HUD and HAs debate costs to be included in property management fee

Project-based accounting system differentiates between front-line and management expenses

As the industry prepares for project-based accounting, one of the key issues will be the property management fee. HUD is now determining which costs will be included in the management fee, and the guidelines it issues will determine how flexible the new system will be. PHADA representatives recently met with HUD, along with other industry groups and several executive directors, to discuss HUD’s draft of these guidelines.

The new project-based accounting system will be modeled on the accounting and management system used in the multifamily program. In multifamily housing, the revenues from a property are used to pay a property management company a fee to manage the property. This fee is an established amount set when a property is first built and adjusted along with the rent each year. HUD has not yet determined how management fees will be set for housing authorities, but one possibility is that they will be based on management fees used in the multifamily program.

The amount of the management fee is important, because in the multifamily program, certain expenses have to be paid out of the management fee. These expenses cannot exceed the management fee, and thus the amount of this fee may determine how a housing authority organizes its expenses. PHADA is concerned that HUD will set the management fee at a lower amount than is “reasonable.” PHADA is also concerned that HUD will unreasonably require HAs to account for front-line functions performed centrally as part of the management fee, forcing authorities to make management decisions because of accounting rules.

HUD has shared with PHADA and the other industry groups preliminary guidance on how agencies will have to distribute their expenses between the management fee and the front-line projects. Over a series of two recent meetings PHADA, HA representatives, and others presented comments to the Department concerning these draft guidelines.

Multifamily handbook guidance for management and front-line expenses

The multifamily handbook, 4381.5, rev. 2 (entitled “The Management Agent Handbook”) is relatively clear about what expenses are front-line and what are paid for out of the management fee. In addition, this handbook, as well as Handbook 4370.2, Financial Operations and Accounting Procedures for Insured Multifamily Projects, is also clear that front-line functions can be centralized. It concludes that consolidation of functions can result in cost savings.

These are the functions that are considered to be front-line as defined in 6.38 (a)(1):

- Taking applications;
- Screening, certifying and recertifying residents;
- Maintaining the project; and
- Accounting for project income and expenses.

It acknowledges that front-line management functions can be conducted centrally out of the management office when it states in 6.38 (a)(2) that “if front-line management functions for several properties are performed by staff of the agent operating out of a single office…” In 6.37 (c) the Handbook explains why this work might be done out of a single office when it describes handling the payroll. “Rather than maintaining separate payroll and separate fringe benefits plans for each property, some agents consolidate payroll and fringe benefit functions in order to reduce costs for the properties.”

In Handbook, 4370.2, the description of what costs go into the front line account of Office Salaries, 6310, specifically states that taking applications, verifying income and processing maintenance requests are front-line costs “regardless of whether the employ-
In memory of Floyd Carter

By Tim Kaiser, PHADA Executive Director

Under normal circumstances, President Jon Gutzmann’s column would appear on this page. Jon agreed it would be more appropriate to use the space for a tribute to former PHADA President Floyd Carter. Sadly, Floyd was killed in an automobile accident in South Carolina the weekend after Thanksgiving. His wife, Janet, was also in the vehicle. Fortunately, she escaped with only injuries.

I first met Floyd Carter in early 1990 when I joined the PHADA staff as a legislative assistant. At that time, he was already a prominent and respected professional in the public housing industry. Floyd had previously served as Executive Director of the York, Pennsylvania HA and then moved on to Raleigh where he served as Executive Director from 1977 to 1993. After paying his dues working in the PHADA ranks, he became Vice President of the association’s policy making committee and later rose to Sr. Vice President. He served as PHADA President from 1991 to 1993.

Floyd always struck me as an impressive individual, but not self-impressed. Despite his lofty position within PHADA, I never felt like his employee because he was so thoroughly approachable, possessing a friendly laugh and easygoing demeanor that made me so comfortable. Other staff felt the same way. Floyd also possessed an innate characteristic of sheer presence that actors and politicians often futilely try to hone. Still, you either have “it” or you don’t. Floyd Carter surely had “it.” Tall, handsome, smart and articulate, he was a natural leader.

Floyd possessed an innate characteristic of sheer presence. Tall, handsome, smart and articulate, he was a natural leader.
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TX) and Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) and Capitol Hill staff. For the same reasons, HUD Secretaries Sam Pierce and Jack Kemp and their staffs also solicited Floyd’s views.

I vividly recall Floyd taking the lead for PHADA as HUD launched the Public Housing Management Assessment Program (PHMAP) in the early ’90s. There was some tension with the Department as it moved forward with PHMAP, but Floyd helped to bridge the divide. Working with others such as Rick Gentry, Al Watson, John Callen, Gerald Nicely and key CLPHA and NAHRO leaders, he helped form workable compromises on these and other important housing policy matters. Floyd did all this because he wanted to improve public housing and was committed to the low-income clientele it serves.

Joe Schiff established a close relationship with Floyd during his tenure at HUD, calling on him for advice and guidance. Janet Carter once confided to me that Joe doggedly pursued Floyd to join his then fledgling consulting firm. Recognizing Floyd’s many talents, Joe persisted and was ultimately successful in getting Floyd to sign on as a fellow consultant at the Schiff Group. He worked there for about a decade, again proving to be a valued advisor to many in our industry.

Floyd more recently returned to public housing management as the Greensboro HA’s Deputy Executive Director. He attended our 2004 annual convention in New Orleans to help mark PHADA’s 25th anniversary. Floyd gave a memorable speech about PHADA’s early days, describing how the association rose from a small social club to the influential housing policy advocate it is today. It is not an exaggeration to note that Floyd Carter played a critical role in PHADA’s rise. In hindsight, I am glad he was so warmly received at our silver anniversary celebration. It proved to be PHADA’s final opportunity to express our gratitude for his prior contributions.

Floyd Carter was more than a successful housing professional. Since learning of his untimely death, many people have contacted me and others to share their sorrow. Not surprisingly, virtually all of the phone callers and written communications consistently used positive terms such as “good guy,” “people person,” “well-respected,” “dedicated public servant,” “committed to the residents.” Aside from all these attributes, Floyd was a Vietnam veteran, social worker, church leader, and devoted community activist in the Raleigh and Greensboro areas, serving on many local boards and foundations. Some of these include the Boys and Girls Club, the United Way, and the local YMCA, among others.

I was not at all surprised to see so many of Floyd’s friends and colleagues in attendance at the December 2–3 visitation and funeral service. Some of those paying their respects included Steve Beam (Raleigh HA), Tina Akers (Greensboro), Harrison Shannon (Durham), Joe and Polly Schiff, and former PHADA President James Tabron. Several current and former staff from the Raleigh and Greensboro HAs also attended. All these people had one thing in common—they wanted to say goodbye and show Janet and other Carter family members their deep appreciation of the man.

