach		Hialeah
Marianna	Live Oak	Deland		Hollywood
Milton	Macclenny	Dunedin		Key West
Niceville	Ocala	Eustis		Miami Beach
Panama City	Palatka	Fort Pierce		Miami-Dade
Pensacola	Suwannee	Haines City		Monroe
Springfield		Hernando		Pahokee
Tallahassee		Hillsborough		Palm Beach
Wakulla		Indian River		Riviera Beach
Walton		Lake		Stuart
Washington		Lake Wales		West Palm Beach
		Lakeland		
		Lee		
		Manatee		
		Mulberry		
		New Smyrna Beach		
		Orange		
		Ormond Beach		
		Osceola		
		Pasco		
		Pinellas		
		Plant City		
		Polk		
		Sanford		
		Sarasota (City)		
		Sarasota (County)		
		Seminole		
		St. Petersburg		
		Sumter		
		Tarpon Springs		
		Titusville		
		Venice		
		Volusia		
		Winter Haven		
		Winter Park		

## APPENDIX B

### FAHRO SURVEY: GENERAL MEMBERSHIP

**Your PHA Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Information on Public Housing Units**

1. Number of public housing units \_\_\_\_\_
2. Number of public housing developments \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of households currently occupying public housing units \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of households on waiting list for occupancy of public housing units \_\_\_\_\_
5. Current Public Housing Assessment Score (PHAS) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Date of current PHAS \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Information on Section 8 (Housing Choice) Vouchers**

7. Number of Section 8 vouchers administered \_\_\_\_\_
8. Number of project-based Section 8 vouchers administered \_\_\_\_\_
9. Number of portable Section 8 vouchers administered from another agency ("port-ins" that continue to be billed back to original agency)  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. How many applications to administer Section 8 vouchers issued by another agency ("port-ins")  
do you receive each month (average of last three months)? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Current utilization rate for Section 8 vouchers \_\_\_\_\_%
12. Utilization rate current as of (date) \_\_\_\_\_
13. Number of households on Section 8 waiting list \_\_\_\_\_
14. Date (month/year) waiting list was last opened \_\_\_\_\_
15. Current Section 8 Management Assessment (SEMAP) score \_\_\_\_\_
16. Date of current SEMAP \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact information for person completing survey:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone/Email: \_\_\_\_\_

## FAHRO SURVEY: HOPE VI QUESTIONS

### **Information on HOPE VI Developments**

Please provide the following information for each of your PHA's HOPE VI grants. If development is not yet complete for any of these grants, please provide information as estimated on your HOPE VI grant application.

#### **HOPE VI Grant #1**

17. HOPE VI Grant #1 Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_

18. Additional public resources used with HOPE VI this grant \$ \_\_\_\_\_

*Note that additional public resources might include the Low Income Housing Tax Credit, HOME, municipal bond proceeds, or other public sources of funding. If in doubt about how to respond to this question, please contact Anne Lockwood Williamson at arwill@ufl.edu or (352) 273-1170 or (800) 259-5705.*

19. Additional HOPE VI resources provided by private sector investment  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_

*If in doubt about how to respond to this question, please contact Anne Lockwood Williamson at arwill@ufl.edu or (352) 273-1170 or (800) 259-5705.*

#### **HOPE VI Grant #2**

20. HOPE VI Grant #2 Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_

21. Additional public resources used with this HOPE VI grant \$ \_\_\_\_\_

*Note that additional public resources might include the Low Income Housing Tax Credit, HOME, municipal bond proceeds, or other public sources of funding. If in doubt about how to respond to this question, please contact Anne Lockwood Williamson at arwill@ufl.edu or (352) 273-1170 or (800) 259-5705.*

22. Additional HOPE VI resources provided by private sector investment  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_

*If in doubt about how to respond to this question, please contact Anne Lockwood Williamson at arwill@ufl.edu or (352) 273-1170 or (800) 259-5705.*

## TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing used the following questions in its telephone interviews with a sample of public housing authority Executive Directors throughout Florida. Executive Directors were also encouraged to add any additional comments they might have at the conclusion of the interview. These interviews were conducted during the months of January and February 2004.

1. What affects a public housing authority's ability to lease public housing units?
2. What affects a public housing authority's Section 8 voucher utilization rates?
3. What affects administrative costs associated with administration of public housing authority programs?
4. Are there any regulations that could be modified to assist public housing authorities in reducing their costs?
5. What are the advantages of being a large, medium or small public housing authority?
6. What are the disadvantages of being a large, medium or small public housing authority?

## APPENDIX C

**Table C-1  
Port-In Housing Choice Vouchers Among the States**

State	Total Available Units	Total Occupied Units	Port Move-ins Billing	Rank by Number of Port-ins
US	2,073,821	1,788,004	33,024	N/A
CA	294,999	267,850	4,532	1
MA	73,041	66,273	4,149	2
WA	43,595	31,979	2,740	3
FL	87,109	76,997	2,416	4
TX	138,713	121,944	2,197	5
GA	47,829	43,299	2,128	6
MN	30,647	28,294	1,906	7
IL	82,692	42,730	1,160	8
NJ	64,306	58,593	1,138	9
CO	27,372	25,307	940	10
AZ	20,384	19,362	898	11
NC	54,802	49,478	813	12
NY	203,432	178,047	716	13
ME	12,268	11,437	626	14
MD	42,629	34,942	623	15
CT	34,139	27,626	589	16
RI	9,596	8,181	573	17
PA	81,280	50,994	506	18
OR	31,422	30,417	481	19
PR	29,423	25,792	470	20
OK	22,348	20,653	361	21
LA	37,387	31,304	320	22
OH	84,261	77,022	278	23
NV	11,919	10,738	260	24
MO	39,873	36,463	259	25
NM	13,604	12,370	227	26
SC	23,610	21,489	225	27
VA	42,651	33,998	225	28
NH	9,127	8,019	204	29
KS	11,003	9,109	184	30
MI	45,949	41,127	157	31
WI	27,834	25,828	151	32
AR	22,480	21,023	79	33
IA	21,231	19,966	70	34
ND	7,216	6,922	63	35
IN	37,065	32,574	58	36
AL	28,911	25,356	45	37
TN	30,630	28,057	44	38
UT	10,318	9,117	37	39

State	Total Available Units	Total Occupied Units	Port Move-ins Billing	Rank by Number of Port-ins
MT	5,551	4,922	35	40
MS	17,842	16,943	27	41
ID	6,442	5,971	25	42
NE	11,239	6,793	25	43
KY	32,083	27,772	12	44
WV	14,663	13,132	11	45
VT	6,079	5,739	10	46
DC	10,774	7,559	10	47
WY	2,124	2,107	8	48
HI	12,003	10,323	8	49
DE	4,444	3,963	4	50
SD	5,642	5,300	1	51
AK	4,081	3,824	0	52
GU	2,515	1,882	0	53
VI	1,029	927	0	54
MP	215	170	0	55

Source: Residence Characteristics Reports, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development