

ADDENDUM TO RAB COMMENTS REGARDING THE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND PHA RESPONSES TO THE 2026 ANNUAL PHA PLAN

Note--The Public Hearing Comments from 9/10/2025 and PHA responses to them were reviewed by and discussed with the Resident Advisory Board at their meeting on 9/24/2025.

Public Hearing Comment #1—Grievance Policy

RAB Comment #1—What is PBRA (project-based rental assistance)?

HACM Response: It is a type of subsidy. In privately-owned subsidized housing (often referred to as “multifamily housing”), the subsidy in many units is PBRA. When a public housing authority undergoes a RAD conversion for a property, they have a choice of using Project-based vouchers (PBVs) or PBRA as the subsidy. Since HACM has a voucher program, historically, HACM has used PBVs, not PBRAs.

RAB Comment #2: Many people were not aware of their grievance rights. Can HACM start issuing grievance forms now to residents so that they can grieve something?

HACM Response: HACM has a running list of persons in public housing who have requested and are waiting for a grievance hearing due to the fact. Persons had the right to grieve something within either 5 or 10 days of an act or failure to act by HACM (the amount of days allowed for a request is depending on when the action/inaction occurred). Grievances are described in the public housing lease signed by the public housing resident. Also, the policy is posted on HACM’s website.

RAB Comment #3: Shouldn’t the Resident Organization be assisting in informing the residents about their grievance rights? Also, a lot of residents don’t know anything about grievances.

HACM Response: Yes, the resident organization (RO) can assist in getting the word out. The RO could invite the property manager to discuss the grievance process and take questions at the RO meeting, and we will be doing more education so that residents understand the process. I think we should also invite the City Attorney to a RAB meeting to explain the process. Additionally, there is also a required part of the process, required by HUD, that there be an attempt at an informal settlement between the parties—the housing authority and the resident. They meet to see if they can work out an agreement. If not, the resident still has the right to continue onto the formal grievance hearing.

RAB Comment #4: When I requested a formal grievance with the rent assistance office, I was told by the rent assistance voucher office that there is no formal grievance and that it would be an informal hearing. When the Housing Authority tells a resident that, it may cause a grievance to be past that time period and residents may have missed their opportunity. Also, it should not be just evictions that it applies to but anything.

HACM Response: It is correct that there is no formal grievance process in the voucher program, although the informal hearing is a lot like one.

For issues related to the PBV programs, it falls under the normal PBV procedures, which is an informal hearing. In the response to the original public hearing comment, we have included the section from RAD Revision #4 which states, “For the termination of assistance and several other PHA determinations, PBV program rules require the PHA to provide an opportunity for an informal hearing, as outlined in 24 CFR § 982.555.”

For other issues related more to property management in RAD/PBV projects, the Project Owner would provide an informal hearing.

Also, these hearings are not just for evictions, but for many actions taken or not taken by a housing authority that impacts a resident.

However, we want to stress again—in the RAD/PBV program, it does not follow the public housing formal grievance process. It follows the process laid out in RAD Revision #4 regulations.

RAB Comment #5: If your grievance is with the manager in a RAD/PBV development, who does it go to?

HACM Response: Per the RAD regulations, it would go to the project owner, who in this case is ultimately HACM. That would be someone that was not a part of the original decision, so not the housing manager. It could be a supervisor or some other impartial member of HACM staff. Now, it is possible that in the future we could change the procedures that the RAD developments are under, but that would probably require a change to the Operating Agreement and would probably also require approval of WHEDA and/or the Investor.

RAB Comment #6: If a resident grieves their eviction notice, is their eviction put on hold until the hearing is held? And should they continue paying rent or is the rent put on hold?

HACM Response: The actual grievance policy states, “However, residency may not be terminated (even if the notice to vacate under state law has expired) until the time for the resident to request a hearing has expired, or, if a hearing was requested in a timely manner, until the completion of the grievance process.” In other words, HACM needs to hold off on taking action until the hearing, whether a formal grievance panel hearing in public housing or an informal hearing in a RAD development, is completed. The exception would be a number of types of criminal activity, which is not grievable. However, during this time, rent should still be paid by the resident.

RAB Comment #7: Why isn't HACM using an independent mediator in these situations? What if someone accidentally agrees to something that violates their rights?

HACM Response: In the informal settlement meeting, it is a meeting between the resident and the Housing Authority, usually the property manager. No one is deciding anything—it is just an attempt at the resident and management to settle the issue.

We can look at the possibility of using a mediator. It is not built into the HUD regulations that it has to be an independent mediator.

RAB Comment #8: Why do we have to go through the property manager who is biased in this case? That can go against our grievance—that is conflict of interest to me.

HACM Response: Again, this is a requirement under HUD that there has to be this opportunity for an informal settlement meeting between the property management and the resident. The resident is not bound by the meeting—they can move forward to the grievance. This is a required part of HUD's process in public housing. We can also bring in the City Attorney's office to explain this to the RAB as well.

RAB Comment #9: Can we still look at some 3rd or 4th year law students that could maybe act as the Chair/lead hearing officer?

HACM Response: That is a good suggestion, and yes, we can look at that.

RAB Comment #10: Can we add that the residents that actually want to be on these panels should have to take some aptitude tests to ensure that they have the ability to understand the laws when they are dealing with a tenant grievance? That was one of the key problems when the original process was held. Residents were on panels and they did not understand that they were violating people's rights.

HACM Response: In the prior grievance process, there would have been an attorney as the lead person on the 3 person panel, so I would have hoped that the attorney would have been looking out for people's rights.

Public Hearing Comment #2—Partnership Preference in our Administrative Plan

RAB Comment #11—Would that be on the voucher side for a homeless partnership preference? I live in a RAD/PBV property and we recently got some homeless people here?

HACM Response; HACM currently has a homeless preference but it is on the tenant-based voucher side, not on the project based voucher side. However, homeless individuals sign up on wait lists like everyone else, so I'm guessing that they had signed up on the waiting list a while ago and were pulled in order off the wait list.

On the tenant-based voucher side, they would get a preference and be moved up the wait list. However, they would need to be referred and verified by the Continuum of Care or Coordinated Entry system, so we know they meet the specific definition of homelessness.

We also have a more limited homeless preference in the public housing program but we would allow a limited number of slots.

RAB Comment #12: We did put a preference in for MATC students at risk of homelessness at Hillside, right.

HACM Response: We did put that into our ACOP, but MATC did not follow up with referrals.