PHADA will try to find a fitting way to honor Floyd’s memory during our Commissioners’ Conference next month. There is no way, however, that we can fully acknowledge all that he did for our organization, the public housing industry in general, and the residents it serves. Floyd Carter’s passing at just 60 years is a reminder of the fragile line between life and death. At the same time, his legacy reminds us how one person can positively impact so many others. On behalf of many current and former PHADA members and staff, I just wanted to say how fortunate we feel to have known this gifted man. Floyd Carter will not be forgotten.
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Floyd presents an award to HUD Secretary Jack Kemp.
Floyd T. Carter, PHADA past president, dies at 60

Floyd Thomas Carter of Raleigh, North Carolina, died on Saturday, November 26, 2005 in Florence, South Carolina. Mr. Carter and his wife were returning home from Thanksgiving vacation when their vehicle was struck on Interstate 95. Mr. Carter died instantly from massive internal injuries.

He was born October 10, 1945 in Charleroi, Pennsylvania, the son of the late Everett and Viola Carter of Belle Vernon, Pennsylvania. Mr. Carter had two brothers, James and Richard, who predeceased him. Surviving family members who mourn his death are: his spouse, Janet L. Carter, his two sisters, Elizabeth Stokes of Donora, Pennsylvania and Brenda Martin of Axton, Virginia; his father-in-law, Andrew R. Freeman of Monessen, Pennsylvania; his brothers-in-law Andrew Freeman II of Toledo, Ohio and Mark Freeman of Dothan, Alabama. His surviving sisters-in-law are Margaret Carter of Donora, Pennsylvania, Gloria Carter of Indianapolis, Indiana, and Sherion Freeman of Dothan, Alabama. He is also survived by a host of nephews and nieces.

Mr. Carter was educated in Pennsylvania and received his Bachelor's degree from California State University in June 1966. He was a veteran of the Vietnam War and received his honorable discharge in 1970.

Mr. Carter moved to Raleigh in August 1977 to accept a position as Executive Director of the Raleigh Housing Authority. In 1993, he left the housing field to become a consultant with the Schiff Group, a national housing firm based in Vienna, Virginia. In that capacity, Mr. Carter provided a host of management and operational consultative services to many housing authorities across the nation, concentrating on organizations based within the northeast and southeast. His expertise remains valued by public and private housing executives who viewed him as the consummate professional. Mr. Carter remained a private consultant until 2003 when he was advised to reduce his travel schedule due to health reasons. At the time of his death, he was Deputy Director of the Greensboro, NC Housing Authority.

Mr. Carter received many housing awards and served as national President of the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association from 1991 to 1993. Through the years, he was very active in the Raleigh community, having served on many boards of directors and chairing several. A few of his activities were: Former Chairperson of United Way of Wake County; Former President of Raleigh Little Theater, Former President of Family Services of Wake County, Board Member, United Arts Council of Wake County, Board Member of Raleigh Chamber of Commerce, Board Member of Wake County Bank of America, Greater Triangle Community Foundation, Boys and Girls of Wake County, Garner Road YMCA, Children's Museum of the World (Exporis), and founding Board Member of the Cardinal Club. Mr. Carter was also active in the Greensboro community.

Throughout his life, Mr. Carter held a strong belief in Jesus Christ and faithfully attended church. Upon moving to Raleigh, he and his wife joined First Baptist Church, Wilmington Street, where he served on the Building Committee, the Trustee Board, and in whatever capacity requested. He was a willing Christian servant. His commitment stemmed from his strong belief in the biblical commandment of “love thy neighbor as thyself.”

In lieu of flowers, those wishing to honor Mr. Carter’s life may do so by making a financial contribution to The Family Life Center of First Baptist Church, 101 S. Wilmington Street, Raleigh, NC 27601.

“Fee”

Continued from page 1

...“Fee” works on site or in the agent’s office.”

The multifamily handbook seems quite clear about what functions are considered to be front-line costs, and clear as well that they do not have to be performed at the site itself. They can be performed in the agent’s office.

Costs paid out of the management fee are to be paid for work conducted supervising the front-line management functions. These responsibilities are spelled in 6.39 and include “supervising project personnel” and “monitoring project operations...or analyzing project performance reports” and “preparing budgets”. There are some ambiguities, particularly in human resources, where the handbook states that recruiting on site personnel is both a management and a front-line expense, but for the most part the handbook is clear that management fee expenses are supervisory in nature. The management fee pays for the costs associated with supervising the work done to manage the property.

HUD’s draft guidance on management fee vs. front-line expenses

HUD’s draft guidance contains some helpful elements. For instance, it references chapter 6 of the Management Agent Handbook, 4381.5, Rev. 2, quoted above as the source for general instruction on “when an expenditure can be charged as a front-line cost versus when it should be paid from the management fee.”

It also specifically cites a number of instances when front-line functions can be performed centrally. These include rent collection, waiting lists, reexams, resident services and specialized maintenance services. It goes further by saying as well that the costs associated with centralized rent collection, waiting lists, reexams and resident services can be prorated to the front-line projects using an allocation system based on units. This guidance will make the management and accounting for these functions much easier and goes beyond the rule which calls for centralized services to be accounted for using the “fee for service” method.

Despite these useful provisions, the guidance also includes several decisions which appear to run counter to the instructions in handbook 4381.5. For instance, it says that off-site supervision, as in the
case of the supervisor of a specialized maintenance crew, is not paid out of the front-line account but out of the management fee. In addition, it states that various functions that are clearly front-line, such as procurement, warehouse, processing work orders, inspections and risk management must be charged to the management fee if they are performed centrally. HUD provides this guidance even though the management agent handbook states front-line functions can be performed centrally.

Finally, the guidance states that certain management responsibilities, such as human resources and legal, about which the handbook is ambiguous, will generally have to be expensed in the management fee. As an example, the guidance states that “only legal expenses directly related to the operation of a project—e.g. eviction services, landlord-tenant disputes etc.—can be charged to the project as a front-line expense.”

**HA and industry comments on HUD’s guidance**

Representatives of the three industry trade groups, more than a dozen housing authority executive directors and finance directors, HUD officials and a private sector property manager attended the two meetings on this subject. PHADA was particularly well represented as its current president, Jon Gutzmann of St. Paul, Minn., its immediate past president, Rick Parker of Athens, Ga., and two former presidents, David Morton of Reno, Nev., and David Madden of Ozark, Ala. all participated.

