

Department of Housing and Community Development

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Affordable Housing - Public Housing

Objective

To obtain a Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) rating of at least 85 percent or better on a 100-point scale and maintain an occupancy rate of 95 percent or better.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Clients housed	2,839	2,818	2,850 / 2,789	2,780	2,780
Number of New Households Served	NA	84	85 / 84	85	85
Efficiency					
Average income served as percentage of Area Median Income	23%	23%	30% / 23%	30%	30%
Service Quality					
Percent on-time re-certifications	99%	99%	95% / 100%	95%	95%
Percent on-time inspections	99%	100%	95% / 100%	95%	95%
Outcome					
Occupancy Rate	NA	99%	95% / 99%	95%	95%
HUD's PHAS rating (1)	NA	94%	85% / NA	85%	85%

(1) FCRHA achieved HUD High Performer status for the Public Housing Program in FY 2012; FY 2013 PHAS score pending.

Department of Housing and Community Development FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Affordable Housing - Fairfax County Rental Program

Objective

To maintain an overall occupancy rate of 95 percent or higher for FCRP multi-family properties.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Individuals housed	5,578	5,662	5,600 / 5,722	5,600	5,600
Number of units in program (1)	2,063	2,063	2,063 / 2,063	2,063	2,063
Efficiency					
Average income served as a percentage of Area Median Income	38%	40%	40% / 38%	40%	40%
Service Quality					
Occupancy rate (2)	99%	98%	95% / 100%	95%	95%
Outcome					
Occupancy rate	NA	98%	95% / 99%	95%	95%

(1) Includes all FCRP multifamily units, the Woodley Hills mobile home park and the Coan Pond working singles residences; does not include senior housing properties and certain special needs programs.

(2) Measure includes all FCRHA-managed FCRP multifamily rental properties, excluding active senior properties.

Department of Housing and Community Development

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Affordable Housing - Section 8

Objective

To obtain a Section 8 Management Assessment rating of 90 percent or better on a 100-point scale in the categories of timeliness and quality of inspections, rent calculations, lease-ups and contract enforcement, as well as in nine other areas specified by HUD.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Individuals housed	9,103	9,317	9,000 / 9,636	9,000	9,000
Efficiency					
Average income served as a percentage of Area Median Income	21%	21%	30% / 19%	30%	30%
Service Quality					
Utilization rate (1)	100%	100%	98% / 103%	98%	98%
Percent on-time recertifications	100%	100%	95% / 100%	95%	95%
Percent on-time inspections	100%	100%	95% / 100%	95%	95%
Outcome					
HUD SEMAP rating (2)	102%	100%	90% / 100%	90%	90%

(1) Due to federal budget cuts through sequestration, voucher funding reserves needed to be used in FY 2013 to fill the gap between funding needed to sustain housing for program participants and avoid terminations.

(2) FCRHA achieved HUD "High Performer" status for the Housing Choice Voucher program in FY 2013.

Department of Housing and Community Development

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Affordable Housing - Elderly Housing Assisted Living

Objective

To maintain an occupancy rate of 92 percent or higher and accurately track the cost for two subsidized Assisted Living facilities that contain a total of 112 beds.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Assisted Living clients housed (1) (3)	108	102	102 / 102	100	100
Efficiency					
Assisted Living cost per client (2)	\$31,625	\$36,224	\$33,000 / \$32,967	\$34,000	\$34,000
Service Quality					
Assisted Living occupancy rate (3)	96%	88%	86% / 90%	90%	90%
Outcome					
Assisted living overall customer satisfaction rating	93%	100%	92% / 100%	92%	92%

Assisted Living Measure

(1) Refers to the number of beds in use as of the end of the fiscal year.

(2) Includes all operating costs except major capital expenditures.

(3) Individuals housed and occupancy rate are expected to remain lower than normal due to attrition in anticipation of building renovations at the Lincolnia Senior Housing Campus (Mason District)

Department of Housing and Community Development

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Affordable Housing - Elderly Housing Independent Living

Objective

To maintain a customer satisfaction rating of 90 percent or higher and maintain an occupancy rate of 95 percent or higher.

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Independent Living individuals housed (1)	410	504	504 / 502	498	498
Efficiency					
Independent Living cost per client	\$10,551	\$10,734	\$12,000 / \$11,632	\$14,000	\$14,000
Service Quality					
Independent Living occupancy rate	99%	99%	95% / 99%	95%	95%
Outcome					
Independent Living overall customer satisfaction rating	91%	95%	90% / 96%	92%	92%

Senior Independent Measure

(1) Refers to households served in all senior independent living units, including those managed by the FCRHA and properties managed by third-party firms under contract with the FCRHA, as of the end of FY 2013. The number of individuals housed is lower due to attrition in anticipation of renovations of the Lincolnia Senior Housing Campus; this is reflected in current and future estimates

Department of Housing and Community Development

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Affordable Housing - Home Ownership

Objective

To obtain a Program Assessment rating of 95 percent or better on indicators addressing sales rate, foreclosures and rate of participation.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
First-time homebuyers	51	32	30 / 42	40	40
Efficiency					
Cost per new homeowner (1)	\$5,788	\$7,981	\$8,000 / \$5,253	\$5,500	\$5,500
Service Quality					
Participant satisfaction survey scores	97%	92%	95% / 95%	95%	95%
Outcome					
Assessment rating	95%	99%	95% / 96%	95%	95%

(1) Cost per homeowner rose in FY 2012 because fewer homebuyers purchased that year, due in part to a lack of access VHDA/FHA mortgages for the purchase of ADUs. In addition, the VHDA SPARC program, which provided significant resources for first-trust mortgages in the past, was discontinued by VHDA.

Department of Housing and Community Development

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Affordable Housing – Preservation

Objective

To preserve 2,500 units of affordable housing by the end of fiscal year 2014 (from 2004 to 2014) and to leverage every \$1 in local funds invested in preservation with \$3 in non-County resources.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Number of affordable housing units preserved	33	34	160 / 168	160	160
Efficiency					
Amount of General County funds per affordable housing unit preserved (1)	\$5,838	\$0	\$30,000 / \$15,991	\$20,000	\$20,000
Service Quality					
Amount of funds leveraged per \$1 of County funds for units preserved (2)	\$18	\$0	\$3 / \$9	\$3	\$3
Outcome					
Cumulative number of affordable units preserved since April 2004	2,436	2,470	2,630 / 2,638	2,798	2,958

(1) No county funding was expended on new affordable housing preservation actions in FY 2012; however, county funding was expected in FY 2013 under the Housing Blueprint for the Preservation of Mount Vernon House senior apartments, which is reflected in the current and future estimates (in anticipation of a similar project in FY 2014).

(2) No county funding was expended on new affordable housing preservation actions in FY 2012.