

24 CRFR 903.2 ANALYSIS

Name	Address	Unit Type	Units
Mohawk	1052 Boylston Street Akron, OH 44306	Public Housing	101
Joy Park	524 Fuller Street Akron, OH 44306	Public Housing	163
Van Buren	410 Pasadena Place Barberton, OH 44203	Public Housing	200
Valley View	943 Springdale Street Akron, OH 44310	Public Housing	100
Summit Lake	9 Plato Lane Akron, OH 44301	Public Housing	239
Honey Locust	3299 Prange Drive Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44223	Public Housing	125
Colonial Hills	27 Colonial Hills Drive Akron, OH 44310	Public Housing	150
Pinewood	8788 Ray Court	Public Housing	125

Step 1: Average Income Portfolio

Mean Total income of PH families in Covered Developments \$10,018

Established Income Range lower limit: \$7,651

Established Income Range Upper Limit: \$10,351

Median Total income of PH families in Covered Developments \$8,856

Adjusted Mean total Income ($\$9,001 / 1.10$) = \$8,183

Established Income Range (adjusted) lower limit: \$6,956

Established Income Range (adjusted) Upper Limit: \$9,410

Established Income Range (adjusted) Upper Limit base on ELI: \$25,750

Step 2: Average Income by Development

Bedroom size adjustments calculation per PIH Notice 2001-4

Unit Mix	1	85%	2	100%	3	125%	4	140%	5	161%	Total Units	Sum Adj factor	Adj Factor
Mohawk		0	76	76	18	22.5	7	9.8		0	101	108.3	1.07
Joy Park		0	92	92	44	55	27	37.8		0	163	184.8	1.13
Van Buren		0	80	80	78	97.5	42	58.8		0	200	236.3	1.18
Valley View		0	53	56	36	45	8	11.2		0	100	112.2	1.12
Summit Lake	71	60.35	150	150	76	95		0		0	297	245	0.82
Honey Locust		0	80	80	37	46.25	20	28		0	137	154.25	1.13
Colonial Hills	50	42.5	50	50	49	61.25		0		0	149	111.25	0.75
Pinewood		0	80	80	22	27.5	23	32.2		0	125	139.7	1.12
Portfolio	121	102.85	661	661	360	450	127	177.8		0	1269	1391.65	1.10

Step 3 above or below EIR

Name	Mean Total		Adjusted Mean	Mean	Adjusted Mean
Mohawk	\$7,541	1.07	\$7,048	90%	92%
Joy Park	\$7,182	1.13	\$6,377	76%	77%
Van Buren	\$10,624	1.18	\$9,003	116%	108%
Valley View	\$7,928	1.12	\$7,079	87%	85%
Summit Lake	\$8,689	0.82	\$10,596	95%	128%
Honey Locust	\$10,124	1.13	\$8,959	111%	108%
Colonial Hills	\$9,637	0.75	\$12,849	105%	155%
Pinewood	\$10,763	1.12	\$9,610	118%	116%
Portfolio	\$8,999	1.10	\$8,248		

Site Based Waiting List Demographics

Site: Pinewood Gardens

Site Based initiated: July 1, 2013

Note: The property has a total of 125 units; the population percentage is calculated on the actual occupancy as of the noted date.

	Initial Population July 1, 2013	Current Population July 1, 2021	% Change
AA	82/124 (66.13%)	100/125 (80%)	+13.87%
W	35/124 (28.22%)	23/125 (18.40%)	-8.82%
Biracial	5/124 (4.03%)	4/125 (3.20%)	-0.83%
Am. Indian	1/124 (0.81%)	0/125 (0.00%)	-0.81%
Asian	0/124 (0.00%)	0/125 (0.00%)	0.00%
Hawaiian/Pac.Islander	1/124 (0.81%)	4/125 (3.20%)	+2.39%
Non-Hispanic	119/124 (95.97%)	122/125 (97.60%)	+1.63%
Hispanic	5/124 (4.03%)	3/125 (2.40%)	-1.63%
Non-Disabled	117/124 (94.35%)	110/125 (88%)	-6.35%
Disabled	13/124 (5.65%)	15/125 (12%)	+6.35%