The discussion was lively and many useful observations were made. First of all, PHADA pointed out the contradictions between HUD’s draft guidance and the handbook it cited as the source of general instruction. Gregory Byrne, Director of the Financial Management Division, responded by saying that although the guidance contradicted the handbooks, it mirrored the actual practice of accounting in the multifamily program.

A good deal of time was then spent by the HA executive and finance directors explaining to HUD why, in some situations, it was beneficial for HAs to centralize functions. Since it was so cost effective in many instances, they argued that authorities must be allowed to continue managing these tasks centrally which they could not do if they were forced artificially to pay for all of these centralized activities out of a capped management fee.

Procurement was one of the most important functions discussed at the meetings. Numerous reasons were offered why it could make sense to conduct procurement centrally. Many purchases are so complex, such as well-head purchase of natural gas, that it requires a specialist to carry them out, as they are beyond what it is reasonable to expect a property manager to be able to perform.

In addition, centralized procurement is very cost-effective, as agency directors with 1000 or more units explained that one or two employees could carry out the entire procurement responsibility. Bulk buying of certain goods and services for the entire authority also results in savings which would be lost if each property was responsible for its own purchases.

Equally important to the directors was the fact that procurement is highly regulated, and therefore must be done professionally and be well documented. Agencies cannot afford to have this function done improperly. In addition to the potential financial implications, procurement, they told the HUD officials, is often the first item to be examined during an inspector general visit. Inadequate documentation will lead the inspector general to find that the authority has misspent its funds. Thus, numerous compelling reasons were provided why HUD should permit procurement to be done centrally, but accounted for as a front-line expense.

Accounting for a central warehouse also consumed a great deal of discussion. Several HA officials pointed out that their authorities cover small geographical areas conveniently serviced by a central warehouse. Their central warehouses are cost-efficient methods of maintaining their property. Similarly, they added that their sites currently do not have any space for a site warehouse. Therefore, it would not be cost-effective to abandon a perfectly good space and have to spend money retrofitting each property to create site warehouses. If an agency takes advantage of bulk purchasing, it must have a place to store its purchases, and there will be costs associated with receiving, distributing, controlling and securing stock at each site. A central warehouse, therefore, may be more cost-effective.

Authority directors also emphasized the cost-effectiveness of processing work orders centrally. Small teams of a few employees can handle authorities with thousands of units, freeing up property managers for less clerical responsibilities. As the handbook specifically authorizes taking work orders centrally, HUD’s draft guidance on this issue seems particularly inappropriate.

The HA directors also believed that centralized inspection served a useful purpose. Some felt that the UPCS system was so complicated that it required highly trained staff, while others felt there was an inherent conflict of interest in having maintenance personnel perform inspections.

The issue of how to expense maintenance supervisors also engendered considerable debate. First of all, it was pointed out that if a single property was large enough to have a maintenance supervisor on site, then his or her salary was a front-line expense. There are properties in New York City, for instance, that are this large. HUD agreed that in this case, a maintenance supervisor is a front-line expense.

Since HUD has stated that properties may share staff, it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that in the case of an agglomeration of properties large enough to support a maintenance supervisor, the maintenance supervisor would also be a front-line expense. HUD appeared to agree with this logic, but felt that

---

**HUD issues new notice on KDHAP (PIH 2005-36)**

On December 1, HUD published a notice detailing operational requirements for the Katrina Disaster Housing Assistance Program (KDHAP, pronounced “kay-dee-hap”). The notice appears to conform to earlier HUD publications, web postings and guidance. It includes more detailed descriptions of processing steps for eligible households and describes the treatment of eligible families currently under a standard HCV HAP contract. Agencies that have executed or plan to execute a KDHAP ACC with HUD should carefully review the notice, which is available at www.phada.org.

---

See “Fee,” continued on page 10
Katrina evacuees still in hotels, three months later

In November FEMA announced that it would stop paying hotel bills for families displaced by Hurricane Katrina as of December 1. This announcement prompted a national outcry, as it meant FEMA would essentially be rendering tens of thousands of families homeless three weeks before Christmas. FEMA soon reconsidered and announced it would extend the deadline until December 15 for Katrina evacuees nationwide. However, the ten states with the largest proportion of Katrina families received extensions through January 7. As of December 1, this means that Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, Tennessee, and Texas. Families will be able to apply for extensions after both the December 15 and January 7 deadlines.

FEMA reports it is not trying to put people on the street, but rather trying to move them into longer-term homes before the holidays,” said acting FEMA director David Paulison in a press release. FEMA has paid over $300 million for hotels since Hurricane Katrina devastated the Gulf Coast region in September.

In October the Katrina Disaster Housing Assistance Program (KDHAP) evolved out of an agreement between FEMA and HUD. The program provides vouchers at fair market rent for victims of Hurricane Katrina. To be eligible for this program, the family must be eligible by FEMA standards and must have been a previous public housing or tenant-based Section 8 voucher participant.

Since the onset of the program, the Housing Authority has issued over 3,000 vouchers under KDHAP and the Dallas Housing Authority has issued approximately 931. Dallas reports that of those 931 vouchers, approximately 700 families are under contracts with landlords. PHAs participating in the KDHAP program are working diligently with local landlords to help families locate housing. However, some landlords are refusing to participate for fear that they will not be paid. Both Houston and Dallas report that KDHAP subsidies are being paid on time, and the PHAs are providing weekly reports to verify that their numbers are correct in order to avoid this problem.

The FEMA deadline for KDHAP voucher issuance is December 31. There is no word on whether or not this deadline will be extended in light of the amount of families still without homes. If a family does not qualify for KDHAP, they are referred to FEMA’s hous-

Yvonne Andrews, a Dallas Housing Authority employee, says, “People want to go to New Orleans and see the damage for themselves. Then they come back and say, ‘Okay, I will sign a year lease.’”
ing assistance program. This gives them money for three months of housing, but does not guarantee them a home. Once the money runs out, the family has to apply for an extension to receive more money.

The other issue PHAs face is the short-term lease expectation. PHAs are having a hard time convincing families to sign a 12-month contract. Many families want to contract for six months so they can “go home.” Yvonne Andrews, a Dallas Housing Authority employee, says, “People want to go to New Orleans and see the damage for themselves. Then they come back and say, ‘Okay, I will sign a year lease.’” New Orleans officials and HANO staff are currently meeting to determine how much damage has been done and what exactly can be rehabilitated and what needs to be rebuilt. There is no scheduled date to start moving New Orleans families back into their homes. Under KDHAP the family has 18 months to use the voucher. It is still unclear what will happen to these families after 18 months.

