May 31, 2012

Description of two (2) approaches to reorganization, Mandatory Public Housing Management System and Shared Service System. Both approaches assume that additional resources will be necessary to build out the capacity that is contemplated.

	Description	Governance	Admin and Staffing Funds	Benefits/Outcomes	Challenges/Limitations
Mandatory Public Housing Management System	Form a single, consolidated housing authority property management system consisting of local site staff, regional supervision and technical assistance and centralized back-office functions. Participation in the system would be mandatory for all small and medium LHAs with state-only hard units and Sec. 8 (167 LHAs) and optional for all other housing authorities. Housing authorities that have persistent operating problems and low performance measures could also be required to utilize this system.	Maintain local boards to function in an ownership and development capacity and link local boards to the governance of the operating system. Form a single governance structure to oversee the property management system that is accountable to Governor, legislature, housing authorities and residents. The sub-committee considered a large governance structure with representatives from all 170 LHAs meeting twice each year and electing a governing board of 11 to 13 that would meet monthly. Upon further consideration, DHCD recommends consideration of a simpler approach with a board of 13, 5 of which are LHA members elected on a regional basis, 4 of which are appointed by the Governor and would need to have extensive housing experience, 2 residents (with a history of involvement and likely appointed by the Governor) and 2 members from DHCD and ANF.	Majority of existing funds shift to public housing management system to cover site office, site managers and site maintenance/custodial staff who would be employed by this system. Small portion of funds remain with each LHA to cover an asset manager to provide a link to the management operation and assist the board with real estate issues. Build out of this system will require an estimated $8.5 to $12 million increase over existing funds to pay for central and regional supervision and TA and centralized back office functions.	Operations • Invests in highly trained central and regional staff • Improves local services by local staff on site-based activities and expands access to professional supports	Operations • More complicated and costly transition due to current staff contracts that must be transitioned. • Some local administration functions & staff (e.g., bookkeeping) shift to central office
				Governance • Governance of operations becomes highly skilled and more accountable • Local governance focuses on high priority issues of ownership & development and obtaining local services/funding	Governance • Governance of new management system needs to be structured in an way to ensure that it is accountable to local boards
				Government Oversight • Focuses DHCD oversight to regulatory compliance, fiscal compliance & performance evaluation • Reduces administrative and bureaucratic infrastructure (fewer entities to monitor)	Government Oversight
Shared Service System with a combination of voluntary and some mandatory shared services	Maintenance of current operational system with the overlay of shared services that would be purchased between housing authorities.	Maintain local boards in their full capacity. Governance of the services would occur via contracts between housing authorities.	Existing funds remain with housing authorities to continue current operations. Build-out of this system will require additional funds, but no cost estimate has been done as the actual services to be shared have not yet been defined but likely to be a similar amount as the public housing management system. Pays for the purchase of shared services between LHAs.	Operations • Relatively easy transition because the services can be built out and layered on top of current system. • In some places, local services improve due to input of skilled shared services.	Operations • Approach is less sustainable and efficient if purchase of services is voluntary. • EDs retain responsibility for all functions, some of which require skills and experience that exceed the typical labor pool (given salary, training and sometimes part-time limitations) • Unclear how an LHA acquires more skilled services/support if no other LHA in its area can provide them (or it chooses not to participate).
				Governance • Local governance remains as is.	Governance • Governance of operations remains with local boards that are often not equipped to supervise property management functions. • Unclear how shared services would be governed.
				Government Oversight • If mandatory, helps to shift DHCD oversight to regulatory compliance, fiscal compliance & performance evaluation.	Government Oversight • Expands administrative infrastructure by increasing the number of entities to monitor • Distracts DHCD from its regulatory role by requiring more centralized technical assistance supports to small and medium LHAs