Site: Spicer Terrace

Site Based Initiated: May 1, 2016

	Initial Population July 25, 2016	Current Population July 1, 2021	%Change
AA	8/12 (66.67%)	8/12 (66.67%)	0.00%
W	4/12 (33.33%)	4/12 (33.33%)	0.00%
Biracial	0/12 (0.00%)	0/12 (0.00%)	0.00%
Am. Indian	0/12 (0.00%)	0/12 (0.00%)	0.00%
Asian	0/12(0.00%)	0/12 (0.00%)	0.00%
Hawaiian/Pac.Islander	0/12 (0.00%)	0/12 (0.00%)	0.00%
Non-Hispanic	12/12 (100%)	12/12 (100%)	0.00%
Hispanic	0/12 (0.00%)	0/12 (0.00%)	0.00%
Non-Disabled	0/12 (00%)	0/12 (0.00%)	0.00%
Disabled	12/12 (100%)	12/12 (100%)	0.00%

Site: Edgewood Village

Site Based initiated: January 1, 2015 (HOPE VI New Construction Project) – Baseline was set per HUD instructions with the FY15 Annual Plan Submission.

Note: The property has a total of 128 project-based assisted units; the population percentage is calculated on the actual occupancy as of the noted date.

	Initial Population January 1, 2015	Current Population July 1, 2021	% Change
AA	121/128 (94.53%)	113/126 (89.68%)	-4-85%
W	7/128 (5.47%)	13/126 (10.32%)	+4.85%
Biracial	0/128 (0.00%)	0/126 (0.00%)	0.00%
Am. Indian	0/128 (0.00%)	0/126 (0.00%)	0.00%
Asian	0/128 (0.0%)	0/126 (0.00%)	0.00%
Hawaiian / Pac.Islander	0/128 (0.00%)	0/126 (0.00%)	0.00%
Non-Hispanic	128/128 (100.00%)	125/126 (99.21%)	-0.79%
Hispanic	0/128 (0.00%)	1/126 (0.79%)	+0.79%
Non-Disabled	114/128 (89.06%)	94/126 (74.60%)	-14.46%
Disabled	14/128 (10.94%)	32/126 (25.40%)	+14.46%

Site: Cascade Village

Site Based initiated: January 1, 2015 (HOPE VI New Construction Project) – Baseline was set per HUD instructions with the FY15 Annual Plan Submission.

Note:

	Initial Population January 1, 2015	Current Population July 1, 2021	% Change
AA	(92%)	113/126 (89.68%)	-4-85%
W	(6%)	13/126 (10.32%)	+4.85%
Biracial	(1%)	0/126 (0.00%)	0.00%
Am. Indian	(0.00%)	0/126 (0.00%)	0.00%
Asian	(0.6%)	0/126 (0.00%)	0.00%
Hawaiian / Pac.Islander	(0.00%)	0/126 (0.00%)	0.00%
Non-Hispanic	(98.00%)	125/126 (99.21%)	-0.79%
Hispanic	(0.00%)	1/126 (0.79%)	+0.79%
Non-Disabled	(80%)	94/126 (74.60%)	-14.46%
Disabled	(20%)	32/126 (25.40%)	+14.46%

AMHA Waitlist Audit
Conducted by Lauren Green-Hull and Vanessa Beane
June 28, 2021
Time Period: 8/1/2018-6/1/2021

Pinewood – 125 units

Average placement on the waitlist at move in: 42

<u>Moved in: (61)</u>	<u>Moved Out: (61)</u>
AA: 42	AA: 46
W: 12	W: 12
Hawaiian/Pac.Isl: 2	Hawaiian/Pac.Isl: 1
Multiracial: 5	Multiracial: 2

Edgewood: 127 units

Average placement on the waitlist at move in: 45

<u>Moved in: (28)</u>	<u>Moved out: (31)</u>
AA: 24	AA: 25
W: 4	W: 5
Multiracial: 0	Multiracial: 1
Disabled: 9	Disabled: 9

Observations & Suggestions:

- **Observation:** The average placement on the waitlist at the time of move-in is in the mid-40s for both audited properties, as noted above. This has been an observation/concern identified in previous audits as well. Additionally, the individuals closer to the top of the list, are often not on the next list printed/used/reviewed, so it is unclear what happened to these households.
 - **Suggestion:** The disposition of clients who do not select an available unit would be a key tracking measure to determine any potential disparities or barriers to obtaining AMHA housing. Given the ongoing nature of this concern, FHCS would strongly recommend AMHA evaluate their current placement structure and process to improve the placing of tenants in their proper order. Methods of contact, time given to respond to contact, and tracking responses to offers given are just some of the areas AMHA should evaluate to ensure an improvement in the placement process. AMHA should also consider the use of technology internally, as well as externally in communication to applicants (i.e. develop an app for mobile devices), to improve their placement practices.