To date there are ten KDHAP referral call centers located in designated relief centers in Gulfport, Miss.; Baton Rouge; Memphis; Atlanta; Dekalb, Ga.; Little Rock; San Antonio; Houston; Ft. Worth; and Dallas. HUD published a 13-page question and answer document on its website on November 16 (see phada.org/advocate for details). This document makes an attempt to clarify some gray areas concerning KDHAP and how to it is to be administered.

On October 28, 2005 HUD issued a memorandum entitled Multifamily Disaster Clarification of Notice H 04-22 and Additional Guidance. In this notice it states that the “Department will rely upon FEMA eligibility determination” in providing services to Katrina families. Relying on FEMA to determine eligibility may be a problem in some cases, however. FEMA has changed some families’ eligibility status after reassessing the disaster area and homes. Also, FEMA is not providing determinations fast enough to meet the need. Some KDHAP centers are seeing as many as 100 families a week.

The October memo also states, “Owners should amend their leases to state that the displaced person is certifying that they are eligible for assistance according to Notice H 04-22.” It further states, “If the disaster-placed resident is later found to be ineligible, they may be evicted.” FEMA may find residents to be ineligible because people that are not eligible are added to the household, the home is found to be habitable, or the home is not in a designated disaster neighborhood. Finding any family from New Orleans to be ineligible for assistance, however, may be questionable; they are unlikely to be able to return to their home, as the infrastructure is not in place to support any type of sustainable lifestyle. In addition, a family that is found ineligible for assistance may have no recourse except to apply for public assistance, where waiting lists are months and sometimes years long.

Hurricane Katrina has highlighted the lack of affordable housing in the United States. PHADA has previously reported on a bill now in Congress which provided for an affordable housing fund to be created out of the profits from government-sponsored enterprises, including Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The legislation designated that ten percent of this funding would be allocated toward rebuilding the Gulf Coast for the next two years. However, the bill is at a standoff after the House wrote in an anti-voter registration clause. As it stands, the Senate is not expected to address the bill during this session.
2006 commissioners’ conference

hotel

Tradewinds Island Grand Resort • Tradewinds Sandpiper Hotel

Located on 18 tropical acres directly on the Gulf of Mexico, Tradewinds Resort is the largest beachfront resort on Florida’s central west coast.

Registration & Room Rates

Register at the Tradewinds Island Grand Resort/Sandpiper Hotel by calling 1-800-808-9833 and ask for the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association room block.

Tradewinds Island Grand Resort
5500 Gulf Boulevard
St. Pete Beach, FL 33706

When making your room reservations, please only reserve needed rooms. This will make it possible for attendees to stay at the conference hotel and help PHADA fulfill its contractual requirements. After December 5 any unsold rooms in the PHADA room block will be released for sale to the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Island Grand</th>
<th>Sandpiper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Hotel Room</td>
<td>$155 s/d</td>
<td>$145 s/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Bedroom Suite</td>
<td>$165 s/d</td>
<td>$155 s/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluxe 1-Bedroom Suite</td>
<td>$175 s/d</td>
<td>$165 s/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury 1-Bedroom Suite</td>
<td>$185 s/d</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A nightly resort amenity fee of $8.00 for each hotel room and/or one bedroom suite will be added as an incidental charge and is subject to 12% tax. The fee for multi-bedroom units is $17.00 plus tax nightly. A portion of the room rate is being used to offset convention costs.

agenda

Thursday, January 5
EDEP: Executive Housing Management, Part 1

Friday, January 6
EDEP: Executive Housing Management, Part 2

Saturday, January 7
EDEP: Ethics

Sunday, January 8
Registration: 8:00 am–5:00 pm
EDEP: Public Relations
Various organizational committees will meet all day.
Committee members and Trustees should arrive by Saturday, January 7. Other attendees should plan to arrive by Sunday, January 8.
Welcome reception: 5:30 pm–7:30 pm

Monday, January 9
Registration: 7:00 am–4:00 pm
Continental breakfast: 7:00 am–8:00 am
Opening session: 8:00 am–10:00 am
Get ready for a week of informative programs and sessions that reflect the need of housing executives, commissioners and staff. Sessions will be held approximately 10:00 am–4:00 pm.

Tuesday, January 10
Registration: 7:00 am–4:00 pm
Continental breakfast: 7:30 am–8:30 am
Program sessions: 8:30 am–4:30 pm
EDEP Graduation Luncheon: 12:00 pm–1:30 pm
Celebrate those individuals who recently completed the EDEP Program. All conference attendees are invited.

Wednesday, January 11
Registration: 8:00 am–12:00 pm
Continental breakfast: 8:00 am–9:00 am
Program sessions: 9:00 am–12:00 pm
Closing dinner: 6:00 pm–9:00 pm
Get ready to Rock Around the Clock with DJ Cadillac Kid as we step back into the 50’s!
Don’t miss this opportunity to learn, share ideas, and network with your colleagues from across the country. Register for the Commissioners’ Conference by December 5 for a discounted registration fee.

Register for the conference:
Register online at www.phada.org, or fill out the form below and mail or fax it, along with the registration fee, to:
PHADA Commissioner’s Conference
511 Capitol Court NE
Washington, DC 20002-4937
FAX: (202) 543-4381

Register with the hotel:
Register with the Tradewinds Island Grand Resort/Sandpiper Hotel by calling (800) 808-9833. Mention that you are attending the PHADA meeting.
Tradewinds Island Grand Resort
5500 Gulf Boulevard
St. Pete Beach, FL 33706

(Please fill out a separate form for each registrant, including spouses)

Name ___________________________________________ First Name for Name Badge ____________________

Housing Authority __________________________________ Position __________________________

Street Address ________________________________________________________________________________

City/State/Zip ______________________________________ Phone ________________________

Is this your first PHADA meeting? ☐ yes ☐ no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHADA/Rutgers EDEP registration (conference registration included)</th>
<th>Conference registration only (for those not taking EDEP classes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ ______ Executive Housing Management: $900</td>
<td>After December 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ ______ Ethics: $800</td>
<td>Member: $440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ ______ Public Relations: $800</td>
<td>Nonmember: $545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtract discount for multiple classes:</td>
<td>Spouse: $170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400 off any two classes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800 off all three classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ ______ Total</td>
<td>On site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member: $465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmember: $570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse: $180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payment method:
Check or money order enclosed in the following amount: $ _______________
Please bill my ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa ☐ American Express

Account # __________________________________ Signature ___________________________________________ Exp. Date ____________________

*A $75 processing fee will be deducted from all refunds resulting from cancellations.

EDEP registrants please note: On-site registrations are not accepted for the EDEP program, and class size is limited to 40. Classes have been filling up, so early registration is recommended. You will receive confirmation of your EDEP registration from Rutgers University. If you do not receive a Rutgers confirmation, please contact the PHADA office at (202) 546-5445. Refunds will be issued only to registrants who withdraw on or before December 5, 2005.

Disclaimer: PHADA endeavors to offer a wide range of quality programming and speakers for its conferences. If you have a suggestion for a speaker or topic, please let PHADA know by contacting Cheri Gainor at (202) 546-5445. Please note that the statements made by speakers and the materials distributed by the speakers are solely those of the speakers. PHADA does not endorse such statements or materials and disclaims any and all liability arising out of reliance on any speaker’s statements or materials.
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there would not be many situations like this one.

Similarly, PHADA said that in the case of specialized maintenance trades operating throughout an entire authority, the situation is analogous to the single large property in New York City, and the supervisor’s costs should be considered front-line. Byrne questioned whether there was a genuine need in all cases for maintenance supervision, but the directors were adamant that supervision was required. They pointed out, too, that in some situations private managers centralize their maintenance and include supervision as a front-line expense. It is useful for maintenance supervisors to be working supervisors, but even in situations where union contracts prohibit supervisors from undertaking repairs themselves, their costs should still be front-line expenses.

The group also discussed some of the difficult issues associated with accounting for human resources and legal costs. In general, authority personnel at the meeting believed that some of these expenses could not be covered by the management fee as HUD proposed. Housing authorities have agency wide responsibilities which private managers are not required to meet, such as Section 3 regulations and affirmative action goals. An authority required to hire 30 percent of its new personnel based on Section 3 criteria cannot leave all the hiring decisions to each individual site.

The Harvard cost study reported that public housing is also far more unionized than the private sector. Managing union contracts also requires central organization and can be more costly. A union contract must be adhered to carefully, and a different set of standards at one property, for instance providing clean up time at the end of the day, could lead to an authority-wide precedent requiring the agency to provide clean up time to all employees.

Discipline procedures can also be very time consuming under union contracts. They generally require multiple stages, often including the opportunity to appear before a state labor panel which may involve legal representation. Thus, since these are expenses not incurred by private operators, housing authorities must either be provided additional money in their management fee or they should be allowed to expense some of these human resource expenses to the front-line.

Housing authorities are also subject to extraordinary legal expenses as well. Quite a few HAs have been sued for discrimination and the ensuing legal battle can be extremely expensive. Similarly, negotiating union contracts is expensive, especially if negotiations go all the way to arbitration.

HUD acknowledged that HAs could face extraordinary legal costs. It suggested dealing with them on a case by case basis. In order to evaluate this idea, PHADA would like to see the guidance the Department might suggest the field offices use in determining when and what sort of extraordinary costs would be eligible for special consideration.

HUD has informed PHADA that it will take the comments made at these two meetings under consideration. At some point soon, it expects to reissue its draft guidance for further industry review and discussion.
Last-minute final project-based voucher rule changes limit their use with low income housing tax credits

On October 13, HUD published its final rule governing the project-based voucher (PBV) program, which took effect on November 15. This rule comes more than 18 months after HUD’s proposed rule and resolves a number of questions concerning the use of PBVs that have arisen since HUD initially developed policies governing their use in 2001. The rule provides some clarity and stability for PBV’s, and several provisions are helpful to program sponsors. However, the final rule contains a set of provisions concerning rents to owners that may cause some HAs serious problems as they plan to use PBVs in developing affordable housing in their communities.

Combining assistance
One longstanding federal concern has been combining various sources of federal housing support in one development. The federal fear is that some projects may become “over-subsidized” through the layering of several different kinds of federal housing support. The practice of combining CDBG, HOME, LIHTC, tax exempt bond funding, and deep subsidy program support has become increasingly common as developers and program sponsors become more sophisticated in structuring development arrangements and as costs for developing housing have risen. The PBV final rule includes several provisions designed to address this concern.

Prohibition on subsidized units. Section 983.54 generally prohibits any use of PBV assistance for a public housing unit, a unit with any other project- or tenant-based Section 8 assistance, a unit with any governmental rent subsidy, a unit with Section 236 or Section 521 assistance under the Rural Housing Service (except for interest reduction payments), a Section 202 (disabled or elderly supportive housing) or Section 811 unit, a Section 101 rent supplement unit, a unit with any other form of tenant-based rental assistance, or a unit with any other duplicative federal state or local housing subsidy as determined by HUD. The list in 983.54 does not include LIHTC units.

Layering review. The rule also includes a requirement for a layering review when a project involves multiple sources of federal subsidy. The review is designed to determine compliance with layering regulations (24 CFR 4.13) and these reviews must be concluded before a HA may enter into an Agreement to enter into a HAP Contract or execute a HAP contract for existing housing with an owner. Some sponsors have indicated that the department may take several months to fulfill this requirement.

Effects of other subsidies on rents. In addition to the prohibition against using PBVs with certain forms of subsidy and the requirement for a completed layering review, the final rule includes a provision that limits the rent the program can pay to owners of units with certain forms of subsidy. Subpart G generally describes requirements for deter-
“PBV”
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... mining the rent to the owner for a unit coming under a PBV HAP contract. Sec. 983.304 in that Subpart limits potential rents associated with the use of HOME funds, the insured or non-insured Section 236 program, Interest Reduction Payment funds, Section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate funds, Section 515 funds from the Rural Housing Service, or any other type of federal subsidy administered by HUD. One provision of this section that HUD did not include in the proposed rule limits potential rents for percent of AMI, the tax credit rent will be 30 percent of 50 percent of AMI adjusted for family size.

Different sections of the final rule (983.301(b) and (d)) limit PBV rents in LIHTC properties to the lower of 110 percent of the applicable FMR, the reasonable rent, or the rent requested by the owner. In 983.301(c) in certain specified LIHTC units where the tax credit rent is higher than 110 percent of the FMR, the rule permits rents to owners to rise up to the tax credit rent.

Provisions of 983.301 and 983.304 contradict one another. One provision permits the use of higher tax credit rents in certain LIHTC units, but uses the applicable FMR as the standard in other LIHTC units. The other provision limits rents in all LIHTC units to the LIHTC rent. Thus LIHTC units that meet certain thresholds designed to encourage deconcentration may negotiate a rent to owner at the tax credit rent if it is higher than the applicable FMR, but for all LIHTC properties where the FMR is higher than the LIHTC rent, rent to owners is limited to the tax credit rent.

These conflicting provisions present various levels of difficulties for different communities depending upon their local economic situations. Tax credit rents depend on local income information, while FMRs depend on local housing markets. In very high cost housing markets, it is likely that housing cost growth rates have exceeded income growth rates, and so tax credit rents tend to be substantially lower than local FMRs. In one high cost community, the differential between FMRs and tax credit rents exceeds $1,000 per unit per month for larger unit sizes. In moderate housing cost communities, the picture may be mixed, with tax credit rents higher than FMRs for some unit sizes and FMRs higher than tax credit rents for other unit sizes. Finally in low housing cost communities, the tax credit rents may routinely offer a significant premium over the local FMRs. The conflicting rule provisions, and particularly the LIHTC limitation in 983.304, will be a very significant disincentive to the use of PBV assistance in LIHTC units in very high cost housing markets, which are precisely the markets requiring significant subsidies for developing affordable housing. In lower housing cost communities where the need may be less severe, 983.304 and the contradiction in provisions will not likely discourage the use of PBV assistance in conjunction with LIHTCs.

Developments in the pipeline. The new LIHTC restrictions will have profound impacts on developments whose financing has already been negotiated, but which are still under development and do not yet have an executed HAP contract for PBV assistance. The final rule effectively changes the agreements for these developments, and in high housing cost communities, it may render developments under construction financially infeasible. One PHADA member reports that the rule change will render a 179-unit mixed income development infeasible. The HA stands to lose $2.9 million in performance deposits and predevelopment costs. This agency also reports that its community’s loss of the LIHTC tool will also jeopardize the planned rehabilitation of 324 other obsolete public housing units.

Existing PBV/LIHTC properties. In addition to eliminating the combination of PBV’s and LIHTCs as a development tool, the final rule will also impact LIHTC units already under a HAP contract prior to the effective date of the rule (November 14, 2005). These HAP contracts may be based on HUD’s pre-November 14 policy allowing FMR-based rents for LIHTC units. Where tax credit rents are significantly lower than FMRs, rents on these units may be effectively frozen, since any rent redetermination must move rents toward the lower tax credit rent regardless of changes in FMRs. Capping rents in this fashion may risk the financial viability of properties in high housing cost communities in the medium and long term.

HUD’s rationalization

In its preamble to the final rule, HUD acknowledged this change in policy briefly and announced three justifications. The department asserted that it is “inappropriate to allow owners to collect higher rents from voucher families than they are allowed to collect from tax credit families,” that “allowing higher rents would result in a duplicative subsidy,” and that the new provision reflects 42 USC 1437 f (o) (13) (H) of the statute.

One PHADA member reports that the rule change will make it infeasible to continue with a 179-unit mixed income development currently under construction.

Implications of limiting PBV rents for LIHTC units

Although a seemingly minor change to the rule, the addition of LIHTC units to the list of subsidies limiting rents to owners in the PBV program produces a number of seemingly unintended and often counterintuitive outcomes. LIHTC developments may set aside 40 percent of the units for households with incomes below 60 percent of area median income (AMI), or they may set aside 20 percent of the units for households with incomes below 50 percent of AMI. It appears that the “tax credit rent” will depend on the developer’s original commitment. If the property reserves units for families with incomes below 60 percent of AMI, the tax credit rent will be 30 percent of 60 percent of AMI adjusted for family size. If the property reserves units for households below 50 percent of AMI, the tax credit rent will be 30 percent of 50 percent of AMI adjusted for family size.

The_section prohibits rents to owners that “exceed the subsidized rent (basic rent) or tax credit rent as determined in accordance with requirements of the applicable federal program …” The Section also prohibits rents that exceed any limitation imposed to comply with HUD subsidy layering requirements, and it permits HAs to reduce initial rents to owners due to other governmental subsidies, including tax credits or exemptions, grants, or other subsidized financing.
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Whether FMR rents are inappropriate is a matter of opinion, and the opinion here is one with which many disagree. In addition, the PBV subsidy would permit households to live in LIHTC units with incomes substantially lower than 50 percent or 60 percent of AMI, and these families will probably pay significantly lower rents than unsubsidized tenants. Finally, language in the section cited by HUD discusses limitations on rents for LIHTC properties that meet certain criteria and is silent concerning LIHTC properties that fail to meet those criteria. PHADA does not believe that silence means the statute permits HUD to impose the tax credit rent limitation.

HUD’s rationale is further undermined by its discussions of LIHTC units on its web site. The department states:

It is important to note that the LIHTC Program restricts only the portion of the rent paid by the tenant, not the total rent. As a result, certain rental assistance programs can be used to raise the total rent above the LIHTC rent limit. For example, project-based Section 8 contract rents can exceed the LIHTC limit, but tenant-based Section 8 contract rents cannot. (http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/affordablehousing/training/lihtc/basics/eligibility.cfm)

The department argues that an appropriate use of combined PBV and LIHTC subsidies involves paying rents on LIHTC units that exceed the standard tax credit rent limitations. The argument is undermined by the operation of tenant based HCV assistance in LIHTC units. With tenant-based assistance, LIHTC property owners may receive rents up to the local FMR.

PHADA’s letter
As a result of the impact of the unannounced change to 983.304, PHADA delivered a letter to Assistant Secretary Cabrera objecting to this unanticipated policy change. PHADA proposed that, since the rule includes two clearly contradictory sections (983.301(d) and 983.304), the department may consider the unannounced change as an error and correct that error with a notice announcing deletion of LIHTCs from the list of subsidy programs that limit rents to owners in the PBV program. Alternatively, PHADA suggested that HUD rescind the change to 983.304 and publish that change as a proposed rule. That would give HAs and other stakeholders to consider the change and submit comments, and would give HUD the opportunity to deliberate over the change and the comments.

Conclusion
HAs, PHADA and other industry groups and stakeholders were taken by surprise by HUD’s unannounced unilateral change to a four-year-old policy governing the use of PBV assistance in LIHTC units. In addition to PHADA, the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, the National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, and the National Leased Housing Association have written to Secretary Cabrera to criticize the policy and to suggest remedies to the problem. Some HAs have also written to express their concern. Although there may be some remedy to the problem in the making, the final rule may have already poisoned some financing arrangements, seriously constraining opportunities to develop, rehabilitate or preserve affordable housing in certain communities.
Property Manager: The Petersburg (VA) Redevelopment and Housing Authority is seeking a property manager. Minimum requirements: Bachelor's degree in business and/or public administration, sociology, psychology, or related human services field; significant years of experience in public and/or private housing management or any equivalent combination of training and/or experience. This position provides management to all of PRHA's public housing developments and/or other PRHA-owned facilities, involving considerable scope of responsibility in terms of property management, profit and loss, supervision, physical needs assessments and tax credits. Candidate must obtain certification as a Public Housing Manager within one year of hire. Spanish language a plus.

Essential knowledge and skills: Considerable knowledge of both private and public property management including HUD regulations and public housing practices, rules and regulations; proven administrative and supervisory skill sets and some knowledge of resident services and techniques.

Candidate must possess a valid Virginia driver's license. DMV report must meet Authority standards. Resumes may be submitted with a completed State Application (DPT 10-012).

Mail applications to: P.O. Box 311, Petersburg, VA 23804-0311. Attention Mrs. Shelia Ward, Personnel Specialist. Open until filled. EOE.

Executive Director: The Housing Authority of the City of Clay Center, Kansas is seeking a qualified leader to oversee the day-to-day operations of the authority. The portfolio includes 144 Public Housing Elderly/Disabled units and 20 USDA Rural Development Section 515 units. The position requires the following: mid-to-senior level administrative experience in subsidized housing and knowledge of HUD housing program regulations and requirements, experience in budgeting and asset management, outstanding oral and written communication skills and program development and implementation abilities. Must have the ability to work with a Board of Commissioners that maintains an excellent and supportive working relationship with the Executive Director. Must have the desire to maintain and further enhance resident and community relationships. Applicants must possess a Public Housing Management Certification or the ability to acquire such certification within one year of hire. Salary is commensurate with experience. Excellent benefits package of health, dental and retirement.

Qualified applicants should submit a resume with references to: Clay Center Housing Authority, 330 W Court, Clay Center, KS 67432. EOE.

Human Resources Manager: The Detroit Housing Commission (DHC) is currently accepting applications for the position of Human Resources Manager. This position manages the day to day activities of the DHC human resources office. She or he will report to the Administrative Officer and will have hands-on responsibility for administration of the DHC policies and rules of conduct, recruitment and retention of employees, classification and compensation, employer-employee relations, labor relations, benefits and worker's compensation, employee training and development, human resources information system and records maintenance. Candidates should possess a combination of education, training, and experience that includes a B/BA/B degree from an accredited college or university with major course work in business or public administration, human resources management, organizational development, or a closely related field; and 5 years of generalist human resources management experience including 3 years of public sector supervisory experience and experience working in a union environment. He or she must be able to effectively collaborate with all levels of staff, possess excellent customer service skills, have knowledge of wage and hour and labor laws, and must possess working knowledge of computer programs such as Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint. Salary negotiable based upon education and experience. Submit cover letter with resume and salary history to Deputy Executive Director, Detroit Housing Commission, 1301 East Jefferson Ave., Detroit, Michigan 48207. Position open until qualified candidate is selected.

Site Manager: The Oak Park Housing Authority is seeking a Site Manager for a 198 unit high-rise development for seniors.

The ideal candidate has HUD onsite management experience with seniors and persons with disabilities. Experience with this population is essential as is high energy and high tolerance. The job requires supervision of clerical and maintenance staff, preparing and implementing budgets, handling applications and waiting lists, coordinating move-ins and move-outs, assigning tenant service requests and planning social, recreational and educational activities for the residents.

Housing administration requires experience with HUD regulations for public and multi-family housing for seniors and persons with disabilities. Also, familiarity with HUD Manager 2000 or WinFam software programs is a plus. Salary range is $30-45,000. EOE.

Submit resume to Sandra Kincaid at skincaid@oakparkrw.com or fax to 708-386-9362.

Project Manager: The Housing Authority of Portland (HAP) is recruiting for a full-time Project Manager. The successful candidate for this position will be part of the team charged with carrying out the HOPE VI redevelopment of HAP's Iris Court property; a 5 acre, 129 unit housing project scheduled to start construction in 18 months.

Key responsibilities of the Project Manager include supervision of the design team selection process, coordination of public design workshops and site master planning process, oversight of the design team and consultants, and management of the project design, environmental assessment, land use approval and permitting processes.

The ideal candidate for this position will have a minimum of 4 years of increasingly responsible experience in construction project management and contract administration for large public works developments.

The annual salary for this position is $53,768 to $72,259. Applications consisting of a cover letter, resume and completed HAP application will be accepted until the position is filled. Applications may be obtained at 135 SW Ash St., Portland or at www.hapdx.org. Submit completed application materials to:

Housing Authority of Portland, Human Resources Department; 135 SW Ash St., Portland, Oregon 97204-3540.

Director of Finance: The Tuskegee Housing Authority is seeking a highly skilled and motivated professional with vision and dedication to fill the position of Director of Finance. This position performs complex administrative and supervisory work related to all fiscal operations of the Authority in accordance with GAAP, Project Based Management, Capital Asset Management, and Human Relations functions. Strong background with HUD programs, policies, procedures, and regulations related to the operation of a public housing authority is essential. Knowledge of the generally accepted accounting principles, practices of management and supervision, budgeting and budget administration is required. Requirements: Bachelor's degree from an accredited college/university in accounting, finance, business administration, or closely related field; at least five (5) years experience in a financial position preferably with a housing authority or other governmental agency. Certified Public Accountant desirable. Applicant must have a valid Alabama Driver's License, insurance under the Authority's auto insurance and bondable. Starting salary negotiable. Excellent employee benefits package. Interested individuals should send a cover letter and resume to Mrs. Linda M. Simpson, Executive Director, Tuskegee Housing Authority, 2901 Davison Street, Tuskegee, AL 36088 or email us at tuskegeepepa@yahoo.com. Application/resumes will be accepted until December 15, 2005 or thereafter until such time as position is filled. Tuskegee Housing Authority is an equal opportunity employer and reserves the right to reject any and all applications/resumes.

Assistant Director of Property Management: The Burlington Housing Authority, a HUD High Performer, is seeking a dynamic, self-motivated individual for its property management division, which manages over 600 apartments assisted under the Public Housing, Section 8 Project-Based and Low Income Housing Tax Credit programs. The Assistant Director of Property Management will be in training to become the Director of Property Management in July.
The ideal candidate will have a college degree or equivalent and at least five years of property management experience, including familiarity with HUD assisted housing programs and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program. Previous supervisory experience is preferred. Sensitivity to the needs of elderly, disabled and low income households is a must.

BHA offers a competitive salary, commensurate with qualifications and experience, as well as an excellent benefit package. Applications will be accepted until the position is filled.

Send your resume with a cover letter detailing salary requirements and pertinent information regarding your qualifications and interest to: Paul Dettman, Executive Director; Burlington Housing Authority; 65 Main Street; Burlington, Vermont 05401. BHA is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Executive Director/ HOPE VI Coordinator: The Winnebago County (IL) Housing Authority is seeking a skilled and experienced individual for the position of Executive Director/ HOPE VI Coordinator to be responsible for the overall management of a high-performance housing authority with 311 public housing units, 367 Section 8 vouchers, and a Hope VI mixed finance program and development. The successful applicant will be responsible for overseeing all programming and the day-to-day operations of the Authority.

Minimum requirements include a bachelor’s degree, preferably in public administration, business administration or a related field, at least five years of experience in public housing, HOPE VI program coordinator experience, tax credit experience and the ability to be PHM certified within six months of hire. Residency after appointment is preferred. Salary commensurate with experience.

Please submit letter of interest, resume, references and salary expectations by December 14, 2005 to: Executive Search Committee, Executive Director/ HOPE VI Coordinator, c/o Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP, 100 Park Avenue, Rockford, Illinois 61101. No faxes or e-mails please.

Request for Proposals—Energy Audits: The Housing Authority of the City of White Plains, New York is accepting competitive sealed proposals with qualification and statements to conduct energy audits for its public housing units located at the developed sites. A total of seven buildings exist in its portfolio.

The energy audit will be conducted in accordance with 24 CFR part #965, subpart C, Energy Audits and Energy Conservation Measures, HUD Rehabilitation Energy Guidelines for Multi-Family Dwellings, HUD Energy Conservation for Housing - A 1998 Workbook and the PA Energy Star for Homes Guidelines. HUD recommended “What PHAs need to know about Energy Audits.” All applicants must familiarize themselves with HUD’s regulations and have demonstrated a history in providing similar services either with housing developments or related programs. All applicants must follow New York State, Westchester County and local White Plains Codes and Regulations when performing the audit.

Deadline to submit proposals and qualifications is 4 pm. Friday December 23, 2005. Proposals may be mailed or hand-delivered to the White Plains Housing Authority at the trailer complex located at 223 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. For information and a copy of the criteria governing this request, please contact Gilbert Galli, Modernization Coordinator, at 914-949-6462, x 19 between the hours of 8 am to 4 pm M-F. The White Plains Housing Authority reserves the right to reject any or all proposals. EOE.

Request for Proposals—Strategic Plan: The Housing Authority of the City of Tulsa will receive Proposals for a Consultant to Perform a Strategic Plan Update, until 10:00 a.m. on January 5, 2006. The objective of this Request for Proposals is to solicit the services of one (1) qualified consulting firm to provide services for assessing and providing recommendations for revisions thereto. This will include a review of all THA departments and community outreach efforts. It is the Authority's intent to establish a relationship with a firm to develop a revised Strategic Plan. This requires comprehensive knowledge of the housing industry, specific knowledge of Public Housing Authority administrative and management requirements, knowledge of trends in Public Housing and a comprehensive understanding of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS: All proposals are due on or before JANUARY 5, 2006, at 10:00 a.m. in the Capital Improvements Department of the Housing Authority of the City of Tulsa, 415 E. Independence, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74106. Proposal must be clearly marked “PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTANT TO PERFORM STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF TULSA.” Proposals received after the deadline will be returned to the respective providers unopened. To request a complete copy of this RFP contact Denise Brinker at tulsahousing.org.

Request for Proposals—Development Consultant: The Housing Authority of the City of Stamford is seeking the services of an experienced Development Consultant that will assist in implementing the revitalization of its existing housing stock and the development and preservation of additional housing and community service facilities. The Consultant will also undertake activities that will strengthen the Authority and enable it to further its core mission. The scope of those responsibilities is generally described under Scope of Services in the Request for Proposals. It is subject to change, however, based upon the identified needs, opportunities and constraints and according to the discretion of the Executive Director.

By this announcement, the Authority is seeking proposals from qualified consultants to provide Development Consulting Services, as described in the Request for Proposals (“RFP”). Proposals are to be received no later than by 2:00 p.m. on Friday, January 6, 2006.

Before submitting its proposal, the respondent shall examine the entire RFP. The submission of a proposal will be construed as evidence that such an examination has been made. Requests for the full Request for Proposals should be addressed to: Vincent Tufo, Director of Development, Housing Authority of the City of Stamford, 22 Clifton Avenue, P.O. Box 1376, Stamford, CT 06904. Telephone: (203) 977-1400 Ext. 3318; Fax: (203) 977-8522; vtufo@stamfordhousing.org.

All procurement decisions shall be at the sole discretion of the Housing Authority of the City of Stamford. The Housing Authority of the City of Stamford reserves the right to waive any minor irregularities in any response when this action appears to be in its best interest. The Housing Authority of the City of Stamford is an Affirmative Action Equal Opportunity Employer.

Request for Proposals—Executive Director Search Firm: The City of New London Housing Authority is seeking proposals to perform a search for the position of Executive Director. A copy of the Request for Proposals may be obtained by e-mail: Ivettew@newlondonhousing.org or by contacting: Ivette Webster, Administrative Executive Assistant, 860-443-2851.

Request for Proposals—Search Consultant: The City of New London Housing Authority is seeking proposals to perform a search for the position of Executive Director. A copy of the Request for Proposals may be obtained by e-mail: Ivettew@newlondonhousing.org or by contacting: Ivette Webster, Administrative Executive Assistant, 860-443-2851.

Request for Proposals—Pay Comparability Study: Fairfield Alabama Housing Authority is accepting proposals from qualified firms or individuals to provide a Pay Comparability Study of all the Authority’s positions.

Proposal deadline: January 26, 2006. Proposal packages that include instructions, scope of services, and evaluation criteria are available from A. W. Thomas, Executive Director, Fairfield Alabama Housing Authority, 6704 Avenue D, P.O. Box 352, Fairfield, Alabama 35064; 205/923-8017 or Fax 205/923-5574.

Fairfield Alabama Housing Authority reserves the right to reject any and all proposals and waive any informality in the the proposal process. FAHA is an Equal Opportunity Agency.

Request for Proposals—Development Consultant: The City of New London Housing Authority is seeking proposals to perform a search for the position of Executive Director. A copy of the Request for Proposals may be obtained by e-mail: Ivettew@newlondonhousing.org or by contacting: Ivette Webster, Administrative Executive Assistant, 860-443-2851.

Request for Proposals—Search Consultant: The City of New London Housing Authority is seeking proposals to perform a search for the position of Executive Director. A copy of the Request for Proposals may be obtained by e-mail: Ivettew@newlondonhousing.org or by contacting: Ivette Webster, Administrative Executive Assistant, 860-443-2851.
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Submit job listings and RFQs online at phada.org/submit.php (preferred) or email ksenzee@phada.org. Submissions will be posted on the PHADA website unless otherwise requested. The Advocate reserves the right to edit all advertisements. Placement of ads is subject to space availability. PHADA members receive priority in case of space limitations. Job listings should have an application due date at least 30 days from the Advocate publication date. Ads will be published in two consecutive issues (4 weeks) unless a shorter run is requested. There is no charge for running a job or RFP ad in the newsletter or on the website.
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